

VINCENZO GIOBERTI
THE MORAL AND POLITICAL PRIMACY OF THE ITALIANS
BRUSSELS, 1843

PART II: THE ITALIAN PRIMACY IN REGARD TO THOUGHT

II: ITALY IS THE LEADER IN THE PHILOSOPHICAL SCIENCES

THE PROTOLOGIC PRINCIPLE OF KNOWLEDGE GOVERNS HER THEORIZING

Italy's supremacy in the practice of theoretical thinking results from what has been discussed. She alone possesses and keeps intact the protologic principle of knowledge. Besides being common to every part of the encyclopedia, this principle belongs especially to the teachings of reason and constitutes the first science – the foundation and entry way of all theory. And since the axiom of creation has been discarded or at least obscured and altered by non-Catholic schools and by all those who have withdrawn from Italian influence, protology can rightly be considered a privilege of Italian philosophy. It is certain and reasonable that the first science is neither a futile effort nor a sterile desire only where the biblical and encyclopedic Prime is preserved.

Dissenting thinkers, whether ancient or modern, have only the name and the appearances of science. Either they do not know the principle of creation or they reject it, which forces them to introduce a preposterous confusion or an absurd divorce into the principles of knowledge and to ground their arguments in dualism or pantheism. Those systems, far from aiding science, are its worst enemies. By unifying the manifold or multiplying unity, they substitute darkness and disorder for light and scientific order. Knowledge that is solid and truthful must put unity and variety together; the latter must obey the former so that they are not confused by conjunction nor separated by distinction but recognized as equals or rivals.

The pantheist, who strives to identify contraries or unify the manifold, is compelled to carve unity up and make identity different, on the one hand mixing up what is distinct, on the other making distinct what is the same – exactly the reverse of a thoughtful and scientific approach. By forcing the reflective distinction of cognition back into the confusion of intuition, the pantheist actually eliminates those first, crude outlines of intuition that provide a guiding thread for later reflection. They are like emplacements or parapets marking an accessible route on which thoughtful people can reach the goal by a direct path and not wander randomly. Pantheism can thus be compared to that ultimate and absolute chaos imagined by certain atheist philosophers. Not only would it reduce the world to primeval disorder, it would also preclude any later cosmogony, killing the seeds of life that float in the primeval night and bring forth from its womb the wonders that we see.

The efforts of the dualist are even more futile and paltry. He not only splits the concept of God in half; he also eliminates the essence of knowledge, which is preserved in the order, in the rhythm, in the placement and systematic linkage of principles and conclusions. Just as these things require number and harmony, they also need unity.

The problems of pantheism and dualism cannot be solved by combining them and balancing one against the other – as some of the ancients tried to do, especially Pythagoras and the famous Hegel among the moderns. His system, to mention it in passing, is basically a renewal (a worsening, in part) of Pythagoreanism and a return to the infantile philosophy of the pagans. In Hegel's theory, contrariety is eliminated by identity, and dualism is corrected and remedied by pantheism – a cure worse than the disease. The brilliant German was not aware that the harmonizing dialectic must operate on the concept of creation, not on that of identity. Nor did he see that one should look not in absolute thought for the substantial coexistence of contraries but in absolute will for the cause that produces them.

The principle of creation is the hinge on which the first science must turn. This is possible only where the Catholic word resounds in its purity, where pantheistic teachings in every era have been a scandal – even stranger than they were rare.

PANTHEISM PURE AND SIMPLE WAS ALWAYS UNKNOWN IN ITALY
THE VARIOUS ERAS OR FORMS OF ITALIAN PHILOSOPHY
FIRST FORM: PYTHAGOREANISM AND ITS ACHIEVEMENTS

Exactly such a place is Italy, whose philosophy, first-born in the Occident, has renewed itself many times in different forms, following various political events on the peninsula but always keeping itself clean of the infection of pantheism – or less infected than the philosophies of other regions.

Before Christ, all dissenting philosophies vacillated between the pantheist system and dualism, making either a clever composite or a shapeless one by mixing the two, more or less consistently or inconsistently. An almost pure pantheism prevailed in the Orient, save for the sects of Confucius and Zoroaster, which aimed more at practice than theory. Being more active and ethical than rationalist, they had to stick with whichever of the two opposed theories did more to preserve human freedom. Nonetheless, the duality of the I Ching and of the Nask??? somehow suggest a prior pantheistic unity, and the subtle speculations of their interpreters on the Tai Chi and the Acherene Zervan??? make you suspect the very ancient emanationism of the first Taoists (before Lao Tse and probably the same as the Samaneans??? of Central Asia and Northern India, who seem to have preceded the last Buddha by a few centuries) and perhaps of U Sheng??? and Aoma.

But of all the ancient schools, one came nearest the truth by skimming the surface, so to speak, of the great doctrine of creation. Its cradle was in the Occident and its glory in large measure Italian. Later it became the parent of Greek philosophy, whose three luminaries – Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato – were all but Catholic, given the times in which

they lived. Compared to them, the other sects of the day seem almost schismatic and heretical. All three understood the imperfection of that pagan orthodoxy, however, and they aspired [*indarno ???*] to reconstruct the primitive faith. All three deeply felt the need for a new light of revelation to dispel the darkness of their age.

The first of them – Italian like us as well Greek, and nourished on the old Doric, Etruscan and Pelasgian wisdom – founded the Italic school. His is the most brilliant picture that history provides of Italy's ancient wisdom. There are four outstanding features of Pythagoreanism, in which resides the most ancient form of our philosophy as well as the most exotic.

The first of these is universality in every field. Because the sage of Croton joined the active life with the contemplative and art with religion, his establishment was a cult, a polity, a monastery, a college, a school and an academy all at once.

The second characteristic is literary and scientific universality. The Pythagoreans were the living portrait of the encyclopedic intellect of the Italians. They embraced every discipline accessible to their age, not satisfied with separate insights but studying the mutual relations of everything knowable and marrying rigor of doctrine with the delights of myth and the symbolism of numbers. This is how they foresaw many scientific findings of the moderns and a few of their fantasies. Applying music to astronomy, they were Dante's precursors in poetry and forerunners of Kepler, Galileo and Copernicus in theorizing about the heavens.

The temperament of Oriental pantheism, mediating the categorical duality of their ten fundamental opposites, is the third hallmark of the Italic school. What is a step backward in the moderns – in Hegel, for example – was a real improvement in the days of the Samian or Tyrrhenian philosopher. Much more than in Hegelian dualism, the monad clearly dominates the dyad in the Pythagorean system. The principle that unifies the opposites and resolves differences, [*interzandosi ???*] itself between them, is harmony and not identity.

Finally – their fourth and last distinction – one must attribute to the sages of Magna Graecia the first seed of theoretical and political realism in the West, the claim to recognize in rational concepts and civil laws an objective reality, an absolute value, divine and independent not only of human will but also of the contingency of created things and of the vagaries of institutions fashioned upon those laws. The metaphysical realism of the Pythagoreans, written up and ripened by Plato and the Alexandrians with the doctrine of the Logos and Demiurge, passed to the Christian school, where it was transformed and cleansed of any stain of pantheism by the special zeal of Augustine, Anselm, Bonaventura and Thomas. They are the tetrarchy of Catholic thought that preceded the revived paganism of Luther and Descartes.

Political realism – hereditary monarchy, in other words, tempered by natural and elective aristocracy and forming the Doric and Pelasgian ideal of government – was then transmitted by the school of Croton to Etruscan Rome. It was modeled on the

Pythagorean cosmos, where the earth and other planets move around a motionless sun in a perpetual and harmonic cycle. The legend that makes Numa a student of Pythagoras, as I have mentioned elsewhere, preserves some of the history.

The Republic was a true interregnum that grew out of princely abuses. Caesar's mighty genius, rather than repeat the work of the Gracchi, resumed that of Romulus and Servius Tullius, bringing the Latin state back to its foundations, making patricians agree with plebeians by means of the tempering harmony of royal power. Having anticipated efforts by Nerva and Trajan that were less durable because they came too late, Caesar would be the savior of the fatherland, not a parricide.

SECOND FORM: LATIN PHILOSOPHY
THIRD FORM: PATRISTIC PHILOSOPHY
FOURTH FORM: THE REALISM OF THE EARLY PERIOD,
WHICH WAS ABOVE ALL AN ITALIAN SYSTEM

Etruscan Rome used Pythagorean thought not just to improve its form of government. Theoretical teachings also eventually entered when seeds sown by the son of Mnesarchus in southern Italy and then transported to Greece returned home, crossing into Latium. The three most famous schools of Hellas – the Academy, Stoa and Peripatos – were children of the Socratic movement but grandchildren of the Italic cults. From his teacher Anaxagoras, Socrates took the great principle of Nous, which gives order to Hyle and remains apart from it. In substance this concept is Pythagorean. And from the influence of Italic science came those remarkable moderations of pantheism found in all the Greek schools without exception, even those, such as the Eleatic and Alexandrian, that held more of the Oriental doctrines.

Latin philosophy, the second form of Italian thought, is different in character from Greek philosophy. When Greek ideas returned to our peninsula and settled in Rome, they took a more austere and practical turn. Rome owed a great deal [*manco largo ???*] to Pythagoreanism, but she was also prudent in finding an accord with the right sense of politics. The Greek sect that did best in Rome, then, was Stoicism. It became livelier and exuberant and showed a new face – a system in which ethical issues have greater value and significance than other parts of science, a system based on the doctrine of human freedom and intrinsically opposed to pantheism. And even if Roman Stoicism has more depth than breadth, being more practical than theoretical, lacking scope but well endowed with power, it compensates by being more moral and religious than the Greek Porch.

The theoretical weakness of Latin wisdom (the reason for its brief career) corresponds to a similar defect that ruined Roman institutions. These were in many ways excellent, but they sinned in that the government of the metropolis fed on [*si mangiava ???*] the nation. This led to the war of the provinces (called *Italic* with good reason) and ultimately to the total massacre of the Republic. In Roman philosophy, then, science was too narrow and was smothered by craft, by which I mean the practical application of principles. The

study of ideas was subordinated [*posposto ???*] to that of facts, doing all the more damage because, while the periphery yielded to the center in the political order, the opposite happened in philosophy. Science, like Roman literature, had little vitality, having become sterile even before the assaults and abuses of the barbarians. Hence philosophy was ready to acquire the divine wisdom of Christianity, in which thought and action, idea and fact, the theoretical and the practical are in wondrous balance and accord, one compensating for the other [*il sottentrare in vece di quelle ???*].

The philosophy of the Fathers, even though it spread through the whole Catholic world, was ours especially, and we can consider it the third form of Italian thought. Establishing its center in a Catholic Rome, philosophy drew from the city the breath that gave it life. Tertullian, Augustine and Bernard may have been born outside Italy, but they thought and wrote like Romans, just as Trajan and Seneca felt and acted like Latins though they were born far from the Tiber and Latium. The Fathers restored Pythagorean and Platonic realism, removing it from the fog of pantheism and informing it with the sovereign doctrine of creation. The Scholastics, Italian by origin and allegiance, continued their work and put it in more rigorous form.

Scholasticism, the fourth form of our philosophy, split into the two opposed camps of nominalism and realism. The former, subdividing into more sects, represents Aristotelian teaching at various levels of development, from the still Platonic Stagirite through the sensism and atheism of Strato. Between them comes Theophrastus, a wonderful talent, yet more skilled at observing facts than at theorizing philosophically. The most celebrated authors and advocates of the nominalist system were French or English – Roscelin, Abelard and Occam – while the leaders of realism came from Italy. In a daring Platonic way, Anselm of Aosta and Bonaventura of Bagnoregio expressed the same teaching to which Thomas Aquinas brought the reserve and strict method of the Peripatetics.

Thus, the intellectual war of the Celtic and Germanic mind against Pelasgian and Italian wisdom started with the Middle Ages and the beginnings of scholasticism. And even though the divine Bernard was French, his standing as a monk and the teachings that he upheld in his fight with Abelard show priestly Roman thought conflicting with the Gallic layman's novelties.

The waning of realism and scholasticism was contemporary with the demise of papal dictatorship and Italian primacy, and this double decline followed from the intellectual and political influences of the barbarians on the peninsula. Because Italy and the Pontiff represent the idea manifest as a people and a person, they cannot preserve their rule when the senses take the place of ideas, following the canons of nominalism. This is pagan sensism brought into Italian Christianity by barbarian teachers under the cloak of a false Aristotle. It was the first step in modern dissent, which was reared and nourished by the Saxon monk and the Breton philosopher,¹ just as dissent in the early Church originated with the Gnostics, who were in a sense the nominalists of emanationism and pantheism.

¹Occam and Abelard ???

FIFTH FORM: RENEWAL OF SOME ANCIENT SYSTEMS, IMITATING PAGANISM
ON VICO, UNIQUE IN HIS TIME:
HE HAD NO SCHOOL BECAUSE BY HIMSELF HE WAS BETTER THAN A SCHOOL
SIXTH FORM: IMITATING THE FRENCH
SEVENTH AND FINAL FORM: IMITATING THE SCOTS AND GERMANS
NEED FOR AN ITALIAN REFORM OF PHILOSOPHY

Renewed studies of classical antiquity in the fifteenth century gave birth to a fifth form of Italian philosophy which in substance was a revival of paganism. Thus, despite the extraordinary merit of Pomponazzi, Patrizi, Cardano, Telesio, Bruno, Campanella and a good many others, their teachings did not take root among us. The Italian mind, abandoning theory almost entirely, turned its attention for two centuries to political wisdom and to the science of calculation and experiment, guided by two of the greatest, Machiavelli and Galileo. In between came Sarpi, who had the talents of both and greatly resembled them in the breadth of his mind and the nature of his studies. He came particularly close to the first, applying the rarest gifts to certain anxieties that matched the degeneration of the people and the declining times.

The theoretical current awoke again in Italy with Vico. To renew Platonic and Christian realism, he had the stunning idea of going back to their first sources, not Greek but Italic. He would rediscover the elements of ancient Pelasgian wisdom among the remains of the Latin language and reconstitute the body of that wisdom, as modern geologists reconstructed the dimensions and organic features of another world from its scattered bones. But Vico was not understood in his time, and even in our day very few understand him. The problem is not so much the difficulties of expression and partial mistakes that make some of his teachings hazy. To appreciate his deeply Italian thought and sensibility simply demands more strength and subtlety of mind than one can find today. The *New Science* can be compared to a fertile land that God [set ??? *campò*] in the ocean, keeping it unknown and uninhabited for a long time, saving it for the diligent industry of future sailors and settlers. Thus, a century after it was written, while still buried under the dust of libraries, this stunning work had the allure of a discovery.

Already during Vico's lifetime, the teachings of Descartes – Protestantism applied to philosophy – had leaked into Italy and flourished there because the learned were more inattentive than selective or tasteful. I note that Luther and Descartes, the two chief enemies of Italian wisdom, visited Italy and carried back with them a harsh and secret rancor against us, giving vent to it in their teachings. And if the philosopher was less violent and fearsome than the friar, at least in appearance, he was also luckier. His teachings won citizenship in our country under the two successive forms of psychological rationalism and sensism. Yet even among these aberrations the prudence of our ancestors still shone forth. While embracing the alien heresy, we could at least dispense with its most outrageous and [unsettling *disorbitanze* ???] conclusions. In the past century, for example, Genovesi tempered Locke's teachings with those of Leibniz and was more

eclectic than Cartesian. And we remember Romagnosi as a deeper and more moderate sensist than his contemporaries who taught the same system across the mountains.

With Romagnosi one can say that the servile habit of Gallic theorizing ended among us. Still, those who have lived long among foreigners and have largely forgotten the thought of the fatherland find it hard to take it up again, choosing to return home only after having sampled other districts. In the same way, after the Italian mind has shaken off the French yoke and forsaken the site of servitude, it wishes to try other countries, wandering in the wilderness before returning to rest in the promised land, held by the fathers of old. Italy's is a strange destiny. Having lost her self-awareness for many centuries, she gropes her way to find it again, looking where it is not nor can be, yet believing that she can have peace while not returning, like the prodigal son of the Gospel, to the bosom of her parent.

Such is the final form of Italian philosophy as it continues in the present – a clever imitation of Scottish and German teachings. Our brave and honored Galluppi is the Reid of Italy, drawing people back to the truth by correct understanding improved by deep analysis, but without escaping the limits of observation and experiments. Armed with these implements, Galluppi gloriously vanquished the sensism of his predecessors, combating it with his own weapons. He made our thinkers familiar again with that shrewd forbearance, experimental and inductive, that produces useful discoveries in the sphere of internal facts – the application of Galileo's method to psychology.

But direct sensation is not enough for philosophy to be a science. Sensible phenomena cannot be completely explained without rising higher and entering the secret sanctuary of reason. Thus, as the Scottish school [replaced *??? sottentrò*] the critical school in the previous period, in our time Rosmini succeeded Galluppi. From terminology to incidental themes and beyond, the sect that he founded cleverly revived the errors and pretensions of German Cartesianism – of Kantianism, that is.

Renewed and Italianized by the illustrious Roveretan, in one sense this Kantianism [submits to detracts from *??? sottostà*] the teachings of the Scots and Galluppi by moving away from the reliable guidance of common sense and experience. On the other hand, it provides no remedy for the defects of the aforementioned schools since the reason to which it has recourse is a sham, empty and sterile. Reason for Rosmini and Kant is purely subjective, however they may name it or [dignify *??? coonestata*] it, and a subjective faculty cannot be the foundation of science. It neither helps the mind escape from psychology nor provides a firm basis for that same psychology. No wonder, then, that Rosminianism has shown itself to be so unproductive in the hands of its author. He has been able to extract nothing more from it than an insubstantial ethics bristling with the spines and subtleties of Scotism, while [*indarno ???*] straining to squeeze from it any ontology at all.

If Rosminianism wishes to be orthodox, it is infertile, reluctant to shed light on the consequences contained in its principles, [hiding *posponendo ???*] a culpable fertility behind scientific impotence. But should the author and his followers become less pious

and timorous than they are, one would soon see the pantheism of Fichte and Hegel emerging in Italy. This is where Rosmini's principles lead, without a doubt. Like the critical philosophy, his thought moves ultimately to absolute scepticism and nihilism. This is the final goal of psychologism, as shown by the current state of the Hegelian school. The vogue for Rosminianism that existed for a time in some parts of Italy, even though it is gone today, is a sign that German dissent could take the place of Celtic dissent if our native wisdom does not shield the fatherland.

Already circulating on the peninsula are certain works that present German pantheism as a discovery. These foreign goods, far from helping science, do it injury. The learned, not much used to fending for themselves and having no sure rule for judging the real worth of those works, eagerly accept them. But to substitute German rationalism for French sensism would be to leap from the frying pan into the fire, which should give pause to those few who still see some good in Rosminianism.

If wiser minds today still feel the need to return to the ancient wisdom of the fatherland, why halt in Germany after leaving France? Why drink from the cup of error and drain it to the last drop before tasting the pure waters of truth? Why drag out an apostasy which has become tedious and annoying even to those who profess it? Why postpone reconsecration?

You Italians who drink from foreign springs, know that you are exiles even while living in Italy. Your exile is willful, not a matter of need, not innocent but culpable. Of your own will, you disown your native worship and venerate strange gods from abroad. You are exiles not in body but in soul. While your person remains on the peninsula, your spirit dwells across the mountains, conforming thoughts and feelings to the ancient enemies of your fatherland.

Ah, return to your senses! Put an end to a long and mournful error. Learn to feel and philosophize like Italians. Turn your ears to the words of a compatriot, harshly separated from our common mother but perhaps more Italian than you. Even while far away, he lives spiritually in that sweet fatherland, feeds on her ancient wisdom and thinks about her past, while you, breathing her healthy air and enjoying her vital light, persist in destroying her reputation by repaying her favors with ingratitude and insulting the Providence that made you her sons.

TERENZIO MAMIANI

Tapping the vein of wisdom on the other side of the mountains is less reasonable and excusable for us Italians today because it has dried up. Anyone [who took it home **???** *chi l'a in casa*] a little while ago and found plenty of nourishment in it (illusory though it was) is now forced to look elsewhere. And so the time seems ripe to restore the ancient Pelasgian wisdom by perfecting and combining it with the divine illuminations of Christianity, and then to inaugurate it in the rest of Europe. Having squandered her

intellectual resources and being now reduced to extreme poverty, Europe can restore herself only by drawing anew from the inexhaustible mine of Italian intellect.

One outstanding talent has already undertaken the work of reform by leading his compatriots back to the best sources and renewing the ancient Platonic marriage – which never should have ceased – between delightful writing and rigorous teaching. Terenzio Mamiani, taking up Vico's idea, [*???* *rappiccò*] again the thread of Italy's philosophical traditions and showed by example (as Vico never did, making his discoveries largely ineffective) how one can and must put theoretical ideas into an elegant garb which is all ours and Italian, removed from barbaric crudities and foreign [*scede* *???*] alike.

This is of the highest importance not only for literature but also for theory. The conjunction between the idea and its sign is so deep and strong that thinking and reasoning in the Italian way becomes difficult, almost impossible, when one's consciousness, imagination and expression are barbarian. In fact, what is good taste in writing becomes good sense in learning when two different forms of the same thing are expressed by using this double endowment of good judgment so that the mind grasps exemplars of things in the intellect and externalizes them correctly. In his final works, Mamiani comes close to this wise and moderate form of philosophy, in which reason and experience, facts and ideas, synthesis and analysis are in wonderful agreement because each of them is assigned to the level appropriate for the work of science. This form of philosophy is almost a privilege of the Italian genius which excels in forcefulness because it is the best tempered.

The same approach to thought and philosophical studies shone in a contemporary of ours whose name is known and beloved in Piedmont. It would be so in the rest of Italy had his fate matched the goodness and greatness of his mind, heart and teaching. Luigi Ornato, close and heroic friend of Santorre Santarosa, saw the fatherland again after a voluntary exile of ten years and ended his days suffering from a long and painful illness. He was skilled in many fields of learning and quite expert in Greek, but he directed all this knowledge toward philosophy and religion, the apex of all his thoughts. He lived and died in love with the Idea and found consolation in contemplating it, like Galileo and Homer, whose blindness afflicted him in the last years of his life. I thought it not out of place to mention this person, whose modesty and misfortune deprived him of the fame he deserved, because it seems fitting to me that Italy should measure her gratitude not so much by results, which often depend on chance, as by the noble efforts and great-souled intentions of her sons.

ITALIAN PHILOSOPHY MUST BE BASED ON THE PRINCIPLE OF CREATION
NOT HAVING ESTABLISHED PHILOSOPHY ON THIS BASIS WAS THE CAUSE OF ITS DECLINE

The reform conceived by Vico and pursued by Mamiani cannot be brought to completion unless the ancient Pelasgian tradition is joined with Christianity and both are reduced to a single principle whose substance is based on reason while the expression that gives

meaning to it belongs to revelation. This is the principle of creation, the only act that comprehends and controls all science, infusing it with a new breath of life.

The idea of creation is as old among mankind as the truth that corresponds to it. But since it was first obscured and then lost by the dissenting peoples, this idea has not held sovereign power in Christian philosophy until now, nor has it gained the supreme place that it would need to inform every part of the encyclopedic edifice. There are various causes to which one might attribute the decline of Pelasgian realism and of the realism that flourished in the two Christian periods of the Fathers and the Middle Ages. In any event, philosophical opinions based on truth do not decay or decline except when the method used to develop and establish them does not correspond to their truth and goodness. And since imperfection in methods prevents good teachings from taking root, they cannot arise again unless the old flaw is fixed and, as the truth unfolds, new supplements and new levels of subtlety and splendor are added to it.

The Fathers and the most distinguished masters of the schools served the Pelasgian philosophy very well, to be sure, cleansing it of every stain of pantheism and handling many parts of it with mastery. Their work was incomplete, however: the principle of creation as it actually informs the concepts and treatises of these outstanding thinkers does not control their science formally, and their principle was not constructed and integrated by means of a scientific formula. One cause of this, I believe, was that the Christian schools conferred supreme authority on the names of Plato and Aristotle. They repudiated their errors but did not improve their methods. The other cause was the difficulty – almost a moral impossibility – of making a new blueprint for a construct as all-encompassing as the totality of human knowledge.

When false religions and flawed civilizations die, they leave behind them a definite trail whose extent is usually proportional to length of the eras when they prevailed. Hence, since paganism was rooted in Europe's soil for so long, many traces of it have naturally survived and still remain in the present. With these residues so conspicuous in the arts, literature and laws, in customs and institutions and even in the names of people and objects, no wonder that the situation has been no different in the philosophical disciplines. Therefore, one can truly state – without insult to the holiest and most eminent names – that even when European philosophy was orthodox in substance, it preserved some part of pagan heterodoxy in its methods and procedures.

Briefly, this heterodox element can be traced to the lack of a genuine ontologism. Even in full flight, pagan philosophy was psychological or cosmological, taking mankind or the world as points of departure, or in any case marrying these two concepts to the supreme and absolute Idea as it started its theorizing. Thus, the Prime of the most ancient Italic school was the duality of the Doric theocosm, like the Cronotopos of Iran or Chaldaea. The pantheism in the Pythagorean concept was tempered, through its Pelasgian character, by the distinction between Theos and Hyle – a distinction that preserved the decree of religion, up to a certain point, at the loss of scientific unity.

With the doctrine of creation, Christianity reduced the Prime of faith to its ontological simplicity and purity. But Christianity claimed not to intervene directly in the human disciplines, contenting itself with authoritative instruction about true belief without telling how to explain or demonstrate it by a scientific method. For this reason, the psychological Prime was not rigorously discussed in the Christian schools. Many distinguished it from the ontological Prime. Others, realizing that the two Primes are identical, set the concept of Being apart from that of creation and thereby deprived the protological formula of the most essential condition of its integrity.

These scientific mistakes did not prejudice the essence of doctrine as long as theology took precedence over theory and religion played a propaedeutic role – doing duty for intuition, as it were, in relation to reflective cognition and science in general. But when philosophy was detached from its leader and chose to go its own way, the defect in the protological principle bore fruit. Within a short span of years, the psychologism of Descartes gave birth to pantheism, biblical rationalism, sensism, fatalism and immoralism, which were seen combined and unified as a system in the work of Spinoza.

Today, therefore, we need to construct the fundamental formula of knowledge. Other philosophical questions are of little moment in comparison to it. This question is the basis and meaning of them all since the whole method of science depends on its resolution. Protology is the primary theoretical need of the period we live in and is well suited to its character. It matches the aspiration to restore ancient orthodoxy in the field of reality and knowledge by driving resurrected paganism back to the grave, while at the same time giving new order to the encyclopedia and to Europe, shaken and shattered as they are by the political and religious schism of three centuries.

For this reason, the establishment of principles and sources is of the greatest consequence in every sphere. Today, this is the unanimous instinct of popular desire, of learned research and of expert consideration in the various domains of action and thought. But the only possible protology is the one that is based on the ideal formula which expresses the first origin of things and generates the first principles from which cognitions emerge. The doctrine of the formula is both old and new. It is old in that its seeds are included in the principle of creation, written by God's hand on the frontispiece of the book of revelation. It is new because no such principle has been scientifically explained until now.

This should cause us no surprise. As I have just noted, Christian philosophy retained part of the procedure of pagan science until the sixteenth century (beyond the damage done by nominalists, even among the ranks of the realists), and from then on it was weakened by Cartesianism, which is a second paganism. These notions are now throwing off their last sparks, foretelling the coming triumph of Christian ontologism. Burning below the surface and consuming all their tinder, these fires are naturally dying out to leave a firm and fertile soil ready for the human effort that soon gives rise to fruitful fields and populous cities, the nesting-ground of science and civilization.