distinguish the genuine Aristotle from the questionable accompaniments with which he had made his first appearance in Western Europe. Fresh translations of Aristotle and Averroes had already been made from the Arabic (∏eplτ⅛ f φα *iστοριαι* from the Hebrew) by Michael Scot,· and Hermannus Alamannus, at the instance of the emperor Frederick II. ; so that the whole body of Aristotle’s works was at hand in Latin translations from about 1210 to 1225. Soon afterwards efforts began to be made to secure more literal translations direct from the Greek. Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253) was one of the first to stir in this matter, and he was followed by Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas. Half a century thus sufficed to remove the ban of the church, and soon Aristotle was recognized on all hands as “ the philosopher ” *par excellence,* the master of those that know. It even became customary to draw a parallel between him as the *praecursor Christi in naturalibus* and John the Baptist, the *praecursor Christi in gratuitis.*

This unquestioned supremacy was not yielded, however, at the very beginning of the period. The earlier doctors who avail themselves of Aristotle’s works, while bowing to his authority implicitly in matters of logic, are generally found defending a Christianized Platonism against the doctrine of the *Metaphysics.*

So it is with Alexander of Hales (d. 1245), the first Scholastic who was- acquainted with the whole of the Aristotelian works and the Arabian commentaries upon them. He was more of a theologian than a philosopher; and in his chief work, *Summa uniυersae theotogiae,* he simply employs his increased philosophical knowledge in the demonstration of theological doctrines. So great, however, did his achievement seem that he was honoured with the titles of *Doctor irrefragabitis* and *Theotogorum monarcha.* Alexander of Hales belonged to the Franciscan order, and it is worth remarking that it was the mendicant orders which now came forward as the protagonists of Christian learning and faith and, as it were, reconquered Aristotle for the church. During the first half of the 13th century, when the university of Paris was plunged in angry feuds with the municipality, feuds which even led at one time (1229) to the flight of the students in a body, the friars established teachers in their convents in Paris. After the university had settled its quarrels these continued to teach, and soon became formidable rivals of the secular lecturers. After a severe struggle for academical recognition they were finally admitted to all the privileges of the university by a bull of Alexander IV. in 1253. The Franciscans took the lead in this intellectual movement with Alexander of Hales and Bonaventura, but the Dominicans were soon able to boast of two greater names in Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. Still later Duns Scotus and Occam were both Franciscans. Alexander of Hales was succeeded in his chair of instruction by his pupil John of Rochelle, who died in 1271 but taught only till 1253. His treatise *De anima,* on which Hauréau lays particular stress, is interesting as showing the greater scope now given to psychological discussions. This was .a natural result of acquaintance with Aristotle’s *De anima* and the numerous Greek and Arabian com­mentaries upon it, and it is observable in most of the writers that have still to be mentioned. Even the nature of the universals is no longer discussed from a purely logical or metaphysical point of view, but becomes connected with psychological questions. And, on the whole, the widening of intellectual interests is the chief feature by which the second period of Scholasticism may be distinguished from the first. In some respects there is more freshness and interest in the speculations which burst forth so ardently in the end of the 11th and the first half of the 12th century. Albert and Aquinas no doubt stood on a highçr level than Anselm and Abelard, not merely by their wider range of knowledge but also by the intellectual massiveness of their achievements; but it may be questioned whether the earlier writers did not possess a greater force of originality and a keener talent. Originality was at no time the strong point of the middle ages, but in the later period it was almost of necessity buried under the mass of material suddenly thrust upon the age, to be assimilated. On the other hand, the influence of this new material is everywhere evident in the wider range of questions which are discussed by the doctors of the period. Interest is no longer to the same extent concentrated on the one question of the universals. Other questions, says Hauréau, are “placed on the order of the day—the question of the elements of substance, that of the principle of individuation, that of the origin of the ideas, of the manner of their existence in the human understanding and in the divine thought, as well as various others of equal interest ” (i. 42o). Some of these, it may be said, are simply the old Scholastic problem in a different garb; but the extended horizon of which Hauréau speaks is amply proved by mere reference to the treatises of Albert and St Thomas. They there seek to reproduce for their own time all the departments of the

Aristotelian system.

John of Rochelle was succeeded in 1253 by John Fidanza, better known as Bonaventura (*q.v.),* who also had been a pupil of Alexander of Hales. But the fame of “ the Seraphic Doctor ” is connected more closely with the history of mysticism (see Mysticism) than with the main stream of Scholastic thought. Like his master, he defended Plato—or what he considered to be the Platonic theory—against the attacks of Aristotle. Thus he defended the *uηiυersalia ante rem* as exemplars existent in the divine intelligence, and censured Aristotle’s doctrine of the eternity of the world. Among the earlier teachers and writers of this century we have also to name William of Auvergne (d. 1249), whose treatises *De universo* and *De anima* make extensive use of Aristotle and the Arabians, but display a similar

Platonic leaning. The existence of intellections in our minds is, he maintains, a sufficient demonstration of the existence of an intelligible world, just as the ideas of sense are sufficient evidence of a sensible world. This archetypal world is the Son of God and true God. Robert Grosseteste, important in the sphere of ecclesiastical politics, has been already mentioned as active in procuring translations of Aristotle from the Greek. He also wrote commentaries on logical and physical works of Aristotle. Michael Scot, the renowned wizard of popular tradition, earned his reputation by numerous works on astrology and alchemy. His connexion with philosophy was chiefly in the capacity of a translator. Vincent of Beauvais (d. 1264) was the author of an encyclopaedic work called *Speculum majus,* in which, without much independent ability, he collected the opinions of ancient and medieval writers on the most diverse points, transcribing the fragments of their works which he deemed most interesting.

Albertus Magnus introduces us at once to the great age of Scholasticism (1193-1280). The limits of his long life include that of his still greater pupil, Thomas Aquinas (1227- 1274). For this reason and because the system of Thomas is simply that of Albert rounded to a greater completeness and elaborated in parts by the subtle intellect of the younger man, it will be convenient not to separate the views of master and scholar, except where their differences make it necessary. Albert was “ the first Scholastic who repro­duced the whole philosophy of Aristotle in systematic order with constant reference to the Arabic commentators, and who re­modelled it to meet the requirements of ecclesiastical dogma ” (Ueberweg, i. 436). On this account he was called “ the Universal Doctor.” But in Albert it may be said that the matter was still too new and too multifarious to be thoroughly mastered. In St Thomas this is no longer so. The pupil, entering into his master’s labours, was able from the first to take a more comprehensive survey of the whole field; and in addition he was doubtless endowed with an intellect which was finer, though it might not be more powerful, than his master’s.

The monotheistic influence of Aristotle and his Arabian commentators shows itself in Albert and Aquinas, at the outset, in the definitive fashion in which the “ mysteries ” of the Trinity and the Incarnation are henceforth detached from the sphere of rational or philosophical theology. So long as the Neoplatonic influence remained strong, attempts were still made to demonstrate the doctrine of the Trinity, chiefly in a mystical sense as in Erigena, but also by orthodox churchmen like Anselm. Orthodoxy, whether Catholic or Protestant, has since generally adopted Thomas’s distinction. The existence of God is maintained by Albert and Aquinas to be domonstrable by reason ; but here again they reject the ontological argument of Anselm, and restrict themselves to the *a posteriori* proof, rising after the manner of Aristotle from that which is prior for us to that which is prior by nature or in itself. God is not fully comprehensible by us, says Albert, because the finite is not able to grasp the infinite, yet he is not altogether beyond our knowledge; our intellects are touched by a ray of his light, and through this contact we are brought into communion with him. God, as the only self- subsistent and necessary being, is the creator of all things. Here the Scholastic philosophy comes into conflict with Aristotle’s doctrine of the eternity of the world. Albert and Aquinas alike maintain the beginning of the world in time; time itself only exists since the moment of this miraculous creation. But Aquinas, though he holds the fact of creation to be rationally demonstrable, regards the beginning of the world *in time* as only