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INTRODUCTION

In this Introduction I consider four topics. While the first three topics are relatively short, the fourth topic, Bonaventure’s anti-Judaism, merits an extensive treatment.

BONAVENTURE’S VERBAL PLAYFULNESS

As I work my way through Bonaventure’s commentary on Luke’s Gospel, I continue to be amazed at his verbal playfulness, especially in his introductions to new sections. At first I thought that his use of rhyme and alliteration was idiosyncratic. In researching Bonaventure’s sermons for what they have to contribute to an analysis of Bonaventure’s anti-Judaism, I have come across a possible source for Bonaventure’s agility with words – word lists for preachers. I give an example. Bonaventure introduces his commentary on Luke 10:20b–24 in this wise: “And indeed Christ does this by proposing a fourfold cause or reason for joy. For he shows that there will be joy for the disciples concerning God’s infallible pre-
science, irreprehensible providence, incomprehensible potency, desirable presence” (de Dei praescientia infallibili, de providentia irreprehensibili, de potentia incomprehensibili, de praesentia desiderabili). A reason for Bonaventure’s use of these rhymes may be found in Géraud du Pescher’s Ars faciendi sermones: “For the words of Sacred Scripture must be presented in an attractive way that will spur curiosity, so that listeners may be enticed by these means and may be more attentive to grasp and more ready to assimilate the information given them” (Verba enim sacre Scripture debent esse ornata et proposita curiose, ut per hec alliciantur auditores et sint magis solliciti ad intelligendum et informationem eorum avidius audiendam).¹

Chapter 7 of the Géraud du Pescher’s Ars faciendi sermones contains twelve sub-chapters of word lists (186–197). The second sub-chapter deals with Latin words ending in -is and -bilis. As the reader goes down the alphabetical list of words ending in -bilis, she finds: “Infallible: the promise of God, friendship with God, purity, the divine embrace, the reward of God, divine love, supernal glory, happiness” (Infallibilis: Dei promixio, Dei amicitia, puritas, divinus amplexus, stipendium Dei, divinus amor, gloria superna, felicitas) (p. 190).² It is to be recalled that Bonaventure used infallibilis as he set up his commentary on Luke 10:20b–24.

I am not saying that Bonaventure utilized such a word list from an author who flourished in the first half of the fourteenth century. Rather I am suggesting, along with D’Avray, that such word lists were common in his day as a means of enticing the preacher’s audience to listen to his message and of alleviating the tedium of long sermons or lectures. Perhaps, there was some mnemonic purpose also. I would also suggest that Bonaventure creatively used this tradition of rhyming introductions, for I cannot find any example of Bonaventure’s slavish use via mix-and-match of Géraud du Pescher’s word lists.

**BONAVENTURE’S DEPENDENCE UPON HUGH OF ST. CHER**

In my article, “A Comparison of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, Hugh of St. Cher, and St. Bonaventure on Luke 8:26–39,” I tracked Bonaventure’s borrowing of Scripture quotations from his older contemporary, Hugh of St. Cher (d. 1263). In preparing this annotated translation of Bonaventure’s commentary on Luke 9–16, I began to note that the Quaracchi editors often said: “Cardinal Hugh makes the same comment.” Having learned from Bonaventure to follow the wisdom of one’s elders, I followed the lead of the Quaracchi editors and began to compare in a rather systematic way Bonaventure’s exegesis with that of Hugh of St. Cher. As a result of my

---

3 *Preaching of the Friars*, p. 254: “This *ars* is, of course, an extreme case, and furthermore the author belongs to the first half of the fourteenth century, but it seems symptomatic of a tendency that is well under way in the period which more immediately concerns us.”


5 See, for example, QuarEd on p. 299, n. 9 say this about Bonaventure’s commentary on Luke 11:31: “Card. Hugh (on Matthew 12:42 and on Luke 11:31) proposes the same seven preeminent characteristics.”
comparative study, this volume is rich in its notations of Bonaventure’s dependence upon Hugh of St. Cher, not only for Scripture quotations, but also for quotations from ecclesiastical and other authorities. I refer readers, who are interested in even more detail than I can provide in the confines of this commentary, to my article, “Bonaventure’s Commentary on Luke: Four Case Studies of his Creative Borrowing from Hugh of St. Cher,” where I treat Luke 11:29–32, 11:41, 13:20–21, and 16:16. It is my firm opinion, substantiated by the four test cases studied in this article, that Bonaventure is a child of his culture and borrows from his predecessors and that his borrowing is not what we today call plagiarism. Rather it is his creative adaptation of tradition to his purposes.7

CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE OF BONAVENTURE’S INTERPRETATION OF THE PARABLES

In a future monograph I plan to explore in full detail the contemporary relevance of Bonaventure’s interpretation

---

7 Zachary Hayes, “Bonaventure of Bagnoregio: A Paradigm for Franciscan Theologians?” in The Franciscan Intellectual Tradition: Washington Theological Union Symposium Papers 2001, ed. Elise Saggau; (St. Bonaventure, New York: Franciscan Institute Publications, 2002), 43–56, esp. pp. 46–47 has called attention to Bonaventure’s view of himself as “a poor and needy compiler.” See what Bonaventure says about his work in the introduction to Book II of his Sententia Commentary in Opera Omnia 2:1: “For I do not intend to champion new opinions, but to repeat commonly held and approved ones. Let no one think that I want to be the fabricator of new doctrine. For I know and confess that I am a poor and needy compiler.” Of course, Bonaventure is not merely mouthing what his master and father, Alexander of Hales, taught him. But the point is clear that Bonaventure is deeply beholden to tradition.
of Jesus' parables in Luke's Gospel. Of the many parables that occur in Luke 9–16 I single out that of the Good Samaritan and provide brief comments on the contemporary relevance of Bonaventure's exposition as a down payment of the promised monograph.

It seems to me that vast majority of New Testament scholars maintain that most of the parable interpretation before the advent of Adolf Jülicher's two volumes on the parables was allegorical and thus to be devalued. Surely there are nuances in the viewpoints of individual scholars, for no one wants to make a sweeping generalization that all pre-Jülicher parable interpretation was allegorical. Nonetheless, I would venture to say that most New Testament scholars bypass medieval parable interpretation as irrelevantly allegorical. Perhaps, the judgment of Klyne R. Snodgrass may be taken as representative: "Allegorizing, in fact, was the primary method for the interpretation of Jesus' parables from at least the time of Irenaeus to the end of the nineteenth century.... Some Church Fathers and Reformers, of course, protested such allegorizing.... Still, allegorizing is no legitimate means of interpretation. It obfuscates the message of Jesus and replaces it with the teaching of the church."9

---


In this regard I would refer interested readers to Bonaventure’s postill on the literal sense of Luke 10:30–37 (#52–61). In his literal exegesis of the parable of the Good Samaritan Bonaventure uses Bede, Ambrose, and the Glossa Ordinaria once each. But as is his dominant mode for interpreting scripture, he interprets these eight verses via other scripture passages. An indication of the breadth of his knowledge of scripture is the fact that he takes quotations from sixteen different Old Testament books and eight different New Testament writings. The most scripture quotations stem from Psalms (8), Isaiah (5), and Sirach (5). I give a small example of Bonaventure’s literal exposition from what he has to say about Luke 10:34 (#58): “... And because this injured man was in need not only of medication, but also of a means of transport and hospitality and food, the text adds: And setting him on his own beast, as a means of transport, brought him to an inn, for hospitality, and took care of him, by giving him food. And thus he fulfilled what Isaiah 58:7 says: ‘Break your bread with the hungry and bring the needy and homeless into your home.’” In my opinion Bonaventure’s interpretation of the literal sense of Luke 10:30–37 is very much in accord with contemporary exegesis as represented in the master work of Arland J. Hultgren. Most amazing in this context is the fact that Bonaventure does not allegorize, for he first presents “the spiritual sense” in #62–64 as a distinct type of interpretation.

---

parable of the Good Samaritan as the best known example of theological and ecclesiastical allegorizing.

BONAVENTURE’S ANTI-JUDAISM

THE CONTEXTS OF ANTI-JUDAISM IN ST. BONAVENTURE’S WRITINGS

The bibliography on anti-Judaism in the Middle Ages is immense. Skilled guides for our concerns are Jeremy Cohen, Gilbert Dahan, and Robert E. Lerner. I first set Bonaventure’s writings in various contexts and then deal with specific texts in his nine folio volumes.

---

11 Gavin Langmuir, “Anti-Judaism as the Necessary Preparation for Anti-Semitism,” Viator 2 (1971): 383–389 provides this definition of “anti-Judaism” on p. 383: “Anti-Judaism I take to be a total or partial opposition to Judaism — and to Jews as adherents of it — by men who accept a competing system of beliefs and practices and consider certain genuine Judaic beliefs and practices as inferior. Anti-Judaism, therefore, can be pagan, Christian, communist, or what you will, but its specific character will depend upon the character of the specific competing system.”


INTRODUCTION

BONAVENTURE’S THEOLOGICAL CONTEXT¹⁵

At the risk of simplification in an area that is very complicated¹⁶ I state that the two primary theological influences on Bonaventure’s views of the Jews were St. Paul, especially his Letter to the Romans, and St. Augustine. As I read through the bibliography on medieval ant-Judaism, I was amazed to see how seriously patristic and medieval writers took Romans 11:25–26: “A partial blindness has befallen Israel until the full number of the Gentiles enter. And thus all Israel will be saved.” For it is only within the last thirty years that we New Testament scholars have done justice to Romans 9–11 and not considered it a mere “appendix.” In today’s scholarly literature on Paul and Romans a common view is that Romans 9–11 is the main point of Romans, as Paul vigorously argues for God’s fidelity to promises made to Israel, even though Israel has largely failed to come to faith in Jesus, the Messiah and Lord.¹⁷

¹⁵ It is impossible in the course of this presentation to go into all types of Christian anti-Jewish polemics. See Amos Funkenstein, “Basic Types of Christian anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages,” Viator 2 (1971): 373–382. Funkenstein considers four types: The various forms of “Dialogues with the Jews”; rationalism and/or philosophy applied to religious topics; attacks on post-biblical Jewish literature; argumentation that Jewish post-biblical literature contains references to Christ. See further Dahan, The Christian Polemic against the Jews in the Middle Ages.

¹⁶ See Cohen, Living Letters of the Law, p. 391: “The selected images of Jews and Judaism in Christian theology from late antiquity to the High Middle Ages that we have considered underscore the complexity and extent of that role, one that defies any simple summary or generalization.”

Augustine’s contribution to the medieval view of Jews was at least threefold and very influential. First, in the first part of his commentary on Psalm 58 Augustine underscores God’s mercy and maintains that the very existence of the Jews is a witness to God’s mercy. He writes: “It was on Cain, and, significantly, after he had slain his brother, that God put a mark, to prevent anyone killing him. This is the sign that the Jews bear today. They preserve tenaciously the remnants of their law; they practice circumcision, observe the Sabbath, slaughter the paschal lamb, and eat unleavened bread. The Jews abide; they have not been killed, for they are necessary to Gentile believers. Why? So that God may give us proof of his mercy by his dealings with our enemies.”

Second, the scriptures of the Jews bear independent witness to the Gentiles of the truth of Christianity, for neither Christians nor Jews invented the testimonies contained in these scriptures. Augustine comments on Psalm 58:1–2 in Book 18.46 of his The City of God: “Although they were conquered and oppressed by the Romans, God did not ‘slay’ them, that is, he did not destroy them as Jews. For, in that case, they would have been forgotten and would have been useless as witnesses to what I am speaking of. Consequently, the first part of the prophecy, ‘Slay them not lest they forget thy law,’ is of small import without the rest, ‘Scatter them.’ For, if the Jews had remained bottled up in their own land with the evidence of their Scriptures and if they were not to be found everywhere, as the Church is, the


Church would not then have them as ubiquitous witnesses of the ancient prophecies concerning Christ.\textsuperscript{19}

Finally, Augustine conveys the truth of Paul’s promise of the conversion of Israel at the end of days. In his commentary on Malachi 4:5–6\textsuperscript{20} in Book 20.29 of his \textit{The City of God} Augustine alludes to Romans 11:25–26 as he writes: “It is most widely maintained in the speech and hearts of the faithful that through the exposition of the Law by Elijah, that great and marvelous prophet, to the Jews in the last days before the judgment, the Jews will believe in the true Messiah, that is, our Christ.”\textsuperscript{21}

In summary, the Augustinian legacy to the Middle Ages about the Jews focused on their witness value, which was predicated on fidelity to Jewish scriptures and praxis, and the hope of their conversion at the end of days.

\textbf{BONAVENTURE’S ECCLESIASTICAL CONTEXT}

\textit{Sicut Judeis}

Papal protection of the Jews, especially those living in Rome, dates back to Pope Gregory I (d. 604) and found articulation in the Bull \textit{Sicut Judeis} of Pope Calixtus II (d. 1124). This Bull was reissued, modified by many subsequent Popes, and found its way into the Church’s


\textsuperscript{20} Septuagint numbering is employed.

\textsuperscript{21} This is my translation of CCSL xlviii, p. 752: Per hunc Heliam magnum mirabilemque prophetam exposita sibi lege ultimo tempore ante judicium Iudaeos in Christum verum, id est in Christum nostrum, esse credituros, celeberrimum est in sermonibus cordibusque fidelium.
Canon Law. As Solomon Grayzel states: “Moreover, it appears to have been repeated more frequently than any other papal utterance concerning the Jews: being used by six popes during the twelfth century (including Innocent III), by ten popes during the thirteenth, by four popes during the fourteenth (including an antipope), and by three during the fifteenth century.” It seems worthwhile to quote Sicut Judeis, for few have ever seen or read it in its entirety:

“Even as the Jews ought not have the freedom to dare to do in their synagogues more than the law permits them, so ought they not suffer curtailment of those [privileges] which have been conceded them.

“This is why, although they prefer to persist in their obstinacy rather than acknowledge the words of the prophets and the eternal secrets of their own scriptures, thus arriving at an understanding of Christianity and salvation, nevertheless, in view of the fact that they have begged for our protection and our aid and in accordance with the clemency which Christian piety imposes, we, following in the footsteps of our predecessors of happy memory.... Grant their petition and offer them the shield of our protection.

“We decree that no Christian shall use violence to force them into baptism while they are unwilling and refuse, but that [only] if anyone of them seeks refuge among the Christians of his own free will and by reason of faith, his willingness having become quite clear, shall he be made a Christian without subjecting himself to any opprobrium. For surely none can be believed to possess the true Christian faith if he is known to have come to Christian baptism unwillingly and even against his wishes.

“Moreover, without the judgment of the authority of the land, no Christian shall presume to wound their persons, or kill them, or rob them of their money, or change the good customs which they have thus far enjoyed in the place of their habitation. Furthermore, while they celebrate their festivals, no one shall disturb them in any way by means of sticks and stones, nor exact forced service from any of them other than such as they have been accustomed to perform from ancient times. Opposing the wickedness and avarice of evil men in such matters, we decree that no one shall dare to desecrate or reduce a Jewish cemetery, or, with the object of extorting money, exhume bodies there interred.

“Should anyone, being acquainted with the contents of this decree, nevertheless dare to act in defiance of it – which God forbid – he shall suffer loss of honor and office or be restrained by the penalty of excommunication, unless he make proper amends for his presumption. We desire, however, to place under the protection of this decree only those [Jews] who do not presume to plot against the Christian faith. Given....”

---

If one asks about the effectiveness of the frequently re-issued *Sicut Judeis*, one must remember that the medieval papacy was far less powerful than its contemporary counterpart and that *Sicut Judeis* really had no penal bite. As Grayzel soberly comments: “The penal clause, contained in this Bull as in practically all others, was rarely, if ever, enforced. No one, as far as one can tell, was actually removed from office or made to suffer excommunication for converting Jews by force or even for the tortures and murders to which they were subjected throughout the bleak years of the Middle Ages.”24 And implicitly harkening back to Augustine’s notion of Jewish witness and God’s plan of salvation for Jews, Grayzel concludes his article: “Probably the greatest protection offered by the Church was its constant reminder of human decencies and its reference to the Jewish people as an integral part of the Divine Plan.”25

IV LATERAN COUNCIL

Decrees 67–70 of IV Lateran Council (1215), which concerned the Jews, reveal another dimension of Bonaventure’s ecclesiastical context.26 Decree 67 forbade Jews, under any pretext, from extorting heavy and immoderate usury from a Christian. Decree 68 stated that Jews and Saracens “of either sex, and in all Christian lands, and at all times, shall easily be distinguishable from the rest of the populations by the quality of their clothes.” This decree also forbade Jews from going about in public during the Sacred Triduum and on Easter Sunday.27 Decree 69 continued the ban on Jews holding public of-

---

fice and thereby having power over Christians, and Decree 70 concerned those who, despite voluntary baptism, still retained elements of their former faith.

THE BURNING OF THE HEBREW TALMUD AT PARIS IN 1242

Nicholas Donin, a convert from Judaism, persuaded Pope Gregory IX that the Jewish Talmud contained deviations from biblical norms and blasphemies. The only secular ruler to follow the Pope’s demand that the Talmud be investigated was King Louis IX of France. Jeremy Cohen describes what happened after Louis IX had the Talmud put on trial: “The clerical court found the Talmud guilty as charged and condemned it to the stake.... Twenty or twenty-four wagonloads of manuscripts – probably ten to twelve thousand volumes – were burned in Paris in the Place de Grève over the course of one and one-half days in 1242.” At least two things are significant about this tragic event. First, it raised the question about the Augustinian theory of the value of the witness of the Jews. Were the Jews giving witness solely to the Bible or also against Christianity in their halackic and haggadic commentaries on the Bible found in their Talmud? Second, Bonaventure was a student in Paris in 1242. To what extent, if any, were his views of the Jews influenced by the burning of the Talmud?

I pause to give an answer to this second question by taking a quick look at what Bonaventure’s teacher, Alexander of Hales (d. 1245), taught about the Jews.\textsuperscript{31} It is very instructive to see how Alexander of Hales argues the question, “Whether the Jews are to be tolerated?”\textsuperscript{32} He gives a positive response, arguing by means of the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX and the Augustinian legacy of Jewish witness and Jewish salvation at the end of time. Alexander is very much aware of the burning of the Talmud at Paris in 1242. In the second point of his argument he raises an objection to the toleration of the Jews: “Moreover, in their book, which is called Talmud, many things were contained that blasphemed Christ and the Blessed Virgin. Therefore, since they observe the teaching of this book as a law, they are to be dispersed together with books of this kind.” To this objection he responds: “Concerning the second point it must be said that their books, in which blasphemies of this sort are contained, are to be burned. But they, if they pertinaciously persist in blasphemy of this kind, having been convicted before a judge, are to be fittingly punished. But it is a different matter if they blaspheme secretly.”

Bonaventure’s passion treatises, in any narrow sense, but only to position them within a Parisian ‘textual environment’ that was also rich in symbolic action, to see them in association with what Paul Strohm has termed, in speaking of late fourteenth-century England, ‘a broad array of roughly contemporary statements and gestures.’\textsuperscript{31} While admitting Bonaventure’s creativity, I also recognize how traditional he was and underscore what he says at the beginning of his commentary on Book II of the Sentences about his dependence upon his Master, Alexander of Hales. See Opera Omnia 2:1.

\textsuperscript{32} See his Summa Theologica III: Secunda Pars Secundi Libri (Quaracchi: College of St. Bonaventure, 1930) #740 (pp. 729–730). This question occurs under the title of “Concerning Jews and pagans,” which in turn is a subheading of “Concerning those sins by which divine omnipotence is dishonored,” which for its part falls under the larger section “About the species of actual sin.”
Alexander of Hales argues from the bases tradition provided him: Pope Gregory IX’s version of *Sicut Judeis* and the Augustinian legacy. He also manifests the fairness of a judge: First show me the public evidence and a recalcitrant blasphemer, then I’ll mete out a fit punishment.\textsuperscript{33} It would seem that Bonaventure, Alexander of Hales’ student, would follow in his master’s footsteps.

**COMPULSORY JEWISH ATTENDANCE AT CHRISTIAN SERMONS**

Beginning around 1245 a new wave of Christian missionary activity among the Jews commenced. In a 1245 letter to the Archbishop of Tarragona Pope Innocent IV incorporates an earlier royal edict of King James I of Aragon: “Likewise, we desire and we hereby decree, that whenever the Archbishop, bishops, or Dominican or Franciscan Friars, visit a town or a place where Saracens or Jews dwell, and whenever they want to preach the word of God to the said Jews or Saracens, these shall gather at their call, and shall patiently listen to their preaching. And our officers, if they want to attain our favor, shall, heedless of excuse, compel them to do so.”\textsuperscript{34} In Robert Chazan’s view: “A militant Church sought, and often received, the support of the secular overlords of the Muslims and Jews in forcing them to hear Christianity’s message delivered by trained, learned, and elo-


\textsuperscript{34} See Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the Thirteenth Century*, p. 257.
quent preachers.” There is no evidence that Bonaventure trained preachers for this new mission.

**LEARNED JEWISH RABBIS REQUIRED TO DEBATE WITH CHRISTIAN PREACHERS**

The most celebrated example of such disputations is that between Paul Christian and Rabbi Nahmanides. Paul Christian (d. 1274) was converted from Judaism by the Dominican Raymond of Penyafort (d. 1275) and joined the Dominican Friars. In the summer of 1263 King James I of Aragon summoned Rabbi Moses ben Nahman (Nahmanides) of Gerona to debate with Paul Christian before the royal court in Barcelona. According to the Latin source for this debate Paul Christian intended to prove the truth of four propositions: 1) “that the messiah, which means Christ, whom the Jews have been awaiting, has undoubtedly [already] come; 2) that the same messiah, as had been prophesied, should at once be divine and human; 3) that he in fact suffered and died for the salvation of the human race; 4) that the legal or ceremonial [provisions of the Old Testament] terminated and were supposed to terminate after the arrival of said messiah.” What is amazing is that Paul Christian’s proofs are taken from the Old Testament and from the self-same Talmud which had earlier been found to contain blasphemies and errors. There was no doubt in the mind of King James I who had won the debate. The king proceeded to order the Jews to attend sermons of the Dominican friars, that blasphemous passages be deleted from Jewish books, that a censorship commission be established to accomplish the aforemen-

---

35 *Daggers of Faith*, p. 48.
tioned expurgation, and that Paul Christian be empowered to engage in missionary activity among the Jews.\textsuperscript{38}

Such disputations along with sermonizing in synagogues established a new pattern of Christian missionary activity among the Jews. The Jew was no longer “the intellectual Jew”\textsuperscript{39} or “the hermeneutical Jew,”\textsuperscript{40} but the real Jew. One can ask whether Bonaventure ever moved beyond treating the Jew as an abstraction, “the intellectual Jew,” and ever got caught up with the new evangelization of the Jews, “the real Jew.” I think that Gilbert Dahan is correct to answer in the negative.\textsuperscript{41} Bonaventure seems to have been a dyed in the wool Augustinian traditionalist. That is not to say, however, that Bonaventure transcended the milieu of anti-Judaism in which he was reared. But I’m ahead of myself and will return to my presentation of the contexts of Bonaventure’s anti-Judaism.

**THE REPRESENTATION OF THE JEWS IN PREACHING**

The Jews are portrayed negatively most frequently in sermons that deal with themes of Christ’s passion.\textsuperscript{42} They are also the subjects of “exempla,” which were very


\textsuperscript{39} See Dahan, *Les intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs*, p. 585.

\textsuperscript{40} See Cohen, *Living Letters of the Law*, pp. 2–3 and n. 3.


\textsuperscript{42} See also treatises on Christ’s passion, e.g., *Sermo de Vita et Passione Domini*, which is attributed to St. Anselm and also bears the title, *Stimulus Amoris*, and is found in PL 184:953D–966A. For a full discussion, see Thomas H. Bestul, *Texts of the Passion*, especially pp. 92–98 where Bestul discusses Bonaventure’s “passion texts.”
popular in medieval sermons. One example story, dating from about 1250, can be titled “A Jew Falls into a Stinking Pit.” Although it ostensibly deals with the necessity of repenting when one is young, it is really an attack on Jewish literal interpretation of scripture, which prevents Jews from seeing the true spiritual and messianic meaning of scripture. The preacher says: “There are some who are advised to turn from sin, but they say that they are still too young. They say that when they are older, they will stop sinning. It will happen to them as it did to a Jew that I read of. There was once a Jew who on their Sabbath fell into a foul, stinking pit. Along came a man who saw him in this pit and wanted to help him out. But the Jew said no, because it was his Sabbath day: ‘Therefore, you shall not labor for me, and I will not labor for you.’ And so this passersby let the Jew remain there. Within a little while the stench of this pit was so great that the Jew died there. Truly, I’m very afraid that these men will not turn from their sin until such time as they die of its stench.”

Sara Lipton makes the persuasive case that exempla against the Jews were the basis for their largely negative portrayal in the Bible moralisée, two representations of which she studied and dated to Paris in 1225. Lipton writes: “The fact that numerous visual signs in the Bible moralisée seem to be inspired by exempla confirms the suspicion that the imagery of the manuscripts was created by, and conforms to the approaches of, those early thirteenth-century clerics who were engaged in formu-

43 Translation adapted from Joan Young Gregg, Devils, Women, and Jews: Reflections of the Other in Medieval Sermon Stories (Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 1997), 215, 233.
lating and disseminating effective popular preaching techniques.”

But there is also a very positive image of the conversion of the Jews in the Bible moralisée. Here the roots are not in St. Paul or St. Augustine, but in Venerable Bede’s allegorization of Tobit. Lipton presents two examples. In her figure 4 she provides a roundel of Tobit 11:10–11 along with its commentary roundel which shows that the elder Tobit’s joyous welcome of his son and daughter-in-law is compared to the ultimate conversion of the Jews at the end of the world. Lipton writes of figure 85: “The text interpreting the elder Tobias’ cure from blindness (Tob 11:13–16) confidently predicts the collective conversion of the Jews: ‘The gall of the fish [applied to Tobias’ eyes] signifies the malice of the devil, which first the Judaic people will have perceived working within the Antichrist; then when the Lord will have taken it [or: him] away from their midst at the end of the world, all will be illuminated by the faith of Christ.” Lipton has directed me to Bede’s commentary on Tobit and to the sculptures of Tobit at Chartres.

I translate Bede’s allegorical commentary on Tobit 11:11–14, which stands behind Lipton’s figures 4 and 85: “And embracing him, he kissed him along with his wife, and was weeping for joy. Judea, at the end of time, embraces Christ with joy and weeps for joy because it believes, and it weeps for sorrow because it has come to the Lord so late. Then Tobit, taking the fish’s gall, anoints his father’s eyes. And the Lord reveals to believ-

---

46 Images of Intolerance, p. 19.
48 Images of Intolerance, p. 205, n. 20.
ers more clearly how great was the wickedness of the ancient dragon, which once ago tried to devour him in the passion, but instead killed his members through this, that is, he lost those he had formerly held in his grasp. *From the eyes of Tobias a white skin began to come off like the skin of an egg*, after his eyes had been anointed with the fish’s gall. And he received his sight. And the people of the Jews, after they realize that the most wretched malice of the most wicked enemy has been dispersed, will receive the light.”

Bede’s very positive view of the Jews harkens back to St. Paul and to St. Augustine, but he alone is the one who sees this interpretation in Tobit 11. Bede’s interpretation of Tobit is found in the sculpture work at Chartres Cathedral, whose building is almost co-extensive with the life of Bonaventure – 1200–1260. As Adolf Katzenellenbogen comments: “The cycle of Tobit and Tobias occupies the whole outer archivolt (of the north transept) and acts as frame for the four other cycles. It has to be read clockwise from the left to the right. If interpreted in accordance with the commentary of Venerable Bede, the cycle ... gives an all-inclusive illustration of the final salvation of the Jews by Christ and the Church.” If we recall that the artwork in me-

---


dieval cathedrals not only inspired admiration, but also taught the faithful, we can see what a positive view of
the Jews the cycle of Tobit and Tobias projected.

THE LARGELY NEGATIVE VIEW OF THE JEWS IN ARTWORK

My last point about the teaching value of medieval artwork in its various forms, especially at Chartres Cathedral, leads naturally to this point. I refer to the work of Heinz Schreckenberg.51 Although much that Schreckenberg presents comes from a later period, there is sufficient material from miniatures in psalters or evangelaries, panel paintings, and sculptures to indicate the largely negative way such art depicted the Jews, especially under the categories of Ecclesia and Synagoga. But in his section on “Reconciliation of the adversaries” Schreckenberg presents some art pieces that give a positive view of the Jews.52 I give the one example of a miniature contained in a manuscript of Honorius Autun’s exposition of the Shunamite woman in The Song of Songs 6:13. This miniature dates from the second half of the twelfth century and depicts the Shunamite woman along with five Jews in a carriage whose wheels are the four gospels. Above the carriage, which is heading towards salvation, is the word Jews.53 In his interpretation of The Song of Songs 6:12 Honorius Autun states: “For the Jews who have converted at the end of the world will display such great behavior that the Church will be amazed and use their example. For

---

observes: “No antagonism is apparent, and the cycle ends with the salvation of Israel.”

52 The Jews in Christian Art, pp. 66–74.
53 The Jews in Christian Art, p. 72, n. 11.
they will be converted by Elijah and Enoch at the evening of the world....”  

THE POLITICAL CONTEXT OF THE JEWS

The First Crusade marks the beginnings of Jewish expulsion from Europe. In 1096 bands of armed crusaders and uncontrollable mobs attacked Jewish settlements in western and central Germany: Speyer, Worms, Mainz, Cologne, Metz, Trier, and Regensburg and Prague to the east. There were forced conversions, slaughter of those who would not convert, and self-immolation of entire families who would rather kill themselves than experience violence, forced conversion, or death at the hands of their attackers. Eleven hundred Jews fell. As far as Jewish expulsion from Europe is concerned, Gavin I. Langmuir observes: “Once Europe had fully accepted medieval Christianity, the expulsion of Jews began in earnest: from England and southern Italy in 1290, from France first in 1306 and finally in 1394, from many parts of Germany by 1350, and from Spain in 1492 and Portugal in 1497. While these expulsions were the work of secular authorities, impelled primarily by self-interested motives, no pope spoke out against them, and


by 1500 much of Europe was judenrein. Even though he considers his comparison a “superficial” one, there is much truth in the remark of Ivan G. Marcus: “A superficial comparison might suggest that just as the Christian Middle Ages were getting ‘made,’ to use Southern’s idiom, the Jewish Middle Ages were getting ‘unmade.’”

Scholars debate the causes for the increase of anti-Judaism to the point of Jewish expulsion from most of Europe. For our purposes I cite two scholars. In his 1982 book Jeremy Cohen laid heavy blame on “the friars,” who moved away from the Augustinian view of the Jews and confronted real Jews for having deserted biblical religion. In his 1999 monograph Cohen recapitulated his earlier thesis: “Some fifteen years ago I advanced the thesis that Dominican and Franciscan friars of the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries developed a new anti-Jewish ideology in Latin Christendom. I argued that this outlook condemned medieval Jews for having deserted the biblical religion which, in Augustinian terms, justified a Jewish presence in Christian society; that, seeking to diminish such a presence, the mendicant orders thereby contributed to the decline and virtual disappearance of European Jewry during the later Middle Ages; and that the new, ‘mendicant’ anti-Judaism derived from the ‘evolving self-consciousness’ of medieval Christian civilization – from the critical

56 Toward a Definition of Antisemitism (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 303.
58 The Friars and the Jews. Among the notable weaknesses of this book are Cohen’s unwarranted generalizations about the key role “the friars” had in medieval anti-Judaism. It is difficult, for example, to see how Cohen’s generalizations would apply to all 30,000 Franciscan friars who existed in 1250.
place of the thirteenth century in its development and, ultimately, from factors having little to do with the Jews themselves. In his 1999 book Cohen strengthens his arguments, but is less sweeping in his conclusions. On p. 396 he writes: “In all, the movement away from Augustinian doctrine was typically gradual, often incomplete, and notably erratic. Officially, the medieval Catholic Church never advocated the expulsion of all Jews from Christendom or repudiated the doctrine of Jewish witness; where it had effectively ceased to be operative, as in the polemic of Raymond Martin, at least an acknowledgment of Paul’s eschatological vision for the Jews remained. Still, late medieval Christendom frequently ignored the mandates implied in ‘Slay them not, lest at any time they forget your law.’ The expulsion, harassment, and persecution of its Jews by prince, cleric, and layperson alike all bespoke opposing constructions of the Jew and his Judaism – to the effect that they had no proper place in Christendom – regardless of whether such ideas directly caused any particular act of hostility.

From the evidence Cohen has presented it is clear that Dominican and Franciscan friars were involved in confrontations with “real Jews.” One bemoans any contribution the friars, Dominican or Franciscan, might have made to medieval anti-Judaism. Shortly I will present Bonaventure’s contribution and set it in the context of his total output and let my readers pronounce judgment upon it.

59 Living Letters of the Law, p. 313.
R. I. Moore locates the change in attitude and behavior towards the Jews in the fears of the Christian persecuting society, namely, Christian fear of the Jews’ ancient culture and religion, educational prowess, positions as advisers to princes and even as advisers at the papal court. Moore writes: “... Since Jews were in fact better educated, more cultivated and more skilful than their Christian counterparts legend must reduce them below the level of common humanity, filthy in their persons and debased in their passions, menacing Christian society from below, requiring the help of the powers of darkness to work evil far beyond their own contemptible capacities.” Moore, whose hypothesis has been highly influential, is more concerned with clerical grasping for power than with the thought of theologians, be these friars or not.

CONCLUSION ON BONAVENTURE’S CONTEXTS

In brief compass I have presented the theological, ecclesiastical, cultural, and political contexts of Bonaventure’s anti-Judaism. As a way of summary, I present what David Berger says about the attitude of St. Bernard of Clairvaux (d. 1153) towards the Jews, for I think that Bonaventure is much like Bernard, whose published Opera Omnia runs to eight folio volumes and can provide evidence of diverse viewpoints. Bernard’s contact with Jews was minimal, and he formed his attitude towards them almost totally on the basis of theological considerations. In his attacks upon the Cistercian monk Radulph, who was encouraging the mobs to

---

massacre Jews as he preached the Second Crusade in 1143, Bernard was a strong proponent of the Augustinian views about the Jews, especially Paul’s teaching about the ultimate conversion of the Jews in Romans 11:25–26. This is not to say that Bernard was not a conveyer of anti-Jewish prejudices. As Berger concludes: “… he was an unusually strong opponent of the destruction of Jews, yet an equally strong spokesman for anti-Jewish stereotypes and prejudices. Bernard himself, because of his very strong belief in the Biblical promises which he cites and his devotion to canon law, was able to overcome his prejudices and protect Jews from physical violence, but this achievement was no simple matter.”

ANTI-JUDAISM IN BONAVENTURE’S WRITINGS

I treat the relatively few references to the Jews in Bonaventure’s oeuvre under the following three generalizations. Bonaventure is a proponent of the Pauline teaching that the Jews will be saved at the end of time. Second, there is anti-Jewish invective in Bonaventure’s writings, especially when he deals with Christ’s passion. Third, Bonaventure does not address real Jews, but Jews in the abstract, the intellectual Jew.

THE JEWISH PEOPLE ARE ASLEEP UNTIL THE END OF TIME

In his “Sermo 20 de Diversis” (Feria Sexta in Parasceve) #6 Bonaventure interprets 1 Samuel 19:9–10 and Saul’s attempt to kill David by throwing a spear at him: “Saul,

---

64 See Dahan, “Saint Bonaventure et les Juifs” for a very fine overview.
who was the first king chosen by God, but who afterwards was rejected, signifies the Jewish people who first were accepted by the Lord and afterwards prepared the cross for its Savior.... David, strong in hand, signifies Christ. Saul, the reprobate king, signifies the Jewish people who were rejected by the Lord, wanted to crucify the Lord, but the Lord was unharmed, the spear was thrust into the wall, into his flesh because his divinity did not suffer anything evil. And it is said there that when Saul had fallen asleep, the spear was removed from him. This spear is Christ’s cross that had been among the Jews, but Emperor Constantine transferred it to the Christians. Saul, who is sleeping, signifies the Jewish people who are still sleeping.  

It seems to me that for Bonaventure the contemporary Jewish people is asleep until the last day. Relative to Bonaventure’s interpretation of the future of the Jews on the last day, we have his last published sermons or “Collations on the Six Days of Creation.” Collation 15:25 reads: “The fact that the Jews will be converted is certain because of Isaiah and the Apostle who teaches authoritatively: Though the number of the children of Israel are as the sands of the sea, the remnant will be saved. And again: A partial blindness only has befallen Israel, until the full number of the Gentiles should enter.” In Collation 16.4 Bonaventure interprets the two

---

65 This is my translation of Saint Bonaventure, Sermons de Diversis Volume I, ed. Jacques Guy Bougerol (Paris: Les Editions Franciscaines, 1993), 304. See also Bonaventure’s Lignum Vitae #30 in Opera Omnia 8:79 for a like interpretation of 1 Samuel 19. In 1993 Bourgerol also published his second volume of Bonaventure’s Sermones de Diversis. The passage I quoted above from Sermon 20.6 is the only passage of anti-Judaism contained in these sixty-two occasional sermons which take up some 765 pages.

66 Opera Omnia 5:401–402. Translation modified from José de Vinc, The Works of Bonaventure V: Collations on the Six Days (Paterson:
sons of Judah by Rahab, namely, Zerah and Perez, in Genesis 38:27–30 to refer to the calling of the Gentiles and the calling of the Jews that will be at the end: “The Jews believed at first, but they immediately drew back their hand at the time of the primitive church. But after all of the Gentiles have come in, then Zara will be born and the Jewish people will be converted.”

There are also seven passages in Bonaventure’s Commentary on Luke’s Gospel where his hermeneutic of Romans 11:25–26 is at play. In his commentary on Luke 3:2a (#5) Bonaventure clearly refers to the first part of Romans 11:25: “Likewise, it is shown that Judea is divided while Rome is united, because the plenitude of the Gentiles had to enter and the multitude of the Jews be scattered because of the sin of unbelief.”

In his commentary on Luke 4:31–44 (#85), which deals with the healing of a man and the healing of a woman, Bonaventure provides an allegorical interpretation that the man is a Gentile and Simon’s mother-in-law is the Jewish synagogue: “And therefore, the cure of a man comes first, because as it is said in Romans 11:25–26: ‘When the full number of Gentiles will have entered, then all Israel will be saved.’”

In his postill on Luke 7:1–10 (#17) Bonaventure uses Romans 11:25–26 to provide an allegorical reading of this miracle story: “The sequence of the cure shows that the greatness of Gentile faith is preferred to Israelite

---

St. Anthony Guild Press, 1970), 25–26. Bonaventure’s references are to Romans 9:27 and 11:25, which continues with: “and thus all Israel will be saved.”

faith. Romans 11:25–26 has: ‘A partial blindness has befallen Israel until the full number of the Gentiles enter. And thus all Israel should be saved.’

In his exposition of Luke 8:10 (#16) Bonaventure utilizes Romans 11:25 to explain the blindness of the Jews to the meaning of Jesus’ parables: “And this happened because of a divine judgment, according to what Romans 11:25 has: “Brothers and sisters, I would not have you ignorant ... that a partial blindness has befallen Israel until the full number of the Gentiles should enter.”

In his exegesis of Luke 13:30 (#38) Bonaventure interprets “the Jews” who were first and “the Gentiles” who were last by means of Romans 11:25–26: “A special example of this appears in the two people, namely, the Jews, who are blinded, and the gentiles who are elected. Romans 11:26–26 reads: ‘For I don’t want you to be ignorant, brothers, of this mystery ... that a partial blindness has befallen Israel until the full number of the Gentiles should enter. And thus all Israel will be saved.’

Bonaventure interprets Luke 13:35: “And I say to you: You will not see me until the time comes when you will say: Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord” in this wise (#76): “So the Lord wants to say that this Jewish people will not see Christ for their salvation unless it converts to faith and praises him. This is the final expectation in the last days after the full number of the Gentiles. So Romans 11:25–26 has: ‘A partial blindness

---

70 Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, p. 582.
72 This is my translation.
has befallen Israel until the full number of the Gentiles should enter. And thus all Israel will be saved.’ And Romans 9:27 says: ‘Isaiah cries out concerning Israel: Though the number of the children of Israel are as the sand of the sea, the remnant will be saved.’ And in this the depth of the divine dispensation is manifestly apparent, which causes the Apostle to exclaim in Romans 11:33: ‘Oh, the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God. How incomprehensible are his judgments and inscrutable his ways.’

In his postill on Luke 19:40 (#62) Bonaventure interprets “the mystery” of the stones crying out to refer to the praise of the Gentiles: “Thus the Glossa comments: ‘If blindness has befallen Israel, so that it ceases to praise God, the people of the Gentiles, their stone hearts having been softened, will believe in and proclaim their Creator.’ According to what Romans 11:25–26 says: ‘A partial blindness has befallen Israel until the full number of the Gentiles should enter. And thus all Israel will be saved.’

It seems to me that Bonaventure’s assimilation of the thought and hope of Sts. Paul and Augustine about the future conversion of the Jews was strong. Put in other words, Bonaventure is not addressing “real Jews,” for they are sleeping.

**BONAVENTURE’S TREATMENT OF CHRIST’S PASSION**

I look at this subject from what Bonaventure says in some of his shorter, devotional works, in some of his

---

73 This is my translation.
74 This is my translation.

**BONAVENTURE’S PERFECTION OF LIFE ADRESSED TO SISTERS**

In the middle of his *De Perfectione Vitae ad Sorores*, a short work of twenty pages in his Opera Omnia, Bonaventure offers his sixth meditation, which is a three and a half page reflection on Christ’s most ignominious, most cruel, most general, and most lengthy passion under the heading of “On Remembering Christ’s Passion.” In contemplating Christ’s most ignominious passion, Bonaventure observes in 6:4: “O good Jesus, O benign Savior, for not once, but multiple times you were put to shame! The more places in which a person is put to shame, the greater and more public becomes his ignominy. And behold, Lord Jesus, you are bound in the garden, slapped in the house of Annas, spat upon in the courtyard of Caiphas, derided in the palace of Herod, carried your cross on the road, crucified on Golgotha. Woe is me! Woe is me! Behold, the liberator of captives is captured. The glory of angels is mocked. The life of human beings is killed. O miserable Jews, you have well fulfilled what you have spoken beforehand: For you said: Let us condemn him to a most wretched death.”

---

75 Opera Omnia 8:107–127.
76 This is my translation of Opera Omnia 8:121. At the end of his observation Bonaventure quotes the mockers of the just person from Wisdom 2:20. Thomas H. Bestul, *Texts of the Passion*, p. 93, highlights this single passage as one that “contains a typical outburst against the Jews as the murderers of Christ.” Bestul fails to translate the “me” in the double Heu me! Heu me! (“Woe is me! Woe is me!”) and thereby misconstrues the nature of Bonaventure’s affective meditation. See how Bonaventure moves his sixth meditation to a practical conclusion of repentance for his readers in 6.10: “Woe also to those whose hearts not even such bloodshed, not even the payment of such a price, can soften with pity, inspire with kindness, inflame with zeal for good. Assuredly, these enemies of the cross of Christ are hurling at the Son of God – now enthroned at the right hand of the Father –
BONAVENTURE’S MYSTICAL VINE OR TREATISE ON THE LORD’S PASSION

I call attention to two passages in Bonaventure’s *Vitis Mystica seu Tractatus de Passione Domini*, which runs for thirty pages in his Opera Omnia.\(^{77}\) In Chapter IV Bonaventure treats the seven bonds by which the vine is tied. Bond six is the crown of thorns by which his mother, the Synagogue, that is, the Jewish people, offer coronation to Jesus Christ, our peace.\(^{78}\) As Bonaventure continues his reflection on this sixth bond, he considers the blood shed thrice by the faithful soul’s Spouse: “Behold, O bride, your spouse, blood red in his perspiration, flagellation, crucifixion. Lift up the eyes of your mind and see whether this is the tunic of your Spouse or not. Behold, a most evil wild beast, a rabid dog, the Jewish people\(^{79}\) devours him. A most evil wild beast condemns your son, your brother, your Spouse.”\(^{80}\)

---

worse blasphemies than did the Jews of old while he hung on the cross.” I have modified de Vruck’s translation, 1.245–246. See Opera Omnia 8:123.

\(^{77}\) Opera Omnia 8:159–189.

\(^{78}\) Opera Omnia 8:166.

\(^{79}\) I have translated *plebs* by “people.” Bestul, *Texts of the Passion*, pp. 93–94 makes much of this single passage and even goes so far as to give a quasi-Marxist interpretation of *plebs* as “the mob,” who are opposed by the dominant class. His conclusion is redolent of special pleading: “By the thirteenth century *plebs* was *undoubtedly* a disparaging term, describing the un-noble and the subjected, a resonance that *must be* heard in Bonaventure’s usage” (p. 94; emphases mine).

Chapter XX continues Bonaventure’s reflection on the rose of Christ’s passion as he discusses Christ’s third shedding of his blood, which occurred when “impious Jews” plucked his cheeks and drew blood. Bonaventure concludes his meditation: “I see the sacrilegious hands of this most impious nation, which is not content with striking, slapping, and covering with spittle the adorable face of Jesus all-good, but now is also enkindled to pluck his cheeks and draw from that most sweet face the blood which reddens our rose. I see in this Lamb without blemish a patience worthy of admiration and imitation, as he turns in all meekness his most pure cheeks to the harrowing of most impure nails, so that, if ever shame should cover our own face for his sake, we may suffer patiently.”

BONAVENTURE’S TREE OF LIFE

There are four anti-Judaistic passages in Bonaventure’s Lignum Vitae, which is eighteen pages long in his Opera Omnia. In this work Bonaventure discusses four fruits of The Tree of Life found in the mystery of Christ’s passion. He opens his meditation on “Jesus, handed over to Pilate” with these words: “O horrible impiety of the Jews, which could not be satiated by such insults but went further and, raging with the madness of wild


81 Opera Omnia 8:184–185. Translation of de Vinck 1:196 modified. Note the exhortation to imitation that concludes this meditation. See Bestul, Texts of the Passion, p. 95 for an argument that Bonaventure’s attempt to inspire resulted “in a subtext with a strong, but much different meaning, a subtext that surely led to the arousal in the reader of emotions quite other than love of Christ” (emphasis mine). It seems that Bestul commits a methodological error as he universalizes from his own private experience.

82 Opera Omnia 8:68–86.
beasts, exposed the life of the Just One to an impious judge as if to be devoured by a mad dog.\textsuperscript{83}

In his meditation on “Jesus, joined with thieves” Bonaventure twice considers Jesus’ prayer that his Father forgive his enemies: “...the most mild Lamb prayed out of the sweetness of his kindness to his Father for those who were crucifying him and deriding him ...‘who in all his torments did not once open his mouth to say even the slightest word of complaint or excuse or threat or abuse against those accursed dogs. Rather he poured upon his enemies words of a new blessing not heard since the beginning of the world.”\textsuperscript{84}

In his multi-layered meditation on “Jesus, pierced with a lance” Bonaventure comments: “Behold how the spear thrown by the perfidy of Saul, that is, of the reprobate Jewish people, through the divine mercy fastened in the wall without making a wound (1 Samuel 19:10) and made a cleft in the rock and a hollow place in the cliff as an abode for doves (The Song of Songs 2:14).”\textsuperscript{85}

Finally, there is the long meditation on “Jesus, bathed in gore” where Bonaventure uses the Joseph story from Genesis 37:31–33 in a typological manner: “Recognize,

\textsuperscript{83} Opera Omnia 8:77 (#23). Translation is from Ewert Cousins, Bonaventure: The Soul’s Journey into God, The Tree of Life, The Life of St. Francis (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist, 1978), 145. Bonaventure introduces his reflection on “Jesus, condemned to death” with: “Pilate was not ignorant of the fact that the Jewish people were aroused against Jesus not out of zeal for justice but out of envy” (Opera Omnia 8:77 [#24]; Cousins, p. 146).

\textsuperscript{84} Opera Omnia 8:78 (#27); Cousins, p. 150. Bonaventure is dependent on Anselm here; see PL 158:155D–156A.

\textsuperscript{85} Opera Omnia 8:79 (#30); Cousins, p. 155. See above on Sermo 20.6 of Bonaventure’s Sermones de Diversis for a similar interpretation of 1 Samuel 19:9–10.
therefore, O most merciful Father, the tunic of your beloved son Joseph, whom the envy of his brothers in the flesh has devoured like a wild beast and has trampled upon his garment in rage, befouling its beauty with the remains of blood, for it has left in it five lamentable gashes. For this is indeed, O Lord, the garment which your innocent Son willingly gave over into the hands of the Egyptian prostitute, that is, to the Synagogue, choosing to be stripped of the mantle of his flesh and to descend into the prison of death rather than to seek temporal glory by acquiescing to the shouts of the adulterous people.  

**BONAVENTURE’S SUNDAY SERMONS**

In his fifty Sunday Sermons I have found five passages that relate to Christ’s passion and contain anti-Jewish sentiments. Bonaventure’s Sermon 6, “Dominica infra

---


67 Bonaventure preached many more sermons than these fifty, which were edited by Bonaventure and his secretary, Friar Marcus de Montefeltro, sometime during the years 1267–1268. These fifty sermons are thus representative of and an “official” redaction of Bonaventure’s sermons. See *Sancti Bonaventurae Sermones Dominicales*, ed. [J.] G. Bougerol, Bibliotheca Franciscana Scholastica Medii Aevi 27 (Grottaferrata: Collegio S. Bonaventurae, 1977), 127. I do not consider *Sermones Dominicales*, p. 183 (Sermon 7 #10 on Luke 2:48 for “Dominica infra Octavam Epiphaniae”), which deals with the Virgin Mother’s third sorrow concerning the blindness and malice of the Jews, to whom she extends the compassion she has for sinners. Nor do I take into account *Sermones Dominicales*, p. 377 (Sermon 35 #9 on Luke 16:2 for “Dominica Octava post Pentecosten”)
Octavam Nativitatis,” has as its text Luke 2:34, “This child is destined for the ruination and resurrection of many in Israel and for a sign that will be contradicted.”

It is a long meditation on Christ the good physician and the salvific medicine that he brings. I translate paragraph 6 as a representative passage of Bonaventure’s anti-Judaism:

“Third, Christ as salvation on account of his voluntary acceptance of the death inflicted upon him was destined for the ruination of the impious. For on the cross Christ, like a bunch of grapes crushed in the winepress, gave forth through the wounds of his flourishing body a fragrant liquid for the healing of all diseases and most sufficient for salvation. But the impious Jews take so much offence at this medicinal liquid that they incur the ruination of death and multiply ruination upon ruination by spurning the medicament that is most salubrious and the antidote by which the human race was saved. They are like toads, which are so repulsed by the good

where Bonaventure discusses the carnal Jews in the desert, who abandoned their reasoning power on account of their gluttony and murmured against God. In *Sermones Dominicales*, pp. 448–449 (Sermon 46 # 5 on Matthew 22:7 for “Dominica Decima Nona post Pentecosten”) Bonaventure has almost the identical treatment of the carnal Jews in the desert.

*Sermones Dominicales*, pp. 169–178.


I have been unable to discover an exact reference for Bonaventure’s view of the toad fleeing the vineyard. See, however, Louis Charbonneau-Lassay, *The Bestiary of Christ: With Woodcuts by the Author*, translated & abridged by D. M. Dooling (New York: Parabola Books, 1991), who on p. 170 says this about the medieval view of the toad: “Although the frog does not necessarily inspire disgust, the toad on the contrary is everywhere the object of general revulsion, as much because of its pitiable gait as it drags itself along as on account
and fragrant aroma that issues from the vineyard that they turn around and flee. Of this it is said in Proverbs 29:16: ‘When the impious are multiplied, crimes will be increased. But the just will behold their ruination.’ Truly when the impious Pharisees were multiplied, crimes were increased, when ‘the high priests and the Pharisees took counsel how they might seize Jesus by stealth and put him to death.’ But the just, that is, the apostles, saw their ruination when the children and heirs of the kingdom were cast outside through divine reprobation and the Gentiles reclined in the bosom of Abraham through merciful adoption.

Bonaventure's Sermon 14, “Dominica in Quinquagesima,” has as its text Luke 18:32–33: “For he will be delivered to the Gentiles, and will be mocked and scourged and spit upon. And after they have scourged him, they will put him to death.” In paragraph 13, after his description of how in their cruel malice the Jewish people fulfilled Luke 18:32–33, Bonaventure comments: “And what is worse: they put him to death solely out of jealousy, according to what was prefigured in the murder of Abel, about whom it is said in 1 John 3:12: ‘Cain, who was of the evil one ... why did he kill his brother? Because his own works were wicked, but his brother's just.’ Perverse Cain, who killed his just brother solely out of jealousy, signifies, by reason of his malignity, the Jewish people, who killed Christ, born from the Jewish people and nation, because they were envious of his good deeds. And this is what Christ said to them: ‘I have per-

of its wart, which exudes at times a disgusting, poisonous slime.”

91 This quotation is a conflation of John 11:47 and Matthew 26:4.
92 The allusions are to Matthew 8:11–12. See Sermones Dominicales, p. 173.
formed many good works among you. For which work do you want to kill me? For this is Christ who has fulfilled all mysteries whatsoever of the Old Testament.

In Sermon 29, “Dominica Secunda post Pentecosten,” Bonaventure preaches on Luke 14:16: “A certain man made a great supper and invited many.” In paragraph 5 we read: “Third, Christ is said to be that man in a most fitting way on account of the power of his wondrous strength in working many miracles. So John 11:47 states: ‘The Pharisees said: What are we to do since this man is performing many signs?’ For he has raised the dead, cleansed lepers, given sight to the blind, extended mercy to the lame and feeble, liberated those oppressed by demons, and cured every disease. And despite these good works which he has performed among you, most wicked Jews, you seek to kill him. ‘O insanity and greatest perversity! You are angry with the one who brings healing, but are not angry with the one who wounds.’

In Sermon 32, “Dominica Quinta post Pentecosten,” Bonaventure takes as his text Matthew 5:22: “Everyone who is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment.” In paragraph 12 Bonaventure presents what seems like a stereotypical remark about the Jews: “Certainly, if angry people would attend to this judgment (Jude 14–15), they would never crucify their brother by

---

94 This is not an exact quotation from John 10:32.
95 This is my translation of *Sermones Dominicales*, pp. 232–233.
96 *Sermones Dominicales*, p. 336. Bonaventure alludes here in a general way to Bernard of Clairvaux’ Sermon 42, n. 3 on The Song of Songs. Bonaventure also “quotes” this same passage in Sermon 6.5 in *Sermones Dominicales*, p. 172. See SBOp 2:34: “O astonishing perversity! The person is angry with his physician when he should be angry with the archer who shot him.”
means of the poison of slander, as the Jews are said to have crucified the Lord through poisonous speech. 97

In Sermon 46, “Dominica Decima Nona post Pentecosten,” Bonaventure gives a homily on Matthew 22:7: “But when the king heard of it, he was angry, and, having sent his armies, destroyed those murderers.” In paragraph 4 Bonaventure interprets “the armies” of the parable as the Romans under Titus and Vespasian and “the murderers” as the Jews who persecute the saints, that is, the apostles who were sent to them. 98

In conclusion to my presentation of the passages of anti-Judaism in Bonaventure’s Sunday Sermons I offer the generalization similar to the one I made earlier about Bonaventure’s Occasional Sermons: Considering that Bonaventure’s Sunday Sermons cover 350 pages, 99 five passages or two pages, while hardly excusable, is not overwhelming.

BONAVENTURE’S COMMENTARY ON CHRIST’S PASSION IN LUKE 22–23

There are eight passages. In his commentary on Luke 22:4 (#5) Bonaventure writes: “The thirst of avarice motivated Judas, and the thirst for cruelty motivated the high priests. And therefore, they together entered into an evil and perverse pact.” 100

Luke 23:10 reads: “But the chief priests and the scribes were standing by, constantly accusing him.” In his

97 Sermones Dominicales, p. 360.
98 See Sermones Dominicales, p. 448.
99 Sermones Dominicales, pp. 131–480.
100 Opera Omnia 7:541. Translations are mine.
comment (#12) Bonaventure observes: “Now this constancy was not a virtue, but it was pertinacity, because it did not spring from a love of justice, but from the malice of envy. For it is this that arms the heart to impugn one’s neighbor, as Augustine says: ‘Through every sin the virus of the ancient enemy floods the human heart, but the passion of envy swamps all human emotions. It is this that armed Cain against his brother Abel, and the sons of Jacob against Joseph, the Babylonians against Daniel, and the Jews against Christ.”

In his commentary on Luke 23:11–12 (#15) Bonaventure quotes part of the Glossa Ordinaria: “And so these two (Herod and Pilate) designate the persecution of the two peoples against Christ. So the Glossa: Like Herod and Pilate, so the Jews and Gentiles, although dissimilar in nationality, religion, and perspective, nevertheless are united in persecuting Christians and destroying faith in Christ.”

In remarking on the Jewish preference for Barabbas in Luke 23:19 (#23), Bonaventure notes: “And this was the greatest wickedness: to grant life to a destroyer of life and to seize life away from the fount of all life.”

---

101 Opera Omnia 7:568–569.
102 Opera Omnia 7:569. The Glossa Ordinaria, however, in column 987 continues: “In the type of Herod and Pilate who became friends because of Jesus a figure of the Jews and Gentiles stands forth, so that through the passion of Christ a future concord of both will be made, so that first the Gentiles receive the kingdom of God, and transmit the devotion of their faith to the Jew, so that they, too, may be clothed with the body of Christ through the glory of his majesty, which they previously had despised.” It is obvious that behind the Glossa Ordinaria’s commentary stands Romans 11:25–26.
103 Opera Omnia 7:570.
About the Jewish demand that Jesus be crucified in Luke 23:21 (#25) Bonaventure comments: “The wicked demanded this out of cruelty and anger.”¹⁰⁴

In his commentary on Luke 23:34 (#41) Bonaventure writes of Jesus’ prayer to the Father for forgiveness of his enemies: “Wherefore, it is also manifest in this that he was a pious and merciful high priest, offering himself and interceding for the salvation of the people. And on account of this Luke alone, who has a special interest in Christ’s priesthood, describes and narrates this prayer. Thus Bede comments: ‘Since Luke was disposed to depict Christ’s priesthood, it is fitting that the Lord in his gospel intercedes for his persecutors by reason of his priesthood.’”¹⁰⁵

In his postill on Luke 23:44–45 (#55) Bonaventure observes: “Now one must pay attention that in that darkening of the sun is understood the blindness of the Jews, and in the rending of the veil the revelation of the scriptures which was made to the Gentiles. So it is said in John 9:39: I have come for judgment on this world, so that those who do not see may see and those who see may become blind. Or, it could refer to the end of time about which Psalm 103:20 says: You have appointed

¹⁰⁴ Opera Omnia 7:571
¹⁰⁵ Opera Omnia 7:577. In Opera Omnia 7:577 QuarEd rightly state in n. 2 that Bede’s text is the basis for the Glossa Ordinaria. In CCSL cxx, p. 403 Bede goes on to say: “It is sobering to note that he does not pray for those who, incited by the spurs of envy and pride, preferred to crucify him whom they knew to be the Son of God rather than to believe in him....” The Glossa Ordinaria in column 991 comments: “Not for those does he pray, who knew he was the Son of God, but deny and crucify him out of envy and pride.”
darkness, and it became night. During it all the beasts of the forest will go about.”

Bonaventure in his commentary on Luke 23:47–48 (#57–58) follows Bede and the Glossa Ordinaria: “So in this centurion appeared the quickness among the Gentiles to believe, and on the contrary the hardness among the Jews leading to disbelief” (#57). And #58: “Now ‘this crowd’ refers to the people of the Jews, who even though they saw the truth, as the centurion had, only beat their breasts, but did not break out with a vocal confession.”

**BONAVENTURE DOES NOT ADDRESS REAL JEWS, BUT JEWS IN THE ABSTRACT**

In his commentary on the meaning of “the elder brother” of Luke 15:24 Hugh of St. Cher distinguishes between four meanings of “the Jews.” Since Hugh of St. Cher’s distinctions have important bearing on Bonaventure’s consideration of the Jews, I quote him at length: “Notice, however, that in the development of the parable about the Jewish people, they are mentioned in different times and different persons, according to the Rule of Ticonius. For at one time the text speaks of the Jewish people according to the state of certain ones

---

106 Opera Omnia 7:581. The Glossa Ordinaria in columns 993–994 does not mention the blindness of the Jews, but states: “...but Luke is concerned to join the miracle of the sun with the miracle of the veil. Now the veil is torn, so that the ark of the covenant and all the sacraments of the law which had obtained may appear and go over to the Gentiles.”

107 Opera Omnia 7:582.

108 Ticonius [d. ca. 423] is famous for his seven rules of interpretation [of the Bible]. See Augustine’s *Doctrina Christiana* III, 30–37 for these rules, none of which seems to apply to the case at hand. Nonetheless, Hugh’s point is very well taken.
among the modern Jews who search deeply into the prophets and attain some degree of spiritual understanding. At other times it speaks with respect to the state of those who preceded the coming of Christ and did not worship idols. And at other times it speaks with respect to the state of those who were there at the time of Christ; namely, the Scribes and Pharisees. At other times it speaks with respect to those living in the last times who will convert at the preaching of Elijah and Henoch.”

From what I have been able to observe, Bonaventure focuses attention on the Jewish people from three aspects: those who preceded the coming of Christ and often serve as types of the New Testament; the scribes and Pharisees who were present at the time of Christ and were mainly his opponents; those living at the last times. Like Hugh of St. Cher, Bonaventure does not address contemporary or “modern” Jews. Or in terms of our current scholarly argot Bonaventure deals with “the intellectual Jew” or “the hermeneutical Jew.”

In our preceding discussions we have seen that Bonaventure deals with the Jews living during the last times through his dependence upon St. Augustine, who in turn was dependent on what St. Paul said in Romans

109 A Commentary on The Parable of the Prodigal Son by Hugh of St. Cher, OP (†1263), translated, with introduction and notes by Hugh Bernard Feiss (Toronto: Peregrina, 1996), 63. In his interpretation of Luke 15:28, “His father, therefore, came out and began to entreat with his elder son,” Hugh of St. Cher comments: “that is, the last Jews, whom the Lord will call at the end through his preachers. Not the modern Jews, because no one preaches to them and they are not now called to faith.” See A Commentary on The Parable of the Prodigal Son, p. 71.
110 Dahan, Les intellectuels chrétiens et les juifs, p. 585.
111 Cohen, Living Letters of the Law, pp. 2-3 and n. 3.
11:25–26. In our considerations of what Bonaventure said about Christ and the Jews in his accounts of the Passion we have glimpsed his typological use of the Old Testament. For example, both Joseph and David are types of Christ.

The onus of this final section is to view additional passages in Bonaventure’s works that deal with his treatment of the Jews who lived during the time of Christ. The first group of passages comes from Bonaventure’s Sentence Commentary and might as readily be discussed under the rubric of Bonaventure’s presentation of Christ’s passion. The second group of passages stem from Bonaventure’s Commentary on the Gospel of Luke.

OBSERVATIONS ABOUT THE JEWS IN BONAVENTURE’S COMMENTARY ON THE SENTENCES

The greatest single bulk of Bonaventure’s corpus consists of the 3,868 pages that comprise his four folio volumes of commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard. In these four volumes there are four small passages, actually dubia or doubts that need clarification. These, in one theological way or another, deal with the role of the Jews during Christ’s passion. I summarize and sometimes translate these passages.

In Book I of his Sentence Commentary distinction 48 dubium II Bonaventure considers the cause of the Passion. I summarize: In the genus of action the Jews did not cause the passion, whose cause was Christ’s good intention, which directed his voluntary passion towards a noble end. The action of the Jews was evil and dis-
pleasing to God, but Christ’s passion was good and pleasing to God.\textsuperscript{112} In Book I of his Sentence Commentary distinction 48 dubium III Bonaventure takes up the evil of Christ’s passion. I offer this summary: It is a good action that Christ suffered by the Jews, that is, Christ endured the penalty that the Jews inflicted upon him. However, the infliction of the passion upon Christ is evil.\textsuperscript{113}

In Book II of his Sentence Commentary distinction 40 dubium III Bonaventure deals with the question “that the Jews, in crucifying Christ thought that they were showing obedience to God.” And he answers: “I respond that this does not refer to all Jews, but only to the simple who were deceived by their leaders. For the Jewish leaders, that is, the high priests and scribes, were moved out of envy and malice, because they well knew his sanctity and innocence, even though his divinity escaped them. But the simple and common people were moved out of ignorance, for hearing from their leaders that he had blasphemed, they thought that by killing Christ, a blasphemer, they were thus showing obedience to God. This ignorance, however, does not excuse, because the works that Christ performed could offer an indication of his sanctity not only to the great, but also to the little.”\textsuperscript{114}

Book III of his Sentence Commentary distinction 20 dubium III concerns the teaching that “Christ was handed over by the Father and that he handed himself over” and asks whether God was somehow responsible for Christ’s death. Bonaventure resolves: “And thus it is

\textsuperscript{112} See Opera Omnia 1:860–861.
\textsuperscript{113} See Opera Omnia 1:861.
\textsuperscript{114} Opera Omnia 2:934.
obvious that death on the part of the one undergoing it was pleasing and acceptable to God, but on the part of those inflicting it was merely permissible.¹¹⁵ Bonaventure goes on to say that his consideration of the rule of God’s providence, as treated in Books I and II of his commentary on the Sentences, answers the question of why God permitted another to be killed when God could have prevented it.

**WHAT BONAVENTURE’S COMMENTARY ON LUKE’S GOSPEL SAYS ABOUT THE JEWS WHO LIVED DURING CHRIST’S TIME¹¹⁶**

As I worked through Bonaventure’s 601-page commentary on Luke’s Gospel, I was shocked by the virulence of some of his anti-Judaistic comments and pleasantly surprised that his anti-Judaism was as limited as it was. I present the passages of Bonaventure’s anti-Judaism that I have detected.

It is common for Bonaventure to engage in anti-Judaism when he comments on polemical passages. Take, for example, his commentary on Luke 7:31 (#57): “Now the Lord said: To what then will I liken, etc. After our Savior had extolled the privilege of virtue in John, he now argues against the perfidy of disbelief among the people. His argument against their disbelief is fourfold. For he points out their *infidelity, hardness, detraction, and blasphemy.*¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ Opera Omnia 3:433.
¹¹⁶ I presuppose that the remarks Bonaventure makes about the Jews in his Commentary on Luke are similar to those he makes about the Jews in his Commentary on John. See Opera Omnia 6:237–530.
¹¹⁷ *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke,* p. 620. For similar comments about the “perfidy” of the Jews, see Bonaventure’s exposition of Luke 14:2 (#4) and Luke 14:4 (#7) which occur in a polemical context.
Two of Bonaventure’s most virulent anti-Judaistic passages occur in the commentary published in this volume. In his interpretation of Luke 11:32 (#68) Bonaventure quotes Chrysostom and does so by following the text of Chrysostom he found in Hugh of St. Cher’s commentary on this verse: “Therefore, the hardness of the unbelieving Jews is greatly condemned. So Chrysostom says: ‘Within three days the Ninevites became God’s people, although they had not had prophets. Within the three days of the crucifixion the Jews became the people of the devil. The former escaped imminent vengeance; the latter have suffered the most atrocious vengeance.’”

In his commentary on Luke 11:51 (#98) Bonaventure again quotes Chrysostom: “This is the generation, from which punishment will be required. But in this punishment it will be especially required of the Jewish nation, for perfidy was consummated in them. So Chrysostom says: ‘Just as God promised to good people through many generations that Christ would come, but bestowed him as a gift to the last holy ones, so too what God threatened to evil people through individual generations God has now rendered to the final generation. For never was such grace given to men and women as that which came in Christ or has such destruction come upon impious people as upon the Jews.’”

---


119 See the commentary below on Luke 11:51 for more detail.
During the course of his interpretation of the parable of Luke 19:11–27 Bonaventure expounds Luke 19:14, “But his citizens hated him,” under the category of “the obduracy of human perfidy in the rebellion of the Jewish people.” He agrees with the Glossa Ordinaria that “the citizens” refer to the Jews.\textsuperscript{120}

As he gives his postill on the parable of Luke 20:9–19, Bonaventure comes to Luke 20:14: “Let us kill him that the inheritance may become ours.” His interpretation is: “They said this in a perverse scheme, not in order to acquire a new inheritance since Christ was extremely poor, but to preserve the old one....So this evil proposal stems from avarice as well as from envy....A figure of this occurred earlier in the story of Joseph. Genesis 37:18–20 states: ‘His brothers thought of killing him and said to one another: Behold, the dreamer is coming. Come, let us kill him and cast him into some old cistern. We will say that a most evil wild beast devoured him.’\textsuperscript{121}

Luke 21:4 reads: “For all these from their abundance have put gifts into the Temple treasury, but this poor widow from her want has put in all that she had to live on.” Bonaventure interprets the rich to be “the Jews,” whose abundance is their presumption in their own righteousness. The poor widow is the church gathered from the Gentiles.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{120} Opera Omnia 7:479 (#21).
\textsuperscript{121} Opera Omnia 7:506–507. On p. 507, n. 3 QuarEd mention that in the Roman Breviary for the Friday of the Second Week of Lent the Joseph story is read in conjunction with Matthew 21:33, which is a Synoptic parallel to Luke 20:14. See my earlier discussions of Bonaventure’s use of the Joseph story in his Mystical Vine and Tree of Life.
\textsuperscript{122} Opera Omnia 7:522–523 (#8).
If I add the aforementioned six instances of anti-Judaism to the eight I detected in Bonaventure’s commentary on Luke 22–23, I come to fourteen embarrassing occurrences. While I deplore these references, I note that they come to some four pages in a commentary of six hundred and one pages.

CONCLUSION

During the course of this long section on Bonaventure’s anti-Judaism I have set Bonaventure within his larger context and have provided anti-Judaistic passages from the nine volumes of his massive output. To me it seems manifest that Bonaventure is a traditionalist in the mold of St. Paul and St. Augustine when it comes to the Jews. But no matter how learned and saintly he was, he could not successfully slough off his medieval skin of anti-Judaism. As one pours through his voluminous writings, his anti-Judaism will surface, especially when he is considering Christ’s Passion and dealing with the failure of the Jews of Jesus’ time to acknowledge Christ, who worked so many miracles, as Son of God.

I give the last word to Robert E. Lerner, who concludes his study of Bonaventure and others who went against the medieval grain by being more favorably disposed to the Jews: “To avoid clumsiness I have occasionally fallen back on the term philo-Judaism, but the more accurate phraseology for the stance of my subjects would be ‘relatively more benign attitude towards the Jews than the late medieval Christian norm.’”

123 The Feast of Saint Abraham, p. 120. Lerner treats the views toward the Jews of Joachim of Fiore (d. 1202), Gerardino of Borgo San Donnino (d. ca. 1276), St. Bonaventure (d. 1274), Peter Olivi (d. 1298), John of Rupescissa (d. 1365), John of Bassigny (fl. 1360), Frederick of Brunswick (d. ca. 1392), Francesc Eiximenis (d. 1409), and
OUTLINE OF
ST. BONAVENTURE’S
COMMENTARY ON LUKE,
CHAPTERS 9-16

Before giving a detailed outline of this volume of commentary, I remind my readers that Bonaventure has a fourfold division of Luke’s entire Gospel:

I. Luke 1-3: The Mystery of the Incarnation;
II. Luke 4-21: Christ’s Magisterial Preaching;
III. Luke 22-23: The Medicine of the Passion;

So Bonaventure’s commentary on Luke 9-16 occurs in Part II of his overall outline and has the following sections:
INTRODUCTION

LUKE 9

Lk. 9:1-11:13  The sending forth of those who understand and how they should preach #1
Lk. 9:1-62  The mission of the Apostles #1
Lk. 9:1-17  The form to be used in preaching #1
Lk. 9:1-9  The formation of preachers through divine precept #1-14
Lk. 9:10-17  Formation by divine deed and example #15-28
Lk. 9:18-45  The way to be used in making progress #29
Lk. 9:18-27  The difficulty of the way #29
Lk. 9:18-22  Christ is to be known through faith #29-36
Lk. 9:23-27  Christ is to be imitated by means of the cross #37-42
Lk. 9:28-45  The joy of glory #43
Lk. 9:28-31  Revelation of promised glory #43-55
Lk. 9:32-36  Consideration of the glory revealed #56-69
Lk. 9:37-45  Confirmation of the glory manifested #70-84
Lk. 9:46-62  The norm of presiding #85
Lk. 9:46-50  Humility of soul #85-93
Lk. 9:51-56  Equanimity in zeal #94-101
Lk. 9:57-62  Perspicacity in judgment #102-111

LUKE 10

Lk. 10:1-11:13  The mission of the disciples #1
Lk. 10:1-24  The form of preaching #1
Lk. 10:1-3  The appointment of the disciples who are accompanying Christ #2-6
Lk. 10:4-16  The formation of those going forth on mission #7
Lk. 10:4-7  The common formation for all going on mission #7-13
Lk. 10:8-16  Special formation concerning different audiences #14-27
Lk. 10:17-24  The consolation of those returning #28
Lk. 10:17-20a The repression of false happiness #28-33
Lk. 10:20b-24 The Savior's invitation to genuine happiness #34-42
Lk. 10:25-42 The form of living #43
Lk. 10:25-29 The commandment that regulates one's life #44-51
Lk. 10:30-37 A parable illumines the commandment of life #52-64
Lk. 10:38-42 A human example illustrates the form of life #65-80

LUKE 11

Lk. 11:1-13 The form of praying #1
Lk. 11:1 Jesus as an example of prayer #1-3
Lk. 11:2-4 Jesus teaches his disciples how to pray #4-17
Lk. 11:5-13 Jesus gives motivation for prayer #18-35
Lk. 11:14-21:38 The falsehood of Jesus' Jewish adversaries is refuted in four different ways #36
Lk. 11:14-14:35 The deceitfulness of the Jews who falsely judge Christ's miracles is refuted in two ways #36
Lk. 11:14-13:9 Christ refutes the Jews' deceitfulness and fallacy and instructs his disciples #36
Lk. 11:14-54 Christ confutes the deceitfulness of the Jews #36
Lk. 11:14-28 The fallacy of those blaspheming is refuted in a threefold manner #36
Lk. 11:14-16 The expression of Jewish deception #37-42
Lk. 11:17-26 Rejection of the deception expressed #43-57
Lk. 11:27-28 Commendation of the truth proven #58-63
Lk. 11:29-32 The fallacy of those who are disbelieving #64-69
Lk. 11:33-54 Christ refutes the fallacy of the hypocrites #70
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 11:33-36</td>
<td>Christ commends the simplicity of a right intention</td>
<td>#71-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 11:37-54</td>
<td>Christ confutes the deceitfulness of wicked hypocrisy</td>
<td>#77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 11:37-41</td>
<td>Christ rebukes duplicity</td>
<td>#78-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 11:42-54</td>
<td>The threat of misfortune</td>
<td>#85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 11:42-44</td>
<td>Woes against the Pharisees</td>
<td>#86-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 11:45-54</td>
<td>Woes against the lawyers</td>
<td>#89-102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:1-59</td>
<td>Christ gives instruction on how to avoid the fallacy he has just refuted</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:1-12</td>
<td>Instruction on how to avoid duplicity arising from timidity</td>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:1-3</td>
<td>Instruction on how to avoid deceit</td>
<td>#1-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:4-7</td>
<td>Christ strengthens his disciples to repel timidity</td>
<td>#8-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:8-10</td>
<td>Christ urges his disciples to preserve the truth</td>
<td>#12-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:11-12</td>
<td>Christ offers assurance in the face of persecution</td>
<td>#17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:13-59</td>
<td>Instruction on two kinds of solicitude</td>
<td>#21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:13-34</td>
<td>About the solicitude that is avarice</td>
<td>#21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:13-15</td>
<td>Discursive teaching against avarice</td>
<td>#21-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:16-21</td>
<td>Christ gives a frightful example against avarice</td>
<td>#26-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:22-28</td>
<td>Christ gives an unassailable argument against avarice</td>
<td>#32-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:29-34</td>
<td>Christ deters from avarice by promising the things that are desired</td>
<td>#41-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:35-59</td>
<td>Encouragement about the anxiety that is providence</td>
<td>#49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:35-48</td>
<td>Encouragement through considering the second coming</td>
<td>#49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse Range</td>
<td>Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:35-40</td>
<td>Christ urges all to the anxiety that is vigilance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:41-48</td>
<td>Christ urges the prelates to be vigilant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:49-13:9</td>
<td>Christ urges vigilance from a consideration of the first advent and censures negligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:49-53</td>
<td>The efficacy of Christ’s first coming prompts vigilance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:54-13:9</td>
<td>Christ rebukes negligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 12:54-59</td>
<td>Christ rebukes negligence in acknowledging grace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LUKE 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse Range</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:1-9</td>
<td>Negligence with regard to doing penance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:1-3</td>
<td>Censure of such negligence through an example Christ has heard about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:4-5</td>
<td>Censure of negligent repentance by an example Christ has seized upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:6-9</td>
<td>Censure of negligent repentance by an example Christ has thought of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:10-14:35</td>
<td>Christ refutes his opponents who argue that he works his miracles at the wrong time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:10-35</td>
<td>Christ refutes his opponents during an assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:10-17</td>
<td>Christ argues against his opponents that the Sabbath is a time for performing miracles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:18-35</td>
<td>Good deeds are to be done without interruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:18-21</td>
<td>Examples from nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:22-35</td>
<td>The revelation of a divine decree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:22-30</td>
<td>The severity of the divine strictness in judging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Passage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 13:30-35</td>
<td>The sublimity of the divine disposition in redeeming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 14:1-35</td>
<td>Christ refutes his opponents during a banquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 14:1-6</td>
<td>Christ confutes the Pharisees who were watching him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 14:7-24</td>
<td>Christ instructs the reclining banqueters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 14:7-11</td>
<td>Christ instructs those invited to a wedding banquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 14:12-15</td>
<td>Christ instructs those invited to the banquet of a household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 14:16-24</td>
<td>Christ instructs those invited to the eternal banquet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 14:25-34</td>
<td>Christ instructs the crowds following him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 14:25-27</td>
<td>Christ instructs the crowds by explicit teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 14:28-34</td>
<td>Christ instructs the crowds in parables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 15:1-17:19</td>
<td>Threefold confutation of the Jews’ lack of mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 15:1-2</td>
<td>A threefold expression of Jewish lack of mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 15:3-32</td>
<td>The manifestation of God’s mercy is described in three parables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk. 15:3-7</td>
<td>The parable of the lost sheep</td>
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THE SENDING FORTH OF THOSE WHO UNDERSTAND AND HOW THEY SHOULD PREACH

1. Then having summoned the Twelve, Jesus, etc. In the previous three main sections of this part of the Gospel the Evangelist dealt with the teaching of Jesus Christ. Through this teaching the disciples themselves had been inspired in what they should believe, encouraged in the things they should imitate, and instructed in what they should understand. Now follows the fourth section which concerns the sending forth of those who understand and how they should preach. Now the order of this section is sufficiently clear in itself. For some preachers are of higher status, but others are of lower status. So this section has two parts. The first deals

---

1 On p. 216 n. 8 QuaerEd rightly mention that the Vulgate does not have Jesus (“Jesus”). See Bonaventure’s Commentary on Luke 4:1 for his outline of Luke’s Gospel.
with the mission of the Apostles. The second with the mission of the seventy disciples, where Luke 10:1 below reads: Now the Lord appointed seventy others, etc.

THE MISSION OF THE APOSTLES

The present chapter itself forms the first part and has three sections, according to the three things that the Evangelist considers necessary for Apostles and prelates\(^2\) who have been sent forth to preach. The first is the form to be used in preaching. The second concerns the way to be used in making progress, which the Evangelist explains in verse 18: And it came to pass as he was praying in private. Third is the norm to be used in presiding, which is described in verse 46: Now a discussion arose among them which of them was the greatest.

THE FORM TO BE USED IN PREACHING

Now he explains the form to be used in preaching in a twofold way. First, a divine precept stands behind it. Second, it has a divine example where Luke 9:10 reads: And the Apostles on their return announced\(^3\) to him.

\(^2\) The main point behind Apostle and prelate is “having been sent by one in authority.”

\(^3\) On p. 216, n. 11 QuaReD correctly indicate that the Vulgate has narraverunt (“told”) whereas Bonaventure reads nuntiaverunt (“announced”).
Luke 9:1–9

THE FORMATION OF PREACHERS THROUGH DIVINE PRECEPT

Now relative to the formation of preachers through divine precept the Evangelist introduces three points, namely, the authority committed to them, the integrity enjoined upon them, and the benefit attached to their work. Authority is given first place as the leader. Integrity is present on the way, as 9:3 says: And he said to them: Take nothing for your journey. In third place he adds benefit as the consequence of the mission where 9:6 reads: And going forth, they went about ... preaching the gospel and working cures everywhere. – Now words, no matter how genuine their preacher may be, are ineffectual unless divine testimony backs them up. And such are the divine miracles. So in this first part there is first an explication of the granting of power to perform miracles and then the commissioning with the authority needed to preach the mysteries. For the first paves the way for the second.

2. (Verse 1). So with regard to the granting of power to perform miracles the text says: Then Jesus, having summoned the twelve apostles, that is, as the primary prelates, chosen from all others, according to what is said in Luke 6:13 above: “Jesus summoned his disciples. And from these he chose twelve, whom he also named Apostles.” Therefore, these had been summoned, that is, called together into unity to commend unity, for which the Holy Spirit is given, according to what is said in Acts 2:1: “And when the days of Pentecost were drawing to a close, all the disciples were together in one place.” Thus Numbers 11:16–17 has: “The Lord said to Moses: Gather unto me seventy men ... at the door of the tab-

4 The Vulgate does not read discipuli (“the disciples”).
ernacle of the covenant.... And I will take of your spirit and give it to them.” – That is the way it is now. So the text adds: *He gave them power and authority*, so that they would have power over spiritual matters and authority over corporal matters. And to give a further explanation of this the text continues: *over all the demons*, referring to their power; *and to cure diseases*, referring to their authority. And by this means their mission would have a double type of witness, in accord with the two types of creature, namely, spiritual and corporal. And this is what is expressly mentioned in Mark 3:15: “He gave them power to cure sicknesses and cast out demons.” So there is true fulfillment of what the Psalmist says: “The Lord will give the word to those who preach good tidings with great power” (67:12).

3. (Verse 2). Now concerning commissioning with the authority needed to preach the mysteries the text says: And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God. For in their mission rests their authority, without which no one must preach. Therefore, Romans 10:15 has: “How are they to preach, unless they be sent?” So too Isaiah did not dare to preach unless he were sent. Isaiah 6:8 reads: “Behold, here am I. Send me.” Jeremiah 23:21 shows the opposite about the false prophets: “I did not send prophets, yet they ran.” But such were not the Apostles, who were called in such a way that their authority might be commended. For the word, Apostle, means having been sent. And they had been sent to preach, according to what 1 Corinthians 1:17 says: “The Lord did not send me to baptize, but to preach.” – They had been sent to preach, not some small matter, but a great one, namely, the kingdom of God. By this can be understood the teaching of the truth, according to what Matthew 21:43 has: “The kingdom of God will be taken away from you, and will be given to a people yielding its
fruits.” It can also be said to be the grace of the Holy Spirit, in accord with what Romans 14:17 reads: “The kingdom of God does not consist in food and drink, but in justice and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.” Luke 17:21 below says: “The kingdom of God is within you.” Further, it can also be said to be eternal glory, according to what John 3:5 has: “Unless a person is born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.” Through all these ways the Apostles are sent forth to preach the kingdom of God, namely, through true doctrine, divine grace, and eternal glory. – And since he had granted them the power to cure to enhance the authority of their preaching, the text adds: And to cure diseases. That is, he sent them with this power to confirm the truth they preached, according to what Mark 16:20 says: “They went forth and preached everywhere, while the Lord worked with them and confirmed the preaching by the signs that followed.” So a sign and goal of the spiritual mission of preaching is the healing of the diseases of vices in the listeners.

4. Now there are three types of evidence that the preacher is sent forth by the Lord to preach the Gospel. First is the authority of the one sending, be this of the bishop or especially of that bishop who takes the place of Peter, who for his part takes the place of Jesus Christ. So the person sent by him is sent by Christ. Second is the zeal for souls in the person who is sent, when that individual’s primary goal is the honor of God and the salvation of souls. Third, the preaching brings forth good fruit and conversion in the listeners. – By means of the first sign they are heralds of the Father, by the second heralds of the Son, and through the third heralds of
the Holy Spirit. Concerning such preachers it is said in John 15:16: “I have appointed you that you should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should remain.” And the person who is thus sent can say what Isaiah 61:1 has: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me,” etc.

5. (Verse 3). And he said to them: Take nothing for your journey. After explaining the authority by which the Apostles were commissioned, the Evangelist gives a description of the integrity of life enjoined upon them. Now there are three components to this life style, namely, a paucity of things needed to sustain life, bare essentials in clothing, and humble manner of life.

First, with regard to a paucity of things needed to sustain life, it is said: And he said to them: Take nothing for your journey, that is, in the form of temporal sustenance, so that you may preach by example what 1 Timothy 6:7 says: “For we brought nothing into the world, and certainly we can take nothing out.” And in order for his meaning to be more clear, he gives specific instructions when he says: Neither staff, namely, for support, nor wallet, for storing things, nor bread, for eating, nor money, for buying things. This verse prohibits all sustenance, so that it may be shown that the preacher must rely with deep hope on God alone, according to what 1

5 Bonaventure does not give any more detail on this somewhat cryptic interpretation.

6 In its entirety Isaiah 61:1 says: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me. He has sent me to preach to the meek, to heal the contrite of heart, and to preach release to the captives, and deliverance to those who are in prison.”

7 It is virtually impossible to do justice to Bonaventure’s verbal playfulness: In paupertate victus, tenuitate vestitus, et humiliitate convicitus. Obviously, the boundaries between these three categories are quite fluid.
Peter 5:7 reads: “Cast all your care upon him, because he cares for you.” So also Blessed Francis, when he used to send the brothers out to preach, used to say to them the words of the Psalm: “Cast your care upon the Lord,” etc. (54:23).\(^8\) However, in this matter the Lord does not forbid, as Augustine says, careful providence, but overwrought anxiety,\(^9\) according to what Matthew 6:34 says: “Do not be anxious about tomorrow…. For...sufficient for the day is its own trouble.”

6. And so (we move) to the correct understanding of this precept which one Evangelist negates, namely, Luke, and another Evangelist affirms, namely, Mark, who in 6:8 says: “And Jesus instructed them to take nothing for their journey, but a staff only.” About this matter Augustine in his The Harmony of the Gospels says: “Both precepts are from the Lord: to take nothing but a staff, and not to take a staff. Not to take a staff means not to be anxious. To take nothing but a staff refers to the power granted to preachers to receive what they need.”\(^10\) Wherefore, Luke 10:7 below reads: “Eating and

---

\(^{8}\) See 1 Celano 29: “Accepting the command of holy obedience with much joy and gladness, they humbly prostrated themselves on the ground before Saint Francis. Embracing them, he spoke sweetly and devotedly to each one: ‘Cast your care upon the Lord, and he will sustain you.’ He used to say this phrase whenever he transferred brothers by obedience.” Translation from Francis of Assisi: Early Documents, Volume I: The Saint, edited by Regis J. Armstrong, J. A. Wayne Hellmann, William J. Short (New York: New City Press, 1999), 207. Cf. St. Bonaventure’s Life of St. Francis, chapter 3.

\(^{9}\) On p. 218, n. 5 QuarEd refer to Book II, chapter 30, n. 73ff. of Augustine’s The Harmony of the Gospels. As far as I can ascertain, Bonaventure is providing the gist of what Augustine says in n. 73–78.

\(^{10}\) On p. 218, n. 6 QuarEd refer to Book II, chapter 30, n. 73ff of Augustine’s The Harmony of the Gospels. Their reference is so general, because as they astutely continue in their note 6: Augustine’s opinion is found in the Glossa Ordinaria’s interpretation of Luke 9:3. That is, Bonaventure did not check Augustine’s opinion directly or
drinking what they have.”¹¹ – Now the literal observance of this precept pertains to the perfect preachers, who perfectly imitate Christ. In their person Peter says in Matthew 19:27: “Behold, we have left all and have followed you.”¹² But its spiritual observance applies to all preachers, so that the preacher of truth may contemn earthly things. Otherwise, if they proclaim the word of God out of cupidity for lucre, they are not disciples of Christ, but of Balaam the soothsayer, according to what 2 Peter 2:14–15 says: “They have their hearts exercised in cupidity. Children of a curse, they have forsaken the right way,” that is, the way of poverty. From this way “they have gone astray. They have followed the way of Balaam...who loved the wages of wrongdoing.” – Therefore, the preacher of truth must avoid above all else the vice of cupidity. Otherwise, he will not be a preacher, but a flatterer. For which reason 1 Thessalonians 2:5 reads: “At no time have we used words of flattery, as you know, nor any pretext for avarice. God is our witness.” For he knew that by this he would provoke God’s wrath, as it is said in Micah 3:11–12: “Her princes have rendered judgments for the sake of bribes, and her priests have taught for hire, and her prophets have di-
vined for money....For this reason Zion will be plowed as a field,” etc.

7. Second, with regard to the bare essentials in clothing, the text adds: Neither have two tunics, so that the teaching of the Master may thus agree with the teaching of the Precursor in accordance with what Luke 3:11 has: “Let him who has two tunics share with him who has none.” And also this is according to what 1 Timothy 6:8 says: “Having food and sufficient clothing, let us be content with these.” Now by forbidding not one garment, but two, he provides for necessity and avoids anxiety in changing and superfluity in possessing. So Bede says: “One garment is whatever is necessary for a person according to different places and times. Two refers to what is beyond necessity.” And this is apparent with regard to the Lord himself, who besides his seam- less garment had other garments, which were divided, as it is said in John 19:23. – But according to the spiritual understanding the duplicity of simulation and hypocrisy is forbidden, lest they retain one garment in hiding and use one for public appearance and lest they be counted among those of whom it is said in Matthew 7:15: “…who come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly are ravenous wolves.” Similarly Blessed Francis avoided such duplicity, for when he was ill, he refused to have a piece of fur put on his chest inside his

---

13 On p. 218, n. 12 QuarEd indicate that these words come from the Glossa Ordinaria on Luke 9:3. Bede’s interpretation ultimately stems from Book I of Jerome’s Commentary on Matthew 10:10 (PL 26:65A) and is generalized in the Glossa Ordinaria. See CCSL cxx, p. 195 for Bede’s actual words.