

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

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

[1999 - 2008](#)

[2009 - 2022 \(Current page\)](#)

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

Articles

1. Freedman, Joseph S. 2009. "Necessity, Contingency, Impossibility, Possibility, and Modal Enunciations within the Writings of Clemens Timpler (1563/4-1624)." In *Spätrenaissance-Philosophie in Deutschland 1570-1650. Entwürfe zwischen Humanismus und Konfessionalisierung, okkulten Traditionen und Schulmetaphysik*, edited by Mulsow, Martin, 293-318. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
 "The four modal concepts of necessity, contingency, possibility, and impossibility are examined within Timpler's textbook on metaphysics. Section 8 of Timpler's collection of philosophical exercises is devoted to discussion of necessity and contingency. Timpler's textbook on logic discusses necessary and contingent formal enunciations and also presents brief treatment of the concept of modality itself. In discussing modal concepts and modality Timpler cites a variety of sources. Most frequently cited are Aristotle, Sacred Scripture, "scholastics" (*scholastici*), Franciscus Piccolomineus (1520-1604), Francisco Suárez (1548-1617), and Jacob Zabarella (1533-1589). Timpler's discussions of modal concepts also include citations of other authorities, including Cicero, St. Augustine of Hippo, Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, Averroes, Chrysostomus Javellus, Julius Caesar Scaliger, Benedictus Pererius (c. 1535-1610), Petrus Ramus (1515-1572), and Bartholomew Keckermann (d. 1609). In the case of some of the questions (*quaestiones*) and problems (*problemata*) contained in Timpler's writings pertaining to modal concepts, however, no sources are cited at all.
 With regard to Timpler's citations of sources the following two points should be mentioned. First Timpler may have relied on some authorities more heavily than his infrequent citations of them would suggest. And second, Timpler was usually quite eclectic in his use of such authorities. In many cases for example, when arguing in his textbook on metaphysics that something is possible which nonetheless never was nor will be -- Timpler uses Aristotle in order to support his own view. Yet when arguing that absolute necessity does not conflict with free will, Timpler cites several passages from Aristotle to the contrary; yet Timpler concludes that Aristotle's testimony is not sufficient in this case. In his textbook on metaphysics, Timpler argues that Jacob Zabarella incorrectly defines necessary and contingent things; in doing so, Timpler notes that Zabarella misinterprets Aristotle. On the other hand, Timpler agrees with Zabarella's distinction between that which is possible and that which is absolutely necessary.
 Timpler appears to have regarded himself primarily as a metaphysician, and he makes metaphysics central to his thought. Most of Timpler's views on modality are

- elucidated within his textbook on metaphysics. The most basic ontological components of this latter textbook are diagrammed in Table A1." (pp. 295-296).
2. ———. 2009. "The Godfather of Ontology? Clemens Timpler, "All that is Intelligible", Academic Disciplines during the Late 16th and Early 17th Centuries, and Some Possible Ramifications for the Use of Ontology in our Time." *Quaestio. Yearbook of the History of Metaphysics* no. 9:3-40. Paper read at the International Conference *Origin and Development of Modern Ontology*, held at the Università di Bari (Italy) 15-17 May 2008. "The first known mention of the term ontology (*ontologia*) occurs in a short encyclopedic treatise – within the section therein that examines metaphysics – first published by Jacob Lorhard in the year 1606 (1). Lorhard's discussion of metaphysics – which he equates with ontology – is excerpted directly from a textbook on metaphysics first published by Clemens Timpler in the year 1604 (2). What was (and: is) the significance of this new concept, and what part did the metaphysics of Timpler play in its introduction? This article will endeavor to place possible answers to these questions into the following four broader contexts: 1) the scope of academic disciplines taught during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; 2) concepts that could/should be considered as being ontologically basic/important – and those academic disciplines which discussed them – during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; 3) the emergence of encyclopedic academic writings and the concept of «All that is Intelligible» (*omne intelligibile*) during the early seventeenth century; 4) ontology as understood in the early seventeenth century as well as some potential applications of ontology in our time. This contextual material includes philosophical texts and curricular information with a primary (but not exclusive) focus on Central Europe." (p. 3)
- (1) J. LORHARDUS, *Ogdoas scholastica: continens diagraphen typicam artium: grammatices latinae, grammatices graecae, logices, rhetorices, astronomices, ethices, physices, metaphysices, seu ontologiae*, Apud Georgium Straub, Sangalli 1606 [Halle ULB: Gc 6]. Concerning this work by Jacob Lorhard, refer to the following doctoral dissertation (Department of Philosophy, University of Bari, Italy): M. LAMANNA, *La nascita dell'ontologia. L'opera metafisica di Rudolph Göckel (1547-1628)*, Dipartimento di Filosofia - Università degli Studi di Bari, 2008 [now published: Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2013]. Also refer to the following web site: www.formalontology.it [now moved to www.ontology.co].
- (2) C. TIMPLERUS, *Metaphysicae systema methodicum*, Excudebat Theoph[ilus] Caesar, Steinfurti 1604 [Marburg UB: XIV b 100]. The following additional imprints of this textbook are extant (listed here by place and date of publication): Lich 1604, Hanau 1606, Frankfurt a.M. 1607, Marburg 1607, Hanau 1608, Frankfurt a.M. 1612, Hanau 1612, and Hanau 1616. Timpler's short treatise on the liberal arts (*Technologia*) was included with all of these extant imprints from the year 1606 onwards. In this article, the 1616 imprint will be cited: C. TIMPLERUS, *Metaphysicae systema methodicum [...] in principio accessit eius technologia; hoc est tractatus generalis et utilissimus de natura et differentiis artium liberalium*, Apud Petrum Antonium, Hanoviae 1616 [Freiburg/Br. UB: B 2272 bi]. A full bibliography of all of the imprints of all of Timpler's extant published writings is given in J.S. FREEDMAN, *European Academic Philosophy in the Late Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries: The Life, Significance, and Philosophy of Clemens Timpler, 1563/64-1624*, 2 vols., Olms, Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1988 («Studien und Materialien zur Geschichte der Philosophie», 27), vol. 2, pp. 740-768.
3. ———. 2009. "A Complex and Largely Unstudied Concept: The History of "Scientific Method" during the Early Modern Period and its Relevance for K-12 Education Today." In *2006 -2007 Proceedings of the Society for the Philosophical Study of Education*, edited by Helfer, Jason, 111-126. Bloomington: AuthorHouse. "Scientific method appears to have evolved as a sub-category of the concept of method. Method (*methodus*) began to be discussed as an independent concept -- mostly in writings by Protestant authors -- from about the year 1550 onwards.(3)

Jacobus Zabarella (1533-1589), a professor at the University of Padua, uses the term scientific method (*methodus scientifica*) within his treatise *De methodis*, which appeared in print by no later than the year 1578; it is possible that other sixteenth-century authors mentioned this term as well.(4)

The first known work published specifically on the subject-matter of scientific method appeared in the year 1606.(5) Its author, Joannes Bellarinus, was an Italian, Roman Catholic cleric whose writings -- first published during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth-centuries -- were largely theological in content.(6)" (pp. 111-112)

(2) Tens of thousands of academic writings from the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries (most of which were written in Latin) are extant -- in published and in manuscript form -- at libraries in and beyond Europe. Most of these writings have not been used beyond the eighteenth century. Rare book holdings in European libraries are not completely accessible via online catalogs. Research done in connection with this article included extensive searches for writings on the subject-matter of scientific method; it is possible, however, that additional extant writings on this same subject-matter will be located at some later date.

(3) The first published work -- or one of the first published works -- devoted specifically to the concept of method is Jodocus Willichius, *De methodo omnium artium et disciplinarum informanda opusculum, una cum muftis utilibus et necessarijs exemplis* (Francofordii ad Viadrum: Johannes Eichorn, 1550); I have used the copy owned by the Berlin (Germany) Prussian State Library with the call number A 1573 (nr. 1); the best general survey concerning the concept of method during this period remains Neal Ward Gilbert, *Renaissance Concepts of Method* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960). Also refer to the following two discussions of method: Joseph S. Freedman, "The Diffusion of the Writings of Petrus Ramus in Central Europe, c.1570-c.1630," *Renaissance Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (Spring 1993): 98-152 (107-111); Joseph S. Freedman, "Encyclopedic Philosophical Writings in Central Europe during the High and Late Renaissance (c. 1500 - c. 1700)," *Archiv for Begriffsgeschichte* 37 (1994): 212-256 (221-223, 245-246). These two articles have been reprinted in Joseph S. Freedman, *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700* (Aldershot et al.: Ashgate/Variorum, 1999), IV and V, respectively. Also see Joseph S. Freedman, "A Neglected Treatise on Scientific Method (*methodus scientifica*) published by Joannes Bellarinus (1606)," Jorg Schonert und Friedrich Vollhardt, eds., *Geschichte der Hermeneutik und die Methodik der textinterpretierenden Disziplinen*, *Historia Hermeneutica. Series Studia* 1 (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 2005): 43-82 (43-45, 65-66).

(4)... duae igitur scientificae methodi oriuntur, non plures, nec pauciores, altera per excellentiam demonstrativa methodus dicitur ... altera ... resolutiva nominatur ... ," Jacobus Zabarella, *Opera logica ... affixa praefatio Joannis Ludovici Hawenreuteri ... editio tertia* (Coloniae: Sumptibus Lazari Zetzneri, 1597), reprinted with an edition by Wilhelm Risse (Hildesheim, Georg Olms, 1966), cols. 133-334 (*De methodis libri quatuor*): 230E, The earliest edition of this work that I have been able to locate is Jacobus Zabarella, *Opera logica* (Venetiis: Apud P. Meietum, 1578); I have used the copy owned by the Duke August Library in Wolfenbiittel (Germany) with the call number H: 0 28. 20 Helmst. Concerning the career and writings of Jacobus Zabarella refer to Charles H. Lohr, "Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries: Authors So-Z," *Renaissance Quarterly* 35, no. 2 (Summer 1982): 164-256 (233-242). Concerning the possibility of finding additional discussions of scientific method by sixteenth-century authors refer to footnote 2 above.

(5) This work is cited in footnote 8 below.

(6) Concerning Joannes Bellarinus and his theological writings refer to the writings listed in Freedman, "Bellarinus" (see footnote 3), p. 47.

(8) 8 Joannes Bellarinus, *Praxis scientiarum, seu methodus scientifica practice considerata, ex Aristotele potissimum accepta* (Mediolani: Apud haer. Pontij & Joan. Baptistam Piccaleum impressores archiep., 1606); I have used the copy owned by Saint Louis University (Missouri) Library with the call number 1606.2 Bellarinus.

4. ———. 2010. "Published academic disputations in the context of other information formats utilized primarily in Central Europe (c. 1550-c. 1700)." In *Disputatio 1200-1800. Form, Funktion und Wirkung eines Leitmediums universitärer Wissenskultur*, edited by Gindhart, Marion and Kundert, Ursula, 89-128. Dordrecht: Springer.
- "What is – or: what can be understood to fall under the umbrella of – an academic disputation? An answer to this question can be approached by placing such disputations within the context of other information formats – which could also be referred to in this context as instructional media – that were utilized in academic instruction (held primarily in the German language area of Europe) during the period between 1550 and 1700. (1)
- When comparing disputations to other information formats / instructional media the following two general questions arise: 1. What is meant by – and what is included within the context of – information formats / instructional media? 2. To what extent can and/or should disputations be considered to include (a) published disputations as well as (b) disputations that were held orally but concerning the content of which we have relatively little – or no – written information?
- The constituent parts of academic instruction during this period can be placed within two broad categories: 1. the presentation of accepted knowledge and doctrines falling within subject-matters belonging to the academic curriculum and 2. academic exercises intended to provide students with basic skills pertaining to that curriculum. Accepted knowledge and doctrines normally were orally delivered to students in the form of lectures. Many of these lectures have survived in written form, either as unpublished manuscripts (as lecture manuscripts and as notes taken by students) or in published form (usually as textbooks). (2) Also extant – both in published and unpublished form – are collections of commonplaces, encyclopaedias, lexicons and other book-length writings generally intended to supplement lectures and published textbooks. (3)" (pp. 89-90)
- (1) (...) 1547 is the earliest publication date of any disputation that could be located in the course of research done for this study (and previous studies by this author). Manuscript records of such disputations from the early sixteenth century do exist; two such manuscript collections can be mentioned. Disputations held at the University of Leipzig in partial fulfilment of the Master of Arts degree from 1512 through 1553 are extant at Leipzig UA: Urkundliche Quellen B 066 (1512–1527), B 067 (1527–1539), B 068 (1540–1553). A collection of public and private disputations held at the University of Heidelberg Faculty of Arts during the years 1537 and 1538 is extant in manuscript form: Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana (Vatican Library, Vatican City) Pat. Lat. 201; a film of this collection is available at Saint Louis (Missouri / USA), Vatican Film Library: Film Roll 3638.
- One may ask why there do not appear to be any (or: hardly any) published disputations prior to this date. It could be argued that opposition to intricately organized (i.e., »scholastic«) disputations by some (»humanist«) authors active in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries (e.g., Desiderius Erasmus, Juan Luis Vives) served as a factor here, cf. the relevant discussion given in Ku-ming (Kevin) Chang, *From Oral Disputation to Written Text. The Transformation of the Dissertation in Early Modern Europe*, in: *History of Universities* 19 (2004), pp. 129–187 (159–161, 184). The earliest examples of published disputations found here were published in connection with instruction at the University of Königsberg in the late 1540s (see the first title cited within fn. 36 as well as A. in Table 13). It could also be argued that Jesuit academic institutions played a leading role holding published disputations during the second half of the sixteenth century, cf. the following publications: Ulrich G. Leinsle, *Dilinganae disputationes. Der Lehrinhalt der gedruckten Disputationen an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Dillingen 1555–1648*, Regensburg 2006; Gerhard Stalla, *Bibliographie der Ingolstädter Drucker des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Baden-Baden 1977.
- (2) Refer to the following article: Ann Blair, *Note-Taking as an Art of Transmission*, in: *Critical Inquiry* 31 (2004), pp. 85–107.
- (3) Refer to the following publications (monograph, article, and bibliography): Ann Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought*,

Oxford 1996; reviewed by Joseph S. Freedman in *Scientia poetica* 2 (1998), pp. 222–242; Joseph S. Freedman, *Encyclopedic Philosophical Writings in Central Europe during the High and Late Renaissance (c. 1500 – c. 1700)*, in: *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 37 (1994), pp. 212–256 as reprinted in Joseph S. Freedman, *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500–1700*. Teaching and Texts at European Schools and Universities during the High and Late Renaissance, Aldershot / Brookfield 1999, VI; Giorgio Tonelli, *A short-title list of subject dictionaries of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries as aids to the history of ideas*, London 1971, exp. ed., rev. and annot. by Eugenio Canone, Firenze 2006.

5. ———. 2011. "Religious Confession and Philosophy as Taught at Central European Academic Institutions During the Late 16th and Early 17th Centuries." In *Universität, Religion und Kirchen*, edited by Schwinges, Rainer Christoph, 375-430. Basel: Schwabe.

Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft für Universitäts- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte 11.

"To what extent was there a correlation between religious confession and academic (or: <scholastic>) philosophy - that is, philosophy as taught at academic institutions - in Central Europe during the late 16th and early 17th centuries? (1) The meaning of philosophy during this period will be discussed shortly; the term (religious) confession will be examined later. Here <religious confession> is used to refer to the adherents of those religions generally considered dominant in Central Europe during this period, that is, to Reformed Protestants/Calvinists, Lutherans, and Roman Catholics.(2) (p. 375)

(...)

"While metaphysics appears to have had a distinct place within Roman Catholic philosophical curricula (both Jesuit and non-Jesuit) in Central Europe from the mid-sixteenth century onwards, this seems not to have been the case at Protestant schools until near the end of that century (22). Metaphysics is not mentioned in the 1589 curricular document for the Altdorf Academy summarized in Table D-3 (23). In contradistinction to Ingolstadt and Dillingen curricula (D-1 and D-2), in Altdorf logic and rhetoric were taught within the faculty of philosophy and the arts (α.) as well as within the preparatory grade-levels (classes) 1 and 2 thereto (β.) (24). The philosophy (arts) curriculum published for the University of Freiburg im Breisgau in the year 1593 (D-4) shows some similarities with Protestant as well as with Jesuit philosophy curricula. As in Jesuit curricula, 1. logic, physics, and metaphysics are emphasized within the philosophy curriculum and 2. rhetoric, poetics (often referred to as *humanitas* in Jesuit curricula), and grammar are emphasized - with grammar at the lower level progressing up to rhetoric - at the elementary level. As in many Protestant curricula, logic appeared both within the philosophy curriculum as well as within the lower level curriculum (a. and y. in D-4) (25)." (pp. 381-382)

(1) The term <scholastic philosophy> is not used here because it can be taken to refer to a relatively small number of academic disciplines (e.g., metaphysics and logic) but not to others (e.g., ethics, poetics, rhetoric, and history). For this reason, the term <academic philosophy> - which is intended to have a broader focus - is utilized in its stead.

(2) Here reference can be made also to general surveys of church history such as Karl Heussi, *Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte*, 12th ed. Tübingen 1960, pp. 268-381 (Reformation und Gegenreformation, 1517-1689) as well as Karl B. Bihlmeyer and Hermann Tüchle, *Church History*, translated from the 17th German edition, Vol. 3, *Modern and Recent Times*, Westminster 1966, pp. 1-206 (First-Period, 1517-1648).

(22) In the case of the Jesuit University of Dillingen, however, Ulrich Leinsle questions the importance of metaphysics in the curriculum there: «Die Metaphysik, oft als «Gipfel und Höhepunkt» der gesamten Philosophie gepriesen, fällt durch eine eher bescheidene und nach außen hin fragmentarisch wirkende Behandlung

auf». Ulrich G. Leinsle, *Dilingae disputationes. Der Lehrinhalt der gedruckten Disputationen an der philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Dillingen 1555-1648*, Regensburg 2006, p. 530.

(23) Ordo sive brevis descriptio praelectionum et exercitationum academiae Altorphinae (Altorphii: Apud Christophorum Lochnerum et Johannem Hofmannum typo-graphos academicos, 1589), fol. A4v-B2v, (Philosophicae et artium facultatis), B3v-B4r [Wolfenbüttel HAB: 202 Quodl. (7)]. In this Altdorf Academy curriculum, the philosophy faculty is synonymous with the arts faculty; concerning the gradual renaming of Central European arts faculties as philosophy faculties refer to back to footnote 19. Some authors placed selected arts disciplines at a lower level than selected philosophical disciplines but considered other arts disciplines as part of philosophy; for example, refer to Matthias Flacius, *Opus logicum in organon Aristotelis Stagiritae ... constans libris XIII* (Francoforti: Ex officina typo-graphica Nicolai Bassaei, 1593), pp. 1 and 4 [Wolfenbüttel HAB: O 75a 8° Helmst.]; also refer to the classifications of philosophy and the arts given - in 1610 and 1611, respectively - by Georgius Clainerus SJ as outlined in Joseph S. Freedman, *Aristotle and the Content of Philosophy Instruction at Central European Schools and Universities during the Reformation Era (1500-1650)*, pp. 215, 237.

(24) In the 1589 Altdorf curriculum, the Professor of Latin also taught rhetoric and history, while the Professor of Greek also taught poetics; see Ordo... Altorphinae (footnote 23), fol. B1r.

(25) Refer to Tables D-3, D-6, and D-7 as well as the following article: Joseph S. Freedman, The Diffusion of the Writings of Petrus Ramus in Central Europe, c. 1570-C.1630, in: *Renaissance Quarterly* 46/1 (1993), pp. 98-152; this article has been reprinted in Freedman, *Philosophy and the Arts* (footnote 3): IV. As mentioned earlier (when discussing Tables B-1 through B-4), <philosophy> is understood in the context of this article to include all academic disciplines falling within the domains of theoretical philosophy, practical philosophy, and philology, comprising all of the subject-matters at all levels of the Freiburg Arts Faculty curriculum as summarized in Table D-4.

6. ———. 2012. "Johann Kahl's Collection of Writings on Practical Philosophy (1595) in Context." In *Philosophie der Reformierten*, edited by Frank, Günther and Selderhuis, Herman J., 241-298. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstat: Frommann-Holzboog. PP = Johann Kahl, *Propaideia Practica* (1595).

"Johann Kahl (Joannes Calvinus or Calvus) is best known as an author of legal treatises. (1) His Law Dictionary – first published in 1600 with the title »Lexicon juridicum« – continued to be republished into the second half of the 17th century.

(2)

He also authored two treatises and two orations pertaining largely to practical philosophy, all of which were published in the year 1595. (3) These two treatises and two orations – as well as their relevance for jurisprudence and to Kahl's own commitment to Christianity – serve as the focus of this study." (p. 241)

(...)

"In commenting Kahl's writings on practical philosophy, the following five general Conclusions can be ventured. First, logic and Christianity are both given substantial emphasis – and also are closely interrelated – within Kahl's writings. (111) Kahl specifically emphasizes the importance of logic for all academic disciplines, and notes its particular importance for jurisprudence.(112) Kahl uses logic – as evident of his use of »method« (methodus), »logical analysis« (analysis logica), and other logical

concepts (e.g., causality) – throughout his writings.(113) And Kahl refers to prudence, the arts, intelligence, science, and wisdom as »logical« virtues(s) (virtus logica). (114)"

(...)

"Second, it has already been noted that Clemens Timpler utilized – and may have been the first person to introduce (in the year 1604) – the concept of »morality« (*honestas*); for Timpler, *honestas* is goodness that is normative »in and through

itself« (*in se et per se*) within a specific social environment – as opposed to moral (i.e., universally valid) goodness. (122) Kahl did not make this distinction, yet it would appear that some components thereof can be ascertained within several statements found within his writings. In his discussion of the virtue of beneficence (when considered as a sub-category of virtue), Kahl notes the nothing is more pleasant and more unifying than the »similarity of good morals« (*morum similitudo bonorum*) among family members, citizens, and people (generally speaking). (123) (...)

Third, Kahl appears to place substantial emphasis on the subject-matter of war. (125)

He regards it to be of the highest priority for a commonwealth (*respublica*) to keep intact the right to wage war. (126) In the synopsis (*Synopsis politicae brevissima*) that precedes the text of Kahl's Commentary on Aristotle's »Politics« war and peace is

mentioned within one of his three definitions of the commonwealth. (127)" (...)

"Fourth, one can ascertain an independent outlook within Kahl's philosophical writings. Kahl's use of logical analysis provides him with a mechanism that (for example) he can use to organize commentary on Aristotle and Cicero in an independent manner; this also provides contexts for independent statements and judgments. "

(...)

"And fifth, a number of topics discussed – and positions taken – within Kahl's philosophical writings serve as indications not only of his interest in jurisprudence, but also of the importance of the former for the latter. (132)" (pp. 262-267)

(1) Recent literature that mentions Johann Kahl includes the following [Bibliography, G.]: STROHM: *Calvinismus und Recht* [Calvinismus und Recht. Weltanschaulich-konfessionelle Aspekte im Werk reformierter Juristen in der Frühen Neuzeit, Tübingen 2008 (Spätmittelalter, Humanismus, Reformation. Studies in the Late Middle Ages, Humanism, and the Reformation 42).] as well as the articles authored by MAHLMANN/STROHM and ZWIERLEIN within STROHM/FREEDMAN/SELDERHUIS (Eds.): *Späthumanismus [und reformierte Konfession. Theologie, Jurisprudenz und Philosophie in Heidelberg an der Wende zum 17. Jh. Spätmittelalter und Reformation*, Vol. 31, Tübingen 2006.]

(2) Refer to the editions [Bibliography, D.] published in 1600, 1610, 1611, 1619, 1664, 1665, 1670, 1683, 1734, and 1759.

(3) Refer to the citations of these philosophical writings in Table C; in Bibliography [D.] these writings are also cited along with three philosophical disputations – published in 1599, 1600, and 1602 – in which Kahl is listed as the presider thereof.

(111) Kahl sometimes appears to use the terms »theology/theological« and »religion« as synonymous

with Christianity; for example, see PP 71; 77 (and V. in Table E.) as well as PP, 111 (and IV. in Table F). The importance of both logic and Christianity in Kahl's »Themis Hebraeo-Romana [...] Iurisprudentia Mosaica [...] methodice digesta« (1595) is discussed – with the aid of extensive quotations from that legal treatise – in STROHM: *Calvinismus und Recht* [Bibliography, G.] 136 – 139.

(112) »Dialectica tam necessaria est [...] nedum in Iurisprudentia, inter omnes satis vaga & dispersa, evaserit, nisi forte peculiare ab ipsa natura lumen atque acumen logicum singulari Dei benedictione sortitus fuerit. Atque hinc plures Topica legalia, in usum Iuris studiosorum iam pridem exhibuerunt.« PP, 5. One additional indication of Kahl's emphasis on the importance of logic for jurisprudence is evident from the title of his »Jurisprudentiae Romanae [...] synopsis methodica« (1595) [Bibliography, G.] as well as from the title of his treatise cited in footnote 111 above.

(113) For example, see PP, 2 – 73; 77; 97; 104 ff; 107 f (as quoted in III. C. of Table F); 128; 131(– 147);

168 and II. in Table G; also see PP3, fol.*5 r, lines 1 ff; fol.*5 v, lines 2 – 24, 44 f.

(114) See PP, 111 (and IV. in Table F)

(122) Refer to footnotes 109 and 110, to the corresponding passages in the text of this article, and to Table P.

(123) PP, 136 f. Also see footnote 56 and the corresponding passage in the text of this article.

(125) Kahl, of course, was not alone in discussing war within academic writings during this period; for example, two editions of a treatise on war by Albericus GENTILIS (Alberico Gentili) are cited in E. of the Bibliography. Philosophical writings devoted to – or containing sections on politics normally devoted some attention to the subject-matter of war; refer to the following writings (cited in E. of the Bibliography): FREIGIUS: *Quaestiones oeconomicae et politicae*, 151; HOCKENHAFFEN: *Axiomata disciplinae moralis*, 150 – 153 (nos. 38 – 63); KIRCHNERUS/VELBRUGGEN: *Philosophiae practicae synopsis*, fol. D2 v – D4 r (nos. 160 – 175); TIMPLERUS: *Philosophiae practicae [...] politicam*, 454 – 506.

(126) In this context, Kahl also notes that war should be waged in accordance with the following guide lines: »In respublica autem maxime quoque conservanda sunt iura belli (quod suscipiendum est eam solum ob causam, ut sine iniuria in pace vivatur) nec post victoriam crudeliter tractandi devicti, verum tuendi, ait.« PP, 135 f.

(127) »Respublica vero seu politia est ad populi legitime consociati salutem iuste facta ordinatio: quicumque demum casus, seu pacis, seu belli, incidit.« PP3, fol.*6 r. All three of Kahl's definitions of *respublica* are quoted within footnote 74.

(132) It has already been noted that (i.) Kahl's interest in jurisprudence probably began prior to his return to Heidelberg in 1586 and (ii.) he began to teach jurisprudence and publish legal writings well before he became a professor of jurisprudence in 1605; refer back to footnotes 16 and 17 as well as to the corresponding passages in the text of this article. An introductory section in one of Kahl's treatises on jurisprudence discusses the importance of philosophy (including logic and rhetoric) for the study of jurisprudence: CALVINUS, *De jurisprudentiae Romanae studio recte conformando* (1600) [Bibliography, D.] 1 – 48.

7. ———. 2012. "Johann Heinrich Alsted's, 'Philosophia digne restituta' (1612). Ein kurzer Überblick über Inhalt und Bedeutung des Werkes." *Nassauische Annalen* no. 123.
Johann Heinrich Alsted's *Philosophia digne restituta* (1612): A Brief Overview at Its Contents and Significance.
Wiesbaden: Verein für Nassauische Altertumskunde und Geschichtsforschung.
8. ———. 2012. "Georg Liebler's Textbook on Physics (1561) in the Context of His Academic Career." In *Die Universität Tübingen zwischen Scholastik und Humanismus*, edited by Lorenz, Sönke, Köpf, Ulrich, Freedman, Joseph S. and Bauer, Dieter R., 249-296. Ostfildern: Thorbecke.
Tübingen Bausteine zur Landesgeschichte 20.
"Instruction in the academic discipline of physics during the sixteenth century has received relatively little attention. (1) The textbook on physics first published by Georg Liebler in 1561 – and subsequently republished in expanded form in the year 1573 – appears to have been widely disseminated during the last four decades of the sixteenth century. (2)
The 1561 edition of Liebler's textbook – in the context of his own career and of writings published by his own contemporaries – serves as the focus of the current study." (p. 249)
(...)
"Among the most difficult concepts mentioned within academic writings on physics – and also within other philosophical subject matters – during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is the concept of nature. The terms "nature" (*natura*) and "natural" (*naturalis*) had a wide range of different meanings within individual academic writings during this period; individual authors sometimes did not explain all, some, or any of the ways in which they used these two terms.
In a broadsheet largely devoted to natural philosophy that was published in the year 1557 by Christophorus Mylaeus (Table I), a central distinction is made between

“nature itself” (*natura ipsa*) and *natura altera*. (46) The latter is apparently equivalent (or: roughly equivalent) to human nature; the former – which is not directly defined or described – serves as the subject matter of his broadsheet. However, the terms *natura* and *natural* appear to have been utilized in (at least) eleven additional ways by Mylaeus in this broadsheet (C in Table I). (47)"

(...)

"The following general comments concerning the 1561 edition of Liebler’s textbook on physics can be ventured here. First, Liebler appears to adopt a rather rigid disciplinary approach in his textbook on physics; he appears to avoid discussion of issues and questions that are interdisciplinary in scope.¹²³ Second, he seems constrained by – or at least conscious of – the need to avoid too much discussion of detailed subject matter in his textbook.¹²⁴ And third, it would appear that he sometimes struggles with the task of writing his textbook, which – as mentioned earlier – could be described as not being particularly well organized. (125) Any real or perceived problems with Liebler’s textbook on physics notwithstanding, his textbook was republished – in its original or expanded version – at least ten times following its initial publication in the year 1561. (126) And the expanded version of this textbook – published for the first time in 1573 – may have been the only extant textbook containing extensive commentary on the physics of Petrus Ramus. (127) An examination of this expanded, 1573 version of Liebler’s textbook on physics, however, falls beyond the scope of the present study."

(1) The 1561 edition of Liebler’s textbook on physics (*Epitome philosophiae naturalis*) will be referred to here as Liebler (1561).

This edition of Liebler’s textbook on physics contains two separate paginations. The first pagination comprises the title page, the dedication, and a page of verse; the second pagination (pages 1 through 301) contains the actual text. In citing the text, the appropriate page numbers (without reference to the fact that they are contained within the second pagination) are given.

A copy of this 1561 edition owned by the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek München has been used to prepare the text, footnotes, and tables of this article; a copy hereof owned by the Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen is the source of the four pages from that same work that have been reproduced as illustrations in this article.

Refer to the following literature (cited in full in G of the Bibliography): Des Chene [Dennis. *Physiologia: Natural Philosophy in late Aristotelian and Cartesian Thought*. Ithaca, New York [et alia]: Cornell Univ. Press,] (1996); Freedman, “Professionalization” (2001); Freedman, “Mylaeus” (2008); Grafton and Siriasi [eds., *Natural particulars : nature and the disciplines in Renaissance Europe*. Dibner Institute studies in the history of science and technology. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press,] (1999); Leinsle [Ulrich G. *Dilinganae disputationes. Der Lehrinhalt der gedruckten Disputationen an der Philosophischen Fakultät der Universität Dillingen, 1555–1648*. Jesuitica. Vol. 11. Regensburg: Schnell und Steiner,] (2006).

(2) Refer to a. A.-B. in Table B as well as A. 1.–2. in the Bibliography.

(46) Mylaeus, *Theatrum universitatis rerum* (1557) [Bibliography, F] as cited fully in Freedman, “Mylaeus” [Bibliography, G], p. 245, footnote 29; the relevant texts from this broadsheet are quoted there on pages 302–312. The 1551 edition of Christophorus Mylaeus’s treatise on historiography consists of five “Books” (libri); Book 1 is devoted to *natura ipsa* (which also is the subject matter of his *Theatrum universitatis rerum*). *Natura altera* is the focus of the remaining four Books; Books 2, 3, 4, and 5 discusses *prudencia, principatus, sapientia, and literatura*, respectively. See Mylaeus, *De scribenda universitatis scribendae* (1551) [Bibliography, F]. Concerning *natura altera* also refer to relevant texts as discussed, cited, and quoted in Freedman, “Mylaeus” [Bibliography, G], pp. 245, 282 (Table B), 312 (Table L, nos. 48–51).

(47) Mylaeus, *Theatrum universitatis rerum* (1557) [Bibliography, F] as cited fully in Freedman, “Mylaeus” [Bibliography, G], pp. 268–269, footnote 182.

(125) The following passage would appear to suggest that Liebler felt overwhelmed when attempting to discuss simple natural bodies: “Hactenus de primis et simplicibus naturae corporibus disservimus: nunc ad ea quae ex illis componuntur,

nostra sese convertet oratio: ... Quorum omnium causas brevissime, sequentes vestigia Aristotelis, explicare conabimur." Liebler (1561), p. 253. A very brief, single-page table of contents was included in the 1563 imprint (and all subsequent extant imprints) of Liebler's textbook on physics; a (longer) subject-index accompanied all extant imprints thereof from 1586 onwards; refer to a. in Table B as well as to A. 1.–2. in the Bibliography.

(126) See a. in Table B as well as A. 1.–2. in the Bibliography.

(127) The writings – mainly on logic, rhetoric, grammar, geometry, and arithmetic – of Petrus Ramus and Omer Talon appear to have spread most widely in Central Europe from 1570 onwards; refer to the documentation and discussion given in the following article: Freedman, "The Diffusion of the Writings of Petrus Ramus" [Bibliography, G].

9. ———. 2012. "Philosophy Instruction, the Philosophy Concept, and Philosophy Disputations Published at the University of Ingolstadt, c. 1550 - c. 1650." In *Dichtung - Gelehrsamkeit - Disputationskultur. Festschrift für Hanspeter Marti zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Sdzuj, Reimund B., Seidel, Robert and Zegowitz, Bernd. Köln, Wien, und Weimar: Böhlau.

"In the year 1981, Hanspeter Marti published an article on the value of published philosophical disputations (that is, disputations published in connection with philosophy instruction at academic institutions) for research on topics pertaining to Early Modern European studies. (2) The following year, this article was followed by his publication of an extensive bibliography of philosophical disputations published in Central Europe between the years 1660 and 1750. (3) His bibliography has been widely utilized in the three decades following its publication; in part due to the publication thereof, increased attention has also been accorded to disputations as an important academic genre. (4)

The present study is focused on philosophical disputations published in Ingolstadt – in connection with academic instruction held at the University there – during the hundred-year period between c. 1550 and c. 1650. Here, provisional answers will be given to the following five questions. First, what was the scope of philosophy instruction at the University of Ingolstadt during the period between c. 1550 and c. 1650? Second, how did this scope evolve during that same period? Third, what were those subject-matters falling within the parameters of philosophy, the sciences, and the arts at the University of Ingolstadt during the period? Fourth, what can be said concerning the content of this Ingolstadt philosophy instruction? And fifth, to what extent can published philosophical disputations help provide answers to these first four questions?

One additional, more general question must also be posed here. During the 16th and 17th centuries, which academic subject-matters were generally understood to fall within the parameters of European academic philosophy? An answer can be ventured here on the basis of discussions of this same matter found in literally hundreds of philosophical writings published during these two centuries. (5)" (pp. 316-317)

(2) Marti: *Der wissenschaftsgeschichtliche Dokumentationswert* (1981) as cited in full in the Bibliography [In: *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* 1 (1981): 117–132.]. „Philosophical Disputations“ here refer to philosophical disputations and dissertations published in connection with academic instruction. No attempt will be made here to distinguish between disputations and dissertations; refer to Hanspeter Marti's articles on the same in: *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* (1994) as cited in the Bibliography. [Tübingen: Niemeyer]

(3) Marti: *Philosophische Dissertationen* (1982) as cited in the Bibliography. [*Philosophische Dissertationen deutscher Universitäten 1660–1750. Eine Auswahlbibliographie*, unter Mitarbeit von Karin Marti. München: K.G. Saur, 1982.]

(4) Refer to Freedman: *Published academic disputations in the context of other information formats used primarily in Central Europe (c. 1550–c.1700)* (2010) and Freedman: *Disputations in Europe in the Early Modern Period* (2005); these two

articles were published in volumes (cited here in the Bibliography) that are devoted to the subject-matter of disputations (and dissertations).

(5) Freedman: *Classifications* (1994) discusses classifications of philosophy, the sciences, and the arts during the 16th and the 17th centuries.

10. ———. 2012. "Central European Academic Text on Preaching and Sermons during the Final Quarter of the Seventeenth Century: In the Service of Pietist Preaching?" In *Aus Gottes Wort und eigener Erfahrung gezeiget*, edited by Soboth, Christian and Sträter, Udo, 227-255. Halle: Verlag der Franckeschen Stiftungen. Erfahrung - Glauben, Erkennen, and Gestalten im Pietismus. Beiträge zum III. Internationalem Kongress für Pietismusforschung 2009.
11. ———. 2014. "The History of 'Scientific Method' (*methodus scientifica*) in the Early Modern Period and its Relevance for School-Level and University-Level Instruction in Our Time." In *Renaissance Now! The Value of the Renaissance Past in Contemporary Culture*, edited by Dooley, Brendan. Bern: Peter Lang. "Francis Bacon (1561-1626) is often associated with the concept of scientific method (*methodus scientifica*); however, it cannot be documented that he directly refers to it within his writings. (1) Yet it does appear that this concept began to be mentioned and discussed no later than during Bacon's lifetime. (2) Scientific method was discussed by what appears to have been a relatively small number of authors during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. (3) Yet these early discussions of this concept are relevant to present day debates concerning the utilization of the scientific method when placed in the context of academic instruction at the school - and university - levels. Scientific method appears to have its origin as a sub-category of the concept of method. Method [*methodus*] apparently began to be discussed as an independent concept from about the year 1550 onwards. (4) Textbooks on logic frequently (if not usually) contained a chapter or a section on method; monographic treatises and disputations devoted to this same concept are also extant. Method was often considered to have (at least) the two basic sub-categories of synthetic method and analytic method. The concept of scientific method itself is mentioned no later than in the year 1578, when Jacob Zabarella briefly discusses it within his published treatise on method [*De methodis*]. (7) According to Zabarella, scientific method has two component parts, one of which is 'synthetic' [*demonstrativa*] and the other 'analytic' [*resolutiva*]. It is possible that other sixteenth-century authors - prior to, in, or after the year 1578 - utilized this concept as well. (9) The first known work published specifically on the subject-matter of scientific method appeared in the year 1606. Its author, Joannes Bellarinus, was an Italian, Roman Catholic cleric whose writings - first published during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries - were largely theological in content. (10) He published a large work which included a compilation of Tridentine doctrine and Roman Catholic catechism; that work apparently was first published in 1607 and went through at least twelve editions, including one from the year 1877. His treatise on scientific method, on the other hand, appears to only have been republished once (in 1630); very few copies of the 1606 edition of this treatise appear to have survived. (11) Bellarinus's treatise on scientific method, which was first published in Milan in 1606, has the following title: *Praxis scientiarum, seu methodus scientifica practicae considerata. Ex Aristotele potissimum accepta*. It consists of a dedication, a detailed table of contents, a short index, and the text. The text consists of an introduction and four 'Books' [*libri*]. In the introduction, Bellarinus equates scientific method [*methodus scientifica*] with the practice of the sciences [*praxis scientiarum*]. (13)" (pp. 287-292?) (...)
- "One can conclude by making the following two general points. First, the scientific method can be utilized in elementary level instruction in order to teach logical ways of solving problems, analytical / critical thinking, and deductive reasoning, that is,

general skills that transcend (natural) science instruction proper. Analogously late 16th-, 17th- and 18th-century discussions of scientific method are closely linked to the domain of logic.

They also focus on 'science' [*scientia*] insofar as science is understood to comprise a wide range of academic disciplines beyond [natural] science. (101)

One could make the case that the manner in which scientific method has often been utilized in instruction at the elementary school level over the past twenty-five years has its historical precedents dating back to the earliest known published discussions of this concept.

And second, while one might argue that logical thinking and deductive reasoning - both of which can be linked to the scientific method - do not themselves directly result in discovery; they also are not without relevance thereto.

Louis Pasteur's assertion, 'Chance only Favours the Prepared Mind' summarizes this point. Many of our simple, routine tasks - which we sometimes do so regularly that we are no longer conscious of them - are actions informed in great part by logic, thereby providing basic parameters for our more complex undertakings. We generally utilize methods - some of which we may or may not regard (or label) as scientific - in order to increase our chances of making discoveries and/or reaching other goals.

In the context of research, we endeavour to employ rational strategies for what we might refer to when we use constructs such as 'the systematic search for chance finds.'" (pp. 314-316; some notes omitted)

(1) While Chapter 2. of Book 6 of Bacon's *De dignitate & augmentis scientiarum* is devoted to the subject-matter of method, he does not mention scientific method as such; see Francis Bacon, *Opera Francisci Baronis de Verulamio [... tomus primus: qui continet de dignitate & augmentis scientiarum libros IX*. (Londini [London]: In officina Joannis Haviland, 1623) [hereafter Bacon (1623)], 284-92.

(...)

At the beginning (135) of Book 3 Chapter 1 of that same work, Bacon divides 'science' [*scientia*] into theology and philosophy; the latter is divided into natural theology [*numen*], natural philosophy [*natura*], and the study of man [*homo*], which includes a range of additional subject-matters beyond theology and natural philosophy; also see pages 141, 144, 145, and 181-2 with regard to Bacon's classification of the subject matters falling within the (broad) scope of science.

(2) Scientific method is apparently not mentioned in any of the three works by Francis Bacon - *The Two Books of Francis Bacon. On the proficence and advancement of learning, divine and humane* (London: Printed [by Thomas Purfott and Thomas Creede] for Henrie Tomes, 1605.) [hereafter Bacon (1605)], Francis Bacon [=Franciscus de Verulamio], *Instauratio magna*. (Pars secunda, Novum organum.) Apud Joannem Billium typographum regium, 1620. [Oxford, Bodleian Library: Arch. A. c. 5] [hereafter Bacon (1620)], and Bacon (1623) - cited in fn. 1. But here the following point must be noted. The subject-matter of the present study limits itself to those writings where 'scientific method' - and its Latin-language equivalent, *methodus scientifica* - are specifically mentioned. One could argue that a discussion of the history of the scientific method should not be so limited. In that case, however, one would need to find a viable and defensible way of deciding what does and does not fall within the framework of scientific method over a given extended period of time.

(3) This assertion is to be understood with respect to the tens of thousands of academic writings from the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries (almost all of which were written in Latin) that are extant - in published and in manuscript form - at libraries in and beyond Europe. The overwhelming majority of these writings have not been utilized beyond the eighteenth century (or earlier).

(4) The first published work - or one of the first published works - devoted specifically to the concept of method is Jodocus Willichius, *De methodo omnium artium et disciplinarum informanda opusculum, una cum multis utilibus et necessarijs exemplis*. Francofordii ad Viadrum [Frankfurt/Oder]: Johannes Eichorn, 1550. Berlin SB: A 1573 (nr. 1) [hereafter Willichius, *De methodo* (1550)]. The best

general survey concerning the concept of method during this period remains Neal Ward Gilbert, *Renaissance Concepts of Method* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960). Also refer to the following two discussions of method: Joseph S. Freedman, 'The Diffusion of the Writings of Petrus Ramus in Central Europe, c.1570 - c.1630' *Renaissance Quarterly* 46, no. I (Spring 1993), 98-152: 107-11; Joseph S. Freedman, 'Encyclopedic Philosophical Writings in Central Europe during the High and Late Renaissance (c. 1500-c.1700)', *Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte* 37 (1994), 212-56, 221-3, 245-6. These two articles have been reprinted in Joseph S. Freedman, *Philosophy and the Arts in Central Europe, 1500-1700 Variorum Collected Studies Series, CS626* (Aldershot, UK and Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Variorum, 1999), IV and V, respectively.

(7) See Jacobus Zabarella, *Opera logica*. (Venetiis [Venice]: Apud P. Meietum, 1578) [hereafter Zabarella (1578)]; here the 1597 edition of Zabarella's *Opera Logica* (as reprinted in 1966) has been used; see id., *Opera logica [...] affixa praefatio Joannis Ludovici Hawenreuteri [...] editio tertia*. (Coloniae [Cologne]: Sumptibus Lazari Zetzneri, 1597; reprinted with an edition by Wilhelm Risse. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1966), [hereafter Zabarella (1597)]. It is possible that Zabarella utilized this term elsewhere in a work (in printed or manuscript form) prior to the year 1578.

(9) Refer to the point made in footnote 3.

(10) Joannes Bellarinus's treatise on scientific method is discussed in detail - together with brief discussion of his theological writings - in the following article: Joseph S. Freedman, 'A Neglected Treatise on Scientific Method (methodus scientifica) published by Joannes Bellarinus (1606)' Jorg Schönert und Friedrich Vollhardt, eds., *Geschichte der Hermeneutik und die Methodik der textinterpretieren den Disziplinen*, *Historia Hermeneutica. Series Studia 1* (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 2005), 43-82: 43-5, 65-6.

(11) The only copy of Bellarinus published in 1630 that I have located to date is Joannes Bellarinus, *Speculum humanae atque divinae sapientiae, seu Praxis scientiarum et methodus scientifica*. (Mediolani [Milan]: Apud haeredes P. Pontii, 1630) [Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale: Z 11253]. Concerning extant copies of the 1606 edition, refer to Freedman, 'Bellarinus' (fn. 10), 43.

(13) Bellarinus (1606), 3 (Num. 4).

(101) Bellarinus uses the term *scientia* to mean 'knowledge' as well as to mean 'science: In the latter sense, *scientia* is not identified with what would be referred to as natural science in the United States today. During the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, *scientia* usually denotes a wider or narrower range of academic disciplines (or is understood more broadly to mean 'knowledge'); refer to the following: Freedman, 'Bellarinus' (fn. 10), 46 (fn. 8), 48, 69; Joseph S. Freedman, 'Classifications of Philosophy, the Arts, and the Sciences in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe' *The Modern Schoolman*, vol. 72, no. 1 (November 1994), 37-65 and reprinted in Freedman, *Philosophy and the Arts* (fn. 4), VII; Giorgio Tonelli, 'The Problem of the Classification of the Sciences in Kant's Time' *Rivista critica di storia della filosofia* 30 (1975), 243-95. Concerning Francis Bacon's use of the term *scientia* refer to footnote 2 in this article.

12. ———. 2016. "The Three Operations of the Mind (tres operationes mentis) and the *Compendium logisticae* by Erhard Weigel, Bonde Humerus, and Albertus Wahler (1691/1706) - An Overview, Discussion, Some Contextual Information, and a Brief Assessment." In *Erhard Weigel (1625–1699) und seine Schüler. Beiträge des 7. Erhard-Weigel-Kolloquiums 2014*, edited by Habermann, Katharina and Herbst, Klaus-Dieter, 143-171. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.
 "In the year 1691, a treatise – ostensibly on arithmetic (*logistica*) – was published by Erhard Weigel and two of his students: Bonde Humerus and Albertus Wahler.(2) But it also contains a lengthy “preface” (prooemium) devoted to discussion of the three operations of the mind. This preface – together with related content added elsewhere in this treatise – places arithmetic (and mathematics generally) in broader contexts that are worthy of examination." (p. 143)

(...)

"In the Preface to the *Compendium logisticae*, this discussion of the three operations of the mind in the realm of logica is followed by discussion – summarized in [A] of Table E (cf. page 159) – of these same three operations within the framework of logistica.¹⁶ The first operation (*simpliciter*) is either (α) a “unity” (*unum*) that is complete by virtue of itself (*totum pro se*) or (β) a unity that is linked with “another” (*altero*) or “others” (*alteris*) while nonetheless remaining whole.

(17)

The second operation (*combinare*) corresponds to the subject matter – including addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division – of arithmetic; the latter falls within the parameters of logistica.⁽¹⁸⁾

The third operation (*Combinato combinare seu proportionaliter*) applies logistica to much broader contexts: to [a] physics, [b] civil society and government, and [c] poetry and orations.⁽¹⁹⁾ Considered within the realm of logistica, these three operations are also regarded as applicable not only to arithmetic and algebra, but also to geometry, to the remaining mathematics disciplines, to theoretical philosophy, to practical philosophy, and – generally speaking – to the world at large.

(20)" (p. 145)

(2) While research focusing specifically on Bonde Humerus and Albertus Wahler has not been undertaken, the following publication can be cited here: *Humerus and Jacobi, Stemma Sueonum in Coelo Heraldico* (1691).

(17) *Compendium logisticae*, pp.11–12. It would appear here that (within the realm of logistica) propositions can be included within the parameters of the first operation. But this also appears to be the case in at least some late 17th-century publications on logic; refer to fn. 73.

(18) This is clear from the definition of logistica – *Ars computandi numeros* – given at the beginning of the preface (on page 1) of this treatise and in [E] in Table A.

(19) Refer to [A] 3. [a], [b], and [c] in Table E as well as to *Compendium logisticae*, p.14.

(20) *Compendium logisticae*, p.15. Logistica is also directly applicable to ethics, which is referred to, cf. [C] of Table E and *Compendium logisticae*, p.19, as aretologica, a term that clearly links the two. A discussion by Erhard Weigel of individual mathematical disciplines is presented in *Weigelius: Idea matheseos universae*. (1669), pp. 33–68 (Caput VII–XXI), 69–84 (Mathematische Kunst=“Übungen”). That Weigel applies arithmetic broadly to practical philosophy and civil life is can also be deduced from the full titles of Weigel: *Methodi novantiquae . . . collegio . . . arithmetico-morali . . .* (1673) and Weigel: *Arithmetische Beschreibung der Moral=Weißheit*. (1674).

(73) During the second half of the 17th century, the first operation of the mind, as discussed in (at least some) writings on logic devoted to one or more of the three operations – was understood in such a manner that propositions could be included within the scope of simple apprehension.

If so, then *cogito, ergo sum*, a proposition, could be said to fall within the scope of the first operation of the mind. (...)"

13. ———. 2016. "Introduction: The Period Around 1670. Some Questions to Consider." In *Die Zeit um 1670: Eine Wende in der europäischen Geschichte und Kultur?*, edited by Freedman, Joseph S., 7-73. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
14. ———. 2016. "The Transition (Übergang) of the Great Chain of Being as Reflected in 16th-Century Writings on Philosophy and the Arts." *Wolfenbütteler Renaissance-Mitteilungen* no. 37:39-76.
15. ———. 2017. "The ‘Unexpected’ in the Context of Philosophy and the Arts as Taught at 16th- and 17th-Century Academic Institutions." In *You Were No Expected To Do This: On th Dynamics of Production*, edited by Blanga-Gubbay, Daniel and Ruchaud, Elisabeth, 95-110. Düsseldorf: Düsseldorf University Press.
16. ———. 2018. "All You Need is Love? Emotion (Gefühl) and Norm in the Synopsis (*Tabulae synopticae* : 1728) of Philosophical Writings by Johann Franz Buddeus

(1667–1729)." *Pietismus und Neuzeit* no. 44:13-30.

"Johann Franz Buddeus (1667-1729) was Professor of Practical Philosophy and Morals at the University of Halle (1693-1705), where he taught not only Practical Philosophy but also (beginning no later than the 1698-1699 academic year) a much broader range of philosophy subject-matters. Among his writings published during the year 1703 in connection with his academic instruction was a three-volume series on philosophy (Instrumental Philosophy, Theoretical Philosophy, and Practical Philosophy) intended to provide a comprehensive survey of philosophy as a whole.

(1) A detailed and very useful Synopsis thereof in outline format - containing a supporting preface by Buddeus - was published by Johannes Jacobus Schatzius in the year 1728 (2). Here the concepts of emotion (*Gefühl*) and norm as presented by Schatzius within is Synopsis of Buddeus's philosophy will be examined." (p. 13)

(1) The Practical Philosophy of Buddeus was first published in 1697: *Joh[annes] Franciscus Buddeus : Elementa philosophiae practicae quibus ethica, jurisprudentis naturalis, jurisprudentia gentium, et politica, tum generalis, tum specialis succincte traduntur, in usum praelectionum academicarum edita. Halle Magdeburgicae: Sumptibus Johann. Frid. Zeidlciri, 1697. [Berlin, Staatsbibliothek: Np 3252].*

Buddeus's *Philosophia Instrumentalis* and his *Philosophia theoretica* were first published in 1703 and are cited (together with the 1703 edition of the Practical Philosophy which serves as the third volume of that three-volume series) in note 6.

(2) *Tabulae Synopticae Philosophiae D. Johannis Francisci Buddei eclecticicae in usum studiosae juventutis adornatae et cum praefatione ipsius celeberrimi auctoris editae a M. Johanne Jacobo Schatzio Argentiniensi & p. t. illustris gymnasii Isenachensis Directore & Bibliothecario. Budingae: Typis & impensis Job. Frider. Regelin, 1728. [Dresden, Staats-, Landes-, und Universitätsbibliothek: Phil.A.93.s]* Buddeus's supportive preface is found on fol. a2r-a2v. Concerning the life and career of Johann Jakob Schatz (1691—1760), who was Rector at a Gymnasium illustre in Eisenach from 1728 until 1738, refer to CERL (www.dat.cerl.org/ last accessed on 22 March 2019). No additional biographical research concerning him has been undertaken. Here this Synopsis by Schatz will be referred to in subsequent notes as Buddeus-Schatzius (1728). Here the use of italics in the Synopsis is reflected each time that italics are used within individual notes.

(6) *Joh[annes] Franciscus Buddeus : Elementa philosophiae Instrumentalis seu institutionum philosophiae eclecticicae tomus primus. Halae Saxonum: Typis et impensis Orphanotrophii Glaucha-Halensis, 1703. [Halle ULB: Fa 2008 ({}), Johannes Franciscus Buddens: Elementa philosophiae theoreticae seu institutionum philosophiae eclecticicae tomus secundus. Halae Saxonum: Typis et impensis Orphanotrophii Glaucha-Halensis, 1703. [Regensburg, Staatliche Bibliothek: Philos. 818], Joh[annes] Franciscus Buddeus : Elementa philosophiae practicae seu institutionum philosophiae eclecticicae tomus tertius. Halae Magdeburgicae: Apud Joh. Fridericum Zeitlerum, 1703. [München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek: Ph.u.67-3]*

17. ———. 2020. "Footnotes (as Annotations) in Historical Context and Their Relevance for Digital Humanities in Our Time." In *Annotations in Scholarly Editions and Research*, edited by Nantke, Julia and Schlupkothen, Frederik, 109-129. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Abstract: "This chapter focuses on early uses of footnotes (as one category of annotations) in Central Europe during the second half of the seventeenth century. Attention is also accorded to what can be regarded as an institutional context for these early footnotes: the precursors of the Humanities (mainly: Ancient Languages and Literatures) as well as the roles of academic disciplines and interdisciplinarity at Central European academic institutions during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. That institutional context is used to call attention to issues pertaining to (inter-)disciplinarity in our time and the relevance of these issues to collaboration between colleagues in the Humanities and the Digital Humanities. Mentioned is the possibility that innovative uses of footnotes (often along with other forms of

annotations) during the late seventeenth century by little known authors might serve as a catalyst for innovation in the Digital Humanities."

18. ———. 2020. "The literary production of philosophy professors 16th- and 17th-century Central Europe: a brief overview." *Acta Universitatis Carolinae* no. 40:209-217.
Abstract: "The submitted study deals with various types of works written by 16th- and 17th-century Central European philosophy professors. Their intensive production is examined with the use of the following nine categories: 1. lectures, 2. disputations, 3. academic exercises, 4. polemical writings, 5. translations, 6. editions of ancient and post-ancient writings, 7. monographs, including commentaries, 8. auxiliary writings, and 9. other kinds of writings. These categories form the basis of further content analysis."
19. ———. 2021. "The Origin and Evolution of the *ius archivi* concept in Early Modern Central Europe." *Archivalische Zeitschrift* no. 97:15-52.
"One can venture to assume that individuals responsible for the management of archival information from ancient times onwards have theorized concerning issues pertaining thereto. However, our historical knowledge of archival theory – theorizing about archives and/or information that is found in archives – is best based on extant written records. Archival theory during the ancient and medieval periods is not accorded direct discussion here.² However, relevant in the present context are the following two points. First, some medieval European jurists discussed the legal validity of documents located in archives. And second, many of those medieval discussions are cited or mentioned within legal writings published in Central Europe – regarded here as roughly corresponding to Holy Roman Empire – during the 16th century and thereafter. Here the principal focus is on discussions concerning archives – archival theory – within Central European writings published from the year 1597 up to the end of the Holy Roman Empire in the year 1806. From the 16th through the first half of the 18th centuries discussions and mentions of archives were found in Latin-language, Central European publications on jurisprudence. This includes (usually brief) entries on archives in published lexicons on jurisprudence; archives are mentioned there using a variety of terms, including *archivum*, *chartophylacium*, *grammatophylacium*, *scrinium*, *tabularia*, and *tablina*. Archives are also mentioned in 16th-, 17th-, and early 18th century Latin language editions of the Justinian civil law corpus." (pp. 15-16, notes omitted)
20. ———. 2021. "The Good Arts, the Bad Arts, and Nature According to Georg Stengel (1584-1651)." In *Early Modern Disputations and Dissertations in an Interdisciplinary and European Context*, edited by Friedenthal, Meelis, Marti, Hanspeter and Seidel, Robert, 397-422. Leiden: Brill.
Summary: "Georg Stengel (1584–1651) is best known for his work as a theologian and a dramatist. But worthy of attention here are the contents of disputations over which he presided as a professor of philosophy at the University of Dillingen from 1614 to 1617. Stengel's biography is briefly presented along with some additional documentation (mostly through the year 1617) in large part on the basis of manuscript sources. While at the University of Dillingen he presided over nine disputations containing seven distinct texts. The first of these nine disputations, *On Good or Bad Syllogisms* (1616) was republished in greatly expanded form (as two volumes) in 1618, 1623, 1649, and 1662. Each of the remaining disputations focus on the arts (*ars*), on nature (*natura*), or on both. And in all of these individual disputations, the arts, the effects of nature, and syllogisms all are either good or bad. In these disputations, however, that which is "bad" might best be described as that which is not good in a number of different ways. Here special attention is accorded to the disputation *On the Good Arts in General* (1616), which focuses on nature as well as on the arts. The distinction is made there between 1. the liberal arts and 2. those arts that pertain to the use of the body. But

the numerous examples of individual arts presented within this disputation all can be referred to as corporeal arts. Nature is understood there to have two meanings: (1) The ordinary course of nature and (2) physical causality (physics). It is noted that physics results in knowledge (scientia) while the arts do not. But is emphasized that while the arts require nature, they also perfect nature. Discussed here – as well as in the disputations *On the Good Arts in Particular* and *On the Bad Arts* – are ways in which the arts can be misused. But in *On the Good Arts in General* it is also noted is that the (good) arts, with their focus on experience, induction, and singulars, connect to occult forces and can also participate in divinity. In the concluding phrase to this disputation, God (while not directly mentioned) is said to be “the first and highest artisan” (*primus et summus artifex*).”

21. ———. 2022. "Keckermann, Bartholomaeus." In *Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy* , edited by Sgarbi, Marco, 1784-1787. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. Abstract: "Bartholomaeus Keckermann (d. 1609) was a Reformed Protestant who taught at the University of Heidelberg and thereafter at the Gymnasium Athenaeum in Danzig (Gdańsk). Innovative was the publication of his writings on logic in multiple formats and his use of the concept of the systematic textbook (*systema*). Although he did not publish an encyclopedia, his publications cover a very wide range of subject matters; most of his monograph-length publications are included within two separate two-volume collections (1613 and 1614) of his publications as well as a separate collection (1617) of his publications falling within the parameters of mathematics. Keckermann’s writings were widely read for many decades after his death."
22. ———. 2022. "Timpler, Clemens." In *Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy* , edited by Sgarbi, Marco, 3263-3266. Cham, Switzerland: Springer. Abstract: "Clemens Timpler (1563/4–1624) was a Reformed Protestant and professor of philosophy at the Gymnasium illustre Arnoldinum in Steinfurt (Westphalia). He was an independent and innovative thinker. His textbook on metaphysics, first published in 1604 and reprinted at least eight times by 1616, was his most influential work. He was best known for his view that All that is Intelligible (omne intelligibile) – and not an entity (ens) – is the subject matter of metaphysics. His influence was hampered in part because virtually none of his contemporaries agreed with his views concerning All that is Intelligible. His writings were cited – both critically and uncritically – during his lifetime and for many decades following his death."
23. Freedman , Joseph S. 2022. "All that is Intelligible, Ontology, and Charts: A Brief Assessment of the Birth of Ontology." *Journal of Knowledge Structures & Systems* no. 3:57-60. Abstract: "In this commentary motivated by Øhrstrøm & Uckelman (2022; this issue), I provide important remarks concerning All that is Intelligible and Ontology - "and how both concepts evolved." "In a departure from prior common consensus, Clemens Timpler asserted - in his treatise on metaphysics (1604) - that All that is Intelligible (and not entity) was the subject-matter of metaphysics. With very few exceptions, his contemporaries {including Rudolph Goclenius the Elder - continued to regard entity as the subject-matter of metaphysics. One exception was Jacob Lorhard, who in 1606 also referred to metaphysics as ontology. Evidence documenting a connection (if any) between Lorhard and Goclenius needs to be presented. It would be best not to closely link Lorhard to Petrus Ramus or to "Ramists." As initially conceived, Timpler's All that is Intelligible as well as Lorhard's adoption thereof as the subject-matter of ontology both appear to have been short lived. In what follows, I draw on Freedman (1988, 1993, 2001, 2009)." (p. 57)
- References
Freedman, J. S. (1988). *European academic philosophy in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries: The life, significance, and philosophy of Clemens*

- Timpler, 1563/64-1624* . 2 vols. Studien und Materialien zur Geschichte der Philosophie, 27. Hildesheim, Zurich, & New York: Georg Olms.
- Freedman, J. S. (1993). The diffusion of the writings of Petrus Ramus in Central Europe, c. 1570-c.1630. *Renaissance Quarterly* , 46 (1), 98-152.
- Freedman, J. S. (2001). Melancthon's opinion of Ramus and the utilization of their writings in Central Europe. In M. Feingold, J. S. Freedman, &W. Rother (eds.), *The influence of Petrus Ramus* (pp. 68-91). Schwabe Philosophica, 1. Basel: Schwabe Verlag.
- Freedman, J. S. (2009). The Godfather of Ontology? Clemens Timpler, "All that is Intelligible," academic disciplines during the late 16th and early 17th centuries, and some possible ramifications for the use of ontology in our time. *Quaestio. Yearbook on the History of Metaphysics*, 9, 3-40.
- Øhrstrøm, P. Uckelman S. L. (2022). Lorhard, Ramus, and Timpler and "The birth of ontology". *Journal of Knowledge Structures & System s*, 3 (2), 48-56.