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Paul Richard Blum (Loyola University Maryland / Palacký University Olomouc)

*From Humanist Knowledge to Encyclopedic Science: Antonio Zara’s* Anatomia ingeniorum et scientiarum [Day 1 Keynote]

Antonio Zara opens his *Anatomia ingeniorum et scientiarum* of 1615 with the patterns of a humanist dedication to Archduke Ferdinand of Austria, in which he unfolds the praise of humanity and its position in the divine creation. The body of the book is an encyclopedia of all disciplines, including law, medicine, military, and theology; the systematic framework is, as the title announces, the anatomy of the human mind. Every chapter abounds with citations and references to all authorities available, from the Presocratics to contemporary natural philosophers and Jesuits. The book is intended to be comprehensive, that is, it provides information about all the fields covered and resources of research; most importantly, it presents a framework of all learning that is plausible and therefore accessible and realistic: all fields of objective knowledge are located in the structure of the human mind. Thus, the *Anatomia* can be seen as one example in the series of comprehensive presentations of the world and knowledge that are known as encyclopedias. This paper will make comparisons with some of the known sources, like Juan Huarte’s *Examen de ingenios para las ciencias* and Antonio Possevino’s *Bibliotheca selecta*, but also with comprehensive philosophies like Tommaso Campanella’s *Realis philosophia epilogistica*, and Francesco Patrizi’s *Nova de universis philosophia*. In this perspective, the details of information and theories achieve meaning primarily through the organizing system chosen by the author, which appears to shift from universal foundations in metaphysics to pedagogical and methodical purposes like, in this case, medical anatomy. The method turns into the message.

Marco Sgarbi (University of Venice)

Vernacular Metaphysics in Renaissance Ragusa

Renaissance is notoriously a stingy period of metaphysical works, one need only look at the repertoires of Paul O. Kristeller, Edward F. Cranz and Charles H. Lohr to realize this. After the great medieval cathedrals of Thomism, Scotism and Occamism, the Renaissance saw a progressive marginalization of metaphysics as the science of being as being (τὸ ὂν ᾖ ὂν, ens qua ens) and a reduction of it as a part of logic or theology. The theoretical systematizations of Nicolaus Cusanus, Marsilius Ficinus, Giovanni Pico della Mirandola certainly invested metaphysical themes, but their concerns were more directed towards a new conception of human being within the great chain of being. However, it would be incorrect to conclude that there was a total abandonment of metaphysical studies, in fact within universities and religious circles a progressive refinement of the exegeses proposed in the previous centuries continued, just think of Tommaso De Vio. However, it was necessary to wait for the end of the century and the success of the Jesuits to have a truly new metaphysical conceptual apparatus capable of having a profound impact on Renaissance and modern philosophical thought. The situation of marginalization is more dramatic if the field is restricted to metaphysical works produced in the vernacular: in Italy they can be counted on the fingers of one hand, and the same is true for other European countries. To the general indifference towards the discipline was added in these specific cases the fact that the readers of vernacular works were mostly disinterested in metaphysical themes, preferring ethical or natural philosophy topics. This paper will focus on one of the very few metaphysical works written in the vernacular and produced in Ragusa in the second half of the sixteenth century.

Eva Del Soldato (University of Pennsylvania)

Matija Frkić and His Enemies

A particularly productive angle from which to consider the philosophical profile of the Franciscan thinker Matija Frkić (1583-1669) consists in taking into consideration the several polemical debates in which he was involved during his long life. My paper will focus on Frkić and his “enemies”, that prominently included Fortunio Liceti, in order to highlight the priorities of the Franciscan’s theoretical agenda.

Giovanni Rossi (University of Verona)

A Renaissance Rereading of Aristotelian Political Theories: Gučetić’s treatise *Dello stato delle republiche* (1591)

The Ragusa humanist Nikola Vitov Gučetić (Nicolò Vito di Gozze, 1549–1610) provides an excellent example of the widespread circulation of Aristotelian political theories in Europe at the end of the sixteenth century. A typically Renaissance enthusiast of encyclopedic knowledge – ranging from economics to politics, from astronomy to natural philosophy, from poetry and aesthetics to theology – Nicolò was in constant correspondence with numerous European intellectuals, while at the same time devoting himself to concrete political activity and serving in important government positions in his own city.

In his reflections on political theory, Nicolò recovered and essentially updated the Aristotelian teachings on the same matter. His treatise (formally a dialogue) *Dello stato delle republiche* (1591), divided into eight days, completes the discourse begun with his *Governo della vita famigliare* (1589): following Aristotle, Nicolò first reflects on the economy and then develops an analysis of the different types of government, focusing on the role of the law and the legislator, the citizen and those in charge of government, the changes in the regime of government and the related themes of sedition and tyranny, the magistrates, without neglecting issues like the best urban configuration, the shape and location of buildings, the location of the city within a certain territory, and concluding with the theme of the education of the young.

All these themes clearly go back to Aristotle, but do not exclude a “contamination” with the thought of other classical philosophers, starting with Plato (a constant presence in the treatise); they also point to the rich and diversified Renaissance tradition of general introductory works dedicated to political matters. From Francesco Patrizi of Siena to Alessandro Piccolomini up to Jean Bodin and Giovanni Botero (all quoted in Nicolò’s work), a relevant part of the European intelligentsia throughout the sixteenth century is committed to the identification of a shared corpus of political rules that can cope with the traumatic rupture of religious unity (which was not caused only by the Reformation) and can respond to the challenges brought by Machiavelli’s unapologetic realism.

In this context, Gučetić’s work contributed to the recovery of the Aristotelian and classical heritage in general (not just on the level of philosophical argumentation, but very often also resorting to the demonstrative force of historical examples), but it also updated it with references to the theories of contemporary authors. This is exactly what the title of the work suggests: *Dello stato delle republiche secondo la mente di Aristotele con essempi moderni giornate otto* (Venice, 1591). Evidence of this attempt to update the Aristotelian theoretical framework – in order to confirm its validity – can be drawn from the “Avertimenti civili per lo governo delli stati”, which Gozze placed in the appendix to the work: these are 122 maxims that combine theoretical knowledge with practical experience. They belong to a successful literary genre, often used by the political writers of the time.

Maiko Favaro (University of Rome – Sapienza)

Aristotelianism and Platonism in Nikola Vitov Gučetić’s *Dialogo della bellezza* and *Dialogo d’amore*

Gučetić’s dialogues on beauty and love are explicitly based on Plato’s thought. However, the two characters in the dialogue, Cvijeta Zuzorić and Marija Gundulić (Gučetić’s wife), also often refer to Aristotle and Aristotelian philosophers such as Averroes and Agostino Nifo. Actually, Gučetić was “very studious” of Averroes, as his wife mentions in the dialogue on love. The year before the publication of the two dialogues, Gučetić had published a commentary on Averroes’ *De substantia orbis*. Therefore, in my paper I would like to explore the relationship between Aristotelianism and Platonism in Gučetić’s two dialogues.

Craig Martin (University of Venice) - [Day 2 Keynote]

Daniel Furlanus, on the margins of the Aristotelianism

Daniel Furlanus, a native of Crete who studied at Padua, edited and commented on Theophrastus’ *On Winds, On Fire,* and other writings on nature, as well as the Aristotelian work On Breath. This paper analyzes Furlanus' understanding of the relation between Aristotle's and Theophrastus’ natural philosophy, especially concerning physical problems surrounding the elements and Renaissance conceptions of the boundaries of the Aristotelianism and the Aristotelian corpus.

Pavel Gregorić (Institute of Philosophy in Zagreb)

The organistic cosmological theory of Antonius Medus

Antonius Medus (Dubrovnik, c. 1540–1603) was a little-known representative of late Renaissance Aristotelianism. He was an autodidact who published three books in Venice, two commentaries on Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* – on Book Lambda (1598) and on Book Zeta (1599) – and a polemical commentary on Porphyry’s *Isagoge* (1600).

In his commentary on the “astronomical” chapter 8 of *Metaphysics* Lambda, Medus criticizes the current cosmological theories. He dismisses the concentric theories of Eudoxus, Callipus and Fracastoro (Aristotle included) as mechanistic, he criticises the Ptolemaic theory of epicycles on doctrinal and empirical grounds, and brushes aside the Copernican heliocentric theory as mathematically elegant but unsupported either by Aristotle or by facts. Medus then elaborates an “organistic” version of the Aristotelian concentric cosmological theory, one which he believes is better aligned with both Aristotle’s metaphysics and the astronomical knowledge of his time.

In this paper I present Medus’ cosmological theory that features 31 celestial orbs moved by a total of 24 unmoved movers. I discuss the structure and the principles of Medus’ theory, I show how it is meant to explain various astronomical facts, and I indicate its deficiencies. Despite its limitations, Medus’ theory addresses some gaps in the cosmology of Book Lambda and offers an interesting way of fixing them. Moreover, Medus’ text is a testimony to the resilience of Aristotelian cosmology and a reminder that the three astronomical models – the Aristotelian, the Ptolemaic, and the Copernican – were still competing for supremacy at the turn of the 17th century.

Tomáš Nejeschleba (Palacky University Olomouc)

Francesco Patrizi’s *Discussiones peripateticae* as a possible source of Valeriano Magni’s Synopsis and Critique of Aristotle’s philosophy

Valeriano Magni (1586–1661), the Capuchin monk, influential church politician, theologian and philosopher, created his philosophy as an alternative to Second Scholasticism. Based on medieval Augustinianism, Bonaventurian tradition and Platonism in general on the one hand and on modern Galilean physics on the other, he made a critique of Aristotelian philosophy a substantial part of his own philosophical approach. Magni’s anti-Aristotelianism aims at demonstrating the incompatibility of Aristotelian philosophy with modern physics, its inner inconsistencies and finally its contradictions with Christian thought.

 The question arises at to what extent Magni actually follows the late Renaissance critique of Aristotelianism and Francesco Patrizi’s *Discussiones peripateticae* in particular. The paper will analyze similarities between Magni and Patrizi and question the possible influence of Renaissance Anti-Aristotelianism on this seventeenth century thinker.

Luka Boršić (Institute of Philosophy in Zagreb)

Patrizi’s Nemesis: Aristotle or Scholasticism?

Relatively abundant secondary literature on Francesco Patrizi (Frane Petris/Petriš/Patricio/Patricius) usually describes his most important contribution to philosophy, and indirectly, to the emergence of modern science, as a systematic and detailed refutation of virtually entire Aristotle’s philosophy. More rarely, one can find descriptions of his project as a fight against scholasticism or Aristotelianism as it was taught in schools of the 16th century. However, this distinction – going against Aristotle’s philosophy vs. going against scholasticism – in Patrizi’s works has not been thoroughly studied. My presentation will explore this distinction, with an intention to answer the following question: Was Patrizi more Aristotelian than he would have liked us to think?