Scholars of medieval thought from the middle of the nineteenth century to the present have employed the term ‘scholasticism’ in various senses: some have extended the term to make it practically equivalent to ‘medieval philosophy’, counting Boethius of the sixth century the first of the scholastics and the fifteenth-century Nicholas of Cusa the last (Grabmann 1909–11); others have confined the term to the period of the High Middle Ages, allowing the twelfth-century Peter Abelard, or sometimes the late eleventh-century Anselm, to be the first of the scholastics and closing off the main scholastic period just prior to the Reformation, while acknowledging the continuation of scholastic thought in the Iberian peninsula in such figures as Francisco Suárez and Jean Poinsot of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Which of these approaches to adopt and favor is decisive in determining the subject matter at hand. The present essay, partly on historical and partly on terminological grounds, will side with the latter usage and approach; the course of scholastic thought is closely associated with the twelfth-century schools that eventually formed the burgeoning universities at Paris and Oxford, while the English ‘scholasticism’, despite its occasionally pejorative connotations, consistently points to the High Middle Ages as a period of thought that has distinctive features.

What are the features characteristic of the scholastic thinkers associated with the schools of the twelfth to the seventeenth centuries? Speaking in the most general terms, we can say that there are at least three overarching traits: (1) thinkers treasured rigorous argumentation and trusted logic and dialectics to uncover, through discussion and analysis, philosophical truth (the principle of reasoned argument or ratio); (2) they accepted, as a fundamental guide to developing their own ideas, the ancient insight (see Aristotle, Metaphysics, book A) that earlier philosophers whose thought and writings were remembered and preserved had so privileged a claim on one’s attention that to show the legitimacy of one’s own reflections involved constant reference to and dialogue with such predecessors (the principle of authority or auctoritas); and (3) by and large, thinkers during this period felt obliged to raise questions about the relationship of their theories to revealed truths and to coordinate the insights of philosophy with theological teaching (the principle of the harmony of faith and reason, or concordia).

True, some medieval thinkers during the centuries mentioned came close to suggesting the worthlessness of certain customary authorities – Peter Olivi, for example, displays at times a fairly dismissive attitude toward Aristotle and Averroes, as does Nicholas of Autrecourt in the fourteenth century – but, for the most part, the range of authoritative texts was uniformly accepted as worthy of intellectual attention, though the number of such
texts was subject to growth over time with the addition of new authors. Instead of rejecting authorities, philosophers of the Middle Ages tended to propose distinctions so as to allow a set of texts and their corresponding arguments to be judged correct in one respect, though wanting in other respects. Even Olivi, for example, spends considerable time arguing for certain interpretations of key passages in Aristotle to buttress his case for a given doctrinal point (Olivi 1924, In II Sent. q. 57 348). We must acknowledge, moreover, that some thinkers, chiefly those identified by historians as “Latin Averroists,” certainly appeared at times to modify, if not reject, the third principle since they thought it incumbent upon philosophers to state what they adjudged to be the consequences of their philosophical principles solely in terms of natural reason without any effort to alter their conclusions with reference to revealed teachings. Yet even here matters are not so clear; Siger of Brabant, for example, did take his faith quite seriously and would, speaking as a Christian intellectual and not as a philosopher, point out the tension between the philosophical view and the Church’s doctrine (Wippel 1998). The tendency to advance intellectually by first considering alternative viewpoints expressed in earlier literature and then surmounting them through proposing a synthetic perspective wherein the truths of the opposing views can be duly recognized is the quintessentially scholastic inclination and, to the extent that such a tendency is regularly put into practice, the scholastic method.

The institutional setting and environment of thinkers during this period determines in large part the focus of their intellectual attention as well as the precise form their works take. Scholasticism is nearly unintelligible apart from the institutions in which philosophy and theology were taught and the changing and novel influences to which thinkers during this time were subject, in the form of Latin translations becoming available of works originally composed in Greek and Arabic. Consequently, this essay will begin with a description of the institutional setting of the philosophy produced in the Middle Ages, outlining in broad strokes the passage from the schools of the twelfth century to the universities of the thirteenth as well as some of the features of the latter. Thereafter, it will turn to the new literature introduced by the translations, the changes in curriculum that the new literature required, and the academic exercises and forms of discourse developed to advance philosophical and theological thought.

Institutional setting

Origins of the universities

The origins of the universities in which so much of the teaching of philosophy occurred are to be found mainly in the cathedral and local schools of the towns where the first universities appeared: Bologna, Paris, and Oxford. At Bologna, the rise of the university is associated with the growth of a school of civil law and a school of canon law. Though theology and other faculties eventually appeared in Bologna, the university did not figure in any major way in the history of philosophy until the late thirteenth century (Verger 1973, pp. 36–41). Much more typical of most northern European universities in terms of structure and curriculum was the University of Paris.

Paris grew out of the cathedral school of the cathedral of Notre Dame, where Peter Abelard taught in the early twelfth century, the monastic school of St. Geneviève, where Abelard also briefly taught, and the school of St. Victor, which had as its successive masters
the illustrious teachers HUGH OF ST. VICTOR and RICHARD OF ST. VICTOR. The predominance of Paris is not, however, attributable simply to the series of distinguished philosophers and theologians, such as Abelard, the Victorines, and PETER LOMBARD who taught in its schools throughout the twelfth century – the school of Chartres had equally eminent scholars closely associated with it – but also to its urban location and its close connection with and value to the royal court. Hence it is no accident that the University of Paris is first recognized as a legal corporation and its rights acknowledged in a decree, dating to July 1200, of the French king, Philip Augustus. Since, however, Philip’s decree had the effect of defending the university scholars’ rights by subjecting them unreservedly to the strictures of canon law and its enforcement by the Bishop of Paris, the university as a corporation found it increasingly advantageous to appeal to the papacy to safeguard itself against arbitrary decisions on the part of the local hierarchy to refuse degrees to worthy members. As a result of these appeals to the papacy, the popes came to have a direct and, for the most part, cordial relationship with the University of Paris and the first statutes of the University of Paris were promulgated in 1215 by Robert Courson, a papal legate, as part of an effort to settle a dispute between the Bishop of Paris and the university corporation (Pedersen 1997, pp. 130–7, 158–72).

The situation at Oxford is slightly more complicated and certainly less well documented, but the pattern is in many ways similar to that found at Paris: a local group of schools enjoying a series of well-known teachers, though much less distinguished than the ones associated with Paris; a favorable location (in Oxford’s case, the town was a legal center); and, in addition, the historical accident of a conflict between the English crown and the Archbishop of Canterbury, which caused the king to order all scholars home from foreign territories, thereby temporarily increasing vastly the number of teachers and students in the town (McEvoy 1998; Pedersen, 1997, pp. 159–64; Southern 1984). As at Paris, conflicts between the university’s scholars and the townspeople resulted in strife – in this case students were hanged (suspendium clericorum) in retribution for an accidental death – and the university went on strike for five years (1209–15). When, however, the university was reconciled to the town, the latter yielded to it on all the key points and the university’s rights were enshrined in the statutes issued at the time of the settlement, 1215, by Robert Courson, the papal legate ordered to negotiate the restoration of the university.

Structure of the universities

The structure of medieval universities differed considerably from that found in modern universities, though certain similarities are nonetheless discernible. The northern European universities patterned after Paris are really teaching guilds or corporations, organizations of teachers designed to teach students academic subjects and to train the next generation of scholars. The control exercised by the teaching masters over the administrative arm of the universities shows the extent to which the guild mentality was predominant; academic administrators, such as deans and provosts, were severely limited in their terms of office and were expected to return to the faculty from which they originated after the service of their terms. Once the universities gained full autonomy and legally recognized status, they established internal regulations in conformity to the general statutes mentioned above, though they were also known to “reform” or alter those statutes when they deemed it conducive to the academic well-being of their communities, as happened in Paris in the faculty of arts in 1255. The modern reader must remember that many of the steps toward MA degrees and
the sequence of steps to be followed in obtaining a higher degree were modeled on the pattern of traditional education found in the case of a master craftsman and an apprentice. The graduate of a medieval university became, at graduation, a member of the faculty of masters under whom he had studied and was obliged to a period of postgraduate teaching exceeding a year as part of his postgraduate duties. A final point to note on this score is that the degree received at a university was not simply a record of academic achievement; it was also a license to teach both within one’s home university and elsewhere, the right of teaching anywhere (ius ubique docendi). Here we have the earmark of what made a medieval university education, as opposed to a school education, worthwhile, since only a university (a studium generale) could grant such a universal license (licentia); at the same time, we have in the licentia the sign of what is distinctively medieval about such an education, since the practice of the craft is what the graduate is now licensed to do.

Another striking feature of medieval universities is the extent to which they mandated sequences of courses and hierarchized their faculties in a much stricter manner than we typically find in modern universities. Though in a modern university a student must have acquired a baccalaureate prior to seeking and obtaining a master’s degree, what precise subject is studied and what books are read at the undergraduate level are not generally prescribed except as required by a particular department or unit within the university. In a medieval university, by contrast, every student had to take the MA prior to being accepted for a course of studies in one of the higher faculties: theology, medicine, or law (canon or civil). Furthermore there was a single curriculum set within any given university’s faculty of arts that required a certain set of books be lectured on (legere) and argued over (disputare); by the end of the BA sequence the student began to do minor amounts of teaching which steadily grew until, by the completion of the MA sequence, the student was ready to take on the role of teacher in his own right (Weisheipl 1974, pp. 207, 214–15). Though, as we shall see presently, the canon – so to speak – of required readings for the arts degrees changed over time owing to the introduction of materials recently translated as well as to the introduction of texts authored by Latin writers themselves, the set of universally required texts for the MA, and hence for any advanced study, meant that medieval academics had in their university studies a common intellectual framework rarely found in modern universities.

Finally, before turning to the wave of translations, curricula, and academic exercises associated with curricula, we should note the relative youth of most entering university students and the comparative maturity of the graduates of the faculty of theology, the faculty of which so many famous medieval philosophers were alumni. Most students entered the university when they were approximately 14 years of age, though a few were known to be as old as 17 and a few as young as 12. The BA course took three years and the MA another three, with an additional year of teaching associated with it. Hence most students entering one of the higher faculties, such as theology, were approximately 22 years of age. The length and precise course of studies stipulated by university statutes varied from university to university – at Paris the sequence of hearing lectures, giving lectures, and participating in disputes involved fourteen years of study, whereas at Oxford a similar sequence took only ten or eleven years (Courtenay 1994, pp. 331–2) – but overall the average theologian who had both taken his MA and become a full-fledged member of the theology faculty would be about 36 years of age at inception, that is, at the outset of his theological teaching career. Since, as we shall see, much of this comparatively long period of time, i.e. some twenty-two years, would have been spent either in the study of philosophical texts or in the study of theological texts that often called forth philosophical speculation, we should not wonder that
the best and most original philosophical works are usually the products of members of the faculty of theology.

Translations

If we examine what philosophical texts were available to the Latin West prior to the wave of Latin translations that were done in the period between 1140 and 1300, we may be surprised at how little direct knowledge of Greek, and later on Arabic, philosophical texts medieval philosophers confined to reading Latin could have had. Latin readers generally had available to them the old logic (*ars vetus*), i.e., the *Categories*, the *Perihermenias*, the *Topics* of Cicero, and the *Topical Differences* of Boethius along with the latter’s translation of Porphyry’s *Isagoge* (Introduction to the *Categories*) as well as his commentaries on the *Isagoge*, *Categories*, and the *Perihermenias*; these works constituted the only direct knowledge Latin readers had of Aristotle up until the middle of the twelfth century (Ebbesen 1982, pp. 104–9). The received inheritance from the Platonic tradition prior to the wave of twelfth and thirteenth-century translations was equally meager in terms of direct access to the primary texts. Only a partial translation of Plato’s *Timaeus* was available, along with an extensive commentary by Calcidius, and a section of Plato’s *Republic* in a translation by Cicero, though the latter did not apparently enjoy wide circulation. Indirect access to the Platonic tradition, on the other hand, was nigh on ubiquitous. The works of the pagans usually read in schools – Cicero, Seneca, Apuleius, and Martianus Capella, to mention a few – communicated much in the way of Platonic doctrines and seemed to correlate extremely well with the Platonism present in both the Latin Fathers, such as *Augustine* and Ambrose, and the Greek Fathers, such as *Pseudo-Dionysius* and Gregory of Nyssa. Hence even an author so well steeped in Aristotelian dialectic as Abelard could still feel in the second quarter of the twelfth century that the greatest philosopher of ancient times was Plato (Gregory 1988, pp. 54–63).

The advent of the translations, many of them done in the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, changed all of this. Sometime in the middle of the twelfth century, probably as early as 1160, the writings of the Islamic philosopher *Avicenna* were translated into Latin in Toledo by a group of translators that included *Dominicus Gundissalinus*. Though Avicenna’s works were self-standing essays and not by any means akin to the literal commentaries on Aristotelian texts to be found in Averroes writings, they did provide an overview of many key Aristotelian metaphysical and psychological notions, laying the foundation for the later Latin effort to understand Aristotle. From about the middle of the twelfth century also, Aristotle’s own works on nature, science, and ethics began to appear, either in partial or complete form. The Latins came to know by the end of the twelfth century Aristotle’s *Physics*, *De caelo*, most of his *Metaphysics*, *De anima*, *Parva naturalia*, the first three books of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, and the *Posterior Analytics*; among these are the Aristotelian writings on natural philosophy (*libri naturales*) proscribed in the condemnation of Paris in 1210 and the first statutes of the University of Paris in 1215. Sometime in the 1220s, Averroes’ writings also began to appear in Paris and Oxford and were used by masters of arts as well as theologians. It was Averroes more than any other of the Aristotelian commentators known to the Latin West who allowed the masters of Oxford and Paris to delve into the meaning of the Aristotelian texts and come to understand their underlying structure. Finally, by the middle of the thirteenth century, nearly all of the Aristotelian corpus (the chief lacuna being the *Politics*) was available in some form, including the whole of the *Nicomachean Ethics*, a work translated in its entirety for the first time by *Robert Grosseteste*.
Reactions to the introduction of the Aristotelian writings were initially mixed: at Paris, efforts to assimilate Aristotle led to curious interpretations on the part of early figures such as Amalric of Bené and David of Dinant and resulted in their writings being banned and the prohibition of public reading of, or lecturing upon, Aristotle’s works on natural philosophy. At Oxford, the works were known and read freely since there was no prohibition on their use, though there does not ever seem to have been at Oxford the kind of enthusiasm for Aristotelianism seen in the masters of arts of Paris during the 1260s and 1270s. Yet, despite the renewal of the Parisian prohibitions of 1210 and 1215 by Pope Gregory IX in 1231, by 1255 the newly translated works were incorporated into the curriculum at the University of Paris and constituted the majority of the books for which students were responsible at their examinations and disputes. The precise stages through which the increased acceptance of Aristotle’s works was achieved is not known; the documentary record for the period of 1220–35 is very sparse. But that the medieval universities made the alien texts of Aristotle the primary texts for their curricula is a remarkable fact and a testimony to the desire on the part of intellectuals of that time to assimilate and appropriate whatever was of value in the earlier pagan culture. To the extent that the ideal of assimilating the wisdom of ancient culture was the guiding principle of their activity, we might suggest that the foundational aim of the medieval universities was the same as that expressed in St. Augustine’s De doctrina christiana and repeated in the twelfth century in the Didascalcon of Hugh of St. Victor: the ordering of all wisdom and knowledge to the study of theology.

The curriculum adopted by the faculty of arts at Paris in 1255 represents an enormous change in medieval higher education. From the time of Boethius until the beginning of the thirteenth century, the focus of medieval learning had always been upon the trivium (grammar, rhetoric, and dialectic) and quadrivium (geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and music). Indeed, during a good amount of the Middle Ages, these branches of study were considered not simply propaedeutic to philosophy, but also largely constitutive of it. Prior to the statute of 1255, much of the curriculum, both in the earlier schools and the nascent universities, was devoted to the classical texts presenting the liberal arts (artes liberales) that comprised the trivium and quadrivium, texts such as Plato’s Timaeus for astronomy, Augustine’s De musica for music, and Priscian’s Institutiones grammaticae for grammar, and of course the logical works of Aristotle for dialectic. The persistence of these traditional texts may be seen in the 1215 statutes wherein, in the process of forbidding public lecturing on Aristotle’s books on natural philosophy, many of these same works are mentioned as being either recommended options or obligatory for teachers and students.

In the Parisian statute of 1255, however, all of the twelfth-century emphasis upon quadrivium and trivium was set aside and efforts were made instead to accommodate the Aristotelian writings by ceding the majority of the time for lecturing and disputing to the newly translated literature. According to the terms of the statute, practically all of the Aristotelian corpus was required reading and material for examination, including: the Physics, De generatione et corruptione, De anima, the Parva naturalia, Nicomachean Ethics, Metaphysics, and the pseudo-Aristotelian Liber de causis. Shortly thereafter, further translations made available Aristotle’s De economica, Rhetorica, and Politics, which were subsequently added to the curriculum. Nor were the only additions to the traditional list of readings coming from translated literature: in mathematics, Thomas Bradwardine’s De proportione,
or at least some treatises summarizing it, became books of study at Oxford after 1328; in
optics, John Pecham’s *Perspectiva communis* was similarly employed by the early fourteenth
century; in logic over the course of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, the
curriculum came to include various treatises by William of Sherwood, Walter Burley,
William Heytesbury, and Paul of Venice, among others (Ashworth 1994, pp. 352–60,
357–69; Weisheipl 1964, pp. 170–3).

*Faculty of theology*

The Bible was the main authoritative source of theological teaching and instruction through-
out the Middle Ages with the Church Fathers functioning as sources of secondary impor-
tance. By the end of the twelfth century, however, theologians such as Peter of Poitiers, Peter
Abelard, and Peter Lombard began to assemble the sayings (*dicta*) of the Fathers as well as
supporting biblical texts into collections of definitive opinions or *sententiae*. These collec-
tions of theological opinions became increasingly popular as starting points for theological
argument and reflection, figuring often in the academic exercises to be described below; by
1228 at the latest, Alexander of Hales, who would eventually enter the Franciscan order
and become one of its earliest and most influential theologians, introduced at Paris the prac-
tice of commenting upon the collection of *sententiae* drawn up nearly a century earlier by
Peter Lombard. Henceforth, Lombard’s *Sentences* became the main textbook in speculative
theology, serving in that role until the end of the seventeenth century.

Students in theology were expected to hear lectures on the Bible and Lombard’s *Sen-
tences* for a number of years. Once they became bachelors of theology, students had to deliver
lectures on the Bible and on the *Sentences*. After devoting three to four years to giving these
lectures, candidates then proceeded to participate in disputation for at least one year prior
to being admitted into the society of the masters under whom they had studied. Once they
were masters, medieval theologians were to continue to lecture on the Bible, hold regular
disputed questions, and communicate their theological ideas through preaching.

*Academic exercises*

Medieval intellectual life was characterized by a regular form of teaching and learning
known as the question (*quaestio*). The distant origins of the *quaestio* may be found in the
writings of Cicero, and even before the great Roman orator, in the practices of the ancient
philosophical schools (Hadot 1982, pp. 2–6). The medieval form takes its proximate source,
however, from the development of academic practices in the faculty of theology during the
second half of the twelfth century. As mentioned above, theologians lectured primarily on
the Bible, but turned their attention increasingly to collections of Patristic theological opin-
ions. In the course of lecturing, masters would often raise short questions called for by the
text that they were expounding. Such short questions often were hermeneutic in scope, but
steadily became more and more concerned with speculative matters. Though initially
questions were reserved for the end of a class meeting, they soon became too complicated
to manage within the setting of the lecture period. As a result, schools began to hold special
sessions in which the master would hold a dispute on the topic broached in the original

As the universities devised their curricula, they incorporated the practice of holding dis-
putes in separate sessions both in the theological faculties and elsewhere. It seems, nonethe-
less, that the theological faculty provided the model for the introduction of the pedagogical
method into the other faculties. In the university setting, questions began to take on a more formal structure and to evolve into differing types depending upon their function within the curriculum. To start with the theology faculty’s practices, masters would hold regular disputes (quaestiones ordinariae) as part of their teaching duties and these regular disputes took one of two basic forms. If the disputes were within the confines of the master’s own classes or his “school,” then they were considered private since it involved only a given master and his students. But apart from such classroom disputes there were regular public disputes involving not only a given master and his students, but also the other members of the theological faculty, masters and students. These public, regular disputes were held at least once every two weeks and all university theologians were obliged to hold them. Topics for these disputes were chosen by the masters who held them and were announced in advance. The disputes followed a distinct procedure: in the first session, known as the disputatio, the master’s advanced students or bachelors would play the role of disputing parties, one student opposing (opponens) the master’s view by advancing arguments against it with the other responding (respondens) by making counterarguments and providing a preliminary solution; in the second session, known as the determinatio and held at least one day later, the master would make a definitive reply or “determine” the question and answer each of the objections raised in the first session against the position taken (Bazán 1985, pp. 50–70).

Such regular disputes should be distinguished sharply from the occasional disputes known as quodlibets (quaestiones quodlibetales). At least within a university setting, quodlibets could only be conducted by a master, could only be held at Lent or Easter rather than throughout the academic year, were on a topic decided by the attendees and not by the master (though the master organized the questions raised according to a schematic pattern prior to replying), and were not part of the regular teaching of the master since no professor was obliged to hold them. Despite the last mentioned characteristic, quodlibets were sometimes favored by certain masters as one of the chief means for expressing their thought, as may be readily seen in the numerous quodlibets of Thomas Aquinas, Henry of Ghent, and Godfrey of Fontaines. Just as in a regular dispute, a quodlibetal question was held over at least two days, though the interval between the original discussion among the attendees and the reply of the master holding the quodlibet is known to have been a week or more on some occasions. Just as in a regular dispute, too, the entire faculty was required to attend a quodlibet, with members of other faculties and even interested parties from outside the university being permitted to attend as well (Wippel 1982, pp. 67–77; 1985, pp. 157–73).

Much of the structure of the disputed questions is repeated in the disputes held in the faculty of arts, though with some important differences. Like in the theology faculty, masters of arts are known to have held public and private disputations, though the former were not so frequent as in theology and do not seem to have served the same pedagogic function. Private disputations or ones held in the schools were extremely common and it is just such disputations as classroom exercises that underlie the many different types of questions, problems (sophismata), insolubilia, and other forms of literary expression so commonly found in surviving manuscripts.

**Types of literature**

The world of learning described in the foregoing, with its set books of study and obligatory disputations, is the proximate source of the various forms of literature characteristically
termed “scholastic”. There is first of all the disputed question, a literary version of the exercises described above. An example of such a disputed question might be Aquinas’s *Quaestiones disputatae de anima*, a series of disputations believed to have been held in Rome at the beginning of the 1270s. In the case of Aquinas’s literary version of the proceedings, we know that he reworked the material for publication; but in many cases such revision is known not to have occurred and the resulting material is a report of the proceedings or a *reportatio*. Next, we have the quodlibets, which tend to survive mainly in the form of reworked copies, though a few reports are also recognized. Both of these first two types are associated primarily with faculties of theology in medieval universities. The third type of literature, however, is characteristic of the faculty of arts: the commentary on Aristotle. But, in such cases, the term ‘commentary’ is used in describing two different literary forms: the literal commentary, often called a *sententia* or *scriptum*; and the question commentary. Over time, the latter form came to dominate within the literature and is believed to be related to the private disputations held by arts masters within their schools, though the transition from literal commentary to question commentary is not well documented or understood. Finally, we have a type of literature associated mainly with the faculty of theology: the *summae*. *Summae* or handbooks were not exactly manuals, but rather overarching accounts of a subject, accounts often quite sophisticated. The most famous, of course, are the *Summa theologiae* and *Summa contra gentiles* of Thomas Aquinas, but the form goes back earlier to the *summae* of figures such as Alexander of Hales and William of Ockham. *Summae* are systematic renderings of entire subjects, often groups of disputed questions, organized according to an architectonic plan of relating one group of subjects to another; as such, they need not be theological in their content, despite the prevalence of the *summa* form within theology. William of Ockham’s *Summa logicae*, for example, is an architectonic treatment of all the parts of logic, composed of units that are chapters.

This description of literary forms is by no means exhaustive – many forms, such as *sophisma*, *syncategoremata*, and *insolubilia*, are in the interest of space left out of consideration entirely – but does fairly indicate the main forms the reader is likely to encounter in the course of studying the philosophy of the Middle Ages and the ones most closely associated with the activities of Scholastic authors.
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