

lated to the intellect; GOOD is being related to the appetite. The principle refers to the ontological good and true, and hence, does not refer directly to the moral order.

**Virtus consistit in medio** (*Virtue is found in the mean*). Aristotle's basic principle of good moral action is to place VIRTUE between two extremes that are called vices. Virtue is the good habit whose act avoids the extremes and maintains the mean of honest living. Aristotle puts it in this way: "Virtue, then, is a state of character concerned with choice, lying in a mean, i.e., the mean relative to us, this being determined by a rational principle, and by that principle by which the man of practical wisdom would determine it" (*Eth. Nic.* 1107a 1–3).

**Bibliography:** R. J. DEFERRARI et al., *A Latin-English Dictionary of St. Thomas Aquinas Based on the Summa Theologica and Selected Passages of His Other Works*, 5 fasc. (Washington 1948–53). T. W. WILSON, *An Index to Aristotle in English Translation* (Princeton, N.J. 1949). D. D. RUNES, ed., *Dictionary of Philosophy* (Ames, Iowa 1955). *Enciclopedia filosofica* 4.1859–62. N. SIGNORIELLO, *Lexicon peripateticum philosophico-theologicum* . . . (Naples 1906; Rome 1931). PETRI DE BERGOMO, *Tabula aurea* (Photocopy from Thomas Aquinas's *Opera Omnia*, Editiones Paulinae; Rome 1960).

[R. SMITH]

## SCHOLASTICISM

First used in a derogatory sense by humanists and early histories of philosophy in the 16th century, scholasticism has come to mean either a historical movement or a system of thought that was bequeathed by that movement.

In the historical sense described in this article, it is an intellectual movement in the history of the Church that can be divided into three periods: medieval, modern, and contemporary. Medieval scholasticism arose gradually in the 12th century from the use of Aristotelian DIALECTICS in theology, philosophy, and Canon Law; it matured in the 13th with the assimilation of new philosophical literature and consequent concentration on metaphysics; it declined in the succeeding period; and it passed into desuetude with the RENAISSANCE. Modern (or middle) scholasticism, extending from 1530 to the early 19th century, witnessed a revival of metaphysics in the 16th century, a multiplicity of eclectic schools in the 17th, and an abandonment of ancient sources and method in the 18th. Contemporary scholasticism began with the rediscovery of the works of St. Thomas Aquinas in mid-19th century, spread throughout the Catholic world under the aegis of Leo XIII, and flourished in the 20th century, particularly in Continental Europe and in North and South America.

As a system, scholasticism has sometimes been unjustly described as "one of the greatest plagues of the

human mind" (Diderot), or as "philosophy brought into slavery to papist theology" (C. A. Heumann), and curtly dismissed as not meriting attention. At the other extreme, some seem to consider it a homogeneous body of doctrine providing answers to all possible problems. The truth lies between these two extremes (see SCHOLASTIC METHOD; SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY).

### 1. MEDIEVAL SCHOLASTICISM

It is customary to trace the roots of scholasticism to the Carolingian age and to divide medieval scholasticism into four periods: preschoolasticism (c. 800–1050), early scholasticism (1050–1200), high scholasticism (1200–1300 or 1350), and late scholasticism (1350–1500).

**Prescholasticism.** The learning of the Middle Ages has its origins in the enactments of CHARLEMAGNE and in the vision of ALCUIN that brought about the establishment of episcopal and monastic schools and the gradual revival of the trivium and quadrivium. In this early period, dialectics occupied a relatively small place in the trivium and relied mainly on *De nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae* of Martianus Capella, the *Institutiones* of CASSIODORUS, a few chapters of the *Etymologiae* of ISIDORE OF SEVILLE, the *Dialectica* of Alcuin, and perhaps some treatises of BOETHIUS. What came to be called the old logic (*logica vetus*), i.e., Aristotle's *Categories* and *Perihermenias* and Porphyry's *Isagoge*, was not popularly known or used [J. Isaac, *Le Peri Hermeneias en occident de Boèce à saint Thomas* (Paris 1953) 38–42].

The "new Athens" that Alcuin sought to build in France [*Epist.* 86; *Patrologia Latina*, ed. J. P. Migne, 217 V., indexes 4 v. (Paris 1878–90) 100:282] was not marked by any great philosophical revival. Alcuin himself was content to duplicate the culture of the past; RABANUS MAURUS was primarily a compiler who brought Alcuin's program to Germany; Fredegisus (d. 834), disciple and successor of Alcuin, showed perhaps a wider interest, since his *De nihilo et tenebris* contains some original thought; while the *Dicta* of CANDIDUS OF FULDA offers the first medieval proof of the existence of God based on dialectics. The court of Charles II the Bald witnessed a discussion on the nature of the soul, its origin and relation to the body, involving HINCMAR OF REIMS, RATRAMNUS OF CORBIE, and PASCHASIUS RADBERTUS. Above all, the court was famous as the home of the one truly original thinker of this period, JOHN SCOTUS ERIUGENA, whose *De divisione naturae* (c. 866) is a synthesis of theology based on Neoplatonic principles. In theology proper, the Carolingian period was marked by controversies on predestination and the Real Presence, initiated by GOTTSCHALK OF ORBAIS. Neither controversy seems to have resulted from the use of dialectics.

**Early Scholasticism.** The Carolingian renaissance was of short duration. The dismemberment of the Empire, the coming of the Normans, frequent wars, and general political disorder were hardly favorable to intellectual pursuits. Yet the 10th century was not wholly devoid of intellectual life in some monasteries and cathedrals; one need only consider the learning of Gerbert of Aurillac, who became Pope SYLVESTER II, and his disciple FULBERT OF CHARTRES. Such men prepared for the revival of learning in the 11th century that centered largely on the question of dialectics. As *scholasticus* at Reims (973–982) Gerbert had provided a full course on the old logic (J. Isaac, *op. cit.* 44).

Less than a century later St. PETER DAMIAN complained of the Aristotelian subtlety that had spread through the schools and of those who forgot it was but a handmaid and not the queen (*Patrologia Latina*, 145:603). He may have had in mind his contemporary, BERENGARIUS OF TOURS, who had urged recourse to dialectics on all questions, since reason was the gift of God. Applying this science to the Eucharist, Berengarius concluded that since reason proclaims that accidents cannot exist apart from substance, the bread and wine must remain after the Consecration. The effect of the Consecration is but to add another form to the bread, that of the “intellectual body” of Christ: an allegorical, spiritual, and symbolic rather than a real, physical presence is the result. Berengarius remained throughout the 12th century an example of reason and logic intruding where it had no place. Yet, while some reacted strongly against dialectics, others were quick to recognize its value if used with restraint. “For those who examine the matter carefully, dialectics does not undermine the mysteries of God” (Lanfranc of Bec, *In 1 Corinthians* 1.11; *Patrologia Latina*, 150:157), and what St. Paul reproves is not the art of disputing but the perverse use some make of it (*In Colossians* 2.3; *Patrologia Latina*, 150:323). In this approach LANFRANC prepared the way for the daring but sound metaphysical meditations on dogma of St. Anselm.

*Anselm of Canterbury.* The *Monologium* of ANSELM OF CANTERBURY is a profound prayerful study of the existence and nature of God, yet professedly is based on reason and not on the authority of Scripture. In it, Anselm clearly affirmed that faith is his starting point; yet through reason he will seek to understand what he believes. “Faith seeking understanding” (*Fides quaerens intellectum*) was, in fact, the original title of his second great work, the *Proslogion*. Conscious of the novelty of his position—he had been reproved by Lanfranc for his daring—Anselm himself recommended prudence in the spread of his writings (*Epist.* 1.74; *Patrologia Latina*, 158:1144).

The dialectic that Anselm fostered among his pupils at Bec led to the systematic *Sententiae* and *Summae* of the 12th century. The first steps were taken by ANSELM OF LAON, pupil of St. Anselm, who for some 30 years taught in the episcopal school of Laon. Though his teaching was primarily on Scripture, he did apparently organize the material of older theology in more systematic fashion. His school attracted a host of pupils who were to become famous in 12th-century theology: GILBERT DE LA PORRÉE, and ROBERT OF MELUN (HEREFORD), Alberic of Reims, Lotulphus of Novara, and WILLIAM OF CHAMPEAUX.

*Peter Abelard.* Of much more importance for the systematization of theology was the work of Peter ABELARD. The *Sic et Non* produced by his school is a vast repertoire of Biblical, patristic, and canonical material for and against specific points of doctrine. Its prologue, the work of a master dialectician, sets forth principles for the reconciliation of opposing texts through the analysis of words, authentication of texts, or noting changes of opinion on the part of an author. Perhaps the most influential Abelardian principle was that “one can often solve a controversy by showing that the same words are used in different senses by different authors” (*Patrologia Latina*, 178:1344D). The dialectical method of Abelard was utilized by both canonists and theologians, reaching notable heights in the *Decretum* of Gratian, originally known as the *Concordantia discordantium canonum*, and the *Libri sententiarum* of PETER LOMBARD (see SENTENCES AND SUMMAE; GRATIAN, DECRETUM OF).

Abelard is perhaps best known for his role in the controversy concerning UNIVERSALS, “which is always the most important question for those engaged in dialectics” (*Historia calamitatum* 1.2). Disputing the solutions of his teachers, ROSCELIN and William of Champeaux, Abelard attributed universality to names, not things. This position, sometimes called NOMINALISM, was vastly different from the nominalism of the 14th century. The 11th-century controversy centered on grammar and logic without the aid of Aristotle’s metaphysics and psychology.

*School of Chartres.* During the first half of the 12th century the most eminent center of learning was the cathedral school in Chartres. Inspired by a deep feeling for ancient culture, masters such as BERNARD OF CHARTRES, THIERRY OF CHARTRES, Gilbert de la Porrée, and CLARENBAUD OF ARRAS cultivated an integral humanism that was literary as well as theological. Perhaps JOHN OF SALISBURY, later Bishop of Chartres, was the most eloquent spokesman of the literary humanism typical of this school. WILLIAM OF CONCHES, HONORIUS OF AUTUN, and BERNARD SILVESTRIS developed a Platonic cosmology out of earlier sources. Acquainted only with Platonic

sources, apart from the *Organon* of Aristotle, the philosophy taught at Chartres was mainly an eclectic Platonism, centered on questions of God and the world, EXEMPLARISM, creation, the sciences, as well as the Latin classics and the LIBERAL ARTS. ADELARD OF BATH and other alumni became well known translators of scientific works from Arabic into Latin.

*Mysticism.* At Paris the Abbey of Saint-Victor, founded in 1108 by William of Champeaux for the CANONS REGULAR OF ST. AUGUSTINE, became a flourishing school of theology and mysticism under HUGH OF SAINT-VICTOR and RICHARD OF SAINT-VICTOR. To his contemporaries, Hugh was the “new Augustine, the agent of the Holy Spirit,” a learned theologian famous for his theological summa *On the Sacraments of the Christian Faith* (tr. R. J. Deferrari, Cambridge, Mass. 1951), his program for Christian schools, the *Didascalicon* (tr. J. Taylor, New York 1961), and his ability to use all knowledge as paths to union with God. Richard was the outstanding mystical writer of this school; his works were appreciated and used especially by St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas Aquinas.

Cistercian mysticism, stemming from St. BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, was marked by its psychological approach. Almost every writer of this school of mysticism produced a treatise on the soul as a preface and key to his spiritual doctrine (see SOUL, HUMAN, 2; ISAAC OF STELLA; ALCHEM OF CLAIRVAUX; WILLIAM OF SAINT-THIERRY). One exception to this was ALAN OF LILLE, who had taught at Paris and Montpellier before entering monastic life. He is known mainly for his theological works against the heretics of his day and for his attempt to reduce theology to a more exact science.

**High Scholasticism.** History can never be divided by centuries. Yet mid-13th-century Paris, with St. ALBERT THE GREAT, ROGER BACON, St. BONAVENTURE, and St. THOMAS AQUINAS, was a far different “city of letters” from the mid-12th-century Paris of Peter Lombard. The 12th and preceding centuries had been essentially patristic in content, largely dominated by the doctrine and spirit of St. AUGUSTINE.

*Introduction of Aristotle.* Apart from his logic, Aristotle was known only through secondary sources; and the West little suspected that he had written anything else. In the 13th century scholastics were caught up in a ferment of thought as their cultural horizon was suddenly broadened and their allegiance to the past was deeply challenged through the influx of a vast philosophical and scientific literature translated from the Greek and Arabic. For the first time they came face to face with a world-system, a *Weltanschauung*, which relied completely on reason and appeared almost entirely at variance with the

Christian faith. They were faced with doctrines such as the Prime Mover, eternal motion, denial of creation and providence, uncertainty on the immortality and spirituality of the soul, and a morality based on reason alone. Such theories seemed almost like a new revelation, or, for many, like intruders from an alien world. “The Christian people,” said WILLIAM OF AUVERGNE, “is plunged in astonishment by theories hitherto entirely unknown to it” [*De universo* 1.3.31 (Paris 1674) 1:805b]. The first reaction on the part of traditionalists was one of distrust: the synod at Paris in 1210 forbade the use of Aristotle’s writings on natural philosophy or commentaries on them in the schools; the University of Paris statutes of 1215 extended this prohibition to the “metaphysics and natural philosophy, *summae* on them, or books on the doctrine of DAVID OF DINANT, AMALRIC OF BÈNE, or Maurice of Spain.” Yet such prohibitions, renewed in 1231 by Gregory IX, did not exclude private study or use of such works, or prevent their growing popularity. In 1255 the new statutes for the faculty of arts officially included all the known works of Aristotle in the texts assigned for public lectures. As the profundity and novelty of Aristotle’s thought was further complicated by the crudity and literalness of the translations, scholastics were inclined to turn to AVICENNA and, after 1230, to AVERROËS as guides in understanding the Philosopher (see ARABIAN PHILOSOPHY). Unfortunately, Avicenna’s interpretation was largely Neoplatonic, especially on the origin of things from God by necessary emanation, and on the nature of the soul (see EMANATIONISM). The acceptance of Averroës as the Commentator gave rise eventually to a crisis at Paris.

*Universities.* This influx of literature clearly could not have produced its far-reaching effects had it not been for the formation and organization after 1200 of a new scholastic milieu, in the founding of the University of PARIS, and those of OXFORD, Cambridge, Toulouse, BOLOGNA, and others. Usually divided into four faculties of theology, medicine, law, and arts, the universities are remembered mostly for the work achieved in theology and in arts, which quickly became primarily a school of philosophy. In the theological faculty, while the older traditions were maintained, new methods, inspired partly by the “new logic” of Aristotle (the *Analytics*, *Topics*, and *Sophistical Refutations*, translated about 1128 by James of Venice), produced a new type of scientific theology in contrast to the scriptural studies (*sacra pagina*) of the 12th century. Roger Bacon complained bitterly of the displacement of the Bible as the heart of theology by the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. He blamed ALEXANDER OF HALES, who as dean of the school had made the first public gloss on the *Sentences* (c. 1230). For better or for worse, Alexander was making use of a procedure already

in vogue in the arts faculty, of using the work of some “authority” (e.g., Aristotle, Porphyry, Donatus) as the basis of scholastic lectures. In arts at Paris, Roger Bacon himself seems to have been the first to undertake such courses on the newly discovered writings of Aristotle.

*English Scholars.* The Englishman Roger Bacon was a product of the University of Paris, where he lectured in arts longer than any other master. Bacon traced his own preference for mathematics and mathematical methods to ROBERT GROSSETESTE, one of the most original and versatile minds of the century. Conversant with the works of Aristotle, some of which he had translated, Grosseteste was by inclination more Neoplatonist and Augustinian. Influenced likewise by optics and perspective, he attempted to deduce from the nature of light a complete cosmological system, wherein the dynamic energy of light produced the finite world and the multiplication of individual beings. Such scientific ideals, especially his faith in mathematical reason, reappeared in Bacon, who set as his ideal the renewal of contemporary thought through a reassessment and reorganization of Christian wisdom. On the other hand, in ADAM OF BUCKFIELD one finds a proof that Aristotle’s writings were by no means neglected at Oxford. Yet both Dominicans, such as RICHARD FISHACRE and ROBERT KILWARDBY, and Franciscans, such as THOMAS OF YORK, ROGER MARSTON, and JOHN PECKHAM, were inclined to an eclectic type of Aristotelianism and to resist the complete acceptance of the Philosopher in Christian schools. The trends implanted by Grosseteste retained their vitality even in the 14th century, with a renewed interest in mathematics and physics on the part of THOMAS BRADWARDINE and the Merton College group of physicists (see JOHN OF DUMBLETON; RICHARD OF SWYNESHED; WILLIAM OF HEYTESBURY).

*Parisian Scholars.* For the medieval schoolman, as for the modern historian, scholasticism meant primarily the University of Paris, the *studium* of the Church, “the city of books and learning” (Gregory IX). The long tradition of schools at Notre Dame, Sainte-Geneviève, Saint-Victor, gave rise about 1200 to a guild (*universitas*) of masters and scholars, which under royal patronage and papal direction soon became the most famous and important seat of learning in the Western world. At first, most of the masters in theology, guided by the directives of Pope Gregory IX (1228 and 1231), continued the conservative, so-called Augustinian, traditions of the 12th century. At the same time, the Aristotelian ideal of a science gradually made clear the distinction between philosophy and theology, and indeed the further distinction between theology as exegesis and theology as an organized body of knowledge (M. D. Chenu, *La théologie comme science au xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris 1957).

*Franciscan School.* Alexander of Hales, who joined the Franciscan Order in Paris after a long and fruitful theological career, showed very little tendency to use the works of Aristotle; at most, he cited well-known axioms and principles. In contrast, his associate, JOHN OF LA ROCHELLE, depended closely on Avicenna in his *Summa de anima*; otherwise he remained close to traditional theology.

A much greater knowledge of the philosophers was manifested by St. Bonaventure, likely because when he had studied in the arts faculty Aristotle was given more prominence. Nonetheless, though he spoke the language of Aristotle, considered him “the more excellent among the philosophers,” and made great use of his works, Bonaventure can hardly be called an Aristotelian. Primarily the theologian whose only master was Christ, Bonaventure regarded philosophy as a help in understanding the faith: “As the children of Israel carried away the treasures of Egypt [Ex 3,22; 12, 35], so theologians make their own the teachings of philosophy” [*Opera omnia* (Quaracchi 1882–1902) 8:335b], “taking from philosophical knowledge on the nature of things what they need to build” the structure of theology and reach an understanding of the things of God (*ibid.* 5:205a). Yet a close examination of the philosophy thus incorporated into the synthesis of Christian wisdom shows relatively little acceptance of Aristotle. In later years, faced by the Averroist crisis, Bonaventure became vehemently critical of Aristotelianism and of any attempt to philosophize independently of the safeguards of faith. Though his disciples, John Peckham and MATTHEW OF AQUASPARTA, made more use of the Philosopher, they were close to Bonaventure in outlook and spirit.

*Dominican School.* A marked contrast to the Franciscan and early Dominican school is found in St. Albert the Great and St. Thomas Aquinas. Among the scholastics Albert was the first to see what riches the Greco-Arabic science and philosophy contained for Christian thought. He was inclined to emphasize the practical separation of philosophy and theology, since philosophical problems should be handled by philosophical methods, and to establish a new hierarchy of authority: “In matters of faith and morals Augustine is to be believed rather than the philosophers, if they are not in agreement. But if one speaks of medicine, I should rather believe Galen or Hippocrates; or if of the nature of things, I believe Aristotle or some other who is expert in the nature of things” (*In 2 sent.* 13.2). If Albert did not succeed in building a true philosophical synthesis from such an overwhelming wealth of material, he did make possible the work of St. Thomas, providing as well inspiration for a school of his own among the German Dominicans, who emphasized the Neoplatonism inherent in his thought (see THEODORIC

OF FREIBERG; ULRIC OF STRASSBURG; ECKHART, MEISTER).

For Thomas Aquinas, the basic problem was to discover how as a Christian scholar he could order anew the whole structure of Christian wisdom in such a way that pagan philosophy would be made tributary to the Christian faith. For Thomas there was no need to reject or despise whatever pagan reason had discovered of the truth; just as grace does not destroy nature but perfects it, so sacred doctrine presupposes, uses, and perfects natural knowledge (*Summa theologiae* 1a, 1.8 ad 2). Some truths about God exceed the ability of reason. But there are other truths that the natural reason of man is able to reach (*C. gent.* 1.3). Both come under theology because God has seen fit to reveal both and propose them to man for belief (1.4), even though the second group is properly of the philosophical order. Both kinds of truth are incorporated into the *Summa contra gentiles* and the *Summa theologiae*.

Many contemporaries took scandal at the synthesis Thomas achieved, complaining that he had brought Aristotelian naturalism and metaphysics into the heart of theology in speaking of the being of God and creatures, the POTENCY of MATTER (to the abandonment of Augustine's SEMINAL REASONS), the definition of soul as FORM, and the rejection of any theory of ILLUMINATION in knowledge. Yet they apparently failed to see that the Aristotle of St. Thomas was not simply the Aristotle of Athens in Latin dress, but an Aristotle brought into captivity to Christ, whose principles found interpretations and applications in problems he himself had never faced. Above all, the synthesis of St. Thomas is *his* synthesis; Thomism is not the mere evolution of Aristotelianism, but a revolution born of St. Thomas's own great intellect.

*Averroist Crisis.* The Angelic Doctor's knowledge of Aristotle and Averroës helped him meet in adequate fashion the crisis that had developed in Paris after 1255 (see AVERROISM, LATIN; INTELLECT, UNITY OF). With the introduction of the unfamiliar corpus of Aristotle into the arts curriculum, many masters turned for aid and enlightenment to the commentaries of Averroës. Under the latter's influence some came to seek a philosophy free from theological control. When their teachings contradicted the faith, they were careful to propose them merely as the conclusions of reason and philosophy. To philosophize, as SIGER OF BRABANT said, was to expound as faithfully as possible the thought of Aristotle, in methodical abstraction from the faith. The theologians were quick to react. In 1267 and 1268 Bonaventure publicly rebuked and condemned errors current in the university that "arose from the unbridled use of philosophical investigation." Yet only with the return of St. Thomas to Paris

were such brash philosophers met on their own level. Attacked by innumerable theologians, the Averroist movement was formally condemned on Dec. 10, 1270, by the bishop of Paris, Étienne TEMPIER. The 13 propositions condemned embodied the essential tenets of Latin AVERROISM. This condemnation seems to have had little effect; the conferences *In Hexameron* of Bonaventure in 1273 witness the bitterness of his opposition to Aristotle and Averroists. After the death of Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure in 1274, there was no theologian great enough to stem the Averroist tide in Paris. In the eyes of many, notably John Peckham and Robert Kilwardby, the Aristotelianism of Aquinas was dangerously close to that of the Averroists.

*Condemnation of 1277.* When the Parisian unrest was felt at the Papal Curia, Pope JOHN XXI wrote to Bishop Tempier on Jan. 18, 1277, directing him to ascertain where and by whom the errors in question had been taught or written, and to transmit to him, as soon as possible, all pertinent information [*Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis*, ed. H. Denifle and E. Chatelain, 4 v. (Paris 1889-97) 1:541]. Apparently without reply or further consultation with the Curia, Bishop Tempier issued a *motu proprio* and a condemnation of 219 propositions on March 7, 1277, the third anniversary of the death of Aquinas. In the prefatory letter, Tempier explicitly named Siger of Brabant and BOETHIUS OF SWEDEN as propagators of the errors condemned, and warned against the pretext of teaching a proposition as true according to reason, while it may be false according to faith (*ibid.* 1:543; see DOUBLE TRUTH, THEORY OF). The propositions condemned by Tempier included Averroist doctrines already condemned, multiplicity of worlds, each and every limitation of God's absolute freedom of action, individuation by matter, and certain crucial teachings of St. Thomas (*ibid.* 1:544-555). However, no proposition touched the specific Thomistic doctrine of the unicity of substantial form, so violently attacked by Peckham and other Augustinians. Consequently, Robert Kilwardby, Archbishop of Canterbury, proceeded at Oxford on his own authority to condemn 16 additional propositions, including 6 that touched the unicity of form, on March 18 (*ibid.* 1:558-559). The Paris condemnation, confirmed by the Pope on April 28, was an overwhelming victory for traditional Augustinianism.

In the light of the condemnation of 1277, WILLIAM DE LA MARE tried to preserve orthodox Franciscan teaching by drawing up a *Correctorium* of individual passages in the writing of Aquinas. This *Correctorium* was officially adopted by the Franciscan Chapter of Strasbourg in 1283; only notably intelligent lecturers were allowed to read the works of Aquinas, and then only with the *Correctorium* as a guide. Spontaneously, early supporters of

THOMISM, particularly at Oxford and Paris, where controversy was most intense, replied with *CORRECTORIA* to William de la Mare's "Corruptorium" [see RICHARD KNAPWELL; THOMAS OF SUTTON; JOHN (QUIDORT) OF PARIS].

*Early 14th Century.* Another reaction was the numerous controversies that occupied the scholastic world well into the 14th century concerning ESSENCE AND EXISTENCE, the unicity and plurality of FORMS, ILLUMINATION, the soul and its powers, and the like, that involved GILES OF ROME, HENRY OF GHENT, PETER THOMAE, WALTER OF CHATTON, and others. In the midst of this intellectual turmoil, faced with the skepticism of theologians on the one hand and the audacity of philosophers on the other, John DUNS SCOTUS sought to create a new synthesis. In a critical yet positive spirit, he undertook to examine anew the limits of reason contrasted to faith, the whole problem of knowledge (mainly against Henry of Ghent), the object of metaphysics, and the doctrine of being, giving greater emphasis to divine liberty and metaphysical proofs for God's existence. Whether Scotus was successful in weaving all these elements into a true synthesis is not altogether evident, but SCOTISM became a thriving school of thought in later periods of scholasticism.

The last of the great scholastics of this period was WILLIAM OF OCKHAM, who epitomized the spirit of criticism that pervaded the early 14th century. His contemporaries called his nominalist position the "modern way" (*via moderna*) in contrast to the "old way" (*via antiqua*) of Thomas and Scotus. His NOMINALISM also played a significant role in the later development of scholasticism (see OCHKAMISM).

**Late Scholasticism.** After 1350 scholastic thought quickly moved away from the metaphysics utilized so fruitfully by the great theologians of the 13th century and was beginning to examine new questions. To this extent it did not immediately lose its vitality. One evidence of this change was the 14th-century interest in speculative grammar, that is, the philosophical analysis of language, in which metaphysics became the foundation of grammar. Parallel to this was the growth of logic after the *Summulae logicales* of Peter of Spain (JOHN XXI); WILLIAM OF SHERWOOD is an example of the close bond between logic and metaphysics. Late scholasticism also witnessed the beginnings of modern physics and scientific methodology. At Oxford physicists began to apply mathematics to the study of nature, and to construct new theories on space and motion. At Paris, JOHN BURIDAN, ALBERT OF SAXONY, and NICHOLAS ORESME anticipated, by their teachings on IMPETUS, gravitation, and the universe, many later discoveries in physics and astronomy;

their doctrines implied radical departure from the physics of Aristotle.

While such new ideas occupied the professors of the arts faculty, the theologians appear to have advanced little beyond the giants of the preceding period. Instead, they manifested the tendency to crystallize into schools. THOMISM, which had become the official doctrine of the Dominican Order, was championed by HARVEY NEDELLEC, JOHN OF NAPLES, John CAPREOLUS, and later by Tomasso de Vio CAJETAN. Since Scotism was not official among the Franciscans, more originality and independence was found in such scholastics as ANTONIUS ANDREAS, Francis of Meyronnes, HUGH OF NEWCASTLE, Peter Thomae, and WILLIAM OF ALNWICK. Among the Augustinians, the doctrines of Giles of Rome were made official even within his lifetime.

With this, Paris unfortunately became a city of conflict and confusion. Religious-minded scholars revolted against it, while the growing number of humanists sought means to restore the classical concept of the liberal arts and return to the prescholastic type of culture. Since the University of Paris failed to achieve a synthesis of all these elements, old and new, one might take the founding of the Collège de France (1530), for the study of classics not provided at the university, as a sign that scholasticism was at an end. In Germany, the vitriolic attacks of Martin LUTHER on the schoolmen and on philosophy, and the ravages of the Reformation, destroyed whatever scholasticism was in that country. There had been little scholasticism, as such, in Italy, and it gave way before the humanists. Only in Spain did it show new life with the rise of middle scholasticism.

**Bibliography:** E. GILSON, *History of Christian Philosophy* (New York 1955). A. A. MAURER, *Medieval Philosophy*, v. 2 of *A History of Philosophy*, ed. É. H. GILSON, 4 v. (New York 1962–). F. C. COPLESTONE, *History of Philosophy* (Westminster, Md. 1946–) v. 2–3. D. KNOWLES, *The Evolution of Medieval Thought* (Baltimore 1962). J. PIEPER, *Scholasticism*, tr. R. and C. WINSTON (New York 1960). P. VIGNAUX, *Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, tr. E. C. HALL from 3d French ed. (New York 1959). P. DELHAYE *Medieval Christian Philosophy*, tr. S. J. TESTER (New York 1960). F. UEBERWEG, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, ed. K. PRAECHTER et al., 5 v. (11th, 12th ed. Berlin 1923–28) v. 3. A. FOREST et al., *Le Mouvement doctrinal du XI<sup>e</sup> au XIV<sup>e</sup> siècle (Histoire de l'église depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*, eds., A. FLICHE and V. MARTIN, 13; 1951). J. DE GHELLINCK *Le Mouvement théologique du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle (2d ed. Bruges 1948)* B. BAZÀN, J. WIPPEL, G. FRANSEN and D. JACQUART, *Les questions disputées et les questions quodlibétiques dans les facultés de théologie, de droit et de médecine* (Turnhout 1985). L. BOYLE, *Facing History: A Different Thomas Aquinas* (Louvain 2000). L. BIANCHI and E. RANDI, *Vérités dissonantes: Aristote . . . la fin du Moyen Age* (Fribourg 1990). J. WIPPEL, *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas: From Finite Being to Uncreated Being* (Washington 2000).

[I. C. BRADY]

## 2. MODERN OR MIDDLE SCHOLASTICISM

Modern or middle scholasticism extends roughly from 1530 to 1830. It may be conveniently divided into three periods: second scholasticism (1530–1650), reaction and adjustment (1650–1750), and crossroads and transition (1750–1830),

**General Characteristics.** As a system and method of speculative and practical thought modern scholasticism exhibited seven general characteristics that resulted from a peculiar combination of traditionalism and modernity in both philosophy and theology: (1) continuity with the past; (2) orientation of philosophy to the Word of God; (3) systematic realism; (4) rational method; (5) adjustment to contemporary science and modern philosophy; (6) concern with ideology; and (7) developments characteristic of different religious orders and of Protestant scholasticism. At times many of these positive characteristics were excessive; they were frequently ridiculed and misinterpreted by nonscholastics who, using the term scholasticism in a pejorative sense, revealed some of the negative characteristics of the system such as its antiquarian character and reliance on authorities in philosophy to the detriment of legitimate speculation.

The leaders of this movement were predominantly, though not exclusively, Catholic priests and Protestant clergymen. Among members of religious orders DOMINICANS, FRANCISCANS, and JESUITS predominated, although the diocesan clergy, BENEDICTINES, CARMELITES, AUGUSTINIANS, and members of other orders also made substantial contributions.

The transition to modern or middle scholasticism was necessitated by the humanists of the Renaissance whose use of, as well as expressed contempt for, scholasticism exemplified its unique characteristics; those who tried to change or destroy it were themselves shaped by it, and they adapted the results of this development to their own problems and times. Most significant were the invention of printing (c. 1440), the fall of Constantinople (1453), the discovery of America (1490–92), and the Protestant REFORMATION. These world events changed radically the cultural milieu of early modern scholasticism with powerful consequences for its evolution during subsequent centuries. Thus modern scholasticism began in the turmoil of the Reformation and terminated in the confusion of the French Revolution, the dissolution of monasteries, the suppression of religious orders, and the diminution of scholastic writers who were forced into practical apologetics.

Geographically, modern scholasticism flourished in Belgium, Great Britain (including Ireland and Scotland), France, Germany (together with Austria and the Netherlands), Hungary, Italy, Portugal, Poland, and Spain, usu-

ally in the shelter of Catholic or Protestant universities and in religious houses of study. Scholasticism was also transplanted to the New World with the establishment of religious orders and the founding of institutions of higher learning in North and South America and the Philippines. American colleges, such as Harvard, Yale, and William and Mary, reflected the scholasticism current in Protestant universities of the 16th century, especially Cambridge and Oxford, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and institutions in Germany and the Lowlands.

**Second Scholasticism.** The “second scholasticism” of the late 16th and early 17th centuries was a period of renewed activity after the chaos of the 14th century. Generally by 1500 the various theological schools were free to hold distinctive philosophical positions and to make consequent theological interpretations of revelation and church doctrine that became characteristic of the great religious orders. Despite these variations within schools, the following core of scholastic philosophical doctrine may be noted as common to all: (1) Thinkers agreed that the world is apprehended immediately as other than the individual knowing mind and that sense and intellect are two different modes of knowing. (2) Natural philosophy and psychology were characterized by an advocacy of pluralism (as opposed to monism), of a teleological dynamism operative within the world of nature, and of freedom and responsibility in man, who was regarded as having an immortal soul. (3) The possibility of metaphysics was recognized, as well as that of a normative and not merely descriptive ethics, not autonomous in the rationalist’s sense but dependent on law and on a lawgiver knowable to man without benefit of revelation. (4) The existence of one God, infinite in being and power, a free Creator who conserves the universe by His all-powerful will, was regarded as demonstrable. (5) Knowledge was divided in a way that kept the philosophical and theological orders formally distinct, yet considered Christian revelation an indispensable auxiliary to reason and to moral integrity.

Three famous schools were well established at the beginning of the modern period: the Thomist (whose various interpretations are sometimes styled Thomistic to distinguish them from the original doctrine of St. Thomas), the Scotist (and similarly, Scotistic), and the nominalist. After 1600 the teaching of F. Suárez and his school (Suarezianism) was added to the traditional three. Common to all scholastic and nonscholastic thinkers within the Church was the powerful Augustinian movement of long standing in Christianity. Among the scholastics the resulting variety and doctrinal differences were jealously guarded; at times the various religious orders exploited their chosen masters with a loyalty that might have been expressed: “my order, right or wrong.” Yet, out of this

welter also proceeded many outstanding scholastic works.

*Dominicans.* Among the Dominicans, John CAPREOLUS, Tommaso de Vio CAJETAN, and Francis Sylvester FERRARIENSIS, together with JOHN OF ST. THOMAS, constituted a classical commentator tradition that sought a positive rather than an apologetical understanding of St. Thomas. At the University of Salamanca, Francisco de VITORIA instituted a new pattern of achievement in scholasticism on the eve of the Reformation when he took the actual text of the *Summa theologiae* of St. Thomas as a text in theology in place of the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. His successor, Melchior CANO, was famous for his treatise on sources, in which he also presented a scheme for the reform of theology and philosophy. Among Cano's pupils were the Dominicans, Bartolomé de MEDINA and Domingo BÁÑEZ, and the Augustinian, Fray Luis de LEÓN. The Jesuit J. MALDONATUS had been, with Cano, a pupil of Vitoria. Bañez and others at the end of the 16th century engaged in a prolonged debate with the Jesuits over theological explanations concerning human freedom and divine grace (see THOMISM).

*Franciscans.* Franciscan scholastics of the period, like Dominican and Augustinian thinkers, were rooted in the systematic achievements of their medieval predecessors. St. Bonaventure or John Duns Scotus, for some, and William of Ockham, for others, constituted the sources of speculative guidance. Franciscans were free of official pressure to follow one master exclusively. Scotus was declared their doctor in 1593, although in 1550 the Capuchins had been forbidden to follow him and were encouraged to return to St. Bonaventure. Neither St. Thomas, declared a Doctor of the Church by Pius V in 1567, nor St. Augustine was excluded, and Aristotle appeared often in a Scotistic context.

Outstanding interpretations of the Franciscan tradition appeared early in the 16th century in works of M. O'FHELY and Francesco Licheto (Lychetus, d. 1520), whose commentary on Lombard's *Sentences* was reissued in 1639 by Cardinal Sarnan. Other 16th-century authors were A. TROMBETTA and the Capuchin theologian Peter Trigonus (Pedro Trigoso de Calatayud).

Seventeenth-century Franciscan scholastics useful in interpreting Scotus include Hugh Cavellus (MacCaugnwell, 1571–1626), Johannes Bosco, a Belgian recollect, and B. MASTRIUS. The Italian, L. BRANCATI, with Andrew Rochmarius, a Pole (d. 1626), and Alphonsus Bricero (d. 1667), called a second Duns Scotus when teaching in Lima, Peru, exemplify the international spread of 17th-century Scotism. John Ponce of Cork assisted L. WADDING in editing the works of Scotus and wrote his own manuals, *Integrum philosophiae cursum*

*ad mentem Scoti*, together with a complete course in theology according to the mind of Scotus. He is also credited with introducing, in the 17th century, the actual formula often attributed to Ockham, *Entia non sunt multiplicanda praeter necessitatem* (Entities are not to be multiplied unnecessarily).

William van Sichem (d. 1691) produced a clear, easy-to-teach *Cursus philosophicus* harmonizing Scotus, St. Thomas, and Bonaventure. Mattheus Ferchius (1583–1669) and Gaudentius Bontempi (1612–72) exemplify commentators on St. Bonaventure's work.

An important and scholarly presentation of the theology of Duns Scotus came from the pen of C. Frassen, a doctor at the Sorbonne in 1662, whose *Scotus academicus* and *Cursus philosophiae* embody noteworthy simplicity of style, clearness of method, and subtlety of thought; both volumes went through numerous editions until late in the next century. By the middle of the 18th century, however, Franciscan philosophy and theology had suffered the general decline of modern scholasticism. In many writers of this period the original basic accord between Scotus and Thomas had been transposed into an irreconcilable opposition (see SCOTISM).

*Augustinians.* By 1530, the Augustinians (Hermits of St. Augustine) had a commitment to an earlier scholastic tradition that fitted in with their special claim on St. Augustine. In 1287 a general chapter of Florence commanded members of the order to accept and defend the position of GILES OF ROME, one of their members who had been a pupil of St. Thomas Aquinas, himself declared a second doctor of their order in 1560. This new synthesis avoided some disadvantages associated with the Platonic elements in Augustinianism, especially its theory of knowledge and its absence of a dialectical method and of an ordered system. The school flourished into the 18th century, with the teaching of Augustinian philosophy and theology at Salamanca, Coimbra, Alcalá, Padua, Pisa, Naples, Oxford, Paris, Vienna, Prague, Würzburg, Erfurt, Heidelberg, Willenberg, and other centers of learning.

Bartholomaeus ARNOLDI taught Luther during his monastic days and later was his theological opponent. Both Arnoldi and J. Altenstaig were *moderni* or nominalists in their philosophy. In the 16th-century disputes about grace, Augustinian scholastics generally accepted an efficacy of grace *ab intrinseco*, as opposed to the Molinist doctrine *ab extrinseco*. Cardinal H. NORIS, a Louvain theologian, and Cardinal G. L. BERTI, invited by the general of his order, Schiaffinati, to write a methodic exposition of Augustinian theology, were involved in the dispute over grace. They confronted the "primitive" Augustinianism of BAIUS and his followers, C. O. JANSEN, and J. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE.



Earlier in the 16th century Raffaello Bonherba (d.1681) examined the principal controversies between St. Thomas and Duns Scotus in the light of the doctrine of Giles of Rome, as did Fulgentius Schautheet about 1660. Federico Nicola Gavardi (1640–1715) was one of Giles's most important interpreters. In the works of Jordan Simon (1710–76) there is a curious eclectic philosophy built on a foundation derived from Raymond LULL. (See AUGUSTINIANISM.)

*Oratorians.* In the 17th century, with the physics of Aristotle in ruins and that of Galileo in triumph, there came a joining of Augustinianism and CARTESIANISM through the influence of the Congregation of the Oratory, founded in 1661 by Cardinal P. de BÉRULLE. Among the ORATORIANS, the cause of Augustinianism, as a vehement protest against the alleged paganization of Christianity by Thomism, was advanced by THOMASSIN, R. SIMON, B. LAMY, J. B. DU HAMEL and especially N. MALEBRANCHE, of whom J. B. BOUSSUET said that his doctrine was “*pulchra, nova, falsa.*”

*Benedictines.* The Order of St. Benedict bore many attacks against Catholicism but managed to produce some of the classic works of scholarship in the modern period and, as with other religious orders, less distinguished manuals and compendia. Many Benedictine authors took St. Thomas as their guide, but some looked to St. Anselm of Canterbury as an intellectual father. Andreas de la Moneda (d. 1672), a Spaniard, wrote a course in scholastic and moral theology “according to the mind of Anselm and Thomas.” Probably the best work on dogmatic theology produced by a German Benedictine was *Theologia scholastica secundum viam et doctrinam divi Thomae Aquinatis* (Augsburg 1695, 1719) by Paul Mezger (1637–1702). The *Philosophia Thomistica Salisburgensis* (Augsburg 1706) of Ludwig Babenstuber (1660–1726) was in the old peripatetic tradition. Celestin Pley (d. 1710) offered a synthesis of rationalism, Thomism, and Benedictinism in his *Theoremata theologiae angelicae Benedictino-Thomistica* (Salzburg 1711). Nor was the Franciscan Doctor, Scotus, neglected, as the works of A. C. Hermann (c. 1720) and Marianus Brockie (1687–1757), written “according to Scotus,” indicate.

*Carmelites.* Carmelite professors at Alcalá and Salamanca early in the 17th century published their lectures in a series of manuals of Thomistic scholastic philosophy and theology. Authors of the philosophy manuals were designated as COMPLUTENSES (the old Roman name of Alcalá was Complutum) and those of the theology series as SALMANTICENSES. The works exhibited a high degree of consistency in doctrine because of the discussions that influenced the final form of each work. Disputes were settled by vote.

Later in the 17th century, attempts were made by some to elevate to the rank of a theological school the doctrine of John Baconthorp, a Carmelite Averroist. St. JOHN OF THE CROSS, the classic writer on “empirical mysticism,” was intimately acquainted with the *Summa theologiae* of St. Thomas from his higher studies at Salamanca. Carmelites engaged also in polemic writings against QUIETISM, JANSENISM, GALLICANISM, Cartesianism in philosophy, and RATIONALISM in Scripture and history.

*Servites.* Founded in 1233 at Florence, the Order of SERVITES originally followed Scotus. Later they turned from him to Henry of Ghent, actually a secular master but mistakenly thought to be a Servite. His Augustinian philosophy of a Neoplatonic character was made obligatory during the 1600s. H. A. Borghi, at Pisa in 1627, wrote a text for students based on Henry of Ghent, as did Jerome Scarpari (d. 1650) and Calistus Lodigeri (d. 1710); the last named was said to have advocated Henry's doctrine so strongly as almost to bring the man himself back from the grave. But Gerard Baldi (d. 1660) followed St. Thomas in his *Catholica monarchia Christi*, a theological treatise, and Marc Struggl (d. 1760) followed Molinism. At the beginning of the 19th century, Constantine Battini (d. 1830) contributed to the restoration of theological studies in Italy that later fructified in the works of the Servite cardinal, A. LÉPICIER.

*Jesuits.* Founded in 1540, some five years before the beginning of the Council of Trent, suppressed in Europe in 1773 and restored in 1814, the Society of Jesus came into the stream of modern scholasticism in time to contribute with the Dominicans to the flowering of Spanish scholasticism. St. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA personally and in the official documents of the Society rooted Jesuit philosophical and theological speculation in Aristotle and St. Thomas, a directive reiterated in the RATIO STUDIORUM.

The guidance given by St. Thomas was not taken as strictly as among the Dominicans, however, and a certain liberty of thought independent of established masters soon characterized Jesuit theology and philosophy. This appeared to some as eclecticism and to others as laxism—e.g., the teaching of PROBABILISM in problems affecting conscience. Many early Jesuits broke away from the physics of Aristotle in favor of new scientific movements. Later, some Jesuit textbook writers departed completely from metaphysics and the Thomistic synthesis, some adopting a Cartesian orientation, others the methodology and format of C. WOLFF or modifications of the sensism of É. B. de CONDILLAC and J. LOCKE. Yet some of the pioneers of the return to St. Thomas in the 19th century were members of the Society of Jesus.

Francisco de TOLEDO, first Jesuit cardinal and “father of scholastic philosophy in the Society of Jesus,”

had held the chair of philosophy at the University of Salamanca before becoming a Jesuit and had studied under the Dominican Domingo de SOTO. During Bellarmine's time at the Roman College practically all the professors were Spaniards, e.g., Gabriel VÁZQUEZ and his rival, F. SUÁREZ. M. SA was a Portuguese from Coimbra. C. ALAMANNI, born at Milan, studied under both Vázquez and Suárez and wrote a *Summa totius philosophiae e divini Thomae Aquinatis doctrina* (Padua 1618–23), which follows the form of St. Thomas's *Summa theologiae*. Later, following the style of the new manuals stimulated by Suárez, he published a *Summa philosophica D. Thomae ex variis eius libris in ordinem cursus philosophici accommodata* (Paris 1639), which F. EHRLE reedited at Paris in 1894. GREGORY OF VALENCIA, J. de LUGO, and L. LESSIUS were also at the Roman College at some time during their careers.

Peter da FONSECA, called the "Portuguese Aristotle," was provincial when the work of the Coimbricenses was undertaken by the Jesuit professors of the University of COIMBRA. Somewhat like the project of the Carmelites at Alcalá and Salamanca, this famous course was later published at the direction of the Jesuit general, C. ACQUAVIVA. Fonseca may also be the father of the doctrine on *SCIENTIA MEDIA* made famous by his pupil, L. de MOLINA, in his *Concordia* . . . (Lisbon 1588). (See SUAREZIANISM; MOLINISM.)

*Council of Trent.* In its totality scholasticism embraces exegesis of Scripture, patrology, and Church history, as well as systematic theology and its related philosophy. In all areas, but particularly in philosophy and theology, scholastics contributed to the formulation of conciliar decrees at Trent (1545–63), clarifying and making precise the concepts and definitions expressing the imputation of guilt, the causal influence and effects of supernatural grace, the reality of infused virtues, the analogy of matter and form in the Sacraments, and the sacramental character. These decrees also exemplify the masterful use by the Church of the contributions made by various orders and schools through their delegates at the council.

Later, in turn, scholastic philosophy was influenced by Trent in such matters as the distinction of three degrees of CERTITUDE that appears in the manuals after 1563. The discussion of certitude in the theological context of the Lutheran teaching on justification by faith alone and the Christian's personal certitude of his own state of justification shifted the emphasis from the objective to the subjective order. To be certain meant to be secure, although certitude had reference also to the truth of things. In the manuals it went through curious forms that bear little resemblance to the teaching of the great medi-

eval scholastics [S. Harent, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, ed. A. Vacant et al., 15 v. (Paris 1903–50) 6:211–215].

*Sociopolitical and Moral Theory.* Diego LAÍNEZ, a Jesuit delegate to Trent, had held the doctrine that the power to govern was delegated by the people to the sovereign, who was responsible to them for just rule. Another Jesuit, St. Robert BELLARMINE, for whom the Dominicans, Pedro de SOTO and Domingo de SOTO, were favorite authorities, carried on a famous controversy with James I, King of England, and his apologist, Filmore, over the political theory on the divine right of kings. Suárez gave powerful expression to the scholastic position on the origin and nature of civil power in his *Tractatus de legibus* (Coimbra 1612). The Dominican Vitoria shared with three other Spanish theologians, Domingo de Soto, Molina, and Suárez, the creation of a body of classic political theory attending to natural law and its implications.

Vitoria, Soto, and Suárez may be grouped also with Cajetan, Toletus, Bellarmine, and Gregory of Valencia in their brilliant reworking of the scholastic position on warfare. More the legalist, Suárez was interested in the source of lawmaking and took the existence of a plurality of individual states, each enjoying its own sovereignty as a perfect society, as a practical datum of 16th-century life. But Vitoria maintained that the good of the world as a whole (*bonum orbis*) was the care and concern of all, and he seems to have been the last scholastic internationalist until the 19th-century Jesuit, L. TAPARELLI D'AZEGLIO.

Generally in Europe, economic expansion raised questions in moral theology concerning just prices, monetary standards, and usury. Another development centered around the rights of penitents and practical standards or rules of confessors to make equitable moral judgments. St. Alphonsus LIGUORI, who had founded the Redemptorists at Scala in 1732, published his *Annotationes* (1744) to a classic work in moral theology by the Jesuit H. BUSENBAUM. Reissued in 1753 as *Theologia moralis*, after being recast in Liguori's own classic style, it was the source of many compendia of moral theology. By 1750 CASUISTRY, or the practice of formulating cases and solving them to illustrate the right or wrong involved, had become a synonym for moral laxity; but not before the Dominicans had forbidden the use of probabilism to their confessors and the Jesuits had developed a considerable doctrine and practice of the same. The Redemptorists sought a balance in EQUIPROBABILISM.

**Reaction and Adjustment.** From 1650 to 1750 the multiplicity of schools, writings, changes in format, and attempts to combine the traditional with the modern

found a type of unity with the rise of the new manuals, first under the influence of Suárez and then later with Leibnizian-Wolffian developments. Allied with this was the growth of Protestant scholasticism and scholasticism's continuing confrontation with the new science and with modern reforms in philosophy.

*New Manuals.* Under the pressure of a widespread polemic and reflecting contemporary change in method, the four areas in which scholastics were trained became increasingly specialized. Theologians, despite the work of such scholars as the Benedictines of Saint-Maur, made a dialectical rather than a historical use of Scripture and the Fathers. Texts were excerpted for the specific defense of decrees of the Church or to "prove" scholastic theses in theology. As a result of this, there appeared autonomous manuals and compendia in dogmatic and moral theology that were harmful to an integral understanding and practice of the faith.

Further, attacked as philosophers, scholastic teachers and writers attempted to counterattack as philosophers and had little time for the ponderous tomes of previous eras. Concurrently there arose a variety of courses, manuals, and systematic disputations designed to simplify the teaching of basic matter and attempting to incorporate what was useful in the new sciences. In some of these may be detected the beginning of a more radical enterprise, that of exploring and explaining revelation in terms of philosophies lacking roots in Greek thought. While textbook commentaries declined, works that gave an entire course in philosophy or theology or an integral part of theology became more numerous. In physical appearance these manuals were reduced in size from the folio to the quarto or smaller format.

One landmark terminating this process of change was Suárez's *Disputationes metaphysicae* (Salamanca 1597). Without manifesting a commitment to any one of the classical scholastic traditions, Suárez nevertheless stayed within the boundaries sketched by Thomas, Scotus, and Ockham, while incorporating his own reactions to the philosophical concerns and achievements of non-scholastics. Among these concerns was the subject of metaphysics, now considered in the context of new problems, one of which was the quest for an ontological principle from which everything else could be derived. According to some interpreters, Suárez's inclusion of the possible in the meaning of BEING (defined as "whatever is or can be") meant that metaphysics could be turned into an ontology and the way opened to working out a *mathesis universalis* along lines proposed by G. W. LEIBNIZ and C. WOLFF.

Soon shorter manuals appeared, displacing those of Fonseca (an excellent commentary on Aristotle) and To-

ledo. Most influential were works by the Jesuits, Pedro Hurtado de Mendoza (1578–1615), R. de ARRIAGA, and F. de Oviedo. The last named's *Cursus philosophicus* (Antwerp 1632–39), with its notable stress on principles, perhaps foreshadowed later developments when philosophy would be defined as the "science of principles." J. E. Mora sees Arriaga, very influential during his teaching years at Prague, as representing the link with the scholasticism of Leibniz and Wolff that influenced Kant through his teacher, Martin Knutzen (1713–51).

Dominicans who adopted the manual method and format include A. GOUDIN, A. PINY, and Nicholas Arnu (1629–92). The Carmelite PHILLIP OF THE BLESSED TRINITY, the Benedictines, A. Reding and Joseph Saenz d'Aguirre (1630–68), and the Theatine Z. Pascualigo, followed a similar method and doctrine.

A curious combination of theology and philosophy appeared in the works of prominent scholastic theologians between 1650 and 1750 who used both the Fathers and ancient pagan author to provide historical evidence for their non-Thomistic view that "God exists" is a self-evident proposition. This trend is illustrated by the Oratorian THOMASSIN, the Portuguese Jesuit Antonio Cordeyro (1640–1722), the Sorbonne scholar H. de TOURNELY, the Minim Antoine Boucat (d. 1730), the Capuchin Thomas of Charmes (1703–65), and the Augustinian cardinal G. L. BERTI. These authors presaged positivistic practices that were to appear later and may also have originated the modern argument for the existence of God *ex consensu gentium*.

*Protestant Scholasticism.* Luther's personal contempt for Aristotle and the schoolmen was bound up with his doctrine on the nature and effects of faith. Other factors were his nominalist background in philosophy and the influence of the Devotio Moderna exemplified in THOMAS À KEMPIS and the Brothers of the Common Life at Deventer, itself a reaction to the confusions of late medieval scholasticism. But MELANCHTHON undertook to construct a Protestant theological system and introduced among Lutherans a humanistic ARISTOTELIANISM set to the service of religion. Also in the background of all the Reformers was the scholasticism of Peter RAMUS, whose *Dialecticae institutiones* (1543) was an attempt to substitute for the logic of the schoolmen a more simple type composed ostensibly from Plato, Cicero, and Quintilian. In this sense Ramus was the first "scholastic" Protestant. But with the growing appreciation of metaphysics for establishing the meanings at issue in the Christian dialogue, Ramus's antimetaphysical logic was forbidden in the Protestant universities—at Leyden in 1591, at Helmstedt in 1597, and at Wittenberg in 1603.

Since humanistic Ramism and philosophical skepticism were as unsatisfactory to Dutch, German, and Bohe-

mian Protestants as they were to Catholics, the scholastic teacher of Protestant theology in Central Europe began to rely on the work already cloned by Spanish and Portuguese scholastic philosophers. Of the compendia, Suárez's *Disputationes metaphysicae* outranked all Catholic scholastic literature and served as a textbook in philosophy for many German universities in the 17th and part of the 18th centuries. Soon Protestant authors began to produce their own manuals. Cornelius Martini (1568–1621) at Helmstedt, who, with Johannes Caselius (1535–1613), worked in the Italian Aristotelian tradition pioneered among Protestants by Jakob Schegk (1511–87), wrote an early work using quotations from St. Thomas and Cajetan. In 1604, after making acquaintance with the Spanish scholastics, he printed his *Metaphysicae commentatio*. Jakob Martini (1570–1649) published a *Theoremata metaphysicorum* (Wittenberg 1603–04) showing the influence of Suárez's *Disputationes*, which had appeared in the Mainz edition several years earlier.

By 1617 Christoph Scheibler (1589–1653), author of an *Opus metaphysicum*, was known as the Protestant Suárez. F. P. Burgersdijck (1590–1635), author of an *Institutiones logicae* (Leyden 1626), used his own composition of a kind of Suarezian compendium published posthumously in 1640. Burgersdijck's pupil and successor at Leyden, Adrianus Heereboort (1614–61) also wrote a logic and metaphysics based on his teacher's work. He taught many academic philosophers of the 17th century in the Netherlands, among whom were two of Leibniz's teachers, Jakob Tomasius (1622–84) and J. A. Scherzer (1628–83), both also influenced by Daniel Strahl. B. SPINOZA, who mentions Heereboort, also shared the debt to Spanish scholasticism and took Burgersdijck's division of the causes into his own systematic organization of philosophy. Other prominent Protestant authors were Bartholomew Keckermann (1571–1608); Polanus von Polansdorf (1561–1610); William Ames (1576–1633), under Ramist influence but essentially scholastic; and Johann Heinrich Alsted (Alstedius; 1588–1638), a Protestant encyclopedist.

Across the Atlantic, the records of the Boston Book Market together with the curricular offerings and public dissertations at Harvard show this same scholastic influence in the New World. John Harvard (1607–38) left to the college library his copy of a popular compendium, that of the French Cistercian, Eustachius a S. Paolo, whose *Summa philosophiae* (preface dated 1608) was mentioned favorably by Spinoza.

In England, the Oxford of John LOCKE likewise reflected these manual developments. The Puritans' concern for scriptural preaching alienated them from the use of scholastic matter, and yet John WESLEY and Richard

HOOKE are known for their scholastic borrowings. Works by J. Ray, W. Derham, and C. Mach and the famous *Natural Theology* of William Paley, so disappointing to Darwin, echoed as late as 1836 a scholasticism long since strained thin and mixed with innumerable other elements. As with the Roman Catholics, Protestant scholastics experimented with the Cartesian contribution to modern philosophy. An obdurate Aristotelian among Protestants was Georgius Agricola, who objected in 1665 to the Copernican geocentric system, claiming that if the earth were a star men would all be in heaven!

*Modern Science and Philosophy.* In the light of subsequent history, the new science of mathematical physics evolving at the hands of G. GALILEI and I. Newton was of utmost importance. B. PASCAL confessed his inability to decide between the Ptolemaic, Copernican, and Tychoonian systems, a decision involving further complex options concerning matters in Aristotle's *Physics*. But this was only one of a number of areas that engaged the attention of modern scholastics. At a time when the advance of knowledge with new methods and theories called for quiet scholarship and balanced evaluation, the scholastic world generally was much concerned with the polemic and ideological issues it judged crucial for human welfare in general.

For some, occultism helped to compensate for the decreasing interest in philosophy and theology and was a factor in the terrible witch trials in Europe. The non-physical atmosphere of predictive ASTROLOGY seemed to provide a way of contending with a mechanical interpretation of reality that appeared to menace human values. In the 18th century this materialistic threat had become a powerful ideology at the hands of the ENCYCLOPEDISTS, who threatened institutions and societies in conflict with their ideas and seemed to have the destruction of Christianity as one of their avowed aims.

Moreover, polemic concern with the Reformation distracted competent minds. Controversial theology, a preliminary form of the more developed discipline of APOLOGETICS, began to grow. But putting the old physics or the new science to work for the sake of securing an advantage over skeptics, atheists, and impious materialists did not make clear what the new physics was about in its method and conclusions. Nor did Isaac Newton's famous affirmation of THEISM in the General Scholion appended to the 2d edition (1713) of his *Mathematical Principles of Natural Theology* help the situation.

Despite a few scholastics who were interested in science during the modern period, such as the Jesuit R. G. Boscovich and the Cistercian Juan CARAMUEL LOBKOWITZ, the majority showed little evidence of scientific knowledge in their works. With Galileo's defeat in his

battle for freedom from theological control, and with Copernicus also on the Index from 1616 to the turn of the 19th century, it seemed safer to scholastic philosophers to adopt a watch-and-wait attitude that inhibited scholarly examination and evaluation of the new ideas. Preachers and casuists gained prominence and writers of manuals in philosophy and theology worked almost always with the aim of apologetics in mind.

**Crossroads and Transition.** The last period of modern or middle scholasticism, roughly between 1750 and 1830, may be characterized as one of crossroads and of transition. Noteworthy in this period were the development of Wolffian manuals preceding the revival of Thomism, the concern for ideology, and the Cartesian influence within the scholastic tradition.

*Wolffian Manuals.* In 1720, Christian WOLFF began producing at the Protestant University of Halle, first in German and then in Latin, some 40 volumes of philosophy according to a new method and format. Using Euclid and his geometric method as a model, he aimed to present philosophy systematically by reducing it to its principles. He first proposed a new division of philosophy based on the distinction between experience and reason—a distinction later to widen into the divergent streams of EMPIRICISM and RATIONALISM and never to be closed in scholastic works of Wolffian origin. For Wolff, philosophy belongs to the realm of reason, as distinct from that of experience, and its theoretical or speculative part is metaphysics. Using a systematic breakdown into genus and species, he divides metaphysics into general metaphysics or ONTOLOGY and special metaphysics, and the latter in turn into three parts: COSMOLOGY, PSYCHOLOGY, and THEODICY (see SCIENCES, CLASSIFICATION OF). Wolff's definition of philosophy as *cognitio rationis eorum quae sunt vel fiunt* then sets the tone for its later development, which makes special use of the principles of CONTRADICTION and of SUFFICIENT REASON. Because sensation is radically distinct from rational knowledge and since existence is systematically meaningless in this conception, a philosophy understood as a science of reasons or *rationes* must be a science of essences. But the essence is the possible, and the possible is ultimately the noncontradictory. Thus the primacy of essence for the Wolffian system is practically equivalent to the primacy of logic.

For the most part, scholastic imitators of Wolff maintained a kind of static tension between the extremes of experience (empiricism) and reason (rationalism). Many continued, as did Wolff, one of the less commendable characteristics of postmedieval scholasticism, viz, a rationalistic attitude toward reality that segregates and exalts the speculative power of man's reason while de-

preciating his other powers. Others, however, expressed reservations over the new philosophy. Among Protestant theologians at Wolff's own Halle and in the Berlin Academy there was criticism of his system, especially on the point of sufficient reason. This principle took on an ideological dimension in that, if reason were understood as a determining reason, difficulties were created over the freedom of the will and a point made in favor of fatalism. Mansuetus a S. Felice, (d. 1775), an Augustinian professor of moral theology, wrote several philosophical-theological dissertations on the principle of sufficient reason in connection with liberty, a best possible world, and the various aspects of grace and predestination (Cremona 1775). Cardinal Hyacinthus Sigismund Gerdil of the Barnabites (1718–1802) wrote a short essay on the *Mémoires* of N. de Béguelin (1714–89) that illustrated how the problem of determinism in the moral order brought its metaphysical aspect to the foreground. Earlier, the Benedictine Anselm Desing (1699–1772) wrote *Diatriba circa methodum Wolfianum* (1752), using diatribe in its original Greek meaning of a study or discussion. This purported to show that Wolff's approach was neither a method nor scientific, especially for establishing the principles of natural law.

*Scholastic Imitators.* Scholastic imitation of Wolff's method and format began about 1750. German Jesuits principally in Austria and Franciscan manual writers in Germany and Italy produced a body of philosophical compendia that, in the next two centuries, was to be mistakenly regarded as an embodiment of the scholastic tradition. Often, too, the Kantian critique of Leibnizian scholasticism in its Wolffian form would be taken as a competent demolition of genuine scholastic doctrines.

The Jesuits Joseph Redlhamer (1713–61) and Berthold Hauser (1713–62) were among the early scholastic imitators of Wolff. Two other prominent Jesuit Wolffians were Benedict Stattler (1728–97) and S. von STORCHENAU. Stattler made use of the principle of sufficient reason almost to the saturation point in his *Philosophia methodo scientiis propria explanata* (Augsburg 1769–72), granting the principle an eminence that rivals its use in Wolff and that probably was not equaled in any subsequent scholastic work. Storchenau had taught philosophy at Vienna for ten years when the Jesuits were suppressed in 1773. His *Institutiones logicae* (Vienna 1769) and his *Institutiones metaphysicae* (Vienna 1772), with its division into metaphysics, cosmology, psychology, and natural theology, went through numerous editions until as late as 1833. Both Storchenau and Stattler are related to Suárez in certain features of their philosophy. Stattler's cosmology, already without any doctrine of matter and form to give it substance, is more of an outline of the apologetics of miracles and a remote preparation

for “proving” the existence of God from the fact of law in nature. The Austrian government in 1752 had forbidden the teaching of Aristotelian doctrine on matter and form, and the same prohibition was requested also in Germany. Generally HYLOMORPHISM was held in complete disrepute among these philosophers.

Franciscan manual-writers who reflected the current of the times were Herman Osterrieder (d. 1783) and Laurentius Altieri. The former taught philosophy to Franciscan students in Ratisbon and his *Metaphysica vetus et nova* (Augsburg 1761) was adapted to their needs. It combined basic Scotistic notions with the Wolffian order of ontology, placing the principle of sufficient reason in its accustomed place after the principle of contradiction before treating “the concept of being and its attributes in general.” Giuseppe Tamagna (1747–98) published his *Institutiones philosophicae* (Rome 1778), with a second edition in 1780 under the patronage of the minister general of the Franciscans. In his logic he showed concern for the practical aspects of criteriology and commented on Wolff’s mistake of confusing the existence of sufficient reason with the ability to assign a sufficient reason. He also tried to break out of the Wolffian logic of essences into the assertion of existential reality independent of deduction.

In face of the chaotic condition of textbooks, the minister general of the Friars Minor proposed for uniform adoption a *Philosophiae universae institutiones*; this appeared anonymously in 1843 or 1844 but had the author’s name, Dionysius of St. John in Galdo, displayed on the second edition (Rome 1846).

*Concern for Ideology.* The Jesuits, Ignace Monteiro (1724–1812), *Philosophia rationalis electica* (Venice 1770), Antonio Eximeno y Pujader (1729–1808), and Juan Andrés (1740–1817), attempted to assimilate atomistic and sensualist philosophies in Spain and were ardent defenders of doctrines proposed by Locke in England and Condillac in France, while repeating the strictures of Antonio Genovesi (1713–69) and L. A. Verney (1713–92) against Aristotelian philosophy. Locke’s sensism was taught at the Vincentian college in Piacenza for a time. Vincenzo Buzzetti (1777–1824) was influenced while studying theology by an exiled Spanish Jesuit, Baltasar Mesdeu (1741–1820), who helped him abandon Locke. He taught the three Sordi brothers, who later entered the Society of Jesus (restored in 1814) and worked for the restoration of scholastic and particularly Thomistic philosophy in their order.

The Celestine, Appiano Buonafede (1716–93), a distinguished philosopher, was imbued with doctrines of Condillac. J. BALMES in Spain and the Jesuit J. KLEUTGEN in Germany were not writers of textbooks, but they

worked with an eclectic method of drawing useful matter from St. Thomas and opposed sensism in scholastic writers.

At an opposite pole of the reaction against rationalism were the powerful tendencies already at work in Cartesian and Leibnizian philosophies toward various forms of IDEALISM. In these the world of matter and the experience of sense knowledge, if not denied, had no systematic relevance. Three famous scholastic theologians who launched positive attacks against “scholastics” and attempted a synthesis with the genuine values of critical and idealistic philosophy were G. HERMES, A. GÜNTHER, and J. FROHSCHAMMER. Kleutgen’s defense in Germany against their attacks on scholasticism did not always identify the sources and nature of the scholasticism at issue. A contemporary, J. B. Hauréau, in *De la philosophie scolastique* reduced everything to the problem of UNIVERSALS. The crucial questions at issue in the attempts of these three theologians to assimilate the new philosophy centered around the relation between being and knowledge in the context of faith.

Less successful in confronting the new while maintaining what was valid in the old were apologists such as the Spanish Benedictine B. J. Feijóo y Montenegro (1676–1764). Feijóo admired F. BACON and Newton for their work in the order of experimental truth and eulogized Descartes as a genius. His *Teatro crítico universal sopra los errores communes* (Madrid 1726–40) was not lacking in critical sharpness, unlike the work of another Benedictine, François LAMY, whose refutation of Spinoza, *Le nouvel athéisme renversé*, did not touch the issues very profoundly.

The Benedictine Maternus Reuss in Germany exalted Kant’s philosophy and sought permission to visit the great German philosopher to profit from conversations with him. Other Benedictines teaching Kantian philosophy about this time (c. 1788) were Placidus Muth (1753–182) and Augustinus Schelle (1742–1805). P. ZIMMER followed J. G. FICHTE, while both Zimmer and Marianus Dobmayer (1753–1805) showed evidence of assimilating doctrine from F. W. J. SCHELLING.

J. M. SAILER, Cajetan von Weiller (1762–1826) and Jacob Salat (1766–1851) attempted to use insights from the fideism of F. H. JACOBI and J. G. HAMANN. In France the Abbé Jean Marie de Prades (1720–82) was close enough to the philosophy of the ENLIGHTENMENT to contribute the article on “Certitude” to the famous *Encyclopédie*.

*Cartesian Influences.* Finally, one of the most powerful influences within modern scholasticism in its later period was that of Cartesian Catholic philosophy. Des-

cartes had led the way in adapting his system to scholastic needs when, in the vain hope of having it adopted as a Jesuit textbook at his Alma Mater, he cast his metaphysical masterpiece, *Meditations on First Philosophy* (1641), into scholastic form in *Principles of Philosophy* (1644). (See CARTESIANISM.) Toward the end of the 17th century, however, Catholic philosophers were teaching a brand of philosophy that was committed to Cartesian starting points and methods—sometimes combined with traditional scholasticism, sometimes generating systematic opposition and tensions. Antoine Le Grand (d. 1699), a Franciscan professor at Douai, the Benedictine Robert Desgabets (1620–78), the Minim Emmanuel Maignan (1601–76), and Andreas Pissini found difficulty squaring their Cartesian philosophy with the truths of faith. The Jesuit Honoré Fabri (1607–88) attempted to construct a system based on Aristotle that ended up not very different from the atomism of P. GASSENDI. P. D. HUET began as a partisan of Cartesian philosophy but, coming to regard it as a danger to the faith, wrote *Censure philosophiae cartesianae* (Paris 1680), which was severe in its strictures and of great influence among Catholic philosophers and theologians.

Some 18th-century Cartesians whose manuals went into the following century include the Jesuit C. BUFFIER, whose *Traité des premières veritez* was edited by Lamennais in 1822 and influenced the Scottish philosopher, T. REID; Jean Cochet (d. 1771), who combined the Cartesian *Cogito* with the Wolffian division and method; L'Abbé Para du Phanjas (1724–97); Michael Kalus (d. 1792); and J. V. de Decker. Claude Mey (1712–96) and Antoine Migeot (1730–94) also wrote in this tradition, all of them seeing in Descartes the savior of philosophy after its peripatetic decadence. Migeot was also a good witness to a widespread conception that SCHOLASTIC METHOD was identical with that of Wolff and the geometrical ideal in general.

One of the masterpieces of Cartesian manual writing—which G. VENTURA DI RAULICA, a former Jesuit, onetime general of the Theatines, and a moderate traditionalist in philosophy called “*le cours classique du cartésianisme*”—was the *Institutiones philosophicae auctoritate D.D. Archiepiscopi Lugdunensis*. Written by a Father Joseph Valla (d. 1790), whose name does not always appear on the title page of later editions, it was first used in the Diocese of Lyons and became generally known as *Philosophie de Lyon*. Valla, as well as G. C. Ubaghs (1800–75), Belgian traditionalist, drew considerable inspiration from Malebranche. Emphasizing the importance of a philosophy that conceives man as a soul temporarily confined in a body, Valla warned against philosophical theories that detract from the excellence and spirituality of the mind of man. He urged a doctrine

of innate ideas, emphasizing that the philosopher must not conceive man's mind as so dependent upon the organs of the sense as to derive its ideas from them.

Among the Sulpicians, manuals by Valla (purged of Jansenism), and L. Bailly, *Theologia dogmatica et moralis ad usum seminariorum* (Dijon 1789; 2d ed. Lyons 1804), remained in use until the middle of the 19th century. But French predominated as the language of instruction and Saint-Sulpice was characterized by the general absence of dogma in favor of apologetics and morals, the latter quite juridical and on the rigorous side. Pierre Denis Boyer (1766–1842), one of the more original professors, developed his course on religion and the Church under the inspiration of Bishop Jean Baptiste Duvoisin (1744–1813), a professor at the Sorbonne before the French revolution. But aware of the change from 18th-century hostility to 19th-century indifferentism, Boyer introduced a thesis to show that indifferentism was “contrary to reason, harmful to God, opposed to man's nature, temerarius or opposed to prudence, and contrary to the welfare of society.”

**Bibliography:** General works. F. C. COPLESTONE, *History of Philosophy* (Westminster, Md. 1946–) v.3, 4, 6. G. FITZ and A. MICHEL, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, ed. A. VACANT et al., 15 v. (Paris 1903–50) 14.2:1691–1728. H. S. LUCAS, *The Renaissance and the Reformation* (2d ed. New York 1960). È. H. GILSON, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (New York 1937). J. QUÉTIF and J. ÉCHARD, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*, 5 v. (Paris 1719–23). C. SOMMERVOGEL et al., *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 11 v. (Brussels–Paris 1890–1932). H. HURTER, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae*<sup>3</sup>, 5 v. in 6 (3d ed. Innsbruck 1903–13). Second scholasticism. C. GIACON, *La seconda scolastica*, 3 v. (Milan 1944–50). F. ROTH, *History of the English Austin Friars, 1249–1538*, 2 v. (New York 1961). *A Catalogue of Renaissance Philosophers, 1350–1650*, ed. J. O. RIEDL, (Milwaukee 1940). L. THORNDIKE, *A History of Magic and Experimental Science*, 8 v. (New York 1923–58) v.5, 6. B. HAMILTON, *Political Thought in Sixteenth Century Spain* (New York 1964). Later developments. J. E. GURR, *The Principle of Sufficient Reason in Some Scholastic Systems, 1750–1900* (Milwaukee 1959). M. GRABMANN, “Die Disputationes metaphysicae des Franz Suarez in ihrer methodischen Eigenart und Fortwirkung,” *Mittelalterliches Geistesleben*, 3 v. (Munich 1926–56) 1:525–560. J. F. MORA, “Suárez and Modern Philosophy,” *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 14 (1953) 528–547. È. H. GILSON, *Études sur le rôle de la pensée médiévale dans la formation du système cartésien* (Paris 1930); *Index scolastico-cartésien* (Paris 1913). G. SORTAIS, “Le Cartésianisme chez les jésuites français au XVII<sup>e</sup> et au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle,” *Archives de Philosophie*, 6.3 (1928) 1–93. W. J. ONG, *Ramus: Method, and the Decay of Dialogue* (Cambridge, Mass 1958). W. T. COSTELLO, *The Scholastic Curriculum at Early Seventeenth Century Cambridge* (Cambridge, Mass. 1958). S. E. MORISON, *Harvard College in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, Mass. 1936). M. WUNDT, *Die deutsche Schulphilosophie im Zeitalter der Aufklärung* (Tübingen 1945). P. DIBON, *La Philosophie néerlandaise au siècle d'or* (New York 1954–) v.1. E. A. BURTT, *The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science* (rev. ed. New York 1950). J. DILLENBERGER, *Protestant Thought and Natural Science: An Historical Interpretation* (Garden City, N.Y. 1960). R. CESSAIO, *Le Thomisme et*

*les Thomistes* (Paris 1999). Jean Capreolus *en son temps: Colloque de Rodez*, eds., G. BEDOUELLE, R. CESSARIO and K. WHITE (Paris 1997). J. F. COURTINE, *Suarez et le système de la métaphysique* (Paris 1990).

[J. E. GURR]

### 3. CONTEMPORARY SCHOLASTICISM

Contemporary scholasticism is predominantly a re-discovery of the thought of St. THOMAS AQUINAS that began early in the 19th century, developed slowly in Catholic countries of Europe, gained momentum through the efforts of Leo XIII, spread to most countries of the world, and survives today in various forms. Beginning as an ideological discovery by Catholic philosophers confronted with contemporary problems, it was supported by serious historical studies of the Middle Ages and of scholastic authors previously neglected. These historical and doctrinal studies led to a clearer distinction between NEOSCHOLASTICISM AND NEOTHOMISM. Although contemporary scholasticism includes revived SCOTISM, SUAREZIANISM, and a variety of eclectic adaptations, it is predominantly an attempt to return to the vital thought of St. Thomas in a way that is relevant to contemporary man.

**Origins of the Revival.** The study of St. Thomas never entirely died out in the Dominican Order, although the general chapter of 1748 had to emphasize ancient obligations. In 1757 the Master General, J. T. Boxadors, reviewed the ancient legislation and insisted that all Dominicans return immediately to the solid teaching of the Angelic Doctor. His long letter was included in the acts of the general chapter that met in Rome in 1777 [*Monumenta Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum historica*, ed. B. M. Reichert (Rome-Stuttgart-Paris 1896–) 14:344–350]. That year Salvatore ROSELLI, professor at the College of St. Thomas in Rome (Minerva), published a scholarly six-volume *Summa philosophica* dedicated to Cardinal Boxadors. Intended to renew Thomism in the order, the *Summa* directly influenced all leaders of the Thomistic revival in Italy, Spain, and France. Three editions of this work (Rome 1777, 1783; Bologna 1857–59) and a four-volume compendium (Rome 1837) were quickly exhausted.

*Italy.* The prevailing philosophy in Italy was ONTOLOGISM, promulgated principally by A. ROSMINI-SERBARI and V. GIOBERTI. The earliest pioneer of the Neothomistic movement in Piacenza was Canon Vincenzo Buzzetti (1777–1824). Taught the philosophy of J. LOCKE and É. B. de CONDILLAC by the Vincentian Fathers of Collegio Alberoni, he abandoned Locke's sensism under the influence of Baltasar Masdeu (1741–1820), an exiled Spanish Jesuit. Buzzetti discovered St. Thomas by reading Roselli and a smaller, simpler text by the

French Dominican Antoine GOUDIN. As professor of philosophy in the diocesan seminary (1804–08), Buzzetti wrote *Institutiones sanae philosophiae iuxta divi Thomae atque Aristotelis inconcussa dogmata* [*Enciclopedia filosofica*, 4 v. (Venice–Rome 1957) 1:845–846]. Basically Thomistic, this work suffered from the influence of Christian WOLFF and an insufficient understanding of St. Thomas. Among Buzzetti's disciples were two Sordi brothers, who later became Jesuits, and Giuseppe Pecci, brother of the future Leo XIII.

Serafino Sordi (1793–1865), the younger brother, entered the Society of Jesus (restored in 1814) and tried desperately to revive Thomism. The general was dissuaded from assigning him to the Roman College (Gregorianum) as professor of logic because of faculty opposition: “so strong are the prejudices against Fr. Sordi because he is a Thomist” (letter of the provincial, Oct. 2, 1827; Dezza 33). Domenico Sordi (1790–1880) followed his brother into the Society and was assigned to teach, even though he had many enemies. Among his disciples was the Jesuit Luigi TAPARELLI D' AZEGLIO, author of several Thomistic essays on natural law, who, on becoming provincial of the Naples province, secured the services of Domenico Sordi in 1831 and procured Goudin's *Philosophia* for the Jesuit College in Naples. Sordi, wishing to revive Thomism, formed a private philosophical society that was discovered and disbanded by a Roman visitor in 1833; Sordi was prevented from teaching and Taparelli was sent to Palermo to teach French. In 1834 Matteo LIBERATORE, a Jesuit who had not been a member of the disbanded group, was appointed professor in the college. The first edition of Liberatore's *Institutiones philosophiae* (Naples 1840) was entirely eclectic, influenced mainly by V. COUSIN. By 1853 Liberatore became convinced of Thomism, largely through association with *Civiltà Cattolica*, founded in Naples in 1850 by Carlo Maria Curci and Taparelli. This journal strongly promoted the Catholic cause and restoration of the Christian philosophy of St. Thomas. Giuseppe Cornoldi (1822–92), confrere and close friend of Liberatore, wrote manuals of Thomistic philosophy and many works attacking Rosminianism, ontologism, pantheism, and scientism.

Most zealous for the revival of Thomism in Italy was Gaetano SANSEVERINO, a diocesan priest of Naples. Originally a Cartesian in philosophy, he was influenced about 1840 by Roselli's *Summa*. With assistance from Taparelli and Liberatore, he began publishing and writing articles for *La Scienza e la Fede*, a journal that systematically criticized current rationalism, idealism, ontologism, and liberalism. When he wrote *Philosophia Christiana* (5 v. Naples 1853), refuting D. HUME, T. REID, I KANT, F. W. J. SCHELLING, H. F. R. de LAMENNAIS, and Gioberti, he



was a thoroughly convinced Thomist. Reviewing this work in 1865, the Spanish Dominican Ceferino GONZÁLEZ Y DÍAZ TUÑÓN criticized it for being too Thomistic and contemptuous of modern thought. Sanseverino's work was continued in Naples by Nunzio Signoriello (1831–89) and by many disciples who began publishing major works of St. Thomas, neglected for almost a century. Between 1850 and 1860 the *Summa theologiae* was published also in Parma, Bologna, and Paris. The Parma edition of the *Opera omnia* was published by Fiaccadori (1852–73) in 25 folio volumes.

In Rome the center of Thomistic revival was the Dominican College of St. Thomas (Minerva), where the *Summa theologiae* was used as a textbook. Among the eminent theologians there were Vincenzo Gatti (1811–82), author of *Institutiones apologeticae* (1866), Francisco Xarrié (d. 1866), author of *Theologia Thomistica* and coauthor with Narciso Puig (d. 1865) of *Institutiones theologicae ad mentem D. Thomae* (1861–63), and the philosopher Tommaso ZIGLIARA. Zigliara, regent of the college from 1870 to 1879, wrote an influential *Summa philosophica* that ran through 17 editions and many Italian treatises against traditionalism and ontologism. In 1879 Leo XIII acknowledged his contribution to the Thomistic revival by creating him cardinal and appointing him director of the Leonine Commission entrusted with editing the critical text of St. Thomas.

*Spain.* The influential philosopher J. L. BALMES openly professed to follow the Christian philosophy of St. Thomas in his *Filosofía fundamental* (1846) and *Curso de filosofía elemental* (1847) when Thomism was still unpopular. His friend J. D. Cortés (1809–61) utilized St. Thomas in an attempt to develop Christian political theory. In Spanish seminaries, according to a student plan adopted in 1824 and decreed in 1868 by the board of education, the *Summa theologiae* of St. Thomas was adopted as the basis of theological studies. Enthusiasm for Thomistic theology was renewed at Salamanca by the Dominican Pascual (d. 1816), at Cervera by Francisco Xarrié, and by other Dominicans at colleges in Coria and Ocaña. As early as 1820 the Dominicans Felipe Puigserver and Antonio Sendil vehemently opposed philosophical errors of the day and tried to restore the whole of medieval scholasticism, even its Aristotelian cosmology. In the University of Madrid J. M. Orti y Lara (1826–1904), professor of metaphysics and a layman, openly taught St. Thomas and attacked the prevailing Kantian philosophy of Karl Krause and his Spanish disciples.

The most important and influential representative of the Thomistic revival was Ceferino González y Díaz Tuñón, Dominican professor of philosophy in Manila and

Ocaña, later bishop (1874) and cardinal (1884). His *Estudios sobre la filosofía de S. Tomás* (Manila 1864), *Philosophia elementaris* (3 v. Madrid 1868), and *Historia de la filosofía* (6 v. Madrid 1879–85) were translated into many languages and became standard textbooks of Neothomism throughout the world.

*France.* With the restoration of the monarchy in 1814 French Catholics, such as F. R. de CHATEAUBRIAND, J. M. de MAISTRE, L. G. A. de BONALD, and H. F. R. de Lamennais, fought prevailing rationalism with historical and Christian apologetics. They proposed TRADITIONALISM as historical proof of divine revelation of both natural and supernatural truths. Historical researches of V. Cousin aroused curiosity concerning 12th-century thought and the problem of universals. Catholic seminaries, however, continued to teach eclectic CARTESIANISM exemplified by the *Philosophia Lugdunensis* of Joseph Valla. In 1850 the Dominican Order was reestablished in France by J. B. H. LACORDAIRE, and interest in Thomism was renewed even outside the Dominican Order. Pierre Roux-Lavergne (1802–74), professor in the diocesan seminary in Nîmes, wrote two philosophical textbooks “according to the doctrine of St. Thomas” (Paris 1850–59; 1856) and revised the celebrated *Philosophia* of Goudin (4 v. Paris 1850–51; 4th ed. 1886). A conscientious attempt to return to the philosophy of St. Thomas was made in 1851 by G. VENTURA DI RAULICA, former Jesuit and onetime general of the THEATINES. Ventura, a moderate traditionalist, invoked St. Thomas and attempted to develop a Christian philosophy that required revelation for clear and distinct knowledge of God's existence, the spirituality of the soul, and moral obligations. Although works of St. Thomas were published in Paris prior to the Vivès edition of the *Opera omnia* (1871–82), the revival of Thomism was impeded by traditionalism on the one hand and ontologism on the other; both philosophies fused natural and supernatural orders of truth.

*Germany and Austria.* Instead of combating prevailing idealism, Catholic thinkers tried to reconcile Catholicism with Kant and G. W. F. HEGEL. Georg HERMES, distinguished and influential rector of the Catholic University of Bonn, developed a Kantian rationalism demonstrating supernatural truths that was condemned in 1835. Anton GÜNTHER, rejecting scholasticism completely, elaborated a Christian Hegelianism to prove truths of revelation. By the middle of the 19th century Günther's Catholic Hegelianism was taught in major universities of Austria and southern Germany, even after it was condemned in 1857.

Foremost leaders in the scholastic revival in Germany were Clemens, Werner, Stöckl, Kleutgen, and Com-

mer. Franz Jacob Clemens (1815–62), professor at Münster, wrote on the relation of philosophy to theology from the scholastic point of view (1856) against Günther. Karl Werner (1821–88), professor at Vienna and one-time follower of Günther, wrote a pioneer study *Der hl. Thomas v. Aquin* (3 v. Ratisbon 1858–59), containing the earliest history of Thomism and numerous historical studies of late scholastic philosophers. Albert Stöckl (1825–95), professor at Münster, wrote the first German textbook of scholastic philosophy, *Lehrbuch der Philosophie* (3 v. Mainz 1868), and the first strictly Catholic history of medieval philosophy, *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (3 v. Mainz 1864–66). Hermann Plassmann (1817–64), professor of theology at Paderborn, wrote a less satisfactory, though influential, summary of Thomistic philosophy, *Die Schule des hl. Thomas* (5 v. Soest 1858–61), based on Goudin's *Philosophia*. Franz Morgott, theologian of Eichstätt, was among the most zealous and prolific proponents of Thomism. Morgott, through extensive reading and continual correspondence with Liberatore, Cornoldi, González, and other foreigners, was sufficiently informed to write extensively on the Neothomistic revival in Europe.

The most outstanding German Thomist was the Jesuit Joseph KLEUTGEN (1811–83) called *Thomas redivivus* by M. SCHEEBEN and *princeps philosophorum* by Leo XIII. Through various editions of his *Theologie der Vorzeit* (1st ed. 1853–60), he strenuously opposed Hermetism, Güntherianism, and the pseudo-Thomistic traditionalism of Ventura. In *Philosophie der Vorzeit* (1860) he attempted to give an accurate account of Thomistic philosophy for his day. Although Kleutgen was professor in Rome for 40 years, he earned a wide reputation in Germany as well as in Rome. It is said that he wrote the first draft of *Aeterni Patris*.

**Aeterni Patris and Legislation.** The first encyclical issued by LEO XIII (*Quod apostolici muneris*, 1878) concerned socialism and the general need of a sound Christian philosophy. This was followed by *AETERNI PATRIS* (Aug. 4, 1879), in which he called for the restoration of Christian philosophy and exhorted bishops to “restore the golden wisdom of Thomas and to spread it far and wide for the defense and beauty of the Catholic faith, for the good of society, and for the advantage of all the sciences” [*Acta Sanctae Sedis*, 11 (1879) 114]. Leo XIII exemplified this restoration through numerous subsequent encyclicals concerning social problems, government, human liberty, the religious question, Sacred Scripture, Catholic Action, marriage, and education. The first draft of *RERUM NOVARUM* was written by an eminent Thomist, Cardinal Zigliara. To implement the restoration of scholasticism, Leo XIII founded the Roman Academy of St. Thomas (Oct. 13, 1879); established a commission for

editing the critical text of St. Thomas; ordered in 1880 that an Institut Supérieur de Philosophie be established in Louvain as “a center of studies for promulgating the doctrines of St. Thomas”; and made St. Thomas patron of all Catholic universities, academies, colleges, and schools throughout the world (Aug. 4, 1890). The Catholic University of Fribourg, Switzerland, was founded in 1890, the theological faculty being entrusted to Dominicans.

**Journals.** Although *CIVILTÀ CATTOLICA* zealously promoted the restoration of Thomistic philosophy, other journals occasionally published articles of scholastic interest. The first scientific journal devoted to Thomistic studies was *Divus Thomas* (1880–), published in Latin by the Collegio Alberoni, Piacenza. Ernst COMMER, doctor in theology from the Dominican College of St. Thomas in Rome (1880), founded and edited *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie* (1887–). Thomistic and neoscholastic journals multiplied rapidly: *St. Thomasblätter* (1888–), edited by Ceslaus Schneider of Regensburg; *Philosophisches Jahrbuch* (1888–) by professors of the diocesan seminary in Fulda; *Revue Thomiste* (1893–) by French Dominicans; *Revue néoscholastique de philosophie* (1894–) by Louvain; *Rivista Italiana di filosofia neoscholastica* (1909–) founded by the Franciscan Agostino GEMELLI and edited by professors of the Catholic University of Milan; and *La Ciencia Tomista* (1910–) by Spanish Dominicans.

**Effect of Modernism.** During the pontificate of Leo XIII the reestablishment of scholasticism had six goals: (1) to edit critically the text of scholastic authors, particularly St. Thomas; (2) to study the historical origins and evolution of scholastic philosophy; (3) to expound the solid doctrine (*philosophia perennis*) of scholastic philosophy for a modern age, discarding useless and false views; (4) to study and refute errors of recent and contemporary philosophers; (5) to study the physical sciences and examine their relevance to philosophy; and (6) to construct a new scholastic synthesis of all philosophy consistent with the progress of modern science. Since this program could not be accomplished by one man or one group, it was hoped that cooperation of all Catholic intellectuals could be counted on. This was impossible in the crisis of MODERNISM that broke out after the death of Leo XIII in 1903.

One of the principal causes of Modernism in Italy and France was lack of philosophical and theological training among those who felt the impact of German historicism and higher Biblical criticism. Unable or unwilling to return to the principles of St. Thomas, they felt that scholasticism was not “modern enough” for modern needs. The Holy Office decree *LAMENTABILI* (July 3,

1907) condemned 65 errors of Modernism, many of them directly contrary to the ideals and teaching of neoscholasticism. St. PIUS X noted in his encyclical *PASCENDI* (Sept. 8, 1907) that the Modernists “deride and heedlessly despise scholastic philosophy and theology” [*Acta Sanctae Sedis*, 40 (1907) 636].

*Efforts of Later Pontiffs.* There was no universal acceptance of the Thomistic revival proposed by Leo XIII. Some institutions were willing to teach an eclectic scholasticism; others made no attempt whatever to return either to St. Thomas or to scholasticism. Disturbed by various attempts to evade the directive of his predecessor and being aware of the dangers of Modernism, Pius X insisted that by “scholasticism” he meant “the principal teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas.” In *Doctoris Angelici* (June 29, 1914) he left no room for doubt, declaring solemnly “that those who in their interpretations misrepresent or affect to despise the principles and major theses of his philosophy are not only not following St. Thomas, but are even far astray from the saintly Doctor.” Acknowledging commendations of other saints and doctors by the Holy See, Pius X maintained that their doctrine was commended “to the extent that it agreed with the principles of Aquinas or was in no way opposed to them” [*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 6 (1914) 338]. He went on to insist that all institutions granting pontifical degrees had to use the *Summa theologiae* as a textbook in theology; failure to comply within three years was to result in withdrawal of pontifical status. The question immediately raised was the meaning of “major theses” of Thomistic philosophy. For clarification the Congregation of Studies on July 27, 1914, issued a list of 24 theses, compiled by the Jesuit Guido Mattiussi (1852–1925) as the *principia et pronuntiata maiora* of St. Thomas [ActApS 6 (1914) 383–386]. In reply to queries, the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities stated on March 7, 1916, that the *Summa* was to be used at least as a major reference work for speculative theology and that the 24 theses were to be taught in all schools as fundamental theses in philosophy.

The 24 theses, of which 23 were contrary to the teaching of F. SUÁREZ, posed a problem in conscience for many Jesuits who could not accept them. On Jan. 18, 1917, Wladimir LEDÓCHOWSKI, General of the Society, submitted a letter, intended for Jesuits, to BENEDICT XV for approval or revision. Emphasizing the traditional place of St. Thomas in the Society, the letter stated that although the essentials of Thomistic philosophy are contained in the 24 theses, the prescriptions of Pius X are “sufficiently satisfied, even though not all the theses are held, as long as they are proposed as safe directive norms” [*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 42 (1918) 234]. This interpretation was approved by Benedict XV on March 19, 1917.

The Code of Canon Law issued under Benedict XV in 1917 required all professors of philosophy and theology to hold and to teach the method, doctrine, and principles of the Angelic Doctor (1917 CIC c.1366.2).

PIUS XI reiterated the mind of his predecessors concerning St. Thomas in *Studiorum duces* (June 29, 1923), saying that “the Church has adopted his philosophy for her very own” [*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 15 (1923) 314]. The apostolic constitution *DEUS SCIENTIARUM DOMINUS* (May 24, 1931) imposed with the fullest apostolic authority a detailed curriculum of studies for all seminaries.

*The “New Theology.”* Ecclesiastical legislation during and following the Modernist crisis failed to achieve the broad goals of Leo XIII. A narrow legalized Thomism, out of touch with modern movements after World War II, created resentment and a “new theology” that found inspiration in EVOLUTIONISM, PHENOMENOLOGY, and the teachings of P. TEILHARD DE CHARDIN. PIUS XII, an ardent advocate of modernity, found it necessary to condemn dangerously extreme views of the *théologie nouvelle* in *HUMANI GENERIS* (Aug. 12, 1950). After reviewing the importance of solid philosophical formation in the light of St. Thomas, he lamented, “How deplorable it is then that this philosophy, received and honored by the Church, is scorned by some who shamelessly call it outmoded in form and rationalistic, as they say, in its method of thought” [*Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 42 (1950) 573].

The new spirit of JOHN XXIII made it possible for theologians well trained in Thomistic principles to study modern problems in the light of history, revelation, and scholastic theology. Deeper research into the true meaning of St. Thomas and the breadth of medieval concerns likewise made possible a new, less rigid, and less legalistic scholasticism.

**Philosophers and Problems.** At the beginning of the Leonine revival, the principal centers of scholasticism were Rome and Louvain; but by 1930 there were strong centers in every country. The main concern of philosophers was to expound the ARISTOTELIANISM of St. Thomas’s philosophy, drawn largely from his theological writings.

*Textbooks.* Early textbooks of Neothomistic philosophy were influenced by the Wolffian division of the sciences: logic, ontology, cosmology, psychology, theodicy, and sometimes ethics. This order was followed notably in the influential textbooks of Zigliara, J. J. URRÁBURU, Vincent Remer (d. 1910), Michaele de Maria (1836–1913), Pius de Mandato (1850–1914), and Sebastian Reinstadler of Metz. Ethics and natural theology, when discussed at all, were extracted from the *Summa*

*theologiae* of St. Thomas. Problems of EPISTEMOLOGY were discussed in major logic, and the scholastic method was thought to be a deductive and syllogistic defense of theses (see SCHOLASTIC METHOD). This conception of scholastic philosophy was made familiar to beginners by the Jesuit Stonyhurst series (R. F. Clarke, John Rickaby, Joseph RICKABY, Michael Maher, and Bernard Boedder) and the simple *Summula* (Dublin 1903) by the Irish Cistercian J. S. Hickey (1865–1933). The *Cursus philosophicus* of JOHN OF ST. THOMAS was the basis for better texts by Edouard HUGON, Josef GREDT, F. X. Maquart, and Jacques MARITAIN. A highly influential text was Gredt's *Elementa philosophiae Aristotelico-Thomisticae* (2 v. 1st ed. Rome 1899–1901; 12th ed. 1958). Gredt, a German Benedictine of San Anselmo, seriously faced problems of modern science, but followed the theological order of the *Summa* for psychology, natural theology, and ethics.

A complete course in the philosophy of St. Thomas was given in Louvain by Cardinal D. J. MERCIER between 1882 and 1889. As president of the Institut Supérieur (1889–1905), he and his assistants, Simon Deploige (1868–1927), Maurice DE WULF, Désiré Nys (1859–1927), and Armand Thiéry (1868–1955), developed all branches of a *philosophia perennis* based on Aristotle and St. Thomas, integrating all modern science and mathematics. Mercier, Nys, and De Wulf prepared a *Cours de philosophie* that became influential in many countries through various translations (Eng. tr. 1916). The precise meaning of *philosophia perennis* raised problems for later neoscholastics.

Medieval studies at Louvain were led by Maurice De Wulf, who published the first edition of *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale* in 1900. Believing “scholasticism” to be a single body of doctrine, he inevitably limited the content of *philosophia perennis* as well as the number of true “scholastics” in the Middle Ages. In 1901 he launched the collection “Les Philosophes Beiges,” containing texts of medieval Belgian philosophers.

The neoscholastic revival at Louvain exerted great influence through its numerous publications and long line of distinguished professors, notably Leon Noël (1878–1955), Auguste Mansion, Jacques Leclercq, Fernand Van Steenberghen, Georges Van Riet, Albert Michotte, Louis De Raymaeker, Albert Dondeyne, Alphonse De Waelhens, Gérard Verbeke, and Fernand Renoirte.

*New Interests.* During the first two decades of the 20th century Thomist philosophers emphasized the primacy of POTENCY AND ACT in Thomism (N. del Prado, G. Mattusi, E. Hugon, and G. Manser). In the 1920s the importance of ANALOGY was seen to be the key to Tho-

mistic metaphysics (N. Balthasar, M. T. L. Penido, and S. Ramirez). In the middle 1930s the doctrine of PARTICIPATION and the recognition of Platonic elements in St. Thomas was considered the basis for a deeper appreciation (L. B. Geiger, C. Fabro, A. Little). In the 1940s the existential character of Thomistic metaphysics was emphasized, and some philosophers considered EXISTENCE (*esse*) to be the deepest and truest characteristic of Thomistic metaphysics (J. Maritain, É. GILSON, C. Fabro, and G. B. PHELAN). After the middle of the century other scholastics sought to synthesize St. Thomas with M. Heidegger or E. HUSSERL, leaving the older controversies behind.

Between 1925 and 1950 the principal philosophical controversy concerned the meaning of CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY. After a review by P. MANDONNET of Gilson's *Philosophy of St. Bonaventure* (Paris 1924), the mounting controversy involving all leading Thomists of the period centered on the relation between revelation and philosophy. Some maintained the autonomy of reason in philosophical discourse and only an extrinsic normative influence of revelation on Christian philosophers (Mandonnet, Ramirez, and Van Steenberghen). Others, arguing from various points of view, maintained a direct, intrinsic influence of revelation on Christians who philosophize (Gilson, Maritain, and M. D. Chenu). This fundamentally theological question was argued mainly by philosophers and historians.

**Historians and Historiography.** The revival and development of neoscholasticism profited much from the work of medievalists of the 19th and 20th centuries. German historiography, establishment of the École des Chartres (1829), the work of V. Cousin and J. B. Hauréau, and a new curiosity about the Middle Ages made possible the edition of critical texts and a critical study of scholastic authors. The pioneering work of Catholic historians—Pietro Uccelli, H. S. DENIFLE, Franz EHRLE, Clemens Baeumker, Georg von Hertling, and M. Baumgartner—was continued by Mandonnet, Franz Pelster, August Pelzer, Konstanty Michalski, Martin GRABMANN, Chenu, Gilson, and many others.

The critical edition of the *Opera omnia* of St. Thomas, begun in 1882, continued under eminent Dominican scholars. A center for editing works of St. Bonaventure and other Franciscan scholastics was established at Quarachi, near Florence, in 1877; the edition of Bonaventure (1882–1902) was followed by work on Alexander of Hales and other Franciscan authors. A separate Scotus Commission was established in Rome (1938) under the direction of C. Balić to publish the *Opera omnia* of Duns Scotus (1950– ). The Comissió Lulliana undertook the edition of Ramon Lull's *Opera omnia* (1906–50). The

Benedictines of Solesmes assumed responsibility for publishing a new edition of John of St. Thomas's *Cursus theologicus* (1931– ), and the Albertus Magnus Institut, founded in Cologne in 1931, began publishing the *Opera omnia* of Albert the Great in 1951.

Widespread use of photoelectric reproduction after World War II made old editions of scholastic authors easily accessible to scholars in America. Two institutes of medieval studies were established in North America, one in Toronto in 1929 by Gilson, the other in Ottawa in 1930 under the inspiration of Chenu, which transferred to Montreal in 1942.

Results of these medieval studies were better understanding of St. Thomas, appreciation of different currents in medieval thought, and recognition of pluralism in medieval scholasticism (see PLURALISM, PHILOSOPHICAL).

**Theologians and Renewal.** The last two regents of the College of St. Thomas in Rome (Minerva) were Alberto LEPIDI and Enrico Buonpensiere, who expounded the *Summa* in the tradition of older commentators. In 1909 the college was organized into the Pontifical Athenaeum "Angelicum," which received university status together with the Lateran in 1963.

In the first half of the 20th century Thomistic theologians concentrated on apologetics, developing specialized treatises *De ecclesia* and *De revelatione* as outlined by VATICAN COUNCIL I. Notable among these apologists were J. V. De Groot (1848–1927), A. M. WEISS, Reginald Schultes, Ambroise GARDEIL, Antonin SERTILLANGES, Christian PESCH, and Reginald GARRIGOU-LAGRANGE. (See APOLOGETICS (HISTORY OF).)

Revival of Thomism also renewed ancient controversies concerning grace in the writings of G. SCHNEEMANN, A. M. Dummermuth (1841–1918), J. B. Stuffer (1865–1952), Norbert del Prado, Francisco MARÍN-SOLÁ, Charles Boyer, B. M. Xiberta, and numerous Spanish Jesuits and Dominicans. (See THEOLOGY, HISTORY OF.)

Mystical theology was developed in a way that was notably different from 19th-century asceticism in the writings of A. A. TANQUEREY, J. G. ARINTERO, Bartholomé Froget, and Garrigou-Lagrange. Moral theology was continued somewhat in the older tradition by Hieronymus NOLDIN, Dominikus PRÜMMER, and B. H. MERKELBACH. (See MORAL THEOLOGY, HISTORY OF.)

With World War II a new spirit entered scholastic theology in the extensive writings of Dom Odo Cassel, Romano Guardini, Yves Congar, Chenu, Karl Rahner, Hans Küng, and Edward Schillebeeckx. Leaving aside older controversies, they approached current problems in the light of vital scholastic principles. This renewal of

scholastic theology supported by Biblical, historical, and liturgical studies, led to the general renewal in the Church effected by VATICAN COUNCIL II.

**Scholasticism in the U.S.** Prior to the Leonine directive, Jesuits taught a form of scholasticism in their universities; Dominicans taught St. Thomas in *studia* and colleges; and Orestes A. BROWNSON expressed hope for a scholastic revival, although he knew little of St. Thomas. American bishops, Catholic schools and seminaries, and The CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA responded obediently to the directives of the Holy See regarding scholasticism and the subsequent fear of Modernism. The principal influences on Catholic teaching in the U.S. were Rome and Louvain. Notable pioneers of American neoscholasticism were the Jesuits Nicholas Russo (1845–1902) and Biagio Schiffini, both of Georgetown University. Russo's *Summa philosophica iuxta scholasticorum principia* (2 v. Boston 1885) and Schiffini's *Institutiones philosophicae ad mentem Aquinatis* (Turin 1889) were used for many years in some seminaries. The Dutch Dominican E. L. Van Becelaere (d. 1946) did much to make Thomism respectable among American philosophers outside the Church, notably Josiah ROYCE, who wrote an introduction to Van Becelaere's *La philosophie en Amérique depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours* (New York 1904). The Bavarian priest John Gmeiner (1847–1913) taught Thomistic philosophy for seven years at St. Francis Seminary in Milwaukee and later at St. Thomas Seminary in St. Paul, Minn. Textbooks generally used in seminaries and religious houses were European. Some English texts were written for college students by Msgr. Paul Glen, Celestine Bittle, Henri Renard, and others. In 1927 the American Catholic Philosophical Association was formed by Msgr. E. A. PACE of Catholic University, who was its first president. The *New Scholasticism*, official journal of the association, was founded and edited by Pace and James H. RYAN in 1927. In 1990 the *New Scholasticism* changed its name to *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, reflecting a diminished interest in scholastic philosophy among many members of the Association. On the other hand, the Association's annually elected presidents and the recipients of its annually conferred Aquinas Medal continue, for the most part, to be distinguished philosophers who are interested in maintaining and developing the scholastic tradition.

**Recent Developments.** During the past three decades the study of scholasticism and scholastic philosophy has developed in several directions. New critical editions of medieval scholastic texts by both major and minor authors have continued to appear. Between 1881 and 1965, the Leonine Commission had produced 15 of the projected 50 volumes of its edition of Aquinas's *opera omnia*;

since 1965 another 13 new volumes have appeared, one of the earlier volumes has been revised, and preparation of several more volumes has begun. An important complement to the Leonine edition has been provided to Thomistic scholars by R. Busa's *Index Thomisticus* (1974–80; CD-ROM, 2nd rev. ed. 1993). The critical edition of Scotus's *opera omnia* is now being produced in two academic centers: in Rome the Commissio Scotistica is continuing to work on Scotus's revised Oxford lectures (the *Ordinatio*); working now at The Catholic University of America, the Scotus Project has produced three volumes of the *opera philosophica*, and two more volumes are soon to be published.

As these recent critical editions attest, historical knowledge of the methods, language, and writings of medieval scholastic authors has become ever more precise and minute. Further evidence of this development is provided by a collection of studies of the disputed question (1985), by a monograph by J. Wippel on the metaphysics of Aquinas (1999), and by a collection of papers on Aquinas by L. Boyle (2000). The publications and quinquennial conferences of the *Société Internationale pour l'étude de la philosophie médiévale*, which serve to coordinate the work of medievalists on an international level, have also contributed to this growing historical knowledge. Scholastic philosophy continues to be studied seriously both in Europe (for example at the Universities of Cologne and Paris) and in the U.S. [for example at The Catholic University of America, The Center for Thomistic Studies at the University of St. Thomas (Houston), and Boston College]. The Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies (Toronto) continues to publish monographs, translations, and the journal *Mediaeval Studies*. On balance it might be said that exact historical knowledge of the scholastic tradition has come to predominate in academic work in the field, while the kind of original philosophizing from within the scholastic tradition exemplified in an earlier generation by Maritain and Gilson has declined.

This last observation might be thought to be countered by the emergence of "analytic Thomism" and more generally "analytic medieval philosophy," exemplified by the work of B. Davies, N. Kretzmann, and J. Haldane, by *The Cambridge Guide to Later Medieval Philosophy*, and by the journal *Medieval Philosophy and Theology* (1991–). But although this school seems to have discovered new ways of reading and reflecting on medieval scholastic thought that speak to at least some contemporary philosophers, its critics suggest that it tends to disregard the literary and historical contexts of medieval works and to value medieval philosophy only for points of convergence with the interests and perspectives of analytic philosophy. Still, it is a vigorous move-

ment, producing numerous monographs, collections of studies, and translations.

Pope John Paul II's encyclical *FIDES ET RATIO* (1998), in its defense of both faith and reason, reiterated recommendations of earlier papal documents that the writings of Aquinas and other scholastics be used in the search for timeless truth.

*See Also:* THOMISM; NEOSCHOLASTICISM AND NEOTHOMISM.

**Bibliography:** H. HURTER, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae catholicae*<sup>3</sup>, 5 v. in 6 (3d ed. Innsbruck 1903–13) 5 v. P. WYSER, *Der Thomismus* (Bibliog. Einführungen in des Studium der Philosophie 15–16; Bern 1951). J. L. PERRIER, *The Revival of Scholastic Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century* (New York 1909). F. KLIMKE, *Institutiones historiae philosophiae*, 2 v. (Rome 1923) 2:230–335. J. A. WEISHEIPL, "The Revival of Thomism: An Historical Survey," *Programmata scholarum et status personalis* (River Forest, Ill. 1962). R. VILLENEUVE, "Le Thomisme avant et après l'encyclique *Aeterni Patris*," *Revue Dominicaine*, 26 (1929) 273–282, 339–354, 479–496. A. M. WALZ, *Compendium historiae ordinis praedicatorum* (2d ed. Rome 1948). M. GRABMANN, *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit* (Freiburg 1933); "Der Anteil des Dominikanerordens an der Entstehung und Entwicklung der Neuscholastik im 19. Jahrhundert," *Neue Ordnung*, 1 (1948) 98–112. S. M. RAMIREZ, "The Authority of St. Thomas Aquinas," *Thomist*, 15 (1952) 1–109. A. MASNOVO, *Il neotomismo in Italia* (Milan 1923). P. DEZZA, *Alle origini del neotomismo* (Milan 1940); *I neotomisti italiani del secolo XIX*, 2 v. (Milan 1942). G. SAITTA, *Le origini del neotomismo nel secolo XIX* (Bari 1912). G. E. ROSSI, *La filosofia del Collegio Alberoni ed il neotomismo* (Piacenza 1959). A. FERMI, *Origine del tomismo piacentino nel primo ottocento* (Piacenza 1959). B. M. BONANSEA, "Pioneers of the 19th-Century Scholastic Revival in Italy," *The New Scholasticism*, 28 (1954) 1–37. I. NARCISO, "Alle fonti del neotomismo," *Sapienza*, 13 (1960) 124–147; "Il movimento neotomista," *ibid.* 14 (1961) 441–458; "La concezione dell'essere nella filosofia razionalistica e nel neotomismo," *ibid.* 15 (1962) 86–107; "La dialettica del conoscere nel neotomismo," *ibid.* 419–447; "I Tesari domenicani del 1751 e l'inizio del neotomismo," *ibid.* 277–301; "Neotomismo e scolastica eclettica," *ibid.* 16 (1963) 417–453; "La manualistica domenicana," *ibid.* 17 (1964) 120–128. M. BATLLORI, *Baltasar Masdeu y el neoscholasticismo italiano* (Barcelona 1944), also in *Analecta Sacra Tarraconensia*, 15 (1942) 171–202; 16 (1943) 241–294. L. FOUCHER, *La Philosophie catholique en France au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle avant la renaissance thomiste et dans son rapport avec elle, 1800–1880* (Paris 1955). J. BELLAMY, *La Théologie catholique au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris 1904). D. J. MERCIER, *Le Christianisme dans la vie moderne*, ed. L. Noël (Paris 1918). L. DE RAEYMAEKER, *Le Cardinal Mercier et l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie de Louvain* (Louvain 1952). J. A. MANN, "Neoscholastic Philosophy in the United States of America in the 19th Century," *American Catholic Philosophical Association. Proceedings of the annual Meeting*, 33 (1959) 127–136. *Teaching Thomism Today*, ed. G. F. MCLEAN (Washington 1964). *One Hundred Years of Thomism*, ed. V. BREZIK (Houston 1981). J. HALDANE, "Thomism and the Future of Catholic Philosophy," *New Blackfriars*, 80 (1999). G. MCCOOL, "The Tradition of Saint Thomas in North America: At 50 Years," *The Modern Schoolman*, 65 (1988): 185–206; *From Unity to Pluralism: The Internal Evolution of Thomism* (New York 1989). *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, eds., N. KRETZMANN, A. KENNY and J. PINBORG (Cam-

bridge, 1982). T. NOONE, "Medieval Scholarship and Philosophy in the Last One Hundred Years," in *One Hundred Years of Philosophy*, ed. B. SHANLEY (Washington 2001) 111–32. B. SHANLEY, "Analytical Thomism," *The Thomist*, 63 (1999): 125–37; *Handbook for the Contemporary Philosophy of Religion: The Thomist Tradition* (Dordrecht 2002).

[J. A. WEISHEIPL/EDS.]

## SCHOLASTICUS

*Magister scholarum, maistreescoles, cancellarius*, or master of schools, originally a functionary attached to the cathedral chapter who exercised control of schools (*regimen scholarum, jus scholarum, jus in regendis scholis*) throughout the area under the jurisdiction of the chapter. (In other places, jurisdiction over schools was exercised by certain other ecclesiastical bodies, usually a monastery, a priory, etc.) Before and even during the 12th century, when the great medieval universities were forming, schools of an area continued to have only one *scholasticus* or *magister*, some member of the cathedral chapter. He was the sole ruler of the schools in the cathedral's jurisdiction but had the right to appoint assistants or substitutes. With the increase in the demand for teachers, he granted the *licentia docendi*, or the permission to teach, to persons he judged suitable. No competent teacher could be refused this *licentia*, and it had to be granted freely, without payment of fee, to avoid suspicion of simony (though there were abuses). In Paris the schools (even the university itself) continued to be ruled by the chancellor of the cathedral church, on whom the duties of the *scholasticus* fell. At Salamanca the *scholasticus*, or as he was now called, the chancellor of the university (as opposed to rector), had the right to imprison scholars (a right that he shared with the bishop from 1254 onward), since he was held to be the *iudex ordinarius* of students.

**Bibliography:** É. LESNE, *Histoire de la propriété ecclésiastique en France*, v. 5, *Les Écoles* . . . (Lille 1910–43) 453–512. H. RASHDALL, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, ed. F. M. POWICKE and A. B. EMDEN, 3 v. (new ed. Oxford 1936) 1:279–282; 2:84–88, 144–146, 155–158. H. JEDIN, "Domschule und Kolleg," *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* 67 (1958) 210–223.

[T. C. CROWLEY]

## SCHOLIUM

A biblical scholium may be defined as a brief exegetical explanation of a passage that is difficult on account of variant readings, obscure historical or geographical allusions, grammatical difficulties, and the like. Scholia are usually found in the margin of the text, less frequently at the foot of the page. The author as well as the collector of scholia is called a scholiast.

While this definition agrees with the usage of contemporary authors, it requires certain qualifications. As worded, it is intended to distinguish a scholium from a gloss and from a commentary. Unfortunately all Christian biblical literature does not justify quite so clear-cut a definition of the term. The works to which it has been applied range from a scholium as just defined (Origen) to a full-fledged commentary (Arethas of Caesarea on Revelation).

Once the term's meaning is understood to roam about in this way, we may claim the remains of numerous biblical scholia. Perhaps the earliest are those of Clement of Alexandria in his Hypotyposis of which only fragments survive. Others, to list a few, are those of Origen, Hippolytus, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Hesychius of Jerusalem, Procopius of Gaza, and Arethas of Caesarea.

To consult these and all others, the exegete is obliged to call on the patrologist to help him locate the most accurate available editions. Still a desideratum is a corpus of biblical scholia in the sense defined above.

**Bibliography:** J. SCHMID, *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, ed. J. HOFER and K. RAHNER, 10 v. (2d, new ed. Freiburg 1957–65) 9:448–449. A. GUDEMAN, *Paulys Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, ed. G. WISSOWA, et al. 2A.1 (Stuttgart) (1921) 625–705. G. ZUNTZ, "Die Aristophanes-Scholien der Papyri," *Byzantion* 14 (1939) 547–594.

[C. O'C. SLOANE]

## SCHOLLINER, HERMANN

Benedictine theologian; b. Freising (Bavaria), Jan. 15, 1722; d. Welchenberg, July 16, 1795. He entered the Abbey of Oberaltaich in 1738. After his philosophical and theological studies at Erfurt and Salzburg, he was appointed director of the house of studies of the Bavarian Benedictines (1752–57), and then taught dogmatic theology at Salzburg (1759–66). He became prior at Oberaltaich (1772), and after the suppression of the Jesuits, taught at Ingolstadt (1776–80). As a member of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences he wrote *Monumenta Niederaltaicensia* and *Monumenta Oberaltaicensia, Elisabethcellencia et Oosterhofensia*, which are parts of the master collection *Monumenta Boica*, guided by Scholliner in 1768. Among his other works are *De magistratum ecclesiasticorum origine et creatione* (Salzburg 1751–52), *De disciplinae arcani antiquitate et usu* (Tegernsee 1755), *Ecclesiae orientalis et occidentalis concordia in transubstantiatione* (Regensburg 1756), *De hierarchia ecclesiae catholica* (Regensburg 1757), *Historia theologiae christiani saeculi primi* (Salzburg 1761), and *Praelectiones theologicae ad usum studii communis congregationis Benedictino-Bavaricae* (12 v. Augsburg 1769).