

[Theory and History of Ontology \(ontology.co\)](#) by Raul Corazzon | e-mail: [rc@ontology.co](mailto:rc@ontology.co)

## Bibliography of Joseph S. Freedman on Philosophy in Central Europe (1500-1700): First Part

### Contents of this Section

This part of the section [Bibliographies of Historians of Philosophy](#) includes the following pages:

#### **Jan A. Aertsen:**

[Writings in English](#)

[Writings in German](#)

#### **John P. Doyle:**

[1966 - 2016](#)

#### **Jean École:**

[1961 - 1983](#)

[1984 - 2008](#)

#### **Joseph S. Freedman:**

[1985 - 1997 \(Current page\)](#)

[1999 - 2008](#)

[2009 - 2022](#)

#### **Édouard Jauneau:**

[1954 - 2013](#)

#### **Giorgio Tonelli:**

[Works in English 1961-1974](#)

Works in English 1975-1997

Works in Italian - Scritti in Italiano 1954-1987

Works in Italian - Scritti in Italiano 1987-1995

Works in French - Écrits en Français

Works in German - Essays in deutscher Sprache

Index of the Pages with Bibliographies of Historians of Philosophy and Historians of Logic

## Books

'Central Europe' should be roughly equated with the Holy Roman Empire and with the German language area of Europe.

1. Freedman, Joseph S. 1984. *Deutsche Schulphilosophie im Reformationszeitalter (1500-1650). Ein Handbuch für den Hochschulunterricht*. Münster: MAKs Publikationen.  
148 pages. Second edition revised edition (1985), 171 pages.  
"This short textbook was published in connection with my seminars on the Reformation Era and Central European schools and universities during the 16th and early 17th centuries."  
Inhalt: Abbildungen 7; Verzeichnis der Abbildungen 15; Vorwort der Herausgeber 17; Vorwort - Technischer Hinweis 19; Kapitel 1. Einleitung, zugleich ein Schlußwort 21; Kapitel 2. Der historische Hintergrund 27; Kapitel 3. Schulen und Universitäten im Reformations Zeitalter: Organisation, Studiengang und Lehrstoff 31; Kapitel 4. Der philosophische Lehrbetrieb und philosophische Unterrichtsmethoden 47; Kapitel 5. Die berufliche Laufbahn des Schulphilosophen 55; Kapitel 6. Die philosophischen Fächer: Einige Einteilungen 59; Kapitel 7. Theoretische Philosophie: Metaphysik, Physik und Mathematik 67; Kapitel 8. Praktische Philosophie: Ethik, Oeconomia und Politik 81; Kapitel 9. Philologie: Logik, Rhetorik und Grammatik 97; Kapitel 10. Theologie als Gegenstand der Schulphilosophie 107; Kapitel 11. Die verschiedenen Richtungen der Philosophie (Sectae Philosophorum) 115; Kapitel 12. Die Schulphilosophie im Reformationszeitalter: Quellen und Ausstrahlungen 121; Zeichen und Abkürzungen 130; Auswahlbibliographie 131-148.
2. ———. 1988. *European Academic Philosophy in the Late Sixteenth and early Seventeenth centuries. The life, significance, and philosophy of Clemens Timpler (1563/4-1624)*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.  
Table of Contents:  
Volume 1.  
Foreword I; Preface V-XIX; Chapter 1: Introduction 1; Chapter 2-6: The Life of Clemens Timpler.  
Chapter 2: Timpler's Childhood, Education, and Early Activity as a Private Teacher (1563/4-1592) 7  
Chapter 3: Timpler at Heidelberg (1592-1595) 24

Chapter 4: Timpler as Professor at the Gymnasium Illustre Arnoldinum in Steinfurt/Westphalia (1595-1624) 34

Chapter 5: The Steinfurt Gymnasium Illustre Arnoldinum From its Beginnings in 1588 Until the Pillaging of the School in 1635 46

Chapter 6: Timpler's Personality and Religious Views 66

Chapter 7-9: Timpler's Historical Significance.

Chapter 7: Timpler' s Importance Within Seventeenth Century Europe 86

Chapter 8: Authorities Cited Within Timpler's Writings 125

Chapter 9: Timpler, Aristotle, and "Aristotelianism": Timpler' s Philosophy as School Curriculum 162

Chapter 10-20: Timpler's Philosophy.

Chapter 10: A. The Organization of Timpler's Individual Philosophical Writings. B. Timpler's Short Treatise on the Liberal Arts (Technologia). C. The Interrelatedness of Academic Disciplines Within Timpler's Thought: Mathematics and Theology Within Timpler's Writings 187

Chapter 11: Metaphysics 210; Chapter 12: Physics 249; Chapter 13: Logic 278; Chapter 14: Rhetoric 307; Chapter 15: Ethics 326; Chapter 16: Family Life 351; Chapter 17: Politics 363; Chapter 18: Timpler's Practical Philosophy: Some Conclusions 387; Chapter 19: Optics 403; Chapter 20: Signs and Human Physiognomy 412; Chapter 21: Conclusions 427

Volume 2.

Annotated Table of Contents to the Text of Chapters 1-21 b-n

Footnotes to the Preface XX

Footnotes to chapter 1-21 451

Bibliography 737; Contents listed : 737; Part I: Clemens Timpler 738; Part II: General Bibliography 771; Notes to the Bibliography 843; List of Illustrations XXII ; Illustrations XXV; Index of Persons and Places.

"This monograph is a substantially revised version of my Ph.D. dissertation, which was defended at the University of Wisconsin-Madison on September 16, 1982; it bore the title, "The Life, Significance, and Philosophy of Clemens Timpler (1563/4-1624)." It was written and researched while residing in the Federal Republic of Germany for the ten years previous to its completion. In its present revised form, chapter 11, 12, 17, and 20 of the dissertation have been completely rewritten. Chapters 7 and 18 have been rewritten in part. Minor alterations and corrections have been undertaken in all of the remaining chapters. The bibliography has been expanded in order to include the multitude of additional seventeenth century works discussed in chapter 7 as well as to list relevance secondary literature which has appeared since 1982.

(...)

Clemens Timpler (1563/4-1624) has been chosen as the subject matter of this study principally because the quality of his philosophical writings stands out very noticeably in comparison to that of works written by other late sixteenth and early seventeenth century academic philosophers. Indeed, it could be argued that he was one of the most talented philosophers active in Europe between 1550 and 1650. However, he was less influential than some of his contemporaries (e.g., his own disciple Bartholomaeus Keckermann); one explanation for this shall be ventured in chapter 7 section 16 of this monograph.

Clemens Timpler not only exemplifies the highest standards of late sixteenth and early seventeenth century European academic philosophy, but his works also provide an excellent survey of its scope and content. Timpler published textbooks on metaphysics, physics, logic, rhetoric, ethics, family life (*oeconomica*), politics, optics, and human physiognomy presented well systematized and very detailed presentations of the major philosophical disciplines studied in his day (barring mathematics and grammar). Therefore, the examination of Timpler's philosophy also serves as a very useful vehicle to gain a general understanding of the parameters of and topics discussed within late sixteenth and early seventeenth century European philosophy considered as a whole. For this reason, the specialized

as well as the general scope of this monograph is reflected in its title." (From the Foreword)

Six reviews of this monograph (in French, German, and Italian) have appeared.

3. ———. 1999. *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700. Teaching and Texts at Schools and Universities*. Aldershot: Ashgate. Variorum Collected Studies Series.  
 "This is a collection of seven of my published articles and an introductory article titled "The Study of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Writings on Academic Philosophy: Some Methodological Considerations." (pp. 1-40)."  
 Contents: Preface VII-VIII; Introduction. The Study of Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Writings on Academic Philosophy: Some Methodological Considerations 1-40 (*First Publication*); II. Philosophy Instruction within the Institutional Framework of Central European Schools and Universities during the Reformation Era 117-166 (1985); III. Cicero in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth- Century Rhetoric Instruction 227-254 (1986); IV. The Diffusion of the Writings of Petrus Ramus in Central Europe, c. 1570-c. 1630 98-152 (1993); V. Aristotle and the Content of Philosophy Instruction at Central European Schools and Universities during the Reformation Era (1500-1650) 213-253 (1993) VI. Encyclopedic Philosophical Writings in Central Europe during the High and Late Renaissance (ca. 1500-ca. 1700) 212-256 (1994); VII. Classifications of Philosophy, the Sciences, and the Arts in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe 37-65 (1994); VIII. The Career and Writings of Bartholomew Keckermann (d. 1609) 305-364 (1997); Index of Academic Institutions 1-3; Index of Authors and Persons (Pre-AD 1800) 1-10; Index of Concepts/Terms and People/Places 1-9.
4. Feingold, Mordechai, Freedman, Joseph S., and Rother, Wolfgang, eds. 2001. *The Influence of Petrus Ramus. Studies in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Philosophy and Sciences*. Basel: Schwabe. Schwabe Philosophica 1.  
 Contents: Mordechai Feingold, Joseph S. Freedman, Wolfgang Rother: Preface, 7; Wolfgang Rother: Ramus and Ramism in Switzerland 9; Theo Verbeek: Notes on Ramism in the Netherlands 38; Thomas Elsmann: The Influence of Ramism on the Academies of Bremen and Danzig: A Comparison 54; Joseph S. Freedman: Melanchthon's Opinion of Ramus and the Utilization of Their Writings in Central Europe 68; Riccardo Pozzo: Ramus' Metaphysics and its Criticism by the Helmstedt Aristotelians 92; Erland Sellberg: The Usefulness of Ramism 107; Mordechai Feingold: English Ramism: A Reinterpretation 127; Elizabethanne Boran: Ramism in Trinity College, Dublin in the Early Seventeenth Century 177; Kees Meerhoff, "Beauty and the Beast": Nature, Logic and Literature in Ramus 200; Guido Oldrini, The Influence of Ramus' Method on Historiography and Jurisprudence 215; Ian Maclean: Logical Division and Visual Dichotomies: Ramus in the Context of Legal and Medical Writing 228; Nicholas Jardine and Alain Segonds: A Challenge to the Reader: Ramus on Astrologia without Hypotheses 248; Index of Names 267-285.
5. Freedman, Joseph S., Strohm, Christoph, and Selderhuis, Herman J., eds. 2006. *Späthumanismus und reformierte Konfession. Theologie, Jurisprudenz und Philosophie in Heidelberg an der Wende zum 17. Jahrhundert*. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck.  
 Spätmittelalter und Reformation. Band 31.  
 Inhaltsübersicht: Eike Wolgast: Geistiges Profil und politische Ziele des Heidelberger Späthumanismus; Cornel A. Zwierlein: Heidelberg und "der Westen" um 1600; Joseph S. Freedman: The Influence of Petrus Ramus in Heidelberg from 1572 through the Early Seventeenth Century; Don R. Sinnema: Johann Jungnitz on the Use of Aristotelian Logic in Theology; Günter Frank: Ethik bei Viktorin Strigel und Abraham Scultetus; Kees Meerhoff: Bartholomew Keckermann and the Anti-Ramist Tradition at Heidelberg; Willem van 't Spijker: Heidelberger Gutachten in Sachen Vorstius; Herman J. Selderhuis: Das Recht Gottes. Der Beitrag der Heidelberger Theologen zu der

- Debatte über die Prädestination; Theodor Mahlmann: Die Prädestinationslehre Georg Sohns (1551-1589) juristisch gelesen; Detlef Döring: Samuel Pufendorf und die Heidelberger Universität in der Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts; Christoph Strohm: Weltanschaulich-konfessionelle Aspekte im Werk Heidelberger Juristen.
6. Lorenz, Sönke, Köpf, Ulrich, Freedman, Joseph S., and Bauer, Dieter R, eds. 2012. *Die Universität Tübingen zwischen Scholastik und Humanismus*. Ostfildern: Thorbecke.  
Tübinger Bausteine zur Landesgeschichte, 20.  
Inhalt: Sönke Lorenz, Ulrich Köpf, Joseph S. Freedman, Dieter R. Bauer: Vorwort 9; Sönke Lorenz: Scholastik und Humanismus. Zur Genese der Fachprofessur an der Tübinger Artistenfakultät (1477-1568): Eine Einführung 11; Reinhold Rieger: Konrad Summenharts »Physikkommentar« 95; Stefan Kötz: Geldtheorie an der Universität Tübingen um 1500: Die Traktate *De potestate et utilitate monetarum* des Gabriel Biel (nach 1488/89) und des Johannes Adler gen. Aquila (1516) 117; Stephen G. Burnett: Christian Hebraism at the University of Tübingen from Reuchlin to Schickard 161; Oliver Haller: Die Auswirkungen der Reformation auf Lehre und Wissenschaft an der Tübinger Juristenfakultät 173; Ulrich Köpf: Die Anfänge einer evangelischen Dogmatik in Tübingen: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Wirkungsgeschichte der theologischen Loci Philipp Melanchthons 191; Günter Frank: Der Gegenstand der Metaphysik: Jakob Schegks Begründung der Einheit und Allgemeinheit der Metaphysik 221; Walter Redmond: Aristoteles und Scholastik: Die Logik bei Jacob Schegk 237; Joseph S. Freedman: Georg Liebler's Textbook on Physics (1561) in the Context of His Academic Career 251; Marco Toste: The teaching of Moral Philosophy in Sixteenth-Century Protestant Universities and Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*: The Case of Tübingen 299; Joachim Kremer: Musik an der Universität Tübingen um 1600: Reichard Mangons wieder aufgefundene *Gratulatio ad Pulchieriam Augustam* im bildungsgeschichtlichen Kontext 337; Silke Schöttle, Gerd Brinkhus: ... *ein Schatz der nit allweg zubekommen*: Überlegungen zur Rekonstruktion der Bibliothek des Ludwig Grep von Freudenstein 389; Stefan Kötz, unter Mitarbeit von Miriam Eberlein: Die Matrikel der Medizinischen Fakultät der Universität Tübingen von der Reformation bis zum Ende des Dreißigjährigen Kriegs (1539-1646) 403; Personen- und Ortsindex 491.
7. Freedman, Joseph S., ed. 2016. *Die Zeit um 1670: Eine Wende in der europäischen Geschichte und Kultur?* Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

## Essays

1. Freedman, Joseph S. 1984. "16th and 17th Century Classifications of Philosophical Disciplines: Leibniz and some of his predecessors." In *Leibniz, Werk und Wirkung. IV. Internationaler Leibniz Kongress. Vorträge*, 193-202. Hannover: Gottfried-Wilhelm-Leibniz Gesellschaft.  
"A very large yet currently undetermined number of 16th and 17th century philosophers presented classifications of what they conceived to be the various philosophical disciplines.(1) Leibniz also presented a number of such classifications; Leibniz's classifications show strong similarity with those devised by many of his 16th and 17th century predecessors." (p. 193)  
(...)  
"Leibniz's own attempts to classify philosophical disciplines span at least four decades. These classifications are scattered throughout his writings; it is quite possible that one or more such classifications remain undiscovered." (p. 196)  
(...)  
"Leibniz's classifications (like those of his predecessors) assign a number of different names to philosophical disciplines. At various points Leibniz (a) refers to

individual philosophical disciplines as sciences and arts without using the term philosophy itself, (b) includes the sciences within the category of philosophy, (c) includes philosophy within the realm of the sciences, (d) equates philosophy with the sciences while regarding the sciences as well as the arts as part of habitus, and (e) refers to philosophical disciplines simply as such.(33)

Leibniz apparently does not waver in excluding philology from the realm of philosophy. However, he sometimes separates logic from philology and in most cases he regards the former as part of philosophy.(34) Leibniz's classifications generally assign substantial importance to logic yet do so in very different ways.(35) Like his predecessors, Leibniz lists a large number of disciplines which fall within theoretical philosophy and places relatively few disciplines within the realm of practical philosophy.(36) He usually mentions the discipline of metaphysics.(37) His individual classifications contain many disciplines which are placed within the domain of mathematics and/or physics. Ethics and/or politics are usually considered as part of practical philosophy.(38)

It might be argued that Leibniz's classifications introduce some previously unknown discipline(s) This may or may not be true; too little is known about 16th and 17th century European philosophy in order to adequately document this hypothesis at the present time. One or more of these disciplines may have been presented by some previous author(s).(40) Once a large quantity of these classifications originating in the medieval and early modern periods have been discovered, collected, analyzed, and compared it will be possible to place this aspect of Leibniz's thought within its proper historical perspective." (pp. 196-198)

(1) Classifications of philosophical disciplines are found within the writings of hundreds (and perhaps thousands) of 16th, 17th, and 18th century authors (i.e., both philosophers and non-philosophers). I am currently collecting these classifications for the purpose of an extensive study on this subject.

(33) a. Leibniz (1679); b. Leibniz (1676); c. Leibniz (before 1699); d. Leibniz (1667); e. Leibniz (1697); Leibniz (after 1696).

(34) See Leibniz (1667), Leibniz (before 1699), Leibniz (1697) and Leibniz (after 1696).

(35) See tables 3a-3e.

(36) For example, see Leibniz (1679), Leibniz (before 1699), and Leibniz (after 1696).

(37) See tables 3a, 3b, 3d, and 3e; metaphysics is not mentioned in Leibniz (1679) or in Leibniz (after 1696).

(38) *Oeconomica* is part of natural philosophy in Leibniz (before 1699); logic is part of practical philosophy in Leibniz (1676) and in Leibniz (after 1696).

(39) For example, Leibniz (1679) contains what might have been among the first mentions of the term *geopolitica*. "Decima sexta est [Cosmopolitica] Geopolitica, nempe [Status Generis humani] de statu Telluris nostrae ad genus humanum relato, quae Historiam omnem et Geographiam civilem comprehendit." Couturat, *Opuscules inédits de Leibniz*, p. 40.

(40) Many of the medieval, 16th century, and 17th century authors mentioned within Leibniz's own writings may have themselves given such classifications; most of these authors have been neglected for centuries.

#### References

1667: Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, ed., Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz. *Philosophische Schriften*, vols. 1- (Darmstadt: Otto Reichl/ Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1950- ), 1 (Darmstadt: 1930): 259-261, 274, 280-289; this classification has been simplified slightly in order to meet space requirements.

1676: *Leibniz Philosophische Schriften*, 3 (Berlin: 1980): 637.

1679: Couturat, *Opuscules inédits de Leibniz*, pp.30-41; this classification is presented here in slightly modified form.

after 1696: Louis Couturat, *Opuscules et fragments inédits de Leibniz* (Paris: 1903; reprint ed., Hildesheim: Olms, 1961), pp. 524-527.

1697: Ludovicus Dutens, *Gothofredi Leibnitii Opera omnia in sex tomos distributa*, 7 vols. (Genevae: Fratres de Tournes, 1768), 6: 246 ( 23, Sign.: Li 4860); this

classification is dated 1/11 February 1697 and shall be referred to as Leibniz (1697). before 1699: Joachimus Fridericus Fellerus, *Otium Hanoveranum sive miscellanea ... Godofr. Guilielmi Leibnitii* (Lipsiae: Joannes Christianus Martinus, 1718), pp. 125-138 ( 23, Sign.: Li 4862). Table 3d has been constructed on the basis of the two classifications (one being a synopsis of the other) given on pp.128-138 of this work. Joachim Friedrich Feller was Leibniz's personal secretary; in 1698 Feller ceased to work for Leibniz yet kept many of the latter's papers. See Kurt Müller and Gisela Krönert, eds., *Leben und Werk von Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz* (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1969)» pp.140, 148, 155. Therefore, this classification must have been devised by Leibniz before the year 1699 (assuming that Feller did not devise it himself or take it from the writings of some third person); it shall be referred to here as Leibniz (before 1699). Like Possevini (1593), Leibniz (before 1699) appears to have been conceived as a library classification system. 1593:Antonius Possevinus, *Bibliotheca selecta qua agitur de ratione studiorum* (Romae: Ex typographia Apostolica Vaticana, 1593), 1st pagination, pp .63-64, 2nd pagination, p .61 ( la , Sign.: A 4778 ).

2. ———. 1985. "Philosophy Instruction within the Institutional Framework of Central European Schools and Universities during the Reformation Era." In *History of Universities. Vol. 5* , 117-166. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Reprinted as Essay II in: *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700* . "In order to assess the place which philosophy instruction had within the organisational framework of schools and universities in Central Europe during the Reformation era (c.1500-1650), one should first briefly take a closer look at the concept of philosophy. This concept is very frequently discussed in philosophical encyclopedias, in textbooks on metaphysics, physics, mathematics, ethics, politics and logic, and in other kinds of works as well. Within the context of these discussions philosophy is usually divided into various disciplines. Three classifications of philosophical disciplines by Central European authors are presented in tables a , b, and c. Detailed discussion of such classifications lies beyond the scope of this paper. Only the following points need concern us here. Physics, mathematics, ethics, family life (*oeconomica* ), and politics appear in virtually all of these classifications made during the 1500-1650 period. Metaphysics is occasionally omitted, especially in those classifications presented by some sixteenth-century Protestant philosophers. Family life is sometimes considered as a sub-category of politics. The seven liberal arts (i.e. grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy) are usually included within these classifications. Arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy normally fall within the realm of mathematics. Increasingly from about the year 1550 onwards some authors argue that philology (i.e. logic, rhetoric, grammar, and sometimes poetry and/or history) is not properly speaking a part of philosophy, but rather preparation for and an instrument of the same. This latter development -- as we shall see -- was reflected within the philosophy curriculum of Central European academic institutions during the Reformation era." p. 117 "Metaphysics played an important role in the philosophical curriculum of fifteenth-century Central European universities. By the 1520s, however, metaphysics instruction began to be removed from the curriculum.(97) This was especially true at Protestant universities (e.g. Basel, Leipzig, Rostock, Tübingen, and Wittenberg). (98) Yet at some Catholic universities -- e.g. Ingolstadt (1526), Vienna (1537), and Heidelberg (1551) -- metaphysics instruction was also absent. Beginning in the second half of the sixteenth century, metaphysics instruction was strongly emphasised at Jesuit academic institutions (e.g. the University of Dillingen) and at those universities where the Jesuits were able to influence or determine the philosophy curriculum (e.g. Cologne, Ingolstadt). At some Protestant universities metaphysics instruction slowly resurfaced in the course of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.(99) Sometimes subject matter taken from the discipline of metaphysics was taught as part of physics and/or ethics and/or logic instruction." (pp. 124-125)

(97) No easy explanation can be given for this development; this problem will be discussed in another article.

(98) Metaphysics was taught at the University of Leipzig through the year 1542 but not thereafter; see Leipzig (1502-1558), pp. 667-669.

(99) Max Wundt held to this opinion; see Max Wundt, *Die deutsche Schulmetaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr/Paul Siebeck, 1939), pp. 5, 12-13, 34-69. To date little evidence has been produced to the contrary. At the Altdorf Academy in 1586 and 1589 and at the University of Giessen in 1607 the professor of logic also taught metaphysics; by 1618 in Altdorf and by 1629 in Giessen there was a professor of logic and metaphysics. See Altdorf (1586), fol. B1 Altdorf (1589), fol. B1r; Altdorf (1618); table 1.

3. ———. 1985. "Classification and Definition within 16th and 17th Century Philosophy." In *Studien zur Klassifikation, Systematik und Terminologie. Theorie und Praxis. Akten der 6. Jahrestagung des Münsteraner Arbeitskreises für Semiotik, Münster 25. und 26. September 1984*, edited by Dutz, Klaus D., 321-354. Münster: Institut für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft und MAKS Publikationen.
4. ———. 1986. "Cicero in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Rhetoric Instruction." *Rhetorica* no. 4 (3):227-254.  
Reprinted as Essay III in: *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700*. "Any systematic attempt to investigate the role of Cicero within rhetoric instruction in 16th- and 17th-century Europe will uncover an overwhelming amount of relevant source material in printed and manuscript form extant in hundreds -- if not thousands -- of European archives and libraries. The assertion that Cicero was used within this rhetoric instruction amounts to little more than the statement of a self-evident fact. Less evident is how and why Cicero's writings were used to teach rhetoric during the period from 1500 to 1700. A variety of source materials will be examined here in order to arrive at tentative answers to these two questions." (p. 227)  
(...)  
"A thorough investigation of the use of Cicero's writings at European schools and universities during the 16th- and 17th-centuries will require work with printed and manuscript material pertaining to a substantial number of schools and universities within the various regions of Europe. (55) Printed and archival source materials pertaining to individual academic institutions must be located, collected, and carefully evaluated. These sources contain information concerning a wide variety of subject matters, including the use of Cicero's writings. On the basis of the facts presented in tables g through m the following two hypotheses can be ventured at this time. (56)  
First, in school instruction Cicero's works on rhetoric were studied alongside with his works on other subject matters. At most schools rhetoric was taught in connection with other subjects, e.g., logic, grammar, history, ethics, and politics. (57) Cicero's works on subject matters other than rhetoric were often read in this connection. Interdisciplinary collections of commonplaces such as the Ciceronianus of Petrus Ramus could also be utilized. (58) At Jesuit schools Cicero's writings were used at all pre-philosophy levels of instruction; at Protestant schools they were normally used in the more advanced grades but not in elementary instruction. (59) At universities and within university-level instruction held at other academic institutions, however, Cicero's works generally were utilized within rhetoric instruction but only infrequently within other parts of the curriculum. (60)  
Second, at 16th- and 17th-century schools and universities Cicero was usually not the only author read within the theoretical component of rhetoric instruction. Use was made there of writings by Aristotle, Cicero, Hermogenes, and Quintilian as well as of works by more "modern" rhetoricians such as George of Trebizond (1395-1472/3?), Philipp Melanchthon (1497-1560), and Cyprianus Soarez (1524-1593). (61) At most academic institutions Cicero appears to have been read alongside many other authors within this theoretical instruction. Yet in most cases Cicero was the

principal or only author used within the practical component of rhetoric instruction." (pp. 238-239)

(55) A large number of such academic institutions are discussed in Joseph S. Freedman, "Philosophy Instruction within the Institutional Framework of Central European Schools and Universities during the Reformation Era," *History of Universities*, 5 (1986), (forthcoming).

(56) Tables h through m are based upon the following sources: h: Rudolf Kink, ed., *Geschichte der kaiserlichen Universität zu Wien*, vol. 2: *Statutenbuch der Universität* (Wien: 1854; reprint ed., Frankfurt: Minerva, 1969), pp. 376-383; i: *Leges Academiae Genevensis* (Genevae: Oliva Roberti Stephani, (1559)), fol. Clr-C2r, C3v-C4v [Wolfenbüttel HAB: Pd 72]; j: *Verzameting van Stukken, die Betrekking hebben tot Overijsselsch Regt en Geschiedenis*, Tweede Afdeeling, Zevende Stuk (Deventer: J. De Lange, 1872), pp. 77-83; k: *Catalogus librorum ad quorum explicationem academici professores Collegii Mussi Pontani Societatis Iesu aggredientur ad festum S. Lucae anno domini 1605* (Prostant exemplaria apud Melchiorum Bernardum serenissimi Lotharingiae Ducis, & Universitatis typographum, 1605) (Dillingen/Donau, Studienbibliothek: XV y 13, fol. 244); l: Hans Georg Gundel, ed., *Statuta Academiae Marpurgensis deinde Gissensis de anno 1629* (Marburg: Eiwert, 1982), pp. 103, 126-127, 139, 154-167, 213-217 (especially pp. 166, 213-216) [based on the original in Giessen UA: Hs 33b]; Reinhold Vormbaum, ed., *Die evangelischen Schulordnungen des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1863), pp. 375-383.

(57) For example, one rhetoric textbook by Melchior Junius presents systematically arranged lists of commonplaces taken from the disciplines of ethics, family life, politics, and history. See Melchior Junius, *Methodus eloquentiae comparandae, scholis rhetoricis tradita* (Argentinae: Per Lazarum Zetznerum, 1592), pp. 113-125 [Mainz StB: 1 / w / 859 (1)].

(58) Also see no. 2a in table c.

(59) An outline of instruction held at the Jesuit University of Dillingen (Danube) each year from 1564 until 1614 can be constructed on the basis of extant timetables. Works by Cicero were utilized at every level through the Rhetoric grade but at no level higher than that latter grade. See *Catalogus lectionum, 1564-1614* [Dillingen/Donau, Studienbibliothek: XV y 134, fol. 192-243].

(60) Occasionally Cicero's writings were also used to teach ethics at the university level; for example, see *Rector et professores Academiae Ienensis . . . lectiones theologicae . . . iuridicae . . . medicae . . . philosophicae* (Ienae: 27 Iunij 1564) [Wolfenbüttel HAB: 95.10 Quodl. 2° (245)].

(61) Concerning Trebizond see John Monfasani, *George of Trebizond. A Biography and a Study of his Rhetoric and Logic* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp. 4, 234. On Soarez see Lawrence Flynn S.J., "De arte rhetorica of Cyprian Soarez S.J.," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 42 (1956), 367-74 and 43 (1957), 257-65.

5. ———. 1986. "Signs Within 16th and 17th Century Philosophy: The Case of Clemens Timpler (1563/64-1624)." In *Geschichte und Geschichtsschreibung der Semiotik. Fallstudien. Akten der 8. Arbeitstagung des Münsteraner Arbeitskreises für Semiotik, Münster 2.-3.10.1985*, edited by Dutz, Klaus D. and Schmitter, Peter, 101-118. Münster: MAKS Publikationen.
6. ———. 1988. "Die Karriere und Bedeutung von Clemens Timpler (1563/4-1624)." In *400 Jahre Arnoldinum 1588-1988. Festschrift*, 69-77. Greven: Eggenkamp.
7. ———. 1992. "Aristotelianism and Humanism in Late Reformation German Philosophy: The Case of Clemens Timpler, 1563/64-1624." In *The Harvest of German Humanism: Papers in Honor of Lewis W. Spitz*, edited by Fleischer, Manfred, 213-232. St. Louis: Concordia Press.  
 "Clemens Timpler (1563/64-1624), a German Calvinist philosopher and professor at the Gymnasium illustre Arnoldinum in Steinfurl/West-phalia from 1595 to 1624, is an unknown to most scholars of the Renaissance and the Reformation. Tables 1, 2, and 3 present some basic information concerning him in summary form. In Table 1

(2) Timpler's family ties and career are outlined. Like most other German philosophers of the Late Reformation period—here we shall speak of the period between c.1550 and c.1650—he taught philosophy as his profession." (p. 213)

(...)

"It is Timpler's philosophical writings—and in particular the sources cited therein—which are of primary concern for us here. These sources are summarized in Table 3.

(10) As is evident from this table, Aristotle was by far the author most often cited by Timpler. Furthermore, many of the late 16th and early 17th century authors whom Timpler himself cites— e.g., John Case, Bartholomew Keckermann, Francesco Piccolomini, Amandus Polanus, Jacopo Zabarella—do likewise within their own writings.(11) Aristotle's writings were used in philosophy instruction at all or almost all German academic institutions during the Late-Reformation period (see Tables 7, 8, and 9).

Indeed, those German academic philosophers of the Late-Reformation philosophers of the Late-Reformation era who studied and used Aristotle's writings virtually comprise a universal set Therefore, the term "Aristotelianism"—which itself was not used in this period— only provides us with a very limited amount of information concerning these philosophers. (12) More important and more difficult is the problem of how individual Late-Reformation German philosophers used Aristotle within their own writings." (p. 215)

(...)

"The term *Aristotelianism* , therefore, can be understood so as to refer to almost all of Late-Reformation German philosophy. The same appears to be the case with *humanism* . Like Aristotelianism, the term humanism was not used in the Late-Reformation period. Walter Ruegg has traced the first known use of the German term Humanismus back to the year 1808. (19) Here I shall speak of two basic ways of understanding the terms humanism and Humanismus: 1. that of Jacob Burckhardt and 2. that of Paul Oskar Kristeller.

Among the major characteristics which are attributed by Jacob Burckhardt to "Renaissance humanist" Italian civilization of the 14th, 15th, and 16th centuries are 1. the development of the human individual and 2. the centrality and dignity of man. (20) On the basis of Table 6 (21) it is clear that man has central importance within the philosophy of Clemens Timpler. All that is intelligible to man is the subject matter of metaphysics. (22) Man was created for God's sake; however, all other creatures were created by God for man's sake. Timpler makes a number of statements to the effect that man must preserve him- or herself. " (p. 217)

(...)

"In his article "The Humanist Movement,' ' Paul Oskar Kristeller notes that the term "Renaissance Humanism" ultimately is derived from the Latin *studia humanitatis* ; in the 15th and 16th centuries, the *studia humanitatis* stood for a concise group of scholarly disciplines (i.e., for grammar, rhetoric, history, poetry, and moral philosophy). (24) According to Kristeller, therefore, the *studia humanitatis* during these two centuries essentially constituted an educational curriculum. Considered in this way, humanism also has an integral place within the curriculum of German schools and universities during die Late-Reformation period." (p. 218)

(2) See Joseph S. Freedman, *European Academic Philosophy in the Late 16th and Early 17th Centuries. The Life, Significance, and Philosophy of Clemens Timpler (1563-1564)* , 2 vols. (Hildesheim et al.; Georg Olms, 1988), chapters 2, 3, 4 (pp. 7-45, 454-88) and pp. 738-39.

(10) See Freedman, *Academic Philosophy / Timpler* , pp. 128-31, 134, 142, 563-68; Table 3 presents this material in abridged form.

(11) Concerning John Case see the following monograph: Charles B. Schmitt, *John Case and Aristotelianism in Renaissance England* (Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1983).

(12) The terms *Aristotelici* and *Peripatetici* are occasionally used in philosophical works during this period, though the precise meaning of these two terms is rarely or never explained. Johann Heinrich Alsted mentions the *Peripatetici* within his classification of the various philosophical schools; see Johannes-Henricus Alstedius,

*Philosophia digne restituta* (Herbomae Nassoviorum: 1612), p. 93 [Marburg UB: XIV c 136],

(19) Walter Ruegg, *Cicero und der Humanismus* (Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1946), pp. 2-3.

(20) Jacob Burckhardt, *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, 2 vols., introduction by Benjamin Nelson and Charles Trinkaus, translated by S.G.C. Middlemore (New York: Harper and Row, 1958), 1: 143-50; 2: 351-52.

(21) These statements are summarized in Freedman, *Academic Philosophy* / Timpler, pp. 445-46, 733-34.

(22) For Timpler, All that is Intelligible (omne intelligibile) is all that which man can learn by means of the human intellectual process; see *Ibid.*, pp. 210-12, 412, 604-05, 714.

(24) Paul Oskar Kristeller, "The Humanist Movement," *Renaissance Thought. The Classic, Scholastic, and Humanistic Strains* (New York: Harper, 1961), pp. 9-10, 19-20.

8. ———. 1993. "Aristotle and the Content of Philosophy Instruction at Central European Schools and Universities during the Reformation Era (1500-1650)." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* no. 137:213-253. Reprinted as Essay V in: *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700*. "The philosophy of the late Middle Ages and the Reformation Era, i.e., of the period between 1350 and 1650, has been largely ignored by historians of philosophy. A few philosophers of this period i.e., Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1464) and Francis Suarez (1548-1617) - have frequently been studied by twentieth-century historians of philosophy. However, thousands of philosophers of that three-hundred-year period have been neglected. The writings of those philosophers arose from their academic instruction at schools and universities scattered throughout Europe. One general fact is known concerning a large portion of these writings: they make substantial use of Aristotle's works. How should one proceed in attempting to understand these writings and the manner in which they utilize Aristotle? Generally, there has been a tendency to place these authors within the framework of the "Aristotelian tradition" or "Aristotelianism." It is the purpose of this article to examine the merits of that tendency. To what extent do these two concepts help us to, or deter us from, understanding European philosophy of the late fourteenth through the early seventeenth centuries? This article will focus on the manner in which Aristotle's writings were utilized in Central Europe during the second half of this period, i.e., between 1500 and 1650. At individual Central European schools and universities during this period, philosophy instruction included some or all of the following disciplines: metaphysics, physics, mathematics, ethics, family life (*oeconomica*), politics, logic, rhetoric, grammar, poetics, and history. Texts by Aristotle were usually utilized to some extent in the instruction of metaphysics, physics, ethics, family life, politics, logic, rhetoric, and poetics. In concentrating on Central Europe during these one and one-half centuries, extant sources can be utilized in order to answer the following three questions: 1. In what ways are Aristotle's texts utilized at individual academic institutions during the Reformation era? 2. In what manner do individual philosophers use Aristotle's writings during this period? 3. How does a group of sixteenth and seventeenth-century philosophers interpret Aristotle when discussing individual philosophical concepts?" (2)
- (2) The focus of this article is limited to Central Europe during the Reformation Era for the following two reasons: 1. The curriculum of Central European schools and universities during the Reformation Era can be discussed on the basis of primary sources extant both in manuscript and printed form; however, such sources are much harder to find for schools and universities in other parts of Europe. 2. Central European philosophical works of the late Middle Ages are largely in manuscript form. These works are scattered throughout Europe; the vast majority of them have not yet been read or in many cases even been sifted. The following article discusses and gives primary source bibliography for a large number of these Central

European institutions: Joseph S. Freedman, "Philosophy Instruction within the Institutional Framework of Central European Schools and Universities during the Reformation Era," *History of Universities* vol. 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985): 117-166. (some notes omitted)

9. ———. 1993. "The Diffusion of the Writings of Petrus Ramus in Central Europe, c. 1570 - c.1630." *Renaissance Quarterly* no. 56 (1):98-152.  
Reprinted as Essay IV in: *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700* .  
"For what reasons did Academicians select to use or not to use any given textbook for their own classroom instruction during the Renaissance? To what extent did ideological or pragmatic considerations influence such decisions? In this article these questions are posed to examine the use of the writings of Petrus Ramus (1515-1572) and Omer Talon (ca. 1510- 1562) at schools and universities in Central Europe during the six decades between 1570 and 1630. Did "Ramist" academicians of this period make use in the classroom of writings by these two authors because of some fundamental agreement with their views? Or were these two authors preferred during these six decades because their writings could be used eclectically and/or they fit well into specific parts of the curriculum at certain academic institutions? In the period between 1570 and 1630 there were over 30 universities and hundreds of schools in the German-language area of Europe. A large amount of curricular information—largely in the form of annual, semi-annual, or occasional outlines of instruction as well as personal or official correspondence—exists for many of these schools and universities. Textbooks and printed disputations arising from instruction held at these academic institutions are also extant. This assessment of the use of writings by Ramus and Talon in Central European academic institutions is based on the examination of a substantial portion of this evidence. The task of finding and evaluating such evidence pertaining to other parts of Europe must be left for a separate study." (p. 98)  
"It was the period between 1570 and 1630, therefore, which saw the most extensive use of the writings of Petrus Ramus and Omer Talon at Central European schools. Among the points made by Walter J. Ong in his monograph on Ramus are the following.<sup>125</sup> First, opposition to Ramus from university-level academics was strong and often very well articulated. Second, Ramus's works on logic and rhetoric were relatively uncomplicated in their content. And third, Ramus's writings were best received by, and to a large extent intended for, younger students. Ramus's influence in Central Europe between 1570 and 1630 can be explained within the context of these three points. In Central Europe during these six decades the writings of Ramus found their most extensive use within the realm of the pre-university level curriculum.  
On the basis of the evidence presented in this article, it would appear that it was largely for pragmatic reasons that Ramus was used at some individual academic institutions but not at others in Central Europe during the period between 1570 and 1630. It is difficult to use ideology to explain these developments. Ramus's disciples and commentators generally used Ramus's writings eclectically. Some Ramus commentators (e.g., Friedrich Beurhusius, Severinus Sluterus) also published commentaries on Aristotle, Cicero, or some combination of these and/or other authors. The opinions of individual "Ramists" on a given topic -- e. g. , the classifications of philosophical disciplines, the concept of method -- differed markedly. In fact, it is difficult to make any sense at all of the term "Ramist" when discussing the use of Ramus's writings in Central Europe between 1570 and 1630. The extent to which "Ramism" can or cannot be used as a viable category to explain the use of writings by Ramus and Talon at schools and universities beyond Central Europe is a topic which merits further attention." p. 144 (notes omitted)
10. ———. 1994. "Instruction in Philosophy and the Arts in Early Modern Central Europe: Some Thoughts Concerning the Reproduction of Select Primary Source Materials." *Chloe.Beihefte zum Daphnis* no. 25:961-974.  
Conference Proceedings, "Editionsdesiderate zur frühen Neuzeit. Beiträge zur Tagung der Kommission für die Edition von Texten der Frühen Neuzeit" held at

Wolfenbüttel, Germany, October 4-7, 1994 (Zweiter Teil).

"The bulk of the textbooks used in sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and eighteenth-century Europe which are extant have survived as printed works. This is especially true in the case of editions of works by Aristotle, Cicero, and other ancient as well as modern authors; the same also applies to most commentaries and independently titled textbooks.

Student lecture notes usually have survived as manuscripts. Disputations did not begin to be commonly published in Central Europe until the latter decades of the sixteenth century. Academic correspondence generally is extant in manuscript form, though some collections of such correspondence were published during the early modern period.

Reference works, official academic orations, and announcements of lecture offerings for the coming semester or year were normally published, while curriculum plans frequently were not. Some printed works contained important handwritten addenda such as owner's marks, autographs, student notes, and corrections; some broadsheets and other short printed works have survived due to the fact that they were inserted between leaves of manuscripts.

All of these various types of sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and eighteenth-century works written on diverse philological and philosophical subject-matters together constitute a very large quantity of extant printed and manuscript material. How can one determine which samples of these materials should be edited and/or reproduced in print or non-print formats? In order to provide an answer to this question, three preliminary questions can be posed here: 1. At which libraries and archives are these materials found and how thoroughly have these materials been catalogued there? 2. Which bibliographies of these early modern philological and philosophical works are available? 3. What works have already been made edited and/or reproduced in some format?

Germany does not have a national library having a role comparable to that of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris and of the British Library in London. But Germany does have hundreds of libraries and archives that house sixteenth-, seventeenth-, and eighteenth-century printed works and manuscripts. The Duke August Library in Wolfenbuttel and the Bavarian State Library in Munich are among the most important repositories of philological and philosophical materials from this time period. The Duke August Library has been especially active in publishing catalogs describing its own sixteenth- and seventeenth-century printed works and in making its own bibliographic records accessible electronically. And its holdings - together with those of the Bavarian State Library - form the core of the multivolume *Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des 16. Jahrhunderts* [VD 16]." (pp. 965-966)

11. ———. 1994. "Classifications of Philosophy, the Arts, and the Sciences in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe." *The Modern Schoolman* no. 72 (1):37-65.  
Reprinted as Essay VII in: *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700*.  
"One aspect of the history of philosophy which has received relatively little attention is how the philosophy concept itself has been classified into parts and how these classifications have evolved over the centuries. A few studies have focused on the development of these classifications in the ancient and medieval West; several other studies have discussed their development in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Europe. Classifications of philosophy during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have been almost completely neglected; during those two centuries the manner in which philosophy -- and related concepts such as the arts, the liberal arts, the sciences, and encyclopedia -- was divided into parts underwent some significant changes.  
Philosophy was taught at universities and schools throughout Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and served to prepare students for study of theology, medicine, and jurisprudence.' A large volume of writings -- both in printed and in manuscript form -- was produced in conjunction with this philosophy

instruction. Many textbooks on metaphysics, physics, mathematics, ethics, logic, and other subjects written during this period contained a section on the concept of philosophy, while some writings were devoted specifically to that latter topic. When examining the philosophy concept, most authors provided a definition or definitions thereof before proceeding to classify its parts. Some authors also included discussion of the various schools (sectae) of philosophers.

Despite the fact that many attempts were made to define philosophy during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, these definitions generally do not provide us with much information concerning the philosophy concept itself.

This is partially due to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century views with respect to definitions. During those two centuries, definition theory was normally discussed within logic textbooks and within short treatises specifically devoted to the subject matter of both definition and classification or just definition alone." p. 37 (notes omitted)

This article has its origin in a lecture given at the Fourth International Leibniz Congress at Hannover, Germany in November of 1983 [\*]; it appears here in expanded and revised form.

[\* Published in *Leibniz Werk und Wirkung. IV Internationale Leibniz-Kongress. Vorträge*, Hannover, 14. bis 19. Novembre 1983, Hannover: Gottfried-Wilhelm-Leibniz-Gesellschaft, 1984, pp. 193-202.]

12. ———. 1994. "Encyclopedic Philosophical Writings in Central Europe during the High and Late Renaissance (c. 1500 - c. 1700)." *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* no. 37:212-256.

Reprinted as Essay VI in: *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700* .

"The history of encyclopedias begins in the ancient world and extends up to the present day. What is an encyclopedia? What kinds of encyclopedias are there? And to what extent are encyclopedias intended for pupils at schools, for students at universities, or for some other, non-academic groups of people?

This article will attempt to provide answers to these questions within the limited context of Central Europe during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.(\*). It is important to keep in mind that the Latin term *encyclopaedia* was only one of many terms that were used during that period in order to denote or describe such works. And a few of these terms -- such as method (*methodus*) and system (*systema*) -- can be regarded as very significant for the development of encyclopedias in Central Europe during these two centuries.

Some sixteenth- and seventeenth-century encyclopedias intended to cover all academic subjects, including theology, jurisprudence, medicine, and philosophy. Other encyclopedias only covered one or several of these areas; still others covered the mechanical arts, occult science, or popular subject matter. This article focuses primarily on the area of philosophy, that is, on encyclopedic writings on philosophy that are "interdisciplinary" insofar as they discuss at least two philosophical disciplines." (pp. 212-213, notes omitted)

"The first years of the seventeenth century saw three concurrent developments in Central Europe. First, the metaphysics emerged as a preeminent philosophical discipline. Second, the term *systema* began to be used in the titles of comprehensive textbooks on many philosophical as well as non-philosophical disciplines. Third, there was a sharp increase in the number of encyclopedic philosophical writings. Shortly before the year 1620, there was a virtual explosion in the number of such writings, which then continued to appear commonly in Central Europe through the seventeenth century and thereafter.

As indicated earlier, the discipline of metaphysics contains concepts relevant to all other philosophical disciplines. Just as works on metaphysics and interdisciplinary philosophical works disappeared together in the early sixteenth century, they began to reappear together at the end of that same century. Systematic textbooks on individual disciplines intended to cover the entire scope of those disciplines. This new emphasis on the comprehensive coverage of individual academic disciplines from the year 1600 onwards went hand-in-hand with the reemergence of

encyclopedic philosophical writings which were intended as comprehensive philosophical textbooks." (p. 234)

(\*) It is within the context of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Central Europe that a sufficient diversity and quantity of primary source materials -- including both philosophical texts by individual authors and detailed information concerning the curricula of individual academic institutions -- could be found in order to arrive at conclusions concerning the evolution of encyclopedic philosophical writings.

13. ———. 1997. "The Career and Writings of Bartholomew Keckermann (d. 1609)." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* no. 141:305-364. Reprinted as Essay VIII in: *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700*. "In conclusion, the following three questions can be posed with respect to Keckermann and his writings. First, what was Keckermann's contribution to intellectual history? Second, why was Keckermann so famous during the early seventeenth century? And third, which of these first two questions should concern us most, and why?
- With regard to the first question, Keckermann can be considered to have made at least three contributions to intellectual history. First, Keckermann was one of the earliest Western thinkers to use the term "system" to describe academic treatises; his detailed discussion of the component parts of systematic textbooks appears to be the first of this kind and may have been without parallel during the entire seventeenth century. Second, Keckermann was exceptional in so far as he stressed that each academic discipline -- barring metaphysics -- has its own history. Keckermann documented the history of individual disciplines by including chronologically and systematically arranged bibliographies within writings on some of those disciplines. In his multi-volume history of logic, Wilhelm Risse refers to Bartholomew Keckermann as the first historian of logic. (81) Keckermann's bibliographies, which are evidence of his broad knowledge of scholarship in his time, can still be used today to identify the names of many important sixteenth-century authors of academic works.
- Third, Keckermann was able to integrate discussion of rhetoric, history, collections of aphorisms, dictionaries, emblems, and other "humanist" subject matter within logically arranged and systematically organized treatises. He stressed the relevance of this humanist subject matter to public life. It could be argued that Keckermann made a valuable contribution to early modern European intellectual history insofar as he was successful in incorporating a form of civic humanism within a scholastic framework. (82)
- Turning to the second question, at least eight reasons can be given in order to help explain Bartholomew Keckermann's fame during the seventeenth century. First, his academic career and the publication of his many writings began at an opportune time; higher education had been expanding in Central Europe during the late sixteenth century and continued to do so through the first quarter of the following century. (83)
- Second, academic encyclopedias and encyclopedic collections of academic writings began to appear in Central Europe in about the year 1600; they were published -- and used within academic instruction -- with increasing frequency during the following decades. (84) The author of the preface to the 1614 edition of Keckermann's collected works pointed to their encyclopedic scope and to their enhanced usefulness as a result of that scope. (85) Keckermann published works on almost all of the academic disciplines taught by his contemporaries.
- Third, Keckermann began his career by publishing primarily in the discipline of logic, for which there was a tremendous demand at Central European schools and universities during his time. His many types of logic textbooks were able to be used in logic instruction at various levels. Fourth, the years around 1600 saw the introduction of a number of new textbook formats in Central Europe; with his *Systema* and his *Prolegomena*, Keckermann belonged to that group of scholars at the forefront of these new developments.

Fifth, he used the writings of Aristotle eclectically and the writings of Ramus critically at a time when many other school and university professors chose to do likewise. Sixth, he won the enthusiastic support of colleagues, friends, and students, who edited and published many of Keckermann's works both before and after his early death. Seventh, published attacks directed against Keckermann's writings -- beginning in the year 1599 -- by a host of enemies helped to make him better known. And eighth, Keckermann's reputation had a snowball effect. Some academic institutions and individual professors chose to use his writings in part because of their reputation and of their relative availability in a period when libraries and the book trade functioned less effectively than they do today.

Turning to the third question, I would like to suggest that the study of Keckermann's contribution to intellectual history deserves less attention than does the study of his career and of his systematically-written works. Thousands of professors and other teachers published their writings during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Most of the writings of these authors have been unread for centuries; many of these writings have yet to be rediscovered, assuming that they are still extant at all. So while Keckermann appears to have made several important contributions to European intellectual life within the context of schools and universities, one cannot completely exclude the possibility that he was at least partially preempted by thinkers whose works are still unread or unknown. And it should also be noted that originality was not valued by Keckermann's contemporaries in the same way as it is by twentieth-century scholars. It was not uncommon in Keckermann's time for the authors of academic writings to defend themselves against -- or to attack others with -- the charge of "unwarranted novelty." (86)

On the other hand, if we pose the question how Keckermann's career was so successful, our answer also provides us with information concerning the academic and intellectual environment of his time. The general parameters affecting Keckermann's academic career also pertained to thousands of other individuals who were pursuing such careers during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Certain paths led to successful careers at academic institutions; as part of this process, a professional scholar such as Keckermann might fail to receive the offer of a certain academic position but might also decline to accept another position. (87)

In addition, Keckermann's academic writings generally appear to have differed relatively little in content from the content of writings of other sixteenth- and seventeenth-century authors, including the hundreds of sixteenth-century authors whom he cited as well as those seventeenth-century authors who made use of Keckermann's writings within their own. (88) In studying Keckermann's writings on metaphysics, physics, mathematics, ethics, family life, politics, logic, rhetoric, and history, we are looking at a corpus of learned views that -- barring a relatively small number of controversial points of doctrine -- basically represented the curriculum in the arts and the sciences during his time.

To summarize, the value of studying Keckermann's career and writings lies not so much in the fact that he was original in some scientific, or intellectual sense of that word. Instead, while studying Keckermann we are also provided with a wealth of information concerning academic life in his time as well as concerning a large body of knowledge taught to tens of thousands of students at European schools and universities. It could be argued that the study of the career and writings of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century European professional scholars pertains more to social history or cultural history in some broad sense than it does to intellectual history." (pp. 323-325)

(81) Wilhelm Risse, *Die Logik der Neuzeit*, vol. 1, 1500-1640 (Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag / Gunther Holzboog, 1964), 9.