

TYING THE DOUBLE METAPHYSICS OF JOHANNES CLAUBERG: ONTOSOPHIA AND RATIONAL THEOLOGY*

ANDREA STRAZZONI

The introduction of Descartes' philosophy in the academic curriculum of studies took place, for the first time in history, at the University of Utrecht, quickly spreading to Leiden, Duisburg and Herborn in the early 1650s. Yet, such introduction brought about countless problems in different fields of philosophy as well as in theology and politics¹. The issues of the use of radical doubt, the rejection of substantial forms and the union of body and soul prompted dire accusations of scepticism and atheism to the new philosophy, and called for a defence of its consistence with the Reformed creed and of its legitimacy in replacing the all but uncontested Aristotelian paradigm in philosophy. The German philosopher Johannes Clauberg (1622-1665) was the first academician who attempted to make Descartes' philosophy the basis of all philosophical disciplines of the traditional curriculum of studies, that is, to develop a Cartesian Scholastic². To this aim, Clauberg developed a first philosophy, i.e., a metaphysics based on Descartes' *Meditationes* and finalized to provide philosophy with a

* I thank Henri Krop for his useful remarks on this paper.

1 See VERBEEK 1992.

2 VIOLA 1975.

foundation, or a demonstration of the reliability of clear and distinct knowledge. Moreover, he set a comprehensive logical theory showing how Descartes' rules of the method may be completed by the Scholastic theory of definition, division and syllogism³. Still, Clauberg maintained in the corpus of philosophical disciplines a metaphysics dealing with the meanings of "being". Accordingly, he developed a twofold metaphysics: on one hand, it concerns the principles of thought, i.e. it is a *philosophia prima* within the order of disciplines. On the other, it deals with the most abstract notions of being, and it is to be acquired after having had a full acquaintance of philosophy. To this discipline, Clauberg devoted the three editions of his *Ontosophia* (1647, 1660, 1664)⁴.

In the last years, Massimiliano Savini has provided us with a comprehensive survey of Clauberg's idea of method and *ontosophia*, considered with respect to the historical sources of Clauberg's thought, the parallel debates over Cartesianism in the Netherlands and the internal progress of his positions⁵. As a result, he has shown that the *redoublement* in Clauberg's metaphysics is to be traced back to his original plan of providing a complete course of philosophy before his adherence to Cartesianism – in his 1647 *Elementa philosophiae seu Ontosophia* – where he had both to guarantee the foundational role and the independence from logic of metaphysics as *ontosophia*⁶, and the preliminary function of logic with respect to the whole course of philosophy. If this problem had been solved, in 1647, by some

3 STRAZZONI 2013, 138-141.

4 CLAUBERG 1647, 1660, 1664(2).

5 SAVINI 2004; SAVINI 2006; SAVINI 2011.

6 SAVINI 2011, 25-27, 44; see CLAUBERG 1647, 2.

anticipations of the elements of metaphysics in logic⁷, after his adoption of Cartesianism Clauberg could provide his philosophy with a foundation in the *philosophia prima*, i.e., Descartes' metaphysics (echoing the traditional *metaphysica specialis*, or the science of immaterial beings)⁸, independent from logic, and at the same time he could develop a general metaphysics as the last discipline in the order of teaching and thought⁹. Assuming Savini's reconstruction as a starting point, this article will concern the relations among *ontosophia* and *philosophia prima* in Clauberg's philosophy. After having clarified the plan of Clauberg's philosophy, and shown some sample of his metaphysical arguments, which his first philosophy consists of, I will argue that in Clauberg's philosophy the discipline of *ontosophia*, despite its role as the most abstract science, plays a foundational role with regards to metaphysics as first philosophy. Indeed, *ontosophia* unveils the most important assumptions of first philosophy, which is essentially a rational theology.

1. Metaphysics, logic and physics

The function of metaphysics as first philosophy is outlined by Clauberg against its Aristotelian definition as the science coming after physics: as he writes in his *Differentia inter cartesianam et in scholis vulgo usitatam philosophiam*

7 CLAUBERG 1647, 291, 309; see SAVINI 2011, 54-55, 61-63.

8 *Infra*, n. 89.

9 SAVINI 2011, 299.

(1657, 1680)¹⁰, the very name “*metaphysica*” suggests that this discipline was definitively misplaced in the traditional order of sciences¹¹. This order is reversed by Clauberg by embracing Descartes' plan of disciplines, according to which the tree of philosophy is composed of the roots of metaphysics, the trunk of physics, and the boughs of mechanics, medicine and moral philosophy¹². For Descartes, referred to by Clauberg in his *Initiatio philosophi sive dubitatio cartesiana* (1655)¹³, metaphysics concerns the principles of human knowledge, among which the divine attributes are to be counted¹⁴ as from them it is possible to deduce natural laws¹⁵. As stated in his *Defensio cartesiana* (1652)¹⁶ metaphysics coincides with natural theology¹⁷ and proceeds from the acknowledgment of the notions of self and God to that of bodily reality. According to Clauberg's *Differentia*, such concepts lead to the demonstration

10 The first, German edition appeared in 1657 (*Unterschied zwischen der cartesianischer und der sonst in Schulen gebrauchlicher Philosophie*, see CLAUBERG 1657), followed by the Latin translation in 1680 (CLAUBERG 1680).

11 «Notabilis differentia inter cartesianam et aristoteleam [...] siquidem illa a rebus spiritualibus aut intellectualibus et ratione utentibus, haec autem a corporalibus initium sui scrutinii atque doctrinae primum facit, atque ita in scholis prima philosophia dicitur, dignitatis et naturae, non cognitionis nostrae ordine; contra quam fit in philosophia cartesiana: atque etiam haec primum est inventa, illa autem postremo, indeque nominata metaphysica, quasi post-physica», CLAUBERG 1691, *Differentia*, 1226.

12 *Ibid.*, 1157. For Descartes' words on the tree of knowledge, see AT IX-2, 14.

13 CLAUBERG 1655.

14 «In praefat. Editionis Princip. Gallicae, ubi explicaturus ordinem, quem quis tenere debet in se instruendo hac philosophia, cum iam, inquit, acquisivisset habitum quendam inveniendae veritatis in his quaestionibus (nempe mathematicis) debet serio incipere se applicare verae philosophiae, cuius prima pars est metaphysica, quae continet principia cognitionis, inter quae est explicatio praecipuorum Dei attributorum, immaterialitatis animarum nostrarum et omnium notionum clararum et simplicium, quae sunt in nobis. Secunda est physica», CLAUBERG 1691, *Initiatio philosophi*, 1154. See AT IX-2, 14.

15 «Vide qui Cartesius regulas de motu et corporum existentiam ex Dei natura et existentia derivet», CLAUBERG 1691, *Initiatio philosophi*, 1155. In fact, God is required both to ensure the reliability of our faculties, and to explain the ultimate cause of natural laws.

16 CLAUBERG 1652.

17 «Theologiam seu metaphysicam», CLAUBERG 1691, *Defensio cartesiana*, 1011.

of the reliability of the human faculties, as they include the acknowledgment of the goodness of God¹⁸ and are, at once, the basis of natural philosophical explanations, like the notions of physical modes and natural laws. Based on a unique introspective act, the Cartesian metaphysics is composed of a few simple rules and principles, whereas Aristotelian philosophy was grounded on several *praecognita* embodied by a logic reflecting a vulgar worldview¹⁹. In fact, such logic is described as providing philosophy the ten categories: in some manner, it is a foundational discipline, as it embodies the notions of Scholastic philosophy²⁰. Aristotelian logic and metaphysics are thus paired in their corresponding inadequate concepts, whereas Cartesian metaphysics deals with the proper natures of things, acknowledged through the analysis of the contents of mind²¹. As to the order of disciplines, both theoretically and pedagogically, Clauberg stands for the priority of metaphysics over logic, since metaphysics as consisting on doubt is the very first step in a new way of thinking. This is clear from his *Initiatio philosophi*, which offers a first outlook on his metaphysical foundation of philosophy. As he has to face the problem of an introduction of the student to a new paradigm, together with the demonstration of its reliability, in this treatise Clauberg maintains that the initiation of scholars to the new philosophy through doubt is to be identified with the theoretical justification of philosophy itself. This introduction and

18 CLAUBERG 1691, *Differentia*, 1233.

19 «Illa, (cartesiana) sicuti unum tantum inventorem, et non tam varios auctores [...] habet [...] quemadmodum et pauciores regulas [...] continet [...]. Vulgaris philosophia e contrario assumit multa tanquam fundamenta. [...] Quod autem cartesiana philosophia initium facit a paucis, altera e contrario multas res praesupponat, e sequentibus patet exemplis. Vulgaris philosophia decem categorias, seu summa rerum genera; cartesiana duo tantum statuit», *ibid.*, 1223.

20 SAVINI 2011, 55-61.

21 CLAUBERG 1691, *Differentia*, 1229.

justification is provided, first of all, by means of doubt. Doubt serves as an emendative instrument through which it is possible to reach a metaphysical or absolute certainty on the notions of self, God and matter, and to become acquainted with a new way in reasoning. It is the very first step into the new philosophy²², or the initiation to Cartesianism for everyone who has not been acquainted with clear and distinct perceptions, allowing no further dubitation or suspension of judgement²³. Such a first, emendative step in philosophy belongs to metaphysics²⁴. However, since logic teaches how to conduct understanding, it is in Clauberg's *Logica* that one can find a relevant part of his metaphysical arguments.

The logic of Clauberg is quadripartite: the first two parts, forming *genetica*, concern the formation of thoughts and their expression in speech²⁵. *Genetica* is about definitions, divisions and syllogisms, being a *hermeneutica* or the interpretation of our own discourse²⁶. The last two parts concern the interpretation or resolution (*analytica*) of the sentences of other men. The third part explains how to understand their meanings, while the fourth

22 «Dubitatio nostra, quae aliis debito generalior esse videtur non spectet ad eum qui firma iam philosophicae cognitionis fundamenta iecit, quasi ea deberet in dubium revocare ac reiicere; verum ad illum duntaxat, qui fundamenta eiusmodi nondum posuit quique non aliter consideratur, quam ut vulgaris homo, nihil adhuc scientifice demonstratum habens, nihil clare distincteque perceptum, cui iudicium superstrui queat indubitatum», CLAUBERG 1691, *Initiatio philosophi*, 1138.

23 *Ibid.*, 1142, 1144.

24 *Ibid.*, 1208-1209.

25 «Prior pars tantum comparata est ad id, ut regatur sermo internus seu cogitatio: posterior insuper formare docet sermonem externum seu orationem, quae cogitationis est interpres», CLAUBERG 1691, *Logica vetus et nova*, 780.

26 «Logicae geneticae pars posterior [...] inservit menti ad suos conceptus, modo ad priorem partem accomodato, aliis explicandos. Itaque docet, quibus verbis definitiones, divisiones, syllogismi in mente formati sint efferendi. [...] Quae praecepta hermeneutica a grammaticis et rhetoricis diversa esse nemo non videt», *ibid.*

(*hermeneutica analytica*) expounds the rules for an analysis of their truth according to the precepts of *genetica*²⁷. Actually, it is in the first and in the fourth section that metaphysical arguments can be found, as these parts concern the rules for the formation and analysis of thoughts. Treating «*inveniendi veri methodum*»²⁸, the first section expounds the conditions for clear and distinct perception. Three main questions are put forward: «*quid sit cognoscendum*», «*quis ipse sit, qui vult cognoscere*», «*quomodo possit cognoscere, ubi de methodo*»²⁹. Stating the basics of Cartesian metaphysics, some words are devoted to the objects of knowledge, matching Descartes' hierarchy of knowledge³⁰. The most important metaphysical point in such considerations, however, is to be found in the treatment of the different degrees of certitude of judgements. Two degrees of certitude and truth are outlined: contingent (or moral) certitude, and necessary certitude, embracing in turn three further degrees: *certitudo physica sive de omni*; *certitudo metaphysica per se* and *certitudo metaphysica universaliter prima*³¹. Metaphysical or eternal truths are grounded on the clear and distinct perception of the connection of subject and predicate³². A difference, however, is made among

27 «*Inquirendum est an cogitationes scriptoris, externo sermone nobis explicatae, regulis illis, quas non solum de percipiendi, iudicandi, et recordandi, verum etiam de tradendi modo praescrisit logica genetica, sint conformes*», *ibid.*, 866. See also page 781.

28 *Ibid.*, 780.

29 *Ibid.*, 783.

30 «*Quod omnibus necessario cognoscendum est, ante omnia cognoscamus, v.g. Deum et nos ipsos, in caeteris vero eorum, quae potioris sunt dignitatis et usus, potio-rem rationem habeamus, non necessariis atque inutilibus omissis, cum sapientia non paretur ex quarumvis rerum notitia, sed ex earum duntaxat quae maioris sunt momenti*», *ibid.*, 784.

31 *Ibid.*, 801.

32 «*Unde vero existit summa illa seu metaphysica de axiomatibus nonnullis in animo nostro certitudo? Resp. Certitudo axiomatis affirmantis proficiscitur e subiecti et*

these metaphysical truths, whose highest certitude relies only on the definition of the subject, as in the sentences «*omnis homo est animal rationale*»³³ or «*Deus necessario existit*», analysed in the last part of Clauberg's *Logica*:

examinantur veritas et falsitas, et gradus utriusque in enunciationibus [...] ubi illa [...] *Deus necessario existit*, habet certitudinem [...] metaphysicam, estque per se et universaliter primum, ideoque magis necessaria hac, binarius est par³⁴.

Because God is defined as *ens summe perfectum*³⁵, this definition implies a necessary existence. Therefore, «*Deus necessario existit*» is to be considered even more necessary than «*binarium esse parem*», because the truth of the former sentence depends on the definition of the subject, whereas that of the latter relies on the notion of the predicate³⁶. Clauberg finds in logic the proper place for an analysis of the degree of certitude of the bases of Cartesian metaphysics, which is treated by paying attention to the kinds of subject-predicate connection. This analysis is applied to the *a priori* proof, but also to Descartes' *a posteriori* argument. In the last section of *Logica*, indeed, the principle of causality is examined from an analytical point of view³⁷,

predicati nexu insolubili a mente clare et distincte percepto», *ibid.*, 802.

³³ *Ibid.*, 803.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 891.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 892.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 893.

³⁷ «*Examine analytico subiecimus veritatis certitudinisque gradus ac differentias, iam etiam, Logicae nostrae ordinem secuti, gradus universalitatis in axiomatibus, et quae quibus superiora, quibus inferiora sint, expendamus: hoc enim multum prodesse ad iudicium formandum ipsa nos docuit. Sumamus vulgatissimum illud: quod quid non habet, id alteri dare non potest*», *ibid.*, 894.

involving, in fact, metaphysical considerations; it is considered in the light of the concepts of efficient and exemplary cause, which in the case of God's idea must be identified as it contains perfection in its objective being³⁸. This argument will be properly developed in *Exercitationes de cognitione Dei et nostri*. However, before turning to such treatises, I will spend some words to Clauberg's physics. More than in his other works, in fact, it is in his *Physica* that he develops his overview on the system of sciences, devoting some consideration to the role of rational theology.

In physics, Clauberg is concerned with the study of the mind insofar as it can allow a better explanation of the experiences of man³⁹. The treatises included in his *Physica* (*Physica contracta*, *Disputationes physicae*, *Theoria corporum viventium* and *Corporis et animae in homine coniunctio*)⁴⁰ start with the definition of the basic concepts of physics and end in the analysis of human nature. Clauberg's main focus is on human nature as a premise for the other disciplines. His consideration of the human mind concerns its union with the body, fully analysed in his *Corporis et animae in homine coniunctio*, aimed to further the progress of physics, medicine, theology, law, ethics, didactic and logic⁴¹. Many metaphysical considerations carried on in physics, like those on

38 *Ibid.*, 896-897.

39 «Inscriptio libri huius tria tibi promittit. Primum est explicatio virium et naturae rerum corporearum. [...] Alterum est explicatio proprietatum mentis, non absolute spectata, nam eo intuitu ad scientiam physicam reduci non solet, sed relate ad corpus, quod proprium naturalis philosophiae subiectum censetur. [...] Mens humana quomodo corpori imperet agendo, quomodo item a corpore patiendo sentiat, imagnetur [...] similesque functiones exercent, [...] tractatur. Tertium est explicatio coniunctionis illius hypostaticae, qua mens et corpus ad unum hominem constituendum admirabili modo conveniunt», CLAUBERG 1691, *Physica, Lectori salutem*, I (unnumbered).

40 CLAUBERG 1664(1).

41 CLAUBERG 1691, *Physica*, 209.

actions and passions of the mind, however, have to be considered as the conclusions rather than the premises of natural philosophy. His *Physica* ends with an explanation of body-mind interaction designed to implement our grasp of phenomena rather than to establish such a grasp⁴². In any case, the metaphysical points entailed by Clauberg's *Physica* deserve some attention, especially in their intersections with the themes of his *Exercitationes* and *Ontosophia*. Indeed, in his *Physica* Clauberg clarifies his plan of philosophy, and sets some metaphysical argument.

In his *Disputationes physicae*, refining Descartes' metaphor of the tree of knowledge⁴³, Clauberg outlines the relations among the sciences: he regards law and medicine as badly grounded insofar as they are detached from philosophy. In such a case, they will be only a study of the Prince's decrees and an empirical practice⁴⁴. On the contrary, the proper architecture of the sciences includes metaphysics or first philosophy as the discipline grounding physics, on which moral theory and medicine are based. From moral philosophy, furthermore, law and politics flow⁴⁵. Clauberg underlines the practical value of philosophy, as politics is put at the top of the architecture,

42 See the *Corporis et animae in homine coniunctio*, «illud reale et elegantissimum physicis thema nobis hic tractandum est, quomodo universi conditor [...], nihil impediante tanta naturae corporeae et incorporeae diversitate, unum ex utraque hominem composuerit», *ibid.*, 213.

43 «Philosophia, et praesertim physica, licet iurisprudentiae ac medicinae radix ac fundamentum recte iudicetur», *ibid.*, 53.

44 «Quamvis enim illae disciplinae sine philosophia tractari soleant a multis, quatenus iurisprudentia leges a principis voluntate pendentes, medicina observationes et experientiam sequitur; nemo tamen praeclarum et solidum quid in iis praestare novit, nisi philosophiae praeceptis imbutus ante fuerit», *ibid.*

45 «Nam facile est ostendere, veram iurisprudentiam in morali doctrina, doctrinam moralem una cum medicina in physica, physicam denique in metaphysica vel prima philosophia radicari ac fundari», *ibid.*

while medicine and law are firmly based on physics and metaphysics⁴⁶, or the worthiest sciences⁴⁷. Politics, in fact, gains the status of *scientia* only if it is based on a philosophical theory of man, as in the case of medicine: this theory is fully developed in the *Coniunctio*. According to his *Logica vetus et nova*, indeed, even the knowledge of God is ultimately practical, as it grounds disciplines such as medicine or law⁴⁸. The main metaphysical topic in Clauberg's *Physica* concerns the role of God, defined in traditional terms. He considers God the creator and conserver of matter and motion⁴⁹, and assigns to *res* and *leges* an effective, secondary causality, because laws are the causes that nature follows⁵⁰. Such laws are purportedly deduced from divine perfection⁵¹, whose definition is borrowed from the *Ethica Nicomachea*⁵². This

46 «Quod si forte alia de causa, veluti regiminis civilis intuitu, caput philosophiae iurisprudencia censeatur, id non magis in ipsam iurisprudenciam, quam in politicam, quae pars est philosophiae, quadrare certum est: cum plures legum civilium, quatenus a politica distinguuntur prudentia, imperiti summa cum laude respublicas olim gubernarint atque etiamnum gubernent. Porro philosophiam cum radicem et fundamentum iurisprudenciae et medicinae affirmo, veram et sanam intelligo», *ibid.*

47 *Ibid.*, 54.

48 «At nunquid caeli notitia ad Creatorem agnoscendum ac celebrandum adducimur, et nunquid sequitur, omnem cognitionem quodammodo practicam esse oportere, nullam otiosam aut sterilem», *ibid.*

49 «Materiae substantia servante Deo semper manens», *ibid.*, 57.

50 *Ibid.*, 97-98, 103.

51 «Permanet, quantum in se est, constantia Dei illud non deferente [...]. Enimvero cum sine causa haud quicquam fieri possit, citra actionem causae status demutari nequeat. [...] Unde natura lex nata est prima, a divinae conservationis simplicitate et constantia pendens. Eadem haec Dei perfectio alteri quoque naturae legi finis et origo est», *ibid.*, 6. Clauberg does not address the problem of the creation of eternal truths by God.

52 «Perfectionem artificis ex eo elucere, quod tale opus fabricarit, cui nihil addi, nihil demi possit. His enim verbis describere solemus id quod perfectum appellamus. Et nunquid opera, quae scite affabreque facta sunt, hoc nomine commendantur, quid nihil illis detrahi aut addi possit; ut bene Aristoteles 2 Eth. cap 5», *ibid.*, 100. See ARISTOTLE, *Ethica Nicomachea* V, 2, 1106a 26-1106b 35.

perfection or constancy is in balance with divine freedom⁵³, which is another of the attributes of God. In any case, it is in the *Exercitationes* that the pivotal topic of the role of God in the foundation of philosophy finds its systematisation. Not as regards the deduction of natural laws, which have their justification only in the *Physica*, but as regards the truth of our concepts.

2. Metaphysics as rational theology

Clauberg's *Exercitationes centum de cognitione Dei et nostri*⁵⁴ focus on two main topics: the theory of ideas and the demonstration of the existence of God⁵⁵. The proofs expounded in Descartes' *Meditationes*, indeed, indeed, are examined by Clauberg in the light of the properties of thought.

The rational theology developed in his *Exercitationes* is not only meant to provide physics with a foundation. Since Clauberg conceives of all disciplines as relying on philosophical knowledge, even disciplines like law find their foundation in *philosophia prima*, in accordance with an attempt to

53 «Deum equidem liberrime omnia agere in omnibus nullo modo imus inficias; sed affirmamus insuper, perpetuo eum agere caeteris perfectionibus suis congruenter, adeoque sapienter et constanter; nec uni libertatis attributo sic esse insistendum, ut reliquae eius virtutes, quae non minus in eo spectandae nobis exhibentur, minus a nobis praedicari videantur», CLAUBERG 1691, *Physica*, 101.

54 CLAUBERG 1656.

55 «Quibus de rebus tractat metaphysica sive prima philosophia, illa in primis quae a Renato Cartesio publico data? Resp. Tractat de principiis cognitionis humanae, sive de primis initiis et fundamentis omnis nostrae scientiae, quam ex naturae lumine possumus haurire. Ita mens cuiusque hominis philosophaturi primo incipit a cognitione suae existentiae, qua nihil ei notius esse potest. E sui notitia provehitur deinde in cognitionem Dei creatoris et conservatoris, hunc necessario existere, omnisque datorem luminis esse demonstrat», CLAUBERG 1691, *De cognitione Dei et nostri*, 592.

integrate Cartesianism in the academic curriculum⁵⁶. God, as the first cause, is to be taken into consideration in all disciplines, not only in the deduction of physical laws⁵⁷. Natural theology is thus present from the first to the last step of philosophy⁵⁸, which ends in physics, ethics and politics⁵⁹. His *Exercitationes* contain the presentation and clarification of Descartes' proofs, enriched with corollary considerations borrowed mainly from Scholastic and Renaissance authors. Actually, Clauberg does not add any new points to such proofs: with his considerations, however, he discloses some points implied in Descartes'

56 «Utilis [...] est naturalis Dei cognitio propter alias omnes humanas disciplinas, quarum firma et evidens notitia expetitur. Non enim possunt satis refutari sceptici neque conclusionis ullius vera certitudo haberi, nisi ante probetur Deum summe veracem et causam omnis veri et boni necessario existere, a quo proinde accipiamus omnem intellectum, quo si recte utamur, hoc est si non nisi de clare distincteque perceptis iudicemus, fallere aut falli nequeamus. Et constat inter cunctos logicos et philosophos, non posse obtineri ullius rei creatae veram scientiam, nisi perspectis causis; causas autem non posse perfecte cognosci, nisi ad primam et supremam causam, quae Deus est, recurratur», *ibid.*, 594.

57 «Addo peculiari de causa tractationi de Deo locum esse dandum in primis philosophiae principiis, quoniam perfecta rerum scientia, quam philosophando acquirere laboramus, ex causarum praecipue notitia resultat. At prima rerum omnium causa, et sine qua reliquarum causalitates nec sunt, nec accurate cognosci possunt ullae, est Deus», *ibid.*, 596.

58 «Nam initio philosophiae non ulterius agitur de Deo, quam quatenus eius cognitio ad iacenda omnis scientiae humanae fundamenta desideratur. Sed in fine absoluta de Deo tractatio instituitur, omniaque eius attributa, quae ex naturae lumine cognosci queunt, expenduntur, quod initio necessarium non erat, quoniam non omnia Dei attributa se habent ut principia rerum creatarum, et quae huiusmodi relationem possunt recipere, non tamen absolute ideo aut planius, quam originis illa relatio postulat, opus est explicare. Nec possunt sane attributa Dei absolute et plene satis explanari, antequam rerum ab eo creatarum tractatio praecesserit», *ibid.*, 596.

59 «Dico per universam philosophiam diffusam esse theologiam naturalem, quia dum in operibus Dei rite contemplantis occupamur, fieri nequit, quin ipsius opificis potentiam, bonitatem, sapientiam passim admirando, in eius notitiam magis magisque assurgamus. Quaecumque enim sunt in rerum natura creata et ordinata, ad ipsum tanquam suum principium et originem sunt referenda. Quod respiciens S. Augustinus in Epist. ad Volusianum, ipsam quoque physicam, ethicam, politicam aliasque disciplinas theologiae terminis contineri asseruit», *ibid.*, 596. See Augustine, *Epistola ad Volusianum*, § 5.17.

arguments. His first focus is on the imitative nature of ideas, which can be thus conceived as images, in accordance with the views of Bartholomäus Keckermann and Rudolph Goclenius. Presenting the first proof, in addition to the twofold nature of ideas – formal and objective – Clauberg highlights the relation between human and divine ideas, envisaged as ectypes and archetypes⁶⁰. God, therefore, is at the same time the efficient and the exemplar cause of our innate ideas. As these are conceived as images or imitations, they cannot be more perfect than what they are images of, as stated by Aristotle and Keckermann:

imago est, inquit Aristoteles lib. 6. Top. cap. 2, quae per imitationem efficitur, sive cuius generatio est per imitationem. Imitatio autem, veram eius naturam si intueamur, per se nihil aliud est, quam conformatio imperfectioris ad perfectius, ut bene inter alios definit Keckerm. Syst. Phys. Lib. 4 cap. 8⁶¹.

Assuming the existence of an imitation or an *esse obiectivum seu vicarium* (a term borrowed from Goclenius⁶²), an archetype is thus required⁶³. Besides

60 «Observo 1. conceptum seu ideam omnem habere duplicem dependentiam, unam a concipiente sive cogitante intellectu [...] altera, a re concepta aut simili, cuius scilicet repraesentatio sive imago est, sive unde per imitationem expressa est. [...] Observo 2. intellectum esse causam conceptus efficientem, [...] rem vero conceptam [...] esse causam conceptus exemplarem (quae quidem etiam ad efficientem reducitur) atque eo modo ad conceptum referri, quo archetypon ad ectypon», CLAUBERG 1691, *De cognitione Dei et nostri*, 606. See p. 618: «ex ideis aliae sunt ectypae, qualis est idea Dei et aliarum rerum ab homine non factibilium, aliae archetypae, quae rerum faciendarum formulae et exemplaria sunt et a philosophis ad causam efficientem referuntur».

61 *Ibid.*, 606. See ARISTOTLE, *Topica*, 140a 14-15; KECKERMANN 1623, 564.

62 GOCLINIUS 1613, 1047.

63 «Idea secundum esse vicarium spectata non potest esse perfectior sua causa, hoc est, suo exemplari, imperfectior esse potest. Imo nulla imago plus realitatis et perfectionis repraesentare, quam reperitur in ea re, unde talis imago desumta sive expressa est. [...] Probatum [...] tum ex natura imaginis atque imitationis, tum ex illo axiomate, quod

Aristotle, Keckermann and Descartes⁶⁴, the position of Clauberg relies on Eustache de Saint-Paul and Goclenius' works⁶⁵, which set the ground of Descartes' discussion of ideas⁶⁶. Clauberg's strategy is to refer the basics of Descartes' arguments to the Scholastic sources. However, it is not clear to what extent Clauberg supports the view that ideas are truly mental images or visual contents: «imago quaedam», «tanquam imago» or «per modum imaginis»⁶⁷ suggest that Clauberg is only using a comparison with images more than identifying ideas with them⁶⁸, following a philosophical terminology adopted by Descartes himself⁶⁹. In fact, the status of ideas remains ultimately unexplained, even if Clauberg maintains Descartes' classification of ideas into fictitious, innate and adventitious.

Clauberg's alternative in characterizing ideas is to describe them as definitions. The propositional nature of ideas is supported by Clauberg in reporting Descartes' argument for the existence of the idea of God. It can be

effectus non possit esse nobilior causa. Et sane, quam necessarium est, ut omnis idea habeat causam exemplarem, tam necessarium est, ut omne praeclarum quod habet idea, procedat ac derivetur ab exemplari illa causa. [...] Ut ex nihilo nihil fit a natura: ita nec potest mens nostra ullum realem conceptum formare, nisi rem aliquam imitata: et cuius totum esse in imitatione consistit, id non potest plus continere, quam est in imitabili sive exemplari. [...] Si ergo [...] summae perfectiones non sunt in mente [...] sequitur eas esse extra mentem nostram [...] hoc est, in Deo», CLAUBERG 1691, *De cognitione Dei et nostri*, 609.

64 *Ibid.*, 608, 609-610, quoting Descartes' *Meditatio prima* and *tertia*: see AT VII 19-20, 40, 51-52.

65 EUSTACHE DE SAINT-PAUL 1620, 54-55; GOCLINIUS 1613, 208-209.

66 ARIEW 2011, 101-121.

67 CLAUBERG 1691, *De cognitione Dei et nostri*, 617

68 See *Exercitatio VIII*: «cogitationis et picturae comparatio, ad melius intelligendum pro Dei existentia allatum argumentum utilis», *ibid.*, 609.

69 See Descartes' *Meditatio tertia*, AT VII, 37. On the use of the term in coeval philosophical tradition, see SAVINI 2004, 170-181.

acknowledged, indeed, by understanding the very definition of “God”⁷⁰. Actually, such a characterization does not add anything to our comprehension of the nature of ideas, stating only the linguistic meanings of words and sentences. This is confirmed by the identification of ideas with *themata*, or with whatever can be conceived by mind, following Descartes and the traditional logic. In *Logica vetus et nova* Clauberg states that the difference between perception and judgement matches the difference between simple and complex *themata*⁷¹. Complex *themata*, actually, are propositions⁷². Therefore, insofar as every simple *thema* can be rendered into a complex one, every idea is expressed by a definition. Such intersections of logic and metaphysics, again, do not put light on how ideas represent things. This is also the case with the epistemological considerations developed in physics. Clauberg's *Theoria corporum viventium* contains an overview of mental faculties. He defines the functions of the soul as thoughts (*cogitationes*), divided into actions and passions. Passions are perceptions or *conversiones mentis ab obiecto*, that is, modifications of the soul determined by a form or figure. Actions are wills, or *laciones animi ad obiectum*: «adeo ut voluntas latio quaedam animi esse videatur, tendens ad obiectum in idea propositum; perceptio autem quaedam eius figuratio vel in varias formas conversio, veniens ab obiecto»⁷³. “*Obiectum*”, “*idea*”, “*figuratio*” and “*forma*” are the terms

70 «Addo, quod definitio rei nihil aliud sit, quam clara et distincta rei idea, ita ut, si omnia vocabula in definitione Dei adhibita sint intelligibilia, necessum sit, quid Deus sit, intelligi, Deus, aiunt, est maximum id, quod cogitari potest. Inde sic infero: ergo Deus cogitari potest, hoc est, Dei idea, sensu cartesiano, haberi potest», Clauberg 1691, *De cognitione Dei et nostri*, 604.

71 CLAUBERG 1691, *Logica vetus et nova*, 799-800.

72 *Ibid.*, 829.

73 CLAUBERG 1691, *Physica*, 190.

used by Clauberg to express what is involved in mental activities. Also in the theory of knowledge, thus, Descartes' theory is rendered into Scholastic terms. Eventually, these metaphysical insertions into logic and physics show that the justification of science is provided by an appeal to the veracity of God rather than by a consideration of the actual ways in which ideas match things. Ultimately, the nature of ideas is considered insofar as it serves the demonstration of the existence of God.

In the same manner, the second demonstration of the existence of God is borrowed from Descartes and is clarified through references to Scholastic philosophy. The proof is based on the experienced continuity of our existence, due to Divine conservative action⁷⁴. According to Clauberg, since it is not possible to infer our persistence in being from our past existence, a conservative cause is to be postulated⁷⁵. The demonstration relies on the principle of the successive nature of time and is supported by quotations from Samuel Desmarets' *Systema theologicum* (1645)⁷⁶, used to prove that time is experienced in the same way by men and angels. The reference confirms Clauberg's theological interests: he also demonstrates that we cannot be conserved by angels⁷⁷.

Finally, the third proof is explained by Clauberg in the light of his logic, stating that Descartes did not develop his *a priori* argument according to the

74 As *duratio* is existence, conservation and creation are the same thing: see CLAUBERG 1691, *De cognitione Dei et nostri*, 645-646.

75 *Ibid.*, 636.

76 *Ibid.*, 637. See DESMARETS 1645, V, § 34; DESMARETS 1649, 97-98.

77 «Quod difficilius sit aliena curare et conservare, quam propria et sua, unde sequitur, si anima mea non possit suas proprias cogitationes [...] nec suum corpus [...] conservare, tum nulla probabili ratione posse angelo tribui potentiam consevandi animam meam», CLAUBERG 1691, *De cognitione Dei et nostri*, 639.

canons of the *Topica* but from the intuition of the idea of God:

ille canon logicus: quod convenit definitioni [...] etiam convenit definito (v.g. Deo) [...]. Quaeris, si canon ille definitionis [...] cur eum non retinuit, cur alio potius loquendi modo, quam vulgato et communi usus fuit? Responzionem pete ex Logicae nostrae part. 2 quaest. 134. Voluit potius a notione prima naturae atque ideae, quam a notione secundae definitionis argumentum ducere; [...] cartesiana maior clarius exponit quam definitionis canon [...]. Hae et similes rationes fuerunt Cartesio, cur non uteretur topico isto canone⁷⁸,

The introduction of a logic guided by the criterion of clarity and distinctness supersedes the use of dialectic canons in philosophy. Indeed, in his *Logica vetus et nova* only the syllogistic theory of Aristotle's *Analytica* is accepted, whereas the dialectics of the *Topica* is not considered as being admitted by Descartes⁷⁹. This acceptance is ultimately allowed by the propositional nature of ideas, which enables the inclusion of a proceeding based on the intuition of clear and distinct ideas into a demonstrative, syllogistic system. The use of the notion of *thema complexum*, in fact, is what allows such insertions of ideas into syllogisms. Since *themata* or ideas have a propositional nature, they can be combined in demonstrations. Descartes' third proof, indeed, is presented in a syllogistic form by Clauberg⁸⁰.

The demonstrations of the existence of God open two ways to ensure our knowledge. First of all, Clauberg supports an “ontological” criterion of

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 648.

⁷⁹ It is to be noted, however, that Clauberg himself refers to Aristotle's *Topica* in order to show the premises of Descartes' first proof: *supra*, n. 61.

⁸⁰ «Sic proponi potest: quod continetur in idea seu conceptu, id ipsum de ea verum est. Atqui existentia necessaria continetur in idea seu conceptu Dei, seu, necessitas existendi in Dei idea continetur. Ergo verum est Deum necessario existit. Maior probatur inductione [...]», CLAUBERG 1691, *De cognitione Dei et nostri*, 647.

truth, according to which an idea is more true insofar as it represents something more real than other beings, such as God is. If truth is a matter of correspondence between model and imitation, or between thing and idea, it is still maintained by Clauberg that truth is first of all in the model and by consequence in its ectype. *Veritas rei*, thus, is the condition of correspondence truth⁸¹. Since it contains more perfection, the idea of God is the most true: moreover, the ideas of eternal essences are intrinsically more true than all the others. A traditional point that has its counterpart in Clauberg's theory of transcendentals, which is maintained by him in a Cartesian context⁸². The ultimate argument in the foundation of philosophy, however, is that of *veracitas Dei*, confirming the validity of Descartes' criterion of truth (or evidence in perception) and to be defined as *veritas ethica*:

quoniam philosophaturus ante omnia certam habere debet hanc regulam: quicquid clare et distincte percipio, verum est. Haec autem e veracitate Dei eruitur et a priori demonstratur in metaphysica, licet etiam propriam mentis attendentis conscientiam testem suae certitudinis habeat. [...] Quid intelligitur per Dei veracitatem? Resp. illa quae in scholis veritas ethica dicitur, et a logica nec non metaphysica et physica veritate distinguitur. Consistit autem in dictis, factis, promissis, signis aliis⁸³.

81 In fact, *veritas rei* is the very correspondence of something with its own idea or definition: «quam ad rem observa, quod alii veritatem rei censent consistere in conformitate eiusdem cum sua idea, alii in convenientia cum sua definitione, ubi res eadem diversis tantum modis effertur», *ibid.*, 648.

82 «Per se esse manifestissimum, quod idea Dei mihi exhibeat omnem realitatem, est enim idea Dei, hoc est, entis perfectissimi sive realissimi [...] exhibitio sive repraesentatio. [...] Et hinc sequitur, ideam Dei esse maxime vera, id est, maioris perfectionis, realitatis, veritatis, bonitatis repraesentatricem, quam ulla alia in mente nostra idea, cum nulla alia omnimodam nobis perfectionem repraesentet. [...] Habent etiam realitatem aliae aliis maiorem: veritas enim, realitas, entitas, perfectio hoc loco idem revera sunt», *ibid.*, 616.

83 *Ibid.*, 651.

This statement of God's truthfulness is to be related to the other proof of divine veracity: as *summum ens*, God is the most true being⁸⁴ and cannot deceive us. The ontological *veritas* of God leads to His *veracitas*. That is, the divine attribute of perfection – or His very reality, goodness and unity – is the ultimate guarantee of the truth of our judgements. God is regarded as the most perfect being and as the first cause of things, of truth (as He is truth itself) and therefore as ethically trustworthy: these points are the very ground of every science.

A further point is to be highlighted on Clauberg's *Exercitationes*. Even if primarily intended to ground physics, they are about topics belonging also to the other parts of philosophy. They focus on a broader scope of subjects: some considerations concern the demonstration of the immortality of the soul⁸⁵, the ethical problems related to Descartes' theory of passions (focusing mainly on wonder)⁸⁶ as well as the topic of body-mind relation studied in *Coniunctio*⁸⁷. His *Exercitationes* are functional, ultimately, to the development of a Cartesian Scholastic, or a comprehensive system designed to replace the whole philosophical *curriculum* as the foundation of superior studies. Moreover, his *Exercitationes* reveal some intersections with the last part of philosophy. According to him, rational theology has to be developed as the

84 This is suggested by Clauberg in proving the ethical truthfulness of God through a quotation from Descartes' *Secundae responsiones*: «probatur [...] a summi entis et non-entis oppositione. Resp. 2. p. 76. *Qui est summum ens, non potest non esse etiam summum bonum et verum, atque idcirco repugnat, ut quid ab eo sit quod positive tendat in falsum*», *ibid.*, 652. See AT VII, 144.

85 CLAUBERG 1691, *De cognitione Dei et nostri*, 675-684.

86 *Ibid.*, 722-735.

87 *Ibid.*, 752-755.

concluding part of the system:

nam initio philosophiae non ulterius agitur de Deo, quam quatenus eius cognitio ad iacienda omnis scientiae humanae fundamenta desideratur. Sed in fine absoluta de Deo tractatio instituitur, omniaque eius attributa, quae ex naturae lumine cognosci queunt, expenduntur, quod initio necessarium non erat, quoniam non omnia Dei attributa se habent ut principia rerum creatarum, et quae huiusmodi relationem possunt recipere, non tamen absolute ideo aut plenius, quam originis illa relatio postulat, opus est explicare⁸⁸.

Clauberg will not develop such a complete rational theology. In fact, he developed only a Cartesian ontology, or a branch of philosophy that replaces the old discipline *μετά τα φυσικά*. Such a discipline finds its systematization in his *ontosophia*, or the attempt to develop a theory of being in a Cartesian context. *Ontosophia* is the crown of the system, or a metaphysics that can only be developed after the other disciplines have been established. It can gain the original place of metaphysics and, insofar as it is not designed to ground science, it can deal with mere concepts besides the actual features of substances. It is a replacement, thus, of the traditional *metaphysica*, and can be legitimately developed after physics. However, first philosophy, logic and *ontosophia* are ultimately interconnected.

3. The role of *ontosophia* in the philosophy of Clauberg

Clauberg's metaphysics is to be evaluated in the light of the end of his

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 596. See SAVINI 2011, 184-185.

system. That is, the study of *ens quatenus ens*, or a metaphysics that goes beyond Descartes' foundation of philosophy: besides being a *philosophia prima*, it is also a *philosophia universalis*, *ontosophia*, or the discipline concerning all the attributes of being, no matter if they are only our modes of thinking. In traditional terms, the *metaphysica generalis*⁸⁹. In Clauberg's philosophy, it comes after first philosophy: however, like logic, it has some intersections with foundational theory. An examination of it can highlight the whole structure of Clauberg's system.

Ontosophia had three main editions⁹⁰. Whereas the 1647 version precedes Clauberg's adoption of Cartesianism, the other editions contain Cartesian notions and omit some parts of the first edition (*Prolegomena*, *Didactica* and *Diacritica*), retaining only *Primae philosophiae elementa*⁹¹. Cartesian insertions can be noticed, for instance, in the definition of being as extended or immaterial substance, or in the note on the distinction between first philosophy, based on *cogito*, and *ontosophia*, based on the non-contradiction principle⁹². Even if Clauberg rejects Aristotle's ten categories as the principles of being, he still finds in the Scholastic tradition those concepts allowing the development of a science of being. He proposes, in all the editions of *Ontosophia*, a threefold distinction of the meaning of "*ens*": *intelligibilis*, *realis* and *res*. His 1664 *Ontosophia* is mainly devoted to the properties of *ens* in the third meaning. However, as *philosophia prima* begins

89 On the early history of ontology, see FERRATER MORA 1963, and SAVINI 2011, 25-33. On the distinction of general and special metaphysics in the late Scholastic tradition, see COURTINE 1985.

90 CLAUBERG 1647; CLAUBERG 1660; CLAUBERG 1664(2).

91 CLAUBERG 1647, 37-102. See SAVINI 2011, 189.

92 CLAUBERG 1691, *Metaphysica de ente*, 283, 286 (references are to the third edition).

with the consideration of the mind, *ontosophia* begins with that of intelligible being⁹³. *Ens*, in this meaning, cannot be opposed to anything: indeed, if intelligible being is opposed to a non-intelligible entity, this, in turn, will become intelligible⁹⁴. The second meaning is *aliquid*, or whatever can have a formal being⁹⁵. *Aliquid*, thus, can be opposed to *non ens* as whatever has no formal being⁹⁶. *Non ens* can be, therefore, a sort of *ens* according to the first meaning: even if in this case it is only an *ens rationis*⁹⁷. The third meaning of *ens* is a sub-class of the second one: it is substance as opposed to modes⁹⁸.

93 *Ibid.*, 283. According to Vincent Carraud, the Cartesian foundation of ontology relies on the identification of being with *ens cogitabile*: the Cartesian concept of *mens*, indeed, becomes central in the 1660 and 1664 editions. See CARRAUD 1999.

94 «Non posse quicquam opponi enti sive intelligibili, de quo in praesentia agimus, ne per mentis quidem fictionem. Nam si quid proprie ei opponi posset, id utique foret non ens sive non intelligibile. At eo ipso quo non ens sive non intelligibile opponimus, hoc intelligimus, quia per intellectum ista fit oppositio. Ergo quod non intelligibile tunc dicitur in oratione, fit intelligibile in ratione, unde rationis ens nominatur», CLAUBERG 1691, *Metaphysica de ente*, 283-284.

95 «Aliquid igitur est, quod non tantum mente cogitatur vel cogitari potest, sed alio praeterea modo est aut certe esse potest: sive in mente, ut omnes cogitationes nostrae, sive in mundo», *ibid.*, 285.

96 «Nihilum, quod alicui generatim opponitur [...] non ens appellatum, est quicquid nullum esse reale habet, hinc dicitur aliquid negativum et sua natura, hoc est, cum nulla accedit fictio, tantum negative, id est, per remotionem et absentiam entis animo concipitur, et negativo solum nomine dignum est», *ibid.*, 286.

97 «Haec dicta sunt de nihilo sive non ente, quod enti in secunda significatione accepto contradictorie vel privative opponitur. Hoc vero non obstat, quo minus ipsum quoque nihilum in prima et generalissima significatione ens dici queat. Nempe omnis privatio et negatio, dum rationis nostrae obiectum est, utcunque proprium, hoc est, negativum tantum, de ea conceptum ratio formet, ens rationis dici potest», *ibid.*, 288-289. *Entia rationis*, in fact, must be distinguished: as the fiction of a golden mountain does not imply contradiction, whereas that of square circle does (see *ibid.*, 289).

98 «Ens in significatione tertia acceptum propriissime quoque res dicitur [...]. Vulgo quidem substantia, id est, rei quae ita existit, ut aliquo ad existendum subiecto non indigeat, opponitur accidens, quod in alio existit, tanquam in subiecto; sive, cuius esse est inesse. At non omnia, quae in substantia considerantur, accidentia [...] dici debent; cum plurima sint entis attributa essentialia et inseparabilia, a quibus distinguuntur accidentalia [...]. Et haec proprie modi appellantur, nempe modi rerum ipsarum, a

However, “*ens*” in third signification does not only mean mind and extension: it can also mean modes modified by other modes: that is, *modi mediati* and *immediati*⁹⁹. Therefore, more than substances in a strict sense, *res* are substances or modes (*sensu cartesiano*) conceived as subjects of other modes. Rather than to Cartesian real substances, Clauberg seems to refer to the notions of *subiectum* and *adiunctum* as described by Franco Burgersdijk¹⁰⁰, which Clauberg himself counts among the relative attributes of being in his *Logica contracta* and in *Ontosophia*¹⁰¹. This categorization can be explained by recalling the proper place of Clauberg's *Ontosophia* in the system: its concepts are not designed to be employed in other disciplines but are the result of a speculation on being in its most abstract meanings. Such meanings, therefore, are not regarded as matching the actual features of extended and spiritual substances.

In his *Exercitationes*, moreover, Clauberg admits that even if it is possible to find some attributes common to God and creatures¹⁰², this does

quibus illae afficiuntur et variantur, ut pilei a suis formis», *ibid.*, 290.

99 «Porro res cum opponitur modo [...] non perpetuo significat substantiam; sed interdum etiam accidens, cui alius modus specialior additur, cuius intuitu prior modus tunc res appellatur. Hinc modi alii mediati, alii immediati perhibentur», *ibid.* As Clauberg's *Exercitationes de cognitione Dei et nostri* were published in 1656, well before the circulation of Spinoza's works, this expression cannot have been borrowed from him. An influence of Clauberg on Spinoza, on the other hand, is discussed in LAGRÉE 2002. It concerns, however, biblical hermeneutics rather than ontology.

100 See KARSKSEN 1993.

101 «Essentiae nomine non intelligimus omnia quae rei insunt vel adsunt, sed primum et praecipuum aliquid in ea [...]. Et quicquid praeter illam in re consideramus ut additum et, vel accedens vel accidens (quod neque consituit neque consequitur necessario essentiam, utpote inseparabilem cum ea nexum non habens) adiunctum vocamus», CLAUBERG 1691, *Metaphysica de ente*, 334-335. See his *Logica contracta*, CLAUBERG 1691, 918.

102 See *Exercitatio* LX: «Deum et creaturam habere aliquam in re similitudinem et

not justify the scientific status of *ontosophia*. In other words, even if *ontosophia* is the crown of his system, it is not grounded on first philosophy, since it does not deal with clear and distinct concepts:

hactenus dicta eo faciunt, ut rerum omnium similitudo et convenientia quaedam agnoscatur: at si quis putet me existimare, illis ipsis satis esse probatum tradendam esse ontosophiam seu universalem [...] scientiam, is a mente mea aberrat. [...] Nam si conceptus illi quos habere potest mens nostra, a Deo et creatura quodammodo abstracti et utriusque conceptui communes, non sint satis clari et distincti, sed confusi nimis, et quae mentem veritatis studiosam non satis afficiant, multo minus impleant, dubitari sane cum ratione poterit, an pertineant ad scientiam, utpote quae obiectum requirit quod clare distincteque percipiatur ¹⁰³.

Clauberg, however, sets aside the deeper consequences of Descartes' metaphysics for the theory of being. His *Ontosophia* has a heterogeneous composition, according to which a Cartesian distinction of being in extended and spiritual substance¹⁰⁴ is followed by a survey of its attributes given in traditional terms. As *ens* is first of all a concept or a second notion, *ontosophia* is first of all a study of concepts or *modi considerandi*, i.e., beings of reason. However, because it has not a foundational role with respect to those sciences dealing with objects different from thoughts themselves, according to Clauberg it is still possible to pursue it as a branch of philosophy, or the "science" dealing only with abstract concepts. An emphasis on attributes of

convenientiam», CLAUBERG 1691, *De cognitione Dei et nostri*, 694.

103 *Ibid.*, 703.

104 «Primaria igitur entis realis divisio est illa sine dubio, quae maxime opposita et contraria attributa (intellige positiva) in rebus divisis menti nostrae consideranda exhibet. Nulla autem realia attributa magis opponi sibi queant, quam ex una parte longum, latum et profundum esse [...]; ex altera parte intelligere, velle, nolle et c.», CLAUBERG 1691, *Metaphysica de ente*, 291.

being reduced to mere concepts, *modi considerandi* or beings of reason can be found in different places of the treatise. Discussing real, modal and rational distinctions and the notions of identity and difference, Clauberg admits that

tota haec disputatio de eodem ac diverso potius ad modum cogitandi et loquendi pertinet, quam ad res ipsas in se spectatas. Quod nihil hic novi videri debet, cum similis aliorum generalium entis attributorum sit ratio¹⁰⁵.

Moreover, in the dedicatory letter he states that he is speaking only about our ways of considering things, without clarifying, however, to what extent our abstraction of their attributes is legitimate¹⁰⁶. Despite these remarks, there is a foundational reason for treating transcendentals as real attributes, in Clauberg's perspective. That is, grounding truth on God as the utmost being, whose archetypes are more real, true and good than any other created thing. The definition of God as ethically veracious, provided on the ground of divine perfection and goodness¹⁰⁷, is laid down in the light of the doctrine of transcendentals. The ontological proof of the existence of God has its counterpart in the consideration of being as perfect, true and good. Our thoughts, moreover, are true insofar as they imitate divine archetypes. The correspondence truth is based on the ontological truth, since our ideas of things are more true to the extent that they imitate the models present in the

105 *Ibid.*, 331.

106 «Generalissimos istos conceptus et terminos, uti vocant, ad certum prorsus numerum atque ordinem reduci non posse experiendo didici. Adeo transcendentia illa non solum connexa, verum etiam innexa sibi sunt. Quin imo nihil aliud sunt, quam diversi de re eadem cogitandi modi, qui, animo iam huc iam illuc se convertente, mille formis variari solent et possunt. Id quod hac editione tertia vel inprimis demonstrare studui», *ibid.*, *Lectori salutem*, 279 (unnumbered).

107 *Supra*, n. 83-84.

divine mind¹⁰⁸.

Clauberg's *Ontosophia* reveals, in sum, a problem intrinsic to Cartesianism: that of the adherence to classical metaphysics within a philosophy based on the *cogito*. A tension, therefore, is to be noticed in his metaphysics: between *philosophia prima* and *ontosophia*. Indeed, his metaphysics implies an overestimation of the ontological value of the attributes of being, accordingly of a foundation of truth on a theory deploying the notions of transcendentals. At the same time, it is stated that they are mere ways of considering substances. In any case, insofar as *unum*, *verum* and *bonum* are deemed as actual attributes of things, *ontosophia* seems to have a foundational value, with respect to the other parts of philosophy, more consistent than that admitted by Clauberg himself.

In conclusion, some words are to be devoted to the relations between logic, first philosophy and *ontosophia*, or the study of being¹⁰⁹. In the first edition of his *Ontosophia* Clauberg states that logic has a priority in a didactic order, as it teaches how to use the intellect, whereas metaphysics (still identified with *ontosophia*) comes first in the natural order of the sciences, since it deals with the first genres of things¹¹⁰. In the following editions of Clauberg's *Ontosophia*, and along with the development of his more mature views, the plan of the disciplines changes. As a Cartesian *philosophia prima* is introduced, logic and *ontosophia* come after it. Logic is based on the evidence

108 *Supra*, nn. 81-82.

109 This topic is well considered in SAVINI 2011, 44-69 (*Le rôle de la logique dans l'instauration de la métaphysique, La configuration du rapport entre logique et ontosophia dans la fondation de la métaphysique*) and 184-193 (*Philosophie première et ontologie*).

110 CLAUBERG 1647, 33-34; see SAVINI 2011, 64-65;

criterion prescribed by the method. It maintains, however, its instrumental role¹¹¹: it teaches how to organize and interpret speech in the light of an adequate formation of concepts. Such a logic is implied by Descartes' metaphysics because it makes explicit the rules of reasoning underlying that part of philosophy¹¹². Moreover, it shares with first philosophy its starting point, namely, doubt. If first philosophy discovers the first notions and truths, logic teaches its proper method. It is, somehow, a corollary discipline of first philosophy. The natural order of disciplines outlined by Clauberg prescribes starting with first philosophy and to end, with the help of logic, in *ontosophia*, after all the other disciplines have been established: physics (the trunk of philosophy, also embodying foundational arguments), moral philosophy, medicine, politics, law, mechanics. However, their development is actually interconnected, since metaphysical considerations are implied both by logic and ontology.

ANDREA STRAZZONI

ERASMUS UNIVERSITY, ROTTERDAM

111 CLAUBERG 1691, *De cognitione Dei et nostri*, 592.

112 This is stated in Clauberg's *Exercitationes de cognitione Dei et nostri*: «nuspian apertius Cartesius est logicus, quam in libello de Passionibus animae; sed maxime etiam logicus est, ubi artem celat, ut in Meditationibus metaphysicis. Confer. Log. II. 14. [...] Ad recte definiendum opus esse praemittere divisiones, sancit Logica I. 103. Id quod videmus factum esse ab auctore», *ibid.*, 723. See SAVINI 2004, 378-379.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARIEW 2011 = ARIEW ROGER, *Descartes among the Scholastics*, Leiden-Boston, Brill .

AT = DESCARTES RENÉ, *Oeuvres*, Paris, L. Cerf 1897-1913, ed. by C. Adam, P. Tannery.

CARRAUD 1999 = CARRAUD VINCENT, «L'ontologie peut-elle être cartésienne? L'exemple de L'*Ontosophia* de Clauberg, de 1647 à 1664: de l'*ens* à la *mens*», in VERBEEK THEO (ed.), *Johannes Clauberg (1622-1665) and Cartesian Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publisher (International Archives of the History of Ideas/Archives internationales d'histoire des idées, 164), 13-38.

CLAUBERG 1647 = CLAUBERG JOHANNES, *Elementa philosophiae seu Ontosophia. Scientia prima, de iis quae Deo creaturisque suo modo communiter attribuuntur*, Groningen, typis Joannis Nicolai.

CLAUBERG 1652 = CLAUBERG JOHANNES, *Defensio Cartesiana, adversus Jacobum Revium et Cyriacum Lentulum*, Amsterdam, apud Ludovicum Elzevirium.

CLAUBERG 1655 = CLAUBERG JOHANNES, *Initiatio philosophi, sive dubitatio cartesiana, ad metaphysicam certitudinem viam aperiens*, Leiden-Duisburg, ex officina Adriani Wyngaerden .

CLAUBERG 1656 = CLAUBERG JOHANNES, *De cognitione Dei et nostri, quatenus naturali rationis lumine, secundum veram philosophiam, potest comparari, exercitationes centum*, Duisburg, ex officina Adriani Wyngaerden.

CLAUBERG 1657 = CLAUBERG JOHANNES, *Unterschied zwischen der cartesianischer und der sonst in Schulen gebraeuchlicher Philosophie*, Duisburg, bey Adryan Wyngarten.

CLAUBERG 1660 = CLAUBERG JOHANNES, *Ontosophia nova, quae vulgo Metaphysica, Theologiae, Iurisprudentiae et Philologiae, praesertim Germanicae studiosis accomodata. Accessit Logica contracta, et quae ex ea demonstratur Orthographia Germanica*, Duisburg, typis Adriani Wyngaerden.

CLAUBERG 1664(1) = CLAUBERG JOHANNES, *Physica, quibus rerum corporearum vis et natura, mentis ad corpus relatae proprietates, denique corporis ac mentis acta et admirabilis in homine coniunctio explicantur*, Amsterdam, apud Danielem Elzevirium.

CLAUBERG 1664(2) = CLAUBERG JOHANNES, *Metaphysica de ente, quae rectius Ontosophia*, Amsterdam, apud Danielem Elzevirium. This edition was bounded together with Clauberg's *Physica*.

CLAUBERG 1680 = CLAUBERG JOHANNES, *Differentia inter cartesianam et in scholis vulgo usitatam philosophiam*, Berlin, Völckern .

CLAUBERG 1691 = CLAUBERG JOHANNES, *Opera omnia philosophica*, Amsterdam, ex typographia P. & T. Blaev (reprint Hildesheim, Georg Olms 1968).

COURTINE 1985 = COURTINE JEAN-FRANÇOIS, «Ontologie ou métaphysique?», *Giornale di metafisica* 7 (1985), 3-24.

DESMARETS 1645 = DESMARETS SAMUEL, *Collegium theologicum sive systema breve universae theologiae*, Groningen, ex officina J. Nicolai (1st ed.).

DESMARETS 1649 = DESMARETS SAMUEL, *Collegium theologicum sive systema breve universae theologiae*, Groningen, ex officina J. Nicola (2nd ed.).

EUSTACHE DE SAINT-PAUL 1620 = EUSTACHE DE SAINT-PAUL, *Summa philosophiae quadripartita, de rebus dialecticis, moralibus et metaphysicis*, Paris, Chastelain (1st ed. 1609).

FERRATER MORA 1963 = FERRATER MORA JOSÉ, «On the Early History of 'Ontology'», *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* XXIV/1 (1963), 36-47.

GOCCLENIUS 1613 = GOCCLENIUS RUDOLPH, *Lexicon philosophicum*, Frankfurt, typis viduae Matthiae Beckerii.

KARSKENS 1993 = KARSKEN MICHAEL, «Subject, Object and Substance in Burgersdijk's Logic», in BOS EGBERT P., KROP HENRI A., (eds.), *Franco Burgersdijk (1590-1635): Neo-Aristotelianism in Leiden*, Amsterdam, Rodopi

1993 (Studies in the History of Ideas in the Low Countries, 1), 29-36.

KECKERMAN 1623 = KECKERMANN BARTHOLOMÄUS, *Systema physicum*, Hannover, impensis Ioannis Stockelii 1623³ (1st ed. 1610).

LAGRÉE 2002 = LAGRÉE JACQUELINE, «Sens et vérité chez Clauberg et Spinoza», *Philosophiques* XXIX/1 (2002), 121-138.

LEINSLE 1999 = LEINSLE ULRICH G., «Comenius in der Metaphysik des jungen Clauberg», in VERBEEK THEO (ed.), *Johannes Clauberg (1622-1665) and Cartesian Philosophy in the Seventeenth Century*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publisher (International Archives of the History of Ideas/Archives internationales d'histoire des idées, 164), 1-12.

SAVINI 2004 = SAVINI MASSIMILANO, *Le développement de la méthode cartésienne dans les Provinces-Unies (1643-1665)*, Lecce, Conte.

SAVINI 2006 = SAVINI MASSIMILIANO, «L'invention de la logique cartésienne: la Logica vetus et nova de Johannes Clauberg», *Revue de Métaphisique et de Morale* I (2006), 73-88.

SAVINI 2011 = SAVINI MASSIMILIANO, *Johannes Clauberg: methodus cartesiana et ontologie*, Paris, Vrin, pp. 25-33.

STRAZZONI 2012 = STRAZZONI ANDREA, «The Dutch Fates of Bacon's Philosophy: *Libertas Philosophandi*, Cartesian Logic and Newtonianism», *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa - Classe di Lettere e Filosofia* IV/1, 2012, 251-281.

STRAZZONI 2013 = STRAZZONI ANDREA, «A Logic to End Controversies: The Genesis of Clauberg's *Logica Vetus et Nova*», *Journal of Early Modern Studies* II/2 (2013), 123-149.

STRAZZONI 2014 = STRAZZONI ANDREA, «On Three Unpublished Letters of Johannes de Raey to Johannes Clauberg», *Noctua* I/1 (2014), 68-106.

VERBEEK 1992 = VERBEEK THEO, *Descartes and the Dutch. Early Reactions to Cartesian Philosophy, 1637-1650*, Carbondale and Edwardsville, Southern

Illinois University Press.

VIOLA 1975 = VIOLA EUGENIO, «Scolastica e cartesianesimo nel pensiero di J. Clauberg», *Rivista di Filosofia Neo Scolastica* 67 (1975), 247-266.