Though the soul is dependent on the senses for knowledge of the external world, it enjoys a relative independence of the senses in its knowledge of itself and its own activity. Thus Bonaventure departs from the Aristotelian view that there is nothing in the intellect that is not first in the senses, and he incorporates into his theory of knowledge the way of interiority inherited from Augustine and found in a variety of mystical systems.

**Theology of history.** Among the great theologians of history, Bonaventure is one of the most consistently apocalyptic. Influenced by Joachim of Fiore’s theory of exegesis, Bonaventure interpreted Francis of Assisi as a positive sign of the dawning of a new contemplative age. The adulteration of the wine of revelation by the water of philosophy was seen as a negative sign of apocalyptic import. To Bonaventure it seemed that his own time was experiencing the crisis of the “sixth age” of history. This would be followed by an age of full revelation and peace prior to the end of the world, an age in which the Holy Spirit would lead the church into the full realization of the revelation of Christ, making all rational philosophy and theology superfluous.

**Influence.** Bonaventure’s theological views were instrumental in consolidating late-thirteenth-century opposition to radical Aristotelianism. In the context of the controversy concerning Thomas Aquinas’s philosophy, Franciscans, including John Pecham, Roger Marston, William de la Mare, Walter of Bruges, Matthew of Aquasparta, and others, developed a form of neo-Augustinianism that drew much inspiration from the work of Bonaventure. It is hardly possible, however, to speak of a Bonaventurian school in the fourteenth century. The founding of the College of Saint Bonaventure at Rome by Sixtus V in 1587 was intended to foster Bonaventurian studies. The most significant contribution of the college was the first complete edition of the works of Bonaventure (1588–1599). An attempted Bonaventurian revival in the seventeenth century met with little success. The College of Saint Bonaventure at Quaracchi, near Florence, founded in the late nineteenth century, produced the critical edition of Bonaventure’s works, which provides the basis for the many studies that appeared in the twentieth century.

The influence of Bonaventure as a master of the spiritual life has been extensive, especially in Germany and the Netherlands during the late Middle Ages. The Soliloquy and the Threefold Way were widely disseminated in vernacular translations and influenced Germanic education, piety, and theology for centuries. In Bonaventura deutsch (Bern, 1956), Kurt Ruh calls Bonaventure “an essential factor in the history of the German mind” (p. 295).
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Zachary Hayes (1987)

**BONES** have long been a major object of concern in burial, sacrificial, and divination practices throughout the world. Indeed, this role has been so significant that a number of theories have been developed to explain their prominence. In the earlier part of the twentieth century, many of these theories were based upon evolutionary claims: several scholars hypothesized that the rituals involving bones emerged from earlier hunting cultures, and that the continuing prevalence of bones in the rituals of agricultural societies represented a survival of these earlier beliefs.
Particular emphasis in many of the theories about bones was based on ethnographic evidence from northern Eurasia and northern America, where several hunting societies believed that after they killed an animal, its bones should be treated with ritual care (for instance, buried, hung in trees, thrown into the sea). If done properly, the animal would then be reborn from the bones. The single most famous example of these beliefs is the bear ceremonial, practiced among the Inuit, Saami, and Ainu, among others (see Hallowell, 1926).

Building upon this evidence, figures such as Adolf Friedrich, Karl Meuli, Joseph Henninger, and Walter Burkert argued that these were probably widespread Paleolithic beliefs, and that sacrificial, burial, and divination practices in cultures throughout the world should accordingly be explicated as remnants of these early rituals. Henninger (1971), for example, used this argument to analyze the proscription against breaking the bones of the Passover lamb. Meuli (1946) and Burkert (1983) attempted to explicate ancient Greek sacrificial practice along these lines as well. Combining archaeological data of bone assemblages with the ethnographic record of hunting societies in Siberia, Meuli and Burkert hypothesized that early hunters perhaps felt guilt over killing for food, so they would gather the bones of the killed animals to help restore the animals to life. Accordingly, Meuli and Burkert argued, the ancient Greek sacrificial practice of offering the bones of a slaughtered animal to the gods should be understood as a survival of these earlier hunting rituals.

The problems with such theories are twofold. To begin with, the ethnographic record necessitates a qualification of some of the assumptions made by these scholars concerning hunting rituals. Although it is true that several hunting societies practice rituals to ensure the rebirth of the animals they kill, these rituals are not necessarily focused predominately upon the bones. With the Algonquian Cree, for example, depositing bones in a mortuary is a crucial part of their ritual practices, but equally important is the consumption of the animals’ flesh because the cycle of reincarnation for animals includes the phase of passing through humans (Brightman, 1993). Among the Kwakiutl, as well, a constant concern was to recycle the souls of the animals one killed, but the animals’ skins were at least as important as the bones for this recycling process (see in particular Goldman, 1975, and Walens, 1981).

The second problem with the theories mentioned above is that arguments of survival are often insufficient. Even if a given ritual were to survive from an earlier period, it is still important to understand the meanings that the ritual has for the people who practice it. Because of this, scholars have more recently shifted the focus to analyses of the symbolic associations of rituals in particular cultures. According to this reading, the explanation for the importance of bones in religious practices throughout the world would lie in something simpler than survival from earlier hunter-gatherer practices. The fact that bones survive long after the flesh decays has perhaps made bones—to paraphrase Lévi-Strauss (1963, p. 89)—good to utilize in ritual actions dealing with human afterlife, as well as with sacrifices and divinations to immortal or long-lived gods.

ANCIENT GREEK SACRIFICE. In terms of Greek sacrificial traditions, the most significant attempt to analyze the meanings of the ritual acts has been undertaken by Jean-Pierre Vernant and Marcel Detienne. According to Vernant (1989) and Detienne (1989), the code of early Greek sacrifice can rather be explained with reference to the cultural concerns expressed in Hesiod’s Theogony. There, sacrifice is presented as a recapitulation of the actions of Prometheus. According to Hesiod, Prometheus killed an ox and split it into two portions: the meat and the bones. In order to fool Zeus, Prometheus then disguised both portions—wrapping the bones in fat to make them look appetizing, and hiding the meat in the ox’s stomach to make it look unappetizing. He kept the meat for himself, and offered the disguised bones to Zeus. As a punishment for the trick, Zeus kept fire away from Prometheus, and Prometheus had to steal it in order to cook the meat. Zeus in turn gave humanity women and death. The acts of Prometheus thus won humanity autonomy from the gods, but they also condemned humanity to mortality and a life of labor, as opposed to the immortality of the gods. According to Vernant and Detienne, Greek sacrificial practice is symbolically a repetition of the acts of Prometheus: the offering of bones to the gods thus underscores that gods do not need to eat, while humans, who require sustenance to survive, consume the meat. The sacrificial meal is thus both a communion between gods and humanity as well as a recapitulation of the tragic separation of humanity from the immortal life of the gods. Here, then, the practice of utilizing bones in sacrifice is explicated not through survivals of earlier hunting rituals but rather through the symbolic associations with bones in the culture in question.

BONES IN MORTUARY PRACTICES. Much scholarship has also been undertaken to study the meanings of bones in mortuary practices. A particularly rich area for the study of these practices is Southeast and East Asia, where one finds a strong distinction made between flesh, seen as the inheritance of the mother, and the bones, seen as the inheritance of the father (Lévi-Strauss, 1969, pp. 393–405). In patrilineal cultures that support such a distinction, the goal is often to define ancestors solely in terms of the bones. This has led to the practice of “secondary burial.” After the dead have been buried, they are later dug up again and reburied. The crucial issue here is that during the first internment, the flesh—a pollution that needs to be eradicated—decomposes. The society is then free to bury the bones—associated with the patrilineal line—in a way that ensures the continuity of the patrilineal line freed from the pollution of flesh.

Burial practices of this sort have been described in south China. As James Watson has described among rural Cantonese of the New Territories, Hong Kong, the goal of a family is to maintain the patriline. Marriage is exogamous, so fe-
males are brought in from other lineages in order for a patri-line to continue. Because the patriline is associated with the bones, the flesh that the females contribute is seen as bringing in a dangerous pollution to the family as well. After death, therefore, the goal is to eradicate this flesh and define the ancestor exclusively in terms of the bones. The corpse is first placed in a coffin. Just before the coffin is taken out of the village, the daughters and daughters-in-law of the deceased rub their hair against the coffin, thus absorbing the pollution of the decaying flesh. The coffin is then buried. Then, after roughly seven years (and after the flesh has fully decomposed), the bones are exhumed. The bones are cleaned of every last scrap of flesh and are then placed in a ceramic urn. An auspicious location is determined, and the bones are reburied in a tomb. If done properly, the bones are then believed to bring fertility and good luck to the descendants.

The Merina of Madagascar, as described by Maurice Bloch (1971), also practice secondary burial, but with somewhat different cultural concerns. When a death occurs, the dead person is simply buried on a hillside near the place where the death occurred. This first burial represents the death of the individual. After the corpse has decomposed, the remains are then exhumed. Unlike the Cantonese, however, effort is made to recover not just the bones but also some of the powdered remains of the flesh. The difference here presumably is due to the fact that, unlike the exogamous Cantonese, the Merina are endogamous: because the mother of the deceased came from within the same kin group, the Merina do not feel the need to define the flesh as a nonline-age pollution requiring full eradication (Bloch and Parry, 1982, pp. 20–21). The decomposed corpse would then be moved to a communal ancestral tomb in the land of the deceased’s kin group. For the reburial, the corpses of the other ancestors were taken out and—together with the corpses of the recently deceased—danced with joyously, then reburied in the communal tomb. This communal secondary burial in the ancestral land represents the collectivity and continuity of the ancestral line.

In other burial practices, the goal is to have the soul escape from the confines of the bones. In Hindu practices in Benares, as described by Parry (1982), proper death is believed to occur when the chief mourner cracks open the skull of the corpse to release the vital breath. Following this, the entire body of the corpse is cremated, and the ashes are thrown into the Ganges. The goal, in short, is the complete destruction of the body. Death is thus symbolically presented as though the deceased had renounced his or her own body. Parry argues that the goal is to present each individual death as a recapitulation of the beginning of the cosmos, in which Viṣṇu generated the world through a self-sacrifice. The mortuary practice is thus presented symbolically as part of a regeneration of life.

In all of these mortuary practices, reproduction is indeed crucial—the reproduction of the patriline, the kin group, or the world as a whole. Bones play a crucial role in this reproduction. Yet bones are not necessarily seen as the basis of that reproduction. The particular meanings attached to bones vary dramatically across cultures, and the ways that bones are utilized vary as well with the forms of reproduction that the rituals seek to create.

**Scapulimancy.** Similar points made regarding mortuary practices could also be made with regard to divination practices of scapulimancy. During the late period of the Chinese Shang dynasty (c. 1500–1050 BCE), divinations to ancestors were made through the use of the scapula of oxen and the carapaces of turtles (see Keightley, 1978). Heat was applied to the bones, and the diver then read the resulting cracks in the bones to foretell the future. The divinations themselves were then carved into the bone. Similar forms of scapulimancy (without the carved inscriptions) have been recorded in Mongolia (see in particular Bawden, 1959), Tibet, Japan, and Siberia (Cooper, 1936). It was also practiced in North America among Algonquin speakers, who would utilize the caribou or hare shoulder blade or grous sternum (Speck, 1935, p. 139; Tanner, 1979, pp. 117–124), as well as among northern Athabaskan speakers (Cooper, 1936).

Because scapulimancy is practiced in many of the same cultures across northern Eurasia and the Americas that scholars looked to for examples of hunting rituals concerning bones, attempts have been made to connect scapulimancy to beliefs associating bones with rebirth. Mircea Eliade, for example, proposed that bones were used for divination because they symbolized everything pertaining to the future of life (Eliade, 1964, pp. 164–165). While this remains a hypothesis worth exploring, other explanations have been attempted as well. Bogoras (1907, pp. 487–488), for example, points out that the Chukchi of Siberia treated the scapula used for divination as world maps. Keightley, in part inspired by Bogoras, has suggested that Shang divination bones may have also had the same symbolic associations (2000, pp. 93–96). Further research on the meaning of bones in the numerous cultures that practice scapulimancy would well repay the efforts.

**See Also** Death; Relics; Sacrifice.
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