

Acta Comeniana

29

Archiv pro bádání
o životě a díle
Jana Amose Komenského
LIII
Founded 1910 by Ján Kvačala

International Review
of Comenius Studies
and Early Modern Intellectual History

Internationale Revue
für Studien über J. A. Comenius
und Ideengeschichte der Frühen Neuzeit

This volume appears with financial support
from the Czech Academy of Sciences.

© FILOSOFIA, 2015
nakladatelství Filosofického ústavu AV ČR, v.v.i.

All rights reserved
Printed in the Czech Republic

ISBN 978-80-7007-483-1

ISSN 0231-5955

Contents / Inhalt

ARTICLES / STUDIEN

Sandra BIHLMAIER, <i>Platonism in Humanist Logic Textbooks of the Sixteenth Century: Melancthon, Ramus and the Philippo-Ramists</i>	7
Jan ČÍZEK, <i>Peter Chelčický und Johann Amos Comenius: vom Gedanken der Gewaltfreiheit zum Konzept einer universalen Toleranz</i>	41
Jacques JOSEPH, <i>Henry More: The Spirit of Nature as Imaginatio Dei</i>	61
Radmila PRCHAL PAVLÍČKOVÁ, <i>Konversionserzählungen. Die Darstellung des Glaubenswechsels in lutherischen Leichenpredigten aus dem 16. Jahrhundert</i>	87
Sergio García RODRÍGUEZ, <i>Descartes on Drugs: The Limits of the Cartesian Intervention in Body and Mind</i>	123
Kateřina ŠOLCOVÁ, <i>Johannes Jessenius's Pro vindiciis contra tyrannos Oratio and the Reception of Monarchomachy in the Bohemian Lands</i>	137

REVIEWS / REZENSIONEN

Kamil Boldan, Bořek Neškudla, Petr Voit, <i>The Reception of Antiquity in Bohemian Book Culture from the Beginning of Printing until 1547</i>	
Lucie Storchová, <i>Bohemian School Humanism and its Editorial Practices</i> (Jana KOLÁŘOVÁ)	169
Victor M. Salas – Robert L. Fastiggi (eds.), <i>A Companion to Francisco Suárez</i> , (Andrés L. JAUME)	177
Jan Malura, <i>Meditace a modlitba v literatuře raného novověku</i> (Radmila PRCHAL PAVLÍČKOVÁ)	180
Valentin Weigel – <i>Sämtliche Schriften. Neue Edition, Vol. 10: Vom Ort der Welt. Scholasterium christianum</i> (Martin ŽEMLA)	185
Simon J. G. Burton, <i>The Hallowing of Logic: The Trinitarian Method of Richard Baxter's Methodus Theologiae</i> (Petr PAVLAS)	188
Iva Lelková, <i>Sny o mnohosti světů. Athanasius Kircher (1602-1680), John Wilkins a jejich obraz vesmíru</i> (Daniel ŠPELDA)	191

Olga Fejtová, „ <i>Já pevně věřím a vyznávám...</i> “ <i>Rekatolizace na Novém Městě pražském v době pobělohorské</i>	
Olga Fejtová, „ <i>A tak ne oni nás, ale my je zpravovati máme!</i> “ <i>Jednota bratrská v městech pražských v době předbělohorské a rejstřík členů pražského sboru</i> (Martin NODL)	194
Johann Crüger, <i>Praxis Pietatis Melica. Edition und Dokumentation der Werkgeschichte</i> , hrsg. von Hans-Otto Korth, Wolfgang Miersemann (Jan MALURA)	198
Fletcher DuBois - Hans-Peter Gerstner (eds.), <i>Comenius in Heidelberg: Student in Heidelberg - Lehrer der Menschheit</i> (Iveta MAREŠOVÁ).....	204
Kateřina Šolcová, <i>Comenius im Blick. Der Briefwechsel zwischen Milada Blekastad und Dmitrij Tschizewskij</i> (Jana STEJSKALOVÁ).....	206
 OBITUARIES/ NEKROLOGE	
„ <i>Zur Fülle des Wissens gehört die Menschlichkeit.</i> “ <i>In memoriam Klaus Schaller</i> (V. SCHIFFEROVÁ)	211
<i>In memoriam Radim Palouš</i> (V. SCHIFFEROVÁ).....	221
 Abbreviations / Abkürzungen	231
Contributors / Die Autoren.....	233

Victor M. Salas – Robert L. Fastiggi (eds.), *A Companion to Francisco Suárez*, Leiden – Boston, Brill 2015 (= Brill’s Companions to the Christian Tradition, Vol. 53), 383 pp. ISBN 9789004281585

During recent years we have had vast production of different works in different languages dealing with Suárez’s thought. It is worth mentioning the work of J. F. Courtine, *Suarez et le système de la métaphysique* (Paris 1990), and the short and useful book by Jean-Paul Coujou *Le vocabulaire de Suárez* (Paris 2001). In English we find José Pereira’s book, *Suárez: Between Scholasticism and Modernity* (Milwaukee 2007) and, recently, a companion edited by Benjamin Hill and Henrik Lagerlund, *The Philosophy of Francisco Suárez* (Oxford 2012). Perhaps, in this line, is where we should locate the volume under review. Despite the hegemony of English and French, there are some new studies in Spanish, such as *Suárez y el destino de la metafísica* (Madrid 2013) by Leopoldo Prieto López, and a selection from *Disputaciones metafísicas* (Madrid 2011) edited by León Florido. With the first book we find an exposition of Suarezian metaphysics with some commentaries on his age and his reception, but inside a scholastic background. Concerning the anthology published by Professor Florido, it is clear that we have a useful collection of texts from *Disputationes* and a no less valuable introduction concerning the age and the destiny of Suárez’s philosophy in the Modern Period. It is no less clear that any introduction to Suárez’s philosophy must deal with the context, inheritance and projections of Suarezian thought, his political and legal reflections and, of course, his theological contributions. In this sense, approaching this author is a difficult task, mainly because it requires a combination of sensitivity to historical context and deep theological and scholastic training that allows each element of Suárez’s enormous work to be situated in a comprehensive framework. The book edited by Salas and Fastiggi more or less accomplishes this aim. In fact, there are chapters more sensitive to the contextual aspects, such as the chapter written by Salas and Fastiggi which opens the book. Salas and Fastiggi depict the life trajectory of Suarez as well as some of his influences and projections in the philosophy of the Modern Period, but the historical schema is perhaps quite elementary, so Salas and Fastiggi eliminate some aspects of the interpretation of the significance of his period. In this sense the reflections written by José Ferrater Mora in his article “Suarez and Modern Philosophy” (*Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 14, 1953, 4, pp. 528–547) are, in fact, completely contemporary. That is, Francisco Suárez is a representative of a conservative movement in the Early Modern Period, his philosophy is the philosophy of a university professor, and is elaborated from a Christian point of view. This is clear in his sentence at the beginning of his *Disputationes* when he states that “*nostram philosophiam debere christianam esse, ac divinae Theologiae ministram*” (Disp. Ad lectorem).

This point has historical significance, so it allows us to differentiate between a Suarezian apology and a genuine historico-philosophical work, and on many occasions the reader has the impression of reading a full apology for Suarism in reaction to “liquid Modernity” or Postmodernity, in a word, an anachronistic work that, paradoxically, is somewhat symptomatic of our time.

Despite the carelessness of some of the historiographical reflections that, of course,

could have been eliminated, in the case of some scholars coming from different philosophical traditions, i.e. some of them adherents of the analytical tradition but, unfortunately, with a lack of profound historicism, it is worth emphasising the synthetic view that the book attempts. In fact, we find a chapter by Jean-Paul Cojou devoted to exposing the political thought and legal theory in Suarez and another concerning natural law by Paul Pace. Both studies are relevant and offer views on a not peripheral aspect of Suarez's thought, as the Salamanca School and no less Suarez were scholars in the realms of civil and canonical law. A full understanding of the Suarezian work is only possible after considering the structure of the Spanish academic system in which Suarez develops his activity, and the role of law in it. The book *La Escuela de Salamanca* (Madrid 2000) by Juan Belda is an excellent testimony, and no less the studies *La Escuela de Salamanca. De la monarquía hispánica al Orbe católica* (Madrid 2009) by M. A. Pena, not listed in the general bibliography of the *Companion*. Unfortunately, the Spanish references in this *Companion* are quite old and perhaps follow just certain branch of research, so not only the afore-mentioned books, which falls inside the most strict Catholic orthodoxy, but complete references to the most living tradition in Spanish thought represented by José Ferrater Mora and the Ortega school are missing. The constant references to the works of Elorduy, Hellín or Uscatescu represent only a fraction – the most catholic and conservative – of Spanish scholarly works concerning Suárez's philosophy. To sum up, there are more interesting sources than only the Catholic ones that the *Companion* systematically obliterates. In the study of Suarezian Philosophy an omni-comprehensive view that incorporates not only religious authors, but independent scholars is absolutely necessary.

The topic of soul in Suárez's philosophy was discussed for the first time by the Spanish priest and scholar Salvador Castellote, who prepared a bilingual and critical edition of the Treatise on Soul in 1979. This is a peculiar work in Suarez's thought as the book was composed early in his career, at the beginning of his academic activity, and continued again just before his death. In fact, it was finished by his disciple Alvares. The reflection on soul is important in order to understand the problem of knowledge and the aim of psychology as philosophical discipline. In addition, what is known as the dualist problem inaugurated by Descartes's conception of soul clearly depends on Suárez (see Paul Hoffman "Descartes's Theory of Distinction", *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, Vol. LXIV, No. 1, 2002). In this connection, the book has an excellent contribution by Simo Knuuttilla who deals with a full exposition of the *De Anima* of Suárez. Knuuttilla highlights many different sources which Suarez quoted, including the medical and Neo-Platonic ones – perhaps in the same way that Helen Hattab did in the companion published by Oxford in 2012. In addition, Knuuttilla points out the importance of notions such as "sympathy", or "harmony" in order to explain how vital acts are coordinated by one soul. Furthermore, Knuuttilla explains some aspects of Suarezian psychology such as the theory of active intellect which illuminates the gnoseology of Suarez. It is worth recalling the *sui generis* Thomism exhibited on this point by Suarez – and no less in other metaphysical questions – that embraces the idea that agent intellect does not merely illuminate the phantasm. According to his own interpretation, which differs from Thomism, it is possible to understand single things; Knuuttilla states clearly that "*for Suárez, the intellect forms concepts differently, depending on whether one is considering individuals or their common features with a universal. One thinks about*

individual human beings with concepts that are formed on the basis of the species. These correspond to phantasms that are more concrete than the phantasms that are sufficient for a universal concept." (p. 215). According to Knuuttilla his treatment of the rational soul is perhaps the more dualistic one, as Suarez regards the human intellect as having a lower status in the hierarchy of intellectual beings; that is, there are some intellects completely separate from bodies such as spiritual creatures have. In general, we can state that Suarez remains faithful to Aristotelian and Thomist tradition with some innovations such as certain medical discussions or some Neo-Platonic concepts. In a word, it is a conservative treatise which pays attention to some novelties in order to actualize what is recognized as a given truth.

The book grants considerable importance to metaphysics. Obviously, this topic was Suarez's most important contribution. In this sense, the book offers several chapters devoted to an analysis of the fate of metaphysics and its vicissitudes after Suarez's re-foundation, and other authors centered fully on analyzing some relevant topics. As examples of the first we can mention the chapter by Constantino Exposito, *Suárez and the Baroque Matrix of Modern Thought*; the contribution by John Kronen, *Suárez's Influence on Protestant Scholasticism: The Cases of Hollaz and Turretín*; and, finally, the study presented by Jean-François Courtine on the influence of Suarism in what is called by Courtine "contemporary metaphysics". It is presented in chapter 3, entitled *Suárez, Heidegger and Contemporary Metaphysics*. The book is almost completely lacking references to the influence of Suarez on rationalism or empiricism. It is clear that what is important is to understand Suarez's thought, but no less the history of its influence. One cannot hold Suarez to be significant without mentioning in what sense he was not only a hero of Scholasticism but also to what measure he influences non-scholastic philosophy. An apologetic tone resembling a *defensio fide* has no place in philosophy or history of ideas.

The systematic analysis of some relevant point in metaphysics is well represented in the book. In fact, Rolf Darge, Daniel Novotný, José Pereira, Michael Renemann and Víctor M. Salas have presented excellent studies in a Neo-Scholastic stream that illuminates some obscure points. The problem of analogy is magisterially covered by Salas, who explains the Suarezian solution of the analogy of intrinsic attribution. Furthermore, Salas testifies how Aquinas's analogy is framed in the space of judgment and Scotus's analogy in the space of concepts, hence Aquinas develops an ontological theory while Scotus develops a semantic one. Finally, he assumes that Renaissance Scholasticism is consecrated in a semantic domain and not in a pure metaphysical one concerning analogy. This is fully consistent with the intellectual environment in Salamanca University during Suarez's student years and the influence of Scotism and Nominalism. Suarez involves both streams in his metaphysics: the semantical dimension of Scotus and the metaphysical one from Aquinas and Thomism. The afore-mentioned points are clear after José Barrientos' work "La Escuela de Salamanca: desarrollo y caracteres" (*Ciudad de Dios: Revista Agustiniiana*, Vol. 208, Nos 2-3, 1995, pp. 1041-1079). In short, the Thomism of Salamanca School was an open one, even more in the case of Suarez. Pereira's contribution follows his interesting book of 2007 and points out that the most impressive traits of Suarez's metaphysics are his "*architectonic sense and phenomenal erudition*" (p. 301) which is condensed in his full systematization and creation

of a super-system as an epochal character. Finally, Daniel Novotný offers an interesting essay concerning *entia rationis* focused on the structural analysis of this topic.

To sum up, we can say that the book represents a considerable effort to present Suárez's thought to the academic community. But unfortunately, it lacks a certain historical sense. It does not explain in which sense Suárez is a modern philosopher and not only a mommy or a relic. I would like to conclude with the illustrious ideas of the Spanish thinker José Ferrater Mora concerning Suárez: "*Scholasticism was, undoubtedly, one way of answering the fundamental problems of modern times. Confronted with these times, it adopted an attitude similar to that adopted by Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century. The theologians and philosophers of the Counter-Reformation period, as Windelband states, tried to repeat for the modern epoch the same difficult service that Thomas Aquinas had performed for the Middle Ages. In the same sense in which Thomas Aquinas had absorbed into a great system the Arabic-Aristotelian philosophy, the Spanish theologians and philosophers, and Suárez in particular, confronted the new problems with an energetic absorption of all the philosophical difficulties of the past.*" (J. Ferrater Mora, p. 535).

Andrés L. Jaume (Palma)

**Jan Malura, *Meditace a modlitba v literatuře raného novověku*
[Meditation und Gebet in der Literatur der Frühen Neuzeit],
Ostrava, Ostravská univerzita 2015, 278 S. ISBN 978-80-7464-698-0**

Der an der Universität Ostrava tätige Literaturhistoriker Jan Malura gehört zu den wenigen Wissenschaftlern, die Ende der 1990er Jahre mit der Untersuchung literarischer Gattungen begannen, die der älteren Forschung als Phänomene des Verfalls und Niedergangs oder zumindest als Arbeiten ohne jede künstlerische Ambition galten. Das angebliche Fehlen künstlerischer Qualitäten, aber auch die Verknüpfung dieser Gattungen mit der geistlichen Welt des Menschen der Frühen Neuzeit, mit seinem Glauben, seiner Frömmigkeit und dem Streben nach dem eigenen Seelenheil drängten diese Gattungen an den Rand des wissenschaftlichen Interesses. Als erste bewusste Wahrnehmung darf man vor allem Kalistas Werk *České baroko* (Der böhmische Barock) von 1940 ansehen, in dem eine große Bandbreite marginaler Gattungen einschließlich Predigten, geistlicher Lieder oder Gebete und Meditationen behandelt wurde. Werke der Erbauungsliteratur wurden prinzipiell nicht in den tschechischen literarischen Kanon aufgenommen. Erst seit Ende der 1990er Jahre machten Literaturhistoriker – genannt seien zumindest Miloš Sládek¹ oder Hana Bočková² – auf das Paradox aufmerksam, dass

¹ Miloš SLÁDEK, *Svět je podvodný verbíř aneb výbor z českých jednotlivě vydaných svátečních a příležitostných kázání konce 17. a prvních dvou třetin 18. století* [Die Welt ist ein betrügerischer Werber oder Eine Auswahl aus tschechischen einzeln erschienenen Festtags- und Gelegenheitspredigten vom Ende des 17. und aus den ersten beiden Dritteln des 18. Jahrhunderts], Praha 2005.