

MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHICAL TEXTS IN TRANSLATION

Francisco
Suárez

A COMMENTARY ON
ARISTOTLE'S
METAPHYSICS

(Index locupletissimus in Metaphysicam Aristotelis)

TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN
WITH AN INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

by

JOHN P. DOYLE

MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Francisco Suárez

A COMMENTARY ON
ARISTOTLE'S METAPHYSICS
OR
"A MOST AMPLE INDEX
TO THE METAPHYSICS
OF ARISTOTLE"

(INDEX LOCUPLETISSIMUS

IN METAPHYSICAM ARISTOTELIS)

Mediæval Philosophical Texts in Translation

No. 40

Roland J. Teske, S.J., Editor

Editorial Board

Lee C. Rice

Mary F. Rousseau

John L. Treloar, S.J.

Wanda Zemler-Cizewski

Francisco Suárez

A COMMENTARY ON
ARISTOTLE'S METAPHYSICS

OR

"A MOST AMPLE INDEX TO THE
METAPHYSICS OF ARISTOTLE"

(INDEX LOCUPLETISSIMUS

IN METAPHYSICAM ARISTOTELIS)

Translated with an Introduction and Notes

by

John P. Doyle
Saint Louis University



Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Suárez, Francisco, 1548-1617.

[Index locupletissimus in Metaphysicam Aristotelis. English]

A commentary on Aristotle's Metaphysics : a most ample index to The metaphysics of Aristotle / Francisco Suárez ; translated with an introduction and notes by John P. Doyle.

p. cm. — (Mediaeval philosophical texts in translation ; no 40)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-87462-243-3 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Aristotle. Metaphysics. 2. Metaphysics. I. Doyle, John P., 1930- II. Title. III. Series.

B434.S8313 2004

110--dc22

2004006434

All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America

© 2004 Marquette University Press



MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY PRESS
MILWAUKEE



The Association of Jesuit University Presses

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	7
English Translations:	
I. Suárez's Plan for His <i>Metaphysical Disputations</i>	20
II. The Preface to the Second Metaphysical Disputation	23
III. <i>The Most Ample Index</i> :	
A. The First Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	25
B. The Second Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	38
C. The Third Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	53
D. The Fourth Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	68
E. The Fifth Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	79
F. The Sixth Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	108
G. The Seventh Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	118
H. The Eighth Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	153
I. The Ninth Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	165
J. The Tenth Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	186
K. The Eleventh Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	203
L. The Twelfth Book of the <i>Metaphysics</i>	207
IV. An Index of Disputations	224
Corresponding Latin texts:	
I. Ad lectorem	248
II. Disputatio II: Prooemium	250
III. Index Locupletissimus.....	252
IV. Index Disputationum	390
Persons Mentioned in the <i>Index</i>	410
Bibliography.....	413

To Mary Gale

My dear wife for the last forty-one years,
to our seven children, to their spouses,
and to our grandchildren, with love and
gratitude for all that you are and for all
that you have given me

INTRODUCTION

Francisco Suárez (1548–1617), Scholasticism’s “Outstanding Doctor” (*Doctor eximius*),¹ was arguably the greatest Jesuit philosopher-theologian of all time. A case for this could be made from the viewpoint of his thought and also of what a German might call its *Wirkungsgeschichte*, its influence on later thinkers.² As regards his thought and its place in Scholasticism, my late friend and colleague at *St. Louis University*, Vernon Bourke, put things well when he very astutely wrote:

If we think of Thomism, Scotism, and Ockhamism as the three points of a triangle, then we may picture Suarezianism as a type of thought which falls within this triangle, on some questions moving closer to one point, on others approaching a different point. To some readers it looks like eclecticism but Suarezianism is a well informed and highly personal philosophy which shares some of the features of all the major schools of earlier Scholasticism with systematic consistency and coherence.³

From my personal four-decades-long study of Suárez and Suarezianism, I can and will, with conviction, second Professor Bourke’s judgment. While I would not call myself a Suarezian, in the sense of a simple follower of Suárez, I will confess to anyone that I have learned a tremendous amount from the *Doctor eximius*. I would also tell anyone who wants to learn the history of medieval philosophy, and especially the history of the Aristotelian tradition through the Middle Ages, that Suárez will be his best teacher. Here I agree, for the most part, with the greatest twentieth-century historian of medieval philosophy, my own teacher at the *University of Toronto*, Etienne Gilson, when he writes:

In the Preface to his *Metaphysical Debates* Suarez modestly introduces himself as a theologian who, to facilitate his own work, has felt it advisable to lay down, once and for all, the philosophical principles of which he makes use in his theological teaching. In fact, Suarez enjoys such a knowledge of medieval philosophy as to put to shame any modern historian of medieval thought. On each and every question he seems to know everybody and everything, and to read his book is like attending the Last Judgment of four centuries of Christian speculation by a dispassionate judge, always willing to give everyone a chance, supremely apt at summing up a case and, unfortunately, so anxious not to hurt

equity that a moderate verdict is most likely to be considered a true verdict. Rather than judge, Suarez arbitrates, with the consequence that he never wanders very far from the truth and frequently hits upon it, but, out of pure moderation of mind, sometimes contents himself with a 'near miss'.⁴

Forty years ago I would have accepted everything in Gilson's paragraph. But today I cannot accept its final appraisal of Suárez's passion for "equity," with its implication of a lawyer's eclectic mentality. Instead, I credit Bourke's estimate of "a well informed and highly personal philosophy" which displays a "systematic consistency and coherence." Yet, at the same time, I do totally embrace Gilson's estimate of Suárez as an historian, with which estimate Bourke would also have agreed.

While Gilson was immediately basing his remarks on the 1597 "Metaphysical Disputations" (*Disputationes Metaphysicae*), the same remarks easily apply to every work through Suárez's entire *Opera omnia*, which comprises 26 double-columned quarto Latin volumes in its last complete edition.⁵ Nonetheless, of all these works, undoubtedly it is the *Disputationes Metaphysicae* which is central and most important. It is fair to say that everything which Suárez ever published had a basis in the metaphysics that he systematically presented in the *Disputationes*.

As Bourke said, Suárez's philosophy was highly personal and also well-informed. It was deeply rooted in his scholarship and especially, going back beyond the four centuries mentioned by Gilson, in his knowledge of and sympathy for Aristotle. This is particularly manifest in the two volumes of the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, where he has cited Aristotle, always with respect if not always with complete agreement,⁶ a total of 1735 times.⁷ In addition, he prefaced the whole work with the present "Most Ample Index to the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle."

Balancing the system in the *Disputationes*, the Index amounts to a late medieval commentary, "by way of question," on the first 12 books of the *Metaphysics*. Shorter in length than, for example, St. Thomas Aquinas' (1225–1274) commentary on the same 12 books,⁸ Suárez's Ample Index more than makes up for that by cross-referencing the *Disputationes* itself hundreds of times. In fact, the Index and the *Disputationes* are exactly as Suárez intended them to be, complementary of one another and mutually supportive.

More to explain, let me say that medieval commentaries on Aristotle were basically of three kinds.⁹ There were summaries or 'paraphrases' (*paraphrases*) of the text; 'expositions by way of comment' (*expositiones*

per modum commentii); and 'expositions by way of question' (*expositiones per modum quaestionis*). The first kind was illustrated by the work of Avicenna (980–1037)¹⁰ and among Christians, by St. Albert the Great (ca. 1200–1280).¹¹ The second was the method favored by Averroes (1126–1198), in his long commentaries on Aristotle,¹² and later by St. Thomas. The third method may be found in the *Quaestiones subtilissimae* ('Most Subtle Questions on the Books of the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle') of Duns Scotus (1266–1308),¹³ as well as here in the Ample Index.

In this third method, customary questions which were occasioned by the text were raised and answered. Suárez's fellow Jesuit, Pedro da Fonseca (1528–1599),¹⁴ used the third method. But alongside this he made a critical edition of the Greek *Metaphysics*, translated it into Latin, and gave explanations which were literal commentaries on Aristotle's text.¹⁵ In his Ample Index, Suárez was heavily dependent upon Fonseca's much longer and more elaborate work,¹⁶ but he limited his own effort to a commentary *by questions*, which would be coupled with the 2000 page systematic doctrine of the *Disputationes*.

To my mind, the first question about the Index which anyone should ask is: did Suárez read Greek? More specifically, was he reading a Greek text of the *Metaphysics*? I think the answer to both questions is decidedly affirmative. The education in humanities which Suárez received as a young man certainly required his learning Greek. During his student days at the University of Salamanca, studies in the language of Homer, Plato, and Aristotle were emphasized to the degree that in 1561, the year Suárez enrolled at the University,¹⁷ there were at Salamanca four concurrent Chairs of Greek.¹⁸ At the same time and through the decades after, the Jesuits were training their scholars in Greek.¹⁹ While second to Latin, this training in Greek was prescribed in the preliminary (1586) *Ratio Studiorum* ("Plan of Studies") of the Jesuit Order, for which *Ratio* Suárez was a member of a Jesuit evaluation team at Rome.²⁰ Greek continued to be prescribed for Jesuit schools in the definitive *Ratio Studiorum*, which appeared in 1599,²¹ just two years after the first publication of the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*. While Suárez may not have known Greek as well as Fonseca did, had he not been able to read it with some facility he would have been out of place as a leading Jesuit philosopher and theologian.

That Suárez was comfortable with Greek is supported, if not decisively proven, by numerous passages in the *Disputationes* and other works where he has commented on Greek words.²² It is true that in the *Disputationes* and in the Ample Index, he also shows that he had access to at least four Latin translations of the *Metaphysics*. In their chronological order, these were

authored by William of Moerbeke (ca. 1215–1286), John Argyropoulos (ca. 1415–1487), Cardinal Bessarion (ca. 1403–1472), and Pedro da Fonseca. Suárez usually shows a preference for Fonseca;²³ but he does not slavishly follow him. Thus on occasion he rejects Fonseca's translation or interpretation²⁴ and prefers the text of Argyropoulos or Bessarion,²⁵ and sometimes he is clearly making his own new version.²⁶

In the English translation for this volume, wherever Suárez is directly quoting Aristotle or Plato I have footnoted it with their Greek. As regards the Latin, in the corresponding places where Suárez is translating from the *Metaphysics*, I have footnoted the four Latin versions just mentioned. Accordingly, any reader who so desires can check Suárez's Latin against Aristotle's Greek (as well as my translation) and also against the Latin translations which Suárez had in hand. If he does that, I am confident that such a reader will conclude with me that Suárez was at least a fair Greek scholar. He could read Aristotle in the original. But he did rely on earlier translations, of which he could at times be critical. On the further matter of Suárez's citations: while they are usually accurate, at times he does make mistakes. Some of these might be only apparent in that they have resulted from his use of different texts from those which I was able to find. Or perhaps he was citing from a wonderful but still human and fallible memory. Often a mistake seems to be what he himself in at least one place has called a "typographer's error."²⁷ But while he may be one or two digits out of the way, the substantive point being made is usually valid.

There was one surprise I got came from Suárez's citations. After working with him in many other areas, I had come to expect that in a work as broad as the Index he would cite just about everyone before him. But he does not. In at least one of the Books of the Index²⁸ he has cited no one except Aristotle. And among those mentioned in the *Disputationes* but not in the Index are St. Augustine (354–430), St. Anselm (1033–1109), St. Bonaventure (ca. 1217–1274), Henry of Ghent (1217?–1293), Walter Burley (1275–1344?), Petrus Aureoli (1280?–1322), Durandus of Saint-Pourçain (d. 1334), Hervaeus Natalis (d. 1323), William of Ockham (ca. 1290–1349), Francis Lychetus (d. 1520), Domingo Soto (1494–1560), and Domingo Bañez (1528–1604).

Most times, I found his cross-references to the Index itself and to the *Disputationes* to be accurate. There were some discrepancies and, for whatever reason, there seemed to be more in the cross-references he gave in Book 12. Perhaps he was at that point less careful—possibly tired or rushing himself for a publication deadline. The thought also occurred that it might be his editors who made the mistakes. Either way, as one who over years has

included many cross-references in his writings, some of which in the end did not match, I can have sympathy. *In fine*, overall I was most impressed at how precise both his citations and cross-references were.

As the reader will see, the following volume is divided into translations and the corresponding Latin texts. The translations are in order:

(1) *Suárez's Plan for his Metaphysical Disputations*. This is his preface to the 1597 edition. It is an address to his reader in which he lays out his intention as a Christian theologian to pursue a Christian philosophy, specifically a metaphysics which will be at the service of his theology. This metaphysics will be in two main parts. The first of these will be what will shortly after be called an "ontology"²⁹ or a general science of being, in which after establishing "real being insofar as it is being" as the object of metaphysics, he will proceed to study its properties, its principles, and its causes. The second part will then descend from the general concept of being to study those beings, God and creatures, substances and accidents, which are contained under that concept. Finally, it should be noted that in this preface he speaks of the present Index and gives his reader some idea of its purpose.

(2) *The Proemium to the Second Metaphysical Disputation*. This short piece is important. After again indicating the systematic plan of the *Disputationes*, it contrasts that with the disorganized text of Aristotle and commentaries on it. But then he says that, in order to satisfy "students of Aristotle," he has added the present Index which follows the order of the *Metaphysics* and which gives cross-references to the Disputations. It will also, he tells us, comment at times directly on the text of Aristotle and will explore matters which for whatever reasons have not been covered well enough in the Disputations.

(3) Next comes the *Most Ample Index* itself. In this Suárez, as he promised, follows the order of the *Metaphysics*, essentially commenting on it as I have said, "by way of question." To appreciate this Index, a modern reader should have some familiarity with Aristotle's text and the main problems interpreters have encountered with it. To facilitate that, I have at the start of most Books added a summary of the remarks of Jules Tricot, the important French translator of the *Metaphysics*. I chose Tricot's remarks for a number of reasons. First, they were succinct. Second, they were the thoughts of an authentic scholar. Third, while Tricot's scholarship may be a few decades old, it is still valuable for understanding the main nineteenth and twentieth-century debates about the composition and the meaning of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, debates which often bear on problems which Suárez and the medievals encountered. Finally, there is something which will not

be evident from the summaries I gave, but which was in the background of my choosing Tricot. This is that he, unlike many contemporary writers, extends his interest out beyond the text of Aristotle to the traditions of his Greek and Latin commentators. In short, Tricot pursues understanding of Aristotle in a way which I am certain Suárez would endorse.

(4) *An Index of Disputations*: This amounts to a Table of Contents for the fifty-four Disputations which comprise the main portion of Suárez's work. To make it easier for readers to find these Disputations I have added volume and page numbers to Suárez's list. A further benefit of this may be that a reader will be able to see at a glance the relative importance which Suárez attached to each Disputation from the number of pages he allotted to it. In passing I did notice minor variations between some of the Section headings in the main text of the *Disputationes* and the Index of Disputations. Generally, in my notes I ignored such variations and mentioned them only on rare occasions.

Following the translations, the next portion of the current volume is devoted to the Latin texts. Thus I have transcribed in their original language the Preface to the whole work, the Prologue to the Second Disputation, the Most Ample Index itself, and the Index of the Disputations. The most important notes that I added contain the Latin translations mentioned above, i.e., those of Moerbeke, Argyropoulos, Bessarion, and Fonseca. On this score, let me say that I deliberately separated the Greek of Aristotle from the Latin of Suárez and these others. My purpose in this was to allow interested persons to compare the Latin translations without the immediate distraction of the Greek. At the same time, the Greek will be available and matched directly to my English translation of Suárez's Latin. My hope is that this is clear and that it makes some sense to interested readers.

The volume includes a *Dramatis Personae*, that is, a list of and a few facts about persons whom Suárez mentions in the Ample Index. Again, I have added a bibliography of sources in various languages to which readers may go for more in depth understanding of the issues raised in the translated texts.

Ante-penultimately here, let me say something about my translation. It is as literal as I could make it in what I hope is still readable English. To achieve that, at times, I did break Suárez's long sentences into shorter ones; I also on occasion changed a passive to an active voice; and I changed an impersonal Latin construction to a more colloquial English personal one. With a goal of aiding comprehension, I frequently included the original Latin word or phrase after a translation, especially if that translation was a bit free. With the same goal, I have supplied words [in square brackets]

which are not actually in Suárez's text, but which seem clearly enough to be called for from the context.

Penultimately: a word about the source of my translation as well as about two previous modern translations of the Most Ample Index into languages other than English. For my Latin source, I used Charles Berton's edition of the *Disputationes Metaphysicae* from the above-mentioned *Opera omnia*. On a few occasions, I corrected it for an obviously better reading. The two other translations were in Spanish³⁰ and in French.³¹ Both were sometimes useful, especially for detecting nuances in what Suárez had written. However, neither was very helpful for locating his citations or cross-references. The Spanish text translated them directly without any identifying or verifying footnotes. The French text does have footnotes but I found them to be vague and inexact.

Ultimately, I would like to share with interested readers a table of Chapter divisions from various relevant editions and translations of the *Metaphysics*. I apologize that I do not have the divisions, with their folios identified, of Argyropoulos and Bessarion in the work from which I cited them. I had that work for a limited time through Interlibrary Loan and I sent it back before it occurred to me to check the Chapter divisions in it. But that said, let me end this Introduction with the following table:

Various Chapter Divisions in Books 1–12 of the Metaphysics

As given by W.D. Ross

In: *Aristotle's Metaphysics*, 2 vols., Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1953.

Book I. Ten Chapters: (980a21–993a27).

Book II. Three Chapters: (993a30–995a20).

Book III. Six Chapters: (995a24–1003a17).

Book IV. Eight Chapters: (1003a21–1012b31).

Book V. Thirty Chapters: (1012b34–1025a34).

Book VI. Four Chapters: (1025b3–1028a6).

Book VII. Seventeen Chapters: (1028a10–1041b33).

Book VIII. Six Chapters: (1042a3–1045b24).

Book IX. Ten Chapters: (1045b27–1052a11).

Book X. Ten Chapters: (1052a15–1059a14).

Book XI. Twelve Chapters: (1059a18–1069a14).

Book XII. Ten Chapters: (1069a18–1076a4).

As given by Francisco Suárez (1548–1617)

In: *The Most Ample Index* (i.e.: *Index locupletissimus*).

- Book I. Seven Chapters (pp. I–IV).
- Book II. Three Chapters (pp. IV–IX).
- Book III. Six Chapters (pp. IX–XIV).
- Book IV. Eight Chapters (pp. XIV–XVII).
- Book V. Thirty Chapters (XVII–XXVI).
- Book VI. Two Chapters (pp. XXVI–XXIX).
- Book VII. Seventeen Chapters (pp. XXIX–XLII).
- Book VIII. Six Chapters (pp. XLII–XLVI).
- Book IX. Twelve Chapters (pp. XLVI–LIV).
- Book X. Thirteen Chapters (pp. LIV–LX).
- Book XI. Eleven Chapters mentioned (pp. LX–LXI).
- Book XII. Ten Chapters (pp. LXI–LXVI).

As given by William of Moerbeke (ca: 1215–1286)

In: *Metaphysica Lib. I–XIV*. Recensio et Translatio Guillelmi de Moerbeka. Edidit Gudrun Vuillemin-Diem, in *Aristoteles Latinus*, ed. G. Verbeke, vol. XXV, 3.2 (Leiden/New York/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995).

- Book I, Nine Chapters (pp. 11–42).
- Book II, Three Chapters (pp. 43–47).
- Book III, Six Chapters (pp. 48–66)
- Book IV, Eight Chapters (pp. 67–91).
- Book V, Thirty Chapters (pp. 92–124).
- Book VI, Four Chapters (pp. 125–131).
- Book VII, Seventeen Chapters (pp. 132–167).
- Book VIII, Six Chapters (pp. 168–178)
- Book IX, Ten Chapters (pp. 179–194).
- Book X, Ten Chapters (pp. 195–217).
- Book XI, Twelve Chapters (pp. 218–245).
- Book XII, Ten Chapters (pp. 246–269).

**As given by John Argyropoulos (ca. 1415–1487)
and Cardinal Bessarion (ca. 1403–1472)**

In: *Aristotelis castigatissime recognitum opus metaphysicum...* [Parisiis]: Apud Henricum Stephanum, 1515.

- Book I. Seven Chapters (fols. 2r-15r).
- Book II. Three Chapters (fols. 15r-17r).
- Book III. Six Chapters (fols. 17r-25v).
- Book IV. Eight Chapters (fols. 25v-36r).
- Book V. Thirty Chapters (fols. 36r-50v).
- Book VI. Two Chapters (fols. 50v-53v).
- Book VII. Seventeen Chapters (fols. 53v-68v).
- Book VIII. Six Chapters (fols. 68v-73r).
- Book IX. Twelve Chapters (fols. 73r-80r).
- Book X. Thirteen Chapters (fols. 80r-88v).
- Book XI. Eleven Chapters (fols. 89r-100r).
- Book XII. Ten Chapters (fols. 100r-109v).

As given from Cardinal Bessarion

In: *Averrois Commentaria et Introductiones in omnes libros Aristotelis cum eorum versione latina*, Tom. VIII, Venetiis: Apud Junctas, 1562; 1573–1574.

(with Averroes' Comments interspersed)

- Book I. Five plus Four Chapters—i.e. Nine in all (fols. 1ra–27vb).
- Book II. Three Chapters (fols. 28rb–35vb).
- Book III. Eight Chapters (fols. 35rb–63rb).
- Book IV. Six Chapters (fols. 63vb–99rb).
- Book V. Thirty Chapters (fols. 100ra–143ra).
- Book VI. Two Chapters (fols. 143va–152ra).
- Book VII. Twenty Chapters (fols. 152vb–208rb).
- Book VIII. Eight Chapters (fols. 209rb–224vb).
- Book IX. Seven Chapters (fols. 225va–248rb).
- Book X. Four plus Nine Chapters—Thirteen in all (fols. 249rb–276rb).
- Book XI. Five Chapters + Two Chapters + Four Chapters—Eleven in all (fols. 277rb–285vb).
- Book XII. Four Chapters + Five Chapters—Eight in all (fols. 290va–339vb).

As given by Cardinal Bessarion

In: *Aristotelis Opera*, vol. III, *Aristotelis Latine interpretibus variis*, edidit Academia Regia Borussica (Berolini: Apud Georgium Reimerum, 1831), pp. 481–536.

Book I. Nine Chapters (pp. 481–487).

Book II (i.e., I Minor [α] in Bessarion's [or Bonitz's] listing) Three Chapters. (p. 487).

Book III (i.e. II) Six Chapters (pp. 487–491).

Book IV (i.e. III) Eight Chapters (pp. 491–496).

Book V (i.e. IV) Thirty Chapters (pp. 496–502).

Book VI (i.e. V) Three Chapters (pp. 502–503).

Book VII (i.e. VI) Seventeen Chapters (pp. 503–510).

Book VIII (i.e. VII) Six Chapters (pp. 510–512).

Book IX (i.e. VIII) Ten Chapters (pp. 512–515).

Book X (i.e. IX) Ten Chapters (pp. 515–519).

Book XI (i.e. X) Thirteen Chapters (pp. 519–524).

Book XII (i.e. XI) Ten Chapters (pp. 524–527).

As given by Pedro da Fonseca (1548–1599)

In: *Commentariorum in libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis Stagiritae*. Tomi quatuor, Coloniae: 1615–29; rep. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964

Book I. Seven Chapters (Tome I, cols. 37–8—373–4).

Book II. Three Chapters (Tome I, cols. 375–6—549–50).

Book III. Six Chapters (Tome I, cols. 549–50—633–34).

Book IV. Eight Chapters (Tome I, cols. 633–34—929–30).

Book V. Thirty Chapters (Tome II, cols. 3–4—1141–42 [Note that all of Tome II is devoted to the 5th Book of the *Metaphysics*.])

Book VI. Two Chapters (Tome III, pp. 1–193).

Book VII. Seventeen Chapters (Tome III, pp. 194–437).

Book VIII. Six Chapters (Tome III, pp. 438–508).

Book IX. Twelve Chapters (Tome III, 509–670).

Book X. Thirteen Chapters (Tome IV, pp. 2–46).

Book XI. Eleven Chapters (Tome IV, pp. 48–76).

Book XII. Ten Chapters (Tome IV, pp. 78–131).

[In the 1570 edition of the *Opera omnia* of St. Thomas Aquinas there are two translations of the *Metaphysics*: (1) the *Versio Antiqua*, which is the text of Moerbeke, as given later in Cathala and Spiazzi, and (2) the version of Bessarion. Neither version is divided into Chapters. Instead, their divisions are into “*Lectiones*,” which are reproduced in Cathala and Spiazzi.³² In this arrangement, Book VI contains 4 *lectiones*; Book IX has 11; Book X has 12; Book XI contains 13; and Book XII has 12.]

Notes

- ¹ An honorific title, which came from a letter of commendation to Suárez by Pope Paul V. On this, see Raoul de Scorraille, S.J., *François Suarez de la Compagnie de Jésus* (Paris: P. Lethielleux, 1912–13), vol. 2, pp. 126–7.
- ² For a recent brief presentation of Suárez, the man, his work, and his influence, see John P. Doyle, “Suárez, Francisco,” *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (London and New York, 1998), vol. 8, pp. 189–96. But still the main source for Suárez’s life is the just cited work: R. de Scorraille, *François Suarez ...*. In English, Joseph Fichter’s biography (*Man of Spain, Francis Suarez*, New York: Macmillan, 1940) is readable. For a shorter but still accurate presentation, cf. P. Monnot, “Suarez, François. I. Vie et oeuvres,” *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, XIV, 2^o partie (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1941) cols. 2638–2649.
- ³ Vernon J. Bourke, *Will in Western Thought: An Historico-Critical Survey* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1964), p. 177.
- ⁴ Etienne Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*, 2nd edition (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1952), p. 99.
- ⁵ Cf. Suárez, Franciscus, S.J., *Opera omnia*, 26 vols., Paris: L. Vivès, 1856–1866; plus two volumes of indices, 1878.
- ⁶ It may be noted that Jesuit professors were obliged by the *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* to follow Aristotle in philosophy wherever possible. For this, see: Sancti Ignatii de Loyola, *Constitutiones Societatis Jesu*, P. IV, c. 14, n. 3, in *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu*, vol. 65 (Romae: Borgo S. Spirito, 1938), p. 151. For just one of a number of places where Suárez will not follow Aristotle for the reason that his view is incompatible with Christian Faith, cf. *Index locupletissimus*, IX, c. 9, q. 5, vol. 25, p. lii.
- ⁷ For this, see J. Iturrioz, S.J., “Fuentes de la metafísica de Suárez,” *Pensamiento*, numero extraordinario (Madrid, 1948), p. 40.
- ⁸ Cf. S. Thomae Aquinatis, *In duodecim libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis expositio*, ed. M.R. Cathala, O.P., Taurini: Marietti, 1950.
- ⁹ On the methods of medieval commentary, see esp. Martin Grabmann, *Methoden und Hilfsmittel des Aristotelesstudiums im Mittelalter*, (München: Verlag der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1939), pp. 17–54; and D.A. Callus, *Introduction of Aristotelian Learning to Oxford* [from *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 29 (1943)], London: H. Milford, 1944.
- ¹⁰ Cf., *Avicenna Latinus. Liber de philosophia prima sive scientia divina*, I–IV, édition critique de la traduction latine médiévale, par S. Van Riet, Louvain: E. Peeters and Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.
- ¹¹ See, e.g. Albertus Magnus, *Metaphysica*, I–II, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 16, ed. Bernhard Geyer, Münster im Westfalia: Aschendorff, 1960–64. Also see, Georg Wieland, *Untersuchungen zum Seinsbegriff im Metaphysikkommentar Alberts des Grossen*, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters*, Neue Folge, Band 7 (Munster: Aschendorff, 1992), p. 11.

- ¹² Cf. Averrois Cordubensis, *Commentarium magnum in Aristotelis De Anima libros*, recensuit F. Stuart Crawford, Cambridge, MA: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1953.
- ¹³ See Joannis Duns Scoti, *Quaestiones subtilissimae super libros Metaphysicorum Aristolis*, in *Opera omnia*, (Lugduni: Sumptibus Laurentii Durand, 1639), vol. 4, pp. 497–848.
- ¹⁴ On Fonseca, see John P. Doyle, “Fonseca, Pedro da (1528–99),” in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (London and New York: Routledge: 1998), vol. 3, pp. 688–90.
- ¹⁵ Fonseca’s *Commentary on the Books of Aristotle’s Metaphysics* (the first volume of which appeared in 1577) contained a Greek text which he had himself established from the best available manuscripts and printed editions. Through the first volumes, in a right hand column matching the Greek to the left, he gave a Latin translation. An explanation of the text followed each chapter and then commentary, by way of question, on most of the chapters throughout the first nine Books of the *Metaphysics*. A last volume, published after Fonseca’s death, gave the Greek and Latin, plus the explanation, for Books ten, eleven, and twelve, with just the text in the two languages for Books thirteen and fourteen.
- ¹⁶ For Fonseca’s influence on Suárez, cf. Eleuterio Elorduy, “Influjo de Fonseca en Suárez,” *Revista portuguesa de filosofia*, 11 (1955), pp. 507–519.
- ¹⁷ Cf. De Scorraille, vol. 1, p. 30; Fichter, p. 29.
- ¹⁸ Cf. article “Salamanca,” in *Enciclopedia Universal Ilustrada Europeo-Americana*, tomo LIII (Madrid: Espasa Calpe, 1926), p. 118b.
- ¹⁹ In the only place of which I am aware in which he mentions the study of Greek, Suárez cites the *Constitutions of the Society of Jesus* (Part II, Chapter 12, Paragraph 2), where St. Ignatius Loyola has prescribed the learning of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, plus other languages such as Chaldean, Arabic, and Hindi, where they may be needed. Cf. Suárez, *Tractatus de religione Societatis Jesu*, V, c. 3, n. 5, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 16(bis), p. 813.
- ²⁰ For this, see Allan P. Farrell, S.J., *The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education: Development and Scope of the Ratio Studiorum* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1938), p. 233.
- ²¹ For the Greek program of 1599, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 350–52. For the actual text of the *Ratio* as it pertains to Greek, cf. *Ratio atque institutio studiorum Societatis Iesu*, introduzione e traduzione di Angelo Bianchi, testo latino a fronte (Milano: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 2002), pp. 246, 274, 286, 294, and 302.
- ²² See, for examples: *Disputationes Metaphysicae* (hereafter *DM*), 13, 11, n. 3, in *Opera omnia*, vol. 25, p. 207; *ibid.*, 15, 1, n. 5, p. 499; *ibid.* 34, 1, n. 14, vol. 26, p. 352; *ibid.*, 42, 3, n. 7, p. 612; *ibid.*, 44, 13, n. 20, p. 728, and n. 28, p. 730.
- ²³ For Suárez on the worth of Fonseca’s translation, see esp. *Index*, I, c. 7, q. 1, vol. 25, p. iv.
- ²⁴ Cf. e.g. *DM* 22, 1, n. 24, vol. 25, p. 807.
- ²⁵ On these two, note that the humanist scholar, Jacobus Faber Stapulensis, in a dedication to Robertus Fortunatus with which he prefaced the work entitled, *Aristotelis castigatissime recognitum opus metaphysicum* a Clarissimo principe Bessarione Cardinale Niceno latinitate foeliciter donatum/ xiiii libris distinctum: cum adiecto in xii primos libros Argyropyli Byzantii interpretamento/ rarum proculdubio et hactenus desideratum opus. Deus optimus qui sub nomine ipsius entis in hoc opere celebratur: (Parisii: Apud Henricum Stephanum, 1515), has stated that Argyropoulos liked to paraphrase and that Bessarion was a more literal translator. Cf. “Sed revertamur ad Bessarionis interpretationem. Hanc charissime Fortunate sic cum graeco contuli, et ad intelligentiam sicubi in devium flectebatur iter revocavi: ut hos libros nunc vel facile absque commentariis legi posse haud dubitem. Cui adieci Argyropolum qui magis sapit paraphrasten: Bessario vero potius partes interpretis agit, intelligent haec: qui latina graecis contulerint.”
- ²⁶ For a good example of Suárez using previous translators and commentators to get to the sense of Aristotle’s Greek text, cf. *Index*, VII, c. 3, q. 4, vol. 25, p. xxxi.
- ²⁷ *DM*, 47, s. 3, n. 3, vol. 26, p. 795.

²⁸ That is, Book 4.

²⁹ First to use this term was the Protestant Scholastic, Rudolph Goclenius (1547—1628) who in his *Lexicon philosophicum* (Francofurti, 1613), p. 16, coined the word in Greek.

³⁰ For this, see: Francisco Suárez, *Disputaciones metafísicas*, 7 vols., edición y traducción de Sergio Rábade Romeo, Salvador Caballero Sánchez y Antonio Puicerver Zanón, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1960–1966. The translation of the *Index locupletissimus* is in volume 1, pp. 20–178.

³¹ Cf. *Suárez et la refondation de la métaphysique comme ontologie. Étude et traduction de l'Index détaillé de la Métaphysique d'Aristote de F. Suárez*, par Jean-Paul Coujou, Louvain/Paris: Éditions Peeters, 1999.

³² Cf. S. Thomae Aquinatis, *In duodecim libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis expositio*, ed. M.-R. Cathala, O.P. et R.M. Spiazzi, O.P., Taurini: Marietti, 1950.