

Theological Renewal after the Council of Trent? The Case of Jesuit Commentaries on the *Summa Theologiae*

Theological Studies
2018, Vol. 79(1) 107–127
© Theological Studies, Inc. 2018
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0040563917744653
journals.sagepub.com/home/tsj



Bernhard Knorn, SJ

Philosophisch-Theologische Hochschule Sankt Georgen, Germany

Abstract

As part of the Catholic reform after the Council of Trent, the Jesuits Francisco de Toledo, Gregorio de Valencia, and Gabriel Vázquez further developed the theological innovations of the School of Salamanca. Their commentaries on the *Summa Theologiae* (ca. 1563–1604) are marked by a creative retrieval of Aquinas and other theological sources as well as by openness toward current questions. This new method of theological argumentation related past authorities and articulations of the faith more effectively to the present, in order to better preserve the ecclesial community through time.

Keywords

Thomas Aquinas, Catholic reform, Jesuits, Renaissance humanism, School of Salamanca, theological authority, theological method, Francisco de Toledo, Gregorio de Valencia, Gabriel Vázquez

The Reformations of the sixteenth century unsettled the classical theologies and posed an unforeseen challenge to theologians who decided not to subscribe to the “novelties” introduced by the Lutheran or Calvinist Reformers. At once, many theologians were involved in controversies. They needed to secure the grounds for their positions and find ways for effectively communicating theological statements

Corresponding author:

Bernhard Knorn, SJ, Philosophisch-Theologische Hochschule Sankt Georgen, Offenbacher Landstraße 224, Frankfurt am Main, Germany.
Email: b.knorn@jesuits.net

within a highly controversial and politicized environment. The theological debates triggered by the Reformations need to be understood within the context of the internal reforms asked for in many parts of the church since long before. Likewise, the Council of Trent (1545–1563) had to deal with the theological innovations or—depending on one’s perspective—challenges of the Reformations. Its full meaning, however, may only be grasped if it is also seen as a council working for that internal reform.¹ The pastoral reforms, in particular those orchestrated by Carlo Borromeo (1538–1584) in Milan, are well known; their achievements and failures have been widely studied.² But how did systematic theology³ develop during the second part of the sixteenth century, roughly within 40 years after the closure of the council?

Theologians faced the challenges that the Protestant Reformations brought about, such as questions of legitimate authority, of ecclesiology, or about the interpretation of the Bible. The call for reform, however, originated in developments from the previous century: a wave of mysticism, a new interiority in religious life and a greater pastoral motivation, the growing plurality of philosophical systems, the rediscovery of the classics in Renaissance humanism—connected with a new sense for history and its quest for sources—and finally new pedagogic ideals that underscored the role of the learning subject by introducing regular disputations, repetitions, and examinations (the *modus parisiensis*). All this was waiting to be incorporated into theology.

-
1. John W. O’Malley, *Trent: What Happened at the Council* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2013), 250–60. There has been a long-lasting debate about how to best name these efforts for a reform on the Catholic side: Counter-Reformation, Catholic Reformation, and Catholic reform are probably the most common suggestions. Each name has unwanted connotations or does not encompass the whole phenomenon. In order to refer to the responses to the wide-spread call for “reform” in the church and not only to the reactions to the “Reformations” of the sixteenth century, “Catholic reform” is used here—despite the same Latin word *reformatio* was originally used for both. For further discussion see John W. O’Malley, *Trent and All That: Renaming Catholicism in the Early Modern Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000).
 2. Mariano Delgado and Markus Ries, eds., *Karl Borromäus und die katholische Reform* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2010); the reforms in the context of early modern Catholicism: Guy Bedouelle, *La réforme du catholicisme: 1480–1620* (Paris: Cerf, 2002); Michael A. Mullett, *The Catholic Reformation* (London: Routledge, 1999); Robert Bireley, *The Refashioning of Catholicism, 1450–1700: A Reassessment of the Counter Reformation* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1999).
 3. The term “systematic theology” was not common in the sixteenth century and is used here for heuristic purposes only. The usual distribution of chairs at a theological faculty at the beginning of the century was: chair of Sacred Scripture; the chairs of the Prime and the Vespers for commenting on Lombard’s Sentences; several chairs for specific theologies (e.g. Aquinas, Scotus, nominalism); chair of moral theology. All the chairs not dedicated to Sacred Scripture or moral theology could today be summarized under systematic theology. In the course of the sixteenth century, the structure of these chairs changed dramatically. For the development within the Spanish faculties of theology, see Melquiades Andrés, *La teología española en el siglo XVI* (Madrid: La Editorial Católica, 1976), 1:29–61.

Within the limits of a case study, this article explores how systematic theologians within the Catholic Church embraced an internal theological renewal and so helped to implement a true Catholic reform. Not much is known about theologians during this period of time—apart from single scholars like Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621) and Francisco Suárez (1548–1617), whose works had a long-lasting impact on Catholic theology at least until the early twentieth century. A reason for this lack of scholarship is that, in general, for the past few decades, post-Tridentine theology has not enjoyed a good reputation.⁴ It has been associated with anti-Protestant polemics, apologetics, and voluminous doctrinal handbooks—learned, but dealing with *quisquilia* that had no connection to real life, new philosophical thought, scientific discoveries, and the conceptions of a new era. There is some truth in these points. Such legitimate criticism, however, should not obstruct the view of the important theological-methodological developments. The theological achievements of this period remain largely uncharted territory.⁵

In this regard, it is especially important to pay more attention to the time immediately before the paradigm shift that, according to Stephen Toulmin, happened during the first half of the seventeenth century.⁶ Before the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648), Renaissance humanism with its emphasis on rhetoric strongly influenced philosophers and theologians, who aspired to accommodate their thought to a specific place, time, and circumstance. Toward the middle of the century, logic and objectivity became the new paradigm, which is marked by a quest for the universal, the timeless, and the general. Debate had to give way to written proofs. According to John O'Malley, the Jesuits with their principle of accommodation and their emphasis on preaching and teaching embraced those ideals stemming from Renaissance humanism.⁷ At their foundation stood the theological conviction that grace and nature, revelation and

-
4. Christopher Ruddy, "Ressourcement and the Enduring Legacy of Post-Tridentine Theology," in *Ressourcement: A Movement for Renewal in Twentieth-Century Catholic Theology*, ed. Gabriel Flynn and Paul D. Murray (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 185–201.
 5. Encyclopedic overviews exist for the Spanish theology of the sixteenth century. For the decades after the closure of the Council of Trent, they tend to be rather brief: Melquiades Andrés, *La teología española en el siglo XVI*, vol. 2 (Madrid: La Editorial Católica, 1977), ends in 1570; Juan Belda Plans, *La Escuela de Salamanca y la renovación de la teología en el siglo XVI* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 2000), introduces briefly the successors of the great masters of the School of Salamanca in the late sixteenth century (752–824) and traces the consequences of the School (827–926), but does not study internal theological developments in detail. For a discussion of the various meanings of the debated concept "School of Salamanca," see Miguel Anxo Pena González, *La Escuela de Salamanca: De la monarquía hispánica al orbe católico* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 2009), 415–84. Pena likewise does not give special attention to the development of theology during the decades after the Council of Trent.
 6. Stephen Toulmin, *Cosmopolis: The Hidden Agenda of Modernity* (New York: Free, 1990), 22–44.
 7. John W. O'Malley, *Saints or Devils Incarnate? Studies in Jesuit History* (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 181–98.

reason, sacred and pagan can be reconciled.⁸ This began to change at the time of Superior General Claudio Acquaviva (in office 1581–1615), when Jesuit life and thought got more and more regulated. Therefore, a closer look at three Jesuit theologians who were still influenced by the earlier paradigm could shed more light on the theological renewal after the Council of Trent.

Jesuit Theologians and the School of Salamanca

The Jesuits Francisco de Toledo, Gregorio de Valencia, and Gabriel Vázquez are not well known today. Yet, they were among the most influential proponents of a new style of Catholic theology after the council.⁹ Primarily developed by Dominicans in the first half of the sixteenth century at the University of Salamanca, Jesuits embraced this new style and used it as an instrument for Catholic reform. It is marked by a creative retrieval of Thomas Aquinas, by a new attention to important theological sources like the Scriptures and the Church Fathers, and by developments in methodology. The return to the sources was part of the agenda of Renaissance humanism. Toledo's Cardinal-Archbishop Jiménez de Cisneros (1436–1517), for instance, financed the monumental six-volume polyglot edition of the whole Bible (1520). Erasmus of Rotterdam (ca. 1467–1536) revised the Latin translation of the New Testament and he edited Greek and Latin Church Fathers in the 1530s. Although many humanist theologians studied Scholastic authors as well, they would not have based their theology primarily on Aquinas like the authors from the School of Salamanca. For the systematic aspirations in theology of these Spanish authors, however, the *Summa Theologiae* was very useful. During the first two decades of the sixteenth century they started commenting on this book instead of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*.

This decision came along with the introduction of a new style of teaching and new academic methods, formed by a critical adoption of humanist ideals. Theologians from the School of Salamanca shared the humanist appreciation of the classical authors and languages, but not over against Sacred Scripture and patristic sources. They cared for a literary Latin style in their works, although without aestheticism. And they dealt with moral questions in greater detail and stressed the values of human life, but tried to

8. Stephen Schloesser, "Accommodation as a Rhetorical Principle: Twenty Years after John O'Malley's *The First Jesuits* (1993)," *Journal of Jesuit Studies* 1 (2014): 347–72 at 350 and 364, <https://doi.org/10.1163/22141332-00103001>.

9. The title page of a Jesuit treatise from 1623 indicates the importance of these three authors at least for theology in the Society of Jesus: Valentin de Herice, *Quatuor tractatus in primam partem S. Thomae* (Pamplona: Carlos de Labayen, 1623). The ornamental frame in form of a portico, engraved by Jean de Courbes, depicts on top Luis de Molina, Robert Bellarmine (cardinal), and Francisco Suárez. Ignatius of Loyola and Francis Xavier, both canonized in 1622, stand as saints at the lateral columns. At the stereobate, in the foundations, are pictured Gabriel Vázquez, Francisco de Toledo (cardinal), and Gregorio de Valencia.

avoid anthropocentric or individualistic pitfalls.¹⁰ Aquinas's work was adopted by minds open to many other schools of thought. Furthermore, their thorough reflections on methodology allowed them to determine more effectively the role of authorities and of previous articulations of the faith in theological argumentation. When they systematically and methodically referred back to the Scriptures and to the church fathers in a time of new articulations of the faith by Reformers, they attempted to underpin and so preserve the community within the church through the centuries.

Early Jesuits Adopting a Theological Reform

The interest in this theological reform movement can be traced back to the founding generation of the Society of Jesus. Although Ignatius of Loyola (ca. 1491–1556) and his first companions did not intend to found a religious order dedicated primarily to academic theology, Ignatius himself studied at universities where theology professors had introduced a reform that would become the hallmark of post-Tridentine theology.¹¹ After initial studies in Alcalá and an unsuccessful attempt to study in Salamanca in 1526–1528, he took classes at the Dominican college in Paris, probably with the important Scottish philosopher John Mair (1467–1550), whose pupils Peter Crockaert (ca. 1465–1514) in Paris, and especially Francisco de Vitoria (ca. 1483–1546) and Domingo de Soto (1495–1560) in Salamanca, had reformed the studies of theology. Between the 1550s and the 1570s, many early Jesuits studied in these Dominican institutions, several of them before joining the Society of Jesus.¹² Juan Maldonado, Gregorio de Valencia, Francisco Suárez, and Juan de Lugo studied in Salamanca. Alfonso Salmerón, Diego Laínez, Francisco de Toledo, Gabriel Vázquez, Luis de Molina, and others studied in Alcalá. In this reform university, founded by Archbishop Jiménez de Cisneros, theology was taught with principles similar to those of Salamanca.

After the Council of Trent, the Jesuits would carry forward this theological movement that had begun with the School of Salamanca in the 1520s. They also extended it to many other countries by virtue of the Jesuit system of colleges and their increasingly standardized educational methods. External and internal factors supported this orientation at Aquinas. In 1567, four years after the Council of Trent's conclusion, the Dominican Pope Pius V (r. 1566–1572) declared Aquinas a Doctor of the Church and

10. Belda Plans, *Escuela de Salamanca*, 155–62, 183–98, 245–61, 309–11; Pena González, *Escuela de Salamanca*, 485–88.

11. For early configurations of theology within the Society of Jesus, see Cándido Pozo, "San Ignacio de Loyola y la Teología," *Archivo teológico granadino* 53 (1990): 5–47; Bernhard Knorn, "Jesuits in Systematic Theology: A Historiographical Essay," in *Jesuit Historiography Online*, ed. Robert A. Maryks (Leiden: Brill, 2017), https://doi.org/10.1163/2468-7723_jho_COM196256.

12. John Montag, "The Jesuits and the School of Salamanca: How the Dominicans Formed the Society of Jesus," in *New Voices in Catholic Theology*, ed. Anna Bonta Moreland and Joseph Curran (New York: Crossroad, 2012), 147–62.

commissioned the first complete edition of his works, published in 1570–1571. Within the Society of Jesus, the *Constitutions* (promulgated in 1558) gave Aquinas a prominent role in Jesuit formation (no. 464) and the *Ratio studiorum* (1599) included detailed rules for the adherence to his doctrine in theology. These rules were supplemented by a list of topics from the *Summa Theologiae* that had to be treated.¹³ In their retrieval of Aquinas, the Jesuits had important predecessors, whom they studied diligently: Thomas de Vio Cajetan (1469–1534) wrote and published the first complete *Summa* commentaries in 1508–1523. It soon became an often discussed reference work, but remained solitary.¹⁴ Also the Dominicans in Salamanca and Alcalá wrote commentaries, but these did not appear as complete works in print at the time of their composition.¹⁵ Only thanks to the Jesuits did the Thomistic revival become a constant and successful movement in theology. Toledo, Valencia, and Vázquez wrote comprehensive commentaries on the *Summa Theologiae* and (with the exception of Toledo) published them. A brief summary of their academic biographies indicates their connection to the School of Salamanca and the history of their own work of commenting on Aquinas.

Francisco de Toledo (1532–1596)

After studying liberal arts in Zaragoza, Francisco de Toledo entered the University of Salamanca in 1556 for theological studies and was taught by Domingo de Soto, whom he admired for his ingenuity.¹⁶ Already one year after joining the Jesuits in 1558, he was called to the Roman College of the Society of Jesus, where he first taught Aristotelian philosophy. From 1563 until 1569 he taught Scholastic and moral theology and became the first important Jesuit commentator of the *Summa Theologiae*. The following 30 years of his life he served as preacher at the papal court, papal envoy, consultant at various pontifical congregations, and main contributor to the revision of

13. Ladislaus Lukács, ed., *Monumenta paedagogica Societatis Iesu*, vol. 5: *Ratio atque institutio studiorum Societatis Iesu 1586 1591 1599* (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 1986) 389–94. Herein cited as *MPSI*.

14. Cajetan's commentaries, however censored and purged, were incorporated in the Editio Piana of Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae* (1570–1571). Also the critical edition, which started in the late nineteenth century (Editio Leonina), printed Cajetan's commentaries, but restored their original version: Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae, cum commentariis Thomae de Vio Caietani*, 9 vols. (Rome: Typographia Polyglotta, 1888).

15. Francisco de Vitoria, *Comentarios a la Secunda secundae de santo Tomás*, ed. Vicente Beltrán de Heredia, 6 vols. (Salamanca, 1932); Domingo Báñez, *Scholastica commentaria in primam partem angelici doctoris D. Thomae*, 2 vols. (Salamanca: Gast/Renaut, 1584–1588). Most of the other parts of Báñez's commentaries were edited between 1942 and 1951 by Vicente Beltrán de Heredia.

16. Giuseppe Paria, "Prolegomena," in *Francisci Toleti in Summam theologiae S. Thomae Aquinatis enarratio* (Rome: Congregatio de propaganda fide, 1869), 1:v–xxxi at vii; for an updated summary of Toledo's biography, see Pedro Suñer, "Toledo, Francisco de," *Diccionario de historia eclesiástica de España* (Madrid: Instituto Enrique Flórez, 1975), 4:2572–74.

the *Vulgate*.¹⁷ In 1593, he became the first Jesuit ever created a cardinal, but one year later he renounced this title. During his time in service for the papal Curia, he published first a number of philosophical commentaries on Aristotle's works and then his commentaries on the Gospel of John. Other biblical commentaries and the *Summa casuum conscientiae sive de instructione sacerdotum* were published shortly after his death. This handbook in casuistry for the formation of priests, which saw 46 editions and translations into several languages, helped build his posthumous fame.¹⁸ The commentaries on Thomas's *Summa*, however, remained as manuscripts in the archive of the Roman College until 1869, when Giuseppe Paria published them in four volumes with the title *In Summam theologiae S. Thomae Aquinatis enarratio*. This edition coincided with the burgeoning neo-Scholastic Thomistic revival of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Gregorio de Valencia (1549–1603)

Gregorio de Valencia succeeded in publishing during his lifetime all four volumes of his *Commentarii theologici* (1591–1597), which appeared in several re-editions during the following two decades in Ingolstadt, Lyons, and Venice.¹⁹ Before joining the Jesuits in 1565, Valencia had already finished his philosophy studies at Salamanca.²⁰ From 1566 to 1568 he continued there with theology, while Francisco Suárez gave him private lessons in philosophy. Then he added two years of theology in Valladolid, where Vitoria's disciple Mancio de Corpus Christi (ca. 1507–1576) became his most important professor. His preparation for teaching theology was particularly thorough, since he took two further years of probably personal studies in the same two universities before he went to Rome in 1572. Upon the election of Everard Mercurian

17. Luke Murray, "Catholic Biblical Studies after Trent: Franciscus Toletus," *Journal of Early Modern Christianity* 2 (2015): 61–85, <https://doi.org/10.1515/jemc-2015-0004>.

18. James F. Keenan, "The Birth of Jesuit Casuistry: *Summa casuum conscientiae, sive De instructione sacerdotum, libri septem*, by Francisco de Toledo (1532–1596)," in *The Mercurian Project: Forming Jesuit Culture, 1573–1580*, ed. Thomas M. McCoog (Rome: Institutum Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2004), 461–82.

19. Listing of all editions: *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, ed. Carlos Sommervogel (Brussels: Schepens, 1898), 8: 396–98. The full title of Valencia's work indicates the reference to Aquinas: *Commentariorum theologicorum tomus quatuor in quibus omnes materiae, quae continentur in Summa Theologiae Divi Thomae Aquinatis, ordine explicantur*.

20. The most detailed biography from archival sources: Wilhelm Hentrich, *Gregor von Valencia und der Molinismus: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Prämolinismus mit Benützung ungedruckter Quellen* (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1928); Hentrich, "Gregor von Valencia und die Erneuerung der deutschen Scholastik im 16. Jahrhundert," in *Philosophia perennis: Abhandlungen zu ihrer Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, ed. Fritz-Joachim von Rintelen (Regensburg: Habel, 1930), 1:293–307; see also Antolín Álvarez Torres, "Gregorio de Valencia," in *La Filosofía Española en Castilla y León de los orígenes al Siglo de Oro*, ed. Maximiliano Fartos Martínez and Lorenzo Velázquez Campo (Valladolid: Universidad de Valladolid, 1997), 393–411.

(1514–1580) as superior general of the Society of Jesus in April 1573, Valencia moved to Bavaria, where he taught for the following 19 years at the centers of the academic Counter-Reformation: first at the University of Dillingen on the Danube and from 1575 at Ingolstadt, where he held the most prestigious chair of Scholastic theology in the German-speaking lands at the time. In line with the orientation of these universities, Valencia's earlier works are mostly controversial and apologetic theology.²¹ However, he managed to leave the arena of Counter-Reformation controversy. From 1591 onwards, Valencia dedicated all his efforts to completing and publishing his commentaries on the *Summa*, which was a task from Superior General Claudio Acquaviva: This work was supposed to serve as a handbook for use in Jesuit universities. Once completed, he was appointed professor and prefect of studies at the Roman College in 1598. Two years later he had to defend the work and doctrine of his fellow Jesuit theologian Luis de Molina (1535–1600) in the disputations at the Congregation *de auxiliis* that tried to resolve the conflicts between Jesuits and Dominicans on questions of grace and human freedom—a demanding task that weakened Valencia's health so much that he had to retreat to Naples, where he died in 1603 at only 54 years of age.

Gabriel Vázquez (1549–1604)

Gabriel Vázquez shared almost the same dates of life with Valencia, but their academic biographies were very different.²² He studied philosophy in Alcalá under Domingo Báñez (1528–1604), who, like Valencia's teacher Mancio, worked on the revision of Vitoria's *Summa* commentaries. Báñez tried to introduce a greater fidelity to Thomas into the commentary, which he regarded as too much influenced by Renaissance humanism.²³ In 1569, Vázquez joined the Jesuits and pursued theological studies in Alcalá from 1571 to 1575, while teaching philosophy. Later he taught theology in the Jesuit colleges of Ocaña, Madrid, and Alcalá. In 1585, he was sent to the Roman College to replace Francisco Suárez, who had fallen sick. An enmity between both theologians of very different character ensued. These academic animosities as well as tensions between Spain and the Holy See made Vázquez's stay in Rome unpleasant. He returned to Alcalá in 1591 without a position and, two years later, continued teaching there. It was only during the last ten years of his life that he published

-
21. On Valencia's apologetic *Analysis fidei* (1585), see Franco Motta, "Analisi della fede e sintesi dell'autorità: La verità secolarizzata di Gregorio de Valencia (1549 ca.–1603)," in *Avventure dell'obbedienza nella Compagnia di Gesù: Teorie e prassi fra XVI e XVII secolo*, ed. Fernanda Alfieri and Claudio Ferlan (Bologna: Mulino, 2012), 49–67 at 55–63.
 22. For biographical details, see Luis Maldonado, *El comentario de Gabriel Vázquez a la "Quaestio I" de la Summa en la perspectiva de la problemática contemporánea planteada en torno a la esencia de la teología* (Vitoria: Eset, 1964); Herman H. Schwedt, "Vázquez, Gabriel," *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* (Herzberg: Bautz, 1997), 12:1168–75.
 23. Fernando Domínguez Reboiras, "Summenkommentare (nach 1500)," in *Lexikon der theologischen Werke*, ed. Michael Eckert et al. (Stuttgart: Kröner, 2003), 682–86 at 684.

major works, in particular the first three volumes of his *Commentarii ac disputationes* on St. Thomas's *Summa, prima pars* (two volumes, 1598) and the first volume of the *prima-secundae* (1599). The second volume of the *prima-secundae* and the four volumes of the *tertia pars* were printed after his death from 1604 until 1615—except the commentaries on the *secunda-secundae*, which remains in manuscript in the Spanish National Archives.²⁴ The printed volumes were re-edited several times in Alcalá, Ingolstadt, Venice, Antwerp, and Lyons until 1631.²⁵ Also a biblical and a philosophical work of his were only posthumously published.²⁶

Three Early Jesuit Commentaries on the *Summa Theologiae*

What are the characteristic features of the *Summa* commentaries of these three authors? To which developments in theology do they bear witness? In which sense are they innovative? Due to the confines of this article, the following remarks can only provide a brief first glance at these three works, without any attempt to discuss specific contents or trace the intricate debates of their time. Three aspects, however, could suitably serve for a preliminary comparison that captures the most important formal features of these commentaries. These features include the intentions of the authors, their methodical and didactic approaches, and their means of argumentation. Therefore, the prologues of the books have been studied; the methods of commenting on Aquinas's text, of debating the questions, and of presenting the conclusions have been investigated; finally, the three authors' commentaries on Thomas's question about theological argumentation²⁷ have been compared with each other. Even this limited research reveals important features of a new kind of theological work. Furthermore, it indicates a rapid development of the genre of *Summa* commentaries within the four final decades of the sixteenth century.

Francisco de Toledo: In Summam theologiae S. Thomae Aquinatis enarratio (Written 1563–1569)

When Francisco de Toledo started teaching theology at the Roman College in 1563, he was asked to begin with the topic of God's knowledge and predestination. Treating this hotly debated issue was a challenge for the professor in his

24. This manuscript treats only some selected questions (on judgment, contracts, usury, simony, vows, and oaths) and "was not printed because it is short (no está impreso por ser breve)," as notes on the manuscript indicate: Gabriel Vázquez, "Obras teológicas" fol. 125r and 170r, Universidades, L.1197 (SRD C21928), Archivo Histórico Nacional, Madrid. Further description in Luciano Pereña Vicente, "Importantes documentos inéditos de Gabriel Vázquez," *Revista española de teología* 26 (1956): 193–214 at 193–205.

25. Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 8:513–18.

26. *Paraphrasis et explicatio ad nonnullas Pauli epistolas* (Alcalá: Sánchez de Ezpeleta, 1612); *Disputationes metaphysicae* (Madrid: Sánchez, 1617).

27. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* (hereafter cited as *ST*) 1, q. 1, a. 8.

first theology class. We know what and how he taught from the notes of one of his students: Robert Bellarmine sat in this class and his *Reportatum Toleti* has been preserved. According to him, Toledo said, “In this difficulty, I intend to say what I think, neither in a spirit of contradiction nor of introducing novelties, but with eagerness and desire for the truth; and so that many may understand what the holy doctors and pillars of the Church said, and may not at once in faith accept things that are only probable.”²⁸ Also in the prologue to the *Enarratio*, Toledo underlines his loyalty to Holy Scripture, the councils, the papal decisions, the traditions of the church, and the consensus of the church fathers.²⁹ It was not so much the issues he taught that caused troubles, but rather his methods, which he had already started to adopt one or two years before while still teaching philosophy. These were unfamiliar and therefore suspicious to his colleagues, who asked, Why did Toledo attract so many students? He no longer taught in the usual way, just dictating, but he used the *Summa Theologiae* as his textbook!³⁰ Because of these rumors the new theology professor had to leave the college and report to the Superior General Diego Laínez (1512–1565), who was working in Trent at the council. Laínez managed to calm the situation with letters he wrote, in support of Toledo. Laínez also indicated the true reason behind the accusations: Other professors did not dare to engage in disputations with Toledo, probably because it would have resulted in embarrassment for them.³¹

Toledo’s argumentation, as the *Enarratio* shows, is clear, concise, and sharp. He includes many biblical references, indicating his talent as a biblical scholar, but also refers to numerous patristic and Scholastic sources. His stated goal is to “firmly explain St. Thomas first, then Cajetan; and thirdly, we will discuss those more difficult issues with sentences from other important theologians, always pointing out what has to be held in faith, and as much as possible putting forward the words and opinions of the holy Fathers.”³² In the same prologue, he explains and defends his proposal not to comment on Lombard’s *Sentences* but on a work that Thomas wrote “in his mature age, which is called *Summa theologica*, in which he moved away from the order of the Master [Lombard] and discusses the theological matters in a remarkable order,

28. “In hac difficultate, dicam quod sentio, non animi contradicendi nec inducendi novitates, sed studio et desiderio veritatis, et ut nonnulli intelligant quod doctores sancti et columnae Ecclesiae dixerunt, nec statim quod probabile est tamquam de fide recipiant.” *Reportatum Toleti*, fol. 119v, in Feliciano Cereceda, “En el cuarto centenario del P. Francisco Toledo,” *Estudios eclesiásticos* 13 (1934): 90–110 at 96.

29. Francisco de Toledo, *In Summam theologiae S. Thomae Aquinatis enarratio*, ed. Giuseppe Paria (Rome: Congregatio de propaganda fide, 1869), 1:6 (prooemium).

30. Suñer, “Toledo,” 2572.

31. Mon. Laínez VI, 489 and 516–18, quoted in Cereceda, “Cuarto centenario” 94–95.

32. “Ut prius S. Thomam pro viribus explanemus; consequenter Caietanum; loco autem tertio, quae difficiliora fuerint, iuxta aliorum insignium Theologorum sententias discutiemus, quae fide tenenda sunt, semper ostendentes, ac quantum nobis fuerit concessum sanctorum Patrum dicta et placita proponentes.” Toledo, *Enarratio*, 1:6 (prooemium).

conciseness, and dignity; thus it is a highly useful work.”³³ Nevertheless, Toledo also praises the *Sentences* and its commentators, because it gathered so many quotations from Scripture and the church fathers, however “scattered and without method.”³⁴ In his commentaries, he intended to strengthen the rich tradition of positive theology from biblical and patristic sources. This should support the methodically organized Scholastic argumentation in its efforts to bring light to difficult issues and to refute the heresies.³⁵

Toledo did not give his work the common title *commentarii* but *enarratio* (i.e. exposition, detailed interpretation), because he preferred to write in a pleasant style for teaching instead of attempting to comment on every issue of the original text.³⁶ The organizing principle of his work is the structure of Aquinas’s *Summa*, whose question and article titles Toledo uses as headings in his own work. He summarizes each article from the *Summa* with *conclusiones*; then he comments on them by explaining particular concepts, discussing dissenting positions (*dubia*), and providing arguments for the truth of Thomas’s position by adducing reasons and quoting authorities (*probatio*). Sometimes he discusses a particular question separately (*quaestio, controversia*) and comes to his own *conclusiones*. In rare cases, Toledo supports a position divergent from Thomas. More often he has a different opinion from that of Cajetan; in a manuscript, Toledo provides a list of ten topics, just for selected issues from the first three questions of the *Summa*, in which he contradicts this influential cardinal and almost normative commentator of the *Summa* at his time.³⁷ In this regard, the intent stated in the prologue to explain Cajetan was not put into practice. Francisco de Toledo proves to be an independent thinker who knew that he was venturing into a new approach in theology. Many aspects of this approach seem strongly influenced by the rhetoric as it was taught at the Roman College during his time. According to Stefania Tutino, its main purpose was communicating the truth of theology and stirring people toward it.³⁸ But it also generated seeds of doubt (*dubia*) in order to make persons reflect, to improve the argumentation and, ultimately, to construct a language that was supposed to convince.

Gregorio de Valencia: *Commentarii theologici (1591–1597)*

Gregorio de Valencia started teaching theology in Dillingen in 1573, four years after Toledo had left his chair at the Roman College in order to become the preacher at the

33. “Fecit etiam aliud opus matura iam aetate, quod Summa Theologica dicitur, in qua ab ordine Magistri recessit, et miro ordine, brevitate et gravitate res theologicas discussit; opus quidem utilissimum.” Toledo, *Enarratio*, 1:5 (prooemium).

34. “Sparsim et absque methodo,” Toledo, *Enarratio*, 1:4 (prooemium).

35. Toledo, *Enarratio*, 1:4.

36. Paria, “Prolegomena,” xxviii–xxviii.

37. Edition with brief introduction: Friedrich Stegmüller, “Tolet et Cajétan,” *Revue thomiste* 39 (1934): 358–70.

38. Stefania Tutino, *Shadows of Doubt: Language and Truth in Post-Reformation Catholic Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), 113–14.

papal court. Already in 1571, the University of Ingolstadt, 80 kilometers down the Danube river from Dillingen, had issued an *ordo studiorum* that referred to the reform of studies in Salamanca and at the Roman College by Toledo. It confirmed the practice of commenting on the *Summa Theologiae* alongside the *Sentences*. The Jesuits Theodor Peltanus (1511–1584) and Jerónimo Torres (1527–1611) gave lectures using Aquinas's *Summa*. A plan of studies in 1575 went even further. It established a schedule of three professors lecturing on the *Summa* within the course of ten years in a shifted arrangement. By means of this, the students would get the chance to study the entire work within four years. Valencia probably contributed to this plan of studies just before he was transferred to Ingolstadt later in the same year.³⁹ Consequently, he found a well-prepared place for his undertaking.

During his tenure in Ingolstadt until 1592, Valencia was involved in many controversies with the theology of the Reformation, which enabled him to work out his own style of theology. He organized his *Commentarii theologici in disputationes*, whose single *puncta* refer to specific questions and articles of Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*. Although Valencia did not want to depart from the general structure of the *Summa* and Thomas's positions, this organizing principle reveals a greater independence from the reference text compared to Toledo's *Enarratio*. Valencia writes in the prologue: "Sometimes, though, and only rarely, we depart from the position of St. Thomas, but we will not even for a little disregard it without reason and authority from other theologians."⁴⁰ This principle reflects the strict position of adherence to Aquinas from the 1586 draft *Ratio studiorum*.⁴¹ But Valencia, further on, stresses his independence: "The work may serve as a commentary on the books of St. Thomas, and at the same time it could be read for itself, because it is made up from its own parts for itself and is not further dependent from the books or the *Summa* of St. Thomas."⁴² Besides Aquinas, he mentions Cardinal Cajetan as a point of reference, in whose commentary "the meaning and position of St. Thomas is being explained and his teaching is being defended against those theologians who opposed it."⁴³ These two aspects, Thomas and the defense of the faith, are important in regard to the two model theologians Valencia mentions by name: Johannes Eck (1486–1543), the most famous of his predecessors on Ingolstadt's chair of theology and fierce defender of the traditional faith against Luther, and Domingo de Soto from the School of Salamanca. These two figures stand

39. Hentrich, "Gregor von Valencia und die Erneuerung," 301–3.

40. "Quandoque tamen, idque raro a divi Thomae sententia discedimus, sed non sine ratione, et auctoritate aliorum Theologorum minime contemnenda." Gregorio de Valencia, *Commentariorum theologicorum tomi quatuor* (Ingolstadt: David Sartorius, 1591), 1:praefatio.

41. *MPSI* 5, 13.

42. "Inserviat opus libris D. Thomae tanquam commentarius, et simul possit per se legi tanquam suis ex partibus per se constitutum, et a D. Thomae libris seu Summa non prorsus dependens." Valencia, *Commentarii*, 1:praefatio.

43. "Mens sententiaque D. Thomae exponatur, ipsiusque defendatur doctrina contra eos Theologos qui illam oppugnaverunt." Valencia, *Commentarii*, 1:praefatio.

for sharp controversial theology and the Thomistic renewal, respectively, but Valencia in his prologue highlights something else: their austere style in disputations. This style helped to explain Aquinas more faithfully. Nevertheless, he writes, they chose topics for discussion more freely than other commentators.⁴⁴ The authorities Eck and Soto were therefore supposed to support Valencia's new type of commentary and his way of dealing with Aquinas. He intended to make his own selection of topics to discuss, raise new issues, and make new connections between the various topics.

Although the commentaries were not meant to be a work of controversial theology like Valencia's earlier publications, apologetic issues take up considerable space. However, there is an important difference from similar works: Whereas for Toledo in Rome the "heretics" were a rather general kind of dissenting theologians, for Valencia in the land of the Reformation they were clearly visible. Unlike many others, he read the original works of Protestant authors just as he studied the sources of the Church Fathers and Scholastic theologians in a truly humanist manner. He did not rely on collections of heretical Protestant quotations like the one from Johannes Cochlaeus (1479–1552),⁴⁵ which were circulating among Catholic controversialists: "I worked hard to ensure that, if any quotations either from orthodox or heretical authors seemed to pertain to the matter, I would relate all of them faithfully after examining the sources themselves, so that I would not cite anything false or uncertain."⁴⁶ Correct reference and benevolent interpretation of another's statement are important principles in the "presupposition" of the *Spiritual Exercises* of Ignatius of Loyola.⁴⁷

Finally, Valencia shared a profound pedagogic concern. Toledo in his prologue primarily praised the outstanding dignity and the tradition of theology, before he explained the theological structure of the *Summa Theologiae* compared to the *Sentences*. Valencia, instead, wrote in the first sentence of his preface that the first thing he has to do, is to "reflect about the plan and the method, how I most suitably could do this [commentary]."⁴⁸ He highlights again and again his didactic principles. He needs to select the most important topics from Aquinas's *Summa* and make adjustments in their arrangement, because he wants to facilitate easier learning. Writing primarily a book for theology classes, Valencia had also other readers in mind, at the end of each volume, he added an index of philosophical questions treated in the book "for philosophers, according to the structure of courses in Aristotle's philosophy, just as it is read in schools; and another [index] for preachers. For it is important for preachers not only

44. Valencia, *Commentarii*, 1:praefatio.

45. *Articuli CCCC Martini Lutheri ex sermonibus eius sex & triginta* (Cologne: Quentel, 1526).

46. "Laboratum quoque a me multum est, ut si quae sententiae, sive orthodoxorum, sive haereticorum ad rem pertinere viderentur, eas omnes memorarem fideliter, ipsis fontibus inspectis, ne quid falsi aut incerti a me citaretur." Valencia, *Commentarii*, 1:praefatio.

47. *Sp. Exx.* [22], as in Louis J. Puhl, trans., *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius* (Chicago: Loyola University, 1951), 11.

48. "Nihil habui prius, quam ut de ratione ac methodo cogitarem, qua id commodissime facere possem." Valencia, *Commentarii*, 1:praefatio.

to stir up the affection of their audience, but also to teach the intellect.”⁴⁹ With this last point Valencia tried to address the concern of the Council of Trent that urged the bishops and priests to preach and “to give explanations and interpretations of Sacred Scripture” regularly.⁵⁰

Gabriel Vázquez: *Commentarii et disputationes in Summam S. Thomae (1598–1615)*

Already the title indicates that Gabriel Vázquez works with two different literary forms: commentaries and disputations. This work is also considerably larger than the commentaries of Toledo and the disputations of Valencia. Each “part,” referring to the parts of Aquinas’s *Summa Theologiae*, is split up into several volumes. Vázquez uses not only the structure of the *Summa*, but begins each *articulus* with the complete text of Thomas’s article (except in the third part, which was published posthumously). Then he usually gives a brief summary of the article (“*summa et confirmatio totius articuli*,” or similar headings). After that, he comments on the article in different forms, for example with “remarks on the article” (*annotationes circa articulum*) explaining the most important statements and corroborating them with quotations from biblical or patristic sources. Sometimes he treats debated issues from the article’s history of reception (*dubitatio circa textum*). More often, however, references to those debates are included in a different section, which is a new feature compared to the two other authors: Vázquez interrupts the course of the commentary with *disputationes*, which are numbered consecutively and listed in a separate index at the end of each volume. These treatises explore specific topics in depth. They often begin with the *status controversiae*, then they usually discuss the positions of a wide range of theologians and lead toward several conclusions, which Vázquez supports with a number of arguments and which are sometimes followed by *corollaria*. Providing a commentary to Aquinas’s *Summa Theologiae* does not seem to be the main focus of this work. These elaborate disputations, instead, take up most of the space in the books, whereas the commentaries on many articles tend to be very brief. Sometimes they are even reduced to just one or two propositions in the form of a response to the question in the title of an article.

Although Vázquez seems to depart from commenting on the original text of the *Summa*, he intends to defend the positions of Thomas, whom he regards as “the most important and the most acute teacher that God has ever given to us.”⁵¹ Having added

49. “Unum pro Philosophis, iuxta ordinem cursus Philosophiae Aristotelis, prout in scholis praelegitur; alterum pro concionatoribus. Nam cum ad Concionatorem spectet non modo movere affectum auditorum, sed etiam erudire intellectum.” Valencia, *Commentarii*, 1:praefatio.

50. Council of Trent, session 5, decree 2,1 (On Instruction and Preaching): Norman P. Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 668.

51. “Gravissimum, atque acutissimum nobis divinitus datum Doctorum,” Gabriel Vázquez, *Commentariorum ac disputationum in primam partem S. Thomae tomus primus* (Alcalá: Viuda de Juan Gracián, 1598), ad lectorem.

more words of praise for Thomas, he continues by saying that he read very carefully the authors Thomas quoted: Scripture, the decrees of the church, the documents of the councils, and the Greek and the Latin Church Fathers. Nothing important shall be lacking in his work. Vázquez, inspired by the project of Renaissance humanism, had obviously encyclopedic aspirations.

Gabriel Vázquez furthermore addresses the reality of theological debate and disagreement, which, according to him, is never useless but legitimate, and helps for progress in theology.⁵² Theology in general is a discipline of debate, he writes, because it is not self-evident. He points out that there are, for instance, apparent differences between Aquinas and his commentator Cajetan.⁵³ Therefore, he sees his role in mediating between the authorities and in supporting the different positions by supplying further grounds, adducing arguments from a wider range of theologians and making use of philosophical reason.⁵⁴ In particular within the disputations, under chapter titles like *opinio Alberti*, *sententia Durandi*, or *quid senserit Scotus*, Vázquez often allows almost one entire page for explaining the position of a particular author—unlike the two other Jesuit commentators who usually, like Thomas in the *Summa*, only quote a brief proposition. Really trying to understand the opinion of theologians and only then debating it in detail, was important at the time of the publication of the *Commentarii et disputationes*, especially in Spain, since they had the potential to be received as a major statement in the heyday of a hot dispute, the *de auxiliis* controversy. In the final paragraph of the prologue, Vázquez mentions how contentious this could be, as he is going to treat the matters of grace and predestination—despite an order of “silence for the Spanish theologians, which about four years ago was issued by the Holy Father concerning the topic of grace in order to calm down certain contentions.”⁵⁵ Pope Clement VIII (r. 1592–1605) had ordered the opponents to refrain from further debates, and established the Congregation *de auxiliis*. Various universities were invited to examine the question, before the pope would make a decision. Nevertheless, Vázquez included the respective matters in his book, which in due course helped to further incite the controversy.⁵⁶ In order to re-establish unity at least within the Society of

52. Vázquez, *Commentarii*, 76 (disp. 12, c. 2).

53. Vázquez, *Commentarii*, 4 (q. 1, a. 1).

54. “Haec nostra scholastica Theologia non tantum testimoniis Scripturae, Conciliorum, et Patrum, atque Ecclesiae traditionibus praecipue innitur, sed etiam rationibus philosophicis non parum iuvatur.” Vázquez, *Commentarii*, 2 (q. 1, praefatio). For a discussion of the relationship between theology and philosophy, see Vázquez, *Commentarii*, 73–77 (disp. 11–12).

55. “Silentium Hispanis Theologis abhinc annos quatuor circiter a Summo Pontifice circa materiam de Gratia ad sedandas quasdam contentiones indictum.” Vázquez, *Commentarii*, ad lectorem.

56. Eleuterio Elorduy, “La predestinación en Suárez: Controversias con Vázquez, Salas y Lesio,” *Archivo teológico granadino* 10 (1947): 5–151 at 91–101. For the political implications of the controversy, see Paolo Broggio, *La teologia e la politica: Controversie dottrinali, Curia romana e Monarchia spagnola tra Cinque e Seicento* (Florence: Olschki, 2009), 45–129.

Jesus, Superior General Claudio Acquaviva ordered in 1606 that for a new edition of this work all statements against Suárez in this matter should be purged.⁵⁷

A Theological Contribution to the Catholic Reform

In the final section of this article I intend to summarize in which aspects the work of Toledo, Valencia, and Vázquez contributed to a Catholic reform especially in academic theology after the Council of Trent. This will highlight the historical significance of these authors and may foster a more differentiated view of theology in the post-Tridentine era.

Factors for Innovation in Theology

After a time of doctrinal struggle and after a council with strong theological impact, theological scholarship may usually need some time for a re-set to the ordinary. In fact, it might seem that these three theologians chose to retreat to Thomas Aquinas in a time of uncertainty and that they did not aim at creative innovations or groundbreaking work. In order to see more clearly the innovative features that made their work an instrument for Catholic reform, we first need to identify various factors that are able to elicit innovative developments in theology.

Some such factors are determined by the methods and functions of systematic theology according to Bernard Lonergan (1904–1984), who was himself a famous Jesuit interpreter of Thomas Aquinas. A first important task of theology is communication and mediation.⁵⁸ Efforts to communicate the Christian faith into the present time and to mediate between the sometimes dialectical opposition of historical articulations and current understandings are a stimulus for theological innovation. Therefore, especially in times of cultural change, systematic theology will only be relevant for the life of faith if it takes into account how current cultural situations and specific articulations of the Christian doctrine are related (the *cultural matrix*).⁵⁹ The three Jesuits lived and worked in a time of cultural change, marked by controversy. It seems that the reasons for the new approaches seen in their commentaries on the *Summa Theologiae* are to be found precisely in the pursuit of addressing and of coming to terms with these challenges. For Lonergan, cultural intersections are equally crucial in a second feature of theology: All scholarly discourse is ultimately oriented toward conversion and the praxis of faith.⁶⁰ This practical aim of theology with its very concrete and visible consequences may demand new approaches. Since our authors elaborated their commentaries in the

57. Klaus Reinhardt, "Vázquez, Gabriel," *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2nd ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1965), 10:645–47 at 646.

58. Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, 2nd ed. (New York: Seabury, 1979), 351–53; Robert M. Doran, "Bernard Lonergan and the Functions of Systematic Theology," *Theological Studies* 59 (1998): 569–607 at 606, <https://doi.org/10.1177/004056399805900401>.

59. Lonergan, *Method*, xi, 41–55.

60. Lonergan, *Method*, 235–47.

context of the formation of theology students, the practical application of their teaching was certainly part of their concern. A third source for innovation is the recourse to the normative sources of theology and their proper meaning. This applies particularly to theological commentaries for they are already at least twice removed from the Christian primary sources like Scripture and patristic texts.⁶¹

In the following sections I will explore in detail how these factors operated within the Jesuit *Summa* commentaries. Since the analysis of these works offered above focused primarily on their formal and methodical features, the innovative elements highlighted below will refer to those aspects of the works. Possibly innovative features in the contents need to be identified in further studies. The formal setting, however, can prepare the ground for creative developments in theology itself—for a theology that opens the Scriptures for present-day believers, responds to current questions, and is able to communicate the contents as well as the reasons of the faith.

A Comprehensive Theology After a Time of Change: With Thomas Aquinas

The first striking feature of the Jesuit *Summa* commentaries is their comprehensiveness. These three theologians intended to write a systematic introduction to the whole of theology. This was not an easy task after a time of tremendous change. Renaissance humanism had introduced into the world of thought a quest for sources, a new kind of erudition based on classical literature as well as on philosophy and theology, oriented toward rhetorical discourse and teaching. The Reformations had shaken up religious concepts and convictions, and the Council of Trent had set the more and more denominational Catholic Church onto a track of reform that had to be integrated into theological scholarship as well. Under these new circumstances, our three authors were supposed to write textbooks for a rapidly growing number of Jesuit theology students. A thorough formation of the clergy was one of the main demands from the Council of Trent. Furthermore, a theology for teaching students had to shift back from the mode of Counter-Reformation controversy with its discussion of highly particular issues to an ordinary introduction to all the important topics of theology.

In this situation, our authors had to identify suitable methods of dealing with the theological questions and find fitting ways of arranging the topics. They decided to base their theology on Thomas Aquinas's *Summa Theologiae*. Francisco de Toledo and Gregorio de Valencia faced resistance to this decision. In the 1560s in most universities, except some Spanish universities under the direct influence of the Salamanca School, Peter Lombard's *Book of the Sentences* was still the standard text in theology. All three Jesuits gave similar reasons for this decision as Aquinas, when he himself decided to write a *Summa* instead of commenting anew on the *Sentences*. He criticized "the multiplication of useless questions, articles, and arguments, partly also because those things that are needful for [beginners in theology] to know are not taught according to the order of the subject matter . . . , partly, too, because frequent repetition brought

61. Lonergan, *Method*, 280–81.

weariness and confusion to the minds of readers.”⁶² The clear and concise structure of Thomas’s theology, his logical arrangement of the topics, and his systematic comprehensiveness were reasons why the Jesuits used his text. The introduction of the *Summa Theologiae* into the educational system of the Society of Jesus with these first complete *Summa* commentaries in the tradition of the School of Salamanca had long-lasting consequences: The Jesuits’ option for Aquinas solidified his place in Catholic theology for centuries.

A Methodical Theology in Connection with its Foundations: Adopting Cano’s De locis theologicis

Another important aspect of the theological reform for which the three authors worked is the fact that they employed a methodological framework in order to engage the various references to historical sources in their argumentation. The growing importance of positive theology, a new appreciation and integration of Scripture and of the theology of many church fathers,⁶³ and in general the need the Jesuit commentators felt to discuss a wider range of authors, are not only due to the opposition to Protestant theologians who rejected “Scholastic” argumentation.⁶⁴ They also reflect the role history was assuming in theological argumentation. The Jesuits drew the consequences from methodological developments in the School of Salamanca, in particular from the methodological work *De locis theologicis* (1563) by Melchor Cano (ca. 1509–1560). Cano identified “places” (i.e. sources, references) of authority in theology that provide evidence for a thesis, and he structured these sources according to a hierarchical order.⁶⁵

62. “Partim quidem propter multiplicationem inutilium quaestionum, articulorum et argumentorum; partim etiam quia ea quae sunt necessaria talibus ad sciendum ... ; partim quidem quia eorundem frequens repetitio et fastidium et confusionem generabat in animis auditorum,” Aquinas, *ST*, prooemium.

63. Ornamentally decorated title pages capture the importance of the Church Fathers. The first editions of Gregorio de Valencia’s commentaries from Ingolstadt (1591), for instance, has a portico frame on the title page. The four classical church fathers Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, and Gregory are depicted as standing in column niches. Allegories of Theology and Philosophy watch from the top of the pediment, in whose tympanum is Christ shown in a vignette. On the portico’s bottom is St. John, depicted as Evangelist and visionary. For the second edition from Lyons in 1603, Jacob de Fortiazeri engraved a frame based on the title page from Ingolstadt. Instead of John the Evangelist, Thomas Aquinas is now in the foundation.

64. For an overview of the mixed reception of Aquinas in early Protestant theology, see Christoph Schwöbel, “Reformed Traditions,” in *The Cambridge Companion to the Summa Theologiae*, ed. Philip McCosker and Denys Turner (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 319–42 at 319–32.

65. Mariano Delgado, “Die neue theologische Methode Melchior Canos (1563) und die Erneuerung der römisch-katholischen Theologie,” in *Zwischen Reform und Abgrenzung: Die römische Kirche und die Reformation*, ed. Armin Kohnle and Christian Winter (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2014), 11–39.

Juan Maldonado (1533–1583), who had studied philosophy with Francisco de Toledo and theology with Domingo de Soto, was the first Jesuit to adopt this method and put it into practice when he was theology professor in Paris from 1565 to 1569.⁶⁶ Our three authors borrowed this system and discussed extensively the use of such theological references in order to establish a foundation for their own theological argumentation. Valencia and Vázquez even referred explicitly to Cano's work, seemingly without any reservations, in spite of his vitriolic hatred for the Jesuits.⁶⁷

Each of them focuses on a particular issue of the *loci* that relates to his specific context: Toledo discusses the sources of theology in general and defines the theological status of each particular type of source.⁶⁸ He also relates positive and Scholastic theology to each other: One approach cannot be placed over against the other, he said; rather they rely on each other, because theology discusses the content of the sources (*theologia positiva: scriptura, doctores*) in a methodical way for various purposes that have to do with the praxis of faith (*theologia scholastica: per consequentiam deducere, obscura et difficilia aperiens, ab haereticorum sophismatis ineptis liberans*).⁶⁹ Gregorio de Valencia's commentaries on the issue reveal a more personal set of priorities, probably due to the context of German post-Reformation controversy, in which he worked: In particular the use of biblical arguments was a debated issue. Therefore, Valencia discusses extensively the senses of Scripture and their particular roles in theological arguments. Inductive arguments that draw from a wide range of sources become more important for him. He concludes with a truly humanist exhortation: The students should first of all study all the books of Sacred Scripture; they should read the church fathers, the councils, and the pontifical decrees, learn the languages and rhetorical forms, know the liberal arts, the natural sciences, and philosophy, search for clarification of difficult issues in doctrinal matters, and finally consult natural reason, since the supernatural is not irrational.⁷⁰ Gabriel Vázquez's focus in his discussion of the *loci theologici* is how to argue against false doctrines, which might reflect the intensifying debates of the *de auxiliis* controversy in Spain. He works out exact definitions of the *locus* concept itself and of the single *loci* and, in dialogue with the approaches of Durandus and Cajetan, investigates in detail which arguments may convince which kind of person. For this purpose, he discusses the relationship between theology and philosophy and concludes that philosophy and, interestingly, history play an important role within the whole range of theological argumentation.⁷¹

66. José Ignacio Tellechea Idígoras, "Metodología teológica de Maldonado," *Scriptorium Victoriense* 1, no. 2 (1954): 183–255; Inos Biffi, "La figura della teologia in Juan de Maldonado: Tra rinnovamento e fedeltà," in *Figure moderne della teologia nei secoli XV–XVII*, ed. Inos Biffi and Costante Marabelli (Milan: Jaca, 2007), 137–55.

67. Boris Hogenmüller, "'Enemigo de los Jesuitas:' Melchior Canos Verhältnis zu den Jesuiten," *Theologie und Philosophie* 88, no. 3 (2013): 389–96.

68. Toledo, *Enarratio*, 1:46–52 (q. 1, a. 8).

69. Toledo, *Enarratio*, 1:4 (prooemium).

70. Valencia, *Commentarii*, 1:53–54 (disp. 1, punct. 5, par. 3).

71. Vázquez, *Commentarii*, 1/1:69–78 (q. 1, a. 8, with disp. 11 and 12).

These methodological developments show clearly that the recourse to Scripture, the Church Fathers, and other theologians was much more than proof-texting. From Toledo to Vázquez, our three authors engaged more and more in elaborate literary debates with those theological authorities in the *dubia* sections or in the *disputationes*. They used a theologically grounded method for relating back to foundational texts and theological authorities in order to prove the truth and legitimacy of certain positions or to show the antiquity of a specific doctrine and the constant teaching in a certain matter. All this helped them establish anew the communion and the diachronic constancy of the Catholic Church, which had been put into question during the struggles of the Reformation.

A Communicative Theology: Inspired by Renaissance Humanism

The three commentaries show a clear pedagogic motivation. The three Jesuits shared a zeal for communicating the theological doctrine by means of well-structured “questions” that allow one to easily grasp the most important points, and by “disputations” for discussing specific issues in greater detail and for debating conflicting positions. Both literary forms originate in rhetoric and, thus, indicate the influence of Toulmin’s afore mentioned dynamic paradigm, which was typical for Renaissance humanism. This required an adaptation to the specific place, time, and circumstances. Certainly, theology in these commentaries seems to be much more “timeless” than contemporary theologies that take the context into account. They generally did not intend to explore new theological issues, they rather based their theology on a widely accepted work and frequently emphasized that they did not want to teach anything that could lead to doubt in dogmatic issues. Renewal and contextual adaptation happened rather in the ways of approaching, discussing, and presenting the topics. At times, when they are overly concerned with proving certain propositions and to specify their dogmatic status, it seems that they are already heralding Toulmin’s later paradigm of logic and objectivism.

Nevertheless, the three Jesuits still favored a learned Catholicity in a humanist manner with constant recourse to the sources, open to non-theological literature and arguments from reason, to history, and to debate. Their works are no longer commentaries in a strict sense. Greater liberty in dealing with current questions could happen at the expense of faithfulness to Thomas. This is a recurrent feature already in previous commentaries. Cajetan, although his commentary seems to treat the *Summa* question by question, went beyond the text in a speculative manner—which our authors in turn criticize. Theologians of the School of Salamanca, for example Francisco de Vitoria’s successor Domingo de Soto and Domingo Báñez, tried to be more faithful to the original intentions of Thomas. The three Jesuit authors intended to do the same. Already Vitoria’s and Báñez’s commentaries allowed space for discussing *dubia* regarding the articles, citing other Scholastic authors or other commentators. These amplifications became more and more important for Toledo, Valencia, and Vázquez in their intention to focus on the actual questions of their contemporaries. They wanted to be as faithful as possible to Aquinas while at the same time dealing with the currently debated issues. The competition between these two ideals reflects the debates within the Society of Jesus from the 1560s until the 1610s during the drafting and the implementation of the

Ratio studiorum: To which extent should adherence to Aquinas be required for Jesuit theology professors? After all, the openness toward debated questions and the permission of a certain eclecticism are integral parts of the requirement to follow the Thomistic doctrine in the final text of the *Ratio* from 1599.⁷²

In doing this, our authors became teachers for generations of theologians after the Council of Trent. Although Toledo's commentaries were not published before the nineteenth century and despite his rather short tenure at the Roman College, he became instrumental for introducing the *Summa Theologiae* as the principal theology textbook in the Jesuit educational system. Valencia, during almost twenty years of teaching in Ingolstadt, was regarded as "the teacher of the teachers" (*doctor doctorum*) and as the "restorer of theology in Germany"⁷³ after decades that were more characterized by controversy than by a theology that deals with the whole range of topics proper to the discipline. Vázquez, finally, was a very popular teacher in Rome and Alcalá—more than Suárez, for whom it was difficult to cope with this fact. With the text of Thomas's *Summa Theologiae* and the summarizing commentaries, Vázquez tried to safeguard that the students would get introduced to the full range of theological matters. In his disputations, he intended to debate a great variety of special questions.

However, Vázquez treated many matters so extensively that his volumes became too large. His commentaries lack the conciseness and clarity of Toledo's *Enarratio*. These downsides of Vázquez's attempt at comprehensiveness asked for a shift to a different kind of theological work: theological treatises on specific questions. Suárez, who is known for this genre, was the logical successor to these developments. Although he worked through almost all the questions of Aquinas's *Summa*, he no longer published commentaries, but single works whose titles tell the topics he treats therein. With his kind of works, he became the most influential Jesuit theologian in the seventeenth century. The three Jesuit commentators of the *Summa Theologiae* we have been studying here relayed the new approach to Aquinas from the School of Salamanca to the colleges of the Society of Jesus. They developed it further from commenting on Thomas's text to writing independent works of theology. With that, they helped to re-create Catholic theology after the Reformation and the Council of Trent.⁷⁴

Author Biography

Bernard Knorn, SJ, is a research scholar in systematic theology at Boston College and Hochschule Sankt Georgen in Frankfurt, Germany. He works in the areas of contemporary soteriology and ecclesiology as well as on Jesuit theologians of the sixteenth century.

72. Ulrich G. Leinsle, "Delectus opinionum: Traditionsbildung durch Auswahl in der frühen Jesuitentheologie," in *Im Spannungsfeld von Tradition und Innovation*, ed. Georg Schmuttermayr et al. (Regensburg: Pustet, 1997), 159–75 at 169; Marco Forlivesi, "Francisco Suárez and the 'rationes studiorum' of the Society of Jesus," in *Francisco Suárez and His Legacy: The Impact of Suárezian Metaphysics and Epistemology on Modern Philosophy*, ed. Marco Sgarbi (Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 2010), 77–90.

73. "Restaurator der Theologie in Deutschland," Matthias Joseph Scheeben, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, ed. Martin Grabmann, 2nd ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1948), 1:479.

74. The author wishes to thank Jack Nuelle for assistance in research and Joseph A. Appleyard, SJ, for his editorial review of the manuscript.