The Historiography of pre-1773 Jesuit Philosophy: 1814–2018

(15,382 words)

Jacob Schmutz
jacob.schmutz@sorbonne-universite.fr
Last modified: November 2018

Article Table of Contents

In 1849, Orestes Brownson (1803–76), a famous New England intellectual recently converted from Presbytarianism to Catholicism, visited the College of the Holy Cross in Worcester (Massachusetts), one of the oldest Catholic institutions of higher learning in the United States of America. He expressed dismay at the fact that its freshly imported Jesuit Italian professor of philosophy "virtually adopted Cartesianism."[1] He was obviously expecting something much more romantically medieval.

Why Descartes in a nineteenth-century American Jesuit college, and not any of the heroes of Jesuit Scholasticism, such as for instance Francisco Suárez (1548–1617)? Brownson's experience was telling of the state of Jesuit education in the first half of the nineteenth century. After the restoration of the Society in 1814, looking back at the founding thinkers of the "first" Society of Jesus (1540–1773) was simply not a first-hand option. The generational link with the former had almost been completely broken, and the teaching of philosophy meant taking position in a very scattered field, dominated by the ideological debates of post-Napoleonic Europe. It would take several decades for the Society of Jesus to recover its own past tradition and to progressively establish a new set of authorities for philosophical education. In this contribution, I will attempt to sketch the emergence of a historiographical tradition on pre-1773 Jesuit philosophy, within as well as outside the Society of Jesus, and explain its different ideological motivations and hermeneutical options. I will show that nineteenth- and twentieth-century Jesuit and non-Jesuit historians of philosophy had very different, sometimes even competing, interests in recovering this tradition. I will attempt to explain how a canon of classical Jesuit philosophers was constituted, how this historiography became progressively deconfessionalized, and why Jesuit philosophy—and not Descartes, as taught by Brownson's anonymous professor—is today perceived by many historians as the true archetype of modernity: "Suárez was already a distinctively modern thinker, perhaps more authentically than Descartes," claims for instance Alasdair McIntyre.[2]

A Difficult Nineteenth-Century Recovery

When arriving at the newly restored Roman College (1824), the young Carlo Maria Curci, S.J. (1809–91), future founder of the journal *La Civiltà cattolica*, described philosophical education as in a "Babylonian state," in which the only common denominator seemed to have been the onslaught on Aristotelianism.[3] What remained of the influence of eighteenth century Jesuit textbooks had indeed little to do with the sixteenth century curriculum, but was a rather eclectic mixture of experimental sensualism and Wolffian rationalism, as illustrated for instance in the works of the Silesian Kaspar Sagner (1720–81)[4] and the Austrian Sigismund von Storchenau (1731–98), two formerly Jesuit authors that were still widely used in early nineteenth-century Spain and in the Bourbon territories of Italy. The major intellectual preoccupation for Jesuit authorities was not the historical recovery of the past tradition, but the establishment of new textbooks susceptible to provide a minimum of doctrinal uniformity to the re-established order. Equally appalled at the bad condition of philosophical teaching, the Dutch superior general Jan Roothaan, S.J. (1783–1853), often portrayed as the "second founder" of the Society, promoted a new *Ratio studiorum* (1830–31), which reasserted the benefits of traditional Jesuit education and set a conservative agenda, rejecting new trends and liberal ideas. Having himself taught Scholastic philosophy in his early days, Roothaan was convinced of the necessity of returning "to the old doctrines."[5]

Roothaan found support in the figure of a Piemontese nobleman, Luigi Taparelli d'Azeglio, S.J. (1793–1862), who had become the first rector of the Roman College.[6] In spite of enjoying the authority of a rector, Taparelli had to keep his own personal study group almost secret, since it was dedicated to Thomas Aquinas, much to the distaste of his eclectic and modernist colleagues. After five years at the head of the Roman College, he was pushed out to become Provincial of Naples—a move often seen as a victory for the opponents of Scholasticism within the Society. It took indeed at least two more decades for the "Thomistic" turn promoted by Taparelli to really gain ground within the new Society. From his new base in Naples, the Piemontese labored hard to impose his views, with the help of two brothers, Serafino Sordi, S.J. (1793–1865) and Domenico Sordi, S.J. (1790–1880), both born in the Province of Piacenza, where they had been students of the prominent Vincenzo Buzzetti (1777–1824), one of the key figures of the Thomistic revival within Enlightenment Catholicism.[7] With the founding of the journal *La Civiltà cattolica* (1850),[8] these Naples-based Jesuits designed a powerful new tool in which they associated their desire to restore Thomism as the standard Catholic philosophy with their political anti-liberalism and support of the temporal claims of the papacy. It is important here to remember that Pope Pius IX had two years earlier sought refuge in Naples after the 1848 revolution, and found a powerful support among the Jesuits against the Republican ideals of Giuseppe Mazzini and Giuseppe Garibaldi.[9] It was from this environment that first new influential textbooks of philosophy emerged, by Matteo Liberatore, S.J. (1810–92), another student of Taparelli in Naples, and Józef Alojzy Dmowski, S.J. (1799–1879), a Pole who had done his theological studies under Taparelli's rectorate in Rome. This Thomistic turn eventually triumphed at the highest level in the Vatican, when a former student of Taparelli's secret group, the young Gioacchino Pecci (1810–1903),[10] issued the famous 1879 encyclical *Aeterni Patris* as pope Leo XIII: certainly not the birth-act of neo-Thomism, as commonly assumed, but rather a belated consecration of a powerful tradition that had gained the favor of many nineteenth-century Jesuits.[11]

This close association of the restored Jesuits with the triumph of neo-Thomism had important consequences on their own philosophical historiography, i.e. on the way they would look at the past intellectual achievements of the Society.[12] In 1886, an anonymous contributor to the prestigious British philosophy journal *Mind* summarized it in a very grim fashion: being now "coerced into a way of thinking more conformable with the philosophy of St. Thomas," it was to be expected that soon, nobody in the Society would uphold a natural philosophy in line with contemporary science, so that the

"Atomistic school will have died out," since "Jesuits, whether professors or others, rarely pass the age of sixty."[13] This anonymous commentator was referring to the earlier decision (1878) of the Belgian superior general Pieter-Jan Beckx (1795–1887) to enforce the teaching of the neo-Thomist doctrine of the real distinction of matter and form in all colleges of the Society—and this at a time when modern science had definitely given a farewell to Aristotelian hylemorphism. By suddenly committing themselves to a scientifically antiquated *medieval* authority—Thomas Aquinas—the Jesuits seemed to renew the recommendation of the harshly disputed 1599 *Ratio studiorum*, but at the same time rejected two centuries of Jesuit progress of studies. This left the Jesuit generations of the late nineteenth century with two contradicting options: either admitting that the Jesuits, as a *Renaissance* or *early modern* order founded in 1540, had to pursue this tradition of adapting Christian theology to changing historical contexts; or on the contrary, saving, among the 233 years of past Jesuit philosophy (1540–1773), only what was the best testimony of the "traditionalism" of the early Jesuits, namely their commitment to the philosophy of Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas, enshrined as authorities in their historical *Ratio studiorum*.[14]

Although the first option was followed by a number of Jesuit theologians of the so-called "Roman School,"[15] such as Carlo Passaglia, S.J. (1812–87) and Johann Baptist Franzelin, S.J. (1816–86), defenders of a more historical-philological approach to Christian theology and therefore interested in the achievement of some early modern Jesuit historians of dogma, such as in particular Denis Petau (1583–1652),[16] it was clearly the second, "Neapolitan" option, that won the ideological battle for the shaping of the philosophical curriculum,[17] as it is for instance symbolized by Liberatore's role in the condemnation (1849) of the "ontologism" of Antonio Rosmini (1797–1855), who had made an original attempt to construct a Christian philosophy adapted to modernity, but who was now suddenly accused of giving too much weight to "subjectivism."[18] A German Jesuit usually associated with the "Roman School," Joseph Kleutgen, S.J. (1811–83),[19] illustrates this "overlapping"[20] between the desire to resource theology and the criticism of early-modern philosophy. He rose to prominence with his bestseller *Philosophie der Vorzeit* (1860–63),[21] a book initially directed against modernist tendencies within German Catholic theology, which was rapidly (1866–68) translated into Italian by the Neapolitan circle of Taparelli. This book celebrated the achievements of medieval Scholastic method, and identified some early modern Jesuits such as Suárez, Vázquez, and Lugo as its paramount synthesis. This narrative went hand in hand with a strong repudiation of late medieval nominalism as well as of Cartesian scepticism and subjectivism, seen as the hallmark of a "modern philosophy" having lost track of any foundation in the ultimate structure of reality. It became the neo-Scholastic historiographical masterplan for decades to come, and it forced the Jesuits into a decisively medieval turn.

This had a strong consequence on their own historiography, since among Jesuit authorities, only those closely linked to the ancient and medieval tradition had to be rescued. This explains the vast intellectual program of historical recovery of Jesuit sources that started in the 1860s, which corresponded indeed to a form of "Jesuit *ressourcement* [...] regarding its early traditions in text," as Thomas Worcester, S.J. described it.[22] The philosophical focus was almost exclusively put on the early 1580–1620 "founding" generation, as opposed to all the later seventeenth and eighteenth-century modernizing Jesuits, often brilliant innovators in experimental science, who had contributed to the development of Enlightenment philosophy and who had effectively been the initial intellectual references of the restored Society.[23] But Sagner, Storchenau and their 'novantique' contemporaries were now dismissed as "Wolffians" or "modernists." This program of historical recovery of the early Jesuits took two steps: the first one was a series of nineteenth-century reprints of Jesuit classics, all taken from the first founding generation or from authors compatible with the neo-Thomist agenda. The most famous project was the 26-volume Vivès reprint (Paris, 1856–61)[24] of Suárez's *Opera omnia*, of mainly theological nature, its author being thereby erected as the "founding father" of Jesuit Scholasticism. Other theological reprints correspond to the key references of Kleutgen, such as the complete theology of Juan de Lugo (Paris, 1891–94) and Luis de Molina's polemical *Concordia* (Paris, 1876). One of the earliest Jesuit commentaries on Aquinas' *Summa*, by the Jesuit Francisco de Toledo (1534–1609) was edited based on manuscripts by Giuseppe Paria, S.J. (1814–81), a Roman archivist linked to the *Civiltà cattolica* group (Rome, 1869). Among purely philosophy courses, Liberatore himself arranged for a new edition of the *Quaestiones philosophicae* of the Roman Jesuit Silvestro Mauro, S.J. (1619–87; repr. Paris, 1876). Although a later figure, Mauro was closely linked to the Augustinian-Thomistic turn that had imposed itself in the Roman College in the middle of the seventeenth century, and he was remembered especially as a brilliant commentator of Aristotle. His paraphrasis was also unearthed by the future Jesuit cardinal Franz Ehrle (1845–1934), as an antidote to the growing body of Protestant neo-Aristotelianism of the nineteenth century (Paris, 1885–86). But the most striking testimony of the neo-Thomist agenda was probably the choice of reprinting the *Summa philosophica* of the Jesuit Cosma Alamanni (1559–1634; repr. Paris, 1885–92), a rather secondary and largely uninfluential Jesuit professor of the college of Milan. Its major virtue must have been its lack of originality: Alamanni professed classical Suarezian views, and he had organized his work in a fashion appealing for neo-Thomism, with a *Prima, Prima-Secundae, Secunda-Secundae* and *Tertia pars*, reminiscent of the names of the different parts of Aquinas's *Summa of Theology*.

The second step consisted in the promotion of historical scholarship applied to the early Society of Jesus. The major output was the drafting of vast histories of the first Society for each national context, which usually always included a section dedicated to education, the development of Jesuit philosophy and sometimes even references to archival sources. But in the same time, historical method was applied to Jesuit scholastic philosophy itself and to its authors. The French Jesuits were here incontestable leaders in this enterprise. The famous nine-volume *Bibliotheca* by the Alsatian Carlos Sommervogel, S.J. (1834–1902), based on earlier work by the Flemish Augustin de Backer, S.J. (1809–73), remains to date the most complete repertory of philosophical sources produced by the Jesuits—although "woefully incomplete"[25] when it comes to manuscripts, university dissertations or certain less documented national contexts. Sommervogel himself and other French Jesuits also contributed to a great number of entries in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (1899–1950), a monument of apologetics, in which we find some jewels of historical erudition, such as the eighty-column long (but today almost never quoted) entry on "God" by Marcel Chossat, S.J. (1863–1926).[26] Raoul de Scorraille, S.J. (1842–1921) composed an authoritative biography of Suárez, which remains an unsurpassed archive work, in spite of its hagiographic tone.[27] Under the Franco regime, the Basque Jesuit Eleuterio Elorduy (1896–1990), one of the finest experts on Suárez's thought in the twentieth century, labored all his life to obtain the beatification of the *Doctor Eximius*.[28]

Enshrining Suárez as a "second Aquinas" at the age of triumphant neo-Thomism remained a risky enterprise: to ruin it, it sufficed to rebuke Kleutgen's claim that the Jesuits were the most accomplished expositors of Aquinas, and show that their philosophy had already been contaminated by the "spirit of modernity." And as a matter of fact, Jesuit neo-Thomism or "Suarezianism" quickly proved a difficult position to hold, as they came under regular attack from various sides, especially from their historical Dominican opponents who revived seventeenth-century polemics about the correct interpretation of key philosophical issues, such as the proper object of metaphysics, the hylemorphic structure of the human composite or the nature of intellectual abstraction. Norberto del Prado, O.P. (1852–1918), who held the prestigious chair of dogmatic theology at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland), concluded harshly: "Suarez [...] non ambulat per vias D. Thomae."[29] This lead to a considerable inflation of literature dedicated to the founding figures of the Society, either to reaffirm the epistemological validity of Jesuit contributions—as opposed to the traditional Thomistic realism—or, on the contrary, to argue for the Thomistic orthodoxy of Jesuit philosophy. When the Vatican issued the *24 Thomistic Theses* (1904) in a desperate attempt to fix the philosophical canon of proper Christian philosophy,[30] Jesuits had to vindicate their own tradition, admitting that a number of definitions—for instance on the entitative character of prime matter or the "intentional" distinction between essence and existence—did not correspond exactly to what the Vatican had declared proper Thomistic doctrine. Historical studies on key metaphysical concepts such as essence and existence, causality, creation etc.

among Jesuit authors appeared in scores, but even one of the most dedicated defenders of the value of Jesuit metaphysics, the Frenchman Pedro Descoqs, S.J. (1877–1946), seemed forced to confess that the "unity of material being is conceived by the Angelic Doctor in a more metaphysical and much more satisfactory manner than by Suárez."[31] No wonder that in later generations, number of prominent professors of philosophy in key Jesuit institutions would just convert themselves to "real" historical Thomism: an early case was Pierre Rousselot, S.J. (1878–1915), whose promising career was interrupted by his untimely death on the WWI front, who wrote a seminal work on the *Intellectualism of Thomas Aquinas* (1908). Other exemplary cases of an attempt to return to orthodox Thomism include another Frenchman, Joseph de Finance, S.J. (1904–2000), in Rome, or George P. Klubertanz, S.J. (1912–72) in the United States, whose studies are still considered today as some of the key contributions to Aquinas scholarship. Another option consisted in abandoning the "Scholastic ghetto"[32] as both a philosophical dead end and as fundamentally improper for the urgent task of the renovation of theology. This lead to denouncing the rationalist deviation of their forefathers, as it will be epitomized in the work of Henri de Lubac, S.J. (1896–1991), another prominent student of Rousselot, and in the turn towards Patristics promoted among the Lyons Jesuits of Fourvière College, the key centre of "Ressourcement" theology.[33] Although one of the last attempts to defend the "Thomistic" character of Vatican II was the work of a Jesuit—and first American cardinal ever—Avery Dulles, S.J. (1918–2008), who wrote a very rationalist treatise on Christian faith still indebted to Kleutgen's classics from Suárez to Lugo, one has to admit that most prominent Jesuit theologians of the twentieth century, such as the Canadian Bernard Lonergan, S.J. (1904–84), the Germans Erich Przywara, S.J. (1889–1972) and Karl Rahner, S.J. (1904–84), the Swiss Hans Urs von Balthasar, S.J. (1905–88, he left the Society in 1950), or the Frenchman Jean Daniélou, S.J. (1905–74) showed little interest in the philosophy of their Renaissance forefathers, reverting only to the spiritual message of Saint Ignatius and to the recovery of scriptural and Patristic sources of Christianity. Przywara for instance made it clear that Suárez had "betrayed" Thomism by committing himself to some form of Scotist univocity in his conception of being—an interpretation popularized by his Swiss student von Balthasar.[34] The philosophical heroes of Jesuit philosophy ceased even to be Christian: the bestseller of post-WWII Jesuit philosophy was *The Thought of Karl Marx* (1956) by Jean-Yves Calvez, S.J. (1927–2010), not to mention all the studies dedicated to Sigmund Freud, even to explain Ignatius's own vocation.[35]

First Attempts at Historicizing Jesuit Philosophy

Outside of the Jesuit order, the major obstacle to the development of a historiography in the nineteenth-century were the aftershocks of the powerful eighteenth-century anti-Jesuitism that accompanied the 1773 dissolution of the Society. This anti-Jesuitism had taken many forms. In its first and most famous form, Jesuits were considered potential enemies of what was then believed to be a major achievement of modernity: the national, absolutist and bureaucratic state. In constituted states, such as France or Portugal, the Jesuits were seen as dangerous heretics, capable to disrupt the public order, with their doctrines of political "resistance," as for instance in Michelet's bestseller *Des jésuites* (1843); in non-unified countries, such as Italy, the Jesuits were seen the major obstacle to political unification, as in Gioberti's pamphlet *Il gesuita moderno* (1846). But a second more philosophical type of anti-Jesuitism is more directly relevant for our interest here: Jesuits were identified with Scholasticism, and its abstruse distinctions and terminology, and for that reason were totally downgraded or even omitted in most histories of philosophy, a genre in growth.[36] Johan Gottlieb Buhle (1763–1821), in the volume dedicated to early modern philosophy of his eight-volume *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie* (1796–1804), translated into French and Italian, has little to say about them, besides dismissing their "pedantism, lack of taste, sophistry and useless subtleties,"[37] and the fact that they persecuted all reformers of philosophy, in particular their own former student Descartes.[38] A few decades later, in Bavaria, where the Jesuits had played an immense role in building up a higher education system, the anticlerical Munich professor Carl von Prantl (1820–88) despised them publicly as *Jesuiten-Nullen,*[39] and considered their domination of pre-secularization universities in Europe as a "historical misfortune" for philosophy.[40]

But in spite of this rampant anti-Jesuitism, an academic historiography on Jesuit philosophy started developing in European secular universities for an unexpected motive, which entailed also its first deconfessionalization: nationalism and regionalism, which were powerful forces in post Napoleonic-Europe. Pride of the achievements of the nation has led non-clerical nineteenth-century historians to acknowledge the place of Jesuits in the history of philosophy, even if sometimes reluctantly admitting that they had constituted the bulk of intellectual life in places that did not produce any of the great minds of what had become (largely until now) the new official equation of European philosophy (British empiricism + French rationalism = German criticism). In Italy, a secular and spiritualist philosopher teaching in Padua, Baldassare Poli (1795–1883), was appalled at the absence of Italian authors (besides Boethius and Aquinas) in the influential eleven-volume history of philosophy by the (Protestant) Marburg professor Wilhelm Gottlieb Tennemann (1761–1819), another of the key representatives of the historicization of philosophy in Germany. While taking care of an Italian translation of the work (it had already exerted major influence in France thanks to a translation by Victor Cousin, who reproduced its three-stage vision of philosophy from ancient, medieval to modern), Poli composed two volumes of *Supplementi,* which contain numerous and still historiographically precious references to the achievement of Italian Jesuit philosophers, mainly of the post-Cartesian period, next to more commonly known figures of Italian Enlightenment such as Giambattista Vico (1668–1744)—himself a former student of the powerful college of the Jesuits of Naples[41]. But Poli managed to never mention that any of the authors he highlighted—such as for instance the Sicilian Jesuit Giuseppe Polizzi (1603–91), whom he claimed to have developed a theory of induction comparable to Bacon's—were actually Jesuits. In Spain, a similar attitude prevailed in the historical work of the Andalucian regionalist Mario Méndez Bejarano (1857–1931), who could not miss to mention number of Jesuit Scholastic professors of the past centuries in the Southernmost province of Spain (1929).[42]

The interest into Jesuit philosophy benefitted also from the rising historiography on medieval philosophy that took place in the nineteenth century. Besides nationalist or romantic motivations, this historiography often took an apologetic turn, as a response to the secularization of universities. In Bavaria for instance, Prantl's criticism was immediately met with apologetical responses emphasizing the value of Jesuit learning, in a spirit typical of the German nineteenth-century *Kulturkampf*. A college teacher from Eichstätt, Franz Sales Römstock[43] drafted a precious prosopographic register of Jesuit philosophers, and it took the efforts of a French Jesuit, Charles-Hyppolite Verdière, S.J. (1887),[44] to propose an alternative history of the university of Ingolstadt, the flagship institution of Bavarian Jesuits. Decades earlier, a little-known Bavarian Benedictine, Thaddä Anselm Rixner, O.S.B. (1766–1838), author of a resolutely anti-modern and counter-revolutionary history of philosophy[45] had already written a history of philosophy in Bavaria in which long sections were devoted to the achievements not only of his fellow Benedictines, but also of the Jesuits.[46] Academic history, then a booming discipline all over Europe, proved a propitious field to recover some achievements of the past Jesuits. In France, abbot Jean-Marie Prat (1809–91) led the way with studies on Juan Maldonado (1533–83) and on key institutions such as the college of Clermont in Paris and the University of Pont-à-Mousson.[47] The growing historicization of the medieval philosophical tradition also helped to integrate the Jesuits into the long history of now triumphant Thomism: an influential and evocative case is the three-volume *History of Medieval Philosophy* (1864–66) by the Bavarian canon Albert Stöckl (1823–95), in which the third volume erects Suárez as the saviour of Scholasticism after the onslaught of Renaissance skepticism and eclectism,[48] as well as the work of the Austrian prelate Karl Werner (1821–88), who also tried to grasp the specific "modernity" of early modern Scholasticism and to differentiate it from its medieval models.[49] A similar stance can be found in the work of Martin Grabmann (1875–1949), the acclaimed German Aquinas-scholar and historian of Scholastic method, who wrote a seminal article on what he believed to be the unprecedented structure of Suárez's *Metaphysical Disputations* (1917).[50]

Jesuit Philosophy and the Question of Modernity

Following this historical rediscovery, the major issue for historiography was now to understand the place of the Jesuits within a well-established narrative of "modernity"[51]: for some authors, broadly speaking "secularist" and often anticlerical, modernity was identified with the rise of the national absolutist state and with the autonomy of the subject-citizen. For others, very often those still attached to *ancien régime* values, modernity was the betrayal of divine revelation, the rise of moral and intellectual relativism, and the definitive loss of temporal power for the papacy. Politico-theological issues, much more than metaphysical ones, were thus the central points of contention. Considering that the first Jesuits composed their works during the sixteenth and seventeenth-century debates between church and state, one easily understands why the assessment of their political thought suddenly became a heated issue, much more than their contribution to logic, metaphysics or natural philosophy.

This explains why the first, outside of Jesuit circles, to have shifted from a negative to a positive valuation of Jesuit philosophy were paradoxically not Catholics (still largely influenced by anti-Jesuitism), but Protestants and even Jews. A good example was the nineteenth-century German Protestant reception of the political and legal philosophy of the Jesuits. A Saxon aristocrat, Karl von Kaltenborn-Stachau (1817–66), wrote one of the first modern histories of natural law and contributed to uncover the Catholic sources of Hugo Grotius's acclaimed *De iure belli ac pacis* (1625)[52]—a motive that has been repeated *ad nauseam* in histories of legal philosophy to this day. The Jesuit contribution to "secularized" conceptions of natural law has become a key element for claiming their modernity. In France, where the souvenir of Enlightenment anti-Jesuitism was still very vivid, it took Adolphe Franck (1810–93)—himself a secular Jew defending a rationalist conception of natural law—to give a first positive appraisal of Francisco Suárez's contribution to the post-religious refoundation of legal philosophy.[53]

But the most telling and fascinating case is probably the Italian intellectual context: a non-unified State in the nineteenth century, the Italian intelligentsia was then divided between secular monarchists, papal monarchists and republican nationalists. Considering the prominent place Jesuits had occupied in Italian learning during three centuries, it was essential to understand their own conception of the relationship between the secular state and the papal claim for political supremacy. Much more than any medieval author, it was the generation of the Jesuit Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621) which was at the center of all attention. The historiographical debate really took off in the 1850s between papalist Jesuits—headed by the conspicuous Taparelli d'Azeglio and the *Civiltà cattolica* group from Naples—and anti-papalist nationalist historians, then headed by the Hegelian philosopher Bertrando Spaventa (1817–83). Taparelli claimed Suárez for a Christian monarchy; and Spaventa replied with a series of fiery pamphlets, later reprinted by the equally nationalist and proto-Fascist Giovanni Gentile (1875–1944), claiming on the contrary Suárez and the Jesuits as the true fathers of modern doctrines of democracy and popular sovereignty.[54] He accused Taparelli to radically misrepresent Suárez: "non è il vero Suárez, ma un dottore posticcio ad uso dei gesuiti del secolo decimonono."[55] He was a good historian enough to see a considerable shift among Jesuit authors: whereas many seventeenth century Jesuits, in France just as in Spain, had been outspoken monarchists (the famous "jésuites gallicans" in France), he labored to show that the (supposedly) true founders of the Jesuit tradition, such as Suárez, Mariana and Bellarmino, advocated a doctrine of the double *potestas*, or indirect power of the king, that anticipated modern theories of contractualism: only God, and the people of God, were the ultimate bearers of sovereignty, which would legitimize a Republican constitution and an opposition to the temporal monarchs, as Suárez is believed to have outlined it in his contested *Defensio fidei* (1613) against the English king James Ist. The possibility of presenting Jesuit political thought as anti-monarchist and pro-democratic explains why anti-clerical authors suddenly became interested in them, as it was the case for Giuseppe Saitta (1885–1965) in Italy, with an influential essay entitled *Sixteenth Century Scholasticism and the Politics of the Jesuits.*[56] Himself an ex-priest who had become a nationalist in Gentilian fashion, he paid lip-service to the "revolutionary" aspect of some elements of Jesuit political philosophy. Even in Anglican circles, Suárez suddenly became somewhat of a hero: Cambridge-educated constitutional historian John Neville Figgis (1866–1919) claimed that with his doctrine of indirect power, Bellarmine and Suárez "look forward to the modern separation of Church and State."[57] Another classical work on Jesuit philosophy focusing on their politics are the three volumes entitled *Second Scholasticism* by Carlo Giacon, S.J. (1900–84), written during the difficult years of WWII, and which he saw as an intellectual contribution to the restoration of a Christian Democratic order in post-war Italy.[58]

During the twentieth century, a number of scholars have thus insisted on the "modernity" of Jesuit philosophy lying in their proto-contractualism, their secularization of the concept of natural law and their subjective or facultative conception of human rights. The pioneers of this major shift in historiography are unfortunately largely forgotten today. In the Spanish-speaking world, a key author was Luis Recaséns Siches (1903–77), born in Guatemala, educated in positivist and neo-Kantian philosophy and member of the Spanish Republican government before being exiled to Mexico. He had written an influential 1927 PhD dissertation on the legal philosophy of Suárez which presented him as a contractualist and thinker of democracy. Attention has also been given to the Jesuit economic thought, stressing its role in the development of "modern" conceptions of value, money and commercial exchange. In a 1935 Cambridge dissertation, Hector M. Robertson (1905–84) turned towards the Jesuits to refute the famous Weberian thesis of a "Protestant" birth of modern capitalism, and the interest in their economic thought has grown ever since.[59] The most vocal advocate in considering the Jesuits as "modern" and not medieval was certainly Franz Borkenau (1900–57), an Austrian thinker close to the Frankfurt School, who published in his Parisian exile an important work on the comparative influence of Jesuit and Jansenist theologies of grace on early modern political thought.[60] All these contributions have been essential in shaping a new periodization of the history of philosophy, removing the Jesuits from their place as "last medievals" or "restorers" of Scholasticism, as the neo-Thomists saw them, and placing them on the contrary at the very eve of modernity. English-speaking scholarship, since the seminal remarks by the Italian-educated German émigré Wolfgang von Leyden (1911–2004) on the potential influence of Suárez on John Locke (1632–1704),[61] has also granted due attention to Jesuit political and legal philosophy, which enjoys for instance a good coverage in Quentin Skinner's influential *Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (1978).[62] Following von Leyden, Morton White (1917–2016) has even an exaggeratedly kind word for the long-term impact of Suárez as having anticipated the doctrine of the American revolutionaries.[63]

Even neo-conservative critics of modernity largely embraced this secularization paradigm, transforming the Jesuits into the ideal scapegoats for the rise of positivistic conceptions of law and moral relativism. Among the most influential proponents of such a reading, we find the French legal scholar Michel Villey (1914–88), who argued that the major "disaster" of early modern legal philosophy was the shift from natural *right* to natural *laws*, operated by the Jesuits: "in contrast with Aquinas, it seems that Suárez inclines towards rationalism. He enlarges the field of precepts that we could find in the treasure of our reason." He thereby accomplishes the "metamorphosis of natural right into a system of rational law."[64]

Attempts to vindicate the "modernity" of the Jesuits in the realm of theoretical philosophy, i.e. mainly logic, theory of cognition, metaphysics were no less polemical. Again, it depended on the definition given to "modernity," and it was perhaps less easy than in political philosophy. Parallel to the rise of the autonomous political subject against divine or monarchical heteronomy, a well-entrenched narrative characterizes "philosophical" modernity as the rise of the knowing subject who contemplates the world according to the rules of its own understanding. This is why many scholars, from Martin Heidegger to Michel Foucault, have defined modernity as the "age of representation." Vindicating human "ideas" as the prime object of human understanding had

Michel Foucault, have defined modernity as the "age of representation." Vindicating human "ideas" as the prime object of human understanding had become the hallmark of Descartes, the *Logique* of Port-Royal or of Locke, a "way of ideas" that leaves the external world unknown in itself. Historiography embarked on a search for pre-modern roots of this conception, and Suárez became again a good candidate to illustrate the turning point between late medieval nominalism and early modern idealism. Historians of philosophy inspired by the phenomenological method thereby reiterated the criticism Jacques Maritain (1882–1973) had already leveled against the Jesuits in his 1924 *Reflections on Intelligence*: "Descartes, misguided by Vázquez and his false notion of the objective concept [...], believes that the immediate object of intellectual perception is not the thing itself, but some image or picture of the thing in us."[65] A similar interpretation is given, in phenomenological fashion, by Jean-François Courtine, who speaks of the objective concept as a "screen" between the thinking mind and the extramental thing.[66]

Jesuit philosophy thereby became a matter of interest as the *source* of early modern innovations, first in theory of knowledge, and then also in logic, metaphysics and to a lesser degree in the philosophy of nature, in particular causality. The Jesuits could then be considered as "modern" if they anticipated Descartes or Kant; in the opposite case, they were relegated to the "medieval" past. Given the enormous importance historians of early modern philosophy have given to theories of knowledge as a defining element of modernity (from Cartesian clear and distinct ideas and Lockean sensations down to Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*), it should not be surprising that the Jesuit contributions to the history of philosophical psychology were the first to have been studied in that perspective.

Franz Brentano (1838–1917), known for his many borrowings from Scholastic vocabulary, dedicated already a few pages to Suárez in his early work on Aristotelian psychology.[67] Another interesting pioneer of this approach was the early work of Hermann Schwarz (1864–1951), who had composed a history of early modern theories of perception which started with a long discussion of Scholastic *species,*[68] based mainly on the works of Gabriel Biel and his influence on Francisco Suárez (1895). It was the beginning of a new type of historiography: whereas neo-Thomist readers of Suárez had always vindicated his "Thomism,"[69] Schwarz was one of the first to highlight the impact of late-medieval nominalism on Jesuit philosophy. The book influenced strongly Ernst Cassirer when he wrote his *Substance and Function* (1910), and its problematic echoed typical neo-Kantian concerns about concept formation and the interplay between sensibility and understanding.

It is also from this German background that we have to understand Martin Heidegger's sustained interest in Suárez, in whom he saw the godfather of modern metaphysics. For Heidegger, the systematization of the *Disputationes* constituted in a certain way the paramount example of oblivion of being, by reducing being to a pure concept. In a chapter of *Sein und Zeit* entitled the "task of a destructuring of the history of ontology," he celebrated Suárez for having constructed what he now calls us to destructure or deconstruct: "in its *scholastic* mold, Greek ontology makes the essential transition via the *disputationes metaphysicae* of Suárez into the 'metaphysics' and transcendental philosophy of the modern period; it still determines the foundations and goals of Hegel's *Logic*."[70] The same year, during his Summer semester class on the *Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, he also dedicated a number of sections to Suárez, in particular his theory of purely rational (and not real) distinction between essence and existence, and he gave a typically German criterion for Suárez's modernity: "this is exactly the Kantian thesis,"[71] claims Heidegger. A couple of years later, a little-known Swiss Jesuit, Max Rast (1892–1973), concluded a seminal article on Suárez's concept of possibility (as non-contradictory, and independent of the creative power of God) by arguing that it also largely anticipated the conception of neo-Kantians such as Heinrich Rickert and Wilhelm Windelband. Rast claimed that Suárez's conception of essences is reminiscent of the concept of *Geltungsbereich* of neo-Kantian philosophers, independent of any form of existence—noting only the replacement of God by the "pure consciousness."[72] The same topics were of interest in neo-Thomist circles after WWII: Étienne Gilson (1884–1978) and Gustav Siewerth (1903–63) also dedicated numerous and important pages to Suárez's metaphysics, but criticized him as a "nominalist" obscuring the created existential being by his conception of purely abstract possible essences.[73] Under both Heideggerian and Gilsonian influence, many dissertations were written comparing Suárez with Descartes, Kant and other major figures of early modern philosophy, on privileged topics such as theories of ideas, essence and existence, the fate of Thomistic theory of analogy, the object of metaphysics, etc.[74] Only rarely did scholars venture outside of Suárez: one notable exception being here the seminal work of the Neapolitan historian Piero Di Vona (1928–2018), who published in 1968 a study on the distinction between essence and existence taking into account many other early modern Scholastic authors, Jesuits and non-Jesuits, making thereby an important step towards the expansion of the canon.[75]

Expanding the Canon of Jesuit Philosophers

It might thus seem paradoxical that in the decades during which Suarezianism largely died out within Jesuit education, it kept being passionately studied by secular philosophers outside of the Society. But as different as they were in their philosophical options, Brentano, Heidegger, Gilson and their followers had all fallen to a trap constructed by nineteenth-century neo-Scholastic Jesuit historiography, which had enshrined Suárez as the absolute point of reference. During most of the twentieth century, although becoming increasingly deconfessionalized, the study of Jesuit philosophy remained to a very large extent a one-man obsession. Multiple commemorative congresses on Suárez's philosophy were organized in 1917 (third centenary of his death), 1948 (fourth centenary of his birth), 1997 (fourth centenary of the publication of the *Disputationes metaphysicae*) and 2017 (fourth centenary of his death), with often very repetitive contributions on the same almost "official" list of topics taken from law, metaphysics and theory of knowledge. Until twenty years ago, the *Doctor Eximius* was the only early modern Jesuit philosopher to have been translated into modern languages, and the vast bibliography on his thought outnumbers that on all other Jesuit philosophers.[76]

A true historicization of Jesuit philosophy would imply to take into account the entire tradition, and thus challenge the focalization on one man and one epoch, i.e. the famous 1580–1620 generation. Globally, a more wide-ranging interest in Scholastic philosophy had started to develop in the 1920s and in the 1930s, mainly again in Germany, where history of philosophy had become the backbone of the curriculum. In Leipzig, the Protestant (and prominent future Nazi philosopher) Max Wundt (1879–63), one of the pioneers of the study of early modern Scholasticism, argued that "only from this Scholastic background can we understand the specific physionomy of so-called modern philosophy," and he explicitly lamented our lack of knowledge of the Catholic tradition.[77] Around the same time, a Catholic prelate from Bonn (and incidentally also a future Nazi dignitary), Karl Eschweiler (1886–1936), produced several important studies,[78] of great historical quality, arguing that the true spirit of modernity often associated with Descartes was in reality a Jesuit achievement. Eschweiler argued that the shift towards subjective knowledge in Descartes was largely anticipated in Jesuit conceptions of the act of faith, and their elaboration of a doctrine of subjective *certitudo fidei*, stressing in particular the role of the Jesuits Juan de Lugo (1583–1660) and Rodrigo de Arriaga (1592–1667).[79] Other important names to be mentioned in that context are Ernst Lewalter (1892–1956, yet another German scholar closely associated with Nazism)[80] and the Jesuit Bernhard Jansen (1877–1942).[81] Both produced important historical monographs showing the complex web of influences between Jesuit and non-Jesuit traditions, including in Protestant countries. Nationalism and regionalism also helped again to broaden the spectrum: local traditions were studied with great care, and allowed scholars to move away from the focalization on the Spaniard Suárez. For Portugal, the Jesuit country *par excellence*, Friedrich Stegmüller (1902–81) produced the model of what should actually have been done for every country, namely a complete list of philosophical and theological resources available from the Jesuit traditions of Evora and Coimbra,[82] and the historiography on Pedro da

complete list of philosophical and theological resources available from the Jesuit traditions of Évora and Coimbra,[82] and the historiography on Pedro da Fonseca (1528–99) and the Colegio das Artes has been flourishing ever since.[83] For other regional contexts, one could give the example of the lifelong work of the Irish-Argentinian Jesuit Guillermo Furlong Cardiff, S.J. (1889–1974) for the Río de la Plata region, or more recently the monographs by Roman Darowski, S.J. and Franciszek Bargiel, S.J. for Poland, or, as a paradigmatic case of local micro-history, the monograph on the Jesuit philosophy taught at the Bavarian University of Dillingen by Ulrich Gottfried Leinsle.[84]

Postmodern Jesuits: Expanding the Canon

The most recent tendency of the historiography of Jesuit philosophy confirms this shift towards a more radical historicization. Today's historiography increasingly shies away from the "grand narratives" of modernity, be it of neo-Thomist or Heideggerian coinage, and prefers investigating the individuality of specific doctrines, authors or local traditions. Researchers have also progressively emancipated themselves from the "influence" paradigm which had dominated most of earlier scholarship, which considered Jesuit philosophy *only* worth studying if one could prove some form of its influence on Descartes, Spinoza or Leibniz. On the contrary, some of the most groundbreaking studies on Jesuit philosophy of the last twenty years were those that considered Jesuit philosophy as a matter of interest *per se*.

As a result, we have witnessed in the last twenty years a true explosion of studies on Jesuit philosophy, not dedicated to Suárez, not even to the "founding" generation, not dedicated to metaphysics or law, but focussing on as many fields as humanities, rhetoric, logic, ethics, science as well as on non-conventional topics in theology. Such a new approach called of course for some secret "godfather," and one name stands out here: François de Dainville, S.J. (1909–71), a French Jesuit who published in 1940 a doctoral dissertation on the *geography*, and not *philosophy* of the Jesuits, as part of an ambitious new book series project entitled "Jesuits and the Education of French Society."[85] Based on an impressive documentation, Dainville had shown the extent to which *humanist* and not only *Scholastic* methodology had been integrated in the Jesuit curriculum. Dainville was then himself a student in the School of Fourvière in Lyons, and became closely linked to the anti-Scholastic "Ressourcement" movement inspired by de Lubac and Daniélou, already mentioned above.[86] During all his life, he published articles on Jesuit mathematics, cosmography, history of science and classroom practices, thereby turning himself into a hidden guru for French history of education and sociology of knowledge—not surprisingly, his collected articles were published in a series directed by the neo-Marxist sociologist Pierre Bourdieu.[87]

By turning the focus towards humanism, education history and philosophy of science, Dainville had opened new perspectives for historians of philosophy disgusted by the eternal debates about the intellectual identity of "Suarezianism." Since the nineteenth century, Jesuit philosophy had always been identified as the ultimate (and for some the worst) form of Scholasticism and apologetics. Thanks to Dainville, they could now be portrayed as the pioneers of contemporary liberal arts education, as humanists, or as offering "a fusion of the humanist approach to Aristotle with that of the long established scholastic approach," as Charles Schmitt wrote in an influential article, speaking in this case of the Coimbra commentaries.[88] Historians such as Charles B. Schmitt (1933–86) and Charles H. Lohr, S.J. (1925–2015) started marketing the Jesuits as "Renaissance" philosophers, not as neo-Scholastics. Robert Maryks speaks even of a "re-definition" of Jesuits through their liberal arts tradition, inspired by Renaissance humanism, which allowed them to found the widest educational system of the early modern era.[89] Lohr's seminal studies on Jesuit metaphysics abandoned the Heideggerian and neo-Thomist paradigm and embedded for the first time Suárez in the context of Renaissance Aristotelianism and his immediate contemporaries, and not in wide-ranging comparisons with Aquinas and Scotus.[90] Lohr's catalogue of *Renaissance Aristotle Commentators*[91] contains a notable percentage of Jesuit authors, and constitutes still an indispensable tool for further research into the varieties of Jesuit philosophy.

It would be fastidious to list all the innovative work that has recently been produced according to this new paradigm, in particular because they all follow a very interdisciplinary approach, not isolating philosophy from other forms of learning. This scholarship recovers in a way the integrity of the seventeenth century *Cursus philosophicus*, which comprised logic, physics, metaphysics, psychology and ethics, to which one can add the propedeutic *humanitates* and the complex place of mathematics in its relationship with philosophy[92]. Important collective and survey volumes, under the direction of Luce Giard and John O'Malley, testify of the variety of topics and the richness of ongoing historical scholarship[93]. In what follows, I shall restrict myself to highlight only two aspects of this new research, which both have to do with the very definition of *philosophy* itself.

First, a striking aspect of recent scholarship has been the expansion of the chronological and geographical canon: whereas around 1900, about ninety percent of all studies were dedicated to the "big five" Suárez, Bellarmine, Fonseca, Molina, and Vázquez, recent historiography has insisted on the necessity to take into consideration what was *before* and especially what came *after*. Sven Knebel has lamented, with his usual sense of provocation, that "seventeenth century philosophy is still a *terra incognita*,"[94] since the whole Jesuit tradition is often seen by scholars as the simple repetition of Suarezian insights. Knebel's own work and that of many other recent scholars is progressively changing the picture, and they lead towards a reassessment of the eternal question of the "modernity" of Jesuit philosophy. If modernity goes with novelty, whatever that means, then it might well be that the 1600-generation was more philosophically medieval than previously admitted, and that only the later generations that integrated what is now really considered as "modern" could claim such a qualification: in logic, the development of a facultative conception focusing on the psychological operations of the mind rather than on its abstract objects (categories, universals); in physics, the taking into account of experimental science; in metaphysics, the development of new ontologies of facts and truthmakers, not the classical question of abstract being *qua* being. Some examples will suffice: in metaphysics, Suárez had barely done more than following medieval models by expanding the question of the "being qua being" to include also non-actual forms of being, i.e. the possible. Only later generations of Jesuits would then dig deeper into the philosophical questions of what it means for things to be "possible," or, in a more temporal way, "future." This lead Jesuits of the 1620–40 generation to construct the first real ontologies of "possible worlds" by asking question about the ontological commitment of modal or temporal propositions. This has lead seventeenth century Jesuits to develop new concepts, unheard of in medieval Scholasticism, that have just been recently discovered by scholarship and are still insufficiently mapped, such as "events" (*eventus*), "truth-makers" (*verificativa*), "futuribles" (*futurabilia*), "states of affairs" (*status rerum*) or, the most important of all, "possible worlds" (*mundi possibiles*)[95]. New big names of Jesuit metaphysics are now emerging: Thomas Compton Carleton (1591–1666), the first European philosopher to admit negative entities, Antonio Pérez (1599–1649), who tried to reconcile Jesuit philosophy with Augustinian exemplarism, and Sebastián Izquierdo (1601–81), with his acclaimed 1659 *Pharus scientiarum*, who is providing the missing link between Jesuit philosophy and nineteenth-century *Sachverhalt*-ontologies.

Similar advances in research have been made in specific aspects of logic, in particular in the study of *entia rationis*, for which the post-Suarezian authors were the real innovators,[96] or in philosophy of mind.[97] In natural philosophy, following Charles Schmitt's encouragement to shy away from the "slavish Aristotelians" but to look for the existence of "intelligent, progressive philosophy continuing in the tradition,"[98] the focus of research has now abandoned the eternal quest of the "sources" of Galileo, but is turning the whole classical "influence" paradigm on its head: rather than to look for the obscure Jesuit sources of Descartes and Galileo, to prove the latter's "novelty," it is more interesting to study the way the Jesuits integrated Descartes and Galileo into their own curriculum, thereby suddenly showing, as Renée Raphael aptly puts it, that "Galileo's readers more closely mirrored his practices than they did his

own curriculum, thereby suddenly showing, as Renée Raphael aptly puts it, that "Galileo's readers more closely mirrored his practices than they did his rhetoric. They tended to see the *Two New Sciences* less as a decisive break with past styles of scholarship than Galileo proclaimed it to be."[99] According to such a new paradigm, already anticipated by the French scholar Gaston Sortais, S.J. who had studied the French Jesuit reception of Descartes,[100] it is essential to return to the seventeenth and eighteenth century classrooms practices and see what really mattered: how, in spite of censorship and setbacks, the Jesuits integrated the new metaphysics and new natural philosophy in their curriculum, and how they became active participants of the scientific Republic of Letters. Here as well, historiography has found new heroes in natural philosophy, largely posterior to the Suárez-generation, such as for instance the Jesuits Honoré Fabri (1607–88), Francesco Maria Grimaldi (1618–63), famous for his description of the diffraction of light, or the Dalmatian-born Jesuit polymath Ruđer Josip Bošković, (1711–87).[101]

A second major innovation in recent philosophical historiography is to look for philosophy at the heart of theological debates. Nineteenth-century Jesuits liked to present their theology courses in the most rational way possible, thereby making, as we have seen, a number of concessions to unacknowledged Cartesian, Wolffian or Leibnizian assumptions. Today's most innovative scholars proceed in a different way: rather than looking for the most rational arguments, the focus is rather on the apparently most "irrational" aspects of theology—angels, the physics of the incarnation, the fire of hell, the immaculate conception of Mary, or Biblical miracles as they were treated in the thousands of Bible commentaries produced by the early modern Jesuits.[102] The aim of such a research is not to show that there are good reasons to believe in angels; but its aim is to consider angels, the fire of hell or the body of Christ as paradigmatic cases of conceptual innovation, in which the Jesuits *test* the limits of their logic, physics or metaphysics developed in their *cursus philosophicus*. Equally, the development of early modern ethics can hardly be understood with reading moral *theology*. Étienne Gilson had already shown the way to travel in his 1930 monograph on Descartes and theology[103]: early modern conceptions of liberty of indifference were not developed in commentaries on the *Nicomachean Ethics*, but primarily in the theological tradition, in questions on *liberum arbitrium* of commentaries of the *Sentences* or the *Summa*. In a groundbreaking book on the early modern emergence of the notion of probability, Sven Knebel has also argued that we should not only look for conceptual innovations in the autonomous fields of logic or mathematics, but in challenges posed by post-Molinist theology of free will: out of one thousand Sevillans, how probable is it that no one commits a sin, considering that each of them possesses perfect free will to sin or not to sin? There is no metaphysical necessity for a single sin to occur: but it is highly unlikely that no sin occurs, argue theologians, wherefore one should speak of a "moral necessity" and not of a "metaphysical" necessity.[104] Seventeenth-century Jesuits thereby developed a complex moral modal logic out of theological questions. With the progressive development of moral theology into an autonomous discipline—another largely Jesuit innovation[105]—early modern concepts of decision-making, rational choice, autonomy of the person, etc. have to be looked for in the huge literature that unfolded around probabilism in theology. These evolutions were again largely post-Suarezian and reached their high point only in the second half of the seventeenth century.[106]

Conclusion

It is not surprising that the nineteenth and twentieth century historiography of pre-1773 Jesuit philosophy has largely followed the trends of general philosophical historiography during that period: from an apologetic reconstruction to a postmodern deconstruction, it was deeply linked to the ideological battles between church and state during the reestablishment of the Society in the nineteenth century, and to the rise and fall of "grand narratives" in twentieth century continental philosophy. One result is at least that our map of the past is now more precise: it has more figures on it, and also a much wider geographical extension, with numerous quality monographs on local contexts. Whether considered as late medieval or early modern, Jesuit philosophy has gained a respectability it never enjoyed before among mainstream historians of philosophy.

In an influential article published from his American exile, the Spanish historian of philosophy José Ferrater Mora (1912–91) wrote that "the role played by Scholasticism in modern philosophy is nowadays a fact."[107] This was certainly a bold claim more than fifty years ago, but it definitely anticipated contemporary evolutions in the practice of the history of philosophy. Today, no respectable scholar of early modern philosophy would engage on a conceptual analysis of a given topic without at least considering the *status quaestionis* in the Coimbra commentaries or in the generation of Francisco Suárez,[108] and there are signs that even later authors such as the Jesuits Pedro Hurtado de Mendoza (1578–1641) or Rodrigo de Arriaga (1592–1667) and their contemporaries are now entering the canon of historians of early modern philosophy.

The major challenge of future historiography is to avoid falling into the trap of misrepresenting this newly unearthed Jesuit philosophy as something unitary or consistent over time. Early modern Jesuit philosophy was an extremely differentiated tradition, in permanent dialogue with other traditions, be they Scholastic or non-Scholastic. In philosophy, Suárez had for instance more in common with Renaissance Dominicans such as Soncinas than with later Jesuit metaphysicians such as Izquierdo. Equally, Claude Buffier's *Cours des sciences* (1723) might be more familiar to a reader of Rousseau than to one of Suárez. An empirical and micro-historical approach is needed more than ever if we want to get a true grasp of what "Jesuit philosophy" really was at a given time, at a given place, by a given teacher.

Jacob Schmutz

Notes

1. As quoted by Philip Gleason, *Contending with Modernity: Catholic Higher Education in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 106.

2. Alasdair McIntyre, *Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry. Encyclopedia, Genealogy and Tradition* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1990), 121.

3. Enrico I. Narciso, O.P., "Il movimento neotomista," *Sapienza* 14 (1961): 441–58, here 457.

4. On the persistence of Sagner's work in Bourbon Italy, see Enrico I. Narciso, O.P., *La* Summa philosophica *di Salvatore Roselli e la rinascita del tomismo* (Rome: Libreria Editrice della Pontificia Università Lateranense, 1966), 94–98, 114–16; on the Wolffianism of these Central European Jesuits, see elements in Werner Sauer, *Österreichische Philosophie zwischen Aufklärung und Restauration. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Frühkantianismus in der Donaumonarchie* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1982).

5. Luigi Taparelli d'Azeglio, S.J. to Pieter-Jan Beckx, S.J., 1861, as quoted in Pietro Pirri, "Il Padre Taparelli e il rinnovamento della scolastica al Collegio Romano," *Civiltà cattolica* 78/1 (1927): 107–21, 399–409, here 121. On the career of Rothaan, see C. J. Lighthart, *The Return of the Jesuits: The Life of Jan Philip Roothaan*, trans. Jan Slijkerman (London: Shand Publications, 1978).

6. There is no encompassing study on the intellectual culture of the nineteenth-century restored Roman College, soon to become the Università Gregoriana. See the commemorative volume edited by the Pontificia Università Gregoriana, *L'Università Gregoriana del Collegio Romano nel primo secolo dalla restituzione* (Rome: Tipografia Cuggiani, 1924); Giuseppe Filograssi, S.J., "Teologia e filosofia nel Collegio Romano dal 1824 ad oggi," *Gregorianum* 35 (1954): 512–40, and the general history of the restoration of the Jesuits in Italy by Giacomo Martina, *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia* (*1814–1983*) (Brescia: Morcelliana, 2003), 47–71; Peter Walter, "*Den Weltkreis täglich von Verderben bringenden Irrtümern befreien* (Leo XIII.): Die Internationalisierung der theologischen Wissenschaftswelt am Beispiel der Neuscholastik," in *Transnationale Dimensionen wissenschaftlicher Theologie*, ed. Claus Arnold et al. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 330–35.

7. On the link between the Sordi brothers and Buzzetti, see Narciso, *La* Summa philosophica *di Salvatore Roselli*, 76–81; Paolo Dezza, S.J, *Alle origini del neotomismo* (Milan: Bocca, 1940), 29–76.

8. On the history of the *Civiltà cattolica*, see Francesco Dante, *Storia della "Civiltà Cattolica" (1850–1891): Il laboratorio del papa* (Rome: Edizioni Studium, 1990). On the role of its founder Curci, see Giandomenico Mucci, S.J., *Il primo direttore della "Civiltà Cattolica": Carlo Maria Curci tra la cultura dell'immobilismo e la cultura delle storicità* (Rome: Edizioni "La Civiltà Cattolica," 1986); Mucci, S.J., *Carlo Maria Curci, il fondatore della "Civiltà Cattolica"* (Rome: Edizioni Studium, 1988).

9. Pius IX (Giovanni Maria Mastai Ferretti, 1792–1878) returned to Rome in 1850.

10. His brother, Giuseppe Pecci, S.J. (1807–90), has also been a Jesuit (from 1824 to 1848) and rejoined the Society as cardinal one year before his death.

11. For an explanation of the way the nineteenth century "revival" was closely linked to seventeenth century Thomism, see Jacob Schmutz, "From Theology to Philosophy: The Changing Status of the *Summa theologiae*, 1500–2000," in *Aquinas's* Summa theologiae*: A Critical Guide*, ed. Jeffrey Hause (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 221–41. The rise of neo-Thomism in nineteenth-century Italy have been widely documented, with however different forms of emphasis often due to the identity of their authors. For a good summary, see Heinrich Schmidinger, "Der Streit um die Anfänge der italienischen Neuscholastik," in *Christliche Philosophie*, ed. Emerich Coreth et al. (Graz: Styria, 1988), 2:72–82, with an excellent bibliography. Classical studies include also Giovanni Felice Rossi, *La filosofia nel Collegio Alberoni e il neotomismo* (Piacenza: Collegio Alberoni, 1959), Enrico I. Narciso, S.J., "Alle fonti del neotomismo," *Sapienza* 13 (1960): 124–47; Narciso, *La* Summa philosophica *di Salvatore Roselli*; Luciano Malusa, *Neotomismo e intransigentismo cattolico,* 2 vols. (Milan: Istituto propaganda libraria, 1986–89) on its anti-liberal political ramifications; Nobert Peitz, *Die Anfänge der Neuscholastik in Deutschland und Italien* (*1818–1870*) (Bonn: Nova&Vetera, 2006), dealing with its German context and particularly interesting for philosophy. In the English language, a good summary of the nineteenth-century revival of Thomism is provided by Bernardine M. Bonansea, "Pioneers of the Nineteenth-Century Scholastic Revival in Italy," *The New Scholasticism* 28, no. 1 (1954): 1–37; James A. Weisheipl, "The Revival of Thomism as a Christian Philosophy," in *New Themes in Christian Philosophy*, ed. Ralph McInerny (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968), 164–85; Gerald A. McCool, S.J., *From Unity to Pluralism: The Internal Evolution of Thomism* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1989); McCool, *The Neo-Thomists* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1994). The recent critical study by Walter, "Die Internationalisierung der theologischen Wissenschaftswelt am Beispiel der Neuscholastik," highlights its international character, and also provides excellent bibliography. The Jesuit contribution was already studied by Dionisio Domínguez, S.J., "El neoescolasticismo y la Compañía de Jesús," *Estudios eclesiásticos* 14 (1935–36): 318–32, 540–54; 15 (1936): 168–84, and Dezza, *Alle origini del neotomismo*, and more recently by Oliver Rafferty, "The Thomistic Revival and the Relationship between the Jesuits and the Papacy, 1878–1914," *Theological Studies* 75, no. 4 (2014): 743–73. On the specific role of the original Taparelli, see Pirri, "Il Padre Taparelli"; Robert Jacquin, *Taparelli* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1943). For Dmowski's role, see Roman Darowski, S.J., "Józef Alojzy Dmowski, S.J., Precursor of the Renewal of Thomism," *Forum philosophicum* 9 (2004): 241–58.

12. For a general presentation of the historiographical tendencies in the restored Society, see Robert Danieluk, "Some Remarks on Jesuit Historiography, 1773–1814," in *Jesuit Survival and Restoration: A Global History, 1773–1900*, ed. Robert A. Maryks and Jonathan Wright (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 34–48. This corresponds chronologically to the endeavor of the restored Society to restore the historical knowledge about the first Society.

13. Anonymous, "Recent Revolutions in Jesuit Philosophy," *Mind* 11, no. 43 (1886): 449–54, here 453.

14. On the place of Aquinas in the original *Ratio studiorum*, see the enlightening comments by Johann Theiner, *Die Entwicklung der Moraltheologie zur eigenständigen Disziplin* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1970) and Dominique Julia, "Généalogie de la *Ratio studiorum*," in *Les jésuites à l'âge baroque, 1540–1640*, ed. Luce Giard and Louis de Vaucelles (Grenoble: Jérôme Millon, 1996), 115–30; Francesco Mattei and Cristiano Casalini, "Padre Claudio Acquaviva: *Ratio studiorum* e *libertas opinandi*," *Educazione: Giornale di pedagogia critica* 5, no. 1 (2016): 7–26, and the ancient but still precious research of Andreas Inauen, "Stellung der Gesellschaft Jesu zur Lehre des Aristoteles und des hl. Thomas vor 1583," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 40 (1916): 201–37.

15. On the strong differences but also shared assumptions of the Roman School and the Neoscholastic Revival, see Charles Michael Shea, "*Ressourcement* in the Age of Migne: The Jesuit Theologians of the Collegio Romano and the Shape of Modern Catholic Thought," *Nova et vetera* 15, no. 2 (2017): 579–613. Among the major older studies on the "Roman School," see Karl H. Neufeld, "'Römische Schule': Beobachtungen und Überlegungen zur genaueren Bestimmung," *Gregorianum* 63 (1982): 677–99, and the seminal thesis by Walter Kasper, *Die Lehre von der Tradition in der römischen Schule* (*Giovanni Perrone, Carlo Passaglia, Clemens Schrader*) (Freiburg/Breisgau: Herder, 1962).

16. Petau's *Dogmata theologica* (originally published in Paris, 1644–50) were reedited by Carlo Passaglia, S.J. and Clemens Schrader, S.J. in a new Roman edition: *Opus de theologicis dogmatibus expolitum et auctum collatis studiis* (Rome: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide 1857).

17. The "Roman School," on the other hand, proved very powerful in shaping the theological agenda and strongly influenced the Vatican I Council. See Charles Michael Shea, "Giovanni Perrone's Theological Curriculum and the First Vatican Council," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 110, nos. 3–4 (2015): 789–816.

18. On Liberatore's thought, see Tommaso Mirabella, *Il pensiero politico del p. Matteo Liberatore e il suo contributo ai rapporti tra Chiesa e Stato: Con la pubblicazione di un carteggio inedito* (Milan: Giuffrè, 1956). His role in the condemnation of Rosmini is highlighted in Malusa, *Neotomismo e intransigentismo cattolico*, 1:389; Walter, "Die Internationalisierung der theologischen Wissenschaftswelt," 333.

19. Kleutgen is often credited to have been the author of the first draft of the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (1879), although this would require additional archival confirmation, and he was also a major collaborator of the *Dei Filius* constitution of Vatican I. On Kleutgen, see Konrad Deufel, *Kirche und Tradition: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der theologischen Wende im 19. Jahrhundert am Beispiel des kirchlich-theologischen Kampfprogramms P. Josef Kleutgen, S.J.* (Paderborn: Schöningh Verlag, 1976); McCool, *From Unity to Pluralism*, 167–215; Peter Walter, "Joseph Kleutgen, S.J. (1811–1883)," in *Klassiker der Theologie*, ed. Friedrich W. Graf (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2005), II, 89–104; Peitz, *Die Anfänge der Neuscholastik*, 146–98. For an excellent appraisal of Kleutgen's role in historiography, see John Inglis, *Spheres of Philosophical Inquiry and the Historiography of Medieval Philosophy* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 62–104.

20. Shea, "*Ressourcement* in the Age of Migne," 582.

21. Joseph Kleutgen, *Die Philosophie der Vorzeit,* 2 vols. (Münster: Theissing, 1860–63). It was translated into French and Italian (*La filosofia antica esposta e difesa* (Rome: Tip. e Lib. Poliglotta, 1866–68). Sign of the growing interest in his thought, an English translation is currently being prepared (*Pre-Modern Philosophy Defended*, trans. William H. Marshner (South Bend: Saint Augustine's Press, 2019).

22. Thomas Worcester, S.J., "A Restored Society of a New Society of Jesus?" in *Jesuit Survival and Restoration,* ed. Maryks and Wright, 13–33, here 27.

23. A leader in the historiographical recovery of this tradition was the Catalan scholar Miquel Batllori, S.J. (1909–2003), with his seminal work on the scientific, philosophical and literary culture of the exiled Jesuits of 1767 (Miquel Batllori, *La cultura hispano-italiana de los jesuitas expulsos: Españoles – Hispano-americanos – Filipinos* [Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1966]). For other recent appraisals of eighteenth-century Jesuit scientific culture, see the seminal work by Steven J. Harris, "Jesuit Ideology and Jesuit Science: Scientific Activity in the Society of Jesus, 1540–1773" (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin at Madison, 1988) and Marcus Hellyer, *Catholic Physics: Jesuit Natural Philosophy in Early Modern Germany* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 2005). On their link with the Enlightenment ideas, see the case-study on France by Catherine M. Northeast, *The Parisian Jesuits and the Enlightenment, 1700–1762* (Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, 1991).

24. The Vivès reprint reproduced actually without any critical scrutiny the classification of Suárez's works proposed in a first twenty-three-volume Venetian edition realized by the publisher Sebastiano Coletti (1740–51), following the ordering of subject-matters according to the *Summa* of Aquinas. There has not been any serious research done on the activity of Louis Vivès, who started as a traveling salesman for books before becoming a prominent Catholic printer: for a first overview, see Claude Savart, *Les catholiques en France au XIXe siècle: Le témoignage du livre religieux* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1985), 170–72.

25. Marcus Hellyer, "Jesuit Physics in Eighteenth-Century Germany: Some Important Continuities," in *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773*, ed. John W. O'Malley, S.J. et al. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999), 550.

26. Marcel Chossat, S.J., "Dieu, son existence," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1910): 4/1:874–948. On the unique intellectual project of the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, see recent studies in Sylvio H. De Franceschi, ed., *Théologie et érudition de la crise moderniste à Vatican II: Autour du* Dictionnaire de théologie catholique (Limoges: Presses de l'Université de Limoges, 2014). Important Jesuit contributors to the *DThC* were Joseph Brucker, S.J. (1845–1926), Jacques de Blic, S.J. (1887–1948), a disciple of Rousselot and a brilliant historian of moral theology and philosophy, Henri Bernard, S.J. (1889–1975), a prominent missionary in pre-Maoist China, whom we owe a lot of important studies on missionary theology and Chinese culture. A one-hundred-column entry was dedicated to Suárez by Pierre Monnot, S.J., Paul Dumont, S.J. and René Brouillard, S.J., "Suárez," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1941): 14/2:2638–728.

27. Cf. Raoul de Scorraille, S.J., *François Suárez, de la Compagnie de Jésus, d'après ses lettres, ses autres écrits inédits et un grand nombre de documents nouveaux,* 2 vols. (Paris: Lethielleux, 1912–13). Like some his Italian counterparts, Scorraille had been a fierce royalist, and opposed vehemently the "Ralliement" policy of Leo XIII (himself, as we have seen, a former student of Taparelli), who had tried to apease the relationship between the Catholics and the French Republic. On Sommervogel's enterprise, see Robert Danieluk, *La bibliothèque de Carlos Sommervogel: Le sommet de l'œuvre bibliographique de la Compagnie de Jésus (1890–1932)* (Rome: Institutum Historicum S.I., 2006).

28. Eleuterio Elorduy, S.J., "Datos para el proceso de beatificación del P. Francisco Suárez, S.J.," *Archivo teólogico granadino* 23 (1970): 5–78. Elorduy had collected all the former archives of the French Jesuits of Toulouse, including the notes left by Raoul de Scorraille, S.J. for his biography. They were long kept at the University of Deusto (Bilbao), and are now deposited at the Universidad Loyola Andalucía (Seville). I wish to thank Juan Antonio Senent de Frutos for giving me access to this precious material.

29. Norberto del Prado, O.P., *De veritate fundamentali philosophiae christianae* (Fribourg: Ex Typis Consociationis Sancti Pauli, 1911), 205. Under the pseudonym of Alberto Martin, the French canon Albert Michel (1877–1972), a later contributor to the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, had already denounced Suárez as anti-Thomist in a series of articles ("Suárez metaphysicien commentateur de Saint Thomas," *La Science catholique* 12 [1898]: 29–59, 686–702, and 819–37).

30. The episode has usually been criticized as the most reactionary moment of modern Catholic thought. On the general context, linked to the modernist crisis and the consolidation of neo-Thomism, see Paul B. Grenet, *Les 24 Thèses thomistes* (Paris: Téqui, 1962); Étienne Fouilloux, *Une Église en quête de liberté: La pensée catholique française entre modernisme et Vatican II, 1914–1962* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1998), 41.

31. Pedro Descoqs, S.J., "Thomisme et suarezisme," *Archives de philosophie* 4 (1926): 82–192, here 165. On this debate, see also the later testimony by Cornelio Fabro, C.S.S., "Neotomismo e neosuarezismo: una battaglia di principi," *Divus Thomas* (Piacenza) 44 (1941): 167–215, 420–98, and a reconstruction in Leopoldo Prieto, "Francisco Suárez e Tommaso d'Aquino," in *Neotomismo e suarezismo: Il confronto di Cornelio Fabro*, ed. Jesús Villagrasa (Rome: Ateneo Pontificio Regina Apostolorum, 2006), 91–136.

32. Johann Baptist Lotz, "Joseph Maréchal (1878–1944)," in *La philosophie chrétienne d'inspiration catholique: Constats et controverses, positions actuelles*, ed. Philibert Secretan (Fribourg: Academic Press, 2006), 233.

33. For this context, see Dominique Avon, "Une école théologique à Fourvière ?," in *Les jésuites à Lyon: XVIe–XXe siècle*, ed. Étienne Fouilloux and Bernard Hours (Lyons: ENS Editions, 2005), 231–46. For the general context of "Ressourcement" theology, see Jürgen Mettepenningen, *Nouvelle Théologie – New Theology: Inheritor of Modernism, Precursor of Vatican II* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2010); Gabriel Flynn and Paul D. Murray, *Ressourcement: A Movement for*

Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

34. See for instance Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Herrlichkeit*, vol. 3/1: *Im Raum der Metaphysik* (Einsiedeln: Johannes Verlag, 1965), 386–87, on the "vicious circle [...] of neo-scholasticism," reducing philosophy to an enquiry of abstract being and theology to apologetics.

35. See for instance Louis Beirnaert, S.J., *Expérience chrétienne et psychologie* (Paris: Éditions de l'Épi, 1964).

36. On the rise of historicism applied to the history of philosophy in Germany (but mainly focusing on Protestant scholars), see Ulrich Johannes Schneider, *Philosophie und Universität: Historisierung der Vernunft im 19. Jahrhundert* (Hamburg: Meiner Verlag, 1999), on Tennemann, 159–66, 170–76, 216–18, passim; for a global survey, see Gregorio Piaia and Giovanni Santinello, eds., *Models of the History of Philosophy*, vol. III: *The Second Enlightenment and the Kantian Age* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2015) and Catherine König-Pralong, *Médiévisme philosophique et raison moderne: De Pierre Bayle à Ernest Renan* (Paris: Vrin, 2016), revealing interesting changes in the appreciation of medieval thought among Protestants. On Tennemann's work in particular, see Giuseppe Micheli, *Tennemann storico della filosofia* (Padua: CLEUP, 1992).

37. I quote here according to the French translation, which is even a bit harsher than the German original: Johann Gottlieb Buhle, *Histoire de la philosophie moderne, depuis la Renaissance des lettres jusqu'à Kant*, trans. A.-J.-L. Jourdan, (Paris: F. I. Fournier, 1816), 4:18. For the German original, see *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie seit der Epoche der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1803), 9-10.

38. Buhle, *Histoire de la philosophie moderne*, 4:16.

39. Carl von Prantl, *Geschichte der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Ingolstadt, Landshut, München* (Munich: Kaiser, 1872), 1:443.

40. For a new general perspective, see Dale K. Van Kley, *Reformed Catholicism and the International Suppression of the Jesuits* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018). On German Enlightenment anti-Jesuitism in the eighteenth century, see Richard Van Dülmen, "Antijesuitismus und katholische Aufklärung in Deutschland," *Historisches Jahrbuch* 89 (1969): 52–80; for France, see Michel Leroy, *Le mythe jésuite: De Béranger à Michelet* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1992); for Italy, see Daniele Menozzi, "I gesuiti, Pio IX e la nazione italiana," in *Il Risorgimento*, ed. Alberto Maria Banti and Paul Ginsborg (Turin: Einaudi, 2007), 451–78; general studies in Pierre-Antoine Fabre and Catherine Maire, eds., *Les antijésuites: Discours, figures et lieux de l'antijésuitisme à l'époque moderne* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2010).

41. Baldassare Poli, *Supplimenti al* Manuale di storia della filosofia *di Guglielmo Tennemann: Saggio storico* (Milan: Antonio Fontana, 1836): 638–39, for Polizzi. On Poli's historiographical attitude, see Gregorio Piaia, "Baldassare Poli e l'eclettismo fra Italia e Francia," in *I filosofi e la genesi della coscienza culturale della 'Nuova Italia' (1799–1900)* (Naples: Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici, 1997), 41–57. For the contribution of Sicilian Jesuits, see also the seminal Vincenzo Di Giovanni, *Storia della filosofia in Sicilia*, 4 vols. (Palermo: L. Pedone Lauriel, 1873), which contains also a first attempt to list philosophical manuscript sources. For a more recent valuation of Sicilian Jesuit philosophy, see Corrado Dollo, *Modelli scientifici e filosofici nella Sicilia spagnola* (Naples: Guida Editore, 1984).

42. Mario Méndez Bejarano, *Historia de la filosofía en España, hasta el siglo XX: Ensayo* (Madrid: Renacimiento, 1929).

43. Franz Sales Römstock, *Die Jesuitennullen Prantl's an der Universität Ingolstadt und ihre Leidensgenossen: Eine biobibliographische Studie* (Eichstätt: Brönner, 1898).

44. Charles-Hyppolite Verdière, S.J., *Histoire de l'Université d'Ingolstadt: Contre-réforme religieuse et réforme littéraire,* 2 vols. (Paris: Lethielleux, 1887).

45. Thaddä Anselm Rixner, O.S.B., *Handbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie,* 3 vols. (Sulzbach: J. E. von Seidel, 1828–29).

46. Thaddä Anselm Rixner, O.S.B., *Geschichte der Philosophie bei den Katholiken in Altbayern, bayerisch Schwaben und bayerisch Franken* (Munich: Georg Franz, 1835).

47. Jean-Marie Prat, *Maldonat et l'Université de Paris au XVIe siècle* (Paris: Julien, Lanier & Cie, 1856).

48. Albert Stöckl, *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, vol. 3: *Periode der Bekämpfung der Scholastik* (Mainz: Franz Kirchheim, 1866), 628ff., where Stöckl speaks of the "Wiederbelebung der Scholastik" and emphasizes the role of the Jesuits.

49. Karl Werner, *Franz Suarez und die Scholastik der letzten Jahrhunderte,* 2 vols. (Regensburg: G.J. Manz, 1861).

50. Martin Grabmann, "Die *Disputationes metaphysicae* des Franz Suárez in ihrer methodischen Eigenart und Fortwirkung" (1917), repr. in Grabmann, *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben. Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Scholastik und Mystik* (Munich: Hueber, 1926), 1:525–60. Grabmann's hypothesis has until now never been really challenged, although several historical cases of earlier systematic presentations of metaphysics could be found. None of them, however, proved as influential as Suárez's. See in particular Charles Lohr, S.J., "Metaphysics," in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. Schmitt and Quentin Skinner (Cambridge University Press, 1982): 537–638; Jordán Gallego Salvadores O.P., "La aparición de las primeras metafísicas sistemáticas en la España del siglo XVI: Diego Mas (1587), Francisco Suárez y Diego de Zúñiga (1597)," *Escritos del Vedat* 3 (1973): 91–162.

51. For a critical discussion of the label 'modern' applied to Jesuit philosophy, see José Ferrater Mora, "Suárez and Modern Philosophy," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 14 (1953): 528–47; and Robert C. Miner, "Suárez as Founder of Modernity: Reflections on a *Topos* in Recent Historiography," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 18, no. 1 (2001): 17–36, who concludes his study (mainly dedicated to Gilson, McIntyre and Milbank) that "Suárez plays a key role in several distinct strands of anti-modern historiography." For a recent historiographical survey of the same issue, see Stephen Schloesser, "Recent Work in Jesuit Philosophy. Vicissitudes of Rhetorical Accommodation," *Journal of Jesuit Studies* 1, no. 1 (2014): 105–26.

52. Carl von Kaltenborn-Stachau, *Die Vorläufer des Hugo Grotius auf dem Gebiete des ius gentium sowie der Politik im Reformationszeitalter* (Leipzig: G. Mayer, 1848), 136ff.

53. See Adolphe Franck, "Les publicistes du XVIIe siècle: L'école de la résistance. I. – Suarès," *Revue contemporaine* 49 (1860): 730–58.

54. A first but still useful attempt to entangle this debate was the Italian Franciscan scholar Agostino Gemelli (1878–1959), "La sovranità del popolo nelle dottrine politiche di Fr. Suarez," *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 11, no. 1 (1918): 95–120; it is then the backbone of Carlo Giacon, *La seconda scolastica*, vol. 3: *I problemi giuridico-politici: Suárez, Bellarmino, Mariana* (Milan: Bocca, 1950), 35–43 and 168–74.

55. Bertrando Spaventa, *La politica dei gesuiti nel secolo XVI e nel XIX: Polemica con la Civiltà cattolica* (*1854–55*), ed. Giovanni Gentile (Milan: Società Editrice Dante Alighieri di Albrighi, Segati & C., 1911), 160.

56. Giuseppe Saitta, *La scolastica del secolo XVI e la politica dei gesuiti* (Turin: Bocca, 1911).

57. John Neville Figgis, "Societas Perfecta," in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, ed. James Hastings (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), 11:col. 650.

58. Cf. Carlo Giacon, S.J., *La seconda scolastica*, vol. 1: *I grandi commentatori di san Tommaso: Il Gaetano, il Ferrarese, il Vitoria* (Milan: Bocca, 1944); *Suárez* (Brescia: La Scuola, 1945); *La seconda scolastica*, vol. 2: *Precedenze teoretiche ai problemi etico-giuridici: Toledo, Pereira, Fonseca, Molina, Suárez* (Milan: Bocca, 1947); *La seconda scolastica*, vol. 3: *I problemi giuridico-politici: Suárez, Bellarmino, Mariana* (Milan: Bocca, 1950).

59. Hector M. Robertson, *Aspects of the Rise of Economic Individualism: A Criticism of Max Weber and His School* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935). For recent contributions on Jesuit philosophy of economics, see See for instance Wim Decock, "Jesuit Freedom of Contract," *The Legal History Review* 77, nos. 3–4 (2009): 423–58, and huge literature about the economic thought of thinkers such as Juan de Mariana (1536–1624) and Leonard Lessius (1554–1623).

60. Franz Borkenau, *Der Übergang vom feudalen zum bürgerlichen Weltbild: Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie der Manufakturperiode* (Paris: Alcan, 1934).

61. Wolfgang von Leyden, "Introduction," in John Locke, *Essays on the Law of Nature*, trans. and ed. Wolfgang von Leyden (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954). For a critical assessment of von Leyden's reading (and stressing his dependency on the older Gierke), see Francis Oakley, "Locke, Natural Law, and God," in Oakley, *Politics and Eternity. Studies in the History of Medieval and Early Modern Political Thought* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 222–23 in particular.

62. See Quentin Skinner, *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, vol. 2: *The Age of Reformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 135–73, discussing mainly Molina, Suárez, Bellarmine, and Mariana among the Jesuits.

63. Morton White, *The Philosophy of the American Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978), 145.

64. Michel Villey, *La formation de la pensée juridique moderne* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1982), 386–87. A similar reading of Jesuit doctrines of natural law can be found in many other authors, whether they lament it or rejoice themselves about it. For a similar vindication of Suárez's "decisive role," see André de Muralt, *L'unité de laphilosophie politique:De Scot, Occam et Suárez au libéralisme contemporain* (Paris: Vrin, 2002), 115. A general sketch of this secularisation narrative can be found in Pauline C. Westerman, *The Disintegration of Natural Law Theory: From Aquinas to Finnis* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

65. Jacques Maritain, *Réflexions sur l'intelligence et sur sa vie propre* (Paris: Nouvelle Librairie Nationale, 1924), 32–33.

66. See Jean-François Courtine, *Suárez et le système de la métaphysique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1990), 178–79; Courtine speaks also of the "eclipse" of the real thing behind the concept (182). A similar claim has been made earlier by the Swiss historian of philosophy André de Muralt, "L'élaboration de la notion husserlienne d'intentionnalité: Esquisse d'une confrontation de la phénoménologie avec ses origines scolastiques," *Revue de théologie et de philosophie* 10 (1960): 265–84, here 268: "Suárez [...] defines intellectual cognition exclusively as an intentionality of representation. The first known object (*id quod cognoscitur*) is not this or that formal aspect of the thing, immediately known by the concept (*conceptus formalis*), as the Thomists claim, but the objective content of the concept (*conceptus obiectivus*), i.e. the formal aspect of the thing as objectified by thought and reified in an ideal entity. The road is now open for the disciple of Suárez, the student of the Jesuits of La Flèche, René Descartes, for whom the first knowledge is that of internal representations, now called ideas." For a criticism of this interpretation, see Jacob Schmutz, "Hurtado et son double: La querelle sur les images mentales dans la scolastique moderne," in *Questions sur l'intentionnalité*, ed. Lambros Couloubaritsis and Antonino Mazzù (Brussels: Ousia, 2007), 157–232, as well the enlightening debate between Jorge Gracia and Norman Wells in a series of articles: Jorge J. E. Gracia, "Suárez's Conception of Metaphysics: A Step in the Direction of Mentalism?," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 65 (1991): 287–309; Norman J. Wells, "*Esse cognitum* and Suárez Revisited," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 67 (1993): 339–348; Jorge J.E. Gracia, "Suárez and Metaphysical Mentalism: The Last Visit," *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 67 (1993): 349–54.

67. Franz Brentano, *The Psychology of Aristotle, in Particular His Doctrine of the Active Intellect: With an Appendix Concerning the Activity of Aristotle's God*, trans. Rolf George (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1977), 26–28.

68. Hermann Schwarz, *Die Umwälzung der Wahrnehmungshypothesen durch die mechanische Methode* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1895), 6–62. Schwarz would later become one of the most fanatic representatives of Nazi philosophy.

69. See for instance Stöckl, who claimed that Suárez theory of cognition "ist fast überall der thomistischen nachgebildet." Cf. *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, 3:644.

70. Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time: A Translation of* Sein und Zeit, trans. Joan Stambaugh, (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1996), 19. On Heidegger's reading of Suárez, see Costantino Esposito, "Heidegger, Suárez e la storia dell'ontologia," *Quaestio* 1 (2001): 407–30; Esposito, "Le *Disputationes metaphysicae* nelle critica contemporanea," in Francisco Suárez, *Disputazioni metafisiche*, trans. Costantino Esposito (Milan: Bompiani, 2007), 745–853.

71. Martin Heidegger, *Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988), 97.

72. Max Rast, S.J., "Die Possibilienlehre des Franz Suarez," *Scholastik* 10 (1935): 340–68, here 366–67.

73. See in particular É. Gilson, *L'être et l'essence*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Vrin, 1962), 157: "On ne pouvait pousser plus loin la déexistentialisation de l'essence," speaking of Suárez's focalization on possible being as the object of metaphysics. On Gilson's and Siewerth's appraisal of Suárez, see a good summary in Esposito, "Le *Disputationes metaphysicae* nelle critica contemporanea," 758–72; and also Miner, "Suárez as Founder of Modernity," 18–21.

74. For metaphysics, see the seminal studies of Courtine, *Suárez et le système de la métaphysique* and Ludger Honnefelder, *Scientia transcendens: Die formale Bestimmtheit der Seiendheit und Realität in der Metaphysik des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit* (*Duns Scotus, Suárez, Wolff, Kant, Peirce*) (Hamburg: Meiner, 1990). The debate in interpretation in more critical fashion with Rolf Darge, *Suárez' transzendentale Seinsauslegung und die Metaphysiktradition* (Leiden: Brill, 2004) and José Pereira, *Suárez: Between Scholasticism and Modernity* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2007) who propose a more "existentialist" reading. For theories of ideas, see Timothy J. Cronin, *Objective Being in Descartes and Suárez* (Rome: Universitas Gregoriana, 1966).

75. Piero Di Vona, *Studi sulla scolastica della Controriforma: L'esistenza e la sua distinzione metafisica dall'essenza* (Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1968).

76. See the bibliographies by Plácido Múgica Berrondo, S.J., *Bibliografía suareciana* (Granada: Universidad de Granada, 1948); Jean-Paul Coujou, *Bibliografía suareciana* (Pamplona: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Navarra, 2010) and Sydney Penner and Jacob Schmutz, "Bibliography of Works on Francisco Suárez, 1850–present," http://www.sydneypenner.ca/bib.shtml (accessed October 23, 2018).

77. Max Wundt, *Die deutsche Schulmetaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1939), 27.

78. Karl Eschweiler, "Die Philosophie der spanischen Spätscholastik auf den deutschen Universitäten des 17. Jahrhunderts," in *Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft* 1 (1928): 251–325; Eschweiler, "Roderico de Arriaga S.I.: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der spanischen Spätscholastik," in *Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft* 3 (1931): 225–85. On the context and development of Eschweiler's thought, see Thomas Marschler, *Karl Eschweiler (1886–1936): Theologische Erkenntnislehre und nationalsozialistische Ideologie* (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2011).

79. These historiographical ideas were first laid out in his earlier *Die zwei Wege der neueren Theologie* (Augsburg: Benno Filser, 1926), 40–49 in particular.

80. Ernst Lewalter, *Spanisch-Jesuitische und Deutsch-Lutherische Metaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der iberisch-deutschen Kulturbeziehungen und zur Vorgeschichte des deutschen Idealismus* (Hamburg: Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut, 1935).

81. Bernhard Jansen, S.J., "Deutsche Jesuiten-Philosophen des 18. Jahrhunderts in ihrer Stellung zur neuzeitlichen Naturauffassung," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 57 (1933): 384–410; Jansen, "Die scholastiche Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 50 (1937): 401–44; Jansen, "Die Pflege der Philosophie im Jesuitenorden während dem 17./18. Jahrhundert," *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* 51 (1938): 172–215, 344–66, 436–56.

82. Friedrich Stegmüller, *Filosofia e teologia nas universidades de Coimbra e Évora no século XVI* (Universidad de Coimbra, 1959).

83. See in particular the contributions by António Manuel Martins, *Lógica e ontologia em Pedro da Fonseca* (Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 1994); Mário Santiago de Carvalho, *Psicologia e ética no curso jesuíta Conimbricense* (Lisbon: Edições Colibri, 2010) and Cristiano Casalini, *Aristotle in Coimbra: The* Cursus Conimbricensis *and the Education at the College of Arts*, trans. Luana Salvarini (London: Routledge, 2017).

84. For South America, many Jesuits are listed in Walter Redmond, *Bibliography of the Philosophy in the Iberian Colonies of America* (The Hague: Nijhoff, 1972); for the Río de la Plata area (Argentina, Uruguay), see Guillermo Furlong Cardiff, S.J., *Nacimiento y desarrollo de la filosofía en el Río de la Plata 1536–1810* (Buenos Aires: Guillermo Kraft, 1952); for Chile, see recent research by Abel Aravena Zamora, "Manuscritos filosóficos coloniales conservados en el Archivo Nacional Histórico de Santiago de Chile," *Revista española de filosofía medieval* 22 (2015): 289–305; for Perú, see the whole legacy of Rubén Vargas Ugarte, S.J. (1886–1975); for Colombia and Nueva Granada in general, see José del Rey Fajardo, S.J., *Catedráticos jesuitas de la Javeriana colonial* (Bogotá: CEJA, 2002). For Poland and Lithuania, see Roman Darowski, S.J., "La philosophie des jésuites en Pologne du XVIe au XVIIIe siècle: Essai de synthèse," *Forum philosophicum* 2 (1997): 211–43 and Darowski, "Philosophy of Jesuits in Lithuania since the Sixteenth until the Eighteenth Century," *Problemos* 73 (2007): 18–24; for Croatia, see Mijo Korade, "Prilog o filozofiji hrvatskih isusovaca u 17. stoljeću – rukopis fizike Leonarda Bagnija iz Godine, 1628," *Prilozi za istraživanje hrvatske filozofske baštine* 24, nos. 1–2 (1998): 131–44; for Slovakia and Hungary, see the important bibliography around Péter Pázmány, S.J. (1570–1637), for instance Paul Richard Blum, "Péter Pázmány als Philosophieprofessor," in *Pázmány Péter és kora* [*Péter Pázmány and His Time*] (Budapest: Pázmány Péter Katoliku Egyetem, 2001), 35–49. For Southern Germany (Bavaria), see the splendid monograph by Ulrich Gottfried Leinsle, O.Praem., *Dilinganae Disputationes: Der Lehrinhalt der gedruckten Disputationen an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Dillingen, 1555–1648* (Regensburg: Schnell & Schneider, 2006). Certain contexts remain very unexplored, in particular immense Brazil, with the exception of huge literature around António Vieira, S.J. (1608–97) and the documentary research done by Serafim Leite, S.J. (1890–1969). Even in Spain, we have witnessed recently a regionalization of Jesuit studies—with the very qualitative research produced for Andalucia by scholars such as Estanislao Olivares, S.J. and Eduardo Moore, S.J.. For a survey of the Salmantine Jesuit tradition, see Sven K. Knebel, "Salamanca und sein Ambiente. Ein Repertorium zur Jesuitenscholastik des 17. Jahrhunderts," in *Die Ordnung der Praxis: Neue Studien zur spanischen Spätscholastik*, ed. Frank Grunert and Kurt Seelmann (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 2001), 429–58.

85. François de Dainville, *La géographie des humanistes* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1940).

86. On the intellectual context of Dainville's work, see the collected essays in Catherine Bousquet-Bressolier, ed., *François de Dainville, pionnier de l'histoire de la cartographie et de l'éducation* (Paris: École nationale des Chartes, 2004). Another forgotten French pioneer of such a "humanist" approach to Jesuit philosophy was Marcel Chossat, S.J. (1863–1926), who wrote a masterful monograph on the College of Avignon, *Les jésuites et leurs œuvres à Avignon, 1553–1768* (Avignon: P. Séguin, 1896), anticipating largely Dainville's methodology on focusing on education history and the humanist curriculum. He also contributed to the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, with an impressive entry on the existence of God ("Dieu, son existence," in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1910), 4/1:874–948, in which he discussed a wide array of early modern Jesuits beyond the classical canon, identifying in particular the importance of later figures such as Antonio Pérez, S.J. (1599–1649). And as an antidote to triumphant Suarezianism, he published an extremely well annotated reprint of excerpts of the commentary on the *Summa* (1st ed. 1598) by Gabriel Vázquez, S.J.: *Opera omnia*, editio nova ad fidem variarum editionum collatarum diligenter excusa et notis illustrata, ed. Marcel Chossat (Paris: Vivès, 1905).

87. See François de Dainville, S.J., *L'éducation des jésuites: XVIe–XVIIIe siècles*, ed. Marie-Madeleine Compère (Paris: Minuit, 1991).

88. Charles B. Schmitt, "Towards a Reassessment of Renaissance Aristotelianism," *History of Science* 11 (1973): 159–93, here 169.

89. Robert A. Maryks, *Saint Cicero and the Jesuits: The Influence of Liberal Arts on the Adoption of Moral Probabilism* (Aldeshot: Ashgate, 2008), 146.

90. Charles H. Lohr, S.J., "Jesuit Aristotelianism and Sixteenth-Century Metaphysics," in *Paradosis: Studies in Memory of Edwin A. Quain, S.J.* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1976), 203–20.

91. Charles H. Lohr, *Latin Aristotle Commentators*, vol. 2: *Renaissance Authors* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1988).

92. Antonella Romano, *La Contre-Réforme mathématique: Constitution et diffusion d'une culture mathématique jésuite à la Renaissance* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1999).

93. See in particular essays collected in Luce Giard, ed., *Les jésuites à la Renaissance: Système éducatif et production du savoir* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1995); Luce Giard and Louis de Vaucelles, S.J., eds., *Les jésuites à l'âge baroque, 1540–1560* (Grenoble: Jérôme Million, 1996); John W. O'Malley, S.J., Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Steven J. Harris, Frank T. Kennedy, S.J., eds., *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773* (Toronto University Press, 1999); O'Malley et al., *The Jesuits II: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773* (Toronto University Press, 2006).

94. Sven K. Knebel, *Wille, Würfel und Wahrscheinlichkeit: Das System der moralischen Notwendigkeit in der Jesuitenscholastik 1550–1700* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 2000), 27.

95. For a general overview of these innovations, see Jacob Schmutz, "Les innovations conceptuelles de la métaphysique espagnole post-suarézienne: Les *status rerum* selon Antonio Pérez et Sebastián Izquierdo," *Quaestio* 9 (2009): 61–99. The innovative aspect of these post-Suarezian metaphysicians had already been highlighted by Ramón Ceñal, S.J., "La existencia de Dios en la escolástica de los siglos XVII y XVIII," in *Homenaje a Xavier Zubiri* (Madrid: Moneda y Crédito, 1970), I, 245–325. For Pérez, see also Tilman Ramelow, *Gott, Freiheit und Weltenwahl. Die Metaphysik der Willensfreiheit zwischen Antonio Pérez S.J. (1599–1649) und G.W. Leibniz (1646–1716)* (Leiden: Brill, 1997) and Gian Pietro Soliani, *L'apparire del bene. Metafisica e persona in Antonio Pérez S.J. (1599–1649)* (Bari: Edizioni di Pagina, 2018). For Izquierdo, see José Luis Fuertes Herreros, *La lógica como fundamentación del arte general del saber en Sebastián Izquierdo. Estudio del* Pharus scientiarum (Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia / Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses, 1981). On the early modern Jesuit invention of the notion of truth-makers, see Jacob Schmutz, "Réalistes, nihilistes et incompatibilistes: Le débat sur les *negative truthmakers* dans la scolastique jésuite espagnole," in *Dire le néant*, ed. Jérôme Laurent and Claude Romano (Caen: Presses Universitaires de Caen, 2007), 131–78; Brian Embry, "Truth and Truthmakers in Early Modern Scholasticism," *Journal of the American Philosophical Association* 1, no. 2 (2015): 196–216.

96. For the early modern theories of "beings of reason," see studies in John P. Doyle, *Collected Studies on Francisco Suárez, S.J. (1548–1617)*, ed. Victor M. Salas (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2010) and Daniel D. Novotný, *Ens rationis from Suárez to Caramuel: A Study in Scholasticism of the Baroque Era* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2013).

97. See in particular Sven K. Knebel, *Suarezismus: Erkenntnistheoretisches aus dem Nachlass des Jesuitengenerals Tirso González de Santalla (1624-1705); Abhandlung und Edition* (Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner, 2010). Several monographical articles on specific figures of Jesuit philosophy of mind have appeared in recent years: see for instance Michael Edwards, "Digressing with Aristotle: Hieronymus Dandinus' *De corpore animato* (1610) and the Expansion of Late Aristotelian Philosophy," *Early Science and Medicine* 13, no. 2 (2008): 127–70; Anna Tropia, "Suárez as a Scotist: The Portrait of the Doctor Eximius in Losada's Commentary *On the Soul*," in *Francisco Suárez and his Legacy*, ed. Marco Sgarbi (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2010), 89–101.

98. Schmitt, "Towards a Reassessment of Renaissance Aristotelianism," 177.

99. Renée Raphael, *Reading Galileo: Scribal Technologies and the Two New Sciences* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017), 15.

100. Gaston Sortais, S.J., *Le cartésianisme chez les jésuites français au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1929).

101. It would be difficult to list here all the innovative historiographical works on Jesuit early modern natural philosophy. For an overview, see Sheila J. Rabin, "Jesuit Science before 1773: A Historiographical Essay," *Jesuit Historiography Online*, ed. Robert A. Maryks, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2468-7723_jho_COM_196375 (accessed October 23, 2018) and Louis Caruana, "The Jesuits and the Quiet Side of the Scientific Revolution," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Jesuits*, ed. Thomas Worcester (Cambridge University Press, 2008), 243–60. Another good overview can be found in two collective volumes edited by Mordechai Feingold, ed., *Jesuit Science and the Republic of Letters* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2002); *The New Science and Jesuit Science: Seventeenth Century Perspectives* (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2003). For Italy, see Ugo Baldini, Legem impone subactis*: Studi su filosofia e scienza dei gesuiti in Italia, 1540–1632* (Rome: Bulzoni Editore, 1992); Baldini, *Saggi sulla cultura della Compagnia di Gesù (secoli XVI–XVIII)* (Padua: CLEUP, 2010); Raphael, *Reading Galileo* (for the reception of Galileo by Jesuits); Domenico Collacciani and Sophie Roux, "La querelle optique de Bourdin et de Descartes à la lumière des thèses mathématiques soutenues au Collège de Clermont," in *Chemins du cartésianisme*, ed. Antonella del Prete and Raffaele Carbone (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2017), 51–84. The evolution of natural philosophy in the German provinces has been remarkably studied by Hellyer, *Catholic Physics*. On the guiding principles of the development of Jesuit experimental philosophy, see Steven J. Harris, "Transposing the Merton Thesis: Apostolic Spirituality and the Establishment of the Jesuit Scientific Tradition," *Science in Context* 3, no. 1 (1989): 29–65.

102. For a remarkable illustration of this methodology, see Bernd Roling, *Physica sacra. Wunder, Naturwissenschaft und historischer Schriftsinn zwischen Mittelalter und früher Neuzeit* (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Roling, "Light from Within: The Debate on the Glorified Body in Jesuit Theology; Francesco Suárez, Adam Tanner and Rodrigo Arriaga," in *Cognitive Psychology in Early Jesuit Scholasticism*, ed. Daniel Heider (Neunkirchen-Seelscheid: Editiones Scholasticae, 2015), 123–158; Christoph Sander, "For Christ's Sake: Pious Notions of the Human and Animal Body in Early Jesuit Philosophy and Theology," in *Human and Animal Cognition in Early Modern Philosophy and Medicine*, ed. Stefanie Buchenau and Roberto Lo Presti (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2017), 55–73.

103. Etienne Gilson, *Études sur le rôle de la pensée médiévale dans la formation du système cartésien* (Paris: Vrin, 1930).

104. English-language readers can get an idea of Knebel's arguments expressed in his 2000 German monograph *Wille, Würfel und Wahrscheinlichkeit* in the following articles: Sven K. Knebel, "Agustin de Herrera, A Treatise on Aleatory Probability: *De necessitate morali in genere; Tractatus de voluntate Dei,* quaestio X," *The Modern Schoolman* 73 (1996): 199–264; Herrera, "The Renaissance of Statistical Modalities in Early Modern Scholasticism," in *The Medieval Heritage in Early Modern Metaphysics and Modal Theory, 1400–1700*, ed. Russell L. Friedman and Laugo O. Nielsen (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 2003), 231–51.

105. On this development, see Johann Theiner, *Die Entwicklung der Moraltheologie zur eigenständigen Disziplin* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1970).

106. For recent contributions on the moral philosophy of the Jesuits, see Rudolf Schüssler, *Moral im Zweifel*, vol. 1: *Die scholastische Theorie des Entscheidens unter moralischer Unsicherheit* (Paderborn, Mentis Verlag, 2003); Schüssler, *Moral im Zweifel*, vol. 2: *Die Herausforderung des Probabilismus* (Paderborn: Mentis, 2006); Maryks, *Saint Cicero and the Jesuits*; Jean-Pascal Gay, *Morales en conflit: Théologie et polémique au Grand Siècle (1640–1700)* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2011).

107. Ferrater Mora, "Suárez and Modern Philosophy," 532.

108. See for instance recent work dedicated to Descartes and early modern philosophy in general by Jean-Luc Marion, *La théologie blanche de Descartes* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1981); Dennis Des Chene, *Physiologia. Natural Philosophy in Late Aristotelian and Cartesian Thought* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996); Jorge Secada, *Cartesian Metaphysics: The Scholastic Origins of Modern Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Vincent Carraud, Causa sive ratio: *La raison de la cause de Suárez à Leibniz* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 2002); Marleen Rozemond, *Descartes's Dualism* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2002); Robert Pasnau, *Metaphysical Themes, 1274–1671* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), who all include a discussion of the transition between medieval and early modern philosophy. A chapter on Suárez is now also included in most grand historical enterprises, such as for instance in Terence Irwin, *The Development of Ethics*, vol. 2: *From Suárez to Rousseau* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Cite this page

Schmutz, Jacob, "The Historiography of pre-1773 Jesuit Philosophy: 1814–2018", in: *Jesuit Historiography Online*. Consulted online on 09 November 2020 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/2468-7723_jho_COM_211797>
First published online: 2018