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- Cristóbal de los Cobos (1553-1613?)
- Jacob Lorhard (1561-1609)
- Clemens Timpler (1563-1624)
- Cornelius Martini (1568-1621)
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For the complete references see: Selected Bibliography on the History of Continental Ontology from Suárez to Kant

Pedro da Fonseca (1528-1599)

Being (not God) is the subject of Metaphysics - Exclusion of accidental beings and beings of reason from Metaphysics
"Comprising four quarto volumes, Fonseca's In libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis Stagiritae (Commentary on the Books of Aristotle's Metaphysics) contains a critical Greek text which he himself established from the best available manuscripts and printed editions. (...) After rejectirig opinions which bold that the subject of metaphysics is God, Aristotelian 'separate substances', or being in the categories, Fonseca says that the first and adequate subject of metaphysics is being -- in so far as it is common to God and creatures (In libros Metaphysicorum IV c.1 q.1 s.3). Understood in this way, being is analogous, although as said of species within one genus or of individuals within one species it is univocal. Between God and creatures, between created substance and accidents, between different classes of accident, and between real being and being of reason, being is analogous by analogies both of proportion and of attribution. As God is related to his being, so in proportion a created substance is related to its being. Likewise, as created substance and its being are related, so in proportion is an accident related to its being. Again, as one kind of accident is disposed to its existence so is each other kind of accident to its existence. And as real beings are disposed to their being, so beings of reason are to theirs (Metaphysicorum IV c.2 q.1 s.5, 7). An analogy of attribution obtains among accidents as an analogy of two things to a third
(that is, created substance), while between accidents and substance it is analogy of one to the other. The same is true of beings of reason among themselves and then in comparison with real being; for beings of reason do not depend less upon real beings than do accidents upon substance. Again, a creature is being only by attribution or reference to God. Pursuing this, Fonseca distinguishes between formal and objective concepts. A formal concept is an 'actual likeness' (actualis similitudo) of a thing that is understood, produced by the intellect in order to express that thing. An objective concept is that thing is understood in so far as it is conceived through the formal concept. Both the formal and the objective concept of being are one, but not perfectly so for the reason that they do not prescind perfectly from the concepts of the members which divide being. Being as such is transcendent as are also the concepts of thing, something, one, true and good (Metaphysicorum IV c.2 q.2 s.1, 4-5; q.5 s.2).

In God alone there is a perfect identity of essence and existence. In every creature, essence is distinct from existence, but not as one thing from another. Rather, says Fonseca, a created essence is as distinct from its existence as a thing from its ultimate intrinsic mode. In this opinion, he tells us, he is following Alexander of Hales and Duns Scotus (12) (Metaphysicorum, IV c.2 q.3 s.4). It is possible that here Fonseca has also to some extent anticipated the Suárezian doctrine of modes. Excluded from the subject of metaphysics are accidental beings (entia per accidens) and beings of reason. An accidental being, in the sense excluded, is a juxtaposition of two or more beings which lack any (intrinsic) relation to one another (Metaphysicorum IV c.1 q.1 s.3). Beings of reason are those which exist only inasmuch as they are objects of understanding. Within such beings of reason, as they stand in contrast with mind-independent real beings, Fonseca distinguishes proper being of reason from one which is fictitious. Properly taken, a being of reason is one whose being depends upon the understanding in such way that it can still be said of real beings, for example, the concepts of genus, species, and the like. A fictitious being as such is a being whose essence depends upon the understanding in such way that it cannot be said of any real being, for example, a chimera, a goat-stag, or the like (Metaphysicorum IV c.7 q.6 s.5).


**Texts**


**Studies**


   "I intend to show that the sixteenth century Jesuit, Petrus Fonseca, whose *Institutionum Dialecticarum libri octo* (1564) was one of the most popular textbooks of the period, was well acquainted with [material implication]. Fonseca introduces the subject in his discussion of the appropriateness of the name 'hypothetical' as applied to compound propositions."
3. ———. 1997. "Petrus Fonseca on Objective Concepts and the Analogy of Being." In Logic and the Workings of the Mind. The Logic of Ideas and Faculty Psychology in Early Modern Philosophy, edited by A. Easton Patricia, 47-63. Atascadero: Ridgeview. "Petrus Fonseca was a Portuguese Jesuit who lived from 1528 to 1599. He was one of those responsible for drawing up the Jesuit Ratio Studiorum which set the curriculum for Jesuit schools across Europe, and he was also responsible for initiating the production of the Coimbra commentaries on Aristotle, or Conimbricenses, which served as texts for many schools and universities in the seventeenth century. He was himself the author of two popular texts, an introduction to logic, and a commentary on Aristotle's Metaphysics. His logic text was one of two alternatives prescribed by the Ratio Studiorum of 1599, and may have been used at La Flèche; his Metaphysics commentary was used at many Jesuit schools, and may also have been used at La Flèche.

In short, Fonseca was a leading figure in the Scholastic Aristotelian tradition of the late sixteenth century, a tradition which lies behind many of the developments in early modern philosophy, and which in many ways is more important than the humanist tradition represented by Petrus Ramus.

I have chosen to discuss Fonseca on objective concepts and the analogy of being both because an examination of these issues will help us to understand how logic came to be bound up with the philosophy of mind and because the history of how these issues were treated helps solve a small problem about Descartes’s sources. My paper has four parts. I shall begin by giving a historical outline of treatments of analogy and their relevance to Descartes. Secondly, I shall discuss late medieval theories of signification, particularly as they appear in Fonseca, in order to show how logicians turned away from spoken language to inner, mental language. Thirdly, I shall explain how it was that analogy, as a theory of one kind of language use, was particularly bound up with the discussion of concepts. Finally, I shall look at the distinctions Fonseca made while discussing the concepts associated with analogical terms." p. 47 (notes omitted).


"Fonseca's treatment of topics in the rather substantial section on topics in Institutionum dialecticarum is of interest for at least three reasons. First, although the works of Bird, Stump, and Green-Pederson have shed a great deal of light on the tradition of the topics from Boethius to the 15th century, little is known about later scholastic views on topics in the late 16th and 17th centuries. The tract on topics in Fonseca's well-circulated logic book is certainly a good place to begin an examination of this obscure area. Second, in the tract on topics in ID a heavy dependence on Boethius's works De topicis differentiis and In Cicerona topica is very evident; a legitimate prima facie concern is that Fonseca's views on topics are unoriginal and not worth the trouble of careful study. I think it can be shown, however, that Fonseca's views on topics are very different from those of Boethius. Not only does Fonseca conceive of the primary purpose of topics in a different way from Boethius, but certain features of Fonseca's treatment of topics reflect the concerns of non-scholastic approaches to logic in the 16th century, e.g. the humanist concern for usefulness and relevance of logic, the humanist and Ramist concerns for pedagogy and easy memorization. What results is a rather unusual, hybrid treatment of topics. Finally, Fonseca's views on topics happen to provide some rather interesting background to Cartesian criticism that certain rules of dialecticians hinder the natural light of reason in the discovery of truth."


9. Madeira, João. 2006. Pedro Da Fonseca’s Isagoge Philosphica and the Predicables
from Boethius to the Lovanienses, Leuven University.
Contains in Appendix the Latin text and an English translation of Fonseca's *Isagoge Philosophica*.


"This paper starts from the fact that the fourth volume of Fonseca's "Commentariorum in Metaphysicorum Aristotelis Stagiritae libros" (CMA) contains no "quaestiones" to Met. XII. An analysis of several explicit remissions to topics and questions to be developed in the context of that Aristotelian script (Met. XII), made by Fonseca in several places in volumes I, II and III of his CMA, reveals that his project was, from the beginning, to develop in the IV volume the subjects related to the philosophical discourse about God, divine attributes, omnipotence and freedom, contingency as well as to the separate substances'. This indicates clearly that the metaphysics of Fonseca remained unfinished given the fact that the text on an important thematic cluster was not published notwithstanding the inclusion of such text in the original project of Fonseca. It is sustained that this fact should be taken in due consideration in any global interpretation of Fonseca's thought as well as in any comparison with other (finished) ontologies. Suarez is the most obvious case but not the only one."


"It is claimed that in order to a better understanding of the reception of the text of the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle in the second half of the sixteenth century one must carefully
distinguish the commentaries to the whole work from texts that treat particular questions. Although much work is still to be done, the great commentary of Pedro da Fonseca appears as the major original commentary to the *Metaphysics* produced during that period.


**Benet Perera (Benedictus Pererius) (1535-1610)**

"The problem that continues to haunt the commentators [of Aristotle] is how to reconcile *philosophia prima* as universal *scientia de ente* with *philosophia prima* as *theologia*. The latter appears to be a special science rather than a universal one, since it studies one particular being (albeit the highest one), whereas the former studies being qua being. Aristotle had already recognised this problem and had come up with a solution that proved so cryptic that it provoked even more discussion. (26)

In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries this discussion received an entirely new impulse in Protestant metaphysics. Although the early reformers had a very low opinion of Aristotelian metaphysics, by the end of the sixteenth century their successors had taken to writing textbooks on Aristotle's *Metaphysics* which copied the model of earlier commentaries. In fact, the Protestant scholasticism that emerged from the middle of the sixteenth century onwards drew heavily on the great Commentaries of the Counter Reformation, notably the ones composed by the Spanish Jesuits. (27) Faced with the institutional problem of how to teach theology and philosophy, the Protestant masters turned back to systematic Aristotelian philosophy of the familiar kind. (28) Moreover theological controversies within Lutheranism and between Lutheranism and Calvinism made precise definitions of terms like 'substance' and 'accident', 'nature' and 'person' absolutely imperative. (29)

This fuelled a keen interest in Aristotelian metaphysics. The Protestants were trying to construct a metaphysics conceived as a universal science of being, a *scientia de ente*. This meant the removal of all the heterogeneous elements of Aristotelian metaphysics that could only with difficulty be combined with this "pure" science of being. Hence we find in most Protestant metaphysics a marked tendency to separate natural theology from metaphysics as a science of being qua being. Therefore, by separating true metaphysics as a universal science of being from natural theology as a *scientia particularis*, the ubiquitous problem of the subject matter of metaphysics was solved. The first to make this separation in the sixteenth century was actually a Jesuit, Benito Pereira (c 1535-1610). (30) His solution was taken up in various ways by Protestant scholastics, both Calvinist and Lutheran, such as Nicolaus Taurellus (1547-1606), Abraham Calov (1612-1686) and Rudolphus Goclenius the Elder (1547-1628). This tradition was not an isolated German phenomenon but also spread to England. By distinguishing between "first" or "summary philosophy" and natural theology, Francis Bacon clearly draws on this tradition as well."


On the sixteenth and seventeenth century debate concerning the relation between universal scientia de ente and particular theology, see Rompe, Die Trennung; and Leinsle, Das Ding und die Methode. For medieval "separatist" arguments, see Zimmermann, Ontologie oder Metaphysik, pp. 292-314; and Lohr, "Metaphysics," pp. 587-590.

Texts

2. Commentary on Aristotle’s *Physics*; reprinted Paris, 1579; Lyon, 1585; Cologne, 1595.

Studies


Bibliography on a Selection of Ontologists from 1560 to 1644 http://www.ontology.co/biblio/history-continental-authors.htm


**Diego de Zúñiga (1536-1598)**

**Texts**


**Studies**


Rudolf Göckel (Goclenius) (1547-1628)

"Goclenius is best described as a protestant Scholastic', his most important contribution to the metaphysics being terminological. He is the first philosopher to use the word ontologia [in Greek] (*) to describe general metaphysics (...) Strangely enough, this word does not appear in the Isagoge, but rather in the Lexicon. Still, his use of the word precedes that of Calovius by 23 years (...), and that of Jean-Baptiste Duhamel by 65 (...).

Although he does not use the term ontologia in the Isagoge, Goclenius does distinguish general metaphysics from special metaphysics in this work and a fortiori stood the concept of general metaphysics. The distinction between general and special metaphysics is not Goclenius's invention, however. The Spanish Jesuit Benito Pereira (c. 1535-1610) had already made it by 1562 (see Rompe Die Trennung von Ontologie und Metaphysik. Der Ablösungsprozess und seine Motivierung bei Benedictus Pererius und anderen Denkern des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts1968, pp. 7-13) and an earlier manuscript making the distinction has been found (Zimmermann Ontologie oder Metaphysik. Die Diskussion über den Gegenstand der Metaphysik an 13. und 14. Jahrhundert 1965, p. 60).

Both Wundt and Vollrath seem to have discovered the distinction between general and special metaphysics only in the Praefatio of Goclenius's Isagoge and have remarked that this distinction does not appear in the main text of the work. This is incorrect, however. The second part of the Isagoge is a series of disputations, the first of which, entitled De ente Communi, ad omnes Categorias consequente discusses this distinction (Rompe is aware of this and hers is at present the most trustworthy account of Goclenius's work) Goclenius says that some divide first philosophy (prima philosophia), which is usually called 'metaphysics', into two parts. The first is universal and studies the most general notion of being common to all things (de Ente in communi). The second part is particular and deals with God, divine spirits (daemones), and disembodied intellect (intellectus separatus a corpore, p. 126). Goclenius ascribes this view to Aristotle and then goes on to say that he prefers to divide things up differently. Knowledge (scientia) should be divided into a universal and a particular part, and the universal part should be called 'first philosophy'. The particular part in turn should be divided into a 'transnatural' part which deals with God, and a 'natural' one, which deals with natural entities (pp. 126-7).

Goclenius's idea of knowledge, then, has a particular part which seems to contain every specific science. In contrast, Perera includes only theology, 'spiritology', and psychology, and Christian Wolff only theology, psychology, and cosmology, within special metaphysics. Thus Goclenius is proposing a way of cutting up the sciences such that prima philosophia is truly cast in the role of the queen of the sciences, lording over them all as the scientia universalis. On the face of it, Goclenius's taxonomy of metaphysics is more reasonable than that of Wolff or Pereira. If one is going to take seriously the notion of a 'superscience' which studies the most abstract idea of being which the objects of all specific sciences share, then one is compelled, I think, to include all of the particular sciences within specific metaphysics. This is true unless, of course, one has platonic misgivings about the possibility of being able to have knowledge about substances which have matter mixed up in them. However, a good Scholastic, wedded as he is to the spirit of Aristotle, has no such misgivings."

(*) The term ontologia was coined by Jacob Lorhard in 1606 [Note added by Raul Corazzon]


"Thus the Marburg professor Rudolph Goclenius in the preface to his Isagoge in primam philosophium (1598), spoke of two separate sciences, a universal science called 'first philosophy' and a particular science called 'metaphysics'. First philosophy deals with being, its properties and its principles; metaphysics studies the various types of immaterial being:
God, the intelligences and the human soul."


**Texts**


**Studies**


2. ———. 2013. *La Nascita Dell'ontologia Nella Metafisica Di Rudolph Göckel (1547-1628)*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms. "Nel dibattito seguito al cosiddetto Ontological Turn della filosofia analitica contemporanea un posto di assoluto rilievo ha avuto, e continua ad avere, l'ipotesi di distinguere l'ambito dell'ontologia da quello della metafisica. Si tratta solo dell'ultima insorgenza di un dibattito epistemologico che ha conosciuto più riprese nel corso dei secoli, in contesti anche molto differenti tra loro. A livello strettamente terminologico, la prima distinzione dell'ontologia dalla metafisica si registra all'inizio del XVII secolo, all'interno della Schulmetaphysik riformata, in particolare calvinista. È in quell'ambito che un autorre come Rudolph Göckel (lat. Goclenius) potè intestarsi una simile operazione a seguito delle istanze scaturite dall'“importazione” dei modelli metafisici dell'aristotelismo gesuita (in particolare di Benet Perera, più che di Francisco Suárez) nella Germania protestante. Erano trascorsi quasi ottant'anni dall'interdetto pronunciato da Lutero contro la metafisica e le sue pretese epistemologiche. Il “ritomo” alla metafisica tra i calvinisti coincide pertanto con la nascita dell'ontologia come scienza propriamente detta e con la distinzione di quest'ultima dalla metafisica, intesa perlopiù come teologia: nel corso delle dispute tra riformati e protestanti si affinerà un modello che dominerà il dibattito scolastico in ambito continentale sino agli anni di Kant, determinando profonde conseguenze nel modo di pensare la realtà."


---

**Gabriel Vasquez (Vazquez) (1549-1604)**
Texts


Studies


Diego Mas (Didacus Masius) (1553-1608)

Texts


Studies

1. Bastit, Michel. 2004. "De L'intérêt D'une Lecture Traditionnelle De Saint Thomas: La Question De L'esse Chez Diego Mas." *Revue Thomiste* no. 104:447-468. *Résumé*. On essaie ici de tester sur un texte de Diego Mas la fécondité théorique d'une lecture traditionnelle thomiste, au sens de lecture au sein d'une école. À partir des questions concernant l'ordre de l'existence à la forme et à l'essence, on aperçoit progressivement que la rigoureuse procédure scolastique utilisée par l'auteur du texte reconduit son lecteur à la question elle-même, et le met ainsi en mesure d'être philosophe en acte. En outre cette rigueur permet à une pensée de ce type d'entrer en rapport avec les développements de la philosophie exacte moderne et contemporaine où se manifeste aujourd'hui un regain d'intérêt pour la métaphysique et l'ontologie que l'on aurait tort de négliger."

43:3-92.
Reprinted in: Diego Mas, *Disputación metafísica sobre el ente y sus propiedades* - Edited by Santiago Orrego and Juan Cruz Cruz - Pamplona, EUNSA, 2003, pp. 17-88.


**Cristóbal de los Cobos (1553-1613?)**

**Texts**


(*) De la colección de manuscritos estudiados durante los homenajes centenarios tributados al Doctor Eximio. (Edited by Eleuterio Elorduy).

**Studies**

**Clemens Timpler (1563/4-1624)**

"Within three of his writings, Timpler notes that the study and knowledge of metaphysics is required for the study and knowledge of all other philosophical disciplines. For this reason, Timpler's Metaphysics textbook merits examination here prior to consideration of his other philosophical writings. The basic components of Timpler's Metaphysics textbook can be outlined as follows:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>the principle of contradiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All that is Intelligible</td>
<td>Nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>privation/Negative Something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being/</td>
<td>positive Being/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something</td>
<td>entity (ens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive Something</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quiddity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Timpler considers the subject matter of metaphysics to be everything which is intelligible to human beings; therefore, All that is Intelligible (*omne intelligibile*) is the all-inclusive category within which all component parts of Timpler's metaphysics are subsumed. Timpler divides the category All that is Intelligible into Something (*aliquid*) and Nothing (*nihil*). Each individual intelligible falls within one and only one of these two categories. Timpler asserts that Nothing cannot be perfectly defined. His brief remarks concerning Nothing shall be presented within chapter 15 section 17 and within chapter 20 section 9. Timpler's "Something" (*aliquid*) is equivalent to "Being" (esse; est) in the broadest sense of the latter. Timpler's "Being" can be explained with the use of the following table:
"Being" (understood in its broadest sense) includes A and C yet excludes B. The broadest and most basic distinction made within Timpler's Metaphysics textbook, therefore, is the distinction made between something (i.e., "Being" understood in its broadest sense) and Nothing (i.e., Non-Being). There is no medium between Something and Nothing; any given intelligible object falls into one and only one of these two categories. According to Timpler, these two categories are contradictorily opposed to one another. The principle which states this contradictory opposition--i.e., which states that it is absolutely impossible for an intelligible subject matter to be both Being and Non-Being simultaneously --is the principle of contradiction; Timpler regards this principle to be indemonstrable and absolutely necessary. The principle of contradiction is the most important rule contained within Timpler's Metaphysics textbook; in so far as it comprises All that is Intelligible, it regulates the entire subject matter of that textbook. Timpler also notes that the principle of contradiction is "that primary complex principle which is basic to all of the arts" (i.e., to both the liberal arts and the illiberal arts). It must be emphasized that All that is Intelligible and the Principle of Contradiction (all sub-categories of the former are regulated by means of the latter) are the broadest, most general categories not only of Timpler's Metaphysics textbook, but of all of his other writings as well. These two categories embrace the entirety of Timpler's thought as expressed within his various philosophical writings. The study of metaphysics is basic to the study of all other disciplines partly due to the fact that it directly deals with these two general categories which are basic to every other discipline."

From: Joseph S. Freedman - *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 1988, pp. 210-211 (notes omitted).

**Texts**


**Studies**


---

**Cornelius Martini (1568-1621)**

**Texts**


**Studies**

Bartholomäus Keckermann (1572-1609)

**Texts**


**Studies**


Francisco de Araujo (1580-1664)

**Texts**


**Studies**


Johann Heinrich Alsted (1588-1638)

**Texts**

1. Alsted, Johann Heinrich. 1613. *Metaphysica Tribus Libris Tractata Per Praecepta*
Methodica. Herborn.

   Vol. I Praecognita disciplinarum; II. Philologia; III. Philosophia theoretica; IV.
   Philosophia practica; V. Tres superiores facultates; VI. Artes mechanicae; VII.
   Farragines disciplinarum.
   Reprint of the 1630 edition: Encyclopaedia. Septem tomis distincta - Stuttgart,


   Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz in Kommission.
   Texts edited with introduction and commentary.

Studies


   On Alsted see pp. 100-139.
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