

## Nineteenth-century Catholic reception of Aquinas

Thomas Marschler

### Angaben zur Veröffentlichung / Publication details:

Marschler, Thomas. 2021. "Nineteenth-century Catholic reception of Aquinas." In The Oxford Handbook of the Reception of Aquinas, edited by M. Levering and M. Plested, 359–74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198798026.013.21>.

### Nutzungsbedingungen / Terms of use:

licgercopyright

Dieses Dokument wird unter folgenden Bedingungen zur Verfügung gestellt: / This document is made available under the following conditions:

**Deutsches Urheberrecht**

Weitere Informationen finden Sie unter: / For more information see:

<https://www.uni-augsburg.de/de/organisation/bibliothek/publizieren-zitieren-archivieren/publizieren>



THE OXFORD HANDBOOK OF

---

THE  
RECEPTION  
OF AQUINAS

---

*Edited by*

MATTHEW LEVERING

*and*

MARCUS PLESTED

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, ox2 6DP,  
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of  
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Oxford University Press 2021

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted

First Edition published in 2021

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in  
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the  
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted  
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics  
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the  
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the  
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form  
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press  
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available


Library of Congress Control Number: 2020940646

ISBN 978-0-19-879802-6

Printed and bound by

CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CRO 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and  
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials  
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.



0 100 - 750

## CHAPTER 22

---

# NINETEENTH-CENTURY CATHOLIC RECEPTION OF AQUINAS

---

THOMAS MARSCHLER

### BEFORE NEO-SCHOLASTICISM

---

FROM about 1750 onwards, the production of literature by post-Tridentine scholasticism had come more and more to a standstill. Whereas the second half of the eighteenth century still saw appreciable attempts to integrate scholastic heritage into Wolffian methodology in the teaching of philosophy and theology (shaped by Thomism in, for example, Pietro Maria Gazzaniga, OP (1722–99)), a paradigm shift finally came about at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Leinsle 2010: 354–5). But in around 1800, there was no lack of references to Thomas Aquinas and other medieval authors in the most widespread dogmatics handbooks, which were often still written in Latin, and they continued to contain many of the structural principles, concepts and theses of scholasticism, though focusing on ‘positive’ theology. This is particularly evident in the five-volume dogmatics by the Mainz dogmatist Bruno F. L. Liebermann (1759–1844), which was regarded by some of his contemporaries as still belonging to the ‘old school’ of methodology (Peitz 2006a: 32) even though it no longer displays any discernible interest in a speculative deepening of the traditional contents (Walter 2018). Even though, with its striving to bring about a new synthesis between reason and faith, Catholic Romanticism had rediscovered one of thirteenth-century scholasticism’s fundamental concerns, when it came to putting this into practice, its taking up of Thomist ideas was at best piecemeal. The unmistakable inspiration of Franz von Baader (1765–1841) by Thomas Aquinas has not yet been fully investigated. By contrast, it is quite clear

that Georg Hermes (1775–1831) and Anton Günther (1783–1863) (both of whom had large numbers of followers and had a crucial influence on the intellectual life of German-speaking Catholicism in the first half of the nineteenth century) built their systems on anti-Thomist premises derived from critical or idealistic philosophy. In the Tübingen School, sharp and methodologically sound criticism of scholasticism is to be found in Johann Baptist von Hirscher (1788–1865) (Hirscher 1823), whereas Johann Adam Möhler (1796–1838) repeatedly cited evidence from Thomas in his *Symbolik*. The important dogmatics handbooks by Franz Anton Staudenmaier (1800–56) and Johannes Evangelist von Kuhn (1806–87) make positive reference to scholastic authors, above all Thomas, with the latter already auguring the beginnings of neo-scholasticism. Kuhn, however, clearly rejected their core systematic concern—even from the perspective of interpreting Aquinas (Peitz 2006a: 359–70).

## THE NEW TURN TO THOMAS AQUINAS BEFORE *AETERNI PATRIS*

---

### Italy

There were appreciably stronger continuities with older scholasticism in southern Europe in the early nineteenth century even though, often under the influence of the state authorities, modern trends had also been established in the teaching at ecclesiastical seminaries. Neo-scholasticism, for which the initial impetus came from religious orders in Italy, can be understood as a counter-movement to this (Peitz 2006a: 16–30).

The actual cradle of Italian neo-Thomism is generally held to be the Collegio Alberoni of the Lazarists in Piacenza, which had had Thomist-orientated teachers since its foundation in 1751 (Rossi 1988). The Piacenza-born secular priest Vincenzo Buzzetti (1777–1824) taught there from 1806, first of all philosophy, then from 1808 until his death in 1824 dogmatics (Peitz 2006b). As a result of the stimuli he had received during his own studies at this college—not least from the six-volume *Summa philosophica ad mentem Angelici Doctoris S. Thomae Aquinatis* by the Neapolitan Dominican Salvatore M. Roselli (1722–84)—but probably also as the fruit of his own reading of older Thomist works, he aimed to give a contemporary shape to Thomist thought, which he himself employed in his teaching without ever putting it in published form. Students took up his ideas and subsequently spread them beyond Piacenza. One of them, Serafino Sordi (1793–1865), entered the Jesuit order and, together with his brother Domenico Sordi (1790–1880) and Luigi Taparelli d’Azeglio (1793–1862), who wrote works on social philosophy and the doctrine of natural law, provided the stimulus for a new Thomist tendency at the Collegio Romano in the 1820s (Schmidinger 1988: 110–16; Peitz 2006d; 2006e). This, however, soon had to make way for a party more inclined towards the positive method (‘Roman School’). The Jesuit Giovanni Maria Cornoldi (1822–92) had studied both in

Piacenza and subsequently in Rome (Malusa 1986–9). After works on anthropology and natural philosophy, the decidedly Thomist character of which initially met with fierce criticism within the order, in the 1870s he developed a course in philosophy written in the same spirit (Cornoldi 1872), which was translated into several languages and can be regarded as a prime example of rigid neo-Thomism in Italy.

Alongside Piacenza, Rome and Naples must also be mentioned as centres of the new turning to the thinking of Thomas Aquinas. In Rome, the Dominican Order had consistently modelled its education of the friars on the Thomist tradition (Collegium S. Thomae/Minerva) using textbooks from the eighteenth century (above all by Goudin (†1695) and Roselli (†1784) in philosophy and by Gotti (†1742) in theology). The Roman college, however, proved itself pretty much incapable of producing any noteworthy academic personalities after Roselli, who had spent the last phase of his teaching career there. It was not until the mid-nineteenth century that this changed again, with Tommaso Maria Zigliara (1833–93), a young Dominican embarked on his studies in Rome who was to become one of the most famous neo-Thomist philosophers of his age. After writings dedicated to the dispute with the ontologism that was influential in Italy at that time, in 1876 the future cardinal first published his *Summa philosophica*, which was reprinted countless times and remained one of the most important manuals until after the First World War (Giammarino 1975). This is a presentation distinguished by its clarity and succinctness, albeit one in which—as so often in neo-Thomism—the controversies with modern philosophy confine themselves to rejecting summary theses.

A key role in the renewal of Thomist philosophy in Italy was played in the 1840s by the Neapolitan diocesan priest Gaetano Sanseverino (1811–65), who likewise had the opportunity to become familiar with the Dominican Order's intact Thomist tradition in his home town (Piolanti 1965; Peitz 2006a: 101–12). His principal work is a seven-volume, partly posthumously published course on philosophy (Sanseverino 1862–8). This work, also abridged in the form of compendia, became a standard work used in the training of priests (Dovere 1978). In 1840 Sanseverino founded the periodical *La scienza e la fede* in Naples, the purpose of which was to tackle various areas of intellectual life with the aim of defending the Catholic faith. From the mid-1860s this periodical was also clearly committed to strict Thomism (Peitz 2006a: 132–4). In 1846, again in his home town, Sanseverino inaugurated Italy's first Thomist academy (Accademia di Filosofia tomista). Sanseverino's friend Nunzio Signoriello (1820–89) became known above all as the author of a lexicon of scholastic terms (Signoriello 1864). From among his students, Salvatore Talamo (1854–1932) acquired an influence extending beyond Naples, not least in paving the way for the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (Piolanti 1986).

Also in Naples, the Jesuit Matteo Liberatore (1810–92) had come into contact with the revived Italian Thomism (McCool 1996: 145–66; Peitz 2006c; Dante 2010). That notwithstanding, his early philosophical work takes up 'at most scholastic commonplaces which can be harmonised with modern teachings that are acceptable to him' (Peitz 2006a: 250). This changed from the early 1850s, when he began to work on the editorial staff of the periodical *Civiltà cattolica*, which at that time adopted an explicitly

Thomist orientation. The reason for Liberatore's intellectual turnabout apparently lay in his studies of the history of philosophy as well as in his reception of the writings of Sanseverino and Clemens. He published a philosophical epistemology (Liberatore 1857–8), which contains a systematic presentation of Thomist theory, alongside a criticism of idealistic philosophy and the contemporary systems inspired by it which were particularly influential in Italy at the time. He also published on anthropology and a three-volume philosophy course in Latin (Liberatore 1860–61).

In Perugia, after being appointed bishop (1846), Gioacchino Pecci (1810–1903), later Pope Leo XIII, promoted the Thomist orientation of the diocese's priestly formation (Duranti 1962), which was initially in the hands of his elder brother Giuseppe Pecci (1807–90) (a member of the Jesuit Order), who moved to Rome as a professor in 1860. Before that, he and Gioacchino had arranged for the establishment of a Thomist academy in Perugia. During the pontificate of Leo XIII, the Perugia-born philosopher Gabriele Boccali (1843–92) and the theologian Francesco Satolli (1839–1910) took on important tasks in Rome, the latter as cardinal and prefect of the Congregation of Studies.

## Germany

### Protagonists of a Renewed Interest in Thomas Aquinas since 1850

Explicit beginnings of a turning to scholasticism (not so much specifically Thomism) are scarcely to be found in Germany before the 1850s, and those that can be discovered are initially more strongly perceptible in publications than in the institutional sphere. As in Italy, one important concern is to triumph over the contemporary philosophy of the late idealistic epoch which was perceived as a danger to faith—in the Catholic sphere, specifically the dispute with Güntherianism—but another was to do justice to the scholastic legacy and recognize its lasting significance. There are indications of this in the countless contributions made by Kuhn's pupil Wenzeslaus Mattes (1815–86) to the first edition of Wetzer and Welter's *Kirchen-Lexikon*, which was published mainly in the 1850s; his detailed articles on the lemmata *Scholasticism* (Mattes 1852) and *Thomas Aquinas* (Mattes 1853) can be cited as examples here. To be particularly highlighted from the first phase of German neo-scholasticism are, however, three other scholars and their post-1850 works.

Franz Jakob Clemens (1815–62) had studied philosophy and theology in Bonn and gained a doctorate in Berlin (Walter 1988: 134–9; Peitz 2006a: 84–100). Having returned to Bonn, he caused a stir in 1853 with a critical analysis of Günther's philosophy, in which he contrasted philosophical rationalism with a programme of genuine Christian philosophy and revelation theology (appealing, inter alia, to Pius IX's 1846 inaugural encyclical *Qui pluribus* (Denzinger 1991: 2776–7)). Clemens hardly ever appeals directly to Thomas in his arguments; nevertheless there is a rejection of the Güntherians' charges against Thomas (e.g. regarding his purported semi-Pantheism). Clemens completed his

post-doctoral studies in Bonn in 1855 and accepted a professorship in theology at Münster in 1856. His inaugural lecture in Latin, which also appeared in print (Clemens 1856), compiles evidence from numerous scholastic sources (including Thomism) for the thesis of a primacy of the revelation-based science of faith over the natural science of reason, and confronts this with modern philosophy's claim to autonomy. He himself concludes that only the recognition of a supernatural *ordo cognitionis* as the yardstick for philosophy is capable of leading the way out of the unholy dispute between schools and the threat posed by contemporary errors. He regards the scholastic legacy as a *philosophia perennis*, which he sees as being above all a continuation of the tradition of the Fathers and not a blind adoption of Aristotelian principles. In defending it against widespread prejudices, Clemens at the same time concedes that it is in need of supplementation with more recent scientific insights. The controversy with Johannes Evangelist von Kuhn over the relationship between philosophy and theology that followed the publication of Clemens' work in 1859/60, and in which other scholars soon intervened, represented a first litmus test for the neo-scholastic programme. From 1859 on, Clemens was able to advocate his positions journalistically as the philosophy editor of the periodical *Der Katholik*, which was published in Mainz.

A short time after the appearance of Clemens' treatise, Hermann Plassmann, who was born in 1817 in the Archdiocese of Paderborn and ordained to the priesthood there in 1843, began to publish a comprehensive, strictly Thomist-orientated philosophy course in German (Walter 1988: 139–44; Peitz 2006a: 207–47). After several years of pastoral work and a failed novitiate with the Jesuits, Plassmann had been sent to Rome to continue his studies, where he obtained his master's degree at the Dominicans' college in 1856. His death in 1864 prevented the completion of the planned theological part of the textbook. Plassmann's philosophy course (*Die Schule des h. Thomas von Aquino*) consists of an introductory volume, a supplementary volume, and four extensive volumes each on the usual treatises (logic, psychology/physics, morality, metaphysics), all of which were printed in quick succession (Plassmann 1857–62). Alongside other older works, Plassmann's model was particularly the classic textbook by Goudin. Compared to Clemens, Plassmann adopts a combative, indeed triumphalist tone when he predicts victory for Thomist philosophy in the confrontation with the confusion of modern thinking, on account of the unshakeable principles upon which the whole Thomist system is based. For Plassmann, the theological teaching authority of the Catholic Church and the philosophical teaching authority of Thomism coincide. In contrast to Clemens, Plassmann does not see any need for the scholastic system to be supplemented with knowledge from more recent sciences. His strict emphasis on the truth of Thomist teaching, even against the competing variants of scholastic Aristotelianism, shows him to be a Thomist 'of strict observance', and foreshadows the revival of old disputes between schools that was to be felt even more intensely in later neo-scholasticism. It is likely to have been above all against Plassmann that the criticism of the Dillingen philosopher Alois von Schmid (1825–1910) was directed. In the works of authors who demand 'in pompous words' a 'subjection to the letter of the Thomist system', indeed 'a complete

disregard for all modern thought systems', Schmid could see nothing more than a 'new type of unscientific traditionalism' (Schmid 1862: 65).

Unlike Plassmann's philosophy course, which for the reasons just given was not widely disseminated, the philosophical and theological writings of the Dortmund-born Jesuit Joseph Kleutgen (1811–83), who taught in Rome, rank among the undisputed reference works of neo-scholasticism (Walter 1988: 145–75; Peitz 2006a: 146–99; for a biography: Wolf 2013: 329–434). The first of four volumes of his *Theologie der Vorzeit vertheidigt* (Defence of the Theology of the Past) appeared in 1853, but the complete first edition was not available until 1870. A second edition (with the exception of vol. 3) came on the market in 1867–74. As an 'added extra' Kleutgen published the two-volume *Die Philosophie der Vorzeit vertheidigt* (Defence of the Philosophy of the Past) between 1860 and 1863 (2nd edn 1878). Kleutgen's intention is similar to that of the other neo-scholastic authors: he wishes to defend the thinking of the 'past', i.e. pre-eminently medieval scholasticism, against a Catholic theology and philosophy that have lost their firm foundations as a result of opening themselves too much to the spirit of the times. The *Theologie der Vorzeit* presents itself primarily as a rebuttal of the theology of Georg Hermes, which is rejected as being rationalistic, and of Hirscher's pamphlet criticizing scholasticism; however, the third and fourth volumes, as well as the other volumes in the second edition, include an extensive refutation of the theses of Anton Günther, whose works Kleutgen had been instrumental in having placed on the Index in 1857. The Jesuit consistently bases his presentation of the orthodox counter-positions on texts from St Thomas, and emphasizes the latter's pre-eminent position within scholasticism (Kleutgen 1860: 113–30). However, he also quotes—varying according to topic—Church Fathers and early modern scholastic authors, specifically Jesuits such as Suárez or De Lugo, interpreting Thomas in conjunction with their teaching. Unlike Plassmann, Kleutgen's concern is not to focus the 'Past' on strict Thomism but rather to construct an orthodox uniform tradition against which contemporary thinking can be measured. As compared to Plassmann and the early Italian neo-scholastic authors discussed above, Kleutgen for the first time conducts the debate explicitly in the field of theology. The Jesuit's attempt late in life to write a systematic textbook of dogmatics in Latin which was to offer a version of Thomas's *Summa* adapted to the needs of the day got no further than the first volume on the Doctrine of God (Kleutgen 1881).

As well as by authors taking up a neo-scholastic position, the renewed interest in Thomas Aquinas in mid-nineteenth-century Germany is also illustrated in their own way by Catholic philosophers and theologians who took either a critical or a neutral view of Aquinas' thinking and rediscovery. The Munich private scholar Johann Nepomuk Oischinger (1817–76) showed himself to be a harsh opponent of Thomism. In 1858 he wrote a monograph entitled *Die speculative Theologie des heiligen Thomas von Aquin* in which he even combined a rejection of central principles with accusations of heresy against Thomas, above all in Trinitarian theology. The book was placed on the Index in 1859. A greater stir was caused by the work published in 1854 by the Munich philosopher Jakob Frohschammer (1821–93) *Ueber den Ursprung der menschlichen Seelen*, in which he criticized Thomas' teaching for maintaining that every human

spiritual soul is created directly by God. The book was placed on the Roman Index in 1857, followed by further writings of Frohschammer' which also contained criticisms of central Thomist theses. When he was condemned in 1862 by the apostolic brief *Gravissimas inter* (Denzinger 2012: 2850–61) for his definition of the relationship between theology and philosophy and suspended from the priesthood in 1863, this heralded the start of his final break with Rome (Pahud de Mortanges 2005). Late in life Frohschammer elaborated his rejection of Thomas's philosophy in an extensive monograph (Frohschammer 1889).

The Austrian theologian Karl Werner (1821–88) adopted a more reporting than evaluating stance as an historian (Pritz 1968) when he published three copious volumes in 1858 and 1859 entitled *Der heilige Thomas von Aquino*; these were devoted to a biography of Thomas, a presentation of his teachings, and the history of Thomism down to the nineteenth century. In his systematic opinions, Werner, who taught as a professor in Sankt Pölten from 1847 on, broke away more and more clearly from his origins in the school of Anton Günther, advocating a contemporary philosophy that carried forward the flow of the tradition of the *philosophia perennis* and specifically the thinking of Aquinas (Werner 1867: 84–7). Strict Thomists and Güntherians have criticized him in equal measure for this mediatory standpoint (Peitz 2006a: 354–6).

### Consolidation of the Neo-Scholastic Movement in Germany

From about 1860 on, one can speak of the neo-scholastic movement's becoming increasingly prevalent in Germany too (Walter 1988; Peitz 2006a). Alongside the publication of the works already discussed, there were a number of factors that favoured this development, just a few of which were the decline of idealistic philosophies, the placing of philosophers and theologians like Günther and Frohschammer on the Index, the increasingly anti-liberal and anti-modernist course of Pius IX's pontificate (cf. the letter *Tuas libenter* of 1863, the encyclical *Quanta cura*, and the *Syllabus errorum* of 1864), and the administrative promotion of Thomism by the same Pope (Piolanti 1974).

Openness towards renewed scholasticism was displayed early on by the theological educational establishments in Eichstätt, Mainz, and Würzburg. Whereas the Eichstätt dogmatist Joseph Ernst (1804–69) was most likely to have been committed to the method of the 'Roman School' around Passaglia and Schrader, the historian of philosophy Albert Stöckl (1823–95) occupied himself extensively with the Middle Ages and left no doubt as to the pre-eminence of Thomas Aquinas (Stöckl 1864–6). Franz von Paula Morgott (1829–1900) was a decidedly Thomist scholar teaching at Eichstätt, first of all philosophy (from 1857) and then from 1869, as Joseph Ernst's successor, dogmatics (Naab 2002). Among his early works are two on Thomas Aquinas' doctrine of the soul. His study of Thomas's Mariology (Morgott 1878) attracted great international attention. Also to be mentioned are his work on Aquinas' doctrine of the sacraments as well as numerous articles in the second edition of Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon*. The most important works of Mathias Schneid (1840–93), who had already been teaching philosophy at Eichstätt since 1869, also date from the 1870s; notable among them is a defence of hylomorphism against objections from modern science (Schneid 1873).

In Mainz, where a certain continuity with the scholastic tradition had been retained through the work of Liebermann, the moral theologian Christoph Moufang (1817–90, professor from 1851) and the dogmatist Johann Baptist Heinrich (1816–91, professor from 1851) (Walter 2003) can be regarded as belonging to the neo-scholastic movement without their having been Thomists in the narrower sense. Heinrich's *Dogmatische Theologie* is one of the most comprehensive textbooks in this discipline in the nineteenth century, the first six volumes of which its initiator was himself able to complete before he died (1873–84). Mainz also became a centre of the neo-scholastic movement as a result of the reorientation of the periodical *Der Katholik* after Heinrich and Moufang took over its editorship in 1850; from 1856, they were assisted by the philosopher Paul Leopold Haffner (1819–99). Its Thomist character is displayed above all in lengthy reviews, always taking account of publications from abroad as well, in commentaries on current controversial issues in theology, and in articles on the contemporary significance of Thomist teaching (Peitz 2006a: 128, 140–5).

With one or two exceptions, strict Thomism was unable to gain any great influence at Church educational institutions or at universities in the German-speaking countries either in the early phase of neo-scholasticism or later. An example of this is Constantin von Schüzler (1827–80), who was a qualified lawyer and convert initially belonging to the Jesuit Order; he received a doctorate in theology in 1859 from Munich with a valuable study on the efficacy of the sacraments (Schüzler 1860) and a post-doctoral degree from Freiburg in 1862 (Marschler 2006b). Despite his speculative gifts, he was never given a chair of theology. Neither his fierce criticism of the Tübingen dogmatist Johannes von Kuhn's doctrine of grace, a criticism invoking Thomas Aquinas (Schüzler 1865; 1867) and taken up again later in the field of Christology, nor his rejection of Molinist positions in Germany gained him more than a few prominent supporters. He was better received in the Dominican Order, as attested by the posthumous publication of two of his works by Thomas Esser, OP (1850–1926).

## NEO-SCHOLASTICISM FOLLOWING *AETERNI PATRIS* (1879)

---

A neo-scholasticism focusing on the philosophy of Thomas can only be said to have gained universal acceptance in the Catholic sphere in the decades after Vatican I and above all after Leo XIII's encyclical on Aquinas.

With Gioacchino Pecci, a pope was elected in 1878 who as bishop of Perugia had already promoted a Thomist reorientation of studies. As supreme pastor of the Church, he took up this concern again with his encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, which was published in the second year of his pontificate, on 4 August 1879 (Piolanti 1981). In it, after emphasizing the Church's teaching authority, Leo XIII declares 'the right use of philosophy' to be chief among 'the natural helps' in order to free men from error and prepare reason for

faith. The Christian faith 'reposing on the authority of God, is the unfailing mistress of truth'; therefore it must also be recognized as a yardstick by the philosopher. The pope sees this ideal of a Christian philosophy as realized in scholasticism, above all in the work of Thomas Aquinas. Of him it can be said 'he victoriously combated the errors of former times, and supplied invincible arms to put those to rout which might in after-times spring up'. It is scarcely any longer possible to surpass the synthesis of reason and faith achieved by Thomas. Leo XIII points to the recognition accorded to St Thomas by past popes and councils, and deplors the instability of many recent systems which have turned away from him. He urges the bishops to promote the renewal of philosophy in the spirit of Aquinas. But the pope expressly emphasizes that this does not imply a rejection of modern scientific progress. He leaves scope for departures from scholastic thinking where the latter proves no longer to be tenable, and calls especially for the study of the original sources.

In subsequent years, Leo XIII promoted the practical implementation of this programme in various ways (Ernesti 2019: 267–281). On 18 January 1880, with the *motu proprio Placere nobis*, he commissioned the preparation of a new complete edition of Thomas's works (Bataillon 1981). He ensured its financing and entrusted the task to Cardinals de Luca, Simeoni, and Zigliara. For the two main theological works, the *Summa theologiae* and the *Summa contra gentiles*, he ordered the commentaries by Cajetan and Sylvester of Ferrara to be reprinted with them, thus supporting the interpretive tradition of the Dominican school. The rapidly produced first volumes of the *Editio Leonina* (1882ff) failed to satisfy even their contemporaries with respect to textual criticism. The discussions this engendered promoted the development of historical research into scholasticism in the Catholic sphere, the first great proponents of which—Heinrich Denifle, OP (1844–1905), Clemens Baeumker (1853–1924), and Franz Ehrle, SJ (1845–1934)—were already actively publishing by the end of the nineteenth century. Further important measures taken by Leo XIII to implement the concerns of *Aeterni Patris* were the elevation of Aquinas as the patron of Catholic schools in 1880 (*Breve Cum hoc sit*), the founding of the Pontifical Academy of St Thomas Aquinas in Rome in the same year, and of the Roman Dominican university, the *Angelicum*, in 1895 (Berger 2005: 121–81). At their general chapters in the 1890s, the Dominicans formally adopted the resolution that they would orient themselves to their order's saint, and in 1898 prescribed a special oath of loyalty to the 'solid teaching of St Thomas' for their members.

## Important Thomists in the Last Third of the Nineteenth Century

Almost all Catholic textbooks of philosophy and systematic theology in the last third of the nineteenth century are shaped by neo-scholasticism and endeavour to connect to Aquinas' thinking. The number of historical works dedicated to him also greatly increased. Hence it is only possible to mention a small number of these authors here, specifically those whose Thomist character is particularly marked.

Strict Thomists in the German-speaking countries found a new publication organ in the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und spekulative Theologie*, which was founded in 1886 (first volume 1887) by Ernst Commer (1847–1928) (Berger 2005: 183–225). After studying in Germany, Commer had been awarded a doctorate in theology at the Dominican college in Rome; from 1884 he taught apologetics in Münster and from 1888 dogmatics in Breslau and later in Vienna. From the period before 1900, his four-volume philosophy textbook in particular is worth mentioning (Commer 1883–6). Among the most assiduous collaborators on Commer's *Jahrbuch* for over two decades, above all as a reviewer, was Michael Glossner (1837–1909), who came from the Eichstätt school and had in 1871 published a presentation of the doctrine of grace which was directed against Kuhn and, inter alia, defended the *praemotio physica* as an original doctrine of Aquinas (Marschler 2006a). Glossner's main work is his two-volume *Lehrbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, published in 1874, in which he builds on the lecture manuscripts of his Eichstätt teacher Joseph Ernst but also endeavours to provide a more strictly Thomist presentation of the treatises and, above all in ecclesiology, places novel emphases. Glossner was never offered a chair at a German university. The Silesian Thomist Ceslaus Maria Schneider (1840–1908), who had entered the Dominican Order after studying at the Collegium Germanicum in Rome, also worked far removed from the official academic life of Germany (Berger 2006). After being forced to leave the order again for family reasons, from 1870 on he worked in pastoral ministry as a simple secular priest and, alongside this, published an astonishing amount. For example, he translated the whole of Aquinas' *Summa theologiae* into German (Schneider 1886–92), founded his own Thomist periodical, which admittedly only ran for two years (*St. Thomasblätter*, 1889–90) and wrote extremely extensive treatises marked by original speculation (e.g. on the theory of theological principles, the Immaculate Conception of Mary, the relationship between nature and grace, God's knowledge, and topics of moral and social philosophy). His particular interest in the relationship between human freedom and divine activity alongside a strictly anti-Molinist attitude was likewise pursued by the Dominican Gundislav Feldner (1849–1919), who also frequently published in the *Jahrbuch*. In a treatise on God's influence on rational creatures, he criticized the interpretation of Aquinas by the pope's brother, Cardinal Giuseppe Pecci (Feldner 1889; 1890). Herman Schell (1850–1906), who was a friend of Commer and was perceived at the start of his career to be a Thomist, also wrote a series of articles for the *Jahrbuch*. After Glossner had been decidedly critical of his book on the doctrine of the Trinity, Commer distanced himself from him more and more (Hausberger 1999).

The perhaps most independent theologian within German neo-scholasticism was the Cologne seminary professor Matthias Joseph Scheeben (1835–88). His most important works on dogmatics, *Die Mysterien des Christentums* (1865) and the uncompleted *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik* (1873–1887), prove that although he was in every respect inspired by Thomas, he cannot be classed as a strict Thomist. In defining the relationship between nature and grace as organic, he restored a central Thomist principle to the heart of the theological debate (Paul 1975).

## Other countries

From 1880, the world's first explicitly Thomist periodical, *Divus Thomas*, appeared in Piacenza under the aegis of Alberto Barberis (1847–96). Since 1877 Barberis had been teaching at the college in Piacenza, basing his lectures on Sanseverino's philosophy course and showing a particular interest in questions of natural philosophy and philosophical psychology. Works on dogmatics informed by Thomism were published at the end of the nineteenth century by the Jesuit Camillo Mazzella (1833–1900) and by Francesco Satolli (1839–1910), who taught in Rome and was from 1895 a cardinal and from 1897 prefect of the Congregation of Studies. As a representative of the Thomist reorientation of the Jesuit Gregorian University in Rome following *Aeterni Patris* (Rafferty 2014) one can name the French-born Jesuit Louis Billot (1846–1931), who had taught dogmatics in Rome since 1885 and already published the first of his theological treatises before the turn of the century (e.g. Billot 1892; 1893).

A prominent figure in Spanish neo-Thomism was the Dominican Zeferino González (1831–94). He studied as a missionary of his order at the still Thomist-orientated university of Manila (Philippines), where from the 1850s on, he also taught as a professor. The fruit of his reading of Thomas was a work on Aquinas' philosophy (González 1864), which is accounted foundational for Spanish neo-scholasticism. After he returned to his native country, there followed a three-volume philosophy course (1868), which combines a clear Thomist orientation with an openness to improvements and to contemporary questions. Then came a three-volume history of philosophy (1878/9) that testifies to an independent study of the sources for the authors dealt with right down to the immediate present. At this time, González had already been appointed bishop of Cordova (1875). Via Seville, he was then transferred in 1885 to the metropolitan see of Toledo, which brought with it a cardinalate.

In mid-nineteenth-century France, no neo-Thomist movement had been founded that was comparable to those in Italy or Germany. The Oratorian Alphonse Gratry (1805–72) had 'through his enthusiastic reference to Thomas Aquinas prepared the way for neo-Thomism' (Grabmann 1933: 264) without its being possible to associate him properly speaking with this school of thought. All the same, there were as many as three French translations of the *Summa theologiae* published between 1850 and 1870 (C. J. Drioux, J. Carmagnolle, F. Lachat). The vernacular excerpt from the *Summa* by Frédéric Lebrethon (1812–79) was even honoured in its second edition (Lebrethon 1866–7), with a foreword by Pope Pius IX in which the neo-scholastic programme is confirmed. One must also point to the important new editions of key classical works of Thomism that were produced in France during the nineteenth century (e.g. John of St Thomas, Salmanticenses, Goudin, Gonet, Billuart). In 1884, Maurice d'Hulst (1841–96), as the first rector of the Institut Catholique in Paris, founded a Société de Saint Thomas d'Aquin. Comprehensive expositions of Thomist philosophy were offered by Edmond Domet de Vorges (1829–1910) and Joseph Gardair (1846–1911), both of whom taught at the Institut Catholique (Jacquin 1974).

In 1889 the Dominicans had taken over the teaching at the newly founded University of Fribourg in Switzerland. In 1894 Gallus M. Manser, OP (1866–1950) was one of its first graduates to be awarded a doctorate, and in 1899 he himself began to teach there as a professor. The *Revue thomiste*, the strictly Thomist character of which became progressively apparent, was launched as the faculty's journal in 1893. In Lucerne, a Thomas Academy was founded by Canon Anton Portmann (1847–1905). He became known as the author of a condensed compendium of Thomas's *Summa* (Portmann 1885) which, in a similar way to the Thomas lexicon by the Trier philosopher Ludwig Schütz (Schütz 1881), was valued as an important study aid.

The renewal of Thomism in Belgium is inextricably linked to the name of Désiré-Joseph Mercier (1851–1926) (Van Riet 1988), who was appointed in 1882 to a chair for Thomist philosophy in Leuven, which had been established in the wake of *Aeterni Patris*, and in 1889 became the first president of the likewise newly established Institut Supérieur de Philosophie. Mercier, who founded the *Révue néo-scholastique* as the institute's publication organ in 1894, advocated an open form of Aristotelianism understood from the perspective of scholasticism and open to modern insights, which included dialogue with the natural sciences, and spoke out against a philosophy that was too strongly constrained by theological guidelines. As a representative of strict Thomism in Belgium at the time of Leo XIII, one can cite the Dominican Antoninus M. Dummermuth (1841–1918), who made a name for himself with a bulky work on the *praemotio physica* (Dummermuth 1886), directed against the Molinist exposition given by the German Jesuit Gerhard Schneemann (1829–85), who was living in Leuven at the time (Schneemann 1879; 1880).

## SUMMARY

---

The new turn to Thomas Aquinas from about 1850 onwards spread, in the form of 'neo-Thomism' or rather 'neo-scholasticism', from Italy and Germany and, being increasingly promoted by the Church, shaped Catholic philosophy and theology for a century. Its primary interest was systematic, not historical. Its original concern was to construct an Aristotelian-scholastic *philosophia perennis* in order to overcome the modern philosophies that were perceived as endangering faith, and to restore the Church's authority against the claims to autonomy made by modern reason. Kleutgen comprehensively extended the programme of philosophy and fundamental theology to all areas of dogmatics, and presented the 'Theology of the Past' (understood as time-transcending theology) as also being a basis for overcoming inner-theological rationalism. Thomas Aquinas was an authoritative point of reference for all neo-scholastics; however, the way in which he was interpreted often remained committed to the norms laid down by the early modern school tradition, being further constricted by concentrating on strict Thomism on the one hand and selected authors of the Jesuit school on the other. The repristination of the post-Tridentine school debates (such as the dispute over grace)

only rarely achieved their former complexity and originality of reflection. The attempts to present the Thomist 'system' employing the modern methodological ideal of basing this on just a few underlying principles did serve to systematically penetrate the enormous volume of material and they also pursued didactic interests, but they often obscured the elements that did not come from Aquinas himself, and prevented the necessary differentiations that would be suggested by a close reading of the sources. It was only with the beginning of an historical-critical approach to medieval studies at the end of the nineteenth century that people learnt to understand Thomas once again in the context of his own age, and also to take in account insights as to the way his works came into being. It was a fruit of neo-scholasticism, but at the same time one of the roots of its being overcome, bringing out as it did the historical contingency of Aquinas' thinking and increasing awareness of the variety of scholastic thought that existed before and after Aquinas. Alongside providing this stimulus, the neo-Thomism that began in the nineteenth century had further merits which, for all the justified criticism of its unhistorical and restorative nature, should not be overlooked. To be cited among these would be, for example, the revival of a self-confident Catholic identity above all in the field of philosophy, the renewal of the speculative spirit in dogmatics, and not least the global interlacing of Catholic academic activities, which had previously fragmented into national debates (Walter 2013). In the twentieth century the innovative potential of these factors gradually came more and more to fruition.

## SUGGESTED READING

---

Coreth, Neidl, and Pfligersdorffer (1988); McCool (1996); Peitz (2006a); Piolanti (1981).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

---

- Bataillon, L. J. (1981), 'L'édition Léonine des œuvres de saint Thomas et les études médiévales', in A. Piolanti (ed.), *Atti dell'VIII Congresso tomistico internazionale. L'édition Léonine Patris nell'arco di un secolo* (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Ed. Vaticana), 452–64.
- Berger, D. (2005), *In der Schule des hl. Thomas von Aquin. Studien zur Geschichte des Thomismus* (Bonn: nova & vetera).
- Berger, D. (2006), 'Schneider, Ceslaus Maria', in D. Berger and J. Vijgen (eds), *Thomistenlexikon* (Bonn: nova & vetera), 598–602.
- Billot, L. (1892), *De verbo incarnato. Commentarius in tertiam partem S. Thomae* (Rome: Forzani).
- Billot, L. (1893), *De Deo Uno et Trino. Commentarius in primam partem S. Thomae*, 2 vols (Rome: Typogr. Polyglotta S. C. de Propaganda Fide).
- Clemens, F. J. (1856), *De scholasticorum sententia philosophiam esse theologiae ancillam commentatio* (Münster: Aschendorff).
- Commer, E. (1883–6), *System der Philosophie*, 4 vols (Münster: Nasse).
- Coreth, E., Neidl, W. M., and Pfligersdorffer, G. (eds) (1988), *Christliche Philosophie im katholischen Denken des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 2: *Rückgriff auf scholastisches Erbe* (Graz: Styria).

- Cornoldi, G. M. (1872), *Lezioni di filosofia ordinate allo studio delle altre scienze* (Florence: Manuelli).
- Dante, F. (2010), 'Matteo Liberatore, un cattolico intransigente', *Gregorianum* 91: 808–23.
- Denzinger, H. (1991), *Enchiridion symbolorum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum/ Kompendium der Glaubensbekenntnisse und kirchlichen Lehrentscheidungen*, 37th edn, ed. P. Hünermann (Freiburg: Herder).
- Dovere, U. (1978), 'Gaetano Sanseverino filosofo. Tentativo di ricostruzione', *Doctor communis* 31: 73–97.
- Dummermuth, A. M. (1886), *S. Thomas et doctrina praemotiois physicae, seu responsio ad R. P. Schneemann, S.J., aliosque doctrinae scholae thomisticae impugnatores* (Paris: Ephemeridis L'année dominicaine).
- Duranti, F. (1962), 'La rinascita del tomismo a Perugia. Appunti per una storia del neotomismo', *Aquinas* 5: 249–94.
- Ernesti, J. (2019), *Leo XIII. Papst und Staatsmann* (Freiburg: Herder).
- Feldner, G. (1889), *Die Lehre des hl. Thomas über den Einfluss Gottes auf die Handlungen der vernünftigen Geschöpfe* (Graz: Moser).
- Feldner, G. (1890), *Die Lehre des heil. Thomas von Aquin über die Willensfreiheit der vernünftigen Wesen* (Graz: Moser).
- Frohschammer, J. (1889), *Die Philosophie des Thomas von Aquino kritisch gewürdigt* (Leipzig: Brockhaus).
- Giammarino, M. (1975), 'Alle origini del neo-tomismo. Il Cardinal Tommaso Zigliara (1833–1893) nelle sue opere filosofiche e nell'epistolario', *Memorie domenicane* n.s. 6: 167–339.
- González, C. (1864), *Estudios sobre la filosofía de Santo Tomás* (Manila: Corsada).
- Grabmann, M. (1933), *Die Geschichte der katholischen Theologie seit dem Ausgang der Väterzeit* (Freiburg: Herder).
- Hausberger, K. (1999), *Herman Schell (1850–1906). Ein Theologenschicksal im Bannkreis der Modernismuskontroverse* (Regensburg: Pustet).
- Hirscher, J. B. (1823), *Ueber das Verhältniß des Evangeliums zu der theologischen Scholastik der neuesten Zeit im katholischen Deutschland. Zugleich als Beitrag zur Katechetik* (Tübingen: Laupp).
- Jacquin, R. (1974), 'Deux promoteurs inattendus de la philosophie de Saint Thomas d'Aquin', *Divinitas* 28: 357–68.
- Kleutgen, J. (1860), *Die Theologie der Vorzeit vertheidigt. Letzter Band* (Münster: Theissing).
- Kleutgen, J. (1881), *Institutiones theologicae in usum scholarium*, vol. 1: *De ipso Deo* (Regensburg: Pustet).
- Lebrethon, F. (1866–67), *Petite somme théologique de saint Thomas d'Aquin à l'usage des ecclésiastiques et des gens du monde*, 4 vols, 2nd edn (Paris: Dillet).
- Leinsle, U. (2010), *Introduction to Scholastic Theology* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press).
- Liberatore, M. (1857–8), *Della conoscenza intellettuale*, 2 vols (Rome: Civiltà Cattolica).
- Liberatore, M. (1860–61), *Institutiones philosophicae*, 2 vols (Rome: Typis Civitatis Catholicae).
- Malusa, L. (1986–1989), *Neotomismo e intransigentismo cattolico*, 2 vols (Milan: IPL).
- Marschler, T. (2006a), 'Glossner, Michael', in D. Berger and J. Vijgen (eds), *Thomistenlexikon* (Bonn: nova & vetera), 221–7.
- Marschler, T. (2006b), 'Schäzler, Constantin Freiherr von', in D. Berger and J. Vijgen (eds), *Thomistenlexikon* (Bonn: nova & vetera), 587–92.
- Mattes, W. (1852), 'Scholastik', in H. J. Wetzer and B. Welte (eds), *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. 9 (Freiburg: Herder), 701–61.

- Mattes, W. (1853), 'Thomas von Aquin', in H. J. Wetzer and B. Welte (eds), *Kirchen-Lexikon*, vol. 10 (Freiburg: Herder), 911–31.
- McCool, G. (1996), *Nineteenth-Century Scholasticism: The Search for a Unitary Method*, 2nd edn (New York: Fordham University Press).
- Morgott, F. v. P. (1878), *Die Mariologie des heiligen Thomas von Aquin* (Freiburg: Herder).
- Naab, E. (2002), *Die Gegenwart Gottes in der Gnade. Universalität und Relation der Gnade nach Eichstätter Theologen im 19. Jahrhundert* (Regensburg: Pustet).
- Pahud de Mortanges, E. (2005), *Philosophie und kirchliche Autorität. Der Fall Jakob Frohschammer vor der römischen Indexkongregation (1855–1864)* (Paderborn: Schöningh).
- Paul, E. (1975), 'Matthias Joseph Scheeben', in H. Fries and G. Schwaiger (eds), *Katholische Theologen Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert*, vol. 2 (Munich: Kösel), 386–408.
- Peitz, D. (2006a), *Die Anfänge der Neuscholastik in Deutschland und Italien (1818–1870)* (Bonn: nova & vetera).
- Peitz, D. (2006b), 'Buzzetti, Vincenzo', in D. Berger and J. Vijgen (eds), *Thomistenlexikon* (Bonn: nova & vetera), 69–72.
- Peitz, D. (2006c), 'Liberatore, Matteo', in D. Berger and J. Vijgen (eds), *Thomistenlexikon* (Bonn: nova & vetera), 382–7.
- Peitz, D. (2006d), 'Sordi, Domenico und Serafino', in D. Berger and J. Vijgen (eds), *Thomistenlexikon* (Bonn: nova & vetera), 622–5.
- Peitz, D. (2006e), 'Taparelli, Luigi', in D. Berger and J. Vijgen (eds), *Thomistenlexikon* (Bonn: nova & vetera), 658–63.
- Piolanti, A. (ed.) (1965), *Gaetano Sanseverino nel primo centenario della morte* (Rome: Libreria Ed. Vaticana).
- Piolanti, A. (ed.) (1974), *Pio IX e la rinascita del tomismo* (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Ed. Vaticana).
- Piolanti, A. (ed.) (1981), *Atti dell' VIII Congresso tomistico internazionale. L'enciclica Aeterni Patris nell'arco di un secolo* (Città de Vaticano: Libreria Ed. Vaticana).
- Piolanti, A. (1986), *La filosofia cristiana in Mons. Salvatore Talamo ispiratore della 'Aeterni Patris'* (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Ed. Vaticana).
- Plassmann, H. E. (1857–62), *Die Schule des h. Thomas von Aquino*, 5 vols (Soest: Nasse).
- Portmann, A. (1885), *Das System der theologischen Summe des hl. Thomas von Aquin* (Lucerne: Räder). 2nd edn 1903.
- Pritz, J. (1968), *Mensch als Mitte. Leben und Werk Carl Werners* (Vienna: Herder).
- Rafferty, O. P. (2014), 'The Thomistic Revival and the Relationship Between the Jesuits and the Papacy, 1878–1914', *Theological Studies* 75: 746–73.
- Rossi, G. F. (1988), 'Die Bedeutung des Collegio Alberoni in Piacenza für die Entstehung des Neuthomismus', in E. Coreth, W. M. Neidl, and G. Pfligersdorffer (eds), *Christliche Philosophie im katholischen Denken des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 2: *Rückgriff auf scholastisches Erbe* (Graz: Styria), 83–108.
- Sanseverino, G. (1862–78), *Philosophia Christiana cum antiqua et nova comparata* (Naples: Manfredi).
- Schmid, A. (1862), *Wissenschaftliche Richtungen auf dem Gebiete des Katholicismus in neuester und in gegenwärtiger Zeit* (Munich: Lentner).
- Schmidinger, H. M. (1988), 'Thomistische Zentren in Rom, Neapel, Perugia usw. S. Sordi, D. Sordi, L. Taparelli d'Azeglio, M. Liberatore, C. M. Curci, G. M. Cornoldi u. a.', in E. Coreth, W. M. Neidl, and G. Pfligersdorffer (eds), *Christliche Philosophie im katholischen Denken des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 2: *Rückgriff auf scholastisches Erbe* (Graz: Styria), 109–30.

- Schneemann, G. (1879), *Die Entstehung der thomistisch-molinistischen Kontroverse. Dogmengeschichtliche Studie* (Freiburg: Herder).
- Schneemann, G. (1880), *Weitere Entwicklung der thomistisch-molinistischen Kontroverse. Dogmengeschichtliche Studie* (Freiburg: Herder).
- Schneid, M. (1873), *Die scholastische Lehre von Materie und Form und ihre Harmonie mit den Thatsachen der Naturwissenschaft* (Eichstätt: Brönner).
- Schneider, C. M. (1886–1892), *Die katholische Wahrheit oder die theologische Summa des heiligen Thomas von Aquin deutsch wiedergegeben*, 12 vols (Regensburg: Manz).
- Schütz, L. (1881), *Thomas-Lexikon* (Paderborn: Schöningh). 2nd edn 1895.
- Signoriello, N. (1864), *Lexicon peripateticum philosophico-theologicum* (Vigi: Soler Fratres). 2nd edn 1872.
- Stöckl, A. (1864–6), *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (Mainz: Kirchheim).
- Van Riet, G. (1988), 'Kardinal Désiré Mercier (1851–1926) und das philosophische Institut in Löwen', in E. Coreth, W. M. Neidl, and G. Pfligersdorffer (eds), *Christliche Philosophie im katholischen Denken des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 2: *Rückgriff auf scholastisches Erbe* (Graz: Styria), 206–40.
- von Schüzler, C. (1860), *Die Lehre von der Wirksamkeit der Sakramente ex opere operato in ihrer Entwicklung innerhalb der Scholastik und ihrer Bedeutung für die christliche Heilslehre dargestellt* (Munich: Lentner).
- von Schüzler, C. (1865), *Natur und Uebernatur. Das Dogma von der Gnade und die theol. Frage der Gegenwart* (Mainz: Kirchheim).
- von Schüzler, C. (1867), *Neue Untersuchungen über das Dogma von der Gnade und das Wesen des christlichen Glaubens* (Mainz: Kirchheim).
- Walter, P. (1988), 'Die neuscholastische Philosophie im deutschsprachigen Raum', in E. Coreth, W. M. Neidl, and G. Pfligersdorffer (eds), *Christliche Philosophie im katholischen Denken des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, vol. 2: *Rückgriff auf scholastisches Erbe* (Graz: Styria), 130–94.
- Walter, P. (2003), 'Johann Baptist Heinrich als dogmatischer Theologe', in E. B. Vidal (ed.), *Sentire cum ecclesia. Homenaje al Padre Karl Josef Becker SJ* (Valencia: Promolibro), 113–33.
- Walter, P. (2013), 'Den Weltkreis täglich von Verderben bringenden Irrtümern befreien (Leo XIII.). Die Internationalisierung der theologischen Wissenschaftswelt am Beispiel der Neuscholastik', in C. Arnold and J. Wischmeyer (eds), *Transnationale Dimensionen wissenschaftlicher Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 319–53.
- Walter, P. (2018), 'Zur Thomas-Rezeption bei Leopold Liebermann (1759–1844), einem Mainzer Theologen des 19. Jahrhunderts', in B. Dahlke and B. Knorn (eds), *Eine Autorität für die Kirche? Thomas von Aquin in der Neuzeit. Festschrift für Leonhard Hell* (Freiburg: Herder), 103–25.
- Werner, K. (1858–1859), *Der heilige Thomas von Aquino*, 3 vols (Regensburg: Manz).
- Werner, K. (1867), *Zur Orientirung über Wesen und Aufgabe der christlichen Philosophie in der Gegenwart* (Schaffhausen: Hurter).
- Wolf, H. (2013), *Die Nonnen von Sant'Ambrogio. Eine wahre Geschichte* (Munich: C. H. Beck).