

of that social whole may entail the changed application of timeless principles. But the Jesuit commentators might respond that supernatural mysteries in the strict sense are less patient to this sort of revision, inasmuch as they never fit easily into the intellectual horizon of any age. Is Chalcedon's one-person-two-natures any more or less intelligible now than it was in the fifth century? And how could one demonstrate that save by pinpointing the original *sensus* of the dogma—something that, were it possible, would render its transposition into more contemporary conceptualities superfluous anyway? Can “critical contemporaneity” run both ways?

The questions I have raised about whether the Jesuit commentators should be applauded only to the degree to which they anticipate today's *Dogmengeschichte* should not, however, be allowed to obscure the theological virtuosity on display in *Theologie in Umbrüchen*. Without ever losing control of his argument, Knorn surveys, digests, and contextualizes a staggering amount of theological argumentation. He has a knack for recognizing surprising analogies and disanalogies between the post-Tridentine and the post-Vatican II eras in theology. He is to be congratulated for a masterful monograph.

Aaron Pidel, S.J.

Theology Department, Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, Italy
aaron.pidel@marquette.edu

DOI:10.1163/22141332-11040008-13

Rafael Ramis Barceló, *La Segunda Escolástica: Una propuesta de síntesis histórica*. Historia de las Universidades, 78. Madrid: Dykinson, 2024. Pp. 444. Hb, €42.00.

Rafael Ramis Barceló is a history of law professor at the University of the Balearic Islands. He holds a PhD in law from Pompeu Fabra University (Barcelona) and a bachelor's degree in law, philosophy, comparative literature, political science, and sociology, as well as a degree in religious studies. Ramis Barceló is best known for his expertise in the history of Spanish universities, his knowledge about the origins of Modernity, especially in the Hispanic context, and the history of Lulism. He has produced extensive academic work. Such a vast output at his young age tells of a talented scholar who is fully devoted to academic research.

The work presented here is divided into the following sections: *Introduction* (15–26); Ch. 1: *The Historiographical Debate and the Study Proposal* (27–54); Ch. 2: *Precursors to Second Scholasticism* (55–78); Ch. 3: *The First Period*

(1507/1517–1607/1617) (79–168); Ch. 4: *The Second Period* (1607/1617–1665/1670) (169–230); Ch. 5: *The Third Period* (1665/1679–1773) (231–314); *Afterword: From the “Second” to the “Third” Scholasticism* (315–46); *Conclusions* (347–66); *Bibliography* (367–436); *Table of Contents* (437–44).

With this book, the author endeavors to give an account of the “sociological and institutional history” (16) of Second Scholasticism or, in the author’s own words, something perhaps less conceptually refined than a Scholasticism historian might wish for. As a historian of universities, Ramis Barceló “tends to see Scholasticism more as a collection of schools than as a system of important authors,” because “the analysis of university programs and Scholastics courses in academic and conventual settings provides a different perspective of a nature that is more sociological than philosophical or theological” (16). Therefore, this work does not offer an in-depth analysis of prominent Scholastics authors from that period, namely “Cayetano, Javelli, Vitoria, Soto, the *Conimbricenses*, Báñez, Molina, Vázquez, Lessius, Suárez, Mastri, Belluto, Juan de Santo Tomás” (16), or of the main themes or leading schools, such as Thomism, Scotism and the Society of Jesus school of thought. In turn, the book, created to present primary sources explicitly, contains a list of many highly valuable works from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries that were unjustly overlooked by more than a few modern thinkers, when not openly attacked.

Ramis Barceló then proceeds to define the research aim, thereby explaining his understanding of Second Scholasticism. In this regard, he claims to “support the notion of ‘Second Scholasticism’ as being equivalent to ‘Catholic Scholasticism in the Modern Age,’ reserving the idea of ‘Modern Scholasticism’ for an interconfessional perspective, i.e., encompassing not only Catholics but also Calvinists, Lutherans, etc.” (17).

In the company of Grabmann and Giacon, the author embraces a tripartite division of Second Scholasticism, which spans from 1512 to 1773. Ramis asserts in this regard that the first period (1512, Fifth Lateran Council–1617, death of Francisco Suárez) was the most creative phase, during which Scholasticism attempted to provide a response to Humanism and the Reformation. The second period (1607–70) is the span of time in which Second Scholasticism became threatened by new science (that is, the mechanical science of the scientific revolution) and rationalist philosophy, and also by highly intellectual reformed Scholasticism. The third (1670–1773, papal suppression of the Jesuits) is a period of repetition and dispersion after confirming the inability of Scholastic philosophy to stop the progress of empiricist philosophy, experimental science, and historical criticism (18).

Although the work aims to present a sociological history of the Schools capable of proving that “Second Scholasticism is much more than Thomism,” Ramis, however, acknowledges that, essentially, “the debate about Second Scholasticism arose between Thomism and Scotism, seasoned with a splash of nominalism,” knowing that “all Jesuit Scholastics swung between these two extremes” (20).

As regards the first period, in addition to certain Dominican figures influenced by an accommodating form of Thomism with more than a few voluntaristic and nominalist elements (such as Cayetano, Javelli, Vitoria and Soto) and a later generation of Dominicans who advocate a less eclectic form of Thomism (such as Mancio de Corpus Christi, Bartolomé de Medina and Báñez), the greatest amount of attention is focused on Society of Jesus authors like Francisco de Toledo, Fonseca and the *Conimbricenses*, Molina, Bellarmine, Gregorio de Valencia, Gabriel Vázquez and Francisco Suárez. With respect to Suárez, following a very brief biographical description, his two main works are discussed: *Disputationes metaphysicae*, considered “a masterpiece of systematisation of preceding philosophical materials,” and *De legibus*, “the highest expression of legal theology of that time” (133).

Later, addressing moral economics and legal theology, Ramis informs us about Scholastics’ interest during that period in the genre of *De iustitia et iure* (such as those by Soto, Báñez, Molina, Lessius, etc.), *De legibus*, and *De contractibus* treatises. This is a decisive feature shared by all the currents and schools of the time, which shows the extent to which “implicit Scotism” (an expression aptly dubbed by Ramis himself) intellectually dominated the entire Second Scholasticism. Indeed, Scotus’s emphasis on will, freedom, and, above all, human *praxis*, was likely expressed in the typical practical orientation granted to theology and philosophy in that era. This is the decisive feature that distinguishes the Second from the First Scholasticism, thus rendering it the true origin of philosophical Modernity. Also accurate is Ramis’s observation about the interest sparked by the moral doctrine of *restitutio* at that time, from which one of the main lines of reflection about property or ownership stems, following the contemporary expression *omnis restitutio fundatur in dominio*.

A timely and interesting section follows the study of *practical theology*, this time concerning ecclesiology, a highly relevant branch of science at that time, given the regalist ambitions of the absolute monarchies over the church and the growing conciliarism after Avignon, arising from a democratising spirit taken from Marsilius of Padua and William of Ockham and applied to ecclesiastical governance structures, particularly to the pope in relation to the council after the double (and triple) papal obedience had undermined the authority of the Holy See.

Regarding the second period (1607–70), Ramis Barceló states that it represented “the end of the epistemological prevalence of Second Scholasticism in European thought” (169). In that sense, Ramis notes, “the tension between the natural and supernatural realms in Jesuit Scholastics” became particularly relevant. Specifically, Ramis Barceló asserts, “to close the chasm between nature and grace—moving away from both Luther and Calvin, while responding to both, and to the Dominicans—a new solution was needed: Suárez decided to hypothesize about a state of ‘pure nature’ that could make it possible to connect these two seemingly irreconcilable poles” (172).

It is also apt that certain trends are described as being inherent to this second period, including “the crisis of Aristotelian natural philosophy and new science” and “the configuration of a reformed Scholastic theology and philosophy.” As an example of reformed Scholastics, Ramis Barceló presents the work by Abraham Calov entitled *Systema locorum theologicorum* (Wittenberg, 1655). We feel that the information about *Collegii Salmanticensis Fr.[atrum] Discalceatorum Cursus theologicus* (Lyon, 1647), a set of twelve tomes and fourteen volumes, “undoubtedly the most important of those written during this period and probably one of the most relevant in the history of Scholasticism” (191) is particularly interesting. The section on “The Jesuits and their Thomism” also seems to us to be the same. As Ramis states, “the most interesting aspect of this generation [of the Society of Jesus] was the series of individual voices,” which, “following the *Ratio studiorum*, discussed Aristotle and Saint Thomas, but their solutions nearly always differed” (193). These voices included the Jesuits Leonardus Lessius (1554–1623), a professor in Douai and Leuven who was particularly close to Molina; Juan de Salas (1552–1612), professor at the Roman College and other institutions and author of numerous treatises, one in the form of *Disputationes* about Thomas Aquinas’s *prima secundae* (Barcinonae, 1607) and another, a *Tractatus de legibus* (Ludguni, 1611); Martin Becanus (1563–1624), a Flemish controversialist, professor at several universities and author of a *Summa Theologiae Scholasticae* (2 vols., Ludguni, 1620); Pedro Hurtado de Mendoza (1578–1641), professor in Salamanca and author of *Disputationes a summulis ad metaphysicam* (Vallisoleti, 1615); Luis de Torres (1562–1655), professor in Alcalá; Adam Tanner (1572–1632), professor in Munich, Prague, Vienna, and Ingolstadt and author of a *Universa theologia scholastica, speculativa, practica* in four tomes (Ingolstadii, 1626–27); Diego Ruiz de Montoya (1562–1632), professor in Seville and Cordoba who was part of the “Sevillian School,” along with his disciple Diego Granado (1571–1632), an expert in theology of grace with certain ideas later supported and popularised by Leibniz (195); Théophile Raynaud (1587–1663), a famous Jesuit in France in that period, professor in Lyon, where he fought against Bañezism and certain

nominalist trends, and author of a *Theologia naturalis, sive Entis increati et creati, intra supremam abstractionem, ex naturae lumine, investigatio* (Lyon, 1622), clearly inspired by Suárez.

Later, when addressing “Jesuit thinking,” there follows a thorough study of the Jesuits of the era, particularly Juan de Lugo (1583–1660), cardinal and professor at the Roman College and author of *Disputationes Scholasticae et Morales* (Lyon, 1636) and *Disputationes de iustitia et iure* (Ludguni, 1642); Antonio Pérez (1599–1649), the successor of Lugo and promoter of the Augustinian current sponsored by the “Sevillian School,” which defended theological optimism within the Society, with a recognized influence on Leibniz (cf. 219); Rodrigo de Arriaga (1592–1667), a disciple of Juan de Lugo and Hurtado de Mendoza, “from whom he got his nominalist leanings,” as Ramis notes (220), professor at the University of Prague and author of a *Cursus philosophicus* (Antuerpiae, 1632), which was widely known across Europe at that time. Finally, Francisco de Oviedo (1601–51), professor in Alcalá and at the *Colegio Imperial* in Madrid, was the author of a “widely read” *Integer cursus philosophicus ad unum corpus redactus, in summulas, logicam, physicam, de coelo, de generatione, de anima et metaphysicam distributus* (Lyon, 1640) (221), a complete course on philosophy in the manner of the time.

When it comes to the third period (1665–1773), Ramis Barceló, along with Grabmann, asserts that “Second Scholasticism in this period was decadent and epigonic” (231). By that time, secular philosophy was the prevailing trend at diverse Reformed universities, while it had become an unstoppable phenomenon in Catholic countries. Scholastics then faced two, albeit nuanced, options, i.e., to accept modern philosophy, which was tantamount to abandoning Scholasticism, or to condemn it more or less vehemently. Ramis found evidence of both trends—attempts, on the one hand, to combine Scholasticism and secular philosophy with the so-called *philosophia vetero-nova*, and, on the other, a rejection of secular philosophy and perseverance in the old ways of Scholasticism.

Of particular interest in this third period are matters such as the appearance of Suarism; the rise of *philosophia novo-antiqua* in seventeenth-century France, which amounted to an effort to combine Scholasticism and Cartesianism; modern secular ideas received among the so-called *moderni* and eclectic Scholastics starting in the eighteenth century; and the University of Salzburg Thomism as a center of resistance against acceptance of secular philosophy.

The term *Suarism* was generally used to refer to a theological doctrine which, in order to align freedom and grace, offered a moderate interpretation of *scientia media* and denied the physical predetermination of the Dominicans. In France, with royal support for the Jesuits, the doctrine of Suarism became

widespread in their schools. Suárez thus reached the status of *common doctor* of the Society in France. In Spain, during the regency of Queen Mariana and the reign of Charles II, from 1660 to 1670, the Society began to hold certain chairs in Valencia and Alcalá, thus commencing Suárez's absolute recognition in Spain and soon becoming the author to follow by the Jesuits of Alcalá, Salamanca, and nearly the entire Society in Spain.

Also worth mentioning is the *Afterword: From the "Second" to the "Third" Scholasticism*. In this section, following an analysis of the reasons why Second Scholasticism disappeared (the list includes the extinction of the Society of Jesus in 1773, the introduction of illustrated thought, regalism and the predominance of political power and royal interventionism, exhaustion of the philosophy and theology of Second Scholasticism and, finally, the disengagement of the religious orders) and the consequences thereof, a "study proposal" of so-called "Third Scholasticism" is discussed. Following Giacón, who used this expression to refer to Scholasticism in the contemporary era (1773–1965), Ramis also adopts it, with certain caveats, to refer to the period and the vicissitudes experienced by Scholasticism between the papal abolition of the Society of Jesus (1773) and the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council (1965). In this context, the author reserves the term *neo-Scholastic* to refer to the latter phase of this third period, which extends from the *Aeterni Patris* encyclical (1879) by Leo XIII to the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council. Inherent to this neo-Scholasticism, says Ramis, was "the definitive consecration of Saint Thomas" (325). Indeed, "Pope Leo XIII, in his *Aeterni Patris* encyclical, declared that the doctrine of Saint Thomas should be the basis of all Catholic philosophy and theology" (337). In 1880, Leo XIII set up a commission for this purpose, tasked with preparing the critical edition of the works of the Aquinate and his main commentators. It has produced the successive volumes of the current *Leonine Edition*. Finally, this neo-Scholasticism, the final form of Scholasticism, endured into the Second Vatican Council, which, as the author remarks, "did not reject Scholasticism, but did not encourage it either" (344).

With this, we will confirm that the work presented represents a valuable academic contribution that gathers both historiographical criteria and information and primary and secondary bibliographical sources of extraordinary value in the study and scholarly assessment of Second Scholasticism, particularly in relation to modern thought. In addition to these exceptional merits, which I would call intrinsic, this monograph also contains two more extrinsic merits. On the one hand, it justly acknowledges the tremendous work done by the Second Scholasticism theologians and philosophers. On the other, it represents a renewed invitation to study the works of those thinkers who, at the dawn of Modernity, can help us better

understand the orientation and course of modern thought. Therefore, we are delighted with the publication of this book and must congratulate the author for such commendable work.

Leopoldo J. Prieto López

Department of Humanities, Francisco de Vitoria University,
Madrid, Spain

leopoldojose.prieto@ufv.es

DOI:10.1163/22141332-11040008-14

Jonas Nordin, Gustavs Strenga, and Peter Sjökvist, eds., *The Baltic Battle of Books: Formation and Relocation of European Libraries in the Confessional Age (c. 1500–c. 1650) and Their Afterlife*. Library of the Written Word, 116. Leiden: Brill, 2023. Pp. xvi + 350. Hb, \$139.00. Open Access.

This edited volume offers a significant investigation of the transformations and enduring significance of book collections in Northern Europe during the Age of Confessionalization. The collection of essays, despite its original conference being canceled due to the COVID-19 pandemic, provides a comprehensive examination of how religious, political, and military conflicts shaped the fate of libraries, focusing particularly on the impact of the Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and subsequent wars.

One of the volume's key strengths is its focus on multiple centuries and political regions, emphasizing the long-term consequences of the events it discusses. The book is divided into three sections on creating, relocating, and reconstructing libraries. It also engages with contemporary issues such as the restitution of cultural artifacts, the use of digital technologies in reconstructing lost libraries, and the ongoing debates surrounding national identity and cultural heritage.

The introduction, "A Battle of Books through Five Centuries," by the volume's editors, sets the tone for the collection by exploring the unpredictable destinies of book collections over the centuries. The authors investigate the impact of religious conflicts on libraries during the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, highlighting how these upheavals led to the destruction, relocation, and sometimes rapid regeneration of monastic and other significant collections. The chapter also touches on contemporary issues of restitution and ownership, using examples such as the 2011 exchange of manuscripts between Sweden and Denmark. The authors advocate for continued international