Chapter 1 : Translation of Theology in English

Confusion of scholastic philosophy and Catholic theology has resulted in the recurring criticism that scholastic philosophy uses authority as its first criterion and is no more than a method for rationalizing predetermined conclusions dictated by ecclesiastical authority.

Origins[edit] During the medieval period, scholasticism became the standard accepted method of philosophy and theology. The Scholastic method declined with the advent of humanism in the 15th and 16th centuries, after which time it came to be viewed by some as rigid and formalistic. An important movement of Thomistic revival took place during the 16th century and enriched Scholastic literature with many eminent contributions. Repeated legislation of the General Chapters, beginning after the death of St. Thomas, as well as the Constitutions of the Order, required all Dominicans to teach the doctrine of St. Thomas both in philosophy and in theology. In the midâ€"19th century, interest in Roman Catholic circles in scholastic methodology and thought began once again to flourish, in large part in reaction against the " Modernism " inspired by thinkers such as Descartes , Kant , and Hegel , the use of which was perceived as inimical to Christian doctrine. Moreover, given that Modernism remained the perceived enemy of neo-Scholasticism throughout the late 19th and early 20th centuries, there were certainly changes over the decades in what was attacked. Certainly, however, common threads of thought can be detected. These include 1 the belief that revelation continued up to and including the present day and, therefore, did not stop with the death of the last apostle; 2 the belief that dogmas were not immutable and that ecclesial dogmatic formulas could change both in interpretation and in content; 3 the use of the historical-critical method in biblical exegesis. In particular, Catholic interest came to focus on the 13th-century theologian Thomas Aquinas , whose writings were increasingly viewed as the ultimate expression of philosophy and theology, to which all Catholic thought must remain faithful. The Italian writers at first laid special emphasis on the metaphysical features of Scholasticism, and less to the empirical sciences or to the history of philosophy. Papal support for such trends had begun under Pope Pius IX , who had recognized the importance of the movement in various letters. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception , the Syllabus errorum and the proclamation of papal infallibility all heralded a move away from Modernist forms of theological thought. Aeterni Patris set out what would come to be seen as the principles of neo-scholasticism, and provided the stimulus for the donation of increased support to neo-scholastic thought. Key principles[edit] Neo-scholasticism sought to restore the fundamental doctrines embodied in the scholasticism of the 13th century. The essential conceptions may be summarized as follows: God , pure actuality and absolute perfection, is substantially distinct from every finite thing: He alone can create and preserve all beings other than Himself. His infinite knowledge includes all that has been, is, or shall be, and likewise all that is possible. As to our knowledge of the material world: To the core of self-sustaining reality, in the oak -tree for instance, other realities accidents are addedâ€"size, form, roughness, and so on. All oak-trees are alike, indeed are identical in respect of certain constituent elements. Considering this likeness and even identity, our human intelligence groups them into one species and again, in view of their common characteristics, it ranges various species under one genus. Such is the Aristotelean solution of the problem of universals. Each substance is in its nature fixed and determined; and nothing is farther from the spirit of Scholasticism than a theory of evolution which would regard even the essences of things as products of change. But this statism requires as its complement a moderate dynamism, and this is supplied by the central concepts of act and potency. Whatsoever changes is, just for that reason, limited. The oak-tree passes through a process of growth, of becoming: Its vital functions go on unceasingly accidental change ; but the tree itself will die, and out of its decayed trunk other substances will come forth substantial change. The theory of matter and form is simply an interpretation of the substantial changes which bodies undergo. The union of matter and form constitutes the essence of concrete being, and this essence is endowed with existence. Throughout all change and becoming there runs a rhythm of finality; the activities of the countless substances of the universe converge towards an end which is known to God; finality involves optimism. Man, a compound of body matter and of soul form , puts forth activities of a higher orderâ€"knowledge and volition. Through his senses

he perceives concrete objects, e. All our intellectual activity rests on sensory function; but through the active intellect intellectus agens an abstract representation of the sensible object is provided for the intellectual possibility. Hence the characteristic of the idea, its non-materiality, and on this is based the principal argument for the spirituality and immortality of the soul. Here, too, is the foundation of logic and of the theory of knowledge, the justification of our judgments and syllogisms. Upon knowledge follows the appetitive process, sensory or intellectual according to the sort of knowledge. The will appetitus intellectualis in certain conditions is free , and thanks to this liberty man is the master of his destiny. Like all other beings, we have an end to attain and we are morally obliged, though not compelled, to attain it. Natural happiness would result from the full development of our powers of knowing and loving. We should find and possess God in this world since the corporeal world is the proper object of our intelligence. But above nature is the order of grace and our supernatural happiness will consist in the direct intuition of God, the beatific vision. Here philosophy ends and theology begins. Lateth-century spread[edit] In the period from the publication of Aeterni Patris in until the s, neo-scholasticism gradually established itself as exclusive and all-pervading. Thomas Aquinas , and ordered the publication of the critical edition, the so-called "Leonine Edition", of the complete works of Thomas Aquinas. The movement also spread into other countries. Thomas together with history and the natural sciences. Paris ; Brussels ; Freiburg ; Munich Earlyth-century development[edit] In the early 20th century, neo-Thomism became official Catholic doctrine, and became increasingly defined in opposition to Modernism. Variation within the tradition of neo-scholastic Thomism is represented by Martin Grabmann â€" , Amato Masnovo â€" , Francesco Olgiati â€" , and Antonin-Dalmace Sertillanges â€" Gilson and Maritain in particular taught and lectured throughout Europe and North America, influencing a generation of English-speaking Catholic philosophers. Many Thomists however continue in the neo-scholastic tradition. Due to its suspicion of attempts to harmonize Aquinas with non-Thomistic categories and assumptions, neo-scholastic Thomism has sometimes been called "strict observance Thomism.

Chapter 2 : Scholastic Philosophy | calendrierdelascience.com

Scholasticism is not so much a philosophy or a theology as a method of learning, as it places a strong emphasis on dialectical reasoning to extend knowledge by inference and to resolve contradictions. Scholastic thought is also known for rigorous conceptual analysis and the careful drawing of distinctions.

In the 12th century a cultural revolution took place that influenced the entire subsequent history of Western philosophy. The old style of education, based on the liberal arts and emphasizing grammar and the reading of the Latin classics, was replaced by new methods stressingâ€¦ Nature and significance Scholasticism is so much a many-sided phenomenon that, in spite of intensive research, scholars still differ considerably in their definition of the term and in the emphases that they place on individual aspects of the phenomenon. Some historians, seeming almost to capitulate to the complexity of the subject, confine themselves to the general point that Scholasticism can only be defined denotatively as that kind of philosophy that during the European Middle Ages was taught in the Christian schools. The question of its connotation , however, remains, namely, What kind of philosophy was it? This highly symbolic fact not only suggests the initial shift of the scene of the intellectual life from places like the Academy to the cloisters of Christian monasteries but also marks even more a change in the dramatis personae. New nations were about to overrun the Roman Empire and its Hellenistic culture with long-range effects: Thomas Aquinas , was born, though he was rightly a southern Italian, his mother was of Norman stock, and his Sicilian birthplace was under central European Hohenstaufen control. It was a decisive and astonishing fact that the so-called barbarian peoples who penetrated from the north into the ancient world often became Christians and set out to master the body of tradition that they found, including the rich harvest of patristic theology as well as the philosophical ideas of the Greeks and the political wisdom of the Romans. In fact, the incorporation of both a foreign vocabulary and a different mode of thinking and the assimilation of a tremendous amount of predeveloped thought was the chief problem that confronted medieval philosophy at its beginnings. And it is only in the light of this fact that one of the decisive traits of medieval Scholasticism becomes understandable: Consequently, the writings of medieval Scholasticism quite naturally lack the magic of personal immediacy, for schoolbooks leave little room for originality. It is therefore misleading, though understandable, that certain polemicists have wrongly characterized Scholasticism as involving no more than the use of special didactic methods or a narrow adherence to traditional teachings. Augustine had the Scholastics not done their patient spadework. Albertus Magnus and Aquinas. On the other hand, the moment had to come when the prevalent preoccupation with existing knowledge would give way to new questions, which demanded consideration and answers that could emerge only from direct experience. By the later Middle Ages, procedures for exploiting and discussing antecedent stocks of insight had been largely institutionalized, and it was an obvious temptation to perpetuate the dominion of those proceduresâ€"which could lead only to total sterility. Although the idea of including faith was expressed already by Augustine and the early Church Fathers , the principle was explicitly formulated by the pivotal early 6th-century scholar Boethius. His famous book, De consolatione philosophiae The Consolation of Philosophy , was written while he, indicted for treachery and imprisoned by King Theodoric the Goth, awaited his own execution. In any case, the connection between faith and reason postulated in this principle was from the beginning and by its very nature a highly explosive compound. Boethius himself already carried out his program in a rather extraordinary way: His friend Cassiodorus , author of the Institutiones â€"an unoriginal catalog of definitions and subdivisions, which in spite of their dryness became a source book and mine of information for the following centuriesâ€"who, like Boethius, occupied a position of high influence at the court of Theodoric and was also deeply concerned with the preservation of the intellectual heritage, decided in his later years to quit his political career and to live with his enormous library in a monastery. This fact again is highly characteristic of the development of medieval Scholasticism: To be sure, the great thinkers of Scholasticism, in spite of their emphatic affirmation of faith and reason, consistently rejected any such rationalistic claim. But it must nonetheless be admitted that Scholasticism on the whole, and by virtue of its basic approach, contained within itself the danger of an

overestimation of rationality, which recurrently emerged throughout its history. The true name of this protagonist is, in spite of intensive research, unknown. Paul the Apostle Acts of the Apostles. In reality, almost all historians agree that Pseudo-Dionysius, as he came to be called, was probably a Syrian Neoplatonist , a contemporary of Boethius. Maximus the Confessor , wrote the first commentaries on these writings, which were followed over the centuries by a long succession of commentators, among them Albertus Magnus and Aquinas. The main fact is that the unparalleled influence of the Areopagite writings preserved in the Latin West an idea, which otherwise could have been repressed and lost since it cannot easily be coordinated with rationality â€"that of a negative theology or philosophy that could act as a counter-poise against rationalism. It could be called an Eastern idea present and effective in the Occident. Thus, negative theology was brought to medieval Scholasticism, as it were, through the back door. The most important book of Denis, which dealt with the names that can be applied to God, exemplified his negative theology. It maintained first of all the decidedly biblical thesis that no appropriate name can be given to God at all unless he himself reveals it. Thus, On Mystical Theology concluded by finally relativizing also the negations, because God surpasses anything that humans may possibly say of him, whether it be affirmative or negative. The influence of Denis is reflected in the noteworthy fact that Aquinas , for instance, not only employed more than 1, quotations from Denis the Areopagite but also appealed almost regularly to his work whenever he spoke, as he often did and in astonishingly strong terms , of the inexhaustible mystery of being. The translation into Latin of the Corpus Areopagiticum, which was made in the 9th centuryâ€"i. The church, though not until centuries later, condemned the book, apparently convinced that any counterpoise to its own position could become dangerous in itself. Early Scholastic period If there was any philosophical-theological thinker of importance during the Middle Ages who remained untouched by the spirit of the Areopagite, it was the 11th-century Benedictine St. Anselm of Canterbury , a highly cultivated Franco-Italian theologian who for years was prior and abbot of the abbey Le Bec in Normandy and then became, somewhat violently, the archbishop of Canterbury. To be sure, a theologian such as Anselm certainly would never have subscribed to the extreme thesis that nothing exists that is beyond the power of human reason to comprehend: Nevertheless, in the case of Anselm, the very peculiar conjunction of faith and reason was accomplished not so much through any clear intellectual coordination as through the religious energy and saintliness of an unusual personality. It was accomplished, so to speak, rather as an act of violence, which could not possibly last. The conjunction was bound to break up, with the emphasis falling either on some kind of rationalism or on a hazardous irrationalization of faith. But, also within the framework of medieval Scholasticism, a dispute was always brewing between the dialecticians, who emphasized or overemphasized reason, and those who stressed the suprarational purity of faith. Berengar of Tours , an 11th-century logician , metaphysician, and theologian, who was fond of surprising formulations, maintained the preeminence of thinking over any authority, holding in particular that the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist was logically impossible. His contemporary the Italian hermit-monk and cardinal St. Quite analogous to the foregoing controversy, though conducted on a much higher intellectual level, was the bitter fight that broke out almost one century later between a Cistercian reformer, St. Bernard of Clairvaux , and a logician and theologian, Peter Abelard. As is well known, it has been asserted that this was the principal, or even the only, subject of concern in medieval Scholasticismâ€"a charge that is misleading, although the problem did greatly occupy philosophers from the time of Boethius. Their main concern from the beginning was the whole of reality and existence. The advance of medieval thought to a highly creative level was foreshadowed, in those very same years before Abelard died, by Hugh of Saint-Victor an Augustinian monk of German descent , when he wrote De sacramentis Christianae fidei On the Sacraments of the Christian Faith , the first book in the Middle Ages that could rightly be called a summa ; in its introduction, in fact, the term itself is used as meaning a comprehensive view of all that exists brevis quaedam summa omnium. To be sure, its author stands wholly in the tradition of Augustine and the Areopagite; yet he is also the first medieval theologian who proclaims an explicit openness toward the natural world. And it was the University of Paris , in particular, that for some centuries was to be the most representative university of the West. It is thus remarkable, though not altogether surprising, that there seems to have existed not a single summa of the Middle Ages that did not, in some way or other, derive from the University of Paris. Much more important

than the book itself, however, were the nearly commentaries on it, by which—into the 16th century—every master of theology had to begin his career as a teacher. At the very moment of its consolidation, however, an upheaval was brewing that would shake this novel conception to its foundations: These writings were not merely an addition of something new to the existing stock; they involved an enormous challenge. During the lifetime of Abelard the full challenge of the Aristotelian work had not yet been presented, though it had been developing quietly along several paths, some of which were indeed rather fantastic. For instance, most of the medieval Latin translations of Aristotle stem not from the original Greek but from earlier Arabic translations. Within the Western Christendom of the 2nd millennium, a wholly new readiness to open the mind to the concrete reality of the world had arisen, a view of the universe and life that resembled the Aristotelian viewpoint. The tremendous eagerness with which this new philosophy was embraced was balanced, however, by a deep concern lest the continuity of tradition and the totality of truth be shattered by the violence of its assimilation. The English historian of philosophy F. A third great commentator was a 12th-century orthodox Jewish philosopher, Moses Maimonides , also born in Spain, who wrote his main works in Arabic. Maimonides was at the same time a vigorous adherent of the Aristotelian worldview and was thus confronted by the same unending task that preoccupied the great teachers of medieval Christendom. Although he knew no Greek, he conceived a plan of making accessible to the Latin West the complete works of Aristotle by way of commentaries and paraphrases; and, unlike Boethius, he did carry out this resolve. He also penetrated and commented upon the works of the Areopagite; he was likewise acquainted with those of the Arabs, especially Avicenna; and he knew Augustine. Nevertheless, he was by no means primarily a person of bookish scholarship; his strongest point, in fact, was the direct observation of nature and experimentation. After having taught for some years at the University of Paris, he traveled, as a Dominican superior, through almost all of Europe. Not only was he continually asking questions of fishermen, hunters, beekeepers, and birdcatchers, but he himself also bent his sight to the things of the visible world. To be sure, the resulting Summa theologiae or —73 , which Aquinas himself chose to leave incomplete, was a magnificent intellectual structure; but it was never intended to be a closed system of definitive knowledge. In the meantime, the poles of the controversy—the biblical impulses, on the one hand, and the philosophical and secular ones, on the other—had begun to move vigorously apart, and partisans moving in both directions found some encouragement in Aquinas himself. But in his later years he realized that the essential compatibility as well as the relative autonomy of these polar positions and the necessity for their conjunction had to be clarified anew by going back to a deeper root of both; that is, to a more consistent understanding of the concepts of creation and createdness. The latter idea was supported also by the Italian mystical theologian St. Bonaventure , who, in his earlier days as a colleague of Aquinas at the university, had likewise been enamoured of Aristotle but later, alarmed by the secularism that was growing in the midst of Christendom, became more mistrustful of the capacities of natural reason. Aquinas answered this objection in somewhat the following way: This may sound like an optimistic rationalism, but the corrective of negative theology and philosophy was also present in the mind of Aquinas. Not only, as he argued in his treatise on God, do humans not know what God is; they do not know the essences of things either. Late Scholastic period Aquinas did not succeed in bridging the faith-reason gulf. When he left Paris and after his death , the gulf became much more radical. Indeed, on March 7, , the Archbishop of Paris formally condemned a list of sentences, some of them close to what Aquinas himself had allegedly or really taught. This ecclesiastical act, questionable though it may have been in its methods and personal motivations, was not only understandable but unavoidable, since it was directed against what, after all, amounted in principle to an antitheological, rationalistic secularism. Quite another matter, however, were the factual effects of the edict, which were rather disastrous. Above all, two of the effects were pernicious: This was to happen in the next generation. It was therefore futile to attempt to coordinate faith with speculative reason. This mere factuality, he held, can neither be calculated nor deduced, but only experienced; reason therefore means nothing but the power to encounter concrete reality. Any collaboration with speculative reason must be rejected as untheological. Faith is one thing and knowledge an altogether different matter, and a conjunction of the two is neither meaningfully possible nor even desirable. Inexorably, and justified by reasons on both sides, a divorce was taking place between faith and reason—to the connection of

which the energies of almost 1, years had been devoted. What was occurring was the demise of medieval Scholasticism.

which the energies of almost 1, years had been devoted. What was occurring was the demise of medieval Scholasticism.

However, in the High Scholastic period of the 14th Century, it moved beyond theology, and had applications in many other fields of study including Epistemology, Philosophy of Science, philosophy of nature, psychology and even economic theory.

Neo-Scholasticism is the development of the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages during the latter half of the nineteenth century. It is not merely the resuscitation of a philosophy long since defunct, but rather a restatement in our own day of the philosophia perennis which, elaborated by the Greeks and brought to perfection by the great medieval teachers, has never ceased to exist even in modern times. It has some times been called neo-Thomism partly because St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century gave to Scholasticism among the Latins its final form, partly because the idea has gained ground that only Thomism can infuse vitality into twentieth century scholasticism. But Thomism is too narrow a term; the system itself is too large and comprehensive to be expressed by the name of any single exponent. This article will deal with the elements which neo-Scholasticism takes over from the past; the modifications which adapt it to the present; the welcome accorded it by contemporary thought and the outlook for its future; its leading representatives and centres. Traditional elements Neo-Scholasticism seeks to restore the fundamental organic doctrines embodied in the Scholasticism of the thirteenth century. These essential conceptions may be summarized as follows: His infinite knowledge includes all that has been, is, or shall be, and likewise all that is possible. All oak-trees are alike, indeed are identical in respect of certain constituent elements. Considering this likeness and even identity, our human intelligence groups them into one species and again, in view of their common characteristics, it ranges various species under one genus. Such is the Aristotelean solution of the problem of universals. Each substance is in its nature fixed and determined; and nothing is farther from the spirit of Scholasticism than a theory of evolution which would regard even the essences of things as products of change. But this statism requires as its complement a moderate dynamism, and this is supplied by the central concepts of act and potency. Whatsoever changes is, just for that reason, limited. The oak-tree passes through a process of growth, of becoming: Its vital functions go on unceasingly accidental change ; but the tree itself will die, and out of its decayed trunk other substances will come forth substantial change. The theory of matter and form is simply an interpretation of the substantial changes which bodies undergo. The union of matter and form constitutes the essence of concrete being, and this essence is endowed with existence. Throughout all change and becoming there runs a rhythm of finality; the activities of the countless substances of the universe converge towards an end which is known to God ; finality, in a word, involves optimism. Through his senses he perceives concrete objects, e. All our intellectual activity rests on sensory function; but through the active intellect intellectus agens an abstract representation of the sensible object is provided for the intellectus possibilis. Hence the characteristic of the idea , its non-materiality, and on this is based the principal argument for the spirituality and immortality of the soul. Here, too, is the foundation of logic and of the theory of knowledge , the justification of our judgments and syllogisms. Upon knowledge follows the appetitive process, sensory or intellectual according to the sort of knowledge. The will appetitus intellectualis in certain conditions is free, and thanks to this liberty man is the master of his destiny. Like all other beings, we have an end to attain and we are morally obliged , though not compelled, to attain it. Natural happiness would result from the full development of our powers of knowing and loving. We should find and possess God in this world since the corporeal world is the proper object of our intelligence. But above nature is the order of grace and our supernatural happiness will consist in the direct intuition of God , the beatific vision. Here philosophy ends and theology begins. Adaptation to modern needs The neo-Scholastic programme includes, in the next place, the adaptation of medieval principles and doctrines to our present intellectual needs. Complete immobility is no less incompatible with progress than out-and-out relativism. To make Scholasticism rigid and stationary would be fatal to it. The doctrines revived by the new movement are like an inherited fortune; to refuse it would be folly, but to manage it without regard to actual conditions would be worse. Ehrhard one may say: We have now to pass in review the various factors in the situation and to see in what respect the new

Scholasticism differs from the old and how far it adapts itself to our age. Elimination of false or useless notions Neo-Scholasticism rejects the theories of physics, celestial and terrestrial, which the Middle Ages grafted on the principles, otherwise sound enough, of cosmology and metaphysics ; e. It further rejects those philosophical theories which are disproved by the results of investigation; e. Even the Scholastic ideas that have been retained are not all of equal importance; criticism and personal conviction may retrench or modify them considerably, without injury to fundamental principles. Study of the history of philosophy The medieval scholars cultivated the history of philosophy solely with a view to its utility, i. Modern students, on the contrary, regard every human fact and achievement as in itself significant, and accordingly they treat the history of philosophy in a spirit that is more disinterested. With this new attitude, neo-Scholasticism is in full sympathy; it does its share in the work of historical reconstruction by employing critical methods; it does not attempt to condense the opinions of others into a syllogism and refute them with a phrase, nor does it commend the practice of putting whole systems into a paragraph or two in order to annihilate them with epithet or invective. Neo-Scholasticism, however, does not confine its interest to ancient and medieval philosophy; its chief concern is with present-day systems. It takes issue with them and offsets their theories of the world by a synthesis of its own. It is only by keeping in touch with actual living thought that it can claim a place in the twentieth century and command the attention of its opponents. And it has everything to gain from a discussion in which it encounters Positivism, Kantism , and other forms or tendencies of modern speculation. Cultivation of the sciences The need of a philosophy based on science is recognized today by every school. Neo-Scholasticism simply follows the example of the Aristotelean and medieval philosophy in taking the data of research as the groundwork of its speculation. That there are profound differences between the Middle Ages and modern times from the scientific point of view, is obvious. One has only to consider the multiplication of the sciences in special lines, the autonomy which science as a whole has acquired, and the clear demarcation established between popular views of nature and their scientific interpretation. But it is equally plain that neo-Scholasticism must follow up each avenue of investigation, since it undertakes, as Aristotle and Aquinas did, to provide a synthetic explanation of phenomena by referring them to their ultimate causes and determining their place in the universal order of things; and this undertaking, if the synthesis is to be deep and comprehensive, presupposes a knowledge of the details furnished by each science. It is not possible to explain the world of phenomena while neglecting the phenomena that make up the world. Like a short-sighted reader, its eye pores closely, and travels slowly, over the awful volume which lies open for its inspection. These various partial views or abstractions. And further the comprehension of the bearings of one science on another, and the use of each to each, and the location of them all, with one another, this belongs, I conceive, to a sort of science distinct from all of them, and in some sense, a science of sciences , which is my own conception of what is meant by philosophy" Newman, "Idea of a University", Discourse III, iii, iv, 44 sqq. There is, of course, the pedagogical problem; how shall philosophy maintain its control over the ever-widening field of the various sciences? In reply, we may cite the words of Cardinal Mercier, a prominent leader in the neo-Scholastic movement: As the domain of fact and observation grows larger and larger, individual effort becomes less competent to survey and master it all: Innovations in doctrinal matters Once it turned its attention to modern fashions of thought, neo-Scholasticism found itself face to face with problems of which medieval philosophy had not the slightest suspicion or at any rate did not furnish a solution. It had to bear the brunt of conflict between its own principles and those of the systems in vogue, especially of Positivism and Criticism. And it had to take up, from its own point of view, the questions which are favourite topics of discussion in the schools of our time. How far then, one may ask, has neo-Scholasticism been affected by modern thought? First of all, as to metaphysics: Cosmology can well afford to insist on the traditional theory of matter and form, provided it pay due attention to the findings of physics, chemistry, crystallography, and mineralogy, and meet the objections of atomism and dynamism, theories which, in the opinion of scientific authority, are less satisfactory as explanations of natural phenomena than the hylomorphism q. The theory also of qualities, once the subject of ridicule, is nowadays endorsed by some of the most prominent scientists. In psychology especially the progressive spirit of neo-Scholasticism makes itself felt. The theory of the substantial union of body and soul , as an interpretation of biological, psychical,

and psycho-physiological facts, is far more serviceable than the extreme spiritualism of Descartes on the one hand and the Positivism of modern thinkers on the other. As Wundt admits, the results of investigation in physiological psychology do not square either with materialism or with dualism whether of the Platonic or of the Cartesian type; it is only Aristotelean animism , which brings psychology into connexion with biology, that can offer a satisfactory metaphysical interpretation of experimental psychology. So vigorous indeed has been the growth of psychology that each of its offshoots is developing in its own way: Along these various lines, unknown to medieval philosophy, neo-Scholasticism is working energetically and successfully. Its criteriology is altogether new: It is equally at home in the field of experimental psychology which investigates the correlation between conscious phenomena and their physiological accompaniments; in fact, its theory of the substantial union of body and soul implies as its corollary a "bodily resonance" corresponding to each psychical process. The laws and principles which the modern science of education has drawn from experience find their adequate explanation in neo-Scholastic doctrine ; thus, the intuitive method, so largely accepted at present as an essential element in education , is based on the Scholastic theory that nothing enters the intellect save through the avenue of sense. In the study of ethical problems, neo-Scholasticism holds fast to the vital teachings that prevailed in the thirteenth century, but at the same time it takes into account the historical and sociological data which explain the varying application of principles in successive ages. Its positions still call for defence against the objections of writers like Mill, who regard the syllogism as a "solemn farce". Accordingly, with due consideration for modern modes of thinking, neo-Scholasticism adapts the teaching of the Middle Ages to actual conditions. Even as regards the relations between philosophy and religion, there are important changes to note. For the medieval mind in the Western world, philosophy and theology were identical until about the twelfth century. In the thirteenth the line of demarcation was clearly drawn, but philosophy was still treated as the preliminary training for theology. This is no longer the case; neo-Scholasticism assigns to philosophy a value of its own as a rational explanation of the world, on a par in this respect with Positivism and other systems; and it welcomes all who are bent on honest research, whether their aim be purely philosophical or apologetic. Parallel with these modifications are those which affect the pedagogical phase of the movement. The methods of teaching philosophy in the thirteenth century were too closely dependent on the culture of that age; hence they have been replaced by modern procedures, curricula, and means of propagation. It would be ill-advised to wrap neo-Scholastic doctrine in medieval envelopes, e. Without at all lessening its force, syllogistic demonstration gains in attractiveness when its essential characteristics are retained and clothed about with modern forms of presentation. In this connexion, the use of living languages as a means of exposition has obvious advantages and finds favour with many of those who are best qualified to judge. Appreciation By interesting itself in modern questions, interpreting the results of scientific research and setting forth its principles for thorough discussion, neo-Scholasticism has compelled attention: Among non-Catholics, many leaders of thought have frankly acknowledged that its methods and doctrines deserve to be examined anew. Kant, Ein Kampf zweier Welten", loc. Among Catholics , neo-Scholasticism gains ground day by day. It is doing away with Ontologism , Traditionalism , the Dualism of Gunther, and the exaggerated Spiritualism of Descartes. It is free from the weaknesses of Pragmatism and Voluntarism , systems in which some thinkers have vainly sought the reconciliation of their philosophy and their faith. Neo-Scholasticism has a character of permanence as truth itself has; but it is destined in its development to keep up with scientific progress. Like everything that lives, it must advance; arrested growth would mean decay. This document sets forth the principles by which the movement is to be guided in a progressive spirit, and by which the medieval doctrine is to take on new life in its modern environment. We certainly do not blame those learned and energetic men who turn to the profit of philosophy their own assiduous labours and erudition as well as the results of modern investigation; for we are fully aware that all this goes to the advancement of knowledge. Numerous works were produced by Zigliara , Satolli , Liberatore , Barberis , Schiffini , de Maria, Talamo, Lorenzelli, Ballerini, Matussi, and others. The Italian writers at first laid special emphasis on the metaphysical features of Scholasticism , without paying sufficient attention to the sciences or to the history of philosophy. Recently, however, this situation has undergone a change which promises excellent results.

Chapter 4 : Scholasticism | philosophy | calendrierdelascience.com

Scholasticism is a term used to designate both a method and a system. It is applied to theology as well as to philosophy. Scholastic theology is distinguished from Patristic theology on the one hand, and from positive theology on the other.

This article treats of the notion of scholastic philosophy, various misconceptions concerning it, and the manuals and schools in which it is taught. Scholastic philosophy is characterized by its emphasis on system. It is a synthesis that attempts to organize all the questions philosophy asks and to present the answers in a strictly logical format. This systematization most frequently uses the Aristotelian concept of science scientia as its internal principle of organization. The scholastic philosopher attempts to explain things in terms of their causes with the aid of definition, division, and demonstration. The content of scholastic philosophy comprises several sciences: All knowledge begins with sense data, but the intellectual knowledge developed from such data differs essentially from simple sense knowledge. This doctrine separates scholastic philosophy from most modern and contemporary philosophies. Perhaps the most striking characteristic of scholastic philosophy is its methodâ€"basically the logic of aristotle as augmented and refined by later scholastic philosophers. The method, when abused, results in a rigid formalism, insisting upon the mechanics of science rather than on an intellectual grasp of reality. Properly used as a technique of organization for either teaching or research, scholastic method has often produced splendid results. The popular misconceptions about scholastic philosophy have arisen out of its character as the philosophy of the Christian schools. In common usage "scholastic philosophy" connotes an arid verbalism, a closed system of thought perpetuated by rote memorization. Yet the technical vocabulary of scholastic philosophy is a necessary instrument of its precision. Behind this abstract terminology lies an intense effort to gain insight into the nature of reality by induction from the facts of experience. While the system is traditional, it is subject to constant criticism and reevaluation, and is open to new development in all directions. Scholastic philosophy has been identified with medieval philosophy. This is warranted only in the sense that it reached maturity during the 13th century, when the great scholastic syntheses were achieved. But the philosophical origins of scholastic philosophy go back to Plato, Aristotle, the Neoplatonists, and St. Augustine , as well as to Arabian and Jewish thinkers. Scholastic philosophy has been continually developed since the Middle Ages , even within Protestant circles, though it has generally suffered from the isolation of Catholic thought since the Reformation. In fact, scholastic philosophy claims to represent the tradition of Western philosophy, preserving what is best in every age. Confusion of scholastic philosophy and Catholic theology has resulted in the recurring criticism that scholastic philosophy uses authority as its first criterion and is no more than a method for rationalizing predetermined conclusions dictated by ecclesiastical authority. Such is not the spirit, at least, of scholastic philosophy. Its basic commitment is to the facts of reality, objectively observed. Its attitude is that, in philosophy, reason must be convinced by evidence. This is expressed in St. Since the Reformation, scholastic philosophy has flourished mostly in Catholic seminaries, where emphasis has been on the philosophical notions necessary for scientific theology, giving a pragmatic cast to scholastic philosophy and obscuring its proper function of exploring the concrete realities of the universe. The tendency to separate scholastic philosophy clearly from theology, and to respect it as an autonomous discipline, is growing. Any system of philosophy taught in schools produces capsule formulations of its entire doctrine for the use of students. Such are the scholastic manuals, which have, like all manuals, the advantage of conciseness and the disadvantage that the student may study words and not realities. Intended to cover a vast amount of material economically, manuals condense the matter into little more than a logical outline. Moreover, if the authors use similar books as their sources, the result is a condensation of other condensations. For the student to acquire true philosophical insights from such an arid presentation requires a teacher of genius. Various schools of thought have grown up within scholastic philosophy. Although these share many common doctrines and methods, they differ somewhat in content see thomism; scotism; suarezianism; augustinianism; ockhamism. For the history of scholastic philosophy, see scholasticism. American Catholic Philosophical Association. Proceedings of the Annual Meeting 32 ; 30 ; 12

Chapter 5 : CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA: Scholasticism

Scholasticism: Scholasticism, the philosophical systems and speculative tendencies of various medieval Christian thinkers, who, working against a background of fixed religious dogma, sought to solve anew general philosophical problems (as of faith and reason, will and intellect, realism and nominalism, and the.

E-mail The method of scholasticism sought to understand the fundamental aspects of theology, philosophy, and law. Apparently contradictory viewpoints were offered in order to show how they possibly could be synthesized through reasonable interpretation. A problem would first be "exposed," and then it would be "disputed" in order to cause a new "discovery" in the mind of the person who was seeking new personal knowledge. Each text investigated had a commentary. The master helped the student to read the text in such a way that he could really understand what it was saying. This experience was to be much more than just memorative. There were yes - and - no positions to various texts, which sought to keep the student from merely memorizing the text. Abelard developed the yes - and - no method with great precision. The two most exciting types of disputations were the quaestio disputata, which was a disputed question, and the quodlibet, which was a very subtle form of disputed question that could be publicly disputed only by a truly great master, whereas the disputed questions could be talked about by lesser minds still growing in knowledge. Anselm of Canterbury is the first great developer of scholasticism. His Monologion investigates problems surrounding God from a reasonable and yet prayerful viewpoint. He developed the famous principle "faith seeking to know. He became involved in the disputed question concerning whether "universals" were really things or merely names. Gilbert de la Porree continued to develop various views in a scholastic manner. Victor sought to give scholasticism more of a mystical flare; he was criticized by many because of his lack of reasonableness. He was deeply indebted to Augustine for his views. Bernard of Clairvaux developed a psychological view in scholasticism which, although wedded to a form of mysticism, sought to be more reasonable than mystical. Peter Lombard developed a series of "sentences" that were to be taught to seminarians studying for the priesthood in the twelfth century. These scholastic sentences were usually simple and also capable of being memorized by the students. It is this form of scholasticism that has caused many persons to discredit it as an uncreative experience. Albert the Great Albertus Magnus was not much of an improvement over Peter Lombard, but he deeply influenced Thomas Aquinas, who was the apogee of scholastic thought. Thomism has many forms, but they are all trying to interpret the system of thought developed by Thomas Aquinas. His great effort was to combine what could be called non - Christian philosophy with both Christian philosophy and theology. Christian Scripture could be combined with elements of ideas discovered by natural thought unaided by the grace of Scripture. Thomas Aquinas was heavily influenced by not only Aristotelianism but also Platonism. He also attempted to combine the thought of Averroes into his system. Some of his contemporaries considered some of his ideas to be heretical. Cardinal Tempier of Paris was especially disturbed by his view concerning the resurrection of the body as it was presented in his Disputed Questions. Bonaventure was another great schoolman, but his style of presentation is turgid and pales somewhat in relation to the presentations of Aquinas. Bonaventure was quite polemical in his attacks against Aristotelianism, which undermined his attempt to be reasonable. In the fourteenth century Giles of Rome presented some brilliance within the scholastic tradition, but he was not very consequential in relation to Aquinas. The great scholastic thinker of the fourteenth century was John Duns Scotus. He had an extremely subtle understanding of the use of words. He was chiefly interested in the problem of epistemology. His school of thought, Scotism, influenced many people in later ages, including Martin Heidegger and Ludwig Wittgenstein. William of Ockham rounds out the glorious age of scholasticism. He was called a nominalist because he wondered if exterior reality to the human mind was given a series of words which remained primarily in the mind. For William of Ockham it was unclear that the human mind could actually know exterior reality. Scholasticism went into desuetude in the fifteenth century, but it was revived in the sixteenth century. The twentieth century has experienced a renewed attempt to make the Thomistic form of scholasticism credible as a system of thought. This movement within Roman Catholic circles has been

partially successful. Scholasticism Advanced Information The term scholasticism from the Latin schola, "school" refers properly both to the doctrine and method of teaching in the medieval European schools and to their successive revivals to the present day. As a method, scholasticism involves 1 the close, detailed reading lectio of a particular book recognized as a great or authoritative work of human or divine origin - for example, Aristotle in logic, Euclid in geometry, Cicero in rhetoric, Avicenna and Galen in medicine, the Bible in theology - and 2 the open discussion disputatio in strict logical form of a relevant question quaestio arising from the text. As a doctrine, scholasticism refers to the kind of philosophy, theology, medicine, and law canon and civil taught by the faculties responsible for these disciplines. These four faculties constituted the medieval universities that began to be organized in the 12th century, beginning in Bologna, Paris, and Oxford. The most important faculties, however, were arts philosophy and theology, and the term scholasticism is usually understood in the context of those disciplines. Aristotle, however, was interpreted differently by different professors depending on the commentaries used, notably those of "the Commentator," Averroes; the Christian Neoplatonist, Saint Augustine; or the pagan Neoplatonist, Avicenna. Similarly in theology, the Bible was variously interpreted depending on the kind of philosophy used to understand the Christian faith systematically. Among the numerous ways of systematizing the faith, certain schools of theology stand out as particularly notable and viable throughout the Middle Ages and to the present day. The most important of these scholastic theologies were Thomism, developed from the teaching of Saint Thomas Aquinas; Augustinism, developed from Saint Augustine; Scotism, from John Duns Scotus; Nominalism, from William of Occam; and Suarazianism, formulated by Francisco Suarez, a 16th century Jesuit who tried to synthesize various schools. The basic principle underlying all forms of scholasticism was rational consistency with the Christian faith as taught in the Bible and as understood by the living Church of Rome through the writings of the ancient Greek and Latin Fathers, the rulings of the ecumenical councils, the liturgy, and the continuing teaching and practice of the church. Scholasticism is generally divided into three periods: In this early period, however, the dominant philosophical influence was Platonism or Neoplatonism, particularly as it was reflected in the work of Saint Augustine. Augustine formulated the maxim "Understand so that you may believe, believe so that you may understand" - an approach that lay at the heart of scholasticism - and urged the use of dialectics in examining Christian doctrine. In a stricter sense, scholasticism began with the Sentences c. Assimilation of this new learning took place in the universities of the 13th century through the genius of the Dominicans Saint Albertus Magnus and his great pupil Thomas Aquinas, whose Summa Theologiae is widely regarded as the pinnacle of scholastic theology; and of the Franciscans Saint Bonaventure, John Duns Scotus, and William of Occam early 14th century , who challenged the Dominican school. With the multiplication of universities between the 14th and 16th centuries came a decline in the standard of teaching and the caliber of teachers, and a "logicism" or formalism of thought that aroused the animosity of a new humanism that arose mainly outside university circles. The term scholasticism then began to be used in a derogatory sense. The Protestant Reformation in the 16th century stimulated a revival of theology by a return to the language of the Bible, the Fathers of the Church, and the great scholastics of the 13th century. Due largely to the scientific revolution of the 17th century beginning with Galileo , the quest for philosophic originality beginning with Rene Descartes , the rise of nationalism and colonization, and the splintering of Protestant religions, second scholasticism declined. Some forms of schoolbook scholasticism, however, remained for a time in Catholic countries, particularly Spain and Latin America. By the 18th century, scholasticism had again become a derogatory term, especially in non - Catholic countries. By , neo - Thomism or neoscholasticism began to be heard through the writings of Gaetano Sanseverino in Naples, Matteo Liberatore in Rome, and the Jesuit periodical Civilita Cattolica founded in Naples in Through subsequent encyclicals, Leo exemplified the applicability of Thomistic ideas to contemporary problems. All subsequent popes, including John Paul II, reiterated the need for a Christian philosophy based on Thomistic principles. The rise of Modernism in the Roman Catholic church after , however, resulted in a multiplicity of ecclesiastical condemnations, a legislated Thomism, and a failure to realize the hopes of Leo XIII. Despite this and two world wars, much fruitful work was accomplished by outstanding scholars, numerous periodicals, and editors of historical texts, including the critical edition of the works of Aquinas the Leonine Edition. Among the great number of modern scholars who

called themselves Thomists but not neo - Thomists or neoscholastics were Jacques Maritain, Etienne Gilson, Martin Grabmann, and Yves Congar. For reasons still not fully understood, a decided reaction against Aquinas and neoscholasticism occurred in the s. Aquinas was, however, the only scholastic doctor mentioned by name in all the conciliar documents. The real reasons for the decline of neoscholasticism must be sought in the wider sociological and psychological concerns of contemporary society. Scholasticism Catholic Information Scholasticism is a term used to designate both a method and a system. It is applied to theology as well as to philosophy. Scholastic theology is distinguished from Patristic theology on the one hand, and from positive theology on the other. The schoolmen themselves distinguished between theologia speculativa sive scholastica and theologia positiva. Applied to philosophy, the word "Scholastic" is often used also, to designate a chronological division intervening between the end of the Patristic era in the fifth century and the beginning of the modern era, about It will, therefore, make for clearness and order if we consider: The origin of the word "Scholastic"; II. The history of the period called Scholastic in the history of philosophy; III. The Scholastic method in philosophy, with incidental reference to the Scholastic method in theology; and IV. The contents of the Scholastic system. Origin of the Name "Scholastic" There are in Greek literature a few instances of the use of the word scholastikos to designate a professional philosopher. Historically, however, the word, as now used, is to be traced, not to Greek usage, but to early Christian institutions. In the Christian schools, especially after the beginning of the sixth century, it was customary to call the head of the school magister scholae, capiscola, or scholasticus. As time went on, the last of these appellations was used exclusively. The curriculum of those schools included dialectic among the seven liberal arts, which was at that time the only branch of philosophy studied systematically. The head of the school generally taught dialectic, and out of his teaching grew both the manner of philosophizing and the system of philosophy that prevailed during all the Middle Ages. Consequently, the name "Scholastic" was used and is still used to designate the method and system that grew out of the academic curriculum of the schools or, more definitely, out of the dialectical teaching of the masters of the schools scholastici. It does not matter that, historically, the Golden Age of Scholastic philosophy, namely, the thirteenth century, falls within a period when the schools, the curriculum of which was the seven liberal arts, including dialectic had given way to another organization of studies, the studia generalia, or universities. The name, once given, continued, as it almost always does, to designate the method and system which had by this time passed into a new phase of development. Academically, the philosophers of the thirteenth century are known as magistri, or masters; historically, however, they are Scholastics, and continue to be so designated until the end of the medieval period. And, even after the close of the Middle Ages, a philosopher or theologian who adopts the method or the system of the medieval Scholastics is said to be a Scholastic. The Scholastic Period The period extending from the beginning of Christian speculation to the time of St. Augustine, inclusive, is known as the Patristic era in philosophy and theology. In general, that era inclined to Platonism and underestimated the importance of Aristotle. The Fathers strove to construct on Platonic principles a system of Christian philosophy. They brought reason to the aid of Revelation. They leaned, however, towards the doctrine of the mystics, and, in ultimate resort, relied more on spiritual intuition than on dialectical proof for the establishment and explanation of the highest truths of philosophy. Between the end of the Patristic era in the fifth century and the beginning of the Scholastic era in the ninth there intervene a number of intercalary thinkers, as they may be called, like Claudianus Mamertus, Boethius, Cassiodorus, St.

Cardinal Mercier's A Manual of Modern Scholastic Philosophy is a standard work, prepared at the Higher Institute of Philosophy, Louvain, mainly for the use of clerical students in Catholic seminaries.

Philosophy and Christian Theology In the history of Christian theology, philosophy has sometimes been seen as a natural complement to theological reflection, whereas at other times practitioners of the two disciplines have regarded each other as mortal enemies. Some early Christian thinkers such as Tertullian were of the view that any intrusion of secular philosophical reason into theological reflection was out of order. Thus, even if certain theological claims seemed to fly in the face of the standards of reasoning defended by philosophers, the religious believer should not flinch. Other early Christian thinkers, such as St. Augustine of Hippo, argued that philosophical reflection complemented theology, but only when these philosophical reflections were firmly grounded in a prior intellectual commitment to the underlying truth of the Christian faith. Thus, the legitimacy of philosophy was derived from the legitimacy of the underlying faith commitments. It was during this time however that St. Thomas Aquinas offered yet another model for the relationship between philosophy and theology. According to the Thomistic model, philosophy and theology are distinct enterprises, differing primarily in their intellectual starting points. Philosophy takes as its data the deliverances of our natural mental faculties: These data can be accepted on the basis of the reliability of our natural faculties with respect to the natural world. Theology, on the other hand takes as its starting point the divine revelations contained in the Bible. These data can be accepted on the basis of divine authority, in a way analogous to the way in which we accept, for example, the claims made by a physics professor about the basic facts of physics. Since this way of thinking about philosophy and theology sharply demarcates the disciplines, it is possible in principle that the conclusions reached by one might be contradicted by the other. According to advocates of this model, however, any such conflict must be merely apparent. Since God both created the world which is accessible to philosophy and revealed the texts accessible to theologians, the claims yielded by one cannot conflict with the claims yielded by another unless the philosopher or theologian has made some prior error. Since the deliverances of the two disciplines must then coincide, philosophy can be put to the service of theology and perhaps vice-versa. How might philosophy play this complementary role? First, philosophical reasoning might persuade some who do not accept the authority of purported divine revelation of the claims contained in religious texts. Thus, an atheist who is unwilling to accept the authority of religious texts might come to believe that God exists on the basis of purely philosophical arguments. Second, distinctively philosophical techniques might be brought to bear in helping the theologian clear up imprecise or ambiguous theological claims. Thus, for example, theology might provide us with information sufficient to conclude that Jesus Christ was a single person with two natures, one human and one divine, but leave us in the dark about exactly how this relationship between divine and human natures is to be understood. The philosopher can provide some assistance here, since, among other things, he or she can help the theologian discern which models are logically inconsistent and thus not viable candidates for understanding the relationship between the divine and human natures in Christ. For most of the twentieth century, the vast majority of English language philosophyâ€"including philosophy of religionâ€"went on without much interaction with theology at all. While there are a number of complex reasons for this divorce, three are especially important. The first reason is that atheism was the predominant opinion among English language philosophers throughout much of that century. A second, quite related reason is that philosophers in the twentieth century regarded theological language as either meaningless, or, at best, subject to scrutiny only insofar as that language had a bearing on religious practice. The former belief i. Since much theological language, for example, language describing the doctrine of the Trinity, lacks empirical content, such language must be meaningless. The latter belief, inspired by Wittgenstein, holds that language itself only has meaning in specific practical contexts, and thus that religious language was not aiming to express truths about the world which could be subjected to objective philosophical scrutiny. In the last forty years, however, philosophers of religion have returned to the business of theorizing about many of the traditional doctrines of Christianity and have begun to apply the tools of

contemporary philosophy in ways that are somewhat more eclectic than what was envisioned under the Augustinian or Thomistic models. In keeping with the recent academic trend, contemporary philosophers of religion have been unwilling to maintain hard and fast distinctions between the two disciplines. As a result, it is often difficult in reading recent work to distinguish what the philosophers are doing from what the theologians and philosophers of past centuries regarded as strictly within the theological domain. In what follows, we provide a brief survey of work on the three topics in contemporary philosophical theology thatâ€"aside from general issues concerning the nature, attributes, and providence of Godâ€"have received the most attention from philosophers of religion over the past quarter century. We thus leave aside such staple topics in philosophy of religion as traditional arguments for the existence of God, the problem of evil, the epistemology of religious belief, the nature and function of religious language. We also leave aside a variety of important but less-discussed topics in philosophical theology, such as the nature of divine revelation and scripture, original sin, the authority of tradition, and the like. Trinity From the beginning, Christians have affirmed the claim that there is one God, and three personsâ€"Father, Son, and Holy Spiritâ€"each of whom is God. Although we profess three persons we do not profess three substances but one substance and three persons â€¦ If we are asked about the individual Person, we must answer that he is God. No doubt this is an understatement. Indeed, it looks like we can derive a contradiction from the doctrine, as follows: Either way, however, we have a problem. If the Father is identical to God and the Son is identical to God, then by the transitivity of identity the Father is identical to the Son, contrary to the doctrine. On the other hand, if the Father is divine and the Son is divine and the Father is distinct from the Son, then there are at least two divine personsâ€"i. Either way, then, the doctrine seems incoherent. At first blush, it might seem rather easy to solve. The answer, in short, is that the Christian tradition has set boundaries on how the doctrine is to be explicated, and these sorts of models fall afoul of those boundaries. Modalism confounds the persons. It is the view that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are mere manifestations, modes, or roles played by the one and only God. Ruling out modalism thus rules out analogies like the Superman analogy just given. Tritheism divides the substance. It is a bit tricky because controversial to say exactly what tritheism, or polytheism more generally, is. For discussion, see Rea But whatever else it might be, it is certainly implied by the view that there are three distinct divine substances. Assuming the items in your shopping cart count as multiple distinct substances, then, the problem with the shopping cart analogy is that it suggests polytheism. In what follows, we will consider several more sophisticated models of the trinity: These do not exhaust the field of possible solutions, but they are the ones to which the most attention has been paid in the recent literature. For more detailed surveys, see Rea and, at book length, McCall This suggests the analogy of a family, or, more generally, a society. Thus, the persons of the trinity might be thought of as one in just the way that the members of a family are one: Since there is no contradiction in thinking of a family as three and one in this way, this analogy appears to solve the problem. Those who attempt to understand the trinity primarily in terms of this analogy are typically called social trinitarians. This approach has been controversially associated with the Eastern Church, tracing its roots to the Cappadocian Fathersâ€"Basil of Caesarea, his brother Gregory of Nyssa, and their friend Gregory Nazianzen. Against this practice, see especially Ayres and Barnes b. Consider, for example, the children of Chronos in Greek mythology, of whom Zeus was the liberator. These children included Zeus, Hera, Ares, and a variety of other Olympian deitiesâ€"all members of a divine family. Nobody, however, thinks that the fact that Zeus and his siblings nor even, say, Zeus and his begotten daughter Athena count in any meaningful sense as one god. For this reason, social trinitarians are often quick to note that there are other relations that hold between members of the trinity that contribute, along with their being members of a single divine family, to their counting as one God. Richard Swinburne, for example, has defended a version of this view according to which the unity among the divine persons is secured by several facts in conjunction with one another. First, the divine persons share all of the essential characteristics of divinity: Second, unlike the deities of familiar polytheistic systems, their wills are necessarily harmonious, so that they can never come into conflict with one another. Third, they stand in a relationship of perfect love and necessary mutual interdependence. On this sort of view, there is one God because the community of divine persons is so closely interconnected that, although they are three distinct persons, they nonetheless function as if they were a single

entity. One might think that if we were to consider a group of three human persons who exhibited these characteristics of necessary unity, volitional harmony, and love, it would likewise be hard to regard them as entirely distinct. And that is, of course, just the intuition that the view aims to elicit. Still, many regard the sort of unity just described as not strong enough to secure a respectable monotheism. Thus, some social trinitarians have attempted to give other accounts of what unifies the divine persons. Perhaps the most popular such account is the partâ€"whole model. Moreland and William Lane Craig have argued that the relation between the persons of the Trinity can be thought of as analogous to the relation we might suppose to obtain between the three dog-like beings that compose Cerberus, the mythical guardian of the underworld. One might say that each of the three headsâ€"or each of the three souls associated with the headsâ€"is a fully canine individual, and yet there is only one being, Cerberus, with the full canine nature. At this point, therefore, it is natural to wonder what exactly it is that makes both proposals count as versions of social trinitarianism. Unfortunately, this is a question to which self-proclaimed social trinitarians have not given a very clear answer. However, this answer is less than fully illuminating. What is needed is some characterization of the common core underlying the diverse views that are generally regarded as versions of social trinitarianism. The following two theses seem to capture that core: One of the more serious problems is that it is inconsistent with the Nicene Creed. Likewise, the Creed says that Father and Son are consubstantial. This claim is absolutely central to the doctrine of the trinity, and the notion of consubstantiality lay at the very heart of the debates in the 4th Century C. But the three souls, or centers of consciousness, of the heads of Cerberus are not in any sense consubstantial. Other versions of the partâ€"whole model raise further worries. A cube, for example, is a seventh thing in addition to its six sides; but we do not want to say that God is a fourth thing in addition to its three parts. The reason is that saying this forces a dilemma: Either God is a person, or God is not. If the former, then we have a quaternity rather than a trinity. If the latter, then we seem to commit ourselves to claims that are decidedly anti-theistic: Bad news either way, then. Thus, many are motivated to seek other models. Historically, the use of psychological analogies is especially associated with thinkers in the Latin-speaking West, particularly from Augustine onward. Augustine himself suggested several important analogies, as did others in the medieval Latin tradition. However, since our focus in this article is on more contemporary models, we will pass over these here and focus instead on two more recently developed psychological analogies.

Scholastic Theology Our course of studies in Scholastic Theology is organized into two levels. The first is known as the «Baccalaureatus Sententiarius» Cycle, the second, the most advanced of all studies, as the «Magister Sacrae Doctrinae».

A huge subject broken down into manageable chunks Random Quote of the Day: It combined Logic , Metaphysics and semantics into one discipline, and is generally recognized to have developed our understanding of Logic significantly. The term "schoolmen" is also commonly used to describe scholastics. Scholasticism is best known for its application in medieval Christian theology, especially in attempts to reconcile the philosophy of the ancient classical philosophers particularly Aristotle with Christian theology. However, in the High Scholastic period of the 14th Century, it moved beyond theology, and had applications in many other fields of study including Epistemology , Philosophy of Science , philosophy of nature, psychology and even economic theory. Essentially, Scholasticism is a tool and method for learning which places emphasis on dialectical reasoning the exchange of argument, or thesis, and counter argument, or antithesis, in pursuit of a conclusion, or synthesis , directed at answering questions or resolving contradictions. In medieval Europe, dialectics or logic was one of the three original liberal arts the "trivium" , in addition to rhetoric and grammar. There are perhaps six main characteristics of Scholasticism: An acceptance of the prevailing Catholic orthodoxy. Within this orthodoxy, an acceptance of Aristotle as a greater thinker than Plato. The recognition that Aristotle and Plato disagreed about the notion of universals, and that this was a vital question to resolve. Giving prominence to dialectical thinking and syllogistic reasoning. An acceptance of the distinction between "natural" and "revealed" theology. A tendency to dispute everything at great length and in minute detail, often involving word-play. The Scholastic method is to thoroughly and critically read a book by a renowned scholar or author e. The Bible, texts of Plato or St. Augustine , etc , reference any other related documents and commentaries on it, and note down any disagreements and points of contention. The two sides of an argument would be made whole found to be in agreement and not contradictory through philological analysis the examination of words for multiple meanings or ambiguities , and through logical analysis using the rules of formal logic to show that contradictions did not exist but were merely subjective to the reader. These would then be combined into "questionae" referencing any number of sources to divine the pros and cons of a particular general question , and then into "summae" complete summaries of all questions, such as St. Scholastic schools had two methods of teaching: Scholasticism was concurrent with movements in early Islamic philosophy , some of which presaged and influenced European Scholasticism. Later, the Islamic philosophical schools of Avicennism and Averroism exerted great influence on Scholasticism. There were also similar developments in medieval Jewish philosophy especially the work of Maimonides. Anselm of Canterbury is sometimes misleadingly referred to as the "Father of Scholasticism", although his approach was not really in keeping with the Scholastic method. Other early Scholastics include Hugh of St. The Franciscan and Dominican orders of the 13th Century saw some of the most intense scholastic theologizing of High Scholasticism, producing such theologians and philosophers as Albertus Magnus , St. Thomas Aquinas , Alexander of Hales died and St. Bonaventure - This period also saw a flourishing of mystical theology, such as Mechthild of Magdeburg - and Angela of Foligno - , and early natural philosophy or "science" at the hands of such men as Roger Bacon and Robert Grosseteste c. Late Scholasticism 14th Century onwards became more complex and subtle in its distinctions and arguments, including the nominalist or voluntarist theologies of men like William of Ockham. Thomism and Scotism are specific off-shoots of Scholasticism, following the philosophies of St. Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus respectively. Scholasticism was eclipsed by the Humanism of the 15th and 16th Centuries, and it came to be viewed as a rigid, formalistic and outdated way of conducting philosophy. It was briefly revived in the Spanish School of Salamanca in the 16th Century, and in the Catholic Scholastic revival Neo-Scholasticism of the late 19th and early 20th Century, although with a somewhat narrower focus on certain scholastics and their respective schools of thought, most notably St.

Chapter 8 : Scholasticism - By Movement / School - The Basics of Philosophy

Scholasticism, is a term used to designate both a method and a calendrierdelascience.com is applied to theology as well as to philosophy. Scholastic theology is distinguished from Patristic theology on the one hand, and from positive theology on the other (see Theology).

Reformed scholasticism Following the Reformation, Calvinists largely adopted the scholastic method of theology, while differing regarding sources of authority and content of theology. Neo-scholasticism The revival and development from the second half of the 19th century of medieval scholastic philosophy is sometimes called neo- Thomism. Thomistic Scholasticism[edit] As J. Repeated legislation of the General Chapters, beginning after the death of St. Thomas, as well as the Constitutions of the Order, required all Dominicans to teach the doctrine of St. Thomas both in philosophy and in theology. It focuses not only on exegesis of the historical Aquinas but also on the articulation of a rigorous system of orthodox Thomism to be used as an instrument of critique of contemporary thought. Due to its suspicion of attempts to harmonize Aquinas with non-Thomistic categories and assumptions, Scholastic Thomism has sometimes been called "Strict Observance Thomism". Partly, this was because this branch of Thomism had become a quest to understand the historical Aquinas after the Second Vatican Council. Still, those who had learned Scholastic philosophy continued to have unresolved questions about how the insights of the medieval synthesis could be applied to contemporary problems. This conversation departed from the academic environment and entered internet discussion groups such as Aquinas, [25] Christian Philosophy, [26] and Thomism, [27] and websites such as Open Philosophy, [28] where it continues today. Analytical Scholasticism[edit] A renewed interest in the "scholastic" way of doing philosophy has recently awoken in the confines of the analytic philosophy. Attempts emerged to combine elements of scholastic and analytic methodology in pursuit of a contemporary philosophical synthesis. Analytical Thomism can be seen as a pioneer part of this movement. It was thought that the best way to achieve this was by replicating the discovery process modus inveniendi. By reading it thoroughly and critically, the disciples learned to appreciate the theories of the author. Other documents related to the book would be referenced, such as Church councils, papal letters and anything else written on the subject, be it ancient or contemporary. The points of disagreement and contention between multiple sources would be written down in individual sentences or snippets of text, known as sententiae. Once the sources and points of disagreement had been laid out through a series of dialectics , the two sides of an argument would be made whole so that they would be found to be in agreement and not contradictory. Of course, sometimes opinions would be totally rejected, or new positions proposed. This was done in two ways. The first was through philological analysis. Words were examined and argued to have multiple meanings. It was also considered that the auctor might have intended a certain word to mean something different. Ambiguity could be used to find common ground between two otherwise contradictory statements. The second was through logical analysis, which relied on the rules of formal logic â€" as they were known at the time â€" to show that contradictions did not exist but were subjective to the reader. Scholastic instruction[edit] Scholastic instruction consisted of several elements. The first was the lectio: This was followed by the meditatio meditation or reflection in which students reflected on and appropriated the text. Finally, in the quaestio students could ask questions quaestiones that might have occurred to them during meditatio. Eventually the discussion of questiones became a method of inquiry apart from the lectio and independent of authoritative texts. Disputationes were arranged to resolve controversial quaestiones. In this case, the teacher responded and the students rebutted; [31] on the following day the teacher, having used notes taken during the disputation, summarised all arguments and presented his final position, riposting all rebuttals. Arguments for the position taken would be presented in turn, followed by arguments against the position, and finally the arguments against would be refuted. This method forced scholars to consider opposing viewpoints and defend their own arguments against them.

Chapter 9 : Irenical Theology: Heidelberg

Not so much a philosophy or a theology as a method of learning, scholasticism places a strong emphasis on dialectical reasoning to extend knowledge by inference, and to resolve contradictions.

The schoolmen themselves distinguished between theologia speculativa sive scholastica and theologia positiva. It combined religious doctrine, study of the ideas of the Church fathers, and philosophical and logical analysis based on Aristotle and his commentators, and to some extent on themes from Plato. There have been several revivals, including neo-scholasticism. With time, scholasticus became the title for the head of a school. The curriculum of the early Christian schools was the study of the seven liberal arts, including dialectic , the only branch of philosophy under systematic study at that time. Dialectic, which was usually taught by the scholasticus, became the prevailing method and system of philosophy throughout the Middle Ages. As a result, the name "Scholastic" came to be associated with the dialectical teaching of the masters of the schools. At the height of Scholastic philosophy, during the thirteenth century, the curriculum of seven liberal arts had been replaced with the studia generalia, or universities, but the philosophers of the thirteenth century were known as "Scholastics," a designation which continued until the end of the medieval period. A philosopher or theologian who adopts the method or the system of the medieval Scholastics is said to be a Scholastic. Augustine is known as the Patristic era of philosophy and theology. The early Fathers of the Church developed a Christian philosophy based on Platonic principles, using reason to support revelation, and relying on spiritual intuition rather than logical proof to establish the truths which became the doctrine of the Church. The Patristic era ended in the fifth century, and between the fifth and ninth centuries, there were a number of thinkersâ€"including Claudianus Mamertus, Boethius , Cassiodorus, St. The Scholastic Period In the ninth century, the Carolingian revival of learning gave a new direction to Christian thought. The masters of the schools began to include discussions of psychology , metaphysics , cosmology, and ethics in their teaching of dialectic, giving rise to the Christian rationalism which characterizes Scholastic philosophy. During the eleventh and twelfth centuries conflict arose between rationalists such as Roscelin, Abelard , and Peter Lombard , and Christian mystics such as St. Bernard, and the Victorines, who felt that they were threatening the Christian faith. Gradually the rationalists reconciled their methods with the orthodoxy of the Church and accommodated reverence for the mysteries of faith. Eclectics, like John of Salisbury, and Platonists, like the members of the School of Chartres, brought the Scholastic movement to a greater degree of toleration. By the end of the twelfth century, rationalism was dominant in the Christian universities, but coexisted with mysticism. After the capture of Constantinople in , the works of Arabian, Jewish and Greek philosophers were introduced into the Christian schools through Latin translations. Aristotle was now known not only as a logician, but as a metaphysician and a psychologist. The Arabian translations and commentaries on Aristotle were tinged with pantheism , fatalism and other Neo-platonic errors, and this gave rise to a new wave of conflict within the universities. Pantheists like David of Dinant and Averroists like Siger of Brabant alarmed the Church authorities and threatened to entirely discredit Aristotelianism, which was found to lack the element of mysticism. The University of Paris became a center for philosophical debate. The Church imposed strict disciplinary measures in an attempt to control the danger which they felt was undermining the Catholic faith. New access to translations from Greek revealed that the original teachings of Aristotle did not necessarily imply the errors attributed to him by students of the Arabian commentators. Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas succeeded in establishing the authority of Aristotelianism, and St. Bonaventura demonstrated that it was not incompatible with Christian mysticism. The study of Aristotle also opened up new possibilities for the natural sciences, as demonstrated by the work of Roger Bacon. During the high scholastic period â€" , scholasticism moved beyond theology into the philosophy of nature , psychology , epistemology and philosophy of science. In Spain , the scholastics also made important contributions to economic theory, which would influence the later development of the Austrian school. However, all scholastics were bound by Church doctrine and certain questions of faith could never be addressed without risking trialand even execution for heresy. During the fourteenth century, the energies of the Scholastics became increasingly absorbed in

theological debates between the Franciscans, who followed the tradition of St. Augustine , and Dominicans, who followed Thomas Aquinas. Duns Scotus criticized the Dominicans and developed a new form of Scholasticism, Scotism, which gave primacy to the will over the intellect. In the Christian universities, a renewal of interest in Averroism, the cultivation of excessive formalism, the development of artificial terminology, the extended discussion of subtle aspects of theological questions, and neglect of the study of history and nature undermined the creative power of Scholasticism. Scholasticism came to be viewed as rigid, formalistic, outdated and an improper method of doing philosophy. During the catholic scholastic revival in the late s and early s, certain scholastics, notably Thomas Aquinas , and their respective schools of thought were revisited. Scholasticism is often referenced in discussions of theology or metaphysics. Scholastic Method Scholastic philosophy combined logic, metaphysics and semantics into one discipline, and is recognized to have contributed significantly to modern understanding of logic. The scholastics would choose a book by a renowned scholar, called auctor, as a subject of investigation, for example, the Bible. By reading the book thoroughly and critically, the scholars learned to appreciate the theories of the auctor. Then other documents related to the source document would be referenced, such as Church councils, papal letters, ancient texts or commentaries. The points of disagreement and contention among these multiple sources would be written down as individual sentences or snippets of text called sententiae. For example, the Bible contains apparent contradictions for Christians, such as the laws regarding what foods are kosher, and these contradictions have been examined by scholars ancient and contemporary, so a scholastic would gather all the arguments about the contradictions, looking at them from all angles with an open mind. Once the sources and points of disagreement had been laid out, dialectic was used to reconcile the two sides of an argument so that they would be found to be in agreement. This was done using two methods, philological analysis and logical analysis. Words would be examined and it would be argued they could have more than one meaning, and that the author could have intended the word to mean something else. The ambiguous meaning of words could be used to find common ground between two otherwise contradictory statements. Logical analysis relied on the rules of formal logic to show that contradictions did not exist objectively, but were subjective to the reader. Scholastics developed two different genres of literature. Any number of sources could be referenced to illustrate the answer to the question. The second genre was a summa, encompassing all the conceivable questions about Christianity and cross-referencing them with related questions. Scholastic Training Scholastic schools had two methods of teaching, the lectio and the disputatio. The lectio was a simple reading of a text by a teacher who would expound on certain words or ideas, but no questions were allowed. The disputatio was at the heart of the scholastic method. There were two types of disputatio. The first was the "ordinary," in which the question to be disputed was announced beforehand. The second was the quodlibetal in which the students would propose a question to the teacher without any prior preparation, and the teacher would respond, citing authoritative texts such as the Bible to prove his position. Students would then rebut the response and the debate would continue back and forth. During the exercise notes would be taken, and the teacher would then summarize the arguments from the notes and present his final position the next day, answering all the rebuttals.