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ABSTRACT

Richard of Saint Victor deliberately constructs his treatise De Trinitate with trinitarian structures to sustain the hearts and shape the minds of his readers with the contemplation of the Trinity. His work fits within a genre of writing in the Middle Ages where the formation of the theological apprentice was at the heart of crafting one’s theological work. And while probably not unique among other compositions on the Trinity, Richard imbues his treatise with some “trinitarian dimensions” that make us appreciate the level of his creativity as a theologian and the impact these further dimensions had upon his readers’ spiritual formation.

Richard’s work has three major levels. Level one is a linear argument for the Trinity. It begins by establishing that God is one substance, then that God is three persons, and finally how the unity of divine substance fits with the triunity of persons. That is one level. And to read the work the first time is to encounter and be taken by this argument. Level two is the style and structure with which that argument is made. In addition to arguing for the Trinity, Richard argues for the Trinity “trinitarianly”; and to discover Richard’s deliberate use of triads and an organization to his treatise reflective of its main subject matter is to find delight in another dimension of the work. It is to read the work again—a second time—with a view to how this linear argument is designed and organized. Finally, in addition to the linear argument and its structure, there are also “allusions” such as Richard’s attempt to make his triadic structures appropriate to each person of the Trinity. So while at the level of (a) argument/content he makes a case for
the Power, the Wisdom, and the Goodness of the Divine, and at the level of (b) structure he builds with triads, he also appropriates the (c) significance for each person of the Trinity: Power of the Father, Wisdom of the Son, and Goodness of the Spirit.

The dissertation consists of three sections: Section I, “Introduction & Background,” establishes the context for the thesis; Section II, “Articulating the Trinity ‘Trinitarianly’ for the Formation of Souls,” argues the main thesis; and Section III, “Objections & Response,” handles objections and is followed by a brief conclusion. The introductory section answers questions leading up to a detailed study of the structuring of Richard’s De Trinitate. Section II develops the substance of the thesis in chapters 4 and 5. Chapter 4 argues for the structural dimension of the thesis and is divided into five parts. Part one, “Inventional, Ordering Devices,” shows how Richard structures his written works in accordance with their main objects of study in order to aid his readers’ contemplation. Part two, “Breadth: Beginning with the End in Mind” looks at the broader horizon of Richard’s De Trinitate by showing how the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad structures the linear layout of the treatise. Part three, “Depth: Richard’s Trinitarian Structures in Book III,” looks at the detail of Richard’s work in book III where his trinitarian structuring is the most ornate. In part four, “Perspective: Additional Trinitarian Structures and Triads,” we show the declining intricacy of these trinitarian structures and triads in the rest of the work. And part five, “Book VI and Discovering De Trinitate in Relief” brings all of these dimensions together to reveal Richard’s treatise as a work of art still attached to the marble from which it was carved and discovers the method by which he “drew out” contemplations from his previous work. Then, in chapter 5, “Forging These ‘Trinitarian Dimensions’ in the Faithful,” we show how Richard uses these forms to shape the
trinitarian consciousness of his readers and consummate trinitarian love within his community. Section III takes up objections to the thesis and gives a response, concluding that neither forms of meditative practice in the 12th century nor borrowing paradigms from theological predecessors accounts for the trinitarian structuring of *De Trinitate*. We fittingly end our work with a summary of our findings and a meditative reflection on the “craftsmanship” and “artistry” of Richard as a “constructive theologian.”
INTRODUCTION

There was a time when the theological task was about devotion to the one true God; where imagination traced the vestiges of the Divine. Theology was caught up—enraptured—by its object of study. As a result, the style as well as the substance of theology was imbued with a spirit reflective of its focus. Theologians saw themselves as made in the image of their Creator and undertook to study and write their theological works in ways that gave evidence of this. To be creative was the grand duty of one created by divine creativity. To write theology meant writing creatively, of “letting it be” on the page so as to reflect the divine glory. To practice theology was not merely to study about God; it was, rather, to worship Him. It therefore consisted of evangelizing one’s own mind as well as others with divine meditations creatively “constructed” to sustain the soul in a meditative journey of theological reflection and devotion toward God.

Richard of St. Victor’s treatise *De Trinitate* fits within this genre of composition in the Middle Ages, where the formation of the theological apprentice was at the heart of crafting one’s theological work. And while probably not unique among other written compositions on the Trinity, Richard imbibes his work with some “trinitarian dimensions”

---

1 As Richard writes, “If you marvel how God the Maker of everything brought into actuality from nothing at the very beginning of the world so much and so many various species of things just as He willed, think how easy it is for the human soul to fashion by means of the imagination any representations of things whatsoever at any hour and to form some unique creatures, as it were, as often as it wishes, without preexisting material and from nothing, as it were.” Grover A. Zinn, trans., *Richard of St. Victor: The Twelve Patriarchs, The Mystical Ark, Book Three of the Trinity*, Classics of Western Spirituality Series (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), 298. Richard of St. Victor, *Mystical Ark* IV.20. Hereafter referred to as *RSV’s Three Main Works.*
that make us appreciate the level of his creativity as a theologian and the impact these further dimensions had upon his readers’ spiritual formation. In what follows we demonstrate that Richard intentionally crafts *De Trinitate* with triadic structures and forms that are suitable to the task of sustaining the hearts and shaping the minds of his readers with the contemplation of the Trinity.

The Levels of *De Trinitate*

Richard’s *De Trinitate* contains three levels. On one level, the argument of the work progresses in a linear fashion to make a case for the truth of orthodox, Trinitarian belief. Richard establishes that God is one substance, that God is three persons, and how the unity of divine substance fits with the triunity of persons. That is one level. And to read the work the first time is to encounter and be taken by this argument. But at another level is the style and structure with which that argument is made. It is to see, in addition to arguing for the Trinity, that Richard argues for the Trinity “trinitarianly.” And to discover Richard’s deliberate use of triads and an organization to his treatise reflective of its main subject matter is to find delight in another dimension of the work. One reads the work again—a second time—with a view to how this linear argument is designed and organized. Furthermore, one finds greater delight when reading it at this other level. In the same way that the presentation of a culinary work might stimulate your senses as well as your appetite, so too does a theological work impress when its arrangement is as well cared for as its content. Thus to read *De Trinitate* attending to this other level—its structure—is to delight in it in another way.  

Finally, in addition to the treatise’s 2 'Delight' in theological contemplation sustains interest in spiritual things. When there is always something new to discover, the mind is enticed with a “holy curiosity” for further “treasures.” Delight thus
argument and structure, there are also trinitarian allusions such as Richard’s attempt to make various triadic structures appropriate to each person of the Trinity. So while at the level of (a) argument/content he makes a case for the Power, the Wisdom, and the Goodness of the Divine,\(^3\) and at the level of (b) structure he builds on a triadic structure to make this case, he also appropriates the (c) significance of each one to each person of the Trinity: Power of the Father, Wisdom of the Son, and Goodness of the Spirit.

These three strata show the levels of his work. And just as the vessels within the layers of an archeological investigation begin to reveal the way of life of a particular time period or people group, so discovering these strata and treasures within *De Trinitate* reveals something of the process involved in constructing a theological contemplation of the Trinity. On the first level, they reveal the role of reason and its function within the theological-contemplative process. Richard plainly and simply offers sound, logical arguments for the belief that God is “one substance, three persons.” Two things are noteworthy here. First, Richard does not offer an argument for the Trinity that excludes other sources for the same belief (e.g., Scripture, experience). He is very explicit about this in the introduction. There he notes that all resources—visible and invisible—are at the disposal of the theologian who wishes to pursue, by means of them, the knowledge of aids the mind in memory and recollection. Consequently, language of delight in Richard’s works should not be regarded as simple rhetorical flourish. See Mary Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400-1200*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 34 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 117. See also Achard of St. Victor’s Sermon 13.33 in Hugh Feiss, trans., *Achard of Saint Victor: Works*, Cistercian Studies, 165 (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 2001), 249-50.

\(^3\) Since ‘God’, traditionally, can designate either the divine essence or the first person of the Trinity (i.e., the Father) I prefer to use the term ‘Divine’ when speaking of the divine essence trinitarianly conceived. This provides greater clarity in places where one or the other meaning can be clarified. In allusions to Scripture or creedal formulas, I default to the traditional use of these words.
the triune God. Second, Richard is not overly ambitious with respect to what reason can
deliver when peering into the divine mystery of the Trinity; there is no denigration of the
mystery of God, nor circumscription of God within the confines of rational reasons in
such a way that God becomes “boxed-in” by a set of self-evident and necessary truths. As
Richard makes clear in *The Mystical Ark*, knowledge of the Trinity comes at the
intersection of the fifth and sixth levels of theological contemplation, where the faithful
soul reaches the heights of those things that are both “above reason” and “beyond
reason.” Here the traditional philosophical categories and distinctions that served earlier
stages of contemplation begin to bleed into one another. As Richard puts it:

There is nothing in which [imagination] is able to assist this work. For where reason fails, what can imagination do? What would imagination do there, where there is no changing and no shadow of vicissitude; where the part is not less than its whole, nor the whole is more universal than its individual parts; indeed, where the part is not lessening the whole, and the whole is not made up from parts, since that is simple which is set forth universally, and that is universal which is brought forth in the particular as it were; where the whole is single; where all is one and one is all? Certainly without doubt human reason fails in these things. And what can imagination do there? Without doubt in such a kind of manifestation imagination can hinder it and is completely unable to assist.⁴

But lest we think reason has failed in providing any sort of progress in trinitarian
contemplation, we need to see how Richard understands this. Reason succeeds in
affording the faithful soul with a fleeting glimpse but not a full gaze. Reason does
provide comprehension, just not full comprehension. As we stare into the brilliance of the
sun, we can see its contours, dimensions, and luminance. We can make various

inferences and judgments about it. Yet because we are blinded every time we gaze upon it, we cannot fully see it. So too, reason provides the contours of the Trinity—that the Divine is one and three—in such a way that one can believe but not fully comprehend. As he says:

> However, no corporeal sense teaches, nor does any human reason fully convince us, that God is three in person in one substance and one in substance in three persons. And so corporeal things are below reason, but divine things are above reason. We call “above reason” what we truly believe exists although we are able neither to comprehend it by the intellect nor to prove it by a proof from experience. Therefore everything of that sort which transcends the smallness of our capacity by the greatness of its incomprehensibility ought rightly to be said to be above reason. Therefore so that we may be able in whatever kind of way to hammer out the form of angelic similitude in ourselves, it is necessary to suspend our soul with continual quickness in wonder at such things and to accustom the wings of our contemplation to sublime and angelic flights.5

For Richard, reason succeeds as it fails, like a mother who succeeds in bringing her child to life even as she succumbs to the pains of childbirth. It marks the transition from the terrestrial climb to the heavenly ascent. Reason gives way to wonder; and this wonder shapes and forms the soul in such a way as to merit angelic flights into the mystery of the Divine. Like the winged cherubim who guard the throne of God, such wonder tempers the soul with an angelic disposition worthy of His presence. The corollary to this notion of not denigrating the mystery of the Divine by the use of reason consists of this latter point: that reason is one among many forms of investigation into the Trinity. Reason is necessary but not sufficient for the theological contemplation of the Divine. It is part of a theological process that includes discretion, wonder, virtue, discipline, patience, and

grace; all contribute to the formation of one seeking to be transfixed by the contemplation of God. To assess Richard’s argument on the basis of his rational argumentation alone, therefore, fails to see the important, but limited role reason plays in the theological journey and to give reason a place and a standing that not even Richard himself affords it in his own work.

On the second level, *De Trinitate* reveals the creativity and ingenuity with which Richard crafted his treatise. At this level we see how his arguments and meditations reflect the main aspects of the Trinity in an organizational form. Any treatise on the Trinity requires showing that the Divine is one and that the Divine is three without any sort of contradiction, but individual writers can choose how to do so. In Richard’s case, he deliberately structures his *De Trinitate* in regular series of threes and ones. Three unique arguments are given for the truth of one of his claims and then a summary is given to show how all three of those arguments support and undergird that one claim. For example, in book III, Richard uses three separate arguments to show that the Divine must be a plurality of persons. The first is an argument from the fullness of goodness, the second, an argument from the fullness of happiness, and the third is an argument from the fullness of glory. Each of these arguments, on its own, establishes the truth of the claim that the Divine must be a plurality of persons; but Richard goes further to show how all three form the single substance of that conclusion. And this triadic structuring of *De Trinitate* showcases how Richard deliberately crafts his content with forms that creatively reinforce its trinitarian significance. After all, if a reader is frequently struck by how the regular occurrences of three mutually exclusive and sound arguments come together to undergird the same truth, how much more likely is he to be persuaded by the argument
that despite the triunity of persons, God remains one? Indeed, it is precisely this idea that “one truth” can be learned in three different ways and yet remain one-and-the-same that Richard uses for his final argument in *De Trinitate* VI.25.

So one way Richard fills out the trinitarian dimensions of his treatise is with the triadic structures he uses to organize his rhetoric. Another way is by limiting himself to strictly triadic illustrations and metaphors. The introduction alone shimmers with a superabundance of triads: faith, hope, and love; faith, knowledge, consummation; first, second, and third heaven; immortality, incorruptibility, and eternity; human, angelic, and divine; inheritance, merit, and divinity; actuality, virtue, and intellect; faith, reason, and experience. As the work progresses the triads come more in line with the trinitarian divisions of persons (e.g., Unbegotten, Only-Begotten, and Neither-Begotten-Nor-Unbegotten), such that triadic distinctions come to be expected. But the fact that these illustrations and metaphors are so widespread and non-triadic patterns and illustrations so scarce, demonstrates just how intentional Richard is in structuring and styling his treatise in this “trinitarian” way.

The third and final level of *De Trinitate* gets to the heart and soul of what Richard does with the trinitarian crafting of his work. Here the trinitarian content mingles with a trinitarian structure that further explicates the divine revelation of God as Father, Son, and Spirit. Thus, as the linear argument proceeds to show that God is a triunity of persons—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—it simultaneously reinforces the unique attributes and properties of each divine person. In books I-II, for example, Richard makes the case

---

6 The tradition of appropriating certain properties to specific persons is a common one, dating back to the patristic period and is therefore not unique to the 12th century or Richard in particular. For more on appropriation of properties to divine persons, see esp. Dominique Poirel, *Livre de la nature et débat*
for the Divine being one substance. He does this by arguing from supreme power, wisdom, and essence; but in the process he provides individual associations with each person of the Trinity. So while the one true God is omnipotent and omni-wise,\(^7\) and these divine properties are identical with the divine substance, supreme power is uniquely appropriated to the Father, supreme wisdom to the Son, and supreme goodness to the Spirit. And this is just one among many allusions Richard makes throughout the work.

When one stands back to ponder the level of craftsmanship and care with which this work was written, one cannot help but delight in its artistry and intricacy—even more so in its design as formative literature. And if we imagine readers taking the same care in reading *De Trinitate* as Richard took when composing it, then it’s not too farfetched to see how these subtle trinitarian dimensions might strike the reader with a love for the work that propels him further into it. Like the sudden discovery of rare coins on grains of sand might compel an explorer to seek out further treasures beneath, these added dimensions to Richard’s treatise on the Trinity surely invited further study; and upon further study, functioned to reinforce its main subject matter in newly discovered ways.

So when we approach a work like Richard of St. Victor’s *De Trinitate* and a thesis delineating the trinitarian dimensions with which it was constructed, we are not simply providing some general thoughts about the relation of style to substance; we are rather at the heart of theology itself—where Christian formation, discipleship, and devotion to

---

\(^7\) While ‘omni-wise’ is not Richard’s, it adequately captures what Richard means when he distinguishes between the Wisdom unique to Divinity and the wisdom in which man participates: “*sapientiam summam,*” “*sapientiam ipsam,*” “*plenitudinem sapientiae.*” Richard, *De Trinitate* II.13. My thanks to Dr. Dennis Martin for coming up with this term during our weekly Latin readings.
God are the governing framework from which and by which theology is read and written. It is written with a vow to maintain fidelity to the Scriptures as the divinely inspired Word of God as well as to those church Fathers who handed them down; and it is crafted in a way that exercises and “sustains” the soul in its ascent toward a bona fide divine encounter. It is written with a desire to make the incommunicable communicable: to bring the holiness—the uniqueness—of the Divine into the common; and by doing so, to make the common “special.” In return, learning brings the communicable to the incommunicable in a way that “extends” through all the multidimensionalities of visible and invisible things to the outer realms of reason, imagination, devotion, and study, propelling the soul of the novice toward beatitude—of union with God—creator with his Creator. It brings theology full circle, returning God’s Word and oneself to Him full rather than void and empty (Isaiah 55). Richard constructs the theology in De Trinitate with a view to celebrating rather than challenging these traditions. Like the solemn walls of the faithful monk’s cell, they provide a glorious freedom and silence within which to hear the Word of God, to be transfigured by it, and to bring that “apocalypse” to the page in a way that draws oneself and others into conformity with its brilliance.

Survey of Literature on Method and the Organization of this Work

The literature on Richard of St. Victor can be divided into four categories. Early work on him focused on whether he was more a mystic than a scholastic. Subsequent

---

work sees a blend of both in Richard with the emphasis on his sources and influences determining which of the two is given greater weight. Steven Chase, for example, sees a strong Dionysian influence at work in Richard’s *Mystical Ark*; whereas Nico den Bok sees more influence from Augustine and Anselm and downplays Dionysian influence. Aside from scholarship focused on Richard’s spirituality, his trinitarianism is receiving greater attention, with some claiming it is the most important trinitarian theology between Augustine and Aquinas. This high esteem for Richard is based on the view that he provides a robust social trinitarianism. Nico den Bok deals with the question as to whether the social trinitarian reading of Richard is warranted and concludes that it is not. He argues that while leaning more in this direction, Richard offers a more “Mono-

---


10 Den Bok, 163 n. 53. Dumeige sees Richard using Dionysius for illustration rather than as inspiration for his own thought. Coulter, 177. Cacciapuoti argues against the retrieval of Dionysian apophasis in Richard. Pierluigi Cacciapuoti, “Deus existentia amoris”: *Teologia della carità e teologia della trinità negli scritti di Riccardo di San Vittore (†1173)*, Bibliotheca Victorina, 9 (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1998), 106-7 [not read]. Den Bok concurs, noting if true, the “distinction between imago and veritas collapses.” Den Bok, 134 n. 162. Boethius is also relevant as an alternative or complementary source for these ideas. See nn. 322 and 360 of this work.


12 Den Bok’s concern is that contemporary interpreters misrepresent Richard’s thought by anachronistically projecting their modern conceptions of person, freedom, relationality, individuality,
Personal’ Trinitarianism.” That is, the relationship of God-to-man remains that of Person-to-person and not that of God-to-society/mankind nor one divine person to one human person.\textsuperscript{13} Other works situate Richard within his Victorine context. These focus on specifics such as exploring the liturgical sequences used and adapted by the Victorines\textsuperscript{14} or detailing the hermeneutical practices of various Victorine writers.\textsuperscript{15}

Richard composed in Latin, and not all of his work can be found in an English translation.\textsuperscript{16} His \textit{Benjamin minor} (under the title \textit{Twelve Patriarchs}), his \textit{Benjamin major} (under the title \textit{Mystical Ark}) and book III of his \textit{De Trinitate} can be found in society, etc. into the Trinity, subsequently appealing to this Trinity as a “Perfect-Society” in order to prescribe those modern utopian ideals. See den Bok, 88-89, 189 n. 150, 190 n. 154, 314 n. 126, and esp. 477-87. I share den Bok’s concern, but for matters related to the textual history of Richard’s \textit{De Trinitate} (see Appendices A-B of this work) and Richard’s \textit{quid/quis} distinction, I believe there is a non-anachronistic social trinitarianism in Richard that den Bok’s thesis precludes. See esp. nn. 323 and 457 of this work.

\textsuperscript{13} Den Bok, 460.


\textsuperscript{16} Works of Richard’s that have yet to be translated into English include \textit{Ad clamat ex seir, Carbonum et cinerum, Causam quam nesciebam, De comparatione Christi ad florem et Mariae ad virgam, De concordia temporum vegum conregnantum super Iudam et Israel, De differentia peccati mortalis et venalis, De differentia sacraficii Abrahae a sacraficio beate Mariae virginis, De Emmanuele, De eruditione hominis interioris, De exterminatione mali et promotione boni, De judicaria potestate in finali et universali judicio, De meditandis plagis quae circa finem mundi eventient, De missione Spiritus sanctii, De potestate ligandi et solvendi, De quaestionibus regulae sancti Augustini solutis, De sacrificio David prophetae, De spiritu blasphemiae, De statu interioris hominis, De superexcellenti baptismo Christi, De templo Salominis ad litteram, De tribis de personis appropriatis in Trinitate, De verbis apostoli, Declarationes nonnullarum difficultatum Scripturae, Elemosina patris erit in oblivione, Expositio difficultatum suborintium in expositione Tabernaculi feoderis, In Apocalypsin Joannes, In Ezechielis visionem, In illa die, Liber exceptionem, Misit Herodes rex manus, Nonnullae allegoriae tabernaculi feoderis, Quomodo Christus ponitur in signum populorum, Quomodo Spiritus Sanctus est amor Patris et Filii, Sermones centum, Super exiti editum seu de tribus processionibus.
Grover Zinn’s book published as part of the *Classics of Western Spirituality* series. Clare Kirchberger provides English translations of some of Richard’s works, including various of his sermons on the Psalms, selections from *Mystical Ark* and *Twelve Patriarchs*, as well as *Four Degrees of Violent Love*. The only full English translation of Richard’s *De Trinitate* is soon to be published by Brepols and translated by Chris Evans. Currently, the work is only accessible in a French translation by Salet, a German translation by von Balthasar, and in Danish by Rydström-Poulsen. The only critical Latin edition of Richard’s work remains that of J. Ribaillier. Chris Evans graciously provided an advance copy of his forthcoming English translation of *De Trinitate*, and in what follows, we rely mostly on his translations. Where further analysis of the Latin is required, we use Ribaillier’s critical edition.

The most recent works specifically to treat the topic of structure and method in Richard of St. Victor’s *De Trinitate* have been Dale Coulter’s *Per visibilia ad invisibilia*, and Nico den Bok’s *Communicating the Most High*. Coulter focuses more broadly on Richard’s *Mystical Ark* and *De Trinitate*, arguing for a theological method of


contemplative ascent from visible to invisible things. He sees the former work as a prerequisite for undertaking a study of the latter. Nico den Bok focuses mainly on Richard’s *De Trinitate* and argues for the pseudo-Athanasian creed—the *Quicumque*—as the starting point for an inquiry based on finding “necessary reasons” for the truths it inscribes. To that extent, den Bok sees Richard’s method following Anselm’s *fides quaerens intellectum* where this is understood as taking those things already held and believed by faith and seeking further and more “fitting” or “certain” reasons for believing them to be true.

The thesis put forward in this work situates itself very near Coulter and den Bok. We agree with den Bok that Richard takes the *Quicumque* as his main starting point for his trinitarian reflections, and that Richard primarily seeks necessary reasons along the lines of an Anselmian *fides quaerens intellectum*, but we argue further that Richard deliberately incorporates these arguments as part of triadic structures with formative aims. As a result, we see Richard’s amazing philosophical clarity and consistency matched by an equally amazing organizational skill—a dimension to Richard’s treatise that has yet to be fully appreciated. The thesis, likewise, falls in line with Coulter’s

---

23 Coulter, 19. Coulter argues for the harmony of the scholastic and mystical dimensions of Richard by rooting it in an overarching framework—*per visibilia ad invisibilia*—that sees them as complementary dimensions of a contemplative ascent to the face of God.

24 Commentaries on the *Quicumque* became common in the 12th century. For sources, see den Bok 156 n. 26.

25 This formative aim in Richard’s compositions has not gone unnoticed. See, e.g., I. Van ‘T Spijker, “Learning by Experience: Twelfth-Century Monastic Ideas,” a chapter in *Centers of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East*, eds. Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair A. MacDonald (Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1995), 197-206. What we wish to highlight in this work is how this dimension manifests itself in Richard’s *De Trinitate*, a work that might be judged more by its philosophical abstraction than for its formative aims. Furthermore we tailor our analysis to the specific way Richard designs his work with triadic structures in order to use them for this purpose.
analysis of seeing contemplation within *De Trinitate* as an ascent from visible to invisible things. But where Coulter sees Richard harmonizing opposites, we argue that opposing terms in *De Trinitate* are more often part of a triad. In *De Trinitate*, Richard usually searches for a third, and this third creates triadic forms and structures that underly Richard’s entire treatise. In addition, we add further context to Coulter’s *Per visibilia ad invisibilia* by filling out the Augustinian heritage from which Richard draws all of the major pieces for his *De Trinitate*. *Per visibilia ad invisibilia* is one among several Augustinian margins within which Richard lives and composes his work.

Our thesis uncovers an added dimension to Richard’s treatise on the Trinity, and attending to this dimension helps us appreciate, understand, and read Richard’s *De Trinitate* in a proportionately deeper way. For as we discern the intricacies of Richard’s compositions we become further enriched by them. As Richard himself says:

> Certainly, the more fully, the more firmly something is learned, the more richly the mind will be enlarged for holding larger and deeper things. But nevertheless, it seems evident that whatever skill has been obtained by instruction is strengthened, enlarged and perfected by use and exercise. Again: What does it mean that in one and the same effort in which we are instructed and are exercised we see now more subtly, now more clearly, unless it means that enlargement and sharp-sightedness of the mind increase according to the mode of attention?26

We claim that Richard constructs his *De Trinitate* with trinitarian forms and structures for the purpose of sustaining the hearts and shaping the minds of his readers with the contemplation of the Trinity. Richard gives the content of his work a Trinitarian form that has the power to transform his reader in ways it cannot if it is ignored.

This work is divided into six chapters. Chapter 4 lays out the main thesis, showing that Richard argues for the Trinity “trinitarianly” for the formation of souls. But to situate that thesis properly, we must provide some appropriate context and explain the major theological influences Richard drew upon for composing his work (Chapter 1). Likewise, it is helpful to understand life at the abbey where he composed the work and the relationship the treatise has with some of his other literary compositions (Chapter 2). We also must proceed with caution concerning the role of reason in theological contemplation for Richard, lest we restrict ourselves to our modern and narrow view of this term and misunderstand him. This corrective helps us see the highly favorable but limited role reason plays in Richard’s views on theological contemplation (Chapter 3).

With that context in mind, we focus on our thesis: the trinitarian way Richard structures his *De Trinitate* and how he uses these structures for formative purposes. Chapter 4 focuses on the *structural* elements of the thesis, making the case that Richard deliberately crafts his treatise with triadic forms. Chapter 5 deals with the *formative* implications of these structures and determines how they edify the individual reader as well as the Christian community.

Finally, we look at the chief objections that might be raised against our thesis and provide adequate rejoinders to them (Chapter 6). We then conclude with a fitting summary of our findings and some insight on what Richard’s *De Trinitate* teaches us about “constructive theology” (Conclusion).
CHAPTER ONE

THE INFLUENCE OF AUGUSTINE AND ANSELM

See and ask for the ancient paths . . .

The sources and influences on Richard of St. Victor are as vast as any in the 12th century, and so rather than get caught up in detailing all of them we confine ourselves to those who are the most frequently cited by him in his treatise on the Trinity: Augustine and Anselm. 27

The Heritage of Augustine

We begin with Augustine—and appropriately so—for between the two, Richard cites Augustine forty-three times more than Anselm. 28 This is to be expected given that Augustine’s works were the most frequently read at the abbey of St. Victor and that the Victorines, like many other canons regular in the 12th century, looked to his writings (and his Rule) for constructing their lives in accordance with the “common life.” The canons regular and Richard’s life as one will be discussed in more detail in chapter 2. For now it is only important to point out that as a canon regular, living in Paris, Richard was

27 In narrowing our focus to Augustine and Anselm we do not deny the many other sources and influences on Richard’s thought but only highlight the two primary theologians he draws upon in De Trinitate. As is clear from the Victorine reading-cycle, Richard knows Gregory the Great and Origen. He also builds on Boethius for his taxonomy of properties in II.25 and his definition of ‘person’ in bk. IV. There are also traces of Pseudo-Dionysius, Hugh of St. Victor, Achard of St. Victor, and others. But Anselm of Canterbury and Augustine—particularly their works on the Trinity—are the primary influences on Richard as he composes De Trinitate.

28 Congar, 87.
the most familiar with Augustine’s writings, memorized large sections of them, and prized them above all. In Richard’s world, Augustine’s corpus would take second place only to the Scriptures. Augustine, therefore provides the primary margins within which Richard composes his De Trinitate.

For brevity we limit our treatment of Augustine to the work he devoted to the Trinity. Richard cites it most in his own treatise because he too is writing on the Trinity. This focus provides the opportunity for some direct contrasts between these two works. But because our thesis deals with how Richard writes with a view to the formation of his readers, we further confine our analysis to the formative dimensions of Augustine’s De Trinitate with a view to how these are used by Richard. This proves just as fruitful as a more comprehensive treatment of Augustine’s corpus because Augustine’s De Trinitate is a mature work—written in his later years. As a result, it takes up many of the central

29 “We are fortunate in having for the Victorine community a list that identifies a substantial number of works assigned for reading during meals. Found in chapter 48 of the Liber ordinis [sancti Victoris Parisiensis] under the title “De lectione mensae,” the list shows that at mealtime, which was one of the few times outside of a chapter meeting or the daily round of liturgical celebrations when the canons gathered as a group, they listened to the lector reading from a prescribed sequence of works, mostly patristic, that tended to be homilies or biblical commentaries. Among the authors whose works are specifically mentioned in this list is Augustine of Hippo, whose homilies and biblical commentaries comprise a significant portion of the yearly cycle of readings. In this distinctive, communal reading and hearing, Augustine was present for the canons in a way set apart from the regular liturgy and periods of instruction or study, each of which also offered numerous opportunities to encounter Augustine’s writings.” Grover A. Zinn, Jr. “The Influence of Augustine’s De doctrina christiana Upon the Writings of Hugh of St. Victor,” a chapter in Reading and Wisdom: The De doctrina christiana of Augustine in the Middle Ages, ed. Edward D. English, Notre Dame Conferences in Medieval Studies (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995), 48. And also, “... one-fourth of the [Victorine] year was dedicated to Augustine, slightly less to Origen, and about one-sixth to Gregory.” Ibid., 50. In the context of required Scripture reading, see Hugh of Saint Victor, The Didascalicon of Hugh of Saint Victor: A Guide to the Arts, trans. Jerome Taylor (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 104.

30 Most date Augustine’s De Trinitate to the decade prior to his death in 430. The ideas were already part of Augustine’s thought in ca. 399 when he likely began the work, but not completed until he was in his late sixties. Allan D. Fitzgerald, Augustine Through the Ages: An Encyclopedia (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), s.v. “De Trinitate.”
themes and concepts from his other writings. Moreover, the theology of the Trinity is the core of Christian orthodoxy itself. It is the source and end of all theology—the nexus in which everything true and right and good coheres. Augustine’s De Trinitate thus forms a developmental and theological apex from which we can see some of the main contours of his thought and discern some key foundations upon which subsequent trinitarian reflection would be constructed.

We begin where Augustine began his treatise on the Trinity: with the Scriptures. He cites Scripture plentifully but one verse focuses our thoughts on De Trinitate’s formative dimensions: 1 Corinthians 13:12.\footnote{Augustine, De Trinitate, I.1, 8, 10, 13; II.17; III.4; V.1, 10; VI.10; VIII.4; IX.1, 3; X.3, 9; XII.14; XIII.20; XIV.2, 17, 18, 19; XV.2, 8, 9, 11, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24. Note the higher frequency in XV where Augustine consummates the journey to the “face-to-face.” All citations of Augustine are taken from Nicene & Post-Nicene Series: On the Trinity, Enchiridion, Faith and Creed, Catechising, ed. Philip Schaff. Nicene Fathers, 3 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark Publishers, 1980). On the importance of 1 Corinthians 13:12 to Augustine’s thought see Frederick van Fleteren, “Per speculum et in aenigmate: The Use of 1 Corinthians 13:12 in the Writings of St. Augustine,” Augustinian Studies 23 (1992): 69-102.} In this one verse, and the chapter that surrounds it, we discern the major themes Richard picks up on in Augustine’s theology. The verse states, “Now we see in a glass (speculum) darkly, but then we shall see face-to-face.”\footnote{Videmus nunc per speculum in enigmate tunc autem facie ad faciem nunc cognosco ex parte tunc autem cognoscam sicut et cognitus sum.} It was probably part of a collection of theophanic texts (i.e., those that deal with a visitation from God and/or the desire to encounter God in some more direct way).\footnote{See, e.g., how Augustine connects this ‘mirror’ (speculum) with the ‘watchtower’ (specula) Moses is placed in before he is permitted to see God’s glory: Augustine De Trinitate II.16-18 (cf. Exodus 33:22). Given the basic Christian desire for direct encounter with God, and its priority within monasticism, catenas of scriptures pertaining to encounters with the Divine were an early part of the inherited Christian tradition. See esp. Bogdan G. Bucur, “Theophanies and Vision of God in Augustine’s De Trinitate: An Eastern Orthodox Perspective,” St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly 52:1 (2008): 67-93. 1 Corinthians 13:12, however, seems to have become a gathering point for them, providing a central place for their collective contemplation. In 2 Corinthians 3:18 Paul, alluding to Exodus 33:22, introduces a theology of participation and illumination that contains key elements in Augustine’s thought: face, mirror, glory, reformation in the image of God. Augustine pulls all of this together in his use of 1 Corinthians 13:12.}
We will treat the specific wording of this verse in detail later, showing a play on the Latin wording for ‘mirror’ that connects with Richard and Anselm, but for now the context of this verse demands our attention. 1 Corinthians 13 is primarily about the priority of love above everything else. Without love, speech loses the ability to provide true knowledge. As the apostle Paul says, to “. . . speak in the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love . . .” is to be a “clanging gong or cymbal.” Further, love is the greatest of those things that remain when all else fails: “And now these three remain: faith, hope, and love. But the greatest of these is love.” And what kind of love is the greatest of all? It is divine love; a love that is one-of-a-kind. Such love is “patient, kind, and not envious or boastful or arrogant or rude. It does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; it does not rejoice in wrongdoing, but rejoices in the truth. It bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things.”

It is the love God has for his children; and the love He rightfully asks of them in return—a love that overflows toward God and neighbor. This love plays a prominent role throughout Augustine’s writings. Indeed, it is hard to find a single work where it does not turn up. And where it does turn up in Augustine, it is often prioritized. De doctrina christiana, for example, a work Richard heard read frequently at St. Victor, is conceived as a journey from fear to love. In the same work love is the regula fidei that governs scriptural exegesis and

---

34 1 Corinthians 13:4-7. Paul’s description dovetails with the description God gives to Moses in Exodus 34:6: “Then the LORD passed by in front of [Moses] and proclaimed, ‘YHWH, YHWH-EL, compassionate and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in lovingkindness and truth . . .’.” Paul picks up on all of these allusions to the Hebrew ‘דנ汚’ for “lovingkindness” throughout the Torah, Prophets, and Psalms: God’s faithfulness and lovingkindess endure forever, a divine love that “cries out” (ἐκλήσεως) for human imitation and reciprocation.

35 “De doctrina christiana” by Augustine and Moralia on Job by Gregory the Great were regular mealtime reading at St. Victor.” Coulter, 227 n. 6. See also n. 29 above.
homiletic preaching. Likewise, this love plays an important role in Augustine’s *De Trinitate* and Johannine homilies, and its prominence may have led Richard to give it focused treatment in his own argument for the Trinity of divine persons. As Augustine writes in his main section devoted to love in his *De Trinitate*:

No other thing, then, is chiefly to be regarded in this inquiry, which we make concerning the Trinity and concerning knowing God, except what is true love, nay, rather what is love. For that is to be called love which is true, otherwise it is desire; and so those who desire are said improperly to love, just as they who love are said improperly to desire. But this is true love, that cleaving to the truth we may live righteously, and so may despise all mortal things in comparison with the love of men, whereby we wish them to live righteously.

This love also becomes important in the later sections of Augustine’s *De Trinitate* where it is incorporated with triads designed to elevate the mind toward further levels of righteousness and rest in the contemplation of the Trinity.

The second element in 1 Corinthians 13 is the move from what is partial and imperfect to what is complete and perfect. As we see later, this distinction is the fulcrum

---

36 Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* III.

37 I think especially of Augustine’s tenth homily on the 1st Epistle of John: “I have seen the end of all perfection.”

38 Augustine, *De Trinitate* VIII.7. Bk. VIII begins Augustine’s movement into love: love with respect to he-that-loves, that-which-is-loved, and love. He refines the triad in the subsequent books. Two points of connection with Richard’s *De Trinitate* are (a) Augustine’s precedent for using triads in his articulations of the Trinity and (b) these triads are drawn out from the concept of Love.

39 Augustine’s love triads in *De Trinitate*: faith-hope-love (VIII.4); he-that-loves, that-which-is-loved, and love (VIII.10); myself, that-which-I-love, and love (IX.2); memory-understanding-will/love (X.1ff.); remember-understand-love (XV.28). As David Bell points out, Augustine articulates his goal in *Sermon* 52.16-17: “Look in the creature, and see if it be possible to find something there ‘by which we might demonstrate that some three things are shown forth separately, and [yet] operate inseparably.’” Quoted in David N. Bell, *The Image and Likeness: The Augustinian Spirituality of William of St. Thierry*, Cistercian Studies, 78 (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 1984), 34-35.
upon which Richard’s entire treatise rides. Now we see the Divine only partially, dimly, in a dark glass; but then, we shall see fully, completely, face-to-face. For now, knowledge of the Divine comes through glimpses, from prophecies, from tongues, but then we shall behold—in a never-ending, and everlasting glimpse—the eternal face of God. For now we think and reason as children, maturing in knowledge and faith: We still see only partially. All of this is the scriptural background to the quest for true knowledge rooted in faith and that underlies the theological method of Augustine, Anselm, and Richard. This desire to take what is imperfect and partial toward its perfection and wholeness motivates them to write on the Trinity as they do. Augustine writes:

But that is the right purpose which starts from faith. For a certain faith is in some way the starting-point of knowledge; but a certain knowledge will not be made perfect, except after this life, when we shall see face to face. Let us therefore be thus minded, so as to know that the disposition to seek the truth is more safe than that which presumes things unknown to be known. Let us therefore so seek as if we should find, and so find as if we were about to seek.

Third, we see the ‘mirror’ of 1 Corinthians 13:12 as a “gathering point,” a ‘collatio’ used by Augustine to bring together allusions to similar wording and parallels with other biblical texts. In doing so, he constructs the move from partial to perfect as a journey—an

40 The concept of ‘plenitude’ (e.g., fullness, completion, perfection) plays the most significant role in Richard’s argumentation for the Trinity of persons in bk. III and often forms the third element of his triadic structures (e.g., Highest-Best-Fullest). As shown in chapter 3 of this work, it is the primary principle Richard uses to decorate the margins of Augustine and Anselm on the Trinity. See esp. n. 79 and n. 171 of this work.

41 “Given the nature of medieval mirrors the image is apt. They were made of polished metal and gave at best a fuzzy and somewhat dim reflection. Subject to tarnishing, the accumulation of dirt and other vicissitudes of use, they needed careful attention to be useful. So it is with the soul. Only by continual attention to discipline can the mind become still, as it were, and begin to experience a new reality, divine showings . . .” Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 20-21.

42 Augustine, De Trinitate IX.1.
ascent—along three lines. First, it is an ascent from immaturity to maturity, from formation to re-formation: “When I was a child, I reasoned like a child; when I grew up I put childish things aside.” Here we note the pedagogical dimensions of Augustine’s treatise on the Trinity where he starts with “first things”—Scriptures pertaining to the Trinity and the proper way to understand and reconcile them. But he subsequently moves on to “second things”—adult things—things that demand the identification and use of that chief thing within man that sets him apart in the material created order: his soul, his mind, his reason. It is to discover that one has been created in the image of God and that the proper ordering and use of that image—in mind, understanding, and will/love—properly prepares one’s soul for a direct encounter with God: the promise of seeing Him face-to-face.

Augustine, like the Victorines, gave great weight to the letter of Scripture, even to

43 In general, the first part of Augustine’s De Trinitate focuses more specifically on scriptural exegesis to both provide evidence for the divinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and to resolve difficulties in their interpretation. The latter part shifts into a meditative reflection on the image of God in man.


45 Augustine’s inspiration for connecting the soul to God came from listening to bishop Ambrose. Augustine writes, “I noticed, repeatedly, in the sermons of our bishop . . . that when God is thought of, our thoughts should dwell on no material reality whatsoever, nor in the case of the soul, which is the one thing in the universe nearest to God” (emphasis mine). De beata vita I.4. Quoted in Peter Brown, Augustine of Hippo: A Biography, Revised Edition with a New Epilogue (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2000), 75.

46 On the new Victorine emphasis on the ‘literal sense’ of Scripture: “One of the most interesting developments in the exegesis especially of Ezekiel’s temple vision during the later Middle Ages is the effort to literalize its text. In the later twelfth century Richard of St. Victor, a major visionary writer himself, commented on Ezekiel specifically to refute the assertion of Bede and Gregory that the plan of the temple citadel was irreducibly incoherent, literal non-sense, and thus only to be read ‘spiritually’ and as metaphor (including synecdoche, ekphrasis, metonymy, and so on). As Beryl Smalley said of this literalizing effort, ‘a scientific movement is really afoot,’ a movement to objectify and de-trope the ekphrasis, understanding it less as an instance of rhetorical allegoria and more as the linguistically
the point of emphasizing the significance of prepositions. One such preposition exploited by Augustine was ‘ad’ in ad imaginem Dei (i.e., to the image of God).\(^{47}\) Man is not simply created in the image of God; through sin, that image is marred and has to be restored. Thus man, though created in the image of God, must still be restored to that image. That ‘ad’ begins the ascent to God and requires both intellective and affective control as one seeks to be restored in full accordance with that image. And in a play on the Latin wording that becomes commonplace after Augustine, that ‘mirror’ (speculum) also becomes the ‘watchtower’ (specula)—the place in the house of God (domus Dei) one ascends, keeps a lookout, and awaits a visitation from the Lord.\(^{48}\)

But Augustine also frequently glosses 1 Corinthians 13:12 with two important scriptural allusions. These glosses further establish the contours of his theology and become foundational to Richard’s as well. The first is Romans 1:20 and the second is 2 Corinthians 4:18. In Romans 1:20, it states that “the invisible qualities of God have been made plain to men through those things which have been made so that men are without excuse.” Thus through visible things one comes to discern the invisible qualities of God. As Augustine writes:

> But indeed all these visible and sensible things are, as we have often said, exhibited through the creature made subject in order to signify the invisible and intelligible God, not only the Father, but also the Son and the Holy Spirit, “of whom are all things, and


\(^{48}\) See the picture of Godefroy of St. Victor in the ‘watchtower’ in Fassler, 338-339. For Richard’s use of the term, see *Mystical Ark*, V.3; Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 313; *De Trinitate* V.6, 21; VI.23.
through whom are all things, and in whom are all things”; although “the invisible things of God, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead.”

That Augustine understands this trajectory of visible to invisible with the mirror (speculum) of 1 Corinthians 13:12 is demonstrated by the fact that he continues in II.16 to speak of Moses’ desire to see God plainly; but it is not until God places Moses in the ‘watchtower’ (specula) that he will be able to see His glory; that is, his divine substance:

Assuredly he knew that he saw corporeally, and he sought the true sight of God spiritually . . . the Lord afterward said to Moses, “Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see my face, and live.” And the Lord said, “Behold, there is a place by me, and thou shalt stand upon a rock: and it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee into a watch-tower of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand while I pass by: and I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back parts; but my face shall not be seen.”

Thus the “ascent” from the imperfect to the perfect, from the partial to the complete vision of God, also consists of moving from the visible to the invisible (per visibilia ad invisibilia). One discerns by means of visible things what one ought to think about God, because God, in providing them, makes this possible.

---

49 Augustine, De Trinitate II.14.

50 Augustine, De Trinitate II.16. Augustine goes further in II.17 to connect the watchtower-rock within which Moses stands to behold God’s glory with the Church. And he is clear that this “vantage point” is reached not merely by intellectual acumen but spiritual discipline. If the contemplative is to see the incorruptible substance of Divinity, he must put corruptible things aside. As he says, “… the more pure the more it rises to spiritual things; and it rises the more to spiritual things the more it dies to carnal things.”

51 Coulter’s book by the same name argues that the movement in Richard’s thought from visible to invisible is based on Romans 1:20. Here we only wish to add the Augustinian heritage of this principle and show how intricately it was associated with the exegetical history of 1 Corinthians 13:12; an exegesis both Anselm and Richard knew well.
And this leads us to the second gloss. What is visible also changes. Visible things come to be and cease to be, but invisible things are eternal; and God is the most eternal of all. 2 Corinthians 4:18 states, “while we look at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal.” The context of 1 Corinthians 13:12 makes clear that the contrast between what is partial and what is complete is not just a question of what is lacking that might be fulfilled, but also—and this is the point of emphasis in the passage—a question of what lasts when everything else fails: “And now these three remain: faith, hope, and love” (emphasis mine). What is eternal remains, lasts, and abides. What is temporal does not. So what is eternal? In the final analysis, only God is eternal. But God is Truth and God is Love, and thus to seek God is to seek the Truth and Love in the way of truth and love. These are the rails that mark the journey. They are what fix the lines of movement toward God. And that movement, that passion, ends with its eternal destination. It is where the soul, remaining in love, remains with Him and in Him as its fixed and eternal resting place. As Augustine says in his Confessions: “Thou hast formed us for Thyself, and our hearts are restless till they find rest in Thee.”

These themes do not offer a comprehensive survey of Augustine’s theology or his own De Trinitate, but they do represent major contours of this thought. Many of them coalesce around the ‘mirror’ of 1 Corinthians 13:12. But that mirror and these themes

52 See esp. Augustine, De Trinitate XIV.1, where he summarizes the structure of bks. XII-XIV.

53 John 3:33; 1 John 4:7-8; 2 John 3; Wisdom 3:9.

54 In Augustine’s De Trinitate, this ‘rest’ is associated with (a) full vision or contemplation (of God): I.10, XI.5-6; (b) the house of the Lord: II.17; and (c) the satisfaction of a contented or holy will: VIII.7, IX.9, IX.12, XII.1, XV.26.
provide the margins of subsequent trinitarian articulation and reflection in the Augustinian tradition. And as we will see, Richard also writes within them.

The Guidance of Anselm

The second most cited author in Richard’s *De Trinitate* is St. Anselm of Canterbury.\(^{55}\) Anselm lived just a generation prior to Richard, but Anselm’s works were well known to him. This is for two reasons. First, a good bit of Anselm’s compositions and ecclesiastical involvement focused on debate about the Trinity, some of which was fueled by one of his early works: *De Grammatico*. Second, two of Anselm’s greatest works on the Trinity—his *Monologion* and *Proslogion*—became popular and were widely published before Richard’s time.

Anselm became part of a new cycle of trinitarian polemics with one of his early writings: *De Grammatico*—a treatise laying out some basic principles for predication. Among the things Anselm considered in this treatise was the question of whether a white substance is a white substance proper or a substance that is white. In the process Anselm used the Trinity as an illustration. But this rather innocuous illustration was made a controversy. Roscelin accused Anselm of leaning towards a tritheistic conception of the Divine based on this distinction.\(^{56}\) This prompted Anselm’s response which he took up in

\(^{55}\) As Feiss notes, “. . . of Richard’s works the *De Trinitate* and the *Ad clamat* are the two most influenced by Anselm in spirit, aim, and method.” Hugh Feiss, “Learning and the Ascent to God in Richard of St. Victor,” (Ph.D. diss., Pont. Athanaeum of Sant’ Anselmo, 1979), 122. This is noteworthy given that Anselm had much less influence on Richard’s predecessor, Hugh. Ibid., 26. Ribaillier further notes, that despite the overlap of vocabulary with Achard’s *De unitate* and the fact that both Richard and Achard follow the general outline of the *Monologion*, Richard is more faithful to Anselm’s ‘supreme Good’, Achard developing his from ‘supreme Beauty’. Ribaillier, 29-31.

his *On the Incarnation*. But Anselm’s trinitarian reflections continued, and his treatment would reach its most sublime form in his *Monologion* and *Proslogion*. These two works, along with an added dialogical exchange with Gaunilo who responds “On Behalf of the Fool,” were some of the most copied and published of Anselm’s works. The *Monologion* was written under the promptings of some of Anselm’s pupils; the *Proslogion* was written later as Anselm’s thoughts further coalesced to form a single argument for the existence of God. The writings became so popular, in fact, that Anselm sought the advice of his mentor, Lanfranc. Lanfranc’s only corrective was that Anselm cite his authorities rather than merely quote them. After these writings Anselm attended the Council of Bari (1098)—a council that had as one of its chief objectives to reconcile East-West rifts with respect to whether the Holy Spirit was sent from both the Father and the Son or from the Son alone. Anselm was a major representative of the former view and defended it in an attempt to persuade those who held to the latter. As a result of that debate, Anselm wrote *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*.57

Thus a generation prior to Richard of St. Victor there had been quite a bit of activity clarifying and better articulating theological contemplation of the Trinity. Much of the debate and contours of trinitarian thought at the time were given shape by Anselm’s thought and writings.58 Given the popularity of Anselm’s *Monologion* and *Proslogion*, it

57 Ibid.

58 The intervening years between Anselm of Canterbury and Richard contain many other historical developments and figures we pass over here. While these establish the more proximate, Parisian context of Richard’s thought (e.g., William of Champeaux, Hugh of St. Victor, Abelard, Peter Lombard, Bernard of Clairvaux, William of St. Thierry, etc.) we forgo this broader analysis in order to devote more space to the specific structural and formative connections Richard’s *De Trinitate* has with Anselm’s *Monologion*. The choice of Anselm also locates our analysis within the general consensus of Richardian scholarship that *De Trinitate* and *Ad clamat ex seir* are the most influenced by Anselm’s thought and method. For Feiss and
is not surprising that Richard would have known them and incorporated some of their elements into his own work on the Trinity.

Anselm likewise fits within the Augustinian tradition but his connection with Augustine becomes explicit in his *Monologion*; for despite Lanfranc’s admonition to cite his sources, the only author Anselm explicitly mentions is Augustine.  

As we will see, Richard works very closely with Anselm’s *Monologion*. We therefore have at least *prima facie* grounds for seeing the new fullness Richard develops on the Trinity as the fruit of an Augustinian-Anselmian trajectory. Moreover, our analysis bears this out, highlighting that Richard develops formative as well as logical aspects of his predecessors’ thought.

We divide our treatment of Anselm along three lines. First, because our thesis pertains to how Richard structures his own treatise on the Trinity with formative aims, we look at the structure and formative aims of Anselm’s *Monologion*. Here we see that Anselm structures his *meditatio* according to the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad popular in the 11th and 12th centuries. In addition, we note that the flow, in the last two sections of his work, moves from right thinking to right doing—taking up the Augustinian maxim of being perfect in “word and deed.”

Second, we are interested in Anselm’s understanding of ‘reason’ (*ratio*) and “necessary reasons” (*rationes necessariae*) as they pertain to

———

Ribaillier, see n. 55 of this work. Cf. Den Bok, 163 n. 53. For the 12th century Parisian context, see Poirel.


60 On the history of the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad and its use in the 12th century, see Poirel.

theological contemplation. This sets up the proper historical context for Richard’s own
use of reason and its role in his writings. Thus the treatment of reason and necessity in
Anselm initiates some correctives to be developed in more detail in chapter 3 that
broaden our understanding of the term and its use in the 12th century. In addition, we also
find that Richard picks up on Anselm’s distinction of what is “above and beyond” reason
and the important, but limited, role reason has for Trinitarian contemplation. Third, and
finally, we look to those key Augustinian principles and ideas Anselm identifies and
builds upon that are so central to Richard’s own work on the Trinity. This prepares us to
see how the “heritage of Augustine” and the “guidance of Anselm” fuse together into a
new fullness Richard gives them in his own articulation of the Trinity.

Two main structural elements deserve highlighting in Anselm’s *Monologion*, and
both of them pertain to his intended triadic organization of the treatise. The first concerns
the basic structure that Anselm himself explicitly points to with his own words. In
*Monologion* 29, Anselm writes that chapters 1-28 pertain to “properties” of the supreme
nature, whereas what follows pertains to the supreme nature’s “verbalization.” As he says
in 29, “So far, following reason’s lead, I have been working through the properties of the
supreme nature. It is now, I think, the right moment to investigate, if I am able, the
supreme nature’s verbalization, through which all things were created.” Anselm first
considers God in God’s-self (i.e., God considered by Himself apart from creation).
Created things are spoken of in 1-28 only for the sake of human understanding and
speaking; but here God is considered primarily as what He is *apart* from the created

---

62 Anselm, *Monologion* 29; Davies and Evans, 45.
order, as God in se. What follows in the second section, from 29-65, is a consideration of the processions (i.e., what proceeds within God that is not the created order: God ad intra). Finally, in the third section, 65-80, Anselm moves to the highest element in the created order—Man, created in the image of God—and proceeds to spell out the restoration of man according to that image. As he says:

It is now clear that one cannot get to see anything about the supreme nature by means of what is proper to it. Rather, one must work through something other than it. And hence, it is certain that what one gets closest to knowledge of it through, is that which most closely resembles it. And the more a creature resembles it, the more excellent its nature must be. So such a thing has a double effect: its close resemblance helps bring the inquiring mind closer to the supreme truth, and the excellence of its created nature teaches the mind what to think about its Creator. And the greater the resemblance and excellence, the more it helps and teaches.63

The transition from the second to the third section of the Monologion is also a move from “word” to “deed”—another Augustinian maxim. It is where man—in contemplation of the trinitarian God—undertakes, with God’s help, the reformation of his soul en route to God. Here theological meditation brings moral integrity to the rational soul as it ultimately seeks what is above and beyond it: the face of the Divine. As Anselm says:

To strive to give, therefore, expression to this impressed image; to strive to actualize, by an act of will, this, nature’s potential: such, above all, is, in consequence, the debt that the rational creature owes its Creator. A debt above and beyond the very fact that it exists. To be able to be conscious of, understand and love the supreme good is its most momentous ability (emphasis mine).64

And this transition in Anselm—like we see also in Richard—marks the end of the visible

63 Anselm, Monologion 66; Davies and Evans, 72. Cf. Augustine, De Trinitate VI.8 and n. 45 of this work.

64 Anselm, Monologion 68; Davies and Evans, 73.
footprints and vestiges of the Divine within the created order that man’s graced mind and reason are able to discern. The trail to the fact of God does not end here, but where one steps next in the ascent is “above and beyond” reason. As Anselm says: “This seems to me to be a sublime mystery, which stretches well beyond the horizon of human understanding.”\(^{65}\) Here the sandals of reason are set aside and one treads cautiously in the footsteps of Christ to reform the soul in accordance with His image.

But there is a second triadic pattern to notice in the *Monologion*—and this triad most reveals that the objective of Anselm’s *Monologion* is a formative one. This is the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad that many writings on the Trinity (including Richard’s) in the 11th and 12th centuries draw upon. What interests us about the triad in Anselm is the unique—and reverse!—way he implements it in the *Monologion*. Among the three elements of this triad, power is usually attributed to the Father, wisdom to the Son, and goodness to the Spirit.\(^{66}\) The primacy of the Father generates the Son in wisdom and the Spirit in goodness. So one might expect a straightforward analysis of each element of this triad starting first with Power, and then subsequently with Wisdom and Goodness, as many writers on the Trinity do. But this is not what Anselm does. In fact, he does just the opposite. Rather than start with Power and proceed to Wisdom and Goodness, he starts with Goodness, then Wisdom, and ends with Power. These elements correspond, roughly, with the three sections of the *Monologion* given above: 1-28 with Goodness, 29-65 with Wisdom/Word, and Power in 80.

\(^{65}\) Anselm, *Monologion* 64; Davies and Evans, 70.

\(^{66}\) See, e.g., Richard, *De Trinitate* VI.15 where he incorporates from his *De tribus personis appropriatis in Trinitate*. Ribaillier, 11-12, 247-248.
What is the reason for this? The clue most helpful for making sense of this reverse order of the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad comes from the pen of Anselm himself. Shortly after Anselm wrote the *Monologion*, he wrote his *Proslogion* where he explicitly delineates his method in composing the former work. In the prologue to the *Proslogion*, he writes that he crafted the *Monologion* “as an example of meditation on the meaning of faith from the point of view of one seeking, through silent reasoning within himself” (emphasis mine).\(^67\) Thus although metaphysically, ontologically—according to the order of being—the order of the triad is Power —> Wisdom —> Goodness, reflecting the order from God-to-man, Anselm picks the triad up with respect to the first point of contact man has with God: an experience of his participation in the supreme Goodness that permeates all good things. For man must first encounter and inhabit this Goodness in order to be illuminated with its light and, by means of it, behold the inaccessible light of the glory of God. One then verbalizes the verbalization of God, approximating with words in the mind the perfect Wisdom and Word of God completely exemplified in the Christ. Jesus, the divine Word of God is the most sublime manifestation of the supreme Wisdom of God. As one longs for and seeks the face of God by means of that Wisdom—approximating one’s own “silent reasoning” to that heavenly Reasoning, of one’s internal and temporal word to that eternal Word—one comes closer to glimpsing the supreme essence.

But this imitation and approximation of the Word—‘righting’ one’s own verbalization (and hence, comprehension) of divine Wisdom—cannot stop at words

\(^67\) Anselm, *Proslogion*, Prologue; Davies and Evans, 82.
alone. For chiefly in deed (ultimately, in *power*) one discovers God in Godself. One must serve and worship the Lord (*Domínus*)—as Augustine’s maxim made clear—in word and *deed*. It is to extend the ‘righting’ of words to the ‘righting’ of power.\(^68\) And this integration of word and deed in the soul of the seeker forms the apex of the third section of Anselm’s *Monologion*: the restoration of man in accordance with the image and likeness of God. As that ‘re-flection’ properly imitates and approximates—through its holy efforts and thoughts—the supreme Power-Wisdom-Goodness of God, the closer it comes to seeing God face-to-face (i.e., as He truly is). Here one encounters the supreme essence of God without mediation, above and beyond reasons and similitudes. The rational and devout soul finally reaches, in its earnest longing, the summit of the Most High God.

This leads Anselm to conclude with a chapter on the supreme and *primal* power of God, by means of which come the generation of the Son, the procession of the Spirit, and the creation of man in accordance with the image of God. Before the supreme power of God, man finds himself—despite reaching the summit of God—still kneeling in worship at His footstool. There is one God; there is no other. As Anselm says:

> For the supreme essence alone is that through which anything good is good, without which nothing is good, and out of, through and in which all things exist. So then, since it, alone, is not just a good Creator, but is also the superlatively *powerful master* and the

\(^68\) Here Anselm perceptively captures another key element in Augustine’s *De Trinitate* that likely serves as the basis for the word-to-deed order of the reformation of the image of God material in the last two sections of his *Monologion*. For it matches the *order* by which Augustine said men should imitate Christ in conquering the devil, by putting righteousness before power: “it pleased God, that in order to the rescuing of man from the grasp of the devil, the devil should be conquered, not by power, but by righteousness; and that so also men, imitating Christ, should seek to conquer the devil by righteousness, not by power. Not that power is to be shunned as though it were something evil; *but the order must be preserved, whereby righteousness is before it*” (emphasis mine). Augustine, *De Trinitate*, XIII.13-14.
superlatively wise controller of all things, it is superlatively clear that this is the only thing that all other natures ought, with all their might, to love and worship (emphasis mine).  

Some may object that this Goodness —> Wisdom —> Power reversing of the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad is merely a coincidence; however, we have even further support for it. At the very end of the Monologion, Anselm also reverses the Augustinian triad of Faith-Hope-Love in the direction of Love —> Hope —> Faith. Taken together, these two reversals combine with Anselm’s own explicit statement in the prologue of the Proslogion to make a strong case that he has deliberately ordered these triads for formative aims. He writes, starting with the encounter of the Triune God “from the point of view of one seeking,” and thus the journey begins from love to hope to faith—and from goodness to wisdom to power.

This suffices to show some of the formative structure and aims in Anselm’s Monologion—structures inspired by Augustine that are picked up and used by Richard of St. Victor. Yet Augustine also sowed some seeds in the form of key principles. These principles were further cultivated by Anselm and eventually harvested by Richard. What were they? More specifically, which principles laid down by Augustine and built upon by Anselm led to Richard’s main line of argument for the Trinity of persons in book III of

69 Anselm, Monologion 80. Davies and Evans, 81.

70 Anselm, Monologion 74: “But how are we to tell unambiguously which souls love and will enjoy what they are created to love . . .”; 75: “But the soul could not even attempt such a project, if it thought it could never complete it. Hope, therefore, is as necessary as determination is effectual . . .”; 76: “But love and hope are impossible without belief . . .” (emphasis mine). Davies and Evans, 77-78.

71 Human participation only extends to goodness and wisdom. Since the power described in the last chapter of Anselm’s Monologion emphasizes God’s ‘primal’ power, such power is not something man participates in. Or, to put it another way, while humans may participate in God’s power they do not participate in God’s omnipotence. Cf. Richard, De Trinitate II.11-14.
his work? For brevity we limit our analysis to the key principles that led to the genesis of Richard’s argument for the Trinity of persons in book III. This focus both refines our awareness of the contributions made to his thought by Augustine and Anselm and increases our appreciation of Richard’s originality in providing a new fullness to them. For as he points out at the opening of book III, this will be his “bold undertaking,”72 where he seeks necessary reasons for things he has read but has not seen proven.73

One of the starting points for Anselm’s articulation of the Trinity was a principle found in Augustine’s treatise on the Trinity. Augustine writes that “God is/consists of whatever it is better to be than not to be.”74 We can call it Augustine’s “Principle of Perfection.” He means by it that of all of the many good things we come to know and love, God lacks none of them. It is better to be just than unjust, therefore God is just. It is better to be eternal than temporal, therefore God is eternal. It is better to be loving than non-loving, therefore God is loving, etc. Anselm picks up this Augustinian “Principle of Perfection” and gives it a more “optimal” form. For Anselm, God is not merely the better of what is better or worse; but God is the best of all. Augustine would agree, but Anselm

72 Richard, De Trinitate III.1: Nam, ut verum fatear, ad tentandi ausum non me quidem tam scientia elevat quam aestuantis animi ardor instigat. Quid si non detur pervenire quo tendo?

73 Richard, De Trinitate I.5.

74 Augustine, De Trinitate V.1: “Certainly we find nothing of [outlines of forms, or brightness of colors, or greatness of space, or distance of parts, or extension of size, or any movements through intervals of place] in that, than which we find nothing better in our own nature, that is, in our own intellect, by which we apprehend wisdom according to our capacity. What, therefore, we do not find in that which is our own best, we ought not to seek in Him who is far better than that best of ours; . . . Whoso thus thinks of God, although he cannot yet find out in all ways what He is, yet piously takes heed, as much as he is able, to think nothing of Him that He is not.” Augustine states the principle in VI.8: “For in those things which are not great by bulk, to be greater is to be better.” In XIV.8 he writes, “the image of that nature than which none is better, is to be sought and found in us, in that than which our nature also has nothing better.” And in V.10 and XV.4 Augustine gives the short list of predications of divine perfection, concluding that “the Creator lives in the highest sense.”
elaborates the idea further and allows it to play a more prominent role in his thought. Indeed, with respect to Anselm’s *Proslogion*—a work he prized most of all for its conciseness and rational perspicuity—Augustine’s “Principle of Perfection” is the cornerstone on which the entire work is based. The chief difference in Augustine and Anselm on this point is that Anselm took the principle to its highest level. For Anselm God is not just perfect, but *maximally* so. God is the being-than-which-none-greater-can-be-thought. Thus God is not merely just as opposed to unjust, but the most just of all. God is not merely loving as opposed to unloving, but the most loving of all, and so on. In brief, Anselm takes Augustine’s “Principle of Perfection” and turns it into the “Principle of ‘Maximal’ Perfection.” Doing so gives him much of what he needs in his *Proslogion*. For because God is maximally perfect—the being-than-which-none-greater-can-be-thought—He must also exist in actuality and not simply as an idea in the mind alone. For if the being-than-which-none-greater-can-be-thought exists in the mind alone, one can still imagine a greater being; namely, one that exists in actuality and not as an idea in the mind alone. Therefore, if God is the being-than-which-none-greater-can-be-

---

75 Anselm, *Proslogion*, Prologue; Davies and Evans, 82.

76 Similar language is found in Seneca’s *Quaestiones Naturales*, a work that was in the library at Bec in the 12th century. Whether Seneca is the inspiration for Anselm’s thought is hard to say. Anselm does not—as he had Augustine—name Seneca as a source, but the verbal affinity is noteworthy. See Richard W. Southern, *St. Anselm: A Portrait in a Landscape* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 129.

77 This language of ‘maximal greatness’ for describing God in Anselm’s Ontological Argument has become standard in analytic philosophy since Alvin Plantinga reinvigorated the debate by defending the argument’s logical soundness. Alvin Plantinga, *The Nature of Necessity*, Clarendon Library of Logic and Philosophy (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 196-221. Plantinga further clarifies that maximal greatness does not consist in merely being the most perfect being in the actual world but also the most perfect being in every possible world. In short, no matter what world God creates, there is no world in which God could be greater. His maximal greatness entails His having every possible perfection in every possible world.
thought, he must exist in actuality and not in the mind alone. His maximal perfection entails this.

Richard of St. Victor sees what Anselm has done with Augustine’s “Principle of Perfection” by making it the “Principle of ‘Maximal’ Perfection” and makes two further moves that give him his argument for the Trinity of persons. First, like Anselm, he looks to what is maximally perfect; but unlike Anselm, he narrows his focus to target the greatest virtue of all: Love (caritas). So where Anselm focuses on greatest being, Richard focuses (at least for book III of his work) on greatest virtue. If God is maximally perfect, then highest among the goods of his supreme Goodness must be the virtue of love. And if God is love, then . . . . This brings us to the second thing Richard does in fusing Augustine and Anselm’s principles of perfection. Richard turns his attention to the fullness of this perfection. Where Augustine turned to melius (better) and Anselm to optimum (optimal), maximum (maximal), and summum (highest), Richard turns to plenitudo caritatis (i.e., the fullness of perfect love). It is his desire to articulate the Trinity more “fully” that motivates him. For if God is love, God is perfect love; and if perfect love, this is both the highest love (summe caritatis) as well is the fullest and most complete (plenitudo et perfectio). Yet perfect love, the fullest and most complete,

78 Richard freely varies among amor, dilectio, caritas as he proceeds throughout De Trinitate. Thus the adjectives that modify them are a better indication of the aspect of the love he is drawing attention to.

79 Richard, De Trinitate III.2. The development of thought from Augustine-Anselm-Richard moves along the lines of melius-summum-plenitudinem (i.e., better-highest-fullest). ‘Summa’ plays the most prominent role in Anselm’s Monologion, modifying bonitas, essentia, iustitia, magnitudo, natura, pulchritudo, ratio, salus, substantia, and vita. It is important to notice that Richard focuses on ‘plenitude’ with Anselm’s ‘summa’ for its foundation. This dependence becomes especially clear in chapter 4, Fig. 4.2.

80 Richard, De Trinitate III.2.
cannot be a private love (privatus amor) contained by one person alone. Such love requires a multiplicity, and ultimately, a Trinity of persons. Perfect love entails at the least, a mutual love among equals; and at the most, a third who shares in the love of the other two.\textsuperscript{81}

Consequently, we can see that Richard’s work builds upon two of his theological predecessors: Augustine and Anselm. We discovered that the major contours of Richard’s theology come from Augustine and center around the love found in 1 Corinthians 13 and its quest to see God face-to-face in verse 12. That quest is conceived as an ascent from what is partial and imperfect to what is complete and perfect. The movement from man to God, the movement to the image of God is a movement from childhood to adulthood, from immaturity to maturity. And with the glosses of Romans 1:20 and 2 Corinthians 4:18, that ascent becomes a way of traversing from visible to invisible things, from what is seen to what is unseen, from what is transitory to what is eternal, from what fades away to what endures forever. Ultimately, it is an ascent from faith to love. Likewise, Anselm builds on this Augustinian heritage and guides it further upward. In Anselm we find Augustine’s “Principle of Perfection” becoming the “Principle of ‘Maximal’ Perfection,” where the God who is always the better of whatever-it-is-better-to-be-than-not-to-be becomes the God-who-is-the-best-of-all. He is the being-than-which-none-greater-can-be-conceived. Secondly, we find Anselm constructing his Monologion with the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad and arranging it from the “point of view of one seeking” to

\textsuperscript{81} Richard, De Trinitate III.15. Further detail of Richard’s argument for the Trinity of persons is provided in chapter 4 of this work. Here we only highlight that the main principles upon which Richard’s argument is based come from this fusion of thought he inherited from Augustine and Anselm.
better suit his formative aims. Like Anselm, we will see Richard using the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad as an essential structural guide in the crafting of his *De Trinitate*. 

And like Augustine, we will see Richard continuing to perfect that “mirror” and “watchtower” of 1 Corinthians 13 in order to raise the hearts and enlarge the minds of his readers with “a full and perfect contemplation of the Trinity.”
CHAPTER TWO

THE ROAD TO RICHARD’S *DE TRINITATE*

...where the good way is...

Richard of St. Victor lived in the 12th century about a generation after Anselm of Canterbury. His life is marked by the major historical shifts that were taking place at the time. Among those shifts was a growing movement of monastic reform that was, in its most basic sense, a desire for a purer form of the religious life. And if we are to properly appreciate Richard’s attention to detail in *De Trinitate* we would do well to see how it fits within some of these larger historical trajectories. Situating Richard within this context provides two important insights. First, it relates the intricacy with which *De Trinitate* was written to the moral refinement of the Victorines’ religious life and educational program. Second, it helps us discern the formative relation *De Trinitate* bears to Richard’s other literary works and thus the prerequisites of soul for properly undertaking its study.

The Canons Regular

The Victorines fit within the broader movement of the canons regular. Shortly after the Lateran council of 1059 granted legitimacy to the order, the canons regular grew in large numbers in the 11th century and reached their high point in the 12th.\(^{82}\) Early on

they drew their customs from catenas of patristic and conciliar authorities in the Aachen
Institutes and adopted Benedictine observances for various aspects of their daily life.\textsuperscript{83}

As a result, and as is well known, sharp distinctions are notoriously difficult to draw
between canons regular and the monastic orders.\textsuperscript{84} In the early part of the 12th century,
however, canons regular in France took the \textit{Rule of St. Augustine} as their manifesto.\textsuperscript{85}

Among its primary tenets was the renunciation of personal property. As the author of the
\textit{Libellus de diversis ordini bus et professionibus qui sunt in aecclesia},\textsuperscript{86} a canon regular
himself,\textsuperscript{87} writes about Augustine:

\begin{quotation}
of papal history’, and it is true that, even if the number of regular-canon popes has been exaggerated, they
were influential in the curia. Their members can be found in almost every important area of the church’s
life: they were scholars (Hugh of St. Victor), radical reformers (Gerhoh of Reichersberg) or revolutionaries
(Arnold of Brescia), and canonists (Ivo of Chartres, Gratian). Their total impact has to be assessed as
greater than the Cistercians.”
\end{quotation}

\textsuperscript{83} John Compton Dickinson, \textit{The Origins of the Austin Canons and Their Introduction Into England}

\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., 196; Caroline W. Bynum, \textit{Docere verbo et exemplo: An Aspect of Twelfth-Century
Spirituality}, Harvard Theological Studies, 31 (Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979), 3-4; Zinn, “The
Regular Canons,” 219. On the ambiguity and rapid change of the meaning of ‘\textit{apostolica vita}’ see M.-D.
Chenu, “Monks, Canons, and Laymen in the Search for the Apostolic Life,” a chapter in \textit{Nature, Man, and
Reprints for Teaching, 37 (University of Toronto Press, 1997), 204-219. In addition, the situation is
complicated by the transitions made from one order to another. By the end of the century some canons had
migrated through various orders and forms of religious life and some houses did not live up to the ideals
they claimed as their own. The abbey at St. Victor, however, stands out as one place where word and deed
seem to have made the connection. If the reception of the \textit{Liber ordinis sancti Victoris Parisiensis} is any
indication, it eventually eclipsed the popular custumals of the abbey of St. Quentin at Beauvais and
influenced the customs of the Trinitarians and those of the Val des Ecoliers. Dickenson, 170.

\textsuperscript{85} On the influence of the \textit{Rule of St. Augustine} for the canons regular, see Zinn, “The Regular
Canons,” 219; Dickinson, 62-72, 177; Ladner, 356ff.

\textsuperscript{86} The author is anonymous. He makes numerous comparisons between reformed Benedictines and
reformed canons. His two main goals, as summarized by Fassler: (a) “to promote ecclesiastical unity,
especially through adoption of common rules of life”; and (b) “to encourage religious to demonstrate
through their lives what their conversion means.” Fassler, 201. It was written in the second quarter of the
12th century, probably in the Diocese of Liège. Giles Constable, \textit{The Reformation of the Twelfth Century}
(New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 47. Chenu suggests Raimbaud, provost of the collegiate
church of Saint-Jean, as its author. Chenu, 205.

\textsuperscript{87} Evidence for the author of the \textit{Libellus de diversis ordinibus} being a canon regular consists of the
From the fact that he instituted near the city of Hippo a church of brothers “according to a rule established at the time of the holy apostles,” he is justly called the father of those who are near men; from the fact that when he lived in the bishop’s house he lived communally with his brothers, he is properly said to be the father of those who live among the people with a bishop or under a bishop. There are sermons of his on the clerical way of life, where it appears that they who lived with him before he became a bishop, and they who lived with him when he was a bishop, lived in a similar manner, communally according to a rule.\(^{88}\)

The “discovery” of the Rule of St. Augustine resulted in the conviction that it provided the key to living the apostolic life as described in Acts 4:32-35. The canons regular studied it in detail and looked to Augustine as one of their greatest sources of authority.\(^{89}\)

But movements that gain momentum require not only the possibility for expansion (as allowed by the Lateran council of 1059) but also the acuteness of certain conditions to which that movement reacts. Historians recognize that the 12th century was a time of population growth, expansion of towns, increased trade, and rapid growth in sophistication both at court and in the schools.\(^{90}\)

---

\(^{88}\) Fassler, 196.

\(^{89}\) This is not to limit the canons regular to Augustine. They looked to many patristic sources for their authority and brought Augustine’s thought into dialog with many others. Likewise it is not to limit Augustine to the canons regular. Augustine’s influence in the 12th century was widespread. At least one of Augustine’s works could be found in almost every library. He was as familiar to Cistercians and other monastic orders as he was to the canons regular. But because Augustine was the source of the canons’ Rule, he was given pride of place among their other holdings. And the Victorine reading cycle bears this out. See n. 29 of this work.

\(^{90}\) Chenu, 207. Three further themes become of central importance to the abbey of St. Victor: (a) the physical separation of the south bank of the Seine that left it (esp. Mont-St. Geneviève) outside the practical jurisdiction of the chancellor of the cathedral of Notre Dame. Richard W. Southern, Scholastic Humanism and the Unification of Europe: Foundations, vol. 1 (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997), 219; (b) the exponential commercial growth on the north bank of the river that supported the influx of the royal household (on the whole, mostly supportive of the abbey) as it secured a permanent place on the Île. Ibid., 200.
to see how this new order of priests arose: one that was monastic in its ascetic discipline and commitment to personal poverty but quasi-monastic in its schedule, allowing more time for study and service to the Church. This is an oversimplification and there are many different motives for specific canons regular. But the main point is this: At a time when their secular counterparts had grown comfortable with the new prosperity, the regular canons renounced personal property to pursue the contemplative life lived in common with friends of the sort Augustine was said to have prized above all.

Conditions such as these likely motivated William of Champeaux to give up teaching at the cathedral school of Notre Dame and move to an abandoned hermitage dedicated to St. Victor on the left bank of the Seine. We have two documents written shortly after William left to found the abbey that say as much. One is a letter from Hildebert of Laverdin commending William on his decision. The other is a letter from one of William’s students who indicates just how rapidly William’s school attracted large numbers of students. Because our focus is on the text of Richard’s *De Trinitate* we do not have the space to look at Hildebert’s letter in too much detail. Here we highlight those aspects of the milieu Hildebert commends William for reacting against. He speaks commendably of William’s “putting aside ecclesiastical advancement,” preferring instead

---

91 Dickinson, 200. PL 213.827. The status of canons regular was widely debated and the source of great controversy after the order had been granted official conciliar approval in 1059 and 1063, ibid., 197. It is further worth noting the wide variety of opinion held at the time and the contexts and motives for which one might accept or deny the label ‘ordo monasticus’. Thus in 1156, the author of *Dialogus inter Cluniacensem monachum et Cisterciensam* calls canons regular ‘monachi’ because “to be cenobitical monks is nothing other than to be brethren dwelling in community,” whereas Ivo of Chartres would deny the attribution altogether, claiming to belong to the *ordo canonicus*. See Dickenson, 198-201, 206-208; Bynum, 19.

92 Fassler, 201.
“the lowest place in the house of your God to living in the tents of the unrighteous.”

He tells of William’s giving up “the hawking of pedagogy (lectionem)” and hating “ambition and its prerequisites.” He likewise makes reference to Diogenes, saying that he “feared no man’s power because he hoped for no man’s reward” and that being “devoid of hope as he was of fear, transformed his poverty into riches.” Positively, this is assessed by Hildebert as a true and fuller philosophy. He states that “Hitherto you were but half a philosopher since in the school of the wise you had only the slightest apprehension of the perfection of moral beauty. Now indeed you have extracted from it, like sweet honey from its comb, the formula of the good life” (emphasis mine).

Here we see some of the themes espoused by the canons regular and the Rule of St. Augustine that increasingly became their guide at the beginning of the 12th century. Hildebert commends William for seeking the common life. Furthermore, that life is commendable for what it rejects: ecclesiastical advancement, hawking pedagogy, vain ambition, worldly riches. But Hildebert is careful not to leave it there; he further coaxes William not to give up his teaching vocation, but to relocate it in this purer form of the religious life. With full knowledge that William had recently been humiliated by Peter Abelard, who was on a mission to claim William’s teaching post at the cathedral school at Notre Dame, Hildebert sympathetically encourages William to renew his commitment

---

93 Dickinson, 190.
94 Ibid.
95 Ibid., 191.
96 Ibid., 190.
to teaching at a time when William may have been the most downtrodden. He writes further, “Take good care therefore not to deprive your brethren of the founts of living water, but as Solomon says ‘pour out the springs and spread their waters abroad’ (Prov. v. 15).” And William seems to have heeded these exhortations. For in less than 20 years, St. Victor had become renowned for its scholars who gave a full articulation to their Augustinian ideals and brought them into dialogue with a vast range of patristic, classical, and contemporary resources. Even less than a year after William leaves to found the abbey, a German student of William’s writes to his patron back home:

I am now in Paris in the school of master William, who, though he was archdeacon and one of the chief advisors of the king, gave up all he possessed to retire last Easter to serve God in a poor little church. There, like Master Manegold of blessed memory, he offers his teaching to all comers free of charge, and he now directs a school of secular and sacred learning larger than any I have ever heard of or seen in my time anywhere in the world.

In less than 50 years, Paris becomes the major center of monastic education—unrivaled throughout all of Europe. Small grammar schools with, at best, one great master attracting more than the average number of students (as Lanfranc had Anselm of Canterbury), gave way to a bustling city with a panoply of students who could now easily

97 In this respect, it is easy to see Abelard representing something of the ethos Hildebert commends William for reacting against. For Abelard’s views of William’s departure, see PL 178.120.

98 Dickinson, 191.

99 Quoted in Southern, Scholastic Humanism, 202. This also indicates, as Van Liere points out, that the school at St. Victor was an ‘open school’, making education available to those outside the abbey as well as to its novices for whom it was primarily intended. F. A. van Liere, “Andrew of St. Victor (d. 1175): Scholar Between Cloister and school,” a chapter in Centers of Learning: Learning and Location in Pre-Modern Europe and the Near East, eds. Jan Willem Drijvers and Alasdair A. MacDonald (Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1995), 189. For noteworthy visitors to the abbey, see n. 119 of this work.
move among a variety of great masters of rhetoric, grammar, and theology. The springs that flowed from Laon eventually reach Paris, and pupils of Anselm of Laon, like William, take root en masse there. St. Victor was uniquely positioned at what was soon to become the future training grounds for the next generation of scholars and administrators. This would have been enough to afford it great influence in the 12th century, but the quality of that influence, enriched as it was by the common life, and graced as it was with some of the greatest minds of the age—became a shining example of the Augustinian ideal of teaching by word and deed. In what follows, we divide our treatment of the Victorine canons regular into these respective categories before we place Richard’s *De Trinitate* beside his other literary works.

The Religious Life of the Victorines

Three things are relevant to our treatment of Richard’s *De Trinitate* that connect with religious life at the abbey of St. Victor: (a) language in the “From the Root of Charity” sequence that connects with formative themes in Richard’s work, (b) the extra care the Victorines gave to the composition and ordering of their liturgical rites, and (c) how this rich, liturgical dimension of Victorine life overflowed in service to others. This focus reminds us that Richard composed in this setting, daily reciting the trinitarian formulas found in the *Quicumque*, and using various melodies and associations to link together his thoughts on the Trinity. At various places in *De Trinitate* we discover Richard making allusions to these communal experiences in his language and

100 This is persuasively demonstrated by Southern as he traces the evidence through the lives of Peter Abelard, Otto of Friesing, William of Tyre, and John of Salisbury. See Southern, *Scholastic Humanism*, 204-221.
illustrations. For attentive Victorine, such language provided rich motifs that stirred their souls with a holy longing for the face of God.

The “Ex radice caritatis” (“From the Root of Charity”) sequence was sung on the feast of the translation of the relics of St. Victor and therefore had special significance for the Victorines. As a result, we can look to it as something important for understanding Victorine identity and their shared vision for the common life. It is given here in its entirety to help us inhabit something of the liturgical ambience within which Richard lived and composed *De Trinitate*. It reminds us that Richard’s treatise was inspired by—and written with attention to—these communal experiences. But to fully understand this dimension of Richard’s life requires imaginatively entering into it, of identifying (at least provisionally) with the manner and spirit evinced by their celebrations. Here we walk the halls and enter the chambers of the abbey at St. Victor. We steady our souls and stand with Richard and his brethren as they honor their patron saint, and ascend with them from the root of charity to the summit of joys.

---

101 In addition to the special significance this sequence had for celebrating their patron saint, it also connects them with the same thought in Gregory the Great, who in turn drew from Augustine. See esp. Straw, 92, n. 12. As noted there, Augustine wrote, “radix omnium bonorum est caritas” in *Sermo* 350.1. Augustine also writes in his seventh homily on 1 John, “let the root of love be within, of this root can nothing spring but what is good.”
I
From the root of charity
from the state of piety
let this church sing;
let it sing with the heart,
let it sing with the mouth
and let the household of Victor
rejoice in Victor.

II
The part of that saint given to us
was brought by faithful men
from the city of Marseilles;
first we enjoyed his spiritual presence,
but now we enjoy
his bodily presence.

III
This is the summit of joys;
let us enlarge the innermost sanctuary
of our souls;
the relics of the martyr
are the subject of praise and gladness
for us.

IV
The organ of our heart,
the drum of our flesh
are diverse from one another;
let harmony temper
and unite to each other
with suitable consonance.

V
With our choirs singing together,
let the modulation be one
in our customs;
harsh is the clash
of dissimilar voices,
of diverse customs.

VI
From diverse things
the sound will be disordered
unless the finger of God
first adjust the strings
with sweet instruction;
unless the sweetness of the spirit
touch the heart of the marrow,
the noise of the sound and the exultation of the
flesh
tastes nothing deeply.

VII
This sweetness is not felt
in dividings of minds
nor is it agreeably found
in the land of the living;
may the unity of the faithful
taste this sweetness,
and foretasting, thirst
until it may seize it fully.

VIII
Let us foretaste with the mouth of the heart,
so that by internal savor,
we may be recalled
from the seductive love of the world;
this is the wholesome taste,
this is the unique taste,
through which forgetfulness of worldly care
advances by degrees.

IX
So that this world may grow bitter,
let the odor of Christ become very sweet;
may this sweetness ever grow
in the wine cellar of the heart;
where such a fragrance breathes forth,
spiritual fervor increases
and love of temporal life
grows cold.

X
Victor, triumphant soldier,
special martyr of Christ,
preserve us from the evils of the world,
that worldly love
not drown us in sins;
with one voice, with like mind,
with singular honor,
we are zealous to worship you
while we are tossed in this sea,
confer your assistance.

XI
May you not permit those for whom you are able
to plead
to be deceived in their hope:
make us to be presented to Christ
so that we may contemplate Him
with you in glory;
to your honor, Christ,
this choir has sung repeatedly
the praise of your fighter
in whose presence let nothing sad
disturb our joys. Amen.102

102 Fassler, 318-319.
A few elements in this sequence are worth highlighting. First we notice the focus on the “root of charity.” Charity is the fountainhead of all of the virtues, with a rich history extending all the way back to antiquity. For Richard it is the virtue of virtues he uses to find necessary reasons for the Trinity of persons in book III of his work. Second, we note the “summit of joys” and “advancing by degrees.” Richard uses the summit of joy to speak of the order and ardor of a love that can only be shared by those who are supreme and love each other supremely. The summit also reminds us of the language of “ascent” in Richard, where advancing in theological contemplation took place daily and by degrees. But the highest joy is, as the sequence says, to be made “presented to Christ so that we may contemplate Him with you in glory.”\(^{103}\) That contemplation, though it takes place by degrees, reaches its highest form, as Richard demonstrates, in the contemplation of the Trinity. Moreover, this divine gaze must take place by fortifying one’s soul as a watchtower for contemplation. The military language of the “triumphant soldier” and “special martyr” of Christ reminds us that one’s religious pilgrimage at this time was viewed as a real battle—a matter of life and death.\(^{104}\) Like others of their day, the Victorines saw themselves as special warriors—spiritual warriors—living the common life as a way of fortifying a place on the left bank of the Seine with the true contemplation of God. Finally, and most importantly, we see their vision for the common life: forsaking property and the special refinements of secular life\(^{105}\), and with St. Victor, 

\(^{103}\) Compare Richard, *De Trinitate*, Prologue.

\(^{104}\) The notion of the saint as warrior was common in the Middle Ages. Even rhetoric was taught as a form of military training. See Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*, 106.

\(^{105}\) Property-possession was one source of reform sought by canons regular in reaction to their secular counterparts. The *Rule of Aix* adopted under Louis the Pious in 816 permitted canons to possess property and eventually led to abuses. Morris, 92. As a result, “... cathedral chapters such as Notre-Dame,
we see them seeking “one voice, like mind, and singular honor.”

There were also three major processions during the church year that structured Victorine life: (a) Feast of Purification, (b) Palm Sunday, and (c) Ascension. Fassler summarizes Richard’s description of the first in his *Super exiit edictum*:

. . . this feast [of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin] was distinguished by one of the three major processions of the Church year, during which the participants carried recently blessed and lighted candles throughout the church to the singing of the antiphon “Lumen ad revelationem gentium.” The candles recall the words of the aged Simeon, who, present at the temple when Mary arrived with her child, recognized the baby as the Christ and called him a “light to enlighten the nations.”

The feast commemorates the story recounted in Luke 2:22-38, of the Blessed Virgin submitting to the rites of purification after birth, and presenting her child in the temple.

These three processions divided the Victorine year in accordance with these significant moments in salvation history. They anticipated them. They looked forward to them. Their day-to-day activities were undertaken and understood as part of them; and their readings of Augustine, Origen, and Gregory the Great were sequenced on the basis of them.

Their services were also very intricate and required great effort at sustained focus and contemplation. And while such liturgical artistry was not unique to the Victorines, Paris, grew rich on house rents and market tolls. The churches were inescapably involved in all the complexities of feudal tenure and commercial finance . . .” Ibid., 394. By contrast, the *Rule of St. Augustine* forbade personal property. Ladner, 359.

---

106 Fassler, 319.

107 Fassler, 330. Richard explains these three processions allegorically in *Super exiit edictum seu De tribus processionibus*. See also Coulter, 28.

108 Fassler, 330. Marian liturgical sequences at St. Victor increase during Richard’s tenure and become more pronounced with Godefroy and Walter. For more on this, see ibid., 321-34 and Richard’s sermon “Ave maris stella.”

the care with which they structured and ordered their theological compositions was a mindfulness they suffused throughout every endeavor they undertook, as we can see in the attention they gave even to conduct upon receiving guests. As it states in the *Liber ordinis sancti Victoris Parisiensis*:

> We enjoin that all these things [the welcoming ritual] should be scrupulously carried out, because those who come from outside are especially to be received with great kindness and humanity from the first moment of reception . . . so that from their first impressions of the outside they form an estimate of the things concealed within.\(^\text{110}\)

Such attention to detail was a direct extension of their commitment to purify all aspects of their religious life. As Fassler writes:

> The matins service at St. Victor was lavish and carefully ordered, even more than might be expected of Augustinian canons during this period . . . At the opening of the night office (or matins), all the brethren were ordered in the middle of the choir, opposite the step in front of the altar; all bowed low toward the altar. There they said three prayers; after each of these they prostrated themselves. Subsequently, they took their seats and there said the fifteen Gradual Psalms, with a *Kyrie* and *Pater noster* after each. After every group of five, they prostrated themselves again . . . . During the office psalmody immediately following this opening section, the brethren rose and sat in alternation as each new psalm was sung. Hence half of the entire group got to rest physically half of the time, although all continued to sing antiphonally throughout the entire service.

> Periods of respite may have been necessary: The Victorine Office was known in the Middle Ages as being sung very slowly, with long pauses at the middle and close of each psalm verse.\(^\text{111}\)

This attentiveness in the reciting of their liturgies was further matched by a proportional

---


\(^{111}\) Fassler, 261-262.
mindfulness in composing them. As Fassler’s thesis makes clear, the Victorines adapted a number of liturgical sequences with novel arrangements of their own. One of the most significant is the “Laudes crucis,” a sequence about the cross the Victorines enriched by extending its melody to other sequences. The melody functioned for the Victorines as a mnemonic aid in calling to mind a rich harmony of parallels and contrasts with other sequences they knew.\textsuperscript{112}

These liturgies were a rich source for contemplation and inner renewal, a renewal that would go with the Victorines as they served others in their community. Indeed, service of others seems to have been a hallmark of Victorine spirituality in the 12th century—an emphasis that distinguished them from both the older and new monastic orders of their day. As Bynum writes:

\begin{quote}
The contrast of Victorine life with that of the older and newer monastic orders may be precisely in the way the Augustinian Rule—or rather the Victorine interpretation of it—brought an emphasis to edification \textit{verbo et exemplo} that was not found in the Benedictine orders where “service” was seen positively in the role it played in the individual monk’s solitary quest for God but negatively in the practical requirements entailed by “love of neighbor”.\textsuperscript{113}
\end{quote}

Like many of the new monastic orders, the Victorines shared a commitment to the apostolic life. Where they tried to distinguish themselves was in how well they lived the \textit{Rule of St. Augustine} and served their community with purity, humility, and grace. In this way they helped sanctify their thoughts and their deeds with the goal of calling others to repentance and the full contemplation of God.

\textsuperscript{112} Fassler, 76-77.

\textsuperscript{113} Bynum, 137.
The Educational Program at St. Victor

We have seen something of the “deeds” of the Victorines in their liturgies and service to others. We now turn to the source of their preaching and “words.” As the author of the *Libellus de diversis ordinibus* says, monks should “. . . convert others to their way of life through both example and preaching.”

As we have seen, the formation of the educational program at St. Victor began with its founder, William of Champeaux. In 1108, he eventually acquiesced to the growing antagonism of his pupil, Abelard, on the nature of ‘universals’ and abandoned his head teaching position at the cathedral of Notre Dame. Though he had no desire to return to his teaching or of founding a new order, he did so under pressure from his friend Hildebert of Lavardin who had great regard for William’s teaching and saw him as someone who offered a positive contrast to what was happening in the schools.

William headed the education at the abbey from its inception in 1108 until 1113 when the

---

114 Fassler, 193.


116 Kirchberger, 15. According to Bautier, Gilbert succeeded William as head of the cathedral school until he became Bishop of Paris in 1116 and gave the position to William’s pupil, Abelard. Fassler, 202.

117 Kirchberger, 16. For Hildebert’s letter to William, see n. 123 of this work. Walter of St. Victor’s *Contra quattuor labyrinthos franciae*, written four years after Richard’s death, indicates that the differing spirit and methods of the school and the cloister only increased between 1108 and 1178. See Margaret T. Gibson, “The *De doctrina christiana* in the School of St. Victor” a chapter in *Reading and Wisdom*, 41-47. And by 1185, Godefroy of St. Victor could write in his *Microcosmos*, “In any case, let us [monks] (claustrales) leave this question, which holds very little interest for us, to the disputations of the scholastics, and devote our attention to other things.” Jean Leclercq, *The Love of Learning and the Desire for God: A Study of Monastic Culture*, trans. Cathrine Misrahi (New York: Fordham University Press, 1982), 3.
charter of the abbey was granted and he was asked to become the Bishop of Châlons. Nevertheless, the spirit William left at the abbey—of pursuing education in relative quiet and peace from the city, and of making prayer and contemplation priorities in one’s theological education—remained a heritage the abbey would continue to enrich and enjoy.

It was Hugh of St. Victor, though, who would broaden and deepen the educational program at St. Victor and make it a center of learning that attracted some of the best minds of the age. Two keys made this possibility a reality: increased financial support and greater political stability. As confessor to King Louis VI, Abbot Gilduin was able to secure both. This helped Hugh carry on the vision, begun by William, of broadening the number of resources the abbey needed to expand knowledge of the liberal arts, as well as enriching and deepening the methods by which they studied them. Hugh’s *Didascalicon* gives an indication that the approaches taken at St. Victor were seen as an alternative to those of the secular schools.

---

118 Fassler, 202.

119 Noteworthy scholars and visitors at the abbey: Clarenbald of Arras and Lawrence of Westminster who speak of studying with Hugh of St. Victor, Marcia L. Colish, *Peter Lombard*, Brill’s Studies in Intellectual History, 41 (Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1994), 19; Bernard of Clairvaux commended Peter Lombard for study at the abbey in a letter to Gilduin, prior of St. Victor (1134-36), ibid. 16 (see *Epistola* 410) and Peter Lombard resided there for over a decade, Fassler, 202 n. 91; Robert of Melun under the tutelage of Hugh, Coulter, 239-40; Otto of Freising, Fassler, 202 n. 91; Maurice of Sulley, Bishop of Paris (1160-1196) takes residence at St. Victor in 1170, Coulter, 251. Others like Peter Comestor, chancellor of Notre Dame and Stephen of Garland retire there. Ibid., 253.

120 Fassler, 201. These favors increase when Stephen of Senlis takes over as the Bishop of Paris in 1123 and, with the help of others, persuades King Louis VI to assign “. . . revenues and privileges from prebends of eleven churches in and around Paris to St. Victor.” Ibid., 203.

121 “The Victorines saw themselves setting out on a more refined course of study in the liberal arts. Hugh of St. Victor’s *Didascalicon* for example makes allusions to contrasts with the secular masters.” Fassler, 202; cf. Hugh, *Didascalicon* III.14 (PL 176.773D). In his treatise to novices Hugh writes “You, brothers, who have entered the school of discipline, you ought to seek first in the *lectio divina* that which
practical and theoretical arts, the main disciplines the Victorines were to master consisted of three that would extend throughout them all: Grammar, Dialectic, and Rhetoric.

*Grammar* is “knowledge of how to speak without error”; *Dialectic* is “clear-sighted argument which separates true from false”; and *Rhetoric* is the “discipline of persuading to every suitable thing.”

Also noteworthy is the focus on the moral dimension of learning. The purpose of expanding one’s knowledge did not have as its governing concern to fill oneself up with new information; rather, every source from which knowledge could be obtained was put in the service of the spiritual purity of the individual. The purity of the subject matter being studied mattered little in comparison to the inner purity of the soul undertaking the study. As Augustine said, “... a picture’s value lies not in the image itself but in the cognitive and ethical use someone makes of it, the quality of what we think and think about, using the picture as our instrument.” Thus at St. Victor, even non-theological works were studied in such a way as to refine one’s own knowledge of the truth and sharpen one’s own moral and spiritual proclivities: e.g., How might the errors in this work refine my own knowledge of the truth? How might the vanity and perversions of

---

122 Hugh, *Didascalicon* II.30; Taylor, 82.

123 Hildebert of Lavardin gives some indication that this focus on the moral life may have been the distinctive focus of the school at St. Victor. He clearly sees William’s efforts as a way of rooting theological education in the pure contentment secured by the common life, unburdened as it is by the need for property, possessions, and fame. Dickinson, 190-191; PL 171.141A-3A.

this work sharpen my own resolve to live a holy life before God and develop my soul in accordance with virtue? This “inner purity” was in the service of the richer goal of developing a soul that was, as Richard says, “to a full and perfect purity.” And thus under the guidance of Gilduin and Hugh, the abbey enjoyed a period of broadening their library with new resources and filling it with new compositions of their own. Thus the “widening” of their educational program was also matched by a proportional effort at “deepening” the focus of their pedagogy around divine contemplation and inner purity.

This period of broadening and deepening the educational program at St. Victor comes as a result of the consistent leadership of Hugh and Gilduin as well as the royal favors the abbey had due to Gilduin’s political connections. But when Richard arrives at St. Victor, this period of blessing comes to an end. Richard comes to the abbey about seven years after the death of Hugh. His knowledge of Hugh would come through a careful study of his writings and continuing Hugh’s educational reforms with the help of Hugh’s pupils. The Bishop of Paris, Stephen of Senlin, who was one of the Victorines’ staunchest allies in supporting their efforts at reform, also dies one year after Hugh. And the founding abbot, Gilduin, dies five years after Richard arrives in 1155. Thus Richard arrives at a point when both the external political favor the abbey had enjoyed and the internal constancy of vision conceived of by Hugh and Gilduin were “up for grabs.”

Achard takes up the abbacy for the next six years before leaving in 1161 to become the

125 “However, if anyone should undertake to gird himself for this work and should strive to cover over his ark with gold, nothing prevents him from borrowing the gold of knowledge from external knowledge and secular disciplines provided that he knows how to cleanse himself from all the dross of falsity or vanity and to purify himself in the innermost part to a full and perfect purity, such as the dignity of these works requires.” Richard, Mystical Ark II.10; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 188. The Victorines read the behaviors and dispositions of others in the same manner, imitating what was good and reforming what was bad. Jaeger, 259.
Bishop of Avranches. Richard becomes prior of the abbey the next year, at the same time the community elects Ernisius to be abbot in 1162; an appointment that soon proves to be a source of great irritation for Richard. Where Richard would look to the inherited spiritual and financial prosperity of his predecessors with a view toward furthering their efforts at continual reform, Ernisius would squander these hard-won luxuries with what Richard took to be a spirit of laxity and worldliness the order had been founded to counter. Despite successfully involving the Pope in admonishing Ernisius, Richard endures a decade of Ernisius’s complacent leadership at the abbey until Ernisius is finally deposed in 1172 and Guarin is elected to serve as abbot. Richard, sadly, dies less than a year later.

So on both sides of Richard’s arrival at St. Victor around 1150 lie the death of the head of the educational program and the founding abbot. However little we know of Richard it is clear that he came to the abbey at a time when the treasures of its founders were the most pristine. It would need the guidance of those who could salvage and be good stewards of this heritage, and in ways that would further enrich the kind of reform espoused by the abbey’s founders. Richard’s writings indicate he came to have an increasing role in the educational program at the abbey.126 The question is to what extent Richard saw the immediate heritage of Hugh as the margins within which he would cast the future of the Victorine agenda, or whether he would seek, with good intentions, to improve upon the legacy of his predecessor. The answer to that question involves a very

126 *Tractatus super quosdam psalmos et quarumdam sententias scripturarum*, an earlier work Richard’s *Mysticae admonitiones Psalmum* is based upon, refers to Richard as “magister.” Coulter, 41 n. 80. Though as noted by Southern the term also had the more generic connotation of “teacher” or a term of respect.
careful, comparative analysis of Richard’s *Twelve Patriarchs-Mystical Ark* with Hugh’s *Moral* and *Mystical Ark* treatises.\(^{127}\) And while we don’t have the space to undertake this here, we do want to highlight what this comparison reveals about an important distinction shared by Richard and Hugh and how this helps us understand the “formative chronology” of Richard’s main body of written works.

The Road to Richard’s *De Trinitate*

With a sense for the rich life of the Victorines in their liturgies, their service to others, and their vision for the educational program at the abbey, we now turn our attention to Richard’s main literary works in an attempt to see something of the formative framework his *De Trinitate* shares with his other treatises.

Richard wrote a number of other works besides *De Trinitate*. His works consist of his *Liber exceptionum*, a work that expands on Hugh’s *Didascalicon*. It similarly lays out the main lines of study in the liberal arts with a focus on how to study the Scriptures. Subsequently Richard also wrote two books of Allegories based on selections taken from the Old and New Testaments. Throughout Richard’s time at St. Victor he also gave numerous sermons, and some of his works likely evolved out of them.\(^{128}\) There is some evidence that *De Trinitate* itself may have begun as a collection of sermons or

---

\(^{127}\) Patrice Sicard has noted the lack of manuscript support for the Migne rendering of the titles of Hugh’s ark treatises (e.g., *De arca Noe morali* and *De arca Noe mystica*; PL 176.617-618 and 681-704), preferring instead *De arca Noe* (“Ark of Noah”) and *Libellus de formatione arche* (“Booklet on the Making of the Ark”). But for reasons that will be made clear in what follows, I retain the traditional titles for Hugh’s work.

\(^{128}\) As Coulter notes, “*De statu interioris hominis* was composed in response to a question regarding the interpretation of Isaiah 1.5-6. Still other treatises were produced from Richard’s oral teaching or preaching. This is certainly true of his *Sermones centum*, the *Mysticae adnotationes in Psalmum, Super exit edictum*, and the *De Trinitate*.” Ibid., 23. This movement from oral to written work is also found in other Victorines. On Andrew of St. Victor, see Van Liere, 190-192.
discussions Richard later developed into the form that we now find the treatise today.\textsuperscript{129} His works of tropology and rich symbolism consist of his \textit{Twelve Patriarchs}, \textit{Mystical Ark}, and \textit{De exterminatione mali et promotione boni}. The first is a tropological interpretation of the twelve patriarchs where each one symbolizes a virtue to imitate. The second uses the Ark of the Covenant as a way of tempering the soul in its ascent to the full contemplation of God. It is where Richard provides his religious epistemology in rich detail, laying out theological contemplation in six stages. In \textit{De statu interioris hominis} Richard expounds the text of Isaiah 1:5-6 with the triad of Power-Wisdom-Goodness. The treatise delineates the three wounds of the soul along with their divine remedies. In \textit{De tribus appropriatis personis in Trinitate} Richard likewise expounds on the same triad where each pertains to a particular person of the Trinity and the work of salvation. \textit{Ad me clamat ex seir} is the human side of this triad where humans come to see that their pride, ignorance, and malice need to be reformed in accordance with divine power, wisdom, and goodness. \textit{De exterminatione mali et promotione boni} consists of a movement from the land of servitude in Egypt to the promised land with an emphasis on the transition that takes place at the Jordan river. And \textit{De quator gradibus violentae caritatis} describes four grades of love, from a selfish love to a divine love for others in imitation of Jesus Christ.

Do we have any indication of the chronology of Richard’s works? Most Richardian scholars agree that Richard’s literary works span a very short period of composition, probably no more than a decade or so. As a result, Richard’s theology exhibits a

---

consistency across his works, making the evolution of his thought more difficult to
discern. Nevertheless, there is growing consensus on the order of his three main works:
*Twelve Patriarchs*, *Mystical Ark*, and *De Trinitate*. Feiss, for example, sees a progressive
optimism in each one for the role of reason in the pursuit of eternal truths.\(^{130}\) And Coulter,
den Bok, Zinn, and others see the chronology of these works in that order.

While we cannot be certain with respect to Richard’s chronology,\(^ {131}\) it is possible to
see these three works with respect to their intended ‘formative order’; and we point to
some specific internal evidence from these works that suggest this is the order Richard
expected them to be read. This is important because it indicates that *De Trinitate* is best
understood as a culmination of theological insight and training Richard lays out in his
other works; a culmination that reveals an “ancient road”—a well-worn pathway to the
“heavenly Jerusalem”—where those trained in discernment enter its temple and commune
with God face-to-face.

Three things are needed to establish the formative chronology of Richard’s main
works. First is to recognize a moral-mystical duality in the writings of Hugh and Richard.
Second is to see that this duality is also a sequence from moral to mystical. And third, is

---

\(^{130}\) “«Nam quaedam ex his que credere jubemur, non modo supra rationem, verum etiam contra
humanam rationem esse videntur, nisi profunda et subtilissima indagatione discutiantur, vel potius divina
revelatione manifestentur.» Cf. the description of the role of reason as characterized in [*Twelve Patriarchs*],
[Mystical Ark], and [*De Trinitate*] respectively by Feiss, 120-6. Feiss is right in observing that in this order
these works seem to be slightly more optimistic about the possibility of success for rational investigation in
trinitarian theology. Yet, the differences appear to be very small, there are more similarities than Feiss
observes, and even within [*De Trinitate*] there is some differentiation with respect to this theme too.” Den
Bok, 195 n. 174.

\(^{131}\) On dating *De Trinitate*, a number of Richardian scholars share the view that it is a mature work,
perhaps composed shortly before his death in 1173. Ribaillier, 9; Coulter, 15; Chase, *Angellic Wisdom*,
227-228 n. 49; John Bligh, “Richard of St. Victor’s «De Trinitate»: Augustinian or Abelardian?” *Heythrop
to establish that Richard viewed the contemplation involved in De Trinitate as a culmination of this sequence.

Discovering a Moral-Mystical Duality

We begin with the case for the moral-mystical duality. We look first to Richard’s Twelve Patriarchs which consists of a tropological reading of the sons of Jacob (i.e., “Israel”) by Rachel and Leah. Three clues in Twelve Patriarchs alert us to this moral-mystical duality. First, Richard makes a distinction between the “grace of discretion” and the “grace of contemplation.” As he writes:

By this Joseph the soul is continually instructed and at times is led to full knowledge of itself, just as by his uterine brother Benjamin it is at times lifted up to the contemplation of God. For just as we understand grace of discretion by Joseph, so we understand grace of contemplation by Benjamin. Both are born from this same mother because knowledge of God and of self are learned from reason. Benjamin is born long after Joseph because the soul that has not been practiced over a long time and educated fully in knowledge of self is not raised up to knowledge of God. In vain he raises the eye of the heart to see God when he is not yet prepared to see himself. Let a person first learn to know his own invisible things before he presumes that he is able to grasp at invisible divine things. You must know the invisible things of your own spirit before you can be capable of knowing the invisible things of God. If you are not able to know yourself, how do you have the boldness to grasp at those things which are above you? (italics mine)\textsuperscript{132}

Any careful analysis of Twelve Patriarchs confirms that the main concern Richard has in that work is to impress upon the young Victorine the foundational virtue of “discretion.”\textsuperscript{133} This is accomplished by walking in the ways of the virtues each of the

\textsuperscript{132} Richard, Twelve Patriarchs lxii; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 129. Cf. Fig. 3.1 of this work.

\textsuperscript{133} Richard shows intimate familiarity with the monastic practice of discretio. See, e.g., how intricately he collates various aspects of discretio in Twelve Patriarchs lxx; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main
sons of Jacob alludes to. Learning discretion consists of learning to recognize and curb the affections that drag the body down in its immoral desires; discretion means keeping one’s attention pure in its relationship to carnal desires. Second, the manuscript tradition of Richard’s *Mystical Ark* also went by another name: “On the Grace of Contemplation.” When we look to this second treatise, we notice it is concerned with an entirely different domain: a mystical one focused on the contemplation of God by means of a creative, tropological crafting of the Ark of the Covenant. And whereas *Twelve Patriarchs* was concerned with attention in its relationship to bodily affections, the goal being “discretion,” *Mystical Ark* is concerned with attention in its relationship to mental distractions, contending with that mental vice of ‘*curiositas*’. The goal of the latter work is the mystical contemplation of God. So we see both works have a shared concern for refining and purifying the soul on its way to God: the former with purification of the *moral dimension*—of creating pure discretion on one’s own invisible things (e.g., bodily affections); and the latter with purification of the *mystical dimension*—of creating pure focus on the invisible things of God.

The relationship between “ecstasy” in *Twelve Patriarchs* and *Mystical Ark* reveals a similar distinction: the difference between “knowledge of self” and “knowledge of God.”

In *Twelve Patriarchs* Richard writes:

> Lest the labor of the journey and the difficulties of the ascent terrify you and draw you back, hear and give attention to what the

*Works*, 128. For a helpful survey of these aspects as well as a comparison of *discretio* in Richard and Bernard of Clairvaux, see Mark A. McIntosh, *Discernment and Truth: The Spirituality and Theology of Knowledge*, (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 2004), 43-54.

134 Richard’s *Mystical Ark* went by the title *Benjamin major* in the Migne edition with the subtitle *De gratia contemplationis* (i.e., “On the Grace of Contemplation.”). Chase, *Angelic Wisdom*, xxv.
result of the arrival is. On the peak of this mountain Jesus is transfigured; on it Moses is seen with Elijah and each is recognized without a sign; on it the voice of the Father to the Son is heard. Which of these is not marvelous? Which of these is not desirable? Do you wish to see Christ transfigured? Ascend this mountain; learn to know yourself. Do you wish to see Moses and Elijah and recognize them without any sign? Do you wish to understand the law and the prophets without a teacher, without an interpreter? Ascend this mountain; learn to know yourself. Do you wish to hear the mystery of the Father’s secrets? Ascend this mountain; learn to know yourself. For he descended from heaven when he said: γνῶτι σεαυτόν; that is, “Know yourself.” Do you see how much the ascent of this mountain is effective, how useful full knowledge of self is? (italics mine)\

This moral-mystical duality was a cornerstone of the Victorine educational program from its inception, for we find the same in Richard’s predecessor Hugh of St. Victor. He too devotes a separate treatise to each of these domains: his Moral Ark of Noah and his Mystical Ark of Noah. Hugh took up the first in a response to questions among the brethren “that they might be shown the cause of these unstable movements in man’s heart, and . . . particularly begged to be taught if such a serious evil as this could be countered by any skill or by the practice of some discipline.” The focus of the treatise is on external distractions and bringing order and integration to one’s soul before entering the ark. As Hugh writes:

We have now . . . shown sufficiently clearly the origin of the infinite distraction of our thoughts from which we suffer—that is, from the world and from the lust of it, from the works of creation. Again we have shown by what means our thoughts can be reintegrated—that is, by the works of restoration. And because . . .

---

135 Twelve Patriarchs, lxxviii; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 136. “Ecstatic” contemplation is similar in Twelve Patriarchs and Mystical Ark. The difference has more to do with the directedness (intentio) of ecstatic contemplation. In the first treatise, the focus is upon full “knowledge of self”; in the latter, on full “knowledge of God.”

136 Quoted in Rorem, 130; PL 176.617-618.
there can be no order where there is no limit, it remains for us now, having left the work of creation behind us, to seek out the order of our thoughts where they are bounded—that is, in the works of restoration. For this is the matter that we previously proposed for our investigation—namely, what the order of our thoughts should be, if they are to enable us to build in ourselves the spiritual house of wisdom (emphasis mine).\(^\text{137}\)

Hugh also concludes his \textit{Moral Ark of Noah} with an indication of the formative distinction it bears with his \textit{Mystical Ark of Noah}:

And now, then, as we promised, we must put before you the pattern of our ark. Thus you may learn from an external form, which we have visibly depicted, what you ought to do \textit{interiorly}, and when you have impressed the form of this pattern on your heart, you may rejoice that the house of God has been built within you (emphasis mine).\(^\text{138}\)

This indicates that the Victorines viewed the task of ridding oneself of vices and inculcating virtues as one task, and the task of rising up to mystical contemplation as another—each one deserving of its own treatise. One deals with eliminating external distractions from contemplation (e.g., carnal desires, passions); the other with eliminating internal ones (e.g., mental fornication, \textit{curiositas}, wandering attention, etc.).\(^\text{139}\)

To summarize, Richard makes a distinction between the “grace of discretion” and

\(^\text{137}\) Quoted in Rorem, 140-141. Indeed, the movement in Hugh’s Ark treatises is from the cosmological whole to the center and then from that “sanctified” center back out to the cosmological whole. The ark is the Church, but everything is held together and must lean upon its stable center, who is Christ. Hence once one follows Hugh from the world to Christ and his Church, Hugh can pick up the \textit{pictura} where he left off: “First, I find the center . . . .”

\(^\text{138}\) Ibid., 143; Hugh, \textit{De archa Noe morali}, IV.9. The passage is not found in the PL edition. To be sure, Hugh’s \textit{Mystical Ark of Noah}, as Sicard notes, is more accurately a description of drawing out the dimensions of the ark such that it became a meditative aid for mystical contemplation. Thus “Libellus de formatione arche” is a more accurate title for the “external form” of Hugh’s second treatise; yet “De archa Noe mystica” still describes the formative utility of the treatise. In short, the interiorizing of the external \textit{Libellus de formatione arche} furnishes the soul with the ability to write the interior \textit{De archa Noe mystica}.

\(^\text{139}\) On the role of ‘\textit{curiositas}’ in monastic meditation, see Carruthers, \textit{Craft of Thought}, 82, 94-101.
the “grace of contemplation.” He devotes two of his literary works to each of these respectively. The latter of these works, *Mystical Ark*, also went by the name of “On the Grace of Contemplation” in the manuscript tradition. And while *Twelve Patriarchs* did not go by the title of “On the Grace of Discretion” in the manuscript tradition, it is consistent with the content of the work and the relationship it bears to Richard’s *Mystical Ark*. Finally, we noted that Richard’s predecessor, Hugh, also retains this duality by devoting a separate treatise to each of these domains. Next we discover that this moral-mystical distinction was seen as a moral-to-mystical sequence with very ancient roots in the Christian mystical tradition.

**Seeing the Moral-to-Mystical Sequence**

It is clear, then, that there was a moral-mystical *distinction* in the educational program at St. Victor. We now ask whether there was an *order* to them. Our first hint that there is an order between the two is the distinction between knowledge of self and knowledge of God mentioned above. One has to know oneself first—know oneself in a way that rids the soul of vices and inculcates virtues—in order to make the journey toward the knowledge of God. We remember that the Victorines were diligent students of Augustine. And when we look to Augustine, we also find that this moral-mystical duality expresses the equilibrium he sought to maintain between the active and the contemplative life. Speaking of Augustine’s understanding of the active and contemplative dimensions in the reformation of the soul, Ladner writes:

---

140 This moral-mystical duality and its ascent from moral to mystical further corroborates Coulter’s thesis that the active-contemplative were two main dimensions of ascent in Richard. Coulter, 17. What we add here is that this distinction was part of their Augustinian heritage; and specifically that it relates to an Augustinian architectural mnemonic both Richard and Hugh use as a framework for their compositions.
... because two virtues are set before the human soul, one active, the other contemplative, the first the road, the second the goal, and because though the first one toils so that the heart is purified for the vision of God and in the second he is at rest and sees God: therefore] the first is contained in the precepts for the practice of the temporal life, the second in the doctrine of sempiternal life beyond. And therefore the first [kind of virtues] works, the second rests, because the former consists in the purgation of sins, the second in the light of the purified. And therefore in this mortal life the first exists in the working out of good habits (in opere bonae conversationis), the second rather in faith and, in a very few, in some partial vision of the unchangeable truth as “through a glass in a dark manner” (1 Corinthians 13:12).

That Richard saw this moral-mystical distinction as a sequence from moral to mystical, and that it was connected with the active and contemplative life, is clear from his Super exiit edictum where he speaks of the transition from the Hebrew to the Galilean: “the active life produces a Hebrew, but the contemplative life a Galilean.”

When one surveys the literature before and after Richard, one finds a rich heritage and practice of dividing attention between the two tasks of integrating wayward desires and then preparing the soul for contemplation. Subsequent to Richard we find it in Bonaventure, for example. Bonaventure’s Lignum vitae focuses on the moral dimension using the “Tree of Life” as its guiding metaphor, and his Itinerarium deals with the mystical dimension, picking up on and summarizing themes developed in Richard’s Mystical Ark. Prior to Richard one finds the same two-step sequence in Gregory, and

141 Ladner, 334. Augustine lays out a pathway here “like a road for our return home.” Augustine, De Trinitate XII.10. Hugh and Richard, like many others before them, follow this two-fold path toward God: to seek the purgation of sins (i.e., ridding oneself of dangerous attachments to bodily affections) and the light of the purified (i.e., the mystical contemplation of God).

142 Quoted in Coulter, 29.

143 “Gregory sees conversion as a two-stage process of reform that requires a dual sacrifice to God... For Gregory, reform focuses around compunction, the emotions first of fear and sorrow, and then of joy and love that inspire this two-part sacrifice. As the soul progresses toward perfection, it moves from a
going all the way back to the Desert Fathers (e.g., Evagrius Ponticus, Diodachus, and John Cassian).  

So the tradition and sequence of moving from moral-to-mystical contemplation is an ancient one the Victorines inherited as a foundation for their spiritual reforms. But what we wish to highlight in Richard’s case is how, at least in the Augustinian tradition, this sequence developed into a “spiritual topography” with distinct “places” (loci) that map the chronology of Richard’s main works. Beyond the immediate horizon of Richard’s De Trinitate lies a pathway with clear divisions and places that help us “locate” his other works. Understanding where those places are, and the formative relationship they bear to one another, helps us understand the spiritual journey Richard expects his reader to travel before stepping up to the “entrance” (introitus) of his De Trinitate. To that end, there seems to be a distinct set of mental places Augustine develops in his theological program; and it is likely this very schema the Victorines picked up on as a guide for ordering their own theological compositions. As Marry Carruthers writes:

For a living human being here (“in hac terra”), who is seeking God in the context of a pilgrim-church, the “way” lies from outside, wandering in error, through “the place of the Tabernacle,” to the ascent up to “the home of God.” There are thus three distinct locations in Augustine’s structure, three mnemonic loci: outside, lower, outward, carnal compunction of fear to a higher, inward, spiritual compunction of love.” Carole Straw, Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection, Transformation of the Classical Heritage, 14 (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1991), 214.

---


145 Richard, De Trinitate I.3.
Tabernacle, and *domus Dei* (a common phrase in the Psalms, but one that in this context particularly resonates, recollectively, with Ezekiel 43:10).

Entering the place of the Tabernacle, Augustine invites us to look around and walk about with him: the verbs used here repeatedly are various forms of *ambulare* and *admirari* and *specere* and *ire*, walk, gaze upon, look, go. And in the Tabernacle he sees grouped figures of just men, showing their various attributes (here the verb is *ostendere*), the various virtues disposed in *loci* of the building. And then, having made his inspection of the whole place, he walks across (“*transibo*,” “I will walk over”) from it to the next place, ascending to the *domus Dei*. At this point, Augustine shifts without explanation from first to third-person, and joins his own vision with the experience of the Psalmist, as they move with one soul through the “place of the Tabernacle.”

Anyone as familiar with the Scriptures as Augustine, Hugh, and Richard also knows of the identification of the physical temple of God with the human body. This is true with respect to Jesus speaking of the Jerusalem temple being torn down and rebuilt in three days: “the temple he was referring to was the temple of his body” (John 2:21). It is also true with respect to the Pauline teaching in 1 Corinthians 6 when Paul admonishes the Corinthians about their bodies: “Do you not know that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit who is in you?”

One can easily see, therefore, how those who walked in these exegetical traditions could take the notion of geographically walking up to the temple in Jerusalem to also think of it allegorically with respect to the body and soul. As one enters the “temple of God” the soul becomes purified and ascends to the Holy of

---

146 Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*, 253. Cf. Augustine, *Exposition of Psalms* 41. Richard’s works seem to fit this Augustinian schema that begins with traveling to the temple of the Lord, then thinking of that temple as the temple of one’s body (as in 1 Corinthians 6), and then ascending through the inner chambers of the Temple, and by means of the image of God in the soul of man, of finally seeing God face-to-face. “Richard of St. Victor’s meditation on the Tabernacle, *The Mystical Ark*, is summarized by its author in terms of a three-fold scheme of “places” very like the one Augustine uses here. My thanks to Grover Zinn for pointing this out to me.” Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*, 355, n. 81.

147 1 Corinthians 6:19. See Augustine, *De Trinitate* I.6; VII.3.
Holies in which one comes to see God face-to-face. Thus, not surprisingly, when we look at the final line of Hugh’s *Moral Ark* we see him interpreting the house of the Lord in precisely this way where he speaks of the “house of God formed in you.”  

Richard also confirms this identification of the soul with the temple of God in his sermon on Psalm 28:

> For if by the temple of God we understand the heart of men, we shall soon find who are those who give thanks to God in this temple. For the thoughts of the mind and the affections of the heart are the inhabitants of this temple . . . . She is wholly gathered together within herself and is raised above herself and fully absorbed by the full tide of spiritual happiness . . . and then it is fulfilled, which is said: “And in his temple all shall speak of his glory.”

---

148 Fassler, 218. In fact, Hugh plays with the etymology of ‘ecclesia’ in a way that shows the movement between his two Ark treatises, from the restless world to the inner chambers of the Church: “And in this fashion [the first man] was spread (diffusus) through the four parts of the world and was dispersed (dissipatus). When he is gathered and called together (colligitur et revocatur), first from the four parts of the world he approaches (accedit) the Ark (ad arcam), which is the Church (ad Ecclesiam), and ascending upward from there he gathers himself into a whole (in unum colligit) little by little, until he reaches the highest point (ad summum perveniat) (emphasis mine).” *De arche Noe mystico* VIII.21, quoted in Jessica Weiss, trans., “Hugh of St. Victor, A Little Book About Constructing Noah’s Ark,” a chapter in Jan M. Ziółkowski and Mary Carruthers, eds., *The Medieval Craft of Memory: An Anthology of Texts and Pictures* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002), 61. See also Achard of St. Victor’s “Sermon for the Dedication of a Church” where he utilizes similar themes, taxonomies, and ordering devices as Hugh and Richard and has three houses of stone, wood, and gold converge into the one house that is the perfected human soul. Hugh Feiss, *Achard of Saint Victor: Works*, 201-253. Charts comparing Victorine authors use of the temple-soul symbol can be found in Steven Chase, *Contemplation and Compassion: The Victorine Tradition*, Traditions of Christian Spirituality (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 2003), 73-81.

149 Kirchberger, 239. See also Hugh of St. Victor, *De institutione novitiorum* 12, where the themes of “drawing one’s wits together within oneself” and then “climbing above oneself” offer the same moral-mystical sequence. See also strophe III of the “Ex radice caritatis” sequence in chapter 2 of this work: “This is the summit of joys: let us enlarge the innermost sanctuary of our souls . . .” Gregory the Great also follows this sequence, and speaks of falling “below oneself” as a way of describing the state of the soul when it loses its footing on the road to divine contemplation. Straw, 80. This is also intricately related to the two kinds of “going out” Richard describes in *Mystical Ark* 5.8, Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 320-321. The history of the two directions of knowledge goes back to Plato, but was given clear articulation by Augustine (esp. in his *De Trinitate*), and “renewed with vigor by Hugh of St. Victor.” See Bernard McGinn, *The Golden Chain: A Study in the Theological Anthropology of Isaac of Stella*, Cistercian Studies, 15 (Washington D.C.: Consortium Press, 1972), 173.
When we look further to the ordering schema of Augustine’s *De doctrina christiana*, it follows the same architectural pattern of pilgrimage and ascent. Carruthers refers to this as the ‘ductus’ of a work; that is, the way or the path that leads a reader to the main goal, to its *skopos*. She writes,

> . . . it is in Augustine’s writings that rhetorical *ductus* and the meditational “way” most closely connect . . . [It] is central to his notion of “conversion” as a procedure of changing orientation and way-finding, as though within a topography of locations among which there is a variety of routes . . . [This] notion of *ductus* also informs how Augustine writes about meditation in his work *De doctrina christiana* (“On Teaching Christianity”), modeling it as a “turning” (of direction) in fear, and then climbing through emotional stages on a mental ladder from fear to joy to tranquility.\(^\text{150}\)

She then goes on to cite Augustine’s description of each meditational stage of the journey:

> Above all the work [of reading Scripture] requires that we be turned by fear of God toward knowing His will . . . this fear may both inspire in us thought about our mortality and our inevitable future death, and, as our flesh begins to crawl [*lit.* our flesh looking as though it had broken out in prickles], may affix all the wrigglings of our pride to the wood of the cross. . . . [The second step is piety, the third knowledge, the fourth strength, the fifth mercy, and then] he ascend to the sixth step, where he cleanses that eye by which God may be seen, as much as He can be by those who die to the world insofar as they can. . . . And now however much more certain and not only more tolerable but more joyful the sight of a [divine] light may begin to appear, nonetheless still *darkly* and *in a mirror* it is said to be seen, for it is approached more by *faith* than by *sight* when in this world we *make our pilgrimage*, although we have our *conversation in heaven*. The seventh step of this ladder is wisdom, and “from fear to wisdom the way extends through these steps.”\(^\text{151}\)

\(^{150}\) Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*, 80.

\(^{151}\) Ibid.
If we look at the first five steps on the one hand and the sixth and seventh on the other, they parallel Richard and Hugh’s moral-to-mystical pattern. It is the sixth step by which the eye of the soul is cleansed and enabled to see God and the seventh step that becomes a ladder extending to the goal—the skapos—to the full wisdom of God. That sixth step is where the body is conceived as the “temple of the Holy Spirit,” where, with intellective and affective control, one consecrates that temple and reforms the image of God imprinted there. It is that un tarnishing of the ‘mirror’ of the soul understood as God’s temple, where the religious moves from outside to inside and then begins that ascent to the full wisdom of God within the “house of God.”

Speaking of man’s spiritual journey, and drawing on Augustine, Gregory the Great wrote that “God alone was his proper place (locus), in whom man found his true self and homeland (patria).”

Strikingly, when we look at Richard’s Mystical Ark, it is the cherubim who rest above the ark of the covenant who symbolize the “full wisdom of the triune God.” If Twelve Patriarchs travels with the sons of Israel to bring one to the house of God conceived as the righteous soul, Mystical Ark is where one enters its most holy of places and ascends to full knowledge, where one seeks the Divine face-to-face. Hugh and Richard’s Mystical Ark treatises, therefore, may be fuller articulations of the sixth and seventh stages found in Augustine’s De doctrina christiana.

152 Notice in Twelve Patriarchs that when Richard reaches the final ascent of the mountain (esp. lxvii-lxxxii), he transitions to the change in the “garments” of Christ, alluding to consecration and the “priestly vestments” required of those in the “inner courts” of the Temple. These, too, mark the transition from earthly things to celestial things: “earthly truth in the valley, heavenly truth on the mountain.” Ibid., 138.

153 Straw, 78. Moralia on Job 8.19.35 (CCL 143, 406); Augustine Confessions 1.18.28; 3.6.11; 5.2.2; 7.10.16.
So we see that the moral-mystical dualism Hugh and Richard use in their own literary works has its root in the father of their educational ideals: St. Augustine himself. And we see that Augustine has developed an “architectural mnemonic” for taking a mental journey through the places of the “biblical world” in order to bring them up to the holy hill of the Lord. Then, through the “sanctuary” of their own soul, they seek that still and silent place within by which they might see God face-to-face. This Augustinian schema of Outside-Tabernacle-House of God, as a pathway one can mentally walk through as one seeks the face of God, was therefore very familiar to the Victorines and likely served as the “spiritual topography” Hugh and Richard used to guide the composition of their works and structure the educational program at St. Victor.154

The “Formative” Order of Richard’s Main Works

With this moral-to-mystical road to Jerusalem in mind, we can look to the main literary works of Richard and see, as Nico den Bok appropriately says, “. . . what human beings, according to Richard, need in order to be able to travel, build, and climb.”155 This travel-build-climb schema is exactly the relationship of Richard’s three major literary works: Twelve Patriarchs, Mystical Ark, and De Trinitate. Twelve Patriarchs consists of traveling with the sons of Israel to the mount of transfiguration. This mount is likely the “mystical location” for Augustine, Hugh, and Richard where it was equated with mount Sion, or the heavenly Jerusalem. As Augustine says in his exposition of Psalm 74:

154 Zinn also notes this Augustinian precedent for beginning the spiritual journey in fear and ending in love and its relation to the pattern of Hugh and Richard’s works. Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 15; cf. Richard, Mystical Ark II.17, ibid. 202; Twelve Patriarchs lx, ibid. 117.

155 Den Bok, 107.
Yet even Mount Sion can be otherwise understood. “That one which Thou hast dwelled in the same.” In the place where the People was aforetime, where the Temple was set up, where the Sacrifices were celebrated, where at that time were all those necessary things giving promise of Christ.¹⁵⁶

Richard brings the meditations of his readers in *Twelve Patriarchs* up to the house of the Lord associated with the place where Jesus transfigured before his apostles.¹⁵⁷

*Twelve Patriarchs* consists of traveling, of walking in the ways of the Lord. *Mystical Ark* consists of building, of mentally constructing the intricacies of the Ark of the Covenant, of tempering one’s soul, and rising to the pure understanding of God. The former work, a purgation of external distractions (e.g., affections, carnal desires); the latter, a purgation of internal ones (e.g., mental fornication, *curiositas*). The former follows the earthly teachings of Christ “according to the fleshly manner”¹⁵⁸ until He is transfigured in glory; the latter follows the celestial teachings of Christ “as the fullness of Wisdom” until one beholds the Triune God in the fullness of His glory. For only the final two stages of contemplation in Richard’s *Mystical Ark* provide *trinitarian* reflections of the Divine.

Thus *Twelve Patriarchs* and *Mystical Ark* combine to bring moral integrity to the soul and fix its mystical gaze as preparation for the highest of meditations. Here we reach the “crown” of Richard’s contemplative work: his *De Trinitate*.

¹⁵⁶ Augustine, *Exposition of Psalms* 2.5, 3.4, 11.1, 43.4, 46.5, 46.11, 48.2-5, 51.22, 68.19-20, 74.4, 88.9, 99.11 15.1, esp. 78.34 where Mount Sion is allegorically interpreted as a “looking out.” *Letters of Augustine* XCIII.29; *Civitas Dei* X.32, XI.1, XVIII.30, *Reply to Faustus the Manichean* 16; *Ten Homilies on 1st Epistle of John* 1.

¹⁵⁷ Richard, likewise, explicitly identifies the two mountains. Having brought the disciples with Jesus up the mount of transfiguration, he writes, “On this mountain the Lord taught and Moses learned about the construction of the tabernacle.” *Twelve Patriarchs* lxxiii; Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 142.

¹⁵⁸ See n. 346 of this work for Augustine’s use of this phrase and relevance to Richard.
Richard makes very few explicit connections to his other written works in *De Trinitate*. The genre of *De Trinitate* is noticeably different and is primarily attributable to the fact that necessary reasons and proofs form a more explicit part of its textual fabric. Nevertheless, Richard clearly intended Trinitarian reflection to come at the end of a spiritual journey of purification. And this purification consisted of learning the straight and narrow way of the Lord: of dispensing with vices and inculcating virtues. Daily, and by degrees, one would ascend the holy hill of the Lord, up to the place of the high priest before the Ark of the Covenant. One would rise with the purest of desires and ardor of love, from the visible things to the invisible things of God, and finally to the triune God Himself. Formatively, therefore, one does not attempt to undertake Trinitarian contemplation without meeting these moral and mystical prerequisites of soul. As Richard says in his *Twelve Patriarchs*:

Let him ascend this mountain if he wishes to receive those things, if he wishes to know those things which are above human sense. Let him ascend above himself through himself; to knowledge of God, through knowledge of himself. Let a person first learn in the image of God, let him learn in his similitude what he ought to think about God. The ascent of the mountain, as has been said, pertains to knowledge of self. The things that happen upon the mountain lead on to the knowledge of God. . . . On this mountain the Lord taught and Moses learned about the construction of the tabernacle. What is understood by the tabernacle of the covenant except the state of perfection? Therefore he who ascends the mountain, who gives heed diligently, who seeks for a very long time, who discovers at last what sort he is—it remains that he learn from divine showing what sort he ought to be, what sort of edifice of the mind he ought to prepare for God, and by what obediences he ought to appease

---

159 I attribute this to two things: (a) that *Twelve Patriarchs* and *Mystical Ark* are full compositions. They were likely either prepared as a series of sermons or as final drafts to be read from start to finish. *De Trinitate*, on the other hand, emerges out of dialogical exchange and, as will be shown later, consists of a method of inserting new material; (b) that in *De Trinitate* Richard seeks “necessary reasons” for the Trinity whereas in *Twelve Patriarchs* and *Mystical Ark*, he presupposes them as part of their contemplative ascents.
God. Therefore, when do you think a mind that still is spread out through various desires, that is dragged this way and that by various thoughts, will be worthy to receive this grace? If it is unable to gather itself into a unity, if it does not know how to enter into itself, when will it be able to ascend by contemplation to those things that are above itself? (italics mine)\textsuperscript{160}

This pattern of Richard’s works has also been discerned by other Richardian scholars. As Nico den Bok suggests:

There is a sequence in Richard’s œuvre which resembles a pervasive scriptural (in fact, Old Testament) framework . . .

. . . these latter works themselves show a special convergence and cumulation, like a pyramid the top of which is, enlarged, another pyramid that, enlarged in turn, appears to be a third pyramid. \textit{De exterminatione} describes man in three-staged transformation of his entire affective and cognitive life, whereas [\textit{Twelve Patriarchs}] concentrates on the positive outgrowth of this twofold life; [the] final stage is contemplation (represented by Benjamin, or the ark of the covenant). The [\textit{Mystical Ark}] is in fact a close-up of this final stage, for which the earlier stages are necessary preliminary steps. In contemplation man resumes the three-staged pattern just described \textit{in mente}; its third stage, in turn, is contemplating the trinitarian God. In \textit{De Trinitate} this contemplation is envisaged.\textsuperscript{161}

What we see, then, in Richard’s three main works is a formative pattern; a pattern that follows the sequence from moral to mystical contemplation, and that pays attention to the spiritual topography laid down by Augustine (Fig. 2.1).

\textsuperscript{160} Richard, \textit{Twelve Patriarchs} lxxxiii; Zinn, \textit{RSV’s Three Main Works}, 141-142. When Richard speaks of gathering the wanderings of the mind together into a fixed and holy resolution for moral purity, he refers to the need for both affective and intellective control (e.g., controlling desires and thoughts as well as intentions and wills).

\textsuperscript{161} Den Bok, 103-104. Coulter concurs: “It may well be that \textit{De Trinitate} represents the culminating vision of Richard’s journey to know God and to see God face to face.” Coulter, 35.
It is important for us to keep this in mind as we turn to a detailed analysis of Richard’s *De Trinitate*. For it is not a meditation one takes lightly. When we see the relationship Richard’s *De Trinitate* bears to these other written works it is clear that he expected a great deal of previous soul-work to be done before embarking on its study. Here Richard’s apprentice, “Now distanced from the world . . . ‘collects’ the attention scattered on worldly delights and withdraws to the inner world of his conscience, the ‘citadel’ and ‘courtroom’ of his mind.” With a disciplined and collected soul, crafted in

---

162 My research therefore corroborates Coulter’s view that “the techniques and skills communicated in [Richard’s *Mystical Ark*] are necessary for [De Trinitate]’s success.” Coulter, 225.

163 Straw, 213. On ‘self-collection’ in Gregory the Great, see esp. n. 6 of that work.

164 Ibid., 131.
accordance with the “brilliance” of the Ark of the Covenant, he now stands ready for the most sublime contemplation of God.
CHAPTER THREE
THE ROLE OF REASON IN THEOLOGICAL CONTEMPLATION

There I will meet with you...

Richard’s *fides quaerens intellectum ad plenitudinem*

We have already alluded to some of the elements Richard gains from Augustine and Anselm. Both Augustine and Anselm are seeking the face of God, and Richard joins them in that ascent with a few contributions of his own. Richard opens his *De Trinitate* with 1 Corinthians 13 and this inherited understanding of how one must take oneself and one’s readers from a state of imperfection to perfection. One must put childish things behind, un-tarnish the mirror of the soul, and embody the kind of love that prepares the soul for an encounter with the Divine. Here we add that Richard also shares the religious epistemology of his theological predecessors: the *fides quaerens intellectum* (i.e., faith seeking understanding).

The basis for this is found in the one scripture reference all three of them draw upon: “Unless you believe, you will not understand” (Isaiah 7:9). Consistently, all three of these authors start with the things already believed by faith and seek further reasons for believing them. Thus the view is not that one seeks reasons *in order to* believe, but rather one already believes the things of faith and seeks further reasons for believing them. As Chenu notes with special reference to the 12th century:

Revelation provided more than an external corrective to mistakes in philosophical speculation; it inspired men of faith to produce a
frame of reference which served them in their rational constructions no less than in their art or culture. Neither the essential disparity between philosophy and religion nor the transcendence theology assigned to faith limited the possibilities of a Christian exercise of reason, without faith in any way supplanting reason or perverting the workings of the rational process.\textsuperscript{165}

This “faith seeking understanding” is not, therefore, some sort of Pascalian wager for the unbeliever; it is, rather, the meditative process of the believer who seeks a full understanding of what he already believes. In short, the movement is not from unbelief to belief, but from belief to vision. The goal is to ground that original knowledge with even greater perspicuity. For some of the things of faith are difficult to believe in the absence of good reasons. Faith is enough to believe them on the basis of reliable tradition and authority, but faith still seeks the “evidence of things unseen” (Hebrews 11:1).\textsuperscript{166} This is what Augustine, Anselm, and Richard of St. Victor are after: further evidence for the things of faith.\textsuperscript{167} As Augustine writes, “If, then, when sought, He can be found, why is it said, ‘Seek ye His face evermore?’ Is He perhaps to be sought even when found? For things incomprehensible must so be investigated . . . .”\textsuperscript{168} This is even more the case for the most inscrutable of mysteries: the Holy Trinity.

\textsuperscript{165} Chenu, 234.

\textsuperscript{166} “These difficulties were actively sought for the challenge they offered the devout: ‘. . . for monastic composition the ‘difficult tropes’ and schemes of the Bible were particularly important, what Augustine called \textit{obscuritas utilis et salubris}, ‘productive and health-giving difficulty’.” Carruthers, \textit{Craft of Thought}, 116.

\textsuperscript{167} This method of \textit{fides quaerens intellectum} and its basis in Isaiah 7:9 was also common to other theologians of the 12th century. See, e.g., Abelard, \textit{Theologia Christiana} III.51.

\textsuperscript{168} Augustine, \textit{De Trinitate} XV.2.
But Richard plans to decorate the margins of his theological predecessors, and he indicates at the outset of his treatise the principle by which he will offer a fuller articulation of the Trinity than either of them. He states in his prologue that faith is both the “beginning” (initium) and the “foundation” (fundamentum) of the good.\textsuperscript{169} But he goes further, stating that one moves from faith to knowledge to perfection. He writes:

But just as the beginning of all the good is in faith, so the \textit{consummation} and \textit{perfection} of all the good is in knowledge. And so, let us press on toward \textit{perfection}, and, to the extent we are able to advance toward \textit{perfection}, let us make haste from faith toward knowledge; let us be diligent insofar as we are able, so that we may understand what we believe (emphasis mine).\textsuperscript{170}

This notion of pressing on toward ‘perfection’ is so central to Richard’s project that it can rightly be said to be the golden thread that runs through the treatise from beginning to end.\textsuperscript{171} Whether Richard makes an argument for the Trinity of persons or describes the prerequisites of soul for divine contemplation, he enriches his thought with plenitude (\textit{plenitudo}) and perfection (\textit{perfectio}).\textsuperscript{172} And this is a common theme in the Christian spiritual tradition; indeed, every theologian from Augustine onward seeks the end of faith in understanding (\textit{intellectus}). But what seems especially true in the case of Richard is how often ‘plenitude’ serves as the governing rationale for his most important arguments. Whether it be the ‘plenitude’ of love in bk. III or the ‘plenitude’ of power in bk. I, it is the main concept Richard employs throughout \textit{De Trinitate}. Its mention by him in his introduction, therefore, is not incidental, but an early indication of the tool and the method he uses to develop earlier theological tradition. A rough search of terms yields the following statistics: fullness / \textit{plenitudo} (165x), highest / \textit{summa} (20x), integrity / \textit{integritas} (11x).

\textsuperscript{169} The terminology is a clear indication that Richard envisions \textit{De Trinitate} beginning at the fifth and sixth levels of contemplation he provides in his \textit{Mystical Ark}. The fullness of human ratio becomes the foundation upon which man, at the height of his dignity and rationality, ascends with divine grace into Trinitarian contemplation. Cf. Richard’s use of \textit{initium} and \textit{fundamentum} in Fig. 3.1.

\textsuperscript{170} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate}, Prologue: \textit{Sed sicut in fide totius boni inchoatio, sic in cognitione totius boni consummatio atque perfectio. Feramur itaque ad perfectionem, et quibus ad profectum gradibus possumus, properemus de fide ad cognitionem; satagamus, in quantum possumus, ut intelligamus quod credimus.}

\textsuperscript{171} The pursuit of perfection is a common theme in the Christian spiritual tradition; indeed, every theologian from Augustine onward seeks the end of faith in understanding (\textit{intellectus}). But what seems especially true in the case of Richard is how often ‘plenitude’ serves as the governing rationale for his most important arguments. Whether it be the ‘plenitude’ of love in bk. III or the ‘plenitude’ of power in bk. I, it is the main concept Richard employs throughout \textit{De Trinitate}. Its mention by him in his introduction, therefore, is not incidental, but an early indication of the tool and the method he uses to develop earlier theological tradition. A rough search of terms yields the following statistics: fullness / \textit{plenitudo} (165x), highest / \textit{summa} (20x), integrity / \textit{integritas} (11x).

\textsuperscript{172} For more on the “principle of plenitude” in Richard, see den Bok, 283-302.
spiritual tradition; indeed, every theologian from the apostle Paul onward seeks the end of faith in perfection. But Richard not only shares this quest for fullness, he actually incorporates it as a premise in his most important arguments. This perfection becomes an essential principle for drawing out “new fullness” from inherited theological tradition. Its mention by him in his introduction, therefore, is not incidental, but an early indication of the tool and the method by which he will develop his trinitarian theology. So where Richard “fits” within the heritage of his theological predecessors is within the Augustinian-Anselmian tradition of the fides quaerens intellectum. But as we will see, his most original work comes when he applies the concept of fullness to true Divinity.

Earlier we showed how Augustine and Anselm establish necessary reasons for God as the Most High God; but Richard goes further. He finds necessary reasons to show how this Most High God must also be the Fullest and Most Complete (i.e., a Trinity). In book V Richard provides the clearest articulation of his main goal when he speaks of “a fully formed contemplation of the truth” (omniformem veritatis contemplationem). He then qualifies this in the next sentence as “complete plenitude” (omnem plenitudinem).\footnote{173} Without this complete plenitude, without this fully formed contemplation of the truth, Richard says, one does not have true Divinity (non habet . . . veram divinitatem). Richard therefore glosses the parameters of the theological quest, turning fides quaerens intellectum into fides quaerens intellectum a plenitudine ad plenitudinem (“faith seeking

\footnote{173} Richard also alludes to various aspects of his project with words such as ‘soli’, ‘omni’, ‘plenitudo’. For example, he addresses the imperfection of Boethius’s definition of ‘person’ by first noting that it does not apply to persons alone (soli) and subsequently that it does not apply to all (omni) persons (noticed by den Bok, 226 n. 115). This ebb and flow pervades the work: from one to all, from singularity to multiformity, from defect to perfection, from lack to fullness. But ‘plenitude’ becomes his preferred way of perfecting existing tradition with new fullness, as he does with Boethius’s definition of ‘person’ in book IV. See esp. n. 322 of this work.
understanding *from fullness to fullness.*”) Richard shares the desires of his theological predecessors for a full and perfect contemplation of the Trinity, but he goes beyond them in how he argues for it.\(^{174}\) For as we will see, he not only pursues the Trinity to the full, he also uses ‘fullness’ itself to lay out its reasons.

For all of Richard’s works, learning begins with reading (*legere*) in order to seek the full and free contemplation (*contemplatio*) of those things. The summit is the contemplation of God, but the ascent, as we have seen, requires following a certain pathway to get there. In *Twelve Patriarchs* it begins by walking with Jacob’s sons and wives in an attempt to purge one’s soul of vices and ready oneself for seeing the glory of God on the Mount of Transfiguration. It continues with the *Mystical Ark* by approaching and building the Ark of the Covenant and tempering one’s soul for an ecstatic flight in the contemplation of God. In both treatises the journey begins with reading from the Scriptures, being familiar with its narratives, and learning how to rise to contemplation with allegorical and tropological insights. Richard’s *De Trinitate* likewise begins with reading aimed at contemplation. But the starting point and the tools for the journey differ from his other treatises.

The starting point for Richard’s *De Trinitate* is the *Quicumque*: the Pseudo-Athanasian creed the Victorines were in the habit of reciting daily. Richard is interested in how the propositions embodied in this creed might be proved. As den Bok notes:

> In *De Trinitate* I Richard starts his quest by saying that reading (*legere*) the assertions of the *Quicumque* he does not recall

\(^{174}\) This is also in keeping with Richard’s triadic epistemology where imagination (*imaginatio*), reason (*ratio*), and understanding (*intelligentia*) correspond respectively to things (i) visible and created, (ii) invisible and created, and (iii) invisible and uncreated. Den Bok, 120.
reading how they are demonstrated («probare»). There are many authoritative texts confirming them, yet not as many arguments proving them, nor experiential evidence confirming them. Believing them to be true he intends to give reasons for their truth.175

Thus in De Trinitate, there is an important probare between lectio and contemplatio. As Ribaillier points out, one of the things Richard seeks in De Trinitate is the rational demonstration of dogmatic formulas one already has good grounds for believing176; and the primary tool for this endeavor is ‘reasoning’ (ratiocinando).177 Thus if we are to properly understand this work we must be clear about the role of reason in Richard’s project and how it fits with the mystical ascent to Trinitarian contemplation.

Approaching Richard with an understanding of ‘reason’ as that faculty by which one derives deductive proofs for the existence of God is a more constricted conception than was current in the 12th century: the semantic range of ‘ratio’ was much broader. Its most basic sense was to devote the mind to the basic principles of things. The continuum of meaning for ‘ratio’ moves from simply attending to some physical object through the senses to offering necessary reasons for faith in God. Nevertheless, this has not kept contemporary readers of Richard from judging his work with the more modern

175 Den Bok, 195. As den Bok notes in his own translations of Richard, ‘demonstration’ here has the broader sense of a ‘showing’ and not the strict sense of a formal, logical demonstration. In what follows, we use ‘demonstration’ with this broader meaning.

176 “Il veut, en effet, fournir une démonstration rationelle du bien fondé des formules dogmatiques.” Ribaillier, 19. Further evidence for this is seen in Richard’s discussion of other traditional formulas, as in VI.15ff.

177 In this respect, Richard’s De Trinitate is like Anselm’s exemplum meditandi. It is more a meditation even though contemplation is its main goal. As Richard writes, “Contemplation is a penetrating and free gaze of a soul extended everywhere in perceiving things; but meditation is a zealous attention of the mind, earnestly pursuing an investigation concerning something.” Mystical Ark I.4; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 157.
conception. Consequently, the attraction or antipathy one has when reason is observed offering ‘proofs’ for the truths of God often matches the attraction or antipathy one has for Richard’s project in De Trinitate. On one side are those who are suspicious of any attempt to ‘prove’ the mystery of the Trinity lest the mystery dissipate and theological contemplation and wonder give way to a sapless set of theological inferences and conclusions. On the other side are those who are suspicious of philosophical incoherence, inconsistency, or ambiguity in what they take as a bona fide ‘proof’ for the Trinity with ‘reason’ in the full, modern sense of that term. But with a modern preconception of reason, Richard’s theology simultaneously becomes a success and failure for both sides. For if Richard succeeds in proving the Trinity by means of reason in this sense he fails to preserve the mystery of trinitarian faith. Faith no longer seeks because it has already found. There is no mystery left to discover. On the other hand, if Richard succeeds in preserving the mystery of the Trinity, he does so only by failing to prove the Trinity with modern standards.

Our analysis has to be faithful to Richard’s understanding of reason (ratio), which is broader than the modern and more narrow sense, but also show that he is clearly comfortable offering necessary reasons for belief in the Trinity. These are not the only

178 This modern divide between the clarifying quest of rationalism and the mystery-preserving desires of anti-intellectualism partly explains the rational vs. mystical emphases Richard receives in Chase and Nico den Bok. While Chase’s Dionysian thesis may be consistent with Richard’s theology, Richard’s understanding of ‘ratio’ is more in the tradition of Augustine and Anselm. And while den Bok’s ‘Mono-personal’ trinitarianism keeps Richard within Augustine’s hesitant “Quid tres?” (Augustine, De Trinitate, V.9, cf. XII.6-7), as I make clear in the appendices, the textual development of De Trinitate suggests a greater optimism on the social trinitarian dimensions of Richard’s thought. See den Bok, 377.

179 As Ribaillier notes, despite differences with Abelard, Richard shares a confidence in finding necessary reasons “. . . non seulement à la connaissance de Dieu, mais à celle du Dieu trinitaire.” Ribaillier, 20.
reasons, but they are the primary reasons he seeks in *De Trinitate*. We probably will not satisfy both sides, as coming up with what is clearly the “middle-way” makes those on both sides unhappy with the distance from their respective views. But these are contemporary views. Richard, by contrast, stands at the cross-roads of a nascent scholasticism and an incredibly rich monastic tradition. It thus comes as little surprise to see in Richard both the mystic and the scholar, showcasing in one person how the best of both need not require the separation of the school from the cloister.

Richard’s Objective: ‘Necessary Reasons’ (*rationes necessariae*)

Richard looks for not just any kind of reasons for the contemplation of the Trinity, but necessary reasons. Thus if we are to properly understand him we must know what he means by its two main concepts: ‘reason’ and ‘necessity’. What we discover is Richard’s “high” confidence in reason, comparable to many of the scholastics of his day and beyond. This may surprise some who wish to see him as more a mystic than a rationalist; but as we will see, Richard not only has the highest regard for reason in proving the fullness of true Divinity, he clearly prefers it with respect to the certitude it brings to beliefs held by faith. At regular transitions of argument and illustration in his treatise,

---

180 Nico den Bok provides the fullest and most persuasive case for this. See esp. 184-194.

181 Indeed, as we have seen in chapter 2, the founding of St. Victor and the distinctive focus of its educational program may have been motivated by the desire to keep this division from happening. See esp. nn. 117 and 123 of this work. Leclercq originated a distinction but not the separation between monastic and scholastic theology in the 12th century. Here we merely locate Richard within that context when these two were integrated aspects of the religious life. See Leclercq, *Love of Learning*, 191-235. See also Bernard McGinn, “Love, Knowledge, and Mystical Union in Western Christianity, Twelfth to Sixteenth Centuries,” *Church History* 56 (1987), 7-24.

182 Richard’s confidence in reason does not preclude other sources for religious belief and presupposes the authority and verity of Catholic teaching and Scripture. Necessary reasons for religious belief do not circumvent but undergird these other sources of belief and devotion to God.
those that provide “necessary reasons” provide deeper reasons for religious belief. Nevertheless, we will also see that despite Richard’s high regard for reason, it is only part of the contemplative journey; it is reason, but not reason alone that provides the justifications he seeks. And this reminds us that unlike others who would eventually pursue proofs for their own sake, Richard embarks on a journey—and takes his readers on a journey—that goes well beyond this. He, like his theological predecessors and peers, seeks the face of God. And that journey, while it may require the use of reason, eventually sets foot on holy ground where those sandals must be taken off: where one stands in the presence of God and longs for the encounter of face-to-face. It is because this journey goes “above and beyond” the plateau of reason that reason has its limits for Richard. But it is still a critical part of the movement from visible to invisible things as he makes clear in his Mystical Ark. Indeed, among all modes of attention and investigation, ratiocinando permeates almost every stage of the ascent. And even where reason is surpassed in the higher stages of Divine contemplation, it is still consulted subsequent to receiving truths revealed by divine grace.

Second, we must be clear on what Richard means by ‘necessity’. Two kinds of necessity pervade Richard’s De Trinitate. One we term “logical necessity” and the other “fitting necessity.” The first kind has to do with forms of logical entailment or conclusions derived by deductive reasoning. These deductive arguments take many forms, but the one Richard employs the most frequently in De Trinitate is the reductio ad absurdum—a favorite among philosophers and rhetoricians.\(^{183}\) Here we point out the

\(^{183}\) Philosophers, because it provides the highest justification for a belief; rhetoricians because once its truth is demonstrated, one’s opponent either has to accept its truth or admit to believing a contradiction.
logic that underlies this style of argument to distinguish it from Richard’s arguments from “fitting necessity.”\textsuperscript{184} Consider two mutually exclusive propositions, P and not-P. Because P and not-P are contradictory (i.e., the truth of one entails the falsity of the other), without a doubt only one of the two can be true. As a result, we can take the opposite of the proposition we wish to prove, assume its truth, and see if—together with other known facts—it results in an absurdity or contradiction. If so then the proposition cannot be true because, when supposed true, it leads to a contradiction. But if that proposition cannot be true, then the other \textit{must} be true; for only one of P or not-P can be true. In other words, if we suppose P to be true and then demonstrate that P combined with other known facts leads to an absurdity or contradiction, then P has to be false. And if P is false then not-P must be true. And this is not just true, but \textit{necessarily} true. It \textit{has} to be true; and one can be certain that it \textit{is} true. Truths like this are \textit{necessarily} true and their reasons are “\textit{necessary reasons.” This \textit{reductio ad absurdum} forms the vast majority of Richard’s method of argument throughout his work and affords him with many “necessary reasons” for believing God is one substance and three persons.\textsuperscript{185}

In addition to the logical necessity described above, there is also a kind of “fitting necessity” that Richard employs. It has to do with optimal consistency (i.e., how well things “fit” together). This can apply equally to truths that are to be believed as well as

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{184} Here we situate the “logical necessity” of the \textit{reductio ad absurdum} within the context of Richard’s other two methods of theological inquiry (e.g., fitting necessity, similitudes). For a specific example of the \textit{reductio ad absurdum}, see p. 122 of this work.
\item \textsuperscript{185} The \textit{reductio ad absurdum} is Richard’s preferred form of argument for securing “necessary reasons” in his \textit{De Trinitate}. When Richard uses non-\textit{reductio-ad-absurdum} arguments, he regards the conclusions as persuasive and probable, but not strictly necessary.
\end{itemize}
the relations that obtain between substances or beings.\textsuperscript{186} With respect to beliefs, fitting necessity has to do with the harmony, consistency, and coherence of these beliefs. It is one thing to hold beliefs that are true, but it is a bonus when these beliefs have an added consistency and harmony with one another. It is what makes our set of beliefs not only true but also beautiful to hold and behold. With respect to substances or beings, Richard argues for example, that where Divinity consists in a plurality of persons in a unity of substance, and humanity consists in a plurality of substance (e.g., corporeal-incorporeal) in a unity of persons, there is an ontological gap between these two. And in order for there to be optimal consistency—not merely in thought, but also in actuality—there must exist an intermediate kind of being between the above two. So there is that angelic property that resembles Divinity in that it never possesses a plurality of substance in a unity of persons (e.g., angels, unlike humans, have only incorporeal substance) and it never possesses a plurality of persons in a unity of substance (e.g., angels, like humans but unlike Divinity, have as many substances as persons). Hence the angelic property forms the missing piece that finishes the picture, as it were, and is necessary if that picture is to be perfectly ordered and beautiful. The logic involves three kinds of substance, A, B, C. If one has grounds for believing only A and C from other known facts but lacks evidence for B, one can argue on the basis of the optimal consistency that would be lacking between A and C if there were not some third B that exists as an intermediary between them. Thus in addition to “logical necessity” there is also this

\textsuperscript{186} These parallel Coulter’s categories for Richard, ‘metaphysical criterion’ and ‘aesthetic criterion’. Coulter, 219. While distinct, they should be seen as part of one principle of “fitting necessity,” a principle that Richard applies to each of these domains; one with respect to “things” the other to the “knowledge of things.”
“fitting necessity” Richard uses to argue for the truth of his conclusions. He regards both as “rationes necessariae.”

We therefore have these two kinds of necessity in Richard’s treatise. Richard has a higher regard for “logical necessity” but he uses both as needed to seek the reasons for belief. He is not exclusively committed to one or the other but uses both in a symbiotic fashion throughout his work to persuade his readers.

The best place to see the difference between Richard’s two kinds of necessity and the relationship between them is in book V where he delineates the divine processions. In book IV, Richard begins with Boethius’s definition of ‘person’ (i.e., “an individual substance of a rational nature”) which is both ascertainable and sufficiently applicable to all persons. But Richard wants to go further; he wants to refine the definition and make it more perfect and complete. As he writes, “In order for a definition to be perfect (perfecta), it is necessary for it to cover the entire reality (rei esse comprehendet) and only the reality of the object being defined.” The definition must extend to the entire realm of the things to which it refers, and it must be an interchangeable proposition (i.e., the word ‘person’ must be able to be applied to different things to which its definition appropriately pertains). The solution Richard comes up with is that every person has a

---

187 “So only these reasons that are derived from aseity, immutability, and simplicity are called ‘necessary reasons.’” Den Bok, 192; see also 190 n.154 of that work, where den Bok notes that Richard seems to equate indubitability with ‘necessary’ at some points in his treatise where modern scholars—with stricter definitions—see a distinction between the two.

188 It is this focus on persuasion that forms the intention of Richard’s treatise; it is as much a work of rhetoric as a philosophical treatise. Den Bok, likewise, points to De Trinitate IV.9 as proof that Richard uses probabilis and necessarium in the sense of the rhetoric tradition. Den Bok, 192 n. 162; 193 n. 177.

189 Richard, De Trinitate IV.21.
“rational being from an incommunicable property.” But because Divinity lacks differentiation due to its aseity, the question remains how there can be any plurality of persons in one Divinity. In other words, how is it possible to apply the definition of ‘person’ to three things if there is only one thing? Since ‘person’ requires an incommunicable property, there must be something that distinguishes the divine persons despite the fact that each one of them is identical to the divine substance. The solution is that each divine person has a different “causal” origin. One is from himself, one is from another, and a third is from the other two.

Next, in book V, Richard inquires about the properties of each divine person and provides a particular characteristic of each one. But what is his method? He says we already know that the three persons in the Trinity are differentiated by certain properties (i.e., differences with respect to their original cause), but that those properties applicable to them individually have not yet been “discovered through reasoning (ratiocinando).” He states further that the goal is to support via an “attestation of demonstrative certitude (demonstrativae certitudinis) what we hold by faith.” Here we see him in the pursuit of fides quaerens intellectum, and his method is to find more certain reasons.

His first move is to employ an argument based on “fitting necessity.” He has already shown that there is plurality within Divinity in book III; but now Richard asks which of two kinds of plurality is the more beautiful and hence applies to true Divinity. Is

---

190 Richard, De Trinitate IV.20: “rationale esse ex incommunicabili proprietate.”

191 On the appropriation of specific properties to each of the divine persons, see n. 6 of this work.

192 Richard, De Trinitate V.1.

193 Ibid.
it “a plurality that is differentiated by a most ordered variety of properties and unified in a most appropriate manner of proportions through a marvelous reason?”  

194 Or is it “a plurality connected by no concord of differences or concordant difference between persons and adorned by no order of otherness?”  

195 The answer, because it is the more beautiful, is the first. Therefore “. . . it is necessary to believe that the most pleasant fraternity of persons cannot be lacking in the supreme happiness nor can the most ordered variety of properties be lacking in the supreme beauty.”  

196

But the above argument based on “fitting necessity” is not enough for Richard. He writes subsequently, “But, lest this argument, which we have offered, appears to some to be probable rather than necessary, let us investigate our assertion further through deeper reason” (emphasis mine).  

197 Richard then moves to an argument based on “logical necessity.”  

198

Borrowing an important argument from I-II, Richard next shows that what was said with respect to divine substance can also be said with respect to divine person. In the same way that there can only be one substance that exists from itself and not from any other, so there can only be one (divine) person who exists from himself and not from any

194 Richard, De Trinitate V.2.
195 Ibid.
196 Ibid.
197 “Sed, ne haec quam proposuimus ratio alicui forte probabilis magis quam necessaria videatur, hoc ipsum quod dicimus altiori adhuc ratione investigetur.” Richard, De Trinitate V.

198 This movement from fittingness to “necessary reasons” parallels the same in Anselm’s Cur Deus Homo when Boso, unsatisfied with Anselm’s argument from fittingness, asks for “necessary reasons”; an indication that by the 11th century, there was a growing inclination for necessary conclusions rather than merely probable ones, though both were still considered persuasive for belief. See Coulter, 187.
other; otherwise, there would be an infinity of divine persons in one Divinity. With respect to substance, we can speak of a beginning of time such that there cannot be an infinite regress of substances. There must, finally, be a first cause; a first substance from which all temporal things come to be. But in Divinity (i.e., God in se) there is no beginning of time; God is eternal. There is no first being or second being with respect to time. However there is a first person and second person with respect to origin, where “first” and “second” are understood not temporally but ‘naturally’, or with respect to causal-dependence. So a similar argument can be made with respect to origin of being in book V as was made with respect to temporal order of being in I-II. To put it another way, the same argument that worked for speaking of God ad extra to show that there must be a first substance can now be applied to God ad intra to show that there must be a first divine person. If there is no “divine person” who exists from himself, then there would be an infinite series of divine persons. There would be no first, originating person. And hence there must be a first, originating divine person. There must be someone who exists from himself, who does not draw source from another, and who does not exist from anyone other than himself. Richard subsequently provides the evidence that the property of this divine person is incommunicable and concludes the section by saying, “Behold we have now considered with indisputable arguments that mode of existing spoken at the beginning of the work with probable reasons” (emphasis mine).\(^{199}\)

All of this reveals that Richard is working with two different kinds of necessity. One is a “fitting necessity” having to do with the optimal consistency, harmony, and

\(^{199}\) “Ecce illum existendi modum jam indubitata demonstratione collegimus, de quo in hujus operis exordio locuti sumus, ubi probabili magis quam necessaria ratione usi sumus.” Richard, De Trinitate V.5.
beauty of a set of truths: What is true and what one is more justified in believing is whichever of two beliefs is the more fitting and optimal. The other is a “logical necessity” having to do with truths delivered by means of a process of logical reasoning, and usually the fruit of a *reductio ad absurdum* argument. What we see above is that Richard uses both. But what we also see is that he has a higher regard for “logical necessity.” He sees it offering a level of certitude the other lacks. But notice that Richard doesn’t dispense with more probabilistic forms of argument once he’s discovered a deeper and more logical reason for a particular belief. Rather he offers the “logical necessity” for those who are not *persuaded* by the first kind of necessity. So while Richard himself sees both forms of argument offering “necessary reasons” in the sense that they cannot be doubted, he is aware of the important difference between the two types of necessity he puts forward. They both may be “indubitable” and for that reason necessary to believe; but “fitting necessity” argues for what is more probable (i.e., the more optimal and fitting is more likely true) whereas “logical necessity” argues for what cannot be otherwise. It is not only true, but must be true. The important point is that they both provide adequate justifications for belief even if the level of certitude differs between the two.

In addition to these forms of argument, we mention a third Richard uses prominently throughout his work: his use of the principle of similitude. As Coulter’s thesis makes clear, Richard’s method is one of moving in an ascent from the visible to the invisible. We noted earlier that this *per visibilia ad invisibilia* is a thoroughly Augustinian margin which subsequent Trinitarian authors, including Richard, write within. But there are two things to further point out here. First, any time Richard mentions discerning
invisible from visible things, he does so by means of the principle of similitude. By this he means that he can take something visible and compare it with something invisible in such a way as to highlight their similarities and differences. Greater insight can be obtained by attending to these similarities and dissimilarities. Second, in De Trinitate this is almost always connected with the notion of man being created in the image of God.\textsuperscript{200} Since man is the visible image of God, one can attend to this image in order to see what is true about the invisible reality to which that image corresponds. As den Bok notes:

> The realm of meaning is as wide as reality can be. God and man, the Trinity and his image, have «rationes» which can be discovered by a careful study of properties departing from various similitudes offered to us by Scripture and creation. Human beings are called to read this twofold book and try to understand its text. God has expressed himself first; He descends in writing calling us to read. A human person images the trinitarian God precisely in his transcendent openness of mind to all that can be known and loved. Indicating God by so many human characteristics Scripture invites us to investigate what He can possibly have in common with man.\textsuperscript{201}

This “commonality” between man and God becomes clearer as the apprentice discerns the image in which he was made and by means of which he can rise to knowing God as He is. As Gregory writes, “‘Experiencing in themselves that the invisible is better than the visible,’ they can rise toward God through contemplation of the visible world.”\textsuperscript{202} As

\textsuperscript{200} When Richard speaks of the “ladder of similitude” in De Trinitate V.6 and VI.1, 23—that is, when he uses the principle of similitude as a method and is not merely alluding to the principle—he always refers to the human nature made in the divine image and from which it can be “lifted” to understand divine realities. For the comprehensive list of Richard’s use of the principle of similitude, see III.7, 10, 23; IV.8, 10, 25; V.6, 25; VI.1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23. Also, notice the disproportionately higher frequency of this language in book VI.

\textsuperscript{201} Den Bok, 486.

\textsuperscript{202} Straw, 33. Moralia on Job 15.46.52 (CCL 143A, 781).
a result, as “. . . the universe unfolds, man’s identity becomes more distinct and comprehensible.”\textsuperscript{203} The divine image in man suddenly becomes the ‘mirror’ of 1 Corinthians 13:12 by which one peers into these invisible realities and their similitudes.\textsuperscript{204} Further, there is the creative play between the ‘speculum’ and the ‘specula’ in the Latin such that the “mirror” (speculum) is also understood as the “watchtower” (speclua) where one enlarges one’s mind and “stands up” in order to peer further into these human-divine comparisons. Together, these are the three main methods Richard uses to argue for the truth of his claims in De Trinitate. But as we see in the next section, it is this last method that shows the limits of reason: where the soul transitions from the knowledge of Being to the knowledge of being-in-Being.

Ascending “Above & Beyond” Reason

Like his theological predecessors, and many of his contemporaries, Richard conceives the process of learning as a journey from imperfection to perfection, from faith to full understanding. But when it comes to the contemplation of the Trinity it presents the learner with some unique challenges. This is because the Trinity exceeds one’s rational capacities; it is “above and beyond” reason, as he says.\textsuperscript{205} And thus it is important for us to understand not only the types of reasons Richard seeks in his quest to

\textsuperscript{203} Ibid., 34.

\textsuperscript{204} Augustine elaborates on “fittingness” in detail and connects it with the mirror of 1 Corinthians 13:12. See esp. Augustine, De Trinitate IV.2-3 with respect to harmony/consonance, VI.10 with respect to form/image, and XIII.5, 14 with respect to ‘will’. Coulter suggests Anselm’s use of fittingness is inspired by Augustine’s De Trinitate IV.2, Coulter, 177 n. 11.

\textsuperscript{205} Richard, De Trinitate I.1. On Richard’s use of this phrase in De Trinitate, see n. 440 of this work.
provide his readers with a full understanding of the Trinity but also to point out where reason fits in the ascent to that full and perfect contemplation. As den Bok notes:

Because of the method of «fides quaerens intellectum» the (Pseudo-) Athanasian formulations are caught in a very remarkable tension. On the one hand, if the enterprise is not to fail, they are the threshold, and only that: We should not rest at them, but enter and proceed. On the other hand they are, so to speak, written on the altar, we cannot leave them behind, they will always be before and above us: They will be confirmed by reason, if the enterprise is not to fail. So the Quicumque and its setting in tradition and liturgical life is the «context of discovery» for God’s trinitarian character, whereas De Trinitate offers a «context of justification».

If the enterprise succeeds, we will indeed have gained some understanding of what is expressed by the creed—an understanding which, when fully unfolded, is eternal life. De Trinitate consciously aims at contemplation in its optimal form, which is not only very useful, but also pure enjoyment, communicating everlasting delight and a taste of endless sweetness.²⁰⁶

Richard’s understanding of the positive, but limited role of reason in theological contemplation is virtually identical to that of Anselm, the main contours of which were shared by many others in the 12th century. Anselm, too, saw the path to full theological contemplation as an ascent; indeed, as we have seen, he was widely influential in further contributing to its upward momentum. Moreover, Anselm wrote his Monologion and Proslogion with formative aims. Both bring a person to the summit of that being-than-which-none-greater-can-be-thought through silent reasoning alone. But here we pause to notice a critical point in Anselm’s treatises where the God-seeker stands upon the final precipice of rationality, still seeking the face of his ineffable Creator.²⁰⁷ For how is one to

²⁰⁶ Den Bok, 156-157.

²⁰⁷ In addition to the metaphysical dimension of Creator-created/creature that fixes the contours of the Trinitarian and Christological debates, there is its formative dimension. This formative focus is at the center of Anselm’s project as he instructs his reader in how to properly think and speak of himself, his Creator, and the similitudes and dissimilitudes that obtain between them.
see the face of God when the difference between creature and Creator, the common and
the holy, remains so great? Though one may come to know about God, how is one ever
to come to know and love Him like a lover her Beloved—inseparable, united, and one?
Anselm describes this gap as what is “above and beyond” in his Monologion and Richard
uses the same idea but gives it a fuller articulation in his Mystical Ark when he describes
the factors involved in ecstatic contemplation.\textsuperscript{208} Anselm writes in Monologion 65:

> But what about our earlier conclusion? Namely, that the supreme
> essence is above and beyond all other natures . . . . What then?
> Have I, in some way, brought something to light about something
> incomprehensible, although, in another way, gained no direct
> insight into it? (italics mine)\textsuperscript{209}

For Anselm, as well as Richard, the solution for bridging the divide between the
little essence and the supreme essence is the process introduced by Augustine of seeking
the truth of Divinity by means of the ‘mirror’, by means of the creature who has been
created in the image of God. Anselm continues:

> What we do, when we cannot, or will not, utter something properly,
> is to signify it by means of something else—an \textit{aenigma} for
> example. And often we do not see something properly (i.e., as it is),
> but we see it by means of some likeness or image—when, for
> example, we make out someone’s face in a mirror. Thus we say and
do not say, see and do not see, one and the same thing. For it is
> through something else that we say it, and we see it . . .

\textsuperscript{208} In Mystical Ark IV Richard charts the course for the fifth and sixth stages of trinitarian
contemplation; in bk. V he kindles the “white hot longing” (\textit{aestuantis animi ardor}) that will catapult his
readers into the presence of the triune God. There he lays out the three modes for ecstatic contemplation:
enlarging of the mind, raising up of the mind, alienation of the mind.

\textsuperscript{209} Davies, Anselm: Major Works, 71. The closest Augustine comes to “above and beyond” in his
\textit{De Trinitate} is IX.4: “. . . if knowledge is less than that thing which is known, and which can be fully
known, then knowledge is not perfect . . . . But when the mind knows itself, its own knowledge does not
rise above itself, because itself knows, and itself is known.” Note the allusion to 1 Corinthians 13:12. See
also IX.6 “above the eye of the mind.” He also writes in VII.4, “. . . the super-eminence of the Godhead
surpasses the power of customary speech. For God is more truly thought than He is altered, and exists more
truly than He is thought.”
This line of reasoning, therefore, allows our conclusions about the supreme nature to be true and the supreme nature itself to remain ineffable. We understand them to be indicating the supreme nature by means of something else, rather than expressing it by means of what is proper to its essence.210

This ineffable stopping point requires new methods of inquiry, methods that move above and beyond reason alone. As we mentioned earlier, this place in Anselm’s Monologion is where he finishes his treatment of the “Word” and “Wisdom.” The ‘righting’ of words must now extend to the ‘righting’ of power. And that reformation requires pursuing, within one’s soul, a conformity of word and deed. From 65 to the end of the work, Anselm treats the reformation of the soul in the image of God. For coming to know God as He is requires not merely “fitting reasons” but a “fitting soul.”

In Richard’s works, this ineffable stopping point is described as the place at which reason “fails” (defecerat)—literally “faints away.” In both Twelve Patriarchs and Mystical Ark, he refers to this point as the death of Rachel before giving birth to Benjamin (i.e., contemplation):

And so when Benjamin is born, Rachel dies, because the mind, having been carried away to contemplation, experiences how great the failure of human reason is. Did not Rachel die and did not the sense of all human reason fail in the Apostle when he said: “Whether in the body or outside the body, I do not know; God knows” (2 Cor. 12:2)? Therefore, let no person suppose that he is able to penetrate to the splendor of that divine light by argumentation; let no person believe that he is able to comprehend it by human reasoning. For if it were possible to approach that divine light by some argument or other then it would not be inaccessible.211

210 This ineffable stopping point that requires new methods of inquiry; methods that move above and beyond reason alone, can also be found in Anselm’s Prosligion, 14-16; Davies and Evans, 95-96.

211 Richard, Twelve Patriarchs lxxiv; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 131. Benjamin itaque nascente, Rachel moritur, quia mens ad contemplationem rapta, quantus sit humanae rationis defectus experitur. Nonne Rachel mortua tunc erat, et omnis humanae rationis sensus in Apostolo defecerat, cum
And later, “Moreover, we can conclude suitably enough from the death of his mother what we ought to understand by Benjamin that kind of contemplation which is above reason.”

This failure of reason is not to be thought of in the sense of ineffectualness but merely to show that reasoning—as a method of theological inquiry—is only effectual for some modes of knowing and not others. I can learn quite a bit about my wife, for example. Theoretically I could have full knowledge of her biological makeup, her genetic constitution. I could study her dispositions, learn her temperament, observe her behavior. I could multiply in the acuity of my knowledge of her in all of these ways. But these modes of inquiry are not what provide the most appropriate and fullest knowledge of her. That requires a different mode of seeking, a mode more conducive to enjoying and loving her; and likewise, to her enjoying and loving me. In the same way, Richard and Anselm know that while knowledge of God may come through reason, the kind of knowledge they seek is “above and beyond” it. It is the knowledge of love.

For Anselm, the ascent to God must transition from reason to a reformation of the soul in righteousness. It requires washing one’s hands and cleansing one’s heart so that one might ascend the holy hill of the Lord. For Richard, when reason fails it gives birth to a new form of

---

212 Richard, Twelve Patriarchs lxxiv; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 132. Quod autem per Benjamin illud contemplationis genus, quod supra rationem est, intelligere debeamus, ex matris ejus morte convenienter sati conjicere possimus. PL 196.53CD

213 Indeed, there is much to be made of how love becomes the rich taproot from which one is “drawn out of oneself” until one reaches the “rising” and “alienation of mind” involved in the highest levels of theological contemplation. Love is the source of all language of ‘excess’ in Richard.
contemplation: an ecstasy and alienation of mind that makes the ardent soul ready for divine visitation.

We will describe Richard’s understanding of ecstatic contemplation in chapter 5. For now, we only need to show where reason fits in Richard’s broader religious epistemology; and specifically how it relates to the contemplation of the Trinity. Richard explains this the most clearly in his *Mystical Ark* with the separation of the “crown” of the cherubim on the Ark of the Covenant from the base it rests upon. That physical separation of the crown from the base is what Richard regards as the separation between what is below reason and what is with, above, and beyond it. He writes:

However, in every part and everywhere, the propitiatory is placed over wood, and on that account with sufficient suitability there is represented in it the kind of contemplation that, when going beyond all imagination (*quod omnem imaginationem excedens*), is engaged in reason according to reason (*ratione secundum rationem*). And as the propitiatory (inasmuch as it is the cover of the ark) nowhere descends below wood, nor is permitted to be attached to wood, so when this contemplation surpasses all imagination (*omnem imaginationem supergrediens*) and does not agree to let itself be mixed with anything, it is mindful of invisible things only and directs attention to invisible things only.\(^\text{214}\)

This is the pivotal point in Richard’s religious epistemology that shifts one’s “attention” (*attentio*) or “imagination” (*imaginatio*) in the first two forms of contemplation to reasoning (*ratiocinando*).\(^\text{215}\) Richard describes this shift in his *Mystical Ark* (Fig. 3.1).

---


\(^{215}\) Spijker rightly emphasizes both the ‘narrowing’ character as well as the ‘dynamic ebb and flow’ involved in Richard’s use of ‘*ratio*’: “What is important to notice is the necessity of increasing concentration. The senses offer images to the reason (*ratio*) where they become the object of all kind of cogitations. These wander around purposelessly. When the mind comes upon one of these free-floating thoughts and wants to know more about it, it has to concentrate, and cogitation turns into meditation. Even more concentrated is the contemplation. But from this point of concentration things can be seen in all kinds of ways: the process can now be reversed, an expanded vision is possible.” Spijker, 202.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of Attention</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Ark</th>
<th>Key Verb</th>
<th>Narrowing of Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>supra rationem, et videtur esse praeter rationem</td>
<td>ad Trinitate (exsulto atque tribudio)</td>
<td>learning (cognoscere) those things seemingly contrary to human reason</td>
<td>quae de personarum Trinitate</td>
<td>left cherub</td>
<td>consultare - consult, weigh, ponder</td>
<td>considering things seemingly contrary to reason from irradiation of divine light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supra, sed non praeter rationem</td>
<td>ad Divinitate (ascendo)</td>
<td>perceiving things that transcend limits of human reason</td>
<td>quae de Divinitatis natura (simplici essentia)</td>
<td>right cherub</td>
<td>cernere - separate, lift, distinguish</td>
<td>piercing insight of the understanding from a divine showing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

216 Classifying the powers of the soul was common to the 12th century. As McGinn suggests, Boethius’s four-fold schema of sensus, imaginatio, ratio, and intelligentia was organized into a five-fold.
For greater clarity we arrange Richard’s taxonomy from bottom-to-top to give a sense for the ascent as well as to better highlight the separation of the fifth and sixth modes that culminate in Trinitarian contemplation. The first kind of contemplation consists of constructing the ark by garnering materials; that is, by a free attending to visible things. It is the effortless gaze of the mind as it enjoys the abundance and variety of things God has made. The second adds understanding to this attending of visible things by seeking their rational principle (rationem). The key verb Richard uses to describe this mode is ‘versare’ which literally means “to turn over and over in the mind, to ruminate.” It is symbolized by the gilding of the wood with gold. The third consists of the crown of the ark and represents the rising with one’s attention from visible to invisible things. It “rests” on the four sides of the Ark because it represents the first moment at which contemplation takes its root in reason (in ratione). The two prior forms of contemplation are “below reason”; reason must “accommodate” itself to what is below itself in its interaction with the corporeal sense (sensu corporeo). The third mode consists of “drawing out” (trahere) similitudes from visible things in order to rise toward the greater contemplation of invisible things alone. The fourth involves using “reason according to reason,” where one seeks the similitudes of invisible things only. The key verb Richard uses here is ‘colligere’ which means “to gather, recollect in mind.” The goal is to gather the intelligible fruit gleaned from experience and reasoning and integrate them into a foundation from which one might “stand up” to a full, human understanding of all pattern of ascent beginning with Hugh of St. Victor and Thierry of Chartres. Other classifications were made by William of St. Thierry, Isaac of Stella, William of Conches, Godefroy of St. Victor, Aelred of Rievaulx, and Clarenbald of Arras among others. An overview of the semantic range of these terms in the 12th century is given in McGinn, The Golden Chain, 153-177. On modifications of the Boethian schema, ibid., 208-221.
things. It is symbolized by the propitiatory. The fifth, symbolized by the cherub on the right, consists of those things that are above but not beyond reason. These are those things that are consistent and agree with reason, such as the simplicity and unity of the Divine substance. The sixth, symbolized by the cherub on the left, consists of those things that are both above and beyond reason, where things seem contrary to reason, as when reason seeks the mystery of the Trinity.

The first four stages eventually culminate into one contemplation, involving both human effort and divine grace in the ascent from visible to invisible things. But the fifth and sixth contemplations are “separate” (i.e., “holy”) and depend upon divine grace. The cherubim are in an angelic form. It is only as one tempers one’s soul according to their angelic similitude and holiness—a wholly invisible form that exceeds human fullness and holiness—that one may enjoy the fruits of trinitarian speculation. As he says:

217 Now it becomes clearer why the educational program at St. Victor was so focused on expanding and deepening its knowledge of the liberal arts. Richard’s taxonomy indicates that the wider and deeper one’s knowledge, the greater the foundation (fundamentum) from which one can rise up to the contemplation of divine things. Furthermore, the fourth mode of contemplation, as he says, involves “common understanding” (communem intelligentiam) as well as “full self-knowledge” (ipsa intelligentia nostra videtur intelligere seipsam per semetipsum), where ethics is included here as a prerequisite to divine contemplation. All individual and communal human understanding and righteousness culminate in the fourth mode of contemplation. The “propitiatory,” then, marks the possibility for full understanding—the “foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men” (1 Corinthians 1:25). Faithfulness and grace determine whether it becomes the place of rejection or beatitude; for the fullness of theology—that highest of sciences—is “raised up” from there.

218 Richard, Mystical Ark I.6; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 163. Richard would therefore see theological inquiry sola ratio as stuck at levels four or five with one or two more levels of contemplation to go. Moreover, these final levels require a transition from the active mode of knowing to a more contemplative one (i.e., in the way that a beloved’s letter “faunts away” as a lover encounters the object of her love face-to-face.) Reason, fueled by love, reaches the higher levels of contemplation, but only a seething love for God can carry one “above and beyond” reason to rest with Him face-to-face; and even then, not without the assistance of divine grace and illumination.

219 Richard’s choice of verb is fitting here. He uses cernere with its sense of perceiving by means of “lifting, separating, and distinguishing.” Ibid.
Certainly it ought to be noted that those four previously mentioned contemplations are, in a certain manner, joined together into one (in unum conjuncta). However, these two last ones are separate and are set apart (separatim sunt et seorsum posita). And indeed in those first four kinds of contemplations we grow daily from our own activity (industria), yet with divine assistance (cum divino adjutorio). But in these two final ones everything depends on grace (ex gratia). They are wholly far removed (omnino longinqua) and exceedingly remote (valde remota) from all human activity, except to the degree that each person receives the clothing of angelic similitude from heaven and by divine providence puts it on himself . . . for the reason that without the addition of this highest grace (supremae gratiae) no one would be able to attain to fullness of knowledge (quis ad plenitudinem scientiae pertingere non possit).220

Thus contemplation begins with the wonder and manifold variety of visible things God has made, but only takes its root in reason (in ratione) at the third stage. There the form of investigation still accommodates itself to the mode of those things that are below reason, but rises to the contemplation of invisible things by means of the “principle of similitude.” Once fixed in memory, however, the work of “reasoning according to reasoning” truly begins. In the fourth mode of contemplation, reason works to unite its entire “inventory” of intelligible things—including, and most especially, by bringing moral integrity to one’s soul—in order to provide a foundation from which to stand up and peer into the Divine mysteries (i.e., the things of faith). Reason then applies itself to those things that come down from above and beyond itself in the fifth and sixth modes of contemplation. In the former, divine revelation is shown to agree with reason, such as Richard demonstrates in books I-II of his De Trinitate. In the latter, reason seems contrary to the things of faith. But as Richard shows in book III, necessary reasons for the

220 Mystical Ark 1.12; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 172.
Trinity of persons are not lacking; and where they can be found, there is hope for the zealous who wish to make that final ascent. These necessary reasons become the anchor points Richard places in the rock leading to trinitarian contemplation, ensuring that his readers have both the means and the assurance they need to reach the summit of the Holy Trinity. They are footholds that provide hope for successfully making the journey.

Reason therefore plays a very important part in Richard’s understanding of theological contemplation. Like a choice tool, it is used in the construction of just about every aspect of the “mystical ark,” but it faces its greatest challenges in that face-to-face encounter with the Divine. We therefore ask, with an unknown disciple of the 12th century, “Who then will conduct us to the city of the great king in order that what we now read in these pages and see only as in a glass, darkly, we may then look upon the face of God present before us, and so rejoice?”

In De Trinitate we find the craftsman hard at work to provide the fullness of this contemplation for his readers, and challenging them to forge a unanimity of mind and heart by means of its “trinitarian” structures and forms.

221 Quoted in Leclercq, Love of Learning, 65.
CHAPTER FOUR

ARTICULATING THE TRINITY “TRINITARIANLY”

...and walk in it.

We have shown that Richard sees a symbiotic relationship between necessary reasons offered for truths about God and the fitting necessity—the optimal consistency and the beauty—in which those reasons cohere. Both provide greater certainty and proof for the things already held firmly by faith. But faith’s chief object is God Himself. Richard’s main object of study in De Trinitate is God Himself. And when we look at the connection between God and the kinds of reasons Richard seeks to establish firmer convictions about God’s Trinitarian nature, we find that the terminus of those reasons is God who is their ultimate ground. It is because of who God is and what God is like that the very reasons themselves are eternal, necessary, and beautiful. Thus the most eternal of all beings—the Eternal One—ought to have proportionally necessary and eternal truths that can be known about Him. Likewise God is the most beautiful of all beings. Thus, in addition to finding necessary reasons, Richard expects the constellation of these reasons to reflect the harmony and maximal beauty of true Divinity. Such congruity provides the confidence that one’s beliefs reflect a true knowledge of God. Thus the more necessary and more congruent the reasons, the greater trust one has in believing them. Faith thus increases as the dogmas already believed on the testimony of authority come to be believed additionally on the basis of reason and beauty. For Richard, these necessary and
fitting reasons complement rather than replace those things believed by faith. As Nico den Bok writes:

So, although God is not visible nor created, properties of visible and invisible created things can be compared, by reason, with properties of the invisible and uncreated God.

This comparison is made possible because God creates material and spiritual beings: They are construed by divine wisdom, hence rationally consistent. Moreover, since this God is the best possible «rational substance» they will have good reasons, optimal consistency and beautiful structuring. Yet comparison would still be impossible if the realm of reasons were restricted to creation. For Richard this cannot be the case, however, since . . . God’s own being in fact has the best possible reasons, consistency, and beauty.

As a result of this correspondence between God and the reasons one seeks to obtain in the contemplation of Him, discovering these reasons leads to an awareness of already existing within their order and structure. And one’s journey, one’s ascent to God, consists of following that order back to God in whom that ultimate rational beauty and harmony consists. Nico den Bok accurately describes this correspondence in Richard and the effect it has on the construction of his texts:

Richard has a special talent for discovering parallels between the structure of the «letter» and that of the «things» that can be read from it figuratively. The increased analytical accuracy by which knowledge of the realities of man and God is extended and intensified by way of differentiation and integration of the aspects disclosed matches an increased sense of synthesis. Both spiritual sensitivity and empirical sensibility are refined into a capacity of vision capable of seeing a «content» in its specific form; both of them are enabled and mediated by a more vigorous rational penetration into the complexity of things. So Richard intensifies the hermeneutic circle between vision and analysis. As such he shows a

\[222\] The view was common to the era and was given extensive treatment a generation later by Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* 2-2.2.10.

\[223\] Den Bok, 126-127.
commitment to the objective, for it is the *concrete shape of texts*, or *facts or things* expressed in it, as given, which *leads* both sense perception and reflection; the spirit «goes out» to them via the senses and reason (italics mine).224

It is thus not surprising that those who diligently seek the Divine find their contemplations and compositions coming to reflect that rational order and structure. But Richard’s talent extends above and beyond the relationship between the “letter” and “things”; he also structures his treatises in accordance with the form of their subject matter. Thus Richard applies his analytical skill to “arranging” the aspects of revelation for his readers so that the organizational dimensions of his texts match—as much as possible—the subject being contemplated. In *De Trinitate*, Richard arranges necessary reasons and their optimal consistency in a very special way—a “trinitarian” way. Previously Richardian scholars have claimed an originality for Richard’s *content* in *De Trinitate*. In what follows, we demonstrate that this originality and creativity extends to how Richard *arranges* and *forms* that content.

We now come to the main thesis of this work: the way Richard argues for the Trinity “trinitarianly” for the formation of souls. In this chapter we lay out the triadic forms and structures by which Richard constructs his treatise. The next chapter shows how Richard uses these structures for the spiritual formation of his readers.

### Inventional, Ordering Devices

A written composition can be arranged and organized in many ways, but what is especially true of Richard is his tendency to conform the structural pattern of his treatises

224 Den Bok, 111.
in accordance with their main object of study. One can see organizational patterns in Richard’s *Twelve Patriarchs* consisting of his arrangement around the two wives and the twelve sons of Jacob. Similarly, in Richard’s *Mystical Ark*, the four sides of the Ark of the Covenant contribute to regular patterns of four as Richard composes that work. It is a skill Richard employs throughout his entire corpus. Such organizational patterns are what Carruthers—in her studies on memory-work in the Middle Ages—calls “inventional devices.” These structures aid both the writer and reader in retaining the content for contemplation and assist the grueling meditational activity involved in reading texts in the Middle Ages. Carruthers provides an example of how this works with the Anglo-Saxon poem *Beowulf*: In this poem, King Hrothgar looks upon a sword-hilt depicting the scenes of the Flood and then constructs a speech ordered around the flow of scenes he perceives. He praises Beowulf for saving the Danes from the dangers of Grendel and his mother and then reflects more generally upon life and death. Bringing attention to the role the sword plays in the structuring of the poem, Carruthers writes, “It is clear in the poem that looking at the sword enables Hrothgar’s meditation, that the decorated artifact acts as not only the ‘inspiration’ (as we would probably now say) but as the inventional, ordering instrument with which he composes.” The sword itself becomes a way of

---

225 “In the content and form of almost every work he is in fact doing this: forming the mind of his readers by repetition and variation of basic structures. Cf. Van ‘T Spijker, *Learning by experience*, especially 201ff. In this way reading Richard’s works as they enfold themselves is a spiritual exercise itself.” Den Bok, 102 n. 31. See also idem., chapter 8.

226 For an example, see n. 430 of this work.

227 On the notion of ‘inventional’: “*Inventio* has the meanings of both of these English words [“creative” and “inventory”] . . . . Having “inventory” is a requirement for ‘invention.’ Not only does this statement assume that one cannot create (‘invent’) without a memory-store (‘inventory’) to invent from and with, but it also assumes that one’s memory-store is effectively ‘inventoried,’ that its matters are in readily recovered ‘locations.’” Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*, 205. Further, the word derives from ‘in’ (i.e., into)
collecting and ordering one’s thoughts. It helps gather all of the content to one place, aiding remembrance and recollection. And it gathers content within a particular form (i.e., the sword). The inventional device of the sword helps the reader recall both the content and that content’s structure.

Similarly, Richard chooses “inventional instruments” from the Scriptures that gather the content of his compositions together around a familiar biblical object or narrative. The device aids further recollection and builds a platform for later contemplation. Richard’s goal is to get his reader’s eyes off the book and onto its subject matter so that he can enjoy free flights of contemplation upon the more sublime forms to which it pertains. It is this “freedom” in contemplation that keeps the soul in a ready state for direct encounters with God. As Carruthers writes:

So a reader’s memory, not confined by worries about “the author’s intended meaning,” is freed to roam its memorial symphony, “gathering up” harmonies and antitheses in the compositional activity which Hugh of St. Victor described as “meditation,” the highest kind of study, that “takes the soul away from the noise of earthly business” (such as grammatical commentary) and “renders his life pleasant indeed” who makes a practice of it. Interpretation can then become a form of prayer, a journey through memory like that Augustine took with his mother Monica, by means of which, at moments, the soul seems to recollect beyond its self, to find out God’s own sweetness.228

This is precisely what Richard does with his Mystical Ark, where the Ark of the Covenant serves as the inventional, ordering instrument for the contemplation of God. Everything, right down to the gold and the wood with which it is constructed, becomes a way of

and ‘venire’ (i.e., “to come”) and has the sense of “going into” and “getting to the heart of a matter.” This is exactly how Richard describes his method in De Trinitate I.4, of “drawing out” truths into the open “from the secret sanctuary of wisdom.”

228 Carruthers, Craft of Thought, 147-148.
calling to mind meditations and contemplative resolutions by which one constructs one’s soul into the form of this Ark. All elements of the Ark coalesce in six stages of contemplation on Divinity Richard gives in amazing detail. As den Bok writes:

The basic principle of Richard’s theological method can be expressed without any technical term: «It gives us pleasure to turn our attention eagerly to this description, both to affirm the rule of our teaching from the similitude that is set forth, and to forge the form and the manner of our work in accord with the formula of description.» Scripture provides a specific form or shape, like that of Jacob’s family or the ark of the covenant described in Bible-texts, or even the form of a Bible-text itself. Richard intends to study this form as accurately as possible in order to detect its complex similitude with things human and divine, factual and moral, as believed by the Church. Richard also intends to mold his own rendering of this description including his disclosure of the similitudes hidden in it by the same form; so his works too somehow reflect this form. Finally, the human soul should also be molded in accordance with the structures distilled from this form or «littera»; Richard is convinced that its form offers a model which can bring one’s inner world «into shape.»

We give attention to this inner shaping in the next chapter. But to fully show how Richard’s *De Trinitate* brings one’s inner world into shape, we have to first make the case that Richard is deliberately constructing his work with the very triadic forms and structures by which he intends to edify his readers.

In most of his treatises, Richard takes the inventional, ordering device from Scripture. In the case of *De Trinitate*, the content has a scriptural basis, but its form transcends the text. There is no equivalent “picture” per se of the Trinity in the Scriptures by which Richard can devise a similar contemplation as he does in his *Mystical Ark*. So Richard chooses the dogma itself (“one substance, three persons”), derived from the

---

229 Den Bok, 101-102.
teachings of Scripture, the church Fathers, and the Creeds, to order his contemplation on the Trinity. Thus the quality of formation that takes place in Richard’s readers is proportional to how well they identify and retain the intricacies of these trinitarian structures in his treatise. How well we are formed by them will consist, first, by how well we discern them; and second, by how diligently we explore the various aspects Richard wants to “draw out” from them. We now make the case for Richard’s intentional, trinitarian structuring of his treatise.

Breadth: Beginning with the End in Mind

Richard explicitly states that he structures his *De Trinitate* in a triadic way at the very end of the work. Here he reminds his readers of the most important elements in his treatise. They are so important that he asks his readers to memorize them. He writes:

In the end of our work, we want to repeat and commit to memory the following: as we have shown with sufficient evidence in the previous discussions, it was easily proven from the consideration of omnipotence that there is and can only be one God; it was easily proven from the fullness of goodness that God is triune in person; and it was clearly concluded from the fullness of wisdom how the unity of substance fits with the plurality of persons.  

Earlier we showed how Anselm constructed his *Monologion* in accordance with the triad of Power-Wisdom-Goodness and arranged the triad in a particular way as to devise the meditation from the point of view of one seeking. Richard knows this triad and,

---

230 Richard, *De Trinitate* VI.25.

231 Poirel meticulously traces the complex history of the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad from the patristic era to the 12th century when its trinitarian appropriation became common and controversial. Briefly, he suggests its appropriation in the 12th century begins with Hugh and Abelard. The latter’s language *equates* the three properties with the divine persons; this view is condemned in 1140. Poirel suggests Richard is the first to use the term ‘*appropriatio*’ (see *De Trinitate* VI.10; *De spiritu blasphemiae* PL 196.1192BC) and confidently moves beyond Hugh’s *De sacramentis* to assign positive reasons for the appropriation (see *De Trinitate* VI.15 where Richard inserts material from his *De tribus appropriatis*), but
like Anselm, he uses it to organize the main tenets of his treatise. But whereas Anselm organizes his work in the order of Goodness —> Wisdom —> Power, Richard orders his as Power —> Goodness —> Wisdom. Later, we explore the significance of this different ordering of the triad between Richard and Anselm; but for now it is only important to note the familiarity Richard has with this triad and the fact that both he and Anselm use it as the main organizational structure for their compositions on the Trinity.

Further evidence for this intentional structuring comes as we connect this final summary Richard provides for his treatise with the outline he gives for his entire work in book III. This broader outline serves as a useful map to keep in mind as we explore the intricacies of Richard’s triadic structures and triads throughout his work. At the opening of book III, Richard writes that he previously (referring to I-II) demonstrated the unity and property of the divine substance. In book I Richard argued that Divinity is supremely simple. In book II he argued that there is only one Divinity. The rest of the work, he says, consists of three further steps: Step one (book III) answers the question, “Is there

232 Further evidence of the importance of this triad for Richard can be seen its use as an underlying framework in his Liber exceptionem; a treatise that parallels Hugh’s Didascalicon in delineating the methods and subjects of study at St. Victor. This indicates the foundationalness of this triad to the Victorine educational program and its connections to their teachings on the Trinity. For Richard’s individual use of the triad in De Trinitate, see VI.3, VI.15, VI.25. See also Godefroy’s connection of this triad with the Trinity on p. 187 of this work.

233 Briefly, Anselm orders his Monologion as a journey beginning with the participation of God’s goodness and conforming one’s words and deeds in accordance with Wisdom en route to behold the primal power of God (i.e., God as He is). Richard orders De Trinitate as a beautiful portrait where the first two terms of Power and Goodness stand as opposites with Wisdom as the harmonizing, beautifying term. Richard’s pattern is treated in fuller detail when we contend with some objections to our thesis in chapter 6.

234 This pattern of treating the substance and then the essential properties that inhere in it is a common one, dating back to Aristotle and Plato.
true plurality in true and simple divinity and if the number of persons comes to three as we believe?"; step two (book IV) answers the question, “How is unity of substance consistent with the plurality of persons?”; and step three (book V) consists of investigating “. . . whether . . . there is among the three [divine persons] one person alone who is from himself, and whether each of the other two persons proceeds from the other, and if there are other questions to be investigated concerning the same considerations?” In book VI, Richard treats the diverse modes of procession of the Son and Spirit, the mode proper to each, and what can be learned from the “names” according to the property of each [divine] person.235

The relationship between this “table of contents” in book III and the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad at the end of Richard’s work is the following. Books I-II establish, from a consideration of omnipotence, that there is only one God. Book III shows that God is triune in person from a consideration of supreme goodness. And Books IV-VI fittingly crown the work with a demonstration of the harmony between the unity of substance and the plurality of persons from a consideration of the fullness of wisdom. This is the broad sweep, the overall picture, the bird’s-eye-view, if you will, of Richard’s De Trinitate (Fig. 4.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Goodness</th>
<th>Wisdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.1 Bird’s-Eye-View of Richard’s De Trinitate

235 Nico den Bok, following Ribaillier, argues that this section of bk. III provides the outline of the entire work; he also identifies the Power-Goodness-Wisdom triad as the “rough structure” of the treatise, with books IV-VI filling out the Wisdom part of that triad. Den Bok, 371-372, see esp. n 177. I agree with den Bok but also believe the textual history of De Trinitate is more complicated and that this section of bk. III may be one of the latest stages of its development. For more on this, see Appendix A. On the relationship of this section of bk. III to the authenticity of bk. VI, see nn. 441 and 456 of this work.
This breadth, however, also has a corresponding depth to it that reveals the maturing intricacy of Richard’s thought as he crafted the work. And upon closer inspection, when we consider this breadth and depth together, we find some important clues to the textual history of *De Trinitate*, clues that reveal *De Trinitate* as a work of art “in relief.” It is that depth to which we now direct our attention.

**Depth: Richard’s Trinitarian Structures in Book III**

Now that we are familiar with the broad triadic structure of Power-Goodness-Wisdom Richard used to organize the main lines of argument in his treatise, we zoom in on book III where he makes his case for the Trinity of persons. Here we discover that not only does Richard conceive of a triadic structure for his entire work, but that he deliberately incorporates triads and triadic structures within every one of his books. Book III, however, showcases his most intricate formulations. It is where he uses one triadic structure to form three sections of argument for the plurality and Trinity of persons in Divinity. Then, within each of these three sections, he uses that same triad in order to show how fitting it is to have three considerations supporting one and the same truth.

The pattern is consistent with Richard’s stated method in book I of “drawing out” profound and hidden reasons into the open from the sanctuary of wisdom. In books I-II Richard deals with Power; in book III, with Goodness; and in books IV-VI, with Wisdom. In book III, Richard “draws out” the Goodness from the Power-Goodness-Wisdom triad that structures the entire work. Richard focuses in order to magnify. Book III focuses on Goodness and then magnifies it with an increasingly lucid set of arguments for the Trinity of persons. We now look at how Richard does this in book III.
Richard uses numerous triads in book III, but the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad plays the largest structural role. The triad is introduced in III.2-5, and it structures the material from III.2-20. The following diagram (Fig. 4.2) provides a perspective of the intricacy with which Richard draws these considerations out into the open from the fullness of Goodness and it will be helpful to have in mind as we provide a microscopic analysis of this material in book III.

Fig. 4.2 Richard’s Use of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory Triad in Book III

The Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad structures three sections of book III. The conclusion of each section provides an “anchor point” that marks the end of one pitch and the starting-point for the next.\textsuperscript{236} Section one, in III.2-5, establishes the plurality of

\textsuperscript{236} The language is taken from rock-climbing terminology. In the same way that a lead climber puts in anchor points for those who are making the ascent below him, so Richard provides organizational clues that indicate where each new contemplation begins.
persons; that is, that there must be more than merely one person in true Divinity. Section two, in III.7/11-13, establishes that this plurality must be a Trinity of persons. Section three, in III.14-20, establishes the truth of both the plurality and Divinity in a single argument from supreme benevolence. The material that comes between these sections (e.g., III.6, 8-10 and III.21-25), as will be shown later, consists of earlier stages in Richard’s composition of his work. They are the residual pieces of previous work that shifted as he expanded on his earlier writing.237 The detailed case for this is given in Appendix A, but for now, it is not too difficult to see how Richard’s method of focus and magnification from the fullness of goodness in book III might consist of a literary development as well as a meditative one. Indeed, the unparalleled intricacy of its content and form compared to what we find in the rest of De Trinitate bears this out.

These three sections of material, as well as the further triadic illustrations Richard uses within all three, demonstrate how he extends his arguments into a “trinitarian” form. This form consists of three elements: three arguments, one truth, and an indication that Richard sees the relation of these three arguments and that one truth reflecting trinitarian significance (i.e., that this three-and-one is an allusion to the three-in-one of the Trinity).238 We start first with an example of how Richard takes what was a clear, biblical

237 Compare, for instance, the content after the conclusion of III.20 with that found at the end of chapters 6, 7, 8, all of 9 and 10. They all coalesce around co-eternity, immutability, equality, unity/plurality, similitudes of divinity/humanity, greater/lesser. Aside from the beginning of III.21, the final chapters of the book (III.21-25) never rehearse the content of charity found in the preceding chapters! In addition, the language is more simple, connects with the language in the Quicumque (e.g., one omnipotent, one immeasurable, one God; see III.8), and reminds of the Power-Wisdom-Nature/Being triad Richard develops in detail in I-II (also in VI.20). Richard’s Goodness-Happiness-Glory material was probably “expanded” by him as his meditations developed. Furthermore, III.2-20 has the most intricate triadic forms and structures of the treatise; and this may indicate that the Goodness-Happiness-Glory material is the fullest and most mature development of Richard’s thought on the Trinity. For more, see Appendix A.

238 Like Ribaillier, Richardian scholars have noted the repetition of arguments in bk. III, but instead of seeing their trinitarian structure and significance, they focus on the pedagogical value of reinforcing
dyad and turns it into three to make it fit this trinitarian structure. Later we see how Richard uses the three to undergird one truth and explains their trinitarian significance.

Richard’s intentionality in crafting this material trinitarianly is seen in his scriptural allusion to the need in both the Old and New Testaments for two witnesses to establish the truth of something. Instead he uses not just two arguments for the plurality of persons, but three. The third, he says, stands by to “applaud” (acclamare) the testimonies of the other two. Richard is not content with only one or two arguments, and so he searches for a third. The third witness is the third element in the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad. And this threefold witness becomes the structural basis for the three sections of this material in book III as well as the content found within each section. We thus have a ‘macro’-use of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad in dividing this material into three sections, and we have a ‘micro’-use of the same triad in giving three arguments for one truth within each of those sections. Richard emphasizes each element of the triad, as indicated by the bold words in the following diagram (Fig. 4.3). Let’s look at this more closely.

---

239 See e.g., Matthew 18:16; Deuteronomy 17:6; 19:15; John 8:17; 2 Corinthians 13:1; 1 Timothy 5:19; Hebrews 10:28.

arguments

III.2-5  III.7/11-13  III.14-20

#1  Goodness  Goodness  Goodness

#2  Happiness  Happiness  Happiness

#3  Glory  Glory  Glory

One Truth  for Plurality of Persons  for Trinity of Persons  for Plurality & Trinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arguments</th>
<th>III.2-5</th>
<th>III.7/11-13</th>
<th>III.14-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Goodness</td>
<td>Goodness</td>
<td>Goodness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Glory</td>
<td>Glory</td>
<td>Glory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Truth</td>
<td>for Plurality of Persons</td>
<td>for Trinity of Persons</td>
<td>for Plurality &amp; Trinity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4.3 Richard’s ‘Macro’ & ‘Micro’-Uses of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory Triad

‘Micro’-Use #1: Greatest Love at the Summit of Perfect Goodness (summa)

In III.2-5 Richard calls forward three witnesses to testify for the truth of the plurality of persons in Divinity: (a) the fullness of goodness, (b) the fullness of happiness, and (c) the fullness of glory. III.2 provides Richard’s statement of what he intends to prove. He writes that the “fullness of goodness (plenitudo bonitatis) shows clearly from the nature of charity that in true divinity a plurality of persons cannot be lacking.”\(^{241}\) As we mentioned earlier, where Anselm turned the “Principle of Perfection” in Augustine (i.e., “God is whatever-it-is-better-to-be-than-not-to-be”) to the “Principle of ‘Maximal’ Perfection” (i.e., “God is the best of whatever-it-is-better-to-be-than-not-to-be”), Richard turns his attention to the “plenitude” of this “maximal perfection” (i.e., God is the fullness of the best that it is better to be than not to be). Thus we see Richard regularly arguing first for what is highest among goods in accordance with Anselm’s principle of maximal perfection, and subsequently for the fullness of that highest good at the summit of perfection.\(^{242}\) Richard writes, “... in order that charity be supreme and supremely perfect

---

\(^{241}\) Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 375.

\(^{242}\) As Coulter notes, “... the terms *summus* and *plenitudo* identify the framework within which Richard formulates all attributes of a maximally perfect being.” Coulter, 210-211. But there is also a middle *integritas* that serves as the middle term between them (also noticed by den Bok, 307 n. 98), as will be made clear in what follows.
(summa et summe perfecta), it is necessary that it be so great that nothing greater can exist and that it be of such a kind that nothing better can exist. Richard places charity at the summit of God’s perfections. Then he shifts to point out its fullness. He writes, “But where there is fullness of all goodness, true and supreme charity cannot be lacking. For nothing is better than charity; nothing is more perfect than charity.” And so, from the fullness of supreme goodness, Richard derives the supreme and perfect love from which a plurality of persons cannot be lacking. The “fullness of goodness” who testifies about supreme charity becomes the first of three witnesses in support of the conclusion that true Divinity must consist of a plurality of persons. Fullness of goodness entails fullness of charity; and fullness of charity—by which one person loves another person supremely—requires a plurality of persons.

The second witness called to testify to the plurality of persons is the “fullness of happiness” (plenitudo felicitatis). In III.3, Richard appeals to a distinction between ontological and subjective value. In III.2 Richard argues that supreme charity has superior, objective ontological worth; that is, on the scale of things great to be or have, supreme and perfect charity is highest among them (summe caritatis). In III.3, however, the focus changes. Rather than arguing for charity as the highest of objective goods, Richard now argues that charity is the best of subjective goods; that is, charity is not only

243 Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 375.

244 Ibid.

245 The same idea was already in Gregory the Great: “There cannot be love if there are not at least two persons: if love («dilectio») is self-love and does not tend to another person, it is not love («caritas»).” Quoted in den Bok, 287.
better (\textit{melius}) than other things but also the most pleasing and delightful (\textit{jocundius}).\textsuperscript{246}

As he says,

\begin{quote}
Let each person examine his consciousness; without doubt and without contradiction he will discover that just as nothing is better (\textit{melius}) than charity, so nothing is more pleasing (\textit{jocundius}) than charity. Nature and many experiences teach us this.\textsuperscript{247}
\end{quote}

Here again we see the language of Anselm, but Richard moves that logic toward the \textit{experiential quality} of the perfection this being-than-which-none-greater-can-exist must have and enjoy. He writes further, “Therefore, just as that-than-which-nothing-better cannot be lacking in the fullness of true goodness, so also that-than-which-nothing-is-more-pleasing cannot be lacking in the fullness of supreme happiness.”\textsuperscript{248} In order for there to be such fullness of supreme happiness (i.e., what is most pleasing), love must be “mutual.” There must be both “one who can show charity” and “one to whom charity can be shown.”\textsuperscript{249} Therefore the second witness of supreme happiness also testifies that true Divinity must consist in a plurality of persons.

The third witness called upon to establish the plurality of persons is the “fullness of glory” (\textit{plenitudo gloriae}). Richard develops this in III.4 where he employs one of the

\textsuperscript{246} The terminology of ‘ontological’ and ‘subjective’ is not found in Richard, but the distinction is there. The important point is that Richard assesses perfection of charity first with respect to \textit{possessing} the property of supreme love and next with respect to its \textit{enjoyment}. The distinction is between ‘having’ vs. ‘experiencing’. The distinction is clearly articulated and used similarly by Achard: “First, they rejoice that such they have in part; then they rejoice because such is what they have in this way, for, to rejoice over something because they have it is one thing, and to rejoice over the quality of the thing they have is another.” Sermon 13.29 in Hugh Feiss, \textit{Achard of St. Victor: Works}, 244.

\textsuperscript{247} Zinn, \textit{RSV’s Three Main Works}, 376.

\textsuperscript{248} Ibid., 378.

\textsuperscript{249} Ibid., 376.
clearest examples of his *reductio ad absurdum* style of argument.\textsuperscript{250} He begins with the two key propositions needed to make his point:

(p) There exists a plurality of persons in true Divinity

(\sim p) There exists only one person in true Divinity

Richard then assumes the truth of the opposite proposition he wishes to prove and combines it with other known facts in order to elicit the absurdity: “If we say that in true Divinity there exists only one person, just as there is only one substance, then without doubt according to this He will not have anyone with whom He could share that infinite abundance of His fulness.”\textsuperscript{251} This could be true in one of two ways: (a) either by a defect of power (i.e., God lacks the ability such that even if He wished to have one to share His glory with, He could not have one to share with Him), or (b) by a defect of benevolence (i.e., even if God had the ability and could have one to share His glory with, He would not wish to share it). Given the known and previously established truth that God is undoubtedly omnipotent, the first possibility is ruled out, which leaves the latter. But if the latter were true—that God had the power to share but wished not to—this would lead to the absurdity that the God, whom we know must be that-which-is-greater-than-anything-that-exists and lacking in no perfection, would be far less than perfect; for He would suffer from this severe defect of miserliness, which is uncharacteristic of true majesty and glory. A God who is powerful enough to share the infinite abundance of His

\textsuperscript{250} The following is a specific instance of the *reductio ad absurdum* form of argument Richard uses to argue for the plurality of Divinity in bk. III. On the significance of the *reductio ad absurdum* form of argument to Richard’s treatise as a whole as well as its relationship to other forms of argument he employs, see chapter 3 of this work, esp. nn. 183-185.

\textsuperscript{251} Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 377.
fullness, but unwilling to, would not be the being-than-which-none-greater-can-exist and who lacks no perfection. And given this absurdity, which derives from the supposed truth of (\sim p), Richard establishes—beyond the shadow of a doubt—that (p) must be true: Necessarily “there exists a plurality of persons in true Divinity.” All of this is spelled out by Richard in terms of love:

. . . nothing is sweeter than charity; nothing more pleasing than charity. The life of reason (rationalis vita) experiences nothing sweeter than the delights of charity (caritatis deliciis); enjoys no pleasure more pleasing than this. He would lack these delights in eternity if He remains all alone (solo solitaria) on the throne of majesty because He lacks fellowship (consortio carens in majestatis).\textsuperscript{252}

In summary, then, the plurality of persons is established by the testimony of three witnesses: the fullness of goodness, the fullness of happiness, and the fullness of glory. The “Fullness of Goodness” establishes the plurality of persons by arguing from the objective, ontological superiority of charity among goods; the “Fullness of Happiness” establishes the plurality of persons by arguing from the subjective, experiential superiority of charity among pleasing things; and the “Fullness of Glory” establishes the plurality of persons by arguing that sharing is required of true majesty. Thus all three independently testify and mutually solidify the conclusion that true Divinity must consist of a plurality of persons. Richard integrates it all beautifully in III.5:

Behold, concerning the plurality of persons, we have presented our teaching with such transparent reasoning that whoever wishes to oppose such a clear confirmation would seem to suffer from the disease of folly . . .

\textsuperscript{252} Ibid.
[Witness #1:] For who, except someone suffering from the disease of madness, would say that there is lacking in the supreme goodness (summe bonitati) that than which nothing is more perfect (nihil perfectius), and nothing better (melius)?

[ Witness #2:] Who, I ask, except someone weak in mind, would deny there is the supreme happiness (summe felicitati) that than which nothing is more joyful (nihil jocundius) and nothing sweeter (nihil est dulcitus)?

[ Witness #3:] Who, I say, except someone devoid of reason, would think that there could be lacking in the fullness of glory (plentitudine glorie) that than which nothing is more glorious (nihil gloriosius) and nothing more magnificent (nihil magnificentius)?

[All Three Witnesses:] Certainly nothing is better (nil melius), nothing is more joyful (nil certe jocundius), nothing is more magnificent (omnino nil magnificentius) than true (vera), sincere (sincera) and supreme charity (summa caritate), which he knows does not exist without a plurality of persons (personarum pluralitate).

In his first use of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad Richard notably takes a biblical principle found throughout the Scriptures of the need for two witnesses to establish the veracity of a judicial claim and adds a third witness to “applaud” the testimonies of the other two. Richard takes a two with a biblical precedent and turns it into three. He does not need three arguments to make his claim. He could very well have argued for the truth of the plurality of persons with just one or two elements of the triad (e.g., either Goodness or Happiness). If he wanted to align his use with the biblical precedent, he would only need two arguments. But because he is intentional in

253 Ibid., 378. The “true, sincere, and supreme” may also be a very small reverse chiastic structure (e.g., true-magnificence, sincere-joy, supreme-love). Richard’s summary also reveals that the ‘flow’ or ductus of this material in III.2-5 follows his “Nihil . . . nihil” constructions (e.g., Goodness: melius to perfectius, Happiness: jucundius to dulcius, Glory: gloriosius to magnificentius). These constructions give us the structural and semantic framework of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad Richard uses to structure the material in III.2-20. This “Nihil . . . nihil” is also frequent in strophe VIII.2 of the “Lux iocunda, lux insignis” sequence the Victorines recited at Pentecost where there are other verbal parallels with this material in book III. For the sequence, see Fassler, 276.
articulating the Trinity “trinitarianly,” and Scriptures do not preclude the addition of a third witness, he turns the two into three to fit a trinitarian form.

‘Micro’-Use #2: Most Integral Love in The Purest Happiness (integritas)

Interestingly enough, Richard not only uses this Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad in the opening section and other sections of book III, but he also adopts it as a governing triad that triadically structures III.2-20. Thus Richard uses a ‘macro’ Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad to divide book III into three sections in addition to a ‘micro’ Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad to structure all three! We have already seen the opening argument Richard makes for the plurality of persons from supreme charity on the basis of this triad in III.2-5. In the second section, III.7/11-13, Richard argues for the “Trinity” of persons (i.e., that there must be at least three divine persons in Divinity) from the “fullness” of charity. In a way that parallels Richard’s use of the fullness of happiness to speak of the “pleasing quality” of love, Richard turns in III.7/11-13 to the mutual quality and E-quality of this supreme love to argue for the Trinity of persons. In III.7 Richard establishes that supreme love can only obtain among supreme equals; III.11-13 then builds on III.7 by describing the order and ardor of loving supremely. Thus in III.7 Richard writes, “Surely it ought to be noted that as true charity demands a plurality of

---

254 See n. 239 of this work.

255 By contrast, in Twelve Patriarchs lxxxi, Richard states the same principle but only asks for two witnesses: “I do not accept Christ without a witness nor can any probable showing be confirmed without the witness of Moses and Elijah, without the authority of Scripture. Therefore let Christ summon two witnesses to Himself in His transfiguration if He wishes that the light of His splendor, which is so great and so unusual, not be suspect to me.” Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 139.
persons, so supreme charity demands equality of persons” (italics mine).256 This shows both a connection with III.2-5 as well as a decisive shift to a new section on the “equality” and “integrity” of supreme love. Richard continues, “And so in true Divinity, as the particular nature (proprietas) of charity requires a plurality of persons, so the integrity of the same charity requires supreme equality of persons in true plurality” (italics mine).257 This shift from III.2-5 to III.7/11-13 is further indicated by a transition from “supreme love” to a new section on “loving supremely” as this relates to both the equality of the divine persons (III.7) and the quality (i.e., order and ardor) of their mutual love (III.11-13). Furthermore, Richard recalls the “witnesses” he interrogated in III.2-5. He writes in III.11, “And so, concerning the assertion of Trinity, let us question the same witnesses we brought forth above to testify for plurality” (emphasis mine).258

So Richard uses the same Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad from III.2-5 for this new section in III.7/11-13, but with a twist. That twist consists of baptizing the triad in its second element—the fullness of happiness with respect to its pleasing quality. In III.2-5, Richard argued, “. . . in order for charity to be supreme and supremely perfect (summa et summe perfecta), it is necessary that it be so great that nothing greater can exist, and that it be so excellent that no better love can exist.”259 The move there was from “no greater love” (majus) to “no better love” (melius). In III.11-13, Richard moves from “no greater love” (maximum) to the most excellent love (praecipuum): “For just as in supreme

256 Richard, De Trinitate III.7; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 379.
257 Ibid.
258 Richard, De Trinitate III.11; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 384.
259 Richard, De Trinitate III.2; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 375.
charity what is greatest cannot be lacking, so what is clearly excellent cannot be lacking either.” The goodness of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad in III.2-5, where the emphasis was upon the highest degree of love, has now become the excellence of joy experienced by those who love each other supremely. Richard writes, “Certainly in mutual and very fervent love nothing is rarer or more magnificent than to wish that another be loved equally by the one whom you love supremely and by whom you are supremely loved” (emphasis mine). Therefore on the basis of this most excellent love, there must be a third, a partaker of the love of the other two (condilectum).

Next, Richard considers the defect of “grief” that would exist if each lacked a partaker of their mutual love—either on the basis of lack of power or lack of will—and argues that the “. . . fullness of happiness excludes every defect of charity, whose perfection (consummatio) demands a Trinity of persons, . . .” (italics mine). He thus combines supreme happiness with supreme goodness of his previous argument to give a “mutual attestation” of the truth that there must be a Trinity of persons in divinity. But he still has the third part of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad to use. And he secures this by moving from the “grief” that would obtain from a defect of power or will in desiring a partaker, to a consideration of the “shame” that would obtain for those who would lack such a partaker in their love. As Richard says, “But just as in supreme happiness there cannot be a cause for grieving, so in the fullness of supreme glory there cannot be a

260 Richard, De Trinitate III.11; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 384.
261 Ibid.
262 Richard, De Trinitate III.12; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 386.
matter of embarrassment.” Such a defect would hide “… the splendor of so much glory” (italics mine).\footnote{Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} III.13; Zinn, \textit{RSV’s Three Main Works}, 386-87.}

Richard confirms his use of the same Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad in this second section when he summarizes it all in III.13:

\begin{quote}
Behold how the fullness of divine goodness and the fullness of happiness and glory come together in one witness to truth. They clearly demonstrate what ought to be thought concerning the fullness of divine charity in that plurality of persons. Together, they condemn suspicion of any defect in that supreme charity; in accord they proclaim the fullness of all perfection. In order for charity to be true, it demands a plurality of persons; in order for charity to be perfected, it requires a Trinity of persons.\footnote{Richard alludes to the language of the courtroom in bk. III: e.g., interrogate, witnesses, proclaim, condemn, attest. Richard further plays with this courtroom language by connecting “condemnation” \textit{(damnatio)} with arguments against any “defects” \textit{(defectus)} of charity and “proclamation” \textit{(acclamatio)} with arguments for the “integrity” \textit{(integritas)} of charity.}
\end{quote}

Whereas the first section was an argument from “supreme charity,” this second is an argument about the “\textit{fullness} of divine charity” from which Richard derives the Trinity of persons. We also see that in the same way Richard summarized the argument of his first section, he also summarizes this one—taking all three considerations into account to hold forth a single truth.

We have already shown that Richard uses triads and triadic structures for the broader horizon of his work. We have also demonstrated that he uses triads within specific sections of his treatise. Now we point out that he employs triads that reflect the dogma of Trinitarian orthodoxy: “one substance, three persons” before moving on to Richard’s third, and final, ‘micro’-use of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad in III.14-20.
At the conclusions of III.2-5 and III.7/11-13 Richard summarizes each section so as to make each element of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad undergird one attestation of truth. In III.2-5, Richard uses Goodness-Happiness-Glory, with an emphasis on the first element (Goodness: i.e., the highest of goods), to argue for the single truth that there is a plurality of persons in Divinity. In III.7/11-13, Richard uses the same triad with an emphasis on the second element (Happiness: i.e., equal joy), to argue “in one witness to truth” what must be understood about the fullness of divine love in the plurality of persons.\(^\text{265}\) The truth is that out of a mutual and ardent love they require a partaker of their love; thus a “trinity” is consummated.\(^\text{266}\) Therefore each ‘micro’-use of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad in these two sections of book III, consists of three arguments for a single truth. The first use establishes that there must be a plurality of persons in Divinity; the second that there must be at least a Trinity.\(^\text{267}\) In the next section, III.14-20, we see Richard deriving the truth of both the plurality and Trinity of persons from a single argument, and with an emphasis on the third element (i.e., Glory).

Therefore, in the same way that the Trinity consists of “one substance, three persons,” Richard uses one truth to argue for it in three ways, and conversely to argue from three considerations for that one truth. He thus turns a dyad into a triad to fit a trinitarian form. He then relates the three elements of that triad to one truth. And in the process, he “draws out” a form to this material that reflects the significance of the trinitarian dogma: three in

\(^{265}\) Richard, De Trinitate III.13; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 387.

\(^{266}\) Ibid.

\(^{267}\) Richard’s argument for limiting the number of divine persons to only three comes later in V.15.
one. He provides a trinity of arguments for the Trinity of divine persons. He argues for the Trinity “trinitarianly.”

‘Micro’-Use #3: Fullest Love Out of the Most Abundant Glory (*plenitudo*)

In the third section, III.14-20, Richard takes up the third element in the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad to gather everything he has previously considered into one, single argument. As he says, “But so that this may be more apparent, let us gather into a unity what we have said more diffusely.” He considers whether it might be possible to obtain from some element of a single divine person alone both the plurality and Trinity of persons the earlier two sections already secured. How will Richard obtain this? He considers the “abundance” of Divinity’s glory. He writes, “And for the *magnificence of His honor*, He rejoices over sharing the *riches* as much as He glories over enjoying the *abundance* of delights and sweetness” (italics mine). Richard takes the *goodness* that consists in a divine person “possessing” a bounty of riches and the *happiness* involved in “enjoying” such abundance and subsumes them to the *glory* that is “the magnificence of His honor.” Thus Richard emphasizes the third term of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad by looking at the “supreme benevolence” that can only be enjoyed and bestowed by one who has supreme glory.


269 The relationship between the new argument in III.14-20 and the one in III.7/11-13 mirrors the relationship of Anselm’s *Monologion* and *Proslogion* where the latter was a condensation of the former into a “single argument” for the existence of God. The pattern is found elsewhere in Richard’s *De Trinitate*.


271 Richard’s constellation of terms (e.g., “glory,” “honor,” “majesty,” “magnificence,” etc.) relate to the “aura” or “reputation” of a person’s glory or majesty.
Richard derives the plurality and Trinity of persons based on a consideration of supreme benevolence (benevolentia) in the following way. First, he argues for the “fellowship of a fraternity” (consortio societatis) by pointing out that the supreme magnitude of one divine person would entail an “abundance of delights (deliciarum) and sweetness (dulcedinis)—an abundance that could neither be “had” nor “enjoyed” without the acquisition of “intimate love (intimae dilectionis).” There must, therefore be, at minimum, a plurality of persons in Divinity. But if there is only one partner (unam sociam) then “He alone [would possess] the sweetness of such delights who has a partner and a loved one (sociam et condilectum) in the love that has been shown to Him.” Therefore, in order for there to be a “communion of love” (communio amoris) there must be at least a Trinity of persons.

Next Richard moves to a consideration of the second term of the triad (i.e., Happiness) in his argument from benevolence. Richard’s emphasis is on the generous nature of this supreme benevolence and what it entails for true Divinity. Thus III.14 focuses on the abundance that true Divinity must possess (e.g., goods, bounty, abundance) in order to show such magnificent generosity. While one may have a benevolent and generous disposition, one cannot be supremely generous without

272 Richard, De Trinitate III.14; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 387.

273 Despite the present tense ‘possidet’, the context indicates it should be understood counterfactually. I’ve modified Zinn’s translation to make this more clear.

274 Richard, De Trinitate III.14; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 387.

275 Ibid.

276 The basic meaning of ‘benevolentia’ is a generous disposition toward another, good-will, etc.
possessing a bounty of goods to distribute and share. Thus Richard first emphasizes the ‘Goodness’ component in the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad by attending to the abundant riches true Divinity must possess. But one cannot be supremely benevolent without also sharing these goods with others. Supreme benevolence also entails supreme generosity; that is, this abundance of goods must also be abundantly shared. And the quality and E-quality of this sharing, as emphasized in III.7/11-13, must consist of mutual order and ardor. As Richard says:

> However, where equal benevolence exists in either person it is necessary that each with equal desire and for a similar reason should seek out a sharer of his excellent joy. For when two persons who mutually embrace each other with supreme longing and take supreme delight in each other’s love, then the supreme joy of the first is in the intimate love of the second, and conversely the excellent joy of the second is in the love of the first (emphasis mine).\(^{277}\)

From the goodness found in the bounty and abundance of riches in one divine person, Richard was able to derive the conclusion that there must be a “communion of love” (communio amoris) that requires a third mutually loved (III.14). Here, in the second part of his argument (III.15), from the happiness found in the equal sharing of that abundance, Richard derives the conclusion that there must be a “communion of excellent joy” (praecipui gaudii communione) that requires a third mutually loved (condilectum).\(^{278}\) Richard then discusses why the supreme happiness requires both a plurality and Trinity of persons by pointing out that pleasures of wisdom and power could be possessed by one divine person alone; and hence an argument from the pleasures of


\(^{278}\) Richard, *De Trinitate* III.15; Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 389.
either wisdom or power cannot deliver an argument from reason for the plurality or
Trinity of persons. But the pleasures of charity, unlike the pleasures of wisdom and
power that come only from one’s own heart, are drawn from the “heart of another.”279 So
supreme happiness requires at least two mutually loved. And as these two “ . . . draw the
mellifluous delights of love (melliflua dilectionis oblectamenta)” from the hearts of each
other, “ . . . a great accumulation of joy and pleasure builds up for anyone who gives and
receives love in fellowship with another.” Thus “ . . . the supreme level of that generosity
(benignitatis) would have no place in Divinity if a third person were lacking in that
plurality of persons.”280 And so “ . . . the consummation of true and supreme goodness
cannot subsist without completion of the Trinity.”281

This concludes Richard’s use of the second term of the triad from a consideration of
benevolence. But, if he is consistent, we should find him searching for a way to “draw
out” the last element of the triad with respect to Glory. He does this by considering the
“virtue” of the property of the mutual love for a third person. When one person bestows
love upon another, this is dilectio not condilectio (i.e., the mutual love for a third). But,
“Shared love is properly said to exist when a third person is loved by two persons
harmoniously and in community, and the affection of the two persons is fused into one
affection by the flame of love for the third.”282 As Richard further notes, this is not
“shared love” but “supreme shared love. (summa condilectione).” He then asks a few

279 Richard, De Trinitate III.16; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 389.
280 Richard, De Trinitate III.18; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 391.
281 Ibid.
282 Richard, De Trinitate III.19; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 392.
questions, showing that he connects the “virtue” of *condilectionis* with the great “dignity” obtained in those who perfectly exemplify it.\(^{283}\) He asks:

> If there is *so much worth* (*dignitas*) for each person in these two virtues [i.e., (a) supreme and totally perfect benevolence and (b) intimate and supreme harmony] on account of the virtue itself, what *virtue, what worth*, I ask, will there be where each is fashioned on account of the other, where one is *greatly praised* (*magnificatur*) on account of the other, where one is brought to consummation on account of the other? (emphasis mine)\(^{284}\)

And he concludes that “Just as a virtue of *so much worth* (*tantae dignitatis*) and *supereminent excellence* (*supereminentis excellentiae*) cannot be lacking in the supreme and altogether perfect good, so it is not able to subsist without a Trinity of persons” (emphasis mine).\(^{285}\)

Does Richard summarize III.14-20 in such a way that it reflects one truth held up by these three considerations as he does in III.2-5 and III.7/11-13? In III.20 he writes,

> “Consider now how union with a third person establishes concordant affection everywhere and brings about consocial love through all and in all.” Simply take any one of the divine persons and we will “. . . see the other two love the third concordantly.”

We recall from III.14 the abundance “had” by Divinity that requires a plurality and a

---

\(^{283}\) Here it is is not the experience of *condilectionis* but the *virtue* and *dignity* that comes from having it that Richard wishes to emphasize. See n. 271 above on Richard’s associations of glory with “aura” or “reputation.”

\(^{284}\) Richard, *De Trinitate* III.19; Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 392. *Si tanta itaque dignitas est in his duabus virtutibus cuique ex semetipsa, quid, quae est, virtutis, quid dignitatis inerit ubi quaevis conditur ex altera, ubi una magnificatur ex alia, ista consummatur ex illa?* Richard’s prepositions seem to make further Trinitarian allusions he develops in I-II with respect to being from eternity and V-VI with respect to the modes of procession: e.g., *ex semetipsa* (being from eternity and from itself), *quaevis ex altera* (two being from eternity but from another; *conditur*, literally “built up from”), *una ex alia* (one procession magnified on account of the first), *ista ex illa* (another procession consummated on account of the second).

\(^{285}\) Ibid.
third mutually loved. This is the Goodness of benevolence: the bounty, the “communion of love” (*communio amoris*) that requires both a companion and lover (*sociam et condilectum*). When we take a look at a second divine person we find that the “. . . remaining pair unite with equal desire in love for him.” We remember from III.15 how this abundance is “shared” in all of its fullness. This is the Happiness of benevolence: the “communion of excellent joy.” And finally, when we look at a third divine person we see the “. . . affection of the others flows in equal harmony to the third.” We call to mind the “virtue” and “dignity” of such an abundance where each person is magnified and consummated through fellowship with the others in III.19. This is the Glory of abundance, of benevolence, of generosity. Richard brings it all to a fitting summary:

> Behold how from shared fellowship (*consodalitate*) with a third person in that Trinity it is argued that concordant charity (*concordialis*) and consocial love (*consocialis*) are never found anywhere in an isolated individual.²⁸⁶

Thus, from a detailed and microscopic analysis of III.2-20, we see Richard being very intentional in constructing his treatise with triads and triadic structures. In book III he has taken the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad and used it as the basis for structuring the material in III.2-20. It draws this material out into three sections corresponding to each element in that triad. And within each of those three sections, Richard employs the triad to make three considerations illuminate a single truth. III.2-5 takes the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad to argue for the plurality of Divinity from a consideration of “supreme charity” and with an emphasis on Goodness (i.e., supreme charity is the

²⁸⁶ Richard, *De Trinitate* III.20; Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 393. Richard considers ‘simplicity’ in I-II a perfection, whereas ‘individuality’ is lacking without a trinitarian consummation. It may be perfect but it is not supremely perfect without this consummation.
greatest of all virtues; there is nothing greater, nothing better). III.7/11-13 takes the same triad to argue for the Trinity of persons from a consideration of the “fullness of supreme charity” and with an emphasis on Happiness (i.e., the quality and E-quality of the perfect charity requires a third mutually loved). And III.14-20 takes the triad from a consideration of benevolence and with an emphasis upon Glory (i.e., the virtue and dignity of having, sharing, and manifesting the unsurpassable excellence of “supreme mutual love” (*summa condilectione*)).

Individually and together, Richard’s use of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad in book III makes a strong case for the thesis that Richard argues for the Trinity “trinitarianly”—that he constructs his arguments in ways that reflect the trinitarian dogma. We see this in how he employs this triad throughout book III as well as in how he summarizes each section with three considerations attesting to one truth: God is one substance and three persons. Richard’s arguments not only provide necessary reasons for the greater certainty of this truth; the very form his arguments take seem to manifest it!

**Perspective: Additional Trinitarian Structures and Triads**

When we turn our attention to the other books of *De Trinitate* we also find Richard using triads and triadic structures. In the prologue to the work Richard lists no fewer than eight of them. None of these triads form a structure within the Prologue, but the fact that Richard opens his work with so many right at the outset is good reason to suspect that he will give special attention to triads in the rest of his work (Fig. 4.4).
In book I Richard adds further triads but only one serves to structure the content of his work there: namely, the triad of Highest-Best-Fullest. This is the ‘macro’ triad of book I. The ‘micro’ triad is Being-Power-Wisdom. Book I is significantly briefer than the other books and seems to retain earlier material. The opening chapters in I.1-5 detail more of Richard’s method in beginning with the articles of faith in the Quicumque and searching for necessary reasons. As he says, “I have read but not seen proven . . .,” “I hear daily . . .,” “I find . . .,” “Authorities abound but I don’t recall proofs.” 1.7-10 establish three modes of being and which of those modes will be the focus of the entire treatise. Three modes of being obtain among everything that is or can be: (a) being from eternity and from itself, (b) being neither from eternity nor from itself, and (c) being from eternity and not from itself. He then gives arguments for the existence of each of these

---

287 These triads are as follows: Reasoning: Demonstration, Inference, Certainty; Value: Worthy, Suitable, Diligent; Source: from-himself-not-another, from-one-person-not-another, from-two-persons-not-one-person-alone; Divinity: Father, Son, Holy Spirit; Eternity: from-eternity-and-from-itself, not-from-eternity-nor-itself, from-eternity-not-from-itself; Being: Substance-Power-Wisdom.

288 Richard, De Trinitate 1.5.
modes of being, establishing that all three exist. But the unique focus of *De Trinitate* is on those two modes of being that are from eternity. Books I-II give special attention to the first mode of being from eternity and from itself; III-VI continue to treat the first mode of being, but with special attention to that other mode of being from eternity and not from itself. In short, I-II treat Divinity *in se*; III-VI, Divinity *ad intra*.

Richard organizes book I with the Highest-Best-Fullest triad in three sections. I.11-12 take the being from eternity and from itself and argue that it must be the “highest” being of all. As such, it must be rational because rational is greater than irrational nature, and therefore it must be the highest rational nature of all. It is that “power of being” (*essendi potentia*) from which every essence, all power, and all wisdom come to be. It is the dispenser of everything; and is thus rightly called “primordial substance” (*substantia primordialis*).

The second part of the Highest-Best-Fullest triad is given in I.13-18. In this section Richard describes the internal nature of this primordial being that is from eternity and from itself. Its substance, power, and wisdom are all identical. And, as seems to be a pattern for Richard, he tends to use the second element of his triads to discuss the quality and E-quality of the thing. Thus this section focuses on questions of greater or lesser. He

---

289 According to den Bok, this approach differs from (a) Aquinas’s cosmological arguments that infer a necessary cause from the causes of created things; and (b) Anselm’s ontological argument, principles of which Richard employs in *De Trinitate* III. Richard’s argument in bk. I “from specific ontological features of created things” appears to be unique to him and was followed by Duns Scotus who referred to it as “*ratio Richardi*.” For more on this, see den Bok, 172 n. 87.

290 Richard, *De Trinitate* 1.11.

291 Richard, *De Trinitate* 1.12.

292 Richard, *De Trinitate* 1.13.
has already established that the primordial substance must be the greatest. He then asks whether the primordial substance can have either an “equal” partaker of its substance or an “inferior” partaker of its substance; and he proves that neither is possible.\textsuperscript{293} He concludes that “true Divinity is in a unity of substance, and a true unity of substance is in the Divinity.”\textsuperscript{294} I.17 opens the possibility that despite the unity of substance in Divinity, it is still logically possible for Divinity to have one or multiple persons. What is important is that Divinity is nothing other than God and that there is no multiplicity with respect to the divine substance. Without this ‘logical space’, Richard would not be able to make the further arguments he does in books III-VI with respect to the divine persons and their processions. He then summarizes these arguments in I.18: Regardless of whether one looks at substance, power, or wisdom, “. . . nothing greater and nothing better than God can either be determined by him or be reached through intelligence.” God is the supreme substance and has no equal.

The third part of the Highest-Best-Fullest triad is taken up in I.19-24 and focuses on the “fullness” and “perfection” of the primordial substance with respect to its Being-Power-Wisdom. I.19-20 show that Richard moves from a consideration of what is “better” to what is considered “best” (\textit{melius}) and “perfect” (\textit{perfectius}). As he says, “Therefore, the more human thinking attains to what is best and perfect, the closer it ascends to that which is God, even though it does not reach up to him.”\textsuperscript{295} In I.11-12,

\textsuperscript{293} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} I.14-15.

\textsuperscript{294} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} I.16.

\textsuperscript{295} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} I.19. Cf. Augustine and Anselm at nn. 45 and 63 of this work.
Richard applies the Augustinian “Principle of Perfection” to establish that the primordial substance must be the better of what-it-is-better-to-be-or-not-to-be. In I.13-18, Richard applies Anselm’s “Principle of ‘Maximal’ Perfection” to argue that the primordial substance must be the being-than-which-none-greater-can-be-thought; it must have no partaker and no equal. Finally, in I.19-24, Richard introduces his own “Principle of the ‘Fullness’ of Maximal Perfection” as this applies to the divine substance. And thus he shifts from the *integrity* of Divine substance to a consideration of its *fullness* and *perfection*.

Richard also resorts to a chiastic structure in I.21-24 before he summarizes in I.25. In the *outer part* of the chiastic structure, I.21 and I.24, he argues that the divine substance is supremely powerful (*summe potens*). This is so, first of all, because Divinity does not lack the fullness of omnipotence; God is not merely the best of all powerful beings that exist, but the most powerful of any being that could ever exist. He is “truly” omnipotent: the most powerful being (I.21). What’s more, God does not lack the fullness of omnipotence, because the omnipotence he possesses, he has from himself and not from another. He is his own source of omnipotence (I.24), and therefore “truly” omnipotent. Likewise, in the *inner part* of the chiastic structure, I.22 and I.23, Richard makes the same arguments with respect to wisdom. God is “truly” all-wise because he is the wisest being there could ever be (I.22) and he has his wisdom from himself, not from another (I.23). Richard finally brings his arguments for the perfect omnipotence and perfect wisdom of God to a fitting conclusion pertaining to the “substance” that makes them one. Then he repeats the creedal formula he concluded with in the second section: “... true
divinity remains in unity of substance, and unity of substance remains in true divinity.”

In book II, Richard uses triads and triadic structures to organize his material, but with a level of detail and intricacy that goes beyond what we find in book I. And consequently, Richard’s “expanding” of sections of his work with new material becomes more evident in book II. The first two sections of book II form a large chiastic structure coalescing around the triad he devotes the most attention to in these sections: the three divine properties of Uncreated-Eternal-Immeasurable. II.1 and II.8 form the outer part of the chiastic structure. In II.1, Richard argues that God is uncreated and in II.8, that there can be only one uncreated. II.2-4 parallel II.7 to form the next rung of the chiasm. In II.2-4 he argues that God is eternal, and in II.7 that there can be only one eternal being. The third, final, and inner section of the chiasm consists of II.5 and II.6. In II.5 Richard establishes that God is immeasurable; in II.6 he argues that there can be only one immeasurable God. The chiasm uses the Uncreated-Eternal-Immeasurable triad in the following way (Fig. 4.5):

296 Richard, De Trinitate I.25.

297 For more on Richard’s method of expanding his previous work, see Appendix A.

298 These three properties correspond to the three divine properties emphasized, and recited, in the Quicumque: “Increatus Pater, increatus Filius, increatus Spiritus Sanctus. Immensus Pater, immensus Filius, immensus Spiritus Sanctus. Aeternus Pater, aeternus Filius, aeternus Spiritus Sanctus.”
II.1  Uncreated  
II.2-4  Eternal  
II.5  Immeasurable  
II.6  Only One Immeasurable  
II.7  Only One Eternal  
II.8  Only One Uncreated

Fig. 4.5 Uncreated-Eternal-Immeasurable Chiasm in II.1-8

II.1-5 establish these three divine properties, and II.6-10 that they can only be appropriated to one being. There can be no other being with the same properties. II.2-4 extend Richard’s description of the “eternal” property which entails *no end* (everlasting), *no decay* to a worse state (incorruptibility), and *no change* to a better or equal state (immutability).\(^{299}\) II.9-10 contain a further argument for these divine and incommunicable properties of Divinity on the basis of how well they “cohere” with one another. Their optimal consistency and “mutual relationships” with each other are further evidence for their truth. II.9 demonstrates the harmony from the mutual relation of the Uncreated and Eternal properties; II.10 from the Eternal and Immeasurable properties.\(^{300}\)

At the end of II.10, Richard connects with his earlier material in book I where he argued for the unity of divinity from omnipotence. Since the divine properties are

---

\(^{299}\) Richard takes the three elements of Uncreated-Everlasting-Immutable understood as No Beginning-No Ending-No Change to be a triadic proof for the eternity of Divinity. See Richard’s *De Trinitate* II.4. Augustine’s Unchangeable-Invisible-Immortal triad in his *De Trinitate* II.7-9 counters the corresponding Arian views (e.g., Changeable-Visible-Mortal) with an exegesis of 1 Timothy 1:17.

\(^{300}\) For more on this harmonizing method of Richard, see “Richard’s Penchant for ‘Harmonizing Opposites’” in chapter 6 of this work.
identical to each other (because the divine substance has an ultimate, super-simplicity), God’s omnipotence is identical to his immeasurability and eternity. In II.11 Richard engages in a digression concerning the two properties of Divinity (e.g., Power and Wisdom) that seem to be communicable since other rational beings participate in them; that is, despite the fact that Richard has argued for the incommunicability of these properties, they don’t seem to be limited to Divinity alone. In II.12 Richard introduces the triad of General-Special-Individual with respect to substantiality (substantialitas) in order to show that God’s power and wisdom—though we apply the same words to other rational substances—are sui generis when used of Divinity. They should be understood as “supreme Wisdom” or “supreme Power,” and hence incommunicable with respect to their supreme status. In short, while “power” and “wisdom” are communicable properties (i.e., humans and God have both power and wisdom), omnipotence and omni-wisdom are incommunicable and belong to God alone. Proof that II.11-14 is a digression, and therefore added at a later date, consists of the fact that the summary for the chiastic Uncreated-Eternal-Immeasurable triad comes directly at the end of the digression in II.15. Richard writes:

Except for what we already said above about the singularity of the divinity, behold how many ways we can prove that there is only one God. One uncreated, one eternal, and one immeasurable—each property proves and clearly demonstrates that there is only one God.

The reason this summary is included at the beginning of II.15, which initiates a new

301 See n. 7 of this work.

302 II.11-14 is a digression on the perplexity of the communicability / incommunicability of the divine properties of power and wisdom.
section of book II, is that Richard, having considered the “unity” of Divinity (\textit{divinitatis unitate}) in book I (i.e., there is one divine substance) and the “singularity” of Divinity (\textit{divinitatis singularitate}) in the last half of the chiasm of book II (i.e., there is \textit{only one} God who is uncreated, eternal, immeasurable), now wants to use a single argument to argue for the harmony of the unity and singularity of Divinity. He sees it as a fuller elaboration of the previous arguments he has made until now; a form that matches the Highest-Best-Fullest triad he used in book I. In book I Richard argued that the divine substance is supremely one (\textit{summe unum}). In the last part of the chiastic structure of book II Richard argued that the divine substance is singularly supreme (\textit{unice summum}).

Now, from a single consideration of unity, and particularly with the consideration of the creedal formula “There is one Lord,” Richard argues for the supremely simple identity of Divinity; that is, he will take the unity of book I and the singularity of book II to argue for the “full identity” of unity and singularity.

The section for the full identity of unity and singularity begins in II.15 with the argument for establishing the truth recited in the \textit{Quicumque}, that there is “one Lord.” In a way that reminds of the “Divinity can have no inferior, superior, or equal” of book I,\textsuperscript{303} Richard demonstrates likewise that there can be \textit{only one} Lord from a \textit{reductio ad absurdum} argument that leads to the absurdity that he-who-cannot-be-the-slave-of-another-nor-the-equal-of-another would be the slave of another or the equal of another.

And since this is contradictory, there must be one Lord.

\textsuperscript{303} Further evidence that bks. I and II form a unit in establishing the unity and singularity of Divinity comes when Richard explicitly connects his “one Lord” argument with his argument in bk. I for “one God”: “For, just as it is only possible for one God to exist who is omnipotent, so there it is only possible for one Lord to exist.” Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} II.15. It is likely part of an earlier sequence based on the \textit{Quicumque}. See n. 309 of this work.
From this consideration of supreme Lordship, Richard uses the desire of he-who-is-omnipotent to draw out a further argument for the “fullness” and then the “identity” of the simplicity and unicity of Divinity. Because omnipotent, God lacks nothing that he desires. As Richard says, “No fullness (plenitudo) and no perfection (perfectio) can be lacking where there is omnipotence.”\(^{304}\) And further, “Nothing can be better and nothing can be greater than that which is full and perfect (plenum et perfectum) in every respect (in omnibus).”\(^{305}\) Therefore, “God is the supreme good and his own good to himself.”\(^{306}\) What’s more, this fullness extends to the happiness and blessedness of Divinity: “For what is blessedness other than the fullness and perfection of all good things?”\(^{307}\) The direction of the argument in II.16 is toward the “multiplicity” or “fullness” of supreme goodness; in II.17 he shifts in the opposite direction to its “simplicity.” The divine is full and perfect but also supremely simple. It is simple in the sense that it is non-composite: there are no “distinct realities” in the supreme Good. In II.18 Richard argues further, and in conclusion, that because Divinity’s properties are identical, “... whatever is in the supreme good and true divinity is truly, substantially, and supremely one.” We thus find another of Richard’s fitting summaries reflecting a trinitarian form where he takes the full multiplicity of the supreme Good on the one hand, and the total simplicity of the supreme Good on the other, to see the intricate identity of this perfection and simplicity in one

\(^{304}\) Richard, *De Trinitate* II.16.

\(^{305}\) Ibid.

\(^{306}\) Ibid.

\(^{307}\) “Quid est enim beatitudo, nisi bonorum omnium plenitudo atque perfectio?” Richard, *De Trinitate* II.16.
Divinity. This has established, from a consideration of unity alone, a supreme Good both wholly perfect and supremely simple. In II.19 Richard makes the further point—as he did for each of the divine properties in II.6-8—that there can be only one supreme Good. As Richard says:

And so, as it was said, the entirely perfect good will be not only supremely one but also singularly supreme. . . . If God is truly the supreme good, then as there can only be one supreme good, so it is really clear what we believe: there is only one God.

So, there is only one Divinity. This Divinity is uncreated, eternal, and immeasurable; and there is only one uncreated, eternal, and immeasurable Divinity. Likewise, Divinity is supremely Good in the multiplicity and identity of its properties in a single, perfect essence. And there is only one supreme Good.

This is further evidence that Richard sees books I-II forming a unit to establish the unity of Divinity. We pointed out that Richard conceives his entire treatise in accordance with the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad. What is surprising, when we look to book I, is that Richard speaks only of Substance-Power-Wisdom and nothing of Goodness. There, he was able to show that there is only one supreme Power and only one supreme Wisdom, but he does not show in book I that there is only one supreme Goodness, as he does this later in II.19. In book III, Richard deliberately draws out a third argument so he can have three ways of establishing the same truth. He uses Goodness-Happiness-Glory to establish the plurality of persons in Divinity; and in the last one he derives a single argument from supreme Benevolence. Here we have something similar, but it spans I-II. We can see this by the fact that there are three distinct places at which Richard derives the conclusion that there is “only one God.” In I.11-25 he establishes the unity of
Divinity from the triad of supreme Substance-Power-Wisdom. In II.1-8 he establishes the singularity of Divinity from each of the three divine properties of Uncreated-Eternal-Immeasurable. And finally in II.15-19, he argues for the unity of Divinity with a single argument from supreme Goodness.

What explains this sequence of material in I-II? One has to do with the fact that Richard takes his cues from the chronology of the pseudo-Athanasian creed. The Quicumque states that there are not three omnipotents, but one omnipotent; not three Gods, but one God; not three Lords, but one Lord. The material in I-II follows the order of the creedal formula in the Quicumque: One Omnipotent—> One God —> One Lord. But there is also the sequence in I-II of Power-Wisdom-Goodness. Supreme Power and supreme Wisdom are taken up in I.11-25 but supreme Goodness is taken up in II.15-19 with Richard’s chiasm of Uncreated-Eternal-Immeasurable in II.1-8 coming between them. This sums up Richard’s argument to II.19. Clearly he uses multiple triads in I-II to sequence and structure his material despite the fact that some of these have separated as Richard added to his work.

Finally, in a way that reminds us of the digression of II.11-14 with respect to the super-status of God’s incommunicable “power” and “wisdom,” Richard argues for a similar super-status of Divinity’s simplicity and unity; for it transcends all unities

---

308 See Richard’s rehearsal of this element of the Quicumque in De Trinitate I.5.

309 Richard, De Trinitate, “one omnipotent” (I.25), “one God” (II.14), “one Lord” (II.15). I take it that the chiastic structure from II.1-8, the harmonizing of uncreated-eternal in II.9 and eternal-immeasurable in II.10, as well as the digression on the (in)communicability of wisdom and power in II.11-14 expand the “one God” argument initiated in I.25 and concluded in II.14. The expansion is what accounts for both (1) the Quicumque sequence (i.e., Omnipotent-God-Lord) and (2) the separation of supreme Goodness (II.16ff.) from supreme Power and Wisdom in I.11-25.
comprehensible to us. Thus in the same way that God’s wisdom and power transcend as ‘omni-wisdom’ and ‘omni-potence’, so God’s simplicity and identity of properties transcend as a kind of ‘omni-simplicity’. All such divine properties elude the human mind; they are “above and beyond” it though they can be seen partially as in a mirror.\(^{310}\)

In book IV we discover further connections with Richard’s triadic structures in I-III, noting that the Highest-Best-Fullest (\textit{summa-integritas-plenitudo}) triad that organizes books I and III lies in the background in this book as well. Here, Richard clarifies the definition of ‘person’ in order to bring greater alignment between contemporary understandings of the term and its application to the Divine. He does this with a view to resolving the unity of Divinity he established in books I-II with the plurality of persons in Divinity he proved in book III. The main triad Richard uses to organize his contemplations regarding this harmony in book IV is Meaning-Difference-Definition.\(^{311}\) IV.1-10 pertain to the meaning of ‘person’ (i.e., that each divine person is a someone), IV.11-20 to the difference of persons (i.e., that each person exists separately), and IV.21-25 provide the definition of ‘person’ (i.e., that each person is distinguished by an individual distinction and distinct property). Richard explicitly states that he organizes his material in accordance with this triad when he writes:

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}

\(^{310}\) The incomprehensibility of Divinity connects with the fifth and sixth stages of contemplation Richard describes in his \textit{Mystical Ark}. Reason can lead to an entrance beyond which it cannot follow. For both Anselm and Richard ‘\textit{ratiocinando}’ reaches an ineffable stopping point where one moves from language to being, and from being to “being with.” For Richard, reaching what is “above and beyond” this entrance requires ecstatic contemplation rooted in a burning longing of the soul for the Divine; for Anselm it is the reformation of the image of God in man, where his “deeds” must be righted in addition to his “words” (i.e., his reasonings). For more on this, see pp. 95-105 of this work.

\(^{311}\) Abelard is also familiar with this triad, as it structures material in his \textit{Theologia “Summi Boni.”} See esp. CCCM 2.84-5; 2.96-7; 3.4-3.5. Noticed in Nielsen, 111-112.
As we were able according to our own limited capacity, we arranged this discussion concerning the meaning (significatione), differences (variatione), and definition (descriptione) of the term ‘person’.  

In IV.1-10, on the meaning of ‘person’, Richard deals with ambiguities between ‘substance’ (substantia) and ‘person’ (persona), since the word ‘person’ is commonly used to refer to either. He puts it in the plainest of terms: One asks either “Quid sit?” (i.e., “What is that?”) or “Quis sit?” (i.e., “Who is it?”). The answer to the former is a general or specific name or definition: e.g., an animal, a man, a horse. The answer to the latter is a proper name or something equivalent, such as Matthew, Bartholomew, a father, or his son. The former refers to the quality of substance; the latter refers to the quality of person. ‘Substance’ refers to something whereas ‘person’ refers to someone. A person is both a something and a someone, which is why the word ‘person’ can refer to either one. The importance for trinitarian contemplation is that the divine persons refer to the ‘someones’ of Divinity and not the ‘something’ that is the divine essence (even though, as Richard points out, the persons are identical with the divine substance). In IV.11-20 Richard develops the second element of the Meaning-Difference-Definition triad. As we might expect, he focuses on the quality and E-quality of the thing under consideration with the second element in his organizing triads. With respect to divine persons, Richard then transitions from what it is the same within Divinity to what is different. As he says:

For, a diversity (diversitas) of substances produces ‘something and something else’ (aliud et aliud) to exist in a rational nature, and otherness (alteritas) of persons causes ‘someone and someone else’

---

312 Richard, De Trinitate IV.24.

313 Richard, De Trinitate IV.7.
Richard’s main concern is to steer the simple-minded away from tritheism in their understanding. Thus regardless of how one uses ‘person’ or ‘substance’ the key is to avoid understanding, by either term, that there are three somethings in Divinity. There is only one something but three someones. And to be accurate, one must speak of ‘substance’ with respect to the former and ‘persons’ with respect to the latter. There is one substance, but a plurality of persons in Divinity.

In IV.1-10, Richard establishes that it is logically possible (i.e., not impossible) for there to be a plurality of persons in a unity of substance. In IV.11-20, Richard shows how the “otherness of persons” can obtain without “otherness of substance(s)” as it typically does for non-divine, rational beings. To aid him in this, Richard introduces the term ‘existentiae’ to distinguish three modes of being with respect to quality and origin.

Existence can be differentiated in three ways: (a) according to quality alone, (b) according to origin alone, and (c) according to a concurrence of quality and origin. Humans are distinguished according to quality and origin since they are individuated by quality (i.e., what makes this person different than that person) and by origin (e.g., each

---

314 Richard, De Trinitate IV.9.

315 Richard is well aware of Augustine’s “Quid tres?” and here we see him with Augustine’s same pastoral concern (see esp. IV.5) for steering the “pious and simple mind” away from tritheism; but Richard’s introduction of the quid/quis distinction permits him to divide Augustine’s question into “Quis tres?” and “Quid una?” respectively, making the answers easier to come by, even though explaining the relationship between them remains difficult. See also n. 323 of this work.

may have different parents). Angels are differentiated by quality alone since angels all have the same origin.\(^{317}\) The only mode of being left for the “otherness” in Divinity is that according to origin alone. Richard therefore concludes IV.11-20 with how it is that each ‘person’ exists separately by showing that the difference consists in the fact that “Every person has a rational being from an incommunicable property.”\(^{318}\) It is left to book V to explain what those three incommunicable properties are that distinguish the divine persons according to each one’s “origin.”\(^{319}\)

Finally, in IV.21-25, Richard turns his attention to the definition of ‘person’. He begins with Boethius’s definition of person as “an individual substance of a rational nature” \(\textit{rationalis naturae individua substantia}\), and he refines it to make it more perfect and complete.\(^{320}\) Thus the continual pattern in Richard we saw in books I and III we also see at work here in book IV. In both he starts with what is “highest” \(\textit{summa}\), then what is the most “integral” or best in terms of quality \(\textit{integritas}\); and finally, what is fullest and most perfect \(\textit{plenitudo}\). Thus here, with the third part of the Meaning-Difference-Definition triad, Richard turns his attention to “perfecting” Boethius’s definition of ‘person’. He writes, “However, in order for a definition to be perfect \(\textit{perfecta}\), it is necessary for it to cover the entire reality \(\textit{rei esse comprehendat}\) and only the reality of

\(^{317}\) Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} IV.14.

\(^{318}\) Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} IV.20.

\(^{319}\) Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} V.1: “As we have already said, it is fitting that every person has a rational being from an incommunicable property. But a divine person still requires something further above this, so that it can be called divine.”

the object to be defined.”\footnote{Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} IV.21.} Thus with respect to Boethius’s definition, Richard writes:

Now, Boethius defines person as an individual substance of a rational nature. In order for this definition to be universal (\textit{generalis}) and perfect (\textit{perfecta}), it is necessary for every individual substance of a rational nature to be a person, and, conversely, for every person to be an individual substance of a rational nature.\footnote{Ibid. Here we have a clear example of Richard (a) explicitly noting his interaction with the thought of a theological predecessor (i.e., Boethius) and (b) indicating that his primary way of building on that thought is by “perfecting” it further. Thus the third element in Richard’s triadic structure here indicates the “new fullness” he has drawn out from Boethius. This explicit example further corroborates our claim for Richard’s “perfecting” Augustine and Anselm where he only alludes to their thought without explicitly mentioning them by name.}

In IV.1-10 and IV.11-20 Richard establishes that each of the divine persons are three someones and that they are distinguished in accordance with their incommunicable properties of origin. IV.10 deals with the difference between the ‘something’ and the ‘someones’ of Divinity; IV.11-20 deals with the differentiating quality among the ‘someones’ of Divinity. Finally, in IV.21-25, Richard contends with the difficulties of distinguishing the divine substance from the divine persons given that Boethius’s definition is ambiguous with respect to both: Boethius definition of a person as “an individual substance of a rational nature” applies equally to the divine persons as well as to the divine substance itself. Consequently, one can say that “Divinity is a person” and “the persons of Divinity are persons.” The inaccuracy is a problem. He therefore refines Boethius’s definition to apply ‘person’ only to the divine persons of Divinity and not to Divinity itself.\footnote{Thus while I agree with den Bok that the ‘image of God’ is restricted to the Divine-to-human relation and not (each) divine person-to-human person nor Divinity-to-society, I am more skeptical of his conclusion that Richard’s trinitarianism remains that of Person-to-person. Indeed, in the same way that an individual human substance can be understood as a ‘what’ and not a ‘who’, it is possible to understand individual divine substance as a ‘What’ and not a ‘Who’ (see n. 359 of this work). The difference lies in the} Richard’s refinement of Boethius’s definition concludes, on the basis of
these clarifications,\textsuperscript{324} that ‘person’ should be defined as “someone existing through oneself alone according to a singular mode of rational existence.”\textsuperscript{325} Book V is where he delineates each singular mode of rational existence for each of the divine persons on the basis of each one’s “origin.”\textsuperscript{326}

Do we have any evidence in book IV that Richard designs the form of his arguments by showing how three considerations uphold the same truth? In book III we saw Richard summarize each of his three sections with conclusions that did exactly this. Here in book IV he does not summarize each of his sections in the same way; however he still plays with this idea. For example, in Richard’s rehearsing of the traditional Latin trinitarian formulas in IV.20, he gives three of them:

\begin{quote}
\textit{tres substantias et unam essentiam}\\
\textit{tres subsistentias et unam substantiam}\\
\textit{tres personas et substantiam vel essentiam unam}
\end{quote}

He then concludes, “Among the variety of expressions a single truth must be understood, although the meaning of words is different with different people.”

\textsuperscript{324} Bk. IV consists almost entirely of refinements of definition, but Richard’s \textit{formative concern} is the understanding in the minds of his readers: Knowing the refined definition matters less than that “Among the variety of expressions a single truth must be understood, although the meaning of words is different with different people.”

\textsuperscript{325} “\textit{persona sit existens per se solum, juxta singularem quemdam rationalis existentiae modum.”} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} IV.24.

\textsuperscript{326} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} V.1: “But seeing that we are certain about the unity of the divine substance, the plurality of persons, and the harmony and mutual relation of plurality and unity, the occasion now requires that we inquire about the properties of each person and specify the particular characteristic of each person” (italics mine).
although the meaning of words is different with different people.” There were no doubt other Latin formulations, but Richard chooses three and then highlights how all three express the same truth. One truth found in three formulas; and three formulas describing the same truth. Likewise, Richard summarizes this section in the following way:

I think that no term can be found more suitable for the divine plurality than the word “person.” And indeed there ought to be nothing more authentic (authenticum) for a faithful mind (fideli animo) than what sounds (sonat) in every ear (in ore omnium) and what the Catholic authority confirms (confirmat).\textsuperscript{327}

Since Richard deals with definitions and the concepts by which things are said, heard, and understood, he lifts this “agreement of minds,” with respect to definition, into the realm of agreement of soul in chanting the liturgy. Thus he connects the communi animi with the in ore omnium in a creative way that binds these three creedal formulations on the Trinity together in a harmony that beckons faithful minds toward ecclesiastical unity!

He also concludes in IV.25, “Behold how, by its inclusion, the angelic property arranges the contrariety of opposites as in a kind of symmetrical proportion and composes the dissonance (dissonantiam) of alternating sounds (alternantium) into one consonance (in unam harmoniam).”\textsuperscript{328} Subsequently he asks:

Which, in your opinion, seems to be a more appropriate order, which, I ask, seems to be more befitting for the supreme arrangement of Wisdom (summe sapientis dispositioni): if among this trinity of natures—namely, the divine, angelic, and human natures—the properties of the outer two are related to the third as opposites through contrary natures without the intervention of an intermediate, or if it is said that the third nature intervenes between the outer two natures and, having been connected alternately

\textsuperscript{327} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} IV.20.

\textsuperscript{328} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} IV.25.
(alternatim conjuncta) through the similitude of both natures, reconciles their opposition in a harmony (in unam harmoniam)?

The language of book III was the courtroom; there were three witnesses who testify to one truth. In book IV the language is the liturgy. The sound must be “authentic” in the sense that what is stated is true and firmly believed. It must also compose the “dissonance of alternating sounds into one consonance.” It must be chanted in-tune. Furthermore, it must reconcile contrasting consonances into “one harmony.” And these liturgical allusions come together in the final conclusion of book IV, when Richard writes, “How nothing is dissonant with the reason that we are ordered to venerate one God in the Trinity and the Trinity in a unity.”

Richard realizes at the end of book IV that his clarifications of ‘person’ and his argument for the harmony of unity and plurality in Divinity are only “fitting” (convenit), and therefore may be regarded as only probable and not necessary. Thus, while his goal is to reach a perfect harmony at the end of book IV, we do well to pay attention to the emphasis in the last line of IV.25 that “nothing is dissonant in venerating the one God in the Trinity and the Trinity in a unity.” Book IV consists of refinements of definition and clarifications of terms. It therefore argues for the “non-impossibility” of the harmony

329 Richard, De Trinitate IV.25.

330 Ibid.

331 Here Richard connects his “fitting necessity” with the experience of Victorine liturgical life. The Victorine liturgies were performed in groups standing opposite one another, with their harmon(ies) coming between them. Thus Richard “calls to mind” this liturgical image as a contextual backdrop to his arguments of “fitting necessity” in bk. IV whereby two opposing terms are harmonized by a middle term to achieve optimal consistency. In doing so, Richard not only gives his readers a “common understanding” (communi animi) he also calls on them to sing it with “one voice” (una voce)!

332 Richard, De Trinitate IV.25.
between unity and plurality in Divinity (i.e., non-dissonance) on the basis of these clarifications.\textsuperscript{333} Richard still has to go beyond this to argue for the actual harmony of unity and plurality in Divinity; and he does this on the basis of “necessary reasons” in book V.\textsuperscript{334}

Book V is divided into three sections based on the triad Origin-Relation-Number. Richard fulfills two goals in this book: first, to limit the number of divine persons to three as the Catholic faith teaches; and second, to specify an incommunicable property for each divine person along the way. V.1-5 argue, on the basis of the distinctions Richard first delineates in book I, that there are only two modes of eternal existence in Divinity: (a) one who is from eternity and from himself, and (b) another two who are also from eternity but not from themselves.\textsuperscript{335} V.6-9 deal with the relation the latter two divine persons have to the first divine person with respect to the (im)mediacy of their processions. Thus one procession in Divinity is only immediate, the other is both mediate and immediate. The first procession is required in order for the second procession to obtain since a duality of persons logically precedes a trinity of persons. V.10-15 deal with limiting the number of divine persons to three by ruling out a fourth. V.16-21 consist of a single argument for these same truths on the basis of love. Here Richard introduces

\begin{quote}
333 As Richard states, the method of clarification bk. IV consists of rendering “. . . more certain . . . what was formed from a concept of common minds (communi animi).” Richard, De Trinitate IV.5. It therefore argues for the possibility of harmony between unity and plurality in Divinity on the basis of these clarifications. In bk. V Richard argues for the actual harmony of unity and plurality on the basis of “necessary reasons” rather than just probable ones. In short, the refinements of definition in bk. IV make such harmony “not impossible”; the arguments of bk. V make it necessary. See V.2.

334 Richard, De Trinitate V.1: “But we have not yet apprehended through reasoning those properties that are applicable to them individually. Therefore, let us now pursue these issues . . . ”

335 Cf. Richard’s De Trinitate I.10 and V.5.
\end{quote}
another triad—Gratuitous-Love, Owed-Love, Gratuitous-and-Owed Love—to show how three distinctions of properties in supreme love can obtain with one and the same love in every person. V.22-25 handle a concern as to whether the different kinds of love entail a “diversity of dignity” in Divinity that would make one divine person more worthy than another. These latter two arguments consider the same truth from two different perspectives. In V.16-21 Richard looks at “one and the same love” from the perspective of the distinctive love of each person (e.g., gratuitous, owed, gratuitous and owed); whereas in V.22-25, he looks at the three persons through the prism of one and the same love. Thus Richard focuses on the “fullness” of this supreme love distinguished by three properties in V.16-21 and he also speaks of the “integrity” of that same love in V.22-25. The former has to do with the source and reception of love, the latter with the equal dignity of benevolence involved in that bestowal and reception. As Richard concludes in V.24 before he draws it all together in V. 25: “It is certain and not at all ambiguous that, with regard to the integrity of perfection, there is no difference in the Trinity between love and dignity.”

Book VI and Discovering De Trinitate “In Relief”

When we get to book VI, Richard has two further goals. One is to distinguish two modes of procession in Divinity, and the other is to find arguments for the appropriateness of the divine names ascribed to each of the divine persons. But unlike previous books, though there are plenty of triads in book VI (Fig. 4.6), the book is not organized in accordance with any triadic structure.
Fig. 4.6 Triads in Book VI of Richard’s *De Trinitate*

What are the reasons for this? First, book VI has the most polemical material of the treatise. Most of these dialogical exchanges with “opponents” are found in book VI and this material centers on the debate over how there can be both Unbegotten and Begotten substance in Divinity without this entailing a contradiction.\(^{336}\) If *De Trinitate* began as a dialogical exchange with real or imagined opponents on the basis of the *Quicumque*,\(^{337}\) then the bulk of this material ends up in book VI. Second, Richard “returns” to the language of the *Quicumque* in a way that connects with books I-II.\(^{338}\) Further, there is a higher concentration of the use of the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad in book VI that

\(^{336}\) The highest concentration of this polemical material is in VI.15-25; there is a noticeable shift to the third person plural (e.g., they say, they deny, etc.). Parts of it are found in V.8-9, 13. The only other places ‘begotten’-language is found is I.5, when Richard rehearses the things he finds in the *Quicumque* but has not seen proven; and II.25, where he refrains from their discussion. Ribaillier also notes the difference in style this material has when compared with the rest of the treatise: “Certains passages, par exemple dans le débat sur la formule *substantia genuit substantiam*, tranchent par la vivacité du style sur la sérénité du reste de l’ouvrage.” Ribaillier, 10.

\(^{337}\) For more on this, see n. 460 of this work.

\(^{338}\) This similarity of style and language in bks. VI and I is also noted by Ribaillier: “Enfin la méthode n’est plus tout à fait la même: au chapitre IV du livre I, Richard prétend non pas tant s’appuyer sur les autorités que donner une démonstration rationnelle de la Trinité, *non tam auctoritates inducere quam ratiocinationi insistere*; or dans le livre VI les références à l’Écriture, à la liturgie, aux Pères sont plus abondantes.” Ribaillier, 10.
also connects with earlier material in books I-II.  

Second, book VI offers explicit evidence that Richard returned to insert and edit this material. And though we provide more details of this in Appendix A, here we must treat it because it relates to the intentionality we ascribe to Richard’s incorporating triads. At the opening of book VI, after stating in VI.2 that the relationship of the first and second divine persons is “. . . entirely immediate, and it is according to the principal order of proceeding and according to the operation of nature,” he concludes, “Because this is clear enough from the previous discussions, there is no need for further explanation.” But he then provides further explanation when he introduces the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad in VI.3 stating, “. . . if we desire to know what the singular mode of proceeding is in the supereminent and superexcellent nature of deity, then let us think about the goodness, wisdom, and power of the Unbegotten, and perhaps we will discover what we seek more quickly.” But Richard gives minimal treatment of this triad in VI.3 and only returns to it again in VI.15. The subsequent chapters VI.4-5 suddenly break into an extended treatment on the difference between human and divine procession according to the “operation of nature” (*operationem naturae*). VI.4 contends that the more worthy of the sexes (i.e., man) shows the appropriateness of the conventional language for the parent-child relation to be that of Father-to-Son. This is where divine and human propagation are similar. But there is also dissimilitude, since what holds true concerning the operation of nature in humanity (i.e., male and female parents) does not hold true for the operation of nature in Divinity (i.e., only Father-to-Son). VI.5 then engages in a speculation about

---

339 Further linguistic evidence for connecting this material is Richard’s use of “primordialis” found only in *De Trinitate* I.12-15, II.8, V.7, VI.12, VI.18.
what similitude would exist if it were possible for Adam to will a son who was consubstantial with himself and equal with himself in every way, showing that the principal relation of parent-to-child would still obtain.

Further evidence of editing is seen subsequently when Richard gives an explanation for the distinct causes, reasons, and order of each of the processions in VI.6-7: one, because the first divine person wants a person of equal dignity (condignum); and the other, because he wants a partaker of their mutual love (condilectum). The first desire precedes the second and is therefore considered to be the more principal relation. But following this—despite the fact that he has already given an argument for the distinctness of the modes of procession in VI.6-7—he argues for the distinctness of the modes of procession on a different basis: that one procession is immediate and principal and the other is immediate and not-principal. What makes each procession different is that one is from the first divine person alone and the second is from both the first and second divine persons. But why would Richard need a further argument that distinguishes the two modes of procession if he already provided one “previously ascertained with reasoning” in VI.6-7? And further, why would the condignum-condilectum language developed in those chapters not find its way into the following argument? The only other place we find this language is in VI.17 where Richard gives a paragraph providing an “abbreviated account of this topic,” presumably a briefer argument for things he argued previously. We also have Richard explicitly stating that he is inserting material in the subsequent chapter, VI.18: “But, in order that we may return to that question on account of which we
inserted these remarks . . .” (emphasis mine). In all likelihood, then, this *condignum-condilectum* material in VI.6-7 and VI.17 was inserted at a later date. And if this is true, the same applies for the material found in the latter part of V.16-25, since Richard structures the last two sections of that book around “love” and “dignity” respectively.

One of two things is taking place in book VI. One possibility is that Richard’s focus in the latter part of book V, and the first part of book VI, deals with the two processions. Thus Richard could be constructing book VI around this duality, which would account for the corresponding duality we find in the *condignum-condilectum* material and the corresponding lack of triadic structure. Another possibility is that, given more time, Richard would have found a way to arrange the material of book VI in a triadic way. Given what we have already seen in book III and elsewhere, the latter is more likely.

What is the evidence? We have seen Richard work with the triad of Highest-Best-Fullest as one of the major triads that organizes other sections of his work. What is most notable in those sections is what he does with the “plenitude” in the third part of that triad. But the way Richard speaks of plenitude and fullness in book VI is less developed. With respect to “plenitude” he always and only speaks of the fullness of *Divinity* received or given to one or another divine person. Here is an example:

... possessing all plenitude is common to every person; and both possessing and giving the fullness is a property common to the Father and Son; yet, possessing and not giving it to another is the particular property of the Holy Spirit. ... the Son alone ...
possesses the image, since just as the plenitude of divinity flows from the Father, so the bestowing of the same plenitude flows from the Son. Yet absolutely no person receives the plenitude of the divinity from the Holy Spirit, and, consequently, the Holy Spirit does not express the image of the Father in himself.\textsuperscript{342}

With respect to “fullness,” he only speaks of the fullness of wisdom and “perfect learning” in the final chapters of book VI. Here the intricate details of the fullness of divinity are lacking. Richard speaks only of the “plenitude” of divinity “given and received.” When he begins thinking of his meditations in books V and VI, with his newer contemplations on love and dignity, these more intricate details begin to flourish. But the these are the early buds, not the full flowering of Richard’s contemplations in book III. The love-dignity material in book VI\textsuperscript{343}—especially in comparison to his treatment elsewhere\textsuperscript{344}—is less developed. As a result, we can glimpse this earlier stage in Richard’s thought with a view to how he may have refined this theme for book VI in accordance with his further reflections on love and dignity in other sections of his work. And given the polish of his other writings, he may have rewritten the work in its entirety in light of them.

Book VI therefore contains many triads but no discernible triadic structures. Furthermore, Richard returned to this material with new insights. We are thus left at the end of Richard’s work with a dissipating intricacy of design and a disappointing sense that someone who could so carefully craft book III of his treatise would leave us with a final book that “fails” by comparison. Is there anything further to this? Is there anything

\textsuperscript{342} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} V.11.
\textsuperscript{343} See Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} VI.17d-18b.
\textsuperscript{344} See Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} V.16-25. For comparison of these sections, see Appendix B.
more constructive book VI might reveal in Richard’s articulation of the Trinity? Earlier, we juxtaposed the “breadth” and “depth” of Richard’s *De Trinitate*. The breadth refers to the bird’s-eye-view of the work; that is, how Richard structures the work according to the Power-Goodness-Wisdom triad (Fig. 4.1). The depth of *De Trinitate* refers to the intricacies of Richard’s use of triads and triadic structures in specific sections, the most intricate of which we find in book III (Fig. 4.2). But when we consider the breadth and depth of *De Trinitate* together, we discover that Richard’s method of focusing and then magnifying on some element to draw out further arguments is a *literary process* by which he returned to his own work. This becomes evident when perceive two things: first, despite the fact that books IV-VI deal with the harmony of unity and plurality in Divinity, the arguments “from the consideration of the fullness of wisdom” (i.e., the last part of the Power-Goodness-Wisdom triad) don’t come until the *last few chapters* of book VI; second, the language of these final chapters is simpler and less sophisticated in comparison to the material that immediately precedes it—a pattern reflected throughout *De Trinitate*.345

This simply confirms that Richard is “expanding” and “filling out” his treatise with new insights and material. Nevertheless, these expansions do not disrupt the overall flow since the expansions simply fill out, make more clear, or establish the same point from a different consideration. Richard looks over his previous compositions, finds seeds to cultivate and water, and gives them fuller treatment, fuller insight and articulation. It

345 As demonstrated in Appendix A, this pattern repeats throughout the treatise: Sophisticated reflections and distinctions *precede* much simpler arguments on the same topic. Further, none of the sophisticated language in previous sections finds its way into the concluding material. See also n. 237 of this work.
would be the equivalent of adding pages to a section of a book without rewriting what came before and after it. The pages simply elaborate some element in more detail but do not disrupt the flow of the previous work.

If this is true, then we should expect to see some of his earliest material at the very end of his work—material that connects with the language and content at the beginning of his treatise. And this is indeed what we find. Richard started with the Power-Goodness-Wisdom triad and composed his work arguing for the unity, the plurality, and the harmony of unity and plurality on the basis of this triad. But as he contemplated things further, he expanded his previous work. His final argument for the harmony of unity and plurality from a consideration of the “fullness of wisdom” at the end of book VI was therefore an earlier stage of his writing. It was only as Richard continued to expand and provide further details on the definition of ‘person’ in book IV, and the intricacies of procession and generation in book V, that we find the final component of the Power-Goodness-Wisdom triad drifting further and further away from material it was originally connected with.

The reason why this is important for us to point out is that it helps us broaden our understanding of Richard’s “intentionality” in composing this work. It is tempting, given what we have discovered about Richard’s intricate triads and triadic structuring to treat De Trinitate as a finished work of art, a sculpture in its most perfect and final form. But as we step closer, we discover it is more like a work of art “in relief”: a sculpture attached to the block of marble from which it was carved. The picture is almost full and complete; about as full and complete as could ever be imagined—the form is in “high relief.” And we can be incredibly thankful for this. For unlike a sculpture detached from the mold and
marble that gave it life, where all we see is the work of art and the feeling it evokes as we behold its form, a relief shifts our attention to the artist and his craft. We imagine how the beauty and craft with which the artist chipped away at those things he was able to “draw out” from the marble might advance through those elements left untouched. It brings us to the lines that mark the margins of the artist’s thought. We connect with the “process” of his craft and we join him in his work with our own theological imagination.

In conclusion, Richard deliberately constructs *De Trinitate* with triads and triadic structures. We see that Richard resorts to the same Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad that Anselm uses in organizing his *Monologion*. But unlike Anselm, we see that Richard went to painstaking lengths to incorporate the use of triads and triadic structures within each of his books and even within sections of each of his books. Nowhere is this more apparent than in book III where Richard uses the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad, emphasizes each element of that triad in each of the three sections, and brings all three considerations together in a final argument from supreme benevolence. What remains to explore is the way Richard uses these triads to sustain the hearts and shape the minds of his readers in *their* contemplation of the Trinity. We know the “form” by which Richard molds *De Trinitate*; what we want to know next is how he “forges” that form in his readers; how in “constructing” his trinitarian theology he gave an *inner shape* to their souls and an *outer shape* to their communal life in accordance with these “trinitarian dimensions.”
CHAPTER FIVE

FORGING THESE “TRINITARIAN DIMENSIONS” IN THE FAITHFUL

And you will find rest for your souls.

We have seen the incredible artistry by which Richard constructs his De Trinitate with triadic structures and forms. He also returns to his work, filling it out with further insights and intricacies. Richard gave a lot of attention and care to De Trinitate and he surely expected a mutual devotion from his readers as they joined with him in contemplating the Trinity. As Richard writes in Twelve Patriarchs:

O how many persons we see today, studious in reading, slothful in work, tepid in prayer, who nevertheless take it for granted that they are able to take possession of the peak of this mountain. But I ask, when will those who do not have Christ as leader take possession of it? For Christ who does not wish to ascend except with three disciples does not lead them. Therefore let one who seeks to have Christ as guide of the journey and leader of the ascent join the effort of work and prayer to the effort of reading. No doubt the mind is not lifted up to the complete height of knowledge without much exercise, without constant effort, without burning longing. This is because one who does not follow the footsteps of Christ perfectly does not enter the way of truth rightly.346

346 Richard, Twelve Patriarchs lxxix; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 137; Interestingly, Richard speaks more of the humanity of Christ in Twelve Patriarchs in contrast to Mystical Ark where it is absent. Augustine speaks in his De Trinitate IV.3 of having thoughts of Christ “after a fleshly manner.” If we are right about the Augustinian loci the Victorines follow—outside-Temple-House of God—the contemplation of Christ in Mystical Ark may mirror the shift in Augustine from fleshly to spiritual contemplations of Christ (e.g., human Jesus to divine Wisdom). As Colin Morris notes, “William of St. Thierry and others seized on the phrase [‘to know Christ after the flesh’ (2 Corinthians 5:16)] to describe the condition of the beginner in the monastic life. The monk was intended to go further, progressing on the path of meditation and purification to union with the Eternal Word.” Morris, 377.
Richard’s *De Trinitate* is a mature contemplation, that inner court of God’s temple that very few were able to enter; and of those who did, not without an effort of consecration worthy of approaching the throne of God. It is only after purging the soul of vices, inculcating virtues, and of developing a “holy curiosity” and undistracted resolve for the face of God that one would then embark upon this final ascent. In this chapter we focus on the formative implications of Richard’s triadic structures. How, then, did these “trinitarian dimensions” of *De Trinitate* shape the trinitarian consciousness of the Victorine apprentice and consummate this trinitarian love throughout his community?

**Shaping the Trinitarian Consciousness of the Individual**

The stages of learning at the abbey of St. Victor parallel monastic training in general at the time. Apprentices first focused on learning the literal sense of words. Later they built on the quality of that foundation by exploring the allegorical and tropological insights they could build up from it. They were called “first things” and “second things” respectively.\(^347\) Monastic reading, we must remind ourselves, was a moral act.\(^348\) It was not reading for its own sake, but reading for the purpose of moral and spiritual formation. As Carruthers notes:

> The essential generative process in composition was recollection of “things,” *Memoria verborum* was a task best

\(^{347}\) Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*, 29-32; Den Bok, 115.

\(^{348}\) Speaking of those who read with non-formative aims, Richard says, “Surely they thirst for the sort of thing about which they can boast but not for that by which that can be built up. Indeed, they strive after knowledge, not sanctity.” *Mystical Ark*, IV.14; Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 283. By contrast, Richard indicates that a successful read of his *Mystical Ark* does not consist in turning the last page, but in learning to put such contemplations to good use “. . . by much effort and labor, and, finally, to consummate the work at some time and in the end to be perfect in all things” (emphasis mine). *Mystical Ark* IV.22; ibid., 304. See also Hugh’s *Didascalicon* III.12, V.7, 10, VI.3; Taylor 94, 128, 134, 138.
accomplished without thinking, a first task for children or for slaves. But memoria rerum was the task that produced wisdom and built character, and could help to perfect one’s soul (“perfect” in the sense of “fill in,” inscribe things in all those empty tablets of memory). It built upon matters stored verbaliter by habit, but built up from the various cues they supplied as links in associational chains. The goal of an education was not to become a “living book” (by rote reiteration, the power of an idiot) but to become a “living concordance,” the power of prudence and wisdom. 349

To seek Divinity in all of its plenitude required also seeking a plenitude of soul in accordance with that divine image. As den Bok points out:

If man is «made to» God, he is «made to» the best possible being, which as such must be a trinitarian being. De Trinitate intends to give a hand to anyone who desires to approach the Most High daily, step by step, growing in understanding and love. The fulfillment of this desire will be a perfect love for and vision of God as He is. In its best possible form this loving and knowing is realized, according to Richard, in the mutual and perfect contemplation of divine persons. 350

Thus, like Anselm and Augustine, as Richard “takes” his reader to God, he “re-makes” him in the process, shaping and forming him in accordance with the imago Dei. Doing so enables the reader to untarnish the mirror of his soul so that he can see God “as He is”: in all of his Trinitarian splendor and glory. This should remind us that much of the formative work being done on the apprentice in De Trinitate follows upon previous soul-work: the kind of work we read in Richard’s Twelve Patriarchs and Mystical Ark.

Without the affective and intellection control Richard seeks to deeply inscribe in his apprentices by those works, they lack both the purity of desire and perspicuity of intellect to come to a “full and complete knowledge of the Trinity.”

349 Carruthers, Craft of Thought, 30-31.

350 Den Bok, 153.
Richard wishes to shape the trinitarian consciousness of his reader. And to discover how he does so, we must seek those places where he uses his triads and triadic structures to do this. For as Carruthers cautions:

... the *picturae* and *formae* which we encounter in twelfth century literature, such as those in the meditations of Hugh and Richard of St. Victor, should not be presumed to be *descriptions* of pictures or plans that necessarily existed physically, but to be *prescriptions*, examplars and patterns to be “copied” by the means of rhetoric: augmentation, abbreviation, and translation. Such ekphrastic pictures have the role in monastic rhetoric of the plan measured out by the angel for Ezekiel to hold in his memory, providing ways and places for the *mental* task of composing prayer.\textsuperscript{351}

In what follows we divide our treatment on the formative implications of Richard’s treatise and structures between Wisdom and Love, despite the fact that they have obvious overlaps. For shaping the trinitarian consciousness of the individual we focus on Wisdom; for the communal significance of Richard’s triadic structures we focus on Love. Richard himself makes this division and it will be helpful to review it for this section:

There is usually a significant difference between the pleasures of charity and wisdom. The *pleasures of wisdom* are able to and accustomed to being *drawn from one’s own heart*; but the intimate *delights of charity* are *drawn from the heart of another*. For he, who loves intimately, is not delighted but anxious if he does not *draw from the heart of his beloved* the *sweetness of love* for which he thirsts. But the *pleasures of wisdom* delight more when they are *drawn from one’s own heart*. Therefore, nothing is defined in a manner contrary to nature, if it is asserted that the fullness of wisdom can subsist in a single person (italics mine).\textsuperscript{352}

Wisdom is the crowning piece of Richard’s treatise. As we saw before, Anselm orders his *Monologion* according to the order of Goodness —> Wisdom —> Power.

\textsuperscript{351} Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*, 227-228.

\textsuperscript{352} Richard, *De Trinitate* III.16; Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 389.
Richard orders his as Power —> Goodness —> Wisdom. How do we know that Wisdom is Richard’s point of emphasis? We know this because of the recurring pattern throughout his treatise of introducing the first two terms of a triad only to add a third as the intermediate and harmonizing piece—the piece that brings out the fullness of its beauty. Whether we are speaking of the condilectio of book III, the divine person who harmonizes the gratuitous and owed love of the other two persons in book V, and numerous other examples, the third term is almost always the harmonizing piece. Thus even though the linear order of Richard’s treatise is Power —> Goodness —> Wisdom, the final picture he creates shows the relationship of Power <—> Wisdom <—> Goodness, where Wisdom fittingly perfects the picture by being placed between Power on the one hand, and Goodness on the other. Where unity is established from a consideration of omnipotence (I-II) and plurality is established from a consideration of supreme goodness (III), Wisdom is what brings that unity and plurality together in a complete harmony (IV-VI). It is fitting, then, that Richard crowns his De Trinitate with the fullness of Wisdom.

In chapter 3 we referred to Richard’s method of fides quaerens intellectum a plenitudine ad plenitudinem to highlight the extent to which he “fills out” the fullness of

---

353 This “harmonizing of opposites” was a common meditative practice in the 12th century. Focused treatment of it is given in chapter 6 of this work. For an introduction to this idea in Bonaventure and its relation to Richard, see Ewert H. Cousins, Bonaventure and the Coincidence of Opposites: The Theology of Bonaventure (Chicago: Franciscan Press, 1978).

354 By placing Wisdom last in De Trinitate, Richard makes it simultaneously (a) the consummation of contemplation as well as the treatise and (b) makes it, conceptually, the ‘middle term’ that harmoniously joins Power and Goodness. This also proves consistent with Richard’s final stage in his Mystical Ark where the full contemplation of God achieves its final form in the cherubim who represent the “fullness of knowledge.” The crown of that Wisdom “rests” on the four sides of the Ark and the Unity and Trinity of the Divinity are “harmonized” in the propitiatory. For more on this, see Chase, Angelic Wisdom, 104-111.
Divinity. We showed how Richard combines “plenitude” with principles found in Augustine and Anselm in order to draw out further contemplations on the Trinity. We see this, for example, in books I-II where Richard uses the triad of Highest-Best-Fullest to speak of God’s supreme power, wisdom, and goodness. Using that triad, Richard brings out the full, trinitarian splendor of Divinity. With each new development, one comes to comprehend more and more of the depth and width and length of the Trinity, so to speak.

But in addition to the height of this trinitarian vision of the Divine, there is a corresponding depth Richard seeks for his readers. As one’s understanding of God broadens, the mind itself has to enlarge and widen. In short, if one is to see the fullness of Wisdom, one has to make further room in one’s soul to receive—and be received by—it. Richard is very clear about this in his **Mystical Ark** where he describes the enlarging of the mind that precedes moving into the final ecstasy of Trinitarian contemplation:

And so the human mind is reminded of the *first stage* of its enlarging, when it is said to it by the Prophet: “Set up a watchtower for yourself; lay out bitternesses for yourself; direct your heart in the straight way in which you have walked” (Jer. 31:21). You hear concerning the *second*, when you read: “I will stand upon my lookout; I will fix my position upon the fortification, and I will contemplate what is said to me” (Hab. 2:1). This concerns the *third*:

“Go across to the islands of Gethim and see; and send into Cedar, and consider vigorously” (Jer. 2:10). What does it mean to stand upon a watchtower, except to acquire knowledge of contemplating? For we raise up a watchtower for this: in order that we may be able to see for a long distance from it and to enlarge our vision in all directions. And so in these words is rightly indicated that enlarging of the mind in which a watchtower of contemplation is raised up and knowledge of such an effort is acquired. However, what does it mean to stand upon a lookout and to fix a position, except to strengthen by use the knowledge of speculating? For what one person calls a watchtower, another calls a lookout. Whether they are public or private lookouts, we are accustomed to raise up watchtowers so that when looking out from them we can see imminent dangers long beforehand. So we raise up as it were a
spiritual watchtower, the grace of contemplation, so that we may be able to anticipate the ambush of tempters. However, it is one thing to ascend and set up a watchtower; it is another thing to stand on it and even to fix one’s position. The former is by the acquisition of a skill; the latter is by the exercise of a skill. . . . Indeed it is rightly said and taught that the capacity of the mind increases and is enlarged by the vigor of consideration and attention. And so, if you pursue carefully you will be enlarged more and more to a greater perfection of keensightedness by means of these three stages of advancement (italics mine).

Seeing the fullness of the Divinity in full, trinitarian splendor consists of seeing that Divinity in three primary dimensions. First, it means seeing Divinity at its height—God is the highest of all: He is the Most High. Second, it consists of seeing God as the most integral of all—the quality and E-quality of His perfections are pure and genuine: He is simple and true. Third, and finally, it consists of seeing God as the fullest and most complete. He is the fullness of His perfections. He is the source and fullness of His power, wisdom, and goodness. He is the fullest, most perfect, and most complete of all beings. He lacks nothing. The bounty of his perfection overflows with an infinity of riches. Nothing can be added to Him that would make Him more perfect or more complete: He is King of kings.

But to reach this contemplation in all of its fullness requires daily exercise, of mounting the rungs of the ladder, of ascending and enlarging the mind, and of burning with an ardor of soul that turns that human ascent into an angelic flight. It requires ascending each element of that triad. It requires ascending to its summit, diving into its purity, and becoming awestruck by its plenitude. Thus as Richard describes the fullness

355 Richard, Mystical Ark V.3; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 313-14.

356 For Richard’s use of the Highest-Best-Fullest triad, see esp. pp. 137-161 of this work.
of divinity in terms of what is most High, most Pure, and most Perfect, he inscribes the elements of this triad within his readers as well. As he enlarges their minds with the contemplation of the triune God he is simultaneously enlarging and shaping their souls in accordance with these same divine perfections.

We begin our ascent at the base of the mountain, fully aware of the difficulty involved in reaching the summit of the Most High God, “... for the created and corporeal things show us how distant we are from the greatness and highness (sublimitas) of the Creator. Everything we see warns us to be humble.” At every point of ascent in *De Trinitate*, at every place where Richard moves from visible to invisible things, from humanity to Divinity, one reaches that elevation where language grasps at something “above and beyond” itself. Reason and language have been trustworthy guides to the summit. They have pointed the way. They have shown both *that* true Divinity is one and triune and *how* that unity and triunity obtain without contradiction. But though they have led to a fuller contemplation of the Trinity, they cannot provide full comprehension, because an all-critical ‘super’ guards the transcendence of Divinity.

Richard speaks of this ‘super’ at numerous places in his writings; it is the metaphysical ground for the “above and beyond” involved in the fifth and sixth stages of contemplation of his *Mystical Ark*. But in *De Trinitate*, he gives it some important detail:

> And so, the possession of a substantial being belongs to the divine existence—or rather the possession of a supersubstantial being without creation and without beginning—because it is the property

---

357 Straw, 34; *Moralia on Job* 26.12.18 (CCL 143B, 1279).

358 “But, I ask, seeing that this designated unity of Trinity and Trinity of unity cannot be comprehended (*comprehendi*), surely this does not mean that it cannot be true?” Richard, *De Trinitate* IV.2.
of every substance which receives a name from reality, to be a composite being and to be subject to accidents. However, the divine substance alone, which transcends the nature of substance, has a simple being both without composition and subject to no inherent accidents. And, for that reason, the divine substance is rightly said to have a supersubstantial being (supersubstantiale esse) rather than a substantial (substantiale) being.  

In virtue of the fact that Divinity is a substance (substantia), it exists in the way that everyday things exist. But it is a unique substance (supersubstantiale esse) in that its existence never was non-existent and has existed forever without any composition or subjection to change. God is truly the being that is, was, and forever will be (Revelation 1:4, 8, 4:8). It is this ‘super’ to Divinity that forms the upper limit at which man’s intellectual and formative quest for the face of God ends. Without divine grace, without breaking out beyond language to essence, from being to “being with,” man remains “below and under” that inaccessible light. To rise above and beyond it requires an alienation of mind and ecstatic contemplation, a dependence upon God whereby God benevolently grants a “divine showing.” This is why, in IV.5, Richard points out that the ‘super’ that forms the ontological and epistemological “above and beyond” between God and man is matched by a proportional condescension—a “here and now”—by the Spirit:

. . . the word ‘person’ was by no means ascribed to the very sublime and supereminent mystery of the Trinity (sublimi et supereminenti Trinitatis mysterio) without the divine impulse and superintendence (sine instincu divino et magisterio) of the Holy Spirit. Consider how the same Spirit prophesied through the lips of the prophets, formulated through the lips of the Evangelists, and expounded through the lips of the doctors so many mysteries of our faith, redemption, sanctification, and glorification. He who

---

359 Richard, De Trinitate IV.16.

360 It is worth noting here that although this may suggest Dionysian influence, Ribaillier also suggests Boethius’s ‘ultra substantiam’ as the inspiration for Richard’s ‘supersubstantialis’. Ribaillier, 24.
considers this will in no way be able to believe that the Holy Spirit has subjected to human estimation, rather than ordained through his inspiration, the supreme article of our faith, the very sacred and secret mystery of the Trinity, and the very word that he wanted every heart to believe and every tongue to confess.  

Seeking the summit thus requires knowing where it is as well as how to get there. One must recognize the truth of God’s super-substantialness along with a dependence upon divine grace in order to rise and stand with Moses in the cleft of that rock—in that ‘watchtower’ (specula) where one moves “above and beyond” oneself and awaits the face of God.  

Consequently, God is the Most High God. He does not share this summit with any other. It is a summit reserved for Father, Son, and Holy Spirit alone. As Richard says:

Certainly you are able to grow daily in awareness of God, and each day you are able to be lifted up higher and higher in this lofty flight. But above this watchtower of contemplation you are now completely unable to find another that is higher. For it is one thing to run about here and there in this kind of manifestation and to enlarge one’s knowledge in knowing God; it is another thing to want to seek above these things for other and higher things that you cannot find in any way. There is nothing above God—nothing that exists, that might be able to exist, or that can be thought to exist. There is nothing higher to which knowledge might ascend, nor is it capable of ascending higher. And so, the fullness of knowledge is to know God.

And reaching that summit through contemplation requires following that journey with some of Richard’s theological predecessors. With Augustine, one discerns what it is

361 Richard, *De Trinitate* IV.5.


363 *Mystical Ark*, IV.5; Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 265.
better to be than not to be. With Anselm, one makes further progress by ascending in the mind from one perfection to another until one reaches that summit and discovers the greatest-one-of-all. Richard continues in the tradition of Augustine and Anselm by directing his readers’ minds upward to that being-than-which-none-greater-can-exist.

Formatively, this has tremendous effect. This is because, in the process of growing in one’s own wisdom and knowledge, one is also contemplating better and better things. One may move from one perfection to discover that there is still some further perfection greater and better than the first: e.g., that the mutual love that obtains between a bestower and requiter (or a lover and beloved) is greater than a private love for oneself. This road that proceeds from the base of the mountain and up and around various “grades” of perfection eventually reaches that summit of the being-than-which-none-greater-can-be-thought. But along the way it also perfects the mind of the one who seeks to live in accordance with those newly discovered perfections. For how can one ascend to the face of God if, after one has discovered a greater love, one does not seek to live in accord with it? If mutual love for another is greater than private love for one’s self, how can one continue to ascend that hill of perfection if one only has love for oneself and not for another? Or, alternatively, if it is a greater and better thing to have a “freer contemplation” of the Trinity unhindered by the need to return to books and empowered by arduous memory-work, how can one continue in this ascent through meditation and prayer if the mind is constantly drawn down to the words on a page?³⁶⁵

³⁶⁴ Indeed, in his Mystical Ark, Richard uses the verb ‘supergredior’ —a compound of ‘super’ and ‘credior’, hence it means “to walk or step beyond, to exceed or surpass,” and its etymological connection with ‘gradus’—“by degree, step, rank.”

³⁶⁵ Richard writes, for example, in De Trinitate VI.23: “we gladly utilize the ladder of similitude, so
Whether we are speaking with respect to ability, knowledge, or will, the road to the summit of the Most High God—He who is all-powerful, all-wise, and all-good in a ‘super’-unity of substance—rises through these perfections. And as the apprentice ascends in mind, he discovers higher and higher elevations of perfection he must live in accordance with if he is ever to reach that summit of the being-than-which-nothing-is-greater and nothing better. As Richard says, “Therefore, the more human thinking attains to what is best and perfect, the closer it ascends to that which is God, even though it does not reach up to him.”  

In this way, “with unveiled face, beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord” he is “being transformed into the same image from glory to glory” (2 Corinthians 3:18, emphasis mine).

Once one reaches the summit of true Divinity, however, the contemplation does not end. As we have observed, Richard looks to the quality and E-quality of perfection with the second element of his triads. He considers the integrity and purity of some property of perfection. In book III Richard attends to the proper order and intensity of love along with its pleasing quality. This connects with the formative aims of Richard’s work as follows. Purer joy results from the proper conformity of one’s knowledge and love to the object of contemplation. One experiences truer joy in proportion to one’s congruence of attention and the integrity of one’s longing. In the case of contemplating true Divinity, both knowledge and love are fixed on what is the greatest and best of all. Therefore the

that those who have not yet received the wings of contemplation may have the means by which they can ascend.” Also Hugh: “. . . let the student prepare himself once and for all by fixing these matters in the forefront of his mind, in certain little formulae, so to say, so that thereafter he will be able to run the course before him with free step and will not have to search out new elementary facts as he comes to individual books.” Didascalicon V.1; Taylor, 120.

Richard, De Trinitate I.19.
apprentice must regard God as the greatest in the order of his knowledge and love.\footnote{The notion that only the Trinity can be enjoyed is a common theme in the Christian mystical tradition inspired by Augustine: “The true objects of enjoyment, then, are the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, who are at the same time the Trinity, one Being, supreme above all, and common to all who enjoy Him . . .” \textit{De doctrina}, I.5. And “you are to concentrate all your thoughts, your whole life and your whole intelligence upon Him from whom you derive all that you bring.” Ibid., I.22.}

Loving what is less worthy with greater affection than what is more worthy is disordered and degenerate.\footnote{On `(dis)ordered love’, see n. 400 of this work.} This is why the divine persons love themselves above all: The supreme-ist of all beings requires being loved supremely. Because the divine persons are the most supreme of all, they must love each other supremely and most of all. Because God is the greatest being to know and love, the one who seeks His face must not only place him in the highest place, he must also regard nothing else as more worthy of his attention. As Richard writes in \textit{Twelve Patriarchs}:

Whatever sort of soul you now may be, take action, hasten now to bring Him into the innermost and most secret sanctuary of your heart. For who would deny that the innermost sanctuary of the human heart has or even can acquire recesses of such a sort that the force of supreme and singular love cannot be torn away by any alien delight whatsoever, when it has been fixed by affection to something? Certainly if you seek or love your God supremely, nevertheless you do not love Him singularly. Therefore, He is not yet led into the innermost place; He is not yet situated in the best place.\footnote{Richard, \textit{Mystical Ark} IV.16; Zinn, \textit{RSV’s Three Main Works}, 288.}

Likewise, not only must one regard God as the most worthy of attention, the proportion, the ardor, the intensity, and the longing of one’s soul must also be in accordance with such majesty. Because God is the most majestic of things to behold, He requires the most intense longing and ardor of the soul. The soul should want nothing more. One should
love Him alone “with all one’s heart, with all one’s soul, with all one’s mind, and with all one’s strength” (Deuteronomy 6:5; emphasis mine).

A good place to better understand this conformity of knowledge and will Richard wants to forge in his reader is to look at the proximity and conformity of the Son to the Father in book VI. In VI.21-22, Richard considers how it is that the Divine Son is called “the figure of His substance” (Hebrews 1:3). The term ‘figura’ can be understood as either ‘a forming figure’ or ‘a representing figure’. The former he describes as “the figure of a human, which forms his substance”; the latter he describes as “the figure of an image, which represents him.”

If the divine Son’s figure forms the divine substance of a thing, then the paternal substance would receive its form from the Son, whereas tradition teaches that the Son’s form is received from the paternal substance. But if the Son’s figure represents the paternal substance, this entails there being two divine substances, which is also contrary to the faith. How does Richard solve the dilemma? He points to the beautiful conformity of will that can exist among friends. He writes:

Now your soul is a spiritual nature. Indeed your soul is either beautiful or deformed by its will. A good will makes your soul beautiful; but it becomes deformed by a bad will. Its benignity makes it beautiful; its malignity makes it deformed. From these assertions we may consider what the figure of a spiritual substance is. If the Lord grants it, the same form of perfection (perfectionis forma) can undoubtedly form (informare) your soul and my soul.

Thus, on the basis of sharing this one perfect will, Richard finds what he needs to explain how the Son is the “figure of God’s substance.” But as he makes special mention

---

370 Richard, De Trinitate VI.21.

371 Ibid.
earlier in VI.17, “. . . when we speak of a conformed person, seek carefully, diligent reader, whether perhaps this term is able or ought to refer to a conformity in which only the Son bears the image of the Father on account of a conformity of properties.” There is something unique to the Son’s being called ‘image’ and ‘figure’ of the Father, for he is the archetype of that total wisdom and love. Nothing more immediately represents the paternal glory than the one eternally-begotten in super-conformity to that image. He is the fullness of wisdom. There is no earlier or later, no accretion or decretion of knowledge, no greater or less than. He is the unique progeny of the Father, neither made nor created, but begotten and consubstantial with the Father. And this Word—full of grace and truth—has become flesh, offering a visible model of obedience to the Father by which humanity can be instructed and drawn into that “same form of perfection” (eadem perfectionis forma). As Anselm writes:

And this, then is quite clear enough: what is in the Word through which all things were made is not the likeness to all things, but true and simple essence. What is in the things made, on the other hand, is not simple and absolute essence, but a pale imitation of it. Necessarily, as a result, the Word is not more or less true, depending on its likeness to created things. Rather it would seem that every created nature stands at a higher stage of essence and worth the more it approximates to the Word.

This super-proximity of Son to Father, and likewise, of Spirit to both, means that despite the fact that the Father is Wisdom and the Son is Wisdom and the Spirit is

372 “Quod autem conformem diximus, diligens lector quaerat attentius, ne forte ad id referri valeat vel debeat in quo juxta quamdam proprietatum conformitatem solus Filius Patris imaginem portat.”

373 Monologion 31; Davies and Evans, 47. Cf. Hugh of St. Victor: “The Word and the Father were one in unity, since they were one in nature, and the Word himself wished to become one with us to make us one in Himself and through Himself and with Him [the Father] with whom He himself was one.” Quoted in Rorem, 92. De sacramentis II.1.12; PL 176.412C.
Wisdom; there is, nevertheless, only one Wisdom. As a result of this unity of mind in the fullness of this wisdom—as a result of their clear knowledge of all worthy things in one eternal glimpse—they have an “intimate affection of the mind” (*intimus animi affectus*) and “impulse of a burning love” (*aestuantis amoris impulsus*).\(^{374}\) It is why they have “one spirit (*unam spiritum*) and proceed in one spirit: there is one intention (*unum consilium*) and same purpose (*idem propositum*), and they love the same (*idem amant*), desire the same (*idem affectant*), long for the same with equal desire.”\(^{375}\)

Consequently this supreme wisdom is beautiful in its fullness and the most pleasing in its quality. As Richard says in book V, “the more fraternal the plurality of persons, the more intimate; the more intimate, the more pleasant.”\(^{376}\) What can be more pleasant and intimate than being of one and the same mind? What greater affinity can there be among divine persons when their consubstantiality of substance and proximity of mind are as close as the conformity of the Son to the Father, and as pure as the holiness of their super-spiritual Breath, the Holy Spirit? Who are united in their knowledge and love of one another by Him who illuminates and sanctifies, who refines the impurities of ignorance and impiety in order to lead all men to the Truth?\(^{377}\)

Two implications, therefore, exist for the formation of the apprentice in accordance with the Wisdom of God. First, mankind has been invited—through the processions of Son and Spirit—to return to God. Why? In order that he might taste and grow in that

\(^{374}\) Richard, *De Trinitate* VI.10.

\(^{375}\) Ibid.

\(^{376}\) Richard, *De Trinitate* V.2.

\(^{377}\) Richard, *De Trinitate* VI.10.
intimate affinity and fraternity of persons. Thus as one comes to what is most worthy of his attention and purifies the intentions and desires of his soul—as he seeks the most qualified object for his contemplation, in its most integrated purity—he must re-prove the quality of his own knowledge and love. He must fix his eyes upon the author and perfecter of his faith (Hebrews 12:2). He must move from the foundation of faith to the fullness of knowledge. And in doing so, he “proximates” himself toward that principal relation—where the unity of mind comes closer than the resemblance of a son begotten in the image of his father—where, besides reaching the summit of the Most High God, one also becomes the “friend of God” (Exodus 33:11).

The second implication for the formation of the apprentice is in his relation to his brothers. For just as the fullness of wisdom accounts for the fraternity of divine persons, so as brothers come to refine the integrity of their own knowledge and order it toward the most worthy of things they come closer to one another in both mind and will. As Augustine says:

Why then do we love another whom we believe to be righteous, and do not love that form itself wherein we see what is a righteous mind, that we also may be able to be righteous? Is it that unless we loved that also, we should not love him at all, whom through it we love: but whilst we are not righteous, we love that form too little to allow of our being able to be righteous? The man therefore who is believed to be righteous, is loved through that form and truth which he who loves discerns and understands within himself. . . .

378 “. . . aspicientes in auctorem fidei et consummatorem Iesum” (emphasis mine).

379 Augustine, De Trinitate VIII.6. Note also that as Augustine proceeds to move from visible to invisible things by means of the reformation of the soul created in the image of God, he moves in this section from Body —> Mind —> Righteous Mind. It is thus not the “rational perspicuity” of the mind but rather its spiritual and moral sanctity that makes the soul see all things more clearly: “For righteousness is the beauty of the mind” (emphasis mine). Ibid.
Like other monastic orders in the 12th century, the harmony the Victorines sought was a purer form of the *apostolica vita*, and their means to it was living in communion with God and each other. They desired, by living according to the *Rule of St. Augustine*, by adopting the same habits, the same dress, the same look, by sharing the same dwellings, the same food, the same work, that they would likewise—and most of all—be conformed of mind. They wanted complete unity in their desire and will: to delight in their *shared* knowledge of divine things. In the end, they desired that their external disciplines would reflect their common faith, and that the integrity of their habit would be matched by an inner integrity of soul. They desired that the “organ of their heart” and the “drum of their flesh” might be “united to each other with suitable consonance” (*sibi confederet pari consonantia*). Thus the inner harmony of one apprentice’s soul can be united to another’s to bring about an even greater harmony. As Richard writes in his *Mystical Ark*:

> . . . the Spirit of the Lord daily combines them little by little in His elect and skillfully forms them into one harmony and by the plucking instrument of His graces fits them together in a certain harmonious consonance like a learned harp player who stretches these and loosens those, until a certain melody, mellifluous and sweet beyond measure, resounds from them . . .

Thus as the ascent toward the summit guides the soul in accordance with newly discovered perfections, so the purity of divinity, in its knowledge and love, refines the soul with purer and purer forms of congruity by which the contemplative can come to enjoy an ever-increasing “confraternity” with God and others.

---

The third dimension by which Richard shapes the mind of his reader is by leading him into the *fullness* of divinity. This is probably Richard’s crowning achievement and contribution to the theology of the Trinity. Applying ‘plenitude’ to Power, Richard proves the true omnipotence and wisdom of God in book I. God has these from fullness and not by participation in a source greater than himself. He is thus “truly” omnipotent as well as supremely wise. Applying ‘plenitude’ to Goodness, Richard concludes that a trinity of persons cannot be lacking in true Divinity in book III. And finally, in applying ‘plenitude’ to Wisdom in VI.25 he shows that “full learning” can be shared by three in such a way that they have one and the same knowledge. Thus God is the highest, the best, and the most perfect and complete of all things.

This plenitude accounts for Richard’s “filling out” these dimensions of Divinity; but it also, concurrently “fills in” the soul of his apprentice with a wellspring of pleasures and delights. In this way Richard makes the soul of his apprentice supreme, congruous, and “full” in accordance with these corresponding dimensions of the Trinity. Ultimately Richard wants to “draw out” a further fullness from the soul of his reader so that he becomes increasingly open to the benevolence of God. For it is in this encounter with the “supremely blessed one” that one becomes awestruck by the majesty of His riches, graced by the outpouring and benevolence of His generosity, and drawn out of oneself to seek the fullness of consummate love and joy with others.

Richard also uses the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad in a specific way in book VI, showing that he not only used it to structure his treatise, but that he also intended for it to be understood in accordance with formative aims. He repeats an argument he remembers writing elsewhere, “. . . why, through a special kind of attribution, power is attributed to
the Unbegotten, wisdom to the Begotten, and goodness to the Holy Spirit.” He says that through our daily experience we all know what power, wisdom, love or goodness is. Our experience further reveals how they exceed our human capacity. Whatever power, wisdom, love or goodness each of us may have, we are constantly growing in them; we thus come to know that there is a limit to ourselves: an “above and beyond” ourselves we participate in. As such, this limitation serves as a “mirror” for understanding the ultimate Trinity that can be discerned in these three attributes. As we untarnish that mirror, we can better see the Divine and conform our lives in accordance with Divine Power, Wisdom, and Goodness. Richard first considers each element of the triad as potentially lacking to illustrate the defect it brings to both Divinity as well as the individual’s moral life. Powers can exist where wisdom does not, as with animate objects that can hear, see, walk, eat, etc.—they can do all of these things without wisdom. But wisdom cannot be without power. This is because wisdom itself is a power (potentia). Wisdom receives this power from Power, and thus wisdom does not give Power the power to exist but Power does give wisdom the power to exist. Here Richard describes the relationship between power and wisdom in order to allude to its further, trinitarian significance; for similarly, the Father gives the Son the power to be but not vice versa.

---

381 Richard, *De Trinitate* VI.15. As Ribaillier notes, here Richard incorporates, verbatim, material from his *De tribus personis appropriatis in Trinitate*. Ribaillier, 11-12, 247-248.

382 Richard, *De Trinitate* VI.15. Here we have an explicit identification Richard makes between bonitas and caritas showing that he sees them as intimately related and alludes to both when he uses one or the other term. What’s more, as Poirel shows, the ‘Goodness’ element in the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad had a wide semantic-range for Richard’s predecessor, Hugh: e.g., benignitas, voluntas, amor, bonitas, dilectio, gratia, caritas; whereas Power (potentia) and Wisdom (sapientia) are rarely ever changed. See esp. Poirel, 315-316. This semantic freedom with respect to ‘Goodness’ permits Richard to prioritize caritas in Anselm’s supreme Good and derive his argument for the Trinity in bk. III.
There is only one divine person from himself; the Son, though eternal, is from another. Similarly, it is possible for power and wisdom to be present, but without goodness. As Richard notes, consider Lucifer who had great power and wisdom but a bad will. He serves as a witness to the possibility of having preeminent power and wisdom but “no remaining vestige of goodness.” But goodness requires “willing the good.” It therefore contains two components: (a) willing the good and (b) willing the good. The latter requires wisdom; the former requires power. For one must be able to discern what is good in order to will the good; otherwise one does not know the good he ought to choose. But even if one knows the good, one must also be able to will it; and this requires power. Goodness—that is, willing the good—therefore draws its being from both know-how (i.e., Wisdom) and ability (i.e., Power). The Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad, experienced by every rational creature, therefore, illustrates what ought to be believed about the Trinity, that there is only one who is from himself and not from another, a second who is from another but not from himself; and still a third who draws his origin from the first two. Thus Power is tied to the Father, Wisdom to the Son, and Goodness to the Holy Spirit. Moreover, one cannot think of these three properties in the fullness of their perfection without the others. In the same way, therefore, one can see how Father, Son, and Holy Spirit exist in a harmony of unity and plurality, unique with respect to their causal dependence, but united in the simplicity of their substance. They are unique and inseparable, a Trinity in unity and a unity in Trinity.

Richard uses this trinity of properties to draw the minds of his readers toward what they ought to believe about the properties of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. But unless...
the mirror reflects these properties “rightly” they cannot see God properly. Only as the apprentice rightly orders that trinity of properties in his own soul does he come to know God as He is. Gradually his habitual experience of growing in Power-Wisdom-Love creates a way for him to know God more and more. Without the fullness of this trinity of properties there cannot be a true Trinity with respect to Divinity; without a corresponding fullness of this trinity of properties in his soul, neither is he a “whole” or “holy” person. Godefroy confirms these formative implications of Richard’s teaching, as den Bok notes:

At the end of the twelfth century [Godefroy] of St. Victor, for one, writes that the creating Trinity being supreme power, wisdom and goodness creates man into a created trinity having some power, wisdom and goodness by nature, and recreates him into a recreated trinity having supreme wisdom and goodness and power by grace. Such a sentence can serve as an excellent summary of Richard’s thoughts on God’s trinitarian missions and man responding to them (emphasis mine).  

Thus the apprentice who wants to worship God in his fullness must also seek a corresponding fullness of his soul—a fullness recreated in him as he responds to the exitus and reitus of the trinitarian missions.  He cannot have power alone. Nor can he have merely power and wisdom, “for even the demons believe and shudder” (James

---

384 Den Bok, 467.

385 As Gilles Emery writes, “. . . we are saved by the persons who have created us, and we are conducted to the Father (reditus) by the persons who are also the reason of creation (exitus). The trinitarian order of salvation thus presupposes the trinitarian order of creation that provides its foundation.” Gilles Emery, “Trinity and Creation,” a chapter in Trinity in Aquinas, eds. Rik van Nieuwenhove and Joseph Wawrykow (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 2003), 71. This relationship between the ‘work of creation’ (opus conditionis) and the ‘work of restoration’ (opus restaurationis) was important to the Victorines (see Feiss, 49; Coulter, 40ff;); and, as evidenced by Godefroy, it was intricately united with their understanding of the Trinity and the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad. For more on this, see esp. den Bok, 358-365.
2:19). No. To be complete, he has to have a good will, a loving will. He must have a will that both discerns the good and does the good, that discerns love and wills love. For love draws its being from the fullness of power and wisdom and binds them together into one. As den Bok writes, “when man’s motives are «in order» his entire willing is well-formed, beautiful, just like that of the divine persons.”

Without the harmony of Power-Wisdom-Goodness there can be no true Trinity; and without the same in the soul there can be no true individual, no true “son.” The individual must reform his counter-triad of impotence, ignorance, and malice in accordance with Divine power, wisdom, and goodness. Then he shall “know fully even as he is fully known” (1 Corinthians 13:12). For only as one comes to reflect properly upon oneself and God, and rightly orders that mental trinity, does the gaze of the beatific vision become more clear.

Consummating Trinitarian Love in the Community

We have seen how Richard uses a number of his triads and triadic structures to shape the trinitarian consciousness of the individual. He seeks a proportional depth of soul as it ascends to the summit of the Most High God. He seeks a congruity in the individual’s knowledge and love as it conforms “from glory to glory” to the fullness of Wisdom shared by Father, Son, and Spirit—a conformity revealed most intimately in the conformity of the Son to the Father. He likewise seeks a corresponding fullness of joy.

---

386 Den Bok, 355.

387 For more on the counter-triad of Impotence-Ignorance-Malice and its relationship to Power-Wisdom-Goodness, see Richard’s *De statu interioris hominis*. 
and wonder in the individual’s contemplations of divine plenitude. These are the pleasures of Wisdom drawn from one’s own heart. But Richard desires “more” from his readers than a private Wisdom for themselves alone. Now that they have been filled to the brim with the plenitude of these “inner” delights, he seeks to make their cups overflow with love for others. We turn now to the significance of Richard’s trinitarian forms and structures for the Victorine community.

We now shift from wisdom to love, since, as Richard says, its pleasures can only be drawn from the heart of another. Love is central to Richard’s De Trinitate. In the Prologue, Richard opens with the love chapter of 1 Corinthians 13 along with the familiar triad found there: faith, hope, and love. Following Augustine and Anselm, Richard sees love as the ultimate goal, faith as its foundation, and hope as the movement from faith to love.\textsuperscript{388} But love is the ultimate prize, and without it one cannot truly know God; for “God is Love” (1 John 4:8). Richard writes:

\begin{quote}
Now if I do not have love, then whatever I will have profits me nothing. You hear from the mouth of Truth what the profit of charity is: If someone loves me, then he will be loved by my Father, and I will love him and manifest myself to him. This manifestation then derives from love, contemplation from manifestation, and knowledge from contemplation. Moreover, when Christ, our life, appears, then we will also appear with him in glory, and we will be like him at that time, since we will see him just as he is. You see where we begin, the destination that we reach, or the extent to
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{388} This movement from faith to love is the basis of Richard’s \textit{fides quaerens intellectum}, as is made clear in the following analysis of his Prologue. Love is the basis of Richard’s quest for “\textit{rationes necessariae}” in De Trinitate. The faith-to-love motif is a common one in the 12th century and is found in Augustine. See, e.g., p. 70 of this work where it serves as the structure for his \textit{De doctrina christiana}. William of St. Thierry, as is well known, gives extensive attention to this triad and its Augustinian themes in his \textit{Speculum fidei}. See William of St. Thierry, \textit{The Mirror of Faith}, trans. Thomas X. Davis, ed. E. Rozanne Elder, Cistercian Fathers, 15 (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, 1979).
which we ascend by means of hope and love from faith up to divine knowledge, and through divine knowledge up to eternal life.  

If one wishes to behold the face of God, if one wishes to see the “true God,” then one must love Jesus Christ. For as he promised, those who love him will be loved by his Father and he will manifest himself to them (John 14:21). And the hope, the joy, the love for that appearing is to appear with him in glory and see him as he is. Faith guides, hope draws, but love compels. Thus as Richard uses this love to make his case for the Trinity of persons in book III, he kindles the fire of this love in his readers with the hope that they might consummate this Trinitarian love within their community.  

In the same way that Richard elevates the mind of his readers through various grades of perfection with respect to God’s Wisdom, he does the same for God’s Love. But where wisdom fills the soul to its capacity, love drives the soul out of itself, overwhelms it with such delight and longing that it can only find its fulfillment in overflowing toward others. In the same way that wisdom must become supreme, integral, and perfect, so love must do the same. And if we are to take seriously Richard’s claim that supreme and perfect love requires a plurality of persons for Divinity, how much more must the human possibility for such Trinitarian love require a plurality of persons? If the “fulfillment” of Divinity requires a plurality of persons where such fulfillment obtains, everlastingly, ab eterno, without beginning or end; how much more must this be the case for those who have been crafted in that image, who receive their

389 Richard, De Trinitate Prologue.
390 Ibid.
391 Indeed, Richard’s argument for the Trinity of persons from supreme benevolence in III.14-20 is an argument based on the “overflow” of charity. Cf. the “pouring in and out” (infusio / effluo) of V.23.
beginning *ex tempore*, and who must find *their* plenitude in a “full and perfect contemplation of the Trinity”? As Richard aptly says therefore, “it is necessary that love be directed toward another, so that it can be charity. Therefore, charity absolutely cannot exist where a plurality of persons is lacking.”³⁹²

Richard guides his readers from the base to the summit of supreme love. The first movement in the ascent is a recognition that there is a greater love than private love for oneself without which one cannot have or enjoy fellowship with another. As Richard writes, “As long as someone loves no one else as much as himself, that private love, which he has toward himself, demonstrates that he has not yet apprehended the highest degree of love (*summum caritatis gradum*).”³⁹³ Private love is inferior to love for another. And if one is to ascend to that greater love, one must seek to love another.³⁹⁴

Supreme and complete love has some essential aspects. In III.2-20, Richard explains those aspects in the most exquisite detail with the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad. In order for love to be good it must be for another and not merely for oneself. Second, the love must be mutual in order for it to be pleasing. The second element refers to both the quality and E-quality of this love. With respect to equality, Richard points out that such love must be among equals. As he says, it is not just love of another, but love of “another

---


³⁹⁴ There is an interesting play, too, in Richard’s use of *a semetipso*. With respect to the simplicity of the divine essence in relation to all created things, there is only one *esse a semetipso* (I.6). With respect to God *ad intra*, there is only one divine person who is *a seipso* (IV.15). As an individual seeks his (false) beatitude in a private love for himself, he stands by himself (*stare in semetipso*). It is, therefore, only as the individual discovers and grounds his soul in the sufficiency that is God’s alone that his disillusionment is revealed for what it is and he seeks (true) beatitude by loving God and others. Taking root *ab Alio*, one overflows *ad alterum*. 
of equal dignity (*condignum*).” But for Divinity, this is not just an equality among equals of any degree, but *supreme* equality. In the case of Divinity, they must be supremely equal and equally Divine. Such *supreme* equality, therefore, cannot obtain for non-Divine, rational creatures. But what *can* obtain is a mutual effort, in accordance with divine grace, to reciprocate Divine love “that has been graciously poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit” (Romans 5:5). As Richard says:

> Without this [*spiritus*], none of the spirits are holy, neither human nor angelic spirits. For, the human spirit undoubtedly begins to be holy at that time when it loves what pertains to piety and hates and detests what pertains to impiety. This indeed is the affection of piety; this breath, when it blows from the hearts of many, causes many to be one heart and one mind.

Thus as one ‘breathes’ with the order and ardor of the Holy Spirit’s own Love—by conforming one’s love to Love—one ascends with Him to that summit of supreme dignity by which two, who are supremely equal, can love each other supremely. The mutuality of love among the Victorines will be proportional to the degree that each and every one of them perfects their power, wisdom, and goodness/love. To the extent that some have a greater dignity and integrity of soul than others, those who are more mature in their faith, more ardent in their love, will grieve for those who lack that same form of perfection. In *Twelve Patriarchs*, Richard reveals the tenderness of this brotherly love:

---

395 “In Gregory, inferiors show reverence [*reverentia*] to superiors but superiors show love [*dilectio*] to inferiors.” Straw, 87; Ep. 5.59 (CCL 140, 357-58). Adopting a similar distinction for Richard, we can see that as brothers reach a consummate equality of soul they approach a form of *condilectio* that approximates the perfection of Divine love.

396 Richard, *De Trinitate* VI.10.

Certainly, while [the mind] considers more diligently the successes of some and the failures of others, the infirmity of the latter and the perfection of the former, the pious mind is surely touched by various affections in turn—now this one, now that. Thus it begins to fear for some, to grieve for others, and to hope for good things for the one and better things for the other. It sees in others those things it ought to love and for which it should rejoice. It sees in certain persons those things it ought justly to abhor, and for which it ought justly to grieve. And so in this way when good affections sport with simple thoughts that run forth here and there out of the examined and self-pleased discipline of neighbors—what is this, other than that the brothers of Dina, the sons of Leah, feed their cattle? Do you see how at one and the same time true love of neighbor produces one thing and vain love of self produces the other? True love of neighbor is responsible for the pastures of the brothers for feeding their cattle.398

Only as the Victorines maximize their love in accordance with the true Spirit of the apostolica vita will they begin living righteously in word and deed and experience that mutual and pleasing love that can only be known by the friends of God. The Rule of St. Augustine also serves this purpose. Like a Good Shepherd, it herds them into one fold, teaches them the one voice of their ‘magister’ so that they might live as equals and enjoy the pleasant delights that come from being of “one heart and mind.”

Such equality speaks to the order of one’s love and to the quality of the object or person to whom it is directed. To have mutual love is both to be a good person yourself and to love a brother who equally exemplifies such goodness. The greater the perfection and dignity of something, the greater the priority it should have in your affection for it.399

398 Twelve Patriarchs lii; Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 109. For Richard, even the virtues themselves are spoken of as “brothers” and their unity as “brotherly love.” Ibid., 126, lxix: “whole fraternal union of virtues.”

399 On the role of discretio in the order and ardor of one’s love, and the difference between true and supreme caritas, see den Bok, 310-312.
When one loves something more of lesser value, one’s love is perverse and disordered. ⁴⁰⁰ This is why God—who is the most supreme and perfect—should be loved most of all. It is also why all of the divine persons love themselves as much as they love each other. ⁴⁰¹ But there is also the ardor of one’s love—that is, not only what one loves more, but how much more one loves it: the level of one’s intensity and longing for it. For Richard, one’s love must not only be properly ordered but also properly “ardored.” One’s longing and intensity for something must be in proportion to its dignity and worth. One must therefore love the supreme God with the most supreme longing. Similarly, one must love one’s brother or another with a proportional desire and longing. The ardor of one’s love must be moderated in accordance with discretion.

Thus as brothers grow in their love for one another, as they come to see in each other a proximity of wisdom and love for God, the intensity of their love for each other increases. For they witness the same love and delight they have for God and others coming from another. As Richard says, “For when two mutually loving persons embrace one another with supreme longing, and are supremely delighted in each other’s love, then supreme joy of the one is in the intimate love of the second, and, conversely, the excellent joy of the second is in the love of the first.” ⁴⁰²

---

⁴⁰⁰ The notion of “(dis)ordered love” has a long history in the Christian mystical tradition, making the source and inspiration for Richard’s “inordinata caritas” more difficult to isolate. It is found in all three of the authors the Victorines most frequently read: Augustine, Origen, Gregory the Great. For a good list of sources and a useful survey of suggestions by Richardian scholars, see Chris Evan’s note on Richard’s use of inordinata caritas in III.2 in his forthcoming English translation of De Trinitate.

⁴⁰¹ Richard, De Trinitate V.24. On divine self-love, see den Bok, 312-313.

Finally, as this love ascends in goodness and pleasantness, it must also become full and complete.\textsuperscript{403} For Richard this means it must have everything of perfection and lack nothing that would make it more complete.\textsuperscript{404} Mutual love is greater and better, as well as more pleasing, than private love for oneself\textsuperscript{405}; but the fullest and most complete love—consummate love—is the best and most pleasing.\textsuperscript{406} It is more perfect and complete than mutual love. In a way that matches the “drawing out” of oneself by making that love overflow toward another in \textit{mutual love}, Richard further draws out the abundance of love of a bestower and requiter to \textit{overflow} for a \textit{third mutually loved}.\textsuperscript{407} As long as two remain fixed in their mutual love for each other they lack a third to share in their love. But because each knows how great and how pleasing it is to experience the mutual and intimate love of another; and because they are committed to what is more perfect, they want a third to share in this love. If they did not, they would exemplify the imperfection of selfishness and miserliness by which they hoard the riches of their love, along with its delights and pleasures.\textsuperscript{408} In the same way that private love shows itself selfish in the presence of mutual love, so mutual love shows itself selfish in its encounter

\textsuperscript{403} Zinn, \textit{RSV’s Three Main Works}, 375.

\textsuperscript{404} On the relationship of ‘lacking’ and ‘fullness’ see esp. Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} I.21-24; II.7, 16-17, III.2-5, 11-13, 14-20; V.2, 11, 14, 17.

\textsuperscript{405} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} III.2.

\textsuperscript{406} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} III.11.

\textsuperscript{407} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} III.20.

\textsuperscript{408} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} III.4, 11-13, 14-20.
with consummation love—where mutual love is shared with a third equally loved.\textsuperscript{409}

The ultimate exemplification of such consummate love is the Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit since each divine person is supremely perfect, supremely loved, and has and enjoys (being) a third equally loved.\textsuperscript{410} Out of the abundance of this love humankind was created—by choice and not by nature, of course\textsuperscript{411}—to come to discover this love and enjoy it. The divine ‘generation’ of this love extends to the human procession of Eve from Adam,\textsuperscript{412} and subsequently to the whole human race. For a human person \textit{alone} to know and experience such love does not require \textit{another} human person, since this love already obtains from eternity as a Trinity of divine persons who can share such love with a single human individual alone. But it is “fitting” that God would inscribe creation with a human form from which he could guide, draw, and compel his little ones to approach the throne of his majesty and invite them to enjoy its choicest of riches. Richard writes:

For, who else, except one considered completely insane, can doubt that there is truly \textit{the same affection of piety and one and the same love} in the Father and Son? Thus, \textit{this} love, which is common to both persons, is called the Holy Spirit; this is the one who \textit{is inspired into the hearts of the saints} by the Father and Son; this is the one through whom the saints are sanctified, so that they may merit being saints. Just as the human spirit is the life of the body, so that divine Spirit is the life of spirits.\textsuperscript{413}

\textsuperscript{409} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} III.15.

\textsuperscript{410} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} III.7/11-13, 14-20, 21; V.2, 9, 19, 23-24; VI.11.

\textsuperscript{411} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} III.8.

\textsuperscript{412} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} VI.2, 16.

\textsuperscript{413} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} VI.10.
Thus God gives consummate, divine love a human possibility. This is the place in one’s religious ascent where one becomes “transfixed” with the cosmological, soteriological, and eschatological significance of the two greatest commandments: Love of God and Neighbor. As Gregory marks this with the sign of the cross: “One is lifted high in love of God, and joined together in love of neighbor.” Trinitarianly conceived, love comes to be seen as a consummate, Trinitarian abundance that freely overflows with love for God and others. It “proceeds” out of this abundance and unites another—a third—into its bond of love.

By forging this form in the minds and hearts of his readers, Richard not only adds to their theological delight, he turns that delight into a wellspring of longing for that consummate Trinitarian love supremely exemplified in Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. He makes their soul yearn and burn for it. Such yearning becomes the basis for the “counter-procession” that must return “above and beyond,” where reason itself faints with the longing of Rachel and gives birth to the ecstatic contemplation of Benjamin. Here knowledge and love catapult the soul into the fifth and sixth levels of contemplation. One moves from language to being, and from being to “being with.” Here one hovers in the midst of the propitiatory between the two cherubim. One’s soul passes over to wholly invisible things and flies with holy wings, traversing “how wide and long

---

414 “. . . in Dei suspendere, sed etiam proximo in caritate sociare.” Gregory the Great, Hom. Ez. 2.7.5 (CCL 142, 319).

415 Richard, De Trinitate VI.14: “For, when this Holy Spirit enters the rational mind, he ignites its affection with the divine flame, and transforms it to the similitude of his property . . . . For the whole mind becomes white-hot from the igniting of the divine fire, it flares up and, at the same time, liquefies in the love of God, according to the Apostle: The love of God was poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit, who was given to us.”
and high and deep is the love of Christ.” Here “being rooted and established in love,” one comes to “. . . know this love that surpasses knowledge—that you (plural!) may be filled (πληρωθητε) to the measure of all the fullness of God” (Ephesians 3:17-19; emphasis mine).

That those filled with this divine love for a third would carry it out beyond themselves to their community will scarcely surprise us. For out of this “root of charity” they become enriched by its abundance and overflow with the sweetness of God’s love for others. Through teaching and study they draw the minds of others to the invisible things of God, to those eternal things that last and endure, where moth and rust do not destroy (Matthew 6:19). Through washing the feet of those beyond their walls they seek many “thirds” who might become the beneficiaries of this divine benevolence and be won over to the common life. As Fassler notes:

The ministers of the altar renewed the power of consecration and dedication in the altar-washing ritual, a power believed by them to have first been created by Christ’s redemptive act on the cross. In the actions that followed, it was transferred to the people, as the Victorine community went solemnly forth to adore the lowest members of society and to offer them gifts, not only of washing, food, and money, but also of instruction, both through the hearing of Mass and through the example of the canons’ humility. This particular commemoration of the Last Supper did not attempt a realistic portrayal; rather, it searched for the spirit of the original event and challenged the participants to experience charity and humility in their every day lives. Thus through their particular interpretation of this standard ceremony, the Victorines emphasized their ideals of instruction through deeds and words, attempting to teach through symbolic, ritualized action.416

416 Fassler, 265.
All of these practices of the Victorines, all of their words and deeds, ascend and increase in their purity and generosity as this consummate, Trinitarian love comes to be incarnated among them. It is by means of the triad of Goodness-Happiness-Glory that Richard forges it in them. He enlarges their minds in order to fill them with the fullness of divine Wisdom; he draws out their hearts in order to make them overflow with love for others. He focuses in order to magnify, that his readers might discover and enjoy that consummate love supremely exemplified in the Trinity. Richard thus not only argues for the Trinity “trinitarianly” with trinitarian forms and structures, he also “trinitarianly” forms his readers with them. Thus by filling out all of the dimensions of true Divinity, Richard fulfills his apprentices with “a full and perfect contemplation of the Trinity” in whose image they have been made and in whom they find their true perfection.
CHAPTER SIX

OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSE

*But they said, ‘We will not walk in it’*

We now have a very strong case for the thesis of our work that Richard articulates the Trinity “trinitarianly” for the formation of souls. In chapter 4 we established the structural dimension of our thesis, showing in both micro- and macro-scopic detail the triads and triadic structures Richard uses in constructing his *De Trinitate*. And in chapter 5 we looked at how Richard used these triadic forms and structures for formative aims; that is, how he used them to shape the trinitarian consciousness of his readers and consummate trinitarian love within the Victorine community. In this chapter we consider the most salient objections to our thesis and then defeat them.

Since our thesis comprises three main elements, it may be undermined in three corresponding ways. The three components are (a) the “intentionality” (or “deliberateness”) of Richard’s use of triads and triadic structures, (b) the triads and triadic structures themselves, and (c) the claim that Richard uses these structures for formative purposes. The first can be undermined by arguing that however intentional Richard’s use of these triads and triadic structures may seem, it is either coincidental or less intentional than we have claimed. The second can be undermined by arguing that what appear to be triads or triadic structures are not so; or that if so, they do not have the trinitarian significance we attribute to them. And lastly, the third can be undermined by arguing that the structures do not have the formative purposes or implications we ascribe to them.
Given that Richard explicitly states that he writes *De Trinitate* with formative purposes in mind, whatever structures or structuring his treatise can be shown to have—regardless of whether it is as we suggest or otherwise—such structures and structuring can be shown to fit within Richard’s stated goals. Therefore any threat to the third element of our thesis will be proportional to the success of objections raised against its first two elements and upon which our formative claims were based. In other words, Richard’s treatise has formative aims; these aims are met by whatever structures he incorporates in arranging his material. But if his structures or his intentionality in using them are not as we have suggested, then whatever formative implications we derived from our analysis will be shown to be either disconnected from the way Richard arranges his material or different than what we have suggested. The force, therefore, of any successful objection to our thesis must come against its first two elements—either denying the intentionality involved in Richard’s structures or denying that they have the trinitarian structuring we have claimed they do.

Objection #1: Triads as Common to 12th Century

We look first at those objections that deny the intentionality involved in Richard’s structuring. This can be argued a few different ways. We will list them first and provide our rejoinders later. One objection of this sort suggests that these triadic structures were common to the 12th century, can be pointed to in numerous other literary works, and that we find them in Richard’s *De Trinitate* ought not surprise us.\(^{417}\) Furthermore, Richard

\(^{417}\) The use of triads in the Middle Ages is extensive: in Peter Lombard, see Colish, 26; Abelard organizes his work with the triad of faith-sacraments-charity which is followed by Roland of Bologna, *ibid.*, 66; Constable, *Three Studies in Medieval Religious and Social Thought*, 264-65, 290, 335; For Hugh’s three-storyed picture of Noah’s Ark, see Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*, 271, (see Plate 30); Isidore
employs triads in his other works. He is simply a man rooted in the 12th century where triads and triadic structures were common. His use of them, at most, demonstrates he writes within the inherited traditions of the time and within the same historical milieu as his theological contemporaries. These structures that we find in Richard’s *De Trinitate* are an adopted pattern Richard uses to construct his treatise and therefore the level of intentionality we ascribe to his incorporation of them is suspect.

In addition, one can point to some of the meditative practices common to the era, and incorporated at the abbey of St. Victor, to strengthen the case. A further objection points out that in addition to the commonality of triads to the 12th century that these triads and triadic structures merely express the form by which the Victorines and others pursued their contemplations. Many methods were at work in the 12th century, but two come to mind as the most expressive of triadic appearances and forms. These are the practice of *collatio* and the “harmonizing of opposites.” Let us describe each of these in turn and then see how they might further undermine our thesis.

of Seville’s three stages of building (*dispositio-constructio-venustas*), ibid., 230; Adam of Dryburgh’s *De tripartito tabernaculo*, ibid., 246-250.

In *Twelve Patriarchs* lxxix: work-meditation-prayer, experience-discover-obtain; lxxxii: threefold failure of reason: death of Rachel-fall of disciples-failure of sense-memory-reason; lxix: faith-reason-contemplation, below reason-with reason-above reason; lv: outside-inside-above, corporeal-spiritual-divine. What is noteworthy about *De Trinitate* is the noticeable scarcity of non-triadic structures indicating he intends greater significance for them in *De Trinitate*. Despite many triads in *Twelve Patriarchs*, for example, the treatise is governed by the dualism of Rachel-Leah. On Richard’s non-triadic patterns in *Mystical Ark*, see n. 430 of this work.

This objection could be further strengthened by the suggestion in Carruthers’s studies that memory-work favored twos and threes. Mary J. Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature, 10 (Cambridge University Press, 1992).

For more detailed treatment of *collatio* as a meditative practice at St. Victor and its use by Richard and Hugh, see Coulter, 149-161.

Coulter, 213-220.
Objection #2: The Meditative Practice of collatio

The word ‘collatio’ had a wide semantic range that can refer to either physical or mental acts that involved gathering things together for the purpose of further study. At St. Victor, it seems to have been used in three domains: with respect to communal dialogue, scriptural exegesis, and personal meditation. With respect to dialogue, Sicard suggests it could refer to: (a) a colloquy or conference among several persons, (b) the spiritual reading listened to silently by the entire Victorine community (hora collationis), and (c) the particular discussion between a master and his disciples for the purpose of edification. Likewise, collatio could refer to the ‘collating’ of the comments of church fathers or catenas of biblical texts related to the same passage or idea. So it could refer to the gathering of people as well as the gathering of texts. But the use that interests us most is the activity of gathering ideas together in the mind for some further purpose.

One of the greatest benefits of this practice of gathering ideas together was how it aided the mind in finding one’s way through the maze of a complicated set of ideas.

---

422 ‘‘Gathering’ is a favored word in later monasticism for recollective, meditative reading, undoubtedly because of the etymologia (philologically correct in this case, for colligere was actually fashioned from con + legere) that links it to legere, the verb meaning both ‘gather up’ and ‘read.’” Carruthers, Craft of Thought, 192-193. That listening to spiritual reading was called “collatio” comes from the monastic use of ‘conferentia’ as a talk or speech. See also n. 423 below. “Recollection” (colligere), “collection” (collatio), “gather up” (collocare), “drawing in” (tractare), all refer to aspects in gathering from an inventory, particularly in memory. Ibid., 16. Collatio was also connected with the Victorine use of symbols. See Chase, Angelic Wisdom, 59, 191 n. 8.

423 Coulter, 149-150. The first two types are found in the Liber ordinis sancti Victoris Parisiensis; the third, in Hugh’s De arca Noe moralis. The first is also found in Hugh’s Didascalicon IV.16, where ‘collatio’ has the meaning of “conversation”: “A ‘dialogue’ is a conversation (collatio) between two or among several persons: the Latins call it sermo, or talk, moreover, it is so called because it is interwoven (seritur) among each of the speakers.” Taylor, 119.

424 Sicard further suggests this scholarly activity took two forms: (a) bringing together (collating) the texts of commentators and (b) comparing and contrasting intellectual ideas or images. Coulter 149-150. “The Victorines also saw ‘collatio’ as a scholarly activity involving an act of ‘rapprocher’ and of ‘mettre en rapport’—that is, a mental act of comparing objects or concepts.”
Since *collatio* functioned to bring a diverse set of ideas into one place, that one place could serve as a summary of previous contemplations, thus aiding the mind in memory and recollection. But in doing so, that same place could also serve as a new foundation (*fundamentum*) for subsequent considerations. As we have seen previously, like anchor-points for the rock-climber, these places of condensed-thought became the footholds that aid both the lead-climber and his apprentices in their meditative ascents. Concerning this, Carruthers writes:

> The power of this elementary technique is that it provides immediate access to whatever piece of stored material one may want, and it also provides the means to construct any number of cross-referencing, associational links among the elements in such schemes. In short, it provides a random-access memory, and also sets of patterns or foundations upon which to construct any number of additional collations and concordances of material. This latter goal, the making of mental “locations” for “gathering up” (*collocare*) and “drawing in” (*tractare*), is where *memoria* and invention come together in a single cognitive process.\(^{425}\)

Since this was a meditative practice at St. Victor that one would pursue either in solitude or in the company of others, it is no surprise to find the same practice in their literary compositions: their literature merely reflects this meditative practice in a written form.

The Victorines used *collatio* for two further purposes in their meditations and contemplations. One is called ‘*comparatio*’, the other ‘*translatio*’.\(^{426}\) The first compares ideas or concepts for the purpose of drawing out further insights and considerations. The second consists of gathering these contrasts and “translating” them to another domain.

\(^{425}\) Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*, 16.

\(^{426}\) For further examples of *comparatio-translatio*, see Coulter, 153; Den Bok, 131-132; Zinn, *RSV’s Three Main Works*, 15.
Richard alludes to both practices in *De Trinitate* VI.2, showing that they were often used together:

And so, we ought to examine carefully the natural order of proceeding in humanity and, with all acuteness, search for what the divine reality has in likeness to it (*in se simile habeat*). After finding and understanding it according to the practice of theological discipline (*juxta theologicae disciplinae morem*), we ought to transfer (*transumere*) the terms of the proprieties from the human to the divine according to the principle of similitude (*pro similitudinis ratione*).\(^{428}\)

The *comparatio* that follows consists of collating all of the modes of human procession (e.g., immediate, mediate, or mediate and immediate at the same time). The *translatio* consists of transferring what is important from this collection of truths concerning human production to what is true for Divine procession. The key relation is the principal relation of parent-child, for it is the immediate mode of human procession. Like humanity, the relation of divine Father to divine Son is both immediate and a principal relation. But unlike humanity, the production of the Son is according to the operation of nature. The *collatio* of human modes of production makes it possible to compare them and derive the necessary distinctions needed to see what is similar and dissimilar about the divine procession that obtains between Father and Son.

\(^{427}\) “In the actual practice of making a spiritual interpretation the interpreter would most likely employ both where one’s *translatio* becomes grounded in one’s *comparatio* such that they may be seen as one fluid mental act.” Coulter, 153. Richard also alludes to *comparatio* in *De Trinitate* II.7: “Among those truths that we concluded with reasoning, we draw out some truths by analyzing the property of one attribute, which we are discussing; and we demonstrate other truths by considering the property of another attribute and the mutual relationship between them.”

\(^{428}\) Richard, *De Trinitate* VI.2. The *theologicae disciplinae* should be understood as the *transumere* from humanity to Divinity, as Richard makes clear subsequently: “And so, since, according to the example of divine Scripture (*juxta divinarum Scripturarum morem*), we are accustomed to transfer (*transumere*) the terms of human relationship to the divine reality on the basis of the principle of similitude, . . . .”
So collatio was a way of gathering together a couple of concepts or ideas in order to better remember them and draw out further insights from their joint consideration.\textsuperscript{429} This might undermine our thesis when applied to either of its first two elements. With respect to intentionality, it can be argued that this was a common meditative technique or a common method of composing written work. Consequently, whatever triads or triadic structuring Richard incorporated into his treatise is the result of this technique and therefore not something he intentionally added to his work. Whatever triadic structures appear in \textit{De Trinitate} are simply places where Richard engages in collatio and such structuring is a \textit{by-product} of this method and not an intentional part of Richard’s thought when he incorporates them into his work.

In addition, this objection can undermine the second element of our thesis by arguing in one of two ways. First, it can be argued that such triads are not triads at all but merely places where Richard draws together two concepts. Thus despite the appearance of triadic structuring, they are actually dyads Richard pulls together in his collatio for further insights and reflection. The collatio itself is what accounts for the appearance of a third. Second, even if Richard’s collatios retain a triadic structure, it could be argued that this technique gives them whatever triadic structure they possess. They are simply summaries of Richard’s thoughts; they have no further trinitarian form or significance.

\textsuperscript{429} Another use of collatio is Richard’s \textit{De Trinitate} III.14, but since he deals with the Trinity, the further insights come with greater difficulty: “And indeed nothing seems more credible and nothing seems more correct than when each of these considerations and assertions is considered separately and independently. But if we ever discuss the unity together with the plurality and consider how they can stand together harmoniously, then whatever the various arguments has made convincing runs straight into ambiguity, unless the steadfastness of faith stands in the way.”
Objection #3: Richard’s Penchant for “Harmonizing Opposites”

A still further challenge to our thesis comes from the suggestion that the apparent triads and triadic structuring of Richard’s treatise embody a pervasive method of “harmonizing opposites.” Richard incorporates this throughout his writings and it accompanies his use of “fitting necessity” in De Trinitate. This is what accounts for how Richard ends his treatise with Wisdom despite the fact that the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad ends with goodness. Richard typically treats two things and then harmonizes them with a third. Thus where omnipotence speaks to the unity of substance and goodness to the trinity of persons, wisdom speaks to their harmonization. It can thus be argued that the harmonizing element is the third term of Richard’s triads and triadic structures, and that these structures merely reflect this harmonizing technique. Either these places are by-products of this meditative practice and therefore not intentional; or their triadic form is reflective of this harmonizing pattern and therefore has no trinitarian significance.

Response to Objection #1: Triads Common to 12th Century

We take each of these objections in turn. First, with respect to the commonality of triads and triadic structures in the 12th century, Richard’s use of triads is not surprising. Many of his contemporaries and predecessors incorporated triads and triadic structures into their works. Thus Richard’s employment of them in De Trinitate provides one example of how he wrote within the accepted norms of his time. But Richard’s search for triads in De Trinitate shows him going well beyond these common norms. We have seen, for example, that Richard opens his treatise with a litany of triads. This gives us prima facie justification for believing he will be using more of them in his work and that he will
be doing so in more intentional ways. We have also noted Richard’s pattern of molding his meditations in accordance with the scriptural symbols each of his works have as their special focus. Thus while it is common to use triads in the 12th century, and Richard does use many of them in his *Mystical Ark*, the major contours of his thought break into six stages of contemplation based on the six elements of the Ark: wood, gold, crown, propitiatory, right cherub, left cherub. And the forms Richard’s taxonomies take in *Mystical Ark* establish themselves in accordance with the elements as the contemplation progresses (e.g., four sides, four rings, two poles, etc). Likewise, we find numerous dualities in his *Twelve Patriarchs* since that work follows the sons of Rachel and Leah and the two favorite sons of Rachel: Joseph and Benjamin. Since Richard conforms his reader’s attention in accordance with the main objects of contemplation across his works, his intentional use of triads and triadic structures in *De Trinitate* is all the more evident. Consequently, the central object for contemplation in *De Trinitate* requires infusing the minds of his apprentices with the beauty of three divine persons united in one substance. Indeed, when we compare Richard’s *De Trinitate* with his other works, despite the fact that he has no problem using non-triadic taxonomies, *De Trinitate*’s higher proliferation of triads combined with an inversely proportional scarcity of non-triadic categories makes Richard’s intentional use of them in this treatise even more conspicuous.  

In addition, we have also seen that when Richard uses triads and triadic structures he often does a lot more than simply incorporate them. In book III, for example, we

---

430 Indeed, in the case of Richard’s *Mystical Ark*, which he constructs as a meditation around the four sides of the Ark of the Covenant, he adds “happiness” to the Power-Goodness-Wisdom triad to bring it into alignement with his generally quadratic formulations in that work: “If every good is there, He is the supreme good, the supreme goodness, the supreme happiness” (italics mine). Zinn, RSV’s Three Main Works, 291.
demonstrated that not only does Richard divide the content of book III into three sections based on the triad of Goodness-Happiness-Glory, but that Richard uses that very same triad within each of those sections and chronologically emphasizes each element of that triad. This level of intricacy by which Richard employs the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad exceeds what we find in other treatises on the Trinity and cannot be attributed simply to the commonality of triads and triadic structures being used in the 12th century. Further, Richard claims in book III that he has neither read nor heard the plurality of divine persons proved by means of necessary reasons. He indicates where he perceives the existing theological tradition on the Trinity and then explicitly refers to book III as his “bold undertaking” for the plurality of persons. Richard therefore viewed his use of the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad as something unique and new to the 12th century. Moreover, Richard’s development of principles found in Augustine and Anselm provided evidence of this new undertaking.

Response to Objection #2: Meditative Practice of *collatio*

What about the use of meditative practices at St. Victor like *collatio* and the “harmonizing of opposites”? Is Richard’s incorporation of triads and triadic structures in *De Trinitate* simply a by-product of such practices and techniques? With respect to *collatio* and summaries in *De Trinitate*, these are clearly *triads* he gathers together and not merely two concepts. In book III we saw Richard “drawing out” a third argument on the basis of the fullness of glory to complement his previous two arguments for the plurality of persons in Divinity. Despite the fact that the scriptural precedent only calls for two witnesses to establish the veracity of a judicial claim we find Richard fighting for
a third witness in order to “applaud” the testimonies of the other two. Richard elsewhere speaks of “mutual attestations” of the truth on the basis of two claims, but in each of these places a quest for a “third” follows immediately upon the mutual attestation.\footnote{Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} III.3,12. Bk III.4 and III.13 subsequently argue from the “mutual attestation” in each case for the third from the fullness of glory; also III.19 “mutual concurrence” followed by III.20 to provide the “bond of a third person.”} Richard constantly works to bind the truth in that “triple chord” not easily broken.\footnote{Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} III.5, 20. Cf. Ecclesiastes 4:12.}

Response to Objection #3: Harmonizing of Opposites

The strongest argument against our thesis is the “harmonizing of opposites,” for Richard employs it throughout his other writings in addition to \textit{De Trinitate}. As we said before, this accounts for the fact that Richard, in contrast to Anselm, arranges the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad in the way he does (i.e., where Wisdom becomes the third, harmonizing term of the triad). Richard treats Wisdom after Power and Goodness as a way of perfecting the picture; it is how he crowns the work. But Richard does not limit his use of this harmonizing of opposites to this main triad alone; he employs this method with triads throughout his work. The strength, therefore, of this objection, lies in its ability to account for the same triadic structural evidence but with an alternative explanation than the one we offered. We claim that Richard is intentionally arranging his work with triads and triadic structures because they give a trinitarian form to his content and further reinforce allusions of trinitarian significance. This objection can account for the same arrangement of material and it can admit that there are indeed triadic structures. But it denies they have a deliberate trinitarian form. The triadic structures are simply part
of a meditative practice Richard is familiar with and incorporates into his composition of *De Trinitate*. So this objection explains the same data in an alternative way, and in a way that has widespread explanatory power for describing not just Richard’s use of triads within *De Trinitate*, but *across his works as a whole*.

How do we avoid the force of this objection? First, not all of Richard’s triads fit this harmonizing of opposites practice. Book III’s Goodness-Happiness- Glory triad, for example, does not fit this pattern as we see below. Second, this meditative practice is not consistent with our thesis. It offers an alternative explanation to our thesis only if these places of harmonizing opposites in *De Trinitate* show evidence that they are being done for the sake of this meditative practice and not with a view to how such harmonizations might “fit” structures and meaning of greater trinitarian significance. In other words, the use of this meditative practice whereby two things are harmonized with attention to a third that perfects the picture, as it were, can be used in accordance with the purposes of the one employing it. And one of Richard’s purposes is to provide a “full and perfect contemplation of the Trinity.” Thus we have two elements and a question with respect to which one governs Richard’s method and thought as he composes *De Trinitate*. One is this meditative practice of harmonizing two things with a third. The second is the Trinitarian content of Richard’s contemplations. The question is whether Richard makes his contemplations on the Trinity fit into this meditative practice where he can harmonize two elements by a third or whether he makes this meditative practice fit into his reflections on the Trinity such that they have both a trinitarian form and significance. In short, is Richard harmonizing his trinitarian content by means of this technique or is he “trinitizing” this practice in accordance with his pedagogical and formative aims?
The answer is the latter. It would be one thing if Richard always and everywhere used this practice of harmonizing opposites with a third for whatever triad he may employ. But he does not. We see, for example, in book II where Richard uses the three properties of Uncreated-Everlasting-Immutable to establish the eternity of Divinity. He writes:

> But if we combine those three aforementioned properties into one, then we demonstrate that God is not only everlasting but also eternal. . . . From these three attributes, therefore, it is proven that God is eternal; for, without ambiguity, these three attributes grant that God has eternity and is eternal (italics mine). \(^{433}\)

The same is shown with the three witnesses of book III: Goodness-Happiness-Glory. The harmony already exists between the fullness of goodness and happiness to testify to the trinity of persons that must exist in true Divinity. The fullness of glory does not, therefore, harmonize the fullness of goodness and happiness but confirms their witness. Furthermore, in the concluding section Richard emphasizes not the harmonizing of the first two testimonies by a third, but how three individual points establish one truth. As he says:

> Behold how the fullness of divine goodness, happiness and glory coincide with one another in one attestation of truth, and how they clearly show what ought to be understood about the fullness of divine love in the plurality of persons. Together they condemn the suspicion of any defect in the supreme love, and they proclaim in one accord the fullness of total perfection (italics mine).\(^ {434}\)

Even in a place where Richard does employ the harmonizing of opposites for the giving and receiving of love within Divinity (e.g., gratuitous love, owed love, and both

\(^{433}\) Richard, *De Trinitate* II.4.

gratuitous and owed love), he emphasizes not how the trinitarian content fits this harmonizing pattern but how this harmonizing pattern provides the three distinct properties that relate to *one and the same love*. As he concludes, “Behold the three distinctions of properties in supreme love, although it is still one and the same love in every person, namely, a supreme and truly eternal love.”

Finally, in book VI, where Richard gives his argument for the harmony of unity and plurality in Divinity from a consideration of the fullness of wisdom/knowledge, the harmonizing consists in the source from which the knowledge of three persons is gained. The first person discovers knowledge from himself. The second person learns from the first. The third knows from both the first and the second. The first has the wisdom through discovery. The second has the same wisdom through reading what the first had written down. But Richard does not go on to emphasize the harmony of the third person receiving the same knowledge from the first two persons. Instead he emphasizes the sameness of the understanding shared by all three:

And so, if the same truth of understanding is whole and complete in all three persons, then surely, with respect to the essential truth, the knowledge of one person is not different from the knowledge of the other persons? . . . If therefore *one and the same knowledge* can exist in the three persons, then why is it not believed all the more that *one and the same wisdom* exists in the three persons of the divine Trinity (italics mine).  

Therefore, the harmonizing of opposites does not govern the triads and triadic structures Richard incorporates throughout his work. On the contrary, these harmonies

---

435 Richard, *De Trinitate* V.19.

436 Richard, *De Trinitate* VI.25.
are always being used in the service of the greater trinitarian significance Richard wants to “draw out” from them.\footnote{When Richard explicitly describes his method of harmonizing opposites, it is in sections that have to do with comparing human and divine substance (i.e., his use of the “principle of similitude”) rather than with specifically trinitarian-like triads. See, e.g., De Trinitate III.9, IV.25. In V.5 and V.14 Richard uses the “harmonizing of opposites” to obtain the essential middle elements he needs for his trinitarian purposes: e.g., mode of being from eternity and not from itself, person who both gives and receives fullness of Divinity.}

We have considered the three most significant objections to our thesis and provided sufficient rejoinders to them. Doubtlessly, Richard writes during a time when triads and triadic structures were widely used, and their prevalence in his work indicates he is a man of his time. But the absence of non-triadic patterns, along with the proliferation of triads in De Trinitate, make it more probable that Richard intentionally incorporated them. Likewise, Richard’s “bold undertaking” in book III demonstrates that he moves beyond his theological predecessors in deliberately drawing out and searching for a third by which three arguments come together to support one and the same truth. Richard also uses the meditative practices of his time such as \textit{collatio} and the harmonizing of opposites. But while these techniques are incorporated throughout De Trinitate, they do not account for all of the triads and triadic structures Richard employs. And where they are used, Richard always shows how their form has a further trinitarian structure and significance—a structure and significance that show both the “craft” and “care” of his theology.
“Everything is permissible for me, but not everything is constructive”; or so the apostle Paul wrote the church at Corinth. What does it mean to be “constructive”? More importantly, what does it mean to a theologian like Richard? Above all, it means to choose wisely. Like the craftsman who surveys a vast range of materials and designs from which he must choose what is best and most fitting, so too must the theologian bridge the divide between ‘what is available to the mind’ and what is the most ‘fitting for its attention’. His mind ranges over the vast array of visible and invisible things, discovering—with Augustine—that some of them are better than others. Some are better to have than not to have. Some to be than not to be. Some to use, others, to enjoy. In the end, the craftsman must choose something worthy of his devotion: something worthy of his attention and care. And whatever that ‘something’ is, it surely is good most-of-all: one-of-a-kind. For only something “magnificent” sustains the mind, draws it away from worldly delights, and fixes its gaze on something beautiful. And a good craftsman spends plenty of time with it. For the longer he beholds its invisible form, the more taken he is by its elusive perfection. There, before his mind, is the object of his desire and love. “If only I could see it more clearly? If only I could get closer?”

And so the process begins—little by little, day by day. The craftsman and the theologian ascend in their knowledge and love. Each day brings some new insight, some
new “fullness” they didn’t see before. They chip away. They write—bit by bit, stroke by stroke. More and more is revealed. More and more is “drawn out.” Both are in pursuit of a full and perfect contemplation. With each new strike and stroke, their vision enlarges and grows. The distance between visible and invisible things nears; and the mind—aided as it is now by the icon—moves more and more “freely” between them. The craftsman’s love, the theologian’s joy, their delight, increases with each new flight. The visible puts on invisibility and the invisible puts on visibility—until there is no more variation of shadows. Today, something “good and perfect” has come down from the heavenly lights: a holy “gift.” And there is joy, great joy. Come and see! Come and see! Dilectio becomes condilectio; and the private preoccupation becomes a “mutual sharing.”

But with that change, the rules of “invention” and “construction” shift: The social as well as the individual dimension to their craft now comes to light. Neither works for himself now, but for the good of others. For the craftsman, whatever his handiwork may be—a chair, a fireplace, a footstool, a sword—the value is weighed, not in pounds, but in the quality of the construction and the service it renders others. Similarly, the art of the theologian is not measured, ultimately, by how well he articulates his subject-matter, but by how well he informs another soul with its knowability. Thus for the theologian, as for the craftsman, the “work of creation”—the opus conditionis—demands a sacrificial act: an offering for others. And the more conscientious the craftsman, the more compassionate the theologian, the heavier that burden is borne. For the service now renders their tools “instruments of righteousness,” their canvas: the souls of men. Who will be their potter? their counselor? their ‘watchman’? “Here am I, Lord. Send me!”
These are the “inventors,” and their “inventories” are filled with their artistic quests for perfection. No time for pride, only devotion. These are the humble ones, who unbeknown to themselves, serve all of humanity and not merely their students, their schools, or their cities. Their work—to the extent that it is known and its genius discovered—defines the artifact or subject-matter in a way that becomes a standard for generations to come.

Richard exhibited such invention and genius in the artistry of his works and the formation of his readers. What’s more, he never stopped perfecting them. For Richard, as for the craftsman, a work is never “done.” For unlike the connoisseur, who stands before a “masterpiece” and perceives only exquisite detail and perfection, the theologian and the craftsman see much, much more. The true object of their devotion lies “above and beyond” the grasp: where obedience condescends to “death.” Here the craftsman’s chisel strikes the rock; the theologian’s pen descends to paper.

Admiring a work hanging on the wall of a gallery differs from seeing the same work lying in the studio. In the gallery one seeks a “finished” form—something to be evaluated on its own terms—in isolation from the artist and his other works. In the studio, however, we find the artist and his materials. Here we gain a greater sense for his “craft,” his “tools,” and his “methods.” Alongside other pieces, we may see the development of a theme or pattern that culminates in the artist’s latest work. In the gallery, we behold the work’s divine inspiration; in the studio, we witness its incarnation.

In order to be fully appreciated, therefore, Richard’s De Trinitate requires placement in the studio as well as the gallery. In this work, we spent most of our time examining De Trinitate in the gallery. There we saw Richard creatively construct his
work with triadic structures and forms in order to sustain the hearts and fix the minds of his readers with a full and perfect contemplation of the Trinity.

Stepping back, we saw the breadth of Richard’s work: how he organized the entire contemplation in accordance with the triad of Power-Wisdom-Goodness. Together all three showcase the whole truth of the singularity, plurality, and harmony of the one true God. Stepping closer, we saw the depth of Richard’s work: his dedication to triadic forms and structures by which he focused on specific elements, then magnified their contemplation, and drew out their trinitarian significance. With suitable time and attention paid to each of these dimensions, we came to appreciate the intricacy of the design and the diligent care with which Richard crafted *De Trinitate*.

However, when we combined the breadth of the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad with the depth of Richard’s intricate trinitarian structuring, we also discerned a “theme” and a method by which he constructed the treatise. Richard alerts his readers that he is “...drawing out profound and hidden reasons into the open from the sanctuary of wisdom” (emphasis mine). Consequently, we discovered that his way of focusing and enlarging upon certain elements for trinitarian reflection was an editorial method by which he returned and expanded on his previous work. In the same way that an artist later decides to add some new detail to the foreground of his painting, or to touch up the background to heighten some contrast, so Richard returned to perfect his *De Trinitate*.

And these additions, and their chronology, are not easy to discern. Nor have we attempted a comprehensive analysis of them—a task for which the present work can only

point the way. It took a very keen mind to construct *De Trinitate*; it takes a mind equal to it to discover and appreciate all of its subtleties. As Richard himself says, “... it does not belong to any soul (*cujusvis animae*),” but to the “*diligent one (studiosi)*.” And under the care of a *magister* like Richard, that soul becomes a “sacred space” where the theologian and his apprentice seek the Form and Face—the *quid* and *quae*—of their Love forevermore!

Thus having discovered Richard’s *De Trinitate* “unfinished,” we reluctantly end our work by taking it down from the gallery and placing it in the studio. But lest we rue its newfound resting place, perhaps there is something more to behold there, dwelling as it does among Richard’s *lowly* crafts and tools. Perhaps if we remain awhile, we may discover something about God, what it means to be a “Trinity,” and the “artistry” involved in trying to bring that Word to words. Should we persevere with a diligence approaching Richard’s own devotion and care, perhaps we will discover the true art of this theologian’s craft: allowing his words to punctuate and bleed *beyond the page*—from the gallery of glory to the little studios of our souls; that place where “... everything is permissible, but not everything is constructive.” Perhaps there we can discover what it means to *do* “constructive theology,” where the Craftsman *returns* to His work and resurrects it, daily, in accordance with His image.

X *faciebat*

---

APPENDIX A:

DISCERNING THE TEXTUAL DEVELOPMENT OF RICHARD’S *DE TRINITATE*
Richard does not explicitly say that he uses the Power-Goodness-Wisdom triad to organize his treatise, so providing evidence for this must move beyond the obvious emphasis he gives it at the end of his work to discovering other places in the treatise that demonstrate him doing so.

Fortunately Richard regularly summarizes his work and prepares his readers for what comes next. One of the most important is the opening of book III. He writes that previously, referring to books I-II, he proved the unity and property of the divine substance. In book I Richard argued that Divinity is supremely simple. In book II he argued that there is only one Divinity. Now, in book III, he turns his attention to establishing the plurality of persons. And he then lays out the order of questions he will answer as he constructs the rest of his work in three steps. Step one, beginning with book III, consists of answering the question, “Is there true plurality in true and simple divinity and if the number of persons comes to three as we believe?” Step two, the subject of book IV, answers the question, “How is unity of substance consistent with the plurality of persons?” And step three, the subject of book V, investigates “... whether... there is among the three [divine persons] one person alone who is from himself, and whether each of the other two persons proceeds from the other, and if there are other questions to be investigated concerning the same considerations?”

---

440 As Ribaillier aptly notes, this structure also reveals the “above and beyond” distinction that plays such a prominent role in Richard’s Mystical Ark. Here in De Trinitate, bks. I-II contend with what is above reason (supra rationem) and bk. III and following with what is beyond reason (preter rationem). Ribaillier, 16. Richard also introduces the distinction explicitly in the Prologue to De Trinitate: “For some of those truths which we are ordered to believe seem to be not only above reason (supra rationem) but also contrary to human reason (contra humanam rationem). Richard also frequently alludes to 2 Corinthians 2:16: “Who is capable of these questions?” (Ed ad hoc quis idoneus?). Cf. II.22, III.8, 10 “supra intelligentiam,” VI.22.
Richard aims to demonstrate these considerations by reason. He then adds that he will provide further considerations related to the diverse modes of procession of the Son and Spirit, the mode proper to each, and what can be learned from the “names” according to the property of each person. These further considerations are the focus of book VI.441

Like Anselm’s use of the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad, this is the ‘loose structure’ for Richard’s entire treatise. This becomes evident when one searches in vain for an elaboration of the argument for the consistency of the plurality of persons with the unity of substance from a consideration of the “fullness of wisdom” in book IV. It is not that Richard does not argue for this harmony in book IV. We can see from the concluding section of that book, as well as the summary of conclusions Richard rehearses in book V, that Richard already established it. As he says in V.1:

But seeing that we are certain about the unity of the divine substance, the plurality of persons, and the harmony and mutual relation of plurality and unity, the occasion now requires that we inquire about the properties of each person and specify the particular characteristic of each person (italics mine).

The point is not that Richard lacks an argument for this consistency of unity and plurality in book IV, but that he does so without any recourse to a consideration of Wisdom. The concept of the fullness of knowledge shows up sporadically throughout Richard’s treatise, but it isn’t until the very end of book VI that we encounter the highest concentration on the subject—especially in the final three chapters from 23-25.

441 Nico den Bok likewise argues that this section of bk. III provides the outline of the entire work; he further takes this as evidence for the authenticity of bk. VI rather than a later redaction by a different author. Den Bok 371-372. This view is shared by Ribaillier, 9.
What we have, then, is Richard’s argument for the unity of Divinity in books I-II from omnipotence; an argument for the Trinity of persons in book III from the fullness of goodness; and we have the argument for the harmony of unity and plurality in VI.23-25. There is, therefore, a large gap between books I-III on the one hand, and book VI on the other. What is to account for the fact that Richard clearly establishes the harmony of unity and plurality in book IV but waits until the final chapters of book VI to do so from a consideration of the fullness of Wisdom? Richard gives us a few clues.

The first clue comes at the conclusion of book IV. Richard says “Behold, we have now discussed this issue by means of a digression, and we have strayed far beyond our subject.” And he concludes that the “pious and simple mind” should be satisfied with what was said about how nothing is “dissonant” in venerating “one God in the Trinity and the Trinity in a unity.” The only other place the word “dissonant” is used in Richard’s treatise is in the opening paragraph of IV.25. So the digression refers only to the question Richard considers with respect to the alleged corporeality of demonic spirits in the preceding paragraph. Thus Richard’s argument for the harmony of divine unity and plurality in book IV consists of his explanation of the similitudes between human, angelic, and divine substances. How this connects with book VI will be made apparent shortly.

The second clue comes at the end of book V. Richard writes:

I had intended to reveal publicly what I thought about these issues, but because there is intense profundity in them, it will be better to leave them to be discussed more thoroughly by those who

---

442 “Sed ecce hoc dum per excessum diximus, a nostro proposito longius evagati sumus.” Richard, De Trinitate IV.25.
have greater abilities. It will also be better to prove from the judgment of others what sort of gratitude or ingratitude I deserve from those things that I have said up until now.

As previous Richardian scholars have pointed out, there is suspicion based on this comment by Richard, that perhaps this marks the end of his treatise at book V and leaves questions with respect to the status of book VI.\textsuperscript{443}

This second clue, like the first, presents a perplexity in need of a good explanation. To what does this parenthetical remark at the conclusion of book V refer? Furthermore, does it give us any further insight on how Richard constructed this work? The immediate context suggests that Richard either refers to the issue of procession and the differences between the Son and the Spirit with respect to that property; or, he refers to that plus the appropriation of divine names. We add a third possibility: That this parenthetical statement at the end of book VI is connected with an important distinction Richard makes a few chapters earlier, but admittedly never develops.

Toward the end of V.22, Richard brings up the distinction of the “work of grace” and the “operation of nature.” And while he has brought up the distinction in previous books, it is never as problematic as it is here. The distinction in those other sections always refers to created things\textsuperscript{444}; but here, he is concerned with whether what is perfectly appropriate with respect to human action and propagation might be thought the same for Divinity.\textsuperscript{445} He assures his reader this is not the case. But uncharacteristically,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{443} Ribaillier, 15.
\item \textsuperscript{444} Richard, \textit{De Trinitate} I.9, II.8.
\item \textsuperscript{445} Richard may have been familiar with a contemporary debate about what kind of ‘necessity’ pertains to the divine processions. As den Bok notes, “Abelard combined the principle [of divine plenitude] with the idea of Christian love («caritas») in such a way that it not only showed its importance to the trinitarian relations, but also, again, its impact on the relation between God and the world.” Den Bok, 287
\end{itemize}
Richard does not go on to explain this in any more detail. Instead, he speaks of the profundity of the mystery and the difficulty involved in trying to find suitable words for asserting the truth. The dilemma consists of the tension between two dimensions of God’s being: what God must be (operation of nature) and what God chooses to be (operation of grace). If the divine processions are an operation of nature, then the processions are ‘by-products’ of the divine nature which seems incompatible with the Scriptures. But if the divine processions are an operation of grace then they are not necessary to true Divinity, which results in Arianism.

In all likelihood, the parenthetical statement Richard gives at the end of book V is related to this section of V.22. Further evidence in support of this can be found by the fact that this section of V.22 and the statement at the end of book V have further similarities. They both speak of the profundity of mystery. They both speak of gratitude or ingratitude. They both involve an articulated awareness of those who would judge the quality of one’s work. And they both pertain to finding the right “words” to explain the profundities. But we do not find the statement placed immediately next to that of V.22; instead, it is found at the end of book V.

What explains all of this? V.22, and its concern with the “work of grace” and the “operation of nature” as it relates to procession, is connected with the final section of n. 7-8. But as Gregory of Nazianzus writes in Theological Orations 29, 2: “We do not have the audacity to speak of overflowing goodness as one of the Greek philosophers who dares to say «as a basin that overflows» in a passage on the first and second cause; for we are careful not to assume an origination by natural power, a kind of natural and unforced movement that does not fit to our thoughts on the godhead.” Den Bok, 292 n. 31. Given the tension between Gregory and Abelard on ‘what must be true’ and ‘what could have been otherwise’, Richard’s hesitancy in V.22 is not surprising, though he obviously addressed it when he added the first chapters of bk. VI. See also n. 455 of this work.

446 Den Bok, 433. For more on the dilemma, see den Bok, 301 on “ethical necessity.”
book V. Combined, they reveal that Richard’s thoughts at the end of book V concern perplexities he has not yet explored. The distinction of the work of grace and the operation of nature, and the difference of procession between Son and Spirit, still have questions yet to be answered. As Richard says in both statements, he hopes that those with greater minds will show “. . . gratitude for the things he has shown up until now!” as he would be grateful to those who might shed light on issues he still finds obscure.

When we look to book VI, we discover that Richard eventually takes up the topic of the work of grace vs. the operation of nature as this relates to procession within Divinity. As we mentioned, and as scholars of Richard’s De Trinitate have noted, this statement at the end of book V leaves questions as to the relationship of book VI to the rest of the treatise. Some surmise that book V may have have been the final book at an earlier stage in Richard’s writing, book VI being undertaken at a later date. Most scholars agree that book VI was written by Richard.

But consider how all of these pieces come together to help us make better sense of how Richard constructed his work. It would be one thing if all we had was this one parenthetical statement at the end of book V to help us decide, but we have more. First, we know Richard conceived the overall structure of the work on the basis of the same Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad that Anselm did. But whereas Anselm constructed his treatise in the order of Goodness—>Wisdom—>Power, Richard constructs his in the order of Power—>Goodness—>Wisdom. And the final consideration of wisdom comes at the very end of book VI. When we compare the language found at this section of book VI with the language we find at the end of book IV we find striking similarities. And when we look at the content of books IV, V, and VI, we discover that they all coalesce
around considerations related to explaining the harmony of unity and plurality in
Divinity. Given the “spatial distance” of the arguments from the fullness of wisdom
found at the end of book VI from the conclusion and language at the end of book IV—
along with parenthetical statements at the end of books IV and V that show evidence for
earlier and later material—we have the beginnings of an insight on how Richard went
about his work.

It seems he was in the habit of taking the final pieces of previous work and
“opening them up” to explore further nuances and details. And this “opening up” left the
earlier material on both sides of his newer insights. This explains, in part, why the
language at the end of his books is more simple when compared with newer material that
precedes it. On both sides of the newer material we can see the language that was
connected together at an earlier stage. One of the clearest examples of this is found at the
end of book II where this “earlier” material has migrated to the end of the book. At the
end of book II, Richard provides a “taxonomy of properties” in II.25:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Consubstantial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Equal or Unequal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Similar or Dissimilar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Above or Below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Before or After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Sitting near or together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>Possessor and Possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Action]</td>
<td>Activity or Passivity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. A.1 Taxonomy of Properties in *De Trinitate* II.25**

**This taxonomy of properties predicated of Divinity is from Boethius’s *De Trinitate* IV. It was common to the 12th century. William of St. Theirry uses this taxonomy as the loose structure for his *Enigma fidei*. See Anderson, *The Enigma of Faith*, 57ff.
He states, “And so, it is better at the moment to refrain from this discussion than to attempt a study [that] we cannot furnish in a concise manner.” But when we look at the material that precedes this in II.22-24 we see that Richard has addressed every one of these categories. II.25, therefore, was connected with material that came earlier and Richard inserted II.22-24 at a later time (see Appendix B).

This notion of taking a concluding point not only as a starting point for a new claim, but also giving it an “expanded treatment” of its own—filling out further details—is a pattern with Richard. As we noted when looking at the relationship between Richard’s *Twelve Patriarchs* and *Mystical Ark*, the latter seems to be a full articulation of the last stage of contemplation in the first. *Twelve Patriarchs* treats the knowledge of self, leading it on an ascent to the contemplation of God. It is moral work. One must walk with the patriarchs in an effort to purge oneself of vices, inculcate virtues, and ultimately learn the grace of discretion. *Mystical Ark* picks up where *Twelve Patriarchs* finishes; but rather than start a new journey, *Mystical Ark* “abides” at the final location of *Twelve Patriarchs*. What *Mystical Ark* continues is the ascent begun at the end of *Twelve Patriarchs* by filling it out, in rich detail, as an ascent of crafting the Ark of the Covenant on God’s “holy hill.” There, the lessons of the grace of discretion are transferred to the grace of contemplation. So in the relationship of Richard’s treatises we see a pattern of seeking the “plenitude” of conclusions already established in previous work.

My suggestion is that we can see Richard looking over his previous compositions, trying to find seeds that could be cultivated and watered—of giving them fuller treatment, fuller insight and articulation; and once finding them, adding material that gives that fuller detail within the existing structure of his previous work. It would be the equivalent
of adding pages to a section of a book without rewriting what came before and after it. The pages simply elaborate some element in more detail but do not significantly disrupt the flow of the previous work (Fig. A.2).

Two further points are worth making with respect to this. One is another place in Richard’s work where he indicates that he is “inserting” new material, and the second is how all of this connects with his explicit statements of this method in book I of De Trinitate. In VI.18 Richard writes:

But, in order that we may return (redeamus) to that question on account of which we inserted these remarks (ista interposuimus), with respect to God [the Father] begetting a Son is identical to naturally producing at will a person from his own person according to a singular conformity of his property (emphasis mine).\footnote{Richard, De Trinitate VI.18.}

This indicates that Richard is “inserting” new material to previous work and not merely adding new books or sections to this treatise. Second, Richard explains how this method of insertion is related to his general approach of fides quaerens intellectum. As he writes in the introduction of book I:

It is therefore necessary for us to enter by faith into the knowledge of truths concerning which it is correctly said to us: if you do not believe, you will not understand. Nevertheless, we must not stop immediately at the entrance; but we must always hasten toward a deeper and more profound understanding and pursue it with every effort and with supreme diligence, so that we can advance daily toward an understanding of what we hold by faith.\footnote{Richard, De Trinitate I.3.}

Moreover, in the next chapter, he writes, “But it does not belong to any soul to elicit those reasons from the profound and hidden bosom of nature, and to draw them out into
the open, as if uprooting them from some secret sanctuary of wisdom.”  

What this indicates is that not only is Richard’s entire treatise on the Trinity an “expansion” upon works like those of Anselm and Augustine, but it also indicates a specific method by which Richard “returned” to his own work. The plenitude he adds to Anselm, Augustine, Boethius, and others is a plenitude he seeks in delving into profundities left unearthed in his previous writing!

Fig. A.2 Richard’s “Focus & Magnify” Method of Expansion

So how does this all relate to the ambiguities of the textual process for Richard in books IV-VI of his De Trinitate? The answer is that books IV-VI are an “expansion” of

\[ \text{Richard, De Trinitate I.4.} \]
Richard’s argument for the harmony of unity and plurality.\textsuperscript{451} The broad structure of the entire treatise is Power-Goodness-Wisdom. The consideration of power in books I-II gives Richard his argument for the aseity and singularity of Divinity. The consideration of goodness in book III gives Richard his conclusion for the plurality of Divinity. Book IV gives the argument for the harmony of unity and plurality of Divinity. By book V Richard has already established those three conclusions. But book IV, while giving an argument for unity and plurality of Divinity based on similitudes, does not provide necessary reasons nor resolve the perplexities involved in explaining the relationship between the divine substance and the divine persons. In a word, it establishes the coherence and logical consistency of the harmony of unity and plurality of Divinity. It provides knowledge \textit{that} this harmony is true, but it does not explain \textit{how} this harmony is to be understood. Books V and VI provide more detail in explaining the “how” of this harmony. But we have to wait until the final chapters of book VI for Richard’s argument from the fullness of Wisdom that fittingly completes the governing triad of the treatise.

Thus starting with this Power-Goodness-Wisdom triad, Richard composed his work arguing for the unity, plurality, and harmony of unity and plurality; and as he contemplated these things further, he “expanded” and “filled out” his previous work with new insights and contemplations. His final argument for the harmony of unity and plurality from a consideration of the fullness of wisdom at the end of book VI was part of

\textsuperscript{451} Nico den Bok sees the Power-Goodness-Wisdom triad as the “rough structure” with bks. IV-VI filling out the latter part of that triad. Den Bok, 371-372, see esp. n. 177. However, the Wisdom component is concentrated in the final chapters of bk. VI. The important points to highlight are the following: (a) this rough structuring based on this triad had precedents in Anselm, (b) that Richard “expanded” his work which explains why the material for the Wisdom component of the triad is concentrated at the end of bk. VI and (c) that the textual difficulties pointed to by Ribaillier, Salet, Bligh, and von Balthasar extend beyond a question regarding the authenticity of bk. VI and can be better understood in light of (a) and (b).
an earlier stage of his writing, probably directly connected with content we find at the end of book IV. It is only as Richard continued to expand and provide further details on the definition of ‘Person’, the intricacies of procession and generation, etc. that we find the final component of the Power-Goodness-Wisdom triad drifting further and further away from material it used to be connected with. And this gives us an indication of just how much Richard added to books IV-VI.

Given that Richard’s “expanding” method is the result of making arguments fuller and more complete, it is not surprising to find evidence of this in earlier sections of his work (i.e., in books I-III). But for now, the important point is that there is evidence of this method in Richard, that it connects well with how he describes his work of “drawing profundities out into the open,” of “uprooting them from some secret sanctuary of wisdom.” All of this has implications for better understanding the development of Richard’s thought on the Trinity, the evolution of his composing De Trinitate, how this method may apply to other of his works and that of his contemporaries at St. Victor. But here we can only point it out. The detailed work of identifying where the insertions are, when they were added, and what this says about Richard’s developing thought on the Trinity must be left for future study.

The reason why it is important for us to point out is that it helps us broaden our understanding of Richard’s “intentionality” in composing this work. It is tempting, given what we have discovered about Richard’s intricate triads and triadic structuring to treat De Trinitate as a finished work of art, a sculpture in its most perfect and final form. But as we step closer, we discover it is more like a work of art “in relief”: a sculpture attached to the block of marble from which it was carved. The picture is almost full and complete;
about as full and complete as could ever be imagined—the form is in “high relief.” And we can be incredibly thankful for this. For unlike a sculpture detached from the mold and marble that gave it life, where all we see is the work of art and the feeling it evokes as we behold its form, a relief shifts our attention to the artist and his craft. We imagine how the beauty and craft with which the artist chipped away at those things he was able to “draw out” from the marble would advance through those elements left untouched. It brings us to the lines that mark the margins of the artist’s thought. We connect with the “process” of his craft. He invites us to take up our own theological chisels and join him in his work.

But Richard did not anticipate leaving *De Trinitate* as a sculpture in relief. He was in pursuit of a full and perfect contemplation of the Trinity and his goal was to forge its final form in his readers. However, he never finished. He was still in the process of carving out more to behold and ponder. Yet this unintended “incompleteness” to Richard’s work is all the more wonderful for how well it fits with Richard’s understanding of Trinitarian contemplation; for there is always more above and beyond the rock. *De Trinitate*, like a sculpture in relief, provides comprehension but not full comprehension. To write a treatise on the Trinity is to concentrate the mind on the most Eternal and sublime of all things. As he says, no one can fully comprehend the triune God though we grope at that divine light with all we can. Richard’s *De Trinitate* is all the more “perfect” for having been left as a work-in-progress. For in that very form it captures the ongoing nature of the theologian’s craft: contemplation added to contemplation, more of the mystery disclosed and still more to pursue. Thus Richard—like his own theological predecessors, and above all, like God—leaves us with still more to see, more to discover, more to “draw out” from the “secret sanctuary of Wisdom.”
APPENDIX B:

COMPREHENSIVE DIAGRAM OF RICHARD’S *DE TRINITATE*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Study</td>
<td>Two Modes of Being “from eternity” I.6-10</td>
<td>from-eternity-and-itself / not-from-eternity-nor-itself / from-eternity-not-itself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity “one God”</td>
<td>Highest I.11-12</td>
<td>Main Triad Used Throughout this Section: Essence-Power-Wisdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best I.13-18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fullest I.19-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singularity “only one God”</td>
<td>Uncreated-Eternal-Immeasurable Chiasm (see Fig. 4.5) II.1-8/9-10</td>
<td>Uncreated-Eternal-Immeasurable (1-8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harmonizing Elements of Chiasm (9-10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expansion</td>
<td>Concern: Aren’t Power &amp; Wisdom Communicable? II.11-14</td>
<td>General-Special-Individual (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmony: Unity &amp; Singularity</td>
<td>Full Identity of Unity &amp; Singularity II.15-19</td>
<td>“only one Lord” (15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Multiplicity (16) &amp; Simplicity (17) of Single Perfection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“one (18) &amp; only one (19) supreme Good”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q: Did Richard start with Quicumque (one Omnipotent-God-Lord) and then expand?

Q: Could Goodness here have been connected with Power & Wisdom in I.11-25 such that there was a section-specific use of Power-Wisdom-Goodness here and above expansions separated them?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Material</td>
<td>II.20-24</td>
<td>Goodness</td>
<td>Objective, Ontological Superiority of Love Among Goods (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plurality</td>
<td>Goodness</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Subjective, Experiential Quality of Love Among Pleasing Things (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality/Equality</td>
<td>Glory</td>
<td>Having Magnificent Power to Share Supreme Love (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern: How Two if Only One? III.8-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coeternity, Coequality, &amp; Co-immutability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plurality Requires Divine Persons are Supreme Equals III.6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Two Omnipotents, Immeasurables, etc. such that Only One (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness loving supremely III.11-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human vs. Divine Nature (9-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Goodness</td>
<td>Most Rare &amp; Excellent Love Among Equals (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plurality</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Sweetest Joy With No Speck of Grief (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality/Equality</td>
<td>Glory</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Pure Splendor With No Speck of Shame or Embarrassment (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloriness/Majesty</td>
<td>Goodness</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Full Bounty of Goods / Riches to Give (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality/Equality</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td></td>
<td>communion of love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity</td>
<td>Glory</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Overflow of Abundant Joys to Share (15-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous Material</td>
<td>Distanced By Expansion(s) Above III.21-25</td>
<td></td>
<td>communion of excellent joy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Harmony of Unity &amp; Plurality</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>‘person’ vs. ‘substance’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>‘existence’ &amp; ‘origin’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'fitting' definitions IV</td>
<td>Perfecting Boethius's Definition of 'Person'</td>
<td>Definition IV.21-25</td>
<td>(i) someone (ii) existing through oneself alone (iii) acc. to singular mode of rational existence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Harmony of Unity &amp; Plurality V</td>
<td>Source of Love</td>
<td>Single Argument for Above from Consideration of Love V.16-21</td>
<td>Fullness of One and the Same Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dignity of Benevolence</td>
<td>Concern: Diversity of Dignity Among Divine Persons? V.22-25</td>
<td>Integrity of One and the Same Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguish Modes of the Processions</td>
<td>Establishing Principal Order of Proceeding (Parent-Child) VI.1-2</td>
<td>Initiates Power-Wisdom-Goodness Consideration VI.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Naming &quot;Father&quot; &quot;Son&quot; &quot;Holy Spirit&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Father&quot; &amp; &quot;Son&quot; VI.4-5</td>
<td>Human vs. Divine Procession by 'operation of nature'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— Causes, Reasons, &amp; Order of Divine Processions VI. 6-7</td>
<td>Principal Reason of Processions</td>
<td>condignum-condilectum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only Two Modes of Existing

(Im)mediacy of Processions

Limiting to Three Divine Persons

Gratuitous Love-Owed Love
“one and the same love” from the perspective of the distinctive love of each person

condignum-condilectum looking at the three persons through the prism of “one and the same love”
Despite the appearance of a sequential flow from VI.4-21 through each of the divine names, there is clearly insertion and spreading of material taking place (in VI.18, Richard explicitly says so). And it is much harder to assess in book VI without further clues.

The “Holy Spirit”
VI.8-10

Non-Principal Procession (8)
Life-Giving Breath-Illuminates by Teaching (9)
Sanctifying Breath-Unifies by Love (10)

Appropriate Other Divine Names

Only Son called “Image” - Not Spirit
VI.11

Only Son called “Word”
VI.12-13

Only Spirit called “Gift of God”
VI.14

VI.15

Infusion of Owed Love

Power-Wisdom-Goodness (15)

“Begotten” & “Unbegotten”
VI.16-17c

Digression(s):
VI.17d-18b

condignum-condilectum (17d)

Understanding “UnBegotten” “Begotten”

Only Son “Image” & Figure” - Not Spirit
VI.18c-21

“return to F begetting S before we inserted [the above] remarks…”

(18c)

The lack of triads and organizing structures along with lots of redundancy in book VI makes it more difficult to pin down. What *is* clear:

(a) Fullness of Wisdom argument only in very last chapters
(b) Similar language to Books I & II in specific sections
(c) Polemical material on Unbegotten-Begotten is mostly in book VI.

Wisdom
Harmony of Unity & Plurality
VI.23-25

Fullness of Wisdom

Fullness of One and the Same Wisdom
VI.23-25

Discovered-Learned-Read
Knowledge: From Himself-From One-From Two
Instruction: Devising-Listening-Reading
Memorize: Power-Goodness-Wisdom
NOTES ON COMPREHENSIVE DIAGRAM OF RICHARD’S *DE TRINITATE*:

This diagram represents Richard’s organization of *De Trinitate* as I currently see it. The **bold lines** indicate trinitarian structuring. The bold line furthest left extends down the entire work, and indicates Richard’s broad use of the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad that organizes the entire treatise. The break in that line between books IV to VI indicates how the earlier, “fullness of wisdom” material migrates to the very end of book VI as Richard expanded books IV-VI with new additions. As these bold lines progress inward to the right, they indicate Richard’s use of more localized triads (e.g., Goodness-Happiness-Glory in book III) as he “draws them out” from each element in the Power-Wisdom-Goodness triad. This is seen most clearly in Fig. 4.3.

The **darkest grey sections** indicate some of the earlier material in Richard’s treatise that became “distanced” as Richard added to his work.

The **lighter grey sections** indicate some of Richard’s expansions. In books V and VI one sees this in the *condignum-condilectum* material, the similarity of language and thought indicating the same stage of redaction. In book II there is the “taxonomy of properties” Richard added that distanced the earlier material in II.25 where he states that he doesn’t have time to describe the properties but then adds a discussion of them in II.20-24.

The **greyed out diagonal shading** indicates a possible third level of redaction, where Richard adds an explanation to mitigate a logical concern (e.g., explaining how the communicability of wisdom and power found in rational beings differs from the incommunicability of these properties for Divinity, II.11-14). We know that II.11-14 was added after Richard’s insertion of the Uncreated-Immeasurable-Eternal
chiasm in II.1-10. What’s more, the technicality of language (e.g., Danielitas) in II.12 along with distinctions he borrows from other sources (e.g., General-Special-Individual) parallels the technicality of language found especially in book IV (e.g., person vs. substance, subsistence vs. existence, etc.) where Richard is working with Boethius, and for that reason may indicate the same stage of redaction.

But I must emphasize the preliminary nature of this diagram. Richard may just as well have written the material in II.11-14 at the same time he added the chiasm of II.1-10, his mind foreseeing the logical concern at that point. Further, I believe that the earliest material in Richard’s work is found in books I and VI on the *Quicumque* and the church fathers, and pieces of which can be found in book II, that became distanced as he added to the work. But I do not use the darkest grey shading for this material in books I-II, instead shading only the “fullness of wisdom” material found at the very end of book VI. Thus the darkest grey sections do not indicate the same stage of redaction, but only show where earlier material becomes distanced by Richard’s insertions. This highlights what I wish to emphasize: I am more interested in indicating that redaction is taking place than I am in showing exactly what material goes together or the chronology of Richard’s additions. This diagram, and these shaded regions, help us attend to divisions of material that may represent new stages of redaction as Richard returned to his work. The point is to show that (a) Richard’s additions extend throughout his treatise and are therefore not

---

452 This similarity of language and style has been noticed by others. See, e.g., Ribaillier, 10: “. . . dans le livre VI les références à l’Ecriture, à la liturgie, aux Pères sont plus abondantes,” and “Dans l’ensemble du traité, on ne relève que 46 citations explicites ou implicites: la plupart se trouvent dans le Prologue et au livre VI.” But rather than seeing this as evidence for distancing the material bk. I shared with bk. VI at an earlier stage, the focus has been on what the status of bk. VI is to the rest of the treatise. On the earlier *Quicumque* sequence, see n. 309 of this work.
limited to book VI and (b) much more work remains to be done to discern where these additions are and what their chronology is. This diagram merely depicts the strong, *prima facie* justification we give for (a) in Appendix A and indicates places where further text-critical analysis might help us with questions related to (b).

When I first began working with Richard’s *De Trinitate* I discovered the triadic structures in book III and then began an investigation into his uses in the rest of his work. Initially, the level of intricacy in content and form in book III led me to expect a proportionally high degree of the same throughout the rest of the work. What I found instead is that the most crystalized employment of triads and triadic structuring is in book III and that the triadic structuring in the rest of the work tapers off from there. Further, once I realized where these triads were, I started to notice those places with less refined structure and language. What became the most apparent was that the lack of this structure and refinement is found in the final sections of Richard’s books. These are indicated by the darkest grey sections in the diagram. In addition, this lack of refinement in language and structure is also accompanied by a glaring omission of summaries and conclusions found in those more intricate sections. So, for example, when one reads through the intricacies of the triadic structures and summaries in III.1-20, one is struck by the omission of any of the same language, content, or conclusions in III.21-25 that ends the book. What’s more, one discovers a surprising simplicity of language in these final sections—much simpler than the more intricate material that precedes it. This led me to discover that Richard was not just “inserting” remarks, but that he was expanding entire sections of his work and leaving previous material on either side of those expansions. A good example of the evidence of this can be found in comparing the material in
VI.18c-21 with that in VI.11. In VI.11 Richard has already made an argument for the Holy Spirit not being called “image,” but only the Son. But in what follows in VI.18c-21 Richard makes the same argument with different language. The explanation for this is that the latter comes with the Unbegotten-Begotten polemical material, and VI.11 must have been inserted later. This explains both the redundancy, the placement, and the dissonance of language in both places. Further examples of this method are the expansions found in books I and II, especially the chiastic structure of Uncreated-Eternal- Immutable in II.1-10 and the “taxonomy of properties” that Richard initially says he doesn’t have time to do in a concise manner in II.25 but obviously found time later when he provides this in II.20-24.

The structure of books I-III have been much easier for me to discern than IV-VI (esp. VI!). But there are still questions that can be asked. In book III I know this is the final, triadic structuring of the work Richard intended and added. But it is more difficult to ascertain whether Richard first provided the Goodness-Happiness-Glory triad in III.1-5 and then added two new ones in III.13-20 or whether he had the first two in III.1-13 and then added a final one in III.13-20 with a “Single Argument from Benevolence.” What does seem clear is that Richard would often take the final piece of one of his earlier treatments and then expand that in more detail. Thus his conclusions often become starting points for new expansions of his material.

453 The difficulties in bk. VI have long been acknowledged, e.g., Ribaillier, 15: “Le livre VI présente un plan assez confus: la démonstration que le Fils est l’image du Père y est bizarrement dissociée: elle commence au chapitre XI, puis est reprise au chapitre XX.” This thesis corroborates the difficulties that have been noted with bk. VI, but also clarifies why this is so: Bk. VI lacks the intricate trinitarian structuring Richard employs in the other books and consists of earlier material that became distanced as Richard added new meditations.

454 Indeed, as indicated in chapter 2 of this work, this method extends to the relationship between
doing this with his Single Argument from Benevolence as a later expansion. It is also clear that Richard doesn’t hesitate to add a section after some element in his work where more clarity is needed. So, for example, if he suddenly realizes after treating the incommunicability of God’s divine Power and Wisdom that other rational creatures have some power and wisdom, he knows further explanation is needed. The perplexity is that what he just argued is incommunicable may seem to the alert reader to be communicable as well, which is a contradiction. Thus in book II.11-14 he contends with that concern. And the content on either side of that material reveals that it was a later expansion.

When we look to the parenthetical comments at the end of book V we know that at least some of the content of book VI had not been written yet. I believe this material consisted mainly of the “operation of grace vs. nature” questions left unaddressed in book V. If this is true, as seems most likely from the comment in book V, then something has to explain the “table of contents” Richard seems to provide for books III-VI in the opening of book III; for Richard says there what he plans to do in book VI. It seems more likely that the most intricate language and structuring in a work is a sign of the more mature thought of its author. And when we look over the entire treatise of Richard’s
dRichard’s treatises as well. On this, I agree with den Bok (see p. 75 of this work) and only wish to point out that in the same way that this helps us see Richard’s Mystical Ark as an expansion of the final stage of contemplation in his Twelve Patriarchs, here we have evidence of Richard using the same method within De Trinitate itself (Fig. 4.3).

But now that we know Richard’s insertions extended throughout his treatise and were not limited to bk. VI, it is more likely that the “problematic” statement at the end of bk. V represents an earlier stage in Richard’s writing—material we find largely in book VI on the question regarding the operation of nature vs. the operation of grace. Bk. VI, therefore, need not be explained as “ . . . qu’une ébauche non destinée primitivement à la publication.” Ribaillier, 10.

As Richardian scholars have pointed out before, in addition to the similarity of language and style, this allusion to the content of bk. VI in this opening outline of bk. III is evidence for seeing bk. VI as authentically Richardian. Den Bok, 372 n. 177. Ribaillier, 9.
De Trinitate we see that book III’s triadic structures from 1-20 are the most intricate of all. Book III has a greater crystallization of structure and intricacy and nuance. It also has the table of contents Richard provides at the opening of book III that includes a description of what book VI is about (something we know he wrote—at least pieces of—later than book V). In light of these facts, I believe book III represents Richard’s most mature thought. And as a result, this should caution a solely linear analysis of his argument which would fail to see the further ascent in Richard’s thinking by flattening it in that linear flow. Even though his additions are consistent with the flow of the work (e.g., he is simply expanding more details within an existing linear structure of argumentation) there is more to appreciate in Richard. If we see the maturity of his thought as he returned to composing his treatise with new insights it may turn out that the zenith of his contemplations are not to be found at the end of his work, but somewhere in the middle, and probably in book III.457

When we step back and look at the entire picture we discover that Richard himself was still in the process of crafting De Trinitate. This should remind those who seek a final, finished piece to proportion their analysis to the object of their gaze. We cannot claim a finality for a work that was still in progress. What we can do, however, is assess

---

457 Den Bok, referring to bk. III says, “Richard’s notion of love («caritas») does seem to initiate a social view of God’s trinity,” (p. 460), but rejects it on the basis of (a) constraints Richard initiates with his arguments for divine aseity/personhood in bks. I-II, IV, and (b) the fundamental nature of divine-to-human communication as Person-to-person, where the ‘image of God’ mediates this relation. On the final analysis, Richard brings the fullest plenitude to Divinity within those limits, leaving only “great metaphorical value” (p. 491) for his social trinitarian language in bk. III. But this analysis rests on a linear reading of Richard’s De Trinitate, allowing bks. I-II / IV to rein in the “bold undertaking” of bk. III. But if bk. III contains Richard’s most mature thought, and I-II his earliest—as seems evident in bk. III’s having the most intricate structuring as well as the final table of contents for the entire work—then ipso facto bk. III gets the final say and Richard’s mature trinitarianism may be bolder than den Bok suggests.
and discern the clues to the methods and the patterns that reveal where the author was in the process. Having spent extensive time with Richard’s work, and knowing that there is still much work to do, my latest view is that Richard began with the material of the *Quicumque* as he states in book I. This explains the One Omnipotent, God, Lord sequence in books I and II (though it is spread apart now).\(^{458}\) And this material connects with the Unbegotten-Begotten polemical material found in book VI.\(^{459}\) What I believe is that *De Trinitate* began with the *Quicumque* as part of a polemical exchange on the meanings of its terms, the teachings of the church fathers, and probably as a discussion. Then as Richard returned to his written work he expanded with new material, arguments, definitions, clarifications, and structures as he thought of them. Thus *De Trinitate* probably began with the material of the *Quicumque* and a discussion centered on the teachings of the church fathers and the debate over Unbegotten-Begotten substance. It therefore started in an oratory setting which explains the numerous places that speak of “hearers.” But subsequently it evolved from this oratorical setting to become a work of written composition, one Richard expected someone to pick up and “read.”\(^{460}\) Given the

\(^{458}\) See n. 309 of this work.

\(^{459}\) As others have noted, this Begotten-Unbegotten polemical material may have been inspired by Peter Lombard’s *Sentences* and the debate over the traditional formula “*substantia genuit substantiam*.” If so, Richard must have composed this material after the release of the *Sentences* in the year 1151. See Ribaillier, 11, 29.

\(^{460}\) For more on oratorical elements in *De Trinitate*, see n. 129 of this work and den Bok, 99 n. 21. While I agree with den Bok and others on the presence of these elements, they may also represent an earlier compositional stage. Given the simplicity of language found in these sections (e.g., VI.23-25) by contrast with the more intricate sections (e.g., refining Boethius’s definition of ‘person’), and other evidence we’ve put forward, *De Trinitate* probably began by bringing the *Quicumque* into a composed, dialogical exchange with contemporary ideas on the Trinity (e.g., Abelard, Peter Lombard) and developed subsequently as Richard returned to “focus and magnify” sections with new contemplations, and refine the treatise with more localized triads and trinitarian structures (e.g., III.2-20).
polish of Richard’s other works, it is likely Richard would have rewritten the entire treatise with those crystallizations as a new starting point. He simply wasn’t done thinking about them and still believed he might have more to add. And it is fitting that we find a work like Richard’s never ending in its contemplation of the splendor of the Trinity since the journey from imperfect to full and perfect contemplation of Divinity is everlasting. Richard never stopped, he just simply couldn’t finish—an appropriate gift, given the nature of his subject and the craft involved in its contemplation.
APPENDIX C:

LIST OF TRIADS IN RICHARD’S *DE TRINITATE* BY BOOK
### Prologue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faith</th>
<th>Hope</th>
<th>Love</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manifestation</td>
<td>Contemplation</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Heaven</td>
<td>2nd Heaven</td>
<td>3rd Heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortality</td>
<td>Incorruptibility</td>
<td>Eternity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Angelic</td>
<td>Divine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inheritance</td>
<td>Merit</td>
<td>Divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actuality</td>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Intellect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge by Faith</td>
<td>Knowledge by Reason</td>
<td>Knowledge by Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Book I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstration</th>
<th>Inference</th>
<th>Certainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Utility</td>
<td>Supreme Pleasantness</td>
<td>Highest Riches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthy</td>
<td>Suitable</td>
<td>Diligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagerness</td>
<td>Longing</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essence</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Book II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncreated</th>
<th>Eternal</th>
<th>Immeasurable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better State</td>
<td>Equal State</td>
<td>Worse State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Substance</td>
<td>Special Substance</td>
<td>Individual Substance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>Simplicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity</td>
<td>Simplicity</td>
<td>Identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Book III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fullness of Goodness</th>
<th>Fullness of Happiness</th>
<th>Fullness of Glory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Goodness</td>
<td>Divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>Undertake</td>
<td>Seek with Longing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plurality</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Trinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Mutual Love</td>
<td>Supreme Integral Love</td>
<td>Supreme Consummate Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Magnified</td>
<td>Consummated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>Co-Eternal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Impossible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supreme Benevolence</td>
<td>Equal Benevolence</td>
<td>Perfect Benevolence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divinity</td>
<td>Glory</td>
<td>Majesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Book IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unity</th>
<th>Plurality</th>
<th>Mutuality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediately</td>
<td>Mediately</td>
<td>Mediately &amp; Immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>Enoch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceeds from None</td>
<td>Proceeds from One</td>
<td>Proceeds from Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratuitous Love</td>
<td>Gratuitous &amp; Owed Love</td>
<td>Owed Love</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Goodness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>Receiving</td>
<td>Giving &amp; Receiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poured Out</td>
<td>Poured In</td>
<td>Poured Out &amp; In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Book VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>Principal Order</th>
<th>Operation of Nature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Grandson</td>
<td>Great-Grandson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Love</td>
<td>Same Desire</td>
<td>Equal Desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conception</td>
<td>Articulation</td>
<td>Audition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbegotten</td>
<td>Begotten</td>
<td>Neither-Begotten-Nor-Unbegotten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Son</td>
<td>Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Goodness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovered</td>
<td>Learned</td>
<td>Read</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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