CHAPTER 1

Early Franciscan Theology: An Introduction

For generations, the work of early Franciscan intellectuals has been regarded as relatively unoriginal: a mere attempt to codify and systematize the ideas of earlier authorities, above all, Augustine.[1] Thus, the tradition of thought that was founded by the first scholar-members of the Franciscan order has been almost entirely neglected in scholarly literature. By contrast, the work of later Franciscans like John Duns Scotus and William of Ockham has garnered considerable attention, on the ground that they supposedly broke from their predecessors to develop innovative ideas that laid the foundations for the rise of modern theology and philosophy.[2]

The present volume proposes to make a case for the innovativeness of early Franciscan theology, that is, the theology that was formulated by first-generation Franciscans. These scholars flourished in the 1230s and 40s at the University of Paris, which was the centre for theological study at the time. In investigating the scholarly tradition they established, I will call attention to various aspects of the context in which they worked: most importantly, the intellectual context afforded by the recently established university, the context of the Franciscan order itself, and the philosophical context associated with the translation movement of the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, which witnessed the introduction of many Greco-Arabic philosophical sources in the West.

[1] Artur Michael Landgraf, *Introduction à l'histoire de la littérature théologique de la scolastique naissante*, ed. A.M. Landry, trans. L.B. Geiger (Paris: Vrin, 1973). Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Growth of Medieval Theology (600–1300)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978). Jacques LeClercq, 'The Renewal of Theology,' in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, ed. Robert L. Benson and Giles Constable (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982). G.R. Evans, *Language and Logic of the Bible: The Earlier Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

[2] Hans Blumenberg, *The Legitimacy of the Modern Age* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985). Olivier Boulnois, *Être et representation: Une généalogie de la métaphysique moderne à l'époque de Duns Scot* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999). Louis Dupré, *Passage to Modernity: Essays in the Hermeneutics of Nature and Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, repr. 2012). Ludger Honnefelder, *Scientia transcendens: Die formale Bestimmung der Seiendheit und Realität in der Metaphysik des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 1990).

The exploration of these contextual factors over the course of the first three chapters of the book will help to contest the long-standing assumption that early Franciscans did little but systematize the tradition of Augustine, which had prevailed in the Latin West for most of the earlier Middle Ages. The subsequent chapters will treat the theological vision, theistic proof, doctrines of God and of the Trinity, Christology, as well as the Incarnational and moral theologies of the Summa. In the process, these chapters will highlight how the friars enlisted Augustine, to say nothing of many other authorities, in the effort to bolster their own unique, indeed, innovative system of thought. The present chapter sets the stage for the book's discussion in a number of ways. In the first place, I seek to define what I mean by 'early Franciscan thought' in light of the fact that there were numerous contributors to its development. For reasons that will soon become clear, I ultimately opt to focus on the so-called *Summa fratris Alexandri* or *Summa Halensis,* a multivolume text that was coauthored by leading members of the early school.

As one of the first and arguably the most significant theological synthesis to date, the *Summa* project was taken up just ten years after Francis of Assisi's death in 1226 and mostly completed by 1245, twenty years before Thomas Aquinas even set his hand to the task of authoring his own *Summa theologiae,* on which he worked between 1265 and 1274. In many respects, therefore, the *Summa Halensis* laid the groundwork for the further development of the Franciscan intellectual tradition as well as for the establishment of the burgeoning discipline of systematic theology. Following a corollary discussion of the Summa's historiography, I will evaluate the scholastic context in which it was written, laying the groundwork for an explanation of my approach to its interpretation in the remaining chapters of this book.

Early Franciscan Theology and the *Summa Halensis*

My first task in this book is to delineate the definition of early Franciscan thought that I will presuppose throughout the text. This is no easy task, because the boundaries of the early Franciscan school can be extended to include numerous thinkers who worked before the time Bonaventure's career flourished in Paris, between around 1257 and 1274, some of whom contributed to the *Summa Halensis*.

The production of this great work clearly distinguishes the Franciscan school at Paris from other Franciscan schools of thought at the time, the most academically active of which was based at the young University of

Oxford.[3] While English Franciscans and Franciscan confrères like Robert Grosseteste were certainly engaged in intensive scholarly work during the period of the Summa's authorship, the Franciscan school at Oxford did not produce any collaboratively-authored text that could be likened in size or scope to the *Summa Halensis*.[4]

Although the study of the English Franciscan school is certainly worthwhile in its own right, and there are many lines of comparison with the Parisian school to be drawn, consequently, the focus of this volume will remain on the early Franciscan school at Paris, which was truly the hub of theological activity at this time. First and foremost among the Parisian Franciscans was Alexander of Hales (1184–1245), an Englishman who undertook his education in Paris and likely assumed a chair in theology in 1220–1.[5] From this time, Alexander appears to have taught Franciscan students in Paris, who did not have a school of their own until around 1231. In 1236, Alexander himself joined the Franciscan order, perhaps after realizing that the theology he had developed to that time resonated deeply with the ethos of the Franciscan students for whom he was responsible.[6]

When he joined the order, Alexander secured for the Franciscan house of studies the permanent chair that he occupied in the theology faculty, a post he either passed on to his chief collaborator, John of La Rochelle, in 1241, or held independently of John's status until 1245, when both passed away. At this time, Odo Rigaldi took over the post of regent master of the by then well-established Franciscan school in Paris and was himself succeeded by William of Melitona.[7]

At his death, Alexander left behind him a large body of work, including a four-volume Gloss on Lombard's *Sentences*, completed

[3] A.G. Little, 'The Franciscan School at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century,' *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 19 (1926), 803–74. Michael Robson (ed.), *The English Province of the Franciscans (1224–1350)* (Leiden: Brill, 2017).

[4] James McEvoy, *Robert Grosseteste* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). Richard W. Southern, *Robert Grosseteste: The Growth of an English Mind in Medieval Europe* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986). Daniel Callus, *Robert Grosseteste: Scholar and Bishop* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955).

[5] *Magistri Alexandri de Hales Glossa in quatuor libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi* (Quaracchi, Florentiae: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1951–7), vol. 1, 56–75. According to the Prolegomena to Alexander's Gloss, Alexander was an Englishman born around 1185 in Hales Owen, now in Shropshire, to a fairly well-off, but not noble, rural family. After studying the arts in Paris, he became a master of the arts in 1210 and in the same year began teaching at Paris. Around 1215, he began to study theology, becoming a regent master around 1220–1. He died at age 57 in Paris on 21 August 1245.

[6] Keenan B. Osborne, 'Alexander of Hales,' in *The History of Franciscan Theology* (St Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2007), 1–38.

[7] Adam Jeffrey Davis, *The Holy Bureaucrat: Eudes Rigaud and Religious Reform in Thirteenth-Century Normandy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006).

prior to 1227;[8] three volumes of disputed questions dating from before he became a friar (*antequam esset frater*);[9] as well as disputed questions dating from after he became a friar (*postquam esset frater*), some of which have recently been edited, but many of which remain in need of an edition.[10] For a long time, Alexander was also credited with the so-called *Summa fratris Alexandri* ('Summa of brother Alexander') or *Summa Halensis*, though we will soon see that the question of this text's authorship is rather more complicated than such a straightforward attribution would lead us to believe.[11]

Although developed over a long career, Alexander's 'basic theological positions remained quite constant throughout his authentic writings.'[12] That said, they exhibit some unevenness in style. While the disputed questions provide relatively substantial analyses of Alexander's views on a limited set of issues, the Gloss works systematically through many key theological questions raised by Lombard and Alexander's contemporaries. Such Glossae would usually provide only terse comments about points originally raised by Master Peter Lombard, about whose work we will learn more soon. However, Alexander goes further in seeking to develop some of his own theological positions. Still, he does so in a cursory style and does not always provide significant detail on the topics he covers. This is likely because his Gloss is based upon student lecture notes that were not corrected later by Alexander himself.

While we know very little about the life and career of John of La Rochelle, he was certainly a prolific author.[13] His first work appears to have been the *Summa de vitiis*, followed by the *Tractatus de divisione*

[8] Victorin Doucet, 'A New Source of the "Summa Fratris Alexandri",' *Franciscan Studies* 6 (1946), 403–17. The critical edition of Alexander's Gloss was produced between 1951–7; the Gloss itself was probably written after 1222 and completed before 1227.

[9] *Magistri Alexandri de Hales Quaestiones disputatae 'Antequam esset frater'* (Quaracchi, Florentiae: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1960).

[10] *Alexandri di Hales Quaestiones disputatae quae ad rerum universitatem pertinent* (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica medii aevi, XXIX), ed. H.M. Wierzbicki (Rome: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 2013). *Alexandri di Hales Quaestiones disputatae de peccato originali* (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica medii aevi, XXX), ed. H.M. Wierzbicki (Rome: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 2013). *Alexandri di Hales Quaestiones disputatae de peccato veniali et de conscientia* (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica medii aevi, XXXII), ed. H.M. Wierzbicki (Rome: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 2013). *Alexandri di Hales Quaestiones disputatae de lapsu angelorum ac protoparentum* (Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica medii aevi, XXXI), ed. H.M. Wierzbicki (Rome: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 2015).

[11] *Doctoris irrefragabilis Alexandri de Hales Ordinis minorum Summa theologica* (Quaracchi, Florentiae: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1924–48).

[12] Keenan B. Osborne, 'Alexander of Hales,' 21.

[13] John of La Rochelle, *Summa de Anima*, ed. J.G. Bougerol (Paris: Vrin, 1995), 12.

multiplici potentiarum animae (c. 1233). John's *Summa de anima* (1235–6), the *Summa de articulis fidei*, the *Summa de praeceptis*, and *Summa de sacramentis* all appear to have been completed before Alexander entered the order. John also seems to have authored extensive biblical commentaries and sermons, not all of which are extant. While Alexander and John were undoubtedly the dominant figures in the early Franciscan school at Paris, we can count among them a number of others – mostly their students and successors – who also played a significant role in the school's early formation. These include the aforementioned Odo Rigaldi, William of Melitona, and even the early Bonaventure, who credits everything he had learned and written to his 'master and father', Alexander of Hales, in the prologue to the second volume of his *Sentences* commentary.[14]

Although these and other early Franciscan scholars hold many key ideas in common – on how to prove God's existence, for instance – they also contributed different intellectual abilities and emphases.[15] For instance, John clearly entertains many philosophical and legal or moral questions that do not appear to preoccupy Alexander. For this reason, the personal writings of such authors do not provide the optimal resource for determining whether the early Franciscan school had adopted a cohesive doctrinal core. By contrast, the *Summa Halensis* codifies a comprehensive account of all the main matters philosophical and theological that were debated in the day. This text was used in the education of gifted Franciscan novices at least through the time of Bonaventure and Duns Scotus.[16]

While Alexander gave his name to the project and apparently oversaw it, recent scholarship has confirmed that the text was a collaborative effort on the part of John of La Rochelle and other members of the early Franciscan school. As one author has noted, the project may have started out as an effort to turn Alexander's personal writings into a Summa, but since there were many questions which Alexander's work did not address, a team effort became necessary to fill in the gaps. In the process, a larger, coherent system was born, which exhibits the ingenuity and originality of its authors, above all, Rochelle, who evidently planned to write a large Summa of his own before his services were enlisted in the composition of the *Summa Halensis*.[17]

[14] Bonaventure, *Commentaria in quattuor libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi: in librum II* (Quaracchi, Florentiae: Collegii S. Bonaventurae), Prologue, Lib II, D23, A2, 547.
[15] Scott Matthews, *Reason, Community, and Religious Tradition: Anselm's Argument and the Friars* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001).
[16] Bert Roest, *A History of Franciscan Education (c. 1210–1517)* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 126.
[17] Ignatius Brady, 'Jean de La Rochelle,' in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, vol. 8 (Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1974), 599–602.

The Summa in question, the first three volumes of which were prepared between 1236 and 1245, consists of four massive volumes, which the English Franciscan Roger Bacon, a late contemporary of the Summists, sarcastically described as 'the size of a horse.'[18] The first volume primarily treats the nature of God, both one and Triune. The second volume is divided into two sub-volumes, which respectively cover creation and human nature, and evil and sin. The third volume deals with the Incarnation, moral life, and grace and faith. The fourth volume – as yet not critically edited – addresses questions pertaining to the sacraments.[19]

The critical edition of the first two volumes was prepared in the College of St Bonaventure in Quaracchi between 1924 and 1930.[20] The critical edition of the third volume was prepared under the oversight of Victorin Doucet, under the auspices of the same institution, and was published in 1948. In the Prolegomena to that volume, the product of research conducted between 1931 and 1948, Doucet assessed the work conducted by the editors of the first two volumes, publishing his analysis in English in a series of articles detailing 'The History of the Problem of the Authenticity of the Summa.'[21] As Doucet notes here, the editors of the first two volumes operated on the assumption that Alexander of Hales was the sole author of the Summa, despite a growing body of evidence to the contrary.

Among this evidence was the testimony of Roger Bacon, who claimed that others besides Alexander had a hand in writing the Summa.[22] Also

[18] Roger Bacon, 'Opus Minus,' in *Fr. Rogeri Bacon Opera quaedam hactenus inedita* vol. 1, ed. J. S. Brewer (London: Longman, Green, Longman, and Roberts, 1859), 326: *et adscripserunt ei magnam Summam illam, quae est plusquam pondus unius equi, quam ipse non fecit sed alii. Et tamen propter reverentiam adscripta fuit et vocatur Summa fratris Alexandri et si ipse eam fecisset vel magnam partem* ('and they ascribed to him [Alexander] that large Summa, which weighs more than a horse, which he did not write but others did. And nevertheless, it was ascribed to him out of reverence and called the "Summa fratris Alexandri" as if he himself had written the better part of it'). Amanda Power, *Roger Bacon and the Defence of Christendom* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

[19] Several editions of the *Summa Halensis* exist, but the first truly critical edition was that of the Quaracchi editors, *Doctoris irrefragabilis Alexandri de Hales Ordinis minorum Summa theologica*, which was completed between 1924 and 1948. The other editions are as follows: Venice (1474–5); Nuremberg (1481–2); Papia (1489); Lyons (1515–16); Venice (1575–6); Cologne (reprint of Venice, 1622). For a full list, see Irenaeus Herscher, 'A Bibliography of Alexander of Hales,' *Franciscan Studies* 5 (1945), 434–54. The fourth volume can be found online in the Renaissance edition: https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=ucm.5316866248;view=1up;seq=3;size=150.

[20] Barbara Faes de Mottoni provides a helpful reconstruction of the work of the Quaracchi editors before Doucet in *Bonaventura da Bagnoregio: Un itinerario tra edizioni, ristampe e traduzioni* (Milan: Edizioni Biblioteca Francescana, 2017).

[21] Victorin Doucet, 'Prolegomena in librum III necnon in libros I et II *Summae Fratris Alexandri,'* in *Alexandri de Hales Summa Theologica* (Quaracchi, Florentiae: Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1948); ' The History of the Problem of the Authenticity of the Summa,' *Franciscan Studies* 7 (1947), 26–41, 274–312.

[22] Roger Bacon, 'Opus Minus,' 326.

relevant was the completion between 1882 and 1902 of the critical edition of Bonaventure's oeuvre, which revealed that some minor sections of the Summa were derived from the writings of Bonaventure himself.[23] These writings are found in the fourth volume of the Summa, which had not been finished by the time of the deaths of Alexander and John in 1245. The evidence for this is the bull *De Fontibus Paradisi* (1255), in which Pope Alexander IV declared Alexander of Hales the author of the Summa and ordered William of Melitona to complete the work that remained after his death, a task in which Bonaventure and Odo Rigaldi appear to have provided some assistance.[24]

As for the earlier volumes, Doucet and his team of editors determined on the basis of both writing style and content that volumes 1 and 3 were written by an author they called 'Inquirens', most likely John of La Rochelle.[25] An unknown author called 'Considerans' appears to have assembled volume 2, which bears the mark of Alexander's influence more than volumes 1 and 3, though it also draws extensively on John's work, most notably, his *Summa de anima* and *Summa de vitiis*.[26] In the course of their research, Doucet and his team made the important discovery that, with the exception of two tractates inserted at the very end of volume 2.1 by William of Melitona, these three volumes were not subjected to any later corrections, additions, or subtractions.[27] This would seem to indicate that the initial three volumes were perceived at the time as a relatively cohesive and complete whole that was ready to withstand the scrutiny of an expert readership from 1245.[28]

Further support for this suggestion can be found in manuscript evidence which illustrates that the first three volumes of the *Summa Halensis* were employed as a primary source in the decade intervening until the fourth volume's completion in 1256.[29] This was not the only Summa of the period to be utilized as a coherent body of work despite the fact that its final sections were missing. Many authors of the period left incomplete Summae

[23] Jacques G. Bougerol, 'The School of the Minors in Paris,' in *Introduction to the Works of Bonaventure* (Chicago: Franciscan Press, 1964), 13–21. In volume 4 of the Summa, the section on *De perfectione evangelica* was likely written by Bonaventure between 1253 and 1256.

[24] Robert Prentice OFM, 'The *De fontibus paradisi* of Alexander IV on the *Summa Theologica* of Alexander of Hales,' *Franciscan Studies* 5 (1945), 350–1.

[25] Victorin Doucet, 'Prolegomena in librum III,' 360–1; cf. Victorin Doucet, 'The History of the Problem of the Authenticity of the Summa,' 310–11.

[26] Victorin Doucet, 'Prolegomena in librum III,' 367.

[27] Ibid., 334–7. *SH,* Volume 1: *De missione visibile*, 514–18; Volume 2: *De corpore humano*, 501–630; *De coniuncto humano*, 631–784.

[28] Victorin Doucet, 'Prolegomena in librum III,' 133.

[29] Victorin Doucet, 'The History of the Problem of the Authenticity of the Summa,' 296–302.

at their deaths, including Philip the Chancellor, Roland of Cremona, and even Thomas Aquinas. They could hardly help but do so given the ambitious scope of the projects they undertook, which were aimed at the mastery of all relevant material, rather like the Gothic cathedrals for which the period became famous. In no case was the incompleteness of such texts taken as a reason to avoid or delay their study. This was no less true of the *Summa Halensis.*

Although this Summa inevitably bears the marks of multiple authors, such as minor inconsistencies in style between Inquirens and Considerans, it nonetheless presents a coherent intellectual vision.[30] Neither the later editors of this text nor I myself have been able to detect any substantial doctrinal contradictions within its pages. Of course, questions remain concerning its authorship, some of which will not be possible to answer until further critical editions are produced, especially of Alexander's *post-quam esset frater* questions and other works by John of La Rochelle, some of which are being edited as part of the European Research Council project this author is directing between 2017 and 2021. The availability of these works will make it possible to determine if and how they provided the basis for certain sections of the Summa. While the questions of authorship are certainly of historical interest, however, they do not negate the internal and external evidence outlined above, which confirms the unity and integrity of the text.

Put differently, the coauthored status of the Summa does not give cause or even an excuse to refrain from researching it or to withhold judgement regarding its contents. To avoid its study on such grounds is ironically to contravene directly the manner in which the Halensian Summists intended their work to be received, namely, as the product of a joined-up school of thought, in which the role played by individual contributors was clearly too negligible to be worth mentioning. As Étienne Gilson writes, it is precisely because 'its component fragments are all borrowed from Franciscan theologians belonging to the same doctrinal school' that the Summa exhibits a 'unity of inspiration' and 'remarkably illustrates what may be called the spirit of the thirteenth-century Franciscan school of theology at the University of Paris. Even as a collective work,' Gilson elaborates, the *Summa Halensis* 'has a distinctive signification,'[31] precisely

[30] The coherence of the work has been emphasized by Elisabeth Gössmann in *Metaphysik und Heilsgeschichte: Eine theologische Untersuchung der Summa Halensis (Alexander von Hales)* (München: Max Hueber, 1964).

[31] Étienne Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1955), 327–31, quote from 327.

insofar as it is the indicator of the 'collective mind' of the early Franciscan school.

That is not to deny that the works of the Summa's individual authors provide important background to the study of this text, or that these works extend the boundaries of early Franciscan thought, as the Summa outlines it. Rather, it is simply to acknowledge that such works do not themselves offer the holistic vision into which they were integrated in the *Summa Halensis,* which achieved far more than any one author could on his own. Though there is clearly more to the study of early Franciscan thought than the study of this text, consequently, I have chosen the Summa as a starting point for research on the school, for the sake of establishing the main points on which the contributors broadly agreed and which they most wanted to pass on to later generations of Franciscans.

In this connection, I focus primarily on the theology of the Summa, that is, the sections in the work that treat the nature of God and our knowledge of him in his own right. These topics are covered mainly within volumes 1 and 3. Although my discussion of the theological material in the Summa will be heavily informed by its account in volume 2 of the relationship between God and the world, the status of creation and of the human person, these are more 'philosophical' topics, which enquire into the status of beings other than God. Thus, it seems appropriate to reserve a more in-depth study of their details for another volume. What remains to be considered now is the historiography of the Summa, that is, the history of its interpretation in modern times.

The Historiography of Early Franciscan Theology

This history is relatively brief, largely because the questions surrounding the Summa's authorship, which have been addressed above, have long downplayed the significance of the text to the history of thought. Another reason for the Summa's neglect has also been mentioned already, namely, the common perception that early Franciscan thought constitutes a relatively unoriginal effort to 'systematize' the long-standing intellectual tradition of Augustine in order to assert his authority at a time when Aristotle's recently rediscovered major works were rapidly rising in popularity.[32] Prior to the appearance of the Summa's critical edition, scholars such as Franz Ehrle and Étienne Gilson had already described

[32] Ignatius Brady, 'The *Summa Theologica* of Alexander of Hales (1924–1948),' *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 70 (1977), 437–47.

early Franciscan thought along these lines on the basis of the already available edition of Bonaventure, whose early intellectual formation was fostered by the *Summa Halensis*.[33] In his Prolegomena, consequently, Doucet simply reiterated the by then common opinion that:

> The significance of the *Summa Halensis* consists in this, namely, that both its philosophy and theology collate the tradition of Augustine, and are ordained to its defense, even though Aristotle was on the rise. Thus, it is universally and rightly seen as the foundation of the Augustinian-Franciscan school in the thirteenth century.[34]

This opinion continued to be perpetuated in some form by the major scholars of scholasticism in the early twentieth century, including not only Gilson and Ehrle, but also De Wulf, Mandonnet, and Grabmann. Following Gilson, many have credited Bonaventure with articulating in a mature form the 'Augustinian-Franciscan' system laid down by Alexander and his colleagues. As a result, Bonaventure has come to be regarded as the chief representative of early Franciscan thought, and the significance of his predecessors has been largely disregarded.[35] Even Bonaventure, however, has suffered relative neglect, owing to his perception as an immature counterpart to his Dominican contemporary Thomas Aquinas, and to his great Franciscan successor, John Duns Scotus.[36]

In the effort to accommodate the Aristotelianism of the day, Scotus is said to have rejected or at least radically revised many of the 'Augustinian' positions of his predecessors, in ways that anticipated the rise of modern theology and philosophy. As the first truly pivotal medieval Franciscan thinker, Scotus has become the focal point for scholars working on the Franciscan school. As noted above, Bonaventure takes second place, given

[33] Franz Ehrle, *Grundsätzliches zur Charakteristik der neueren und neuesten Scholastik* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1918) was among the first to label early Franciscans 'neo-Augustinians'. Étienne Gilson followed suit in his voluminous works, including his *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (London: Sheed and Ward, 1955), as did other leading medievalists like Bernard Vogt, in 'Der Ursprung und die Entwicklung der Franziskanerschule,' *Franziskanische Studien* 9 (1922).

[34] Victorin Doucet, 'Prolegomena in librum III,' 88: *Sed momentum, ni fallimur, Summae Halensianae in hoc consistit, quod omnia elementa, theologica scilicet et philosophica, huius traditionis augustinianae in ea colliguntur, ordinantur atque defenduntur Aristotele licet iam invadente. Quare et merito fundamentum Scholae augustino-franciscanae saec. XIII communiter salutatur.*

[35] Étienne Gilson, *The Philosophy of St Bonaventure* (repr. Chicago, IL: The Franciscan Herald Press, 1965). See also A.-M. Hamelin, *L'école franciscaine de ses débuts jusqu'à l'occamisme*,' *Analecta medievalia Namurcensia* 12 (Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1961). Christopher Cullen, *Bonaventure* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

[36] This perception has been perpetuated most famously by Maurice de Wulf, *Medieval Philosophy: Illustrated from the System of Thomas Aquinas* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1922).