

# **CREDERE, ARGUERE, ADMIRARE, CONTUERE, EXCEDERE ET COMPREHENDERE**

## **ANDRÉ DO PRADO AND THE SIX MODES OF BRINGING THE SOUL TOWARDS INFINITY**

Mário João Correia<sup>1</sup>

### **Introduction**

Despite the edition of *Horologium Fidei* and some studies on his life and works, André do Prado OFM (Andreas de Prato) is yet to be thoroughly studied. His most widespread work, *Liber distinctionum* (also known as *Spiraculum Francisci Maironis*, or *Maronis*), extant at least in 5 manuscripts, remains unedited and forgotten<sup>2</sup>. The same goes for a sermon he preached in Basel in the context of the Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence<sup>3</sup>. Scholarly work about his philosophical and theological ideas is introductory and encyclopaedic<sup>4</sup>,

- 1 Junior Researcher (CEEC Ind. 4th Edition), Instituto de Filosofia, Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto, Via Panorâmica s/n, 4150-564, Porto, Portugal; email: mjcorreia@letras.up.pt.
- 2 Cf. Oxford, Bodleian Library, Canon. Misc. 389; Cesena, Biblioteca Malatestiana, cod. D.XX.1; Assisi, Biblioteca Comunale, Fondo Moderno, ms. 45; Cortona, Biblioteca Comunale e dell'Accademia Etrusca, ms. 220; and a fragment of the text in Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, cod. R 109 sup., ff. 191-196. These manuscripts are catalogued in G.R. Smith, «An Inventory of Unprinted Treatises on the Formalities from the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries», in C.A. Andersen (ed.), *Formalitas. The Formalist Tradition in Late Scholastic Philosophy: a Renaissance Forerunner of Formal Ontology*, (access 20<sup>th</sup> Oct. 2024). URL: [www.formalitas.eu](http://www.formalitas.eu).
- 3 Cf. Oxford, Balliol College, 165A, pp. 497-513.
- 4 Cf. J.F. Meirinhos, «Escotistas portugueses dos séculos XIV e XV», in L.A. De Boni et al. (org.), *João Duns Scotus (1308-2008). Homenagem dos scotistas lusófonos*, Porto Alegre: Ed. EST, 2008, pp. 330-347 (Prado's life and works are presented on pp. 332-333); M.S. de Carvalho, «Frei André do Prado», in P. Calafate (ed.), *História do Pensamento Filosófico Português*. Vol. 1: *Idade Média*, Lisboa: Caminho, 1999, pp. 253-277; A.A. do Nascimento, «O Diálogo de André do Prado com o Infante Dom Henrique: o "Horologium Fidei"», *Mare Liberum* 7 (1994) 85-104; A.A. do Nascimento, «André do Prado, Frei», in G. Lanciani – G.

and even the introduction to the critical edition of *Horologium Fidei*<sup>5</sup> gives us little insight into his thought, which has been loosely characterised by scholars as a Scotism mingled with the influences of Ockham and, more importantly, Francis of Meyronnes.

In this article, I will focus on *Horologium Fidei*, a dialogue with two characters: a *magister* (the character of André do Prado) and Prince Henry, the Navigator (*Dominus Henricus*). Given that it is a lengthy dialogue on the Apostolic Creed, *Horologium Fidei* contains lengthy discussions on various topics that go well beyond the literal meaning of the twelve articles of the Creed. One of these lengthy discussions concerns the way a finite being – in particular, the human nature of Christ – can grasp or contact with infinity, inserted in a broader discussion on the hypostatic union in the context of the third article of the Creed: *qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto, natus ex Maria Virgine* (who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary). I thought this discussion would be interesting for the purpose of this publication since one can see an excellent example of the richness of vocabulary concerning vision in the Portuguese context and one that may have been read or known outside the academic milieu.

By analysing the six modes of bringing the soul towards infinity presented by André do Prado, as well as its sources, I will also have the opportunity to understand the way Prado composed his dialogue as an assembly of explicit and implicit quotes of authorities. As we will see, I shall propose a general thesis that needs further study to be confirmed. Finally, I must say that the editorial work by Aires A. Nascimento is defective in many ways, and this could lead us to a reflection on how scholars from different backgrounds should work together.

In order to accomplish my reflection on these topics, I will divide the present article into the following sections: 1. A brief introduction to André do Prado's

Tavani (org.), *Dicionário de Literatura Medieval Galega e Portuguesa*, Lisboa: Caminho, 1993, pp. 53-54; A.D.S. Costa, «Mestre Frei André do Prado, desconhecido escotista português do século XV professor nas universidades de Bolonha e da Cúria Romana», *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia* 23 (1967) 293-337; M. Martins, «O diálogo entre o Infante D. Henrique e Fr. André do Prado», *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia* 16 (1960) 281-295; M. Martins, «O livro que o Infante D. Henrique mandou escrever», *Brotéria* 71 (1960) 195-206; F.F. Lopes, «À volta de Fr. André do Prado (século XV)», in F.F. Lopes, *Colectânea de Estudos* 2 (1951) 121-132.

5 Cf. A.A. Nascimento, «Introdução», in André do Prado, *Horologium Fidei. Diálogo com o Infante D. Henrique*, ed. A.A. Nascimento, Lisboa: Comissão Nacional para as Comemorações dos Descobrimentos Portugueses – Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1994, pp. 5-28.

life and works; 2. A reflection on the six modes of bringing the soul towards infinity, followed by the identification of the source of this typology, namely Bonaventure's *Quaestiones disputatae de Scientia Christi*; 3. through the understanding that the whole passages of the *Horologium Fidei* I am commenting on are copies *ipsis verbis* of Bonaventure, I will do a first survey to demonstrate that most of the content of the *Horologium Fidei* consists on an assembly of quotes glued together by the interaction between the two characters. Then, I will wonder why the editor didn't notice this feature of the dialogue, and I will show some mistakes and misreads he made due to an apparent lack of knowledge of the theological-philosophical discussions that are summoned. These flaws should call our attention to the way we usually work since it is almost impossible to simultaneously be a great Latinist, a great palaeographer, and a great historian of philosophy. It should be standard practice to request more help from each other.

### **1. André do Prado's life and works**

The most complete study on André do Prado's biography was made by António Domingues de Sousa Costa, who updated and expanded the biographical information gathered by Fernando Félix Lopes and Mário Martins<sup>6</sup>. He will be the source of this short note on Prado's life and works, with additions from the finding of more manuscripts with Prado's texts.

Wrapping up these sources of biographical information:

André do Prado was born in Évora in the last quarter of the 14th century, probably around the decade of 1380 or maybe 90. He joined the Franciscan Order in his youth in Évora and made his first studies at the Convent of St. Francis in the same city (maybe also in the *Studium Generale* of Lisbon). By the beginning of the 15th century, André do Prado, together with his fellow Pedro Álvares, continued his studies in Paris for a short period, and then they moved to Bologna. In September 1414, he was ordained priest and, always together with Pedro Álvares, became the Chaplain of the *Collegium Hispanorum* (or College of Saint Clement) of Bologna while they studied at the University. By 1415, he earned his bachelor's degree in theology and became the regent professor of theology inside the *Collegium Hispanorum*. It is in the context

6 Cf. A.D.S. Costa, «Mestre Frei André do Prado...», cit.; F.F. Lopes, «À volta de Fr. André do Prado...», cit.; M. Martins, «O diálogo...», cit.; M. Martins, «O livro que o Infante...», cit.

of his teachings at this college that he wrote *Liber distinctionum*, a dictionary of philosophical and theological terms in alphabetical order that he himself says were inspired by Francis of Meyronnes's *Conflatus*<sup>7</sup>. He probably left the *Collegium Hispanorum* in 1417, but he was still in Bologna in 1422, when he received his degree in theology.

The following trace of his life is that he became a *doctor* in theology in 1425 or 6, and in those years, he was one of the theologians of the *Studium* of the Curia in Rome. We know that he was in Rome not only teaching but also as the attorney (*procurator*) of the Archbishop of Braga, D. Fernando da Guerra, at least until 1443. We also have notice of a sermon that he wrote and preached in Basel in 1436 in the context of the Council of Basel-Ferrara-Florence<sup>8</sup>.

There is no evidence for the exact period when he returned to Portugal, but it was very likely by the end of the decade of 1440. He became the Provincial Vicar and was willing to institute the rule of the Observants in Portugal. It is probably in these first years of return to Portugal that he wrote the dialogue we will talk about in this article. The date of his death is unknown. The last document in which his activity is mentioned dates 1450.

*Horologium Fidei* – and the only manuscript transmitting it<sup>9</sup> – gives us some clues on André do Prado's friendship with Prince Henry and the context of the production of this work. It could be a possible strategy to spread good news about the Portuguese exploration of the seas in the Vatican and present an image of a sovereign that is both literate and brave, active and contemplative. At least, Aires A. Nascimento, the editor, tries to gather clues that point out to that possibility by comparing the contents of the prologue, codicological and archival information that proves an early presence of the manuscript in the Vatican, and a letter from Poggio Bracciolini to Prince Henry<sup>10</sup>.

Given this context, let's move to the contents of *Horologium Fidei*.

7 «Spiraculum hoc opus anotaui quia fere totum spiratum a Conflatu Francisci de Maronis cuius doctrina fulget ut sol et luna.» André do Prado, *Liber distinctionum*, ms. Oxford, Bodl., Canon. Misc. 389, f. 1rb.

8 Cf. Oxford, Balliol College, 165A, pp. 497-513.

9 Cf. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 1068.

10 Cf. A.A. Nascimento, «Introdução», cit. Aires A. Nascimento makes a thread of suppositions taken from documents and codicological information, but there is no proper direct evidence that confirms those suppositions.

## 2. The six modes of bringing the soul towards infinity

As mentioned, *Horologium Fidei* is a lengthy dialogue between a *Magister* and Prince Henry (*Dominus Henricus*) where André do Prado comments on the twelve articles of the Apostolic Creed. The metaphor of the clock has to do with the number twelve: according to the tradition of his time, twelve apostles assigned twelve fundamental articles of the Christian faith<sup>11</sup>. The book reflects this traditional reading and is divided into a *Proemium* and twelve chapters, one for each article. Sometimes, the master also discusses the other two accepted Creeds – the Nicene and the Athanasian – and compares their content, but his point of departure is the Apostle's Creed.

The discussion I am focusing on occurs in the third chapter, concerning the third article, in the part of the chapter where the two characters try to grasp what it means that the Virgin Mary is both the mother of God and the mother of a man. Prince Henry asks his master how the finite and the infinite are mixed in Jesus, i.e., they discuss the hypostatic union and try to specify whether Jesus as human had the same perfections as his divine nature, also whether divine infinity became in some way limited by the created nature it assumed, be it in space, be it in some perfection. After distinguishing between quantity of volume and quantity of power (*quantitas mollis* vs. *quantitas virtutis*) and establishing that God is infinite in the second sense<sup>12</sup>, the discussion suddenly turns to Christ's knowledge. Here is how the issue emerges:

Ma. [...] Et est notandum, serenissime princeps, circa hoc quod licet intellectus et affectus anime rationalis nunquam quiescent nisi in deo et in bono infinito, hoc non est quia illud comprehendat, sed nichil anime sufficit nisi eius capacitatem excedat. Do. He. Quomodo intellectus et affectus anime rationalis feruntur in infinitum? Ma. Hoc fieri potest sex modis, uidelicet: credendo, arguendo, admirando, contuendo, excedendo, et comprehendendo. Primus modus est imperfectionis uie; ultimus modus est summe perfectionis, et proprius est trinitatis eterne et infinite. Secundus et tertius pertinent ad progressum uie. Quartus et quintus ad consummacionem patrie<sup>13</sup>.

- 11 Prado quotes William Brito's *Expositiones vocabulorum bibliae (Summa Britonis)* on this matter. Cf. André do Prado, *Horologium Fidei*, cit., proem., p. 40.
- 12 «Dicitur quod si diuinum uerbum sit simplex est tamen nichilominus infinitum, non quantitate molis, sed quantitate uirtutis.» Ibidem, ch. 3, p. 242.
- 13 Ibid., p. 242. (Ma. [...]) And it must be noted, Serene Prince, that although the intellect and the affection of the rational soul never rest except in God and in infinite good, this is not

After this answer, Prince Henry requests examples and the two characters engage in a long inquiry that aims to distinguish these several kinds of knowledge in Christ's soul. One of the main points that is at stake here is, in fact, Bonaventure's exemplarism as well as his theory of illumination, since all the master's answers are copied *verbatim* from Bonaventure's *Quaestiones disputatae de Scientia Christi*, qq. 6 and 7<sup>14</sup>, as we will see. So, in reality, the ultimate source of this discussion and typology is Augustine, and, more importantly, the *Corpus Dionysiacum*, or rather Augustine grafted onto Pseudo-Dionysius<sup>15</sup>.

First of all, the six modes are conceived as degrees from imperfection to perfection: *credere* is the most imperfect mode of bringing the soul towards infinity and *comprehendere* is the most perfect. This gradation overlaps with another

because <the soul> comprehends Him; however, nothing satisfies the soul but its capacity to exceed itself.

Pr. He. How does the intellect and the affection of the rational soul are brought (*feruntur*) to infinity?

Ma. That can happen in six modes, namely: believing, reasoning, admiring, gazing upon, exceeding, and comprehending. The first mode is of the imperfection of the wayfaring state; the last mode is of the ultimate perfection, and it is proper to the eternal and infinite Trinity. The second and the third belong to the way of progress. The fourth and the fifth to the consummation of heaven.) The translations of *Horologium Fidei* are mine, though I consulted Z. Hayes' translation of Bonaventure's *Quaestiones disputatae de Scientia Christi* and adapted them to the specificities of *Horologium Fidei*'s version of the text. Hayes chose the following terminology: faith (*credendo*), reasoning (*arguendo*), wonder (*admirando*), viewing (*contuendo*), ecstasy (*excedendo*) and comprehension (*comprehendendo*). Cf. Saint Bonaventure, *Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ*, intr. and trans. Z. Hayes, Saint Bonaventure, NY: The Franciscan Institute, 1992, q. 6, p. 171. In order not to confuse the reader, I will stick to the Latin words.

14 Cf. St. Bonaventura, *Quaestiones disputatae de Scientia Christi*, ed. PP. Collegii a S. Bonaventura (Doctoris Seraphici S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia, tomo V), Quaracchi: Typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1891, qq. 6-7, pp. 32-43.

15 «In this respect, as I shall endeavour to show in the following pages, Bonaventure consistently grafts Augustine onto Dionysius, and this not only with respect to what concerns contemplation and mystical theology. In other words, it is also with respect to the ambit of *doctrine* that Dionysius seems to provide Bonaventure with the wider metaphysical and doctrinal framework within which Augustine (alongside other *auctoritates*) is to be understood.» T. Manzón, «According to the Blessed Dionysius: the Areopagitic Character of Bonaventure's Exemplarism, with Particular Reference to the *Quaestiones de Scientia Christi*», in T. Manzón – I. Zavattero (eds.), *Theories of Divine Ideas from the Church Fathers to the Early Franciscan Masters*, Roma: Aracne Editrice, 2022, pp. 323-350, cf. p. 327). Cf. also J.C. Benson, «Structure and Meaning in St. Bonaventure's "Quaestiones Disputatae de Scientia Christi"», *Franciscan Studies* 62 (2004) 67-90; J. Ratzinger, *The Theology of History in St. Bonaventure*, trans. Z. Hayes, Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1989, pp. 157-158.

main distinction: *in via* vs. *in patria*, i.e., the modes of grasping infinity proper of life on earth are more imperfect than the ones that occur solely in heaven.

The only thing the characters say about the first mode was already quoted: *Primus modus est imperfectionis viae*. The word *viae* is to be read according to the dichotomy *in via* vs. *in patria*<sup>16</sup>. *Credere* is proper to the imperfection of our life on earth. Ironically, this mode is considered the most imperfect in a text commenting on the Creed. Still, faith or belief is capable of bringing the soul towards infinity. In a sense, it is an imperfect way through which the human soul seeks to rest in something that exceeds its capacity.

The master expands in his explanation of the other modes by trying to ascribe whether they concern this life or life in heaven and by distinguishing some features that specify them. He says:

Dicitur: in uia possumus diuinam immensitatem contemplari raciocinando et admirando; in patria uero contuendo quando erimus deiformes effecti. Et excedendo quando erimus inebriati, propter quam ebrietatem dicit Anselmus in fine *Proslog.* [c. 26] quod magis intrabimus in gaudium diuinum quam gaudium diuinum intret in cor nostrum, et quod anima illa uerbo unita et magis est deiformis effecta et magis inebriata propter gratiam, non tantum efficientem sed etiam super-excellentem; ideo contuetur diuinam sapienciam et contuendo excedit in ipsam licet non comprehendat eam<sup>17</sup>.

So, *in via*, at our present state, the wayfaring state, Christ's human soul (and ours) is capable of contemplating the divine immensity in two different ways: *raciocinando* and *admirando*. The mention of a *progressus viae* seems to echo one of the most important Biblical passages that was usually summoned in this context: Luke, 2, 52<sup>18</sup>, meaning that Jesus' wisdom grew along his growth, and

16 As we will see below, in Bonaventure's text, it reads «*imperfectionis et viae*», meaning the mode of imperfection and of life on earth.

17 André do Prado, *Horologium Fidei*, p. 242. (It is said that in the wayfaring state, we can contemplate the divine immensity by reasoning and by admiring; in heaven, we can do so by gazing upon when we will be made conform to God. And by exceeding when we will be drunk. It is because of this drunkenness that Anselm says at the end of *Proslogion* that we will more fully enter into the divine joy than the divine joy will enter into our hearts, and that the soul that is united with the Word and is made more God-like is more drunk because of a grace that is not only sufficient but superexcellent; therefore it gazes upon the divine wisdom, and in this gazing upon it is drawn to that wisdom in ecstasy, even though it does not comprehend it.)

18 Luc. 2:52: *et Iesus proficiebat sapientia aetate et gratia apud Deum et homines* («and Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature and in favor with God and man»). Cf. Z. Hayes,

that he was more and more capable of understanding God. Strictly in his human nature, this would happen through the modes of *rationare* and *admirare*. The first of these two modes has to do with the production of reasonings, arguments, definitions, etc., about infinity. *Admirare* needs further explanation. However, in this passage, little is said about it. It is said that *admiratio* is proper not only to Christ's humanity, but also to angels, and that it happens not only *in via*, but also *in patria*<sup>19</sup>. Moreover, it is different from *contuitio*, a mode that is proper to heaven which supposes not only contemplating and being lifted to see divine ideas, or exemplars, but also *deiformitas*, assuming the form of God.

*Contuere* is also compared with *excedere*, and *excedere* with *comprehendere*. Let's start with the last. *Comprehensio* of God is outside the possibilities of human nature, even the more perfected human nature of Jesus, since it is impossible for a finite being to limit or circumscribe infinity. To comprehend means that nothing from the cognized remains hidden from the cognizer, and so the cognizer must be either equal to or greater than the cognized. Only an equal to God can comprehend God: this means that Jesus, as the second person of the Trinity, as the Word, comprehends Himself, but in his human nature, he can only be brought to God through the other modes, of which the most perfect is the mode of ecstasy, of *excedere*<sup>20</sup>. With this explanation, one can see that the gradation of these modes can be seen as a gradation of sameness. The most perfect mode of bringing the soul to infinity is being infinity itself.

Every mode supposes some kind of lift beyond ourselves, acquiring or grasping a sameness to God in different degrees. In *admiratio*, the soul contemplates the light of exemplars (divine ideas) that give certainty to its own similitudes of created things. In *contuitio*, the soul is lifted beyond itself in the sense that it assumes some kind of sameness with God's form, a *deiformitas*. As for the degree of *excessus*, the most perfect a human soul can aspire to, this going beyond is described, through the authority of Anselm, as an *ebrietas*, a drunkenness, an entrance into God's joy. The text suggests that *contuitio* and *excessus* are intertwined in the sense that assuming the form of God will lead to ecstasy.

«Editor's Foreword», in Saint Bonaventure, *Disputed Questions on the Knowledge of Christ*, cit., p. 10.

19 «Do. He. Admiracio est tantum in uia? / Ma. Non, uerum eciam in patria, non tantum in angelis, ymo eciam in ipsa anima assumpta a deo...» André do Prado, *Horologium Fidei*, cit., p. 242.

20 However, as one can see some paragraphs below the enumeration of the six modes, Jesus can comprehend the *exemplaria factiua*, i.e., the divine ideas concerning everything that he created, creates and will create in the future, since those things are finite. Cf. Ibidem, p. 244.

*Excessus*, in some sense, is the opposite of *comprehensio*:

Primo, quia in comprehensione cognoscens capit cognitum. In excessiuo uero cognitum capit cognoscentem; 2º, quia in comprehensiuo terminatur intelligencie aspectus, in excessiuo, uero, intelligencie appetitus; 3º, quia in comprehensiuo fit actu considerans omnia perterrita, presencia et futura, in excessiuo, uero, fit ad cognoscendum <prompta>; 4º, quia comprehensione perceptio fit ut nichil de nouo adiscat, propter uero excessum fit ut nichil adiscere possit: et ideo licet cognicio anime Christi per modum excessus [et] quodam modo dici possit respectu infinitorum, cognicio tamen comprehensiuua non est nisi respectu infinitorum<sup>21</sup>.

Through ecstasy, Jesus (and possibly some other human souls) is grasped by God, and his soul fulfils its desires; its ability to cognize becomes acute, but he still doesn't learn anything about God in His infinity. Transcendence, the primordial divide between finite and infinite is kept<sup>22</sup>.

After this small analysis of the vocabulary, the next question one should ask would be: What sources is André do Prado using here? And the answer, as already pointed out, is that these passages I commented on are not his: they are (almost) *ipsis verbis* copies of the conclusions of Bonaventure's *Quaestiones disputatae de scientia Christi*, questions 6 and 7. The only differences are either mistakes (some from the editor, not the manuscript) or the necessary adjustments to turn Bonaventure's conclusions into a dialogue between two characters. In fact, Prince Henry glues together the passage from the conclusion of Bonaventure's question 6 to the conclusion of question 7. Here are two of Bonaventure's passages from the conclusions of questions 6 and 7 glued together with a question made by Prince Henry, in fact, a question which corresponds to the title of Bonaventure's question 7:

21 Ibidem, pp. 244-246. (First, because in comprehension the cognizer grasps the cognized. In the ecstatic <mode>, on the other hand, the cognized grasps the cognizer. Second, because the comprehensive <mode> culminates in the beholding of intelligence, while the ecstatic <mode> culminates in the appetite of intelligence; third, because in the comprehensive <mode> there is a consideration in act of all the past, present and future, while in the ecstatic <mode> there is a readiness to know; fourth, because in comprehension, perception is so that nothing new is learned, while through ecstasy it is not possible to learn anything: and therefore, even though the cognition of Christ's soul in the ecstatic mode also can be said in a certain way to be about the infinite things, yet the comprehensive cognition is about nothing else than the infinite things.)

22 « [...] et pro tanto dicitur anima illa habuisse scientiam omnem non quia comprehendit omnia que cognoscit diuina sapiencia, cum illa sit infinita et comprehendi non possit a potencia finita.» Ibidem., cit., p. 246.

Passage 1:

St. Bonaventura, *Quaestiones disputatae de scientia Christi*, cit., q. 6, p. 35:

*Postremo, licet intellectus et affectus animae rationalis nunquam quiescat nisi in Deo et in bono infinito, hoc non est, quia illud comprehendat, sed quia nihil sufficit animae, nisi eius capacitatem excedat. Unde verum est, quod ipse animae rationalis et affectus et intellectus feruntur in infinitum bonum et verum et ut infinitum; sed ferri in illud hoc potest esse sex modis, scilicet credendo, arguendo, admirando, contuendo, excedendo et comprehendendo. Primus modus est imperfectionis et viae, ultimus modus est summae perfectionis et proprius est Trinitatis aeternae et infinitae; Secundus et tertius modus pertinent ad progressum viae; quartus et quintus ad consummationem patriae. In uia enim possumus diuinam immensitatem contemplari ratiocinando et admirando; in patria vero contuendo, quando erimus deiformes effecti, et excedendo, quando erimus omnino inebriati; propter quam ebrietatem dicit Anselmus in fine Proslogii, quod magis intrabimus in gaudium diuinum, quam diuinum Gaudium intret in cor nostrum. Et quoniam anima illa Verbo unita et magis est deiformis effecta et magis inebriata propter gratiam non tantum sufficientem, sed etiam superexcellentem; ideo contuetur diuinam sapientiam et contuendo excedit in ipsam, licet non comprehendat eam. Et pro hac causa admiratio non tantum habet locum in via, verum etiam in patria; non tantum in Angelis, verum etiam in anima assumpta a Deo, ut dicat: “Mirabilis facta est scientia tua ex me, confortata est, et non potero*

André do Prado, *Horologium Fidei*, cit., ch. 3, p. 242:

[...] *Et est notandum, serenissime princeps, circa hoc quod licet intellectus et affectus animae rationalis nunquam quiescent nisi in Deo et in bono infinito, hoc non est quia illud comprehendat, sed nichil anime sufficit nisi eius capacitatem excedat.*

D. Hen. – Quomodo intellectus et affectus animae racionalis feruntur in infinitum?

Mag. – *Hoc fieri potest sex modis, uidelicet: credendo, arguendo, admirando, contuendo, excedendo, et comprehendendo. Primus modus est imperfectionis uie; ultimus modus est summe perfectionis, et proprius est trinitatis eterne et infinite. Secundus est tertius pertinent ad progressum uie; quartus et quintus ad consummacionem patriae.*

Do. Henr. – Vellem videre exempla.

Mag. – *Dicitur: in uia possumus diuinam immensitatem contemplari ratiocinando et admirando; in patria uero contuendo quando erimus deiformes effecti. Et excedendo quando erimus inebriati, quam ebrietatem dicit Anselmus in fine Prosl. quod magis intrabimus in Gaudium diuinum quam diuinum Gaudium intret in cor nostrum, et quod anima illa uerbo unita et magis est deiformis effecta et magis inebriate propter graciā, non tantum efficientem sed etiam superexcellentem; ideo contuetur diuinam sapienciam et contuendo excedit in ipsam licet non comprehendat eam.*

Do. He. Admiracio est tantum in uia?

*ad eam*"; sicut Glossa exponit de homine assumpto a Verbo, quod "non potest ei equari in sapientia nec in aliquo alio.

Passage 2:

Ibid., q. 7, pp. 39-40:

Respondeo: Ad praedictorum intelligentiam est notandum, quod dupliciter contingit loqui de sapientia increata: aut secundum quod est exemplar factivum et dispositivum, aut secundum quod est exemplar expressivum et repraesentativum. Primo modo relucet in arte divinae sapientiae e aquae sunt, fuerunt et erunt; et haec sunt finita. Secundo modo relucet omnia, quae Deus potest facere et intelligere; et haec quidem sunt infinita, sicut in praecedentibus monstratum fuit, et Augustinus expresse dicit duodecimo de Civitate Dei. – Anima igitur Christi utroque modo per cognitionem fertur in divinam sapientiam, sed differenter. In ipsam enim, secundum quod est exemplar factivum, fertur comprehendendo [...].

*Mag. Non, uerum etiam in patria, non tantum in angelis, ymo etiam in ipsa anima assumpta a deo, ut dicat cum propheta: "mirabilis facta est scientia tua ex me, et non potero ad eam", sicut glossa exponit de homine assumpto a uerbo, qui non potest ei equari nec in scientia nec in aliquo alio.*

*Do. He. Vellem informari si anima Christi comprehendit omnia que comprehendit sapientia increata, licet non comprehendat ipsam sapientiam increatam.*

*Ma. Etsi uideatur disgressus a prima materia quam petitis, tamen quia hypostaticam materiam primaria concernit nostra intentio, tamen **ad intelligentiam** quesite rei **est notandum quod dupliciter contingit loqui de sapientia incarnata**<sup>23</sup> **aut secundum quod est exemplar factivum et dispositivum, aut secundum quod est exemplar expressivum**<sup>24</sup> **siue representativum. Primo modo [relucet in arte diuine sapientie ea que fuerunt, sunt, et erunt, et hec sunt finita. Secundo modo]**<sup>25</sup> **relucet omnia que deus potest facere et intelligere et hec quidem sunt infinita. Et hoc dicit Augustinus 12 De Ciu. Dei. Anima Christi igitur utroque modo per cognitionem fertur in diuinam sapientiam, sed differenter: in ipso enim secundum quod est exemplar factivum fertur comprehendendo.***

23 This is an error of the editor. It should be *increata* instead.

24 The editor's reading is wrong. It reads *expressivum* in the manuscript. Cf. Ms. Città del Vaticano, Bibl. Apost., Vat. Lat. 1068, f. 46va.

25 The editor jumped two lines, probably because both lines 34 and 36 start with *relucet*. Cf. Ibid.

Given this correspondence, what one should ask would be, instead, what are the sources of Bonaventure? According to the more recent scholarship on this topic, in the whole of the seven questions, Bonaventure borrows the more important definitions of divine ideas from the *Corpus Dionysiacum* and mingles them with quotes from Augustine<sup>26</sup>. Also, the passage that divides *sapientia increata* according to two kinds of exemplars and the exposition of *excessus* are indebted to Pseudo-Dionysius<sup>27</sup>.

Moreover, one can expand on the features of the six modes copied by André do Prado, especially *contuitio* and *excessus*, by looking at other passages from the *Quaestiones disputatae de Scientia Christi*<sup>28</sup>.

Thus, we could say that André do Prado was a vehicle for spreading Bonaventure's vision vocabulary to the context of 15th-century Portugal. However, I don't have any proof or evidence of the actual influence this vocabulary, or *Horologium Fidei* as a whole, had in Portuguese intellectual circles.

### 3. Some hypotheses and remarks

While finding that the content of *Horologium Fidei* I was commenting on was actually an unreferenced quote, I wondered whether that would be the case for the rest of the work. Is *Horologium Fidei* an assembly of passages by other authors?

Some passages are explicitly compositions of referenced quotes by many sources, especially Patristic literature, mediated by small speeches that are used to glue together those quotes. The character of Prince Henry has this

26 He does so also because John Sarrazin's Latin translation and Thomas Gallus' commentary on the *libri Dionysii* establish terminological equivalences that help to read Pseudo-Dionysius and Augustine together. This grafting process was already present in the *Summa Halensis*: «Indeed, the choice of language made by Dionysius' translator John Sarrazin harkens back to the equivalences drawn by Augustine in his famous *Quaestio de ideis*, where he observes how “*rationes enim graece logoi appellantur non ideae*”. The import of this translation was that of suggesting a linguistic and conceptual connection between Dionysius' *exemplaria* and Augustine's *rationes / ideae*. // Before the *Quaestiones de scientia Christi*, this parallel was consciously drawn (although with no explicit mention of Augustine's authority) by Thomas Gallus in his *Explanatio in libros Dionysii* [...]. These parallels can also be found in the *Summa Halensis*.» Tommaso Manzon, «According to the Blessed Dionysius...», cit., p. 330.

27 Cf. Ibidem, pp. 339-343.

28 Cf. T. Scarpelli, «Bonaventure's Christocentric Epistemology: Christ's Human Knowledge as the Epitome of Illumination in *De scientia Christi*», *Franciscan Studies* 65 (2007) 63-86.

function: his questions guide the discussion and move the master from one quote to another. But I believe that, with further study, one will find that most of the passages that are not explicit quotes are, indeed, also copied or adapted from other authors. Here are three preliminary examples that could easily be expanded:

Pseudo-Augustinus, *De spiritu et anima*, ch. 33<sup>29</sup>:

*Aqua in humoribus, aer continetur in pulmone; idcirco semper est in motu, quia ventilabrum cordis est, ne nimio calore cor consumatur et dissolvatur. Sedes ignis est in corde; et ideo inferius est latum, et superius acutum; quoniam formam ignis retinet. Quaedam vis ignea aere temperate a corde ad cerebrum ascendit, tanquam in coelum corporis nostri: ibique purificata et colata per oculos aures, nares, caeteraque instrumenta sensuum, foras progreditur, et ex contactu exteriorum formata quinque sensus corporis facit: visum videlicet, auditum, gustum, odoratum et tactum. Qui tangendi sensus ab anteriori parte cerebri ad posteriorem transiens, et inde per cervicem et medullam spinæ descendens per totum corpus diffunditur.*

André do Prado, *Horologium Fidei*, cit., ch. 1, p. 112:

*Aqua in humoribus continetur. Aer in pulmone idcirco semper in motu est, quia ventilabrum est cordis, ne nimio calore cor consumatur et dissoluatur. Sedes ignis est in corde. Ideo inferius est latum, superius accutum quoniam formam ignis retinet. Quedam vis ignea aere temperate a corde ad cerebrum ascendit tanquam per cellam corporis nostri. Ibique purificata et colera<sup>30</sup> per aures et nares et oculos et ceteraque instrumenta sensuum foris progreditur et contactu exteriori formata quinque corporis sensus facit visum, auditum, odoratum, gustum, tactum. Qui tangendi sensus ab interiori parte cerebri ad posteriora transiens, inde per cervicem et medullam spinæ descendens per totum corpus diffunditur.*

29 Anonymus, *De spiritu et anima*, Patrologia Latina vol. 40, col. 802. This text is also a compilation of sources. It is now known to be neither from Augustine nor from Alcherus of Clairvaux, but the context of its production is the Cistercian milieu sometime near 1170. There is a recent Italian translation of the text I couldn't consult: Anonymous, *Liber de spiritu et anima*, trans. M. Vannini, Florence: Le Lettere, 2021.

30 The editor transcribed the manuscript correctly when one reads *per cellam* instead of *in coelum*, and *colera* instead of *colata*. However, *colera* doesn't make much sense in the context. Cf. Ms. Città de Vaticano, Bibl. Apost., Vat. Lat. 1068, f. 18vb.

Anselmus Cantuariensis, *Monologion*, ch. 7<sup>31</sup>:

Non autem dubito omnem hanc mundi molem cum partibus suis sicut videmus formatam, constare ex terra et aqua et aere et igne, quae scilicet quattuor elementa aliquomodo intelligi possunt sine his formis quas conspiciamus in rebus formatis, ut eorum informis aut etiam confusa natura videatur esse materia omnium corporum suis formis discretorum; non inquam hoc dubito, sed quaero, unde haec ipsa quam dixi mundanae molis materia sit. Nam si huius materiae est aliqua materia, illa verius est corporeae universitatis materia. Si igitur universitas rerum, seu visibilium seu invisibilium, est ex aliqua materia: profecto non solum non potest esse, sed nec dici potest esse ex alia materia quam ex summa natura, aut ex seipsa, aut ex aliqua tertia essentia, quae utique nulla est. Quippe nihil omnino vel cogitari potest esse praeter illud summum omnium, quod est per seipsum, et universitatem eorum, quae non per se sed per idem summum sunt.

André do Prado, *Horologium Fidei*, cit., ch. 1, p. 118:

***Non dubito omnem hanc mundi mollem cum partibus suis sicut uidemus formatum constare ex terra et ex aqua et aere et igne, quae scilicet quattuor elementa aliquomodo intelligi possunt sine hiis formis, quas conspiciamus in rebus formatis, ut eorum informis aut inconfusa<sup>32</sup> natura uideatur esse materia omnium corporum suis formis discretorum; non, inquam dubito sed quero unde hec ipsa quam dixi mundanae mollis materia sit, nam si huius materiae est aliqua materia illa uerius est corporeae uniuersitatis materia. Si igitur uniuersitas rerum seu uisibilium est ex aliqua materia profecto non solum non potest esse, sed nec dici potest esse ex alia materia quam ex summa natura aut ex se ipsa aut certe ex tertia essentia quae utique nulla est. Quippe nichil omnino uel cogitari potest esse preter id summum quod est per se ipsum qui est ipse deus apud quem sunt rationes omnium rerum, dicente Augustino: «Alia ratione conditus est homo, alia conditus est asinus; et iste rationes sunt in diuina mente, sicut res factibiles in mente artificis, et ille res sunt diuina sapientia, qua fiunt uniuersa quae fiunt et sua providencia eterna disponuntur». Nec credendum est quod res sint materialiter ex deo.***

31 Anselmus Cantuariensis, *Monologion*, ed. F.S. Schmitt, (S. Anselmi Opera Omnia, vol. 1), Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1946, ch. 7, pp. 20-21. I aligned the text with Prado's equivalent in «Quare quod nullo modo...», but the text is in fact continuous.

32 The manuscript may be read *inconfusa* or *in confusa*. Cf. Ms. Città del Vaticano, Bibl. Apost., Vat. Lat. 1068, f. 20ra. Independently of the reading, *inconfusa* does not make sense.

Quare quod nullo modo aliquid est, nullius rei materia est. Ex sua vero natura rerum universitas, is quae per se non est, esse non potest; quoniam si hoc esset, aliquomodo esset per se et per aliud quam per id per quod sunt cuncta, et non esset solum id per quod cuncta sunt; quae omnia falsa sunt. Item omne quod ex materia est, ex alio est et eo posterius. Quoniam igitur nihil est aliud a seipso vel posterius seipso, consequitur ut nihil sit materialiter ex seipso.

At si ex summae naturae materia potest esse aliquid minus ipsa, summum bonum mutari et corrumpi potest; quod nefas est dicere.

Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae*, V.6<sup>33</sup>:

*Hanc enim necessitatem non propria facit natura sed condicionis adiectio; nulla enim necessitas cogit incedere voluntate gradientem, quamvis eum tum cum graditur incedere necessarium sit.*

*Do. Hen. Quare?*

*Ma. Quia quod nullo modo aliquid est nullius rei materia est, ex sua uere natura, rerum uniuersitas, que per se non est, esse non potest, quoniam si hoc esset aliquo modo esset per se et per aliud quam per illud per quod sunt cuncta, et non esset solum id per quod cuncta sunt, que omnia falsa sunt. Item omne quod ex materia est ex alio est et eo posterius. Quoniam igitur nichil est aliud a se ipso uel posterius se ipso, consequitur ut nichil sit materialiter ex se ipso aut ex summe nature materia potest esse aliquid minus ipsa; summum bonum mutari et corrumpi potest, quod nefas est dicere.*

André do Prado, *Horologium Fidei*, cit., ch. 1, p. 122:

*Uerum necessitatem hanc ultimam non propriam facit natura sed condicio illa apposita. Nulla enim uera necessitas cogit incedere sponte gradientem, et tamen dum graditur necesse est eum incedere.*

This hypothesis needs further study, but these cases seem sufficient to assert that *Horologium Fidei* is, in fact, a recollection of quotes glued together through the literary form of dialogue.

A second remark I would like to make does not have to do immediately with André do Prado's text but with the modern edition by Aires A. Nascimento. Wouldn't it be better to redo this edition by working together with a team that knows more deeply the sources that are being quoted? Not only because the readers and scholars working on this text would have a

33 Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius, *De consolatione philosophiae*. *Opuscula theologica*, ed. C. Moreschini, Munich – Leipzig: K.G. Saur Verlag, 2005, 5.6, § 29, p. 159.

better assessment of what it really is<sup>34</sup> but also to avoid dozens and dozens of easily avoidable errors.

On notes 23-25, 30 and 32, I already pointed out some of these mistakes, namely mistaking *sapientia increata* with *sapientia incarnata*. Even if Aires A. Nascimento did not know the equivalent text in Bonaventure, it is quite clear that *incarnata* cannot be an option, since the master is speaking about exemplars, divine ideas. In the case of notes 30 and 32, although the manuscript is well read, the context of the phrases shows very clearly that *colera*, in the case of *De spiritu et anima*, and *inconfusa*, in the case of the *Monologion*, should have been corrected.

I will give one more example, but there are many more. In a discussion about the singularity of God and its relation to universals, on page 66, the editor mistakes *Sortes* (or *Socrates*) with *sors* and translates it as *tomado à sorte* (taken randomly). After doing it twice, he takes *sortes* as a plural of *sors* and translates it as *acazos* (chances). The whole text becomes incomprehensible. Socrates as an example of a concrete individual is the most standard example possible, spread in almost every logical, metaphysical, or theological text of the medieval Latin tradition. Here is the Latin transcription and the Portuguese translation:

Do. Hen. Videamus exemplum circa ista ut facilius intelligantur.

Ma. Illud unde sors est. Homo multis conuenire potest nam humanitas secundum rationem sue speciei est apta nata esse in multis; sed illud unde sors per idem esset homo singularis uni tantum conuenit et multis communicabilis non est. Si igitur sors per idem esset homo per quod est hic homo, sicut non sunt plures sortes, sic nec plures homines esse possent. Hoc autem conuenit primo nam per idem est sua essencia et suum esse subsistens et singulariter ens quod nec commune nec uniuersale est, quod non est aptum natum esse in multis quia nec in aliquo est receptum<sup>35</sup>.

H. Vejamos um exemplo a este respeito para que mais facilmente se perceba.

M. Seja um tomado à sorte. Homem pode convir a muitos, pois a nossa humanidade em razão da espécie é passível de surgir em muitos, mas onde acontece ser homem singular apenas a um convém e não é comunicável a muitos. Se, pois, acontecesse

34 For instance, M.S. de Carvalho works on this typology of modes as something original and compares it with Nicholas of Cusa. Cf. M.S. de Carvalho, «Frei André do Prado», cit.

35 André do Prado, *Horologium Fidei*, cit., ch. 1, p. 66. The editor even put *sortes* as a mistake by the copyist, in note 1 on this page.

ser homem pelo mesmo motivo que é este homem, como não há vários acasos assim também não poderia haver vários homens. Isto porém convém ao primeiro, pois por si mesmo é a sua essência e o seu ser subsistente e ser singularmente que nem é comum nem é universal, porque não era passível de surgir em muitos pois nem foi recebido em algo<sup>36</sup>.

The accurate reading should have been *Sortes* or *Socrates*, and it couldn't be translated into *tomado à sorte* nor *acasos*.

This is one example, but the edition has many mistakes like this. I don't mean to diminish the meritorious work of this edition. My claim is that these easily avoidable mistakes should summon our attention to the way we work. It should be a call to a more collaborative endeavour between areas of expertise.

Finally, I would like to stress that it would be important to edit and translate André do Prado's *Liber distinctionum* soon. In terms of Prado's extant manuscripts, it is clearly the most successful. In what concerns the topic of the present publication, some of the entries of this philosophical-theological dictionary would have been of interest, namely *abstractio/abstrahere*, *apprehensio/apprehendere/comprehendere*, *cognitio (intuitiua, abstractiua, confusa, habitualis, etc.)*, *conceptus, notitia (intuitiua, abstractiua, etc.)*, *uerbum nostrum, uniuersale* and *ydee*<sup>37</sup>. Moreover, studying it would help understand the influence of Francis of Meyronnes and other authors within the Franciscan sources in Prado's context. A work to be done in the future.

36 Ibidem, p. 67.

37 I could consult only the Oxford manuscript. Cf. Andreas de Prato, *Liber distinctionum*, ms. Oxford, Bod. Lib., Can. Misc. 389, ff. 1vb-3ra (*abstractio*), 8rb (*apprehensio/comprehensio*), 11rb-11vb (*cognitio*), 13rb-14rb (*conceptus*), 59va-62va (*notitia*), 104rb-108va (*uerbum nostrum, uniuersale* and *ydee*).