CHAPTER 11

MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY AFTER THE MIDDLE AGES

JACOB SCHMUTZ

'Hasn't Amerigo Vespucci discovered lands unknown to Ptolemy, Pliny and other geographers up to the present? Why shouldn't the same be the case in other matters?', asked the acclaimed Parisian professor of theology John Mair (1467–1550) in the first decade of the sixteenth century (Mair 1509, 1v). His judgement could well appear prophetic for all admirers of modern novelties in science, philosophy and religion, if only his name wasn't the symbol of that very tradition that has usually been seen as the major obstacle to discoveries, namely, medieval-rooted scholasticism. From Erasmus, Rabelais and Luther down to Voltaire, passing through Puritan pulpits or Parisian ladies' *salons*, his name and that of his contemporaries used to stand for the idle and obscure debates of academic philosophy: 'to me, a *Cursus philosophicus* is but an Impertinency in *Folio*; and the studying of them a laborious idleness' wrote, for instance, Joseph Glanvill (1636–80) in his attempt to break scholastic dogmatism by the introduction of experimental method (Glanvill 1661, 151, quoted by Knebel 2000, 3). But whereas enlightened minds knew to express their disgust with wit, modern scholars satisfy themselves with a simply dismissive tone. Among historians of logic, for instance, it is commonly held that the creativity of scholasticism came to a certain form of standstill somewhere between the sixteenth and seventeenth century, and that there was something like a 'big void', filled only by the birth of analytical philosophy in the nineteenth century.[1] This standing prejudice against the intellectual value of post-medieval scholasticism is due to a peculiar nineteenth-century blend of anti-clerical positivism and romantic fascination for the Middle Ages. But the empirical reality of the evolution of philosophy is different: during the early-modern period, the medieval scholastic heritage was progressively transformed into a powerful and continuous tradition of academic philosophy that would

be projected, thanks to the discoveries mentioned by John Mair, on the entire planet. It is well known that all major philosophers of the seventeenth century were educated by scholastics, such as Descartes, Leibniz, Spinoza or Locke.[2] But the influence of academic philosophy also reached later authors, such as Kant, Hamilton, De Morgan, Bolzano and even Cantor. Even numerous fields we study today were actually inventions of post-medieval scholasticism: it was, for instance, during the sixteenth century that Aristotelian metaphysics became, properly speaking, *ontology*, that the doctrine of the operations of the soul was for the first time dubbed *psychology* and promising new fields such as *meta-ethics*[3] were invented. In this contribution, we shall defend three historical theses: (1) medieval sources remained a living material for early-modern readers, although some selections were made; (2) early-modern readers were eager not to repeat, but to expand the medieval doctrines; (3) a close historical study of early-modern scholasticism can explain numerous and important features of contemporary philosophy, such as, for instance, the opposition between realism and idealism or even the famous 'Continental-analytical' divide.

1. Material History

Early-modern scholasticism starts when the medieval authors were labelled as *antiqui* and submitted to a process of continuous interpretation.[4] There isn't a line of Thomas Aquinas, wrote the imaginative Basque Jesuit Juan Bautista Poza (1588–1659), that may not be explained and defended in an optimal fashion.[5] But not all medieval authors enjoyed that enviable fate of being the subject of continuous and charitable interpretation, which in the Gutenberg Galaxy was closely linked to the commercial and material dimension of printing as well as to institutional commissions, prohibitions and political command.[6] Later Protestant historians liked to ridicule Catholic scholasticism as *philosophia in servitutem theologiae papae* (Heumann 1719, xxii), but most reformed universities, in particular in Germany, had also strongly insisted on the need to submit philosophical teaching to the creed: in Herborn, for instance, Johann Heinrich Alsted asked that professors of philosophy refute any philosophical doctrine in conflict with Scripture. New libraries were set up everywhere, manuscripts were classified and separated from printed works and a new map of the past slowly emerged: only those medieval authors who were printed turned out to be massively read, and those left in manuscripts were definitively forgotten until twentieth-century medievalists uncovered them again. Those authors were printed whose work the universities or specific religious orders wanted to use as textbooks: this benefited some medieval authors and very often only some of their works. Conversely, due to a lack of patronage or insufficient printing presses, other traditions were doomed to remain totally unknown up to present. Besides a few later figures such as Versor or Almain, fifteenth-century authors would almost entirely be neglected.

A striking feature of this printing movement is that most medieval authors printed and commented on in the early-modern period were actually *theological* authorities, and their *theological* texts were at the centre of inquiry. So it was the case for Thomas Aquinas (for the Dominicans, Jesuits, reformed Carmelites and progressively the entire secular clergy),[7] whose *Summa* was progressively adopted as a standard text in most universities for the teaching of theology, replacing Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. It was also the case for John Duns Scotus (for the Franciscans),[8] Bonaventure (for the Capuchins) Giles of Rome and Gregory of Rimini (for the Augustinians), Henry of Ghent (whom the Servites believed was of theirs), John Baconthorpe (for non-reformed Carmelites) and, of course, Anselm of Canterbury (for some Benedictines[9]) and Bernard of Clairvaux (for some Cistercians). Thanks to the work of some sharpshooters, Peter Auriol was re-edited and became a 'source of inspiration for the moderns' (Mastri 1727, 33, calls him a *promptuarium Neotericorum*), Durandus of Saint-Pourçain remained a reference because of his adoption by Spanish universities in the early sixteenth century, Peter of Tarentaise had some admirers and Guillaume de Saint-Amour remained a political hero for French Gallicans. Some late medieval authorities such as Peter of Ailly or Jacques Almain made it even into Protestant circles as authorities for theologians eager to defend divine command ethics. But only rare birds kept reading the texts of William of Ockham, and the alleged 'nominalism' of Descartes or Hobbes remains largely a historiographical myth.[10] Hereby the medieval canon was progressively set: after the seventeenth century, nobody would read the manuscripts of authors who became the heroes of twentieth-century medievalism, such as Peter John Olivi, Matthew of Acquasparta or Francis of Marchia, nor would medieval manuscripts benefit from the interest in the Church Fathers and biblical philology of the second half of the seventeenth century, as, for instance, promoted by the Maurists in France.[11] The only exception is perhaps the splendid Paris edition of William of Auvergne's *Opera Omnia* (1674), but that happened precisely because its editor, the Sorbonne-scholar Blaise Le Féron, saw in him the last Church Father.

The status of, strictly speaking, medieval *philosophical* texts was different. The only medieval 'philosopher' who was continuously read and reprinted in the West was actually the Arab Averroes.[12] Still among philosophers, Raymond Lull enjoyed a vivid tradition and inspired numerous original encyclopedic projects, in the Catholic just as in the Protestant world[13]. Important new Renaissance translations of Aristotle himself, the 'eternal philosophical dictator' (Heumann 1719, XIX), such as those by John Argyropoulos (1415–87), Joachim Périon (ca. 1499–1559) or the Jesuit commentators of Coimbra (1592–1606), would overshadow the medieval Aristotelian commentators and translations. The reason is that during the sixteenth century, universities and religious orders were eager to commission rapidly new introductory textbooks that would replace them: in logic, for instance, the *Summulae* by the Spanish Dominican Domingo de Soto (1494–1560, cf. Soto 1529) or by Gaspar Cardillo de Villalpando (1527–81) would soon become European bestsellers, and nobody would have a direct access to Peter of Spain's medieval original anymore. The same can be said about other disciplines. Some commentaries on

Metaphysics were still read in the sixteenth century, such as those of Antonio Andrés, John Buridan or Dominic of Flanders, but most of their material would be quickly integrated into new synthetic and widely used commentaries such as those produced by the Italian Dominicans Paolo Barbo 'Soncinas' (d.1494) and Crisostomo Iavelli (ca. 1470–1538). First-hand knowledge of all these medieval philosophical commentaries progressively died out with the strong rise of the philosophical textbook, the famous *Cursus philosophicus*, of which hundreds were produced over the decades. Each order, each province, each university would start commissioning textbooks for its own use.[14] Francisco Suárez's (1548–1617) famous *Disputationes metaphysicae* (1597) were also the result of such an institutional commission to produce a prolegomena to theology.

It was also during the early-modern age that medieval philosophy and theology became a truly 'global' heritage, in no way restricted to a few Western European Catholic monasteries and universities. The Protestant reception of the (mainly) sixteenth-century and Spanish scholastic production has been well documented, at least for the German and Dutch lands, and this explains why philosophers such as Leibniz and Spinoza were still arguing with so many medieval ideas.[15] But regardless of confessional barriers, the modern age saw the rapid expansion of the European network of universities and the projection of its ideas on the rest of the world through colonisation and missionary activity. Medieval authors and ideas rapidly became solidly rooted in the New World: the Portuguese-born Jesuit António Vieira (1608–97) imagined the fate of Aquinas's doctrine of ignorance among the Gentiles of the Brazilian jungle, and the Puritan Samuel Willard (1640–1707), pastor of South Church in Boston and one of the first vice presidents of Harvard College, still echoed late medieval theologians when he claimed that the equity of God's law is founded on the goodwill and pleasure of God. The role of Portugal and Spain was, of course, important in this expansion. The nation of seafarers and the huge empire of the Habsburgs brought the thought of the *Illustri Hispani* to remote places where scholasticism was already well established, such as Flanders or Bavaria, to places where it had to be restored, such as the Czech lands, but also to totally new places, such as Lithuania, Croatia, Hungary and Transylvania, Greece and even remote Armenia and Ukraine, where the metropolitan and prince Peter Mohyla (1597–1647) imported German and Polish professors to educate new generations of Ukrainians in Latin scholasticism in an Academy still existing today.[16] Academic mobility was sometimes also imposed, as for highly creative recusant English, Scottish and Irish scholars who wandered all over Continental Europe during two centuries. If men did not travel, then their books did: some textbooks such as the logical *Manuductio* of Philippe Du Trieu (1580–1645)[17] or the *Medulla* by Hermann Busembaum (1600–68) were on the best-seller list for more than a century; the rather clumsy textbooks by the French Dominican Antoine Goudin (1639–95, Goudin 1670–71) were used in the mountains of Armenia, and those of the Sorbonne philosopher Edmond Pourchot (1651–1734) became popular in Italy but also, more surprisingly, in Ottoman Greece.[18] Some South American colleges and universities, such as those of Mexico and Peru in particular, would quickly rise to the top tier of the world's academic

institutions.[19] Even the lands of Africa and Asia were not untouched by those doctrines: Francisco Furtado (1589–1653) translated the logic manual of the famous Conimbricenses (the Jesuit commentators from the Portuguese College of Coimbra) under the title *Ming li t'an* into Mandarin Chinese (Hangzhou, 1631).[20]

2. The Order of Knowledge

The medieval philosophical curriculum usually followed an order based upon the Arabic classification of the works of Aristotle, starting with logic, continuing with physics (including general and 'special' or 'particular' physics, i.e., the science of the heaven, the world, generation and corruption, etc.) and finishing with metaphysics and in some cases including a section dedicated to ethics. This order (Type I below) remained common in European universities during the 1350–1500 period, and it can be still found, for instance, in the Aristotelian commentaries of Pierre Tartaret (e.g., Tartaretus 1581) or of an Italian secular university tradition such as Padua. It was also adopted by most of the first-generation Jesuit colleges as well as in the universities of Reformation Germany, under the action of Philipp Melanchthon (1497–1560), the *Praeceptor Germaniae.* Some authors chose to modify it slightly, by introducing *ethics* before *metaphysics* (Type I modified), using as criterion the fact that beyond logic, the sciences had to proceed from the most sensible (physics) to the most abstract (metaphysics), and that ethics dealing with the soul's affection was still including a sensible dimension (e.g., Goudin 1670, Praef.).

This order had, however, a couple of problematic issues, and the differential treatment given to them explains the progressive modification in structure that affected the classical teaching of philosophy. Although the local variations are almost infinite[21], two general trends can be observed: Type II shifted directly the place of ethics to the second place of the curriculum. But it kept untouched, from the classical model, the idea that the objects of physics and metaphysics were actually per se mind independent, whereas logic and ethics were dealing with human mental and physical acts. Type III, on the contrary, modified the classical structure very substantially, by bringing together logic and metaphysics at the beginning of the course, and by relegating physics (now independent) to the end of the whole curriculum. In this last model, there were also some variations about the respective place of ethics, when included: usually treated shortly, many colleges dealt with it before getting to the exposition of physics.

The shifting place of physics is probably the easiest to be explained. According to the classical Aristotelian curriculum, physics, mathematics and metaphysics were sciences dealing with extra-mental objects, of which the first kind was defined as being in matter and in movement. This abstract and very formal characterisation of the object of physics and its classical principles (such as matter and form) would progressively give way to the development of experimental physics,

Table 11.1 Ideal-Types of Early-Modern Scholastic Philosophy Courses

Classical Type Ia & Ib		Modern Type II	Modern Type IIIa & IIIb	
Logic		Logic	Logic	
Physics (general and special), Psychology		Ethics	Metaphysics (including Psychology)	
Metaphysics	Ethics	Physics	[Ethics]	Physics
[Ethics]	Metaphysics	Metaphysics	Physics	Ethics
Noteworthy examples:				
Most *cursus philosophicus* produced by religious orders, such as, for the Jesuits, Arriaga 1632; Compton Carleton 1649; Hurtado de Mendoza 1615; Losada 1724–35, Lourenço 1688; Mayr 1739; Oviedo 1640; etc.; for the Dominicans, Poinsot 1631–4; all without ethics; some courses inverted the order between ethics and metaphysics (Ib): e.g., Goudin 1670.		Some French Catholic courses, such as Abra de Raconis 1617; Eustachius a Sancto Paulo 1609; numerous Protestant textbooks also follow this order, e.g., Piccart 1655, 159–167 (who argues that this order goes back to Simplicius); Rabe 1703; Stier 1652.	Already Bouju 1614 (IIIb)[22], and most French courses after Descartes: for instance, Frassen 1657 (IIIb), Pourchot 1695 (IIIb); numerous Central European Jesuit courses in the eighteenth century, but often without ethics: e.g., Gremner 1748; Horváth 1767; Mangold 1755, etc. In Italy, the model was followed by the influential Genovesi 1743–1745. Among Protestants, see Scheibler 1623 (IIIb); Walch 1730 (IIIb), p. 41–48 explains also its epistemological foundation.	

accomplishing in a certain way Descartes's aspiration for a more 'practical' science of nature (Descartes 1637, p. 62). The relationship between the 'old' and the 'new' physics gave rise to numerous censorships and complex debates about specifically theological issues, such as the compatibility of a revised physics with the Christian doctrine of the Eucharist. There was no uniformity in the development of experimental science: it was slow in some regions and traditions and much more rapid in others. But eventually, laboratories measuring the trajectories of canon bullets or air pressure would be set up even in the most remote colleges of the Andes.[23] Even where physics remained conservative, the classical Aristotelian doctrines of matter and space, and place and time, would actually be transformed into something quite different, such as, for instance, an atomistic theory of matter or the replacement of the Aristotelian doctrine of space by the notion of a three-dimensional space.[24] Equally, the epistemology of Aristotle's *Posterior Analytics* would keep inspiring the new theories of scientific demonstration and scientific discovery. Creativity in physics could go hand in hand with conservatism in logic or ethics: John T. Needham (1713–81), famous for his theory of spontaneous generation and first Catholic

fellow of the Royal Society, came from a rather classical scholastic curriculum in the recusant colleges of Douai and Lisbon. In Paris, Pierre Lemonnier (1676–1757) satisfied himself with teaching a quite uninspiring logic and metaphysics course but devoted all his attention to chemistry, physical optics, magnetism, natural history and mathematics. Laplace and Diderot were educated by progressive physics teachers. It should be clear that neither the Spanish expulsion of Jesuits nor the French revolution was about scientific progress, nor was the Enlightenment as 'radical' as sometimes claimed.

The second critical issue was the status of the classical Aristotelian 'science of the soul', which had already enjoyed a wide range of positions in the medieval tradition. Naturalist Aristotelianism considered it as a simple appendix to physics qua biology, whereas a more powerful tradition rooted in the Arabic tradition made it the queen of the sciences, defining philosophy as the correct ordering of the soul. This ultimately Neoplatonic heritage would enjoy a form of revival through the process of secession of psychology from physics. In the Catholic tradition, the focus was set on the soul's immateriality and immortality, especially since the Lateran decree of 1513, which echoed the massive debates at the University of Padua.[25] The question of the soul would from then be treated as a special part of metaphysics, dedicated to the species of spiritual being or substance, often labelled *pneumatologia*. In reformed territories, due to the lasting influence of Marburg professors Rudolf Goclenius (1547–1628) and Otto Cassmann (1526–1607; see Casmann 1594), the question of the soul became part of an encompassing new science called *anthropologia*, divided into *somatologia* (body) and *psychologia* (soul),[26] still practised by Wolff and Kant and whose name has survived to this day. Other more ambitious attempts to look at the soul from the point of view of its intellectual capacity of apprehending simple principles (*gnostologia*) or complex propositions (*noologia*), as it had been promoted by the Königsberg philosopher Abraham Calov (1612–82; cf. Calov 1651), did not survive as a consecrated field of study.

The third transformation affected the status and place of metaphysics. Considered as the highest of the speculative sciences in the Aristotelian classification, it was now increasingly taught together with logic at the beginning of a philosophy course. The early-modern commentators resolved the medieval tension between the definition of metaphysics as science of being qua being, and the definition of metaphysics as science of the highest being by a clear-cut division between both perspectives, which can be found, for instance, in the works of Benet Perera (Pererius, ca. 1535–1610, cf. Perera 1576) and Suárez and in some reformed authors such as Goclenius or Johannes Micraelius (1597–1658).[27] It began from the consideration that metaphysics is the most 'abstract' science. Two different ways of envisaging abstraction entail two different types of objects: either metaphysics makes an 'abstract' consideration of everything there is, including God and creatures, in which case it becomes the science of the first fundamental objective concepts of the soul. Metaphysics in this most 'general' sense would thus consider being and its fundamental attributes, such as the classical transcendentals (unity, goodness,

truth), categories and post-predicaments and also its modal divisions into possible, impossible, necessary and contingent. In some specific cases, the entire field of metaphysics was actually presented as a 'modal' metaphysics, starting with the distinction between possible and impossible being. According to the second understanding, abstraction should not be referred to the speculative power of the thought but to the abstract (i.e., immaterial) nature of the objects of thought themselves, and metaphysics in this sense deals primarily with God, angels and the soul, considered as abstract entities. This is why the French Jesuit Honoré Fabri (1607–88) could reasonably claim that there 'was little metaphysics to be found in Descartes', and that his work actually belongs to theology.[28] Numerous new names were given to that new division of metaphysics: the standard distinctions ran between *metaphysica generalis* and *metaphysica specialis*, or between *ontologia* on one side[29] and *theologia* and *pneumatologia* on the other side. In the eighteenth-century French tradition, general metaphysics would become the so-called *philosophie générale* (see, for instance, the course by Béguin 1782), still taught today as an introductory course to philosophy in the standard curriculum.

The last problematic issue was the status of ethics. More than in other fields, the reception of medieval ethics was highly conditioned by the humanist-scholastic alternative. 'Lay' or 'secular' ethics followed Platonic and literary sources from the Renaissance, whereas more strictly 'theological' ethics used medieval authorities to construct a new discipline called *theologia moralis*.[30] Some scholastic traditions, notably in Spain and Portugal, actually managed completely to exclude ethics from the philosophy course and reduced it to a part of theology. But the apparent subsistence of a strictly philosophical ethics in other Catholic lands should not be mistaken for its independence from theology: just as metaphysics included natural theology and angelology, most ethics were basically constructed as commentaries of Aquinas's *Prima-Secundae* with sections on human acts, freedom and will, and passions of the soul. The most fascinating ethical and legal issues were then treated in specifically dedicated treatises of moral theology and in confession manuals, as can be appreciated by the lasting influence of the *Enchiridion* or *Manual for Confessors and Confessants* (1552) by Martín de Azpilcueta (1492–1586)[31]. The discussion about the right action to undertake in unclear circumstances was at the basis of the emergence of the huge literature today often described as casuistry or 'probabilism'. The scholastics developed a fantastic framework of philosophy of action and *Tiefenpsychologie* in order to explain why we choose to act in certain ways. They did so by reviving numerous Late Antique or medieval questions, such as the doctrine of the first movements of sensibility and their moral characterisation.[32] The treatment of theological virtues and sacraments included important discussions on the relationship between belief and action. 'Business ethics' about just price and just employment was developed in the tradition of *De iustitia* treatises,[33] and sexual ethics was treated in theological treatises on marriage, such as the famous *De matrimonio* by the Andalucian Jesuit Tomás Sánchez (1550–1610).[34] In all ethical and also legal discussions, medieval authorities were still held in particularly high esteem. The early-modern scholastics produced sometimes huge commentaries on the responses

given, for instance, by Duns Scotus or Gregory of Rimini to the classical Euthyphro-dilemma: is something good because God wills it, or does God will because it is good in itself? One tradition would favour a classical account in terms of natural law and advocate positions closely akin to today's moral realism[35]. Others harked back to the Augustinian distinction between *natura* and *voluntas* and developed an autonomous *scientia moralis*, claiming that moral principles could in no way be simply deduced from nature or reality: *Oportet de moralibus moraliter philosophari, sicut de realibus realiter.*[36] This distinction can be seen as the true scholastic ancestor of Giambattista Vico's pragmatic redefinition of human sciences as well as the Neo-Kantian distinction between *Naturwissenschaft*, ruled by causes to be explained, and *Kulturwissenschaft*, ruled by norms and beliefs to be understood.

3. The Scholastic Matrix of Contemporary Philosophy

As this short presentation shows, numerous contemporary issues appear actually to be inherited from the early-modern transformation of medieval philosophy. In this last part, I shall go one step further and argue more generally that our various conceptions of 'what there is' and of the functions of philosophical discourse are largely inherited from these early-modern debates. The opposition between the three ideal-types identified above is in no way just a matter of organisation of teaching: they say a lot about how we should look at reality. Type I and Type II kept from the old Aristotelian heritage the idea that sciences are divided according to the nature of things, as expressed by the medieval axiom *scientiae secantur ut res*. Logic treats human second intentions, whereas physics and metaphysics (including theology) treat extra-mental and thought-independent objects. But even within those more classical structures, one can observe a clearly 'mentalistic turn' (Knebel 2009, p. 424): both the logician and the metaphysician, wrote the Spanish Thomist Domingo Báñez (1528–1604), look at reality 'from the point of view of our concepts of it'[37], whereas the physician considers extra-mental objects directly in themselves. This turn would then definitely be accomplished with massive adoption of Type III, especially in a post-Cartesian context. The authors following Type III justified the integration of logics and metaphysics by the fact that *both* sciences (and not only logic) were dealing with the mind and its operations or, as Edmond Pourchot put it, 'ideas of the mind and first notions of things'.[38] Logic is not seen as a formal classification of terms and analysis of the structure of propositions, but as 'facultative',[39] that is, as an analysis of the cognitive faculties of the mind: 'The newer logics (. . .) both on the continent and in Britain, concentrated more upon the nature and operation of the faculties than upon arguments and valid inference forms' (Yolton 1984, p. 105). In Britain, it took the form of the famous 'way of ideas', claiming that science was primarily concerned with our ideas of things rather with the things themselves.

In France, it was consecrated by the influence of Cartesian 'metaphysics' and the acclaimed Port-Royal Logic. The slow Cartesian reception within the German Catholic tradition would explain, in the middle of the eighteenth century, the rejection of Type I (still followed by Mayr 1739) and adoption of Type III (e.g., Mangold 1755). In Protestant Germany, the integration of logic and metaphysics was already eased by the very idealist interpretation of the object of metaphysics as 'intelligible being' or 'supertranscendental'[40] and would then also be generalised with the reception of Cartesian logics and metaphysics as exemplified by the work of Johannes Clauberg (1622–65)[41]. The integration between logics and metaphysics would survive until the Kantian aftermath: this is how his disciple Karl Ludwig Poerschke (1752–1812) would start teaching the *Critique of Pure Reason* (Pozzo 1998).

The transmission and filtering of the medieval heritage thus followed two paths: Path I has been widely studied since it crosses the classical European philosophical heartland (French Cartesianism, English and German idealism, Wolffian-Leibnizian rationalism, etc.), whereas Path II remains largely untravelled by historians[42]. Ironically, it corresponds to the division between the culturally dominant ancestors of the 1957 EEC and its 'new' Southern and Eastern enlargement:

Table 11.2 Early-Modern Paths of Transmission of Scholastic Property

	Path I The Idealistic Main Road	Path II The Realistic By-Pass
Logic deals with	The activity of the mind: formal truth as dependent on the mind and its cognitive faculties ('facultative' logic)	Mind-independent objects and structures: objective propositions and truths, formal modes of reasoning
Metaphysics deals with	Objective (i.e., mind-dependent) concepts, first ideas or notions of things	Mind- and God-independent objects and states of affairs (*status rerum*)
God	Philosophically significant as warrant of theoretical or moral truths.	Philosophically insignificant: no divine warranty for theoretical or moral truths.
Traditions	*Idealist interpretation of medieval metaphysics* France, Protestant Germany (Leibniz-Wolff), Holland, Britain and all Cartesian-influenced traditions (e.g., Pourchot, Genovesi and Italian idealism, etc.)	*Realist interpretation of medieval metaphysics* *Mitteleuropa*: some authors from Poland, Czech lands, Bavaria, Austria, Hungary, etc.; some Catholic colleges such Colegio Imperial (Madrid), Collegium Romanum
Aftermath	Kant German and British Idealism	Bolzano Frege Neo-Aristotelianism

Kant's Copernican revolution was not, however, the only possible way to read the medieval heritage. According to the principle of interpretation mentioned above, Duns Scotus's doctrine of *esse obiectivum* (the fact that all beings are objects of thought), for instance, could equally be seen as a form of proto-idealism but also as a form of radical realism. This largely explains the long debates among seventeenth-century Scotists about the true teaching of Scotus and more generally of medieval authors on the question of whether 'formalities' or 'possibilia' were, for instance, mind dependent or not.[43] Those who considered God as the ultimate source of ideas and possibles would eventually embrace the idealist road. But those who took seriously the claim that truths remain truths (*circumscripto omni actu intellectus*) or that moral truth would remain moral (*etiamsi fingamus Deum non esse in rerum natura*) (Bellarmino) engaged themselves on a new realistic road in which the object of philosophical discourse was considered as ultimately independent of human thought. Just like the idealist road, this interpretation can be traced back to a number of Spanish colleges, whose teaching then spread over a variety of European academic institutions. Its paragon author was the very creative and idiosyncratic Jesuit Sebastián Izquierdo (1606–81), who had tried to develop an innovative doctrine of mind-independent states of affairs (*status rerum*), which science would have progressively to discover.[44] The concept of state of affairs was a generic way to designate all the possible (but not actual) objects of the human mind: essential or existential, future or present, disjunctive or vague, and so on. Following this realist premise, other early-modern authors did not hesitate to enrich our ontological vocabulary and developed, for instance, an ontology of events (*eventus*), a doctrine of mind-independent truth-makers (*verificativa*) or an complex ontology of 'moral beings' (*entia moralia* or *moralitates*). The conception of science is transformed: it is not considered as the result of the correct use of the cognitive faculties, but rather as the sum of the mind-independent facts and truths that are slowly discovered by enquiring human thought.

In conclusion, one can say that medieval philosophy had a paradoxical fate after the Middle Ages. Its conceptual tools finally led not only the famous *novatores* but also the more orthodox scholastics to embrace new worldviews that are quite far from the medieval one. It is therefore no surprise that the late–nineteenth century revival of interest in medieval philosophy in confessional Catholic circles would often go hand in hand with a strong rejection of early-modern philosophy at large, including its scholastic background. On the one hand, the idealistic or mentalistic tradition, including the doctrine of Suárez and numerous Jesuits, is accused of being too proto-idealistic or 'nominalistic' and is presented as an unhappy parenthesis in the history of thought. On the other, the more realistic tradition is seen as guilty of having lost sight of the foundational character of divine power and knowledge in the constitution of the world and in the orientation of morality. The early-modern scholastic transformations of late medieval thought therefore even reached the status of new heresies, called *ontologismus* and *philosophismus*, another interesting seventeenth-century scholastic neologism later used by the German theologian Joseph Anton Sambuga (1752–1815) to attack rationalism in all its forms.[45] Medieval

philosophy would then become a safe haven for anti-moderns or simply the object of antiquarian and aesthetic fascination. It would not be a living material anymore—what precisely it had been for so long from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. In the last decades, the analytical revival has helped to change this situation, by inviting us to look at the medievals from the point of view of the coherence of their arguments and the pertinence of their concepts. It is to be hoped that this revival will also finally reach the early-modern scholastic tradition and help us to write a more varied history of philosophy without gaps.

NOTES

1. See, for instance, Ashworth (1982, p. 787); De Libera (2002, p. 33). For the development of early-modern logic, the major tool remains Risse (1964–70). For an example of its creativity, see, for instance, Roncaglia (1996); Redmond (2002); Friedman & Nielsen (2003); on the relationship with semantics, the best synthesis is Meier-Oeser (1997).

2. There is an important literature on each individual figure. See, for instance, Ariew (2011) for Descartes. More generally, on the French context, see Brockliss (1987).

3. Cf. Caramuel (1682): just as there are metaphysics, conceived as a science of the first concepts and first rules of the understanding, there must be a meta-ethics, defined as a science of the first principles of morality.

4. Suárez (1655, p. 326b): 'Sub Scholasticis antiquis comprehendimus omnes qui ante nostra tempora et ante Calvini errorem scripserunt . . .' On the early-modern conceptions of scholasticism, see Quinto (2001), and on the historiographical names ('second scholasticism', 'late aristotelianism', 'academic philosophy', etc.), see Forlivesi (2006).

5. Poza (1627, p. 1211): 'Nulla est propositio Doctoris Sancti quae non optime explicari et defendi queat'.

6. For a synthesis on the prohibitions and commissions in the Catholic tradition, see Schmutz (2010).

7. It was also during the seventeenth-century that the first vernacular translations of the *Summa* were published. The bibliography on this early-modern Thomism is huge: on the Renaissance Thomism, see the classical monograph by Kristeller (1970); on the Spanish school of Salamanca and its sources, see Belda Plans (2000); on the varieties of attitudes towards Thomism, and a more extensive bibliography, see Schmutz (2008a); De Franceschi (2010).

8. For a survey, see Porro & Schmutz (2008) (including an extensive bibliography); Schmutz (2002).

9. The French Jesuit Théophile Raynaud produced also a beautiful new edition of Anselm's works, including his prayers, in 1630.

10. This myth should at least have been dismantled since Hübener (1983). Authentic nominalists were rare, such as the Frenchman Jean Salabert (cf. Salabert 1651) or the Englishman Obadiah Walker (cf. Walker 1673). Among the members of the Society of Jesus, the most 'nominalistic' course was that of Hurtado de Mendoza (1615), who influenced several of his pupils (R. de Arriaga, A. Pérez).

11. On the revival of Church Fathers, which in some circles would be seen as an alternative to medieval theology, see contributions in Backus (1996), as well as the monographs of Quantin (1999, for France) and Quantin (2009, for England).

12. On this Italian Aristotelianism and the reading of Averroes in particular, such as in the Padua school, see Hasse (2004); Poppi (1970). More generally, on the specific issues of early-modern Aristotelianism, see Bianchi (2003); Frank &Speer (2007); Piaia (2002); Pozzo (2003); Schmitt (1983a); Tucker (2000).

13. See the classical survey by Rossi (2000).

14. On this tradition of textbooks, see Blum (1998); Freedman (1993, 1999); Thorndike (1951).

15. On the German Protestant reception within the Schulmetaphysik, see the groundbreaking works of Eschweiler (1928) and Lewalter (1935). On the further development in the German lands, see Freedman (1984, 1988); Leinsle (1985, 1988); Petersen (1921); Trueman & Clark (1999); Wundt (1939). For a case study on Dutch reformed scholasticism, see Goudriaan (1999). For Britain, see Costello (1958); Howell (1961); Schmitt (1983b); Yolton (1986). There were also minor and little studied scholastic traditions in reformed Denmark and Finland.

16. Cf. Symchych (2009). More generally, there has been a renewed interest, since the fall of communism, in the national traditions of scholasticism in Eastern Europe. Other important contributions include Darowski (2008) (Lithuania); Darowski (1994, 1998) (Poland); Ibrulj (2009) (Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina); Sousedík (2007) (Bohemia).

17. One of the sources of John Locke: Milton (1984).

18. Cf. Demetracopoulos (2010).

19. The study of South American colonial scholasticism has made considerable progress in the last decades. The best starting point remains the precious sources inventory by Redmond (1972). Important case studies include Beuchot (1997); Beuchot & Marquínez Argote (1996); Hampe Martínez (1999).

20. Cf. Wardy (2000).

21. A general overview can be found in Brockliss (1996).

22. Note that Bouju's title page actually claims following the traditional order (Ia), but effectively he starts with logics followed by 'universal metaphysics' and physics, and finishes with ethics. On the relationship between Descartes's order of science and the scholastic order, see Ariew (2011, 55–64).

23. Some good recent case studies on scientific traditions are Baldini (1992) (for the Roman Jesuits); Brockliss (2004) (on the end of Aristotelian physics at the University of Paris colleges); Des Chene (1996); Dollo (1979 and 1984) (on Sicily); Feingold (2003) (on the Jesuits in general); Hellyer (2005) (for the German Jesuits); Kusukawa (1995) (on the German reformation); Leijenhorst (2003) (pre-Hobbesian context in England). The literature dedicated to specific figures is huge, and there are numerous overviews on the universities: see Feingold & Navarro-Brotóns (2006). For an example of the scientific culture in South American colleges, see, for instance, the excellent case study by Keeding (1983) (Ecuador).

24. See, for example, the case study by Leijenhorst & Lüthy (2002).

25. There is a vast bibliography on this decree. See Grendler (2002), for its reception in Italian universities, and a full bibliography in Schmutz (2010). On the problematic of the immortality of the soul, the standard synthesis remains Di Napoli (1963).

26. On the epistemological status of the *De Anima*, see Wels (2007, 201–2) in particular; more generally, on the background, still useful, the general presentation by Kessler (1982). On the emergence of psychology as an independent scientific discipline, see the important and erudite monographs by Salatowsky (2006) and Vidal (2006), quoting most of the older bibliography on the subject. Des Chene (2000) has a more limited textual basis.

27. This story has often been told, since Vollrath (1961). See general presentations in Courtine (1990); Darge (2003); Honnefelder (1990); Leinsle (1985,1988). Recent collections of essays in Forlivesi (2009) and Esposito (2009) have added considerable new material.

28. Fabri (1674, p. 13), quoted by Knebel (2009, 400): 'Ad Metaphysicam venio, de qua ille [sc. Cartesius] pauca scripsit; nec enim meditationes illae de Deo et anima, quas "metaphysicas" vocat, ad Metaphysicam pertinent, sed ad Theologiam. Aliam ego Metaphysicam agnosco, nimirum rationum universalium scientiam, cuius ille numquam meminit (. . .)'.

29. As recently discovered (2002), the first author to have used the expression *ontologia* seems to have been the Swiss Calvinist theologian Jakob Lorhard in 1606, and not Rudolf Goclenius as commonly acknowledged. On the historiography on this term, most older literature is inaccurate: see Devaux & Lamanna (2009).

30. On the development of the teaching of moral philosophy in a more secular context, see Kraye (1982); Lines (2003, 2007); and on the Renaissance sources, Ebbersmeyer (2010). On the opposite, on the development of moral theology into an autonomous discipline, see Theiner (1970). A good sketch of the development of moral theology remains Vereecke (1986). On the history of probabilism, see Kantola (1994); Schüssler (2003); Schüssler (2006). Knebel (2000) uncovers the metaphysical foundations of the doctrine of probabilism.

31. On the complex relationship between legal discipline and confessional issues in post-Tridentine Catholicism, see the excellent work by Lavenia (2004) and a good survey article by Decock (2011).

32. See, for instance, the monograph by Couture (1962).

33. See, for instance, the classical De Roover (1971); more recently, Gómez Camacho (1998); Decock (2009).

34. See the excellent reconstruction by Alfieri (2010).

35. Natural law theory (as well as international law, *ius gentium*) is one of the aspects in which historiography has always acknowledged the originality of second scholasticism. The bibliography on specific authors such as Vitoria, Suárez or the scholastic sources of Grotius is intimidating and often very repetitive. Todescan (2007) gives an excellent bibliographical overview. Important recent contributions include Grunert and Seelman (2001); Kaufmann and Schnepf (2007); Scattola (1999); Todescan (1973); on the history of 'subjective' rights, see Brett (1997); Guzmán Brito (2009).

36. Caramuel (1645, p. 17). For a critical assessment of this scholastic distinction between 'nature' and 'culture', see Schmutz (2008b).

37. Báñez (1584, p. 289a), quoted by Knebel 2009, 421: 'Logicus vero et metaphysicus considerat res per ordinem ad conceptum mentis'.

38. Pourchot (1695, p. 218): '. . . Deinde tanta est illius, tamque arcta cum logica connexio, ut prima pars Logicae eadem ac prima Metaphysicae pars esse videatur: utraque enim circa mentis ideas, primasve rerum notiones aut perceptiones esse occupata'.

39. The expression was coined by a seminal article by Buickerood (1985); for a convincing argument on its development down to eighteenth-century German *Vernunftlehre* and Kant, see Tonelli (1994), with new materials in Sgarbi (2008, 2010).

40. See Doyle (1997, 1998).

41. Clauberg (1691, II, p. 592): 'Quibus de rebus tractat Metaphysica sive prima Philosophia, illa inprimis quae a Renato Cartesio publice data? Resp.: tractat de principiis cognitionis humanae, sive de primis initiis et fundamentis omnis nostrae scientiae, quam ex naturae lumine possumus haurire'. For a contextual analysis of Descartes' metaphysical project, see the classic work by Marion (1986); Savini (2009).

42. For a first sketch, see Schmutz (2009).

43. On this well-studied debate, see Hoffmann (2002); Sousedík (1996).
44. See Izquierdo (1659). For an attempt in interpretation, see Schmutz (2009).
45. Cf. Sambuga (1805). The expression goes back to the seventeenth century and was used to describe a position in ethics claiming that there were strictly 'philosophical' sins, and that directedness towards God was not a criterion for moral acts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abra de Raconis, Charles-François d'. 1617. *Totius philosophiae, hoc est Logicae, Moralis, Physicae et Metaphysicae brevis et accurata, facilique et clara methodo disposita Tractatio*, Paris: Denys de la Noue.

Alfieri, Fernanda. 2010. *Nella camera degli sposi. Tomás Sánchez, il matrimonio, la sessualità (secoli XVI–XVII)*, Bologna, Italy: Il Mulino.

Ariew, Roger. 2011. *Descartes among the Scholastics.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill.

Arriaga, Rodrigo de. 1632. *Cursus philosophicus.* Antwerp, Belgium: B. Moretus (Plantin).

Ashworth, E. J. 1982. 'The eclipse of medieval logic'. In Kretzmann, Kenny and Pinborg, 1982, 787–96.

Backus, Irena, ed. 1996. *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West: From the Carolingians to the Maurists.* 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.

Baldini, Ugo. 1992. l*egem impone subactis. Studi su filosofia e scienza dei Gesuiti in Italia, 1540–632.* Rome: Bulzoni.

Báñez, Domingo. 1584. *Scholastica commentaria in primam partem Angelici Doctoris D. Thomae*, Rome: G. Ruffinelli.

Béguin, Nicolas. 1782. *Principes de philosophie générale, de physique, de Chimie and de géométrie transcendante.* 2 vols. Paris: Nyon.

Belda Plans, Juan. 2000. l*a Escuela de Salamanca y la renovación de la teología en el siglo XVI.* Madrid: BAC Maior.

Beuchot, Maurício. 1997. *Historia de la filosofía en el México colonial.* Barcelona: Herder.

Beuchot, Maurício and Germán Marquínez Argote, eds. 1996. *La filosofía en la América colonial. Siglos XVI, XVII y XVIII*. Santa Fé de Bogotá: El Buho.

Bianchi, Luca. 2003. *Studi sull'aristotelismo del Rinascimento.* Padua, Italy: Il Poligrafo.

Blum, Paul Richard. 1998. *Philosophenphilosophie und Schulphilosophie. Typen des philosophierens in der Neuzeit.* Stuttgart, Germany: Franz Steiner Verlag.

Bouju, Théophraste. 1614. *Corps de toute la philosophie divisé en deux parties.* Paris: Denys de la Noue.

Brett, Annabel S. 1997. *Liberty, Right and Nature. Individual Rights in Later Scholastic Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brockliss, L. W. B. 1987. *French Higher Education in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries. A Cultural History.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

———. 1996. 'Curricula'. In *A History of the University in Europe*, *vol. 2: Universities in Early-Modern Europe*, ed. Hilde de Ridder-Symoens, 563–620. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2004. The Moment of No Return. The University of Paris and the Death of Aristotelianism, *Science and Education* 15(2–4): 1–20.

Buickerood, James G. 1985. The Natural History of the Understanding: Locke and the Rise of Facultative Logic in the Eighteenth Century. *History and Philosophy of Logic* 6:157–90.

Calov, Abraham. 1651. *Scripta philosophica.* Rostock and Lübeck, Germany: Wild and Hakelmann.
Caramuel Lobkowitz, Juan. 1645. *Theologia moralis ad prima eaque clarissima principia reducta.* Louvain, Belgium: P. Zangrius.
———. 1682. *Met-ethica.* Vigevano, Italy: C. Corrado.
Cardillo de Villapando, Gaspar. 1567. *Summa summularum.* Alcalá, Spain: Juan de Villanueva.
Casmann, Otto. 1594. *Psychologia anthropologica, sive animae humanae doctrina.* Hanau, Germany: G. Antonius.
Clauberg, Johannes. 1691. *Opera omnia philosophica*, ed. J. Th. Schalbruch, 2 vols. Amsterdam: P. and I. Blaeu,
Costello, William T. 1958. *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth-Century Cambridge.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Courtine, Jean-François. 1990. *Suárez et le système de la métaphysique*, Paris: PUF.
Compton Carleton, Thomas. 1649. *Philosophia universa.* Antwerp, Belgium: Meursius.
Couture, Roger A. 1962. *L'imputabilité morale des premiers mouvements de la sensualité de saint Thomas aux Salmanticenses.* Rome: Gregorian University Press.
Darge, Rolf. 2003. *Suárez' transzendentale Seinsauslegung und die Metaphysiktradition*. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill.
Darowski, Roman. 1994. *Filozofia w szkolach jezuickich w Polsce w XVI wieku.* Kraków: Fakultet Filozoficzny TJ.
———. 1998. *Studia z filozofii jezuitów w Polsce w XVII i XVIII wieku*, Kraków.
Darowski, Roman. 2008. Philosophy of Jesuits in Lithuania since the Sixteenth until the Eighteenth Century. *Problemos* 73: 18–24.
Decock, Wim. 2009. Lessius and the Breakdown of the Scholastic Paradigm. *Journal of the History of Economic Thought* 31(3): 57–78.
———. 2011. From Law to Paradise: Confessional Catholicism and Legal Scholarship. *Rechtsgeschichte* 18:12–34.
De Franceschi, Sylvio H. 2010. L'empire thomiste dans les querelles doctrinales de l'âge classique. Le statut théologique de Thomas d'Aquin au XVII^{e} siècle. *XVIIe siècle* 62(2):313–34.
De Libera, Alain. 2002. *La référence vide. Théories de la proposition.* Paris: PUF.
Demetracopoulos, John. 2010. Purchotius Graecus I: Vikentios Damodos' *Concise Ethics*, *Verbum. Analecta Neolatina* 12(1):41–67
De Roover, Raymond. 1971. *La pensée économique des scolastiques.* Paris and Montréal: Vrin.
Des Chene, Dennis. 1996. *Physiologia. Natural Philosophy in Late Aristotelian and Cartesian Thought.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
———. 2000. *Life's Form. Late Aristotelian Conceptions of the Soul.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Descartes, René. 1637. 'Discours de la méthode'. In *Œuvres*, vol. 6, ed. Ch. Adam and P. Tannery. Paris: L. Cerf, 1902.
Devaux, Michaël and Marco Lamanna. 2009. The Rise and Early History of the Term Ontology. 1606–1730. *Quaestio* 9: 173–208.
Di Napoli, Giovanni. 1963. *L'immortalità dell'anima nel Rinascimento.* Torino: S.E.I.
Dollo, Corrado. 1979. *Filosofia e scienze in Sicilia.* Padua: CEDAM.
———. 1984. *Modelli scientifici e filosofici nella Sicilia spagnola.* Naples: Guida.
Doyle, John P. 1997. Between Transcendental and Transcendental: The Missing Link? *Review of Metaphysics* 50: 783–815.

———. 1998. 'Supertranscendental being: On the verge of modern philosophy'. In *Meeting of the Minds. The Relations Between Medieval and Classical Modern Philosophy*, ed. Stephen F. Brown, 297–315. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols.

Ebbersmeyer, Sabine. 2010. *Homo agens. Studien zur Genese und Struktur frühhumanistischer Moralphilosophie.* Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

Eschweiler, Karl. 1928. 'Die Philosophie der spanischen Spätscholastik auf den deutschen Universitäten des 17. Jahrhunderts'. In *Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft* 1: 251–325.

Esposito, Costantino, ed. 2009. *Origini e sviluppi dell'ontologia. Secoli XVI–XXI.* Turnhout, Belgium, and Bari, Italy: Brepols and Pagina (Quaestio, 9).

Eustachius a Sancto Paulo. 1609. *Summa philosophiae quadripartita, de rebus dialecticis, moralibus, physicis et metaphysicis*, Paris: Ch. Chastellain.

Fabri, Honoré. 1674. *Epistolae tres de sua hypothesi philosophica.* Mainz, Germany: P. Zubrodt.

Feingold, Mordechai, ed. 2003. *The New Science and Jesuit Science. Seventeenth Century Perspectives.* Dordrecht, the Netherlands, and Boston: Kluwer.

Feingold, Mordechai and Víctor Navarro Brotóns, eds. 2006. *Universities and Science in the Early-Modern Period.* Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Springer.

Forlivesi, Marco. 2006. 'A Man, an age, a book'. In *Rem in seipsa cernere. Saggi sul pensiero filosofico di Bartolomeo Mastri (1602–673)*, ed. M. Forlivesi, 24–144. Padova: Il Poligrafo.

———, ed. 2009. *I dibattiti sull'oggetto della metafisica dal tardo medioevo alla prima età moderna.* Padua: Il Poligrafo (Medioevo, 34).

Frank, Günter and Andreas Speer, eds. 2007. *Der Aristotelismus in der frühen Neuzeit—Kontinuität oder Wiederaneignung*? Wiesbaden, Germany: Harrassowitz.

Frassen, Claude. 1657. *Philosophia academica.* Paris: D. Thierry.

Freedman, Joseph S. 1984. *Deutsche Schulphilosophie im Reformationszeitalter (1500–650). Ein Handbuch für den Hochschuluntericht.* Münster, Germany: MAKS.

———. 1988. *European Academic Philosophy in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries: The Life, Significance and Philosophy of Clemens Timpler.* 2 vols. Hildesheim, Germany: G. Olms,

———. 1993. Aristotle and the Content of Philosophy Instruction at Central European Schools and Universities during the Reformation Era (1500–1600). *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 2:213–53.

———. 1999. *Philosophy and Arts in Central Europe, 1500–700: Teaching and Texts at European Schools and Universities.* Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.

Friedman, Russell L. and Lauge O. Nielsen, eds. 2003. *The Medieval Heritage in Early Modern Metaphysics and Modal theory, 1400–700.* Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer.

Genovesi, Antonio. 1743. *Elementa metaphysicae.* Naples: B. Gessari.

———. 1745. *Elementorum artis logico-criticae libri V.* Naples: P. Palumbo.

Glanvill, Joseph. 1661. *The Vanity of Dogmatizing.* London: Henry Eversden.

Gómez Camacho, Francisco. 1998. *Economía y filosofía moral. La formación del pensamiento económico europeo en la escolástica española.* Madrid: Síntesis.

Goudin, Antoine. 1670–71. *Philosophia iuxta inconcussa tutissimaque D. Thomae dogmata.* 4 vols. Lyon, France: A. Jullieron,

Goudriaan, Aza. 1999. *Philosophische Gotteserkenntnis bei Suárez und Descartes, im Zusammenhang mit der niederländischen reformierten Theologie und Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill.

Gremner, Johann. 1748. *Philosophia vetus et nova.* Prague: J. Schweiger.

Grendler, Paul F. 2002. *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Grunert, Frank and Kurt Seelman, eds. 2001. *Die Ordnung der Praxis. Neue Studien zur spanischen Spätscholastik.* Tübingen, Germany: Mohr.
Guzmán Brito, Alejandro. 2009. *El derecho como facultad en la neoescolástica española del siglo XVI.* Madrid: Iustel.
Hampe Martínez, Teodoro, ed. 1999. *La tradición clásica en el Perú virreinal.* Lima: Fondo Editorial de la Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos.
Hasse, Dag Nikolaus. 2004. 'The attraction of Averroism in the Renaissance: Vernia, Achillini, Prassico'. In *Philosophy, Science and Exegesis in Greek, Arabic and Latin Commentaries*, ed. P. Adamson, H. Balthussen and M. W. F. Stone, 131–47. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
Hellyer, Marcus. 2005. *Catholic Physics. Jesuit Natural Philosophy in Early Modern Germany.* Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press.
Heumann, Christoph August. 1719. *Praefatio, in qua de appellatione, natura atque ἀσοφία theologiae et philosophiae scholasticae disputatur*. In Adam Tribbechow, *De doctoris scholasticis et corrupta per eos divinarum humanarumque rerum scientia liber singularis*, 2nd edition. Jena, Germany: J. F. Bielckius.
Hoffmann, Tobias. 2002. *Creatura intellecta. Die Ideen und Possibilien bei Duns Scotus mit Ausblick auf Franz von Mayronis, Poncius und Mastrius.* Münster, Germany: Aschendorff.
Honnefelder, Ludger. 1990. *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.
Horváth, János. 1767. *Institutiones logicae et metaphysicae.* Trnava, Slovakia.
Howell, Samuel W. 1961. *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500–700.* New York: Russell and Russell.
Hübener, Wolfgang. 1983. 'Die Nominalismus-Legende. Über das Mißverhältnis zwischen Dichtung und Wahrheit in der Deutung der Wirkungsgeschichte des Ockhamismus'. In *Spiegel und Gleichnis. Festschrift für Jacob Taubes*, ed. N. W. Bolz and W. Hübener, pp. 87–111. Würzburg, Germany: Königshausen and Neumann.
Hurtado de Mendoza, Pedro. 1615. *Disputationes a summulis ad metaphysicam*, Valladolid, Spain: Juan Godínez de Millis.
Ibrulj, Nijaz. 2009. Bosnia Porphyriana. An Outline of the Development of Logic in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Survey. Periodical for Social Studies 2* (Sarajevo):109–66.
Izquierdo, Sebastián. 1659. *Pharus Scientiarum*, Lyon, France: Cl. Bourgeat and M. Lietard.
Kantola, Ilka. 1994. *Probability and Moral Uncertainty in Late Medieval and Early Modern Times.* Helsinki: Luther-Agricola Society.
Kaufmann, Matthias and Schnepf, Robert, eds. 2007. *Politische Metaphysik. Die Entstehung moderner Rechtskonzeptionen in der Spanischen Scholastik.* Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.
Keeding, Ekkehard. 1983. *Das Zeitalter der Aufklärung in der Provinz Quito.* Cologne, Germany, and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag.
Kessler, Eckhart. 1982. 'The intellective soul'. In Kretzmann, Kenny and Pinborg 1982, 484–584.
Knebel, Sven K. 2000. *Wille, Würfel und Wahrscheinlichkeit. Das System der moralischen Notwendigkeit in der Jesuitenscholastik 1550–700.* Hamburg, Germany: Meiner.
———. 2009. 'Metaphysikkritik'? Historisches zur Abgrenzung von Logik und Metaphysik. *Medioevo* 34:399–424.
Kraye, Jill. 1982. 'Moral philosophy'. In Kretzmann, Kenny and Pinborg, 1982, 303–86.
Kretzmann, Norman, Anthony Kenny and January Pinborg, eds. 1982. *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

AQ

Kristeller, Paul Oskar. 1967. *Le thomisme et la pensée italienne de la Renaissance.* Montréal and Paris: Institut d'Etudes Médiévales and Vrin.
Kusukawa, Sachiko. 1995. *The Transformation of Natural Philosophy: The Case of Philip Melanchthon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lavenia, Vincenzo. 2004. *L'infamia e il perdono. Tributi, pene e confessione nella teologia morale della prima età moderna.* Bologna: Il Mulino.
Leijenhorst, Cees. 2003. *The Mechanisation of Aristotelianism. The Late Setting of Thomas Hobbes' Natural Philosophy.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill.
Leijenhorst, Cees and Christoph Lüthy. 2002. 'The Erosion of Aristotelianism: confessional physics in early-modern Germany and the Dutch Republic'. In *The Dynamics of Aristotelian Natural Philosophy from Antiquity to the Seventeenth Century*, ed. C. Leijenhorst, Chr. Lüthy and J. M. M. H. Thijssen, 375–441. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill.
Leinsle, Ulrich Gottfried. 1985. *Das Ding und die Methode. Methodische Konstitution und Gegenstand der frühen protestantischen Metaphysik*, Augsburg, Germany: Maro Verlag.
———. 1988. *Reformversuche protestantischer Metaphysik im Zeitalter des Rationalismus.* Augsburg, Germany: Maro Verlag.
Lewalter, Ernst. 1935. *Spanisch-Jesuitische und Deutsch-Lutherische Metaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der iberisch-deutschen Kulturbeziehungen und zur Vorgeschichte des deutschen Idealismus.* Hamburg, Germany: 1935 (Ibero-Amerikanische Studien, 4).
Lines, David A. 2003. *Aristotle's 'Ethics' in the Italian Renaissance (ca. 1300–650): The Universities and the Problem of Moral Education.* Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill.
———. 2007. 'Humanistic and Scholastic Ethics'. In *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy,* ed. James Hankins, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 304-318.
Losada, Luis de. 1724–35. *Cursus philosophicus Regalis Collegii Salmanticensis Societatis Iesu in tres partes divisi.* Salamanca, Spain: E. García de Honorato y San Miguel.
Lourenço (Laurentius), Agostinho. 1688. *De triplici ente cursus philosophicus tripartitus.* Liège, Belgium: G. H. Streel.
Mair, John. 1509. *In quartum Sententiarum.* Paris: P. Pigouchet and J. Granion.
Mangold, Josef. 1755. *Philosophia rationalis et experimentalis hodiernis.* Munich and Ingolstadt, Germany: J. F. -X. Craetz and Th. Summer.
Marion, Jean-Luc. 1986. *Sur le prisme métaphysique de Descartes.* Paris: PUF.
Mastri, Bartolomeo. 1727. 'Metaphysica'. In *Cursus philosophicus ad mentem Scoti*, 4th edition. Venice: N. Pezzana.
Mayr, Anton. 1739. *Philosophia peripatetica antiquorum principiis et recentiorum experimentis conformata.* 4 vols. Ingolstadt, Germany: J. A. de La Haye.
Meier-Oeser, Stephan. 1997. *Die Spur des Zeichens. Das Zeichen und seine Funktion in der Philosophie des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit.* New York and Berlin: de Gruyter.
Milton, J.R. 1984. The Scholastic Background to Locke's Thought. *Locke Newsletter* 15 (1984), 25–34.
Oviedo, Francisco de. 1640. *Integer cursus philosophicus ad unum corpus redactus.* Lyon, France: P. Prost.
Perera (Pererius), Benet. 1576. *De communibus omnium rerum naturalium principiis et affectionibus libri quindecim*, Rome: Tramezini.
Petersen, Peter. 1921. *Geschichte der aristotelischen Philosophie im protestantischen Deutschland.* Leipzig, Germany: Meiner, 1921.
Piaia, Gregorio, ed. 2002. *La presenza dell'aristotelismo padovano nella filosofia della prima modernità.* Padua: Antenore.

Piccart, Michael. 1655. *Isagoge in lectionem Aristotelis, hoc est, Hypotyposis totius Philosophiae Aristotelis*, ed. J. C. Dürr. Altdorf, Germany: G. Hagen.
Poinsot, João (John of Saint Thomas). 1631–4. *Cursus philosophicus thomisticus.* 5 vols. Alcalá, Spain: A. Vázquez.
Poppi, Antonino. 1970. *Introduzione all'aristotelismo padovano.* Padua: Antenore.
Porro, Pasquale and Jacob Schmutz, eds. 2008. *La posterità di Giovanni Duns Scoto.* Turnhout, Belgium, and Bari, Italy: Brepols and Pagina *(Quaestio, 8)*.
Pourchot, Edmond. 1695. *Institutiones philosophicae ad faciliorem veterum et recentiorum Philosophorum intelligentiam.* 4 vols. Paris: J.-B. Coignard.
Poza, Juan Bautista. 1627. *Elucidarium Deiparae.* 2nd edition. Lyon: Rouillé.
Pozzo, Riccardo. 1998. Kant within the Tradition of Modern Logic: The Role of the 'Introduction Idea of a Transcendental Logic'. *Review of Metaphysics* 52: 295–310.
———, ed. 2003. *The Impact of Aristotelianism on Modern Philosophy.* Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press.
Quantin, Jean-Louis. 1999. *Le Catholicisme classique et les Pères de l'Eglise. Un retour aux sources (1669–713).* Paris: Institut d'Etudes Augustiniennes.
———. 2009. *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity. The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the Seventeenth Century.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Quinto, Riccardo. 2001. *Scholastica. Storia di un concetto.* Padua: Il Poligrafo.
Rabe, Paul. 1703. *Cursus philosophicus, sive compendium praecipuarum scientiarium philosophicarum.* Königsberg, Germany: Boye.
Redmond, Walter B. 1972. *Bibliography of the Philosophy in the Iberian Colonies of America.* The Hague, the Netherlands: Nijhoff.
———. 2002. *La lógica del Siglo de oro. Una introducción a la historia de la lógica.* Pamplona, Spain: EUNSA.
Risse, Wilhelm. 1964–70. *Die Logik der Neuzeit.* 2 vols. Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt, Germany: Frommann and Holzboog.
Roncaglia, Gino. 1996. *Palaestra rationis. Discussioni su natura della copula e modalità nelle filosofia 'scolastica' tedesca del XVII secolo.* Florence: Olschki.
Rossi, Paolo. 2000. *Logic and the Art of Memory. The Quest for a Universal Language*, trans. Steven Clucas, London: Athlone Press (1st Italian edition 1960).
Salabert, Jean. 1651. *Philosophia nominalium vindicata.* Paris: S. and G. Cramoisy.
Salatowsky, Sascha. 2006. *De Anima. Die Rezeption der aristotelischen Psychologie im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert.* Amsterdam and Philadelphia: B.R. Grüner.
Sambuga, Joseph Anton. 1805. *Über den Philosophismus, welcher unser Zeitalter bedroht.* Munich: J. Lentner.
Savini, Massimiliano. 2009. Johannes Clauberg e l'esito cartesiano dell'ontologia. *Quaestio* 9:153–72.
Scattola, Merio. 1999. *Das Naturrecht vor dem Naturrecht. Zur Geschichte des 'ius naturae' im 16. Jahrhundert.* Tübingen, Germany: Niemeyer.
Scheibler, Christoph. 1623. *Philosophia compendiosa.* Giessen, Germany: Chemlinus.
Schmitt, Charles B. 1983a. *Aristotle and the Renaissance.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
———. 1983b. *John Case and Aristotelianism in Renaissance England.* Montreal and Kingston, Ontario, Canada: McGill and Queen's University Press.
Schmutz, Jacob. 2002. L'héritage des Subtils. Cartographie du scotisme du XVIIe siècle. *Les Etudes philosophiques* (1):51–81.
———. 2008a. Bellum scholasticum. Thomisme et antithomisme dans les débats doctrinaux modernes. *Revue thomiste* 108(1):131–82.

———. 2008b. 'Juan Caramuel on naturalistic fallacy'. In Juan Caramuel Lobkowitz, *The Last Scholastic Polymath*, ed. P. Dvorak and J. Schmutz, 45–69. Prague: Filosofia.
———. 2009. 'Quand le langage a-t-il cessé d'être mental? Remarques sur les sources scolastiques de Bolzano'. In *Le langage mental du Moyen Age à l'âge classique*, ed. J. Biard, 306–37. Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium: Editions de l'ISP.
———. 2010. 'Les normes théologiques de l'enseignement philosophique dans le catholicisme romain moderne (1500–1650)'. In *Philosophie et théologie à l'époque moderne*, ed. J.-C. Bardout, 129–50. Paris: Ed. du Cerf.
Schüssler, Rudolf. 2003. *Moral im Zweifel*, vol. I: *Die scholastische Theorie des Entscheidens unter moralischer Unsicherheit.* Paderborn, Germany: Mentis Verlag.
———. 2006. *Moral im Zweifel*, vol. II: *Die Herausforderung des Probabilismus.* Paderborn, Germany: Mentis Verlag.
Sgarbi, Marco. 2008. 'Aristotle, Kant and the rise of facultative logic'. In *Aristotle and the Aristotelian Tradition*, ed. E. De Bellis, 97–108. Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino.
———. 2010. *La Kritik der reinen Vernunft nel contesto della tradizione logica aristotelica.* Hildesheim, Germany: G. Olms.
Soto, Domingo de. 1529. *Summulae.* Burgos, Spain: J. Junte.
Sousedík, Stanislav. 1996. 'Der Streit um den wahren Sinn der scotischen Possibilienlehre'. In John Duns Scotus, *Metaphysics and Ethics*, ed. Ludger Honnefelder, Rega Wood and Mechthild Dreyer, 191–204. Leiden, the Netherlands: Brill.
———. 2007. *Filosofie v českých zemích mezi středověkema osvícenstvím*, Prague: Višehrad.
Stier, Johann. 1652. *Praecepta doctrinae logicae, ethicae, physicae, metaphysicae, sphaericae-que*, 4th edition. London: R. Daniel.
Suárez, Francisco. 1597. *Disputationes metaphysicae.* Salamanca, Spain: J. and A. Renaut.
———. 1655. *Tractatus theologicus de vera intelligentia auxilii efficacis eiusque concordia cum libero arbitrio. Opus Posthumum.* Lyon, France: Borde, Arnaud and Rigaud.
Symchych, Mykola. 2009. *Philosophia rationalis у Києво-Могилянській академії: компаративний аналіз могилянських курсів логіки кінця XVII-першої половини XVIII ст.* Vinnitsa, Ukraine: O. Vlasiuk. AQ
Tartaretus, Petrus. 1581. *In Aristotelis philosophiam naturalem, divinam et moralem exactis-sima commentaria.* Venice: Melchiorre Sessa, 1581.
Theiner, Johann. 1970. *Die Entwicklung der Moraltheologie zur eigenständigen Disziplin.* Regensburg, Germany: Pustet.
Thorndike, Lynn. 1951. The Cursus philosophicus before Descartes. *Archives internationales d'histoire de la science* 4:16–24.
Todescan, Franco. 1973. *Lex, natura, beatitudo. Il problema della legge nella scolastica spagnola del secolo XVI.* Padua: Cedam.
———. 2007. 'Il problema del diritto naturale fra Seconda scolastica e giusnaturalismo laico secentesco. Una introduzione bibliografica'. In *Iustus ordo e ordine della natura. Sacra doctrina e saperi politici fra XVI e XVIII secolo*, ed. F. Arici and F. Todescan, 1–61. Padua: Cedam.
Tonelli, Giorgio. 1994. *Kant's Critique of Pure Reason Within the Tradition of Modern Logic. A Commentary on Its History*, ed. David H. Chandler. Hildesheim, Germany: G. Olms.
Trueman, Carl R. and R. Scott Clark, eds. 1999. *Protestant Scholasticism. Essays in Reassess-ment.* Carlisle, UK: Paternoster Press.
Tucker, George H., ed. 2000. *Forms of the 'Medieval' in the 'Renaissance'. A Multidisciplin-ary Exploration of a Cultural Continuum.* Charlottesville, VA: Rookwood Press.
Vereecke, Louis. 1986. *De Guillaume d'Ockham à saint Alphonse de Liguori. Etudes d'histoire de la théologie morale moderne, 1300–787.* Rome: Collegium S. Alfonsi de Urbe.

Vidal, Fernando. 2006. *Les sciences de l'âme, XVIe–XVIIIe siècle*, Paris: Champion.
Vollrath, Ernst. 1961. Die Gliederung der Metaphysik in eine metaphysica specialis und eine metaphysica generalis, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 16(2):258–84.
Walch, Johannes Georg. 1730. *Introductio in philosophiam.* Leipzig, Germany: J.F. Gleditsch.
Walker, Obadiah. 1673. *Artis rationis maxime ad mentem Nominalium libri tres.* Oxford: Sheldon.
Wardy, Robert. 2000. *Aristotle in China: Language, Categories and Translation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wels, Henrik. 2007. 'Die Unsterblichkeit der Seele und der epistemologische Status der Psychologie im Aristotelismus des 16. Jahrhundert'. In Frank and Speer, 2007, 191–214.
Wundt, Max. 1939. *Die deutsche Schulmetaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr.
Yolton, John W. 1984. *Perceptual Acquaintance from Descartes to eid.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
———. 1986. 'Schoolmen, Logic and Philosophy'. In *The History of the University of Oxford*, vol. V: *The Eighteenth Century*, ed. L. S. Sutherland and L. G. Mitchel, 565–90. Oxford: OUP.