THE RATIO STUDIORUM OF THE CONVENTUAL FRANCISCANS IN THE BAROQUE AGE AND THE CULTURAL-POLITICAL BACKGROUND TO THE SCOTIST PHILOSOPHY CURSUS OF BARTOLOMEO MASTRI AND BONAVENTURA BELLUTO

MARCO FORLIVESI*

Presentation

During the century following the Council of Trent, a gradual development of two trends within Catholic religious orders became evident: the first consisted in unifying and strengthening the Order's culture by focussing on one author of reference; the other in elaborating a new way of presenting that author's doctrines. In the case of the Friars Minor Conventuals, these trends were fostered and codified in the second decade of the seventeenth century by the minister general of the Order, Giacomo Montanari from Bagnacavallo. Through his work and directives, he promoted the idea that a specific kind of intellectual activity was a prime way to lead an authentic religious life and, at the same time, he established the limitations within which it should be carried out. This activity consisted in providing the Order with new works fea-

* I wish to express my grateful thanks to Carmel Francesca Ace, Luciano Bertazzo, Cristiano Casalini and Daniel J. Cattolica for their competent and generous work, advices and support.

turing innovative didactic characteristics and a renewed defence of the doctrines of John Duns Scotus; its limitations consisted in the obligation to root firmly any philosophical and theological speculation in the thought of the medieval master. Bartolomeo Mastri and Bonaventura Belluto's philosophy *cursus ad mentem Scoti* was probably the major result of this impetus. The following essay examines the ways in which this process occurred and the outcomes to which it led.

1. The *ratio studiorum* of the Minor Conventuals in the century following the Council of Trent

From the end of the sixteenth century[1], the school system of the Order of Minor Conventuals was structured into four – or five – levels, each of which lasting three years and whose institutes were called "gymnasia" and "colleges". These terms, which in any case fluctuated in meaning, did not supplant the older "*studium*" but were superimposed on it, expressing both the diverse seats of learning and the level of instruction imparted in them, that is to say the academic subjects that were treated. Another fairly constant feature was the system that regulated teachers' promotion. Teachers were normally promoted and transferred to another post when the general chapters of the Order were held, usually every three years. This does not mean, however, that

[1] For the Franciscan school regulation previous to sixteenth century, cf. Brlek 1942, Roest 2000, and Fontana 2012. As far as the spiritual and devotional aspect of Franciscans' education before the Council of Trent is concerned – an aspect of their education that is as important as the cultural one, as we shall see –, cf. Roest 2004.

the *ratio studiorum*[2] of the Order did not change several times and that numerous, important and various exceptions to the norms were not made from 1565 to 1628.

The **Constitutiones piae** *and the work of Filippo Gesualdi (1565-1596)*

The *Constitutiones piae* (1565)

The Order's earliest Constitutions, after the definitive separation between the Conventual Franciscans and the Observant Franciscans in 1517, were also subsequent to the conclusion of the Council of Trent: these Constitutions are the *Constitutiones piae*, which were approved by Pius IV on 17th December, 1565. They already structured the Conventuals' school system into levels and named the lowest-level *studia* as "gymnasia". More specifically, the *Constitutiones piae* distinguished between the gymnasia in which logic was taught and the gymnasia in which philosophy was taught. The *Constitutiones* provided for both the subdivision into levels lasting three years and the rule, valid for pupils as well as teachers, that established the prohibition for one to accede to the subsequent higher level if his worth had not been proved at the lower one. As far as the teaching programmes were concerned, the *Constitutiones piae* simply prescribed that Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* should be read

[2] During the period taken into consideration in the present work, the legislation that governed the Conventual Franciscans' education system was basically named after what it ruled, that is, "*cursus studiorum*"; I use the expression "*ratio studiorum*" for the sake of clarity and simplicity.

for three years and that professors of theology, in the seats where they existed, should also hold lessons on the Holy Scriptures[3].

Filippo Gesualdi's transitional regulations (1594)

The period of Filippo Gesualdi from Castrovillari as minister general witnessed a change in the organisation of studies. As soon as he was elected, in 1593, he encharged two luminaries of the Order, Girolamo Pallantieri Sr. from Castel Bolognese and Ottaviano Strambiati Sr. from Ravenna, with preparing a reform of the *cursus studiorum*[4]. Shortly after a year later, that is in 1594, he sent all the provinces a first series of transitional regulations. Besides demanding a verification of the regularity of the form and content of bachelors' *curricula* (a fairly common initiative in the history of the Order), they distinguished the *studia*, conforming to the subjects and programmes, into four three-year levels: *studia* on logic, *studia* on physics, lower *studia* (taken to mean lower *studia* on theology) and colleges (that is, higher *studia* on theology).

In the *studia* on logic, Peter of Spain's *Summulae*, with Pierre Tartaret's commentary, were to be read in the first year; in the second year, Aristotle's texts, accompanied by various commentaries, among which mainly Tartaret's, and, in the third year, Duns Scotus' texts concerning logic were to be presented. In the *studia* "on philosophy", as they were called, Aristotle's nat-

[3] *Constitutiones piae* 1565, cap. 5, pp. 26-28. These programmes are more generic than those prescribed in the earlier Constitutions, that is to say in the *Constitutiones alexandrinae* (approved by Alexander VI in 1501), and, according to Brlek, were characterised by a return to older regulations. Cf. BRLEK 1942, 92, and DI FONZO 1944, 180.
[4] BENOFFI 1933, 88, and PARISCIANI 1983, 612-615 and 625.

ural philosophy was to be explained in the first and second years, and his metaphysics in the third; the entire text of the most important books of Aristotle's works on these topics had to be read, whereas the others books had to be presented concisely. In the lower *studia* on theology, there were two teachers, called 'lectors': one was to present Bonaventure's commentaries on the first and second books of the *Sententiae*, the other on the third and fourth, also taking into account Peter Lombard's text. In the colleges, that is to say in the higher *studia* on theology, the *via Scoti* alone was to be followed. There were two teachers, called 'regents': one was to read Scotus' commentaries on the first and second books of the *Sententiae*, the other those on the third and fourth. The main questions were to be presented in detail, the others concisely. In the higher *studia* on theology there were also lectors subordinate to the regents: the metaphysical, physical and logical lectors. They were also required to follow the *via Scoti*, and the regents were responsible for supervising their theaching[5].

Although several of the prescriptions in these *Ordini* remained in force in the 1596 *Decreta*, of which we shall speak shortly, it is still important to consider them for a variety of reasons. First of all, they seem to be more an ordering of the existing didactic structures and courses rather than a radical restructuring of them. Moreover, later regulations do not make it possible to see equally clearly that the subdivision of the *studia* into logic, physics and lower and higher theology (called here "colleges") in actual fact precedes the reorganisation promoted by Gesualdi. The name for the lectors subordinated to the regents in the higher theological *studia* is also very interesting: unlike

[5] GESUALDI 1594.

the later descriptions of these lectors as "convent bachelors", "masters of arts" and "masters of students" (or "masters of studies"), the titles of "metaphysical lector", "physical lector" and "logical lector" openly state the subjects that were taught by the professors charged of those lectureships[6]. This also makes clear the fact that, in the period when the Viterbo *Decreta* were in force, at colleges all subjects were available, so that it was possible to follow the entire course of studies in them, not merely the final, and highest, level.

The decrees of the Viterbo general chapter (1596)

After a further letter of 27th March, 1595, in which Gesualdi is concerned with verifying students' preparation and their distribution within the *studia*[7], the decisive passage in the scholastic organization of the Order is provided by the *Decreta generalis capituli Viterbensis de reformatione studiorum Ordinis Minorum Conventualium*, published in Padua in 1596[8].

---

[6] COSTA 2001, 330, footnote 188, writes that the convent bachelor was entrusted with teaching metaphysics, the master of studies with the study of physics and the master of arts with logic. However, I believe this is partly mistaken: it seems to me that the tasks of the master of studies, or of students, and of the master of arts, were respectively the teaching of logic and physics.

[7] GESUALDI 1595.

[8] Historians of education have so far not paid much attention to Gesualdi's *Decreta* and have mainly concentrated on examining the Jesuits' *Ratio studiorum.* However, when the latter is compared to the Viterbo decrees, certain similarities become apparent: here, too, the course of studies is divided into the three periods of preparation in the humanities, philosophy and theology, although the length of courses and subdivisions do not coincide with those in use among the Franciscan Conventuals. Other similarities can be seen in the favour with which the institution of academies internal, or parallel, to the *studia* is welcomed, in the very widespread use of disputes, extra practice lessons, revision lessons and exams, and in the recourse to the spirit of emulation and competitiveness among students. The greater attention paid by scholars to the Jesuit *ratio* is justified by the role it played in the "public" sphere, since Jesuit colleges also aimed to form the political élite. Nevertheless, the Viterbo *Decreta* can be placed along the same twin track of rationalising education

Schools were divided into five three-year classes: schools of logic, schools of philosophy, schools of theology and "general" schools, the latter being divided into two categories[9]. Two institutions set above these classifications were added to these five levels: the Assisi *studium* and the Collegio di s. Bonventura in Rome[10]. The schools of the first three classes were also called "gymnasia" or provincial *studia*[11]. Only one subject was taught in them; students' placement in them and the detailed plan of lessons depended on the minister provincial's decisions[12]. In the general *studia* all subjects were taught, and pupils from all the provinces were accepted into them. These *studia* were further distinguished into first-class general *studia* and second-class general *studia*: in the case of the former, some of the pupils were placed in them at their provinces of origin's expense, some others at the discretion of the minister general; in the case of the latter, pupils were placed in them only at the discretion of the minister general[13].

As far as teaching staff is concerned, in the first-class general *studia* two regent masters were present. A convent bachelor, an arts lector and a master of students[14], called "officials of the *studium*", were also present and were

---

and the post-Tridentine ideological recompacting; moreover, they precede the publication of the definitive version of the Jesuits' *ratio* by three years. A comparative study of the history of the *rationes studiorum* of the various religious orders and of their characteristics would thus be useful in order to understand the forms and development of the counter-Reformation cultural totalitarianism.

[9] *Decreta capituli Viterbensis* 1596, no. 1, f. (unnumbered) A2*r*.

[10] *Ibid.*, no. 2, f. (unnumbered) A2*r*.

[11] *Ibid.*, no. 6, f. (unnumbered) A3*r*; no. 24, f. (unnumbered) B3*r*.

[12] *Ibid.*, no. 3, f. (unnumbered) A2*r*.

[13] *Ibid.*, nno. 2-5, f. (unnumbered) A2*r*-*v*.

[14] This figure is not to be confused with the master of novices or professed friars, called at times *magister morum*, responsible for their spiritual and disciplinary education.

subordinate to the regents[15]. The second-class general *sudia* were different from the previous ones in the sole fact that there was only one regent master. Finally, in the gymnasia only two teachers, called lectors, were present[16]. For the use of these titles, the *Decreta* prescribed that only the teachers responsible for the general *studia* had the right to the title of regent, while all the other teachers were to be qualified simply as lectors[17].

The *Decreta* provide a detailed table of the syllabuses, which mainly retains the regulations of 1594. In the logic gymnasia, Peter of Spain's *Summulae* with Tartaret's commentary were to be expounded in the first year; in the second year, the main texts on logic by Aristotle were to be read accompanied by a commentary, such as Tartaret's; in the third year, the problematics concerning universals, formalities, etc., according to Scotus were to be explained[18]. In the gymnasium of philosophy, or "of physics" as it was called, in the first two years Aristotle's books on natural history were to be read; in the third, those concerning metaphysics. The 1596 *Decreta* kept the criterion according to which the books and parts considered as major ones were to be expounded in detail whereas the others were to be merely outlined[19]. The theology syllabuses differed according to the type of institute. In the first-class general *studia* the first regent had to expound the first and third books of Lombard's *Sententiae* «iuxta mentem Scoti»; similarly, the second regent expounded the second and fourth books. In the second-class general *studia*, since there was only one regent, and in the provincial theological *studia*, the

---

[15] *Decreta capituli Viterbensis* 1596, no. 22, f. (unnumbered) B2*v*.
[16] *Ibid.*, no. 10, f. (unnumbered) A4*r*.
[17] *Ibid.*, no. 9, f. (unnumbered) A4*r*.
[18] *Ibid.*, no. 23, ff. (unnumbered) B2*v*-3*r*.
[19] *Ibid.*.

first year was to be dedicated to trinitarian themes, the second to angelological themes and the third to christology and theology of sacraments; all this was to be carried out «summatim ad mentem Bonaventurae opinione Scoti non reiecta»[20]. The reason for this disparity in syllabuses was rooted in customs among Franciscans that had arisen in the fifteenth century, according to which it was thought that two levels of theological teaching were possible: brighter students could tackle the doctrines of *Doctor Subtilis*, while the less gifted could, and should, conform to the standpoints of Alexander of Hales, Francis of Meyronnes, Richard of Middleton and, above all, Bonaventure[21].

The programmes hitherto set out determined the general structure of the curriculum Gesualdi wanted, yet they do not contain all the subjects taught, all the more so because they do not explain the role of the other subordinate teachers in the general *studia*. As we continue to read, we find that during periods when there were no classes, lectors were ordered to hold lessons on the Holy Scriptures[22]. In the theological gymnasia, on some days called "peripatetic", one of the lectors was to explain ethics reading parts 2 and 3 of Alexander of Hales' *Summa theologica*[23]. Lessons were also to be held in all the gymnasia on sacred oratory: on some Sundays, a lector was supposed to illustrate briefly the rules for preaching and have students practise both in Latin and in the vulgar tongue[24]. Finally, the study of Hebrew and

[20] *Ibid.*, no. 21, f. (unnumbered) B2*r*.
[21] DI FONZO 1944, 180.
[22] *Decreta capituli Viterbensis* 1596, no. 30, f. (unnumbered) B4*v*.
[23] *Ibid.*, no. 31, f. (unnumbered) B4*v*.
[24] *Ibid.*, no. 32, f. (unnumbered) C1*r*.

Chaldean was also possible; this, however, was left up to students' good will, who were rewarded with dispensations[25].

The careers both of pupils and of teachers were organised in such a way as to correspond to the divisions in the curricula. Their denominations and titles depended on the level of instruction attained: a student was one who was still engaged in the study of grammar, rhetoric or logic; a bachelor of logic was one who had completed his studies on logic and was studying philosophy; a bachelor of physics was one who had ended his course on philosophy and was studying theology[26].

Three further bachelor titles are mentioned in the *Decreta*: those of the bible, of the *pro exercitio* and of the *pro cursu*. I must confess, however, that their meaning is not clear to me. Antonio Sartori maintains that a *pro cursu* bachelor was a teacher, but he bases this on documents that are at least a century older than the period we are considering[27]. Filippo Rotolo also documents, through an exemplary case, that at the end of the fifteenth century the *pro cursu* (*magisterii*) bachelor was one who, by means of teaching in a general *studium*, gained a diploma entitling him to be called "master"[28], yet the problem still remains as to how to ascertain whether matters still remained the same at the end of the sixteenth century. The Quaracchi fathers (mentioned by Sartori) and Lorenzo Di Fonzo write, on the other hand, that this figure was a student, but besides disagreeing among themselves as far as details are concerned, they mean some who were not at the end of the theology course,

---

[25] *Ibid.*, no. 33, f. (unnumbered) C1*r-v*.
[26] *Ibid.*, no. 15, f. (unnumbered) B1*r*.
[27] SARTORI 1966, 111-113.
[28] ROTOLO 1995, p. 31.

as seems to be the case in the *Decreta*[29], but at the beginning of it. Piana distinguishes the *pro exercitio* bachelors from the *pro cursu* ones on the basis of the fact that while the former were destined to remain bachelors, the latter completed studies entitling them to be called "masters"[30].

For my part, I can only provide a probable solution, which is not far from Piana's statement. The fact that such titles are included in a classification concerning students and that a convent bachelor is to be found as a distinct, independent figure leads me to believe that these names might designate the level of education attained by a student. A decisive point concerns the evolution of the practices of conferring a doctorate. During the sixteenth century, being nominated a master required either passing an exam in a public *studium*, or getting a papal brief, or – from 1561 onward – passing an exam on the occasion of a general or a provincial chapter of the Order[31]. The foundation of the Collegio di s. Bonaventura – about which I shall treat hereinafter – had introduced a considerable novelty, that is to say, the existence, within the Order, of an institution that by right issued a doctoral degree. I hence suggest that, according to the Viterbo *Decreta*, "biblical bachelor" was the title acquired by he who had concluded his studies on theology in a provincial *studium*, "*pro exercitio* bachelor" was the title acquired by he who had concluded his studies on theology at a general *studium*, and "*pro cursu* bachelor" was the title acquired by he who had been admitted to the *studium* in Assisi or to the Collegio di s. Bonaventura, in Rome, that is to say, to the institutions

---

[29] DI FONZO 1944, 176.
[30] PIANA 1970, 51*-52*. The distinction between *pro exercitio* bachelors and *pro cursu* bachelors is also to be found in ROEST 2000, but this author, too, refers to periods prior to the one that is the object of our enquiry here.
[31] Cf. *infra*, footnotes 281.

qualified in the *Decreta* as superior to the aforementioned five regular levels of education[32].

Properly speaking, the school career of students began when they moved on to logic after studying letters. To this end, the student had to sit an exam with the minister provincial, who was assisted by a few lectors; if he passed, the minister provincial informed the minister general or chapter general, who then saw to admitting the student to the course. If the three-year course had already started, the minister provincial anyway had the power to admit students to it, after, however, having informed the minister general[33]. In order to move on to the next level, the student had to have followed the previous one for three years and withstood "public disputations"[34], that is an exam; moreover, the teacher of the *studium* and the warden of the convent had to write letters of reference guaranteeing the student's serious dedication to learning and his good morals respectively[35]. Passing the student and conferring the title of bachelor on him according to the steps recalled above was the prerogative of the minister general or the chapter general, who were, in their turn, obliged to have received letters from the teachers, called *litterae testimoniales*, attesting the results obtained by the student[36]. Admission to general *studia* required at least three years' study at provincial *studia* and the usual *litterae testimoniales*. It further required that students «per aliquos scholasticos actus se honorifice exercuerint», that is to say, as far as I can interpret

---

[32] *Decreta capituli Viterbensis* 1596, no. 2, f. (unnumbered) A2*r*.
[33] *Ibid.*, no. 13, f. (unnumbered) A4*v*.
[34] This scholastic act was also called "public conclusions" and "public theses": cf. WEIJERS 2013 and FORLIVESI 2000.
[35] *Decreta capituli Viterbensis* 1596, no. 14, f. (unnumbered) B1*r*.
[36] *Ibid.*, no. 47, f. (unnumbered) C4*v*.

it, that they had passed their exams or public disputations clearly distinguishing themselves[37].

Teaching posts were also ordered according to a certain progression. Only those who had not been condemned or suspected of heresy, had led an exemplary religious life and had not been a warden or rector of a convent, unless by necessity for a brief period, could apply to become a teacher[38]. Furthermore, the applicant had to have completed his course of studies and passed all the exams, particularly the final one[39]. In order to be awarded a post, the teacher should have sweared, before either the minister general or the minister provincial, that he would have carried out the programme of the courses assigned to him for the next three years[40]. Promotion in an academic career was regulated by a rule by which teachers might teach a subject in a higher class only if they had previously taught it in a lower one; in particular, in order to become regent in a general *studium* of the first class it was necessary to have been previously regent in a *studium* of the second class[41].

A system of controls and sanctions was supposed to ensure that the school system ran smoothly. The regents had to verify that the teachers under them completed the planned courses[42] ; the regents were, in their turn, subjected to control on the part of the warden and provincial minister[43]. Negligent regents and lectors were threatened of losing their mandate[44]. Students

---

[37] *Ibid.*, no. 5, f. (unnumbered) A3*r*.
[38] *Ibid.*, no. 8, ff. (unnumbered) A3*v*-4*r*.
[39] *Ibid.*, no. 16, f. (unnumbered) B1*v*, and no. 8, f. (unnumbered) A4*r*.
[40] *Ibid.*, nno. 11-12, f. (unnumbered) A4*v*.
[41] *Ibid.*, no. 16, f. (unnumbered) B1*v*.
[42] *Ibid.*, no. 22, f. (unnumbered) B2*v*.
[43] *Ibid.*, no. 51, f. (unnumbered) D2*r*.
[44] *Ibid.*, no. 26, ff. (unnumbered) B3*v*-4*r*.

were not given the chance to "repeat the course": they could remain in any given class for only three years, after which they either passed or were expelled[45].

The programme of teaching activities was rich and not restricted merely to lessons. Teachers were obliged, at least on some occasions, to engage in lively debates for the benefit of the students. The first lector, in the role of president of the *studium*, had to present and defend theses publicly. The sub-lectors, i.e. subordinate teachers, were obliged to defend theses in the role of *respondens*[46]. Students were encouraged both to teach and to debate issues. As far as the former activity is concerned, one of the best students was chosen and he was occasionally told by the first lector to repeat in front of the other students one of the lessons given by that lector[47]. As for the latter activity, during vacations "circular disputations", or "circles", were held, over which each regent had to preside by turns: in this case, it was the bachelors and students that, according to a previously established calendar, had to present, defend or counter theses[48]. Among these activities, the *Decreta* also recall the "public conclusions", which functioned, however, as the final exam of each three-year course. These "conclusions" were compulsory for every order of students and had to be based on the subjects studied either in the last year or throughout the whole three years[49].

There were also connections with the outside academic world, albeit not very close ones. Many fathers were public lectors, that is to say teachers at

---

[45] *Ibid.*, no. 17, f. (unnumbered) B1*v*.
[46] *Ibid.*, no. 24, f. (unnumbered) B3*r*.
[47] *Ibid.*.
[48] *Ibid.*, no. 26, f. (unnumbered) B3*v*.
[49] *Ibid.*, no. 25, f. (unnumbered) B3*r-v*.

public *studia*; they were obliged by the *Decreta* to hold, at the minister general's discretion, also a course at the convent in which they lived[50]. Furthermore, there was the possibility, when necessary, of calling upon teachers outside the Order, for which, however, the minister general's license was indispensable[51]. Finally, we can see from a paragraph dedicated to the rules applying to attending lessons outside the cloister that this was not a rare event: students were forbidden to go to lessons outside the convent if this meant missing a lesson or a liturgical rite, but lectors were required to hold lessons at times that did not prevent students from attending external lessons[52].

A tie between theological speculation and religious practice were training in preaching sermons, exercises on matters of conscience and liturgical obligations. As far as the exercises on matters of conscience are concerned, students were to carry out practice lasting one hour, after lunch or dinner, two or three times a week before all those who lived in the convent. On the first day, a lector set out the question to be discussed and the bibliography; on the second, a student had to deal briefly with the question in the vulgar tongue, the father superior had to test orally someone according to his liking and the lector had to provide a detailed explanation of the case[53].

Liturgical activities obviously played a central role in shaping the character of the Order's new members. Thus, it does not seem unusual that there should be mention of the liturgical life in a document pertaining to the regulation of studies such as the Viterbo *Decreta*, since it is a clear sign that the

---

[50] *Ibid.*, no. 27, f. (unnumbered) B4*r*.
[51] *Ibid.*, no. 49, f. (unnumbered) D1*v*.
[52] *Ibid.*, no. 29, f. (unnumbered) B4*r*.
[53] *Ibid.*, no. 48, f. (unnumbered) D1*r-v*.

document had been conceived as an integral part of a unitary "formative" project. Teachers and students were obliged to take part in the whole divine office, by day and by night, and in the convent mass, the sole exception being the morning office on days when they had lessons[54]. All those who were not yet clerics had to serve at the matins[55]. Moreover, the titles of subdeacon and deacon were not merely formal: on the contrary, they involved carrying out liturgical tasks[56]. Students who were not priests had to serve at mass every day, while bachelors who were not priests had to do so only on feast days[57]. Bachelors in the first three years of priesthood also had their duties since they were among those who might be encharged with hebdomadary service[58].

As far as the school year is concerned, there were lessons from the feast of the Birth of Holy Mary, 8th September, to the Septuagesima Sunday, that is, the 9th Sunday before Easter. There then followed a break for Lent preaching until the *quindena Paschae*, that is, the first week after Easter[59]; after which lessons started again and lasted until the feast of St. Bonaventure, the 14th July[60].

---

[54] *Ibid.*, no. 37, f. (unnumbered) C2*r*.
[55] *Ibid.*, no. 39, f. (unnumbered) C2*v*.
[56] *Ibid.*, no. 38, f. (unnumbered) C2*v*.
[57] *Ibid.*, no. 43, f. (unnumbered) C3*v*.
[58] *Ibid.*, no. 42, f. (unnumbered) C3*r*.
[59] The *Quindena Paschae* were the two weeks over Easter; I understand that teachers were asked to begin lessons again at the beginning of the week after Easter. Properly, the norm decreed that only those who had obtained permission to preach from the minister general could interrupt teaching; however, it is clear both that nearly all the teachers aspired to this office, since it was a source of income, and that the absence of lectors involved the suspension of lessons.
[60] *Decreta capituli Viterbensis* 1596, no. 26, f. (unnumbered) B3*v*, and no. 34, f. (unnumbered) C1*v*-2*r*.

The work of Giacomo Montanari (1619-1620)

Montanari's religious and cultural project

It is not possible for me to establish whether, and for how long, the *Decreta* of the Viterbo chapter were strictly respected. What is certain is that in the second decade of the seventeenth century the Minor Conventuals' *cursus studiorum* was subjected to an extensive reform at the hands of Giacomo Montanari, first a zealous vicar general and then minister general of the Order. Montanari was born in 1570 in Bagnacavallo, near Ravenna. After entering the Order of the Franciscan Conventuals in 1591, he studied in Ravenna under the guidance of Ottaviano Strambiati Sr.. After winning Gesualdi's favour, in 1596 he was admitted to the Collegio di s. Bonaventura and graduated in 1599. In April, 1601, he was nominated teacher of metaphysics at the public *studium* in Bologna but in 1603 he resigned from this post in order to dedicate his energies to preaching. He was nominated first minister provincial for the East and then minister provincial for Hungary; these might not be simply honorary posts since their effectiveness depended on the extent to which the person to whom they were awarded dedicated himself to the tasks connected to them. At the general chapter of 1611, he was elected procurator of the Order, a figure responsible for relationships between the Order and the Holy See. In the summer of 1612, he was nominated vicar general of the Order, that is, the substitute for the minister general William Hugues, who had been "promoted" by the Holy See to another assignment. In 1617 he was elected minister general, a post he held until 1623. All in all, he directed the life of the Order, despite fierce conflicts, for over ten years. From 1623 he be-

longed to the losing political current within the Order in matters concerning religious poverty, and in 1628 he fled to Venice, where he died in 1631[61].

Montanari was an ardent defender of Gesualdi's work. Central to his activity were the total abolition of private property among Conventual Franciscans and the spiritual and doctrinal education of the Order's neophytes. We can have some idea of Montanari's intentions by summing up some of the orders he gave when, in December, 1615, he canonically visited the convent in Bologna (that is to say, all the institutional structures found there: the convent itself, the novitiate, the professate and the *studium*)[62]. A fundamental point in his activity was his order that all distinctions among the friars' cells should be eliminated by imposing a single model. All the cells were to be the same in size and furnishings: a bed, for which he fixed the size, a table, a bookshelf, if necessary, and a holy picture. He forbade the use of closed containers and doors with locks[63] ; private paintings and fireplaces, chests, non-standard beds, birds and animals in general, plants and vases had to be removed. Even the clock in the rooms of the *studium*'s regents was to be taken out. He further decreed that built-in wardrobes and a number of windows should be walled up and that iron grilles should be installed in order to sepa-

[61] FRANCHINI 1693, pp. 286-290; BENOFFI 1933, 92; BONOLI 1989, 169-171; PARISCIANI 1983, 678-682. Franchini seems to maintain, although the passage is ambiguous, that Montanari was a collegiate in 1606; in any case, on this point, Franchini is mistaken.
[62] Ordini dei visitatori 1600-1638, Archivio di Stato di Bologna, Demaniale, S. Francesco, 268/4400, ff. 68*r*-136*v*.
[63] *Ibid.*, f. 89*r*-*v*.

rate the various areas of the convent building and ensure that it was isolated from the outside world[64].

To come to Montanari's "pedagogical" work, if we can call it such, in about 1647 Bartolomeo Mastri himself writes that he encouraged and pressed the youth in the Order, «pupillam occuli eius», to have fear of God, observe the *Rule* and do their school exercises[65]. As far as this youth is concerned, during his canonical visitation to the convent in Bologna Montanari himself summarised his project, widely documented in the uncountable prescriptions and restrictions he laid down in his canonical visitations to the various novitiates, professates and *studia* of the Order, as follows: «Raising Religion is born in particular from educating novices well and from not allowing any freedom to the professed friars»[66].

Montanari's obsession with iron grilles and keys also concerned libraries. The one in Bologna was to be closed with two locks, one usually kept closed with a key and the other locked only at certain times and on special feast days. Anyone who stole books was to be excommunicated; it was forbidden to write one's name in them; he gave the order that a lay friar should have the task of binding books and keeping the library clean; above all, he

---

[64] *Ibid.*, ff. 108*v*-111*r*. Montanari's ideas and orders concerning the perfect "form" that every convent should have took were subsequently published in 1618 as a pastoral letter: MONTANARI 1618.

[65] [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Prologus, p. 22.

[66] Ordini dei visitatori 1600-1638, Archivio di Stato di Bologna, Demaniale, S. Francesco, 268/4400, f. 89*r*: «il sollevamento della Religione nasce in particolare dall'educare bene i novicij e non dare libertà a professi». For a full exposition of Montanari's ideas concerning novices' education, cf. *Manuale* 1618 and *Alcuni avvisi et documenti per ben allevare i novitii*, in *Alfabeto* 1619, pp. 17-31. *Alfabeto* 1619 explicitly refers to MONTANARI (2)1619.

ordered that the catalogue of the books kept by this library should be shown to the Inquisitor so that it would be "purged"[67].

In brief, Montanari was a perfect executor of the Counter-Reformation plan to control society completely. The clergy he intended to educate were expected to believe it noble and holy to "purge" both their own and the convent's libraries and increase them only by adding books by "highly approved" authors, avoiding the acceptance of texts of a suspect content.

The *Epistola pastoralis* (1619)

The problem of the organization of studies is first mentioned in the records of the general chapter of 13th May, 1617, when Montanari was elected minister general[68]. Moreover, on that occasion it was decided to publish a pamphlet against Abraham Bzowski in defence of the repute of John Duns Scotus[69]. A second decisive event occurred during the general visitation that

---

[67] Ordini dei visitatori 1600-1638, Archivio di Stato di Bologna, Demaniale, S. Francesco, 268/4400, ff. 101*r*-102*v*.

[68] *Acta capituli 1617* 1618, pp. 55-56: «Ordinamus ut gymnasia Religionis distinguantur in classes et in unaquaque Provincia sint studia logicae et artium, et unum saltem in quo legatur sacra theologia, prout sancitum est in constitutionibus». I note that in the title page of these acts it is stated that the 1617 chapter was celebrated on 14th May, 1617, yet Whitsun unquestionably fell on 13th May in 1617 and the chapter had been called for precisely that day. When faced with this discrepancy, one is entitled to think either that there is a misprint in the title page or that the somewhat lengthy chapter was formally declared closed only on the following day.

[69] *Acta capituli 1617* 1618, pp. 47-48: «Committimus reverendissimo patri nostro generali […] ut opera et studio eruditorum aliquot patrum libellos infrascriptos pro cuiusque captu compilandos, conscribendos, et typis deinde excudendos curet, videlicet. […] appologia pro Doctore nostro Scoto contra quemdam patrem Barovium, qui adversus dicti Scoti doctrinam libellum in lucem iam emisit». Cf. also PARISCIANI 1983, 729-730 and 751, footnote 142. Strictly speaking, in the text of the acts of the chapter a certain, otherwise unknown, *Barovium* is referred to. I should like to propose two possible interpretations of the name.

Montanari paid to the transalpine provinces of the Order in 1618-19. After he had reached, at the beginning of January, 1619, the convent of St. Francis in Cologne, on 6th January he attended the election of the new minister provincial and, at the end of the chapter, he had Duns Scotus' corpse inspected and transferred[70]. On that occasion, Montanari sent out a long, heartfelt pastoral letter addressed to the whole Order, and dated intentionally 6th January, 1619, which was first published as a text on its own in the same year[71] and then in Perugia in 1620, entitled *Epistola pastoralis*, as the introduction to the *Reformatio studiorum* Montanari himself desired[72].

The *Epistola* is entirely dedicated to demonstrating the close tie among the benefits of studying, the efficacy of preaching and the return to a sound religious life[73]. The text, which is presented as a meditation on the biblical verse «Surge, illuminare Hierusalem», is constructed on the interweaving of two lines of reasoning: on the one hand, he censures certain types of behav-

---

The first is that *Barovium* is a misprint for *Bzovium*, i.e. Abraham Bzowski; the second is that it is a misprint for *Baronium*, i.e. Cesare Baronio. If the latter hypothesis were true, the person in question would nevertheless still be the Dominican Abraham Bzowski: he was indeed the one who, from 1616, continued to publish the *Annales ecclesiastici* after Baronio's death.

[70] PARISCIANI 1983, 750-751.

[71] Ancient biographers and bibliographers of the Order of Minor Conventuals speak of a small volume in 24° printed in Cologne, of which, however, I can find no information. I have only seen three Montanari's pastoral letters: MONTANARI 1618, which is dated Messina, 11th January, 1618; MONTANARI (2)1619, which is dated Brognola [i.e., Brignoles], 19th May, 1619; MONTANARI (4)1619, which is dated Padua, 4th October, 1619. In MONTANARI 1619(3), a letter dated Milan, 10th July, 1619, to the minister provincial of the Province of Naples, one reads that a few days previously Montanari himself had sent to that minister provincial a "printed pastoral letter"; which "printed letter" is referred to is not specified, however one may think that Montanari is referring to MONTANARI (2)1619.

[72] MONTANARI 1619(1).

[73] *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12 (first series of pages; henceforth f.s.).

iour and deplores the contemporary state of affairs; on the other, he suggests precise solutions and points out ways to salvation.

There are fathers, Montanari thunders, who, well-fed, do nothing, publish nothing and sit surrounded by all their comforts without sharing their goods with the brethren in their community[74]. Particularly serious is the inertia among teachers: I know, he writes, that there are places where students learn nothing owing to the fact that lectors present them with very few topics and do not carry out the complete course on the subjects assigned to them[75]. One can witness scheming and pettiness in order to obtain degrees and positions undeservedly, intrigues that Montanari describes in highly sarcastic tones.

> Ad metam et scopum doctoratus ne dixerim omnes, at saltem plerique eorum qui in studiis versantur labores atque cogitatus suos omnes conijciunt; et quando de renovatione Collegij Sancti Bonaventurae de Urbe, aut de alia doctorum promotione, agendum est, quam festinantissime advolant, hinc inde confluunt, omnem artem et industriam depromunt, omnem movent lapidem, nihil intentatum praetermittunt, ut tandem super illa magistrali cathedra fastosi sedeant, caput bireto illo nigro sibi operiri sentiant, ea mente et animo ut ad suos postmodum conventus valeant sese recipere, ea facultare praediti primos in mensa obtinendi accubitus et digniorem in choro (licet raro) sedem occupandi[76].

To combat the deterioration that afflicted the Order, Montanari calls for a return to a truly religious life, which – he writes – is the soul of true science[77], and focusses on leading a life that conforms to doctrine, starting by

---

[74] *Ibid.*, pp. 34-35 (f.s.).
[75] *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40 (f.s.).
[76] *Ibid.*, p. 46 (f.s.).
[77] *Ibid.*, pp. 24-28 (f.s.).

avoiding any *curiositas* or search for appointments[78], It is at this point that the influence and historical importance of Montanari's adroit project clearly stand out, precisely where the pauperism and spiritualism intrinsic to Franciscans might emerge by reviving the times of Michael of Cesena. Montanari directly tackles the question posed by the *Rule* according to which «non curent nescientes litteras, litteras discere» and, by boldly overturning its meaning, renders it an expression of the virtue of *studiositas*, which is conceived as lying midway between ignorance and *curiositas* and as an antidote to the dangers of sloth[79]. Pointing to the examples of Alexander of Hales, Bonventure and Duns Scotus[80], he outlines the nature of the authentic religious: the man who meditates so long that he learns by heart the *Bible*, the *Rule* and Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*, and who, above all, produces texts for printing. Publishing philosophical and theological works is indicated as the supreme way to become a good friar and a good Franciscan. If a friar were not capable of resuming the study of difficult topics, Montanari writes, he can at least dedicate his time to the Holy Scriptures, piety and moral questions[81].

Once he has established the great significance of studying, Montanari proudly announces that he has inaugurated a *studium* outside Italy and intends to set up more[82]. One must not think that, with all his praise of intellectual work, Montanari ignored the danger that studying posed for the religious totalitarianism he promoted. The fervent minister general was so aware of this risk that he clearly and immediately pointed out the elements that

---

[78] *Ibid.*, pp. 42-54 (f.s.).
[79] *Ibid.*, pp. 29-42 (f.s.)
[80] *Ibid.*, pp. 13-15 (f.s.).
[81] *Ibid.*, pp. 35-37 (f.s.).
[82] *Ibid.*, p. 52 (f.s.).

would neutralise the threat that intellectual research represented for the world to which he belonged. Our lights, he writes, are intelligence, which is fully enacted by dedicating oneself to spiritual matters, becoming a friar and studying theology[83]; faith, to be held and led to perfection, which opens the door to the meaning of the Scriptures, makes studying profitable and confounds heretics[84]; vocation, which is the greatest fortune since *religio est paradisus Dei in terra*[85], and which, in the case of Montanari's Order, is moreover Franciscan, that is to say, regulated by a divine *Rule* of absolute obedience, chastity and poverty[86]; and, finally, perfecting the spirit[87]. Here, then, is how Montanari conceives of the sage: a man detached from worldly matters and immune to the taste for innovation.

> […] in tuam abditus bibliothecam, quae iuxta Senecam "fodina est foecunda", terrenas quascumque cogitationes proijce abs te quam longissime et disperge, demittas te deorsum usque ad imum in altissimam humilitatis fossam, priusquam ad scientiam accesseris, et assiduus et solers hanc illam explores venam, hunc illum perfodias librum; ita enim metallum extraxeris adeo solidum eiusque perfectionis, ut qualis sit timor Dei, nosse perfacili studio poteris, et inaestimabilem divinae sapientiae thesaurum adinveneris[88].

Here finally comes the way to wisdom without second thoughts, safely sheltered by what has already been written and approved: *puritas mentis*; *frequens oratio*; *vera humiliatio*; *librorum approbatorum lectio*; *modus studendi*,

---

[83] *Ibid.*, pp. 54-55 (f.s.).
[84] *Ibid.*, pp. 55-56 (f.s.).
[85] *Ibid.*, pp. 56-58 (f.s.).
[86] *Ibid.*, pp. 58-60 (f.s.).
[87] *Ibid.*, pp. 61-62 (f.s.).
[88] *Ibid.*, pp. 62-69 (f.s.); the passage quoted is on p. 68 (f.s.).

«cavendo maxime temeritatem, curiositatem, instabilitatem, rixas, et denique celeritatem in percurrendo»[89].

As we can see, Montanari's work fully belongs to the Church's Counter-Reformation project: faced with the threat that culture represented for his world, he did not opt for an ignorant poverty but chose to occupy the cultural field entirely and to organise it around the totalitarian principle of the *puritas mentis*, seen as a haven from turbulence and *novitates*.

The *Reformatio studiorum* (1620)

A little over a year later, Montanari wrote the dedicatory letter prefixed to the *Reformatio studiorum* and gave to the printer's the work that reorganised discipline in study matters. The letter was addressed to Cardinal Marcello Lante, protector of the Order, and was intentionally dated 14th July, 1620, St. Bonaventure's feastday. Here Montanari states the two fundamental reasons for the reform of studies: the need to return to the true spirit of the *Rule* and the urgent necessity for preaching against the Protestants[90]. The effects of his journey north of the Alps the year before and his desire to see an effective, active Catholic reaction to Protestantism can clearly be seen in these statements. However, besides the contingent facts, it is quite obvious that Montanari's reform was more than a mere reorganisation of norms as far as studies are concerned: actually, it was the prelude to new Constitutions and, as such, played a leading role in the general minister's project.

---

[89] *Ibid.*, pp. 69-70 (f.s.).
[90] MONTANARI 1620.

The legislative part is contained in the section of the volume entitled *Decreta pro reformatione studiorum*. This is a text difficult to summarise. Montanari's *Decreta*, probably also arising out of the congeries of suggestions put forward during the general chapter of 1620 and clearly not sufficiently thought out[91], in many respects is a regression compared to the organisation of studies provided by Gesualdi. They are verbose, poorly ordered, possibly even contradictory, and were thus bound to introduce confusion and difficul-

[91] It is the person who drew up the text who suggests that events occurred as follows: «In comitiis generalibus Romae proxime celebratis multa fuerunt a patribus nostris de nostrorum studiorum reformatione proposita[…]» (*Decreta pro reformatione studiorum*, in *Reformatio* 1620, [prologus], p. 77 [f.s.]). Parisciani, followed by Rotolo and Iannelli, seems convinced of the fact that the entire *Reformatio*, not just Montanari's pastoral letter, was printed for the first time in Cologne in 1619. However, I believe that this theory must be rejected. First, Parisciani gives no proof for his claims, and I am convinced that he never saw a copy of the presumed edition. First of all, he points out typographical characteristics of the alleged volume that are incomplete and inconsistent. In PARISCIANI 1983, 752, footnote 143. Here he states that the Cologne edition is in 24°, which is too small a format for a work that is not bulky but, in any case, fairly long. Furthermore, he gives no indication concerning the printer of the Cologne edition, while he does indicate that of the Perugia edition of 1620. Finally, he gives the page-numbering of the Perugia edition, which is in 8°; in short, it is not possible for that numbering to be the same as the one in the presumed Cologne edition given the different format. Second, the meaning of the passage in the preface to the above-mentioned *Decreta* is quite clear: the reference is to the general congregation held shortly before in Rome. One difficulty might be seen in the fact that that, while the general chapter of 1617 was held in Rome, BENOFFI 1933, 104, calls the intermediate general congregation of 1620 the "general congregation of Todi"; therefore, this would seem to prove that the *Decreta* were the outcome of a debate that took place in 1617 and that they were promulgated before 1620. In fact, not only is there no proof for what has just been stated above but the strength of the indications supporting the hypothesis that there could have been no edition of the *Reformatio* before 1620 remains valid. The expression "*comitia generalia*" is not a technical term for "chapter"; it rather makes one think of an intermediate general congregation. Moreover, while it is true that several of the decisions of the intermediate general congregation of 1620 were made in Todi, it was formally held in Rome on 15th May, 1620: cf. Regesta Ordinis 1620-1623, Roma, Archivio Generale dell'Ordine dei Minori Conventuali, A-28, title page and ff. 180ff.. Finally, Montanari speaks of a *comitia proxime celebrata*: it is hard to believe that this might refer to an event in 1617. In saying this, by no means do I intend to deny that Montanari had intended to reform studies even well before 1620, yet ROTOLO 1995, 38, footnote 144, does not justify his statement according to which the *Reformatio* had been ready since 1615.

ties into all levels of education. Historians belonging to the Order of Conventual Franciscans have usually written that the *Constitutiones urbanae*, drawn up just eight years later, incorporated Montanari's legislation. This is true only of some details as they in actual fact mark a return to Gesualdi's norms, which is quite comprehensible if one examines the plethora of Montanari's decrees.

The *Decreta pro reformatione studiorum* of 1620 prescribed the study *curriculum* to be structured into four or five three-year levels. The lowest grade consists in the school of grammar, rhetoric and literature[92]. There then come the gymnasia of the fourth and third classes, which, however, form a single level of instruction: as we shall see, they have the same programmes and differ only in the quality of the teachers and pupils. They are to be set up in every province[93], and the ministers provincial are responsible for them, even if they have to act in agreement with the minister general[94]. The next level consists in the gymnasia of the second class[95]. The highest level is that of the general gymnasia, or of the first class, and of the colleges, among which above all is the Collegio di s. Bonaventura[96]. Colleges and general gymnasia would seem here to be essentially equal to each other, yet there remain two distinctions between them. In the first place, students placed in the first class of gymnasia may indeed come from any province yet the province of origin pays for their keep; the board and lodging of students placed in the colleges,

---

[92] *Reformatio* 1620, *Decreta pro reformatione studiorum* (henceforth *Dec. ref. st.*), [Ordo gymnasiorum (henceforth Ordo)], no. 11, p. 83 (f.s.).
[93] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 4, p. 80 (f.s.).
[94] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 7, p. 81 (f.s.).
[95] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 2, p. 79 (f.s.).
[96] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 17, p. 87 (f.s.).

on the contrary, is paid by the Order. Secondly, in the first class of gymnasia, at least in theory, all subject matters may be taught, whereas only the highest level of topics is taught in the colleges[97].

As far as the teaching staff is concerned, to the school of grammar, rhetoric and literature Montanari assigns a single man of learning, who can be either a father master or a salaried teacher from outside the convent[98]. For the gymnasia of the fourth/third class, the *Reformatio* is equivocal, prescribing the presence of two lectors in one passage[99] and the presence of just one lector in another, specifying in the latter that the lector has no right to the title of regent[100]. In gymnasia of the second class, there must be a regent and a bachelor[101]. In the gymnasia of the first class, there will be two regents, the one who first concluded his gymnasium studies having priority over the other[102], plus a single lector for the subjects of the Holy Scriptures, dogmas, matters of conscience and holy canons[103]. In addition to these teachers, if the minister general deems it opportune to nominate them (but, from what can be seen in other passages in the *Reformatio*, Montanari does not think it opportune) there will also be a lector for arts and a master of students[104]. Finally, in the colleges, the teaching staff will consist only in a regent and a bachelor[105].

---

[97] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 1, p. 79 (f.s.).
[98] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 11, p. 83 (f.s.).
[99] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 9, p. 82 (f.s.).
[100] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 27, p. 92 (f.s.).
[101] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 12, p. 84 (f.s.).
[102] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 23, pp. 90-91 (f.s.).
[103] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 24, p. 91 (f.s.).
[104] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 25, p. 91 (f.s.).
[105] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 18, p. 88 (f.s.).

If there is already confusion as far as the overall structure and the teaching staff are concerned, Montanari's maniacal nature is revealed in full when it comes to defining programmes. Generally speaking, Montanari is so resolute to make Scotus the Order's ultimate doctrinal point of reference that he gives orders for teachers to render Scotus' doctrine and texts into an orderly series of discussions.

> […] in omnibus gymnasiis praelegatur defendaturque doctor noster subtilis Scotus ea tamen ratione et ordine ut regentes et lectores curent ut eius tota doctrina ad tractationes et materias reducatur, adeo ut quidquid vel iuxta institutum, vel obiter, vel separatim alibi in suis libris Scotus tetigit ad tractatum prout pertinet redigatur[106].

Obviously, this effort and rearrangement is insufficient. There were problems being discussed at Montanari's time that Scotus had not considered; how, then, should they be tackled without losing track of Scotus' *mens*? Or, to put the question in other terms, one may well wonder what makes a thinker a true follower of Scotus. Montanari is aware of the problem and in reply he establishes the triple canon of the perfect Scotist: to debate according to the principles of the medieval master; to do one's best to confirm his theories; to consider him as one with the other Franciscan masters belonging to the *via antiqua*[107].

The first principle is presented succinctly: «si apud recentiores doctores quaestiones de aliqua materia a Scoto haud explicite pertractatae inveniantur,

---

[106] *Reformatio* 1620, *Dec. ref. st.*, De qualitatibus et officio regentum et lectorum, necnon de lectionibus ac disputationibus habendis (henceforth De qualitatibus), no. 7, p. 102 (f.s.).
[107] This is the meaning of the rule, but not exactly as it is expressed: the phrase "*via antiqua*" does not appear in the text.

erunt ad mentem Scoti, hoc est secundum eius doctrinae principia, discutiendae»[108]. The other two principles are discussed at greater length.

> […] animadvertant praeterea regentes et lectores ne rationem docendi in via Scoti dimittant, sed eius doctrinam ad recentiorem methodum reducere et conciliorum sanctorumque patrum auctoritatibus hinc inde petitis et collectis confirmare atque roborare nitantur, prout moris est apud nostrates et a recentioribus in via (ut aiunt) aliorum doctorum scribitur. Ubi vero Scotus materiam aliquam necessariam praetermittat, eadem ab Alexandri de Ales, d. Bonaventurae vel Riccardi libris petatur, ne qua in docendo theologica materia intacta relinquatur: quod si principia et fundamenta explicita, sive implicita, defuerint in via Scoti, ex d. Bonaventura ecclesiae doctore desumentur, qui dici potest fuisse tamquam aerarium doctrinae Scoti, cum multa ab eo notabilia puncta theologica deducantur, immo horum utrorumque doctorum coniungere et concordare doctrinam erit consultissimum[109].

This passage is highly important both because it highlights constant characteristic aspects of the thought elaborated within religious orders in the post-Tridentine period, and because it permits us to understand how the reading of *Doctor Seraphicus* generated Scotist thinkers.

The *Reformatio* also provides real methodological indications, thanks to which we can see how lessons were actually carried out: «regentes et lectores in schola dictent lectiones studentibus et baccalaureis et, in dictando, explicationem etiam praesertim locorum et quaestionum subdifficilium interponant»[110].

The distribution of the subject according to the scheme of *disputatio*, *quaestio* and *articulus* is also explicitly stated : «[…] videant etiam regentes

---

[108] *Reformatio* 1620, *Dec. ref. st.*, De qualitatibus, no. 11, p. 102 (f.s.).
[109] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 12, pp. 104-105 (f.s.).
[110] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 48, pp. 121-122 (f.s.).

quod tractatus in plures disputationes, disputationes autem in plures quaestiones et quaestiones in plures articulos distribui possunt»[111].

Montanari also indicates two authors whose procedure, to his mind, comes close to the above scheme: «qui sane procedendi modus methodo quam tenent in sua *theologia* Nissa [i.e. Nicolas Denisse] et Pelbartus [i.e. Pelbart of Temeswar] persimilis est»[112].

Equally pertinent is his reminder of the immediate purpose of scholastic toil. For students, everything had to take place in such a way «ut scholastici nostri in fine triennii omnia theologica argumenta praecipua in quatuor libris Sententiarum contenta se scripsisse eiusque studuisse gaudere possint»[113]. Teachers should also aim to produce texts.

> […] sub finem praescripti huius temporis regentes et lectores sua manu scripta secum ad capitulum generale deferant, seu transmittant, atque etiam (quantum fieri poterit) lectionum omnium et tractatuum sui cursus seriem totam, ut pater generalis et patres deputati perpendant et mature examinent num sint aliqua digna quae typis publicis committantur[114].

---

[111] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 11, p. 104 (f.s.).
[112] *Ibid.*. Both here and elsewhere in the *Reformatio* the reference is to *Opus super Sententias quod Resolutio theologorum dicitur* (also reprinted with the title *In quatuor libros Sententiarum opus, Resolutio theologorum inscriptum*) by Nicolas Denisse OFMObs (Nicolaus de Nyse; Nicolaus de Niise; Nicolaus Deniise), published in Rouen in 1508, and to *Aureum sacrae theologiae rosarium, iuxta quatuor Sententiarum libros quadripartitum ex doctrina Doctoris Subtilis, divi Thomae, divi Bonaventurae aliorumque sacrorum doctorum* by Pelbart László OFMObs of Temeswar (today Timișoara, in Rumania), published in Hagenau (today Haguenau, in France) in 1503-1508. Both works were reprinted several times in the course of the sixteenth century.
[113] *Reformatio* 1620, *Dec. ref. st.*, De qualitatibus, no. 11, p. 102 (f.s.).
[114] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 13, p. 106 (f.s.).

Montanari's wish to restructure the Order and ideologically consolidate it resulted in the desire to have publications that may be used as reference texts. After having been expressed for the first time in his letter of 1619, this idea become so fundamental to the minister general's economy of projects that it was set as the purpose, at least for the time being, of the very teaching activity[115].

When examined in detail, Montanari's programmes for the various levels of instruction are quite different from those set out by Gesualdi, although some basic points, such as the preference for Tartaret, are identical. Montanari's *Reformatio*, moreover, is almost maniacal in specifying details.

In the fourth/third class gymnasia, students were to face the whole course of logic in the first year and all of natural philosophy in the second and third years[116]. The two lectors were supposed to hold lessons twice a day, in the morning and in the afternoon[117]. As I have already said, the author of reference was to be yet again Tartaret, «qui bonus Scoti interpretes ac sectator fuit, nusquam deflectendo». However, Montanari adds an eloquent note of specification: «donec alius in lucem emittatur liber recentiori methodo conscriptus»[118].

The analytical programme for logic is the following.

---

[115] Actually, a hint of this desire can already be found in the acts of the Viterbo chapter. One can read in *Acta capituli 1617* 1618, p. 55, that on that occasion Ottaviano Strambiati Jr. from Ravenna, at the time public professor of metaphysics in Padua, was appointed to edit the publication, at the Order's expense, of all the works of the late Ottaviano Strambiati Sr. from Ravenna, who, among other things, had been Montanari's teacher. As far as I know, nothing further was done about it.
[116] *Reformatio* 1620, *Dec. ref. st.*, [Ordo], no. 8, pp. 81-82 (f.s.).
[117] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 9, p. 82 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De studentibus et baccalaureis (henceforth De studentibus), no. 14, p. 133 (f.s.).
[118] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 9, p. 82 (f.s.).

> […] lector logicus primum iuxta ritum et ordinem recentiorum lectorum logicam in summulas perstringat, eo operam et industriam suam conferendo ut omnia capita recte exsaminet eaque ex libris Priorum, Topicorum et Perhiermeniae vel aliunde decerpat. Tum de natura logicae, de ente rationis, de primis et secundis intentionibus, de universalibus in communi et in particulari, de praedicamentis, de habitibus et tandem de demonstratione disputationes conficiat[119].

This is followed by the programme for physics:

> […] pari modo procedatur in physica facultate: hoc est primum tex[tum] Aristotelis brevis exponatur, deinde de natura philosophiae, de principiis in communi et in particulari, de natura, de causis per se et per accidens, de motu, de quantitate, de infinito, loco, vacuo et tempore; subinde de coelo, de generatione, de anima disputationes tractatim formentur. Text[um] et capita Aristotelis (ut dictum est) exsponendo ad praescriptum methodi, quam servat Tataretus et alii nostri Ordinis doctores[120].

The gymnasia of the second class were devoted to metaphysics and an outline of theology[121]. The regent had to teach his lesson in the morning on theology[122]. while the convent bachelor had to teach metaphysics in the afternoon[123]. An exception to the rule was made if a student had already studied metaphysics or if there was a public lector for metaphysics (that is to say, a conventual Franciscan who was a public lector residing in the convent); in this case, the convent bachelor had to teach another subject, according to the minister general's decision[124].

---

119 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 7, p. 102 (f.s.).
120 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 8, pp. 102-103 (f.s.).
121 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 12, p. 84 (f.s.).
122 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 12, p. 84 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 14, p. 133 (f.s.).
123 *Ibib.*, [Ordo], no. 12, p. 84 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 14, p. 133 (f.s.).
124 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 12, p. 84 (f.s.).

This is the analytical programme for metaphysics and the relative methodology for teaching it.

> […] a fundamentalibus principiis Aristotelis et Scoti minime recedatur. Et in quaestionibus et articulis disponendis sequens ordo servetur: primo loco quaestionis sive argumenti ratio, si fuerit opus, explicabitur; secundo scholasticorum sententiae et principaliora eorum fundamenta proferentur; tertio loco opinio Scoti cum suis adnotationibus et fundamentis quibus praedicta opinio innitatur et defendenda sit; quarto, opponantur conclusiones primum quidem negativae, mox affirmativae cum praecipuis earum probationibus; postremo tandem adversariorum argumentationes dissolvantur[125].

For the theology programme, the *Reformatio* merely indicates the works of *Pelbartus* (that is, Pelbart of Temeswar) and *Nissa* (that is, Nicolas Denisse)[126].

Montanari was evidently aware of the vastness of the programme imposed because he specified that the regents had only three years in which to complete the programme[127]. In the following two levels, i.e., gymnasia of the first class and colleges, the studens had to face the analytical study of theology[128]. In first-class *studia*[129] this subject was taught by the first regent in the morning[130] and by the second regent towards evening[131]. The only other lector Montanari considered indispensable for this type of *studia* was to explain the Holy Scriptures and dogmas every morning and matters of conscience or

---

125 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 9, p. 103 (f.s.).
126 *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 4, p. 127 (f.s.).
127 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 13, p. 105 (f.s.).
128 *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 4, p. 127 (f.s.).
129 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 23, pp. 90-91 (f.s.), and no. 26, p. 92 (f.s.).
130 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 23, pp. 90-91 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 14, p. 133 (f.s.).
131 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 23, pp. 90-91 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 14, p. 133 (f.s.).

canon law two or three times a week[132]. The method to be used in teaching theology was to be the same as the one employed in teaching metaphysics, while adding, however, a review of the opinions of heretics and Catholics[133].

The analytical programme was the following.

> […] primus regens materias primi libri Sententiarum explicandas suscipiat, hoc est de natura theologiae, quae continet prologus Scoti, de essentialibus Dei, nempe de praedicatis absolutis et attributis ad intra, de cognoscibilitate Dei in via et in patria, de Trinitate, de scientia Dei, de praedestinatione. Alter regens ex secundo Sententiarum materias extrahat, videlicet de creatione, de angelis, de operibus sex dierum, de statu innocentiae, de gratia, de peccato. Quibus absolutis, eodem ordine primus regens tertium, secundum quartum librum aggrediantur[134].

What could not be found in Scotus, as we have already mentioned, had to be sought in Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure or Richard of Middleton[135]. In this case, too, Montanari specified that the regents had only three years in which to carry out the entire programmes[136].

As in Gesualdi's *Decreta*, the *Reformatio* also considered the possibility to give and to have lessons on various subjects alongside the main ones, however, compared to the previous legislation, the extraordinary number of subjects immediately strikes one. Many of those introduced as complementary at the time of Gesualdi became an integral part of the ordinary and compulsory syllabus. In the logic class, we find a 45-minute mathematics lesson, which is interesting given that not all *rationes studiorum* of other orders took

---

132 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 24, p. 91 (f.s.).
133 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 10, p. 103 (f.s.).
134 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 11, pp. 103-104 (f.s.).
135 *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 4, pp. 127-128 (f.s.).
136 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 13, p. 105 (f.s.).

this subject into consideration[137]. In the physics class, a 30-minute lesson on morals was also instituted[138]. One of the lectors' tasks during times when there were no speculative lessons was to teach the Holy Scriptures together with the Church Fathers' interpretations[139]. In particular, this subject was compulsory in first-class gymnasia, where it was to be taught for half an hour[140]. In general gymnasia, teaching lessons on canon law was a task that, according to Montanari, could be entrusted to the lector responsible for teaching matters of conscience or Holy Scriptures[141]. The study of biblical languages, Hebrew, Greek and Chaldean, became compulsory in general *studia*, while it remained optional in the other levels of instruction, as in Gesualdi's time[142].

The qualifications acquired by the students obviously reflect the completion of a certain level of education, yet they reveal the convolution of the *Reformatio*. Those who were attending the gymnasia of the fourth and third class were qualified as professed students[143]. After finishing their studies in those gymnasia, they became qualified as formed students[144]. Those admitted to the gymnasia of the second class within the first two years, or at the end of the second year, had to take a test in which they were examined on the com-

---

[137] The *ratio studiorum* of the Dominicans, for example, forbade the study of this subject: cf. SOPPELSA 1978, 350.
[138] *Reformatio* 1620, *Dec. ref. st.*, De studentibus, no. 15, p. 133 (f.s.).
[139] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 33, p. 115 (f.s.).
[140] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 15, p. 133 (f.s.).
[141] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 47, p. 121 (f.s.).
[142] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 30, pp. 93-94 (f.s.). Montanari and his team evidently had rethoughts, or made a mistake, as far as this is concerned: in *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 15, p. 133 (f.s.) we find the study of these languages compulsory even in second-class gymnasia, the time dedicated to them being established as half an hour.
[143] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 2, p. 99 (f.s.); *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 9, p. 130 (f.s.).
[144] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 10, p. 131 (f.s.).

plete course and on four more basic theological questions. In this way they acquired the qualification of biblical bachelor. In the third year, they had to take a new examination on the whole course, to which public disputations were added. They thus became qualified as formed bachelors[145]. With the latter title, they entered the first-class *studia*, where they had to face a new test in the fourth year of theology, that is, in the first year of the second three-year period of theological studies; if they passed it and sustained public conclusions in the congresses, i.e., in the general chapters and in the intermediate congregations, they would be proclaimed *pro cursu* bachelors and enrolled as candidates in the Collegio di s. Bonaventura. However, not all candidates were admitted: those excluded from the Collegio were awarded the title of licensed bachelors and could be used in missions or as teachers of logic or physics until they were promoted to the doctoral degree[146].

The analytical rules concerning careers and examinations were even more intricate. Students had to take an examination at the end of each school year, held by the visitor to the *studia*, an official chosen by the minister general. It is not clear what relationship these tests had with all the others, of which I shall speak shortly; it does however seem that Montanari relied on them in order to decide to send the less intellectually gifted to study simply matters of conscience[147]. The minister general always had the final word in decisions about students' destinations; these decisions were generally made either at the end of the general chapter or, if this did not take place, on the

[145] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 6, pp. 128-129 (f.s.) and no. 11, p. 131 (f.s.).
[146] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 12, pp. 131-132 (f.s.).
[147] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 5, p. 128 (f.s.).

feast of the Porziuncola (i.e., the feast of Our Lady of the Angels of the Porziuncola, on 2nd August)[148].

To look in greater detail at the norms concerning careers, we can see that during his probationary year the novice had to devote himself to spiritual exercises[149]. Having concluded his year of probation and made his solemn profession, the professed friar had to study letters until the start of the regular three-year cycle; if, however, he was already proficient in this subject, the minister provincial could admit him to lessons on logic or philosophy, provided he communicated it to the minister general beforehand. In no case could the professed friars be admitted to higher studies if they were not sufficiently proficient in letters[150], after which, once they had entered their twenty-second year of age, they could be initiated into the Holy Orders[151]. Nevertheless, exceptions might be made; in sum, every single novice's final destiny was decided on the occasion of the general chapter[152].

In order to move up from a gymnasium of the fourth/third class to the gymnasium of the second class, it was necessary to be a cleric[153] (to be precise, at least a subdeacon) to have reached the age of twenty-one[154] and to have studied in the previous classes. Students took exams, guaranteed by the

---

[148] *Ibid.*, De visitatione et visitationibus gymnasiorum (henceforth De visitatione), no. 13, pp. 148-149 (f.s.).
[149] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 2, p. 125 (f.s.).
[150] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 11, p. 83 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 1, p. 125 (f.s.). In another place the *Decreta* clarify that in professates teaching should not be restricted to logic and natural philosophy but the professed friars should also continue to be instructed spiritually: *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 41, p. 119 (f.s.).
[151] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 2, pp. 125-126 (f.s.).
[152] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 2, pp. 126-127 (f.s.).
[153] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], nno. 11-12, p. 83 (f.s.).
[154] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 2, p. 99 (f.s.).

minister provincial, held by lectors and theologians and were assigned to the various gymnasia by the minister general[155]. However, at a different point in the *Reformatio*, the minister provincial was encharged with visiting the *studia*, thus becoming to all effects an active examiner[156]. In second-class gymnasia, students had to take an exam every year. Furthermore, there had to be another exam in the sixth month of the third year, when it was judged whether they were fit to defend theological topics within cloisters (i.e., as far as I can understand, not in public form).

Although any attempt to find one's way through this maze of rules may not be worth much, it does seem that the above mentioned examinations did not correspond either to that of being awarded the title of biblical bachelor or to the final examination that was mentioned above. Montanari writes that a student was admitted to the public discussion after having been judged favourably by his examiners, without however clarifying of which judgment, or examination, he is speaking[157]. We do know that the exam in the last year of the second-class gymnasia concerned all the logic, physics, metaphysics and theology studied up until then[158]. Yet the public disputations, called elsewhere public theses, were something different and could be held at the end of each year or at the end of the three-year course[159]. It is interesting to note that the *Reformatio* states that it was forbidden to print these theses: in order to avoid any extra expense connected with their publication, Montanari writes, henceforth public theses must be handwritten; if anything was to be printed,

---

155 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 12, p. 83 (f.s.).
156 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 15, p. 86 (f.s.).
157 *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 7, p. 129 (f.s.).
158 *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 8, pp. 129-120 (f.s.).
159 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 14, p. 85 (f.s.).

he adds, a whole series of conclusions should actually be printed so that everyone could make use of them[160]. Once again, Montanari's wish to have texts available and useful for teaching is apparent.

The same norms as those applied for entry into second-class gymnasia were valid for admission to those of the first class[161]; however, there was the additional rule that the applicants had to be already ordained as priests[162].

It is not possible for me to ascertain whether the hotchpotch of exams described in the pages concerning the second-class gymnasia were also valid for those of the first class, nor can I find in the analytical description of the examinations pertaining to the first-class gymnasia the exam previously called "for the fourth year of theology". The *Reformatio* mentions at this point just one exam, which had to be taken at the end of the third year and was supposed to concern theology in its entirety[163]. Going into detail, it seems to consist of two parts: on the one hand, the candidate had to give two public lessons, one of which on a speculative subject (including the arts), the other on dogmatic theology. The topics of these lessons were assigned at random and without warning, and students were given twenty-four hours in which to prepare them; during the lesson, anyone could freely raise an objection or

---

[160] *Ibid.*, no. 15, p. 86 (f.s.). Montanari's order was soon forgotten; this is what one can read in the summary of accounts of the capitolary Congregation in Bologna of 21st May, 1640: «for the conclusions printed and sustained by the Bachelor Ambrosini in Bagnacavallo by order of the Very Reverend Father minister general twenty-five lire» («per le conclusioni stampate e sostenute dal bacc[ellie].re Ambrosini in Bagn[acava]llo per ordine del p[adre]. r[everendissi].mo [ministro generale] lire venticinque») (Spesa generale della provincia di Bologna dei Minori conventuali 1594-1661, Archivio di Stato di Rimini, Corporazioni soppresse, AB 73, ff. 87*r*-88*r*).
[161] *Reformatio* 1620, *Dec. ref. st.*, [Ordo], no. 13, p. 85 (f.s.).
[162] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 13, p. 85 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 26, p. 140 (f.s.).
[163] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 8, pp. 129-130 (f.s.).

when ordered to by the superior. If there was more than one candidate, disputations were supposed to be organised without any forewarning, or under very short notice.

Something that was different again from this exam seems to have been an oral test on all subjects, given in a model at the end of the *Decreta*. This was to take place in front of the minister general, or someone he encharged with this task, and the result of the examination was to be communicated under oath in writing by the examiners[164]. Students who passed this exam gained the right to be admitted to the Collegio di s. Bonaventura. However, effective admission to this seat of learning was subordinated to yet another filter: the minister general, or someone named by him, had to choose forty bachelors, whose names were to be submitted three months before Whitsun to the cardinal protector of the Collegio; it was he who then selected twenty of them[165].

As far as the organisation of teachers was concerned, regulations already found in Gesualdi's *Decreta* were reproposed. Among all the fathers who taught in the *studia* of the Order, only those reponsible for first- and second-class general *studia* were entitled to be called regents[166]. They had to swear before the minister general, the minister provincial or someone encharged with this that they would hold a course diligently and in full[167]. Additionally, they should not have been condemned for, or suspected of, any heresy, and must have led an exemplary religious life[168].

---

164 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 17, p. 87 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 13, pp. 132-133 (f.s.).
165 *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 20, p. 89 (f.s.).
166 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 2, p. 99 (f.s.).
167 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 5, pp. 100-101 (f.s.).
168 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 1, p. 98 (f.s.).

Regents of first-and second-class gymnasia were nominated during the general chapter by the minister general; minister provincials chose all the other lectors, provided the minister general's consent[169]. Departing from the principle that it was necessary to have been head of a lower grade *studium* in order to become a regent of a gymnasium, Montanari decreed that convent bachelors of first- and second-class gymnasia who had obtained their doctorates could be promoted directly to the regency of these *studia*. Moreover, in an attempt to encourage younger scholars in particular to write texts, Montanari added a noteworthy rule: all lectors of whatever grade might accede directly to a regency of a first- or second-class gymnasium if they proved the quality of their work by means of a publication[170].

In order to be promoted to a higher level, a specific grid of evaluation was elaborated, the meaning of which, reading behind all the rhetorical frills, was basically censorious: if only a generic doctrinal orthodoxy was required for teaching at lower levels, in order to accede to important offices it was necessary for applicants to have proved that they had adhered to Scotism by defending Scotus or writing about his doctrines[171]. The control functions established by Gesualdi were confirmed and restructured in the *Reformatio*. The guardians of convents that were seats of *studia*, particularly the guardians of convents that were seats of first-class gymnasia, maintained the task of checking that regents and lectors followed and completed the programme[172]. The invigilation tasks concerning regents were modified in a censorious way.

---

[169] *Ibid.*, De visitatione, no. 14, p. 149 (f.s.).
[170] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 19, p. 88 (f.s.).
[171] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 34, pp. 115-116 (f.s.).
[172] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 25, p. 92 (f.s.).

They were no longer responsible for verifying that lessons were held according to regulations, however some activities that required permission from the head of the *studium* were singled out: holding conclusions in public, debating ouside the convent with people who were not members of the Order, and editing or commenting on books or manuscripts, even in private[173].

An important novelty consisted in the obligation that twice a year teachers should send the minister general written reports on the programme they have held: once before Lent and again at the end of the course[174]. The most conspicuous innovation, however, was the institution of visitors to the *studia*. Similar to what was already happening in the disciplinary and administrative fields, Montanari ordered that ordinary and extraordinary visitors should be instituted. In every province, the minister provincial was the ordinary visitor to the *studia* of that province. However, he was joined by extraordinary visitors, particularly at the end of a three-year course[175]. Needless to say, even in this delicate matter the *Reformatio* introduced confusion: in the passage we are now considering, it is not clear who was to nominate the extraordinary visitors, while at another point the task of instituting visitors in general was entrusted to the minister general[176]. We can, however, see that, at least in some cases, visitors should be regents of general *studia* or have been teachers for some years[177] and should set out after Easter[178].

---

[173] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 42, p. 119 (f.s.).
[174] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 46, p. 121 (f.s.).
[175] *Ibid.*, De visitatione, no. 8, pp. 146-147 (f.s.).
[176] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 15, p. 86 (f.s.).
[177] *Ibid.*, De visitatione, no. 8, pp. 146-147 (f.s.).
[178] *Ibid.*, De visitatione, no. 9, p. 147 (f.s.).

The first task of visitors to the *studia*, who could also ask collaborators for assistence in this, was to gather information about both the teachers and the students there. The visitor could examine the notes for lessons, test students orally without the teachers being present, check their preparation, investigate their morals. He could also, if he so wished, send students he believed were not very gifted to study matters of conscience[179]. This detail is rather important: since those who were demoted to the study of conscience matters were those who were also destined to become confessors, it follows that the less gifted were systematically devoted this task.

The control over teachers was equally strict. They «opinionum varietate et novitate reiecta, ad mentem Scoti, vel s. Bonaventurae, vel Alexandri de Ales, Aristotelem sic interpretentur ut hac via auditores ad sacrae theologiae primordia instruantur».

The visitor to the *studia* also had exhortative tasks: according to Montanari's project, he was to encourage those most suited to write works and invite teachers to adapt the level of their explanations to their pupils' ability[180].

However, the most important initiatives in terms of praise and sanctions were reserved for the minister general. The visitor was normally expected to send him reports on everything at the end of the three-year course of study and at least once a year if the information had been gathered *extra visitam*. In particular, visitors had to send the minister general their reports on students' preparation, which he would then compare with similar reports

[179] Cf. in particular *Ibid.*, De visitatione, no. 6, p. 146 (f.s.).
[180] *Ibid.*, De visitatione, no. 3, p. 145 (f.s.).

from the teachers on the results of the final exams of every three year period of study[181].

Needless to say, negligent regents and lectors risked losing their posts[182], in conformity with Gesualdi's legislation. Montanari was, on the other hand, more indulgent than Gesualdi towards students who were not fully prepared. They could repeat the course, although there were some restrictions: after six years in the fourth-third and second class at the *studia* and a further six in the first class, students had to be removed[183]. Despite this, if a student had not obtained good results for no fault of his own, he might repeat the course again[184]. On the other hand, however, negligent students were threatened with severe punishment[185], and teachers were fully authorised to carry this out[186].

Two of Gesualdi's prohibitions concerning students continued to be respected: they were not permitted to leave the convent during lessons[187] or to study in their home town[188]. Montanari also had some rules for teachers: long, inaugural lectures were to be avoided at the start of the school year; on the contrary, it would be good to involve students by setting them the task of giving a brief speech on the value of studying[189]. Montari made some even

---

[181] *Ibid.*, De visitatione, nno. 1-12, pp. 144-148 (f.s.); the passage quoted is in *Ibid.*, De visitatione, no. 5, pp. 145-146 (f.s.). Cf. also *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 15, p. 86 (f.s.).
[182] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 25, p. 92 (f.s.).
[183] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 21, p. 137 (f.s.). In *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 40, p. 118 (f.s.) one can read that the years in question were twelve, without any further precise details.
[184] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 16, pp. 86-87 (f.s.).
[185] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 18, p. 109 (f.s.).
[186] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 40, p. 118 (f.s.).
[187] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 17, p. 108 (f.s.).
[188] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 25, p. 139 (f.s.).
[189] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 21, p. 110 (f.s.).

stronger recommendations about rules of conduct: teachers should not haughtily surround themselves with students like courtiers, should avoid silly, dishonest talk, were to be models of hard work and good speech and should encourage their pupils to do spiritual exercises and take the sacraments[190].

Compared to the Viterbo decrees, there were more teaching activities. At the end of every lesson pupils had to revise it and put forward problems[191]. There were to be revisions of lessons every day: a quarter of an hour before each lesson was to be dedicated to revising the lesson from the day before, a quarter of an hour after the lesson pupils were to be tested on what they had just heard, and in the following quarter of an hour pupils had to ask the teacher questions[192]. Monthly and annual revision lessons also had to be planned: held on Saturdays, what had been expounded during that period was to be summarised[193]. The programme of debates was also very intense. On the weekday when there were no lessons, two of the pupils were chosen as *arguentes* to hold a debate on the subject (or subjects, if there were two teachers) they had studied, in conformity with the table of subjects drawn up in the appendix to the *Reformatio* book; at the end of the debate, the teachers had to sum it up[194]. On Saturdays, for two hours, one student had to defend against two *arguentes*, his fellow students, conclusions drawn from the subjects dealt with during the week[195]. Still on Saturday, but only once in a

---

190 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, nno. 38-39, pp. 117-118 (f.s.).
191 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 4, p. 100 (f.s.).
192 *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 16, pp. 133-134 (f.s.).
193 *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 37, p. 116 (f.s.).
194 *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 17, p. 134 (f.s.).
195 *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 18, p. 134 (f.s.).

month, there were also *disputationes generales*, when students among themselves, but in the presence of all the teachers, had to defend conclusions drawn from themes tackled that month. At the end of this debate, which was to last two and a half hours, teachers again had to present a summary of what had emerged in the course of it[196]. The *respondens*, that is, the defender nominated for the *conclusiones*, was a student. In colleges, first-class and second-class gymnasia, one of the students most ready for discussing public conclusions was to be selected for this; alternatively, matters were to be arranged so that every student had to be responsible for this task for a week[197].

The teaching activities set out hitherto did not substitute, in Montanari's regulations, the "circular disputations" already mentioned in Gesualdi's decrees; it would appear, however, from reading the *Reformatio*, that the new decrees restricted this practice to pupils in the first-class gymnasia. Three times a week throughout the whole school year, except for a brief period after Christmas[198], two theses (*conclusiones*) concerning the subjects dealt with in lessons during that session were to be proposed; under the presidency of the regent whose subject had been selected for debate, two students chosen according to a pre-established order challenged the above-mentioned theses, while another, taken from the same list, was to defend them (*respondere*); if the *respondens* held his own against the opposers without any difficulty, the convent bachelor, the lector for the Holy Scriptures, or even the other regent, had to intervene in order to explore the subject in greater depth[199].

---

[196] *Ibid.*.
[197] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 18, p. 88 (f.s.).
[198] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 26, p. 112 (f.s.).
[199] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 4, p. 100 (f.s.).

Students were allowed to slack off from their studies not even during holidays, and their time was taken up by debates and private lessons[200]. To cover any time left, it was recommended that literary academies, even public ones, should be instituted: on weekday breaks, and during holidays, everyone, according to his seniority and in the presence of his regents and lectors, had to give a lecture in a topic freely chosen from the following one: morals, theology, mathematics, rhetoric, poetics and ecclesiastic and ancient history[201].

Public disputations, both those held as examinations and those held to gain fame for the speakers themselves and for the Order, were a different case. It would seem that disputations of the former type tended to be those that the best bachelors had to propose at the first-class gymnasia at the end of their three-year course[202]. The latter type seem to have been those held during chapters, either general or provincial. As a general rule, doctors of the Order who had been approved for their doctrine and behaviour had to participate in them. It was recommended that anyone who debated in public should be exceptionally good; private disputations were also possible, and students were advised to practise at length for them[203]. The best lectors, with their assistants, from the second-class gymnasia would be called to the provincial chapter; the minister provincial would choose them, but he was obliged to communicate their names either to the minister general, or to the visitor to the *studia*, or to the president of the chapter[204]. Any regent or lector might be

---

[200] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 20, p. 110 (f.s.).
[201] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 23, pp. 110-111 (f.s.).
[202] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 11, p. 104 (f.s.).
[203] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 30, p. 114 (f.s.).
[204] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 29, pp. 113-114 (f.s.).

called to debate at the general chapter; only lectors at first-class gymnasia were obliged to have a *respondens*, who, however, was chosen by the minister general and had to be a bachelor, that is a student, who was exceptionally good[205]. Finally, public disputations outside the convent were permitted; to this end, one of the best students was elected, or the task was to be carried out by all the students, each of whom was responsible for it for a week[206].

Notwithstanding this plethora of initiatives, and despite the possibility of holding debates outside the convent, compared to the Viterbo *Decreta* the *Reformatio* weakened ties with public universities. As had already been laid down by Gesualdi, fathers who were also public lectors had to hold, at the minister general's disposal, a course at the convent in which they lived[207]. Despite this, the *Reformatio* discouraged attending lessons outside the convent, so much so that it was even forbidden if there were internal lectors for the same subject, which was nearly always the case[208]. It is not clear how this norm might be reconciled with the above-mentioned rule that if a public lector for metaphysics lived in a certain convent, the convent bachelor had to teach another subject, according to the minister general's decision[209] ; perhaps Montanari thought that the public lector should hold a course on metaphysics specifically for the convent's *studium*.

The indications concerning educational issues serving as a connection between theory and practice pick up the Viterbo *Decreta*, burdening them, however, with rules and fine details. We can read indications about how to

---

[205] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 28, p. 113 (f.s.).
[206] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 19, p. 88 (f.s.).
[207] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 32, pp. 114-115 (f.s.).
[208] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 25, p. 139 (f.s.).
[209] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 12, p. 84 (f.s.).

compose sermons and about how to practise them: the teacher (i.e, in general gymnasia who taught Holy Scriptures and in other cases the regent or any lector) had to correct and pay attention to the use of voice, gestures and posture[210]. Attention was also to be paid to acquiring and practising oratory techniques. Yet learning these techniques was considered different from putting them into practice, so students had to give a real sermon at least twice a year. The topic was to be assigned by teachers, who would also indicate texts that were useful for composing one. They had to make sure that the learner/preacher did not restrict himself merely to repeating other men's sermons by heart and did not make too much use of scholastic, overcomplex matters, which, if they did occur, had to be veiled in the Holy Scriptures and the Church Fathers' doctrines[211]. As far as the content of the sermons was concerned, Montanari even went so far as to specify that their style had to be different according to whether they were to be held in Catholic or heretical countries: in the case of the former, morals and the Fathers of the Church were to be preferred, in the latter dogmatics. Finally, an examination, at least an implicit one, was required to obtain the concession to preach in public[212].

Exercises on matters of conscience were kept the same as those prescribed by the Viterbo *Decreta*[213]. Regarding this subject, it should be noted that although the less able were destined to practise them, as I have already said, this does not mean that they were alone in this; on the contrary, everyone had to attend lessons on matters of conscience on the two days a week

---

[210] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 47, p. 121 (f.s.).
[211] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 24, p. 111 (f.s.).
[212] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 19, pp. 135-136 (f.s.).
[213] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], nno. 32-34, pp. 94-97 (f.s.).

when an hour was dedicated to them. Similarly, the rules concerning liturgical obligations were the same as Gesualdi's regulations, with the additional clarification, however, that the dispensation from matins enjoyed by students and teachers did not mean that they did not have to get up at the same time as the other friars, but that they had to spend the corresponding time on studying[214].

In the *Reformatio* ample room is also dedicated to the religious training of novices and newly professed friars. That all teaching and learning should be strictly carried out in the Catholic spirit was rendered explicit by the teacher's obligation to say a prayer to the holy picture hanging in every classroom before every lesson[215] and to take pains over the personal inner formation of pupils[216]. Far more forceful than these exhibitions of devotion was practising spiritual exercises: they were compulsory for all students and were to give an impetus, one reads in the *Reformatio*, to the search for the glory of God, for the integrity of the Order and for the prosperity of the Church[217]. The *Reformatio* also prescribed *collationes spirituales*, which were different from the aforementioned exercises: held after dinner on the days when matters of conscience were studied, their aim was the acquisition of virtues and the "spirit of renewal"[218].

This does not mean that even the directions concerning the formation of professed friars established by Montanari do not contain a few ambiguities.

---

[214] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, nno. 49-50, pp. 122-123 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 20, p. 136 (f.s.).
[215] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 21, p. 110 (f.s.).
[216] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 29, pp. 92-93 (f.s.).
[217] *Ibid.*.
[218] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 35, pp. 97-98 (f.s.).

In one passage, for example, one reads that newly professed friars had to attend a special class in order to evaluate them and find an assignment suitable for them[219]; in a previous passage, however, one can simply read that they had to attend third- or fourth-class gymnasia, which would serve as their professates or second novitiates[220].

Professate areas were to be close to the classrooms (*schola*)[221], and a place had to be found where the professed friars could carry out their spiritual exercises[222]. From the disciplinary point of view, professed friars were to have a *magister morum*, who, when possible, should also be a lector[223]. During this period of their life, the new members of the Order had to assimilate the behaviour becoming a clergyman. In other words, Montanari wanted more attention to be paid to the psychological restructuring of the professed friars than to the improvement of their level of culture. I shall recall here some of the norms concerning them mentioned in the *Reformatio*. They were forbidden to leave the cloister and had to go to confession every week and general confession twice a year; they had to take communion every day and spend half an hour every morning and every evening on silent prayer; they had to do weekly spiritual exercises for an hour with a debate, annual spiritual exercises on the texts by Bernardino Rossignoli and Marco Aurelio Grattarola, and spiritual exercises before being nominated priests; they should not have any relationships with teachers unless they were truly necessary[224].

---

[219] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 6, p. 81 (f.s.).
[220] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 4, p. 80 (f.s.).
[221] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 5, p. 80 (f.s.).
[222] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 29, pp. 92-93 (f.s.).
[223] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 5, p. 80 (f.s.).
[224] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, nno. 22-30, pp. 137-143 (f.s.).

Everything concerning lesson and exercise timetables has already been said above when speaking of teaching programmes. To sum up and integrate this, it should be noted that, according to Montanari's rules, students should wait for the teacher in the classroom using the time to discuss the content of the previous lessons; the quarter of an hour before the actual lesson was to be dedicated to revising what had been explained the day before; the lesson itself lasted an hour and consisted in taking down a dictation; in the quarter of an hour after the lesson, pupils were tested orally on what had just been said, and in the following fifteen minutes they had to ask the teacher questions[225]. The latter, *dictatis lectionibus*, was obliged to remain in the classroom for this half-hour, with the aim particularly of clarifying any doubts the students might have[226].

Normal lessons were held every day except on Sundays and Fridays but if there happened to be a feastday during the week, lessons were also to be held on that particular Friday. On Sundays and Fridays, there were supposed to be private, particular or revision lessons[227]. The school year lasted from the Birth of Mary, 8th September, to the day before Christmas eve; it began again on the feast of the Lord's circumcision, 1st January, and continued until eight days before Ash Wednesday; lessons started again on Ash Wednesday and lasted until the Saturday before Palm Sunday; pupils went back on the Sunday *in albis* and lessons lasted until the eve of Whit Sunday;

---

[225] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 16, pp. 133-134 (f.s.).
[226] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 36, p. 116 (f.s.). It seems to me that there is a contradiction between this norm and the previous one: here, one quarter of an hour alone, when teachers might both ask and answer questions, was prescribed.
[227] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 3, p. 99 (f.s.).

finally, school began again on the Tuesday following Whit Sunday and ended on the feast of St. Bonaventure, 14th July[228].

As we can see, the *Reformatio* does not provide for any break during Lent, but given the preaching required in that period, to which teachers aspired, it does lay down some rules concerning this. A break to allow for preaching was permitted only during Lent to general preachers who had found a substitute and after the minister general's approval; moreover, it could not start before Sexagesima Sunday (i.e., the second Sunday before Ash Wednesday) and had to end no later than the *quindena Paschae*, that is (in this context), the eighth day after Easter[229]. It was, on the other hand, forbidden to suspend lessons during Advent[230] and on the occasion of chapters, congregations, examinations, preaching cycles outside Lent, or as a consequence of journeys needed to present applications for doctorates without having obtained prior permission from the minister general[231].

I shall conclude the summary of the norms in the *Reformatio* to speak once again about an aspect that I have already mentioned and which was one of Montanari's obsessions: writing texts that were both an expression of, and a rule in, the Order's ideology. The regents of the most illustrious gymnasia, one can read in the *Reformatio*, must prepare their lessons in such a way that they may be published at the end of a three-year course[232]. Those who have been teaching for several years are to be let into any convent as fathers emeri-

---

[228] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 19, pp. 109-110 (f.s.).
[229] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, nno. 14-15, pp. 106-108 (f.s.).
[230] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 45, p. 120 (f.s.).
[231] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 46, pp. 120-121 (f.s.).
[232] *Ibid.*, De operibus componendis et in lucem edendis (henceforth De operibus), no. 1, pp. 149-150 (f.s.).

ti, where they will dedicate their time to writing highly demanding works[233]. In general, all the most illustrious fathers were expected to draw up works *in via Scoti*, *in via s. Bonaventurae* and *in via Alexandri de Ales* on any subject, particularly on the themes of dogmatics, patristic, ecclesiastic history and preaching[234]. Again they should seek out, the *Reformatio* further rules, ancient books or manuscripts worthy of being published[235]. The rule remained that the authorisation of the minister general was always required for writing or translating texts (and he would ask the relevant theologians to examine those requests for authorisation)[236], nonetheless Montanari poses the concrete possibility of publishing the works that were sent to the general chapter at the Order's expense. In particular, works that were composed following the demands of the general chapter or the minister general would be printed in the name of the whole religion, which was possible, Montanari notes, through the printers in Lyon, Paris, Cologne or Antwerp, who were willing to publish such works at their own expense, counting on an indubitable profit from the sale of texts[237].

Yet the book of the *Reformatio* does not end with the norms recalled so far. They are followed by the transcription of Paul V's brief following which the Collegio di s. Antonio in Malta was built (endowing it with the same prerogatives as the Collegio di s. Bonaventura in Rome), some texts concerning the duties of a doctor of theology and the formula for the vow to lead a "life

[233] *Ibid.*, De operibus, no. 2, p. 150 (f.s.).
[234] *Ibid.*, De operibus, no. 4, p. 150 (f.s.).
[235] *Ibid.*, De operibus, no. 3, p. 150 (f.s.).
[236] *Ibid.*, De visitatione, no. 7, p. 146 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De operibus, no. 5, pp. 150-151 (f.s.).
[237] *Ibid.*, De operibus, no. 7, pp. 150-151 (f.s.).

in common", an oath that had to be taken, as a profession of faith, by those awarded the title of doctor.

These passages bring the first set of pages in the book to a close, but this constitutes only half the length of the work. A second series of pages, with a discontinuity also in the sequence of fascicles, contain many other texts. It opens with three formularies. On pages 1-19 of this second set of pages, there is an initial list of examination subjects, all of a philosophical nature, of the doctorate exams and admission to first-class gymnasia: *Interrogatorium articulorum super quibus examinandi sunt nostri studentes et baccalaurei promovendi non solum ad lauream doctoratus, sed etiam ad studia nostra generalitia*. There follows on pp. 20-44 the list of subjects on which *professores* of theology had to be orally tested: *Professor theologiae erit examinandus circa haec capita*[238]. Pages 45-49 contain the theological completion of the previous *Interrogatorium*: *Synopsis locorum theologicorum in certas materias distributa a scholasticis nostris studentibus et baccalaureis atque potissimum a recipientibus doctoratus insignia perlustranda*.

In point of fact, these formularies take up only a very small part of the second series of pages in the book. Most of them consist in papers of an essentially devotional nature dedicated to the life of a religious who is dedicated to scholarship. The first section, entitled *Aphorismi seu notabiles declarationes rerum concernentium Scholasticorum statum in communi*, contains a list of short quotaions from the Fathers of the Church, famous authors and *concilia*[239]. This

[238] I think that here the term "*professor*" should not be taken to mean "teacher of" but "he who practises", otherwise it would not be possible to understand the use of this formulary, which is not mentioned at any point in the *Reformatio*. On the contrary, if we read it in this sense, it is possible to take the formulary as a tool for the periodical testing of students of theology.
[239] *Reformatio* 1620, pp. 50-88 (second series of pages; henceforth s.s.)

is followed by a series of much longer texts. Among them we can find written works by Thomas Aquinas and Denis the Carthusian, but the author most quoted is Bonaventure. Two complete pamphlets of Doctor Seraphicus are published within the book, i.e., the *De gradibus virtutum*[240] and the *De pugna spirituali contra septem vitia capitalia*[241], and part of the nineteenth from the *Collationes in Hexaëmeron*[242]. I shall not linger over these texts since they are the subject of specialist studies. What is important here is their significance within this work, a significance defined precisely in Montanari's *epistola pastoralis* which was the preface to his *Reformatio*.

The Constitutiones urbanae *(1628)*

On the occasion of the general congregation in May, 1628, the Order's new Constitutions were promulgated. The minister general of the time, Felice Franceschini from Cascia, wanted them to be called *urbanae* as a tribute to his patron, Pope Urban VIII. Although they are far longer than the earlier *Constitutiones piae*, the chapter dedicated to studying is much more concise than the *Decreta* contained in the *Reformatio*.

The *Constitutiones urbanae* prescribe that schools should be organised into four levels: the classes of gymnasia from the third to the first, plus colleges[243], of which there were now more than a few years earlier[244]. The simplifi-

[240] *Ibid.*, pp. 123-166 (s.s.).
[241] *Ibid.*, pp. 167-185 (s.s.).
[242] *Ibid.*, pp. 186-197 (s.s.), quoted in the text as *Luminaria Ecclesiae, sermo XIX.*
[243] *Constitutiones urbanae* 1628, cap. 5, tit. 4, no. 2, p. 167.
[244] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 21, p. 175.

cation and rationalisation of the school system of the Minor Conventuals sanctioned by the *Constitutiones urbanae* are particularly clear in the rules concerning the teaching staff. In third-class gymnasia a single lector was required whose role was also that of a regent; in second-class gymnasia there were two regents assisted by a master of arts; finally, in first-class gymnasia and colleges the teaching staff consisted in two regents and a convent bachelor[245]. The head of anything connected with the *studium* and the students was the regent who was older according to the year of his doctorate or, subordinate to this, the older according to the year he entered the convent or, other conditions being equal, the older in age[246].

The syllabuses included elements from both Gesualdi's and Montanari's legislations but also presented some new aspects. The organisation of philosophical studies closely follows that of the Viterbo chapter's *Decreta*. In third-class gymnasia, logic up to the *Analytica posteriora* was taught; in the second year, the *Analytica posteriora* were concluded together with the rest of Aristotle's texts on logic; in the third year, universals and formalities according to Scotus were taught. If the students were particularly good, the *Constitutiones urbanae* provided that they should also tackle the first books on natural philosophy[247]. In second-class gymnasia, subjects were shared by the first and second regent. The first regent taught in the first year «physicam ad mentem Aristotelis iuxta Scoti sententiam», in the second and third, metaphysics taken from Scotus' works. The second regent dealt with the treatise (i.e., the topics as a whole) *de coelo et mundo* in the first year, in the second

[245] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 10, pp. 169-170.
[246] *Ibid.*, tit. 5, no. 19, p. 184.
[247] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 11, p. 170.

with the treatise *de generatione et corruptione* and in the third with the *de anima* treatise. In addition to this, the first regent had to teach an introduction to theology, and the master of arts had to explain the subjects assigned to him according to the first regent's instructions[248].

While the study of philosophy was organised according to Gesualdi's outline, the articulation of theological education reveals the influence of Montanari's work. Also at this level of education, i.e., in first-class gymnasia, the teaching was shared by the first and second regents. The first regent was to read Scotus' commentary on the first and second books of the *Sententiae*, the second the commentary on the third and fourth books. The convent bachelor had to teach canon law[249]. We may notice that in the *ratio studiorum* prescribed by the *Constitutiones urbanae* for the least able, Bonaventure's teachings (which had been inherited from earlier centuries and could still be found in the Viterbo *Decreta*) were eliminated, so that all students were finally educated in the theology of *Doctor Subtilis*. As far as colleges were concerned, at the Collegio di s. Bonaventura the statute prescribed that the commentary on *Doctor Seraphicus' Sententiae* should be read. In all the other colleges, the first regent, in agreement with the colleague, presented disputations and controversies drawn from any great doctor of the Order; the second regent taught Holy Scriptures and dogmas; the convent bachelor taught canon law[250]. In short, the Scotist leaning of the new programmes is still evident yet is emphasised less than it had been in Montanari's texts.

---

[248] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 12, p. 170.
[249] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 13, p. 170.
[250] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 14, p. 171.

In all gymnasia and in the seminaries for the professed friars, the study of languages was also required, for which outside teachers could be brought in; students could choose among Greek, Hebrew, Chaldean and Slavonic[251]. If there was a particularly gifted student in a third-class gymnasium, he might act as a *respondens* or teach rhetoric, ethics or the rudiments of logic[252].

Students' and teachers' careers were obviously based on the structure of the *cursus studiorum*. Students were qualified by the level they attended: pupils in the third class were called "initiated", those in second-class gymnasia "students", those in first-class gymnasia "bachelors" and those in colleges "collegials"[253]. Students' *curriculum* followed the order of the classes. At the initial stage of studies, the youngest students' needs were met by allowing them to study in their town of origin[254].

The organisation of examinations on the whole marked a return to Gesualdi's plan, even if the *Constitutiones urbanae* kept, with modifications, a figure introduced by Montanari: the visitor to the *studia*. The students' passage from professate, now called seminary, to the third-class gymnasium did not require any intervention on the part of this official. The candidate was required to be twenty-one years of age, be professed and a cleric. Once he had these requisites, he had to pass two tests: in one, the minister provincial alone evaluated his good morals; in the other, the provincial minister, with the aid of two teachers, judged his ability at letters. All this was followed by a decree from the minister general. Admittance to second- and first-class gymnasia

[251] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 20, p. 174.
[252] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 11, p. 170.
[253] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 3, p. 167.
[254] *Ibid.*, tit. 5, no. 17, p. 183.

depended on a pupil's having spent three years at a lower-level gymnasium, undertaken public theses and passed two examinations. The first of these concerned the candidate's moral and religious maturity and consisted merely in obtaining a letter of guarantee from his local superior and from two fathers concerning his good conduct. The other exam consisted, on the other hand, in an evaluation of the level of preparation he had reached. This is where the visitor to the *studium* designated by the minister general came into play. With two teachers, or fathers who were masters, he would first listen to the candidate teach a lesson on a subject picked out at random and communicated to him twenty-four hours before, then dispute two theses with his fellow students or with the visitor himself acting as *arguens*. On the basis of this test, the examined students would be separated into having failed (rejected), having to repeat the course (mediocre) and passing (excellent). The same rules were also valid for admittance to college, with the difference that in this case the examination does not seem to have been entrusted to the visitor to the *studia*. Moreover, the work of examiner seems to have been the visitor's sole task, with the result, therefore, that his role was played down and reshaped compared to that defined in the *Reformatio*: from inspector and judge of teachers and students, he had simply become an external member of the examination board.

These regulations are presented in the *Constitutiones urbanae* as peremptory, yet departures from them were permitted concerning the class into which students were admitted; in other words, the right was reserved to decide case by case into which class of the gymnasium pupils who had started

their studies might be admitted[255]. Whatever grade they were admitted into, they had to start attending its lessons from the beginning of the three-year course, although once again exceptions were permitted[256].

As a result of the large numbers of applications, admission to colleges was regulated by particular rules. Besides various possibilities of obtaining indirect admission, those who were promoted (*vocati*) to the college but not admitted (*assumpti*) were allowed to repeat the course of the first-class gymnasium[257]. In order to obtain the title of master, it was necessary to reach the end of all the educational levels or to obtain apostolic letters[258].

Teachers' *curricula* ran parallel to that of students. In third-class gymnasia, nomination of teachers was the minister general's prerogative; in those of the second class, the minister general proposed two names for each post of regent and, during the general assembly (that is, the general chapter or intermediate congregation), the definitors elected one of the candidates in a secret ballot[259]. Convent bachelors in first-class gymnasia and colleges could be promoted, at the end of the course, to regents of a second-class gymnasium. Apart from this specific case, the universally valid rule for promotion to any level, obviously excluding the lowest, was that the friar aspiring to it had spent three years in a lower grade *studium*, which was to be proven by means of a certificate awarded by the guardian of the convent where that *studium* had its seat. Not even the minister general could let any steps be skipped; exceptions were only possible when a replacement was required after a death

[255] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, nno. 4-5, pp. 167-168 and tit. 5, no. 3, p. 179.
[256] *Ibid.*, tit. 5, no. 18, p. 184.
[257] *Ibid.*, tit. 5, no. 8, p. 181.
[258] *Ibid.*, tit. 5, no. 2, pp. 178-179.
[259] *Ibid.*, tit. 5, no. 1, p. 178.

or a transfer[260], but in this case being posted to a higher level did not count as a promotion[261]. Anyone who completed the whole *curriculum* as a teacher could also obtain on request the title of perpetual definitor for his own province[262].

The *Constitutiones urbanae* kept a conception of teaching based on dictation[263]. When the signal was given for the start of a lesson, pupils had to reach their classroom without dawdling. Before the lesson, two pupils were chosen at random to repeat the previous lesson; anyone who was not ready for this was punished, perhaps even expelled. After this test,

> nova lectio scriptis excipienda tradatur. Ac si fuerit opus viva voce dilucidetur, ne tamen auditores nimiam prolixitatem pertaesi lectiones aversentur, decretum est, ne ipsa lectio cum sua repetitione, ac insuper, (ut praefertur) explicatione, unius horae spatium ex horologio arenario metiendam excedat[264].

The *Constitutiones urbanae*, just like the earlier Viterbo *Decreta* and the *Reformatio*, also provided for other times for learning outside the normal lessons. The simplest exercise was called "*conferentiae*". It went back to a custom found both in the Viterbo decrees and, under the name of monthly and annual *repetitiones*, in Montanari's reform. *Conferentiae* were to be held every week, or on alternate weeks, in the classroom (*schola*) or where the regent thought fitting, and every pupil at every level in the *studium* had to attend them. On

---

260 *Ibid.*.
261 *Ibid.*, tit. 4, nno. 6-8, p. 168.
262 *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 9, p. 169. Definitors were advisors to the provincial father and had the right to take part in the provincial chapters and congregations.
263 *Ibid.*, tit. 5, no. 12, p. 182.
264 *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 17, pp. 172-173.

the occasion of them, one of the two regents in turn tested anyone he chose on any of the past lessons[265]. Secondly, there were *disputae*. Already present in the Viterbo *Decreta* as *disputae circulares*, they had been kept, albeit multiplied among a host of different activities, in the *Reformatio*. According to the *Constitutiones urbanae*, the regent had to propose for every debate two theses (*conclusiones*) pertaining to subjects that had been tackled during the courses; the theses were put up on the door to the *schola* and had to be defended, as part of their training, by those who were about to sustain theses in public; in this case, only the two *arguentes* were chosen at random. However, if in the *studium* there were no candidates for forthcoming publicly debated conclusions, the defender (*respondens*) was also picked out at random. To be held after refection on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays starting from the feast of St. Francis, 4th October, for the whole school year, they had to last at least an hour[266]. The *Constitutiones urbanae* did not even eliminate disputations and conferences at general chapters but the legislation concerning them was reduced to essentials: the best regents (chosen by the minister general) of colleges and first-class gymnasia had to hold *cathedrae* at general chapters[267] ; regents of colleges and of first- and second-class gymnasia had to defend "theorems", together with their students at provincial chapters[268].

One novelty introduced in the *Reformatio* and maintained in the *Constitutiones urbanae* were the academies, although now they became simply possible as opposed to advisable. The students in colleges and in the first-class

---

[265] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 18, p. 173.
[266] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 19, pp. 173-174.
[267] *Ibid.*, tit. 5, no. 19, p. 184.
[268] *Ibid.*, tit. 5, no. 20, p. 184.

gymnasia had the right to organise academies on all the subjects that were not forbidden. Norms, coats of arms, topics, etc., were decided by students; the guardian, or regent, had to supervise what was happening but could not intervene unless invited to. It was also possible to invite other guests from outside the convent, including laymen[269].

In convents with at least eight friars, there had to be a lector for matters of conscience. It was his duty to teach a lesson twice a week in the vulgar tongue, which all the residents in the convent had to attend; moreover, confessors were obliged to hold a debate among themselves once a week[270]. Sermons were to be held in all convents, and, if they could, all masters, lectors, etc. had to be present at them[271]. The *Constitutiones urbanae* were also concerned with relationships with the "public" cultural world; for this reason, gymnasia and colleges had to be located in the external cloister of the convent, so that any layman that wanted to attend a lesson could do so[272].

The *Constitutiones urbanae* did not eliminate threats of sanctions for negligent teachers and pupils. Pupils absent without good cause might be punished[273]; teachers who were absent without any good reason were to be punished even more severely[274]. As we have seen, compared to Montanari's reform the role of a visitor to *studia* was also maintained, albeit with some changes; the task of guardians, custodians and minister provincials was also kept, if not even reappraised. With the precise aim of avoiding any abuse of

---

[269] *Ibid.*, tit. 6, pp. 185-186.
[270] *Ibid.*, tit. 2, p. 165.
[271] *Ibid.*, tit. 3, pp. 165-166.
[272] *Ibid.*, tit. 5, no. 16, p. 183.
[273] *Ibid.*, tit. 5, nno. 10 and 14, pp. 182 and 183.
[274] *Ibid.*, tit. 5, no. 13, p. 182.

power, it was forbidden for a regent to be elected to the role of custodian or minister provincial[275].

Lessons were to run from the feast of the Birth of Mary, 8th September, until the feast of St. Bonaventure, 14th July. In term-time, every Thursday was a holiday unless there was another feastday in the same week. Lessons were also suspended from the feast of Saints Simon and Judas, 28th October, to 3rd November; from the feast of St. Thomas, 21st December, to 2nd January; from the eighth Sunday before Easter to Ash Wednesday; from Palm Sunday to the Wednesday after Easter[276]. During Lent, from the eighth Sunday before Easter to the week after Easter, college students, bachelors and pupils had to preach, which implies that Lent in point of fact became a vacation period. Preaching during Advent, on the other hand, simply became a possibility. If there happened to be a general chapter, which was always officially celebrated at Whitsun, lessons were held until Ascension Day, unless teachers were called to the chapter[277].

The Collegio di s. Bonaventura

Aims of the College and procedures for admission to it

The Collegio di s. Bonaventura was instituted after the *Constitutiones piae* had been promulgated and was the first institute on a formally university

[275] *Ibid.*. Those responsible for the parts into which provinces were divided were called "custodians". It should, however, be noted that there was also the role of "custodian of custodians".
[276] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 15, pp. 171-172.
[277] *Ibid.*, tit. 4, no. 16, p. 172.

level of the Order of Minor Conventuals. It began its activity, according to the wishes of the Franciscan Conventual pope, Sixtus V, at the convent attached to the Roman basilica of the SS. XII Apostoli, which was entrusted to the Minor Conventuals, sometimes from December, 1587, to January, 1588, and was awarded its own Constitutions in 1589 and 1590[278]. The fact that the Collegio di s. Bonaventura had its own Constitutions also had the effect that any later evolution in the *ratio studiorum* of the Order of Minor Conventuals formally concerned it only indirectly.

There were at least two reasons why Sixtus V was driven to found the Collegio di s. Bonaventura. First, it was his wish to promote the figure and study of Bonaventure of Bagnoregio, so much so that the pope himself proclaimed him Doctor of the Church in March, 1588, and ordered his works to be printed, a work which was begun in the same year and ended in 1596. Yet no less important was his intention to endow the Order of Minor Conventuals with an institute that would confer doctorates[279]. Finally, one should remember the politically relevant fact that both the Jesuits and the Dominicans already had, respectively from 1556 and from the end of the 1570s, their own colleges in Rome, the first of which was explicitly authorised by Pope Pius V to confer doctorate degrees.

The creation of the Collegio di s. Bonaventura can be seen within the context of the gradual break in the contiguity between theological faculties at public *studia* and religious orders. The sixteenth century had already wit-

---

[278] PROSPERO DA MARTIGNÉ 1890, 35-36; SPARACIO 1923, 10 and 19; DI FONZO 1940, 153 and 155, footnote 3; DI FONZO 1987, 5-9. In actual fact, there is no complete agreement among the above-mentioned authors about what happened in the first decades of the college's life.

[279] PROSPERO DA MARTIGNÉ 1890, 35-36; DI FONZO 1940, 156.

nessed the establishment of the custom of awarding monks and friars a doctorate in theology as a result of courses of study or political manoeuvres within religious orders or the Roman Curia, that is to say, by means of procedures that did not require any intervention on the part of colleges of theologians in public *studia*. Even if one disregards for the time being the phenomenon of degrees obtained thanks to the direct intervention on the part of the Holy See (degrees that had a political rather than cultural significance), one can observe that among Conventuals, in the first half of the sixteenth century, a doctorate might indeed be conferred at a general chapter, nevertheless this act still required the appropriate apostolic letters[280].

A first significant event took place in 1561: on 15th July, Pius IV conceded to the minister general of the Minor Conventuals the right *in perpetuum* to confer a degree, both in *artes* and in theology, on any friar of his Order he thought worthy, subject to a strict examination, not only at the general chapter but also at provincial chapters. Even so, in the same brief the pope established that the aspirants who might be awarded a doctoral degree should not have exceeded a certain number, which popes should have decided case by case[281]. As we can see, the Holy See assigned judgement of merit for individual degrees to the minister general but reserved the right to control the numbers of possible graduates for himself. The *Constitutiones piae*, drawn up shortly afterwards, on the one hand reiterated the rule that awarding a doc-

[280] DI FONZO 1940, 162, footnote 19.
[281] PIUS V 1561. Cf. COSTA 1987, 255; IANNELLI 1994, 52-54; ROEST 2000, 116. In FORLIVESI 2002 I expressed the conviction that Pius V's brief did not eliminate the need to obtain a papal brief for every single doctoral degree awarded; it seems to me now, however, that this conviction of mine is contradicted by documents.

torate at the general chapter required passing an examination[282], but, on the other, begged the pope to eliminate the restriction over the limitatation of numbers of candidates at general chapters. Actually, it is not clear to me if this plea was ever answered by Pius IV or his sixteenth-century successors[283].

The institution of the Collegio di s. Bonaventura constituted a second and even more significant turning-point in the history of the Order of Minor Conventuals. By granting to this Order an institute that *ipso facto* awarded degrees on the completion of studies, the Holy See (although this was not fully in its power, since other forces were in play) bestowed on the *studia* within religious orders, even in the case of the Minor Conventuals, prerogatives equal to the ones held by the theologians' colleges at public *studia*, making the separation that was occurring at the time between the formers and the latters even more radical.

In Sixtus V's plans, the Collegio di s. Bonaventura was to host at least twenty bachelors who, by studying fervently *Doctor Seraphicus*' commentary on the *Sententiae*, would specialise in the author's thought and *pietas* and prepare for the tasks of teaching that awaited them at the end of the three-year course. According to the statute rules, the teaching staff consisted in a regent, whose work it was to read and comment on Bonaventure's four books of the commentary on the *Sententiae*, and in a convent bachelor, with whom stu-

---

[282] *Constitutiones piae* 1565, cap. 5, p. 27.

[283] *Ibid.*, cap. 5, p. 28. As far as I can see, the faculty of awarding an unlimited number of degrees at a general chapter would unequivocably be conceded to the Minor Conventuals only in 1621, as we shall see. I should like to point out that on the same page the *Constitutiones piae* provided that non-Italian or Dalmatian friars that aspired to a degree had the possibility of availing themselves of a special procedure at a *universitas publica* in the friar's seat of residence or origin; however, it seems to me that this procedure could hardly have really been applied.

dents would train for teaching and debating[284]. Finally, it must be recalled that control over the institute was in the hands of a cardinal patron, assisted by a cardinal co-patron and by a cardinal vice-patron. The cardinal patron of the Collegio di s. Bonaventura was different from the cardinal patron of the Order of the Minor Conventuals and was supposed to be the oldest of the cardinals born in the Marches. He was entrusted with choosing the regent, with the economic administration and, ultimately, with selecting the very students[285].

Conditions for admission to the College were regulated both by the bull concerning its foundation, the *Ineffabilis divinae providentiae altitudo*, and by later Constitutions. The bull merely prescribed that candidates had to have completed their studies on philosophy; however, the Constitutions of 1589-90 prescribed that eligible candidates had to be bachelors, have sustained public disputations and have already studied logic, physics and metaphysics for at least five years and theology for at least one at the Order's *studia*[286]. However, what made admission to the College really hard was the extremely limited number of places available; these were assigned after an admission examination stipulated in the same *Constitutiones Collegii*. According to these rules, the cardinal patron of the College announced the selection examination at least four months before calling up the applicants; the minister general saw to sending candidates their letters of invitation and a list of themes from which the candidate had to choose four topics to present and be tested on. The examination was held in the Basilica dei SS. XII Apostoli in the presence of the

[284] SPARACIO 1923, 30; DI FONZO 1940, 162-163; DI FONZO 1987, 19.
[285] SPARACIO 1923, 19; DI FONZO 1987, 18.
[286] PROSPERO DA MARTIGNÉ 1890, 36-37; SPARACIO 1923, 19-20; DI FONZO 1940, 154-155.

cardinal patron of the College, the regent and, in the role of *arguentes*, the regent of the Collegio Romano (that is, the Jesuit college), the regent of Collegio di s. Tommaso (the Dominican college) and other renowned theologians[287].

The *Reformatio* contains several rules concerning this admission exam, yet it is difficult to interpret them. In particular, it is not clear which tests candidates had to pass in order to be entitled to take part in the selection. In one passage, one can read that an examination was planned in the first year of first-class *studia*; if the student passed it and sustained public conclusions at chapters and in congregations, he would be proclaimed *pro cursu* bachelor and enrolled as one of the candidates for the Collegio di s. Bonaventura[288]. Elsewhere, only an examination in the last year of a gymnasium, which was on the whole of theology, is mentioned[289]. As we have already written, this examination seems to have been in two parts. On the one hand, the candidate had to teach two public lessons, one on a speculative subject (including the *artes*), the other on dogmatics. On the other hand, there was an oral examination based on a formulary contained in the *Reformatio* book itself, held in front of the minister general or someone he encharged with this[290]. All this, however, was not the final obstacle to admission. As we have said, according to the *Reformatio*, the minister general, or his substitute, would choose forty bachelors whose names were communicated three months before Whitsun to the cardinal patron of the College, from whom he would choose twenty[291].

---

[287] BENOFFI 1932, 23-24; SPARACIO 1923, 20-21; DI FONZO 1987, 21 and 21-22, footnote 23.
[288] *Reformatio* 1620, *Dec. ref. st.*, De studentibus, no. 12, pp. 131-132 (f.s.).
[289] *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 8, pp. 129-130 (f.s.).
[290] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 17, p. 87 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 13, pp. 132-133 (f.s.).
[291] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 20, p. 89 (f.s.).

In actual fact, the minister general's choice does not seem to have been an examination but rather to have consisted in compiling a kind of order of merit in which political interests played a decisive role. The document announcing the admission examination at the chapter of 1635, for example, reveals that ministers provincial and regents actively promoted students' and teachers' careers: we read in it that every minister provincial and every regent might put forward his own requests concerning regencies and students on the occasion of the chapter and that an attempt would be made to satisfy them[292].

The fact remains that the admission examination to the College must have been very demanding. No sixteenth- or seventeenth-century lists of subjects pertaining to the admission exam are known; Lorenzo Di Fonzo found only one from 1775, one from 1821 and a reprint of the latter of 1833. Under the title of *Elenchus positionum theologicarum ad mentem […] s. Bonaventurae* they contain fifteen *dissertationes* and, subordinated to these, two hundred and seventy *positiones*, or theses, which also include references to the works of Bonaventure, in particular to his commmentary on the *Sententiae*. According to Di Fonzo, candidates were expected to choose four *dissertationes* and be questioned and tested on the relative *positiones*[293]. Unfortunately, the considerations upon which Di Fonzo bases his theory in order to sustain that this *Elenchus* is ancient are weak[294]; the fact remains that it may be possible for it to have already been in use in the seventeenth century.

---

[292] BERARDICELLI 1635, no. 5.
[293] DI FONZO 1940, 157-160; cf. in particular footnote 12.
[294] To support his convictions, Di Fonzo merely cites the use of the formula "*reimprimatur*" and the presence of a note «which smacks of early times» («che sa di antico»).

On the contrary, the conferment of the qualification was simple: the statutes of the Collegio di s. Bonaventura prescribed that at the end of the three-year course students would be awarded the title of doctor without having to face any further examinations[295].

The role of the Collegio di s. Bonaventura in the political life of the Order

In the fifty years after it was founded, the weight of the Collegio di s. Bonaventura within the educational system of the Order of Minor Conventuals underwent a gradual, albeit slight, loss of importance. The reason for this lies in the fact that the Collegio could in no way satisfy the numerous requests for doctorates, which were motivated by the benefits that the title of doctor of theology involved. The dialectic between the Order and the papacy in the first twenty-five years of the seventeenth century led to a gradual loosening of the conditions imposed by the Holy See. On the one hand, ministers general continued to press for a large number of men who might graduate at general chapters; on the other, the premises were laid for opening more colleges. Clement VIII conceded the right to the Conventuals to confer four degrees for each Italian province, two for those abroad and four for the bachelors at the Assisi *studium*[296]. The latter institute thus gradually became a college, and indeed, in 1602, it was opened for twelve bachelors, giving them the possibility of graduating there[297]. After a slack period of some years, the zealous activities of Gesualdi and Montanari contributed to giving the Order a good name again, and on 10th June, 1620, Paul V ordered that the Collegio di

[295] SPARACIO 1923, 23; DI FONZO 1987, 22-23.
[296] PARISCIANI 1983, 631.
[297] *Ibid.*, p. 638.

s. Antonio da Padova should be established in Malta[298]. There were thus three active colleges at the time of the promulgation of the *Reformatio*: the Collegio di s. Bonaventura in Rome, the Collegio di s. Antonio da Padova in Malta and the Collegio del Sacro Convento in Assisi[299].

Needless to say, not even these dispositions were able to satisfy the rising tide of requests. A decree of the general chapter of 1617 establishing that no new doctor was to be nominated even intensified the hunger for degrees[300]. On 20th October, 1620, Montanari obtained from Paul V the faculty of awarding doctorates to four or six bachelors more than the pre-established number of those graduating[301], and on 15th April, 1621, Gregory XV conceded the right to confer a doctorate, after the due examination, on anyone the minister general thought worthy, without any limitations as to numbers[302]. If this, as it seems to me, is the meaning of Gregory XV's bull, then the pope's decision paved the way for the possibility of structuring the Order's educational system in a new perspective: it meant that the minister general could confer as many doctorates as he wanted and that establishing which studies in whichever *studia* would entitle students to doctorates could become a matter internal to the Order. However, the fact remains that Montanari did not avail himself of this chance, at least in this form: he preferred, on the contrary, to

---

298 The bull of institution is also published in *Reformatio* 1620, pp. 153-154 (f.s.).
299 *Reformatio* 1620, *Dec. ref. st.*, [Ordo], no. 1, p. 79 and *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 34, pp. 115-116.
300 MONTANARI 1617.
301 PARISCIANI 1983, 777.
302 *Ibid.*, 779. The bull is transcribed in Regesta Ordinis 1620-1623, Roma, Archivio Generale dell'Ordine dei Minori Conventuali, A-28, f. 186*r*.

promote the status of the provinces beyond the Alps, obtaining permission to institute a college in Prague in 1622[303].

Be that as it may, the process of increasing the number of colleges was underway. For example, from 1621 to 1628 the transformation of the gymnasium in Naples to a college was becoming a reality, following a course to which the problem of the economic onus of keeping bachelors while studying was central[304]. The *Constitutiones urbanae* of 1628 would lead to a clarification of rules and to drawing up a table of the entitlements of individual *studia*, which, despite later fluctuations, were to establish the structure of educational courses within the Order until the eighteenth century.

What has been said thus far does not mean that even afterwards the Collegio di s. Bonaventura was not still considered the Order's most prestigious institute, so much so that students enrolled there had precedence over all those enrolled at the other colleges[305].

The cultural leaning of the Collegio di s. Bonaventura

Neither Gesualdi's *Decreta* nor Montanari's *Reformatio* changed the text of the legislation concerning the Collegio di s. Bonaventura; however, one might wonder how an island of Bonaventurism, what is more at the Order's most prestigious institute, was able to survive in a context that the ministers general themselves wanted to be increasingly Scotist in tendency. In actual fact, the only essay, the work of Lorenzo Di Fonzo, dedicated until today to

[303] PARISCIANI 1983, 797.
[304] IANNELLI 1994, 67-71.
[305] SPARACIO 1923, 32-33.

the question of the attention paid to Bonaventure's thought in the Collegio bearing his name does not highlight any specific faithfulness to this medieval scholar. The sole editorial activity concerning the work of *Doctor Seraphicus* was the Vatican edition published from 1588 to 1596. In the seventeenth century, some exponents of the Collegio di s. Bonaventura edited the publication of works by other authors of the *via antiqua* or by followers of Scotus: François de Meyronnes, Vital du Four, Pierre Auriol, Pierre Tartaret, Peter of Aquila and Francesco Lichetto. There were then very few former students of the institute that recalled Bonaventure in the titles of their own works. Actually, even Costanzo Torri from Sarnano himself, the editor of Bonaventure's *opera omnia*, had previously published a work dedicated to reconciling Aquinas and Scotus in Lyon in 1577. All in all, Di Fonzo indicates just six names of "Bonaventurians" for the seventeenth century, moreover improperly including in this category Bonaventura Passeri and Bartolomeo Mastri, who were undoubtedly Scotists, and Matteo Frće, whose faithfulness to Bonaventure's thought is declared rather than proven. Aware of stretching things somewhat, Di Fonzo concludes that while it is true that of those who taught at, or came out of, the Collegio di s. Bonaventura only very few were true "Bonaventurians", nevertheless all former students showed a vast knowledge of the man himself[306].

In truth, such competence could quite easily be integrated into the plan for the disciplinary and ideological unification of the Order of Minor Conventuals pursued by its ministers general from the end of the sixteenth century. We have already seen that for Montanari, for example, Bonaventure was the

[306] DI FONZO 1940, 181.

aerarium of *Doctor Subtilis*, which explains why it was possible to pronounce the words of Bonaventure and hear those of Scotus. Moreover, the Scotism of the Roman "Bonaventurians" was hardly veiled or mentioned in undertones. In this regard, we have the interesting testimony of Mastri himself. From 1638 to 1650 Bartolomeo Mastri and Matteo Frće (*Ferchius*), likewise a conventual Franciscan and already a *socius* of the Order at the time of Montanari, clashed in a lengthy diatribe. In 1646 Frće published a *Defensio vestigationum peripateticarum* in Padua in reply to objections, some of which raised by Mastri and Belluto, to some of his theories. Assisted by an old friend of his and his patron, his fellow brother Ottaviano Camerani Jr. from Ravenna, Mastri replied with a text written in about 1647 but published only in 1650 in Ferrara, furthermore without his superiors' permission: the *Scotus et scotistae Bellutus et Mastrius expurgati a probrosis querelis ferchianis*. One of the accusations that Frće had addressed to Mastri was that of having deserted Bonaventure in favour of Scotus, whereas, since he had been a student at the college dedicated to *Doctor Seraphicus*, he should have remained one of his faithful followers. The «Prima querela Ferchij. *Quod seraphici doctoris minus profiteamur doctrinam quam propagare tenemur, cum eius collegiales fuerimus*» in *Scotus et scotistae* and the relative *expurgatio* are dedicated to this matter[307]. Aiming to highlight the basic Scotism at the Collegio di s. Bonaventura, Mastri and Camerani trace the cultural history of that institution. They write that the first regent of the college, Ottaviano Strambiati Sr. from Ravenna, had already been a Scotist, as was proved both by the manuscript of the lessons he held in Rome in 1586 (and which at the time when *Scotus et scotistae* was being written was kept by

[307] [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Expurgatio prima, pp. 39-67.

Camerani), and by the declaration of Montanari, who was a pupil of Strambiati's. Of the following regents, that is Fabrizio of San Giovanni in Persiceto, Girolamo Alberici from Brisighella, Giovanni Crisostomo from Milan, Pietro Capulio, Felice Centini, Bonaventura of Montegiorgio, Bonaventura Passeri from Nola, Francesco Antonio Biondi from San Severino[308] and Bonaventura Claveri from Bisceglie, only Pietro Capulio was a "Bonaventurian"[309]. The students who graduated from the Collegio di s. Bonaventura also professed Scotus' doctrine, as is demonstrated, Mastri and Camerani continue, in the works by Filippo Fabri, Angelo Volpi, Maurizio Centini, Francesco Antonio Biondi, Bonaventura Passeri, Gaspare Sghemma and Modesto Gavazzi[310]. Frće himself, the *expurgatio* concludes, who declares himself to be a "Bonaventurian", quotes Scotus far more frequently than Bonaventure and contests the latter more often than the times he mentions him in defence of his doctrine[311].

Moreover, the concept of Bonaventure's thought as the aurora of that of Scotus was not the only way that permitted members of the Collegio di s. Bonaventura to study and accept the latter's doctrine while formally agreeing with the former's. Besides the regent's official programme, a considerable part of students' activity consisted in reading in private and in "general tests"

---

[308] His fellow brother Agostino Superbi also describes him as *doctrinae Scoti fidelissimus*: SUPERBI 1631-1632, f. 49*v*.

[309] Not even Di Fonzo mentions any Bonaventurian regents apart from Capulio. However, he does warn readers that the list of regents provided by Mastri and Camerani is different from that proposed by Domenico Maria Sparacio. In reporting the list of regents presented by Mastri and Camerani I do not intend to enter into the debate concerning the sixteenth-century vicissitudes of the College but simply point out the interpretation that these two authors gave to the recent cultural history of their Order.

[310] [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Expurgatio prima, pp. 54-59.

[311] *Ibid.*, Expurgatio prima, pp. 62-64.

of debating with a lector nominated by the regent himself. One report of these internal disputations was published by Bonaventura Passeri in 1621, and its Scotist leaning is even stated in the title: *Pinacoteca selecta praecipuarum conclusionum, ac quaestionum […] in Collegio seraphico almae Urbis ex doctrina Scoti discussarum*[312].

2. THE SYSTEMATIC TEXTBOOK AND THE *VIA SCOTI*

As we have seen, Montanari wanted Scotus to become the doctrinal point of reference for the Order of Minor Conventuals and encouraged students of his Order to write new works on philosophy and theology in every possible way. We have also seen that Montanari can be placed, in the history of the Order of the Minor Conventuals, within an historical process that preceded his activity and continued even after he had been politically defeated. However, the reasons that lay at the roots of his cultural project, and how he and his fellow brothers understood it, still have to be clarified. Here I shall face just two of the many questions that the historical context poses: which reasons nourished Montanari's desire to have new texts at the Order's disposal and what concept he himself, and those after him, might have had of them.

[312] SCARAMUZZI 1927, 202. Passeri's work is presented in the title page of the book as the first volume and, as such, is entitled *De scientia Dei*. I have no knowledge of a second volume of the work.

The urge to draw up new reference texts

At least three factors contributed to the genesis of the wish to dispose of new texts on philosophy and theology. All three transcendend the choices implemented by the Order of Minor Conventuals and together led to the success of a new literary genre: the systematic textbook on philosophy and theology.

The first factor lies in a renewed drive towards the regulation of the cultural world. In the course of the fifteenth century, the Roman Curia had already developed its intention to restrict the spread of *novitates* and to oppose conciliarism, normally upheld by the theologians of the *via moderna*. This aim became effective in the obligation for teachers of philosophical and theological subjects to restrict their teaching to commentaries on texts that already existed[313]. In the second half of the sixteenth century, following the Protestant crisis, the Catholic Church, by now completely engulfed in the papacy, reaffirmed with renewed strength the will to control the cultural world. However, on that occasion, due also to results produced in the philosophical field by university masters' work on commentaries on Aristotelian texts, the desire for regulation did not turn into restricting teachers and thinkers in general to ancient authors and works; instead, it turned into promoting an ideological reorganisation, leaving any transgressions considered dangerous to be lim-

[313] For example, in the statutes of the University of Paris of 1452, the papacy, through Guillaume d'Estouteville, imposed, to counteract the *logica modernorum* and the increase in the "subtleties" of the *summae*, a return to the study of Aristotle "point by point" and the obligation for readers of Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* not to deal with logical or philosophical matters or subjects, or at most (the statutes add with subtle perfidy) to the degree required by the text of the *Sententiae* itself.

ited later by means of the tool of censorship. The mainstays of this political-cultural project were thus the precise determination of the ideology of reference, of which the first expression were the doctrinal outcomes of the Council of Trent and the purge of cultural elements and customs that might endanger the stability and strength of the Church's political structure and power. This plan of action was partly elaborated by some religious orders, first and foremost the Jesuits, and partly absorbed by them. Hence the development of a replication, on a minor yet more clearly defined scale, of the political-cultural project of the Papal Church was stimulated in religious orders: the strengthening of the Order by means of individuating and defining an ideology of reference and a purge of anything that did not fit into the planned framework.

The second factor that boosted the production of new texts consisted in the continual clash between different philosophical and theological schools in the Catholic world. If this clash had become more and more harsh from the second half of the fifteenth century, due to the above-mentioned impulsion impressed upon Catholic religious orders, we now witness a recrudescence of the conflict. Thomists, for example, even reached the point of attacking Scotus himself, expressing doubts not merely about his saintliness but even about his orthodoxy. The Polish Dominican, Abraham Bzowski, in the second decade of the seventeenth century, maintained that Duns Scotus had died in desperation[314]; one is not surprised, therefore, that Montanari and his men should have joined forces around the figure of Scotus and that this should immediately have been expressed precisely in a reaction to writings such as

[314] Cf. SCHMUTZ 2002, 51-52. Schmutz uses the edition of vol. 13 of *Annales ecclesiastici* that was published in Cologne in 1621; however, that volume was first published in 1616.

those of Bzowski. In this sense, the polemical works of Matteo Frće, written from 1619 and 1620, are significant; it was not merely by chance that Frće had been the *socius* of the Order during Montanari's generalship and had been present at the inspection and reburial of Scotus' body according to the wishes of the minister general[315].

The third factor that contributed to the production of new texts can be found in the birth of a new literary genre, that of the *cursus*, or systematic textbook, on philosophy and theology[316]. These *cursus* of philosophy and theology were a creation of the thinkers of the early decades of the seventeenth century[317]. In university culture at the time, above all in Protestant *studia* and

---

[315] For an overview of this kind of work among Franciscans, cf. *Annales Minorum* 1934, 97, and BALIĆ 1937.

[316] By "systematic textbook" I do not mean here a text in which part or the whole reality is illustrated starting from a set of principles. I do not deny that in the Protestant field there were authors who tried to write texts of this type, yet this is not the meaning in which one can speak of a "systematic textbook" referring to most of the works written in the first half of the seventeenth century. "Systematic textbooks" must rather generally be taken to mean those works whose purpose was not the clarification of a prior text but the description of the structure of reality or part of it.

[317] BURGIO 1996, 145-146, writes that the tendency to produce *summae* characterised ecclesiastic university philosophy and theology from the 1670s, that the thought contained in them was jaded, confused and crystallised and that it marked the crisis into which the cultural world had fallen. However, I am of the opinion that if by "*summa*" Burgio means "*cursus*", the statement concerning the dating of the spread of this tendency does not corrispond to reality; it is moreover false to say that seventeenth-century systematic treatises on philosophy or theology lack speculative liveliness. If, on the other hand, by "*summa*" one means "epitome", a further distinction is required. The epitomic production at the end of the seventeenth century within Catholic religious orders seems to have been of two types. In some cases (for example, Sébastien Dupasquier's Scotist *summae*, published for the first time in France in the 1690s), the texts were merely simplifications of theories discussed in the first seventy-five years of the century; in such cases, this production does indeed mark the death of a creative impetus of which the *cursus* and, more in general, the works of the earlier three-quarters of the century were an expression. In other cases (for example, the textbooks by the Somaschan Francesco Caro, published in a first version in Venice in the second half of the 1660s), these works reveal the effects of the attempt to accept elements of the new physics and propose a view of reality that was different from

in the *studia* of the Catholic religious orders, the desire had grown to have at their disposal well-ordered expositions of everything that could be known and which was capable of substituting the treatises of "ancient" university authors, which were seen as disorganic, redundant, attentive to the interpretation of some older text rather than expounding on the reality of matters and, in the case of Aristotelian texts, potentially heterodox. In other words, the desire for systematicity had grown, supported by a threefold need: for order, synthesis and the direct presentation of the design of reality.

This was, as we have said, a need proper to both Protestant university culture and at least part of the Catholic university culture, as is proven by the examples of statements of intentions on the part of authors who were, at least apparently, very distant from one another, such as Francisco Suárez[318], Bar-

---

that elaborated in the preceding decades in Catholic higher institutes of education. As far as their speculative profoundness is concerned, these are also pitiful works; however, they are so for a reason and in a different sense from that by which today we would judge the epitomes that summarise the great works of the previous age to be jaded and confused.

[318] I am referring to Suárez's famous letter to the provost general of the Society of Jesus, Everard Lardinois de Marcourt (Francisco SUÁREZ, *letter* to Everardo Mercuriano, Valladolid, 2nd July, 1579; the letter is published as a photoreproduction in R. DE SCORRAILLE, *François Suarez de la Compagnie de Jésus, d'après ses lettres, ses autres écrits inédits et un grand nombre de documents nouveaux*, 2 voll., Lethielleux, Paris 1912-1913, I, image outside text between pp. 160-161): «el modo de leer que yo tengo […] es diferente que de lo que los mas usan por aca, por que ay costumbre de leer por cartapacios, leyendo las cosas mas por tradicion de unos a otros, que por mirallas hondamente y sacallas de sus fuentes, que son la authoridad sacra, y la humana y la razon cada cosa en su grado. Yo e procurado salir deste camino y mirar las cosas mas de rayz, de lo qual naze que ordinariamente pareze llevan mis cosas algo de novedad, que en la traza, que en el modo de declarallas, que en las razones, que en las soluciones de dificultades, que en levantar algunas dudas que otros no tratan de proposito, que en otras cosas que siempre se ofrezen, y de aqui pienso que resulta que aunque las verdades que se leen no sean nuevas, se hagan nuevas por el modo, o porque salen algo de la vereda de los cartapacios». However, it must be added that Francisco Suárez would soon learn to conform to the line of conduct concerning studies of his superiors and attenuate and dissimulate his distance from other authors of his religious order. On this theme, I take the liberty of referring readers to FORLIVESI 2010.

tholomäus Keckermann[319] and Raffaele Aversa[320]. Nevertheless, it was precisely in the Catholic environment that it led to the birth not only of the systematic *cursus* on philosophy but also of philosophy *cursus* according to the mind (*ad mentem*) of certain medieval authors. The wish to control the cultural world, which had stirred the Roman Curia to forbid any straying from the words of Aristotle or other "approved" authors in the fifteenth century, in a contrary but similar manner spurred Catholic theologians and philosophers to detach themselves from Aristotle[321] and draw up systematic courses on "correct" thought in the seventeenth.

---

[319] On Keckermann cf., for example, VASOLI 1984, 241: «Keckermann si propose, infatti, come suo scopo precipuo, l'elaborazione di un "sistema" ordinato ed organico di tutto lo scibile, capace di sostituire alla "confusa" e "incoerente" "enciclopedia" degli "antichi" scolastici un fondamento logico unitario ed un'esposizione dei dogmata aristotelici semplice ed essenziale». For more recent information on Keckermann, cf. FREEDMAN 1997.

[320] AVERSA 1650, f. (unnumbered) †4: «Novus videbitur fortasse titulus: quando omnes vel physicae vel metaphysicae commentarios separatim scribere et proponere solent. Sed vetustissimum sane nomem, ante physicae et metaphysicae distinctionem excogitatam nominaque discreta. Philosophia olim uno sapientiae instituto exorta est, uno studio adolevit, comprehendens quae postea sub physicae et metaphysicae titulis distracta sunt. Reduco rem ad suam originem. Philosophiam uno ductu contexto, qua metaphysicam physicamque complector. Ita namque antiquitate conforme, ita rationi consonum, ita rebus debitum, ita philosophiae ipsi gratum, ita brevitati et claritati conferens, ita studiosis commodum, ita tibi lector utile iudicavi. […] Haec philosophia est ampla et adaequata contemplatio rerum, incipiendo a primo et summo genere entis, ac deinceps aliorum entis generum tractationem usque ad extremas rerum species prosequendo». A member of the Order of Minor Regular Clerics, founded in Naples in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, Aversa was the author of a course on philosophy divided into two works: the first, entitled *Logica institutionibus praeviis quaestionibus contexta*, was published in 1623; the second, entitled *Philosophia metaphysicam physicamque complectens quaestionibus contexta*, was published in two volumes printed in Rome respectively in 1625 and 1627 and reprinted in Bologna in 1650. Cf. PISELLI 1710, pp. 301-302, 330 and 340-348.

[321] Obviously there were exceptions. First, the philosophy teachers at public *studia* remained tied to Aristotle much more closely, and for much longer, than authors that were members of religious orders. Second, there were thinkers that believed they could see in Aristotle an author who was fully compatible with Christianity. On the latter point, cf. the works by Luca Bianchi and those he collected in BIANCHI 2011.

It goes without saying that the whole process did not occur either suddenly or in one single direction. At first, it was attempted also to use as textbooks works of medieval authors or anthologies of passages taken from them. One can note, for example, the fact that in Leuven in 1596 the *studium* adopted as its official teaching text Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*[322]. As far as the Scotists were concerned, we have already seen that the Minor Conventuals had "rediscovered" Tartaret and John the Canon (Juan Marbres) in philosophy and had gradually attributed a growing importance to Scotus' commentary on the *Sententiae* in theology.

Very soon, however, works began to be elaborated that were constructed according to a new, autonomous arrangement of topics. One can consider some works written by the Dominicans Crisostomo Javelli and Diego Mas, by the Augustinian Diego de Zúñiga and by the Jesuits Benet Perera and Francisco Suárez a prelude to this tendency. In the Catholic environment, the sole environment to which Catholic authors had access, the volumes of the *commentarii* of the Jesuits of Coimbra, the *Conimbricenses*, appeared between 1592 and 1606. In point of fact, they were not yet a systematic *cursus* of philosophy, nonetheless a comparison between these *commentarii* and the earlier ones by the Jesuit Francisco Toledo reveal the evolution of the literary genre of the commentary. Toledo proceeds by commenting on single passages from Aristotle's texts; the *Conimbricenses* develop their commentary on entire chapters from Aristotle's works and, at times, even group them together. In Toledo's work, the *quaestiones* are presented as true and proper commentaries on Aristotle's individual theories; in the texts by the *Conimbricenses*, on the other

[322] MARTIN 1910.

hand, the works of the Stagirite merely serve as an inspiration for considering a certain theme. Moreover, on some occasions, the Jesuits of Coimbra tackle topics that Aristotle does not face anywhere: this is the case of a treatise on the soul when it is separated from the body that they add as a kind of fourth book as an appendix to the commentary on the three books of the Stagirite's work *On the soul*.

From 1603 to 1620, the Jesuit Antonio Rubio published his own *commentarii* on Aristotle's works on logic and natural philosophy; in 1609, the Reformed Cistercian *Feuillant* Eustache Asseline (*Eustachius de s. Paulo*) published the brief but successful *Summa philosophiae quadripartita, de rebus dialecticis, moralibus et metaphysicis*; in 1615 the Jesuit Pedro Hurtado de Mendoza published in Valladolid the first edition of the *Disputationes a summulis ad metaphysicam*; from 1615 to 1617, the Dominican Michele Zanardi published his own *commentarii*; in 1617, the lay priest Charles François Abra de Raconis published the *Totius philosophiae hoc est logicae, moralis, physicae et metaphysicae brevis et accurata tractatio*; from 1622 to 1623 the Jesuit Cosimo Alemanni published his *Summa philosophica e d. Thomae Aquinatis doctrina*; from 1623 to 1648, the Jesuit Francesco Amico published the *In universam Aristotelis philosophiam notae et disputationes*; from 1623 to 1627, the Cleric Regular Minor Raffaele Aversa published his own treatises on logic, physics and metaphysics; in 1625, the Jesuit Bernard Morisan (*Morisanus*) published in Germany his own *commentarii* on the logic, physics, ethics and astronomy of Aristotle and John of Holywood. One important event was the publication of the four volumes of *disputationes* dedicated to logic and natural philosophy by the Discalced Carmelites of the Colegio de s. Cirillo of Alcalá de Henares, that is the *Com-*

plutenses: published respectively in 1624, 1625, 1627 and 1628, the reference to Aristotle's text in them has by now become little more than merely formal, while the aim of expounding philosophy *iuxta angelici doctoris d. Thomae doctrinam et scholam* is stated outright. From 1631 to 1635, the Dominican João Poinsot (*Ioannes de s. Thoma*) published his own course on philosophy (although it was only given this title in the edition of 1637); in 1632, the Jesuit Rodrigo de Arriaga published his own *Cursus philosophicus*; from 1634 to 1636, the Theatine Zaccaria Pasqualigo published his truly unconventional *Disputationes metaphysicae* (a work, despite the title, not dedicated exclusively to metaphysics).

As we can see, the tendency to produce this type of work is not confined to the Order of Preachers or to the Society of Jesus. From the end of the sixteenth to the beginning of the seventeenth century, the conviction that Henry of Gent was a Servite spread among the Servants of Mary, and in 1609 the general chapter of this Order ruled that his works should be published[323]. In 1602, the Franciscan Conventual Filippo Fabri had already published a *Philosophia naturalis Ioannis Duns Scoti ex quatuor libris Sententiarum et Quodlibetis collecta* and in 1637 his *Expositiones et disputationes in XII libros Aristotelis Metaphysicorum* were published posthumously. In 1620, as we have already noted, Montanari had decreed that the teachers of his Order should render Scotus' doctrine and texts into an orderly series of discussions. In 1623, the Observant Franciscan Martin Meurisse published the *Rerum metaphysicarum libri III ad mentem Doctoris Subtilis*[324]; in 1633, the minister general of the Order of Minor Observants ruled that an annotated edition of Scotus' works should

[323] MONTAGNA 1982.
[324] TRIBOUT DE MOREMBERT 1965.

be written, nominating the famous Luke Wadding as the head of this enterprise[325]. In the second half of the 1630s, the minister general of the Order of Augustinians promoted the compilation of a systematic exposition of the thought of Giles of Rome with the aim of making it the official doctrine of the Order[326]. Faithfulness to John Baconthorpe spread among the Carmelites[327].

Montanari's concept of the via Scoti

In *Scotus et scotistae* of 1647-1650, Mastri and Camerani write that Giacomo Montanari was a Scotist. We also read in this text that at the Collegio di s. Bonaventura Montanari had been a student of Ottaviano Strambiati, who, as Montanari himself stated and was proved by the manuscript of Strambiati's lessons in Rome that Camerani possessed at the time, had a very profound knowledge of Scotus' doctrine[328]. However, to choose Scotus as a refer-

---

[325] CASOLINI 1936, 59.
[326] BURGIO 1996, 111-142.
[327] WESSELS 1914.
[328] [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Expurgatio prima, pp. 54-56. The direct testimony of Montanari is in *Reformatio* 1620, *Dec. ref. st.*, De qualitatibus, no. 34, p. 115 (f.s.). In actual fact, the testimony of Mastri and Camerani would seem to contain an error: it has been proved that Montanari was a pupil of Strambiati's in Ravenna, not Rome, and that he was one long before 1596, the year he entered the Collegio di s. Bonaventura (PARISCIANI 1983, 679). Moreover, the statement that Mastri and Camerani attribute to Montanari requires further research. In the *Reformatio* we read that Strambiati was the first regent of the Collegio di s. Bonaventura and was nominated to that post by Sixtus V himself, the founder of the College. Camerani completes the information dating Strambiati's teaching in Rome as 1586. Sparacio, however, claims that the Collegio di s. Bonaventura was founded in 1588, had it first constitution in 1589 and that its first regent was Girolamo Alberici from Brisighella (SPARACIO 1923, 10, 19 and 39). Sparacio is, however, partially contradicted in his turn by DI FONZO 1987, 12-13, who observes that a *studium* had been operative at the convent of SS. XII Apostoli since the mid-sixteenth century. Furthermore, the whole question is compli-

ence point for one's own thought and, even more, to make him a compulsory reference point for new works raises a problem: if and how it may be possible to extend and develop an author's thought without betraying it. As we have seen, in his *Reformatio* Montanari solves the problem by establishing in three criteria the canon for perfect Scotist disciples: to debate according to Scotus' principles; to make an effort to confirm his doctrines; to consider him one with the other Franciscan doctors of the *via antiqua*, whose doctrines Scotus – according to Montanari – developed to maturity and truthfulness.

The question of the portrait of the perfect follower of one author or another is a problem that, in a field of "philosophical confessionality" such as this is, could not but arise, and about which, not surprisingly, diverse doctrinal traditions, however distinct they were from one another, arrived at the same solution. In 1637, 17 years after the *Reformatio* was composed, the reactionary Portuguese Thomist, João Poinsot, indicated the principles to which the perfect Thomist must adhere in terms very similar to Montanari's: in case of doubt, one should follow the school's tradition; one should feel affection for the master's doctrine and make an attempt to defend and extend it; one should seek the glory of the master and not one's own; one should maintain not only the conclusions of the master but also the principles from which they derive; one should seek unity and concord[329]. The parallelism I have just

---

cated by a problem of homonymy: Ottaviano Strambiati is the name of two Conventuals from Ravenna, an uncle and his nephew, who lived around the turn of the sixteenth century: the former was a public professor of metaphysics at the *studia* of Turin and Pavia, the latter a public professor of metaphysics at the *studium* of Padua (cf. FABRI 1664, p. 173). However, none of this means that there are reasons for denying that Montanari was a Scotist.

[329] POINSOT 1637 and POINSOT 1931. As the anonymous editor (Edmond Boissard) of the twentieth-century edition of Poinsot's work writes in *Ibid.*, 224, footnote 1, the work was

pointed out was noted by scholars of the time: when Marco Ginammi, the publisher of Mastri's and Belluto's philosophical works, was to accuse John Punch of having abandoned true Scotism, of which, on the contrary, Mastri and Belluto – according to him – were the real champions, he pointed precisely to Poinsot as an example of an authentic follower of the master of his school. He was such, writes Ginammi (or more likely one of Mastri's pupils), because he defended not only the conclusions of Thomas Aquinas but also the demonstrations elaborated by that medieval master[330].

Montanari's indications in the *Reformatio* may explain why Mastri and Belluto did not write, in their turn, a text such as the one by Poinsot. The concept that they had of themselves as members of a school, and their awareness of the obligations that derived from this, had already been defined by Montanari; thus it was not necessary for them to spend time on the matter. Nevertheless, it is possible to see a parallelism between Poinsot, on the one hand, and Mastri and Belluto, on the other, on a further point that is closely connected to the previous one. In the *Tractatus de approbatione et auctoritate doctrinae angelicae divi Thomae*, Poinsot did not restrict himself to providing a description of a good follower of Aquinas; he also included in his work an apology countering detractors of the master. Montanari's works contained no such an apology, so there was room, from the point of view of Mastri and Belluto, for such a text. The volume of Mastri and Belluto's *cursus* dedicated to logic, published after that on physics but ideally the first in the series,

---

published in 1637 but drawn up between the second and third decade of the seventeenth century. For further information and references to specialist studies, cf. FORLIVESI 1993, 52-55. For the editions of the theological work of Poinsot, cf. FORLIVESI 1994-2001.

[330] GINAMMUS MARCUS, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1644, f. (unnumbered) ¶4*r*.

opens, not merely by chance, with a defence of Scotus written by Ottaviano Camerani[331]. This text, proof of what has just been said, does not mention the hermeneutic problem of the true interpretation of an author, but does intend to defend Scotus' right to belong to the Catholic cultural world, highlighting the esteem that ecclesiastics in general and even his adversaries had shown for the medieval thinker in the course of time.

3. THE WORK OF BARTOLOMEO MASTRI AND BONAVENTURA BELLUTO

Introduction to the life and works of Bartolomeo Mastri

Brief biography

Bartolomeo Mastri was born in Meldola, near Forlì, on 7th December, 1602, into a family belonging to the town's lower nobility. We only have general information about the future philosopher and theologian's life and studies as a child. In one of his works, he writes that he came to learn about the doctrine of John Duns Scotus even before he entered the Order of Minor Conventuals. His younger fellow brother Giovanni Franchini from Modena, who knew Mastri personally, reports in his *Bibliosofia e memorie letterarie di scrittori francescani conventuali ch'hanno scritto dopo l'anno 1585* that at the time of his investiture Mastri had already concluded his studies on grammar, rhetoric, and poetry.

[331] [CAMERANUS OCTAVIANUS], *Doctrina scotica coelitus et humanitus approbata, commendata*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1639, ff. (unnumbered) a4*r*-a6*r*.

Mastri entered the Order of Minor Conventuals in about 1616. The following year he was transferred to the Order's convent and *studium* in Bologna, where he attended all the courses on philosophy and some of those on theology. From 1621 to 1623 he was in the Order's *studium* in Naples. Here he studied theology under the guidance of his fellow brother Giuseppe La Napola (or Napoli) Jr. from Trapani; precisely from this scholar he acquired the systematic view of Scotism and the rudiments of the style he was to adopt in his own works. In November, 1623, he was appointed master of studies (i.e., lector of logic) in Parma and, in October of the following year, master of studies in Bologna. In 1625, he was assigned, as a student, to the Collegio di s. Bonaventura. Here he struck up a lasting friendship with his fellow brother Bonaventura Belluto from Catania, with whom he was to share both his career and his published works for the next thirteen years. Mastri and Belluto graduated from the Collegio di s. Bonaventura in 1628, with doctorate degrees and the plan to write a systematic course on Scotist philodophy.

From 1628 to 1631, Mastri and Belluto were regents of the Order's *studium* in the convent of St. Francis in Cesena, where they taught physics and metaphysics. From 1631 to 1638, they were regents of the Order's *studium* in Perugia, where they taught theology. In 1638, they were appointed regents at the Collegio di s. Antonio, in Padua, after a bitter clash for the control of these chairs between the highest authorities of the Order and two other members of the Order, Matteo Frće from Veglia (today Krk) and Francesco Maria Vaccari from San Giovanni in Persiceto, supported by some of the Veneto Senate. Mastri and Belluto kept these posts until 1641, when each returned to the convent of his home town.

After a few months, Mastri became private theologian to Cardinal Luigi Capponi in Ravenna. In 1645, Capponi left Ravenna to settle definitively in Rome, and Mastri returned to Meldola. In 1646, he ran the risk of being exiled from his home town following a political clash he had become involved in, but the storm passed that year. In 1647, he was elected minister provincial for the province of Bologna. From 1650, the year that marked the end of his mandate, to 1659, he was – as he himself writes in the preface to one of his later works – "almost a second Diogenes" in Meldola.

His frustrated longing for offices and honours was partly satisfied after Giacomo Fabretti from Ravenna, a friend of many years, was elected minister general of the Order at the end of May, 1659. In the same year he succeeded in personally offering the pope, Alexander VII, his most recent volume. In the second half of 1662, during a prolonged absence on the part of Fabretti, who was visiting the central European convents of the Order, Mastri became the minister general's vicar for Italy and the nearby islands for several months. In 1665, he did not succeed in having himself elected the Order's minister general: Andrea Bini from Spello edged his way in between Mastri, supported by the fathers from Ravenna, and Lelio Spada, supported by the fathers from Faenza, and became the winning candidate. Bitter about the lost election, Mastri returned to Meldola. Here he worked on the completion of his last work and on the restructuring of the convent. He died on 11th January, 1673.

Works and speculative orientation

Mastri was the author of four works. The first, in order of publication, was a systematic *cursus* on Scotist philosophy articulated into logic, physics

and metaphysics. It was planned and, to a great extent, drawn up together with his colleague, Bonaventura Belluto, from 1628 to 1646. It was published, divided by subjects, in seven volumes in 4° from 1637 to 1647 and partly republished from 1644 to 1652 with integrations by Mastri alone. After the death of its authors, it was reprinted several times with the title of *Philosophiae ad mentem Scoti cursus integer*. A second work, written, as recalled above, in collaboration with his fellow brother and friend Ottaviano Camerani and directed against Matteo Frće, was published in 1650 in a single volume in 4° entitled *Scotus et scotistae Bellutus et Mastrius expurgati a probrosis querelis ferchianis*. A third work, formally on theology but rich in philosophical elements, was published in four volumes *in folio* from 1655 to 1664. On the basis of some elements in the text it is correct to indicate this work by the general title of *Disputationes theologicae in quatuor libros Sententiarum*. The last work published by Mastri was an extensive *Theologia moralis*, printed in a single *in folio* volume in 1671.

Mastri intended to be a follower of John Duns Scotus and he undoubtedly was, to the extent that he can be held to be one of the most refined champions of *Doctor Subtilis* in the baroque age. Nonetheless it would be incorrect to take his works as a simple exposition of Scotus' doctrine. Being a Scotist in the seventeenth century did not simply mean repeating and propagating the medieval master's doctrines. First of all, Mastri inherited a whole set of standpoints that were the outcome of three centuries of friction between Latin Aristotelians, nominalists, Scotists, and Thomists. In Mastri's day, there was a long history of the effects of Scotus' theories, and Mastri repeatedly recalls the long series of "interpreters" that had come before him.

Moreover, what he proposed was fully immersed in the debate of his time within the context of the university, a debate which actively involved a great number of highly innovative authors, many of whom Jesuits, who cannot be traced back to a single traditional school. Lastly, Mastri was also well informed about the sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century developments in empirical scientific research. He presented and evaluated these developments on the basis of the flimsy physical doctrines which were part of his own tradition and were acceptable to the Roman Curia and Catholic theologians, but he also perceived with honesty that they were the results of competencies and instrumental abilities that he did not possess. All this considered, therefore, it would be superficial to think of Mastri's works as a simple exposition of Scotus' doctrine[332].

Mastri's ideological and cultural formation

The role played by Montanari's *Reformatio*

Mastri entered the Order of Minor Conventuals while the *Decreta* issued by the general chapter in Viterbo were still in force, and worked as a teacher, wrote and published all his works after the *Constitutiones urbanae* had come into effect, but was educated precisely in the years when Giacomo Montanari was applying his plan for the reform of the Order and of the educational system in force in it, a plan that had a deep influence on Mastri.

[332] I do not go into any details here about his philosophical and theological doctrines. For a closer examination of these questions with the relative bibliography, I take the liberty of referring readers to the essays contained in FORLIVESI 2006(1) and to FORLIVESI 2008.

In the prologue to *Scotus et scotistae*, Mastri traces a kind of spiritual-cultural autobiography. He writes here that he had heard of Scotus' doctrine before he entered the Order, and, once he had become a friar, nothing was closer to his heart, after his service to God, than furthering his knowledge of the Scotist doctrine. His dedication to this, Mastri continues, was favoured by the *aurea tempora* of the minister general, Giacomo from Bagnacavallo. In particular, the latter wanted studies in the Order to flourish once more, his model figures being Anthony of Padua, Bonaventure, Alexander of Hales and Scotus. One should note that in these pages Mastri not only praises Montanari unconditionally but also recalls in detail the examples suggested by Montanari at the beginning of his pastoral letter of 1619, a sign that after almost thirty years Mastri could still remembered that text. The rest of his story is, if that were possible, even more explicit. Montanari, Mastri continues, inspired and urged the Order's young men to the fear of God, observance of the *Rule* and doing their school exercises. Read!, Mastri exclaims, the booklet on the reform of studies published in 1620, and anyone of you will see Bonaventure's zeal in Giacomo from Bagnacavallo[333].

Contesting Frće, who had claimed he was a "Bonaventurian", in the work *Scotus et scotistae*, Mastri, assisted by Camerani, wanted to demonstrate that the Order of Minor Conventuals was tied mostly to the thought of Scotus and appealed precisely to the *Reformatio*. The two confrères recalled, quoting pertinently three passages from that text, that Giacomo from Bagnacavallo had ruled that Scotus should be professed by teaching his thought and defending it at all levels in the gymnasia and in all subjects. Furthermore, they

[333] [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Prologus, pp. 21-22.

reproved Frće for not having read with sufficient attention Mastri's works, in which *Doctor Seraphicus* is quoted with praise and from whom theses are taken when *Doctor Subtilis* was of no help[334]: exactly, one should note, what Montanari had stipulated should be done. The reason why Mastri and Camerani had recourse to Montanari's statements can probably also be explained by the fact that Matteo Frće had been a right-hand man of Montanari, and thus the implicit accusation that he had not borne in mind Montanari's directives made the criticism aimed at him even harder. In any case, Mastri's precise knowledge of the *Reformatio* and the strict application of its dictates concerning the use to be made of Bonaventure reveal the spirit in which he read the *Constitutiones urbanae* and the foundations of the concept he had of himself as a teacher and a writer.

Another interesting fact is provided by the best informed of Mastri's biographers, Giovanni Franchini. He writes that in the years when Mastri was a student at the Order's *studium* in Bologna, he wrote and published a poem in praise of St. Bonaventure[335]. I have found no trace of this work but the topic it deals with is in itself worthy of note. As I pointed out when speaking of the distribution of subjects arranged by the Viterbo general chapter, since the fifteenth century students of the Franciscan Conventual Order had been educated according to a double regime: an introduction to the theological themes conforming to the doctrines of Alexander of Hales and Bonaventure was followed by a more advanced study of theology in a Scotist key by the brighter students[336]. Therefore, it is possible that Mastri's poem was the sign of a Bon-

---

[334] *Ibid.*, Expurgatio prima, pp. 60-61.
[335] FRANCHINI 1693, p. 84.
[336] DI FONZO 1944, 180.

aventurian phase in his philosophical and theological formation. However, there is another possible reason, which does not exclude the previous one, for the attention Mastri paid to Bonaventure. As we have already said, Montanari's *Reformatio studiorum* can be seen in relationship to the different speculative traditions within the Order and to his intention to unify them: Bonaventure's thought must be studied as a premise to Scotus', and thus seen as a further development of the latter's[337]. One must, however, also bear in mind that if, from Montanari's perspective, *Doctor Subtilis* had to be the most important reference point for speculative questions, the formation of a friar's character and his *pietas* was to be entrusted to the works of *Doctor Seraphicus*. At the end of his visitation to the convent in Bologna, Montanari gave the order that there should be «father Seraphicus st. Bonaventure's discipline of the inner man translated into the vulgar tongue» in the small library for the novitiate and the professate[338] and that once a month one of the teachers should hold a lesson on the theme "of the inner man". The second part of the volume of the *Reformatio* is taken up, as we have said, by maxims and pious writings, concerning in particular the life of the friar who dedicates himself to studying: the author of most of these texts was precisely Bonaventure. Mastri's poem praising him is a clear clue to the efficacy of the pedagogy Montanari sought; it is not merely by chance that when Mastri wanted to praise Montanari, several years after publishing the poem, he would write that the zeal of Bonaventure lived on in the past minister general[339].

---

[337] *Reformatio* 1620, *Dec. ref. st.*, De qualitatibus, no. 12, pp. 104-105 (f.s.).
[338] In actual fact, this was *De exterioris et interioris hominis compositione* by David of Augsburg, a work erroneously attributed to Bonaventura da Bagnoregio. Cf. FORLIVESI 2002, 34.
[339] [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Prologus, p. 22.

In short, Montanari influenced Mastri's thought not only through his establishing school syllabuses but even more strongly by instilling in him the motivations inspiring his own work: the wish to unify the Order's cultural identity around a single figure; the choice of John Duns Scotus as the author most suitable for this role; the task of publishing a systematic text that would have precisely Scotus as its point of reference, in conformity with the new trends in philosophical and theological treatises within the context of Catholic religious orders; the criteria able to establish what a good disciple of Scotus consisted in; the view of this task as a spiritual mission, which was to engage all the energy of a friar who dedicated himself to studying

The models and the master: Filippo Fabri, Angelo Volpi and Giuseppe La Napola

If Mastri assimilated from Montanari what he felt was the meaning of his life and the mission to which he had been called, there were others that introduced him to a systematic view of Scotism.

A first fact that calls for our attention is that systematic theological works inspired by Scotus were being composed from the early years of the seventeenth century. It was Mastri and Belluto themselves who recalled, when they published the first volume of their own philosophy *cursus*, that their school had already published, or was elaborating, systematic theological works[340]. Mastri and Camerani indicated Filippo Fabri from Faenza and Angelo Volpi from Montepeloso (today Irsina) as the fellow brothers that were

[340] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1637, f. (unnumbered) †3*r*.

most dedicated in this field[341]. Franchini says the same thing, precisely in the pages of the *Bibliosofia* dedicated to Mastri[342], and further down, speaking of Fabri, he exclaims:

> in reality, about seventy years passed in silence concerning Scotists, during which no famous writer spoke out from printers in response to Cajetan, who thus seemed to remain master of the field. But finally in 1601 the Scotists awoke from their slumbers, which was when Fabri began to print, and then came a Volpi from Monte-Pelusio, a Brancati from Lauria, a Mastrio from Meldola, Belluto, Ferchi, and the others recalled in this book, so that it was not only possible that that silence was broken, but also that cheering voices were heard[343].

Although Mastri, as far as I can see, frequently upheld standpoints that were distant from Fabri's, the latter's works undoubtedly constituted a first important example of systematic texts. Of them, we can select for their breadth, *Philosophia naturalis Ioannis Duns Scoti ex quatuor libris Sententiarum et Quodlibetis collecta*, first edition published in 1602, *Disputationes theologicae in quatuor libros Sententiarum*, first edition published in 1613-1614, and *Exposi-*

---

[341] [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Prologus, p. 23.

[342] FRANCHINI 1693, p. 87. The similarity between what Franchini writes and what one reads in *Scotus et scotistae* is so strong that one suspects that the man from Modena merely translated and summarised passages from the work.

[343] *Ibid.*, p. 584: «realmente passarono circa settant'anni silentiarij a scotisti, ne' quali dalle stampe non si fece sentire scrittore di grido che rispondesse al Gaetano, quale perciò pareva rimasto padrone del campo. Ma finalmente nel 1601 si riscossero dal sonno i scotisti, cominciando allhora il Fabri a stampare, e poi venendo un Volpi da Monte-Pelusio, un Brancati da Lauria, un Mastrio da Meldola, Belluto, Ferchi, e li altri ricordati in questo libro, che puote non solo rompersi quel silentio, ma far sentire voci acclamatrici». For a recent presentation of Scotism in the seventeenth century, cf. SCHMUTZ 2002.

tiones et disputationes in XII libros Aristotelis Metaphysicorum, published just once, posthumously, in 1637[344].

However, as far as I can understand Mastri's intellectual life, the decisive experience for him took place in the gymnasium at the St. Lawrence convent in Naples. There Mastri studied theology[345] from 1621 to 1623. The syllabus prescribed by the *Reformatio* for a first-class general gymnasium[346], as was the one in Naples[347], has already been briefly recalled above: the first regent was to explain the topics treated in the first and third books of the *Sententiae*, the second regent those of the second and fourth books, all from a rigorously Scotist point of view or, when necessary, according to the standpoints of other Franciscan doctors of the *via antiqua*[348].

If I have correctly understood what happened, in the years when Mastri was in Naples, the first regent at that *studium* was Giuseppe La Napola Jr. from Trapani, and the second regent, since he had obtained his doctorate later than La Napola, Angelo Volpi.

After graduating from the Collegio di s. Bonaventura in 1617, in 1631 Volpi was considered by Agostino Superbi from Ferrara to be a young promise of Scotism, intent on publishing a vast *summa* of theology[349]. Franchini also refers to this particular, and novel, way of setting out theological questions

---

[344] For biographical and bibliographical indications and some studies on Filippo Fabri, I take the liberty of referring readers to FORLIVESI 2002, *passim*, and to ZEN BENETTI, POPPI 2010, FORLIVESI 2011, FORLIVESI 2014.
[345] FRANCHINI 1693, p. 92.
[346] *Reformatio* 1620, *Dec. ref. st.*, [Ordo], no. 23, pp. 90-91 (f.s.).
[347] *Ibid.*, [Ordo], no. 1, p. 79 (f.s.).
[348] *Ibid.*, De qualitatibus, no. 11, pp. 103-104 (f.s.) and *Ibid.*, De studentibus, no. 4, p. 127 (f.s.).
[349] SUPERBI 1631-1632, f. 11*v*.

when he writes that Volpi revolutionised the exposition of theology by abandoning Peter Lombard's order of topics and setting out the subject in a *summa* where what was considered important by his contemporaries was dealt with explicitly[350]. The work was published in twelve volumes from 1622 to 1646[351], during a regency Volpi held, perhaps continuously, from 1620 to 1647 in Naples[352].

If the figure of Volpi was important in Mastri's intellectual formation, even more so was the dominant character in the Naples *studium* at the beginning of the 1620s, Giuseppe La Napola[353]. In Mastri and Camerani's *Scotus et scotistae*, we find direct testimony, but also an interpretation of the facts, of what was happening in those years in that *studium*.

> Eminebat tunc temporis inter iuniores scotistas admodum reverendus pater magister Ioseph a Drepano, Siculus, vir ingenio subtilissimus (quem propterea honoris causa nomino, tanquam cui scotistarum praesens academia plurimum debeat). Is, primus inter conscotistas, recentiorum opera evolvens, primus, in-

---

350 FRANCHINI 1693, pp. 52-57, in particular p. 53.

351 Angelo Volpi's *Sacrae theologiae summa Ioannis Duns Scoti* consists in three tomes, each of which of four parts, for a total of twelve volumes. It was the irony of fate that it was forbiden *donec corrigatur*, starting from the last volume, in 1659, and then was almost completely censured from 1712 to 1726. This is a fact one should spend some time on in order to comprehend the developments in the relationships of power among the groups of Church members in the eighteenth century. Cf. SCARAMUZZI 1927, 146-152.

352 According to Franchini, Volpi's regency in Naples from 1620 to 1647 was interrupted, but his statement needs to be verified. Cf. also IANNELLI 1994, 129-130. For biographical indications, bibliography and some studies on Angelo Volpi, I take the liberty of referring to FORLIVESI 2002, *passim*.

353 Giuseppe La Napola, o Napoli, Jr., was born on 22nd May, 1586, in Trapani, and died there on 30th November, 1649. For biographical indications about this author, cf. first of all COSTA 2009 and CICCARELLO 2011, which corrects Costa as far as the death of Giuseppe La Napola Jr. is concerned. Domenico Ciccarello, however, misunderstands the meaning of what I wrote in FORLIVESI 2002, 85-90, concerning La Napola's teaching activity in Naples; therefore, although there are more recent works, I think it is the case also to refer readers to those considerations of mine.

quam, logicam, phylosophiam, theologiam, ad formam et stylum modernorum authorum tradere scriptotenus coepit[354].

Thanks to him, the text continues, the Scotist school made very great progress in a very short time, and already Angelo from Montepeloso, auditor of Giuseppe from Trapani[355] and encouraged by the latter's example, elaborated a *summa* along the lines of what his contemporary Thomist schools were publishing : «Summam theologicam in via Scoti ad emulationem recentiorum doctorum pro s. Thoma scribentium (ausu generosissimo) cum ingenti profectu seraphicae studiosae iuventutis typis dederit»[356].

Giuseppe from Trapani was also admired by his contemporary Agostino Superbi, who presented him as a fervent Scotist and author of several books, none of which, however, had been published. Moreover, Superbi, who wrote his notes in 1631-32, expressed a veiled wish that those works would soon be published. We know today that they never were to be, nor have I any knowledge of manuscript notes containing them; nevertheless, La Napola's efforts were not without effects: as Superbi wrote, he educated many pupils and writers[357].

La Napola, therefore, gave those who followed his lessons something more important than a set of theological doctrines, however acute they may have been: he offered a methodologically innovative formation in the Scotist field, capable of bringing that school up to the same level as other schools of

---

[354] [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Prologus, pp. 22-23. I have adapted the spelling and punctuation in the text to modern use.
[355] *Ibid.*, Prologus, p. 23. Angelo Volpi, as Costa points out, does not seem to have been a student of La Napola's; in actual fact, Mastri and Camerani use the generic term "*auditor*".
[356] *Ibid.*.
[357] SUPERBI 1631-1632, f. 90*r*; SBARAGLIA 1921, 152a-b.

the time. As we have seen, the fundamental aspect in this innovation was explicitly recognised by Mastri: Giuseppe La Napola was the first to present Scotist logic, philosophy and theology in the form and style of "modern" authors[358].

When examining the *Reformatio*, we saw how much Montanari insisted on the need for the Minor Conventuals also to have a systematic and paradigmatic text at their disposal. In *Scotus et scotistae*, Mastri presented Montanari's work as follows: he had indicated that the mission of a good friar dedicated to study was to present Scotist doctrine according to the most recent writers' easy and linear fashion, so that once students had finished their courses on philosophy and theology, they were familiar with every topic and subject, and the Franciscan young would soon reach the highest summits of literary fame.

> […] ea post liminio recepta studia, illud unum pro faeliciori incremento, summopere desiderare videbantur ut scotica doctrina, secundum recentiorum facilem aeque ac planam methodum traderetur. Tum ut consumati cursus in philosophia ac theologia, quemadmodum aliae scholae haberentur, et propterea nulla extaret materia, nulla de novo excogitata difficultas, nullum disputationis genus, quod nostris etiam obvium ac familiare non esset. Tum ut seraphica iuventus ad eum literariae gloriae apicem quantotius festino gradu perveniret quem unice zenlatissimus ille pater semper in votis habuit[359].

Hence, although Giuseppe from Trapani did not publish anything, his teachings pointed out the concrete way to satisfying these aspirations.

---

[358] [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Prologus, pp. 22-23.
[359] *Ibid.*, Prologus, p. 22.

The encounter with Bonaventura Belluto

One of Mastri's fellow students following the same course at the Collegio di s. Bonaventura was Bonaventura Belluto. Born in Catania at the beginning of October, 1603, he was baptised with the name Girolamo. After having started studying civil law at the public *studium* in his home town, in 1620 he asked to become a Conventual Franciscan and, on entering this religious order, he adopted the name Bonaventura. Little is known about his formative years, but it is certain that he had Gaspare Sghemma as a teacher and that in 1625 he was admitted to the Collegio di s. Bonaventura. Reserved by nature, he made a lasting friendship during the years in Rome with Mastri, who was jovial and completely the opposite in character to Belluto[360]. From that time, and until 1641, the biographical vicissitudes of the two confréres coincided since they were both dedicated to writing the same work and obtained teaching posts at the same seats of learning with that aim in mind.

In 1641, Belluto returned to Sicily in order to ensure that his considerable family fortune should be inherited by the St. Francis convent in Catania; after that, he never returned to the north of Italy. In 1645, he was elected minister provincial of Sicily and Malta, after which he became *qualificator* (that is, an expert on theological questions) at the Court of the Royal Monarchy of Sicily and a member of the college of theologians at the public *studium* in Catania. While in Sicily, he wrote *Disputationes de incarnatione dominica*, published

[360] FRANCHINI 1693, p. 112.

in 1645, and *Opuscula et resolutiones morales*, printed posthumously in 1679. He died in 1676[361].

Formulation of the philosophy *cursus*

Montanari's *Reformatio* had given substance and voice to the longing for a plan and composition of a systematic course on Scotist philosophy that might be used as a textbook by students of the Order. The encounter between Mastri and Belluto brought that longing to life.

What Franchini writes in the pages of his *Bibliosofia* dedicated to Mastri is particularly useful in order to understand what Mastri, Belluto and all those who dedicated themselves to elaborating a philosophy *cursus* left for those who came after them. Reporting words that Mastri himself had probably pronounced, Franchini informs us of the fact that the study Mastri and his colleagues had to face was heavily textual and that they had become intolerant both towards such a method of philosophical enquiry and towards Aristotle's texts.

After their scholastic conferences, they mainly ended by lamenting the needs of our school and they said it was high time the reins of ingenious minds were loosened and that they should not be kept champing at the bit of texts. Intellects should no longer become stale over that arid study of the Philosopher's texts, wearing out the noblest of efforts of a lively mind by finding a main verb or grasping the construction of someone who, by forming constructions with the most convoluted obstructions, had perhaps done his ut-

[361] Analytical information about Belluto can be found in COSTA 1973 and COSTA 1976.

most so that others would not grasp it despite all their efforts. The other schools, in the works of the *Complutenses*, *Conimbricenses*, and others, had already divorced that method of study and given birth to guides for the study organised according to topics[362].

Despite Fabri's work, in the third decade of the seventeenth century, the Conventual Franciscans were indeed lagging behind other religious orders, such as the Jesuits, the Carmelites and the Dominicans, in elaborating systematic texts that conformed to new needs and new tastes[363].

---

[362] FRANCHINI 1693, p. 87: «Dopo le loro conferenze scolastiche, terminavano per lo più il discorso in deplorare il bisogno di nostra scuola, et essere hormai tempo, dicevano, di rilassare un poco le redini alli ingegni, e non tenerli più à masticar il freno de' testi: non essere più dà irrancidirsi gl'intelletti sù quell'arido studio testuale del Filosofo, logorando i più nobili sforzi d'un vivido intendimento, in trovar un verbo principale, o arrivar la costrutione di chi forsi haveva studiato, perche non si arrivasse da ogni studio, facendo costrutione con le ostrutioni più inviluppate: già le altre scuole, haver fatto il suo divortio da quel modo di studio, e dato alla luce le guide dello studio questionario ne' Complutensi, Conimbricensi, et altri».

[363] The Minor Conventuals' tardiness, compared to the Jesuits, for example, can be calculated to have been about forty years. In the first edition in Latin, published in 1558, of *Constitutiones Societatis Iesu* one can read: «In theologia legetur vetus et novum Testamentum, et doctrina scholastica divi Thomae […]. In logica, et philosophia naturali et morali, et metaphysica, doctrina Aristotelis profiteri oportebit […]» (*Constitutiones S.I.* 1558, pars 4, cap. 14, p. 68). Already in *Declarationes et annotationes in Constitutiones Societatis Iesu*, published in 1559, however, the following explanatory note was added to those words: «Praelegetur etiam Magister sententiarum. Sed si videretur temporis decursu alius auctor studentibus utilior futurus, ut si aliqua summa theologiae {scholasticae} vel liber conficeretur qui his nostris temporibus accommodatior videretur, gravi cum consilio et rebus diligenter expensis per viros qui in universa Societate aptissimi existimentur, cumque praepositi generalis approbatione, praelegi poterit. In alijs etiam scientijs et litteris humanioribus, si libri aliqui admittentur in Societate compositi, ut utiliores quam alij qui communiter in manibus habentur, magna cum consideratione id fiet, prae oculis habendo scopum nostrum maioris boni universalis» (*Declarationes et annotationes S.I.* 1559, declaratio B, pp. 60-61. The word I inserted into the text in braces is added in *Errata quaedam inter legendum animadversa sic emendabis*, p. 124, at the end of the volume). One can also observe that in *Constitutiones S.I. cum declarationibus* 1583, p. 166, the reference to Aristotle in *Constitutiones*, pars 4, cap. 14, no. 3 has been changed into a more peremptory «[…] doctrina Aris-

When in *Scotus et scotistae* Mastri returns in his memory to the second half of the 1620s, he recalls regretfully having seen the Thomist *cursus* of the *Conimbricenses*, *Complutenses* and others published while the Scotist school had to be content with the works of Filippo Fabri, Pierre Tartaret, John the Canon, Nicolas Dorbelles (*Nicolaus de Orbellis* or *Nicolaus Dorbellis*) and a few others, that is to say of authors, apart from Fabri, that belonged to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

> Prodierant namque in lucem post Collegium Conimbricense, his novissimis temporibus, Complutense itidem Collegium. Prodierant quamplurimi cursus in philosophia, atqui omnes in via angelicae scholae. Sola nostra academia, theorematibus patris Faventini contenta, Petri Tatareti, Ioannis Canonici, Nicolai de Orbelis, nonnullorumque ex antiquis nostris, opera tantum versabat[364].

Franchini uses almost exactly the same words in his biography of Mastri: while other schools had at their disposal the courses by *Conimbricenses*, *Complutenses*, etc., the Conventuals had no useful author since, Franchini writes, John the Canon, Tartaret and Fabri whetted thirst rather than quenching it[365].

Presenting the book of their work dedicated to logic, the *Disputationes in Organum Aristotelis* published in 1639, Mastri and Belluto wrote that while Thomists could already avail themselves of a complete course on philosophy, anyone who wanted to start to study Scotus would merely find scattered,

---

totelis sequenda est […]» and *declaratio* B has still further been changed in «[…] aliqua summa vel liber theologiae scholasticae […]».

[364] [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Prologus, p. 23.

[365] FRANCHINI 1693, p. 87.

disorderly questions[366]. In the preface to *Disputationes in libros Physicorum*, published in 1637, Mastri and Belluto write that in recent times the Scotist school had suffered an attack on the part of a great number of opponents; the Scotists had defended themselves against them in the theological field but had neglected the philosophical one, concerning which criticisms were equally significant[367]. In point of fact, Montanari's *Reformatio*, as we have seen, indicated Tartaret as an author of reference for logic and physics, and Pelbart of Temeswar and Nicolas Denisse as authors of reference for theology. A comparison between the table of contents of Mastri and Belluto's *Philosophiae ad mentem Scoti cursus integer*, as the two Conventuals' *cursus* became known, and the *Interrogatorium articulorum* (i.e., the list of examination subjects) at the end of the *Reformatio*, reveals the change in style that had occurred in those years: while Montanari's *Interrogatorium* followed faithfully the order of the Aristotelian texts, Mastri and Belluto's *cursus*, while still dealing fully with the topics listed in the *Interrogatorium*, is far freer in organising them.

The two Conventuals were obviously keen to emphasise that their work was more comprehensive and modern compared to earlier ones. It is therefore not surprising to read in the introduction to *In Organum* that they maintained that even Fabri's work was inadequate. Aware of the importance of this author, who in any case had already been dead for nine years, and having witnessed the success of his *Philosophia naturalis*, Mastri and Belluto wrote that although it was true that the Scotist school owed much to Fabri, the fact

---

[366] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1639, f. (unnumbered) a3*v*.
[367] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1637, f. (unnumbered) †3*r*.

was that he had been concerned mainly with theology, so his philosophical work did not satisfy the needs of the time. The point was, they maintained, that in the philosophical field Fabri had taken the trouble to examine only a few themes and had discussed the standpoints of authors such as Francesco Piccolomini, Arcangelo Mercenario, Jacopo Zabarella, Tommaso de Vio, Crisostomo Javelli and Domingo de Soto. However, they continued, since the time when Fabri had written his works, new, profound thinkers hostile to Scotus had appeared on the scene: the *Conimbricenses*, the *Complutenses*, Suárez, Rubio, Hurtado de Mendoza, Arriaga, Aversa, Amico, Aresi, Morisan (or Morison: *Morisanus*), Mas, Pasqualigo, Poinsot and others. This implied, Mastri and Belluto claimed, that Fabri did not need to use any particularly fine details: setting himself up in contrast to Thomists and secular philosophers, he was able to have recourse to the themes that were common to Scotus and Thomas. We today, on the contrary, they continued, have to consider the *neoterici*[368], who present new difficulties, coin new terms and reject things

[368] *Neoterici*, or *neutrales*, or *recentiores* (at times specified, for example, by *recentiores thomistae*) were for Mastri and Belluto all those authors who did not belong to classical schools and tried to reconcile them or proposed new theories. They were mainly Jesuits, but there were others besides the diversified positions among the authors of the Society of Jesus, as Mastri himself clarified in MASTRI 1646, disp. 6, q. 7, a. 2, no. 158, p. 749b. By the term *neoterici* he indicated explicitly the Jesuits GINAMMUS MARCUS, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1644, f. (unnumbered) ¶4*v*. Other writers, however, used the term in a different sense. PUNCH 1645, nno. 1-2, pp. 1-3, used it simply to mean not belonging to the classical schools; PONTELONGUS FRANCISCUS, *Ad lectores*, in PONTELONGHI 1653, f. (unnumbered) a3*r* attributed the name "*neoterici*" even to Mastri and Belluto, accusing them of having abandoned true Scotism. CARAMUEL 1664, lib. 2, cap. 3, disp. 10, no. 1264, p. 273a specified clearly what was meant by "classical schools" in the first half of the seventeenth century: «praeter has tres scholas», that is the Thomist, the Scotist and the Ockhamist, or nominalist, «nulla est schola classica in Europa quam sciam».

that Thomists and Scotists agreed on[369]. Whether all this corresponds to reality is debatable. The Coimbra Jesuits' *commentarii*, for example, were not a true and proper *cursus*. What Mastri and Belluto probably smarted over was the printing of the *Disputationes* by the Carmelites of Alcalá de Henares, which took place in the years immediately after Montanari's recommendations. They must also have been saddened by the publication of the work by Meurisse, an Observant Franciscan Scotist, even though Mastri and Belluto do not mention him in the texts we are considering now. However, what is important is that the reasons the two confréres used to promote their own work were not unfounded. At the time when they published their books, the Scotist school, particularly when its aim was to educate new members, did indeed have to rely on outdated authors, which marked a twofold weakness: not responding to the more recent and refined criticisms aimed at Scotism and not offering a systematic exposition of contents of this system of thought. Thus Mastri and Belluto were fully entitled to believe, and write, that it was necessary to catch up in two ways: to adopt the new scientific and didactic tool of the *cursus* and to tackle the numerous recent authors who had contested Scotus, or interpreted him freely, without receiving any due response.

In 1639, presenting the first two volumes of their *cursus*, Mastri and Belluto thus summed up the reasons that had motivated their enterprise: to defend the Scotus school and give it a course such as other schools had done[370],

---

[369] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1639, f. (unnumbered) a3*r*-*v*.

[370] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1637, f. (unnumbered) †3*r*; MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1639, f. (unnumbered) a3*r*.

In the later *Scotus et scotistae*, which also included autobiographical details about the state of affairs in the 1620s, Mastri writes as follows:

> […] restabat adhuc ut scotistarum aliquis, pro maiori studentium commodo, cursum philosophicum publico committeret prelo sicque hac in parte etiam nostra scotica schola parem alijs scholis se ostentaret. […] Torquebat supra modum iuvenilem animum meum, illud boni publici desiderium, atque ad illum scopum, si quando Superi arrisissent, totam mentem dirigebat[371].

Admission to the Collegio di s. Bonaventura together with Belluto was precisely what permitted Mastri to make his aspirations come true. The two Conventuals planned the philosophy *cursus ad mentem Scoti* of which they were the authors together, and they worked as a team for many years, until 1641, to carry this project out.

> Contingit anno 1625 (sic disponente Altissimo) me in Collegio d. Bonaventurae de Urbe, una cum patre Belluto collega meo, cooptatum fuisse. Geniorum atque morum nostrorum paritas, illico, sociali ingeniorum foedere (primum communicatis matureque discussis consilijs) in cursum phylosophicum edendum coniurare nos fecit. Itaque post indefessum ac perenne duodecim annorum studium, post plurimos, speculationum, difficultatum exantlatos labores, ad extremum, principio anni 1637, cum Studii augustae Perusiae regentes essemus, primum tomum nostrae philosophiae, Romanis typis, orbi litterario invulgavimus[372].

The friendship between the two Conventuals was undoubtedly a determinant element in the success of the enterprise. As the cases of the *Conimbricenses* and *Complutenses* showed, teamwork made it much easier to carry out such a vast project. In the two second prefaces to *In libros Physicorum* of

---

[371] [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Prologus, p. 23.
[372] *Ibid.*, Prologus, pp. 23-24.

1637, signed separately by Belluto and by Mastri, the former declares that they had both dedicated themselves to the work since they had been at the Collegio di s. Bonaventura, but that Bartolomeo had contributed more[373]; the latter, for his part, states that they had fully collaborated and that they had worked in total agreement[374].

The result of Mastri and Belluto's work was a course on logic, natural philosophy and metaphysics *ad mentem Scoti*. This is the plan of the work as they presented it in the first, in order of publication, of the volumes that made it up, that is *In libros Physicorum*:

> opus nostrum est in quinque volumina distributum, Logicam primum, libros alterum De physico auditu, tertium lib[ros] De caelo et mundo [et De] gen[neratione] et corrupt[ione] simul complectitur, quartum lib[ros] De anima, denique quintum Metaphysicam[375].

With a certain pride, at the beginning of the 1640s, in the letter of dedication in *Disputationes in De anima*, Mastri and Belluto were to write : «paucis ab hinc annis molimur arcem, in qua sese recipere possint scoticae praesertim sophiae professores»[376].

---

[373] BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1637, f. (unnumbered) †4*v*.
[374] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1637, f. (unnumbered) †5*r*.
[375] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1637, f. (unnumbered) †3*v*.
[376] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Eminentiss. ac reverendiss. d. d. Marco Antonio Franciotto S. R. E. cardinali ampliss. ac in provincia Romandiolae s. d. n. Urbani papae VIII a latere legato […] faelic[.]*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1643, f. (unnumbered) □2*r*.

Accomplishment of the philosophy *cursus*

Since in a previous work of mine I have already examined analytically the phases in the production of the single volumes of the work, I shall take the liberty here of merely summing up the matter and referring readers to that essay for further information.

In *Ad lectorem* of *In libros Physicorum* Mastri and Belluto had promised that the following five volumes of the work, concerning respectively logic, the treatise *de coelo et mundo*, the treatise *de generatione et corruptione*, the treatise *de anima* and metaphysics, would be published in the next five years, one volume per year: «omnia namque congesta sunt, et si non adhuc digesta»[377]. At the end of the work, there would be two more volumes than previously planned and twice as much time would be required: the treatises *de coelo et mundo* and *de generatione et corruptione* would be published in two separate volumes, and metaphysics would be published in two tomes. The *approbationes* in the volume *In Organum Aristotelis* stem from 1638, and the volume would be published in 1639; the *approbationes* in the volumes *In De coelo et De metheoris* and *In De generatione et corruptione* stem from 1639-40, and the two volumes were published in 1640; the *approbationes* in the volume *In De anima* stem from 1641, and the volume was published in 1643. As far as *In XII libros Metaphysicorum* is concerned, it is the work of Mastri alone, who declared that in 1641, when he and Belluto separated, the drawing up of the volume had not yet begun[378]; the *approbationes* concerning the two tomes that make it up

[377] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1637, f. (unnumbered) †3*r*.
[378] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, *Lectori*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1646, f. (unnumbered) a3*r*.

stem respectively from 1645 and 1647, and the two volumes were published in 1646 and 1647[379].

The work was enormously successful. Mastri and Camerani, followed by Franchini, write that a thousand copies of *In libros Physicorum* were printed in 1637, and that they were all sold in just five years[380]. Much as Mastri and Belluto were motivated by political, cultural and devotional reasons for formulating and planning their philosophy *cursus ad mentem Scoti*, while writing and publishing the work they also paid a great deal of attention to the economic side of the enterprise. In the mid-seventeenth century, Juan Caramuel y Lobkowitz wrote: «Scoti schola est numerosior omnibus aliis simul sumptibus»[381]; a few decades later, Giovanni Franchini estimated that there were a hundred and four thousand Franciscans in the 1680s[382]. The publication of a Scotist philosophy *cursus* provided the chance to exploit a rich market; the diatribe in 1644 in which Mastri and John Punch were opposed, with the involvement of the publisher Marco Ginammi, also had the open aim of ensuring the largest possible percentage of that market[383].

Relationship with the authors of reference

The volumes of Mastri and Belluto's *cursus* are presented as a collection of *disputationes* on Aristotle's texts but the reference to the Stagirite is purely

---

379 FORLIVESI 2002, 337-367.
380 [CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650, Prologus, p. 24; FRANCHINI 1693, p. 88.
381 CARAMUEL 1664, lib. 2, cap. 3, disp. 10, no. 1264, p. 273a.
382 FRANCHINI 1682, p. 25. To be precise, there were 104,000 male Franciscans, of whom 15,000 were Conventuals; according to the author from Modena, there were about 200,000 nuns.
383 Besides FORLIVESI 2002, 208-214 and *passim*, cf. also FORLIVESI 2013.

extrinsic. In fact, the reactionary boldness, if I may call it that, that the two Franciscans shared with orthodox Thomists, such as the *Complutenses* or Poinsot, consisted precisely in having tried to free themselves from a close examination of Aristotle without betraying the Aristotelian leanings of the tradition they referred to. In *Ad lectorem* in *In libros Physicorum*, Mastri and Belluto write that there are three attitudes towards Aristotle: some authors, in veneration, concentrate on him alone and restrict themselves to explaining his texts; others abhor him and, consequently, restrict themselves to dealing with a subject that he perhaps introduces somewhere. We, they continue, shall comment on the Stagirite's texts and then go our own way[384]. More succinctly, but equally explicitly, they reiterate the same idea in *Ad lectorem* in *In Organum*: we shall not restrict ourselves as others do, Mastri and Belluto write here, to examining the exact words of Aristotle but say just enough in order to introduce something else. At the same time, they continue, our work does not consist in adding ourselves to the countless interpreters of the Stagirite but in presenting a philosophy *in via Scoti*; that is what it is for[385].

The relationship, therefore, that Mastri and Belluto mean to establish with *Doctor Subtilis* is different from the one with Aristotle. In *Ad lectorem* in *In libros Physicorum*, they explicitly state their fidelity to Scotus' thought, and in this perspective, they clarify, they will not merely follow Scotists but go back to the medieval master's writings. That this is the right way to proceed, they argue, has been demonstrated by the fact that both Thomists and Scotists

---

[384] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1637, f. (unnumbered) †3*v*.
[385] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1639, f. (unnumbered) a3*r*.

rely not on the words of disciples, however great they may be, but on those of the master alone, in search of clearer, purer water[386]. That does not mean, Mastri and Belluto further state, that writing a course *ad mentem Scoti* is not useful: Scotus and the ancients suffice but they are neither easy to understand nor easy to apply; moreover, recent authors ask important questions that the ancients did not ask themselves in today's terms. Therefore, Mastri and Belluto write, in our *cursus* both the ancients and the moderns will be considered[387].

Finally, a note is required concerning Mastri and Belluto's standpoint towards those university authors in the first decades of the seventeenth century that they call *recentiores*. The two Conventuals consider the *recentiores* to be of a different school from their own. Nonetheless, Mastri and Belluto, aware of the eclectic nature of many of these authors, feel that if they found in them Scotist or other known standpoints, it would be unfair to accuse them of trying to extract Scotus by force out of these thinkers; they feel that it should rather be recognised that the doctrines of the *recentiores* are frequently based at times on Thomas, at times on Scotus and at times on the *nominales*[388].

These declarations of Mastri and Belluto, in truth, must not lead one to believe that they, like most authors in the Catholic sphere that wrote works *ad mentem* of some thinker or another, merely reproposed what had already been said. Elaborating new works constructed according to a new arrangement of materials, facing criticisms raised by other schools of thought and

---

[386] MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, BELLUTUS BONAVENTURA, *Ad lectorem*, in MASTRI, BELLUTO 1637, f. (unnumbered) †3*v*.
[387] *Ibid.*, f. (unnumbered) †3*r-v*.
[388] *Ibid.*, f. (unnumbered) †4*r*.

developing dialectics within one's own school are not a good strategy for avoiding the posing of new problems, warding off the development of new solutions and withdrawing from the possibility of following new trails[389], How could there be at the same time an abandonment of the words of Aristotle, or of other authors of reference, and fidelity to the "intentions" of the latter? Which criterion would have effectively made it possible, beyond declarations of principles or censorships of what had gone before, to decide what conformed and what did not conform to the *mens* of those authors? Declarations of fidelity, however sincere, towards one medieval author or another did not prevent seventeenth-century Catholic thinkers from going, even despite themselves, well beyond reproposing the thought of ancient doctors. If we then also consider that not all authors, not even Catholic ones, felt the obligation to fit into a consolidated tradition, we understand how university philosophy in that age was far from being monotonous and how it might reserve, for those who were not satisfied with simplistic schemes, continual surprises.

MARCO FORLIVESI

DIPARTIMENTO DI SCIENZE FILOSOFICHE

PEDAGOGICHE ED ECONOMICO-QUANTITATIVE

UNIVERSITÀ GABRIELE D'ANNUNZIO DI CHIETI-PESCARA

[389] As an example of the intrinsic problematicity of the interpretation of Scotus' thought even among Scotists, I take the liberty of referring readers to FORLIVESI 2002, 202-218, 244-252 and 311-327. For an example of the debate on a specific theme, one might see FORLIVESI 2006(2).

APPENDIX: THE *RITUS IN PROMOTIONE AD MAGISTERIUM* ESTABLISHED AT THE VITERBO CHAPTER (1617) BY THE ORDER OF CONVENTUAL FRANCISCANS

Below is the publication of the *Ritus in promotione ad magisterium* established at the Viterbo Chapter (1617) by the Order of Conventual Franciscans[390]. The graphic form the ritual has in the acts of this chapter has only partly been respected. The formulae uttered by the person conferring the doctorate have been put in Roman type, while references to actions carried out, or to be carried out, and indications concerning the formulae to be uttered, have been put in italics. The punctuation has been respected; abbreviations and diphthongs have been written out in full, the shapes of letters and capital letters have been changed in order to respect today's use, and the combination *ij* has been transcribed as *ii*.

Ritus in promotione ad magisterium.

Ecce quam clara est, et quae numquam marcescit sapientia, et facile videtur ab his, qui quaerunt eam, et invenitur ab iis, qui diligunt illam, et quia tu eam a iuventute quaesivisti amator factus illius, ideo eius nomine auctoritate apostolica tibi concessa, et mihi specialiter commissa te doctorem, et magistrum in sacrta theologia, et artibus creo, facio, et instituo, cum omnibus honoribus, gradibus, facultatibus, dignitatibus, et praaeminentiis, quibus magistri, et sacrae theologiae doctores in quibuscumque orbis gymnasiis, et a

[390] *Acta capituli 1617* 1618, pp. 45-47.

quibuscumque Ordinis nostri generalibus rite, et recte instituti, creati, et doctoratus insigniis decorati sunt, potiri, uti, et gaudere de iure, vel approbata, seu laudabili consuetudine solent, et possunt, et sic creatum, institutum, et insignitum volumus, et declaramus prasenti signo sanctae crucis. In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

Hic erit nuncupanda professio fidei, ut supra in decretis pro provinciali[391].

Ad anulum in digito anulari sinistrae manus.

Anulum aureum sapientiae nomine tibi trado, ut eam in sponsam accipias, ut quam immaculatam accipis, perpetuo cum spe immortalitatis conserves.

Ad librum clausum.

Librum sacrosanctae theologiae tibi trado abditum primo, ut scias non esse tibi impune permissum ex tuo capite cum sacrosancta theologia vagari, sed ea tantum a te meditanda doceri, teneri, credi, et praedicari debere, quae veritati catholica fuerint consona.

Aperiatur liber.

Dehinc apertum tibi trado, ut quod gratis accepisti sine invidia communices, et nunquam erubescas evangelium Dei, quod est in salutem omni credenti.

Ad biretum.

Imponitur tibi biretum nigrum signo sanctae crucis ornatum, et quod fuit Iudeis quidem scandalum, gentibus stultitia, nobis vero iugum suave, et

[391] The formula that those elected to the post of minister provincial were to utter is set out in *Ibid.*, pp. 28-31; the formula that those awarded a doctorate should utter ends on p. 30.

onus leve, ut tibi in signum honoris, praeeminentiae authoritatis, et dignitatis, quo intelligas te ad sacrosanctae Ecclesiae aedificationem, et fides incrementum decorari.

Ad osculum pacis.

Osculo pacis sapientiae nomine te amplector, deosculor, atque benedico, sisque semper benedictus, et det tibi Deus de rore caeli, idest Spiritus Sancti, et de pinguedine terrae idest creaturarum scientiae abundantiam, et mittat Deus de coelo sancto suo, et a sede magnitudinis suae sapientiam, ut tecum sit, tecumque faeliciter laboret.

Ad cathedram.

Cathedram magistralem ascendito, et in medio doctorum sedeto, habetoque facultatem legendi, exponendi, et sacros codices interpretandi tanquam magister, et doctor, nunquam tamen ab Ecclesia catholica discedito.

Agantur demum gratiarum actiones.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acta capituli 1617 1618 = *Acta capituli generalis Fratrum Min. Conv. sancti Francisci Romae in Conventu Basilicae Sanctorum XII Apostolorum celebrati die xiv maij 1617*, Panormi, Apud Ioan. Baptistam Maringum 1618.

Alfabeto 1619 = *Alfabeto spirituale di s. Bonaventura, con alcuni avvertimenti, et essercitij spirituali annessi alla lettera pastorale. Cavati da diversi autori*, Mondovì, [s.e.] 1619.

Annales Minorum 1934 = *Annales Minorum*, vol. 27 *(1628-1632)*, Firenze, Ad Claras Aquas 1934.

AVERSA 1650 = RAPHAEL AVERSA, *Philosophia metaphysicam physicamque complectens quaestionibus contexta, Lectori auctor*, Bononiae, Ex typographia HH. Evangelistae Ducciae 1650, vol. 1.

BALIĆ 1937 = CARLO BALIĆ, «Die Bedeutung der historisch-kritischen Methode für die Erneuerung der skotistischen Schule in der Gegenwart. II. Thomistische und skotistische Legenden», in *Wissenschaft und Weisheit* 4 (1937), 181-210.

BENOFFI 1931 = FRANCESCO ANTONIO BENOFFI, «Degli studi nell'Ordine dei Minori» (first part), *Miscellanea francescana* 31 (1931), 151-160 and 257-259.

BENOFFI 1932 = FRANCESCO ANTONIO BENOFFI, «Degli studi nell'Ordine dei Minori» (second part), *Miscellanea francescana* 32 (1932), 23-27.

BENOFFI 1933 = FRANCESCO ANTONIO BENOFFI, «Memorie minoritiche dal 1560 al 1776», *Miscellanea francescana* 33 (1933), 75-106 and 337-358.

BERARDICELLI 1635 = [GIOVANNI BATTISTA BERARDICELLI], *announcement* for calling the general chapter of 1635, Rome, 24th Febraury, 1635 (Roma, Archivio Generale dell'Ordine dei Minori Conventuali, Acta capitula generalia OFM-Conv, I (1260-1700), 1635).

BIANCHI 2011 = LUCA BIANCHI (ed.), *Christian Readings of Aristotle from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance*, Turnhout, Brepols Publishers 2011 (Studia Artistarum, 29).

BONOLI 1989 = GIROLAMO BONOLI, *Storia di Bagnacavallo*, ed. by G. Baldini - M. Bovoli - G. Cortesi, Lugo di Romagna, Walberti editore 1989.

BRLEK 1942 = MICHAEL BRLEK, *De evolutione iuridica studiorum in Ordine Minorum (Ab initio Ordinis usque ad an. 1517)*, Dubrovnik, [s.e.] 1942 (Diss. Pontificio Ateneo "S. Antonio").

BURGIO 1996 = SANTO BURGIO, «Filosofia e Controriforma in Sicilia nel secondo Seicento», *Archivio storico per la Sicilia orientale* 92 (1996), 109-181.

[CAMERANI], MASTRI 1650 = [OCTAVIANUS CAMERANUS], MASTRIUS BARTHOLOMAEUS, *Scotus et scotistae Bellutus et Mastrius expurgati a probrosis querelis ferchianis*, pars prior (the only one published), edited by PAOLO PINZARINI, Ferrariae, Apud Franciscum Succium Thypographum Cameralem 1650.

CARAMUEL 1664 = IOANNES CARAMUEL, *Theologia intentionalis de reali, morali, et virtuali; divino, angelico, et humano; proprietatis et iurisdictionis dominio*, Lugduni, Sumptibus Philippi Borde - Laurentii Arnaud - Petri Borde - Guillelmi Barbier 1664.

CASOLINI 1936 = FAUSTA CASOLINI, *Luca Wadding, O.F.M.. L'annalista dei francescani*, Milano, Vita e Pensiero 1936.

CICCARELLO 2011 = DOMENICO CICCARELLO, «Note di possesso di frati francescani in due incunaboli della Biblioteca Fardelliana di Trapani», in DIEGO CICCARELLI (ed.), *Francescanesimo e cultura nella provincia di Trapani*, Padova - Palermo, Centro Studi Antoniani - Biblioteca Francescana di Palermo 2011, 99-116.

Constitutiones piae 1565 = *Constitutiones piae*, Bononiae, Apud Ioannem Rossium 1565.

Constitutiones S.I. 1558 = *Constitutiones Societatis Iesu. Anno 1558*, Romae, In aedibus Societatis Iesu 1558.

Constitutiones S.I. cum declarationibus 1583 = *Constitutiones Societatis Iesu cum earum declarationibus*, Romae, In Collegio eiusdem Societatis 1583.

Constitutiones urbanae 1628 = *Constitutiones urbanae*, Romae, Apud impressorem cameralem 1628.

COSTA 1973 = FRANCESCO COSTA, «Il p. Bonaventura Belluto, OFMConv (1603-1676)» (first part), *Miscellanea francescana* 73 (1973), 81-136 and 387-437.

COSTA 1976 = FRANCESCO COSTA, «Il p. Bonaventura Belluto, OFMConv (1603-1676)» (second part), *Miscellanea francescana* 76 (1976), 125-208.

COSTA 1987 = FRANCECO COSTA, «Profili di oratori siciliani dell'Ordine dei Minori Conventuali nel secolo XVI», in *Francescanesimo e cultura in Sicilia (secc. XIII-XV)*, Palermo, Officina di Studi Medievali 1987 (Franciscana, 2), 253-271.

COSTA 2001 = FRANCESCO COSTA, *Il p. m. Giovanni Franchini da Modena dei Frati minori conventuali (1633-1695). Cenni biografici e scritti*, in «Miscellanea francescana», 101 (2001), 282-378.

COSTA 2009 = FRANCESCO COSTA, *Il Convento di S. Francesco di Trapani e il suo «Collegium Melitense S. Antonii»*, Palermo, Biblioteca Francescana 2009.

Declarationes et annotationes S.I. 1559 = *Declarationes et annotationes in Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, Romae, In aedibus Societatis Iesu 1559.

Decreta capituli Viterbensis 1596 = *Decreta generalis capituli Viterbensis de reformatione studiorum Ordinis Minorum Conventualium*, Patavii, Apud Laurentium Pasquatum 1596.

DI FONZO 1940 = LORENZO DI FONZO, «Lo studio del dottore serafico nel "Collegio di S. Bonaventura" in Roma (1587-1873)», *Miscellanea francescana* 40 (1940), 153-186.

DI FONZO 1944 = LORENZO DI FONZO, «Studi, studenti e maestri nell'Ordine dei francescani conventuali dal 1223 al 1517», *Miscellanea francescana* 44 (1944), 167-195.

DI FONZO 1987 = LORENZO DI FONZO, «Nel quarto centenario di fondazione del romano "Collegio di S. Bonaventura" OFMConv (1587-1987)», *Miscellanea francescana* 87 (1987), 3-31.

FABRI 1664 = GIROLAMO FABRI, *Le sagre memorie di Ravenna antica*, Venezia, Per Francesco Valvasense 1664, vol. 1.

FONTANA 2012 = EMANUELE FONTANA, *Frati, libri e inse. Antonio (secoli XIII-XIV)*, Padova, Centro Studi Antoniani 2012 (Centro studi antoniani, 50).

FORLIVESI 1993 = MARCO FORLIVESI, *Conoscenza e affettività. L'incontro con l'essere secondo Giovanni di san Tommaso*, Bologna, Edizioni Studio Domenicano 1993 (Lumen, 8).

FORLIVESI 1994-2001 = MARCO FORLIVESI, «Le edizioni del "Cursus theologicus" di João Poinsot (1589-1644)», 2001, http://paduaresearch.cab.unipd.-it/2122/1/mf2001e.pdf. Earlier edition of the essay on paper: MARCO FORLIVESI, «Le edizioni del "Cursus theologicus" di Joannes a s. Thoma, Divus Thomas» (Bon.) 97/3 (1994), 9-56.

FORLIVESI 2000 = MARCO FORLIVESI, «Materiali per una descrizione della disputa e dell'esame di laurea in Età moderna», in ALESSANDRO GHISALBERTI (ed.), *Dalla prima alla seconda Scolastica. Paradigmi e percorsi storiografici*, Bologna, Edizioni Studio Domenicano 2000 (Philosophia, 28), 252-279.

FORLIVESI 2002 = MARCO FORLIVESI, *Scotistarum princeps. Bartolomeo Mastri (1602-1673) e il suo tempo*, Padova, Centro Studi Antoniani 2002 (Fonti e studi francescani, 11).

FORLIVESI 2006(1) = MARCO FORLIVESI (ed.), *"Rem in seipsa cernere". Saggi sul pensiero filosofico di Bartolomeo Mastri (1602-1673)*, Padova, Il Poligrafo 2006 (Subsidia mediaevalia Patavina, 8).

FORLIVESI 2006(2) = MARCO FORLIVESI, «The Nature of Transcendental Being and Its Contraction to Its Inferiors in the Thought of Mastri and Belluto», in FORLIVESI 2006(1), 261-337.

FORLIVESI 2008 = MARCO FORLIVESI, «Gli scotisti secenteschi di fronte al dibattito tra bañeziani e molinisti: un'introduzione e una nota», in STEFANO PERFETTI (ed.), *Conoscenza e contingenza nella tradizione aristotelica medievale*, Pisa, ETS 2008 (Philosophica, 44), pp. 239-281.

FORLIVESI 2010 = MARCO FORLIVESI, «Francisco Suárez and the "rationes studiorum" of the Society of Jesus», in MARCO SGARBI (ed.), *Francisco Suárez and His Legacy. The Impact of Suárezian Metaphysics and Epistemology on Modern Philosophy*, Milano, Vita e Pensiero 2010, 77-90.

FORLIVESI 2011 = MARCO FORLIVESI, «Filippo Fabri vs Patrizi, Suárez e Galilei: il valore della "Metafisica" di Aristotele e la distinzione delle scienze speculative», in GREGORIO PIAIA, MARCO FORLIVESI (eds.), *Innovazione filosofica e università tra Cinquecento e primo Novecento - Philosophical Innovation and the University from the 16th Century to the Early 20th*, Padova, CLEUP 2011 (La filosofia e il suo passato, 40), 95-116.

FORLIVESI 2013 = MARCO FORLIVESI, «"Ut ex etymologia nominis patet?". John Punch on the Nature and the Object of Metaphysics», in VICTOR M. SALAS (ed.), *"Hircocervi" and Other Metaphysical Wonders. Essays in Honor of John P. Doyle*, Milwaukee, Marquette University Press 2013, 121-155.

FORLIVESI 2014 = MARCO FORLIVESI, «Filippo Fabri (1564-1630) on the Nature of Metaphysics. A Paduan Scotistic-Aristotelian Counter-Attack on Rival Doctrinal Traditions», in ALFREDO CULLETON, ROBERTO HOFMEISTER PICH (eds.), *Right and Nature in the First and Second Scholasticism - Derecho y Naturaleza en la primera y segunda escolástica*, Turnhout, Brepols Publishers 2014.

FRANCHINI 1682 = IOANNES FRANCHINUS, *Status religionis franciscanae Minorum conventualium expressus numero provinciarum et conventuum in quibus erat haec religio anno Christi MDCLXXXII*, Romae, Ex typographiae Stephani Caballi 1682, vol. 1.

FRANCHINI 1693 = GIOVANNI FRANCHINI, *Bibliosofia, e memorie letterarie di scrittori francescani conventuali ch'hanno scritto dopo l'anno 1585*, Modena, Per gli eredi Soliani stampatori ducali 1693.

FREEDMAN 1997 = JOSEPH S. FREEDMAN, «The Career and Writings of Bartholomew Keckermann (d. 1609)», *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 141 (1997), 305-364.

GESUALDI 1594 = FILIPPO GESUALDI, *Ordini della purga delli studia da mandarsi alle Provincie*, [end 1594], published in ANTONIO SARTORI, «La "Ratio studiorum" nella provincia del Santo», in ANTONINO POPPI (ed.), *Storia e cultura al Santo di Padova fra il XIII e il XX secolo*, Vicenza, Neri Pozza editore 1976 (Fonti e studi per la storia del Santo di Padova, III, 1), 119-152, here 138-139.

GESUALDI 1595 = FILIPPO GESUALDI, *letter* to all ministers provincial, 27th March, 1595, published in ANTONIO SARTORI, «La "Ratio studiorum" nella provincia del Santo», in ANTONINO POPPI (ed.), *Storia e cultura al Santo di Padova fra il XIII e il XX secolo*, Vicenza, Neri Pozza editore 1976 (Fonti e studi per la storia del Santo di Padova, III, 1), 119-152, here 139-140.

IANNELLI 1994 = PIO IANNELLI, *Lo Studio teologico OFMConv nel San Lorenzo maggiore di Napoli*, Roma, Miscellanea francescana 1994 (I maestri francescani, 3).

Manuale 1618 = *Manuale de' Frati Min[.] Conv[.] nel quale con metodo semplice, e breve s'instruiscono i novitij […] Per ordine, e dispositione del padre […] Giacomo da Bagnacavallo*, Napoli - Bologna - Brescia, Per Paolo Bizardo 1618.

MARTIN 1910 = RAYMOND MARTIN, «L'introduction officielle de la "Somme" de saint Thomas à l'ancienne Université de Louvain», *Revue Thomiste* 18 (1910), 230-239.

MASTRI, BELLUTO 1637 = BARTHOLOMAEUS MASTRIUS, BONAVENTURA BELLUTUS, *In libros Physicorum*, Romae, Typis Ludovici Grignani 1637.

MASTRI, BELLUTO 1639 = BARTHOLOMAEUS MASTRIUS, BONAVENTURA BELLUTUS, *In Organum*, Venetiis, Tÿpis Marci Ginami 1639.

MASTRI, BELLUTO 1644 = BARTHOLOMAEUS MASTRIUS, BONAVENTURA BELLUTUS, *In libros Physicorum*, Venetiis, Typis Marci Ginammi, 1644[2].

MASTRI, BELLUTO 1643 = BARTHOLOMAEUS MASTRIUS, BONAVENTURA BELLUTUS, *In De anima*, Venetiis, Typis Marci Ginammi 1643.

MASTRI, BELLUTO 1646 = BARTHOLOMAEUS MASTRIUS, BONAVENTURA BELLUTUS, *In Organum*, Venetiis, Typis Marci Ginammi 1646[2].

MASTRI 1646 = BARTHOLOMAEUS MASTRIUS, *In XII libros Metaphysicorum*, vol. 1, Venetiis, Typis Marci Ginammi 1646.

MONTAGNA 1982 = DAVIDE MARIA MONTAGNA, «I Servi ed Enrico di Gand († 1293): inchiesta sui manoscritti», *Studi storici dell'Ordine dei Servi di Maria* 32 (1982), 197-204.

MONTANARI 1617 = GIACOMO [MONTANARI] DA BAGNACAVALLO, copy of *letter* to all ministers provincial, Rome, 4th February, 1617 (Ordini dei superiori 1614-1641, Archivio di Stato di Rimini, Corporazioni soppresse, AB 65, f. 19*r*).

MONTANARI 1618 = GIACOMO [MONTANARI] DA BAGNACAVALLO, *Lettera pastorale […] preparatoria alla visita di tutte le chiese, conventi, e luoghi di detto Ordine*, In Palermo et in Rimino, Per Giovanni Simbeni 1618.

MONTANARI 1619(1) = IACOBUS [MONTANARUS] BAGNACABALLENSIS, *Epistola pastoralis*, Cologne, 6th January, 1619, in *Reformatio* 1620, pp. 9-74 (first series of pages). I read the text of the letter in this edition.

MONTANARI 1619(2) = GIACOMO [MONTANARI] DA BAGNACAVALLO, *Lettera pastorale […] nel suo ritorno della visita delle parti oltramontane*, Mondovì, [s.e.] 1619.

MONTANARI 1619(3) = GIACOMO [MONTANARI] DA BAGNACAVALLO, copy of *letter* to the minister provincial of the Province of Naples, Milan, 10th July, 1619 (Costituzioni e ordini dei superiori [XVII sec.], Archivio di Stato di Napoli, Monasteri soppressi, S. Lorenzo maggiore, 1288, f. 28*r*).

MONTANARI 1619(4) = GIACOMO [MONTANARI] DA BAGNACAVALLO, *Lettera pastorale […] nella quale, con eruditione, e dottrina, per osservanza, del voto, della povertà professata nella Regola, si và discorrendo, et essortando ogn'uno all'essatta vita commune*, Padova, Per Giovanni Battistista Martini 1619.

MONTANARI 1620 = IACOBUS [MONTANARUS] BAGNACABALLENSIS, *Illustrissimo ac reverendissimo d. Marcello Lante S. R. E. cardinali universi Ord. Min. Conventualium protectori vigilantissimo*, in *Reformatio* 1620, pp. 1-7 (first series of pages)

PARISCIANI 1983 = GUSTAVO PARISCIANI, «La riforma tridentina e i frati Minori Conventuali», *Miscellanea francescana* 83 (1983), 499-1021 (in the present work I refer to the essay published as an article in the journal *Miscellanea francescana*. However, Parisciani's work was also published as a book at the same time in its own right, with the same type-set as the essay published in the journal but with its own page-numbering: GUSTAVO PARISCIANI, *La riforma tridentina e i frati Minori Conventuali*, Roma, Miscellanea Francescana 1984).

PIANA 1970 = CELESTINO PIANA, «Chartularium Studii Bononiensis s. Francisci», *Analecta franciscana* 11 (1970), thematic issue (I should like to point out that "Analecta franciscana" can also be considered as a series, whose publisher was Ad Claras Aquas, i.e., the Quaracchi fathers in Florence).

PISELLI 1710 = CLEMENTE PISELLI, *Notizia historica della religione de' PP. Chierici Regolari Minori*, Roma, Nella Stamperia di Gio. Francesco Buagni 1710.

PIUS V 1561 = PIUS V, brief *Ut ampliores et uberiores fructus*, 15th July, 1561 (Roma, Archivio Generale dell'Ordine dei Minori Conventuali, Pergamene, busta 5, no. 227).

POINSOT 1637 = IOANNES A S. THOMA, *Tractatus de approbatione et auctoritate doctrinae angelicae divi Thomae*, in IDEM, *Cursus theologicus*, vol. 1, Compluti, Apud Antonium Vasquez Typographum 1637. The text has also been published in POINSOT 1931, 221-301.

POINSOT 1931 = JOANNES A SANCTO THOMA, *Cursus theologicus*, vol. 1, Parisiis - Tornaci - Romae, Typis Societatis s. Joannis evangelistae Desclée et Sociorum 1931.

PROSPERO DA MARTIGNÉ 1890 = PROSPERO DA MARTIGNÉ, *La scolastica e le tradizioni francescane*, Foligno, Stabilimento poligrafico F. Salviati 1890, it. trans. by

LUIGI DA PIEDALAMA, (PROSPER DE MARTIGNÉ, *La scolastique et les traditions franciscaines*, Paris, Lethielleux 1888[2]), vol. 2.

PONTELONGHI 1653 = FRANCISCUS PONTELONGUS, *Disputationes philosophycae*, vol. 1, Utini, Ex Typographia Nicolai Schiratti 1653.

PUNCH 1645 = IOANNES PONCIUS, *Appendix apologetica*, Romae, Sumptibus Ioannis Baptista Smeraldus - Ex typographia Andreae Phaei 1645.

Reformatio 1620 = *Reformatio studiorum Ord. fratrum Min. Con. sancti Francisci*, a reverendissimo p. magistro f. Iacobo Bagnacaballensi eiusdem Ord. ministro generali ordinata, Perusiae, Typis Marci Naccarini 1620.

ROEST 2000 = BERT ROEST, *A History of Franciscan Education (c. 1210-1517)*, Leiden-Boston-Köln, Brill 2000 (Education and Society in the Middle Ages and Renaissance, 11).

ROEST 2004 = BERT ROEST, *Franciscan Literature of Religious Instruction before the Council of Trent*, Leiden, Brill 2004 (Studies in the History of Christian Thought, 117).

ROTOLO 1995 = FILIPPO ROTOLO, «La vicenda culturale nel convento di S. Francesco di Palermo», in DIEGO CICCARELLI (ed.), *La biblioteca francescana di Palermo*, Palermo, E.B.F.-Biblioteca Francescana di Palermo - Officina di Studi Medievali 1995 (Franciscana, 4), 11-157.

SARTORI 1966 = ANTONIO SARTORI, «Gli studi al Santo di Padova», in *Problemi e figure della scuola scotista del Santo*, Padova, Edizioni Messaggero - Basilica del Santo 1966 (Pubblicazioni della Provincia patavina dei frati Minori conventuali, 5), 67-180.

SBARAGLIA 1921 = JOANNES HIERONYMUS SBARALEA, *Supplementum et castigatio ad scriptores trium ordinum s. Francisci a Waddingo aliisve descriptos*, vol. 2, edited by A. NARDECCHIA - T. ACCURTI, Romae, A. Chiappini O.F.M. editore 1921[2] (Bibliotheca historico-bibliographica, 3).

SCARAMUZZI 1927 = DIOMEDE SCARAMUZZI, *Il pensiero di Giovanni Duns Scoto nel Mezzogiorno d'Italia*, Roma, Collegio S. Antonio - Desclée e C. 1927.

SCHMUTZ 2002 = JACOB SCHMUTZ, «L'héritage des Subtils. Cartographie du scotisme de l'âge classique», *Les Études philosophiques* 2002/1, 51-81.

SOPPELSA 1978 = MARIA LAURA SOPPELSA, «Il ruolo dello scotismo nella "Philosophia naturalis" postgalileiana a Padova», in CAMILLE BÉRUBÉ (ed.), *Regnum hominis et Regnum Dei. Acta Quarti Congressus Scotistici Internationalis. Patavii, 24-29 septembris 1976*, vol. 2 *Sectio specialis. La tradizione scotista veneto-padovana*, Romae, Societas Internationalis Scotistica 1978 (Studia scholastico-scotistica, 7), 345-354.

SPARACIO 1923 = DOMINUCUS MARIA SPARACIUS, *Seraphici d. Bonaventurae Ord. min. conv. de Urbe Collegii a Sixto V fundati synopsis historica*, Romae, Typis poliglottis Vaticanis 1923.

SUÁREZ 1579 = FRANCISCO SUÁREZ, *letter* to Everardo Mercuriano, Valladolid, 2nd July, 1579. The letter is published as a photoreproduction in R.DE SCORRAILLE, *François Suarez de la Compagnie de Jésus, d'après ses lettres, ses autres écrits inédits et un grand nombre de documents nouveaux*, vol. 1, Paris, Lethielleux 1912, image outside text between pp. 160-161.

SUPERBI 1631-1632 = AUGUSTINUS SUPERBIUS, *Theatrum theologorum [conventualium] triplici ordine et pleno digestum*, [1631-32], Ferrara, Biblioteca Comunale Ariostea, Manoscritti, Classe I, 97.

TRIBOUT DE MOREMBERT 1965 = HENRI TRIBOUT DE MOREMBERT, «Documents inédits sur Martin Meurisse Évêque de Madaure, Suffragant de Metz», *Archivum franciscanum historicum* 58 (1965), 143-147.

VASOLI 1984 = CESARE VASOLI, «Bartholomaeus Keckermann e la storia della logica», in *La storia della filosofia come sapere critico. Studi offerti a Mario Dal Pra*, Milano, Franco Angeli Editore 1984 (Collana di Filosofia, 2), 240-259.

WEIJERS 2013 = OLGA WEIJERS, *In Search of the Truth. A History of Disputation Techniques from Antiquity to Early Modern Times*, Turnhout, Brepols Publishers 2013 (Studies in the Faculty of Arts. History and Influence, 1).

WESSELS 1914 = GABRIEL WESSELS, «P. Joannes de Bachone O. C. et eius Schola», *Analecta Ordinis Carmelitarum* 3 (1914), 84-90 and 109-115.

ZEN BENETTI, POPPI 2010 = FRANCESCA ZEN BENETTI, ANTONINO POPPI, «La biblioteca del teologo Filippo Fabri», *Quaderni per la storia dell'Università di Padova* 43 (2010), 209-239.