

The aim of my Studies on G. Frege and traditional philosophy (Reidel, 1967) was to compare the contributions and the work of the German mathematician and logician Gottlob Frege (1848-1925) with the previous history of philosophy, of which Frege, not being a professional philosopher, was not too aware. In my consideration of the history of philosophy I stressed, in section 0.4, the need of looking into the traditional trends of the Neuzeit. Section 0.4 is reproduced here. The bibliographical references are appended to it.

#### **0.4 History of philosophy re-examined**

The choice of authors making up the bibliography of the present research has been influenced by a criterion which requires some comments.

Attention has been paid to authors who are not easily classifiable in the up-to-now standard divisions of the history of philosophy. These authors fall within the period of modern philosophy (*Neuzeit*), but the content of their works is rather mediaeval or classic. Without entering into difficult characterizations it is possible to give a sort of "ostensive" definition of these authors by referring to the about 600 names recorded in Rabus [1], from the Reformation to Kant.

These authors have been disregarded by the leading philosophical or logical historiography. As to the former see, for instance, *Überweg*. As to the second, it may be observed that Prantl was unable to complete his *Geschichte* beyond the 15th century, and Bochenski [1] and Kneale [1] for their part have negatively judged the period subsequent to the Middle Ages.<sup>1</sup>

Apart from Rabus and perhaps other older expositions of the history of philosophy, research on these authors has up to now been only a minor concern in philosophical historiography.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, this situation has begun to change; the forthcoming editions of *Überweg* will pay special attention to these authors<sup>3</sup>, and in general an advanced systematic research is being done.<sup>4</sup>

Indeed, a great deal of the extensive material recorded by Rabus [1] is far from being formal logic proper (a fact which supports Bochenski's and Kneale's judgment), and its interest is more from the point of view of general philosophical studies such as philosophy of logic, methodology, ontology, semantics, etc. But these are precisely the studies whose revival characterizes our contemporary philosophy.

## REFERENCES

- Bochenski, I.M.[1]: *Formale Logik*, Verlag K. Alber, München 1956, XV+ 639 pp.
- Greniewski, H. [1]: *Elementy logiki formalnej*, P.W.N., Warszawa 1955, 492 pp.
- Kneale, W. and M. [1]: *The Development of Logic*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1962, VIII+ 761 pp.
- Muñoz Delgado, V. [1]: *La logica nominalista en la universidad de Salamanca (1510- 1530)*, Ed. Revista Estudios, Madrid 1964, 448 pp.+ 20 photocopies.
- Pereira Gomez, J. [1]: *Os professores de filosofia da Universidade de Eborá (1559- 1759)*, Evora 1960, 622 pp.
- Risse, W. [1]: *Die Logik der Neuzeit .Band I: Die Geschichte der Logik von 1500- 1640*, Frommann, Stuttgart 1965, 574 pp.
- Schüling, H. [1]: *Bibliographie der im 17. Jahrhundert im Deutschland erschienenen logischen Schriften*, Universitätsbibliothek, Giessen 1963, 143 pp. [Cf. Risse's review in: *Philos. Rundschau* **12** (1965) p. 298.]
- Wilpert, P.[1]: 'Die Neugestaltung des "Überweg"', *Archiv f. Geschichte der Philosophie* **43** (1961) 85- 99.
- Wundt, Max [1]: *Die deutsche Schulmetaphysik des 17. Jahrhunderts*, Mohr, Tübingen 1939, XXVI + 288 pp.

---

<sup>1</sup> Kneale [1], p. 298; Bochenski [1], p. 297.

<sup>2</sup> For instance Wundt [1].

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Wilpert [1], p. 89.

<sup>4</sup> Above all Risse [1]. Examples of active research in the field are also: Schüling [1], Greniewski [1] (for Poland), Pereira Gomez [1] (for Portugal), Muñoz Delgado [1] (for Spain), etc.