

*Scholastic Hylomorphism
and Western Art:
From the Gothic to the Baroque*

Christopher M. Cullen, S.J.

The transition from Romanesque to Gothic is one of the significant changes in the history of Western art. It affected architecture, sculpture, and eventually painting. This transition was constituted by a realism and naturalism that transformed Western art and remained a constant element of its development through the many variations in style. One of the principal causes of this profound change is the rise of scholasticism. Erwin Panofsky argued this point with regard to architecture in his well-known book, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*. He hints at the possibility that scholasticism also affected sculpture. Taking up this cue, this paper will argue that scholasticism also transformed Western sculpture and painting by introducing a new conception of man. This new conception of the human being can be seen in the way painting and sculpture portray the human body and use it to communicate spiritual truths.

The medieval scholastics appropriated two Aristotelian doctrines: (1) that form is immanent in sensible matter such that it enters into actual composition with matter, and (2) that the rational soul is the substantial form of the body. Man is thus a unified being, and this unity is so profound that one must speak of man as an embodied soul or a spiritualized body. It is this scholastic hylomorphism as a metaphysical position that makes possible a dramatic turn to naturalism and realism in Western art in general from the Gothic to the Baroque and Rococo.¹

¹ Panofsky also sees scholasticism's influence ending in the fourteenth century. See Erwin Panofsky, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism* (1951; rpt. New York: The World Publishing Company, 1957), pp. 10ff. He speaks of scholasticism's

These two doctrines enter Western culture at the time of the Gothic cathedrals and reach the apex of their influence in the Baroque, when the body becomes the expression of the inner spiritual life in all its drama and eternal import. The dynamism and fluidity of the Baroque is the classic and clearest expression of the doctrine that the soul gives life to the body, and concomitantly, that the rational soul confers certain faculties that make man a spiritual being. This scholastic understanding of man is reflected in the Baroque fascination with the psychological or spiritual life. Baroque art is thus the culmination of scholastic hylomorphism.

While taking account of the differences within the scholastic tradition, this study will first outline the basic theses of scholastic hylomorphism. Then, it will examine certain artistic examples that manifest the influence of these doctrines and its expression in Gothic and Baroque art.

THE CAUSE: ARISTOTELIAN UNITIVE FORM AND HYLOMORPHISM

Anton Pegis has brilliantly chronicled in detail the development of the scholastic doctrine of the soul in the thirteenth century in his work, *St. Thomas and the Problem of the Soul in the Thirteenth Century*. But let me recall a basic outline of this position. First, the soul is the form of the living being. In the Aristotelian-Scholastic conception this means that the soul is both the principle of life and the principle of organization. The soul is what makes the thing to live and to carry out its other functions. It is also what confers that order that is so vital to the living organism.

Secondly, the soul forms a profound unity with the matter. It orders the matter and so makes it into an organic whole. It is important to understand that the soul's enlivening of the matter transforms the material cause. Soul as form is both dynamic and unitive. Thus, in the Aristotelian conception, the soul is neither a ghost in a machine nor one thing glued to another nor one thing juxtaposed with another. Rather, the animate being is a composite whole.

On a spectrum of theories about the soul, the Aristotelian position is a middle position. It is the mean between a reified understanding of the soul in which the soul is a substance in its own right—a position that renders the union of body and soul inexplicable and extrinsic, and a non-substantialist

decline and decadence at some length. While he is basically correct, this paper is addressing a fundamental thesis of scholasticism, namely hylomorphism, that remains a key thesis throughout the whole scholastic tradition, even though various scholastics disagree about the fine points of this hylomorphism.

view—a position that regards the soul as an epiphenomenon. Hence, in this doctrine the soul is not a substance in the sense of a separate thing or a certain stuff. In other words, in the Aristotelian view the soul is neither a property or attribute of the thing nor a thing or substance in the sense of a being complete in its own genus and species.² The soul, however, *is* a substance in the sense that it is a form and has an activity that transcends matter. This is a brief sketch of the underlying scholastic doctrine. It is the common scholastic doctrine that makes the artistic developments in question possible.

There are well-known areas of dispute within this Aristotelian-Scholastic doctrine. There are two major disputes that I should mention but from which I wish to prescind, since they do not affect my thesis: (1) the number of substantial forms within a composite and (2) the demonstrability of the immortality of the soul. (There are also different understandings of matter itself within the scholastic tradition. This conception of “matter” is closely connected with the number of substantial forms in a composite whole.)

The most important disputed issue is whether the rational soul is the unique substantial form of the body (the Thomistic position) or whether it is one substantial form among others (the Franciscan position). The Thomistic position argues that the unity of the substance requires a unicity of substantial form. It is by his one rational soul that Socrates is a substance and all that this entails for him, i.e., his corporeality, animality, and rationality. For the Franciscan tradition, the unity of the substance is found in the hierarchical ordering of a plurality of the substantial forms (corporeity, animality) under the one form that makes it to be a particular species, in the case of man, the rational soul. In the Franciscan view, as Anton Pegis puts it, “[T]he presence of these forms does not oppose the unity of the individual because such a unity is derived, not from the substantial form, but from the completing individual form.”³ Furthermore, the two traditions understand the metaphysical principle of matter differently. One relies primarily on Aristotle; the other upon Neoplatonic conceptions.

Bonaventure maintains, for example, that the rational soul is the form of the body, but that the soul is already a composite of form and matter. Hence, Bonaventure argues that the soul is closer to being a substance in its own right than would Thomas after him. Without going into details, let it suffice to say that the Franciscan and Augustinian position rests on the con-

² This is not to deny that some commentators have argued that Aristotle conceived the soul as an attribute, such as the well-known scholar, Jonathan Barnes.

³ Anton Pegis, *St. Thomas and the Problem of the Soul in the Thirteenth Century* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1978), p. 55.

viction that a created being must have a material principle within it in order that it may be capable of receiving forms. Matter is the universal principle of receptivity as well as of change.⁴ And, of course, if this is the case, then it follows that there must be a plurality of substantial forms perfecting matter in different ways.⁵

A second major issue of dispute is the immortality of the soul. In the thirteenth century, the immortality of the soul becomes a vital issue after the Averroists deny that the soul is immortal with their monopsychism and after Scotus denies that the immortality of the soul could be demonstrated. The issue resurfaces again in the sixteenth century after Pomponazzi denies that the individual soul is immortal while also affirming the immortality of the general agent intellect. The second issue is closely bound up with the status of the agent intellect. Nevertheless, we can consider the more general and underlying unity of scholastic doctrine found in its doctrines of immanent form and hylomorphism.

ARTISTIC CHANGES

Gothic Sculpture

I want to look at three moments in the history of art in these centuries in order to illustrate the change that I am talking about. Two are from the early period of scholasticism when it was just beginning to make its influence felt, and one is from the height of scholasticism when it had become an integral part of Catholic thought.

The first of these moments is found at Chartres Cathedral. It is usual to turn to Chartres to study the transition from Romanesque to Gothic sculpture, because the only place where the transition began earlier, namely the Abbey of Saint Denis, is mostly lost to us, since its sculpture was heavily damaged by the French Revolution.⁶

There is a significant shift that takes place from the austerity of Cistercian art and the stylization, angularity, even rigidity, of Romanesque art to the Gothic. This is due to various factors, not the least of which is the twelfth-century Renaissance and the revival of humanism in various European centers. The very beginnings of this change in sculpture can be found

⁴ Étienne Gilson. *The Philosophy of Saint Bonaventure* (New York: St. Anthony Guild Press, 1965), p. 287. Gilson points to the Boethian roots of this attitude.

⁵ Boethius, "Forma vero quae est sine materia non poterit esse subjectum," quoted in Gilson. *The Philosophy of Saint Bonaventure*, p. 288.

⁶ Charles M. Radding and William W. Clark. *Medieval Architecture, Medieval Learning: Builders and Masters in the Age of Romanesque and Gothic* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1992), p. 109.

in the west façade, or Royal Portal (1145–1170) at Chartres Cathedral. Erwin Panofsky made this point in passing in *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*:

It has justly been remarked that the gentle animation that distinguishes the early Gothic figures in the west façade of Chartres from their Romanesque predecessors reflects the renewal of an interest in psychology which had been dormant for several centuries; but this psychology was still based upon the Biblical—and Augustinian—dichotomy between the “breath of life” and the “dust of the ground.”⁷

Sir Kenneth Clark also alludes to this change in his well-known work, *Civilization*, when speaking of the statues of kings and queens there: “Do not the kings and queens of Chartres show a new stage in the ascent of Western man? Indeed I believe that the refinement, the look of selfless detachment and the spirituality of these heads is something entirely new in art. Beside them the gods and heroes of ancient Greece look arrogant, soulless and even slightly brutal.”⁸

But the change becomes even more pronounced as one moves from the sculpture of the west façade to the statues done just a generation later on the north and south porticoes. The statues of the north and south transepts become more natural and realistic. These statues seem to come alive. It is here that one can see even more clearly manifested the different understanding of human nature—an understanding that the Royal Portal only showed the first glimmerings of. William Fleming discusses the north and south porticoes in his work on the relation between art and ideas:

The figures on both the north and south porches, in comparison with the earlier ones on the west façade, have bodies more naturally proportioned; their postures show greater variety and informality, and their facial expressions have far more mobility . . . and in comparison with the impersonality of those on the west front, many of the human figures are so individualized that they seem like portraits of living persons.⁹

Erwin Panofsky, although speaking of the High Gothic at Reims and Amiens, attributes this increasing lifelikeness to Aristotelianism, which saw the soul as the “organizing and unifying principle of the body rather than a substance independent thereof.” Indeed, he says this quality proclaims the victory of Aristotelianism: “The infinitely more lifelike—though not, as yet

⁷ Panofsky, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*, p. 6.

⁸ Kenneth Clark, *Civilization* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 56.

⁹ William Fleming, *Art and Ideas*, 7th ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1986), p. 157.

portraitlike—High Gothic statues of Reims and Amiens, Strasbourg and Naumburg and the natural—though not as yet, naturalistic—fauna and flora of High Gothic ornament proclaim the victory of Aristotelianism.”¹⁰

The art historian, Adolf Katzenellenbogen, wrote an excellent work on the sculptural program at Chartres Cathedral. In it he provides a detailed and penetrating analysis of these porticoes. But what is of importance to this paper is that he identifies the philosophical source of this artistic change. He explicates this source in more detail than Panofsky. A new understanding of the human being changed the way the sculptures were executed, he says. He compares the differences between the sculpture of the Royal Portal, west façade, at Chartres and that of the north and south portals (1194–1264). As he explains, “Gone is the columnar shape, the architectural elongation, the harmonious unity of pure line and volume. The statues have gained bulk. Their proportions are less drawn out. Drapery folds are no longer bound as a dense linear pattern to bodily forms. . . . The human dignity of the figures is stressed by more natural shapes.”¹¹ He characterizes the various differences as the “humanization” of the sculptures. He explicitly ties this “humanization” to the influence of Aristotelianism at the University of Paris. “Here [the University of Paris] the Aristotelian concepts—that universal ideas have reality within visible forms, that the soul is the form of the body—had taken firm roots. The ascendancy of these concepts may well be reflected in the sculptures of the transept wings at Chartres.”¹²

Painting and Giotto

This new philosophical position took somewhat longer to work its way into painting. Nevertheless, one can see the influence of scholastic hylomorphism in the fresco paintings of the early Renaissance master, Giotto. Nearly all art historians recognize the extraordinary difference between Giotto’s painting, with its realistic portrayals of the human being, and what went before. It is striking. Giotto moved away from the two-dimensional paintings in which the figures are set against a background of solid gold to amazingly naturalistic paintings in which human beings come alive in a three-dimensional world literally filled with drama and narrative. The art historian, Cesare Gnudi, describes this phenomenon in Giotto’s work:

In Giotto’s art, reality was not constricted but was intensified by that metaphysical order in which the soul’s impulses were represented *sub*

¹⁰ Panofsky, *Gothic Architecture and Scholasticism*, pp. 6–7.

¹¹ Adolf Katzenellenbogen, *The Sculptural Programs of Chartres Cathedral* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1959), p. 92.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 99.

specie aeternitatis. The inner reality of the passions and spirit generated new forms, created their architecture, and determined their spatial articulation. . . . It is a powerful pictorial architecture that places each individual manifestation of life within a context of related motifs, it embodies the capacity to distinguish and individuate different human situations, states of soul, and feelings.¹³

One can see this in Giotto's well-known masterpiece, the Arena Chapel in Padua, especially, for example, in his *Pietà* or *Lamentation* (1305–06) over the dead Christ.

There were many factors that influenced Giotto and that gave rise to the changes in his style. Without minimizing the role of these influences, it is important to recognize the philosophical source that makes the changes possible. It is found in a different understanding of the human being and of the relation between soul and body. In scholasticism's doctrine the body exists in such a unity with the soul that the body can express the highest aspirations and deepest religious beliefs of the soul.

Giotto's connection with this Aristotelianism is difficult to establish. But I think it can be found in that he turned to sculpture as a model for his painting. Sculpture was ahead of painting in his time, and so, he looked to the best sculpture of his day for the model of the human form in his paintings—he looked to Nicola Pisano (c.1210/1220–c.1278/1284).

Nicola is generally regarded as the most important thirteenth-century sculptor, along with his son Giovanni (c. 1245–1304). He introduced a new classicism and thus a new realism into sculpture. Now what is significant for this thesis is that Nicola was trained at the court of Frederick II, the Holy Roman Emperor. The court of Frederick II in Palermo was a center of Aristotelianism; indeed, remember that it was at the University of Naples, which Frederick II founded in 1224 to train men for imperial service, that Aquinas himself was first exposed to Aristotle by Peter of Ireland, who was "part of an Aristotelian movement generally associated with the court of Frederick II."¹⁴ Torrell says in his biography of Aquinas, "Aristotelian science, Arabic astronomy, and Greek medicine all were flourishing in Palermo, Salerno, and Naples."¹⁵ It was in Naples, for example, that

¹³ Cesare Gnudi, "Giotto," in *Encyclopedia of World Art* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968), vol. 6, p. 346.

¹⁴ Thomas F. O'Meara, O.P., *Thomas Aquinas: Theologian* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame, 1997), p. 4.

¹⁵ Jean-Pierre Torrell, O.P., *Saint Thomas Aquinas*, trans. Robert Royal (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993), vol. 1, p. 6. Torrell points out that Thomas studied Aristotle's metaphysics and natural philosophy at Naples, at a time when they were still officially forbidden at Paris (*ibid.*, p. 7).

Michael Scot, who entered the emperor's service in 1220, was busy making translations of parts of Aristotle, as well as Arabic and Greek sources. Nicola was, in part, influenced by this Aristotelianism at the court of Frederick II.

Nicola may have also been influenced by the architectural sculpture of Northern cathedrals after he perhaps traveled to some of these centers of Gothic architecture.¹⁶ For example, there is evidence of the influence of French iconography in his famous octagonal pulpit in the cathedral at Siena. Of course, he also looked to antique sarcophagi and the Tuscan pulpit tradition for models for his work.¹⁷

Another model for Giotto's painting may be Arnolfo di Cambio.¹⁸ Arnolfo was trained by Nicola Pisano. He then worked in Tuscany, where Giotto could have visited his works. It is Giotto who is usually considered the first of the Renaissance painters.

The Aristotelian-Scholastic metaphysical doctrine, when combined with the Renaissance's return to classicism, made it possible for sculpture and painting to reach new heights. Much is usually made of the influence of classical humanism on the Renaissance artists. But this influence must be balanced with a recognition that both the artists and the patrons were believing Catholics, who were influenced by the more profound penetration into the nature of the human soul that is found in scholastic psychology. Classical naturalism is no doubt an important influence, but perhaps, it is not the whole story. After all, the examples of naturalism from classical antiquity had been around quite some time without being imitated, especially in areas where there were extensive Roman ruins, such as the Italian peninsula. One could list countless examples from this period that indicate the increased naturalism.

By way of contrast, consider the artistic path of Eastern Christianity,

¹⁶ What is important first of all is that he [Frederick II] loved science. . . . A science which came from Aristotle, but also from other books, translated from Greek and Arabic at the emperor's expense. . . . At all events it was in the circles of Frederick II that a natural science distinct from divine science developed for the first time in the Christian world" (Georges Duby, *The Age of the Cathedrals: Art and Society 980-1420*, trans. Eleanor Levieux and Barbara Thompson [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981], pp. 179-80).

¹⁷ M. M. Schaefer, "Pisano, Nicola and Giovanni," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 11 (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967).

¹⁸ "Giotto," *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. "Giotto's most intimate source may be in the work of the less prominent Arnolfo di Cambio who was active in Florence in Giotto's youth and whose style reveals a greater emphasis on simple mass" (Creighton E. Gilbert, "Giotto," *The Dictionary of Art* [New York: Macmillan, 1996], vol. 12, p. 694).

which never moved away from the immovable and two-dimensional character of the icon. This development no doubt reflects various factors. It no doubt reflects a Neoplatonism, which regards the image as a window into reality. The icon is a sort of half-way house or a compromise between the realism embraced by the West and the abstract art that characterizes those religions that do not permit portrayals of the human being.¹⁹

In the period between the Gothic style and the Baroque, it is important to keep two points in mind. First, scholasticism continued to be influential even after other theological and philosophical developments occurred. One must remember that Renaissance Neoplatonism, for example, existed alongside scholasticism and that the Renaissance debates in psychology took place within a fundamentally Aristotelian framework. The basic scholastic position of immanent form and hylomorphism formed the general field for disputes in subsequent centuries.²⁰ Even the Renaissance, from the Trecento through the Cinquecento, remains within the framework of Aristotelian psychology. What one usually studies in intellectual history are the latest developments; but one can easily forget the continued parallel existence and developments in an older system. In the centuries after the thirteenth, scholastic hylomorphism continued to be influential; indeed, the debates within anthropology transpired within a fundamentally Aristotelian position.

Furthermore, certain ecclesiastical councils, while not making the scholastic position an official church teaching, did defend it from certain misinterpretations or from certain theological heresies. As is usually the

¹⁹ Thanks to conversations with Fr. Brian Van Hove, S.J.

²⁰ In particular see "The Organic Soul," in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, ed. Charles B. Schmitt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). William Wallace points to the continuity of the Aristotelian tradition from the thirteenth through the seventeenth centuries: "At one time it was fashionable to propose a sharp dichotomy between the philosophy of the Middle Ages and that of the Renaissance, as though their subjects of interest and methods of investigation were markedly different. . . . The development of thought in this area [natural philosophy] from the onset of the thirteenth century to the mid-seventeenth may be likened more to a continuum than to a series of discrete jumps. Beginning with Albertus Magnus at Paris and with Robert Grosseteste and Roger Bacon at Oxford, and continuing to the textbook syntheses of four centuries later, natural philosophy was concerned with much the same questions and yielded answers that were intelligible within a fairly constant framework. By and large the setting was that provided by Aristotle's *libri naturales*, i.e., the *Physics*, *De caelo*, *De generatione et corruptione*, *Meteorology*, *De anima*, *Parva naturalia*, and so on, with accretions from other sources" (William Wallace, "Traditional Natural Philosophy," in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, p. 202).

case, these councils helped to draw the boundaries for positions harmonious with official church doctrine, even if they did not actually define any one position. For example, the General Council of Vienne in 1311–12 condemned an understanding of scholastic hylomorphism not in harmony with official church teaching.²¹ The Fifth Lateran Council in 1512–17 denounced Pomponazzi who held to an Averroistic monopsychism.²² It defended reason's ability to know the immortality of the soul. It was the Council of Trent that was a major impetus for Baroque art and most important for the purposes of this paper. In its twenty-fifty session, the Council issued a decree defending the use of images in the Catholic faith. The Council argued that the honor showed to them is referred to the original which they represent.²³ The Catholic Church, without actually making any theory of the soul an official doctrine of the soul, did condemn views that would be destructive of the scholastic position.

The Baroque

The Baroque vividly gives expression to the scholastic understanding of man.²⁴ There are countless examples that one could choose from the

²¹ The position "that the rational or intellective soul is not the form of the human body in itself and essentially" ("quod anima rationalis seu intellectiva non sit forma corporis humani per se et essentialiter" Denzinger, 481, cf. 738, 1655). The decision was directed against the Franciscan theologian Peter John Olivi who taught that the rational soul was not of itself, immediately the essential form of the body, but only mediately through the sensitive and vegetative form, which is really distinct from it. The decision of the Council was not a dogmatic recognition of the Thomistic teaching on the uniqueness of the substantial form nor of Aristotelian-Scholastic hylomorphism, but it was a council that encouraged hylomorphism.

²² They held that the rational soul in all men is numerically one unique principle. Obviously, this eliminates the possibility of conceiving of a true unity for the individual human being. Denzinger, 1440.

²³ Denzinger, 1823. This is not to deny that the Council did attempt to restrain the sensuality expressed in some Renaissance art (1825).

²⁴ "The baroque style originated in Rome between the pontificate of Sixtus V (1585–90) and Paul V (1605–21). . . . The Carracci brought an end to the scrappiness, the insubstantiality and the compositional vagueness which typify the art of their immediate predecessors; all the painters of the seventeenth century learned from them how to organize the figures in a picture according to one unifying principle based on a single action. The Carracci brought the painter back to a rational study of the masters, but also to a study of nature and principally of the human body; they restored its robustness, and did not hesitate to seek models among the common people. In his frescoes on the roof of the Gallery of Hercules in the Palazzo Farnese, Annibale Carracci recaptures the sense of monumental composition achieved by Michelangelo in the Sistine Chapel; he uses the same methods, drawing his rhythm from the power of the human body, usually nude" (Germain Bazin, *The Baroque: Principles, Styles, Modes, Themes* [New York: W. W. Norton, 1978], p. 103).

Baroque to illustrate the scholastic conception, but perhaps, none better than the artist that dominated the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, Gian Lorenzo Bernini (1598–1680). He worked under the patronage of seven popes; indeed, he served the papal curia for more than half a century. It was Pope Urban VIII (1623–44) who gave him numerous commissions and made him chief architect of St. Peter's in 1627. More than any other man, he is responsible for the way St. Peter's looks today—he was its foremost architect and sculptor. He was a true genius and is often regarded as the greatest sculptor of the seventeenth century. Bernini was a devout Catholic.

One of his contemporaries said of him that “he wanted his spirit to issue forth to give life to the stone.”²⁵ Or as one modern art historian has put it, “Stone was now completely emancipated from stoniness by open form and by an astonishing illusion of flesh, hair, cloth, and other textures, pictorial effects that had earlier been attempted only by painting.”²⁶

He is responsible for such classic examples of the Baroque, as his *Apollo and Daphne*. One art historian writes of this work, which is in the Borghese Gallery in Rome:

In these Borghese marbles Bernini responded to and competed with the new naturalism of contemporary painting as seen in the work of Annibale Carracci and Caravaggio. He felt that one of his greatest achievements was to have made marble appear as malleable as wax and so in a certain sense to have combined painting and sculpture into a new medium, one in which the sculptor handles marble as freely as a painter handles oils or fresco.²⁷

Or his *St. Teresa in Ecstasy* in Santa Maria della Vittoria in Rome.²⁸

These works exemplify the scholastic understanding of the unity of man. In his statues the body becomes a vehicle for expressing the human soul. Bernini gives expression in stone to the scholastic, and specifically, Thomistic view that the body exists for the sake of the soul and not vice

²⁵ Quoted in Rudolf Preimesberger and Michael P. Mezzatesta, “Bernini,” *The Dictionary of Art*, vol. 3, p. 838.

²⁶ *Encyclopedia Britannica*, s.v., “Sculpture, The History of Western Art,” vol. 27, p. 100.

²⁷ Preimesberger and Mezzatesta, “Bernini,” *The Dictionary of World Art*, vol. 3, pp. 828–31.

²⁸ “*St. Teresa in Ecstasy* is at once Bernini's undoubted masterpiece and the work that most completely captures the Counter-Reformation baroque spirit” (William Fleming, *Art and Ideas*, p. 284). Bernini's work perfectly captures the notion of the soul discussed in this paper. Even the recumbent body seems to come alive, as one can see in his *Blessed Ludovica Albertoni*. Other examples from his work include the *Cathedra Petri* in St. Peter's.

versa. Consider for a moment a work from the last years of his life, *The Blessed Ludovica Albertoni* (1674). In this amazing sculpture Bernini portrays the dying agony of Blessed Ludovica; but this is a woman joyfully anticipating eternal life. The body gives expression to this hope. The dying woman is incredibly alive.

The reason that the Baroque seems to move beyond a general scholastic view of the soul to a specifically Thomist one is that the art of this movement gives expression to the view that complete human nature is not found in the soul alone and to the concomitant view that the soul is naturally joined to the body. Anton Pegis explains well the Thomistic insight:

To consider the soul as the complete nature of man or to hold that it is composed of matter and form is really to leave unexplained the union of soul and body. In other words, if the completeness of human nature cannot be found in the soul alone, and if to explain human nature as implying both body and soul becomes impossible when the soul is considered to be complete even by those who defined the unity of soul and body, the solution must lie in viewing the soul as joined naturally to the body, as part to part for the completion of the nature of man. The intellectual soul must become the form of the body in one act of existence from which will be derived all the operations of life, from the lowest to the highest.²⁹

Another important link between the Baroque and scholasticism may be the latter's detailed analysis of the faculties, or powers, of the soul. One of the leading historians of the Baroque considers a deep interest in psychology to be one of the Baroque's essential elements.³⁰ This too may have its source in scholasticism's facultative psychology. But this takes us too far afield from the argument being pursued here. It is also important to keep in mind the close proximity in time between the development of the Baroque and the revival of Thomism, which began in the late fifteenth century and continued through the seventeenth. (This revival is often referred to as a "second Thomism.")

One could cite countless other examples from the Baroque to illustrate this new conception of the human being. Consider Andrea Pozzo's *St. Ignatius in Glory* in the nave ceiling at Sant' Ignazio's in Rome. Or one could look north of the Alps in Zimmerman's famous *Die Wieskirche* or any of

²⁹ Pegis, *St. Thomas and the Problem of the Soul in the Thirteenth Century*, pp. 184-85.

³⁰ John Rupert Martin, "The Baroque," in *Readings in Art History*, ed. Harold Spencer, vol. 2 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1976). However, Martin attributes this to the growing scientific spirit of the time. I think it more likely that the sources are in the facultative psychology of scholasticism.

the countless Baroque-Rococo churches of German-speaking central Europe, such as the abbey of Ottobeuren, just to mention one of the larger and more famous examples.

Western art took a dramatic turn to realism and naturalism in the High Middle Ages. Hylomorphism is the underlying philosophical position that makes possible the dramatic change and explosive development of the art of this period. As a result of the appropriation of this Aristotelian doctrine, scholasticism developed a different view of the human being. The human being is not a soul using a body but is an embodied spirit. The body is thus spiritualized; the corporeal gives expression to the spirit. The rediscovery of Aristotle led to a profound transformation in philosophy and theology. It did no less in art.