

ABSTRACTS

Roberto Pinzani, Elements of Boethian ontology, pp. 1-31

In the commentaries on Porphyry Boethius on the one hand explains the properties of predication relation at abstract level, from another hand he supplies some ontological options about what can instantiate the terms of the relation, at the end he seems to prefer the similarities as objects of abstract thought. Other options are anyway present, in the commentary on *Categories* and in the *Theological Treatises*. One cannot say that the catalogues are complementary or that the same things are catalogued once only, under the same label. On the contrary, objects such as forms, essences and material components can be considered from points of view that are different and not easily comparable. In the present article I will deal with Boethius' ontological approach not strictly concerned with the Porphyrian text and riddle.

Annalisa Cappiello, Tommaso de Vio Gaetano, Pietro Pomponazzi e la polemica sull'immortalità dell'anima. *Status quaestionis* e nuove scoperte, pp. 32-71

A long historiographical tradition has claimed that the famous Pietro Pomponazzi's *Tractatus de immortalitate animae* (1516) had been inspired by Tommaso de Vio's (also called 'Caietanus') Commentary on *De anima* (1510) – whose basic thesis was that, according to the principles of Aristotelian philosophy, the human soul was mortal – even though Pomponazzi in his entire work never mentioned Caietanus as a model.

Firstly, this article frames the *status quaestionis* focusing on affinities and divergences between the two books and on the possible relationship and exchange between the two authors, especially on the topic of the Aristotelian psychology.

Secondly, the present study shows what emerges from a cross-reading of the sources which includes the collection of the *Opuscula* published in 1519 by the Dominican friar Bartolomeo Spina, who explicitly accused Caietanus of

having paved the way for the scandalous and anti-Christian Pomponazzi's position. The important gain of this collation of texts is the discovery of an unseen moment of debate with Caietanus inside Pomponazzi's *Tractatus*.

Simone Fellina, La fortuna di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola nelle *Disputationes Aristotelicae* di Tommaso Giannini (1556-1638), pp. 72-90

Tommaso Giannini (1556-1638) was a prominent professor at the ferrarese *Studium* between XVIth-XVIIth century. Probably influenced by platonic sympathies nurtured by the Court and partly by the University *milieu*, in 1587 he published his first work titled *De providentia ad sententiam Platonis et Platoniorum liber unus*, which was a catalyst for his academic career. A compilative work in essence, the *De providentia* displays a large amount of sources always tacitly used: Marsilio Ficino, Jacques Charpentier, Giulio Serina, Stefano Tiepolo, Teofilo Zimara, Bessarion, Agostino Steuco and amid the ancients Plotinus, Plutarcus, Sirianus, Proclus (read in Teofilo Zimara and Leonico Tomeo), Giamblicus, Apuleius, Calcidius, Ammonius, Psellus. A small place is reserved to Giovanni Pico della Mirandola and precisely to his *Disputationes adversus astrologiam divinatricem*. The aim of the paper is to provide a supplement of analysis of Giannini's interest in Pico's works considering his later writings, each one commonly identified as *Disputationes Aristotelicae*.

Stefano Caroti, Un effetto indesiderato delle *Conclusiones* di Giovanni Pico della Mirandola: la disputa non voluta con Pedro Garsia, pp. 91-112

The discussion on the 900 *Conclusiones* projected and sponsored by Giovanni Pico della Mirandola in Rome was cut short by the condemnation of 13 of them by the papal commission in 1487. *Princeps Concordiae's* counter-arguments in his *Apologia*, published in the same year, can not be certainly considered a *disputatio* as Pico had called for; the papal intervention removed in this way the possibility to have a better acquaintance with a work which is still a very difficult one, just for its "unfinished" form. Pedro Garsia's *Determinationes magistrales* against Pico's *Apologia* are a very poor reply to

Pico. In this paper Pico's arguments against some of the condemned *conclusiones* are considered as well as Pedro Garsia's counterarguments. Giovanni Pico della Mirandola display a deep familiarity with medieval logical and semantical doctrines, while Pedro Garsia's arguments betray a solid ignorance.