

Medical Topics in the *De anima* Commentary of Coimbra (1598) and the Jesuits' Attitude towards Medicine in Education and Natural Philosophy

Christoph Sander

Technische Universität Berlin

c-sander@heimat.de

Abstract

Early-modern Jesuit universities did not offer studies in medicine, and from 1586 onwards, the Jesuit *Ratio studiorum* prohibited digressions on medical topics in the Aristotelian curriculum. However, some sixteenth-century Jesuit text books used in philosophy classes provided detailed accounts on physiological issues such as sense perception and its organic location as discussed in Aristotle's *De anima* II, 7–11. This seeming contradiction needs to be explained. In this paper, I focus on the interest in medical topics manifested in a commentary by the Jesuits of Coimbra. Admittedly, the Coimbra commentary constituted an exception, as the Jesuit college that produced it was integrated in a royal university which had a strong interest in educating physicians. It will be claimed that the exclusion of medicine at Jesuit universities and colleges had its origin in rather incidental events in the course of the foundation of the first Jesuit university in Sicily. There, the lay professors of law and medicine intended to avoid subordination to the Jesuits and thereby provoked a conflict which finally led the Jesuit administration to refrain from including faculties of medicine and law in Jesuit universities. Towards the end of the sixteenth century, a veritable Jesuit animosity towards medicine emerged for philosophical and pedagogical reasons. This development reflects educational concerns within the Society as well as the role of commentaries on Aristotle for early-modern learning.

* The author would like to thank Yannick Beilke, Daniel Heltzel, Colin Guthrie King, Roberto Lo Presti, Anselm Oelze and this journal's editor for their help. The author would also like to thank the journal's anonymous referees.

Keywords

Jesuits – medicine – natural philosophy – anatomy – physiology – Aristotle – psychology – Coimbra – Portugal – university – education

In 1561, Diego de Ledesma, a Jesuit teacher at the Collegio Romano, conducted a survey among his colleagues. The question he asked was: What should be taught in the philosophy course?¹ Officially, this question had already been answered by the educational programme for Jesuit colleges ever since they began teaching young men.² It was mainly the works of Aristotle that were to be taught at the schools. Nonetheless, the fact that the survey was conducted, and the variety of answers it solicited, reflect the fact that there was no general consensus regarding the scope of the topics and questions to which Aristotle's works should lead. Selected works from the *Corpus aristotelicum* served as a starting point for questions which sometimes reconstructed and elucidated obscure or puzzling arguments in the text, sometimes defended Peripatetic positions against other philosophers or, as happened in many cases, delivered further problems and topics which were only loosely connected to the Aristotelian text. Thus, the proposals submitted by those who replied to Ledesma's survey mainly consisted in lists of questions related to works of Aristotle of which it was felt that they should be discussed in class.

The rapidly growing number of Jesuit colleges and universities all over Europe forced Ledesma and the leading staff of the Society of Jesus (SJ) to address the issue of the philosophical contents that were to be taught in the

1 My study is based on documents edited in Ladislaus Lukács (ed.), *Monumenta paedagogica Societatis Iesu*, 7 vols. (Rome, 1965–1992), quoted here as MPSI, followed by volume number and pages. The survey mentioned above consists only of the responses and the conclusions drawn by Ledesma. I rely on MPSI II, 436–479. Lukács introduces the survey as follows: “Ledesma imprimis petiit ut professores Collegii Romani, scribent quid de studiis ordinandis sentirent” (MPSI II, 436). Cf. also Paul Richard Blum, “Der Standardkurs der katholischen Schulphilosophie im 17. Jahrhundert,” in *Aristotelismus und Renaissance: in memoriam Charles B. Schmitt*, ed. Eckhard Kessler, Charles H. Lohr and Walter Sparr (Wiesbaden, 1988), 127–148, here 139.

2 Cf. e.g. George E. Ganss, *Saint Ignatius' Idea of a Jesuit University; A Study in the History of Catholic Education, Including Part Four of the Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* (Milwaukee, 1954), 44–51; John W. O'Malley, “How the First Jesuits Became Involved in Education,” in *The Jesuit Ratio Studiorum: 400th Anniversary Perspectives*, ed. Vincent J. Duminuco (New York, 2000), 56–74. Cf. MPSI I, 299: “In logica et philosophia naturali, et morali et metaphysica, doctrina Aristotelis sequenda est.”

colleges.³ The primary aim was to establish unity among all Jesuit schools.⁴ Eventually, so as to avoid scandals and increase efficiency, they agreed to develop a standard course.⁵ The second objective of their agenda was to render the study of philosophy the best qualification for studying scholastic Catholic theology.⁶ Censorship, lists of prohibited and prescribed opinions, and the *Ratio studiorum* were both side-effects and supporting strategies in pursuing this agenda.⁷

While the strong connection between philosophy and theology is obvious and comparatively well documented, the apparent absence of a connection between natural philosophy and medicine within the educational programme of sixteenth-century Jesuit educational institutions still awaits a convincing explanation. It is usually argued that medicine did not belong to the Society's educational goals as set down by Ignatius of Loyola.⁸ Jos V.M. Welie has tried to answer the question of why Loyola wished to keep the faculties of law and medicine out of Jesuit universities.⁹ He concludes that "medical education was

3 So far, not much has been written on Ledesma. I rely here on John M. Belmonte, *To Give Ornament, Splendor and Perfection: Diego de Ledesma and Sixteenth Century Jesuit Educational Administration* (PhD thesis, Loyola University Chicago, 2006).

4 Evidence of this can be found in MPSI II, 474, where the desire for a "cursus artium commodus [...] pro tota Societate" is also expressed. On the desired unity of doctrine cf. also Paul Richard Blum, "Benedictus Pererius: Renaissance Culture at the Origins of Jesuit Science," *Science & Education*, 15 (2006), 279–304, here 281.

5 Cf. MPSI V, 28* and 105.

6 Cf. below n. 44 and MPSI I, 281 and 283; V, 231, 234 and 279. To be precise, the ultimate goal of Jesuit education consisted in the preparation for pastoral activities: "Wissenschaft und Lehrtätigkeit [sollten] der pastoralen Zielsetzung zu- bzw. untergeordnet sein. Von hierher folgerte sich fast zwingend eine Abstufung der wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen nach ihrer pastoralen Nützlichkeit. Das ‚medium magis proprium‘ zur Erreichung des Ziels stellte danach die ‚facultas theologiae‘ einer Universität dar." Cf. Karl Hengst, *Jesuiten an Universitäten und Jesuitenuniversitäten. Zur Geschichte der Universitäten in der Oberdeutschen und Rheinischen Provinz der Gesellschaft Jesu im Zeitalter der konfessionellen Auseinandersetzung* (Paderborn, 1981), 57.

7 An overview of censorship is given in Marcus Hellyer, "Because the Authority of My Superiors Commands: Censorship, Physics and the German Jesuits," *Early Science and Medicine*, 1 (1996), 319–354. See also the introduction in MSPI V, 1*-9*. A more detailed account can be found in Ugo Baldini, *Legem impone subactis: studi su filosofia e scienza dei Gesuiti in Italia, 1540–1632* (Rome, 1992), 75–94.

8 I will substantiate this claim below. As a starting point for the scope of Jesuit educational institutes in the sixteenth century, cf. Hengst, *Jesuitenuniversitäten*, 57–59.

9 Cf. Jos V. M. Welie, "Ignatius of Loyola on Medical Education: Or, Should Today's Jesuits Continue to Run Health Sciences Schools?," *Early Science and Medicine* 8 (2003), 26–43.

‘more remote’ to the mission of the society only because the ‘education’ of medicine was ‘more remote,’ not health care itself,” so that “medicine [...] could just as well be taught by lay people.”¹⁰ This basic educational agenda seems to be carefully reflected in the first draft of the *Ratio* in 1586 already, where “digressions on anatomy” were forbidden to teachers commenting on *De anima* in their philosophy course.¹¹ Nevertheless, as Michael Edwards has shown, we encounter in printed Jesuit commentaries on *De anima* and other Aristotelian works numerous physiological and anatomical annotations as well as references to a considerable number of Renaissance medical authors.¹² Edwards is well aware of this apparent contradiction between the official educational guidelines and the printed textbooks, but argues that Jesuit authors “did not ‘digress’ in the sense of including long descriptions of the body” as did their Protestant colleagues.¹³

In what follows I will argue that Edwards’s and Welie’s approaches should not only be combined, but also amended, because even when combined, they still lack historical completeness. The focus of this article will not be about what it means for philosophical psychology when physiological or anatomical knowledge is included in commentaries on *De anima*.¹⁴ The question will rather be why such inclusions occur in the first place; the answer will be sought in an exploration of a specific institutional context, which in turn must be viewed before a specific ideological and educational background.¹⁵ As will be shown, certain particular and highly contingent institutional circumstances led to the

10 Welie, “Ignatius of Loyola on Medical Education,” 41.

11 Cf. below n. 44.

12 Cf. especially Michael Edwards, “Digressing with Aristotle: Hieronymus Dandinus’ *De Corpore Animato* (1610) and the Expansion of Late Aristotelian Philosophy,” *Early Science and Medicine* 13 (2008), 127–170; Michael Edwards, “Body, Soul and Anatomy in Late Aristotelian Psychology,” in *Matter and Form in Early Modern Science and Philosophy*, ed. Gideon Manning (Leiden, 2012), 33–76. In contrast to the findings of Edwards (and others), Ugo Baldini claims that the Italian Jesuit commentaries on *De anima* were “quasi del tutto scissi da una base anatomico-fisiologica.” Cf. Baldini, *Legem impone subactis*, 40.

13 Edwards, “Body, Soul and Anatomy,” 66. Edwards only mentions the Jesuit exception of Dandini.

14 My impression is that the terms “anatomy” and “physiology” are both interchangeably subordinated to the more general term “medicine” in the sources I mostly rely on, namely documents from the MPSI. Hence, I do not use them with any greater precision than my sources do.

15 As far as I can see, Edwards does not show why certain institutional needs made Jesuits think about including medical topics in their philosophical commentaries. Welie, “Ignatius of Loyola on Medical Education,” indeed discusses some hypotheses as to why Loyola denies the relevance of medical faculties for the educational framework of Jesuit

order's negative attitude towards medicine and at the same time to a lax and relatively pragmatic flexibility in the implementation of this attitude.¹⁶

A case study of the commentary on *De anima* written and compiled by the Jesuits of Coimbra in the 1580s and printed in 1598 serves as the centerpiece of the current investigation.¹⁷ This selection is justified for four reasons: (1) The composition of the Coimbra commentaries on eight works of Aristotle was originally initiated by the SJ so as to establish a standard course of philosophy for all their schools and colleges.¹⁸ Although the commentaries had not been selected as official textbooks, they were used for teaching also outside of Coimbra, and in fact even at non-Jesuit schools. The eight commentaries published between 1592 and 1607 appeared in 107 editions in many countries and were even partially translated into Chinese.¹⁹ They may without exaggeration be considered the SJ's flagship commentaries on Aristotle in the sixteenth century. (2) In their commentaries the Conimbricenses proceed in a manner that has been labelled "eclectic," that is to say, they quote hundreds of sources.²⁰ In

universities, but he fails to provide detailed information about how this educational design was actually carried out.

16 Cf. Baldini, *Legem impone subactis*, 65, n. 42: "I motivi dell'esclusione [di medicina] richiederebbero un'analisi specifica, qui sarà sufficiente osservare che essa vigeva già prima per ordini religiosi di natura spiccatamente dottrinale, come i domenicani. Naturalmente l'esclusione dall'impianto didattico non implicava quella dall'interesse dei singoli: molti gesuiti ebbero una qualche cultura medica, giustificata anche dalle esigenze missionarie, ed in ogni grande collegio vi fu, tendenzialmente, un erborista-aromatario." Cf. also Hengst, *Jesuitenuniversitäten*, 59: "Obgleich die Ausführungen des Ignatius [zur Verfasstheit einer jesuitischen Universität] durchaus klare Zielvorstellungen bezüglich Inhalt und Methode eines Jesuitenstudiums umrissen, blieb doch in allen einschlägigen Vorschriften der Blick auf das jeweils Mögliche eine maßgebende Leitschnur."

17 I rely on Collegium Conimbricense, *Commentarii Collegii Conimbricensis Societatis Iesu in tres libros De anima Aristotelis* (Coimbra, 1598).

18 See below n. 50.

19 On the impact in China, cf. Qiong Zhang, "Translation as Cultural Reform: Jesuit Scholastic Psychology in the Transformation of the Confucian Discourse on Human Nature," in *The Jesuits: Cultures, Sciences, and the Arts, 1540–1773*, ed. John W. O'Malley (Toronto, 1999), 364–379.

20 Cf. Paul Grendler, "The Conditions of Enquiry: Printing and Censorship," in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles Schmitt et al. (Cambridge, 2007), 25–54, here 39; Charles Schmitt, "Appendices: The Rise of the Philosophical Textbook," in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles Schmitt et al. (Cambridge, 2007), 792–804, here 804. A deeper analysis of "eclecticism" is given in Edwards's articles, cited above. With regard to the *Conimbricenses*, cf. Mário Santiago de Carvalho, "Sulle spalle di Aristotele (Sul non-aristotelismo del primo corso aristotelico dei Gesuiti di Coimbra)," *Lo Sguardo*, 5 (2011), 45–58.

many cases these numerous references do not support any particular argument, but instead serve to enrich the discourse with non-Aristotelian terminology – they point, as it were, to ‘further reading’. As far as our enquiry is concerned, this tendency to name-drop facilitates the search for medical sources significantly. (3) The choice of a commentary on *De anima* furthermore opens up a philosophical field that was of utmost theological relevance for Catholic authors. Since the Fifth Lateran Council in 1513, questions concerning the immortality and corporality of the human soul had remained a very sensitive issue for early-modern psychology.²¹ Hence, Jesuits were particularly sceptical towards physiological approaches to the soul.²² (4) Finally, it is not a trivial fact that the commentaries were composed in the university town of Coimbra. The Jesuit college was in fact integrated into a full-fledged university which stood under royal jurisdiction and included a medical faculty. This very institutional setting triggered some important developments, as I will argue in the following.

My investigation falls into four sections. In a first step, the considerable weight of medical topics and references in the Coimbra commentary on *De anima* will be sketched. The relation of these references to the anti-medical prohibition of the *Ratio* will be addressed next. The third section clarifies the specific institutional setting of the university of Coimbra so as to shed light on the Conimbricenses’ interest in medical topics. The final section will present a hypothetical explanation for why Jesuit universities did not run a medical faculty.

I Gathering of Evidence. Physiology, Anatomy and Medicine in the Coimbra Commentary

The printed Coimbra commentary on *De anima* accompanies the text’s Latin translation by John Argyropoulos (1415–1487), *rector artistarum et medicorum*

21 Cf. Alison J. Simmons, “Jesuit Aristotelian Education: The De Anima Commentaries,” in *The Jesuits*, ed. O’Malley, 523–525; Mário Santiago de Carvalho, “Filosofar na época de Palestrina. Uma introdução à psicologia filosófica dos ‘Comentarios a Aristóteles’ do Colégio das Artes de Coimbra,” *Revista filosófica de Coimbra*, 22 (2002), 389–419, here 394; Sascha Salatowsky, *De Anima: die Rezeption der aristotelischen Psychologie im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert* (Amsterdam, 2006), 146.

22 Cf. e.g. Tuomo Aho, “The Status of Psychology as Understood by Sixteenth-century Scholastics,” in *Psychology and Philosophy: Inquiries into the Soul from Late Scholasticism to Contemporary Thought*, ed. Sara Heinämaa and Martina Reuter (Dordrecht, 2009), 47–66, here 52–55.

of Padua, which was the translation favoured by Italian physicians.²³ The commentary was printed together with a dogmatical treatise on the soul as separated from the body (*Tractatus de anima separata*) and an extensively physiological treatise especially on the five external senses (*Tractatio aliquot problematum ad quinque sensus spectantium*).²⁴ It is noteworthy that these two supplements are each attributed to another author, but as the commentary refers to both of them, the whole volume does not read as a contingent combination, but much rather as a well-considered arrangement that mirrors two approaches to dealing with Aristotelian psychology.²⁵ After all, the study of the soul together with the body was quite a different inquiry from the study of the soul without it.²⁶ The Conimbricenses explicitly denied that the intellect could be explained in physical terms or that the bodily functions could be explained

- 23 Noted, but not commented, by Antonio Manuel Martins, "The Conimbricenses," in *Intellect et imagination dans la philosophie médiévale. Actes du XIe Congrès international de philosophie médiévale de la Société internationale pour l'étude de la philosophie médiévale, S.I.E.P.M., Porto, du 26 au 31 août 2002*, ed. Maria Cândida da Costa Reis Monteiro Pacheco and José Francisco Meirinhos (Turnhout, 2006), vol. 1, 101–117, here 110. Argyropoulos' translation was used e.g. in Agostino Nifo, *Expositio subtilissima nec non et collectanea commentariaque in tres libros Aristotelis De anima* (Venice, 1559); Nicolaus Tignosius, *In libros Aristotelis de anima commentarii* (Florence, 1551); Bassiano Landi, *In tres Aristotelis Libros de Anima* (Venice, 1569). I could find a copy of the translation in the monastery of Santa Cruz (U/Bc Ms 051 fol. 206r–258v), the most important sponsor of the early University of Coimbra, cf. below n. 64. Argyropoulos's translation of the *Physica* had also been used, cf. MPSI IV, 687. On Argyropoulos's influence in Italy, cf. Jozef Matula, "John Argyropoulos and his Importance for Latin West," *Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis, Facultas Philosophica*, 7 (2006), 45–62.
- 24 In their commentary on the *Parva naturalia*, the Conimbricenses reflect on the absence of the commentary on *De sensu et sensato*, which normally was treated among the *Parva naturalia*: "Quod tamen ad libros de sensu et sensili attinet [...] tota ea disputatio abunde tractata, atque illustrata a nobis sit in libris de anima." Collegium Conimbricense, *Commentarii Collegii Conimbricensis Societatis Jesu, in libros Aristotelis, qui Parva naturalia appellantur* (Lyon, 1593), 2. The *Tractatio aliquot* was written by Cosme de Magalhães (1551–1624), the *Tractatus de anima separata* by Alvarez Balthasar (1561–1630). Cf. Jesuê Pinharanda Gomes, *Os Conimbricenses* (Lisbon, 1992), 52, 57 and 75.
- 25 Cf. Collegium Conimbricense, *De anima*, 39, 189, 345 and 544.
- 26 Cf. above n. 22 and Edwards, "Digressing with Aristotle," 140–142. The Conimbricenses reflect these two approaches as follows: "In hac dubitatione dicendum nobis videtur libros De anima bifariam spectari posse. Nimirum vel per se, ac separatim: vel una cum iis, qui Parvorum Naturalium vocantur, qui illorum quasi accessio quaedam sunt. Tum si priori modo spectentur, eorum subiectum esse animam; si posteriori, corpus animatum." Collegium Conimbricense, *De anima*, 4. Also in the beginning of the *Tractatus de anima separata*: "licet enim consideratio eorum, quae ad animam praecise, ut extra corpus est,

through metaphysics.²⁷ The science of the soul was not meant to be about the living body, nor exclusively about the intellect. In fact, neither the bodily functions of the external senses nor the immortal intellect are examined very thoroughly in *De anima* itself.²⁸

Where, then, do anatomical interests manifest themselves in this commentary, and for what reasons? Aristotle had intended the *Parva naturalia* as a physiological supplement to *De anima* and therefore had not said much about organic issues when discussing the five senses in *De anima*.²⁹ In *De anima* II, 7, for example, he gave a causal explanation of seeing without even a single word about the eye.³⁰ The Conimbricenses, by contrast, when commenting on that chapter, not only dedicated a specific question to composition, form and function of the eye, but they also engaged in a detailed discussion over whether seeing occurs in the *humor crystallinus* or in the optic nerve.³¹ In so doing, they engaged in a dispute with Galen rather than with Aristotle, which was supported by anatomical arguments from a dissection made by Vesalius in Padua.³²

spectant, Metaphysici potius, quam Physiologi sit, ut in primi libri prooemio commonuimus." Ibid., 441.

- 27 When dealing with the question of whether the study of the intellect belongs to physiology (*Num intellectivae animae Contemplatio ad Physiologiae doctrinam pertineat, an non*), the Conimbricenses pointed out that if this were so, the absurd consequence would be that no other discipline would remain: "Si philosophus naturalis de intellectu ageret, atque adeo de intelligibili, futurum ut nulla alia disciplina praeter Physiologiam supereset," Collegium Conimbricense, *De anima*, 9.
- 28 An outline of Aristotle's programme in *De anima* can be found in Stephen Menn, "Aristotle's Definition of Soul and the Programme of the *De Anima*," in *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 22 (Oxford, 2002), 83–139. For the Renaissance context, see as a starting point Eckhard Kessler and Katharine Park, "Psychology: The Concept of Psychology," in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles Schmitt, Quentin Skinner and Jill Kraye (Cambridge, 1988), 455–463.
- 29 Cf. Philip J. van der Eijk, *Medicine and Philosophy in Classical Antiquity: Doctors and Philosophers on Nature, Soul, Health and Disease* (Cambridge, 2005), 175.
- 30 Aristotle only mentions the eyes of fish because of their sparkle (*De anima*, 419a6).
- 31 Cf. Collegium Conimbricense, *De anima*, 187–189: "Utrum visio fiat in humore Crystallino."
- 32 Cf. "Haec tamen sententia ex eo refellitur, quia si ibi fieret visio sequeretur eos homines, in quibus eiusmodi nervi inter se minime iunguntur (quorum nonnullos repertos fuisse constat) aut omnino visu carere, aut ut contrariae opinionis assertores volunt, omnia eis videri duplicia; quod tamen falsum esse experientia comprobavit. Scribit enim Vesalius cap. 4. libri 4. De fabrica corporis humani quemdam se Patavii dissecurisse, cuius nervi visorii a cerebro ad oculos usque divisi pervenirent, qui tamen geminata a simplicibus internosceret, affirmaretque nunquam simplicia sibi dupla visa esse." Ibid., 188. For the reception of the Galenic heritage, cf. Fernando Salmón, "The Many Galens of the Medieval Commentators on Vision," *Revue d'histoire des sciences* 50 (1997), 397–420.

This physiological investigation arose in connection with the ‘common sense’ and the internal or external senses, especially with respect to *De anima* II, 7–11 and III, 2–3. The great number of questions related to these chapters in fact constitute the bulk of the questions on all three books.³³ The commentators’ aim in presenting this material was to provide information about the organic localisation of a certain sense function where Aristotle had remained silent on the issue, or, where Aristotle had in fact presented an opinion, to contest or refute his position on the basis of the findings of recent (or ancient) anatomists.³⁴ Especially Aristotle’s cardiocentrism came under attack and was refuted by phrases like *anatomicae artis experimentis, anatomicis observationibus, anatomes professores negant*, etc.³⁵

- 33 In the Coimbra commentary the sum of pages dedicated to the above-mentioned chapters of *De anima* amount to 132 pages out of 440 total, that is 30%. Cf. also Carvalho, “Filosofar na época de Palestrina,” 398.
- 34 I can provide here only some examples, which I will however quote to some length as they clearly document the role of medical sources within the whole argument. In each case I first indicate the heading of the disputation, including book, chapter, question and article in brackets. All italics are mine. “*Odorem non esse fumeam exhalationem, nec argumenta superius adducta id conficere*” (II,9,q.1a.2), “*Quod autem medici inquit, in viventibus quasdam partes tenues, id est, spiritus odore nutriri, et sustentari; id si de odore ipso intelligatur, a vero abest; si de aëria substantia, qua odor defertur, eatenus admitti debet, quatenus aër, ut libro citato ostendimus, spiritus nutrit, nutritione impropria; qualis est ea, qua lucerna oleo, et aëre circumfuso sustentatur.*” Collegium Conimbricense, *De anima*, 219. “*Quodnam sit organum olfactus*” (II,9,q.4a.2), “*Eamque causam esse volunt, cur praedictae animantes, non nisi inspiratione praeunte, olfaciunt. Multi hac in re Aristotelem reprehendunt. Primum, quia Anatomes professores negant tale operculum inveniri. Secundo, quia tegumenta illa impetu aëris sponte ingruentis, non minus panderentur, quam ut eiusdem inspiratione attracti*” Ibid., 233. “*Quae sint species saporum.*” (II,10,q.1a.2), “*Verum ea saporum contemplatio non est propria saporum, ut saporibus sunt, sed prout faciunt ad temperiem corporis, quam medici praecipue attendunt. Aristoteles vero quia de saporibus disserebat secundum propriam ipsorum rationem, videlicet quatenus gustatum movent, recte extremos saporibus constituit dulcem, et amarum.*” Ibid., 245.
- 35 These quotations emphasize the issue of cardiocentrism. “*Quodnam sit tactus organum, quod medium*” (II,11,q.1a.1). “*Siquis autem dicat nihil aliud voluisse Aristotelem, quam tactum esse in corde, ut in radice, quia inde propagantur nervi, per quos influunt spiritus ad actum sentiendi. Iam ea Philosophi sententia in primo De ortu, et interitu confutata a nobis fuit, ubi cum schola Medicorum, tum aliis argumentis, tum anatomicis observationibus probavimus nervos, et una cum eis animales spiritus a cerebro, non a corde derivari. Praeterquamquod eo modo etiam alii sensus dicerentur esse in corde.*” Ibid., 254. “*Sensum communem non in corde, sed in cerebro residere*” (III,2,q.2a.2), “*At enim id medici acerrime oppugnant, ostenduntque licet vitalium functionum, et arteriarum principium in corde insit: naturalium tamen operationum, et sanguinis, atque venarum fontem in hepate;*

When we look at the sources that are invoked for the anatomical details, we find that Galen is cited 67 times in the commentary, which is as often as Albert the Great or the famous Thomas Cajetan. In commenting on *De anima* II, 7, the Conimbricenses provide 134 references to different works by 72 authors. Among the medical sources quoted we find classical authors such as Theophilus Protospatarius, Jacobus de Forlivio, or Pietro d'Abano, and well-known Renaissance physicians such as Simone Porzio, Francisco Valles, Jean Fernel, and Andreas Vesalius.³⁶ The Conimbricenses also refer to works such as Thomas a Veigas's *Commentarii in Claudii Galeni libros sex de locis affectis* (1566) and Alonso Rodriguez de Guevaras's *Defensio* (1559), Cristóbal de Vega's *De arte medendi* (1564), Realdo Colombo's *De re anatomica* (1562), or Pietro Mattioli's *Dioscorides*-commentary (1554); even *De componendis medicamentis* (1566) of the German Protestant Leonhart Fuchs is quoted.³⁷ I could not find a similarly

sensitiuarum actionum, arbitrarii motus, et nervorum originem in *cerebro* esse. Quam difficultatem quia in primo libro De ortu, et interitu accurate pertractauimus, ubi *Medicorum* sententiam partim rationibus, partim *anatomicae artis experimentis* satis confirmatam amplexi fuimus; non est quod hoc loco actum agamus." Ibid., 293. „An *internorum sensuum* numerus recte a Philosophis constituitur" (III,3,q1a1). "Tribus potissimum rationibus ad *internorum sensuum* multitudinem sonituendam Philosophi adducti sunt. Quidam ex cerebri ventriculis, ubi sentiendi officinas collocatas esse inquirunt, quos ventriculos plures esse *anatomicis observationibus* constat, nempe tres, quatuorve. Sed hoc argumentum aliis parum efficax videtur, idque non sine magna probabilitate." Ibid., 299.

36 The authors mentioned here belonged to a corpus of anatomical and medical texts that was also quoted by other Aristotelians. Cf. on this issue António Alberto Banha de Andrade, *Contributos para a história da mentalidade pedagógica portuguesa* (Lisbon, 1982), 92; Dennis Des Chene, "An Aristotle for the Universities: Natural Philosophy in the Coimbra Commentaries," in *Descartes' Natural Philosophy*, ed. Stephen Gaukroger and John Andrew Schuster (London, 2000), 29–45, here 42; Edwards, "Digressing with Aristotle," 130; Edwards, "Body, Soul and Anatomy," 36.

37 Alonso Rodriguez de Guevara, *In pluribus ex iis quibus Galenus impugnatur ab Andrea Vesalio Bruxelese in constructione & usu partium corporis humani, defensio* (Coimbra, 1559) is only quoted once and *in margine*. Thomas Rodericus a Veiga, *Commentarii in Claudii Galeni libros sex de locis affectis* (Antwerp, 1566) is referred to three times in the commentary on *De anima* and once in the attached *Tractatio problematum ad quinque sensus*. Other references are to Realdo Colombo, *De re anatomica* (Paris, 1562); Pietro Andrea Mattioli, *Commentari, in libros sex Pedacii Dioscoridis Anazarbei, De medica materia* (Venice, 1554); Cristóbal de la Vega, *Liber De arte medendi* (Lyon, 1564); Leonhard Fuchs, *Medicamentorum omnium componendi, miscendique rationem ac modum libri quatuor* (Frankfurt, 1566). The presence of Fuchs in the Jesuit commentary is surprising, given that he was even expelled from Ingolstadt upon the arrival of the SJ. Maybe Vega's investigations into his works may have brought about his reconsideration, cf. Justo Hernández, "La

rich *florilegium* of early-modern learned medicine in any Jesuit commentary on Aristotle before 1600.

Such a physiological and anatomical approach to select topics of *De anima* was not entirely new. Centuries earlier, Albert had shown considerable interest in collecting and referring to this kind of material already.³⁸ This project was subsequently carried further by Renaissance philosophers like Cristoforo Marcello, and it formed a tradition that was cultivated especially at the University of Padua.³⁹ Even in Jesuit commentaries on *De anima*, such an integration of anatomical and physiological questions was not a novelty. For example, Francisco Toletus had similarly dedicated a chapter of his commentary on *De anima* (1575) to the physiology of the eye, citing Galen and Vesalius.⁴⁰ In sum, what the Conimbricenses did was not new in kind, but certainly in dimension.

II Against the Law? The *Ratio Studiorum* and the Digressions on Anatomy

When Toletus in his *De anima* commentary began to deal with the physiology of the eye, he remarked that the topic pleased him (*placuit*) and that knowledge

sangría en el *Liber de Arte Medendi* (1564) de Cristóbal de Vega (1510–1573),” *Asclepio*, 54 (2002), 231–252, here 240. Mattioli, *De medica materia*, 143 also quotes him.

38 Albert’s *De homine* dedicates a long treatise to vision, which is also explained organically (*De visu ex parte organi*), cf. Albertus Magnus, *De homine*, ed. Henryk Anzulewicz and Joachim Roland Söder, *Opera omnia*, 27/2 (Münster, 2008), 148–153. The *Summa de creaturis* was well known in early-modern times and was cited by the Conimbricenses.

39 Marcello discussed five physiological question in considerable length, cf. Christophorus Marcellus, *Universalis de anima traditionis opus* (Venice, 1508), 139v–143v. On anatomical readings of Aristotle in Padua, cf. Regina Andrés Rebollo, “The Paduan School of Medicine: Medicine and Philosophy in the Modern Era,” *História, Ciências, Saúde–Manguinhos* 17 (2010), 307–333; Simone De Angelis, “From Text to the Body: Commentaries on *De Anima*, Anatomical Practice and Authority Around 1600,” in *Scholarly Knowledge: Textbooks in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Emidio Campi (Genève, 2008), 205–227; Edward P. Mahoney, “Albert the Great and the Studio Patavino in the Late Fifteenth and Early Sixteenth Centuries,” in *Albertus Magnus and the Sciences: Commemorative Essays 1980*, ed. James A. Weisheipl (Toronto, 1980), 537–564.

40 Cf. Franciscus Toletus, *Commentaria una cum Quaestionibus in tres libros Aristotelis de anima* (Cologne, 1583), 83v. For the example of Suárez, cf. Michael Edwards, “Background and Influence. Suárez in a Late Scholastic Context: Anatomy, Psychology and Authority,” in *The Philosophy of Francisco Suárez*, ed. Benjamin Hill and Henrik Lagerlund (Oxford, 2012), 25–37.

of this matter was valuable.⁴¹ Aristotle had not been ignorant regarding anatomical issues, but he had felt that they did not belong to the philosophy of the soul. In the same spirit, the Conimbricenses interrupted their digressions on the physiology of the eye at a certain point, explaining that much more could be said about this topic but that this was not the right place to do so.⁴² Both commentaries show an awareness of the fact that this kind of anatomical knowledge had its proper place elsewhere, while considering it important enough to present it, albeit not exhaustively, in the wrong place, as it were. But which better places were there, and why didn't the Jesuits depart from those? The short answer is that the writings of Aristotle dealing with biological, zoological or anatomical issues (such as *De partibus animalium*) were not part of the educational programme, and of the many extant commentaries on those works, not a single one has been written by a member of a religious order.⁴³ Medical learning represented a similarly closed chamber for members of religious orders.

41 Cf. Toletus, *De anima*, 83v: „Placuit ab hac disputatione incipere, ut totam oculi compositionem proponerem, que maxime digna est scitu, nec Philosophus tam mirae cognitionis debet esse ignarus, quamvis non hoc ad hanc philosophiae partem attineat.” Cf. also Edwards, “Body, Soul and Anatomy,” 38.

42 Cf. Collegium Conimbricense, *De anima*, 187: “Ac praeter haec, quae a nobis commemorata sunt, multa alia afferri possent, quae aspectum vitiant, aut iuvant, sed omnia prosequi non est huius loci. Ex dictis iam facile quivis intelliget maxime idoneam esse ad visus functionem oculorum fabricam, cum tam singulari artificio coagmentata sit, et tot musculis, tot tunicis, tot humoribus, et tam assiduo spirituum defluxu ad id munus praestandum abundet.”

43 According to Blum, “Der Standardkurs,” 130, the *Historia animalium*, *De ingressu animalium*, *De motu animalium* and *De partibus animalium* had never been the subject of a commentary (as listed in Ch. Lohr, *Renaissance Latin Aristotle Commentaries*) by a member of a religious order. However, the Conimbricenses quoted these works frequently. Ugo Baldini, “Die Philosophie and die Wissenschaften im Jesuitenorden,” in *Ueberweg Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie. Die Philosophie des 17. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Jean-Pierre Schobinger (Basel, 2011), 3/1,2: 669–769, here 687 and 714, relates the lack of commentaries on this part of the *physica specialis* to the Jesuits' exclusion of medicine. The Conimbricenses and other Jesuits commented on the *Parva naturalia*, which, however, did not play an important role in the curriculum, cf. below n. 44 and 48. The fact that the supplement on the five external senses (cf. above n. 24) was printed together with the *De anima* commentary seems to reflect the wish to give them a more prominent place within the educational programme. It should also be noted that the Conimbricenses discussed topics of physiology in other places as well, most prominently in their commentaries on the *Physics* (e.g., a question on the motion of the heart) or *On Generation and Corruption* (e.g., questions on animal generation or on whether blood and hair are animated).

Led by similar observations, Michael Edwards has argued:

The founding *Constitutions* of the Society (1558) forbade the study of medicine by members of the order, since, together with law, it was seen as a discipline that contributed little to the ultimate goal of all Jesuit studies – the greater honour and glory of God. The main aim of this prohibition was to prevent Jesuits practicing as physicians, but restrictions were also placed on the use of anatomical material within teaching. Thus the regulations for the arts course taught in Jesuit colleges codified in the *Ratio studiorum* of 1591 and 1599 set out strict limits on the extent to which anatomy and medical knowledge could inform discussion of Aristotle's *De anima*.⁴⁴

Although these observations are correct, I think the narrative is imprecise, and when applied to the Conimbricenses it is even false. It is imprecise, because the passage in the *Constitutions* does not apply to the members of the order themselves, but to the universities led by the SJ.⁴⁵ Moreover, it is false that this passage prohibits the practise of medicine to the members of the SJ; however, generally the clergy had been exempted from that practice by Canon Law since the Middle Ages.⁴⁶ Finally, the passage of the *Ratio studiorum*, which actually already dates back to 1586, did not concern the author of the Coimbra commentary.⁴⁷ In 1561, Hieronymus Nadal issued the study programme for the Jesuit college of Coimbra, which with its about 1800 students was then the largest

44 Edwards, "Body, Soul and Anatomy," 56. Below I give Edwards's quotations, but more condensed and with reference to more recent publications. The *Constitutiones Societatis Iesu* of 1558 read: "Sic etiam quoniam Artes, vel Scientiae naturales ingenia disponunt ad Theologiam, et ad perfectam cognitionem et usum illius inserviunt, et per seipsas ad eundem finem juvant; qua diligentia par est, et per eruditos Praeceptores, in omnibus sincere honorem et gloriam Dei quaerendo, tractentur. Medicinae, et Legum studium ut a nostro Instituto magis remotum in Universitatibus Societatis vel non tractabitur; vel saltem ipsa Societas per se oneris non suscipiet." (MPSI II, 282–285). The "Regulae professoris philosophiae" of the *Ratio atque institutio studiorum Societatis Iesu* decree, ever since 1586: "In lib. I de Generatione, et primo item libro de Anima antiquorum opiniones breviter attingantur. In secundo vero libro de Anima, expositis sensoriis, non digrediantur philosophi in Anatomiam. Et caetera, quae, medicorum sunt. [sic] Addant potius, si vacat, Parva Naturalia." This was repeated in 1591 and 1599, cf. MPSI V 106, 280, 398.

45 I will discuss that passage in more detail in part IV of this paper.

46 Cf. Darrel W. Amundsen, "Medieval Canon Law on Medical and Surgical Practice by the Clergy," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 52 (1978), 22–44. The Jesuits asked for an exception to run a hospital in Goa, cf. John W. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, 1993), 172.

47 Cf. above n. 44.

college of the SJ.⁴⁸ Although he was aware that Aristotle had written a great deal that "was of no importance" for the studies (*no son de importancia para la sciencia*), only the doxography of the first book of *De anima* had to be exempted from the students' timetable. The remaining two books had to be read entirely.⁴⁹ In the same year, while visiting Portugal, Nadal picked up the idea of a colleague and commissioned the Jesuits at Coimbra to compile a course book on philosophy that would serve for all colleges of the SJ.⁵⁰ For most works on natural philosophy, including *De anima*, Manuel de Goís was appointed as the author of the commentaries.⁵¹ He taught the philosophy course between 1574 and 1582. In 1585 already, one referred in Rome to these commentaries as "the common commentaries of Portuguese philosophy."⁵² In sum, then, the Coimbra commentary did not undermine, but rather preceded the regulations of the *Ratio studiorum*. Nor does the *Ratio* have left a strong mark on the statutes of the University of Coimbra when they were reissued in 1592.⁵³ The University of Coimbra seems to have been treated as an exception, as it did not have to follow

48 Concerning the size of the college, cf. William V. Bangert, *Jerome Nadal, S.J., 1507–1580: Tracking the First Generation of Jesuits* (Chicago, 1992), 299; Dauril Alden, *The Making of an Enterprise: The Society of Jesus in Portugal, Its Empire, and Beyond, 1540–1750* (Stanford, 1996), 32. Nadal's study programme (1561, *Instructiones Conimbricæ de cursu artium datae*), which was exclusively designed for Coimbra, can be found in MPSI III, 59: "Aristoteles se lea de manera, que muchas partes que el trató difusamente, y no son de importancia para la sciencia, se lean en compendio, diziéndose la substancia solamente dellas, sin se leer la letra, para que quede más tiempo para leer Metaphysica y De generatione y De anima y Parvos naturales, y especialmente la Metaphysica, que es lo que mas aprovecha para la theología scholástica."

49 Cf. also MPSI III, 67 regarding the lectures in Coimbra (1561, *Quae professoribus conimbricensibus visa sunt legenda in cursu artium ex libris Aristotelis*), "Los De anima del primero libro, se leerá el primero capº, con letra y glosa; lo demás se dexará, dando un argumento de todo. El 2º y 3º libro, todo con letrà y glosa."

50 Cf. MPSI III, 316. This plan followed the idea of P. Torres.

51 On Goís, see Cristóvão S. Marinheiro, "The Conimbricenses: The Last Scholastics, the First Moderns or Something in Between? The Impact of Geographical Discoveries on Late 16th Century Jesuit Aristotelianism," in *Portuguese Humanism and the Republic of Letters*, ed. Maria Louro Berbara and Karl A.E. Emenkel (Leiden, 2012), 395–424, here 398–403.

52 Cf. MPSI VI, 41: "commentaria communia philosophiae lusitanis."

53 For example, whereas the *Ratio studiorum* of 1586 and 1591 prescribed a philosophical curriculum of three years, the statutes of the University of Coimbra of 1592 had a curriculum of four years. Cf. Universidade de Coimbra, *Estatutos da Universidade de Coimbra: confirmados por el Rei Dom Phelippe primeiro deste nome, nosso Sehnor, em o anno de 1591* (Coimbra, 1593), 118r and MPSI V, 104 and 279.

the Constitutions of the SJ entirely, as it fell under royal jurisdiction.⁵⁴ In 1591 we even find an (unpublished) disputation held at Coimbra by Cristovão Gil (1555–1608) on a question related to the physiology of the eye.⁵⁵

However, the prohibition on digressions on matters of anatomy and medicine had an impact on Jesuit education elsewhere. In reaction to the *Ratio* of 1586, the province of Milan prevented not only the treatment of anatomy and medicine in commentaries, but also the treatment of the generative faculty and physiognomy.⁵⁶ The province of Spain emphasised (also in reaction to the *Ratio*) that what mattered in teaching was not quantity but quality, and that therefore, medicine, law and mathematics were abolished.⁵⁷ In 1587, the college

-
- 54 This is reflected in the *Ratio* of 1586, cf. MPSI V, 95: “Philosophiae cursus triennio absolvendus est iuxta Constitutiones (Par. 4 cap. 15 n. 2) id tamen non servatur Conimbricæ, ubi ex fundatione academiae, quæ ex regia autoritate dependet, post triennium audiunt etiam philosophi dimidio circiter anno lectionem unam philosophiæ ante meridianam.” Cf. also MPSI V, 334. It should be noted that the passage quoted above only concerns the duration (seven instead of six semesters), but not the content of the study programme. Cf. also Mário Santiago de Carvalho, “Metamorfoses da ética peripatética: estudo de um caso quincentista conimbricense: as disputas sobre os livros da ‘Ética a Nicómaco,’” *Revista de Filosofia de Coimbra*, 28 (2005), 239–274, here 248, n. 37. No other exceptions are mentioned in the *Ratio*.
- 55 One of the one-sided *Conclusiones philosophicæ* of 1591 is entitled “Utrum oculi sint naturæ an vero aquæ?” Gil’s commentary on *De anima* is also preserved in a manuscript (Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa, n.º 2518, f. 104r-176v), but has hardly received any attention in the scholarship. Cf. Gonzalo Díaz Díaz (ed.), *Hombres y documentos de la filosofía española*, vol. 3 (Madrid, 1988), 456. A brief study of the manuscript reveals that Gil closely followed the commentary by the Conimbricenses, including an extensive chapter on the anatomy of the eye (cf. BNL 2518, f. 141v-144r). Gil also referred to Veiga’s commentary on Galen’s *Ars medica* (f. 123r). The manuscript is dated “1591 mense Martii die 21” (f. 176r). Gil might even have had an impact on the printed Coimbra commentary on *De generatione et corruptione*, cf. Domingos Mauricio Gomes dos Santos, “As ‘annotationes in librum de generatione et corruptione’ do P. Cristóvão Gil e as origens do curso conimbricense,” *Anales de la Asociación Española para el Progreso de las Ciencias*, 1 (1956), 83–110.
- 56 A passage for the *Provincia Mediolanensis* reads: “Libri de Anima - Textus primi de opinionibus antiquorum potest compendio tradi. In secundo propter honestatem nihil agatur de potentia generativa animalium; in eodem anatomica omittantur, et medica; nihil etiam de physionomia. In tertio non videtur agendum de statu animæ separatæ.” Cf. MPSI III, 264. The context of this passage is interesting insofar as it concerned also other works of Aristotle.
- 57 The *Provincia Castellana*’s reaction to the *Ratio studiorum* of 1586 is captured thus: “Praeterea, nulla ars aut scientia est, in qua praeceptores omnia exponant. Non ars medica, non iuris scientia, non mathematicae disciplinae. Esset enim inutilis et infiniti laboris; sed his, quæ praeceptiva sunt et quæ propter obscuritatem praeceptivam doctoris operam

in Paris named anatomy as an example of a topic of curious questions that were not to be discussed in class.⁵⁸ Antonio Possevino's *Bibliotheca selecta* of 1593 quoted from the *Ratio* in arguing that the philosophy course should include no digressions on anatomy.⁵⁹

It took some time for this new spirit to make its way into actual commentaries, if one leaves aside small remarks as those quoted above by the Conimbricenses and Toletus.⁶⁰ But fifty years later, John of Saint Thomas (a Dominican educated at Coimbra), Roderigo de Arriaga and Francisco de Oviedo cite the Coimbra commentary as their main source for medical references, but they display great keenness on keeping discussions on medical and anatomical topics short.⁶¹

desiderant, diligenter expositis, reliqua discipulorum industriae et labori discenda relinquunt. Postremo, admonemur proverbio, auream mediocritatem esse servandam [HORATIUS, Odae II 10 5], et non esse spectandum, quam multum aut quam cito quis doceat, sed quam bene doceat." Cf. MPSI VI, 165.

58 The *Collegium Parisiense* decrees: "Philosophiae ac theologiae facultates a propriis professoribus, non cursim nec per compendia, sed exacte ac solide tractentur. Quaestiones autem curiosae, parum honestae quales sunt anatomicae, aut ad rem non multum pertinentes, omnino praetermittantur, neque ullo modo novae aut periculosae opiniones tolerantur." Cf. MPSI VII, 461.

59 Cf. Antonio Possevino, *Bibliotheca selecta: qua agitur de ratione studiorum in historia, in disciplinis, in salute omnium procuranda* (Rome, 1593), 119. Interestingly, Possevino dedicates a whole book (35 pages) of his "virtual library" to medicine (*ubi definit Physicus ibi incipit Medicus*) and emphasizes its use for Christianity and charity. Cf. *ibid.*, 137–172. Cf. also Albano Biondi, "La bibliotheca selecta di Antonio Possevino. Un progetto di egemonia culturale," in *La 'Ratio studiorum': modelli culturali e pratiche educative dei Gesuiti in Italia tra Cinque e Seicento*, ed. Gian Paolo Brizzi (Rome, 1981), 43–76, here 65–67. But it should also be noted that Possevino's *Bibliotheca* was not meant to be a systematic study guide, cf. Paul Richard Blum, *Philosophenphilosophie und Schulphilosophie: Typen des Philosophierens in der Neuzeit* (Stuttgart, 1998), 42. A similar bibliographical interest in medical works (*Ex libris medicorum valde utiles erunt*) can be found in a catalogue by Benito Perera, a Jesuit fellow of Possevino and Ledesma, written around 1562 and composed in order to lecture and study philosophy. The list is edited in Charles H. Lohr, "Some Early Aristotelian Bibliographies," *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, 1 (1981), 87–116, here 115–116. Perera, however, was a special case and his "modern" approach to lecturing philosophy was denounced by some of his fellows, cf. Blum, "Benedictus Pererius," 279–284.

60 Cf. above n. 41 and 42. Already in 1602 Ludovico Masselli complained in a letter to Claudio Acquaviva: „e massimamente che nel corso Conimbricense e nel Toledo si desiderano molte cose, per le quali a giudizio di ognuno non possono a pieno sodisfare." Cf. MPSI VII, 493, 397, 519, 536 and 542.

61 Cf. Roderigo de Arriaga, *Cursus philosophicus* (Paris, 1639), 635b: "De his et similibus quaestionibus, quae plus voluptatis quam utilitatis habent, recte Conimbricenses supra, et in

These topics were considered to be amusing rather than useful (*plus oblectamenti/voluptatis quam utilitatis*). Jesuits of the first half of the seventeenth century would of course display a certain interest in anatomical issues, but they mostly did not express it within works written for use in philosophy classes.⁶² By contrast, in Portugal questions on the anatomy of the senses were discussed continuously in philosophy until the eighteenth century.⁶³

Problematicis quae sunt ad finem Tomi de Anima. [...] De hoc organo nihil nisi ex anatomia dicere possumus. Videantur Conimbricenses supra.” Francisco de Oviedo, *Cursus philosophicus*, vol. 2 (Lyon, 1663), 49b: “Omnia, quae ad materiam huius sectionis spectant, suspensio brachio attingam, quia plus oblectamenti, quam utilitatis afferunt et praecipue quia vix ratio effaciter concludens hac in re invenitur. Adeat Conimbric. Patres, qui plura de his potentiis fuse eleganter, lepide et erudite pertractata legere velit, qui cap. libri 2. de De anima agunt de potentiis externis et quatuor prioribus capitibus libri tertii de potentiis internis [...] Brevissime quae ad has potentias attinet hoc puncto attingam, quia non alia maiori indigent discussione.” Cf. Joannes a Sancto Thoma, *Cursus philosophicus thomisticus*, vol. 3 (Cologne, 1638), 182: “Plura de his videri possunt apud Conimbric. 2. de Anima cap. 8. q. 3. art. 1. proprieque ad medicos et ad anatomen spectant.” All three authors belong to a different generation of scholastics. John of St. Thomas had studied in Coimbra. The quotation of Arriaga is also given in Edwards, “Body, Soul and Anatomy,” 61. The absence of concrete anatomical knowledge within Jesuit education also had been questioned, e.g. in 1648 in Ingolstadt, cf. Arno Seifert, “Der jesuitische Bildungskanon im Lichte zeitgenössischer Kritik,” *Zeitschrift für Bayerische Landesgeschichte*, 47 (1984), 43–76, here 64. Naturally, many seventeenth-century Jesuits also discussed these issues in some detail.

- 62 A striking case of a Jesuit author interested in anatomy (notably of the eye) is Christoph Scheiner, *Oculus hoc est: fundamentum opticum* [...] (Innsbruck, 1619). Cf. *ibid.*, 1: “De necessitate inspectionis anatomicae circa oculum.” The case of Girolamo Dandini, *De corpore animato* (Paris, 1610) is discussed by Edwards, cf. above n. 12. Another later example can be found in Melchior Cornaeus, *Curriculum philosophiae peripateticae* (Würzburg, 1657), 200–208. As Baldwin, Hellyer and others have shown, outside the classroom Jesuits enjoyed a considerable amount of freedom with regard to topics that normally did not have a place in the Jesuit curriculum. Cf. above n. 7 and Martha Baldwin, “Alchemy and the Society of Jesus in the Seventeenth Century: Strange Bedfellows?” *Ambix*, 40/2 (1993), 41–64.
- 63 Cf. António Alberto de Andrade, “Para a História do ensino da Filosofia em Portugal: O ‘Elenchus Quaestionum’ de 1754,” *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, 22 (1966), 280–281. The *Elenchus quaestionum* of 1754 was a prescriptive catalogue for philosophy professors of the University of Coimbra about topics to be taught in class.

III For Crown and Country. Philosophy and Medicine in Early-Modern Portugal

It still remains unclear why the Conimbricenses spent so much energy on issues concerning the anatomy and physiology of the senses. While it is difficult to provide a definite answer to this question, it is reasonable to point to the institutional setting as its main cause. In order to substantiate this claim it will be necessary to give a short historical sketch of the beginnings of the University of Coimbra.

When in 1537, the university moved to Coimbra by decree of King John III, only the faculties of medicine and law were involved. The arts and philosophy were taught at the monastery of Santa Cruz near Coimbra.⁶⁴ Already in January 1538, the study of medicine was also transferred to the monastery, because of the close relation between medicine and philosophy.⁶⁵ In a letter to the King dating from 1543, Affonso do Prado, describing the studies of the new university, underlined once more “the great dependency between medicine and philosophy” and remarked that good philosophers are good doctors of theoretical medicine.⁶⁶ In 1548, the Colégio das Artes was inaugurated and by royal appointment transferred to the Jesuits in 1555, who had arrived at Coimbra 15 years earlier.⁶⁷ In 1561, the King also decreed that the Jesuit college be integrated into

64 Cf. Cristiano Casalini, *Aristotele a Coimbra: Il Cursus Conimbricensis e l'educazione nel Collegium Artium* (Rome, 2012), 61. Casalini's study deals with many aspects of the early history of Jesuit philosophy at Coimbra. However, it does not address the role of medical learning. For a sketch of the university's history, cf. Fernando Taveira da Fonseca, “Early Modern Coimbra: The Town and the University,” in *Coimbra Group Seminar 'University and Town: A Dynamic Symbiosis'* (Leuven, 2010), at <http://www.uc.pt/chsc/recursos/ftf>.

65 Cf. Teófilo Braga, *Historia da universidade de Coimbra nas suas relações com a instrução publica portuguesa por Theophilo Braga*, vol. 1 (Lisbon, 1892), 457.

66 A letter to the King dating from 1 July 1543 about matters of exams: “la segunda, porque como la philosophia sea fundamento de la medecina arguyendo estos dos maestros con rezones de philosophia en los actos los estudiantes será buenos philosophos y por el conseqüente buenos medicos theoreticos y a los doctores medicos les parece que se guarde la constitucion como está y creo que escribirá ó an escrito a V. A. sobre ella porque no querian que en su facultad se metiese persona que no fuese doctor en medicina, y en todas las Universidades siempre algunos de la facultad de artes entra con los médicos por la grã dependencia que ai entre la medicina y philosophia.” Cf. *ibid.*, vol. 2, 125, n. 2. In 1548 a royal decree stated that it was obligatory for every student of law or medicine to complete the philosophy course at the *collegium*. Cf. *ibid.*, vol. 2, 267 and Casalini, *Aristotele a Coimbra*, 53.

67 Hengst, *Jesuitenuniversitäten*, 60 (relying on Juan Alfonso Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae et rerum Societatis Jesu historia*, vol. 1 (Madrid, 1894), 98 and 104) states that the Jesuits had

the university, and he guaranteed that every student who wanted to study at a higher faculty such as medicine had to complete first the Jesuit educational programme.⁶⁸

This alliance between philosophy and medicine set up by the King had significant implications. Coimbra enjoyed special treatment among Jesuit colleges, precisely because it had been founded by royal decree.⁶⁹ At that time Coimbra was the only Portuguese university that awarded degrees in medicine. The only other institution of higher learning, the University of Évora, was completely ruled by the SJ but did not offer studies in law or medicine.⁷⁰ King John himself appointed professors of medicine to the newly opened University of Coimbra. Among those appointed were Alonso Rodriguez de Guevara and Thomas a Veiga in 1558.⁷¹ Both returned the favour by dedicating their studies of Galen to the King.⁷² The King displayed indeed an acute awareness in matters of educational policy, since many students were attracted by the University of Salamanca, while Coimbra lacked a good reputation.⁷³

taken over the university of Coimbra in 1542 already. I think this cannot be the case nor do the relevant passages from Polanco clearly state that. Cf. Casalini, *Aristotele a Coimbra*, 48–57 and Gomes, *Os Conimbricenses*, 13–24 for more details.

- 68 Cf. Marinheiro, “The Conimbricenses,” 395, n. 4; Alden, *The Making of an Enterprise*, 32, n. 29.
- 69 Cf. Also above n. 54.
- 70 Cf. Luís Carolin and Henrique Leitão, “Natural Philosophy and Mathematics in Portuguese Universities, 1550–1650,” in *Universities and Science in the Early Modern Period*, ed. Mordechai Feingold, Victor Navarro-Brotons and Jed Z. Buchwald (Leiden, 2006), 153–168, here 154; Martins, “The Conimbricenses,” 102.
- 71 On the two authors, cf. Antonio Paulo da Rocha Brito, *A faculdade de medicina no século XVI* (Coimbra, 1937), 5–15; Francis A. Dutra, “The Practice of Medicine in Early Modern Portugal: The Role and Social Status of the Físico-mor and the Surgião-mor,” in *Libraries, History, Diplomacy, and the Performing Arts: Essays in Honor of Carleton Sprague Smith*, ed. Israel J. Katz (Stuyvesant, 1991), 135–169, here 143–145; Francisco Guerra, “Medical Education in Iberoamerica,” in *The History of Medical Education; An International Symposium Held February 5–9, 1968*, ed. Charles Donald O’Malley (Berkeley, 1970), 419–462, here 429–430; Michele L. Clouse, *Medicine, Government, and Public Health in Philip II’s Spain: Shared Interests, Competing Authorities* (Farnham, 2011), 55. Of special use is Lígia Bellini, “Notes on Medical Scholarship and the Broad Intellectual Milieu in Sixteenth-Century Portugal,” *Portuguese Studies*, 15 (1999), 11–41.
- 72 Cf. Bellini, “Notes on Medical Scholarship,” 13.
- 73 On Coimbra’s bad reputation, cf. Mário Farelo, “On Portuguese Medical Students and Masters Travelling Abroad: An Overview from the Early Modern Period to the Enlightenment,” in *Centres of Medical Excellence? Medical Travel and Education in Europe, 1500–1789*, ed. Ole Peter Grell, Andrew Cunningham and Jon Arrizabalaga (Farnham, 2010), 127–147, here 128; Bellini, “Notes on Medical Scholarship,” 40. Coimbra’s medical curricu-

With this institutional setting in mind, if we take another look at the sources cited in the *De anima* commentary, we get a more complete picture. The references to Vesalius, Colombo, or Valles reflect the “Vesalian movement” virulent on the Iberian peninsula in the mid-sixteenth century, and particularly in Spain.⁷⁴ The complete absence of Arabic medical authors can probably be explained by the fact that the Jesuits tried to stay away from Arabic (and Jewish) medicine.⁷⁵ It is particularly relevant that the commentary also cites two doctors from Coimbra, namely Veiga and Guevara, two rather local figures in early-modern medical learning whose appearance in the Coimbra commentary underlines the latter’s institutional embedding.

Between 1573 and 1624, roughly 63 students studied medicine in Coimbra each year, and all of them had to pass the philosophical course of the Conimbricenses, regardless of whether they were Jesuits or not.⁷⁶ That led to an intertwining of both faculties, and not just from the point of view of philosophy (which has been mentioned earlier), but also from the point of view of medicine, as Lígia Bellini has argued:

It appears that the principal aspect of the relationship between medicine and the arts was its influence upon the intellectual training of university-educated physicians. Hence, in the light of the curriculum [of Coimbra] outlined above, it is not surprising to find that medical writers of the sixteenth century were in many respects philosophically oriented.⁷⁷

lum had been a copy of the curricula of Salamanca and Alcalá, cf. Guerra, “Medical Education in Iberoamerica,” 46.

74 A study on that trend can be found in José M. López Piñero, “The Vesalian Movement in Sixteenth-Century Spain,” *Journal of the History of Biology* 12 (1979), 45–81.

75 The Conimbricenses only refer to Avicenna’s philosophical writings. Maybe that can be read as an emancipation from Arabic medicine in general, which is a tendency observed also in other contexts, cf. Jeffrey L. Wollock, *The Noblest Animate Motion Speech, Physiology and Medicine in pre-Cartesian Linguistic Thought* (Amsterdam, 1997), 329; Farelo, “On Portuguese Medical Students,” 133; Piñero, “The Vesalian Movement,” 47; Bellini, “Notes on Medical Scholarship,” 36–38. For anti-Semitic trends among Jesuits of the late sixteenth century, cf. Robert A. Maryks, *The Jesuit Order as a Synagogue of Jews. Jesuits of Jewish Ancestry and Purity-of-blood Laws in the Early Society of Jesus* (Leiden, 2010). These supposed anti-Semitic and anti-Arabic trends are contradicted by the fact that the *Canon* still belonged to works taught at the university, see Guerra, “Medical Education in Iberoamerica,” 426; Bellini, “Notes on Medical Scholarship,” 27; Universidade de Coimbra, *Estatutos da Universidade de Coimbra*, 117v.

76 Cf. Farelo, “On Portuguese Medical Students,” 141.

77 Bellini, “Notes on Medical Scholarship,” 24.

In sum, then, the medical and anatomical interests manifest in the philosophical course on the soul are best explained as the result of the tight link between medicine and philosophy in the educational set-up at early-modern Coimbra.

IV Caught on the Wrong Foot. The Ban of Medicine as Mere Coincidence?

The case of Coimbra is thus exceptional with respect not only to the presence of medical references in its philosophical commentaries on Aristotle, but also to the college's medico-philosophical alliance which formed the background to these commentaries.⁷⁸ But, as mentioned above, the SJ had important goals besides being helpful to the King's educational agenda.⁷⁹ Those goals were almost entirely theological. Indeed, we have seen above that the passage in the Constitutions (1558) of Ignatius of Loyola prohibits Jesuit universities from running faculties of medicine or law exactly because they were not directly relevant for theology.⁸⁰

But what does that notorious paragraph actually say? It claims that the study of law and medicine is more remote from the institute (compared to the arts and natural philosophy).⁸¹ For this reason, it will not be taught at Jesuit universities, at least not by the Society's members. Teaching these two professional programmes was seen as a burden (*onus*) that was not the SJ's to carry. While this argumentation is well known, the Jesuits' self-distancing from medicine has also another origin, which has so far been overlooked in the secondary literature. When Ignatius of Loyola founded the order's first university in Messina (1548) – the institute's establishment was confirmed by a papal bull – the original plan also included faculties of law and medicine.⁸² But although the city of

78 Cf. above n. 54.

79 In a speech delivered in Coimbra in 1561, Nadal also mentioned as one of the SJ's distinctive goals that of helping poor people, cf. Bangert, *Jerome Nadal*, 254. For the central role of theology, see Pate, *Jerónimo Nadal*, 30; Ganss, *Saint Ignatius' Idea*, 53.

80 See above, Part II of this paper.

81 Cf. Welie, "Ignatius of Loyola on Medical Education," 39.

82 On that affair, cf. Bangert, *Jerome Nadal*, 64–67; Grendler, "The Conditions of Enquiry," 121–124. More precise accounts are to be found in Rosario Moscheo, "Istruzione superiore e autonomie locali nella Sicilia moderna. Apertura e sviluppi dello 'Studium Urbis Messana' (1590–1641)," *Archivio Storico Messinese*, 59 (1991), 75–221; Daniela Novarese, "Che li legisti debbano fondare le lectioni loro sopra Bartolo. Insegnare e studiare diritto nel Messanense Studium Generale (secc. XVI-XVII)," *Annali di Storia delle Università italiane*, 2 (1998), 73–84. That Loyola, too, originally intended these two faculties to be

Messina first accepted the bull's request to grant the directorate of the university to the Jesuits, it subsequently changed its mind, and for years no agreement was reached over the issue. Eventually, the Jesuits in fact controlled neither the faculties of law and medicine, nor the university, which was now split in two.⁸³ Besides financial issues, a further cause for the Messinese refusal of the Jesuit educational programme lay in the fact that the Jesuits' university design followed the so called 'modus parisiensis', which implied that the university was to be structured hierarchically, in a top-down organisation with a primary focus on theology.⁸⁴ Italian universities, by contrast, had for centuries followed the alternative model of Padua or Bologna, which provided educational programmes for careers in law and medicine rather than in theology. Their study programmes were moreover not determined by the magisters (top-down), but by the students.⁸⁵

A centralistically run religious order like the Jesuits could however not agree with such a form of organisation. This failed attempt to set up a complete Jesuit

included in a complete Jesuit university is also suggested by Pate, *Jerónimo Nadal*, 69; Ganss, *Saint Ignatius' Idea*, 34.

- 83 Here is Polanco's report in his summary of the year 1550: "Magnifice cum classicorum et bombardarum sono et magno apparatu Universitas per urbem est promulgata; et postri die lectiones legum et medicinae sunt inchoatae. Sed cum aegre ferrent Messanenses ut professores juris et medicinae nostris subicerentur, et P. Natalis, consentiente et probante P. Ignatio, de separandis facultatibus egisset, ita ut, uno quidem corpore, quod contineret Theologiae, Philosophiae et humaniorum litterarum lectiones Societati nostrae relicto, aliud corpus ex facultate utriusque juris ac medicinae cum suo Rectore constitueretur, tam gratis animis id Messanenses acceperunt, ut vix satis sibi viderentur posse commendare hoc praedicti P. Natalis inventum et eum amatorem et patrem civitatis vocabant. Cum tamen ad applicationem redituum ventum est, facta dictis minime responderunt; nam quatuor millia aureorum aliis facultatibus assignarunt; Collegio autem nostro, cum quindecim lectorum onus imposuissent, tantum mille et quingentos aureos annui reditus applicabant." Cf. Juan Alfonso Polanco, *Vita Ignatii Loiolae et rerum Societatis Jesu historia*, vol. 2 (Madrid, 1894), 30.
- 84 On the Jesuits' difficulties in getting settled in Italy, see particularly Christopher Carlsmith, "Struggling toward Success: Jesuit Education in Italy, 1540–1600," *History of Education Quarterly*, 42 (2002), 215–246. On the *Modus parisiensis*, cf. Gabriel Codina Mir, *Aux sources de la pédagogie des Jésuites, le 'modus parisiensis'* (Rome, 1968); idem, "The 'Modus Parisiensis,'" in *The Jesuit Ratio Studiorum*, ed. Vincent J. Duminuco (New York, 2000), 56–74; Moscheo, "Istruzione," 92; O'Malley, *The First Jesuits*, 216.
- 85 Some Jesuits complained in 1586 that students, especially at their colleges in Italy, escaped to medicine or law (*ad medicinam vel ad iurisprudentiam dilabuntur*), and in 1591 they tried to stop that "movement" with some regulations only applying to Italy (*Regulae italicae propriae*). Cf. MPSI V, 81 and 333. However, the background to this particular problem remains to be investigated.

university presumably led Loyola to decide that law and medicine should henceforth be excluded. Hieronymus Nadal, who had been the major commissioner during that affair, might have been annoyed even more.⁸⁶

Previous to the publication of Loyola's Constitutions, Nadal had in 1552 limited himself only to canon law, decreeing that nothing should be read which would lead to the fuss observed among lawyers (*iudiciorum strepitus*).⁸⁷ He repeated this point when commenting on the Constitutions, adding that (secular) law and medicine are even more remote from the Institute because Jesuit schools will not benefit from them.⁸⁸ For Loyola, pragmatic as he was, the extensive task of providing teaching in law and medicine was the reason to leave them to others. He did not however make his motives explicit. Nadal's concerns point in a less pragmatic and more programmatic direction: law and medicine were of no use to the religious goals of the SJ. This view was reinforced by Martinus de Olave, who in 1553 prohibited employing professors of law and medicine at Jesuit universities, arguing that the aim of Jesuit education is to form secular and religious servants of the church.⁸⁹ When Diego de Ledesma in 1564 wrote the statutes for the Roman College, he referred to his own college in Rome and the college in Coimbra as "universal colleges," in which all disciplines were taught with the exception of medicine and civil law, which were – he explained – not necessary for religious people.⁹⁰ In sum, then, Nadal, Olave and Ledesma not only mention the "extra costs" of running medical faculties, as Loyola did, but they also tell us why these costs are not worth paying.

86 The only hint about Nadal's annoyance that I could trace – namely that Nadal's subsequent procedures were "ispirata all'esperienza messinese" – is a note in Moscheo, "Istruzione," 104, n. 37. See also the vague allusion in O'Malley, *The First Jesuits*, 215.

87 Cf. Nadal's *De Studii generalis dispositione et ordine* of 1552 in MPSI I, 152: "Rursum erit alia lectio iuris canonici vel ex decretalibus Summorum Pontificum vel ex Decreto. Non legentur autem nisi ea, quae ad theologum et casuum conscientiae dissolutionem attinere possunt. Nihil autem attingetur eorum, quae ad forum spectant et iudiciorum strepitum."

88 Cf. Gerónimo Nadal, *Scholia in Constitutiones S.I.*, ed. Manuel Ruiz Jurado (Granada, 1976), 123: "remotum quidem est a nostro instituto studium iuris canonici, eius partis, quae ad forum contentiosum pertinet. Magis vero est remotum medicinae, et iuris civilis studium. Illud profiteri non possumus in nostris scholis, multo minus hoc." Cf. also above n. 45.

89 See Olave's *Ordo lectionum et exercitationum in universitatibus* of 1553 in MPSI I, 166: "Manco si permeterà in queste universitate professione de iure civili né di medicina, perchè il fine è instruire et formare ministri idonei dela Chiesa cusi religiosi come ancor seculari." Cf. also Bangert, *Jerome Nadal*, 86–88.

90 Cf. *De ratione et ordine studiorum Collegii Romani*, 1564–1565 in MPSI II, 530: "Quaedam sunt collegia universalialia, quale est romanum, et Conimbricense et similia, in quibus omnes disciplinae docentur, demptis medicina et iure civili, quae religiosos docere non oportebat, quamvis ius canonicum non repugnet." Repeated in MPSI II, 532.

In fact, however, there were two sixteenth-century universities run by the SJ which did include faculties of medicine and law, namely Gandia and Pont-à-Mousson.⁹¹ As for Gandia, Nadal explicitly questioned the inclusion of law and medicine there.⁹² As for Pont-à-Mousson, which was the university of the Duchy of Lorraine, founded in 1572 by Charles III, the Jesuit General Everardo Mercurian viewed the Duke's wish to award also degrees in law and medicine with scepticism: "The admixture of those professors of law and medicine is not only inconvenient for us, but also seems to be, as the times are nowadays, dangerous for faith and morality."⁹³ The animosity to medicine had become a fast-selling item in Jesuit rhetoric. From a pragmatic argument concerning institutional and financial administration, it had developed into a programmatic doubt about the use of medicine and had finally ended up as a warning against heresy.

Conclusion

By means of a brief tour through a fairly complicated and ill-understood chapter of sixteenth-century intellectual history, I have tried to demonstrate that the Conimbricenses – even though they belonged to a religiously dominated intellectual order – displayed a distinctive interest in treating anatomical and physiological questions. Conventionally, such topics were treated in commentaries on Aristotle's *De anima*, in the parts dealing with the external and internal senses. Although Aristotle himself had not discussed physiological issues in *De anima*, the Conimbricenses used their commentaries as a place for gathering and storing knowledge about the body. In this, they were driven by the overarching goal of finding a proper place for medical and semi-medical knowledge within their educational framework. Given that *De anima* represented an obligatory stage in the study of philosophy, while Aristotle's works on zoological or

91 Welie, "Ignatius of Loyola on Medical Education," 35, only names the case of Pont-à-Mousson. For the statutes of Gandia (1565), which includes medicine, see MPSI II, 163. For the case of Pont-à-Mousson, see MPSI IV, 757.

92 Cf. MPSI II, 159, n. 99, which quotes from a letter of 1553 to the *rector* of the university.

93 Cf. MPSI IV, 757, n. 7, which quotes from a letter to John Maldonado of 1579: "Etenim illa iuristarum et medicorum admixtio non molesta tantum nobis, sed etiam, ut sunt nunc tempora, et fidei et bonis moribus periculosa fore videtur." Similarly, some Jesuits feared that the philosophy course (in France), if it was not accompanied by the theology of Thomas Aquinas, would rather educate physicians. Cf. *Quae ad studia superiora conferre possunt in Gallia* of 1582 in MPSI VII, 584: "Interdum enim nostri praeceptores magis videntur medicos futuros docere quam theologos."

anatomical topics were beyond the scope of Jesuit education, the Conimbricenses' strategy of introducing medical themes there appears to be both smart and effective.

How must the Conimbricenses' conspicuous interest be explained? We have seen that the study of medicine required basic philosophical training, and at least at Italian universities, philosophy and medicine had for centuries formed an alliance that was also evident in printed textbooks. This traditional alliance was in full accordance with the expectation of the Portuguese King, when he wished that learned physicians be educated at the royal university of Coimbra. The issue at stake in this essay is, however, that the official agenda of the SJ excluded the teaching of medicine at Jesuit universities and in 1586 even banned medical topics from commentaries on Aristotle.

As I have tried to argue, the Jesuits' sceptical attitude towards medicine did not grow out of an original sense of animosity, but was probably triggered by the adverse experience with the order's first university at Messina, where the order could never get a grip on the faculties of law and medicine. While the Messina incident led to the order's overall abandonment of medicine, with Coimbra as a conspicuous exception. However, the independent and idiosyncratic approach of the Conimbricenses did not become the order's standard, but was simply tolerated, in a perfect illustration of the Society's unitarianism and the degree of leeway that it could also permit.

These findings allow for a number of general conclusions. The first point is of a taxonomic nature: The scope of philosophy in sixteenth-century education included topics that cannot reasonably be labelled as "philosophical." Such is the case with the structure of the eye, its having seven coverings, three liquids and nine muscles. The demarcation line between philosophy and anatomical knowledge was therefore not immediately given but had to be negotiated.⁹⁴ The second point concerns the functional role of philosophy in the sixteenth century. Whereas in various different contexts, natural philosophy had served as a complement of medicine, in the Jesuit pedagogical system, it formally lost that job and had to serve once again as an *ancilla theologiae*.⁹⁵ The fact that this

94 Cf. Christoph Lüthy, "What to Do with Seventeenth-century Natural Philosophy? A Taxonomic Problem," *Perspectives on Science* 8 (2000), 164–195, here 166, points to a similar problem for historical scholarship.

95 With regard to Jesuits, see above n. 45 and Charles H. Lohr, "Jesuit Aristotelianism and Sixteenth-century Metaphysics," in *Paradosis: Studies in Memory of Edwin A. Quain.*, ed. Harry George Fletcher III and Mary Beatrice Schulte (New York, 1976), 203–20. Especially at universities in Northern Italy, the study of philosophy was often seen as preparation for the study of medicine. See, e.g., William Wallace, "Natural Philosophy: Traditional Natural Philosophy," in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles Schmitt and

programme was not always crowned with success draws attention to the institutional role philosophy played as a faculty.⁹⁶ When investigating early-modern university philosophy, it is helpful for historians to take into account the whole university, its demands and goals. By the same token, it is prudent not to speak of ‘the Jesuits’, where, quite often, it is historiographically more precise to speak of ‘some Jesuits’ or ‘certain Jesuit colleges.’⁹⁷ The SJ used to picture itself as a monolithic institution. Despite their noteworthy success in living up to this ideal, it should not be taken at face value. A final caveat: the generic label of ‘a commentary on Aristotle’ should be taken with a similar grain of salt.⁹⁸ In Jesuit commentaries, the aim was not just to interpret Aristotle’s work, but also to set down a coordinate system for discussions that were of no immediate use for the understanding of the ancient source, but catered to specific systematic or encyclopaedic concerns. An understanding of these wider concerns, besides shedding light on the continued significance of Aristotle’s works, contributes to a clarification of nothing less than the very role philosophy itself played within the structures of learning and studying in early-modern Europe.

al. (Cambridge, 1988), 199–235, here 231; cf. Rebollo, “The Paduan School of Medicine”; and Heikki Mikkeli, “The Aristotelian Classification of Knowledge in the Early Sixteenth Century,” in *Renaissance Readings of the Corpus Aristotelicum*, ed. Marianne Pade (Copenhagen, 2001), 103–127. Cf also above n. 40.

96 For a historical remark on the role played by the liberal arts, see Maarten J.F.M. Hoenen, “Am Ende der Künste? Zum Begriff der ‘Artes liberales’ in der Spätscholastik,” in *Florilegium mediaevale: études offertes à Jacqueline Hamesse à l’occasion de son éméritat*, ed. José Francisco Meirinhos and Olga Weijers (Turnholt, 2009), 323–347.

97 Cf. most recently, Paul F. Grendler, “Jesuit Schools in Europe. A Historiographical Essay,” *Journal of Jesuit Studies*, 1 (2014), 7–25, here 8.

98 Cf. most recently Michael Edwards, “The Fate of Commentary in the Philosophy of the Schools, C. 1550–1640,” *Intellectual History Review*, 22 (2012), 519–536.