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While it is by now no longer extraordinary to interpret the philosophies of Descartes and Leibniz in the context of early modern scholasticism and its four main strands of Thomism, Scotism, Jesuit, and Protestant scholasticism, similar attempts in the case of Kant are at best a minority enterprise whose contribution to Kant scholarship is hardly taking center stage. To be sure, there have always been those who pointed out the importance of Iberian Jesuit early modern thought in particular for German School Philosophy as a whole (i.e. bridging the confessional divide), which in turn must be seen as an important context for Kant’s own philosophical development. Drawing, to some extent at least, on certain trends in the so-called metaphysical Kant interpretation of the 1920s, Kant scholars in the line of Norbert Hinske and Giorgio Tonelli as well as those coming
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4 Which is by no means restricted to the peculiar shape this line of reading Kant took in Heidegger, but who is often regarded as having provided the paradigm of such an interpretation. For a comprehensive account of this reading of Kant see Christian Baertschi, "Die deutsche metaphysische Kantinterpretation der 1920er Jahre" (Dissertation, University of Zurich: 2004).

from an interest in medieval philosophy and its legacy such as Etienne Gilson and Ludger Honnefelder\textsuperscript{6} have tried to connect Kant’s critical enterprise in one way or another to scholastic thought of the medieval and early modern era. Research in this field tends to focus on Kant’s transcendental approach and its connection to the tradition, although it needs to be said that there is possibly also a lot more to uncover in practical philosophy as well.

Helped by a growing body of detailed scholarship in university history which could establish that the Albertina in Königsberg had actually been a center of both the scholastic and the Renaissance variant of Aristotelianism until the early decades of the 18th century,\textsuperscript{7} there have been a number of attempts to find something like the “missing link” between the Iberian Jesuits and Kant. In this vein, it has been suggested that there is a direct line from the conceptions of the transcendentals in Francisco Suárez\textsuperscript{8} and Sebastián Izquierdo,\textsuperscript{9} or from the core strategy in the account of being in Suárez\textsuperscript{10} to the respective doctrines of Kant. Some see Abraham Calov, arguably the most important Königsberg philosopher before Kant, as the crucial mediator,\textsuperscript{11} others mention Franz A. Aepinus.\textsuperscript{12}


\textsuperscript{7} See, for example, Riccardo Pozzo, “Aristotelismus und Eklektik in Königsberg,” in \textit{Die Universität Königsberg in der Frühen Neuzeit}, ed. Manfred Komorowski and Hanspeter Marti (Cologne et al.: 2008), 172–85. Marco Sgarbi, \textit{Metafisica e logica nel Kant precritico: L’ambiente intellettuale di Königsberg e la formazione della filosofia kantiana} (Frankfurt: 2011) has provided a comprehensive reconstruction of the intellectual context within which Kant’s thought emerged.

\textsuperscript{8} Jean-François Courtine, \textit{Suarez et le système de métaphysique} (Paris: 1990), 435.

\textsuperscript{9} Piero Di Vona, \textit{L’ontologia dimenticata: Dall’ ontologia spagnola alla Critica della ragion pura} (Naples: 2009), 100.

\textsuperscript{10} Olivier Boulnois, \textit{Être et représentation} (Paris: 1999), 493–504.


\textsuperscript{12} Tommasi, \textit{Philosophia transcendentalis}, passim.