



## Aristotelian Psychology in Fifteenth-Century Padua The Case of the Soul, Its Powers, and ‘Ockhamism’\*

When it comes to Renaissance Italy and the question of Ockhamism, scholars can quickly refer to John Monfasani’s seminal article of 1993, which is entitled «Aristotelians, Platonists, and the Missing Ockhamists».<sup>1</sup> Lorenzo Casini, for instance, in an instructive article on the Renaissance debate on the immortality of the soul and the plurality of substantial forms,<sup>2</sup> suggested that a position mentioned in Pietro Pomponazzi, which argues for the pluralist view of the soul, could only be that of Scotus, since, as Casini stated with explicit reference to Monfasani, there was no Ockhamist tradition in Italy. However, as I understand Monfasani, he would not deny Ockhamist positions in (Northern) Italy in general, but only an institutional form of Ockhamism. Monfasani shows that there were no Faculties of theology but only *collegia* of theology in Northern Italy. These *collegia* were mere organizational bodies where doctoral candidates were institutionally gathered. The teaching function of a regular theology Faculty was missing. In this perspective, there was no regular place for professors of theology,<sup>3</sup> and thus an ‘official’ theology was missing too. Since Ockham’s positions found a broad echo in the Faculties of theology in Northern Europe,

---

\*\*I would like to thank Barbara Bartocci, Simon Burton and Andrea Robiglio for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper, and the participants of the Berlin colloquium for theirs. I am also grateful to Lee Klein for the revision of my English.

<sup>1</sup>J. MONFASANI, Aristotelians, Platonists, and the Missing Ockhamists: Philosophical Liberty in Pre-Reformation Italy, «Renaissance Quarterly», 46 (1993), 2, pp. 247-276.

<sup>2</sup>Lorenzo Casini, The Renaissance Debate on the Immortality of the Soul. Pietro Pomponazzi and the Plurality of Substantial Forms, in P.J.J.M. BAKKER and J.M.M.H. THIJSSSEN (eds), *Mind, Cognition and Representation. The Tradition of Commentaries on Aristotle’s De anima*, Ashgate, Aldershot 2007, pp. 127-50, at pp. 142-3.

<sup>3</sup>There were, however, sometimes mendicant friars who casually took on the duty of lecturing on theology. The chairs of Thomist and Scotist theology at the University of Padua were institutionally situated in the Faculty of Arts. MONFASANI, Aristotelians, Platonists, and the Missing Ockhamists, p. 256; M.T. GAETANO, Renaissance Thomism at the University of Padua, 1465-1583. A Dissertation in History Presented to the Faculties of the University of Pennsylvania in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy, 2013, URL: <<http://repository.upenn.edu/dissertations/AAI3609161/>>; cf. P.F. GRENDLER, *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London 2002, pp. 372 ff.

Monfasani's thesis is convincing: there were no positions for professors teaching Ockhamist theology in Northern Italy, and thus Ockhamists(!) were missing there.

In the following, I will hint at the Ockhamist influence at the University of Padua in around the 15<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>4</sup> Specifically, I will focus on the map of the human soul, more precisely, on the question of the plurality of souls and their different powers. I will concentrate on two issues, namely the 'double soul' theory and the 'double power' view, which directly go back to William of Ockham. My picture converges with Monfasani insofar as I refer to Ockhamist 'traces', i.e., to similarities between two of Ockham's positions to be found in different Paduan philosophers, who are certainly neither known to be Ockhamists, nor are they theologians at all. It also converges with modern scholarship that explicitly mentions Ockhamist teaching in Padua, or Renaissance Italy.<sup>5</sup>

I will first outline the medieval debates with respect to the different traditions or currents (1). Then, I will sketch some traces of Ockhamist psychology in Padua in the 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> century, namely the two theories mentioned earlier (2). Third, I will say something about sources (3), and lastly close with two historiographical remarks on the reception of Ockham in 15<sup>th</sup>-century Padua and on the characteristics of the exegesis of Aristotle's psychology in Padua (4).

### *1. The Medieval Paradigm*

Regarding the soul with respect to the body as well as to itself, Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) is, as often, a turning point in medieval philosophy. Before him, it was almost unquestioned that there is more than one substantial form in man, while for Aquinas there is only one single substantial form,

---

<sup>4</sup>The focus on Padua is, first of all, due to pragmatic reasons. It would by far exceed the scope of this paper to refer to all Renaissance philosophers of the period. This is why philosophers of Bologna, who had strong ties with Paduan philosophers are left out here (for the connection between Bologna and Padua, especially concerning psychology, cf. P. KÄRKKÄINEN and H. LAGERLUND, *Philosophical Psychology in 1500: Erfurt, Padua and Bologna*, in S. HEINÄMAA and M. REUTER (eds), *Psychology and Philosophy. Inquiries into the Soul from Late Scholasticism to Contemporary Thought*, Springer, Dordrecht et al. 2009, pp. 27-45). Secondly, it follows an approach that zooms in on specific places of philosophy and researches into the influences flowing together at these. For the University of Padua, its history and teaching, cf. GRENDLER, *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, passim.

<sup>5</sup>Cf., e.g., J. HANKINS, *Humanism, scholasticism, and Renaissance philosophy*, in id. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2007, 30-48, at 38; KÄRKKÄINEN and LAGERLUND, *Philosophical Psychology in 1500*. See the quotations below, fn. 60. Matsen hints, although with qualification, at the similarities between Alessandro Achillini's and Ockham's teaching on universals (H.S. Matsen, *Alessandro Achillini (1463-1512) and his doctrine of 'Universals' and 'Transcendentals'*. A study in Renaissance Ockhamism, Associated University Presses, Lewisburg, Bucknell University Press, London 1974). Eckhard Keßler calls him even «a Renaissance Ockhamist» (E. KESSLER, *The Intellective Soul*, in Charles B. SCHMITT, Quentin SKINNER, Eckhard KESSLER, and Jill KRAYE (eds), *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, and Sydney 1988, pp. 485-534, at p. 495).

namely the rational soul.<sup>6</sup> He allows for no other form, like a form of corporeity, or another soul, be it vegetative or sensitive. To be sure, Albert the Great is, in this respect, a predecessor of Aquinas. Both Aquinas and Albert argue for a strong unity in man. That is to say, man is not to be split up into different beings – i.e., a vegetative, a sensitive, and a rational one – but he is primarily and essentially rational and one individual. Nevertheless, his rational soul encompasses all the functions that lower souls would have, even on a higher level. Since Aquinas favors just one single soul, he needs to safeguard its different operations. Hence, he claims different powers or faculties of this soul which guarantee that a rational soul can be a principle for such divergent, even contrary acts like thinking, smelling, or digesting. The powers are proper accidents of the soul and responsible for different clusters of operations according to different objects. On a macro-level, Aquinas distinguishes between rational, sensitive, and vegetative powers. On a micro-level, he subdivides these powers, e.g., into intellect and will for the rational soul, tasting, hearing, etc. for the sensitive

---

<sup>6</sup>THOMAS AQUINAS, *S. Th.*, I, q. 77, a. 1, corp.: «Respondeo dicendum quod impossibile est dicere quod essentia animae sit eius potentia; licet hoc quidam posuerint. Et hoc dupliciter ostenditur, quantum ad praesens. Primo quia, cum potentia et actus dividant ens et quodlibet genus entis, oportet quod ad idem genus referatur potentia et actus. Et ideo, si actus non est in genere substantiae, potentia quae dicitur ad illum actum, non potest esse in genere substantiae. Operatio autem animae non est in genere substantiae; sed in solo Deo, cuius operatio est eius substantia. Unde Dei potentia, quae est operationis principium, est ipsa Dei essentia. Quod non potest esse verum neque in anima, neque in aliqua creatura; ut supra etiam de angelo dictum est. Secundo, hoc etiam impossibile apparet in anima. Nam anima secundum suam essentiam est actus. Si ergo ipsa essentia animae esset immediatum operationis principium, semper habens animam actu haberet opera vitae; sicut semper habens animam actu est vivum. Non enim, in quantum est forma, est actus ordinatus ad ulteriorem actum, sed est ultimus terminus generationis. Unde quod sit in potentia adhuc ad alium actum, hoc non competit ei secundum suam essentiam, in quantum est forma; sed secundum suam potentiam. Et sic ipsa anima, secundum quod subest suae potentiae, dicitur actus primus, ordinatus ad actum secundum. Invenitur autem habens animam non semper esse in actu operum vitae. Unde etiam in definitione animae dicitur quod est actus corporis potentia vitam habentis, quae tamen potentia non abiicit animam. Relinquitur ergo quod essentia animae non est eius potentia. Nihil enim est in potentia secundum actum, in quantum est actus.» For unicity vs. plurality of forms, cf. e.g. R. ZAVALLONI, *Richard de Mediavilla et la controverse sur la pluralité des formes. Textes inédits et étude critique*, Éditions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, Louvain 1951; D. CALLUS, *The Origins of the Problem of Unity of Forms*, «The Thomist», 24 (1961), pp. 257-285; B.C. BAZÁN, *Pluralisme de formes ou dualisme de substances? La pensée préthomiste touchant la nature de l'âme*, «Revue philosophique de Louvain», 67 (1969), pp. 30-73; R.C. DALES, *The Problem of the Rational Soul in the Thirteenth Century*, Brill, Leiden-New York-Köln 1995; E. MICHAEL, *Averroes and the Plurality of Forms*, «Franciscan Studies», 52 (1992), pp. 155-182; R. PASNAU, *Metaphysical Themes 1274-1671*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 2011, esp. ch. 24-25; W. DUBA, *The Souls After Vienne: Franciscan Theologians' Views on the Plurality of Forms and the Plurality of Souls, ca. 1315-1330*, in P.J.J.M. BAKKER, S.W. DE BOER, and C. LEIJENHORST (eds), *Psychology and the Other Disciplines. A Case of Cross-Disciplinary Interaction (1250-1750)*, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2012, pp. 171-249; E. MITEVA, *The Soul between Body and Immortality: The 13th Century Debate on the Definition of the Human Rational Soul as Form and Substance*, «Philosophia. E-Journal of Philosophy and Culture», 1 (2012), URL = <<http://philosophy-e.com/the-soul-between-body-and-immortality-the-13th-century-debate-on-the-definition-of-the-human-rational-soul-as-form-and-substance/>>.

soul, and nutrition, generation and augmentation for the vegetative soul. In short, we can say that Aquinas suggests a single substantial form position with an extensive set of powers. Since these powers are proper accidents in Aquinas, he and the subsequent tradition spoke of a «real distinction» between the powers among themselves and with respect to the substance or essence of the soul, in which they inhere.<sup>7</sup>

This extensive set of accidents in Aquinas's account was criticized immediately afterwards, e.g., by Henry of Ghent and others. I would like to mention, however, another influential position of the 14<sup>th</sup> century: John Duns Scotus's (d. 1308) «real identity» or «formal distinction». Scotus is well known for his parsimonious use of principles.<sup>8</sup> Yet, in this case, he maintains that a human being is constituted not only of prime matter and an intellectual soul, as Aquinas had said, but also of a *forma corporeitatis*. This latter form of corporeity or bodiliness is necessary, according to Scotus, to explain some obvious natural/metaphysical facts (e.g., in generation and corruption), and some theological necessities (e.g., the veneration of relics). Apart from the plurality of substantial forms, Scotus, as I have said, allows only for one soul, namely the rational one.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, he rejects any other entities, namely proper or other accidents in the soul. The intellective soul is the immediate principle for all acts of the human being, for thinking as well as for nutrition. This, it seems to me, is Scotus's preferred solution; nevertheless, for exegetical motives («to save some authorities»), he

---

<sup>7</sup>For Aquinas's position, cf. J.F. WIPPEL, *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas. From Finite Being to Uncreated Being*, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington D. C. 2000, esp. pp. 275-294; R. PASNAU, *Thomas Aquinas on Human Nature. A Philosophical Study of Summa theologiae 1a 75-89*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002, esp. pp. 151-157; R. PASNAU and Ch. SHIELDS, *The Philosophy Of Aquinas*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO 2003, esp. ch. 6. See D. PERLER, *How Many Souls Do I Have?*, in R.L. FRIEDMAN and J.-M. COUNET (eds), *Medieval Perspectives on Aristotle's De Anima*, Éditions de l'institut Supérieur de Philosophie and Peeters, Louvain-la-Neuve, Louvain, Paris, Walpole, MA 2013, discussing beyond Aquinas also Ockham and Zabarella.

<sup>8</sup>JOHN DUNS SCOTUS, *Reportata Parisiensia II*, d. 16, q. unica, n. 17, in *Opera omnia* 23, p. 74: «Dico igitur quod intellectus et voluntas non sunt res realiter distinctae, sed potest sustineri, quod sunt omnino idem re et ratione; vel quod essentia animae omnino indistincta re et ratione, est principium plurium operationum, sine diversitate reali potentiarum, quae sint vel partes animae, vel accidentia, vel respectus eius. Unde plura in effectu bene possunt esse ab uno in re, quod est omnino idem illimitatum, et tamen principium per se, et causa plurium, non ut ista includunt respectum, et tunc potentiae secundum se nullam omnino habent distinctionem, sed in quantum includunt respectus, distinguuntur ratione; sed ille respectus non est de ratione principii operationis per se. Nec propter hoc sequitur quod intellectus sit voluntas, quia illa non imponuntur principio absolute, sed ut tali sub respectu. Ista via per rationem improbari non potest, quia sicut prima causa, quae est semper illimitata, est omnino eadem, et est principium diversorum immediate, ita quod est illimitatum suo modo, licet non simpliciter respectu istorum, omnino idem re et ratione potest esse, quamquam producta sint diversa.»

<sup>9</sup>For this position of Scotus, cf., e.g., DUBA, *The Souls After Vienne*, esp. pp. 180-188.

proposes a formal distinction between the powers of the soul. Besides the ontological inconsistencies, I think this is Scotus's position of embarrassment.<sup>10</sup>

As a third thinker, I add William of Ockham, whose position will function as a blueprint for the following. Ockham (d. 1374), who is proverbially the most parsimonious theologian of the 14<sup>th</sup> century, assumes three substantial forms, which is not very parsimonious indeed. But it shows Ockham's presuppositions very clearly. These three substantial forms are a 'must' and irreducible when it comes to man as the «rational animal»: (i) Scotus's (or better, the traditional) form of corporeity, (ii) a rational or intellective soul, and (iii), as a third form, another soul, namely a sensitive one.<sup>11</sup> Form (i) is responsible for the shape of the body and solves the above-mentioned

---

<sup>10</sup>SCOTUS, *Reportata Parisiensia II*, d. 16, q. unica, n. 18, pp. 74-75: «Quia tamen ista via [cf. n. 17] non salvat tot auctoritates, sicut potest alia, dico aliter quod potentiae non sunt res alia, sed sunt unitive contentae in essentia animae. De continentia unitiva loquitur Dionysius 5. de divinis nominibus, quia continentia unitiva non est omnino eiusdem, ita quod idem omnino contineat se unitive, nec etiam omnino distincti; requirit igitur unitatem et distinctionem. Est igitur continentia unitiva duplex: Uno modo sicut inferius continet superiora essentialia, et ibi contenta sunt de essentia continentis; sicut eadem est realitas, a qua accipitur differentia in albedine, et a qua genus proximum, ut color, et qualitas sensibilis, et qualitas et quamquam essent res aliae, unitive continerentur in albedine. Alia est continentia unitiva, quando subiectum unitive continet aliqua, quae sunt quasi passiones, sicut passiones entis non sunt res alia ab ente, quia quandocumque determinatur ipsa res, est ens vera et bona. Igitur vel oportet dicere quod non sint res aliae ab ente, vel quod ens non habet passiones reales, quod est contra Aristotelem 4. *Metaph.* [...] *expresse*. Nec tamen magis sunt reales passiones de essentia, nec idem quidditati, quam si essent res alia. Similiter non sunt potentiae idem formaliter, vel quidditative, nec inter se, nec etiam cum essentia animae, nec tamen sunt res aliae, sed idem identitate. Ideo talia habent talem distinctionem secundum rationes formales, qualem haberent realem distinctionem, si essent res aliae realiter distinctae.» Most scholars, however, do not assume this position of Scotus to be one of embarrassment but rather his genuine position; see, e.g., P. KING, *The Inner Cathedral: Mental Architecture in High Scholasticism*, in D. PERLER (ed.), *Transformations of the Soul: Aristotelian Psychology 1250-1650. Special Issue = «Vivarium»*, 46 (2008), 3, Brill, Leiden 2008, pp. 253-274, at pp. 266-268, J.H.L. VAN DEN BERCKEN, *John Duns Scotus in two Minds About the Powers of the Soul*, «*Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie Médiévales*», 82 (2015), 2, pp. 199-240, at p. 230. Cf. also my *Unum antiquum problema: Denys the Carthusian and John Capreolus on the Question Whether the Soul's Essence Is Distinct from Its Potencies. A Late-Medieval Starting Point*, in M. BRÎNZEI and Ch. SCHABEL (eds), *Late-Medieval Commentaries on Peter Lombard's Sentences*, Brepols, Turnhout 2016 (forthcoming). It is clear that what I call his genuine position, namely the no distinction theory, would collide with Trinitarian theology. Since the soul and its structure is paralleled with the immanent Trinity, it is difficult to assume a single soul without differentiation within it, for it would suggest that in God it is the same; thus, this position equals a denial of the Trinity. Trinitarian considerations, I think, are one motive for why Scotus develops a position of embarrassment. For Trinitarian theology in 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> centuries, cf. R.L. FRIEDMAN, *Intellectual Traditions at the Medieval University: The Use of Philosophical Psychology in Trinitarian Theology among the Franciscans and Dominicans, 1250–1350*, 2 vols, Leiden and Boston, Brill 2013; for Scotus in particular, cf. *ibid.*, vol. 1, 341-416.

<sup>11</sup>WILLIAM OF OCKHAM, *Quodlibet II*, q. 10, ed. J.C. WEY, St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, NY 1980, p. 157.11-19: «Ad istam quaestionem [sc. *Utrum anima sensitiva et intellectiva in homine distinguantur realiter*] dico quod sic. Sed difficile est hoc probare, quia ex propositionibus per se notis probari non potest. Probo tamen quod distinguuntur realiter primo sic:

problems in a coherent way (generation/corruption, veneration of relics, etc.). Unlike Scotus, Ockham believes that sensitive and intellective acts are ontologically irreducible to one principle, since they can be – and often are – contrary acts, which cannot exist in the same subject. Thus, we have to assume another two substantial forms, (ii) and (iii), as subjects or means of these different kinds of acts. Unlike Aquinas and like Scotus, Ockham does not argue for a plurality of powers within these two souls, namely sensitive and intellective, but believes each soul to be the immediate principle for all its proper acts. In this perspective, Ockham rigidly adopts his principle of parsimony.<sup>12</sup>

There is another feature in Ockham's theory which results from the view just mentioned and which is important for the following discussion, namely Ockham's distinction between two kinds of powers.<sup>13</sup> He understands powers of the soul (*potentiae animae*) to be either (a) partial causes (*causae partiales*) or (b) partial principles (*principia partialia*). Powers as partial causes (a) are necessary for the vital acts of the composite, and thus they are really distinct, since they go back to distinct dispositions. The act of hearing is based on the organ ear, the act of seeing is based on the eye, etc. Since the organs are distinct, the corresponding powers have to be really distinct, too. Powers as principles, however, are not distinct, since they just go back to the soul as such, or better as the eliciting agent (*anima eliciens*).<sup>14</sup>

Ockham's theory thus is a kind of middle position in many ways; it is, moreover, in some sense disproportionate to the ones mentioned before. Ockham is not as parsimonious as Scotus, since he has one more substantial form and one more soul. He is even less parsimonious than Aquinas, who assumes just a single substantial form. When it comes to powers, Ockham is more parsimonious than Aquinas, who has an extensive set of powers (i.e., proper accidents). Ockham, moreover,

---

impossibile est quod in eodem subiecto sint simul contraria; sed actus appetendi aliquid et actus renuendi idem in eodem subiecto sunt contraria; igitur si sint simul in rerum natura, non sunt in eodem subiecto; sed manifestum est quod sunt simul in homine, quia illud idem quod homo appetit per appetitum sensitivum, renuit per appetitum intellectivum.» For Ockham's position, see, e.g., H. LAGERLUND, John Buridan and the Problems of Dualism in the Early Fourteenth Century, «Journal of the History of Philosophy», 42 (2004), 4, pp. 369-387, esp. pp. 374-376, and Perler's article (see next fn.).

<sup>12</sup>Cf., e.g., D. PERLER, Ockham über die Seele und ihre Teile, «Recherches de théologie et philosophie médiévales», 77 (2010), 2, pp. 313-350; S.W. DE BOER, The Science of the Soul. The Commentary Tradition on Aristotle's De anima, c. 1260 - c. 1360, Leuven University Press, Leuven 2013, pp. 249-252.

<sup>13</sup>For the following, cf. also DE BOER, The Science of the Soul, pp. 249-252.

<sup>14</sup>OCKHAM, Quaestiones in librum tertium Sententiarum (Reportatio), q. 4, ed. F. E. KELLEY and G. I. ETZKORN, St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, NY 1982, pp. 130-148, esp. p. 135.2-6: «Ad quaestionem dico quod potentia animae potest dupliciter accipi: uno modo pro omni necessario requisito ad quemcumque actum vitalem tanquam causa partialis; alio modo pro illo praecise quod se tenet a parte animae elicentis tanquam principium partiale.» However, one should not forget that already Scotus assumes that bodily organs have semi-forms (*formae partiales*); cf. DUBA, The Souls after Vienne, pp. 182-187.

introduces the explicit distinction between powers based on organs or dispositions, which have to be really distinct (see Aquinas) and powers, in general, which must be identical with the correspondent soul (see Scotus). This seems to have been an interesting blueprint for Paduan teaching, which was highly occupied with an Averroistic exegesis of Aristotle's psychology.

## 2. «Traces» of Ockhamist Psychology in Padua

Although there were no professed Ockhamists and no institutionalized teaching *in via moderna* – and hence no *Wegestreit* – in Padua or elsewhere in Italy, as Monfasani has shown,<sup>15</sup> we nevertheless find many traces of Ockhamist positions in Padua.<sup>16</sup> It seems that Ockham's mapping of the soul especially fits the Averroist teaching of the unicity and separability of the intellect. In this perspective, Paduan philosophy picks up traditional views and sets them into a new context. One could even speak of an eclecticism as, for instance, Kärkkäinen and Lagerlund do;<sup>17</sup> or we could speak of the continuity and discontinuity of the medieval tradition.<sup>18</sup> In the following, this will become quite clear. Even where one detects a rather Ockhamist approach to the map of the soul, as we will below, one at the same time finds distinct features of the Thomist or even Scotist tradition. While this would have been unthinkable in Northern Europe, in Italy, or especially in Padua, it was quite common – both before and after the introduction of the school chairs.<sup>19</sup> I will present two

---

<sup>15</sup>See above with nt. 1.

<sup>16</sup>For «school traditions» in Padua, esp. Thomism, cf. GAETANO, Renaissance Thomism at the University of Padua.

<sup>17</sup>KÄRKKÄINEN and LAGERLUND, Philosophical Psychology in 1500, pp. 27-45. The authors follow up on C.B. SCHMITT, Aristotle and the Renaissance, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA / London 1983, pp. 99-103, who already spoke of eclecticism in Aristotelianism. E. MICHAEL, The Nature and Influence of Late Renaissance Paduan Psychology, «History of Universities», 12 (1993), pp. 65-94, at p. 69 labels Paduan psychology as «Renaissance Pluralism».

<sup>18</sup>This seems to be the perspective of Hasse, when, in another context, he speaks of Vernia trying to reach philosophical consistency rather than lacking principles; cf. D.N. HASSE, The Attraction of Averroism in the Renaissance: Vernia, Achillini, Prassicio, «Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies. Special Issue: Philosophy Science & Exegesis», 47 (2004), pp. 131-147, at p. 137. Cf. also K. EISENBICHLER (ed.), Renaissance Medievalisms, Centre for Reformation and Renaissance Studies, Toronto 2009.

<sup>19</sup>Mahoney has already investigated the Thomist and Scotist traditions in Padua. On the one hand, he has identified an «important, though not dominant, influence» of Aquinas's works in Padua; cf. E.P. MAHONEY, Saint Thomas and the School of Padua at the End of the Fifteenth Century, in G.F. MCLEAN (ed.), Thomas and Bonaventure. A Septicentenary Commemoration, American Catholic Philosophical Association, Washington, DC 1974, pp. 277-294, at p. 283. On the other hand, he has noticed interest in Scotist positions, e.g., in Nicoletto Vernia, Pietro Pomponazzi, Agostino Nifo, and Marcantonio Zimara, while there were strong defenders of Scotus (Antonio Trombetta and Maurice O'Fihely) and anti-Scotists (Cajetan); cf. E.P. MAHONEY, Duns Scotus and the School of Padua around 1500, in C. BÉRUBÉ (ed.), Regnum Hominis et Regnum Dei. Acta Quarti Congressus Scotistici Internationalis, Patavii, 24-29 septembris 1976, vol. 2: Sectio specialis. La tradizione scotistica veneto-padovana, Societas Internationalis Scotistica, Roma 1978, pp. 215-

issues: first, double soul positions and second, double power theories. I will refer to some prominent natural philosophers, who were no ‘school heads’ in the Thomist or Scotist tradition and who shared a teacher-student relationship, namely Paul of Venice, Gaetano da Thiene, Nicoletto Vernia, and Agostino Nifo.

### 2.1 Double Soul Positions

The first striking similarity between Ockham and these Paduan philosophers is the double soul theory. Paul of Venice (d. 1429), for example, supposes two total souls (*animae totales*) in man, namely the sensitive soul – which he calls, with Averroes, the cogitative soul and which contains both vegetative and sensitive powers – and the intellective soul.<sup>20</sup> The sensitive soul is the term of generation and is corruptible. It is present in the individual human body and educed from matter. The intellective soul is immaterial and common to all individuals. How do they relate to each other? They are both characterized as first perfection – the intellect, however, as a passive one; they are both complete or full-fledged forms, as the concept of *anima totalis* suggests. But how can one subject have two forms, one could ask with Averroes? Paul draws a distinction between the substantial and the accidental form: the sensitive soul is the substantial form; it informs the body and inheres in it. The intellective soul is an accidental form, only informing the body and not inhering in it and thus constituting a specific and essential being.<sup>21</sup> Paul, hence, differs both from Aquinas, who assumes just one soul, and from Ockham, who assumes two souls but both as substantial forms. Ockham’s position could therefore be questioned with respect to ontology, the question being: how can there be two separate forms in a substance? Moreover, Ockham also has a problem regarding interaction, namely: how can the operations of one soul be in relation with the other and vice versa? On the other hand, one must ask Paul: how can we define man as a rational animal when he is rational only by accident and not essentially? But this is exactly the Averroist

---

227.

<sup>20</sup>PAUL OF VENICE, *Summa philosophiae naturalis. Liber de anima*, c. 5, concl. 4, Venetiis 1503 (repr. Hildesheim / New York 1974), f. 68vb: «Sed in hominibus praeter formas partiales vegetativas sunt duae totales, scilicet sensitiva multiplicata ad partes heterogeneas et intellectiva non multiplicata ad aliquam partem eius individui, scilicet bene ad omnia individua speciei humanae, eo quod intellectus est unus in omnibus hominibus iuxta intentionem Aristotelis et determinationem Commentatoris, III<sup>o</sup> De anima.»

<sup>21</sup>PAUL OF VENICE, *Liber de anima*, c. 5, f. 69ra and c. 36, f. 88ra (concl. 3), f. 88rb (ad 1). See also Z. KUKSEWICZ, *La teoria dell’anima in Paolo Veneto*, in L. OLIVIERI (ed.), *Aristotelismo veneto e scienza moderna*, Antenore, Padua 1983, pp. 325-347, esp. p. 335. Here, Kuksewicz explains the double soul position in Venetus as going back to a logical rather than physical perspective, since the features of the two souls display exactly the two notions given in the definition of man (*animal – rationale*). Yet, if we recall the argument that the cogitative soul is the term of generation, we should be careful not to underrate the physical explanation.

problem: man is a thinking being only by accident and thus his perfection is accidental not only by execution (2<sup>nd</sup> perfection) but even ontologically (1<sup>st</sup> perfection).

His disciple and successor Gaetano da Thiene (d. 1465) knows Paul's position and refers to it as the third possible answer to the question of how many souls we have.<sup>22</sup> The first one reminds us of Scotus, as Gaetano says that this position posits a separate soul for each level of being: a soul for being animate, for being sensitive, for being a man, and an *anima individualis* by which man is individualized into Socrates or Plato. Although Scotus's *haecceitas* guarantees the individualization of man, he did not accept more than one soul in the composite.<sup>23</sup> The second position will later be adopted by Giacomo Zabarella (d. 1589), who says that there are exactly three souls corresponding

---

<sup>22</sup>GAETANO DA THIENE, De anima, II, c. 32, Venetiis 1505, f. 21va-b: «In hac materia plures inveniuntur positiones. Prima fuit quorundam qui posuerunt in eodem composito substantiali tot esse formas substantiales quot sunt praedicata de eo quidditative praedicabilia, quarum quasdam generales esse dixerunt, ut forma per quam est substantia vel corpus, aliam vero specificam vel individuaem, ut forma per quam est in tali specie vel tale individuum, et sic in homine essent animae plures magis communes et minus, ut anima per quam est corpus animatum, et anima per quam est corpus sensitivum sive animal, et anima per quam est homo, istis superadditur anima individualis, per quam est hic homo, ut Sortes vel Plato etc.

Secunda positio fuit aliorum qui dixerunt in plantis unicam esse animam, scilicet vegetativam, in brutis autem duas, scilicet vegetativam et sensitivam, et in hominibus tres, videlicet vegetativam, sensitivam et intellectivam, sic quod in mortalibus anima sensitiva praesupponit vegetativam et intellectiva[m] sensitivam et non econtra<rio>, sicut tetragonus praesupponit trigonum et quaternarius ternarium et non conuertitur.

Tertia positio tenet quod in plantis est solum una anima, scilicet vegetativa et in brutis imperfectis est solum una anima quae est vegetativa et sensitiva, propter eius imperfectionem; sed in brutis perfectis est solum una anima quae est forma totius et illa est sensitiva et non vegetativa, et praeter illam in eis sunt animae plures vegetativae specie differentes, quarum quaelibet est forma partis sicut anima carnis, anima ossis, anima nervi etc. Et ex hoc apparet quomodo caro, os, nervus etc. ab invicem specificè essentialiter distinguuntur, in homine autem praeter tales formas partium ponit alias duas formas quae sunt formae totius, scilicet sensitivam eductam de potentia materiae et intellectivam in qua plures diversificati sunt, quia quidam ponunt eam creari de novo et numeraliter multiplicari. Alii autem insequentes Averroem III De anima ponunt eam unicam in omnibus hominibus ingenerabilem et incorruptibilem.

Quarta positio est domini Alberti et plurium aliorum quod in quolibet animato est tantum una anima, quae habet plures virtutes quibus operatur et quanto anima est perfectior tanto plus habet virtutes, quoniam quicquid potest anima imperfectior et magis universalis potest anima perfectior et minus universalis, et cum hoc excellentius et plus. Unde quicquid potest anima vegetativa potest anima sensitiva et excellentibus, quia perfectior est nutritio, augmentatio et generatio facta anima sensitiva bruti quam facta ab anima vegetativa plante et cum hoc anima sensitiva bruti potest sentire quod non potest anima vegetativa plante, et similiter dicatur de anima intellectiva respectu animae sensitivae et ex hoc patet qualiter in sensitivo est in potentia vegetativum et intellectivo sensitivum loquendo de mortalibus et non econtra<rio>, sicut in tetragono trigon[i]um, ut superius dixit Aristoteles.» On Gaetano's position on the soul and his possible *scotistic* influences, cf. S. DA VALSANZIBIO, La «via Scoti» in Gaetano di Thiene, in BÉRUBÉ (ed.), Regnum Hominis et Regnum Dei, pp. 199-205. On Gaetano in general, A. A. ROBIGLIO, Gaetano da Thiene, in M. SGARBI (ed.), Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy, URL = <<http://link.springer.com/referencework/10.1007/978-3-319-02848-4/page/g/1>>.

<sup>23</sup>Cf. DUBA, The Souls After Vienne, esp. p. 183.

to the specific grades of living being: vegetative, sensitive, and intellective souls.<sup>24</sup> Paul's position is twofold in Gaetano. The first one (3.1) is Paul's, as described above, but with the Christian turn that the intellective soul is created and multiplied according to the number of individuals. The second one (3.2) is Averroes's proper position, claiming that there is only one uncreated and incorruptible intellect for all men. Gaetano opts, however, for the fourth position, which is explicitly connected to Albert and several other theologians. It assumes a hierarchy of souls in which the higher one always has the powers (*virtutes*) of the lower one at its disposal. There is only one soul to a composite, with powers really distinct in regard to both the essence of the soul and the powers among themselves. One might doubt, however, how much Gaetano really differs from Paul's position. First, he seems to somehow stick to the view of a double soul when he says elsewhere that before the created human soul can be united with the human body, matter has to be predisposed by a special agent (*agens particulari*).<sup>25</sup> One can interpret this in the sense that there is a natural goal of generation before the arriving of the soul. Paul called it a «cogitative soul», Gaetano does not name it at all. Second, although Gaetano gives arguments to reject the Averroist position in his *De anima* commentary, III, c. 5, it is curious that the rejected position seems to be stronger and its arguments better defended than most of what is adduced against it.<sup>26</sup> So maybe Gaetano was in fact a «hidden Averroist»<sup>27</sup> or at least a «hidden Ockhamist».

Nicoletto Vernia (d. 1499), disciple and successor of Gaetano draws the same distinction. He speaks of a double man, a corruptible one (*homo corruptibilis*), which is perishable and cannot be beatified, and a man, which is an aggregate of the corruptible one and an intellect, and which can be beatified.<sup>28</sup> Although the *aggregatum* unity is weaker than the unity between matter and extended

<sup>24</sup>GIACOMO ZABARELLA, *De facultatibus animae liber*, cc. 9-13, in *De rebus naturalibus libri XXX*, Coloniae 1590, cols 640-658. PASNAU, *Metaphysical Themes 1274-1671*, p. 590; MICHAEL, *Nature and Influence*, pp. 73-74.

<sup>25</sup>GAETANO DA THIENE, *De anima*, III, c. 5, op. 3, f. 58ra: «Fuit et tertia positio ceteris tutior et magis credenda, non solum, quia fides catholica Christianorum eam tenet, sed etiam ex seipsa, quia ponit animam humanam non generari ab agente particulari educente eam de potentia materiae, sed ab agente supernaturali, videlicet deo ipso creari ex nihilo et materiae ab agente particulari praedispositae infundi et corpori humano uniri secundum esse.»

<sup>26</sup>Cf. GAETANO DA THIENE, *De anima*, III, c. 5, ff. 55rb-59ra.

<sup>27</sup>KEBLER, *The Intellective Soul*, p. 491, for instance, emphasizes Gaetano's tendency towards Averroistic teaching in natural philosophy. In psychology, however, he believes Gaetano to have a conciliatory view between the Latin-scholastic and the Averroistic interpretation of Aristotle. This is why I have used the attribute «hidden».

<sup>28</sup>NICOLETTO VERNIA, *Quaestio utrum anima intellectiva humano corpori unita tanquam vera forma substantialis dans ei esse specificum substantiale, aeterna atque unica sit in omnibus hominibus*, MS Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Lat. VI, 105 (=2656), f. 156r, quoted from: E. DE BELLIS, *Nicoletto Vernia. Studi sull'aristotelismo del XV secolo*, Leo S. Olschki, Firenze 2012, pp. 34-35, fn. 74 and 75: «Ad quod argumentum respondet Gandunus et bene, quod per hominem possumus duo intelligere: aut enim intelligimus per ipsum solum hominem corruptibilem, aut aggregatum ex homine corruptibili et ipso intellectu. Si loquamur de homine primo modo, concedamus vero omnia ad quae deducit argumentum, scilicet quod ille non est intellectivus nec felicitabilis. [...] Tale aggregatum non sit unum tanta unitate quanta unitate est

form in the composite «corruptible man», it still suffices to constitute a unified operation of the composite. The term «aggregate» itself reminds us of Ockham's description of how the accident is one with its subject,<sup>29</sup> and hence Vernia, like Paul of Venice, seems to understand the intellect to be an accident of the corruptible man.

The early Agostino Nifo (d. 1538/1545) also picks up Paul of Venice's idea of a double soul – and develops it further. According to Nifo, the *anima cogitativa* and *anima intellectiva* are not total but partial souls. Together they form one total soul, namely the rational one. The cogitative soul is the form of matter, from which an imperfect man is generated (called a medium). The intellect then is the form of the cogitative soul, from which the rational soul is generated.<sup>30</sup> So, there is one part of the rational soul educed from matter, another one immaterial and the substantial form of the composite.<sup>31</sup> The later Nifo turns to a Neo-Platonic cosmology to overcome the problem of how a rational soul can be material as well as immaterial. The rational soul, he then claims, is a middle form between the two extremes materiality and immateriality.<sup>32</sup>

## 2.2 Double Power Positions

---

unum compositum ex materia et forma extensa. [...] Est tamen unum tanta unitate quod illa sufficit ad operationem unam. Est enim tanta connexio, ut ex sententia Averrois colligitur, inter intellectum et corruptibilem hominem, quod unum sine alio minime esse potest; recipit enim intellectus ipse perfectionem suam in corpore, sine quo minime adeptus esse potest.» For Vernia, cf., e.g., E. DE BELLIS, Vernia, Nicoletto, in SGARBI (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy*, URL = <<http://link.springer.com/referencework/10.1007/978-3-319-02848-4/page/v/1>>.

<sup>29</sup>Cf., e.g., OCKHAM, *Summula philosophiae naturalis*, I, 16, p. 198.38-42: «Sciendum quod 'generari' et 'corrumpi' non solum inveniuntur in compositis ex materia et forma substantiali, sed etiam in aggregatione ex subiecto et accidente inhaerente, sicut quando homo fit albus ibi est unum aggregatum ex homine et albedine, quod nec est homo nec albedo.»

<sup>30</sup>AGOSTINO NIFO, *In tres libros Aristotelis De anima*, Venetiis 1559, col. 720: «Debes scire [...] quod hic est ordo intellectuum quod anima cogitativa hominis est forma materiae, ex qua et materia resultat quoddam non perfecte homo, sed medium. Intellectus est forma cogitativae, e qua et cogitativa constituitur anima rationalis essentialiter et per se, quae anima rationalis habet duas partes, unam per quam est educta de potentia materiae, scilicet cogitativam, quae est ultimus gradus partium sensitivarum, alteram per quam hoc perficitur, et reponitur in specie completa, et est intellectus potentiae, ex quibus tota rationalis anima consurgit, quae est forma substantialis hominis in eo quod homo. Et sic patet quo pacto cogitativa est forma hominis; est enim dimidium formae et non tota forma.» For Nifo, cf., e.g., E. DE BELLIS, Nifo, Agostino, in SGARBI (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Renaissance Philosophy*, URL = <<http://link.springer.com/referencework/10.1007/978-3-319-02848-4/page/n/1>>.

<sup>31</sup>This generic difference between both souls, i.e., the vegetative/sensitive and intellective one, accounts for the split-up of psychology into two disciplines, namely natural philosophy and metaphysics. Cf. P.J.J.M. BAKKER, *Natural Philosophy, Metaphysics, or something in between? Agostino Nifo, Pietro Pomponazzi, and Marcantonio Genua on the Nature and Place of the Science of the Soul*, in P.J.J.M. BAKKER and J. THIJSEN (eds), *Mind, Cognition and Representation. The Tradition of Commentaries on Aristotle's De anima*, Ashgate, Aldershot 2007, pp. 151-177, at p. 158.

<sup>32</sup>AGOSTINO NIFO, *De intellectu*, c. 22, Venetiis 1503, f. 27va-b. E. KESSLER, *Die Philosophie der Renaissance. Das 15. Jahrhundert*, C. H. Beck, München 2008, p. 164.

As said above, a second distinction is characteristic of Ockham and post-Ockham psychology, namely the distinction between two understandings of the term power. While Ockham calls the powers *principium partiale* and *causa partialis*,<sup>33</sup> John Buridan (d. after 1358), a central figure in the reception of Ockham in Paris, names them *potentia principalis* and *potentia instrumentalis*.<sup>34</sup> In both cases, the former power is rooted in the essence of the soul, whereas the latter one originates in the organs. Hence, Ockham and Buridan argue for a real identity between both the soul and powers and the powers among themselves in the first case, as well as a real distinction in the second case. Paul of Venice speaks of «*potentia universalis*» and of «*potentia particularis*», but their description is the same. The first one is rooted in the essence of the soul, whereas the second one originates in the organs. Paul then says that the soul is really and essentially different from its powers and that some powers only differ formally (*ratione et diffinitione*).<sup>35</sup> Alessandro Conti claims that Paul is close to Aquinas and Giles of Rome in assuming a real distinction between the soul's essence and its powers, while he (Paul) adopts a formal distinction between the powers among themselves,<sup>36</sup> which could be characterized as a Scotist understanding. Yet, I would rather suggest another reading of Paul's text: the real distinction refers to the powers in the particular understanding, namely those which originate in the organs, while the formal distinction refers to the universal powers. This interpretation seems to be closer to the text in which Paul first speaks of the differences between vegetative, sensitive, and motive powers and then says that they differ «in *ratione et diffinitione*». The reference to definition also seems to indicate that we speak about different genera of things. Examples for the particular powers are then vision and audition, which originate in organs. Here, it

---

<sup>33</sup>OCKHAM, *Quaestiones in librum tertium Sententiarum* (Reportatio), q. 4, ed. F.E. KELLEY–G.I. ETZKORN, St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure, NY 1982, pp. 135.2-136.18: «Ad quaestionem dico quod potentia animae potest dupliciter accipi: uno modo pro omni necessario requisito ad quemcumque actum vitalem tanquam causa partialis; alio modo pro illo praecise quod se tenet a parte animae elicentis tanquam principium partiale. Primo modo, dico quod potentiae sensitivae distinguuntur ab anima et inter se. [...] Secundo modo non distinguuntur realiter, sicut res et essentiae distinctae, nec inter se nec ab anima sensitiva. Quod probatur, quia frustra fit per plura quod potest fieri per pauciora.» Cf. also DE BOER, *The Science of the Soul*, p. 250.

<sup>34</sup>DE BOER, *The Science of the Soul*, p. 243. For Buridan, cf., as a starting point, e.g., J. ZUPKO, John Buridan, in E.N. ZALTA (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2014 Edition), URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/buridan/>>.

<sup>35</sup>PAUL OF VENICE, *Liber de anima*, c. 4, f. 68ra: «Secundo est notandum iuxta intentionem Aristotelis I° et II° De anima quod potentiarum animae quedam sunt universales, quaedam particulares. Potentia universalis est illa quae immediate fundatur in anima, ut vegetativa, sensitiva, secundum locum motiva, intellectiva et appetitiva, eo quod propria passio immediate fundatur in suo subiecto; potentia vero particularum est illa quae immediate fundatur in organo, ut visiva, auditiva, gustativa et olfactiva et tactiva ac omnes potentiae sensitivae interiores; corrupto enim organo corporali necessario corrumpuntur istae potentiae [...].»

<sup>36</sup>A. CONTI, Paul of Venice, in E.N. ZALTA (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2012 Edition), §5 Psychology, URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2012/entries/paul-venice/#Psy>>.

would be quite odd to simply claim a formal distinction, as Paul himself says, since vision would then be audition, the eye would be an ear, or the eye would hear. Moreover, to posit a real distinction in this context is to claim that powers are accidents (proper accidents in Aquinas's terms).<sup>37</sup> To posit that powers are accidents with regard to the soul and not among themselves seems strange. The claim, however, that powers originating in organs are accidents, while powers directly originating in the soul are not, although they are formally distinguishable, seems coherent. The same distinction is found in Nifo's early commentary.<sup>38</sup> He calls the universal powers *aptitudines* and the particular or instrumental ones *complexiones*. The first ones are convertible with the soul's essence, the other ones are qualities of the second species. In his later corrections, he questions this view by explicitly referring to Aquinas's and Giles of Rome's position that intellect and will are really distinct powers, which they were not in the earlier view.<sup>39</sup> As far as I can see, Gaetano da Thiene, and Vernia do not use this distinction at all. Though Gaetano uses the distinction between absolute and respective powers, by this he simply claims that powers are accidents; powers hence are instruments for the soul and they are in potency towards their acts. But Nifo's disciple Marcantonio Zimara and later on Giacomo Zabarella will refer to the distinction between powers and *aptitudines*. Zimara uses the term *potentia* to denote a power that is equally directed towards contrary alternatives, while *aptitudo* denotes a power that is only directed towards one of the alternatives. *Potentia* is the more general inclination to acts, while *aptitudo* is more specific, namely according to the material circumstances.<sup>40</sup> Zabarella also uses the concept of *aptitudo* to explicitly

---

<sup>37</sup>If Conti's interpretation was correct, then Paul's position would be curious. Paul would then claim that the soul's essence is really different from the powers. Since the powers among themselves differ only formally, they would be really one power, distinct from the soul's essence. Compared to Scotus's solution of embarrassment, it would be much more eclectic. Scotus assumes one soul, which is *in se* formally distinct, while Paul would assume one power, distinct from the soul which as a power is *in se* formally distinct.

<sup>38</sup>NIFO, *In tres libros Aristotelis De anima*, cols 293-294.

<sup>39</sup>NIFO, *In tres libros Aristotelis De anima*, col. 295: «In collectaneis diximus quod potentiae possunt accipi aut pro aptitudinibus, quibus anima est apta in corpore exercere diversas operationes, aut pro potentiis, quae resultant in diversis partibus corporis per hoc quod anima unitur illis mediantibus diversis complexionibus, et sic potentiae sunt aut ipsae complexionibus mediantibus quibus anima exercet diversas operationes, aut sunt qualitates consequentes unionem animae ad diversas partes diversimode commixtas, et hoc pacto enitebar concordare auctores. Nunc vero considerans melius quaestionem iterum revoco in dubium, quia sunt nonnullae potentiae animae, quae non resultant in corpore ex unione animae ad diversas partes corporis, quales sunt intellectus et voluntas; hae enim cum insint animae et non resultent in diversis partibus corporis ex unione animae ad illas, magna quaestio est an differant ab anima, an anima sit hae suae potentiae. Et sic in collectaneis non videmur satisfecisse in omnibus. Divus ergo Thomas et Aegidius dixerunt animam ab eius potentiis differre realiter. Tum quia nulla res creata agit per suam essentiam, sed per potentiam realiter distinctam ab essentia. Tum secundo, quia actus harum potentiarum est accidens, ergo et potentiae; actus enim et potentia sunt eiusdem generis [...].»

<sup>40</sup>MARCO ANTONIO ZIMARA, *Theoremata*, prop. 105, Venetiis 1547, p. 167b: «[Potentia differt ab aptitudine:] Et adverte etiam quod apud sapientes arabes potentia differt ab aptitudine, quia

correct both positions, that of Aquinas and that of Scotus. He criticizes Scotus for the real identity thesis, since, according to Zabarella, substance and faculties or powers of the soul are really distinct. For the soul is a substance and the faculties are qualities, i.e., accidents. Against Aquinas, he supposes that these faculties do not play an active or instrumental role, but exist solely as conditions or inclinations that direct the soul towards its operations.<sup>41</sup> He seems to understand them as emanations of the soul's essence.<sup>42</sup>

### 3. *Why an Ockhamist rather than an Averroist Interpretation?*

Looking back to the first theory mentioned, namely the one of two distinct souls (2.1), one might question its Ockhamist origin. Instead, we might rather situate the solution within a more or less genuine Averroistic exegesis of Aristotle. This is certainly the right background, yet with qualifications. I cautiously spoke of similarities, not of causal relationships. We observed structural analogies, which stand in different contexts but show similar features. However, I would suggest that the structural similarities indeed go back to Ockham's view being applied to an exegesis of Aristotle in the broader context of an Averroistic reading of the Stagirite. The most striking argument *against* this would be that the two souls theory is already to be found in Jean de Jandun. As Jean-Baptiste Brenet makes clear, Jandun's view can indirectly be traced back to Aquinas and Siger of Brabant, and directly to Thomas Wylton and Averroes himself.<sup>43</sup> Jandun's revised text of

---

potentia respicit duo contraria aequaliter, sed aptitudo alterum tantum. Sententia est Avicennae in VI<sup>o</sup> naturalium sectione 4, ca. 5, et in libro de viribus cordis, ca. 3. Unde, ut inquit, quilibet homo potest tritari et gaudere, sed non quilibet habet aptitudinem ad gaudium nec quilibet habet aptitudinem ad tristitiam.» AVICENNA, *De medicinis cordialibus*, Fragmentum, ed. S. VAN RIET, Brill, Louvain, Leiden 1968, vol. 2, p. 191.53-56. His example displays the general, more specific relation between both powers: a human being is as such able to feel happy and unhappy; specific persons in specific circumstances, however, do not have both 'abilities' in the same way or at the same time.

<sup>41</sup>GIACOMO ZABARELLA, *De facultatibus animae liber*, c. 4, cols 625-626: «Ego in hac controversia, licet magis ad Thomae et aliorum praedictorum opinionem accedam, eam tamen penitus recipere non possum, sed adhibendam ei esse puto quandam correctionem; arbitror enim totam huiusce rei veritatem in duobus dictis esse constitutam: alterum adversus Scotum tale est: facultates animae sunt re distinctae ab ipsa animae substantia et sunt qualitates secundae speciei; alterum vero adversus Thomam et alios est: facultates animae non sunt agentia media inter animam et operationem, ut Thomas et Aegidius existimarunt, sed sunt solummodo conditione quaedam et aptitudines animae ad operandum.»

<sup>42</sup>GIACOMO ZABARELLA, *De facultatibus animae liber*, c. 4, cols 626F-627A; cf. also D. DES CHENE, *Life's Form. Late Aristotelian Conceptions of the Soul*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London 2000, p. 146, fn. 7.

<sup>43</sup>J.-B. BRENET, *Ame intellectuelle, âme cogitative; Jean de Jandun et la duplex forma propria de l'homme*, «Vivarium», 46 (2008), pp. 318-341.

his *De anima* commentary dates back to 1317-19,<sup>44</sup> while Ockham's texts originated simultaneously or even later.<sup>45</sup> Since Jandun is known to have been read in Renaissance Padua, for instance by Vernia, who explicitly criticizes Jandun's plurality of souls position,<sup>46</sup> it would be, on the one hand, quite an obvious relation. On the other hand, Paul of Venice studied at Oxford from 1390 to 1393.<sup>47</sup> He must have come across Ockham's teachings, and he indeed criticizes him. But did he also know Jandun? In fact, he did, and he precisely knew Jandun's two souls theory. Yet, he criticizes Jandun for saying that the intellect is just a moving force or the captain of the 'ship' and not the form that gives being to the soul.<sup>48</sup> This may be a misreading of Jandun on the part of Paul, as Bernet suggests.<sup>49</sup> But it shows that Paul did not adopt Jandun's position, at least not in the way he understood it. What about the second position, namely the double power theory? According to Sander de Boer, it is a distinctive feature of Ockhamist psychology. De Boer presents Ockham as the starting point of this new understanding of power. He looked at Jean de Jandun as well, but found only rather traditional interpretations of *potentia* in Jandun.<sup>50</sup> I take this argument *ex silentio*, together with the hints mentioned earlier, namely Paul's being acquainted with Ockhamist positions and his refutation of Jandun, to mean that both positions, the double soul as well as the double power theory (and especially their affiliation), go back to Ockham's teachings. There might be another candidate of transmission, namely John Buridan, who holds the double power position, as mentioned earlier. But apart from the fact that this position can be traced back to Ockham as well,<sup>51</sup> he neither holds the two *souls* theory, nor does he argue for any plurality of substantial forms.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup>J.-B. BARNET, *Transferts du sujet. La noétique d'Averroès selon Jean de Jandun*, Vrin, Paris 2003, p. 13.

<sup>45</sup>Ockham's *Quodlibeta* are based on his London disputations in 1322–24, but the revision takes place in Avignon 1324–25. His Book III of the *Sentences* commentary dates back to 1317–18 (Oxford). Cf. P.V. SPADE, C. PANACCIO, William of Ockham, in E.N. ZALTA (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2015 Edition), URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2015/entries/ockham/>>.

<sup>46</sup>VERNIA, *Quaestiones de pluralitate intellectus contra falsam et ab omni veritate remotam opinionem Averrois et de animae felicitate*, in *Quaestiones. Ristampa anastatica delle rispettive edizioni originali*. Premessa di E. DE BELLIS, Editrice Eurocart, Casarano 1998, pp. 55b-56a. E.P. MAHONEY, Nicoletto Vernia's Annotations on John of Jandun's *De anima*, in B. MOJSISCH, O. PLUTA (eds), *Historia philosophiae Medii Aevi: Studien zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam 1991, 573-593.

<sup>47</sup>A. CONTI, Paul of Venice, in E.N. ZALTA (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2012 Edition), URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/paul-venice/#LifWor>>.

<sup>48</sup>Quoted in B. NARDI, *Sigieri di Brabante nel pensiero del rinascimento italiano*, Edizioni italiane, Roma 1945, p. 123 [Tertia opinio].

<sup>49</sup>BARNET, *Ame intellectuelle, âme cogitative*, p. 336; also NARDI, *Sigieri di Brabante*, p. 123.

<sup>50</sup>DE BOER, *The Science of the Soul*, pp. 229-230. They are similar to the ones in Gaetano, which have been mentioned above.

<sup>51</sup>DE BOER, *The Science of the Soul*, p. 248.

<sup>52</sup>DE BOER, *The Science of the Soul*, pp. 221-224; J. ZUPKO, *How Are Souls Related to Bodies? A Study of John Buridan*, «*The Review of Metaphysics*», 46 (1993), 3, pp. 575-601, at pp. 579-583.

Although it cannot be ruled out that the two souls theory goes back to a reception of Jandun and the two powers theory to another reception of Buridan, it is more probable that both were brought to Padua by Paul of Venice.<sup>53</sup> Anyway, beyond possible causal relationships, the resemblance of Paduan teaching to Ockham's teachings, at least considering the combination of these two important features of Ockhamist psychology, is striking.<sup>54</sup> This being so, it is not precluded that the positions are closely connected to an Averroistic exegesis of Aristotle's psychology. On the contrary, Ockham's map of the soul seems to have been apt for Paduan teaching, especially where it – whether hidden or not – sympathized with the Averroist intellect theory. Ockham was concerned with the different statuses of acts of the sensitive and the intellective souls, especially in cases in which acts of the one were opposed to acts of the other; a single subject, i.e., a single soul, cannot have a sensitive appetite for something and perform a rational act of rejection. In the Averroist camp, the dichotomy was much stronger: the universal intellect had to be separable, while the human being had to subsist without it or, to put it differently, the intellectual soul had to persist, while the cogitative one had to perish with the body. In Ockham, the dichotomy concerned contrary acts or accidents, while in Averroist Padua the dichotomy was between modes of subsistence or substances. The intellect was purely immaterial and the body-soul composite was clearly material – material in the sense of extended, not just in the sense of being dependent on a substantial form. The concept of two total or partial souls was intended to give a solution here, and it was, moreover, a development of post-Ockham Parisian psychology. However, this came at a high cost. The essential unity of man, as introduced and defended by Albert and Aquinas, was lost again. With respect to his being and his (final) perfection, man was just an accidental composite or aggregate. The other

---

LAGERLUND, John Buridan, p. 379.

<sup>53</sup>LAGERLUND, John Buridan, p. 386, fn. 60, e.g., assumes, with A. Poppi, that Pomponazzi was influenced by Buridan *via* Paul's predecessor Biagio Pelacani da Parma; A. POPPI, *Introduzione all'aristotelismo padovano*, Antenore, Padua 1970, pp. 21-23. Another possible 'transmitter' from Paris to Padua, besides Pelacani, is said to be Taddeo da Parma. Taddeo especially makes use of Jandun's works; cf. S. VANNI ROVIGHI, *Introduzione*, in EAD. (ed.), *Le Quaestiones de anima di Taddeo da Parma*, Vita e Pensiero, Milano 1951, esp. pp. xiii-xx. Consequently, Z. KUKSEWICZ, *Der lateinische Averroismus im Mittelalter und in der Früh-Renaissance*, in M.J.F.M. HOENEN, J.H.J. SCHNEIDER, G. WIELAND (eds), *Philosophy and Learning. Universities in the Middle Ages*, Brill, Leiden-New York-Köln, 1995, pp. 371-386, at p. 376, with reference to Vanni Rovighi and Vitali, assumes that Averroism in Bologna(!) was of Parisian origin, namely *via* Taddeo da Parma (cf. also M.C. VITALI, *Taddeo de Parme et les deux rédactions des «Quaestiones De anima» de Jean de Jandun*, *«Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum»*, 28 (1981), pp. 3-13). E. Michael also names Angelo of Arezzo as such a 'transmitter'; MICHAEL, *Nature and Influence*, p. 68. Why should Paduan Ockhamism not be of Oxfordian origin?

<sup>54</sup>See also cf. E. MICHAEL, *Renaissance Theories of Soul*, in J.P. WRIGHT and P. POTTER (eds.), *Psyche and Soma: Physicians and Metaphysicians on the Mind-body Problem from Antiquity to Enlightenment*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 2000, pp. 147-172, esp. 159-60, who links Ockham's theory to Zabarella's and Piccolomini's. She also hints at the scholastic pluralism of Franciscan origin as the possible source for Ockham's view.

concept discussed here, the double power concept, was in its proper sense adopted from Ockham – aside from some terminological differences. I have not discussed this here, but it is obvious that the distinction of powers with respect to the organs genuinely fit Paduan teaching. Here, philosophy, especially natural philosophy, stood in exchange with the medical faculty where autopsy became a more and more important feature. Text book knowledge gave way to anatomical insight.<sup>55</sup> In this perspective, it is obvious that powers as instruments, located in the organs, had to be distinguished from powers as mere principles, induced from their acts. One might speak of a phenomenological turn, or a breaking up of natural philosophy, as Sander de Boer has.<sup>56</sup> Where natural philosophy concentrates on the *phainomena*, there is no place left for the intellectual soul in the narration. It is to be outsourced. Here, Ockham's theoretical considerations converged with practical observations in the field of medicine.

#### 4. Concluding Remarks

I would like to conclude with two historiographical remarks. (1) It has been said that Aquinas's view of the soul and its powers became 'mainstream' from Aquinas up to Descartes.<sup>57</sup> It has also been said that everything changed with Ockham and that his view became 'mainstream'.<sup>58</sup> Elsewhere, I have argued that these two contrasting accounts are too confined.<sup>59</sup> I suggest that we take 15<sup>th</sup>-century Padua as another example of the fact that Aquinas's view was not 'mainstream'. I concentrated on Ockhamist features here, but there would have been many occasions to present Thomistic and Scotistic features as well as other features of school teachings in Paduan philosophers.<sup>60</sup> In this regard, Casini's reasoning, mentioned at the beginning, that the plurality

---

<sup>55</sup>We might think of the tradition inaugurated by Mondino de Luzzi (d. 1326) to illustrate anatomical lectures by dissecting human cadavers and his handbook *Anathomia corporis humani* from 1316; C.U.M. SMITH, E. FRIXIONE, S. FINGER, and W. CLOWER, *The Animal Spirit Doctrine and the Origins of Neurophysiology*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2012, p. 80; DE BELLIS, Nicoletto Vernia, p. 171. See also, e.g., A. CUNNINGHAM, *The Anatomical Renaissance: the Resurrection of the Anatomical Projects of the Ancients*, Ashgate, Aldershot 1997; H. HIRAI, *Medical Humanism and Natural Philosophy. Renaissance Debates on Matter, Life and the Soul*, Brill, Leiden, Boston 2011. J.J. BYLEBYL, *The School of Padua: Humanistic Medicine in the Sixteenth Century*, in C. WEBSTER (ed.), *Health, Medicine and Mortality in the Sixteenth Century*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London, New York, Melbourne 1979, pp. 335-370. N.G. SIRASI, *History, Medicine, and the Tradition of Renaissance Learning*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor 2007; GRENDLER, *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance*, pp. 314-352; MICHAEL, *Nature and Influence*, pp. 80-83.

<sup>56</sup>DE BOER, *The Science of the Soul*, esp. pp. 297-299; p. 305.

<sup>57</sup>KING, *The Inner Cathedral*, esp. p. 272.

<sup>58</sup>DE BOER, *The Science of the Soul*, e.g., p. 251.

<sup>59</sup>Cf. my *Unum antiquum problema*.

<sup>60</sup>James Hankins, in summarizing Averroes's influence on Paduan philosophers, thus gives a precise picture of the different traditions flowing together in Padua. He says: «Some figures like Nicoletto Vernia and Agostino Nifo, both

thesis has to go back to Scotus because there were no Ockhamists, is – without further qualification – a knee-jerk syllogism. All the more because Casini himself points to the similarity with Ockham. It is Ockham's two souls theory in particular that is alluded to by Pomponazzi.<sup>61</sup> This is also made clear by Pomponazzi's refutation itself, which aims at the intimate connection between the acts of sensation and reason. He refers to the sensitive act of pain which must stand in a close connection to the rational act of considering which medicine would cure the pain.<sup>62</sup> If the sensitive act of pain pertains to another substance than the rational one does, our deliberation would not grasp the specific identity of the act, insofar as it is perceived in the sensitive faculty. This refutation is rather another striking argument for the view that Ockham's position was present in Northern Italy, than an argument for the view that it must have been Scotus's opinion, as Monfasani has said there were no Ockhamists.

(2) What does this amalgamation of teachings add up to? I think that it is meant to give a coherent account of the problem in question, raised by the Aristotelian text. Aristotle's texts from *De anima* onwards left much room for interpretation.<sup>63</sup> The status of the intellects (agent and possible) was not very clear, neither was the status of the souls (vegetative, sensitive and rational). The mind-body problem lingered on, and so forth. A 'coherent' account, then, did not mean an account according to 'school' traditions, but according to reason and hence truth, or according to the best interpretations available.<sup>64</sup> The blueprint for interpreting Aristotle's psychology was certainly an Averroistic exegesis. This meant reading Aristotle's intellect as a single, supra-individual entity, and such a

---

arts masters at Padua, took Averroist positions early in their careers, but later moved in more orthodox directions. Others like Gaetano da Thiene and his student John Argyropoulos accepted Averroes' view of Aristotle but thought that philosophical arguments could be mounted for some Christian doctrines that were regarded by other professors purely as matters of faith. Others like Marcantonio Zimara engaged in an internal critique of Averroistic psychology without moving towards a Christian position. Philosophers like Paul of Venice and Alessandro Achillini tried to combine Averroism with Ockhamism, while Biagio di Parma accepted the 'Averroist' separation of philosophy and religion but espoused a materialist psychology. Still others, like Pietro Pomponazzi, argued for positions that were incompatible with Christianity but not indebted in any straightforward way to Averroes.» (HANKINS, Humanism, scholasticism, and Renaissance philosophy, p. 38.) The same perspective is presented by KÄRKKÄINEN and LAGERLUND, *Philosophical Psychology in 1500*, p. 40: «During the time period under consideration [i.e. around 1500, TJ], we thus find representatives of Averroism, Alexandrianism, Scotism, Thomism and, to some extent, Ockhamism.» With respect to 'school philosophy', the most important philosophers are Francesco Securo di Nardò and Vincenzo Merlini in the Thomist, and Antonio Trombetta and Maurice O'Fihely in the Scotist tradition.

<sup>61</sup>PIETRO POMPONAZZI, *Abhandlung über die Unsterblichkeit der Seele*. Übersetzt und mit einer Einleitung herausgegeben von B. MOJSISCH. Lateinisch-deutsch, Felix Meiner, Hamburg 1990, c. 5, 40/41-42/43.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid., c. 6, 42: «Ego namque, qui haec scribo, multis cruciatibus corporis angustior, quod opus est sensitivae; idemque ego, qui crucior, discurro per causas medicinales, ut refellam hos cruciatu; quod nisi per intellectum fieri non potest. Si igitur altera esset essentia, qua sentio et qua intelligo, quo igitur modo fieri posset, ut idem, qui sentio, sim ille, qui intelligo?»

<sup>63</sup>For a general account of Aristotle's psychology, cf. Ch. SHIELDS, *Aristotle's Psychology*, in E.N. ZALTA (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2016 Edition), URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/aristotle-psychology/>>.

<sup>64</sup>GAETANO, *Renaissance Thomism*, p. 266: «The students demanded that lectures on the texts of Aristotle offer the best interpretation possible.»

reading threatened orthodoxy. However, with the recourse to Ockham's theory of the soul, there was another blueprint, more orthodox and fitting the Averroistic exegesis, which enabled its adherents to hold positions similar to the Averroistic one, yet with a more 'traditional' or less heretical notion. Whether orthodoxy was a primary motive cannot be determined anymore. In any case, Ockhamist psychology was meant as a psychology of the individual, which left room for a super-individual interpretation. In Ockham, the different souls or substantial forms respectively belong to the individual: both inform an individual rational being. According to the Averroist interpretation, (even) the (possible) intellect comes from outside and is not substantially part of the human being. Thus, Ockham's map fits well, since it assumes two souls of which one is interpreted as the individual form, guaranteeing life's function etc. The other soul is the 'container', as it were, of the super-individual capacities of men, which are universal and thus cannot be possessed individually. Since the latter is described in terms of 'soul', it is open to be understood as individual.

In the end, Paduan philosophers indeed favored an Aristotelian map of the soul. But it was neither the map that medieval school traditions had designed nor that of the Averroistic heresy. It was a map which brought together all the interesting features which were available 'on the market', so to speak, and which had the most challenging flavor. In this perspective, Paduan philosophy is a paradigm of Renaissance philosophy, in which we not only have one particular Aristotelianism, but many Aristotelianisms.<sup>65</sup> One of these was an Ockhamist Aristotelianism, though not one 'of profession' but one intrinsically motivated. Even if Ockhamists were missing in Padua or Northern Italy, Ockhamist, or better Ockham's, positions were there. And interestingly, important Paduan philosophers – with respect to an important topic of Renaissance philosophy – followed Ockham and used his teachings in order to better interpret Aristotle.

---

<sup>65</sup>SCHMITT, Aristotle and the Renaissance, p. 10. For a discussion of the term 'Aristotelianism', cf. also P. RUBINI, Pietro Pomponazzis Erkenntnistheorie: Naturalisierung des menschlichen Geistes im Spätaristotelismus, Brill, Leiden / Boston 2015, pp. 5-8 (esp. on Pomponazzi being a 'radical Aristotelian').