

Bonaventure on Creation: A Ressourcement for the Modern World

Kasey Kimball

Humanity's relationship with the natural world in modernity is "driven by the desire for mastery and control. . . . [We] have been far more interested in using the world than in really knowing or admiring it."¹ This attitude has been shaped by modern science and technology, both of which train us to approach everything with a "technical-rational" mindset.² As the data on the state of the environment demonstrates with ever-increasing clarity, this posture toward the natural world has been disastrous for the planet. It has been costly to the physical and ontological well-being of human beings in particular: in a world of objects it is difficult to relate to anything or anyone (including God) personally.³ While it is tempting to seek solutions in modern science and technology, it seems foolish to imagine that the very technical-rational mindset that precipitated the current environmental crises could rescue us from them. What we need, rather, is to "learn to swim against the current of objectification-for-the-sake-of-mastery" by cultivating a different mindset.⁴ Given how deeply entrenched we are in the modern way of thinking, we will need help in this work. In light of this, I would like to add my voice to those who have proposed that we look to Bonaventure, the thirteenth-century Franciscan theologian and philosopher. If we can "penetrate through the distinctive medieval dimensions of Bonaventure's system,"⁵ we will find his writings to be "a vital resource . . . for meeting the challenges of the present and future."⁶

In particular, Bonaventure's encouragement to understand creation as a sacrament of the Triune God can help us love the natural world and thereby find our way back both to God and true personhood.

Modernity's View of the Natural World

Before we turn to Bonaventure, we must first get a grasp of how modern science and technology have trained us to objectify the natural world. Martin Heidegger describes technology as both "a human activity" and "a means to an end."⁷ Means and ends are situated within the four types of causality: material, formal, final, and efficient.⁸ Heidegger illustrates these four distinct but interrelated causes by describing the creation of a silver chalice: the material cause is the silver itself, out of which the chalice is made; the formal cause is the shape into which the silver is fashioned; the final cause is the purpose for which the chalice is made. The silver, the form, and the purpose are all "co-responsible" for the chalice.⁹ What about the efficient cause, the cause that "brings about the effect that is the finished, actual chalice"?¹⁰ Heidegger first names the silversmith as the efficient cause and then denies this claim.¹¹ What he wishes to draw to our attention is that a particular material (silver) does not come into a particular shape (a chalice) intended for a particular purpose (sacrifice) because of the silversmith's solitary effort in "making" it.¹² Rather, the silversmith "considers carefully and gathers together" the other three causes;¹³ he must submit to the properties of the material cause, the bounds of the formal cause, and the *telos* of the



Kasey Kimball (BA International Studies, Johns Hopkins University) is beginning her third year of an MA in doctrinal theology at Regent College. Raised on the beautiful Massachusetts coast, she spent six years on staff with InterVarsity Christian Fellowship in Baltimore, MD, before moving to Vancouver, where she is training to teach theology.

final cause. In this way, it is not the efficient cause (the silversmith) alone who makes the chalice, but the four causes together that “bring [the chalice] into appearance. They let it come forth into presencing. They set it free to that place and so start it on its way, namely, into its complete arrival.”¹⁴ In other words, the “bringing-forth” that the four causes accomplish together is a process of “revealing,” of allowing something that was once invisible to come into the open.¹⁵

Because modern technology is also bound up in means and ends, it too is a way of revealing.¹⁶ However, “the revealing that rules in modern technology is a challenging, which puts to nature the unreasonable demand that it supply energy that can be extracted and stored as such.”¹⁷ In modern science, nature appears to us as something “identifiable through calculation . . . [,] orderable as a system of information.”¹⁸ Modern technology asks everything to be part of an undifferentiated “standing-reserve” until we choose to use it.¹⁹ Heidegger later clarifies that it is the essence of modern technology rather than technology itself that sets us down a path of revealing in a narrow way, a way that does not reveal the truth of things but rather their potential to be used; in the end, we too are revealed as nothing more than an anonymous “standing-reserve.”²⁰ In short, modern technology trains us only to “order” and control the materials of creation rather than to be like the silversmith who, attentive to its material, formal, and final causes revealed the truth of a chalice.²¹

Likewise, Romano Guardini deals with the way in which modern technology invites us to ignore the truth of nature and thereby exploit it for our own benefit. Science, he says, helps us understand the world in a rational way.²² This knowledge enables us to coerce nature for our benefit in defiance of its innate limits and structure, to acquire “working rational mastery over plant and animal life.”²³ Like Heidegger’s claim that technology reveals nature as “the chief storehouse of the standing energy reserve,”²⁴ Guardini mentions that technology allows

us to “exploit” natural forces by harnessing their energy and taking it out of context.²⁵ Machines are an effective means of energy extraction, but at a high cost: they separate us from nature, and compel us to relate to it in an abstract way.²⁶ As a result of this, he says, “the sphere in which we live is becoming more and more artificial, less and less human.”²⁷ Furthermore, the pragmatic, this-worldly focus of science closes us off to the “religious element” which, he says, is “not only of an essential part of the human, but of the innermost part.”²⁸

Because modern technology reveals not the truth of nature, but its potential function as “standing-reserve,” and uses scientific knowledge to exploit and objectify nature from a distance, it enables us to have what Martin Buber calls an “I-it” relationship with creation. In “I-It” relationships, we experience by “travel[ing] over the surface of things . . . extract[ing] knowledge about their constitution from them” without their participation.²⁹ To relate to something as an “it” is to see it as a thing, as one object calcified and constrained by the many others surrounding it.³⁰ In this relationship, the “I” becomes distinct and “conscious of itself as subject (of experiencing and using).”³¹ “I-Thou” relationships, by contrast, are exclusive (in the sense that the “Thou” fills one’s field of vision) relationships of direct mutual knowing and love.³² When we relate to something as “Thou” we do not experience it at all, but know it entirely.³³ In this relationship, the “I” becomes not an “individual” but a “person and becomes conscious of itself as subjectivity.”³⁴ Buber holds that even though much of creation cannot willingly interact with us, it is possible to have “I-Thou” relationships with it in the form of “reciprocity of the being itself.”³⁵ This requires not that we notice different things about nature, but that we “become bound up in relation to it.”³⁶ Buber indicates that “I-it” relationships are necessary for the “sustaining, relieving, and equipping of human life,” which is why they have come to dominate humanity over time.³⁷ At the same time, he cautions that

when we have only “I-it” relationships, we lose our humanity and cease to be able to encounter God: the ultimate “Thou.”³⁸

Bonaventure’s View of Creation

As we have seen, modern technology makes it easy to relate to the natural world as an “it” to be mastered and used, rather than a “Thou” to be known and loved. This is detrimental to our ability to relate to a personal God, and thereby be real persons. In contrast, Bonaventure views the natural world sacramentally,³⁹ calling it a book⁴⁰ and a mirror⁴¹ because it points beyond itself to the Triune God upon whom it depends as efficient, exemplary, and final cause.⁴² He recounts how God created the visible world “as a means of self-revelation so that, like a mirror of God or a divine footprint, it might lead man to love and praise his Creator.”⁴³ Creation is the “outer book” that expresses an “inner book”: the Word (God’s Wisdom or Art) by whom he creates.⁴⁴ Human beings are unique in creation by virtue of their ability to read both books.⁴⁵ Indeed, prior to the fall, grace enabled humanity to see the internal book perfectly through the external.⁴⁶ While the entirety of creation’s existence and essence is not merely to signify God, we cannot truly understand it apart from its “essential relation”⁴⁷ to him: a relationship of analogy, like that between an image⁴⁸ and its original.⁴⁹ Indeed if we never allow ourselves to “go beyond [creatures] and arrive at God, following the invitation which things themselves give to us,” we err, and thereby both misunderstand and abuse the natural world.⁵⁰ Those who look at creation and fail to see and worship God, Bonaventure concludes, must be deaf, dumb, blind, and foolish.⁵¹

He traces this erroneous separation of the two books to Eden: after Eve chose external beauty (the apple) over internal wisdom (reason and obedience), humanity was no longer able to see God through creation.⁵² He then invites his readers to forsake the way of Eve, godless philosophy, and inductive inquiry⁵³ and instead “open your eyes, then, alert your spiritual

ears, unseal your lips, and *apply your heart* so that in all creatures you may see, hear, praise, love and serve, glorify and honor your God.”⁵⁴ Although sin mars our ability to read the book of creation, if we submit to the cleansing power of Christ and are aided by the book of Scripture, the material world can aid us in our ascent to God.⁵⁵ By “impart[ing] to the human person a certain knowledge of God,” the natural world can prompt one “to seek [him] more deeply.”⁵⁶

For Bonaventure, the material world is valuable to the spiritual life: even in “our present [that is, postlapsarian] condition the created universe itself is a ladder leading us toward God.”⁵⁷ Different parts of creation reveal God differently: all creatures are “traces” of God, rational creatures are “images” of God, and creatures “who are God-conformed” are his “likeness[es].”⁵⁸ Traces do not offer incomplete representations of God, but ones that are “distant but distinct” compared to that of the image, which is “both distinct and close.”⁵⁹ Bonaventure later specifies that “taking perceptible things as a mirror, we see God through them—through His traces, so to speak,”⁶⁰ and to do so is to occupy the lowest rung on the ladder of ascent.⁶¹ As we ascend, we carry what we learn with us so that “every higher step contains within it all that is contained in the lower.”⁶² Though our vision has been marred by sin and must be cleansed by grace, the material world remains a gift, a visible “sign from heaven” through which we can perceive the truth about the invisible God.⁶³

What Creation Reveals about the Triune God

Bonaventure takes great pains to associate various features of the natural world

Bonaventure views the natural world sacramentally, calling it a book and a mirror because it points beyond itself to the Triune God.

with particular members of the Trinity.⁶⁴ However, because this way of thinking is likely incomprehensible to modern readers,⁶⁵ let us turn to the other way in which Bonaventure understands creation to reveal the Trinity: his theology of exemplarity.⁶⁶ We have said that God creates through the Word, who is his Wisdom or Art. How does this work? Bonaventure begins his explanation inside the “dynamic and expressive” Trinity.⁶⁷ “In God,” Bonaventure says, “there is a proper relationship to productive diffusion. God’s being is supreme good, wherefore it supremely diffuses itself.”⁶⁸ As Delio explains: if God is self-diffusing good, and perfect goodness is personal love, then a perfect God must be, at his core, not mere being, but love. We see this in the Trinity: the Father loves the Son, who receives this love and then gives it to the Spirit, who binds the Father and Son together. Because the Father gives himself completely away to the Son, the Son is a perfect “likeness” or “similitude” of the Father.⁶⁹ The Son, the centre of the Trinity, expresses the “coincidence of opposites” within the Triune life: in him we see that God is uncreated and begetting, self-sufficient and self-giving, going out (*exitus*) and returning (*reditus*).⁷⁰

In addition to being the exemplar of the Trinity, the Son is the exemplar of creation.⁷¹ The Son is begotten by the Father’s self-expression, and therefore called Word.⁷² Because God is open to the Word, the “Absolute Otherness” within the Trinity, the “relative otherness” of creation becomes possible: “the Word is the ontological basis of all that is other than the Father.”⁷³ In this way, the Word contains (and is therefore the exemplar of) the infinite possibilities of God’s creative capacity;⁷⁴ God creates through the Son in the sense that the Son is the Word upon which the “external word” of creation depends as its exemplary cause.⁷⁵ As Delio puts it: “As the Word expresses the Father, creation expresses the Word.”⁷⁶ In this way, all of creation is necessarily related to the Son, after whom it is patterned:⁷⁷ “both the highest and lowest things are rep-

resented by the Word.”⁷⁸ Creation, like the Trinity, has an *exitus-reditus* dynamic to it: it comes from God, is patterned after God, and is meant to reach its *telos* in returning to God.⁷⁹ Creation will return to God as human beings (material like creation and spiritual like God) grow in likeness to the Word, who reconciled the material and spiritual in his incarnation.⁸⁰

Thus far, we have demonstrated that how we treat creation is bound up with how we think about it. In modernity, the primary way that we seek to understand the world is through abstract, rational, scientific means that only disclose the created world as something to be used. To do this is to treat the created world as an “it”: gleaning information without relating to or truly knowing it. When we only know how to have “I-it” relationships, we lose our capacity to be persons who find our being in relation with God and others. Clearly, we need a new way of thinking, not to replace science (for even Buber acknowledges that humanity would not get very far if we lived perpetually enveloped in “I-Thou” relationships), but to compliment it. I believe Bonaventure can help us on this score.

A Sacramental View of Creation

For Bonaventure, Christ is the hermeneutical key to reality. Because the Word is the world’s exemplar (in creation and in destiny), to attain true knowledge of anything, including creation, one must begin with Christ: “It is impossible to understand a creature except through that by which it was made.”⁸¹ While scientists fail to give the natural world meaning because they seek to explain it purely rationally, a sacramental perspective “gives the universe its true meaning by subordinating it to its true end, which is to show forth God to man, and to lead man to God.”⁸² One might argue that to approach the world sacramentally is merely another way to know creation only in an abstract, distant way, to objectify it by using it as a tool on a spiritual ascent away from the material. To need creation to see God, and thereby reach our

telos, the argument might go, is to exploit it. Buber himself warns against this approach, saying: “‘God in the world’ is another language of *It*.”⁸³ However, I do not believe that following Bonaventure will lead us in this direction. His theology was inspired by the life of St. Francis, who “identified each and every creature as a brother and sister” because he had learned to see Christ in them; he became a “true person” by learning to relate to all things in love.⁸⁴ Perhaps, then, adopting Bonaventure’s approach could help us become people who, like Francis, love creation as a “Thou” and thereby re-personalize ourselves and reconnect with God.

Let me explain. Bonaventure teaches that the Word contains all the things that God could create: “not only Platonic universals but also individual things *in their distinctness*.”⁸⁵ Consequently, when creatures mirror God, “their own individuality is intensified.”⁸⁶ If all of creation reveals God, to find God therein requires that we know each creature close-up, in its particularity, as Francis did.⁸⁷ As we said above, we do not discard what we learn from creation as we approach our *telos* (union with God), but gather it up and bring it with us on the rest of the journey. Beholding God in creation helps us become like him, and thereby fulfill our calling to gather up all of creation in our return to him.⁸⁸ As Buber says: “To eliminate or leave behind nothing at all, to include the whole world in the *Thou*, to give the world its due and its truth, to include nothing beside God but everything in him—this is full and complete relation. . . . If you hallo this life you meet the living God.”⁸⁹ Thus, says Delio, we gain knowledge of God not “*from* nature but a knowledge *in* and *through* nature”; it emerges from an “I-Thou” rather than an “I-it” relationship.⁹⁰

Bonaventure also teaches that the natural world is not, fundamentally, a thing. It is not “lifeless and inert. Rather, because the material world is created by God, it is like the Trinity itself, dynamic and relational.”⁹¹ In truth, creation is fundamentally not existence, but love; it is “on a journey” back to

its Creator.⁹² Heidegger observed that we obscure this fundamental truth of creation when we approach it technologically; with Bonaventure as our teacher, we may reveal it as we approach creation sacramentally. Made according to the pattern of the Trinity, all of creation is designed to manifest the unity, generosity, and humble openness to the Other that characterize the love exchanged between the Father and the Son.⁹³ Once we acknowledge this, we realize that “to live rationally is not to wield power over another but to love rightly, promoting a harmony of goodness” in a way fitting to the exemplar after which the world, and we, were created.⁹⁴ To live rationally is to welcome creation as a “Thou” we know in relation, rather than as an “it” we order and constrain for our benefit.⁹⁵ To live rationally, therefore, we must allow a sacramental view to correct the way that modern science and technology have exclusively shaped our thinking about nature, to its detriment and ours.

To view creation sacramentally is to acknowledge our interconnectedness: In Christ our sin-marred vision is healed so that we (like Francis) see him in the world around us. As we see him in creation, we grow more into his likeness, into love. As we love, we become true persons and bring all of creation to our common *telos* in God.⁹⁶ Bonaventure knew that we, unique among creatures, are endowed with free will. We alone can choose how we relate to the rest of creation. May we, by grace, follow not in the way of Adam and Eve but with Bonaventure in the way of Francis: rationally, wisely, obediently—for our good and the good of all creation. X

*Made according
to the pattern
of the Trinity,
all of creation
is designed to
manifest the
unity, generosity,
and humble
openness to
the Other that
characterize the
love exchanged
between the
Father and
the Son.*

Notes

- 1 Craig Gay, "Week 6: Modern Institutions 2: Science and Technology" (lecture, Regent College, Vancouver BC, October 1, 2015).
- 2 Ibid.
- 3 Ibid.
- 4 Ibid.
- 5 Ewert H. Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites* (Chicago: Franciscan Herald, 1978), 231.
- 6 Ewert H. Cousins, introduction to *Bonaventure: The Soul's Journey into God, The Tree of Life, The Life of St. Francis*, trans. Ewert H Cousins (New York: Paulist, 1978), 46.
- 7 Martin Heidegger, "The Question Concerning Technology," in *The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays*, trans. William Lovitt (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), 4.
- 8 Ibid., 6.
- 9 Ibid., 7–8.
- 10 Ibid., 6.
- 11 Ibid., 6, 8.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Ibid.
- 14 Ibid., 9.
- 15 Ibid., 11.
- 16 Ibid., 12.
- 17 Ibid., 14.
- 18 Ibid., 23.
- 19 Ibid., 17, 17n, 19.
- 20 Ibid., 18–20, 24, 27–28.
- 21 Ibid., 33–34.
- 22 Romano Guardini, *Letters from Lake Como: Explorations in Technology and the Human Race*, trans. Geoffrey William Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 43–46.
- 23 Ibid., 44–45.
- 24 Heidegger, "Question Concerning Technology," 21.
- 25 Guardini, *Letters from Lake Como*, 71–72.
- 26 Ibid., 12–24, 97–105.
- 27 Ibid., 17.
- 28 Ibid., 111.
- 29 Martin Buber, *I and Thou* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), 5.
- 30 Ibid., 4, 7, 12–13.
- 31 Ibid., 62.
- 32 Ibid., 4, 8–9, 11, 15.
- 33 Ibid., 11.
- 34 Ibid., 62.
- 35 Ibid., 6–7, 125–26.
- 36 Ibid., 7.
- 37 Ibid., 34, 37–38.
- 38 Ibid., 34, 54, 104–9.
- 39 Ilia Delio, Joseph Chinnici, and Elise Saggau, *A Franciscan View of Creation: Learning to Live in a Sacramental World* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, St. Bonaventure University, 2003), 29; Zachary Hayes, "Is Creation a Window to the Divine? A Bonaventurian Response," in *Franciscans and Creation: What Is Our Responsibility? Washington Theological Union Symposium Papers, 2003*, ed. Elise

Saggau (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute Publications, St. Bonaventure University, 2003), 97.

40 Bonaventure, *The Breviloquium*, trans. José De Vinck, vol. 2, *The Works of Bonaventure: Cardinal, Seraphic Doctor, and Saint* (Paterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild, 1960), 2.5.2, 2.12.1; Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, trans. José De Vinck, vol. 5, *The Works of Bonaventure*, 12.14.

41 Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 2.27; Bonaventure, "The Journey of the Mind to God," in *Mystical Opuscula*, trans. José De Vinck, vol. 1, *The Works of Bonaventure*, 2.1.

42 Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, 2.1.2, 2.1.4, 2.12.2; Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 2.23; Efreem Bettoni, *Saint Bonaventure* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1981), 47, 64–65.

43 Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, 2.11.2. See also, Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 13.12.

44 Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, 2.11.2, 1.2.4, 12n.

45 Ibid., 2.11.2.

46 Ibid., 2.12.4.

47 Bettoni, *Saint Bonaventure*, 62.

48 I am using "image" in its general sense, not the particular meaning Bonaventure assigns to it, which I will discuss below.

49 Etienne Gilson, *The Philosophy of Bonaventure*, trans. Dom Illtyd Trethowan and Frank J. Sheed (Paterson, NJ: St. Anthony Guild, 1965), 189.

50 Bettoni, *Saint Bonaventure*, 62–63; Gilson, *Philosophy of Bonaventure*, 197–98; Leonard Bowman, "The Cosmic Exemplarism of Bonaventure," *Journal of Religion* 55 (1975): 188.

51 Bonaventure, "Journey of the Mind to God," 1.15.

52 Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, 3.3.2; Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 13.12; Bonaventure, "Journey of the Mind to God," prologue, 4.

53 Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 5:1.17.

54 Bonaventure, "Journey of the Mind to God," 1.15, italics original.

55 Ibid. 1.1–2; Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 13.12. For our purposes, it will suffice to say that Christ's grace is capable of restoring our vision. A longer discussion on *how* exactly this comes about is not within the scope of this paper, but will be the topic of my forthcoming thesis.

56 Ilia Delio, *Simply Bonaventure: An Introduction to His Life, Thought, and Writings* (Hyde Park, NY: New City, 2001), 102.

57 Bonaventure, "Journey of the Mind to God," 1.2.

58 Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, 2.12.1.

59 Gilson, *Philosophy of Bonaventure*, 191–92.

60 Bonaventure, "Journey of the Mind to God," 2.1.

61 Ibid., 1.9.

62 Denys Turner, *The Darkness of God: Negativity in Christian Mysticism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 112–13.

63 Bonaventure, "Journey of the Mind to God," 2.11–12.

64 See, for example: Bonaventure, *Breviloquium*, 2.1.2, 2.1.4; Bonaventure, "Journey of the Mind to God," 1.10–11, 2.7; Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 2.23; Bettoni, *Saint Bonaventure*, 47, 64–5.

65 Bettoni, *Saint Bonaventure*, 64; Gilson, *Philosophy of Bonaventure*, 185.

66 I'm relying largely on secondary sources in the following two paragraphs because the main primary text from which Bonaventure's theology of exemplarism derives (his *Commentary on the Sentences of Peter Lombard*) has only been partially translated into English. I was unable to obtain copies of what has been translated.

67 Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites*, 99.

68 Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 11.11.
69 Delio, *Simply Bonaventure*, 40–48; Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites*, 111; Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 1.16, 17, 3.7.

70 Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 1.12.14; Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites*, 110–14; Delio, *Simply Bonaventure*, 43.

71 Bowman, "Cosmic Exemplarism of Bonaventure," 183.

72 Zachary Hayes, "Incarnation and Creation in the Theology of St. Bonaventure," in *Studies Honoring Ignatius Charles Brady, Friar Minor* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 1976), 314.

73 *Ibid.*, 314–15; Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites*, 99.

74 Delio, *Simply Bonaventure*, 60; Bettoni, *Saint Bonaventure*, 48; Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 3.4.

75 Hayes, "Incarnation and Creation," 314; Delio, *Simply Bonaventure*, 46–48.

76 Delio, *Simply Bonaventure*, 60.

77 Hayes, "Creation a Window to the Divine?,"

94–95; Delio, *Simply Bonaventure*, 46, 48.

78 Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 3.8.

79 Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites*, 111; Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 1.17; Bowman, "The Cosmic Exemplarism of Bonaventure," 181.

80 Delio, Chinnici, and Saggau, *Franciscan View of Creation*, 26–27; Bowman, "Cosmic Exemplarism of Bonaventure," 195–96; Hayes, "Incarnation and

Creation," 316–26; Hayes, "Creation a Window to the Divine?," 96.

81 Ilia Delio, "From Metaphysics to Kataphysics: Bonaventure's 'Good' Creation," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 64 (May 2011): 173. On the idea that Christ is the ultimate source of knowledge, see Bonaventure, *Collations on the Six Days*, 1.1, 1.10, 3.4. On the idea that Christ is the exemplar of word and world, see Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites*, 116–18.

82 Gilson, *Philosophy of Bonaventure*, 434–35.

83 Buber, *I and Thou*, 78.

84 Delio, Chinnici, and Saggau, *Franciscan View of Creation*, 30–31. See *ibid.*, 21, and Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites*, 247–49, for discussion on Bonaventure's indebtedness to Francis, particularly of his understanding of the relationship between God and creation.

85 Bowman, "Cosmic Exemplarism of Bonaventure," 182, italics original.

86 Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites*, 249.

87 Delio, Chinnici, and Saggau, *Franciscan View of Creation*, 47.

88 *Ibid.*, 27, 46.

89 Buber, *I and Thou*, 79.

90 Delio, "From Metaphysics to Kataphysics," 177–79, italics original.

91 Delio, Chinnici, and Saggau, *Franciscan View of Creation*, 25. See also Cousins, *Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites*, 98–99; Bowman, "Cosmic Exemplarism of Bonaventure," 185.

92 Delio, Chinnici, and Saggau, *Franciscan View of Creation*, 46. For more on the idea that creation is not being but love, see Delio, "From Metaphysics to Kataphysics," 174.

93 Delio, *Simply Bonaventure*, 45.

94 Delio, "From Metaphysics to Kataphysics," 179.

95 *Ibid.*, 177, 179.

96 Delio, Chinnici, and Saggau, *Franciscan View of Creation*, 27, 45–47.