



Tommaso Campanella in the Schulmetaphysik: The Doctrine of the Three Primalities and the Case of the Lutheran Liborius Capsius (1589–1654) in Erfurt

Marco Lamanna

Volume 39, Number 1, Winter 2016

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1087135ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v39i1.26544>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Iter Press

ISSN

0034-429X (print)

2293-7374 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Lamanna, M. (2016). Tommaso Campanella in the Schulmetaphysik: The Doctrine of the Three Primalities and the Case of the Lutheran Liborius Capsius (1589–1654) in Erfurt. *Renaissance and Reformation / Renaissance et Réforme*, 39(1), 91–113. <https://doi.org/10.33137/rr.v39i1.26544>

Article abstract

Following some recent findings, this essay presents the first known case of the reception of the doctrine of the primalities (power, knowledge, and love) by the Italian Tommaso Campanella within German scholastic philosophy, the so-called Schulmetaphysik. Here, the focus is on the Lutheran Liborius Capsius, the first docent of metaphysics at the University of Erfurt after the interdict by Martin Luther against metaphysics. Through his lectures and the disputations discussed by his students, Capsius shows how the Reformed scholastic philosophy was finally able to receive and integrate Renaissance philosophies (also those of anti-scholastic and anti-Aristotelian provenience). The essay is followed by the transcription of the *Rerum transcendentium stud.* (1635) by Capsius, in which the reception of the doctrine of the primalities takes place.

Tommaso Campanella in the *Schulmetaphysik*: The Doctrine of the Three Primalities and the Case of the Lutheran Liborius Capsius (1589–1654) in Erfurt*

MARCO LAMANNA

Scuola Normale Superiore (Pisa)

Following some recent findings, this essay presents the first known case of the reception of the doctrine of the primalities (power, knowledge, and love) by the Italian Tommaso Campanella within German scholastic philosophy, the so-called Schulmetaphysik. Here, the focus is on the Lutheran Liborius Capsius, the first docent of metaphysics at the University of Erfurt after the interdict by Martin Luther against metaphysics. Through his lectures and the disputations discussed by his students, Capsius shows how the Reformed scholastic philosophy was finally able to receive and integrate Renaissance philosophies (also those of anti-scholastic and anti-Aristotelian provenience). The essay is followed by the transcription of the Rerum transcendentium stud.<i>ium</i> (1635) by Capsius, in which the reception of the doctrine of the primalities takes place.

Suite à des découvertes récentes, cet article présente le premier cas connu de la réception de la doctrine des principes premiers (puissance, connaissance et amour) de l'italien Tommaso Campanella par la philosophie scolastique allemande, ou Schulmetaphysik. On y examine principalement un ouvrage du luthérien Liborius Capsius, premier professeur de métaphysique à l'Université d'Erfurt après que Martin Luther ait interdit la métaphysique. Dans son enseignement et dans les disputations menées par ses étudiants, Capsius montre que la philosophie scolastique de la Réforme a réussi à accueillir et intégrer les philosophies de la Renaissance, y compris celles de traditions anti-scolastiques et anti-aristotéliennes. Cet article inclut la transcription du Rerum transcendentium stud.<i>ium</i> (1635) de Capsius, constituant le témoin principal de la réception de la doctrine des principes premiers.

Introduction

In July 1638, the Italian Tommaso Campanella wrote from France while he was under the protection of Cardinal Richelieu:

From whence I began to savour, not vulgarly, some truths of our world,
and of its Author [...], I considered that I and every egregious mind

* I wish to thank Paul Richard Blum (Baltimore), Germana Ernst (Rome), and Martin Mulsow (Erfurt). This research was made possible by a grant (Herzog-Ernst-Stipendium der Fritz Thyssen Stiftung) from the Forschungszentrum Gotha in 2013.

brought a great debt to the Medicean Princes, who making apparent the platonic books, unseen by our forefathers in Italy, were responsible to take Aristotle's, and in consequence, all sophists' yoke from us.¹

He most likely was not aware that in Germany, from 1635, the Lutheran Liborius Capsius (1589–1654) had introduced his doctrine of the primalities (power, knowledge, and love) during several lectures on metaphysics held at the University of Erfurt, given according to not only an Aristotelian model but a scholastic one as well, i.e., belonging to the Aristotelian scholastic philosophy. This emerges from recent findings in a collected volume (*Sammelband*),² conserved at the Bibliotheca Amploniana in Erfurt, in which there is a short printed text by Capsius, a sort of syllabus of his academic lectures on metaphysics, entitled *Rerum transcendentium stud.<ium>* (1635); in the volume we also find a series of disputations discussed by students of Capsius to obtain the title of *Magister artium* at the Faculty of Arts of Erfurt.

In the *Rerum transcendentium stud.<ium>*, Capsius shows the integration of the doctrine of primalities in his *metaphysica determinata*, i.e., the field of metaphysics that deals with “being” (*ens*) according to its two principal determinations of infinite and finite being (*ens infinitum/ens finitum*). According to Capsius, the primalities of power, knowledge, and love had to be predicated first on the infinite being (God). By contrast, the *metaphysica indeterminata* corresponds to an ontology devoted to studying being according to a formal concept that provides the highest level of abstraction from every possible determination, also from infinite and finite being and the three primalities.

Beyond Campanella, in the *Rerum transcendentium stud.<ium>* Capsius refers to the Turinese nobleman, Cesare Branchedoro, or Branchedauria (Latin *Branchedaurius*), who in 1609 edited an introduction entitled *Oratio praemonitoria ad Imperatores, Reges, Principes & Respublicas de mutaione Imperii romanii & ortu pontificum* in his *Monita politica*. In this introduction,

1. See Tommaso Campanella *al Granduca Ferdinando II de' Medici* (Paris, 6 July 1638), in Tommaso Campanella, *Lettere*, ed. Germana Ernst (Firenze: Olschki, 2010), 509–11: “Da che io cominciai a gustar non volgarmente qualche verità del nostro mondo e del suo autore [...] stimai ancora che io e ogni ingegno egregio portamo grande obbligo ai principi Medicei, che, facendo comparir i libri platonici in Italia, non visti da' nostri antichi, fur caggione di levarci dalle spalle il giogo d'Aristotele, e per conseguenza di tutti i sofisti.” (My translation.)

2. The collocation under which the volume (*Sammelband*) can be found is UB Erfurt: LA. 4° 00261 (18).

Branchedoro eulogized the work *Monarchia di Spagna* by Campanella and the political analyses of the Italian philosopher. The *Oratio* by Branchedoro was also included in the edition of the German translation of the *Monarchia di Spagna*³ (1620), entitled *Von der Spanischen Monarchy*. Quoting Branchedoro, Capsius demonstrated his having read the work of Campanella in its German translation. However, we know that in the *Monarchia di Spagna*, Campanella never referred to the three primalities. Capsius, therefore, surely drew upon this doctrine from another work: for example, from the *Praefatio ad philosophos Germaniae* by Tobias Adami, included in the *Prodromus philosophiae instaurandae* by Campanella, published in Frankfurt a.M. (1617), or from Campanella's *De sensu rerum et magia*,⁴ also edited by Adami in Frankfurt a.M., but in 1620; or even from the manuscripts of Campanella's *Metaphysics* given personally by Gregorio Costa to Adami, during his stay in Naples between 1612 and 1613.⁵

We must take into consideration, however, that the *Metaphysica* by Campanella was published only in 1638, when Campanella was in Paris and Capsius had already referred to the doctrine of the primalities in his lectures in Erfurt. An attempt at examining Capsius's *Rerum transcendentium stud.<ium>*

3. The complete title of the work is *Von der Spanischen Monarchy, Oder Außführliches Bedencken, welchemassen, von dem König in Hispanien, zu nunmehr lang gesuchter Weltbeherrschung, sowohl insgemein, als auff jedes Königreich vnd Land besonders, allerhand Anstalt zu machen sein möchte: Worinnen nicht allein fast aller Herrschafften jetziger Zeit, eigentliche beschaffenheit entdeckt: sondern zumal de Ratione status [...] gehandelt würdt. Nun [...] auß dem Italianischen [...] in vnsere Teutsche Sprach versetzt, vnd erstmals durch den offenen Trucken Tag gegeben*, Gedruckt im Jahr 1620 (s.l.). The work had another edition in 1623. As to Cesare Branchedoro, see Giacomo Moro, "Chi era davvero Caesarius Branchedauria?," *Bruniana & Campanelliana* 22.1 (2016): in print.

4. Tommaso Campanella, *De sensu rerum et magia, Libri Quatuor, [...] Tobias Adami recensuit, et nunc primum evulgavit* (Frankfurt a.M.: Emmelium, 1620), chapter 7, book 1, 23–24. "Quapropter veluti absurdum est asserere, quod ignis calor non calefaciat, nec terra proprio frige faciat frigore, sed alieno ignoto impulsu; ita absurdum est adserere, quod natura sentiat finem, & operetur gratia illius absque sensu, quem ipsa habet, aut quod non habeat; & vere sensus omnis est participatio primae sapientiae, ut Salomon testatur; ac Divus Thom. omnem formam participationem divinam esse docet, & quoniam Deus potens est & sapiens, & amans optimus, ego ostendi in Metaph. omnia Entia, Potentia, Sapientia & Amore constitui, & unumquodque esse, quoniam potest esse, scit esse, & amat esse."

5. On this regard see Paolo Ponzio, *Introduzione*, in Tommaso Campanella, *Metafisica: Universalis philosophiae seu metaphysicarum rerum iuxta propria dogmata* (Bari: Levante, 1994), xvi–xvii. As to Tobias Adami see Luigi Firpo, "Tobia Adami e la fortuna del Campanella in Germania," in *Storia e cultura del Mezzogiorno. Studi in memoria di Umberto Caldora* (Cosenza: Lerici, 1978), 77–118.

reveals that he had drawn upon the doctrine of the primalities from the *Praefatio ad philosophos Germaniae* by Tobias Adami, included in the publication of *Prodromus philosophiae instaurandae* by Campanella,⁶ as we shall demonstrate at the end of this paper. However, before looking at these doctrinal conclusions, it is useful to focus on the academic context of Erfurt and, in particular, on the statute and the role attributed to metaphysics at the University of Erfurt after the advent of the Reformation until the years of Capsius.

The University of Erfurt as *Universitas mixtae religionis*

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, the University of Erfurt conserved the statutes of its foundation, which had occurred in 1392. The Faculty of Arts provided teaching of poetry, rhetoric, history, physics, metaphysics, logic, astronomy, and grammar, which usually lasted for four years. Upon conclusion there were doctoral faculties, divided traditionally into theology, law, and medicine. In the late Middle Ages, a great part of the university's development had coincided with the arrival in the city of Amplonius Rating de Berka (1363/5–1435): probably the first licensed *Doctor Medicinae*.⁷ Beyond founding the Collegium Porta Coeli, thereafter named Collegium Amplonianum, Amplonius succeeded in building, in only a few years, the largest manuscript collection of the late Middle Ages, known later as Bibliotheca Amploniana.

In 1501 Martin Luther matriculated at the Faculty of Arts in Erfurt, obtaining there the title of *magister artium* on 6 January 1505. Also in Erfurt, as is noted, Luther had entered the Augustinian order in 1505, while in Wittenberg he was promoted as *Doctor Theologiae* on 4 October 1512: for this, Erfurt is mentioned among the Luther-Städte (Luther's cities) together with Coburg, Eisenach, Eisleben, Magdeburg, and Wittenberg.

The Reformation came to Erfurt in 1519, with less radical results than in other German cities. For instance, unlike in Frankfurt (Oder), in Erfurt the ecclesiastical professors were not excluded from teaching; in the Faculty of

6. Tobias Adami, *Praefatio ad philosophos Germaniae*, f. C1r–v, in Tommaso Campanella, *Prodromus philosophiae instaurandae* (Frankfurt a.M.: Tampach, 1617), translated from Latin into Italian by Germana Ernst in "Figure del sapere umano e splendore della sapienza divina. La *Praefatio ad philosophos Germaniae* di Tobias Adami," *Bruniana & Campanelliana* 9 (2004): 119–47.

7. Just Christoph Motschmann, *Erfordia literata continuata oder Fortsetzung des gelehrten Erffurths*, Dritte Fortsetzung (Leipzig: Langenheum, 1735), § 24, 311.

Theology the teaching of Catholic theology was preserved and a Jesuit college was soon founded in the city. Erfurt could, for this reason, boast the title of *Universitas mixtae religionis* (mixed-religion university),⁸ refusing to become a confessional university as Luther would have desired. This sort of insubordination generated the conviction among the Lutherans that Erfurt, like Prague, was *eine Quelle religiösen Aufruhrs* (a source of religious riots), meriting the Latin nickname of *Erfordia Praga*.⁹

Conforming to the spirit of the Reformation, Luther's interdict against metaphysics¹⁰ and its tradition could be felt in the city of Erfurt. Linking itself with the humanistic and Erasmian legacy, very present in the cultural life of the university,¹¹ the impact of Luther's interdict produced a complete exclusion of metaphysics from the curriculum of the Faculty of Arts starting from 1521. It could be said, then, that the effects of the Reformation were felt more against scholastic metaphysics than against Catholic theology. Following the exclusion of metaphysics in 1521, the Faculty of Arts presented courses on Latin

8. Erich Kleineidam, *Universitas Studii Erfordensis. Überblick über die Geschichte der Universität Erfurt*, Teil 4: *Die Universität Erfurt und ihre theologische Fakultät von 1633 bis zum Untergang 1816* (repr. Erfurt: Hierana, 1997), 3.

9. With regards to the definition of "Erfordia Praga" and the delusion by Luther about the development of the Reformation in the city of Erfurt, see Christian Peters, "Erfurt ist Erfurt, wird's bleiben und ist's immer gewesen...': Luthers Einwirkungen auf die Erfurter Reformation," in *Erfurt (742–1992): Stadtgeschichte-Universitätsgeschichte*, ed. Ulman Weiß (Weimar: Verlag Hermann Böhlhaus Nachfolger, 1992), 255–75, esp. 262–63, and 275.

10. Philipp Melancthon, *Didymi Faventini adversus Thomam Placentinum, pro Martino Luthero theologo, oratio* (Basel: Cratander, 1521), fol. C1r: "Non damnat Lutherus eam philosophiae partem, quae mathematica, quae gemmarum, plantarum & animantium naturas descripsit: Nam horum cognitionem fatetur ad sacra necessariam esse, soletque in loco uti, quoties res postulat [...]. Damnatautem, si ignoras, eam philosophiae partem, quae de rerum principiis, ventorum ac pluviarum caussis, prodigiosas nugas comminiscitur, adeoque quidquid id est, quod Aristoteles vocat physica ἀρομάτα καὶ μετὰ τὰ φύσικα. Damnatautem quidquid de moribus a philosophis proditum est." In this regard, see also Theodor Dieter, *Der junge Luther und Aristoteles. Eine historisch-systematische Untersuchung zum Verhältnis von Theologie und Philosophie* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2001); Philippe Büttgen, *Luther et la philosophie. Études d'histoire* (Paris: Vrin, 2011), esp. 53–69.

11. Peters, 256ff. On the *via moderna* at the University of Erfurt, see also Wolfgang Urban, "Die 'via moderna' an der Universität Erfurt am Vorabend der Reformation," in *Gregor von Rimini, Werk und Wirkung bis zur Reformation*, ed. Heiko A. Oberman (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1981), 311–30.

and poetry (included under a course entitled *Humanismus*), ancient Greek, Hebrew, rhetoric, logic, ethics, physics, mathematics, and astronomy.¹²

It was Henning Rennemann (1567–1646), pupil of Kaspar Pfaffrad in Helmstedt and later professor of law in Erfurt, who proposed a first defence of metaphysics. In 1601, a student of his, Friedrich Franz von Uslar (1591–1653), discussed, in his presence, a disputation entitled *Dissertatio logico-metaphysica de veritatis natura*. A century had already passed since the arrival of the Reformation in the city, and since the interdiction of the teachings of metaphysics at the university. Erfurt showed itself to be rather behind with respect to other Reformed academies in Germany where, through Jesuit works, scholastic metaphysics was seeing a massive revival.

We should consider that, starting from the 1590s, Calvinists and Lutherans were becoming more conscious that in order to better compete with post-Tridentine Catholic culture and to sustain the theological debates, they needed recourse to the metaphysical lexicon (conceptual and terminological). To resolve the ever more complex theological questions in the debate between Reformed authors, it wasn't enough to turn to the logic, philology, and exegesis of the sacred texts, as sustained by the greater part of Lutheran culture. So in Marburg, as in Herborn, Helmstedt, Giessen, and Wittenberg, the return to metaphysics began in the last years of the sixteenth century, drawing upon the models of the historical adversaries in the faith: the Jesuits.

On the contrary, in Erfurt, except for the isolated case of Henning Rennemann, we must wait until 1627 for the publication of a metaphysical work, and until 1632 for the reactivation of the teaching of metaphysics at the university. To take charge of both operations was Capsius—first publishing his *Sapientia, vulgo metaphysica idealis* (1627), and then assuming the first chair of metaphysics and logic (*Professor publicus metaphysicae et logicae*) since the Reformation.¹³

Capsius had completed his studies in Erfurt, where he was promoted *magister artium* in 1614. In 1615 he became assistant to Johann Rudolph Werner (†1625), then obtained in 1623 the role of guide in the local Pädagogium, one of the pre-university institutions. The competition of the other two educational

12. Erich Kleineidam, *Universitas Studii Erffordensis. Überblick über die Geschichte der Universität Erfurt*, Teil 3: *Die Zeit der Reformation und Gegenreformation 1521–1632* (repr. Erfurt: Hierana, 1997), 235ff.

13. See Just Christoph Motschmann, *Erfordia literata continuata oder Fortsetzung des gelehrten Erffurths, Erste Fortsetzung* (Erfurt: Crusius, 1733), 549–53.

institutions in the city, the Collegium Amplonianum and the Jesuit College, caused a drastic fall in enrolment at the Pädagogium, and Capsius soon found himself to be *unicus paedagogista* (the only pedagogue) in the school: a position that he maintained until becoming professor at the university in 1632.

During the years 1631–32, Erfurt was occupied by the Protestant troops of King Gustav II Adolf of Sweden, in the course of the so-called “Swedish period” (1630–35) of the Thirty Years’ War. The Swedes imposed the total Protestantization of the university, through the new statutes published in 1632. This period is known as the end of the Catholic University of Erfurt.¹⁴ The strong push to confessionalization did not contrast with the restarting of the teaching of metaphysics in the curriculum of the Faculty of Arts. According to the Lutheran professors, the return to metaphysics was a necessity that could no longer be delayed. Capsius was probably the most authoritative personality present in the city to aspire to the chair of logic and metaphysics; he was, after all, “the first who wrote about metaphysics in Erfurt.”¹⁵

The new Evangelic University of Erfurt, derived from the statutes imposed by the Swedish occupation, foresaw therefore six chairs for the Faculty of Arts. Beyond Capsius, other professors were Justus Heckel (ethics), Georg Kaltschmidt (physics), Heinrich Starkloff (ancient Jewish), Georg Schultze (mathematics), and Johannes Rave (history). Two chairs were provided for the Faculty of Law, with Henning Rennemann and August Zeithopf; two for the Faculty of Medicine, with Quirinus Schmaltz and Johannes Rehenfeld, and five chairs for the Faculty of Theology, occupied respectively by Johannes Matthäus Meyfahrt, Georg Großhain, Nikolaus Zapf, Bartholomaeus Elsner, and Zacharias Hogel.

Both Meyfahrt and Großhain were students of Capsius. Also studying at his “school” was Johann Musäus (1613–81),¹⁶ professor of theology in Jena, and known as one of “the most significant protestant theologians of the seventeenth century.”¹⁷ Musäus worked profoundly with the aim to guarantee an adequate metaphysical and ontological foundation to the Lutheran dogmatic, developing the metaphysical studies he had matured with Capsius in Erfurt.

14. Kleineidam, *Universitas Studii Erfordensis*, Teil 3, 132–39.

15. Kleineidam, *Universitas Studii Erfordensis*, Teil 3, 249: “der erste, der in Erfurt eine Metaphysik schrieb.”

16. Kleineidam, *Universitas Studii Erfordensis*, Teil 4, 39.

17. Karl Heussi, *Geschichte der Theologischen Fakultät zu Jena* (Weimar: Böhlau, 1954), 140. “[...] fraglos einer der bedeutendsten Theologen des ganzen 17. Jahrhunderts.”

2. To come back or to go beyond metaphysics? The way to ontology

For all of these arguments, it is clear that the return to metaphysics in Erfurt was played prevalently under the “sign” of Capsius. We move forward now to the key notions of his model. In 1627, when Capsius was still the only pedagogue at the Pädagogium of Erfurt, he self-published (*Impensis auctoris*) his *Sapientia, vulgo metaphysica idealis*—probably in Erfurt, as at that time there were still no editors disposed to financing a work on metaphysics. The work showed how the new models produced by *Schulmetaphysik* were fundamental novelties not only in the scholastic debate but also in the philosophical one. With this publication, Capsius in fact not only contributes to challenging the anti-metaphysical option present in early Lutheran culture, but insists on bringing Lutheran metaphysics to a new standard, especially as regards terminology.

We know that Capsius was the first Lutheran to use the term “ontology” in an appropriate and positive way. Coined in 1606 by the rector of the Reformed Gymnasium of St. Gallen, the Calvinist Jacob Lorhard, the term had its first circulation within the reformed context, with authors like Rudolph Göckel and Johann Heinrich Alsted. In 1613, at the University of Rostock, the Lutheran Matthias Lobetantz discussed in the presence of Andres Hojer a disputation entitled *Disputatio ontologica de bono et malo*. Except for the Latin adjective *ontologica* in the title, Lobetantz does not deal with the complex questions relative to the statute and the subject of ontology debated in the *Schulmetaphysik*.¹⁸ Before Capsius, the Lutherans had refused the term ontology because it seemed too indicative of the metaphysical model proposed by the Calvinists, as is demonstrated clearly in 1608 by the Lutheran Thomas Wegelin during a disputation discussed at the University of Tübingen. Wegelin criticized the doctrine of the ubiquity of Christ proposed by the Calvinists, and that which he defined as *ontologia calviniana* (Calvinist ontology),¹⁹ demonstrating, in this way, that the term had been associated with a precise cultural and confessional origin.

18. On the first occurrences of the term *ontologia* in its cultural context, see Michaël Devaux and Marco Lamanna, “The Rise and Early History of the Term Ontology (1606–1730),” *Quaestio: Yearbook of the History of Metaphysics* 9 (2009): 173–208.

19. Thomas Wegelin, *Disputatio de Christo [...] sub praesidio reverendi et clarissimi viri, Dn. Ioannis Georgii Sigwardi, S.S. Theologiae Doctoris & Professoris celeberrimi* (Tübingen: Gruppenbach, 1608), f. 2r: “[...] id quod deplorando suo monstrant exemplo hodie distorti Calviniani, unionem personalem ex cerebrosa sua Ontologia sic describentes, quasi ea consistat in nuda tantum, eaque ociosa

What did the first Lutheran metaphysicians (Kornelius Martini, Henning Arnisaeus, Jakob Martini, and Christoph Scheibler) criticize the Calvinists for? They criticized the choice of making metaphysics not so much a real science (*scientia realis*) but rather a mental and noetic one: for example, choosing as the subject-matter of the science the concept of “all that is intelligible” (as in the case of the Calvinist Clemens Timpler)—a more extended concept than that of being as being (*ens in quantum ens*)—or choosing a concept of being extended into both real being and rational being (as in the case of the Calvinist Rudolph Göckel). According to the Lutherans, the term ontology indicated new models of metaphysics proposed by the Calvinists, founded on a strong noetization of the statute of science and its subject-matter. This was a tendency that the Lutherans wanted to counter, initially drawing upon the model of the Jesuit Francisco Suárez founded on real being (*ens reale*), as the subject-matter of metaphysics. In this way, metaphysics could maintain for itself the title of *scientia realis*.

Unlike his most illustrious colleagues in Giessen, Helmstedt, and Wittenberg, the Lutheran Capsius retained the term ontology as useful to identify a field of metaphysics. In the *Sapientia, vulgo metaphysica idealis*, knowledge is denominated first as *metaphysica* or *supra-physica* (the science of things that go beyond and exceed physical substances); second, as *scientia universalis*, which deals with all of the universal determinations of being, e.g., transcendental concepts (*transcendentia*) and general properties; third, as ontology (*ontologia*). Finally, knowledge is identified as *prima philosophia*, which deals with the triple priority of being: (1) the *primitas adaequationis*, according to which all subject-matters of other disciplines must refer in the last instance to the subject of first philosophy; (2) the *primitas perfectionis*, which indicates only the “being” perfect and independent in its nature, i.e., God; (3) the *primitas adtributionis*, which orders all of beings according to a list of attributes and predications. In this way Capsius identifies *sapientia* and *metaphysica*.²⁰

Personali sustentatione humanae Naturae in λόγῳ, sine ulla Naturarum & Proprietatum κοινωνίᾳ seu communicatione.”

20. Liborius Capsius, *Sapientia, vulgo metaphysica idealis. Pro acquirenda philosopho-theologica Akribeia* (Erfurt: 1627), 28: “III. Sapientia dicitur Ontologia / IV. Sapientia dicitur φιλοσοφία πρώτη. / Prima certe est 1. Primitate Adaequationis: qua adaequat singulas disciplinas: dum suo subjecto concludit illarum subjecta: quae illis subjiciuntur ut species suo generi. 2. Primitate perfectionis: qua antestat omnibus sui perfectione & independentia. Namque / Sapientia est sui gratia: & maxime libera / Et /

However, in the *Sapientia, vulgo metaphysica idealis* Capsius does not offer further information about ontology. We must wait for the beginning of his lessons on metaphysics at the University of Erfurt and the publication of *Rerum transcendentium stud.<ium>* (1635) to better understand what Capsius means exactly by the term ontology. As already mentioned, the *Rerum transcendentium stud.<ium>* is a short printed text, in the form of lecture notes for students, that recapitulates the main arguments given by Capsius during his lectures. In this work, Capsius attributes the name of ontology exclusively to *metaphysica indeterminata*, the science delegated to studying being in general, abstracted by any particular determination. What is being in general? A concept indifferently present in everything that exists on a particular level, such as the “pine tree being,” or the “dog being.” Which attributes or predicates can be attributed to the concept of being in general? First of all, the names of “one,” “true” and “good” (*unum, verum, bonum*), in the sense that the abstract being from “the pine tree being” is primarily one, true, and good.

After the *metaphysica indeterminata*, or ontology, comes the *metaphysica determinata*—which studies being according to its first determinations of infinite and finite being.²¹ This is the framework of the Reformed and Protestant

Sapientia propositiones suas aliunde non mutuatur / Sapientia est transcendens: reliquae descendentes. 3. Primitate demum Adtributionis: qua explicat adtributa (principia & adfectiones) omnibus Entibus specialioribus vel unite, vel disjuncte competentia. Aut si mavis hoc. / Sapientia prima est omnium. Si non ordine Temporis & Acquisitionis: attamen ordine Naturae: distinctae cognitionis: & dignitatis.” An analogous distinction of primitates can be found some years before in Giovanni Crisostomo Javelli, *Quaestiones super duodecim Metaphysices Aristotelis libros ad mentem Aristotelis et s. Thomae*, question 1, in *Totius rationalis, naturalis, divinae ac moralis philosophiae compendium* (Lyon: Haeredes Iacobi Iunctae, 1568), tomus 1, 709b; Kornelius Martini, *Metaphysica commentatio* (Strassbourg: Carolus, 1605), 10–11; Johannes Combach, *Metaphysicorum liber singularis* (Marburg: Hutwelcker, 1613), chapter 1, theorema 1, nn. 24–25, 5.

21. M<agister>. Liborius Capsius Metaph.<ysicae> Ac Log.<icae> P<rofessor> P.<ublicus>, *Rerum transcendentium stud.<ium>* S.P.D. (Erfurt: Hertz, 1635), fol. 1v. (s.n.): “V. Partitiva demum facta Metaphysicae Anatome in *Syncreticam* & *Diacriticam* parti Proemiali colophonem imponebat. Inde sese accingebat Pars Syncretica ad ipsam Objecti Metaphysici ἐξερῆσθαι γενεσιον. Haec *indeterminata* & *determinata*. Illa Ens spectabat in *Ontologia Abstractiori* secundum Conceptum Formalissimum, praecisum ab omni principio, modoque limitante. Haec idem Ens contemplabatur in Ordine ad Principia & Passiones seu Attributa. De Principiis actum διεξοδικῶς in *Archeologia Entitativa*, ubi Principia Entis *partim* abstractissimi & denudati ab omni determinatori Essendi ratione, *partim* ad determinatum Essendi modum limitati, exculpissimus. *Prioris* quidem principia divisa dedimus in *Essentificum* (quod & rei Essentiam & Illationem ponit) & *Scientificum* (quod confert cognitionem,

Schulmetaphysik that Capsius chooses as his own basic model at the University of Erfurt, in the line that will lead, a century later with Christian Wolff and Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten, to distinguishing a *metaphysica generalis* from a *metaphysica specialis*, i.e., ontology from rational theology, rational cosmology, and rational psychology, until reaching the criticism of Kant. It is a model built on the distinctions of the sciences according to the logical intentions of genus and species (i.e., the *secundae intentiones* of the Latin scholastic tradition) by which ontology is clearly divided, as a general science, from theology and the other special sciences of cosmology, psychology, etc.

It cannot be logically admitted that a species could cause a genus, because the genus is a more extended concept than the species and includes it in itself. Thinking of the infinite being as a species of being in general, God loses, therefore, any power of causation on the subject and the realm of ontology. As a special being, God could only be the cause of other special beings, for example of the other created beings. This model builds metaphysics more on logic than on physics or theology. A metaphysics founded on physics and linked to theology puts in the first place the role of causal nexus. According to Thomas Aquinas, “for each effect that he knows, man naturally desires to know the cause. Now, the human intellect knows universal being. So, he naturally desires to know its cause, which is God alone.”²²

God is therefore the cause of the subject of metaphysics (being). On the contrary, according to the model founded on logic, defended by the *Schulmetaphysik* and Capsius, the causal nexus loses its value in relationship with the distinction of intentions and of logical realms. According to Capsius, as God is thinkable only without a cause of himself, even being (subject-matter

non Essentiam.) Misso hoc, illud non erat causa proprie ita dicta, ordinata ad Effectum re diversum, sed *Virtualis* seu *Ratio Antecedens & Inferens*: juxta quam ratione *dependentiae cognoscitivae* inferitur Conceptus posterior, a priori quodam modo originem ducens, etiamsi secundum rem idem sint. Et haec sumebatur *vel E ratione Entis*: quatenus hoc concipitur ut in signo seu momento primo: Passiones vero in signo seu momento secundo: Momentum vero primum est quodammodo Ratio secundi: sicuti Essentia est Ratio Entis. Ens Ratio unius: &c. *vel E ratione Passionis ad Passionem*: Inter has enim etiam Una est prior, altera posterior. Illa vero hujus ratio est. Veluti Ens, ut sit Bonum, supponit Veritatem; & Immaterialitas est Ratio Incorruptibilitatis.”

22. Thomas de Aquino, *Summa contra Gentiles*, chapter 25, book 3, 12: “Cuiuslibet effectus cogniti naturaliter homo scire causam desiderat. Intellectus autem humanus cognoscit ens universale. Desiderat igitur naturaliter cognoscere causam eius, quae solum Deus est [...]”

of ontology) “exists necessarily without cause,” because “being includes in itself the concept of God.”²³

Within the scholastic division of metaphysics into *metaphysica indeterminata* (ontology) and *metaphysica determinata* (theology), Capsius also introduces eclectic elements, originating from Renaissance and non-scholastic philosophy: for example, the doctrine of the three primalities (power, knowledge, and love) by Tommaso Campanella.

In Capsius’s work, the three primalities describe the first attributes of the most important being studied in *metaphysica determinata*, i.e., the infinite being (God).²⁴ This is the first case of a direct and explicit reception of Campanella’s metaphysics in the German Reformed scholasticism. Until now it was only possible to speak about an *implicit Rezeption* (“implicit reception”) of Campanella through the studies of Martin Mulsow.²⁵

We should remember that Article I of the Lutheran Augsburg Confession (1530) articulates the doctrine of the Christian Trinity in terms of the trinity of attributes of power, wisdom, and love. This usage came via the Greek fathers and John of Damascus. Reading Campanella, the Lutheran Capsius was probably happy to find a philosophical doctrine so close to the Trinitarian theology of the Augsburg Confession. According to Capsius, the three primalities—as the texts will show below—are “the dogma of the great Campanella.” It is a

23. Capsius, *Sapientia, vulgo metaphysica idealis*, 71. “Ens in quantum Ens complectitur Deum. / Atqui Deus est sine principio & causa. / E<tiam> & Ens sine causis esse necesse est.”

24. Capsius, *Rerum transcendentium stud.*, fol. 2r: “Ens *posteriori modo* spectatum erat vel *Infinitum*, quod negative a se ipso & propter seipsum: Vel *finitum*, cujus principium *ad extra* erat *effectivum*, Deus A omnium, & *Finale*, (assimilationis quidem, non indigentiae) Idem Deus Ω omnium, *Ad Intra* erat *Essentia*: Omnis Entis finiti quasi *Prima & Generalissima Forma*. Dum haec Principiis ita agerentur, attingimus *Magni Campanellae Dogma de tribus Primalitatibus, Potentia, Sapientia, Amore*: quibus, tanquam *Character* divino, *Entia* creata *Transcendentali* sua compositione, cum nihil admistione, constare; Quarumque *objecta* sint *Essentia, Veritas, Bonitas*, super has vero seminetur & influant *Necessitas, Fatum & Harmonia*, alicubi asseverat; *Creaturarumque Naturam* in tali compositione derivari *ex primo, summo ac solo uno Ente*: quod ideas suas inexhaustibiles varijs modis, per durationem rerum, quae est *tempus, imago semper idem permanentis aeternitatum*, transportari faciat: In quo adeo ineffabili modo *Primalitates* illae longa infinities altiori & incomprehensibili *Essentiali simplicitate* perfectioneque sine ulla nihilitatis mixtura, tanquam in fonte concurrant: & unum sint, ratione tantum distinctae.”

25. Martin Mulsow, “‘Sociabilitas.’ Zu einem Kontext der Campanella-Rezeption im 17. Jahrhundert,” *Bruniana & Campanelliana* 1–2 (1995): 205–32, esp. 206–07.

philosophical dogma and not a religious one.²⁶ However, the soil is prepared for a wider reception of the Italian Renaissance philosopher.²⁷

To Capsius, the doctrine of primalities was useful to emphasize the theme of the power of God: a central theme in many works of Campanella.²⁸ But the study on the *potentia Dei* could take place, according to Capsius, only within the realm of the *metaphysica determinata*, or within the *metaphysica specialis*, not in ontology which, on the contrary, deals with a logical realm independent of theology and the causation of God. Some Neoplatonic traces—found in the metaphysics of Capsius—are incapable of modifying his ontological model: for example, when he affirms “being is the most common, first and immediate effect of God” (*Communissimus, primus, & immediatus Dei effectus est Esse*), drawing upon a passage of the *Liber de causis* (IV, 37) and, more recently, of the *Isagoge in primam philosophiam* (1598) by Rudolph Göckel.²⁹ According

26. It should be noted that, despite preference accorded by Capsius to Campanella from a philosophical point of view, the Italian philosopher often wrote against Lutheranism, and even more against Calvinism. In this regard, see Campanella's *Dialogo politico contro Luterani, Calvinisti e altri eretici* (1595). Further references can be found in Michele Vittori, “Il protestantesimo drammatizzato. Il *Dialogo politico contro Luterani, Calvinisti e altri eretici* di Tommaso Campanella,” *Gregorianum* 92.1 (2011): 57–66 and Paolo Broggio, “Spagna,” *Enciclopedia Bruniana & Campanelliana*, vol. 3, ed. Eugenio Canone and Germana Ernst, in print.

27. We also know for sure that some years before Capsius, the Lutheran Jakob Martini (1570–1649), teacher of metaphysics at the Protestant University of Wittenberg, carried out a significant reception of Neoplatonic tradition up to Italian Renaissance humanism, with authors like Marsilio Ficino and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. Martini showed this wide reception of authors and texts in his metaphysics, published in 1608, which was built on a clear Aristotelian scholastic standard. Unlike Capsius, Martini disregarded the metaphysics of his contemporary Tommaso Campanella. See Jakob Martini, *Exercitationum metaphysicarum libri duo* (Wittenberg: Shurer, 1608), book 1, exercitatio 3, theorema 2, particularly 65–69.

28. In this regard, see Massimo Luigi Bianchi, *La potenza di Dio in Campanella*, in *Potentia Dei. L'onnipotenza divina nel pensiero dei secoli XVI–XVII*, ed. Guido Canziani et al. (Milano: Franco Angeli, 2000), 135–54.

29. Rudolph Göckel, *Praefatio*, in *Isagoge in primam philosophiam quae dicit consueti metaphysica* (Frankfurt a.M.: Palthenius, 1598), § 29, 10 (s.n.): “Porro si placet sequi Platonicos, qui Deum supra Ens esse dicunt, seu non esse ens, sed τὸ ἄλλο, & principium entis, (sicut unitas principium numeri est, non numerus, punctum principium magnitudinis, non magnitudo) ita tibi informanda fuerit prima Philosophia. / Prima Philosophia est scientia Entis universe sumti. In hac considerantur Principia, πάθη & quasi species. Principium Entis est Deus, (ut recte dicatur: Communissimus primus & immediatus

to Capsius, this causation by God can only happen in the field of special metaphysics and not in the general part of the science.

Capsius shares a similar model of conceding disputations on ontology to his students in Erfurt, as the case of the dispute entitled *De ontologia generali* (1639) demonstrates, discussed by Johann Christoph Segers in his presence. “Being” in general, as the subject of ontology, is an effect not of causation but of an abstraction that obtains a logical intention. According to Segers, metaphysics should be divided into a *metaphysica communis* and a *metaphysica propria*,³⁰ corresponding to the *metaphysica indeterminata* and the *metaphysica determinata* proposed by Capsius. The *metaphysica communis* or *indeterminata* deals with “the most abstract level of being” (*de Entis ratione praecisissima*). The concept of being constitutes the ground for all further transcendental concepts³¹ and the origin of all concepts of our mind.³² Being is therefore the first concept that can be known (*primum cognitum*) by the human intellect.³³

To obtain the concept of being as such, an abstraction from matter is necessary. Following Capsius, his student Segers denominates the abstraction of being *abstractio secundum indifferentiam* (abstraction for indifference),³⁴ because being can be abstracted from any kind of matter, both corporeal and intelligible. There is, however, just one limit to which the undetermined and

effectus Dei est Esse) αὐτὸ ἀγαθὸν, quod ab alio non habet rationem bonitatis, sed alia propter ipsum dicuntur bona. Sequuntur nunc communissima πάθη καὶ ὡς εἶδε Entis, &c.”

30. Johann Christoph Segers, *De ontologia generali, quod Praeside M. Liborio Capsio P.P., III. Nonarum Augusti. In Auditorio Philosophico, Horis a 6. Matutinis* (Erfurt: Martin Spangenberg, 1639), fol. A2r.

31. Segers, fol. A2v: “Ens est Basis & Fundamentum omnium Reliquorum Transcendentium.”

32. Segers, fol. A2v: “Ens est *Transcendens summum*: Trans omne Ens: & omne Ens transiens. II. Est Primus & Simplicissimus conceptus in quem caetera omnia resolvuntur: Primus in Descendendo: Ultimus in Redescendendo. III Est Apex, Meta & Terminus conceptuum nostrorum.”

33. Segers, fol. A2v: “Ens est primo cognitum cognitione confusa, originali, actuali. (...) Ens est, *quicquid quovis modo per definitionem explicatur*. II. Est primum impressum, quod ceu primum scibile primo ab intellectu apprehenditur: III Est, quod menti praesens intellectum primo movet, & ultimo terminat. IV Est, quod tamquam notissimum ab intellectu omnium primo concipitur & ore profertur.”

34. Segers, fol. A3r: “Est autem is non nisi *Actus praecise Entitativus, secundum indifferentiam ab omni materia realiter Abstractus*. Vel: Natura Entis in praecisa sua quidditate spectata juxta attributa essentialia, quae ei de se conveniunt, praecclusis omnino extrinsecis & heterogeneis formalitatibus.”

abstract concept of being must be subordinated, and it is that of not extending its quiddity to the world of the chimeras and the contradictory being.³⁵

For these reasons, we discover that it is only being that has a real essence (i.e., the essence that has an aptitude to exist independently from the act of a human intellect) to merit the title of subject-matter of ontology, especially of the *ontologia directa*. Segers distinguishes between *ontologia directa* and *ontologia indirecta*, where the latter deals with non-beings: the chimeras (for example, “Cerberus”), the contradictory being (for example, the concepts of “created God” and “Virgin harlot”), and the privations (for example, the concepts of “blindness,” “deafness,” and “ignorance”).³⁶

However, long after Luther's interdict, Capsius and his students were still forced to defend, in Erfurt, the epistemological prerogatives of metaphysics and its fundamental place in the encyclopaedia of knowledge.³⁷

Keeping their distance from the Calvinists Göckel and Timpler, some students of Capsius demonstrated the intention to limit the extension of being within the field of *essentia realis* (real essence) and the *aptitudo ad existendum* (aptitude to exist), without giving concessions to the “world” of purely intelligible objects. To do this, in line with the greater part of the Lutheran *Schulmetaphysik*, they promoted a return to the positions of the Jesuit Francisco Suárez regarding the subject of metaphysics, expressed in his *Disputationes metaphysicae* (1597).³⁸ Through Suárez, they wanted to preserve metaphysics

35. Segers, fol. A2v: “Ens est, cui convenit Essentia una realis, aptaque ad realiter existendum. Vel Quod habet Essentiam vel actualem, vel realiter producibilem aut productam. Vel: Quod potest esse independenter a Ratione. (...) Ens est, quod non habet Essentiam plane confictam & Chimaericam. Ens est, quod de se nullam involvit repugnantiam ad esse: neque est mere confictum per intellectum.” On an analogous definition, see Francisco Suárez, *Disputationes metaphysicae* (repr. Olms: Hildesheim, 1998), disp. 2, s. 4, n. 5 and disp. 2, s. 5, n. 16.

36. Segers, fol. A4r: “Superest pro hoc nostro instituto Ontologia indirecta, quae est de Entis opposito, Non-ente. [...] Proprie est Negativum (Metaphysicum) v.g. Cerberus: Deus creatus: virgo meretrix: vel privativum: Idque Physicum: vel Ethicum: illuc Morbus, Coecitas, surditas, &c. huc, Ignorantia, & vitia Moralis spectant.”

37. Georg Christophorus, *Breviari Metaphysici Publicis hactenus disputationibus [...]. Quod Praeside M. Liborio Capsio P.P. XVI Calend. Julii. In Auditorio Philosophico. Horis a 6. matutinis* (Erfurt: Martin Spangenberg, 1638), fol. B2r: “Veritas, qua de hic, est Veritas obiecti: secundum quam Metaphysica vere talis est, qualis esse dicitur aut creditur: Vera scilicet ac Realis disciplina in Encyclopaedia Philosophica.”

38. With regard to real being (*ens reale*) as a subject matter of metaphysics within Lutheran scholasticism, see Henning Arnisaesus, *De constitutione et partibus metaphysicae, Tractatus* (Frankfurt an der Oder:

in its fundamental dimension of real science (*scientia realis*), contrasting the intention to make it a science of pure intelligibility. At the same time, together with the Calvinists, Capsius and his “school” wanted to convince the Lutherans to begin studying ontology. After the resistance to metaphysics, the Lutheran Capsius also tried to remove Lutheran resistance to ontology.

3. A “special” special metaphysics

The *Rerum transcendentium stud.<i>ium*>

 informs us of the principal arguments held in Capsius’s lectures regarding metaphysics. From this we know that the program of the first courses of metaphysics in Erfurt implied the exposition and the explanation of the single parts of Capsius’s *Sapientia, vulgo metaphysica idealis*. Some of these parts—as we have seen—often became the object of the magisterial disputations discussed by Capsius’s students.

However, after dealing with the abstract being—the subject-matter of ontology—and having described the different principles and properties of being in general within his *Archeologia entitativa*³⁹ and *Pathographia entitativa*,

Thimius, 1606), chapter 8, fols. G1v and G3r; Jakob Martini, book 1, exercitatio 2, theorema 4, 36–40; Christoph Scheibler, *Opus metaphysicum* (Giessen: Hampel, 1617), tomus 1, book 1, chapter 1, art. 5, nn. 107–08, 40. For further reference to early Lutheran scholasticism and authors (not Capsius), see Karl Eschweiler, “Die Philosophie der spanischen Spätscholastik auf den deutschen Universitäten des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts,” in *Spanische Forschungen der Görres-Gesellschaft I* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1928), 251–325; Ernst Lewalter, *Spanisch-jesuitische und deutsch-lutherische Metaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Hamburg: 1935; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967), 63–69; Max Wundt, *Die deutsche Schulmetaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1939); Piero Di Vona, *Studi sulla Scolastica della Controriforma. L’esistenza e la sua distinzione metafisica dall’essenza* (Firenze: La Nuova Italia, 1968); Walter Sparr, *Wiederkehr der Metaphysik: die ontologische Frage in der lutherischen Theologie des frühen 17. Jahrhunderts* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1976); Ulrich G. Leinsle, *Das Ding und die Methode. Methodische Konstitution und Gegenstand der frühen protestantischen Metaphysik* (Augsburg: Maro Verlag, 1985).

39. Capsius, *Rerum transcendentium stud.*, fol. 2r: “Haec [sc. *Metaphysica*] indeterminata & determinata. Illa Ens spectabat in *Ontologia Abstractiori* secundum Conceptum Formalissimum, praecisum ab omni principio, modoque limitante. Haec idem Ens contemplabatur in *Ordine ad Principia & Passiones* seu *Attributa*. De Principiis actum διεξοδικῶς in *Archeologia Entitativa*, ubi *Principia Entis partim* abstractissimi & denudati ab omni determinatori *Essendi* ratione, *partim* ad determinatum *Essendi* modum limitati, exsculpissimus. *Prioris* quidem *principia* divisa dedimus in *Essentificum* (quod & rei *Essentiam* & *Illationem* ponit) & *Scientificum* (quod confert cognitionem, non *Essentiam*.) *Misso* hoc, illud non erat causa proprie ita dicta, ordinata ad *Effectum* re diversum, sed *Virtualis* seu *Ratio*

Capsius turned his attention to considering *ens* according to its subsequent determination (*Ens posteriori modo spectatum*).

We find ourselves facing the pair *ens infinitum/ens finitum*, which marks the passage from the *metaphysica indeterminata* to the *metaphysica determinata*,⁴⁰ i.e., from ontology to special metaphysics. In the definition given by Capsius, *metaphysica determinata* is the science that deals with being according to its principles and properties (*passiones*) or attributes,⁴¹ while infinity is defined as the primary attribute of being, according to which being is formally named “infinite.”⁴²

Even if Capsius wanted to follow the many-centuried tradition, both philosophical and theological, which considers the infinite as negation of finite (non-finite), he affirms that “negations don't always indicate imperfections, but often they remove them.”⁴³ This is the case of the infinite that is intended as God-Spirit, on which all depends and in which everything finds its cause and its reason. For this, Capsius shares the scholastic definitions that explain the concept of infinite like *extra genus* and *supra terminos*, distinguishing “infinite of the perfection,” which survives in actuality, from the “potential infinite,” usually attributed to matter. The latter is, in a proper sense, the determination of the infinite as non-entity, characterized by the imperfection and lack of form, or as the infinite of quantity, with which the size of bodies can be measured.⁴⁴

Antecedens & Inferens: juxta quam ratione dependentiae cognoscitivae infertur Conceptus posterior, a priori quodam modo originem ducens, etiamsi secundum rem idem sint. Et haec sumebatur vel E ratione Entis: quatenus hoc concipitur ut in signo seu momento primo: Passiones vero in signo seu momento secundo: Momentum vero primum est quodammodo Ratio secundi: sicuti Essentia est Ratio Entis. Ens Ratio unius: &c. vel E ratione Passionis ad Passionem: Inter has enim etiam Una est prior, altera posterior. Illa vero hujus ratio est. Veluti Ens, ut sit Bonum, supponit Veritatem; & Immaterialitas est Ratio Incorruptibilitatis.”

40. Capsius, *Rerum transcendentium stud.*, fol. 2r.

41. Capsius, *Sapientia*, 198: “Ens contemplabatur in Ordine ad Principia & Passiones seu Attributa.”

42. Capsius, *Sapientia*, 198: “Infinitas est attributum Entis primum, quo Ens formaliter est ac dicitur Infinitum.”

43. Capsius, *Sapientia*, 199: “Negationes non semper important imperfectiones, sed saepius remouent.”

44. Capsius, *Sapientia*, 199: “*Infinitum est, cujus perfectio Terminis nullis continetur Hujusmodi est Spiritus, a quo dependenter omnia: & in quo Eminenter omnia. Scholasticis dicitur Infinitum extra genus. Infinitum supra terminos. Infinitum actu. Infinitum perfectionis, ad differentiam credo Infiniti potentia, quod tale est. / I Secundum non-Entitatem. II. Secundum imperfectionem & indifferentiam ad formarum receptionem. / III. Secundum quantitatem: ubi infinitum vel Magnitudine & divisione.”*

Capsius displays his awareness of the scholastic debate on the infinity of God. If, in fact, Thomas Aquinas demonstrated the infinity of God not exceeding the realm of the *an sit* question,⁴⁵ modern scholasticism aimed, through the infinity, at the *quid sit* question, as well the divine essence in itself.⁴⁶

From his own point of view, Capsius shared the rationalistic tendencies of the modern debate, but distanced himself from those, such as the Dutch Gilbert Jack (Jacchaeus), who affirmed in God the infinity of perfection, not that of extension.⁴⁷ According to Capsius, the essence of God involves unlimited perfection together with extensive infinity.⁴⁸

After dealing with the infinity of perfection, Capsius moves on to the infinity of the power of God, that is, His omnipotence.⁴⁹ Capsius takes interest in Campanella's metaphysics particularly in this regard. The doctrine of primalities, in fact, turns out to be particularly useful to highlight the topic of the power of God, which plays a central role in Campanella's works. According to the scholastic model proposed by Capsius, however, divine power, as well as divine causality, takes place only in the field of the determined and special metaphysics, and not in that of undetermined and general metaphysics.

In the course of his lectures on metaphysics, Capsius thus brought integration to the themes already exposed in his *Sapientia, vulgo metaphysica idealis* with the "dogma of the great Campanella," that is, the "dogma" of the three primalities.

45. Thomas de Aquino, *Summa theologiae*, part. I, q. 7. art. 1: "Illud autem quod est maxime formale omnium, est ipsum esse, ut ex superioribus patet. Cum igitur esse divinum non sit esse receptum in aliquo, sed ipse sit suum esse subsistens, ut supra ostensum est; manifestum est quod ipse Deus sit infinitus et perfectus."

46. In this regard, see Igor Agostini, *L'infinità di Dio. Il dibattito da Suárez a Caterus (1597–1641)* (Rome: Editori Riuniti, 2008), 104–05.

47. Gilbert Jack, *Primae philosophiae sive institutionum metaphysicarum libri sex* (1616) (Leiden: Elseviros, 1640), chapter 4, book 4, 188: "Infinitas ista non est concipienda [...] per modum extensionis, quasi Deus esset in infinitum extensus in quantitate. Verum est infinitas perfectionis omnino indivisibilis: non praecisa aut limitata ad unum genus perfectionis, quemadmodum creaturae, sed modo eminentissimo continens quidquid est virtutis in creatura: adeo quidem, ut haec infinitas reciprocetur cum perfectione."

48. Capsius, *Sapientia*, 200.

49. Capsius, *Sapientia*, 203: "Primum movens est infinitae potentiae. / Potentia Dei infinita est, adeoque omnipotentia."

In *its second way*, being was considered either *Infinite* (that is, negatively coming from oneself or because of oneself) or *Finite*, whose external principle (*ad extra*) was an *effective* principle (God as the Alpha of everything), and *final* principle (i.e., of assimilation, not destitution), where the same God is the Omega of everything. While its (of being) external principle was the essence, the quasi first and most general finite, form of every being. In the eventuality that we handled these things in this way through the principles, we refer to the *Dogma of the three primalities, Power, Knowledge, Love*, of the *great Campanella*: which consists of a divine character, that hasn't any contact with "the Nothing"; despite the composition of the created transcendental beings.

Their (of the primalities) objects are *Essence, Truth, and Goodness*, which, in reality, propagate and influence *Necessity, Fate, and Harmony*. It is affirmed in some place that the nature of the creatures in a similar composition is derived from the *first, highest, and sole Being*, which makes it such that its inexhaustible ideas are communicable according to various modes, through the length of things that is *the time, like the image of the everlasting permanence of Eternity*. Insofar as in some ineffable way, those Primalities, by far infinite, coincide, as if to say, in principle with the highest and incomprehensible simplicity and perfection, with any admixture with "the Nothing" and form a sole one with the simplicity and perfection, being distinct from the latter only according to reason.⁵⁰

50. Capsius, *Rerum transcendentium stud.*, fol. 2r (my translation): "Ens *posteriori modo* spectatum erat vel *Infinitem*, quod negative a se ipso & propter seipsum: Vel *finitum*, cuius principium *ad extra* erat *effectivum*, Deus A omnium, & *Finale*, (assimilationis quidem, non indigentiae) Idem Deus Ω omnium, *Ad Intra* erat *Essentia*: Omnis Entis finiti quasi *Prima & Generalissima Forma*. Dum haec Principiis ita agerentur, attingimus *Magni Campanellae Dogma de tribus Primalitatibus, Potentia, Sapientia, Amore*: quibus, tanquam *Characterem divino*, Entia creata *Transcendentali sua compositione*, cum nihil admistione, constare; Quarumque *objecta* sint *Essentia, Veritas, Bonitas*, super has vero seminetur & influant *Necessitas, Fatum & Harmonia*, alicubi asseverat; Creaturarumque *Naturam* in tali compositione derivari *ex primo, summo ac solo uno Ente*: quod ideas suas inexhaustibiles varijs modis, per durationem rerum, quae est *tempus, imago semper idem permanentis aeternitatum*, transportari faciat: In quo adeo ineffabili modo *Primalitates illae* longe infinities altiori & incomprehensibili *Essentiali simplicitate* perfectioneque sine ulla nihililitatis mixtura, tanquam in fonte concurrant: & unum sint, ratione tantum distinctae."

According to Capsius, after the undetermined part, i.e., in the proper sense of ontology, metaphysics deals with principles and properties (*passiones*), or, the attributes of being; this is actually the determined part of metaphysical science. It is therefore a determined science, because it does not deal with the abstract and undetermined being but with the first determinations of being. Among these there are, in the first place, the goodness, which according to Capsius is founded on truth, and immateriality which is founded on incorruptibility. In the second place there are the determinations of being as infinite and finite.

From the italics present in the above quoted text, we are able to affirm that Capsius had drawn upon the doctrine of primalities from the reading of the *Praefatio ad philosophos Germaniae* written by Tobias Adami and included in the *Prodromus philosophiae instaurandae* (1617) by Campanella.⁵¹ In the *Rerum transcendentium stud.<i>ium*> there is, in fact, reference to the three instruments of divine providence, according to Campanella: necessity, fate, and harmony. In addition to this, we also find the definition of time in God as “the image of

51. Tobias Adami, *Praefatio ad philosophos Germaniae*, fols. B4v–C1v, in Tommaso Campanella, *Prodromus philosophiae instaurandae* (Frankfurt a.M.: Tampach, 1617): “De *Metaphysica* autem, cuius superius memini, ut paullo pleniorem dem gustum, tribus illa partibus et XIII libris constat. Ubi monstratur, quam paucum hoc sit & exiguum, quod ab hominibus sciatur de rebus, idque omne mancum & ex parte, & non uti res ipsae sunt in sese, sed prout capi a nobis possunt. Ponuntur novi & faciliores philosophandi modi non secundum opinionem, sed ex testimoniis scientium & natura sensata. / Considerantur Res creatae tanquam ex *Ente* & *Nihilo* compositae, & Ens transcendentali sua compositione ex tribus Primalitatibus tanquam Characterem divino constare docetur, *Patientia*, *Sapientia* & *Amore*; uti *Nihilum* ex *Impotentia*, *Ignorantia* et *Odio*. / Quia omnis res est, quia potest, scit, & amat esse hoc quod est, & perdendo hoc posse esse, aut scire, & velle esse, subito etiam ipsum suum esse perdit, & perit ob nihilitatem illam annexam, (non enim erat omne vel totum Ens), & in aliam essentiam transit ad transmutationem rerum & generationem. Ex *Primo* itaque ac *Summo* & *Solo vero Ente* (in quo ineffabili modo Primalitates illae longe infinitas altiori & incomprehensibili Essentiali simplicitate & perfectione sine ulla Nihilitatis admistione, tanquam in fonte concurrunt, & unum sunt, ratione tamen distinctae) quod omnes res ex *Nihilo* produxit, Creaturarum natura in tali compositione derivatur; quarum Primalitatum objecta sunt *Essentia*, *Veritas*, *Bonitas*, supra quae seminantur et influunt *Necessitas*, *Fatum*, & *Harmonia*. / Hoc modo *Primum* & *unum Ens Ideas* suas inexhaustibiles variis modis per durationem rerum (quae est tempus, imago semper idem permanentis Aeternitatis) transportari facit cum instrumentis suis (caussis Agentibus, *Calore* & *Frigore*), in molem corpoream (Materiam) sustentatam in *Spacio* (loco) basi huius Mundi, quod in Deo suam habet firmitudinem vel stabilitatem.”

the everlasting permanence of Eternity.”⁵² That is another literal quotation of Campanella.

At the same time as in the *Praefatio ad philosophos Germaniae*, Capsius quotes *veritas*, *bonitas* and *essentia* as the three objects originated from an active presence of the three primalities in the world, despite Campanella in his *Philosophia realis epilogistica*, in which he enumerates *veritas*, *bonitas* and *existentia*,⁵³ not *essentia*.

In conclusion, we are now able to show an explicit—as well as implicit—reception⁵⁴ of some metaphysical themes of Campanella's philosophy, particularly about the doctrine of the primalities. This reception happened in Erfurt within the context of the new tradition of the Protestant *Schulmetaphysik*. Though still considered young, the scholastic tradition brought about by Capsius was in reality already mature enough to be capable of integrating elements belonging to other philosophical traditions, even non-scholastic ones. It therefore left behind the antagonisms of the past between Renaissance philosophy and scholastic philosophy.

M.<agister> Liborius Capsius Metaph.<ysicae> Ac Log.<icae> P<rofessor> P.<ublicus>, *Rerum Transcendentium Stud.<ium> S.P.D., Aere ac Praelo Hertzianis, Jerefordiae (1635), fols. 1v–2r (sine numero) [Signature UB Erfurt: LA. 4° 00261 (18)]*

V. *Partitiva* demum facta Metaphysicae Anatome in *Syncriticam* & *Diacriticam* parti Proemiali colophonem imponebat. Inde sese accingebat Pars Syncritica ad ipsam Objecti Metaphysici ἐξεργασίαν generaliore. Haec *indeterminata* & *determinata*. Illa Ens spectabat in *Ontologiâ Abstractiori* secundum Conceptum Formalissimum, praecisum ab omni principio, modoque limitante. Haec idem Ens contemplabatur in Ordine ad Principia & Passiones seu Attributa. De Principiis actum διεξοδικῶς in *Archeologia Entitativâ*, ubi Principia Entis *partim* abstractissimi & denudati ab omni determinatori Essendi ratione,

52. Tommaso Campanella, *Compendium de rerum natura*, ed. and trans. (Italian) Germana Ernst and Paolo Ponzio (Santarcangelo di Romagna: Rusconi, 1999), ch. 4, p. 40: “Aeternitas est permanentia, seu duratio rei non mutabilis nec in substantia nec in operationibus, ut Deus.”

53. Campanella, *Realis philosophiae epilogisticae Partes Quatuor* (Frankfurt a.M.: Tampach, 1623), chapter 1, part 1 (*Physiologia*), article 1, 3–4.

54. Mulsow, 206–07.

partim ad determinatum Essendi modum limitati, exculpissimus. *Prioris* quidem principia divisa dedimus in *Essentificum* (quod & rei Essentiam & Illationem ponit) & *Scientificum* (quod confert cognitionem, non Essentiam.) Misso hoc, illud non erat causa propriè ita dicta, ordinata ad Effectum re diversum, sed *Virtualis* seu *Ratio Antecedens* & *Inferens*: juxta quam ratione *dependentiae cognoscitivae* infertur Conceptus posterior, à priori quodam modo originem ducens, etiamsi secundum rem idem sint. Et haec sumebatur *vel E ratione Entis*: quatenus hoc concipitur ut in signo seu momento primo: Passiones vero in signo seu momento secundo: Momentum vero primum est quodammodo Ratio secundi: sicuti Essentia est Ratio Entis. Ens Ratio unius: &c. *vel E ratione Passionis ad Passionem*: Inter has enim etiam Una est prior, altera posterior. Illa vero hujus ratio est. Veluti Ens, ut sit Bonum, supponit Veritatem; & Immaterialitas est Ratio Incorrumpibilitatis.

Ens *posteriori modo* spectatum erat vel *Infinitum*, quod negativè à se ipso & propter seipsum: Vel *finitum*, cujus principium *ad extra* erat *effectivum*, Deus A omnium, & *Finale*, (assimilationis quidem, non indigentiae) Idem Deus Ω omnium, *Ad Intra* erat Essentia: Omnis Entis finiti quasi Prima & Generalissima Forma. Dum haec Principiis ita agerentur, attingimus *Magni Campanellae Dogma de tribus Primalitatibus, Potentiâ, Sapientiâ, Amore*: quibus, tanquam Characterè divino, Entia creata Transcendentali suâ compositione, cum nihil admistione, constare; Quarumque *objecta* sint *Essentia, Veritas, Bonitas*, super has vero seminetur & influant *Necessitas, Fatum & Harmonia*, alicubi asseverat; Creaturarumque Naturam in tali compositione derivari *ex primo, summo ac solo uno Ente*: quod ideas suas inexhaustibiles varijs modis, per durationem rerum, quae est *tempus, imago semper idem permanentis aeternitatum*, transportari faciat: In quo adeo ineffabili modo Primalitates illae longè infinites altiori & incomprehensibili Essentiali simplicitate perfectioneque sine ullâ nihilitalis mixturâ, tanquam in fonte concurrant: & unum sint, ratione tantum distinctae. Quae singula quomodo & quousque cum Veterum placitis conveniant nec ne, coram monstratum. A principiis, quorum in Theoriâ proximè substitimus, proxima ad Passiones Unitas & Disjunctas nunc patet via; & hinc demum ad summa Entis genera: seu modos Ens per conceptus expressiores contrahentes. De illis *Pathographia Autoris*: De his *Eidographia Entitativa* in posterum (finitis scilicet ferijs Canicularibus & Nundinalibus) providebunt. Cujus, quicquid hoc omne sit, proximus dies Lunae hora 7. matutina, aspirante Coeli pacatioris aurâ, initium faciet. Id quod maturè praescisse oportebat eos, qui meminerint,

nos hactenus Praecepta scientiarum *Succincta* ac *Methodica perfectione* & *perspicuitate*, inprimis *usu* mentiri consuevisse *multifario*: Inposterum etiam: cum Aristotelicâ Philosophandi ratione praefati *Campanellae* (*vir*, juxta Gaesarem Branchedaurium Taurinensem, in quo quid *ingenium possit humanum, naturae Daemon videtur experiri voluisse*) Philosophemata pro re nata comparaturos: Insuper promissionem de *Collegiis privatiis Praesidiisque publicis* utrinque gratuitis, uti hactenus cum alijs factitatum, adhuc ratam abituros; Quo nomine *ingenia Philosophica*, quae mediocriter ignea & acuta res sequuntur praeclaras, *Socratica* etiam, quae non habent Intellectum ligatum, ad *Palestrae* tàm *publicae* quam *privatae* edenda specimina jam *nonum* invitantur: *Mancipia* vero, *Narcissi*, & *Tenebriones* ἄνομοι per furtiva conventicula coalescentes procul exesse jebentur. Perscriptum X. Septemb. Anno *aerae* à Christo nato *Dionijsianae*. M.DC.XXXV.

