Understanding Aristotle

Lonergan Institute for the "Good Under Construction"

> In Aristotle, there are not two sets of objects but two approaches to one set. Theory is concerned with what is prior in itself but posterior for us; but everyday human knowledge is concerned with what is prior for us though posterior in itself. But, though Aristotle by beguilingly simple analogies could set up a properly systematic metaphysics, his contrast was not between theory and common sense as we understand these terms but between *episteme* and *doxa,* between *sophia* and *phronesis,* between necessity and contingence...in Aristotle the sciences are conceived not as autonomous but as prolongations of philosophy and as further determinations of the basic concepts philosophy provides. So it is that, while Aristotelian psychology is not without profound insight into human sensibility and intelligence, still its basic concepts are derived not from intentional consciousness but from metaphysics. Thus "soul" does not mean "subject" but "the first act of an organic body" whether of a plant, an animal, or a man.[44] Similarly, the notion of "object" is not derived from a consideration of intentional acts; on the contrary, just as potencies are to be conceived by considering their acts, so acts are to be conceived by considering their objects, i.e. their efficient or final causes.[45] As in psychology, so too in physics, the basic concepts are metaphysical. As an agent is principle of movement in the mover, so a nature is principle of movement in the moved. But agent is agent because it is in act. The nature is matter or form and rather form than matter. Matter is pure potency. Movement is incomplete act, the act of what is in potency still.[1]

Aristotle (384-322 BC), Plato's most prominent pupil, was born at Stageira in Thrace on the very edge of the Greek world although he was of pure Greek blood. His native city was under the influence of the rising power of Macedonia, formerly part of the former Yugoslavia. His father was court physician to the King of Macedonia, which indicates that his family belonged to the Greek tradition of medicine and that he came from a tradition of scientific interest...with his "feet on the earth and not his head in the air," so to speak, thus underlining a major difference in attitude between Aristotle and Plato. From an early interest in medical science, Aristotle became interested in biology which explains his emphasis on the importance of the individual man (which, in turn, further emphasizes the difference between Plato and Aristotle since, for Plato, the first science was mathematics) although, for Aristotle, if we should want to find any absolute notions, we can get these by abstracting them from the concreteness of the world within which we live. For example, since, for Aristotle, "horseness" does not exist somewhere amid individually existing concrete things, we should study all the horses of our experience and their characteristics and then, from these characteristics, move toward "horseness" as a form that can be converted into a communicable concept, a communicable definition. Where Aristotle gets the abstract from the concrete, Plato gets the concrete from the abstract.

Aristotle never met Socrates but, on being sent by his father to Plato's Academy when he, Aristotle, was 17 and Plato was 61, he stayed on at the Academy and studied there for 20 years although he left the Academy soon after Plato's death in 348 because of disagreements with its new chiefs. In

---

1Lonergan, *Method in Theology*, pp. 95-96.

Aristotle's own words: "Plato is dear to me, but dearer still is truth."[2] In the beginning, however, much of his thought was still influenced by Plato. With Xenocrates, he left Athens to live for a few years with Hermias, an aristocrat from Asia Minor, who perhaps was the closest model or example of a philosopher-king that was ever produced by Plato's Academy. For 2-3 years in Lesbos, he spent his time studying biology, especially marine biology: "We must not feel a childish disgust at the investigation of the meaner animals for there is something marvelous in all natural things."[3] His detailed studies referred to over 500 different species in labors that attempted to classify the being of all life forms. Then, he returned to his native city for a while but later he returned to Athens where, in 335, he founded an academy of his own, known as the Lyceum where Plato's philosophy was both taught and criticized. This school had more of a scientific character and apparatus than had Plato's: it had a good library that was arranged in a manner which resembled that kind of library that we would find within a natural history museum. When teaching, Aristotle would walk and talk and so, from this habit, the Lyceum students became known as peripatetics. Later, for three years, beginning in 343, he resided at the Macedonian court, serving as the tutor of the young Alexander the Great although his efforts were not too successful since it was said that Alexander disliked philosophy. As a consequence of anti-Macedonian feeling that was aroused in Athens by the orator, Demosthenes (who feared that Macedonia would conquer Greece), on the death of Alexander the Great in 323, Aristotle was forced to flee the city after a charge of impiety was brought against him. He gave the direction of his school to Theophrastus and then withdrew to Chalcis in northern Greece in order to escape death and "to save the Athenians from sinning twice against philosophy." Dying the following year, in his will, he showed concern for his family and also for his slaves since many of his slaves received their freedom while all were secured from being sold.

Aristotle's surviving writings differ from Plato's since, with the exception of a few fragments that he had composed in the form of dialogues for the benefit of the general public (for popular consumption), all current texts are derived from student notes which have made it difficult for us to read and interpret Aristotle accurately. At the same time too, with respect to their writing style, these surviving texts are characterized by a dryness and a precision which differs from the more lively style that is found in Plato's dialogues. Lack of coherence in these student notes makes it difficult for us to understand clearly what exactly Aristotle was saying and what he could have meant and so it is argued that this lack of coherence is a factor which helps to explain why his work continues to excite further study and comment and an ongoing genesis of new possible interpretations. While classical sources refer to 170 titles, only 47 texts are preserved.[4] His writings are classified in a 3-fold manner. (1) Pedagogical works consist of notes that were taken in connection with his teaching. Although these comprised his most important writings, the inner construction of these materials appears to be incomplete. These texts include as follows: the *Organon* (treatises on logic; *organon* referring to "the tool or instrument of knowledge"),[5] the *Physics*, the *Metaphysics*, the *De Anima* (on the human soul), ethical works consisting of three treatises with the *Nicomachean Ethics* being the most important, and, lastly, an assortment of various political and rhetorical works (the *Politics*, the *Poetics* and the *Rhetoric*). (2) Philosophical dialogues consist of works that were published by him and written in the style of the Platonic dialogues. They are sometimes referred to as the *Exoteric Works* since they were all designed for readers who were beginners in the study of philosophy. We have only a few of them and they are

---

2Osborne, *Philosophy for Beginners,* p. 16.
3Osborne, *Philosophy for Beginners,* p. 16.
4Gaarder, *Sophie's World,* p. 106.
5Sullivan, *Introduction to Philosophy*, p. 49.

little used. (3) Encyclopedic works consist of such things as his lists of constitutions, a history of astronomy, his names of plants and animals, a survey of sporting events in Athens, and so on. In general, since the more these different writings are studied the more complex appears to be their structure, it seems that different parts were written at different periods of time although it has been difficult to establish their true chronological order despite many attempts to do so.

Aristotle had a large conception of philosophy: he was the first to divide and then subdivide all the different areas of inquiry into a general classification of knowledge. All the sciences are to be divided and classified according to two criteria: (1) their individual finality as distinct sciences (the objects of their individual study: their purpose in terms of what they are meant to study and do) and (2) their degree of abstraction (by the distance which exists as we move from the givens of our sense perception toward the givens of our understanding which exist as intellectualized, intellectual objects that have been apprehended by us through our acts of understanding within a given context, different kinds of understanding corresponding to different kinds of intellectual object). Three major divisions in philosophy are to be distinguished from each other:

(1) The theoretical or contemplative sciences consist of three parts: physics, mathematics, and first philosophy (i.e., metaphysics). Logic was not included since, for Aristotle, logic is to be regarded as a prior, necessary instrument that is to be used before there can be the doing of any kind of philosophy.

> Briefly put and somewhat cryptically, in Aristotle's own words: "the supreme desirable is one with the supreme intelligible."[6] Theoretical philosophy or the living of a purely theoretical practical life, as a "life exercising itself for [the sake of] wisdom,"[7] is defined by the virtue of our having a knowledge of things as its proper end and goal (a knowledge of things that, in themselves, never change),[8] the sciences belonging to the practice of theoretical knowledge accordingly being divided according to varying degrees of distance that exist relative to the givens of our immediate experience or, in other words, according to various degrees of abstraction. The technical term is this reference to "abstraction." The physical sciences or physics is the science of the study of all things in motion (whether living or non-living). Where living things initiate motion, non-living things can only receive motion through the action of external causes (which exist as external sources). Living things are classified as plants, animals, and human beings according to what they can do or, in other words, by how they exist and live. Mathematics exists as a distinct form of theoretical science (it exists at a more abstract level than the kind of science which exists in physics); and, similarly, at a higher level, metaphysics exists as a theoretical science. Its abstractness transcends the kind of abstraction which exists in mathematics. If mathematicians work with symbols and images that are freely constructed in a manner which is removed from the immediacy which exists within our different acts of human sensing, metaphysicians work with concepts and notions that are removed or which differ from the being of any kind of image whatsoever, whether we should speak of images that are given to us

---

6Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 12, 1072a26ff, as quoted by Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, p. 85.

7Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, p. 86.

8Lonergan, *Second Collection*, p. 140, citing Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 1, 33, 88b 30 ff; *Nicomachean Ethics*, 6, 5, 114a 24 ff; Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, p. 81.

> through our different acts of human sensing or other images that are given to us through our different acts of human imagining. From the being of intellectual objects or from a species of data that is constituted by us through our prior acts of understanding as these acts of understanding exist in other, lesser disciplines, the being of metaphysical terms or the being of metaphysical objects is to be correlated with acts of understanding which exist, most remotely, at the highest of levels.

(2) The practical sciences (sometimes referred to as the order of praxis) within the order of our human cognition consists of the political and ethical sciences, the two being closely related in terms of how Aristotle understands them as a species of human action or activity. An individual can only be good within the context of a good society. Man, by nature, is a social being where, within this context and given the kind of nature which belongs to us as human beings, it follows from this that "it is in acting well, not simply in making [anything], that human life finds its fulfillment."[9]

(3) The productive or the poetical sciences refer to that which we can realize or do and so, within this classification, we have Aristotle's theory on the fine arts (his works on aesthetics). For Aristotle, beyond the kind of action or activity which exists simply in thinking and reasoning, in the kind of action which exists in a manner which transcends our acts of thinking, reasoning, and understanding, two kinds of externalizing action can be distinguished and, so, two kinds of science. A real distinction obtains between that which exists as praxis and that which exists as poiesis. In Aristotle's own words: "the reasoned state of capacity to act is different from the reasoned state of capacity to make."[10] The theoretical and practical sciences cannot be reduced to the productive or the poetical sciences (or, in other words, to the use or the actuation of instrumental or technological forms of human reason).

According to Aristotle, philosophy is a strictly scientific species of activity. As he had noted when referring in a critical manner to Plato's understanding of ethics and the human soul: make a small mistake at the beginning of things in the context of one's inquiry and one's errors will be multiplied later a thousandfold.[11] As a distinct species of inquiry, by its very nature thus, philosophy must go from the experience of a "mere fact" to the experience of a "reasoned fact." It must transcend the givenness of any kind of pure facticity which exists within our world (as we commonly experience this facticity through the deliverances of sense in the context of our sense experience). For example, if we advert to the kind of transcendence which exists in general within philosophy, one of Aristotle's central points (one of his principal contributions) was his doctrine of four necessary causes that should be invoked if we are to understand anything which exists within our world, the world of our ordinary experience (everything which is subject to change and which undergoes any kind of change): simply put, (1) material cause, (2) efficient cause, (3) formal cause, and (4) final cause. The ultimate cause of everything is treated within his discussion of *First Philosophy*, later referred to as Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. Material cause is the "stuff" out of which something is made as in a chunk of marble from which a statue is carved. Formal cause is that which something strives to be (it exists both within

---

9Holger Zaborowski, *Robert Spaemann's Philosophy of the Human Person: Nature, Freedom, and the Critique of Modernity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 11-12.

10Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1140a1, as cited by Zaborowski, *Spaemann's Philosophy*, p. 11.

11Aristotle, as cited by Anthony McCarthy, "The Sexual Revolution's Strange Turn," *Catholic Herald* (September 2, 2016), p. 24: literally quoting Aristotle employing the following words in translation, "a small mistake at the beginning is multiplied later a thousandfold."

our minds within our understanding and also within the potentiality which exists as matter, matter as material potentiality). Horses exist as distinct individuals; but, as we have noted, "horseness" exists as a species of universal. It exists as a species of formal cause which exists within all horses or which pertains to the being of all horses. Efficient cause is the means, the instrument, or a force or action which is expended in order to effect a change in something which exists as an other (in some way). The hammering of a chisel to carve or make something is to be regarded as an efficient cause. Lastly, final cause refers to why an action or an object exists. Why does this object exist with the formal cause which it happens to have? Why does this object exist in the way that it does or why does something behave in the way that it happens to behave?

With respect to questions about how, in Aristotle, we are to engage in the kind of critical thinking and knowing that belongs to the practice of philosophy and science, to understand the methodological achievements and developments which come to us from Aristotle's analysis, a useful division, for the sake of our convenience, distinguishes between the practice and study of deductive logic as a guide that should be used to avoid contradictions in the manner of our reasoning and thinking and a larger view of cognition which refers to an inductive logic of discovery which attends, in general, to the nature of our human cognition as it moves from a partial knowledge of things that is already given to us in our understanding toward a greater knowledge of the same things. Hence, within this context, questions are asked about what is the form or the structure of our human inquiry. What exactly is the form or the structure of our critical acts of human reasoning and thinking? If, with logic or through our logical operations, through the making of non-contradictory inferences, we can work from the intelligibility which exists within propositions which exist as initial premisses toward the kind of intelligibility which would exist within our subsequent conclusions, with other operations or by means of combining our logical operations with non-logical cognitive operations, at a more basic level, we can work toward an understanding or a knowledge of initial first premisses that can then be used as a basis for making logical deductions or moving toward conclusions which can be presented in a way which points to how they exist as conclusions which follow from the intelligibility which already exists within our initial premisses. The achievements of Aristotle's methodology accordingly divide into two basic parts: (1) a theory of syllogistic reasoning as this exists with respect to the being of our logical operations and (2) a theory of cognition as this exists more broadly with respect to the nature of our human cognition in general and how it exists as a species of knowing that particularly belongs to us as human beings, functioning as human agents. Our human knowing differs from the kind of knowing which properly belongs to animals. How we exist as human beings determines the kind of knowing which belongs to us as human subjects and, at the same time too, that which exists for us as the humanly known or, in other words, the kind of being which is given to us in and through our knowing, the kind of being which is informed by the being or the nature of the known (the known as the known is being known by us through our various cognitive acts).

However, this being said, if we are to avoid a misunderstanding or a misconception which could begin to think that the known is to be seen as some kind of human projection, a concluding preliminary note needs to be adverted to in a way which acknowledges, as a general backdrop, that Aristotle adhered or believed in the truth of a realist understanding of human cognition which holds that our human thinking and reasoning normally leads us toward true apprehensions of reality. Whether we speak about a deductive form of logic (deductive logical operations) or an inductive logic of discovery which works with deductive forms of logical reasoning in conjunction with other kinds of cognitional acts, in either case (whether deduction or induction), these operations are all necessary if we are to move into contact with reality through our apprehensions of anything which would exist for us as an understanding and

knowledge of meaning and truth. Admittedly, in itself (or apart from ourselves), truth (or, in other words, truly existing being or truly existing reality) – these things always exists "objectively" as if they were things which somehow exist externally, on the "outside" or independently of how, subjectively, we exist and think as human beings.[12] Being, truth always differs from ourselves even if, by our knowing and living, we can participate within the order of being which refers to the being of truths that are known by us through the being or the actuation of our human cognition (although, today, this view is not widely shared among many modern logicians who prefer, instead, to focus on the being and the apprehension of patterns which are said to exist within the contours of our human thinking and reasoning: patterns which are internally valid because no contradictions can be found among a set or a group of propositions as we go from one proposition to another, the law of contradiction existing as a principle of reason which is being observed in a given situation within the conduct or the operation of our human acts of thinking and reasoning). Truth as union and participation is other than truth as coherence and consistency.

> To understand what has happened, in the later philosophy of Immanuel Kant (d. 1804), a major shift occurred in our understanding of human cognition because of an idealist understanding of knowledge which has come to us principally from Kant's cognitional philosophy, the acceptance of this philosophy in turn leading to a change of focus in the practice and study of logic. In this later newer context, in the study of logic, we attend to inner structures as these exist within the unfolding of our thinking and reasoning within the context of its speculative activity and also in the construction of valid arguments. The criterion or test of truth, or the criterion or test of validity in dealing with the question of truth, is resolved by simply attending to the coherence of a given idea as it is expressed in differing propositions and concepts. In a notion that predates the articulation of Kant's philosophy: the clearness of an idea, in its expression, points to its reasonableness, its would be truth.[13] The object of our focus ceases to be a possible

---

12To avoid any misunderstanding at this point, please distinguish between metaphysics and cognition (that which exists as metaphysics or ontology and that which exists as the cognition of a knowing subject). Truths, as truths, refer to a cognitional species of reality. They exist as terms which belong to the experience of our human cognition. However, through truths, through the experience of truth in the context of our human cognition, realities are known which belong to a transcendent order of being which is the subject matter of metaphysics or ontology. Truths function in a mediating kind of way as a species of middle term since, through an experience and a knowledge of truth, the subjectivity of a knower is directly joined to the being of a reality which exists independently of whether or not it is being known by a given subject at any given time.

13In the context of teaching which comes to us, proximately, from the earlier epistemological analysis of René Descartes (d. 1650) but, more remotely, from the analysis which comes to us from Parmenides and Plato: if, through an intellectual kind of intuition (an intellectual kind of seeing), an idea or concept is clearly and distinctly perceived or known by us, if an idea or concept is clearly given to us within the awareness which exists within our consciousness of self as this is given to us in our *cogito* (our "I think" which, for Descartes, consists of sensing, understanding, willing, and imagining), then its real existence (its real existence) is also clearly given to us. Its real being is to be adverted to. Cf. Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy* I, 9, 7, as cited by Anthony M. Matteo, *Quest for the Absolute: The Philosophical Vision of Joseph Maréchal* (DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1992), Matteo, p. 149, n. 18. Real being can be supposed and accepted because, from clear conceptions or from ideas which exist as conceptions, we get real being. With respect to all our thinking or to all of

correspondence or a possible unity which should exist *cognitionally* between the being of a human knower and the being of something which is other than a human knower (or, in other words, the unity which should exist between the teaching of a given proposition that a given person accepts and believes and that of reality to which a given proposition refers or that of reality that a given proposition is about).

If we should advert to the parameters of the older understanding and teaching that comes to us from Aristotle and the origins of this teaching as it exists in words and concepts, according to one possible translation that has been given of a text that comes to us from Aristotle's philosophical psychology as this exists in his *De Anima* (*On the Soul*): with respect to the kind of unity which exists between ourselves as knowing subjects and something else which is known by us as human subjects, our sensing in act is always that which is the sensible in act (a unity or an identity exists between our acts of sensing and that which is sensed by us within our various acts of human sensing) and, from there, as we move from sensing toward understanding, our understanding or intelligence in act is that which is the intelligible in act (a unity or an identity exists between our acts of understanding and that which we are understanding through our various acts of understanding, that which is being understood by us in a given act of understanding).[14] Act and term (the understanding and that which is understood) cannot be separated from

---

our conceiving, each implies being: conceptions, being; being, conceptions. Cf. Joseph Maréchal, *Le Point de Départ de la Métaphysique*, v. 2, p. 54, as cited by Matteo, p. 41.

In other words but with greater specificity, it is allegedly averred that "in the language of Saint Thomas, every cognition is a concept." "To know is to conceive...." Cf. Etienne Gilson, *Being and Some Philosophers*, 2nd ed. (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1952), p. 222; p. 190. "The intellect can only know what it has conceived." Cf. William E. Murnion, "Aquinas and Maritain on the Act of Understanding," *The Lonergan Review: The Journal of the Bernard J. Lonergan Institute* 4 no. 1 (2013): 57. More specifically: a species, a sensible species, that comes to us from the presentations of our sensible imagery impresses itself upon us, upon our receptive intellects, and our intellects in their activity can respond to it "first by giving the impressed species an intentional quality and then by formulating from it an expressed species [an expressed species which is to be identified with the existence of a concept in order then] to assimilate itself with full intentionality to the object [that is being] represented in it [through the concept]." Hence, through this process: "because the concept represents an object insofar as it is intelligible [to us], through it the intellect becomes all object as object, or [intellect] as other." Cf. Murnion, p. 58, citing texts from Maritain and how Maritain uses texts that are taken from Aquinas in order to argue for the legitimacy of the interpretation which he gives about the primacy of concepts. In the wake of a conceptualist understanding of cognition which we can often find amongst later Thomists (who are often referred to as "Neo-Thomists"), it is said that, prior to Descartes, in the later Middle Ages, "every Scholastic but Sylvester of Ferrara [d.1528] agrees [holds or believes] that *intelligere* and *dicere* (*verbum interius*) are [one and] the same act." No real distinction exists between our acts of understanding and our acts of conceptualization. Cf. Murnion, 74, n. 15, citing Paul Siwek, *Psychologia metaphysica*, 6th ed. (Rome: Gregorian University Press, 1962), p. 349. To know or to understand is essentially to conceive; it is to engage in acts of conception. Understanding does not exist as something which is prior to conception and which leads to our later acts of conception.

14Aristotle, *De Anima*, 3, 430a 2, as cited by Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 1a, q. 14, a. 2.

each other. According to various alternative translations: (1) "in the immaterial order [of things] one and the same is...[that which] understands and...[that which] is understood;" (2) "in the immaterial order, the 'understander and the understood are identical';" or (3) "understanding (*to nooun*) and what is understood (*to nooumenon*) are the same."[15]

Briefly alluding to an explanatory discussion which would want to attend to the being of cognitive operations which are not to be equated with logical forms of deduction, if we should attend to the kind of analysis which, in fact, we find in Aristotle's understanding of human cognition, in the *De Anima*, 3, 4, 430a 3-4, it is argued there that, if material coordinates or material properties are somehow omitted or abstracted out by us through our acts of understanding (perhaps we can speak about material conditions which are somehow "bracketed"), an identity is then seen to emerge between an act of understanding and that which is understood by this same act. An act of understanding possesses a spiritual or an immaterial nature (it transcends the existence or the givenness of material conditions, being not an act of sense) and, similarly, what is being understood as an intelligibility which exists as the term of a given act of understanding, in its own way, also possesses a spiritual, immaterial, intellectual nature. A materiality which accompanies our acts of human sensing is transcended by an immateriality which accompanies our acts of human understanding. The being of a sensible form is transcended by the being of an intelligible form or, alternatively, with a greater degree of nuance, it can be argued that the kind of transcendence which exists in our apprehension of intelligible forms is of a kind that it transcends the kind of transcendence which also exists within the context of our human hearing, a transcendence which can also be noticed by us when rhythmic vibrations are experienced by us in a way which knows that the reception of a sensible form is not to be confused with the matter of its originating source and the possible reception of any matter which has been sensed or matter which can be sensed.[16]

Aristotle's understanding of logic

In a methodological note which refers thus to the role or the significance of Aristotle's logic, it is to be admitted that, in some of his logical texts, Aristotle has identified his understanding of logic with the proper kind of method which belongs, in general, to the ways and means of our scientific inquiry. As we have already noted, logic exists as a species of necessary, preparatory tool for any kind of later work which is to be done within philosophy and science. In the study of logic, through the instrumentality of our human reason or by the use of our reasoning, we attend to our reasoning; we attend to how we function in our acts of human reasoning in a way which can know about how we should properly order all its parts or elements into an order which is distinctive of the kind of activity which properly belongs to us with respect to the being and the functioning of our human reason.[17]

15Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Early Works on Theological Method 1*, eds. Robert M. Doran and Robert C. Croken (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), p. 135, citing Aristotle, *De Anima*, 3, 4, 430a 3-4; *Verbum: Word and Idea in Aquinas*, eds. Frederick E. Crowe and Robert M. Doran (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), p. 46; *Incarnate Word*, p. 395.

16Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, pp. 86-87.

17Kevin White, "Philosophical Starting Points: Reason and Order in Aquinas's Introductions to

Hence, as we have noted and as we attend to the conceptualization of Aristotle's language (in the Greek), in order to signify what is being meant by "tool" or "instrument," Aristotle speaks about an *organon*: a "tool for [our] thinking" as this applies to any objects that we would want to ponder and think about.

As a species of cognitive guide or norm, logic should order or it must order the form of our thinking and reasoning when our reasoning is engaged in deductions of one kind or another from something which is known at A toward something which would be known at B and so, as a discipline or method, in the logic of Aristotle according to his understanding and his conception of it, logical categories and forms are specified in a manner which has continued to exert immense influence within the development of western thought in philosophy although, admittedly, Aristotle himself never spoke about "logic" but preferred instead to speak about "analytics."

In understanding Aristotle's logic, two aspects need to be distinguished if we are not to confuse a purely logical form of thinking and reasoning with a form of thinking and reasoning which transcends the sufficiency of logical considerations *qua* the being of purely logical operations.[18] (1) Where Aristotle treats of logic in terms of our being able to make valid inferences through syllogisms (inferences and conclusions are logically valid because they flow or they come from propositions which do not contradict each other in terms of how they relate to each other), we have a species or a type of logic which is akin to the ways and means of a mathematical form of logic. In the workings of a mathematical or symbolic logic, the meanings of terms and propositions is of no real interest or value. Everything is geared toward a mechanical way of proceeding in the having or the making of any deductions in order to avoid contradictions in terms of how subjects and predicates are to be related to each other within the wording of the species of logical argument which exists when we refer to the order of a syllogism. Quoting a commonly cited example: if every man is mortal; and Socrates is a man; therefore, Socrates is mortal.[19] If A is B and B is C; then, A is C. (2) On the other hand however, arguments which exist as syllogisms, in their brevity and compactness, exist in order to communicate an understanding that has been grasped about the meaning or the truth of a given proposition or thesis where, within this larger more comprehensive context, syllogisms exist as scientific syllogisms (as a form or species of proof or demonstration). They exist as explanatory syllogisms in order to show how or why, in a given instance, we could have intelligently moved from something which exists within an order of description toward something which exists now within a higher order of meaning which refers to the good or the truth of a proffered explanation. If descriptions are familiar with how things seem or appear to be in the kind of being which they have, explanations claim to know about how things truly are or exist (appearances often differing from that which exists as the truth of reality). In attending to how syllogisms exist as explanations, within this context, in Aristotle, logic is not to be understood as if it were something which exists in some kind of purely formal way (i.e., through the mediation of algebraic symbols and movements which exist within the play of a mathematical form of logic) nor, on the other hand, is logic to be regarded as merely a play with the words of our language and speech (existing essentially as kind of "word game").

---

the *Posterior Analytics*, *De Caelo*, and *Nicomachean Ethics*," *Theology Needs Philosophy: Acting against Reason is Contrary to the Nature of God*, ed. Matthew L. Lamb (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2016), p. 150.

18Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, pp. 48-52.

19Scott M. Sullivan, *An Introduction to Traditional Logic: Classical Reasoning for Contemporary Minds*, 2nd ed. (North Charleston, SC: Booksurge Publishing, 2006), p. 121.

Moving on thus, to understand where or why, in Aristotle's understanding of logic, there exists a discussion and a focus on the virtue and necessity of coherence in the kind of thinking which we should always do as intelligent reasonable human beings, a useful point of departure presents itself if we should attend to how first principles exist within any given science: first principles which have been grasped in some way and known in some way since, from their being, by a kind of application or a proceeding from them, very many things can be allegedly understood within the compass or the range of a given science. For an example here, in the physics of Aristotle, it was believed, as a fundamental notion within an explanatory understanding of physics, that every existing thing (or every form of existing thing) as it exists within our physical universe is such that it is geared to occupy "its natural place in the universe."[20] Everything always moves toward its natural, supposed, or intended place within the order of the universe or, in other words, we say that this orientation is such that, by using it, a general order is revealed or, in our study of the physical world in physics, we construct a general order which reveals the intelligibility of our universe (as, initially, we experience this same universe through our various acts of sense perception). By working with this fundamental presupposition within physics as a species of first principle, we can know about a general form or scheme which reveals the larger order that is constitutive of the being of our entire physical universe.

However, if we compare first principles that belong to a given science (hence, they would exist as secondary first principles) with first principles which can be said to exist in some kind of more basic, fundamental way (first principles that are foundational for every form of human thinking in whatever science, in any kind of thinking which pretends to be entirely rational and reasonable), secondary first principles existing as non-contradictory derivatives, then, from within this context, from the usefulness or the explanatory power of secondary first principles, we can raise questions about the meaning or the condition of rationality as this exists whenever, in any given science, we move from secondary first principles toward any conclusions that can be drawn from the being of any secondary first principles. With respect to the being of first principles in general, some are to be regarded as secondary or as consequential to the existence of other first principles that are more primary although, through our reflection on the kind of order which exists within a given science and among the given sciences, we should find that some first principles are primary in a relative sense *while other first principles are primary in an absolute sense*. In the shifts which occur whatever, the character or the quality of reasonableness is something which is continually presenting itself to us as an inherent, intrinsic condition even if it can be argued that, in a given case, a secondary or subsidiary first principle is to be regarded as more truly an assumption than a truth which has been proved from an external point of view or a truth which can be known or shown to be true through arguments which are to be regarded as self-evident or conclusive. In either case (whatever we decide: whether we should speak about the being of an assumption or the being of a pregnant, suggestive idea that is somehow given to us for reasons that we have not yet entirely grasped or understood), in some way, in the reasoning which occurs in the light of all secondary first principles as these exist within any given discipline, the rationality of our thinking and understanding is a phenomenon which, in turn, points to the necessity or the "mustness" of a more basic set of first principles which, if known, would then serve to explain the being or the condition of rationality as this exists as a distinct reality, being common to the supposition or the entertainment of all secondary first principles within science and any conclusions that can be drawn by us on the basis of any principles which can be known and employed by us within the conduct

---

20Isaac Asimov, *Understanding Physics Volume 1 Motion, Sound and Heat* (New York: Barnes & Noble Books, 1993), p. 4.

of our scientific inquiry within any given discipline or subject of study.

With Aristotle thus, in our understanding of first principles, we should distinguish between that which would exist for us as provable, demonstrable first principles (hence: provable, demonstrable premisses that can be known in their truth) and that which would exist for us as unprovable, indemonstrable first principles (hence: unprovable, indemonstrable premisses). The most basic set of first principles (that we can allude to and, in some way, know about) exists not as demonstrables which can be confirmed and proved by various arguments of one kind or another and a point of view which would exist externally to the meaning of these same principles but, instead, such a set – the most basic set of first principles – this specification of set is to be regarded as consisting of indemonstrables. So true are they in fact (they are so basic and foundational) that they cannot be proved by any kind of argument or any point of view that would exist in some kind of outside, external way. For instance: if coherence is necessary in any argument that we would want to make, how can we argue the truth of coherence without observing the necessity of coherence in any argument that we would try to propose? By way then of the kind of proof that can be offered with respect to the being or the truth of indemonstrable first principles: at some point we should find that, in dealing with these kinds of principles, in trying to propose any provable arguments, we immediately discover or we should immediately notice that, within our efforts or despite our efforts, whenever we are engaged in our various acts of thinking and reasoning, we are always having to assume the truth of the thesis or the truth of the theorem that we are trying to prove and so, whenever we are doing this in any given case, we should discover and realize that we are dealing with a first principle which would exist, technically, as a indemonstrable (as a species of indemonstrable). Its truth is so basic or its truth is so fundamental that it exists as a kind of indisputable, ultimate ground: its reality or truth is fundamental with respect to both the order or the laws of all existing things (Being, for short) and also the order or the laws of our human knowing where, here, the order of being (the order of existing things) is to be regarded as the subject matter of metaphysics and the order of knowing, the subject matter of an inquiry which asks about the nature of our human cognition.

In this context thus, no separation or gap can be alluded to, no separation or gap can exist between the order of existing things and the being or the order of our thinking minds and so, within this context, logical laws exist as metaphysical laws and, conversely, metaphysical laws exist as logical laws. With our minds, or with our understanding, we cannot go outside of our own minds or outside of our own understanding in order to find non-rational ways of thinking and speaking which could then prove the truth of a given thesis that we might want to think about or suppose. The condition of reasonableness and the condition of irrationality necessarily exclude each other in a way which explains why being and lack of being are such that they always totally exclude each other. In these types of cases thus, in attending to the meaning of indemonstrables, the necessity that is experienced within the order of our thinking, understanding, and knowing must always point to a like necessity which always also exists within the order of being or the order of all real things. A real distinction cannot be employed to distinguish between that which exists as a basic principle within the ordering of our human thinking and reasoning and that which exists as a species of basic principle within the order and the science of being which exists within the study and the science of metaphysics.

From the science of logistics that we accordingly find in Aristotle, for examples of indemonstrables which point to why they exist as indemonstrables and not as demonstrables, naming some of them, we can consider the principles of (1) identity, (2) contradiction, and (3) excluded middle. Respectively stated through employing a species of algebraic formula: (1) A is A (whatever is, is; or, alternatively,

"a thing is always the same as itself");[21] (2) A cannot be B and not B, or appositely: "'A is B' and 'A is not B'"[22] (a thing cannot both be and not be so and so at the same time and in the same way); and (3) A either is or is not B, or appositely: "either A is B, or A is not B"[23] (a thing either is or is not so and so; a statement of fact is "either true or it is not true").[24] Employing an explanatory form of paraphrase: "...if we think about anything, then (1) we must think that it is what it is; (2) we cannot think that it at once has a character and has it not; [and] (3) we must think that it at once has a character or has it not."[25] These principles, taken together, accordingly articulate or they put together a set of necessary first principles which, if known, designate truths which refer to the fundamental truths of our human minds, the fundamental truths of our human reason. Our minds cannot think in a coherent manner or they cannot operate intelligently if they do not always abide by these basic laws, principles, or norms which exist operatively within the ordering of our minds (within our questioning, our thinking, and our understanding) and which would exist also within the intelligibility and the conceptuality which belongs to how these aforementioned principles are employed as a basis for putting ideas or understandings into communicable words, transitioning from the apprehension of an understood idea to the expression of a verbalized articulate concept. These basic principles are necessary for us as a basis for all our subsequent acts of thinking and reasoning if our acts of thinking, reasoning, and understanding are to exist intrinsically or inherently as rational, reasonable things (as rational, reasonable activities of order, discovering and encountering order as it exists within things and, at times, also introducing order into sets of conditions where, previously, order had not existed or where order has yet to be realized). As we have just noted above for instance with respect to the principle of

---

21Caldecott, *Beauty in the Word*, p. 149.

22Caldecott, *Beauty in the Word*, p. 149. As Aristotle says about the principle of contradiction, in making an affirmation and then affirming its negation, "these two cannot be true together." Cf. *On Interpretation*, 7. As Aristotle more fully elaborates his thesis in the *Metaphysics*, "there is no affirming and denying the same *simultaneously*." Cf. *Metaphysics*, 4, 3, 1005b29, as quoted by Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 1a2ae, q. 94, a. 2; 2a2ae, q. 1, a. 7. In Latin, *non est simul affirmare et negare*. Something cannot be and not be *at the same time and in the same respect*. Cf. *Metaphysics*, 4, 3, 1005b18: literally, "the same attribute cannot both belong and not belong to the same subject at the same time and in the same respect." *Simul* introduces a qualification which includes both meanings, a qualification which introduces a circumstantial factor in how the principle of contradiction is to be understood and how it is to be applied in judging the truth or falsehood of any given thesis which presents itself for consideration. Cf. Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 1a2ae, q. 94, a. 2, vol. 28 (London: Blackfriars), p. 80, n. e. As Aquinas notes in the *Sententia super Metaphysicam*, 4, 6, 600, without the introduction of these qualifications, apparent contradictions would be mistakenly viewed as real contradictions when this is not truly or really the case.

23Caldecott, *Beauty in the Word*, p. 149.

24Caldecott, *Beauty in the Word*, p. 149.

25Joseph, *Logic*, p. 18. While, according to some points of view, it is said or it is commonly taught that the fundamental principle of our human reason is, in fact, the principle of contradiction, please note, however, that if we should want to refer to the metaphysical insight which we have from Parmenides to the effect that, fundamentally, Being is and, conversely, Being cannot not be (Being or reality is identical to itself), then, on this basis, we can argue that the principle of identity should seen to exist as as the first principle or the fundamental law of our human reason and, at the same time, also argue that, from Parmenides, we have a metaphysical insight which grounds the cognitional kind of insight which we have from Aristotle when he identifies the principle of identity as a fundamental law of our human reason in conjunction with the being of other laws and principles.

contradiction (sometimes referred to as the principle of non-contradiction): it is not possible to say about something that something is and is not at the same time and in the same manner. In understanding how these principles of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle relate to each other, suffice it to say that, on the basis of the principle of identity, through our understanding and reflection, we can move toward the principle of contradiction, and then, from there, we can move toward the principle of excluded middle. To avoid any connotations which could refer here to mechanistic determinations of meaning, we best speak not about any kind of derivation that we do without our thinking and reasoning but, instead, about how we can move from one principle to another on the basis of a suggestiveness which exists within each principle and an inference which is grounded in the quality of this suggestiveness. A meaning or an idea that is well understood, or which is more fully understood points, to the being of other meanings or the being of other ideas.

> For the sake of further elaboration, within the kind of thinking which we can associate with the kind of analysis that we find in Aristotle, other indemonstrables can be alluded to: for example, (1) the principle of inference as this exists within the shifts and movements of our human reasoning and (2) the principle of sufficient reason (which, for some, is known as the principle of intelligibility). With respect to inference and the different kinds of inference which exist within the structure of our human reasoning, three different kinds have been used to posit the reality or the truth of a thesis or the reality or truth of a thing's existence: (1) *a priori* inferences move from causes to effects; (2) *a posteriori* inferences move from effects to causes; and (3) *a simultaneo* inferences suggest a species of knowing which refers to what happens when we speak about the immediacy of an intuition. In *a simultaneo* inferences, in apprehending the meaning of a concept or the definition of a given meaning, its truth or reality is something which is directly and immediately revealed to us (it is immediately apprehended by us within the context of our human knowing). Truth or reality manifests itself merely in the meaning of a concept or idea. Something is true or it is real by definition (as soon as a meaning is grasped by us in an act of understanding that grasps it and as soon as this meaning is put into words which we can repeat to ourselves or say to others). Citing a commonly given example: "A finite whole is greater than any of its parts."[26] We cannot understand the meaning of "part," or the meaning of "whole," or the meaning of "greater than" unless we refer to the meaning of the other two terms. The correct understanding or the truth of a "part" presupposes correctly understanding the truth of a "whole" and also correctly understanding the truth of a "greater than" which knows about how a whole is to be compared when it is related to a part. In another way of speaking, we say that a predicate exists within a given subject. If we should understand and know a subject, we immediately understand and know the predicate. We know about the predicate. For examples here: "all men are mortal" and "fire burns."[27] In these cases, we do not move from "x" to "y." Both are given together.
>
> The principle of sufficient reason, as an indemonstrative, points to the intelligibility of being (the intelligibility of things which exist) and the necessity of this intelligibility (its necessary existence) if the being of things is to be known since being (the being of

---

26Mortimer J. Adler, *Aristotle for Everybody Difficult Thought Made Easy* (New York: Simon & Schuster Inc., 1978), p. 155.

27Berman, *Law and Revolution*, p. 133.

> things) can only be known through the principle and the experience of intelligibility as this exists for us within the dynamics of our human cognition.[28] If intelligibility is absent, no given thing can be distinguished from the being of every other thing and so, if distinctions cannot be grasped and understood, nothing can exist in terms of the kind of being which is proper to it. Only an amorphous mass will exist or, in other words, an undifferentiated specification of being: a datum or data instead of things.

On the basis then of these fundamental laws of human reason and in a manner which, in some way, refers to these fundamental laws of human reason, in his *Prior Analytics*, Aristotle adumbrates a list of all the possible syllogisms which exist within the ambit of our human reasoning, indicating which are valid and which are not valid. Forms of inference are always valid in a logical perspective where contradictions are absent as, in each case, we move from the givens which exist in a set of initial premisses toward conclusions which exist already implicitly within the givens of premisses which exist in a syllogism.

In order now to understand Aristotle in terms of his teaching about the good and the form of syllogisms, in his *Prior Analytics*, syllogisms are identified and explained. A syllogism, as a form of argument, consists of a subject, a predicate, and a middle term which connects a subject to a predicate, indicating why a predicate exists within a subject or why a predicate is to be predicated or ascribed of a given subject;[29] hence, a syllogism which exists as a scientific or explanatory syllogism (*syllogismos epistêmonikos*).[30] In our acts of sensing, we encounter something that we want to understand, something about which we can possibly pose questions. Taking an example that comes to us from Aristotle, we have the experience which we have of the moon. Through our acts of sensing, we see the moon at night when no clouds obstruct our vision of it. It is seen by us if nothing is blocking our line of sight. Now, sometimes, our vision of the moon is entirely obstructed by clouds in the sky and sometimes our vision is partially obstructed by clouds that partially obstruct our line of sight. But, what is happening when, on unclouded nights, suddenly and rapidly, a darkening of the moon occurs: a darkening which is described by Aristotle as "the inability of the moon at its full to cast a shadow, there being nothing visible in the way."[31] In other words, we experience no moonlight when suddenly the moon cannot be seen on a cloudless night or we experience less moonlight when, suddenly, part of the moon cannot be seen by us on a cloudless night. No act or datum of sense immediately reveals why no explanation is needed: why no questions need to be asked. Our point of departure at this point is but a material kind of fact which simply says that "the moon is being deprived of its light."[32]

And so, in searching for some kind of reason or explanation, we ask about the being of a possible cause where knowing the cause immediately points to the presence or the givenness of an adequate explanation. We raise questions that could possibly take us toward an object or a thing that could be given to us within a kind of apprehension which can exist within our cognition: an apprehension which

---

28Anthony M. Matteo, *Quest for the Absolute: The Philosophical Vision of Joseph Maréchal* (DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1992), pp. 115-116; p. 139.

29Lonergan, *Verbum*, p. 28, citing as follows: "The Aristotelian formulation of understanding is the scientific syllogism."

30Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, p. 48.

31Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 2, 8, 93a38-39, as cited by Patrick H. Byrne, *Analysis and Science in Aristotle* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1997), p. 89.

32Byrne, *Analysis and Science in Aristotle*, p. 90.

would not exist as an act of sensing but which exists in fact as an act of understanding, a prospective act of understanding. In thinking about this question or in thinking about this problem and in playing with images and configurations that can indicate how we can experience disruptions within our own lines of vision whenever, in our world, we want to see certain objects and why, at times, we cannot immediately see them, it can dawn upon us, it can come to us by way of an insight or an act of understanding that the reason must be the being of some other kind of obstruction: instead of clouds (because we cannot speak about clouds on a cloudless night), we refer to an obstruction or we postulate an obstruction which must somehow exist between the moon and the sun (the sun functioning as an illuminating source, relative to the reflection of the moon). Of course, if we were to imagine ourselves living on the surface of the moon, it would be very obvious to us, through our acts of seeing, that, at times, the earth obstructs the passage of light from the sun to the moon. The earth can totally obstruct this passage of light or it can partially obstruct this same passage of light. However, because, as a precondition for us, our point of departure is not the moon but our location on the surface of the earth (in looking toward the moon as a visible object we never see the earth), it is thus by our reasoning and through our understanding that we can connect the moon and its deprivation of light with the possible obstructing influence of the earth's position. For some strange reason that has yet to be grasped and understood through inquiries that would ask other new questions, at various times, between the sun and the moon, the earth exists as a species of interposition. We do not understand why, in fact, the earth should find itself at times between the sun and the moon (further inquiry and understanding would be needed here) although, in fact, as a new point of departure, we can now begin from an initial understanding which knows about why lunar eclipses exist (what causes them: answer, it is the interposition of the earth) and so, in the light of this understanding, we can then speak about what, in fact, is a lunar eclipse. We can identify a specific meaning, we can put a definition into words about what exactly is the nature of a lunar eclipse. From understanding something about why a lunar eclipse exists (admittedly, this is a limited, a restricted understanding), we can understand that which happens to exist as a lunar eclipse even if, admittedly, other questions have yet to be asked and other questions are left unanswered (for the time being) in the inquiries that we are engaged in.

When we move then into an articulation of the understanding which has been thus given to us in a given case, in specifying our steps and a connection which exists between that which exists as a subject and that which exists as a predicate, the result (in the understanding of Aristotle's logic) is the formulae or the structure of a syllogism. The conceptuality or the terms of the syllogism (the relation between a subject and a predicate through the mediation of a middle term) express the train of thought which has existed within the flow of our understanding (among our prior acts of understanding). As a first premiss or major premiss (by way of an abbreviated example that is given here for purposes of illustration): “every illuminated object having an obstruction between it and its illuminating source is deprived of its light”; as a second premiss or minor premiss: “the earth is an obstruction between the moon and its illuminating source (the sun)”; hence, the conclusion: “therefore, the moon is being deprived of its light.”[33] Something which is, in some way, known by us (through how our prior acts of human sensing combine with our prior acts of understanding) is now being understood by us in a manner which points to its clear expression and, in this type of situation, the use of syllogisms illustrates how this kind of change is effected in us (how this kind of change occurs in us by way of the

33Byrne, *Analysis and Science in Aristotle*, p. 90. To understand why or how we can distinguish between the being of major and minor premisses, see Sullivan, *Introduction to Traditional Logic*, p. 122.

kind of cognition which belongs to us as cogitating, conscious human subjects).[34]

In his analysis of syllogisms and in analyzing the kind of reasoning which exists in syllogistic forms of thinking and reasoning, in the conceptuality of his understanding thus, it can be said about Aristotle that his doctrine or that his teaching about syllogisms has emerged or that it has come to stand for a species of norm or intellectual standard: an inherited, classical system of human reasoning which served to initiate, in subsequent centuries, the entire logical tradition of the west as it has emerged since Aristotle's time and day (although Aristotle was not the first person to engage in syllogistic forms of argument, in either the Greek world or possibly in other worlds).[35] In the context of his teaching thus, the basic building block of all rational argument is to be identified with the form of the syllogism because it exists as a structure that is able to present reasons that can explain how or why, in a given case, in some way, X is related to Y. Using it or by means of how it exists as a form of communicable human argument, a datum of sense which has been understood or a fact which has been sensed (as one species of datum) is shown or it is presented in a way which points to how it has been converted into a fact which has been grasped and understood and then judged to be true. In the kind of transition which exists in Aristotle, what has existed as a datum of sense now exists not simply as a fact nor as an effect but as a "reasoned fact" or as an understood cause.[36] To elaborate a bit more fully:

> In Aristotle, in the kind of knowing which exists in the conduct of analysis in science, this movement of thought and inquiry moves from the experience of sensed effects toward understanding and an experience of causes that have been understood or which can be understood. In the language which Aristotle uses, the effects or the changes which are noticed exist initially as "facts"; however, the causes exist as "reasoned facts." Knowing in terms of learning and discovery begins with what we first know or what is first given to us within the kind of understanding which we first have of the world that happens to exist around us. This knowing begins with an experience of so-called "elemental facts": facts which refer to changes of one kind or another as these are known by us through the kind of knowing which exists in our acts of human sensing and which can be reported through our initial descriptions of them, our acts of inquiry beginning with our ordinary experiences and descriptions and then moving from there toward apprehensions which could exist as scientific descriptions.[37] From these experiences then, by a subsequent process of reasoning, we can then move toward causes which are first or primary within the order of being (the order of existing things) even as they exist as last things or as final things within the order of our inquiring human cognition. What is first for ourselves in the data of our human experiencing gives way, through understanding, to what is first in the order of being or first in itself as a fundamental point of departure for the being and existence of existing things. In Aristotle's own words: "what is last in the order of resolution or analysis [in the order of our human knowing] is first in the order of becoming or production [in the order of reality or being]," or according to another translation which refers to what is said by Aristotle in his *Nicomachean Ethics*, 3, 3, 1112b24: "the first link in the chain of causes

---

34Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, p. 48.

35H. W. B. Joseph, *Introduction to Logic* (Cresskill, NJ: Paper Tiger, Inc., 2000), p. 249.

36Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 1, 13; Patrick H. Byrne, *Analysis and Science in Aristotle* (Albany: State University of New York, 1997), p. 89; pp. 201-203.

37Patrick H. Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop* 8 (1980): 8-9.

is the last in the order of discovery."[38]

If, for example, with respect to "the order of discovery," as this pertains to a form of self-inquiry which asks about who and what we are as human beings, in this context, our inquiry moves toward some kind of answer by first attending to the objects or the content of our sensing and thinking: the givens that come with these acts. We begin with these objects or content and then we move toward identifying the acts or operations which bring these objects into our consciousness of them. Then, from these acts or operations, we can move toward how they recurrently exist for us as habits, continually bringing new objects into our awareness of them or other, familiar objects that we have known before in the context of our previous cognitive experience. The habits, in turn however, reveal the kind of potencies that we have as human beings: all that which we can possibly do as human beings, our potencies existing as natural potencies. They are entirely suited to the kind of being that we happen to be and so, by attending to these potencies and by knowing these potencies, we can then move toward an understanding and a manner of speaking which knows about the reasons, the elements, or the components which are constitutive of what a human being happens to be (what it is that makes a human being a human being); hence, distinguishing a human being from the being of every kind of being. As human beings, one species of cause exists as an interior formal principle. An intellectual soul is joined to another species of cause which exists as an exterior material principle. A soul and a body go together. But, if we attend to the order of being which works with causes as first principles, as points of departure (the order of being as opposed to the order of our human knowing), instead of moving from objects toward something which would exist as the specification of a human essence, we can move from that which exists as the essence of our humanity toward the different objects which can be intended by the species of self-transcendence which is constitutive of who and what we are as human beings (how we exist and be as human beings, living as human subjects).[39] What we experience and know and how we live and act is explained by how we exist as human beings. Our cognitional operations are explained by the being of metaphysical causes although, through the causality of our cognitional operations, metaphysical principles can be understood and known by us in terms of how they all are joined and related to each other. In the kind of rational life which properly belongs to us as human beings, as we engage in the kind of critical thinking which belongs to our scientific, philosophic activity: in living a fully reasonable, rational life, in this context, "man no longer lives *qua* man, but insofar as there is something divine about him."[40] Paradoxically and yet truthfully, who and what we are as human beings is constituted by that which transcends how we exist and live as human beings.[41]

38Jeremy D. Wilkins, *Method, Order, and Analogy in Trinitarian Theology: Apropos Karl Rahner's Critique of the 'Psychological' Approach*, unpublished paper (Houston: University of St. Thomas, November 25, 2009), p. 13, n. 29.

39McCarthy, *Authenticity as Self-transcendence*, p. 63, citing Aristotle, *De Anima*, 2, 4, 415a14020.

40Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 10, 1177b27; *Generation of animals*, 9, 737a910, as quoted by Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, p. 79.

41Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, p. 79.

In the use of syllogisms thus, syllogisms which reflect the being of prior cognitional operations, conclusions are indicated and these same conclusions are shown to be reasonably true in a manner which accordingly points to a self-evident form of rational certainty which exists within syllogisms. The sureness and certainty of conclusions is such that the use of syllogisms surpasses the value of working with all other possible forms of human argument.[42]

Within this context thus, in Aristotle, two kinds of argument can be distinguished from each other if we are to avoid any ambiguities that could be caused by confusions of one kind or another. (1) Some arguments are probably true where the form of reasoning refers to the arts and skill of dialectics as this comes to us originally from the dialectics of Socrates although by way of the mediation and the kind of expansion which comes to us from the later dialectics of Plato. The premisses which are used as points of departure for the subsequent drawing of conclusions are subject to dispute although, in some cases, they can be widely believed by many persons or, in other cases, they can be espoused by persons who are regarded as experts within their respective fields. Citing two examples: "man is a political animal" or "philosophy is desirable as a branch of study."[43] Both propositions can be contested. A given premiss can be probably true but not necessarily true. The truth is likely although it is not self-evident.

42Bernard J. F. Lonergan, "The Syllogism," *Shorter Papers*, eds. Robert C. Croken, Robert M. Doran, and H. Daniel Monsour (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), p. 14. Please note, however, as a qualification and as we allude and defer to a distinction that comes to us originally from the teaching of Aquinas: that which is self-evident to the thinking and understanding of one person might not be self-evident to the thinking and understanding of another person. Cf. Aquinas, *Sententia super Metaphysicam*, 4, 6, 607 [Aquinas's *Commentary* on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*]; Aquinas also, as cited by R. J. Snell, *Perspective of Love: Natural Law in a New Mode* (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2014), p. 97. As both Aristotle and Aquinas admit: a lack of learning or, in other words, a lack of understanding in some persons explains why some persons seek demonstrations for things that cannot be properly demonstrated to themselves or to others (the reality of their truth should be self-evident and all too obvious) and why, too, some persons cannot distinguish between what they should seek demonstrations for (the reality of truth is not too obvious or self-evident) and what they should not have to prove or properly demonstrate. A certain lack of wisdom explains why some indemonstrable principles are adverted to within a given context and why they are used as points of departure for a form of speculative thinking and understanding which tries to relate many different variables into a oneness or whole which is to be regarded as an order of intelligible relations (an order which allegedly speaks about causes and effects and how the existence of a given variable influences the possible being of other variables). Hence, from these considerations, we can conclude and surmise that the quality or the condition of a species of apprehension which is grounded in an experience of self-evidence in terms of something which is immediately grasped and known by us apart from the making of any later judgment in a reflective act of understanding – the apprehension or the understanding is indistinguishable from the kind of understanding which would exist in a judgment – the experience of self-evidence that we have and which can very from person to person, in turn, requires or it suggests to us that this type of apprehension could be open to a form of training or some kind of education that could possibly enlarge or extend its scope: enhancing the ability which a given person has to experience apprehensions of meaning and truth that would appear to be immediately obvious and self-evident, no proofs or arguments being required and, at the same time too, no proofs or arguments being possible.

43Berman, *Law and Revolution*, p. 133.

In determining any premisses that are probable, inductive and deductive procedures can be used as needed as, respectively, we would move from particulars in sense toward a general principle which exists in our understanding or from a general principle which exists in our understanding toward any particulars which can exist in sense.[44] In dialectical forms of reasoning and thinking, participants in a conversation try to persuade each other. One tries to find premisses that the other will accept so that the other will draw the particular conclusions that one would want the other to draw and to hold.[45] Valid methods of dialectical reasoning, if properly employed, should always lead participants toward the set of right premisses that are in fact needed if certain questions and problems are to be successfully understood and, by this understanding, answered or solved.[46] (2) Other arguments however are certainly and inevitably true (they exist as apodictic arguments) because their form of reasoning works with demonstrations from premisses that are necessarily true (premisses whose truth no one can truly doubt or question since the assigned or the obvious predicates already exist within the subjects that are being considered as is the case, for example, in the following propositions: "all men are mortal" and "fire burns.")[47] If you have the subject, you have the predicate. In the apodictic form of argumentation which works from the truth of self-evident premisses, demonstrations are employed and constructed in order to move from that which is known to be true at A to that which can be known to be true at B in a manner which no one can reasonably question or refute.[48] As with the premisses that are used in the context of dialectical arguments, first principles can be determined on a basis which works with both the use of inductive and deductive procedures. We can move from the particulars of sense toward a generality that is known in our understanding or from a generality that is known in our understanding toward any particulars which exist in sense.[49] Both types of procedure can be used interchangeably as the need arises in any given context. It is said, it is alleged, in fact, that, with respect to either dialectical arguments or apodictic arguments, the human mind (our human thinking and understanding) is always continually moving from one type of procedure to the other, back and forth, as the need arises and as circumstances permit. It is only by a kind of introspective analysis that we can distinguish between the being of these two kinds of intellectual movement.

Hence, in Aristotle, by combining self-evident premisses with the form and use of demonstrative reasoning (and only by the use of demonstrative reasoning) – it is only by these means that we can have any real knowledge (any genuine knowledge): in the language of Aristotle, a true knowledge or a scientific knowledge which exists as *epistēmē*.[50] The kind of knowing or the kind of reasoning which exists as it moves from premisses which are self-evidently true explains why this type of knowledge is itself both true and certain,[51] and if, in another context, we should try to work toward conclusions which are only probable and which are not certain or necessary in how they would follow from a prior set of first principles that are probably true, we would be working with a lesser notion of science, a weaker notion of science, or, in other words, an analogical kind of science because its manner only resembles (it does not imitate or reflect) the kind of knowing which only properly occurs if we should

---

44Berman, *Law and Revolution*, p. 133.

45Randall, *Aristotle*, pp. 38-39.

46Berman, *Law and Revolution*, p. 134.

47Berman, *Law and Revolution*, p. 133.

48Meynell, *Redirecting Philosophy*, pp. 254-255.

49Berman, *Law and Revolution*, p. 133.

50Meynell, *Redirecting Philosophy*, p. 255, citing Aristotle.

51Lonergan, *Second Collection*, p. 140, citing Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 1, 2, 71b 25 and 72a 37 ff.

work with the kind of self-evidence which exists in demonstrations which work from premisses which exist as analytic principles (the predicates already existing within the being of subjects).[52] It is always the case thus that a weaker or a lesser notion of science exists if (1) we should work from first principles that could very well be necessarily true but which are not evident to us in the context of our human knowing, or if (2) we should work from first principles which are, in fact, not necessary but which are essentially speculative and tentative, being only fitting, convenient, or suitable for us at a given time within a given context.[53] To give a possibly valid example: if, for instance, in the science of physics, it is discovered (or if it has been discovered) that the constant speed or the invariant velocity of a moving object is intrinsically unintelligible (changes in speed or velocity – only these changes would seem to be intelligible), then, in order to understand the kind of motion which exists in human economic activity, we should attend to variations or rates of change which can occur within the pace of our human economic activity. That which is static and unchanging is unintelligible. That which is dynamic and constantly changing - only this is intelligible and so this is the proper object of the kind of scientific activity which can exist for us in the science or the study of economics.

In looking for arguments which would accordingly evince certainty from within ourselves and also from within the thinking and understanding of other human beings, syllogisms, according to their structure, immediately or understandably lend themselves to a probative, demonstrative form of argument which thinks in terms of truths which would have to be definitively and undoubtedly true because, in a syllogism, a prescribed order determines how, in the conceptuality of our syllogistic reasoning, we can move from the intelligibility which exists within an arrangement of *archai* or premisses that are individually self-evidently known to be true toward the intelligibility which is shown or displayed (which is thus known to exist) within the wording of a resulting necessary, obvious conclusion. A new, self-evident intelligibility is immediately suggested and and presented to us and it is known through a rational arrangement of terms which exists within and among the premisses that have been collected by us within the prior order of one's arguments and thinking where, here, one proposition overlaps or relates to a second proposition through a middling predicate, a middling property, or a middling attribute that is, in some way, shared or which, in some way, is common to both propositions, connecting the two propositions with each other. As Aristotle would have it or as he is often cited and quoted in philosophical literature: in our knowledge of science, we only truly understand something "when we know the cause, know that it is the cause, and know that the effect cannot be other than it is."[54] To repeat a property (or a characteristic) which has already been noted: the certainty of our knowledge is such that things cannot be understood and known to be in any other kind of way. This X has to occur or this Y has to be in only this kind of way and in no other kind of way.

More bluntly speaking with a degree of repetition (although by way of a technical mode of expression), by means of the kind of inference which exists in all instances of syllogistic reasoning: X implies Y (given what is known about X); Y implies Z (given what is known about Y); and so, through the mediation of Y, X implies Z. In other words and, perhaps, in a way which points to another shade of

---

52Lonergan, *Second Collection*, pp. 47-48.

53Lonergan, *Second Collection*, p. 48. On this basis, please distinguish between doctrinal or dogmatic reasoning as this can exist within the work of theology and speculative, systematic reasoning as this can also exist within the work of theologians. Proofs and determinations of certitude exist as one species of object in science; meaning, relations exist as another species of scientific object.

54Lonergan, *Second Collection*, p. 139, citing Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 1, 1, 71b 10-12.

meaning that also merits our attention and understanding: in a syllogism, if predicate P belongs to middle term M and middle term M belongs to all subjects S, then predicate P belongs to all subjects S.[55] Reiteratively speaking: in every syllogism, we move from X to Z or we move from P to S through a mediating "middle term" which exists as a predicate or as an attribution of some kind (it identifies an understood cause or an understood reason) which is not itself directly referenced or which is not directly presented to us within the wording of an understood, stated conclusion or in the identification which is given to us within the wording of a specific conclusion. A conclusion is drawn by us or it is grasped by us through the mediation of a species of deduction as this exists within our acts of human reasoning and understanding. Simply put: if X, then Y. Hence, we should put aside any notion of deduction which would want to think of it as some kind of mechanistic operation or as a mechanical way of human thinking. The middle terms - when these are grasped and understood by us within our acts of understanding – these middle terms indicate where or why a positive relation exists between the two conceptualities that are given to us within the wording of two distinct propositions: this predicate and its subject and this other predicate and its subject. In the wording or the conceptuality of a third proposition which exists as the conclusion, the positive relation which is understood is presented in a way which follows or it proceeds from that which has been understood to exist within the wording of one's initial, prior premisses.

Through the kind of reduction or resolution which accordingly exists in employing syllogistic forms of argument as a means of presenting whatever we have come to know about through our various acts of thinking and understanding (working in conjunction with our various acts of human sensing), we can accordingly understand why a conclusive or a deductive form of inference is ranked by Aristotle as *the method of reasoning* which should be preferred by us within the context of any form of scientific reasoning if we are to indicate why we can intelligently and truthfully move from truths that few persons will dispute or question (or are not able to dispute or question) toward conclusions that are also true but which, perhaps, have not been noticed before or which, perhaps, have been a matter of past dispute and controversy. The truth or the aptness of a conclusion is best shown or it is best known (it is best indicated or it is best illustrated) if it can be shown to follow from other truths or meanings that are better known by us and which no one would want to dispute or question. Hence, for all intents and purposes, these better known truths are used or they are employed by us as a species of telling evidence as a convenient or apt point of departure. In order to argue the truth of a given teaching or the truth of a given belief, if we should choose to work with the kind of argument which exists for us within the structure of a syllogistic form of reasoning, we always best proceed if we can determine a set of first principles which are self-evidently true: a set of true premisses which we can use to point us toward the meaning and the truth of other teachings that we would like to justify before the thinking and in the opinions of other human persons.

When arguments are transposed into the kind of compactness which belongs (in general) to the form of syllogistic arguments, they are presented in a manner which accordingly joins two functions or they meet two purposes. A kind of proceeding is displayed in terms of how, through a prior act of direct understanding, we have moved toward a new unity or a new relation that has been grasped by us in the genesis or the reception of an act of understanding (a direct act of understanding) and, secondly also, through a prior act of reflective understanding as this exists also in judgment, another kind of intellectual proceeding which is also being indicated to us. The reasonableness or the rationality of this second proceeding is indicated to us in a way which points towards its obviousness (its reasonableness

55Roland Krismer, email message, March 19, 2016.

pointing toward its reality or its truthfulness, the necessity of a given judgment which recognizes the truthfulness of a given proposition or teaching). Syllogisms always lead to knowledge; they engender our knowledge in a way which always moves from a condition of potency to a condition of act. By having a syllogism in terms of how it moves through a form of ordered oneness which moves from a set of premisses to a given conclusion, we experience the generation and the flow of that type or species of knowing which is said to properly belong to scientific knowledge *as scientific knowledge*. A provable or a demonstrative type of knowledge exists through the use of syllogisms or, in Aristotle's words, it occurs through "*a syllogism* in virtue of which, *by having it*, we know scientifically."[56] *Syllogismus faciens* scire [an explanatory or scientific syllogism giving knowledge].[57] Through a species of motion which points to a change which has occurred in the content of our understanding and knowledge, in the deductions that we are making or in the conclusions that we are moving toward, our deductions and conclusions always exist as a form of inference where, in the making of every inference, we always move from that which we already happen to know toward that which we can begin now to understand and know through the order of implications which can be found when truths are combined with each other in ways that can reveal a truth which is at best implicitly known but which is not explicitly or fully known because, prior to the combination of propositions which occurs in a syllogism, it has yet to be identified in a way which puts a given meaning or a truth into a form of determination which exists by way of the construction of communicable terms and concepts that exist within the being of language and speech. In any premisses which exist as first principles, we always work with suppositions and hypotheses within a context which has been informed by our prior acts of thinking and understanding where now, our prior knowledge is added to and it is increased through new acts of thinking and understanding that have been coming to us in ways which condition how our current understanding as this is being expressed through the symbolization which exists within the order of a syllogism.

Aristotle's understanding of human cognition

Turning now to Aristotle's logic of discovery (although he did not use this type of language), as we have already noted, Aristotle assumes or adheres to the truth of a realist understanding about the nature of our human cognition. More accurately put, if we encounter persons who are entrenched within a skeptical frame of mind about the powers of the human mind (the scope of our human cognition), the best antidote is for us to get them to talk and to keep on talking since, as their thinking accompanies their way of talking and speaking, they should soon realize that they would want to argue their case in an intelligent manner (in as intelligent a manner as this is humanly possible) and so avoid any contradictions or arguments that would tell against the truth of their particular claims.[58] With Horace thus, as a consequence of engaging in this dialectical form of argument and discussion, as we work to stimulate the kind of cognition which belongs to another human being, we should all eventually realize the reality of an operational truth which says that, yes, *naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret* [you can drive nature out with a pitchfork, but it will always return].[59] Hence, performatively speaking,

---

56Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 1, 2, 71b17, as cited and translated by Byrne, *Analysis and Science in Aristotle*, p. 90: in the genesis of scientific knowledge, this demonstrative type of knowledge exists or it happens as "*a syllogism* in virtue of which, *by having it*, we know scientifically."

57Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 1, 2, 71b17 as cited by Lonergan, *Verbum*, p. 28, n. 58.

58Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, p. 354; *Second Collection*, p. 53; Meynell, *Redirecting Philosophy*, p. 257, citing Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 4, 4, 1005b35-1006a28.

59Lonergan, *Insight*, p. 570; p. 772, citing the Roman poet, Horace, *Epistolae*, I, 10, 24.

necessarily, whether we should refer to ourselves or to the being of other persons, at some point, we would all have to admit that, in some way, truths can be known by us through our knowing (as human knowers) and that a knowledge of truths is entirely proper and natural to us as human beings within the context of our ordinary day to day living. Whether we are skeptics or not, whatever we should want to think of ourselves or call ourselves, in the context of our self-understanding, to the degree that we can grow in any kind of self-understanding and to the degree that we can attend to the kind of data which belongs to our inner experience of self, eventually, we should all realize that apprehensions of truth and reality are normally given to us as human beings through a combination or an interaction of different powers: a combination of active and passive acts (where some acts exist for us as activities while others exist as receptions). Together, all in all characterize and together they reflect the data or the experience which we have of ourselves in our sensing, thinking, understanding, and knowing, the experience of intelligibility coming to us thus as a species of receiving or as the reception of an act that is given to us although, most frequently or commonly,[60] within an initial prior context which is characterized by conditioning activities of questioning and imagining in ways of thinking which encourage us or which create a species of openness and reception which now exists in us when, at unexpected moments, when we least expect it, an understanding of some kind is finally given to us as a gift or as a blessing which we cannot simply produce at will through all of our different acts of cogitative willing despite all that we might do in all our various acts of pondering, questioning, imagining, and thinking.[61] In our human cognition, in the being of our active intellects and in the being of our passive intellects, these two parts together form the kind of fluid or dynamic whole which is distinctive of our human cognition, pointing to its nature and revealing the manner of its operation. We move from initial givens (from that which we already understand) and then, from there, through the kind of encouragement and promotion which exists within our acts of inquiry (the work of our active or agent intellects), we move toward that which we might begin to understand (what we have yet to understand).

Hence, through the operation or the functioning of our human cognition, it has become a commonly admitted fact for us that the thesis of skepticism, in its alleged truth, is a teaching which always acts against itself. It undermines and contradicts itself. To argue the truth of skepticism is to propose the truth of an alleged truth and so, through acting in this way, implicitly, we would be admitting that apprehensions of truth and reality are, in fact, sometimes given to us, to our human minds, to our understanding, in a manner which points to an intimate association which must always exist between apprehensions of truth (the truth of truths that we have come know about in their truthfulness and reality) and experiences of intelligibility and understanding which must always come to us with the experience of these apprehensions. Through intelligibility and understanding, truths are known in their being and reality (they are known with respect to their truthfulness). Metaphorically speaking, if, in our understanding, we should want to refer to the kind of light which would exist in us as an invisible

---

60Please note at this point that, always, our inquiry and learning begins from a point of departure that is not without some prior understanding and knowledge. Our human condition is not characterized by a complete lack of knowledge about anything. Some things we already understand and know and so no questions need to be asked. From within a context which can be referred to in terms which can speak about *a priori* apprehensions of being, we can move toward *a posteriori* apprehensions of being which would emerge for us if we can engage in acts of inquiry which can lead us toward new possible acts of experiencing, understanding, and judgment which would add to the content and the sum of that which we already understand and know.

61Meynell, "On Being an Aristotelian," *Redirecting Philosophy*, pp. 259-260; John Herman Randall, Jr., *Aristotle* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1960), pp. 99-100.

kind of intellectual light, to reject the kind of light or the kind of illumination that is cast for us by the lighting or the dawning of our understanding is to reject how, in fact, we exist as human beings and how or why, as human beings, we cannot exist as some other kind of living being.[62]

With respect then to the particulars of Aristotle's theory of learning, his logic of discovery can be gleaned by us in a way which points to a wider understanding of method and procedure in science and philosophy than a notion of method which is restricted to the practice and the study of syllogistics in logic. Logical operations notwithstanding - they exist as but one species of cognitive act - if we attend to how a philosophy of inquiry is articulated by Aristotle in a way which points to a philosophy of scientific questioning and a basic set of questions which must be asked within every kind of scientific inquiry,[63] then, in this way, from this subjective but thematized (objectified) point of departure, we will be able to move toward an understanding of human cognition which will encompass a number of different kinds of cognitive act: operations which are not limited to the being of logical operations even as they work with the being of logical operations. Hence, within this larger wider context, prior acts of sensing can be adverted to and, eventually, through our inquiry and the asking of different kinds of questions, acts of understanding can alluded to as they emerge in the wake of our prior acts of human sensing.

In adverting then to the kind of order which exists within Aristotle's philosophy of inquiry, a corresponding or a reflective order of acts can then be determined by us in a way which refers to the constitution or the kind of order which belongs to the nature and the functioning (the operation) of our human cognition. Determine first how a given kind of question leads to a distinct species or type of cognitive act and, then, from the sequential and cyclic ordering of different questions as these form a circuit of their own (moving from acts of sense and then returning to acts of sense), determine an ordering of acts which then serves as a basis for determining another corresponding species of order which is constitutive of the being of existing things that can be known by us through our various acts of human cognition. The kinds of questions which we ask specify how, subjectively, we should respond with new acts or new operations if we are to participate or attend to the genesis, the ingress, or the progress of our personal individual human learning or, in other words, as we advert to the being of the different kinds of questions which we ask, these should reveal a logic or a recurrent pattern of acts and

---

62Please note that, in some quarters, such a claim is disputed and, at times, it is rejected. In the philosophy of John Locke, it is argued that, if there exists a human nature, this nature is such that, unfortunately, it cannot be known; however, subsequently, in the philosophy of Jean Jacques Rousseau, it is argued there that a human nature is something which does not exist. It is to be regarded as but a fiction. Belief in the existence of human nature is then to be rejected. Hence, as a new point of departure, as we move from this dogmatically stated point of view toward salient conclusions which can be reasonably and rationally drawn as a fitting consequence, a thesis accordingly presents itself to us to the effect that how we exist and live as human beings determines that which would exist for us as our human essence (as some kind of human nature). Simply put as the central thesis of an existentialist type of philosophy: existence precedes essence; our existence determines our essence. From existence we work toward essence. We can make ourselves into whatever we would like to do and be. Through various forms of intervention, we can, for example, select our own sex and perhaps too, through other forms of intervention, we can turn ourselves into some other kind of living being and so cease to live and exist as human beings. Cf. Pierre Manent, *The City of Man*, trans. Marc A. LePain (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1998), p. 138.

63Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 2, 2, 89b36-90a34.

discovery which in turn explains how, in our human cognition, we can move from a condition of knowledge which exists initially at A toward an augmented condition of knowledge which would exist at B.

Two observations merit attention at this point. First, as Aristotle had noticed and as we should also notice, perennially in our learning, within our discovering and knowing, we are perpetually moving from a cognitive condition which exists at A toward a cognitive condition which would exist as B: from some kind of understanding (or some kind of knowledge) that is somehow already given to us because already, about certain things, no questions have to be asked. Nothing more needs to be understood and known. Some understanding is already given to us in a prior *a priori* kind of way and in a manner which immediately points to the relativity or the incompleteness of our human ignorance and, at the same time too, to the relativity or the incompleteness of our human knowledge where, through the understanding and knowledge that we already have about the meaning or the truth of certain things, we can then begin to move through inquiry and questions toward other possible determinations which can begin to know about the being of other things that we have yet to understand and know, or the being of things that we have not understood and known to the degree that we should understand and know them. What we already understand and know always conditions the individual questions that we would like to ask as we move toward new determinations of questions within our individual concrete contexts. Through the genesis and determination of these new questions, specifications of ignorance can be alluded to, known, and identified as unknowns which exist now as known unknowns.

Secondly, with respect to the kind of wonder or curiosity which belongs to us as human beings, the wonder which exists as a species of generating first principle, echoing Plato, as Aristotle observed when entering into a discussion about the science or the study of being as this is given to us in the inquiries that are constitutive of the science of metaphysics: "all human beings *by nature* stretch themselves out toward knowing [my italics]."[64] Appositely and more bluntly: "all men naturally desire to know."[65] An interest in the existence of all things, an interest in understanding that which is the beingness or the existence of all things, is an inclination or an orientation which is rooted in a point of origin which refers to the inherent existence of our human wonder as a species of motivating, existential dynamic. Citing, again, some of Aristotle's own words: "it is owing to their wonder that men both now begin and at the first began to philosophize."[66]

> Attending thus to this wonder in greater detail in terms of how it exists: as experienced thus within ourselves through the inner experience which we have of ourselves, the sense of wonder that we have admits or it knows that we have a sense of our own ignorance that we would like to escape from.[67] By its very nature, our human wonder anticipates that something is to be added to the data of our sensible human experience; something is to be added to the data and content of our human imagination.[68] In

64Aristotle, the first line of the *Metaphysics*, as quoted and translated by Caldecott, *Beauty in the Word*, p. 8.

65Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1, 1, 980a21-24, citing another translation of the same text.

66Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 1, 2, as cited by Sullivan, *Introduction to Philosophy*, p. 3.

67For more information, see also D. C. Schindler, "Giving Cause to Wonder," *Catholicity of Reason*, pp. 163-228.

68J. Michael Stebbins, *The Divine Initiative: Grace, World-Order, and Human Freedom in the*

> wonder, in questioning, our curiosity is "never idle."[69] A cognitive desire exists among other possible desires and interests,[70] and this desire is to be viewed and judged to exist as a pure desire to understand and know. It differs from all irrational forms of curiosity that would want to understand causes which are of lesser importance than those causes which exert a more primary influence in determining the meaning and existence of things which exist as effects that come from causes, stemming from causes.[71]

The existence of this natural human desire, which exists as an appetitive "seeking principle,"[72] accordingly explains why our human knowledge exists in a way which is completely natural and proper to itself, being entirely natural from our human point of view. It is proper and right for us, as human beings, that we should enjoy the kind of knowledge which is proper to us as human beings, a natural knowledge of things that we can rightly acquire and enjoy and which joins us, as human beings, to desired or intended objects which, potentially, could refer to the whole of reality or the whole of being, this whole constituting a world or a universe which would exist as an order of truly existing things. As Plato, Aristotle's teacher, had himself noted in an earlier context (at another time): "wonder is the feeling of a philosopher, and philosophy begins in wonder."[73]

In order then to determine the kind of order which exists thus within the structure of our human cognition, our fundamental point of departure is accordingly our experience of self with respect to the kinds of questions which we find that we are asking now at this time and now at some other time, questions which accordingly function as an internal species of mover or as interior operators that we experience and find within ourselves (within our consciousness of self) in an awareness which knows that, in some way, we are all conscious and alive, exercising a degree of self-government and self-

---

Early Writings of Bernard Lonergan (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), p. 22.

69J. A. Stewart, *The Myths of Plato* (London: Macmillan, 1905), p. 10. As Stewart argues to the effect that the origins of myth and science all lie in the givenness or in the experience of human wonder and curiosity: "'To know the cause' is matter of practical concern to the savage as well as to the civilised man..." Whether we deal with mythological explanations or with scientific explanations, we work with a species of "scientific" curiosity.

70Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 1a2ae, q. 32, a. 8. See also *Summa Theologiae*, 1a2ae, q. 3, a. 8 where Aquinas links our desire for understanding and also our desire for happiness with the kind of desire for understanding which exists among religious believers in a way which directly leads to the emergence of theology as a scientific discipline. According to Aquinas's argument: if we happen to know or believe that God exists, we are not happy until we should know about why or how God exists in the way that he seems to exist for us within the world that is first given to us through our various acts of human sensing. Granted the existence of something which exists, we want to know about how or why it exists. We move from effects to causes. Hence, in our desire for an understanding of divine things, we discover a trajectory that exists within ourselves which, in turn, points to a solution which can only be had if we should speak about some kind of eventual union with God and how, in our being, we can be joined to the kind of being which God has. Cf. Frederick E. Crowe, "The Exigent Mind: Bernard Lonergan's Intellectualism," *Spirit as Inquiry: Studies in Honor of Bernard Lonergan*, ed. Frederick E. Crowe, S.J. (Chicago: Saint Xavier College, 1964), p. 29, n. 17.

71*Summa Theologiae*, 2a2ae, q. 167, a. 1 & ad 3.

72Martin Rhonheimer, *Natural Law and Practical Reason: A Thomist View of Moral Autonomy*, trans. Gerald Malsbary (New York: Fordham University Press, 2000), p. 32.

73Plato, *Theaetetus*, 155, as cited by Sullivan, *Introduction to Philosophy*, p. 3.

control in how we live and exist as human beings:[74] functioning and living thus not merely or only as substances or as inert things but as agents or subjects who can also do certain things at a certain time and who can also receive other kinds of experience at other times that can be given to us from points of origin that exist externally to ourselves with respect to the kind of being which we happen to have and be.

Tersely put then, as we attend to the kind of data and the verification which exists within our interior experience of self and when we look at how Aristotle investigates the nature of scientific inquiry in the context of the *Posterior Analytics*, we find that he reduces all questions to four basic types (four basic species): (1) whether there is an *X*; (2) what is an *X*; (3) whether *X* is *Y*; and (4) why *X* is *Y*.[75] However, if we examine these four questions and as we examine Aristotle's subsequent discussion, we should find that Aristotle reduces these questions to two basic types.[76] In terms of their characteristic objects or their proper terms, two basic types of questions point to the being or the genesis of two basic operations of the mind that differ from each other, operations of the mind also differing from the kind of operation which belongs to our different acts of human sensing. The first basic type of question combines or groups together "What is an X" with "why X is Y."[77] These two questions then reduce to one basic type of question because these questions can only be answered by a proposed or a proffered hypothesis which allegedly grasps and relates a number of distinct unseen elements or parts into a relation that is itself unseen. The relation joins the parts into a distinct unseen whole. To understand what something is, its essence, its being, or its *ousia*,[78] requires an answer or an explanation which can say why something exists in the way that it happens to be and exist. What questions translate into why questions where here *what* means *why*.[79] By way of an example:[80] if we ask "what is a man?", to answer this question we must transpose, rephrase, and say: "why is this a man?" The *this* refers to an experience of material or bodily parts that we can indicate to ourselves and to others through our various acts of sensing and by means of appropriate physical gestures. However, the answer which directly responds to a why can only be known or grasped by us and other persons through an intervening act of understanding which transcends any givens which exist for us by way of our acts of

---

74An oblique reference to the possible strangeness of our human consciousness refers to how, possibly, we can experience two kinds of consciousness within a kind of oneness which belongs to our consciousness of self. One kind refers to the awareness of self that we have prior to the introduction or the advent of some kind of physical or clinical death. The other kind of consciousness refers to the experience of self that, possibly, we can have in the wake of some kind of physical or clinical death. In the transition which allegedly occurs, our self-consciousness perdures. Our awareness of self endures and continues and, in this awareness, a person does not cease to exist or to not believe that he or she is alive although, on the basis of reports that have come to us from persons who have had near-death experiences (NDEs), in the wake of physical clinical death, persons find that they begin to live within a new dimension of existing things (another kind of ontological context). Cf. Robert Spitzer, *The Soul's Upward Yearning Clues to Our Transcendent Nature from Experience and Reason* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2015), pp. 173-203.

75Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 2, 2, 89b36-90a34 as cited by Lonergan, *Verbum*, p. 26, n. 53.

76Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 2, 2, 89b36-90a6; Aquinas, *In Aristotelis libros Posteriorum analyticorum*, 2, 1.

77Lonergan, *Verbum*, p. 26.

78Meynell, "On Being an Aristotelian," *Redirecting Philosophy*, p. 242.

79Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, p. 29.

80Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, pp. 29-30.

sense: hence, by an act of cogitating which exists as an act of understanding or, in other words, by an "insight into sensible data" which can be conceptualized in a way which refers to the being or the hypothesis of an unseen, invisible human *soul*, a soul which, as human, is other than the being of any other kind of soul if, in fact, it is to explain why something is, in fact, a man and not some other kind of thing (whether living or dead).

In the kind of understanding which deals with what and why questions, in the language of Aristotle and Aquinas, this act of the intellect or this act of understanding refers to an act which exists as a "simple apprehension" ["the first action of the intellect is the understanding of...things, by which it conceives what something is"][81] although, in the context of his own language and the kind of analysis which he uses to effect a transposition which moves from the conceptuality of Aristotle to a conceptuality which is the product of his own understanding, Bernard Lonergan prefers to speak about an apprehension which exists as a direct act of understanding. If, on the other hand however, we should choose to refer to these kinds of acts as abstractive acts of understanding, we would then work with a designation which refers to how these kinds of acts exist as acts of abstraction within our understanding where, here, an intellectual or a formal component is removed or it is distinguished and separated from that which exists as an empirical or material component. The term of this kind of intellectual act is to be identified as a meaning or as an intelligibility that is now known for what it is as the term or as the content of our understanding. Term accompanies act. It comes with act. It exists as a meaning or an intelligibility, relative to its point of origin (as it comes to us from a particular, given act of understanding), although, as a species or type of being, it can be conceptualized or, more directly and honestly, as as species of being, it has been conceptualized within an order of metaphysical terms which speaks about how, through inquiry, the content or the term of an act of direct understanding is something which exists as a form. The language which exists about forms (as we find this within the corpus of Aristotle's writings) is to be understood as a transposition: it transposes the cognitive type of language which prefers to speak about ideas and, from there, it moves toward the being of ideas as we move from the order of our human knowing toward the order of existing things as this exists within the order of metaphysics (more about this later). Where, for instance, Plato speaks about separately existing Ideas, Aristotle prefers to speak about Forms which have an eternity of their own (they exist as idealities) even if or as they exist within the being of sensible, changing things which, as sensible things (as bodies), are directly known by us in a way which refers to our different acts of human sensing.

> Summarizing the gist of Aristotle's thesis in a manner which points to the presence of a qualification within the extent of Aristotle's understanding: "it is the form of a thing which is in the intellect and not the thing itself," where, within this context, if we should work with both a metaphysical way of speaking and a metaphorical way of speaking, we would speak about the migration or the transference of a form from one location to another: through its being understood or its being grasped by us in an act of understanding, a form is invisibly moved from the interiority of an embodied, material thing or the interiority of an experienced, sensed body into the interiority of an understanding intellect, an understanding mind.[82] Hence, Aristotle does not speak about a simple identity between the being of our intellects (the being of our understanding)

81Aquinas, *In Aristotelis libros Posteriorum analyticorum*, 1, 4.

82Giorgio Pini, "Scotus on Concepts," unpublished paper, p. 3; John Milbank and Catherine Pickstock, *Truth in Aquinas* (London and New York: Routledge, 2001), p. 5.

> and the being of a thing which is known by our understanding. Instead, in attending to a conception of knowing which thinks about knowing in term of a cognitional form of identity between a knower and that which is known, an identity which exists however as an intellectually intended identity, Aristotle is presented to us or he is seen as the originator of this viewpoint within the philosophy of human cognition.[83] Our human knowing exists not by way of some kind of confrontation that exists between a would be knower and something which is known but by way of a species of identity which exists between a knower and that which is being known.

Moving on then in the context of Aristotle's analysis, the second basic type of question groups together "whether there is an X" with "whether X is Y": hence, questions about truth. Is this so? Is this true? What possible truth has been grasped by us through the reception of a prior act of understanding as this has been given to us by a prior, direct act of understanding? This distinct type of question can only be answered by pronouncing a verdict of some kind, saying either "yes" or "no," true or false,[84] or by deciding not to make any kind of decision or judgment. Hence, from this, the second basic operation of our human minds exists as the making of a rational judgment (in Aristotle's language, signified as an act of "composition or division").[85] In other words, in an affirmative judgment, we say or declare that

---

83Linus Kpalap, "The Knower and the Known," unpublished paper given at Sogang University, Seoul, Korea, June 3, 2010, p. 7. See also Aristotle, *De Anima*, 3, 4, 429. Please note, however, that if we delve into the earlier history of Greek philosophy as it existed prior to Socrates, in the cognitional philosophy of Empedocles of Agrigentum (*ca*. 490-430 BC), we can find words and statements which, in effect, point toward the principle of identity as this exists with respect to the dynamics of our human cognition. Bluntly put or simply put: "like is known by like." "All cognition is of like by like." Cf. Elizabeth A. Murray, "The Classical Question of Immortality in Light of Lonergan's Explicit Metaphysics," *Lonergan Workshop* 25 (2013): p. 271; W. K. C. Guthrie, *Presocratic tradition from Parmenides to Democritus*, vol. 2, pp. 228-231. Although Empedocles did not distinguish between acts of sensing and thinking (according to Aristotle's criticism of him), two fragments forming a lengthy quotation say that knowing occurs through an identity or a sameness between what exists as a precondition within a knower and that which exists outside a knower in something which is being known by a given knower. Without some kind of identity between internal and external conditions, there can be no knowing, no proper acts of human cognition. Citing some of Empedocles's words as they have come down to us:

> With earth we see earth, with water water, with air the divine air, but with fire destructive fire, with Love Love and with Strife we see dismal Strife; for out of these are all things formed and fitted together, and with these they think and feel pleasure and pain.

Hence, citing Aristotle's paraphrase of Empedocles's position: "knowledge is by similars, ignorance by dissimilars." Cf. Guthrie, p. 229.

84Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 2, 2, 89b36-90a34; Aquinas, *In Aristotelis libros Posteriorum analyticorum*, 2, 1.

85Lonergan, *Verbum*, p. 61; *Incarnate Word*, p. 391; Thomas Crean and Christopher Friel, *Metaphysics and the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas* (Birmingham, England: Maryvale Institute, 2011), p. 15. Less ambiguously with respect to the meaning of judgment and the effects or the consequences of judgment: "To know the...relation of conformity [between one's self as a knower and a thing that is

something is so (something is true and not false); and, conversely, in a negative judgment, we would say or declare that something is not so (something is false or something is not true). To distinguish the intelligibility that comes to us from our acts of direct understanding from the intelligibility that comes to us from our acts of reflective understanding, within the order of reflection which can exist for us within the kind of reflection and science which exists within the study of metaphysics, instead of form, we can possibly speak about the kind of being which exists as act. Act would succeed form as truth succeeds the being of a meaning or being of an idea. In this context thus, that which exists as a species of conceptual or formal being would be succeeded by something which exists as a species of real being if we should choose to speak in this way about what, in fact, happens when we move from the order of speculative understanding which exists in our "simple apprehensions" (or our "direct understanding") toward the kind of understanding which seems to exist if we should refer to a real difference which exists between the kind of understanding which exists in "simple apprehension" and the kind of understanding which exists in the reflections of judgment ("simple apprehension" versus "complex apprehension"). If our context is an understanding of human cognition and a study of this cognition which would exist as a science of its own, acts of reflective understanding have a nature of their own. They differ from acts of direct understanding because of a difference which obtains between the kind of operation which exists in acts of reflective understanding versus the kind of operation which exists in our acts of direct understanding. While acts of direct understanding engage in acts of abstraction, acts of reflective understanding attend to how we have moved from acts of sensing to acts of understanding and if there exists any evidence which points to the truth of a meaning which has been grasped and understood. Our self-reflection and an experience of difference within our consciousness of self points to a real distinction which must exist between acts of direct understanding as this exists in "simple apprehensions" and acts of reflective understanding which would allegedly exist through the being of "complex apprehensions."

> As a species of qualification, however, about what has been said so far, please note thus that, in the kind of analysis which we find in Aristotle and also in the manner of his conceptualization and language, in our acts of judgment, a dual nature is distinguished or two natures are indicated in a way which seems to juxtapose one nature with another. Two natures exist instead of one nature. A synthetic, constructive element is alluded to, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, an affirmative, declarative element. Hence, questions exist (later questions were posed) which asked if Aristotle was successful in clearly distinguishing between the being of these two different aspects (existing as two distinct elements, each having its own distinct nature).[86] Did he, in fact, clearly distinguish between acts of direct understanding and acts of reflective understanding which exist as acts of judgment since, in Aristotle, judgment engages in two different kinds of tasks. On the one hand, allegedly within our judgments, (1) a composition or a putting together of different concepts occurs or, on the other hand, a separation of concepts when we realize that some concepts should not be combined or joined with

known] is nothing else than to judge it so to be or not to be in reality." As Aquinas works with the kind of language, the kind of conceptuality, that he finds in Aristotle in order to speak about how judgment exists as a second fundamental operation of our human minds: "this is to compose and divide, and hence the intellect knows truth only in composing and dividing by its judgment." Cf. Aquinas, *Peri Hermeneias*, 1, 3, 9, as cited by Peter Hoenen, *Reality and Judgment according to St. Thomas*, trans. Henry F. Tiblier (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1952), pp. 4-5.

86Lonergan, *Verbum*, pp. 61-62.

each other. If an act of direct understanding (which, as noted, Aristotle conceptualizes as an act of "simple apprehension") moves through the instrumentality of an imagined fertile, apt image (existing as a phantasm) toward a single, distinct concept or a definition which expresses the fruit or the grasp of one's prior act of understanding (in Aristotle's understanding of the nature or the intelligibility of all our direct acts of understanding as we move from the being and the order of sense to the order and the being of understanding: through images which exist as phantasms: *ta men oun eidê to noêtikon en tois phantasmasi noei*; the "intellect grasps forms in images;[87] "understanding...understands the forms in the images;"[88] "insight is into *phantasm*"[89]), *a fortiori*, if we should speak in this way about the being of a "simple apprehension," then, to a greater degree, if we are to speak about how two or more concepts can be put together to reveal a greater unity or a link that exists between these concepts (leading to a larger, more general concept), then, in order to identify and to distinguish this species of intellectual act, we should or we must speak about the being of a "complex apprehension." These exist allegedly as judgments. These judgments introduce an order which should exist among our ideas and concepts. However, if, for us, the intellectual object is not simply the apprehension of a conceptual complex unity but if, in fact, (2) it is an understanding which wants to declare or know about the reality or the truth of one or more concepts (whether we should speak about simple concepts or about complex concepts), then, within this larger, greater, more demanding context, in Aristotle, a second understanding of judgment presents itself to us in terms of how it seeks to posit a relation or a synthesis which has been grasped by us in our prior acts of understanding. The object here is not essentially a synthesis, the apprehension or the grasp of a synthesis which points to a higher or a wider understanding of things but, instead, the taking of an already understood synthesis and further acts which would work toward an act of understanding which can conclude or move toward a declaration of its reality or a declaration of its truth (or which can deny the factuality of its reality or the factuality of its truth). This is so. This is not so. Either way, in affirmation or negation, a truth is known and it is grasped by us as known. In our awareness, a truth is known in terms of its reasonableness or cogency: hence, its being, its reality. The consciousness or experience that we have of evidence points to the being or the reality of a truth and, as an effect which would thus follow from this, with Aquinas, we would say about ourselves that "knowledge exists as one of the effects of truth" [*cognitio est quidam veritatis effectus*].[90] The one comes from the other.

In Aristotle thus, depending on which passages or texts are being studied, a clear distinction does not exist between that which exists as understanding and that which exists as judgment (acts of direct understanding versus acts of reflective understanding)

87Aristotle, *De Anima*, 3, 7, 431b, as cited by Sala, *Lonergan and Kant*, p. 161, n. 72.

88Aristotle, *De Anima*, 3, 7, 431b, as cited and translated by Patrick H. Byrne, "Situating Insight," *Divyadaan: Journal of Philosophy & Education* vol. 28, no. 1 (2017): 5, citing Bernard Lonergan's *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*. In other words, understanding or insight is into phantasms. Understanding emerges from phantasms or apt images and not from prior concepts or prior conceptions which exist within our minds.

89Bernard Lonergan, as cited by Patrick Byrne, "Situating Insight," p. 5.

90Aquinas, *De veritate*, q. 1, a. 1, as cited by Sala, *Lonergan and Kant*, p. 147, n. 71.

> because judgment, in the language of "composition and division," resembles acts of direct understanding in terms of the unities which are being grasped and understood by them (by our acts of understanding): unities which transcend pluralities and multiplicities as these exist initially among the givens of the data of our sense perception. However, in Aristotle, the being of judgments is such that they also seek to determine if a correspondence exists between that which exists as a form of mental synthesis within ourselves and that which exists as a species of real synthesis within the being of truly existing things (the being of truly existing objects). A real distinction accordingly exists between the type of answer that is given to this kind of question and the type of answer which is given to a question which asks about how concepts can be related to each other in ways that could lead to the understanding and eventually the expression of a new, more general concept.
>
> On the basis then of this real distinction and as a species of new first principle, in the later work of Aquinas and also in the later work of Bernard Lonergan, clarifications were introduced into the thinking and the conceptuality of Aristotle's analysis in a manner which attempted to introduce degrees of clarity that had not been too obvious to anyone or to most persons who had attempted earlier to read into the corpus of Aristotle's philosophy in order to find, within it, a coherent understanding about how things exist within the reality of the world within which we all live (a reality which includes the kind of being which we have and which we are as human beings where our kind of being includes the kind of knowing which belongs to us as human beings and which does not belong to other kinds of living being). From an incoherent understanding about the nature of our human judgment (from an incoherent understanding about the nature of our human cognition), we can thus wonder if, for some in the subsequent history of reflection within philosophy, the result has been a defective, incoherent understanding about the nature of existing things where, in metaphysics, we turn to this science in order to move toward a comprehensive or a general understanding about the nature of all existing things *qua* the nature of being in general as it applies to all things which enjoy some form of real existence. What can be implied about the nature of our world if our point of departure is a particular belief or a particular understanding about the nature of our human knowing, an understanding which could be lacking in the degree of rationality which should belong to it?[91]

Moving on thus from here, with respect *principally* to judgment and on the basis of the kind of rationality which would seem to exist in our different acts of judgment (which exist as acts of understanding), we can begin then to understand in a more exact manner why the kind of realism which belongs to Aristotle's understanding of human cognition is such that it can be differentiated and referred to in terms which speak about how it exists as a critical form of realism, Aristotle existing (reputedly) as the father of critical realism.[92] Talk about a critical form of realism immediately suggests or points to a naïve form of realism since the meaning of one kind of realism immediately suggests the other and so, if it said or if it is argued that our human knowing is characterized by a

---

91Randall, *Aristotle*, p. 6.

92Anthony M. Matteo, *Quest for the Absolute The Philosophical Vision of Joseph Maréchal* (DeKalb, Illinois: Northern Illinois University Press, 1992), p. 11, citing a conclusion that comes to us from the thought of Joseph Maréchal.

critical form of realism, we can understand why, as a species, naïve realism is not to be attributed to the kind of cognition which properly belongs to us as human beings. It does not mesh or jive with the nature of our human cognition and all the operations which properly belong to it although a naïve form of realism can be ascribed to the functioning of our human cognition if we should hold to a truncated understanding of our human cognition or if we should advert to truncated forms of cognitional activity as these can exist among us within the lives of other human beings (persons that we may know or sometimes ourselves when we think back and reflect on cognitional operations that we have been engaging in). By way of a fuller explanation:

> To understand how we can move from a thesis about naïve realism to a thesis about critical realism, with Aristotle, let us distinguish between our acts of sensing and our acts of understanding. Suppose at the start (as a premiss) that an act of sensing is unlike an act of understanding. Whether we move from an act of understanding toward an act of sensing or from an act of sensing toward an act of understanding, one does what the other is not able to do. However if we should suppose that understanding is akin to what we do in our various acts of human sensing, then, if we attend to our acts of human sensing (given allegedly their primacy) and if we should want to know if something is truly known as real (if it truly exists as a reality), it would seem that we would have to engage in the following simple three step procedure. First, (1) we would look at "reality" as this exists outside of ourselves (as it somehow exists for us in an external kind of way) and then, secondly, (2) we would look back at an idea or a datum that somehow exists within ourselves (within our cognitive consciousness of self): possibly within our minds or possibly within our perceptions as we experience these perceptions. At this point, we do not distinguish between that which exists within our minds and that which exists within our perceptions. The idea or the datum that we have on our side, as it exists within our minds or our perception, allegedly reflects or it should reflect the content of that which we have been seeing or that which we have been sensing through our various acts of human sensing. Then, third and lastly, (3) we would compare these two contents with each other to see if there is a fit between them (a congruence between the two). The realism or the reality of our human knowing is explained or it is reduced here to a criterion which comes to us from the kind of performance or the kind of activity that belongs to our different acts of human sensing, a realism which is then taken and applied to all of our cognitive acts. Hence, within this tradition of philosophic analysis, we have the species of realism which exists for us as a specification of naïve realism since, within this context, no real distinction is drawn between the extroverted, empirical kind of realism that properly belongs to our various acts of human sensing and the introverted, self-reflective kind of realism which properly belongs to us in our various acts of understanding (as, interiorily or inwardly, through the asking of various questions, our acts of direct understanding move us or they dispose us toward the kind of reception which exists in our experiencing and receiving acts of reflective understanding that could be given to us and then, from this, the consequent emergence of judgments and evaluations which would then distinguish between the being of notions and ideas which happen to be interesting and arresting although false and these same notions or ideas which happen to be true). Naive forms of realism are to be associated with acts of human sensing; critical forms of realism, with acts of understanding (principally when these acts of understanding exist as the reflective kind

of understanding which exists in our acts of human judgment).[93]

To sum up then, on the basis of Aristotle's philosophy of inquiry in science and philosophy, two distinct kinds of questions accordingly intend two distinct kinds of object which, in turn, point to the being of two distinct kinds of cognitive, mental operation (grounding the being of two distinct kinds of mental operation). Through the mediation of our questions, distinct acts go with distinct objects. We say that distinct acts intend distinct objects. Always, with respect to how these two acts differ from each other, the kind of distinction which exists between them is never to be understood as a species of separation or as a disjunction between them since simple apprehension or direct understanding, as a first species of intellectual act, conditions or we say that it leads us toward acts of reflective

---

93For a fuller understanding of naïve realism and that which exists as critical realism, see Étienne Gilson, *Methodical Realism*, trans. Philip Trower (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2011), p. 21; Matteo, *Philosophical Vision of Maréchal*, pp. 8-12. As Matteo proceeds initially to argue his case (p. 20), in the opposition which exists between the kind of knowing which exists in ultra-realism and the kind of knowing which exists in nominalism, in ultra-realism we have a way of speaking or a philosophy which is grounded in the beliefs and assumptions of naïve realism - a way of speaking which holds that forms, essences, or universals can only be known by us in a manner which exists apart from our acts of understanding, acts of understanding which can belong to us as cogitating human subjects.

Through another form of contrast however, which can add to our understanding of naïve realism in terms of how naïve realism differs from the specifics of critical realism, in his *An Introduction to Bernard Lonergan* (Victoria: Sid Harta Publishers, 2010), pp. 172-174, Peter Beer distinguishes between critical realism, on the one hand, and the being of dogmatic realism, on the other hand. Critical realism and dogmatic realism both admit, as a cognitional fact, that reality is known by us through the mediation of our true judgments (respectively speaking as we move from one type of realism to the other: in critical realism, judgments refer to a knowledge of reality which is given to each of us or which is proportionate to our human acts of cognition; in dogmatic realism, other judgments refer to a knowledge of divine things that is given to us and which is mediated down to us by way of our submission and our adherence to the truth of the official teaching of the Catholic Church as this refers to truths of divine revelation and an order of real objects that is then known by us through the truths of faith which we profess, accept, and believe as confessing Catholics). Cf. Giovanni B. Sala, "1. The Encyclical Letter "Fides et ratio": A Service to Truth," *Vernuft und Glaube*, p. 47, n, 7. However, in a manner which differs from the kind of reasons that can be given by the Church's official teaching and through the obedience and submission of dogmatic realists, critical realists can give reasons which point to the validity of judgments which exist in an individual, personal way. While naive realists point to sensible configurations of one kind or another as their point of individual reference, critical realists point to reasons or understandings that have been understood by them and which they have put into communicable concepts.

Sounding another note: with respect to a positive relation which can exist between differing admixtures of naïve and dogmatic realism, in order to move from the order of understanding and belief into the kind of order which is conditioned by parameters and variables that refer to space and time (terms or experiences which belong to our acts of human sensing), dogmatic realists will picture or imagine that which they believe and accept as the truths of their religious faith and, as a consequence, this picturing and imagining will point to the kind of imagery that we typically find within the visual

understanding which would exist as judgments, these judgments existing as a second species of intellectual act which, in turn, when given, shapes or imparts to our human knowing a unity and a completeness that, otherwise, it would not have as we move from our initial experiencing that is given to us in our acts of sense toward the kind of experiencing that is given to us in our acts of understanding.

The interrelation which exists thus between our acts of sensing and our acts of understanding accordingly points to a species of mutual, reciprocal priority or a species of mutual, reciprocal causality which best explains how our sensing, understanding, and judging exist as cognitive acts which interact and relate with each other in a way which points to the being of a complex type of intelligible unity. These acts all rely on each other in a context which moves from our initial acts of sensing toward our later acts of understanding and then, in judgment, back toward new acts of human sensing if evidence within our acts and data of sensing is to be found and alluded to for any affirmations of being that are desired through the kind of reflection which belongs to us in the making of prospective judgments.[94] To the degree that our human understanding begins with our acts of human sensing and the kind of data that is given to us through our various acts of human sensing and to the degree too that our acts of understanding find meaning within this data of sense, to the same degree also, our acts of reflective understanding must return to our acts of sensing and the kind of data which belong to our acts of human sensing if we are to know about the relevance or the bite which should allegedly exist within the grasp of our initial acts of understanding: the groundedness or the rootedness which should allegedly exist and which must exist if a given act of understanding is to be known by us as a truthful or telling act of understanding or if it is to be judged (more moderately) as an apt or likely act of understanding (the best that we can possibly have within a given, restricted context). Whether true or apt, whatever, if a given judgment concludes to the being of truth or the being of aptness or suitability, then that which is known by us through a direct act of understanding is said to sufficiently explain or to correctly explain why something exists in the way that it happens to exist (according to how we have understood it) because, between our acts of sensing and our acts of understanding, a positive connection is to be alluded to, identified, and communicated to others in a way that should elicit the same kind of verification and confirmation which exists when other persons attempt to make the same judgments which we have also made or judgments that, perhaps, others have also made.

With respect to how direct acts of understanding lead to reflective acts of understanding and the nature of reflective acts of understanding: always, in our judgments, by the kind of self-reflection which exists in judgment, we refer to how, in a given case and context, we have moved from the experience of a datum in our sensing toward the experience of an idea in our understanding. If, through our first acts of inquiry, we have moved or are moving from the givens of sense toward an apt image that we have imaginatively fashioned from the prior givens of sense and which, in turn, points to a meaning or an understanding which is being suggested to us by the pregnancy or the suggestiveness of an entertained apt image (the order which exists within a pivotal apt image pointing to another order which is to be

---

arts which officially the Church encourages for religious reasons that directly relate to her sense of mission and purpose: (1) in order to express what she believes and professes for the sake of the good which can be encouraged among her own members and believers and (2) in order to move the minds and hearts of other persons who might not know about the truths of the Church's Catholic faith, stirring them in their desires, perhaps creating a new openness or a new willingness that they had not existed before but which, now, they can begin to have.

94Meynell, "On Being an Aristotelian," *Redirecting Philosophy*, p. 258.

grasped by us in a direct act of understanding), similarly, through the kind of inquiry which exists in our subsequent acts of reflection, we move from the givens of our understanding toward the givens that can be found by us in new possible acts of human sensing: either adverting to our prior acts of human sensing (possibly repeating them in a new way) or possibly moving and engaging in other new acts of human sensing which, before, had not been known or experienced. The order which exists within the apprehension of an initial act of understanding (a direct act of understanding) points to a chain of reasoning that has moved from prior acts of sense through to direct acts of understanding and, if, through our self-reflection, we can identify this chain of reasoning as we can find it and as we can retrace it within the data of our cognitional awareness of self, from this, we can be directed toward new acts and data of human sensing which would exist for us as apprehensions of evidence that can be specified in a manner which relates it to an idea whose truthfulness is being shown and known, either now with a degree of certainty or with a degree of probability which points to the likeliness of a given truth.

By way of a useful illustration, please distinguish here between the kind of evidence which initially led to a Copernican understanding of the universe in the 16th Century and the acceptance of a heliocentric view of the world in the 17th Century and the kind of evidence that emerged in the 19th Century which served to turn the heliocentrism of the world into a truth which is no longer probable because it is now known with a necessity and a certitude which points to its undeniability.

> To understand how a transition can occur between determinations of probability as these can exist within our scientific judgments and determinations of certitude which can also exist within our judgments, see Thomas S. Kuhn's *The Copernican Revolution: Planetary Astronomy in the Development of Western Thought*. Prior to the 19th Century, it was not possible to take measurements from the earth to a given star or other planetary object which could determine if, in some way, the earth has moved, relative to the taking of readings that are taken at different times. If the earth is stationary, no difference in one's angle of vision should be possible. But, if the earth moves and is not stationary, one's angle of vision should vary if, at one time, one attends to a planetary object and if one then attends to the same object at another time. Readings which could determine differences in angle only became possible in the 19th Century and this development or progress in the kind of evidence which we can have at any given time points to differences in rational ground which can exist within our judgments. An ingress or a collection of probabilities points to an experience of judgment which can be experienced as certain (virtually certain; hence, entirely rational) although, on the other hand and strictly speaking, a real distinction must always exist between that which exists as a probability and that which exists as a certainty even if we must admit that, within the data of our cognitive experience, an accumulation of probabilities will always tend to lead us toward apprehensions of truth and knowledge that are regarded as certain and not probable.

In either case thus, whether we should deal with probabilities or with certainties, perhaps for the first time, in a reflective act of understanding (in a judgment), the truth of an idea is being known by us at a given time and this change in us immediately points to a growth in the understanding and knowledge which now personally belongs to us as human knowers. Or, in other words, within this context of judgment, if we should refer to the kind of personal experience which exists within our newly emerging, immanently generated knowledge of things as this exists for us for the first time, the truth of

an idea is not known simply because or merely because it is believed to be true or because it is assumed or presumed to be true if we are then to ask new questions that could lead us to newer acts of understanding. Its truth is now known by us in an inward fashion because of an intellectual kind of proceeding which exists within ourselves in a judgment, a proceeding which properly belongs to the being of our rational consciousness and the experience that we have of this same consciousness (a consciousness which differs from our sensible, sensing consciousness and from the kind of intellectual consciousness which belongs to how we experience the reception of an idea that has been grasped by us in an act of understanding). As apt images trigger acts of direct understanding, apprehensions of evidence trigger acts of reflective understanding which posit the reality or the truth of an understood idea. In the kind of proceeding which exists in the proceeding or in the emergence of an inner awareness which exists as the revelation of a conclusion, a realization or a verdict of some kind is interiorily uttered in terms of how we are to speak to ourselves about that which we have come to understand and know.

In the general scheme of things which accordingly exists within Aristotle's understanding of human cognition, everything begins with the givens of sense and a first species of conscious act which exists as our acts of human sensing, a contention which can be proved if, with Aristotle, we attend to how we experience ourselves as we engage in our various acts of human cognition. In our experience of self, we should notice that our knowing always begins with our differing acts of human sensing and the givens that belong to our differing acts of human sensing. Bluntly put in the kind of language which Aristotle uses: "if one perceived nothing one would learn and understand nothing."[95] Art [*technē*] and science [*epistēmē*] "arise from sense-perception,"[96] from an apprehension of particulars in sense perception since, from these particulars, from our understanding, we can then move toward something which exists as a general principle. Citing a simple example that comes to us from Aristotle: in the matter of our observations, looking about, we notice that a skilled pilot is the best pilot of a moving ship and then, in another context, we also notice that a skilled charioteer is always the best charioteer to manage and drive a chariot. Hence, on the basis of an initial experience of these particulars, we can surmise and move toward a species of general conclusion or a general principle which would simply say that a skilled man is always the best person to have to do any particular activity.[97] Apprehensions of particularity yield to apprehensions of generality in an orientation and a shift that points to our acts and data of human sensing as a fundamental point of departure for the kind of order which belongs to all the acts of our human cognition since, as Aristotle argues, "if some perception is wanting, it is necessary for some understanding to be [also] wanting."[98] From our experience and the induction of

---

95Aristotle, *De Anima*, 432a6, tr. Hugh Lawson-Tancred (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986), p. 210, quoted in Tim Lynch, "Human Knowledge: Passivity, Experience, and Structural Actuation: An Approach to the Problem of the A Priori," *Method: Journal of Lonergan Studies* 17 (1999): 142. This same passage is translated by J. A. Smith in *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*, ed. Jonathan Barnes (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1984) as "no one can learn or understand anything in the absence of sense."

96Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 2, 19, 100a5-11, trans. Hugh Tredennick (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989), p. 259.

97Aristotle, *Topics*, 1, 1; 100a25-100b23; 1, 12; 105a10-19, as cited by Berman, *Law and Revolution*, pp. 133-134, citing Richard McKeon, ed., *The Basic Works of Aristotle* (New York: 1941), p. 188; p. 198.

98Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 1, 17, 81a38; Lynch, p. 142, n. 31. See also Michael P. Maxwell, Jr., "Lonergan's Critique of Aristotle's Notion of Science," *Lonergan Workshop: Lonergan's*

particulars and only from this induction, only then can we move toward a possible apprehension of universal truths although, as Aristotle notes in the context and manner of his analysis, "it is impossible to get an induction without perception [without our acts of perception which exist as our acts of human sensing]."[99]

In another way of speaking which points to how, in Aristotle, a transition moves from the order of human description to the order of human explanation, if we should want to go into detail about the kind of knowing which initially exists in our different acts of human sensing according to the way of thinking and speaking that comes to us from various texts which belong to the corpus of Aristotle's writings, it can be noticed that, in his *Metaphysics*, Aristotle reiterates a thesis which says that our knowledge of particulars comes to us from the kind of knowing which exists within our different acts of human sensing. To us, from them, we have "the most authoritative knowledge of particulars."[100] Sense knows particulars in a manner which refers to how they exist in an external outward manner (given the extroversion which essentially belongs to our acts of human sensing when objects are perceived to exist in a way which is somehow external to us in our being as sensing subjects). We think here about the being of descriptive traits which exist as descriptive properties or which exist as descriptive conjugates. In the kind of language that comes to us from the Aristotelian tradition, these traits exist as "external accidents." In his Latin, Aquinas speaks about *exteriorum accidentium*.[101] Examples which can be cited refer to how we experience certain things in terms of their "whiteness," their "sweetness," their "hardness," and so on and so forth.[102]

From sense thus and as a perpetuation of everything which is known in sense and which belongs to sense, from all our different acts of human sensing, as a later, subsequent point of departure, everything else follows in terms of our acts of memory and recollection and, from our memory and recollection, an anticipation of how things should be or what we will possibly find:[103] we can grow in the extent of our life experience and in the reach and depth of our practical knowledge and wisdom; we can acquire technological skills and knowhow; and we can move toward the possibility of a form of scientific knowledge that is only interested in understanding the truth of things before any other questions can arise about how we should respond to the truth of things that we have come to understand and know.[104]

To explain these matters in a manner which attempts to move from the order of description toward a way of speaking which proffers a species of suitable explanation (an adequate understanding): in the *Confessions* of St. Augustine, St. Augustine speaks about these categories of Aristotle in a way which reveals their descriptive, anticipative, heuristic character as this can be derived by how we can analyze our ordinary linguistic usage in terms of how subjects and verbs relate to each other (how they can be said to relate to each other). From an understanding of grammar and the kind of order or the kind of structure which exists in our human speech, from there, we can move toward a species of predication

---

Openness: Polymorphism, Postmodernism, and Religion, vol. 18, ed. Fred Lawrence (Boston: Lonergan Institute, 2005): 161.

99Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 1, 18, 81b1-6.

100Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1, 981b10-1. See also William B. Stevenson, "The Problem of Trinitarian Processions in Thomas's *Roman Commentary*," *The Thomist* 64 (2000): 621-622.

101Aquinas, *De Veritate*, q. 10, a. 6, ad 2; 2, p. 29; *Summa Contra Gentiles*, 4, 11, 15.

102Sullivan, *Introduction to Philosophy*, p. 54.

103Aquinas, *De Veritate*, q. 10, a. 2.

104Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1, 1, 980a22-982a2.

that can be described in terms which would refer to the kind of description which exists for us as scientific description and how, possibly, from the givens of a scientific description, we can then move toward the givens or the order of a scientific explanation. Scientific explanation is preceded by scientific description, one good conditioning the emergence of a second good. Quoting own Augustine's words as they come to us from the text of the *Confessions*:

> The book [*The Ten Categories* of Aristotle] seemed to me to speak clearly enough of substances, such as a man is, and of what are in them, such as a man's figure; of what quality he is; his stature; how many feet tall he is; his relationships, as whose brother he is; where he is placed; when he was born; whether he stands or sits; whether he is shod with shoes or armed; whether he does something or has something done to him; and the innumerable things that are found in these nine categories, of which I have set down some examples, or in the category of substance.[105]

In his *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, in the context of his own day, in a manner which resembles the teaching of Augustine, Bernard Lonergan speaks about Aristotle's ten categories in a way which also attests to their heuristic descriptive character:

> A naturalist will assign the genus, species, and instance (substance) of an animal, its size and weight (quantity), its color, shape, abilities, propensities (quality), its similarities to other animals and its differences from them (relation), its performance and susceptibilities (action and passion), its habitat and seasonal changes (place and time), its mode of motion and rest (posture), and its possession of such items as claws, talons, hooves, fur, feathers, horns (habit).[106]

However, in his *Understanding and Being*, an explanation is given about how Aristotle could have arrived at the categories that he, in fact, gave in the listing which he provides within his *Ten Categories*, an understanding that we can replicate within the context of our own personal experience:

> We arrive at Aristotle's categories most simply by going into the woods, meeting animals, and asking, What kind of an animal is this? How big is it? What is its color? What relations does it have? and so on. They are categories of descriptive knowledge, and descriptive knowledge is science in a preliminary stage.[107]

In his logical treatise, the *Categories*, sometimes cited as the *Ten Categories*, after distinguishing between a knowledge of the meanings of words and a knowledge of judgments that are made with the help of words or through the use of words, in, allegedly, an exhaustive set of 10 categories, Aristotle lists 10 general items in speech which we can use to define any given thing or all manner of things. These consist of substance (a thing or a thingness which exists as the primary or basic category, all

---

105Augustine, *Confessions*, 4, 28, as cited in *The Confessions of St. Augustine*, trans. John K. Ryan (New York: Doubleday, 1960), p. 110.

106Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*, p. 420.

107Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *Understanding and Being: The Halifax Lectures on Insight*, eds. Elizabeth A. Morelli and Mark D. Morelli; rev and aug. by Frederick E. Crowe with the collaboration of Elizabeth A. Morelli, Mark D. Morelli, Robert M. Doran, and Thomas V. Daly (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000), p. 199.

other categories referring to it, and 9 accidents (attributes or conjugates) which belong or which inhere within the being of a given substance or thing. They determine that which is a substance or a thing as it exists objectively within the being of a larger, extra-mental world (the world of things which exists beyond our own thinking and understanding), substance being the primary category that all else supposes and presupposes. Accidents consist of: quantity, quality, relation (for example, "He is a father"), place, time or date, position, state (for example, "He is armed"), action, and passion. These categories all possess an "external" ontological aspect (they are endowed with an ontological significance and determination) and so, as we have already noted in the context of Aristotle's realist understanding of human cognition, they are not to be understood as referring to some kind of purely logical intra-mental subjective schema as this can exist within us or as it allegedly exists within the data or the experience of ourselves in our experience of human thinking and knowing.

With respect to the kind of difference which exists between a substance and any accidents or categories which can apply to it in ways that can indicate what kind of substance exists in a given context, because accidents come and go with respect to how a given thing or substance exists, for this reason on this basis, in Aristotle, a real distinction (as opposed to a material or linguistic difference and an ideational, conceptual difference) exists between the nature or the intelligibility of a thing or substance and the nature or the intelligibility of an accident.[108] In other words, the kind of reality which belongs to one is not the kind of reality which belongs to the other. Compared to the being of that which exists as accidental attributes or as accidental events, the nature or the intelligibility of a thing or a substance is something which tends to endure through time and space. It does not come and go as accidents come and go (things or substances are stable, relative to the being of accidents) although, with respect to the being of accidental properties, proper accidents in their being are to be distinguished from the being of incidental accidents. By attending to the nature of a given thing and by understanding the nature of a given thing, we can begin to understand why some accidents are to be regarded as normal and proper to it (they exist as substantial accidents) and why other accidents are to be regarded as incidental or as purely circumstantial. For instance, the having of bodily hair for human beings is a proper accident (it is a proper attribute for us) although, possibly, a human being can exist in a way which is without any hair. The absence of hair points to the presence of a defect: a nature which is defective versus a nature which is intact and healthy. But, on the other hand, hair color, relative to the being of a substance or thing, is an attribute or an accident which is not proper or essential to it (it exists as a circumstantial accident) although, in relation to the being or the givenness of our bodily hair, in this case, it would be a proper or an essential attribute. It is a proper accident. The kind of relation which exists between one thing and another thing (a given accident or attribute as it pertains to this other accident or attribute) determines how accidents are to classified and understood in terms of the nature of their importance (their rating).

However, when Aristotle moves from an account of descriptive categories toward an understanding of science which thinks in terms of *causes* and the necessity of a knowledge which should always think in terms of an order of complementary causes that are distinct from each other (material, formal, instrumental, and final causes;[109] causes which distinguish between the givens and terms of sense and the givens and terms of understanding), he moves from a common sense kind of knowledge toward a

---

108Bernard J. F. Lonergan, *The Triune God: Systematics*, trans. Michael G. Shields, eds. Robert M. Doran and H. Daniel Monsour (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), p. 193.

109Aristotle, *Physics*, 2, 3-5; *Metaphysics*, 1, 3-7, as cited by McCarthy, *Authenticity as Self-transcendence*, p. 61.

notion of science which attends to the being of explanations and to the necessity and the primacy of explanations. Explanations transcend descriptions, the being of our descriptions. Science is true or real knowledge through a knowledge of causes (apprehending the being of causes, distinguishing the kind of being which belongs to them, identifying the differences which exist between causes, converting one's understanding of causes into speakable, definable words and concepts, and then moving toward verification and judgments which can then affirm the reality and being of the causes which have been initially understood and grasped).[110]

In conclusion then, with respect to the kind of understanding which comes to us from Aristotle about the nature of our human cognition, an order of acts encompasses an order of operations which bind logical and non-logical operations with each other in a way or in a relation which thinks in terms of a unity amid many diversities or which joins dialectical aspects with complementary aspects in a manner which reduces everything to an understood whole. Acts of human sensing differ from our acts of human understanding. Yet, each plays a role which points to a species of self-transcendence which exists within the course or the order of acts which is constitutive of our human cognition. As human knowers, we transcend ourselves whenever, through our understanding and our knowledge of truths, we are joined to a world of real objects which exist independently of whether or not they are being known by us through our different acts of reflective understanding (our judgments which can determine if an ideal object exists as only as ideal object or if it also exists as a real, true object). The simplicity which characterizes the kind of knowing that belongs to animals is surpassed by the differentiated kind of knowing which belongs to us as human beings given how, in metaphysical terms, as human beings, we exist as a union of body and a species of soul (our souls including a rational or a reflective element) and how, on the basis of this interacting complex unity, we can cogitate in a manner which reflects the order of being that is constitutive of us in terms of how we exist as human beings. Function follows form or, in other words, how we know is determined by how we happen to exist and be.

In the realist understanding of human cognition that we accordingly have from Aristotle, scientific proofs are to be regarded as a distinct species of human cognition (existing as a distinct entity). As cognitional events, they can be separated from other kinds of cognitive act within as these acts exist within our human knowing. As noted or as we have previously suggested, these proofs exist for us within the data or the consciousness that we have of ourselves engaging in our acts of cognition although, admittedly, things exist within reality not always in terms of how we could be anticipating them with respect to the nature of their existence, nor always in terms of how we could be wishing to conceive of them if we should want to use words and to construct definitions for purposes of communication (either with ourselves or with others).

In the transition which exists in Aristotle as we move from acts of sensing toward our acts of understanding, universals do not exist as separately we might want to think of them or to conceive of them by way of our acts of understanding as we move from our direct acts of understanding through to our reflective acts of understanding and then, from there, on into the kind of articulation which exists as our acts of definition and conceptualization (despite Plato's views on the separate kind of being which should be ascribed to the being of universals). Amid these differences however, both philosophers hold to the reality of that which would exist as a species of universal. That which is really real exists as some kind of universal and the reality of universals is reached through the kind of universalizing activity which belongs to us as human beings in our cognition where, in Aristotle, our intelligence

110Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1, 1, 981a15-981b13.

reaches universally existing things by way initially of our different acts of human sensing (from our different acts of human sensing): through a kind of application which exists as we move through inquiry toward our reasoning from our different acts of human sensing and as we also move from our reasoning and our understanding back toward our acts of sensing and the givens of sense. By way of the kind of reception or passivity which exists within us in receiving or experiencing our acts of understanding (differing from the kind of reception or passivity which exists with respect to our different acts of sense), a universalization of things always occurs in and through our acts of understanding. A particular knowledge of things that is sensate in nature (according to the kind of being which it has and the kind of being which we are) is converted by our cogitating, our understanding, and our knowing into a universalized knowledge of the same things that, as knowledge, is both intelligent and intelligible and not sensing and sensible. More to the point in terms of the objectivity of our human knowledge, a datum or an object of sense or that which has been sensed (as an other, as an externally existing thing) is turned through understanding (from direct understanding to reflective understanding) into another kind of externally existing thing: something which exists now as an understood known and which enjoys, in its own way, a form of external existence if, admittedly, it exists as the intelligibility of an externally existing thing.

Simply put, using the kind of language which has been traditionally used, the sensible is also the intelligible or that which is sensible is that which is intelligible (or, alternatively, that which can be sensed is also that which can be understood) because or, through the mediation of a species of ordering which exists within the work or the effects of our understanding - the self-transcending kind of ordering which we have as human beings and which is to be identified with the kind of understanding which properly belongs to us as human beings - the species of ordering which exists within our knowing participates in and, at the same time, it also reflects or it mirrors the parameters and the assembly of elements which belongs to a like order which exists within a greater world of truly existing things. The intelligibility of our understanding, as understanding, combines or it also belongs to the intelligibility of real objects as these exist within a greater world of externally existing things. The subjectivity of human knowing is such that it exists with an orientation that is inherently directed toward an experience of objectivity which would then serve as a point of departure for the later study of the science of metaphysics and hence the study of the being of all existing things which is the proper object of the kind of inquiry which belongs to metaphysics as a discipline that differs from the study of human cognition. In Aristotle and also in Plato, in the experience of our understanding, a fundamental oneness exists between that which exists as the Mind and that which exists as the Cosmos. If a real distinction exists between the order of the cosmos and the disorder of a chaos, similarly, a real distinction exists between the ordering of our minds and the disorder which commonly belongs to the data of our sense perception.

Aristotle's understanding of metaphysics

"Aristotle's metaphysics of matter and form corresponds to a psychology of sense and insight."[111]

If we should move now from how Aristotle understands the nature of human cognition to how he understands the nature of existing things in general, the science of metaphysics for Aristotle has been traditionally understood and designated as a discipline which is best signified if we should refer to it as

111Lonergan, *Insight* 677/700, as cited by Sala, *Lonergan and Kant*, p. 160, n. 65; cited also by McCarthy, *Authenticity as Self-transcendence*, p. 62.

Aristotle had understood it: in Aristotle's own words, metaphysics as *First Philosophy* [*Prōtē philosophia*], metaphysics as *Wisdom* [*Sophia*], or metaphysics as *First Science* [*Prōtē epistēmē*].[112] Begin with a fundamental question which asks "What is being?" [*tí to on*] and then, from there, in order to understand the nature or the essence of being (what it is for something to be), begin initially with an understanding of things that exist about ourselves, things that we know about whose existence we do not question or doubt. How do these things exist? How have they moved into a condition of existence from a prior condition of not existing? Why are the beings beings? Why are the beings that be things which be or things which exist?[113] Determine thus the first causes or the first principles of things which exist *qua* their existence and then, from there, apply or generalize these causes or principles to the entire universe of existing things (to the being of things that we do not directly know about, in a step which moves from a familiarity with known knowns to that which exists as known unknowns). On the basis of this knowledge, as a further step, move then toward the kind of understanding which is applicable and which is possible for us if we should want to engage in the work of lesser, subsidiary sciences and disciplines where their object of study is always something which exists as a differentiation of being or, alternatively, in other words, as a specification of being. For instance, the science of botany studies the being of plants although, in the kind of being which belongs to plants, a kind of being exists which participates in that which is the beingness or the existence of all existing things. As we have been noting, it is entirely natural for us as human beings and it is quite proper for us as human beings that we would want to understand the being and the existence of all things as we move from understanding the being of a given thing toward possibly understanding the being of some other kind of thing.

At this point thus, on a methodological note: the differences which exist within being in turn explain why, for each science, a different method of inquiry is to be alluded to since, among all the particular sciences, each science works from its own distinct set of first principles in a manner which is peculiar to it. A given set of first principles points to a distinct mode of scientific procedure.[114] If, for instance thus, a certain type of induction is peculiar to the science of biology and another type of induction is peculiar to the science of zoology, the kind of inquiry which belongs to the pursuit of mathematics points to a mode of inquiry which acknowledges the primacy of deduction (deduction rather than induction). Instead of first principles which come from the data of our sense perception in a primary way (in some way, these principles are derived from the data of our sense perception), in the pursuit and practice of mathematics, first principles come from the inventiveness and the ingenuity of mathematical minds when these minds are in a condition of act.[115] The data of sense perception, in this context, play a lesser role (an incidental or a subsidiary role within the discipline of mathematics) if, in contrast, we attend to the kind of role which belongs to induction and the emergence of the lesser sciences of man and nature which exist in a manner which differs from the kind of inquiry that belongs to the practice of mathematics).

However, these things being said, even and as if we admit that, with Aristotle, the beginnings of metaphysics lie in the power or the force of our natural human wonder and a desire that wants to introduce clarity and understanding into an obscure puzzling situation (responding to a question what asks about "What is being?"), it is to be admitted also that, as given to us for our reading and study,

---

112Vasilis Politis, *Aristotle and the **Metaphysics*** (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 2.
113Politis, *Aristotle and the **Metaphysics***, p. 4.
114Randall, *Aristotle*, p. 33.
115Berman, *Law and Revolution*, p. 133.

Aristotle's metaphysics was experienced by very many persons to be something which was very obscure in all of its detailed elaborateness even if its purpose or function was to introduce a new clarity into things that had not been well understood or known: functioning as an ordering principle for the pursuit of all our critical scientific activities. In the context, for instance, in his own day and time, the Iranian philosopher Avicenna (d. 1037) claimed that, though he had read the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle 40 times, he did not succeed in really understanding it. The understanding which he did have was, for him, somewhat limited: too limited for comfort or satisfaction. Hence, as a useful tool or as a point of entry for ourselves in terms of how we can possibly move toward an understanding of Aristotle's metaphysics, from a viewpoint that works from within the realism of Aristotle's cognitional philosophy, the critical realism which allegedly belongs to the nature of our human understanding and how, from the human order of knowing, we can pass to the objectivity of the world of truly existing things (the realm of existing things, the order of metaphysics), we work from a basis which will accordingly allude to a kind of parallel or a corresponding unity which exists for us as we move from the order of our human cognition toward and into a like order which exists with respect to the order of real objects which, together, constitute the order of being (which exists independently whether or not we could be knowing anything about anything which exists within this order at any given time).

As our point of departure then, to understand the causes of being as these causes would apply to the being or the existence of all things which exist within our world, let us begin with two metaphysical principles. One is potency; the other, form. First, with respect to the being of potency and how we can understand what this is and where it sits within the context of Aristotle's thought, from the givens of sense which exist as an experience of sensibility (sensibility as that kind of being which can be sensed and which is known by us by how it is related or how it is revealed to us through our different acts of human sensing, existing as the term of our different acts of human sensing), within the order of reflection and the kind of reflection which exists within the *Physics* of Aristotle and also within his *Metaphysics*, from that which is given to us as sensibility, from that which exists as sensibility, we can understand potency as a particular species or type of being. In another way of speaking, matter as *hule* and potency as *dunamis* refer to the same thing.[116] That which is sensed exists as matter and, at the same time too, this matter (in its formlessness or indeterminacy) exists as potency. A commonly used simple example says that the clay of the earth points to how it exists as potency. It is bereft of any form or shape (relatively speaking since clay is clay and not stone; hence, it does not exist as an instance of pure potency, as an unrestricted kind of potency). Hence, as something that is simply or merely given to us and as something that can be used or taken up by us in a way that can confer on it a noticeable form or shape, for this reason, through an analogical form of reasoning that is given in this example, it is argued that, in its distinctiveness, matter or potency exists essentially as a passivity, as a species of passivity. It is that which can receive. It can become this or it can become that. In becoming this or in becoming that, it exists as the presupposition of any kind of becoming or change. Hence, in the context of Aristotle's analysis, matter or potency technically exists as *hupokeimenon* (literally: as "that which is presupposed by" any kind of change or becoming which would refer to the reception of a determination where, typically, a previously existing determination is replaced by the being of a new determination).[117]

116Aristotle, *Physics*, A.6-7, 193b1, as cited by Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," p. 11.

117Aristotle, *Physics*, A.6-7, 191a9, 193a2-193b22, as cited by Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," p. 10.

Hence, in its condition of potency or materiality, a potency cannot realize itself to become some other kind of thing. For purposes of illustration, we can distinguish between the being of a lump of clay and the being of an earthen clay pot. Notice, grasp the difference between them and we should understand why, to potency or matter, a condition of passivity is to be alluded to. All matter, all potencies exist with a passivity that is proper to potency in terms of the kind of being which belongs to potency. As a species of material cause, clay can be made into a clay pot or into a clay dish. The being of clay, as potency, can be converted or it can be turned into a realization which would exist as either a clay pot or perhaps a clay plate (among other possible realizations that can brought into being from a material substrate which would exist for us as clay). From clay, we can have china. Nothing of clay can receive a realization or be converted into a form or a shape which would refer to the kind of realization which exists if we should refer to the being of a bronze kettle, the being of a bronze pot, or the being of a bronze plate. In matter or potency, relative to form, matter/potency exists as becoming (as that which becomes). Within this context, it exists as the principle of becoming with respect to the being of things. If a material component exists within the being of any given thing, because this component can be moved or because it can be altered in some way, a given thing which has a material component is a kind of being which can be changed or altered in some kind of way.[118] Conversely, if a material component is absent or if it is found to be wanting in some kind of way, then the absence of materiality points to the absence of any possible change or alteration. Something exists in a way that is fully actual, in a condition of realization which would have to be described as completeness and, as complete, perfect.

To account for change thus, to explain transitions where something is moved from a condition of potency to a lessening or an absence of potency (to explain why something receives a determination which makes it into a particular kind or type of existing thing), an active or agent principle needs to be determined and known and if we are to give this kind of principle a name that we can use to talk about it, on the basis of an analogy which refers to the being of a sensible form or shape and the reception of this sensible form or shape (how, in sensation, a form is received apart from its originating source and apart from the matter of this same source),[119] we can take this principle and then, by generalizing it or, in other words, by immaterializing it or by abstracting it, a form is derived which exists simply as form (form as it exists apart from matter, having a kind of reality which differs from the kind of reality which belongs to matter). Form *per se* differs from matter (it is not to be confused with matter) or, in other words, when matter is generalized in a manner which leads to potency (as an apprehension of potency), form differs from potency (a formal cause from a material cause) since, if any given potency receives a determination which diminishes its potency or which lessens the potency which formerly it had possessed, the explanation for this is the entry or the ingress of something which exists as a specification or as a determination (a determination as opposed to the absence of a determination), a determination which exists as a structure or form (form as opposed to potency). Hence, in Aristotle's own words, through a negative species of predication: “by matter I mean that which in itself has neither quality or quantity nor any of the other attributes by which being is determined.”[120] The being of things in our world is explained by the entry and the reception of something which exists essentially as a form (albeit form entering into a set of material conditions in a manner which points to the being and the

118Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 91.

119Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, pp. 85-86. The rhythmic vibration of a sounding bell is received by a like rhythm which emerges and which exists within the hearing of a human hearer, a human listener.

120Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1029a20, as quoted by Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 92.

reality of an essence when form is considered in terms of how it is united to a given set of material conditions).[121] Instead of referring to the being of some other kind of principle in metaphysics which can explain why things exist in the way that they do and how or why they become and change in the way that they do, to the principle of form and the being of form belongs a primacy and a centrality which explains why it has been said about the metaphysics of Aristotle that it is to be regarded as essentially a metaphysics of form. In comparison to form, potency lacks status or, if you will, it exists at a lower, lesser level (existing as becoming). Its indeterminacy more closely connects it with the principle or the privation of nothingness than with the being of something which is to be contrasted with the condition and the negation of nothingness. Potency is that which is somehow without this or that quality or characteristic. That which truly exists is that which exists as form. From a knowledge of forms we move toward a knowledge of potencies. Forms specific potencies in a relation which explains why, within the order of being, the order of existing things, form precedes potency.[122] Simply put: first form, then potency (or, cognitionally, within the order of our human cognition, we begin with understanding, we begin with determinations, something which we already understand; and then, from there, we move toward that which we have yet to experience as a determination as this can be given to us within a new act of understanding that could be possibly given to us).

Since the being of existing things is explained by form, in a shorthand form of expression, with Aristotle, we would then say that, ultimately, being is form and form, being. The determinacy or the specificity of a form points to its stability or its unchangeableness (hence, its eternity), a form of existence that is not subject to any kind of change, any kind of impermanence, or any kind of variation. Hence, from the absence of indeterminacy or, more strongly, from the exclusion of any kind of changeableness or indeterminacy, in form we have a species of existence which always points to the eternal existence of forms (forms which exist apart and which are not conditioned by any conjugates or properties which would refer to spatial temporal categories: determinations of space and time). That which changes and that which never changes necessarily exclude each other (in an absolute and total way) even as we also realize and know that, within our world, nothing exists apart from a combination which exists between that which exists in a condition of potency and that which exists in a condition of form (the indeterminate being of potency being united or joined to the determinate kind of being which exists as form). A potency is informed by a form; a material cause, by a formal cause.

Why the visible or the sensible form of a body is not to be identified with the inner form of a thing is to be explained by the fact that, while our acts of sense directly know (they directly apprehend, they directly experience) the visible or the sensible form that is directly known by us through our various acts of human sensing, our acts of understanding directly know (they directly apprehend or they directly experience) another kind of object which exists as an intelligible form, an intelligible structure,

---

121To avoid confusion, please distinguish here between material conditions which exist as particular matter and material conditions which exist as common matter. Essences exist when form, as a universal, is joined to a universalized apprehension of matter which exists as common matter. The essence of a maple tree refers, for instance, to the unity which exists between, on the one hand, the nature or the intelligibility of a maple tree that is shared by all maple trees (participated in by all maple trees) and, on the other hand, a common materiality which belongs to the shared matter or the corporality which is common to the being of all maple trees. The intelligibility and the materiality both exist as abstractions that are known by us through as our acts of understanding as we individually move from our acts of human sensing toward our later acts of human understanding.

122Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 42.

or an intelligible configuration of intelligible parts or elements which are understood or grasped by us through the mediation of a direct act of understanding that is somehow given to us within a particular context (when, perhaps, we are not expecting to receive a given act of understanding). With St. Ignatius of Loyola, if we should use the kind of language which he uses, in our understanding of Aristotle, we would distinguish between a seeing of visions and an uplifting of our understanding. Forms exist with the kind of being which peculiarly belongs to them, or through the kind of being which they happen to have, because of how they have been apprehended by us through our acts of understanding.

As we have already noted within Aristotle's understanding of human cognition, an apt image or a phantasm that has been imaginatively constructed by us on the basis of the kind of raw material which exists for us in our received data of sense (the received givens of sense) suggests or it directs us to an inner kind of being, a structure or a form which somehow exists within a mass, an aggregate, or an accumulation of matter: a structure or a form which is not sensed but which is grasped or which, in some way, is invisibly "seen" because it has been understood. The form exists interiorily. The external kind of being that is outwardly experienced by us refers to the sensibility of our sensed data; the inner kind of being that is inwardly experienced, the form or the intelligibility of an understood, intellectualized object. A real difference or a real distinction exists between potency and form although this difference will not be understood by us if we cannot begin to discover (if we cannot begin to understand and know) how or why our acts of sense differ from our acts of understanding, our acts of sensing having a different nature or a different form from the kind of nature or form which belongs to our acts of understanding. A real distinction which exists within the order of our human cognition reflects and, at the same time, it points to a real distinction which exists within the order of existing things (the order of being). In both Aristotle and Plato, a real unity exists between our minds and the greater world which is the cosmos or the order of our universe. A fundamental unity exists between the two and so, from the real distinction which exists between our sensing and our understanding, we attend to a real distinction which exists between the metaphysical components of potency and form and then, from the real distinction which exists between these components of potency and form, we can move back toward a greater understanding which we can possible have about the kind of difference which exists between our acts of sensing and our acts of understanding. In knowing about the being of one distinction, we should begin to know more about the being of the other major distinction, back and forth.

With respect then to forms and the meaning of forms, examples of forms refer to such things as the Manness or the humanity of human beings or the Treeness of existing trees (among many other possible examples that can be cited as instances or examples of form).[123] A thing's form denotes the specific characteristics that belong to a given thing and not to any other kind of thing. It explains why a given thing has the visible kind of form which properly belongs to it, the form or intelligibility of a thing being related to the function of a thing because it specifies or it explains how a given thing exists: what it is able to do (in terms of its activity) and what it is able also to receive (in terms of its passivity). Active and passive acts can be distinguished from each in a way which points to how they are related to each other. As human beings, for instance, we can all ask questions and, as human beings, we can also receive acts of understanding that are simply given to us and which are not produced by our mere willing of them or our desiring of them. A form is not *per se* the being of an individual thing or the substance of an individual thing (more about this later) since forms exist as

123Sullivan, *Introduction to Philosophy*, p. 50.

universal realities or, in other words, they exist as universal principles. They exist as a species of cause: a cause which exists as a formal cause. They exercise a species of universal causality as a given form enters into a set of material conditions in a way which introduces an order within a set of material conditions (effecting or establishing an order which works with material conditions but which cannot be reduced to any given set of material conditions). A form is that, for instance, which takes material conditions and when turn turns or converts these conditions in a way which makes either a man or a chicken. It is perishable from a viewpoint which attends to the contingent order of things which exists within our world where, here, we refer to the movement or the migration of forms (when a given form moves from one possible instantiation within a set of material conditions to another possible instantiation within another set of material conditions). Hence, the form of a living being is not the form of a corpse. With death, the form of a living being is said to leave or depart. It ceases to be present and it is replaced by the being or the presence of another form. Its instantiation ends within a given context of conditions and yet, always, at the same time, as an invisible, intelligible reality, it continues to exist as a universal principle because many particulars, at other times and places, can be informed by the being or the presence of same form. As human beings for instance, we all exist as human beings (we all share in the same form) even as we live out our individual lives in each our own individual way.

In conjunction then with form, matter or prime matter exists as a co-principle of possibility for the existence or the being of individual things because, through matter (or the givenness of matter), a form can be joined to that which exists as an instance of matter. Because matter is that which can accept a form, the relation or the ordination which exists on the part of matter with respect to possible receptions of form points to how matter *per se* is to be associated or identified with that which exists essentially as material causality (as some kind of material cause). Prime matter, as unrestricted indefinite matter, can receive any kind of form that could be given to it although when matter exists in a qualified manner (in a manner which points to restrictions that exist with respect to it), it can accept some forms although not other determinations of form. In this context thus, the matter is not pure; the potency is not infinite. In any case however, despite restrictions in qualified instances of matter or in the lack of any restrictions if we should attend to matter as prime matter, in the receptivity of matter or in the openness of matter, in matter we have the principle of changeableness as this exists within the being of things. Absolutely with respect to prime matter but relatively with respect to all determinations of matter, this matter as potency always exists as an undetermined element: it can take on a definition or a meaning which would exist, cognitionally, as an intelligibility and which would exist, metaphysically, as a form. Matter as matter is parallel or it is to be identified with the empirical residue of Bernard Lonergan's cognitional analysis. Within the context of a metaphysical perspective, subtract form as it exists within any given context and what is left over refers to that which would exist as an empirical residue (as prime matter). Matter is not intelligible in and of itself. It only becomes intelligible or it is known to us through the entry or the reception (the consideration) of a form or an intelligibility which realizes or which actualizes that which exists initially as matter or that which first exists as potency. If form exists thus as a universal principle or as the principle of universality within the being of things, matter exists as the principle of individuation among the being of many things because, as given, it refers to that which is unique with respect to the being of a given thing or object. It is an object's "thisness," its quantifiable determination. For instance, all wheels or all trees have the same form or the same function but no two wheels or no two trees have the same matter nor do they share in the same amount and grade of matter.[124] In their individuality, this wheel and this other wheel can have the same form

124Palmer, *Looking at Philosophy,* p. 75.

and, similarly, this tree and this other tree. By referring to these examples thus, more clearly or more vividly, we can then understand how, in the existence of things, a universal principle is joined to a particular principle (form to matter). A positive relation always exists between these two principles (the form of an existing thing "does not exist in actuality without matter,"[125] without its union with matter, form apart from matter enjoying an ideal kind of existence) although, at the same time too, between matter and form, a species of mutual exclusion is to be admitted if we attend to how, together, but as contrary related principles, matter and form exist as explanatory principles and how this kind of existence (as a species of explanation) points to reverberations and conclusions which are to be drawn about the being of existing things (the kind of being which belongs to existing things as these are known and as they exist for us within the world of our ordinary experience).

To understand the notion of substance as we can find this in Aristotle on the basis of what we have come to understand about matter and form and the proportionate or the isomorphic relation which exists between the being of these metaphysical principles and the being of cognitional principles which exist when we refer to our acts of sensing and our acts of understanding, a fully adequate understanding about how substance exists in Aristotle must attend to differences in meaning and significance which exist if we should compare the kind of notion which comes to us by way of Aristotle's *Ten Categories* with the kind of notion which we find in Aristotle's *Physics* and *Metaphysics*. As we have already noticed, in the *Ten Categories*, nine predicates distinguish or indicate a unit or a type of being which for us exists as a substance. A substance exists as the fundamental, primary category; nine subsidiary predicates (cited as accidents) inhere within the being of a given substance. They apply to the being of a given substance. They qualify it in some way in terms of how a given substance exists or, more accurately and precisely, in terms of how a given substance is coming across to us in the experience that we have been having of it or are currently having of it. These distinct predicates all exist as descriptions. They exist as terms or as contents which belong to our differing acts of human sensing. Hence, as descriptions, as an *ordering* of descriptions, they can be viewed as a species of scientific description. The listing of nine predicates supposes a comprehensive arrangement of all the descriptive conjugates that are needed if a given object is to be fully described by us in the kind of knowing which exists at the level of description, employing all our different acts of human sensing, working together in a way which includes all possible descriptive aspects. The primacy of substance points to a notion of being or a notion of reality which says that being or reality exists as a multitude of substances which are all related to each other in ways which point to the order and the being of a cosmic whole (a universe which exists as a cosmos).[126]

> As a technical note at this point (a note that we should not omit): if we should begin now to speak about the notion of being or the notion of reality which exists in Aristotle's thought, please note that, with Plato, Aristotle works with a notion of being that is informed by analogies. An adequate notion of being cannot be univocal. Why this is so is because the kind of being which belongs to a given substance or thing is not always the same kind of being which belongs to another substance or thing although, admittedly, as Aristotle argues, being is "common to all things"[127] although, at the same time too, and as Aristotle argues, this same being also differs from all other things to the degree that all other things differ from each other in terms of the kind of being which

125Pabst, *Metaphysics*, p. 20.
126Hill, *After the Natural Law*, pp. 40-41.
127Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 3, 1005a27, as cited by Pabst, *Metaphysics*, p. 11.

> belongs to each of them.[128] The fullness of being which a given thing has cannot be known or conveyed to ourselves and others through a sense or a notion of being which would be content to work with a univocal significance. Given things often do not belong to the same genus of existing things. However, by referring (implicitly) to possible acts of understanding which could exist for us as analogical acts of understanding, it can be argued that all "things...are one by analogy."[129] In analogical acts of understanding, a common meaning for being can be known (it can be acknowledged as a point of departure), but in a way which also respects differences. Through the use of analogies (through the denotation and the connotation as these exist together in an intelligible unity through the mediation in an analogical form), identities, similarities, and differences can be combined with each other in ways that can lead to an enlargement of our understanding if, through this understanding, a larger number of variables can be joined to each other in a context which refers to the suggestiveness and the fruitfulness of one single act of understanding albeit, an act of understanding which would exist for us as an analogical act of understanding.

Returning now to the kind of discussion that we find in Aristotle about the meaning of substances, in the *Categories*, by referring to the species of descriptive predication that we find in Aristotle's *Categories*, a substance is encountered or it is known by us in terms of how it exists as a body. As a body, a substance exists as a descriptive object of attribution; it exists with a kind of unity or a wholeness which is sensed in terms of the space, the contours, and the shape of its bodily unity and, as we have been noting and arguing, this unity is known through a listing of predicates that are grounded in our various acts of human sensing and, at the same time too, through predicates which are limited by these same acts of sense in the kind of knowing which properly belongs to these acts of sense in our different acts of human sensing. However, from a contrary or a complementary viewpoint (if we should work with another point of point of departure which points to the reasonableness of a second perspective), if we should move toward predicates which are not descriptive (not referring to the data of our senses), if we should work with predicates which are grounded in our acts of understanding (they proceed or they come from our acts of understanding through a kind of transcendence which always exists in our acts of understanding), then, on this basis, a new listing of predicates can be given to us: a set of properties or characteristics which purportedly exist as explanations and which do not exist as descriptions. The explanations propose reasons; they refer to rational considerations of one kind or another that can be understood but not seen. They are to be attributed or they are to be ascribed to a new kind of object or to the being of another kind of unity or whole which is known by us as a consequence of how our human inquiry and thinking has been moving toward this unity through the kind of completion which exists for us through the kind of apprehension which exists in all our acts of understanding (whenever acts of understanding are given to us within the order of our human cognition). A substance ceases to be simply a body when now, as the focus and terminus of our understanding and as the bearer of properties which exist as terms which belong to our acts of understanding, it is turned into an immaterial kind of object: an object which exists as more of a form than as matter or potency, being something which exists as the term of our understanding, existing as an understood (as allegedly a form which exists within a given set of material conditions) because it has been grasped and known by us through acts of understanding which differ from the kind of

---

128Pabst, *Metaphysics*, p. 11 & n. 15, citing texts of Aristotle taken from the *Metaphysics*, the *Categories*, and the *Parts of Animals*.

129Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 5, 6, 1017a 2-3, as quoted by Pabst, *Metaphysics*, p. 13.

knowing which belongs to our different acts of human sensing (our initial acts of understanding existing for us as direct acts of understanding before there can be any kind of move which would exist if our acts of understanding are converted into a form which refers to reflective acts of understanding). Hence, within this larger cognitive context, the form or unity which is known by us within our understanding is a species of form which exists as a substantial form (or central form if we should choose to work with the kind of conceptuality that is employed in the context of Bernard Lonergan's *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding*). Accidental forms refer to the being of explanatory attributes; substantial forms refer to being of objects which exist as things. The matter within which a substantial form exists accordingly exists as substantial matter. Where accidental forms exist within accidental matter, substantial form exists within substantial matter. Substantial matter goes with substantial form and substantial form, substantial matter. Each defines the other: accidental form, accidental matter; substantial form, substantial matter. Reality or the whole of being is composed of a plurality or a variety of different things or, in other words, a plurality of different substances. Things and substances refer to the same thing ("thing" being a new way of our being able to speak about that which exists as "substance").

In understanding thus how an empirical or a sensate notion of substance as this exists in Aristotle is to be understood and related to an explanatory or a rational notion of substance as this also exists in Aristotle, because our obvious point of departure has been the shift from human acts of sensing toward human acts of understanding as this exists within the order of our human cognition, for this reason, the explanatory notion of substance that we find in Aristotle is to be regarded as the truer, more real, more mature notion. It succeeds or it emerges from a prior, more primitive notion of substance as our shift towards understanding within the order of our cognition moves from the materiality of sense, matter, and potency toward the intellectuality of understanding and form. Where the being of a body is known primarily through the experience of its materiality in sense (through the correlative principle of matter as a species of distinct metaphysical principle), the being of a thing is known primarily through the experience of its intellectuality in understanding (through the principle of form as another species of distinct metaphysical principle). Substances as bodies are to be associated with the obviousness of sense and matter; substances as things, with the intellectuality of form and the rarer kind of achievement which exists for us as human beings when we move from acts of cognition which exist as our acts of sensing toward acts of cognition which would exist for us as our acts of understanding. Bodies, physical objects are sensed; substances, things, are understood. For a typical example of this shift, compare how a child conceives of an elephant with how a zoologist conceives of the same creature. A child speaks about "a large animal with trunk and huge ears"; a zoologist speaks about a "member of a species [that is] related more or less closely with other mammalian species, and having evolved in morphology and habits to survive within a certain range of environments."[130]

Through the kind of self-knowledge which thus we can begin to have of ourselves in our self-understanding, we should soon notice that it is easier for us to engage in the first kind of act which exists in our acts of sensing than in the second kind of act which would exist as our acts of understanding. First, we know about bodies; then, we can know about the existence of substances or things. Rarer still, however, than the acts of understanding which exist as our acts of direct understanding is a second kind of intellectual act which would exist for us as a reflective act of understanding (the kind of act which would exist as the drawing of a rational conclusion or a judgment which would emerge in the wake of an apprehension which experiences or knows about a sufficiency

130Meynell, *Redirecting Philosophy*, p. 245.

in evidence which would then immediately point to the reasonableness of a conclusion that knows or which affirms that a given meaning or form is to be regarded as a true meaning or form: a reality which would then immediately join the being of a human knower with an order of things which transcends the being of a given knower).

Shifting now from an understanding of forms toward an understanding of essences as this exists in Aristotle: if, as a formal cause, the substantial form of a thing or the form of a substance is something which exists within a concretely existing individual thing and if it explains why a given thing exists in the way that it happens to be and exist (similarly, a form within an event explains why a given event occurs in the way that it does), then, from the known "whyness" or the known form of a thing, the "whatness" of a thing, the quiddity of a thing, or the essence of a thing is something which can be determined as a further specification of meaning (as a more articulate specification of meaning) if a form which has been abstracted is then rejoined to a material principle which is not to be identified with individual instances of matter which would belong to the distributed being of individual concretely existing things. This matter goes with this form and this other matter goes with the same form. On the one hand: like form, the essence of a thing specifies or it points to the nature or to the intelligibility of an understood thing since, within any given essence as this can be known by us, the "whyness" or the form of a thing is given to us. The form exists as an essential, necessary ingredient. Without form, no essence. Hence, loosely speaking, and yet truthfully, if the "whatness" of a thing refers to the "whyness" of a thing, if the "whatness" of a thing is grounded in the "whyness" of a known thing (its form), then a thing's form is to be associated with a thing's essence in a way which allows us to say, with Aristotle, that a thing's form is a thing's essence. In Aristotle, a thing's form is often referred to as its essence although, through careful study and analysis, a real distinction can be shown to exist between that which exists as a form and that which exists allegedly as an essence (a distinction that was not unknown to Aristotle within the conduct of his own study and analysis although, within the conceptuality of Aristotle's language, no Greek term stands for essence, the Latin neologism "essence" having been invented in order to refer answers that are given to "what" questions or most specifically, as a way of designating "what makes anything what it is").[131]

Technically speaking thus, for the sake of an understanding which a bit more precise, a thing's form is not a thing's essence because, in moving from a form to an essence, an essence exists as a greater, larger thing. The intelligibility which belongs to it is greater than the intelligibility which belongs to a form. To an essence belongs a form or a species of concreteness which differs or which sets it apart from the abstract kind of being which exists with respect to the being of forms and the immediacy of forms within the being of our consciousness whenever, in any given case or instance, acts of understanding are given to us when we are not expecting to receive them within the experience that we have of ourselves whenever we refer to how we exist and live as knowing human beings. In the apprehension of an essence or in the conceptualization and the uttering of an essence, the universality of a form is taken as a given (as a presupposition) and, as a form, it is rejoined or it is reconnected to a new specification of matter which has also been abstracted and generalized although in a manner which differs from the intelligibility of a form. We speak here about a universalization of matter which exists as common matter. A particular specification of matter has been replaced or we say that it is replaced by a specification of matter which is universally applicable. A common form of matter applies to all possible individual instances of the same matter. The union of a universal form with that which exists as common matter accordingly constructs or it constitutes the kind of being which exists as an essence

131Randall, *Aristotle*, p. 245, n. 13.

(an essence which is not a form): hence, the meaning of a given essence.

> To introduce a measure of clarity that is not so obvious in the explanations that are offered by Aristotle, if we work with a cognitive distinction that comes to us originally from the philosophy and theology of St. Augustine,[132] we would say that, if a form is grasped by us through a direct act of understanding, an essence is grasped by us through an act of definition or an act of inner speaking and conceptualization which emerges within us (inwardly) in the wake of a prior act of understanding. Citing in the briefest way the kind of example and illustration that we can take from the kind of understanding which exists in the practice of mathematics: in solving a given mathematical problem, in a direct act of understanding, we immediately know why "x" must always equal "y" or that "x" must always equal "y" (the answer or the solution is all now too obvious to us) and, at the same time too, or in immediately springing from this first realization that we have, we also find that we are experiencing or knowing that

---

132See Gerard Watson, "St Augustine and the inner word: the philosophical background," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 54 (1988), pp. 84-85. With respect to the Augustinian origin of arguments which allege that an intelligible emanation is to be found to exist within the conscious life of our human minds, while Augustine distinguishes between one species of word which exists as a *verbum insitum* (it is to be identified with the rationality of our human minds in its activities in thinking and understanding) and a second species of word which exists as a *verbum prolatum* (it is to be as identified with the outer words of our human speech as this exists in the givenness of articulate, communicable language), he also distinguishes a third species of word which is to be identified as a *verbum intus prolatum*. As a word which exists as an inner word, it refers to a word that is inaudibly spoken. It is expressed inwardly within our human interiority and it functions as an intermediary between a *verbum insitum* and a *verbum prolatum*. In the wake of our understanding, a word is spoken or it is expressed within ourselves (interiorily) and its status is not less than that which we experience in any act of thinking or understanding which occurs within our human minds. But, at the same time also, this word stands apart from the being of any kind of outer word of speech since, within our self-awareness, it cannot be denied that outer words sometimes tend to be deficient communicators of meanings: of meanings which are inchoately but more fully known and sensed from within the depths of our cognitive self-awareness. Outer words, as we sometimes experience them, can lack a fullness of meaning which seems to exist only within the context of a preliminary, pregnant articulateness which commonly belongs to the meaning of inner words. Words are spoken within our souls or within our hearts (as Augustine speaks about it) and they are meant to speak of things that go beyond or which transcend the kind of being which belongs to our acts of understanding. They come from our prior acts of understanding (from the species of word which exists as a *verbum insitum*) and they lead us toward the outer words of human speech which exist as a *verbum prolatum*. Cf. Lonergan, "Introduction," *Verbum*, p. 6. As Lonergan goes on to note and emphasize, in a text that is cited by Frederick G. Lawrence, "The Hermeneutic Revolution and Bernard Lonergan: Gadamer and Lonergan on Augustine's *Verbum Cordis* – The Heart of Postmodern Hermeneutics," *Divyadaan: Journal of Philosophy & Education* vol. 19, nos. 1-2 (2008), p. 59:

> ...as Augustine's discovery was part and parcel of his own mind's knowledge of itself, so he begged his readers to look within themselves and there to discover the speech of spirit within spirit, an inner *verbum* prior to the use of language, yet distinct both from the mind itself and from its memory or its present apprehension of objects.

> we are in the presence of a mathematical law that is universally applicable. The solution of a particular mathematical problem points to the being or the relevance of an invariant mathematical law, and even if this law has not yet put into a formula that can be communicated to other persons, in the apprehension of this same law, we have a new kind of awareness: we experience the term of an intellectual proceeding which is the proceeding of an inwardly known concept or word, a proceeding which is to be identified with the proceeding of an act of conceptualization. Hence, a real distinction needs to be posited if we are to distinguish between the being of a direct act of understanding (Aristotle's act of "simple apprehension") and the being of a subsequent act of cognition which exists as an act of conceptualization. A form moves toward the kind of completion which it can have through the conceptualization or the apprehension of an essence as soon as our acts of understanding are succeeded by a second kind of recognition which always exists within us, through how our acts of conceptualization proceed or emerge from our prior acts of understanding. An internal form of recognition and speaking always springs or flows from our prior acts of understanding and the swiftness or the alacrity of this recognition should accordingly point to the being or the reality of a new species of oneness that we experience within our cognition: moving first from the unity of a form and an act in an act of direct understanding toward the second unity of a form and matter in a subsequent act of conceptualization, our acts of understanding always leading us toward the intellectual kind of proceeding which also exists within us through the thematization which somehow always exists in terms of how our acts of conceptualization are directed and impelled by the kind of non-mechanical thrust or propulsion which always exists within our prior acts of understanding. If thus, by our understanding, we know about the being of forms (we know why this must be that), then, from the genesis, the prolongation, or the fructifying extension of this same understanding as it moves toward a less simple form of understanding, in our understanding we also know about a second kind of universality which exists whenever we talk about the being of essences. An essence exists as a conceptualized form, as a form that has been separated from a prior act of understanding because, now, it has been joined to a new specification of matter which exists as a specification of common matter.

The kind of completion which exists in our acts of conceptualization accordingly explains why, often, in Aristotle, the form of a thing is said to be the essence of a thing despite a real difference that can be alluded to if, in their being and performance, acts of conceptualization are distinguishable from the kind of being and performance which exists in our acts of direct understanding, our acts of understanding always immediately leading to inner acts of conceptualization and the being of conceptualized concepts that are necessary for us if, humanly, we are to engage in any form of interior dialogue within ourselves about something that, perhaps, we have understood or if, subsequently, we are to engage in a form of external dialogue with other persons if we should seek to engage their attention and interest in order possibly to elicit new questions about meaning and understanding or new questions which could ask about the possible truth of any meaning that which we have come initially to understand and know. Simply put, employing a commonly used example: the nature or the form of a maple tree exists among all instances of maple trees and, perhaps, in Aristotle's act of "simple apprehension" or in Lonergan's act of "direct understanding," we truly understand this nature or form. Then, in knowing or speaking about the essence of a maple tree, we allegedly know about the essence of all maple trees in terms of how a common nature or form has been joined to a material potency that

is shared or which is common to the individual being of all maple trees. If, in direct understanding, form and act are united to each other in such a way such that the two cannot be separated from each other, in the thematization or the conceptualization of an understanding that we have received in a given instance of it, an interiorily understood form is turned into a species of externally existing object. We say that it is objectified because, now, it is turned into something that we can begin to think about or talk about. We can begin to pose questions about the nature or the intelligibility of a maple tree as if its being is somehow other than ourselves (as if it is other than that which has been our understanding of it, in a manner which accordingly points to how it exists as a reality which appears to be quite other than ourselves, transcending who and what we happen to be as human beings). In moving thus toward an apprehensions of form, a measure of self-transcendence always exists within our understanding and then, in moving toward apprehensions of essence, a measure of self-transcendence is added to the first measure or the first kind of self-transcendence which had existed for us when, through acts of direct understanding, prospective human knowers are united to that which allegedly exists as a form within the inner being of externally existing things.

The kind of objectivity or in the objectification which occurs as we move from forms to essences accordingly thus explains why, in Aristotle, essences can be identified with substances or why they have been identified with substances (given the union which exists that joins, on the one hand, a substantial form with a specification of matter, on the other hand, that applies to the being of a given substance in all of its many instances). The result is always the being or the reality a truly existing thing which exists as something which is fundamentally primary within the order of being in general and which everything else would have to suppose and presume. The being of things or being in general is something which is explained by the primary type of being which exists in terms of essences (intelligible, understood essences).[133] Essences as substances exist as both the bearer of qualities that can become actual in it and they exist also as the bearer of qualities which are already actual within it.[134] Relative to the being of qualities that come and go, substances endure. They exist as enduring subjects of change.[135]

All these things being said thus about matter, form, and essence and the kind of order which exists among these metaphysical principles and how they are related to a corresponding order which exists

---

133Politis, *Aristotle and the **Metaphysics***, p. 15. Please note, however, that some controversy exists about how precisely we are to understand Aristotle when we encounter his analysis and discussions about the meaning of *primary being* or that which exists as primary being if we are to understand that which exists as the being *qua* being of existing things. If the object of our metaphysical inquiry is an understanding of being in general or, more precisely, the beingness or the existence of things solely in terms of their being and existence, then, if the object is the being of some kind of cause or explanation, then, when this object is conceptualized in terms which would refer to it as a primary kind of being, in our speaking about this primary being, we would accordingly speak about it as a species of first principle. From it, as a fundamental point of departure, many conclusions can be drawn or, more precisely, from the thesis of this primary being and according to how it has been conceptualized, a heuristic is given and supplied that can then be applied in any subsequent inquires that we might want to make with respect to the nature and the being of individual objects as these exist in terms of species and genus. All exist, in their own way, as modifications of being since, to some extent, each exists in an individual kind of way.

134Osborne, *Philosophy for Beginners,* p. 19.

135Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 41.

within the order of our human cognition, if we should want to move toward a set of principles which would serve to the explain the being of these aforementioned metaphysical principles, then we can do no better than to speak about a more fundamental form of relation which exists if we should think about how, in every kind of change or alternation which occurs within our world - changes which we can see and analyze when we look at motion or movement as a distinct type of being or phenomenon – in every change or alternation, a species of reduction occurs if we move from that which exists within a condition of potency toward that which exists within a condition of act. In potency and act, in Aristotle, two different kinds of being exist together in a manner which refers to the being of existing beings where, in the being of an existing thing or a substance, these two different kinds of being exist together within the being of individual things - the potency of a thing exists within the being or the reality of a thing, potency existing within act - and together they explain why emerging things exist within a world which is subject to change even if we should happen to believe that the world is something which has always been as it is (although its parts are such that they appear to be constantly shifting and changing in the kind of being which belongs to them).[136] In other words thus, the whole range of being - whether it is partially material or, in some ways, entirely immaterial – the whole range of being is reducible or it is divisible into these two basic categories of potency and act: citing Aristotle's own words, "the potential and the completely real."[137] Potency exists as a kind of reality, as a kind of being. Absence of reality goes with a kind of void which would exist as a strange kind of presence (it would exist as indetermination); reality, with the kind of being which exists as specification and determination.

While, on the one hand, we have noted that matter exists as potency if we should want to refer to the materiality of bodies (objects which are sensed would exist for us as bodies), potency exists as a larger thing or as a more general category if we should want to refer to immaterial kinds of potency and immaterial kinds of being which can emerge from immaterial kinds of potency where, in both cases, whether we should prefer to speak about the being of a material potency or about the being of an immaterial potency, potency suffices as a more general, apt designation. Its use transcends denotations and connotations which would want to have us think about our acts of human sensing and about that which could be given to us through our various acts of human sensing. Talk about matter instead of talk about potency tends to encourage a way of thinking and speaking that would have us believe that our human cognition is solely constituted by our different acts of human sensing and not by the being or through the kind of instrumentality which belongs to other kinds of cognitive act. To potency belongs a greater degree of abstractness than the abstractness which exists if we prefer to speak about

---

136Please note thus that the eternity of the world was a belief that was commonly held among the ancient Greeks. The contingency of the world or belief in the contingency of the world is a point of view which comes to us from the acceptance and ingress of later Judeo-Christian belief and, through the replacement of grounding assumptions, it can be argued that, in the conduct of later inquires, in both science and philosophy or in how science and philosophy exist together, repercussions were not absent. In the context of his own day and time (centuries after Aristotle), Aquinas had argued that the eternity of the world or the contingency of the world, its createdness, is not something that can be proved one way or the other through the sophistries or the abstractions of our philosophical human reasoning although, if we should know about the contingency of any given thing, we should know that a contingently existing thing is not able to realize its own existence in a manner which would move from the potency or the possibility of its being toward the actuality or the reality of its being.

137Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 11, 9; 1065b16, as cited by Sullivan, *Introduction to Philosophy*, p. 51.

matter than potency.

With respect then to the being of act and potency and moving to determinations of their being and meaning as this comes to us from Aristotle, in act, something exists either as it is fully realized in some kind of way (having, in some way, a fullness of being; hence, in some way, it is bereft of potency), or secondly, as it can be realized in some way (having within it an absence of being that is relative or circumstantial; the absence of being can be amended or corrected through a development which would point towards new actualizations or new realizations of being in shifts that would move from potency to act). In potency *qua* potency, something exists as an openness to realizations of one kind or another or some kind of development or increase which points to its variability or its changeability. The openness exists as potency; or as capacity, passivity, or receptivity. Something can exist thus, in one aspect, as fully actual and real (it, in fact, exists) although, in another but related aspect, it can also exist as something that is entirely possible or potential and so it is not yet, in some way, fully real or actual. What is missing would exist as a species of not yet. Potency is not to be equated with nothingness nor with something that is entirely lacking in being.

As noted or as we have been suggesting, before something can transition from a condition of potency to a condition of act, it must first exist in a condition of being or act before it can become something else, existing within a newer or a fuller condition of act. Change must begin from something which must exist in a prior condition of being before it can possibly change to enter into a new form of being or a new form of existence. For example, to say that oil is flammable is to say that the potential for it to burn is already present within it as an actuality although it needs some kind of external cause (for example, the application of a burning match) if we are then to move from that which is potential within oil to that which is actual within the oil: the burning of a given amount of oil. That which exists in a condition of potency is not able to put itself into a condition of act. Instead of a strict disjunction which would seem to exist thus between being and becoming, through the principle of potency as it exists within the principle of being as the principle of being refers to the being of things, by this means thus, becoming can be regarded as something which exists within the being of existing things as some kind of incomplete, partial act. Becoming, motion, movement is not nothing or non-being and, at the same time, it is not being (it is not act) though it exists as something which exists within the actuality or the being of existing things. Citing some of Aristotle's own words: change or movement would exist as both "actuality and not actuality,"[138] or, in other words, more precisely, change or motion, becoming, exists as the "actuality [the realization] of the potential as such."[139] Appositely: "motion is the actuality of the potential *qua* potential."[140] In becoming or in potency, a third type of being exists since it cannot be equated with that which exists simply as Being or that which exists simply as Non-being or as the very absence of being. To explain more fully:

> On the one hand, the striving or the motion itself exists with a beingness which properly belongs to it (its existence or its actuality cannot be denied) and, on the other hand too, at the same time, this striving or motion has a potency of its own since it has yet to reach its proper goal or a condition of actualization which would exist as the fulfillment of a

---

138Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 11, 9; 1066a26, as cited by Sullivan, *Introduction to Philosophy*, p. 53.

139Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 11, 9; 1065b17, as cited by Sullivan, p. 53.

140Aristotle, *Physics*, 201a11-12, as cited by Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop*, p. 16.

> given movement if movements or motions are distinguished from each other on a basis which refers to their inherent intelligibility (their reasonableness). Not all motions or movements are endowed with the intelligibility which they should have. Irrational actions can be found, for instance, in how some human beings behave. We think about wanton acts of violence, although, on the other hand too, other actions and movements present themselves to us in a way which points to some kind of inherent intelligibility which is understood to a greater degree if we can point to ends, goals, or terms of action which belong or which, in some way, participate in the intelligibility of a given action or motion. Hence, within this context: motions, movements, or actions share in the intelligibility which belongs to the achievement of certain ends or goals. Change is to be understood by us in a way which points to its reasonableness or its rationality and, by the principles which we use to understand change and to detect its presence within the givens of our sense perception or the givens of our self-awareness, we understand how or why change can be distinguished from the kind of flux which exists if chaos should emerge as an object of inquiry for us in our efforts to come to a possible understanding of it. Minus intelligibility and that which exists as change is seen immediately to exist as chaos. Import understanding – or introduce understandings which could come from the kind of actuation which exists for us in higher acts of understanding or in unrestricted acts of understanding – and then, for these reasons, on this basis, different conclusions can be reached.

All these things being said, before any kind of change can occur, before there can be any kind of transition that would move from a condition of potency to a condition of act, something must exist either with a prior condition of being which is more primitive and a condition of being which is less primitive compared to later realizations of being which could replace it or which could come to it. Since, as we have noted, nothing which can be can ever realize itself through its own nothingness, its own potency, and so move toward a new condition of being or act, for this reason we can understand why the existence of potencies always suppose the prior existence of acts; potential being, actual being. Potencies can only be known if we first know about how a given thing exists. The condition of a given act, the givenness of its being, determines what it can receive in terms of its passive potency and what it can become in terms of its active potency through the doing which can also properly belong to it. For example, the phenomenon of our human questioning exists as an act, as an activity, and also as a potency. As an active potency, our questioning makes for the possibility of an increase in our understanding (the receiving which occurs in experiencing new acts of understanding). Acts lead to acts and then, from there, to later acts, and later acts cannot exist without the being of earlier acts. For example, a human being can exist as simply or merely a human being. The existence is fully actual in terms of a received act of being or a received act of existence since no human being can cause him or herself to exist. However, this actuality of existence does not necessarily include or encompass acts of being or existence which would refer to intermittent acts of sensing, thinking, and understanding (if we should limit ourselves to citing these prominent examples among other options and choices that we can also make). These later acts or operations and other similar acts all exist potentially within the mere being or the mere existence of a given human individual. The kind of being or the kind of act which is the existence of a given thing immediately conditions or it determines all the range of potencies that a given thing has or that it can have if we should attend to a second kind of possible being which is the fuller being or the realization of a given thing's existence (all the potencies which properly belong to it to the degree that they can be reduced or brought to a condition of act): what a given thing can become as new actualities emerge through various actions or operations which can change the quality of a

thing's being, the manner of its concrete existence. Acts and operations come and go (in Aristotle's terminology, as noted, they exist as "accidents": hence, a tripartite distinction speaks about accidental potencies, accidental forms, and accidental acts) and so, as these acts and operations cease to exist within a given context, they can be succeeded by the being of other acts and operations and a new order of existing things which can emerge and exist as a consequence among these different acts and operations.

Among differing acts of being and about how acts of being which exist as acts of mere being or existence differ from acts of being which exist as active and passive acts (active and passive operations or active potencies and passive potencies), an Aristotelian distinction speaks about a thing's act of being or existence as a species of first act and how the operations or acts of a thing's being exist as a species of second act, a second act following the being of a first act.[141] One must come before the other. However, that which is first and that which is second always depends on the context of its particular application: where these distinctions are being applied within a given situation. Something is first relative to something which is second but the second can be first relative to a third which would be second. If we should want to speak about three fundamental metaphysical principles which allegedly, in some way, whether explicitly or implicitly, all come to us from Aristotle in terms of potency, form, and act and the kind of order which allegedly exists among these different principles, as Aristotle would have it thus, the reception of a form by a potency can be classed as a second species of first act and so, from this, by way of a conclusion that comes to us centuries later, principally from the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, the reception of an act by a form, a second species of second act. Where, in Aristotle, form enjoys a primacy and a centrality which explains why, in the metaphysics of Aristotle, a metaphysics of form is to be alluded to (the being of things is understood through their forms and the reception of forms), in the metaphysics of St. Thomas Aquinas, from the primacy and the centrality of act relative to the being of form, the result is not a metaphysics of form but a metaphysics of act (the being of things is understood principally through their acts of being or their acts of existence even if, by form, we can know about the kind of existence that, in fact, belongs to the being of a given thing). The relativities that are to be found within the structure and the articulation of a comprehensive metaphysics – as these relativities are determined – on this basis thus, exact specifications of meaning can be known in terms of how they exist within parameters and contexts that are clearly defined and known by us in ways that relate principles and terms to each other together within the wording and the construction of propositions that are governed by the principle of contradiction. The individual terms define the kind of relation which exists among them and the relation in turn defines the meaning of the composite individual terms. Hence: potency, form, and act have each a meaning which is understood by how each term relates to the others and, in a similar fashion, acts of sensing, understanding, and judging have each a meaning which depends on how each type of act relates to the other acts. Acts of understanding are not understood if no contrast exists with acts of sensing and if the kind of role which belongs to our acts of sensing is not understood in terms which can relate to our later acts of understanding and how this species of cognitive act properly exists, one kind of act either leading to another kind of act or presupposing the being of another kind of cognitive act.

As corollaries that can now be understood more fully from a foundation which refers to the being of potency and act, in moving toward concluding our understanding about how the principle of potency and act exists within the thinking of Aristotle's philosophy, three corollaries can be considered in an order of points which encompasses Aristotle's philosophy of nature in a way which moves initially

141Sullivan, *Introduction to Philosophy*, p. 51.

from (1) φύσις [*physis*] or nature as an interior principle of movement which exists within the being of existing things to (2) φύσις [*physis*] or nature as an understanding of things which thinks in terms of four necessary causes which should always be invoked if a larger number of variables is to be reduced to the unity of a more comprehensive form of explanation (an order exists among these causes) and then, from there, to (3) φύσις [*physis*] or nature as a more general principle (a most general principle) which points to how or why, between the being of our cognitional principles and activities and the being and significance of our metaphysical principles, a connatural unity exists: an order which joins these two sets of principles with each other in a way which points to a species of mutual necessity if, from the perspective of this unity, a more adequate understanding of things is to be attained (an understanding which can link a greater number of variables with each other and so answer a larger number of questions). In discussing any given topic or question, all thorough forms of discussion require a form of analysis and a manner of composition or synthesis which can constantly move from cognitional principles to metaphysical principles and then, from there, back toward cognitional principles *ad infinitum* until, eventually, a satisfactory understanding of things is achieved or until, at a later date, new questions will be asked in the hope of moving toward possible increases in the extent and range of our understanding.

First then, with respect to φύσις [*physis*] or nature as an interior principle of movement within things (sometimes cited as the primary Aristotelian understanding of *physis* or as the most well known understanding of *physis* in Aristotle),[142] the nature (or the natural potency) of a thing or the nature (or the natural potency) of an event is that which exists or which refers to a general principle of motion and rest which exists within things as a constitutive inner principle, determining who and what things are and what they can do and experience as a consequence of who and what they happen to be (nature or the natural as that which is capable of self-organization).[143] Citing Aristotle directly: "nature is a

142Grant, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 6. As Grant notes, Aristotle defines *physis* in different ways as he moves or as we move from one text and context to another text and context. We can argue that, from the discussion about nature or *physis* in the *Physics* to the same kind of discussion in the *Metaphysics*, a development can be found. The later the analysis, the more differentiated the meaning. In the *Metaphysics* (4, 4, 1014b16-1015a19), seven definitions are allegedly indicated although, according to Grant, if we take these definitions and compare them to each other, we should find that they can be reduced or condensed into three definitions which allegedly refer to the (1) nature or essence of something, the (2) full being of a thing, and (3) a power or inclination which works within a thing to effect its change and self-movement. As a species of interpretive analytical principle that guides our thinking and understanding: how we understand *physis* in Aristotle depends on the particular kind of approach that we are using in our reading and interpretation of Aristotle, one kind of heuristic leading to a particular specification of meaning and another leading to another. The better or more nuanced our own approach, the more penetration is the extent of our intelligence and the wiser our judgments, then, the wiser will be our understanding of the possible meaning of *physis* in Aristotle as we move through Aristotle through a form of analysis that is not troubled or baffled by differences in Aristotle's choice and use of words since differences word choice do not always point to differences in meaning that are crucial if we are to move toward a comprehensive understanding of *physis* as this exists in the context of Aristotle's philosophy and thought.

143Aquinas, *Sententia super Physicam*, 1, 1, 3; 2, 1, 145; *Quaestio disputata De unione verbi incarnati*, 1 (as cited by Gilby, *Theological Texts*, pp. 286-287, n. 507); Spaemann, *Essays in Anthropology*, p. 76. See also Patrick Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop* 8 (1980): 14, where Byrne explains the meaning of this definition after quoting what

principle or cause of being moved and of being at rest in that to which it belongs primarily, in virtue of itself and not accidentally."[144] In the definition of nature which thus comes to us from Aristotle, the nature of a thing is vital and pivotal if we should want to establish the identify and the life of any given thing. Hence, by means of this internally existing nature, "things have a principle of growth, organization, and movement [which belongs to them]...in their own right."[145] Something is natural to it if, in its development, it is "most in keeping with the perfection of the nature of a definite thing."[146] Physical changes or physical motions exist in conjunction with other kinds of changes or other kinds of motions as these are given, for instance, in the being of meteorological and geological changes, and as we move into chemical changes, biological changes, zoological changes, and human changes as these exist with respect to variations in our human subjectivity, in our "sensation, feeling, thought, habit, and action."[147] The existence of self-movement within things in turn determines or we would say that it demarcates a world which exists, in its collectivity, as that which is "the whole of the changing."[148] Our naturally existing world or Nature is first known by us through our different acts of human sensing. From nature as an interior principle, as a derivative or as a secondary determination of meaning, we have the external world of Nature – Nature, in upper case. By adverting then to the internal principles which exist within things, these principles denote the nature of existing things and so things are natural to the degree that such a principle exists within them and, in addition too, the activity or the behavior of these things is also natural or appropriate to the degree that it complies or that it conforms to the nature which exists within these things or, in other words, the natural being and the natural behavior of a thing reflect or, in some way, they flow from an inner natural principle which somehow exists within them (for reasons or by way of causes which have yet to be understood and identified in any given case).[149] The normativity of internally existing natures directly points to the appropriateness or to the naturalness of certain types of behavior and, conversely too, the inappropriateness or the unnaturalness which would belong to other kinds of behavior that are lacking in normativity.

The indwelling of an immaterial nature suggests that, normally or usually, a given thing has but only one nature or only one intelligible form: one whyness, one whatness, or one quiddity or essence.[150] As

---

Aristotle gives as a definition in his *Physics*, 192b21-22.

144Aristotle, *Physics*, 2, 1; 192b21-23, as translated by R. P. Hardie and R. K. Gaye.

145Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 81.

146Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Essais de Théodicée*, II, #220, in *Oeuvres Philosophiques*, ed. P. Janet (Paris: Alcan, 1900), vol. 2, p. 234, as quoted by Brague, "Are Non-Theocratic Regimes Possible?," p. 4.

147Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop*, p. 8.

148Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop*, p. 7.

149Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, pp. 81-82.

150Please note, however, that the having of only one nature for a given being is not always or necessarily an absolute rule. Exceptions exist. It is not always true since not everything which has existed in this world has had but only one nature or only one substantial form. In Christian belief, it is held, for instance, about Christ that the incarnate Christ possessed two natures at one and the same time: a divine nature and a human nature. What Christ could not do as a man, as a Son of Man, he did as God, as the Son of God. In addition also, if we look at the physical world as this exists for us within the common world of our ordinary experience, we seem to find instances of metamorphosis where a living thing first exists with one kind of nature or form until it comes to have another kind of nature or form. Natures are shed, lost, or relinquished according to a higher order of meaning or principle of intelligibility. Tadpoles become frogs and caterpillars, butterflies. However, if we look for a nature

noted, the nature of a given thing, in specifying what a given thing is, specifies what it is able to do and what is it is not able to do and what it is able to experience or receive from the being of other things, specifying also the identity of the causes or the movers which are needed if a given thing is to undergo the changes which specifically and typically belong to it.[151] If we should employ a more technical way of speaking that comes to us from how the principles of act and potency have been translated and put into terms and designations which have turned them into designations of potency (distinguishing two different kinds of potency): together, with each other, active potencies and passive potencies constitute the nature or the natural potency of a given thing or substance.[152] If we should know the nature or the intelligibility of a thing as a specification of act (hence, as a realization or as a determination), we should immediately know the identity of a corresponding, apt potency: a potency which exists and is known, relative to the being of a given act, a given realization, or a given determination that could be received by the potency in question in a way which would reduce the being of this potency into a condition of act, extinguishing a given potency when, now, it exists within a condition of act. Act supplants or replaces potency in a manner which can point to the being or the identity of new emergent potencies.

Because, in Aristotle, a real distinction exists between a nature and an accident (the nature of a thing, as an explanatory principle, exists as a constant while what a given thing is doing at any given time differs from what it could be doing at some other time),[153] and because accidental attributes or accidental events come and go according to the kind of nature which individually belongs to them, by understanding and attending to the substantial nature or the substantial form of a given thing, we can understand why some accidents can be regarded as normal or proper and why others can be regarded as incidental or circumstantial (at some times, violent). Acts of cognition which are rational are seen to be proper to the life of human beings but not so our height, our weight, and the color of our hair.[154] With respect to the things of this world, the nature of a given thing cannot be simply identified with how a given thing actually exists nor with what a given thing is actually doing in a given act or operation. From a thing's nature, its being or the existence of any of its operations cannot be derived. Understanding a given finite nature or essence does not mean that we will necessarily understand the

---

(an intelligible principle) that can identify how changes in nature can occur within the being of a given thing, we cannot so easily speak about a being which first has one nature and then another nature which would totally differ from the first or which would be unconnected with the first. The purpose or the function of an understanding which knows about a nature is to find an explanation that can account for many different kinds of changes or movements. In dealing with instances of metamorphosis, an understanding of change which wants to understand how or why a succession of forms exists with respect to a given existing concrete being would have to be a species of understanding which knows about the being of a substantial form since, from the perspective of this form, we would understand why an intelligible order exists with respect to the being of a succession of forms. Always, when moving toward an understanding which grasps the form of an intelligible nature, we engage in a species of activity which wants to move from an experience of multiplicity toward a condition of unity as this unity exists within the kind of oneness which belongs to the intelligibility of an understood nature.

151Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop*, p. 14.

152Aquinas, *De Potentia*, q. 1, a. 1 and *Summa Contra Gentiles*, 3, 23.

153Lonergan, *Triune God: Systematics*, p. 193.

154Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 41.

actuality of its being or the actuality of its existence.[155]

Hence, within this context, a nature (as Aristotle understands it) would have to exist as a limited form of explanatory principle. It explains a fewer number of things because it cannot be equated with the concrete being of an existing thing and all the things that a given thing does, performs, or experiences. A certain fullness of reality is missing: a fullness which refers to the simple existence of concretely existing things or/and the activities of these concretely existing things although, admittedly, in some way, the nature of a thing, as an explanatory principle, is such that it is ordered toward possibly receiving acts of being or existence – acts which would refer to the existence of a given thing or being and which could also refer to the being of operations although, as noted, in the metaphysics of form which exists in Aristotle, the being of existing things is not explained by way of act but by the principle of form.

Second, by way of a further understanding of motion or movement which comes to us if we move with the principles of potency and act in the context of Aristotle's philosophy, from potency and act or, alternatively, from matter and form, we can move toward the kind of teaching which Aristotle offers when he speaks about the necessary existence of four different kinds of causes (four necessary causes)[156] if movement or change, as it exists in our world, is to have a fully adequate explanation where, for instance, in book 9 of the *Metaphysics*, Aristotle summarizes the adumbrations and speculations of Pre-socratic teaching as this refers to a general understanding of all the causal explanations which can possibly exist for us in our attempts to understand the being of our world. How to explain why something is changing in the way that it is changing if differing answers can be given about why something is changing in the way that it is changing (differing answers which do not conflict with each is saying or offering as an explanation)?[157] What are these distinct causes and what kind of role do they individually play as heuristic tools if our larger, general object is always an understanding of everything that can undergo or initiate any kind of movement or change within the circumstances of our currently existing world as this world has always existed as a species of reality which, to some extent, is self-moving and self-causing?[158] On a basis which can be determined on the basis of potency and act, or on a basis which can be determined on the basis of matter and form, with respect to these first principles, four distinct causes can be determined where each exists as a relation or as a perspective which works from a slightly different point of departure that is grounded in how it can be said that potency and act or matter and form are related to each other.[159] As a fundamental point of departure however: the association of form and act with determinacy and matter and potency with indeterminacy suggests that none of these contrasting terms is understood if its correlative is not also understood in a way which points to a dialectical but mutual form of determination. The meaning of one mediates the meaning of the other back and forth. One is positive while the other, negative and each cannot be entirely understood apart from its opposition or contrast with the other.

In a way which accordingly shows that Aristotle was the first person to speak about the necessary existence of four necessary distinct causes that must be invoked if we are to have a comprehensive

---

155Lonergan, *Ontological and Psychological Constitution of Christ*, p. 11; p. 53; p. 164.

156Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1, 3, 10; *Physics*, 2, 7, as cited by Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 43; Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop*, p. 15.

157Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop*, p. 15.

158Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 82.

159Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop*, p. 15.

understanding of anything which exists within the world of our ordinary experience, Aristotle notes as follows: (1) Thales, Anaximander, and Anaximenes discovered the kind of being which exists as a material specification of cause (hence, material cause); (2) the Pythagoreans to Plato, form as formal cause; (3) Empedocles and Heraclitus, respectively through the principle of Love and Strife and the principle of *logos*, the being of efficient or instrumental causes; and finally (4) Anaxagoras, Socrates, and Plato, the being of final causes which Aristotle accepted and which he further developed within the later context of his ethics when speaking about how our human movements are directed or intended toward that which would exist as a concrete good.

With respect then to the being of efficient or instrumental causes (given earlier discussions about the meaning of material and formal causes in Aristotle), an efficient or an instrumental cause refers to that by which something else is made. Hence, an efficient cause refers to some kind of instrument or means that is used in a given context. One does this in order to do that. A frequently employed example refers to an artist who carves a statue from a mass of stone. The hammer and chisel that he uses function as efficient or as instrumental causes. By their use, through an external kind of application and use, something else is brought into being which had not existed before.[160] An efficient cause accordingly exists as a catalyst: as an agent cause, as a moving cause, as an agent object, or as a moving substance. It moves matter or something other which exists as an other from a condition of non-being toward a condition of being.[161] In a definition which comes to us from Aristotle, it is "that from which change or rest first begins."[162] A parent, as a substance (*ousia*), through the form of the parent's humanity, takes something other which is not yet human and, by working with it, changes it into something which is now human.[163] More precisely in wording which can be used to define the nature of an efficient cause, it is that "*by which* something [other] is made."[164]

To understand the nature of an efficient cause, we begin by understanding how we can move from the nature of a formal cause to the nature of an efficient cause, an understanding of formal causes leading us toward an understanding of efficient causes. On formal causes: when a form exists within a given thing, as a formal cause, it accordingly exists as a distinct predicate, having its own effect. It indicates what a given thing is: why it exists in the way that it does, what this same thing is able to receive without destroying or violating its being and identity, and what this same thing is able to do as an extension or as a communication of its being and identity if, with respect to the being of a given thing, it exists with a measure of self-motion and self-movement which points to its animate, living nature. Living things or animate substances are characterized by varying degrees of self-motion; dead inanimate things, by a lack of self-motion. When the intelligibility of a formal cause accordingly indicates what a given thing is able to receive (when its passivity is indicated and understood), we can then understand what kinds of action can come to it from without (from external sources and causes): actions which can bring a given thing into a condition of being or actions which can bring a given thing into a specification of being which refers to the kind of fuller being which exists in context of its

---

160Stebbins, *Divine Initiative*, p. 98.

161Joseph Owens, *Elementary Christian Metaphysics*, p. 76 & n. 19 citing Aquinas, *De Ente*, 4. See also Lonergan, *Understanding and Being*, p. 8; and Stebbins, *Divine Initiative*, p. 41.

162Aristotle, *Physics*, 194b30, as quoted by Patrick H. Byrne, "Teleology, Modern Science and Verification," *Lonergan Workshop*, vol. 10, ed. Fred Lawrence (Boston: Boston College, 1994), p. 4.

163Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop*, p. 15.

164Alder, *Aristotle for Everybody*, p. 42.

flourishing. It is one thing to simply be or exist. It is another thing to fully live and be. Then too however, by also understanding what a given thing is able to do, we can also understand how a given thing can also exist and function as if it is itself a species of efficient cause. By its own actions, it can bring something else into being: either a being which is totally other than the being who is the doer or the subject of efficient causality or something which exists within the life of the subject who is the agent or the doer of efficient causality. We can read a book in order to grow in our own understanding and knowledge or we can read a book in order to engage in actions which construct external objects We might want to build a house, a computer, or some other external object. While substances (or things) exist with formal determinations which point to their distinctiveness (who and what they are), through their efficient causality, these same substances or things can pass on or they can communicate their whatness (their formal determinations) to things which would exist as new others (acting upon these others in a way which effects the being of something which, before, had not existed). In a point of difference or contrast with the formality or the immateriality of formal causes, efficient causes work with material means of one kind or another to effect the emergence or the being of other things even if, admittedly, in some circumstances, these other things or these other objects exist in an immaterial way (they have no spatial or temporal conjugates).[165]

> Paraphrasing the kind of argumentation which we can find in the teaching of Aquinas: since contingent being cannot cause itself (since, in Aquinas, the form or the nature of a contingent being is not to be equated with the act of being or the act of existence which belongs to an actually existing contingent thing), the beingness or the existence of an actually existing contingent thing can only be explained if we should refer to an act or a cause of being or existence which comes from something other (externally), this other referring to the reality or the activity of an efficient cause. In a shift which moves toward the kind of truth which is expressed by a proposition which exists for us as an analytic principle (its truth is such that the form or the predicate of a thing exists within the meaning or the being of a given thing; a thing exists as a substance or it exists as a subject), a difference in internal relations distinguishes the causality and the reality of a formal cause from the causality and the reality of an efficient cause. In a formal cause, a form exists within a set of material conditions and, in the consequent internal relation which exists between form and matter as these exist together, as noted, in and by itself, a formal cause does not bring something other into a condition of being from a prior condition of non-being. The causality of a formal cause is limited to specifying why something exists in the way that it happens to be and exist. However, with respect to the being of efficient or instrumental causes: if, in another predicate of relation, an internal relation is constitutive of the being of another thing, if an internal relation brings a being

---

165As Hill notes in *After the Natural Law*, p. 43, the materiality of material and efficient causes is to be distinguished from the formality or the immateriality of formal and final causes and, in differing ways also, each set respectively refers to the being of internal and external aspects with respect to the being and the becoming of things. Matter exists as an internal component when we refer to the being of existing things. Form also exists as an internal component (matter and form go together) and so, with respect to material and formal causes, both exist as internal components with respect to the reality of existing things (things which exist as substances). However, as external causes, an efficient cause brings something which is other into being and, in an external way too, according to Aristotle's understanding of final causes, these act from without or externally to bring something which is other into a condition of fuller, more perfect being.

> into a condition of existence which before it had not enjoyed (moving from a condition of non-being to a condition of being), then, in this sense, we can refer to how this type of internal relation can be regarded as an efficient cause and not as a formal cause. The internal relation which exists within the being of an efficient cause points to a variable or a factor which explains how or why a given something has been brought into a condition of being from a prior condition of non-being. On this basis then, if human beings can understand how they can function as efficient causes, if they can understand how, in their efficient causality, they can effect or bring into being the being of other things (things can refer also to the being or the existence of other human beings), then, they can begin to understand how efficient causes have functioned to effect the being of their personal existence. To some extent, they can understand and know these external causes, determining them and also possibly the order which can join these efficient causes with each other in a manner which is more effective than the being of some other kind of order.

With respect to the being of final causes, for Aristotle (in the context of his teleological biology, his teleological ethics, and his teleological physics): "nature does not act without a goal."[166] In asking why something exists or why it functions in the way that it happens to exist or function, implicitly, in the posing of this question, we would be asking about the existence of some kind of end or purpose, a realization of some kind: a "that for the sake of which,"[167] a "form which finally results when the motion continues on to completion,"[168] where here, in Greek, *telos* refers to the term of a realization or the term of a development which would exist as some kind of "end," "goal," "purpose," or "fulfillment."[169] In general terms thus: an "x" exists in the way that it does because of a "y." Hence, with respect to that which exists as "y," as an explanation, it imparts or it points to a possible direction or to an orientation which can exist with respect to that which exists as "x," informing the being or the nature of "x," belonging in a way to the fuller existence of that which exists as "x." The "x" in question does not exist in some kind of isolation by itself (in a self-enclosed kind of way) but in a manner which points to a measure of self-transcendence which properly belongs to it. The self-transcendence exists initially as a species of passive potency although, in the case of living things, another species of self-transcendence can be identified if we should refer to the possible activation or the eliciting of active potencies which can be brought into a condition of act if we admit that, as a final cause, a given "y" exerts a perfecting influence. Its causality is such that it functions as an immaterial kind of efficient cause through the attractiveness which it exerts on things which are other than itself,[170] at times drawing a lower order of being toward a realization of some kind which cannot be effected in any other kind of way (since, as we have previously noted, as a general principle, nothing which exists in a condition of potency is able to realize itself through a change which could be described as a species of self-actuation, a self-actuation of something which, in its potency, is bereft of that which exists in a condition of act). Realizations of potency come from acts and not from something which exists only as a "could be" or as a possibility (hence, as a potency). If, in the life of a given thing, stages of development can be noticed or if, say, the emergence of "x" makes for the possible emergence of something which exists as "z," then, in order to understand the nature or the being of a living thing or

---

166Osborne, *Philosophy for Beginners,* p. 19.
167Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop*, p. 15.
168Byrne, "*Insight* and the Retrieval of Nature," *Lonergan Workshop*, p. 15.
169Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 34; Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 83.
170Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 84.

in order to understand a possible relation which can exist among a number of different living things, then the necessary result is the postulation of a final cause (an order of finality) that is able to link these different stages and conditions with each other in a way which suggests that formal causes exist for the sake of final causes (for the sake of realizations and perfections which have yet to be, exist, and emerge).[171]

On a critical note: to avoid any confusions here and to determine the kind of final cause which is to be identified with Aristotle's notion of final cause, please note thus that this final cause is not to be identified with the possible being of some kind of inner tendency, a nisus, a desire, or an effort which somehow exists within things as a governing "inner impulse" that impels growth or which directs the life and growth of a given thing,[172] although, on the other hand, it is to be admitted that this type of understanding has been attributed to Aristotle or it has been postulated as a better understanding about how, in nature, teological causes function and operate. In the first case, R. G. Collingwood speaks about final causality as an inner tendency which exists within things, a finality which does not have to be conscious in the manner of its operation in order for it to exist and function as an operative cause;[173] and, without qualification, this understanding is attributed to the kind of understanding that comes to us from Aristotle. But then, on the other hand, in the thought of Bernard Lonergan, a like understanding of finality is given which suggests that, perhaps, Collingwood is its probable source or he exists as a kindred source although, on the other hand, this same understanding is to be attributed to Aristotle in a manner, however, which points to the necessity of a qualification. The finality that comes to us from Collingwood and Lonergan does not come to us from Aristotle in terms which refer to a *telos* or in terms which would refer to a final cause as an *archê hothen hê kinêsis* [as the source of movement].[174] Instead, the parallel in Aristotle is with how, in the *Physics*, Aristotle understands motion or movement as a species of inner principle or inner cause which exists within the being of things. If, in Aristotle, final causes resemble efficient causes in terms of an external causality which belongs to them (the externality of their operation), in Lonergan, the reverse applies: final causes resemble formal causes in terms of a form of internal causality (in their own way, they operate within the being of things). A formal cause indicates what a given thing is; a final cause, what the same thing can become given what it already happens to be. Citing Lonergan's own words on the identity of final causes as these indicate both an absence of Aristotelian origins and also a derivation from Aristotelian origins: "finality is not *principium motus in alio inquantum aliud* [a principle of movement in another thing insofar as it is other]; it is not *id cuius gratia* [that for the sake of which]; [instead] it is *principium motus in eo in quo est* [a principle of movement within the thing itself (in that in which the principle too has being)]."[175] In its dynamism and also its incompleteness, for Aristotle and Lonergan, this inner tendency or this active potency is something which exists as motion, movement, or change, and so it exists as a kind of in between. It exists as a departing or as a shifting from a prior condition of potency toward a later condition of act; or, perhaps more accurately and precisely, it exists as a departing or as a moving from a lesser condition of act toward a later, fuller condition of act.

171Patrick H. Byrne, *Analysis and Science in Aristotle* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1997), p. 197.

172Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 34; Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 83.

173Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 83.

174Aristotle, *Physics*, 2, 1, 192b21-22, as cited by Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding,* p. 476.

175Lonergan, *Insight: A Study of Human Understanding,* p. 476.

To understand, however, how or why final causes differ from efficient causes and how they also differ from formal causes, in its simplicity, a useful point of departure refers to the example of a sculptor who works with stone, hammer, and chisel to carve a statue. In his thinking and understanding, the sculptor has a plan, an image, which exists within his mind. Within the mass of the stone that he is working with, he sees an image that he wishes to reveal and so he removes the obstructing stone to reveal the being of this image. The image, relative to the materiality of the stone, exists as a species of formal cause. It identifies the form of a statue. A statue is a statue because of the form which it has. However, in the work which is being done, material, efficient, and formal causes are being combined with each other in many and various ways and the intelligibility which specifies this combination of differing acts and potencies is itself a predicate (a species of predicate) which transcends the being of all the other causes or predicates which together are needed if we are to explain the being of existing things. The sculptor, in his own right, is a human being and the formal causality of his humanity is being combined with the being of other causes in a way which refers to the being and the finality of a larger, more general scheme of things. In finality, this exists for the sake of that, and in the correlation and interrelation of many different variables, in the context of a general order which exists among many different things, a given end or purpose or, in other words, a condition of perfection or a condition of realization which exists at one level of being is explained by the being of other ends or purposes (other, possible conditions of realization) through a chain of causes which moves through differing levels of being or reality toward higher orders of being or reality. If, for instance, we should look at the organic world of living things which surrounds us, we notice that without water and a cycle of events which make for a regular supply of water, no plant life can ever exist. But then, without the existence of certain kinds of vegetative life, certain other kinds of life form would not exist within the animal kingdom and then too, without the existence of life forms which exist among lower animals, higher animals would not be able to exist. Generically speaking: one type of being creates conditions of possibility for the emergence of other types of being. Hence, in Aristotle, the primacy of final causes is such that it points to why final causes are to be understood in a way which regards them as "the cause of causes" (*causa causarum*).[176] To repeat and reiterate what we have said and to try and give a fuller explanation about how, in our world, a finality exists with respect to the being of existing things:

> In the world of our experience, a final causality imparts a unity or it creates a comprehensiveness that is able to integrate the being of all lesser final causes and, at the same time too, all other primary causes (material, formal, and efficient). All other causes can be understood in terms of how they all relate to each other if we can point to an internal orientation or a vector which exists within the world of our ordinary experience, a world which cannot be or exist in the way that it does if certain levels of being or if certain kinds of being are not to be known in a way which recognizes the fact that certain things exist as points of departure for the possible existence of other things: higher things or higher levels of being even if the being of lower or prior things is without any kind of awareness which would know about the existence of this kind of order or this kind of ordination. As noted, a higher level of being or a higher kind of being can only exist if certain lower levels of being exist in some kind of preliminary way or if, similarly, lower kinds of being exist. Apart from our subjective

176Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 43, quoting D. Q. McInerny, *Metaphysics* (Elmhurst, PA: Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter, 2004), 266; Charles A. Hart, *Thomistic Metaphysics An Inquiry into the Act of Existing* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1959), p. 299.

> considerations or apart from our subjective desires as these exist within the human order of things when we ask about the kind of order which exists among our many human actions and how our actions are orientated toward goals and objectives which are proper to them, within the external world of physical, chemical, biological nature (as this exists) an objective species of order is discoverable, a teleological order of some kind or other even if we would have to admit that the existence of this order is not so easily understood within a context of mind and a way of thinking which prefers to think that a teleological order of things is to be associated only with the human order of existing things and not with an order of things which exists apart from any kind of human intervention that would take up this world in a way that is suited to our refashioning of it ways that would seem to suit our human interests and desires.

By attending thus to the form of a thing (the form of a substance), from the principle of form and by understanding how it relates to the principle of matter as this exists in potency, the result should be an apprehension which knows about an order of being and how finality exists within the being of our world. Consciously or unconsciously, a goal-oriented system strives for its own form of self-realization and for whatever perfection is possible within a context of limitations as these are allowed and permitted by the essence of a particular thing (perhaps according to how this essence is known by us initially through an understanding that knows about the being of its relevant form).[177] If, from the form of a thing, we understand the essence of a thing, from the same form (or, in other words, from the same principle), we should also understand how a thing best exists when it is realized a manner which points to the fullness of its being (the fullness of its reality).[178] For an example here that is often used: metaphysically speaking, an acorn is an actuality which exists as the potentiality for the later being (the later emergence) of a mature oak tree since its matter contains the potentiality for becoming a mature oak tree which is the acorn's eventual actuality in the course of time although, in metaphysical terms, we would say that an oak tree's being or that the oak's tree's existence is the actuality of an acorn: an actuality which would exist as the realization or as the kind of terminus which belongs to the life and being of an acorn. Throughout, a form exists as an operative, operating cause and the form of an acorn is such thus that its realization or its end is the reality of a fully existing tree.

An adequate understanding about the nature of a formal cause should always thus indicate the being and the operation of a final cause and the possible understanding that can be had if we should attend to the possible being and meaning of a final cause. This proceeding of an understanding of finality from a apprehension which first understands and knows about the intelligibility of a formal cause accordingly explains why these two causes exist together as respectively denoting internal and external aspects which belong to the intelligibility of things, an intelligibility however which refers to the "formal nature of things."[179] The form of a thing exists internally as one of its two components (the other component is matter) but, as an internally existing thing, the form or the intelligibility of a thing points to a species of external cause which is the term or the terminus of a formal cause with respect to its possible later realization within conditions that belong to the being of our world in terms of its spatial and temporal conjugates. Hence, the intelligibility of a final cause is other than the being of a formal cause although, from an understanding of formal causes, we move toward an understanding of final causes. Relative to the being of formal causes, final causes exist in an external manner as a higher

---

177Palmer, *Looking at Philosophy*, p. 79.
178Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 41.
179Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 43, n. 12.

principle of order. *Qua* externality, final causes resemble efficient causes (both exist in an external way) although the resemblance ends as soon as we advert to how they refer to different aspects or different parts that are constitutive of how change occurs within the world of our ordinary experience or to a different kind of relation which can exist between act and potency or a different kind of relation which can exist between form and matter. If, in Aristotle, every kind of change is a process of being moved or affected by something else which is other than itself in some way (whether changes occur within our souls or within the being of inanimate nature),[180] to explain every kind of movement or change which occurs, it is accordingly noted and argued that every kind of moving or changing involves a potential (a material cause) which receives a form (a formal cause) from an agent (an efficient cause) in a context which creates conditions that lead to the possible reception of new changes in a growth, a development, or a perfection of some kind which occurs within the being of that which had been potential (a final cause).[181]

To conclude with an example which attempts to explain how these four necessary causes exist together, we can distinguish between the plan of an architect to construct a building and the realization of this same building once it has been constructed. Very many events or causes need to occur before we can have the finished product, a completed building. Now, as an analytic principle (as a truth that cannot be doubted since the predicate exists within the subject), it can be said that, prior to the completion of a given building, the building in question, in fact, does not exist. Its lack of being or its lack of reality explains why it cannot be or act within a currently existing context in order to effect or to bring about a given act or an activity which would contribute to the construction of the building in question. As we have noted, nothing which exists in a condition of potency is able to realize itself. However, if we should want to talk about how we are to advert to a possible application of different causes that can effect the construction of a given building, we can refer here to efficient forms of causality. An architect and subsequent builders work from a realized conception or a thought out plan which exists as a species of formal cause. This thought out plan is to be concretely realized in a manner which works from a set of architectural drawings, these drawings existing as a species of first principle for the generation of a series of efficient, instrumental causes. However, if, within this context, we should move to another point of view and if we should advert to an intelligible order which exists within a series or a succession of acts or causes that ultimately leads toward the realization of a building's construction, we will encounter an intelligibility which differs from the intelligibility or the form of efficient causality: an order of intelligibility which is denoted if we should refer to that which exists as the final causality of a realized intelligibility and why, from the standpoint of a realized accomplished intelligibility, we can go back and find an order which is to be distinguished from other kinds of intelligible order which exist because, here, its point of reference is the maturity of a completed form. Final causes differ from efficient causes because, in each case, a different base or a different point of departure is to be employed as a species of first principle for the determination of a given relation which exists as we move from the formality of one kind of cause to the formality of another kind of cause where, in the being of each cause, act and potency are related in a different way.

As a third species of corollary, in potency and act, we have metaphysical principles which are reflected and more fully understood through a correspondence which exists when we refer to the being of cognitional principles (the being of our cognitional acts) and how, conversely, our cognitional acts are more fully understood if our point of departure shifts and becomes the being and the reality of our

180Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 11, 7, 1072b3, as cited by Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 44, n. 15.
181Byrne, *Analysis and Science in Aristotle*, p. 166.

metaphysical principles. Acts as activities presuppose acts which exist as acts of being or as acts of existence where, in this type of situation, acts of being or existence exist within a condition of potency relative to acts or activities which refer to a species of reality which transcends the kind of being which is given if we should refer to the mere factuality of being or the factuality of existence. For a complete understanding of cognitional activities as these exist among human beings, we must refer to their conditions of possibility and hence, from this, to questions which can ask about the possibility and the reality of these conditions. If, for instance, our human cognition exists as an ongoing form of interaction between our acts of sense and our acts of understanding, is not the condition of possibility for the having of these activities a requisite species of being which would exist for us as the union of a corporeal body with an immaterial soul? The being of things both in the being of ourselves and in the being of others leads to the being (the realization) of our knowledge and our understanding of things even as we admit too that our knowledge and understanding of things leads us toward to the being of things, a greater knowledge about the actual being of things. Through our self-reflection, we come to know about apprehensions of being that are given to us as a consequence of our later acts of inquiry and discovery although, through this same self-reflection, we can also begin to realize that apprehensions of being are already somehow given to us apart from the instigation of any inquiries that could lead us toward new apprehensions of being that would add to the sum of that which we already happen to know about the being of existing things. If it is argued thus, with Aristotle, that pedagogically, from what we already know, we move to that which we can come to understand and know, then, in a similar way, we can argue that being exists as a precondition, as a species of *a priori*. Knowing always supposes being if, from being, from the being that is already understood and know without our having to ask any questions, we move toward knowing and the kind of being that can be known by us through our various acts of cognition, one following on another in a way which moves from our acts of sensing through our acts of direct understanding on into our acts of understanding which would exist for us as our reflective acts of understanding. The transcendence which exists in our human acts of cognition is explained by a greater transcendence which refers to how all these acts exist or how they are brought into being by a world that, in some way, already mysteriously exists in a way which transcends the being of our human cognition. A world exists which is proportionate to the kind of knowing which belongs to us in our human cognition; and the being of this world and the being of ourselves - if all this can be understood or grasped by us in some kind of limited way – this same world is something which transcends the kind of being which is ourselves in how we happen to exist and, yet, this same world also belongs or exists within us (in our being) through a form of participation that is available to us (which is partially given to us) by way of the kind of agency which exists within the kind of awareness which also belongs to us within our human acts of cognition.

Aristotle's understanding of divine things

If we should speak then about the being of a transcendent world and how, in Aristotle, we can speak about our participation in it (how we can move from the proportionate kind of world that we know to the being of a world which transcends the being of our cognitive operations), an understanding of this should exist for us if we can distinguish between two parts or two points where we would go from the first to the second. First, our point of departure continues to be a question which asks about an explanation for the being of our world and the kind of change which exists within our world. However, now, our explanation must be more sufficient or adequate. Until now, our object has been limited to the being of potency and act and how, through potency and act and the interaction which exists between them, being and becoming have been brought together within our world in a way which points to a dialectical form of ordering which is constitutive of our world. As noted: these principles exist

together even as they are also opposed to each other. Never is there not a real distinction between potency and act. Hence, from this, in the ordering which exists within our world, intelligibility is found. It is detected even if, at the same time, the intelligibility of our world is something which is not itself the term of an act of understanding which belongs to us, an act of understanding that we have personally attained or which exists as the term of an inquiry which we have initiated and which has been concluded by the reception of an act of understanding. We usually have our own acts of understanding but, as we attend to our acts of understanding, we find that intelligibility is something which exists also as a given. It already exists for us before we should begin to move toward our own experiences of understanding and intelligibility through any questions that we might begin to ask. We are not entirely the originators of understanding and intelligibility even as we know and admit that, to some extent, we exist as originators of these things (as meaning and intelligibility is given to us within the context of our own experience of self and the world and as we introduce the ordering of meaning and intelligibility into a context where these things had been absent). For the sake or the purpose of understanding, in order to grow in our understanding, we find that we are always moving from the intelligibility of an order in things as this exists within ourselves toward the intelligibility which exists within the world that exists outside of ourselves and, conversely too, we find that we are also moving from the order of intelligibility that exists within the world which exists outside of ourselves toward the intelligibility which also exists within ourselves. In another way of speaking and a bit more bluntly: intelligibility exists as a kind of *a priori*. We have intelligibility as a kind of consequence in our human lives (through our cognitive attentiveness and activity) and we also have intelligibility as a kind of prior condition that exists for us as a fundamental point of departure if we are to have subsequent acts of understanding and the enjoyment or the experience of intelligibility as the term or as the content of our understanding. A useful theological analogy refers to the prevenience or to the necessity of God's grace. "As often as we do good God operates in us and with us, so that we may operate."[182] Grace must first be given to us before we can begin to live in ways that are truly pleasing to God and so, as a result, begin to grow in grace. Our good actions always need the kind of prior help which is the priority or the prevenience of God's grace. Hence, similarly with our acts of understanding and the experience of intelligibility that is given to us in our acts of understanding: it exists for us as a condition of possibility before we can then move toward the kind of attainment and the experience of understanding which can exist within our own acts of understanding.

Second, as a consequence of our self-reflection, we know that no real distinction exists between an act of understanding and the term of such an act which exists as an intelligibility. First the act and then immediately, in the act, intelligibility. No act of understanding exists apart from the experience or the givenness of an intelligibility and no intelligibility exists apart from its generating act of understanding. When intelligibility exists as the term of an act of understanding which belongs to another subject, another understander (someone who is other than ourselves) and when this intelligibility does not exist as the term of our own act of understanding, it would exist for us thus as a known unknown. We know about the existence of intelligibility as this exists in the life of other subjects but this intelligibility is not understood by us through any act of understanding that we personally have. The intelligibility exists in an objective way. It is other than ourselves. On this basis thus, to the degree that we should know about the existence of intelligibility within our world and to the degree too that we should know about its infinity (the intelligibility is so great and complex that it transcends our personal capacity and powers of attainment), then, on this basis, we can begin to admit that, for an adequate explanation of

182Second Council of Orange (529), as quoted by Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, trans. James Canon Bastible (Rockford, Illinois: Tan Books, 1974), p. 229.

intelligibility as it exists in the sweep of its generality and transcendence, we must refer to another known unknown which exists as an infinite act of intelligence (the being of an infinite intelligence of some kind which would have to exist for us as a species of first principle). It is prior or first within the order of all existing things. And so too, within the order of our human cognition, it exists as a priority or as a first because it functions as a necessary point of departure that is given to us if, then, we are to move toward any increments, additions, or expansions that can be given to us within the depth of our personal understanding.

Hence, as a fundamental postulate or as a prior condition which requires our assent and acknowledgement if individually we are to grow in the extent of our understanding and knowledge of things, through our self-knowledge, we can advert to the existence of an originating intellectual principle which functions as an ultimate source and principle of order in our world (an order that we have not created nor an order that we can possibly bring about through the agency of our own actions). And so, in the being of this originating principle, it is such that it does three things. (1) It creates or it constitutes the order which is the being of our world (the being of our world as it is constituted by its intelligibility). As an unrestricted act, (2) it implements or it effects the same order which it happens to know or, conversely, we can argue that the knowing of this order implements or it effects this same order and also (3) it sustains and it maintains this order which it has brought into being through the kind of act which it is as it exists in itself as an infinite act of understanding. Through an introspective, retroactive form of analysis which belongs to us as human beings, we have moved or we can move from acts to potencies and then too from potencies to acts and then, from there, from first acts to the being of other acts (as in "this act explains this other act" or "this act is explained by this other act") and so, for us, the inevitable result is a conclusion which points to the being of an ultimate principle of intelligibility which must exist apart from ourselves because it exists as an intelligence which knows itself in an eminently perfect and exhaustive manner: existing thus, through its efficient causality, as both the primary unmoved mover of all things and as the primary uncaused cause of all effects and yet existing also through a final causality which draws everything to itself through the attractiveness, the good, the love, or the perfection which exists in the unrestrictedness of this intelligence in the knowledge which it has of itself. An act of understanding unrestrictedly knows itself as an act of understanding (the full extent of its power and might) and everything that can also be know by an act of understanding (its extent and its depth) and self-understanding also exists an unrestricted act of self-loving.[183] If our human self-reflection accordingly exists as a perfection which knows no equal within circumstances and conditions that are determined by the being of temporal and spatial conjugates (the kind of contingency which belongs to human acts of understanding reflects the contingency which belongs to how we live and exist within a material world), how much greater then is the self-reflection and the self-knowledge which belongs to the being of an act of understanding that exists without any kind of limit or restriction? In this ultimate first principle and in the simplicity of its unity and being, efficient and final causality accordingly exist together in a manner which is grounded in how this first principle exists as simply an unrestricted, unadulterated act of understanding, enjoying and having a kind of actuality that is bereft of the possibility of any kind of potency and, at the same time too, having an actuality which transcends the being of all classes, kinds, and any subdivisions which could ever possibly exist.[184]

By a kind of analogy thus, we have moved from our human acts of understanding toward a partial kind

183Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 88.
184Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 87.

of understanding which is given to us about the being of an unrestricted act of understanding. Certain things can be said about the being of this act of understanding (necessarily, it exists) and, at the same time too, a greater portion is not understood and known by us since, in admitting that such a thing exists (an unrestricted act of understanding), we would also have to admit that this unrestrictedness is something which is shrouded in inaccessibility and, from this inaccessibility, its mystery. Never can we adequately know it or understand it even as we always know that, in some mysterious way, our acts of understanding exist as effects (contingent acts of understanding supposing the being of acts of understanding which always exist) and so, in some way, our acts of understanding exist through a kind of participation which exists in the being of this unrestricted act of understanding. Secondary causes (as this applies to our contingent acts of human cognition) cannot be known apart from the being of primary causes (as this applies to the being of an unrestricted act of cognition) since the conception or the postulation of anything which exists as a secondary cause always supposes the conception and the being of a primary cause; secondary causality, primary causality.

Given then the principle of sufficient reason which says that nothing happens in our world without the being of some kind of reason or cause, and as we use this principle as a species of first principle within our thinking and our understanding of things: hence, if, in general, motions and effects are to have some kind of ultimate adequate explanation, if motions and effects exist intrinsically as intelligible, reasonable, rational things, then, through a self-evident kind of reflection and argument, intelligence and reasonableness would have to exist in a way which points to its inevitability or to its ultimacy and so, from the perspective of this ultimacy, in Aristotle, we get to a notion of God, cited by Aristotle as *theos*:[185] God as a transcendent, divine type of being who must be utterly unique, existing as both an unmoved, first mover and as an uncaused first cause (the two existing together). Hence, as a consequence: "the divine [*to theion*] encompasses [*periechei*] the order of nature."[186] This being, this *theos*, as divine, cannot be moved by anything else without risk of contradiction. It cannot be caused by anything else and so, as noted, in this first mover or in this first cause, we have a mover or a cause which must exist in a manner that is entirely lacking in any kind of incompleteness (hence, as noted, in any kind of potency). The first mover or the first cause must exist within a condition of pure act (there being no kind of development or species of realization that could possibly exist within this mover or cause which would have us assume that, in it, there must be a transition that would move from a condition of potency toward a condition of act). Hence, uniquely, as an unrestricted type of act, it is entirely actual and most ultimate: it is the beginning and the source of all things even if admittedly, within the context of his understanding, in Aristotle, nothing is said about the being of this first principle as if he exists as some kind of creator for the being of all other things in the world, a creator who, through efficient causality, would bring everything else into some kind of being from a prior condition of non-being or, alternatively, if we should use another conceptuality, bring something into being from a prior condition of nothingness. Instead of God moving outwardly from himself toward the being of a world which is somehow other than himself (even if, in some way, it comes from him), God exists primarily as a lodestone or as a magnet (exercising its influence as a supremely attractive end, object, *telos*, or final cause if we should prefer to work with this technical manner of speaking).[187]

185Rémi Brague, *On the God of the Christians (and on one or two others)*, trans. Paul Seaton (South Bend, Indiana: St. Augustine's Press, 2013, citing Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, XII, 7, 1072b25, 29-30.

186Brague, *On the God of the Christians*, citing Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, XII, 8, 10724b3.

187Pabst, *Metaphysics*, pp. 22-23, p. 26, citing Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, XII, 7, 1072a26-1072b31.

All things exist and be to the degree that they exist in God; or, in other words, by way of an explanation: as they move toward God in a manner which is constantly shifting from prior conditions of potency towards later realizations of act. The degree or the goodness of their individual being is measured by the degree that each imitates the kind of being and the kind of goodness which belongs to God alone, rational beings best imitating God through the being of their understanding.[188]

In the manner of our analysis thus - as we have moved toward first principles and the reality of these first principles – our way of analysis has led us toward the being of a fully actual, immaterial, transcendent power which would exist as mind, reason, or *nous* (if we should use this Greek designation). Subtract the being of the full actuality which belongs to *nous* and, incoherently, we would have to move within a world (we would be confined to a world) where everything would exist with one part or aspect that is always actual and a second part that is always potential or possible. Perfections in being within our currently existing world would be always joined to imperfections in being in a way which would always take away or which would always subtract from the quality or the being of the perfections which, in fact, are already given to us (they already exist in some way) even if, between these different kinds of being – between act and potency - real distinctions will always exist and even if these distinctions are always necessary for us if we are to distinguish between all the different kinds of being which exist within our world in terms which can indicate how they all differ from each other, each type of being having a kind of change which is always peculiar to it. Advert, however, to the possible being of that which exists as full actuality and, immediately, we move into a world which is other than our currently existing world: a world, however, which we must advert to if the world of our ordinary experience is to have any real sense or meaning. Because this first mover or first cause can never ever possibly exist as a contingent being because it is not subject to any kind of change, because it must exist in an eternal way, it must exist as God or that which we refer to as God because, within the context of the kind of thinking that we find in Aristotle, this type of being would have to exist in an entirely transcendent manner if the givenness or the beingness of change as change or the givenness of motion is to have an explanation which is adequate to it.

Hence, through a kind of summary that can be extrapolated from the gist and the scope of Aristotle's philosophical analysis, a 3-fold notion of God is to be identified and determined: (1) God as pure act without any potency, lacking any potency (existing as a potency to nothing) since God cannot change because he is completely perfect; he is pure actuality or, in other words, he is pure activity; (2) God as unmoved mover or God as First Mover or Prime Mover (God exists as only a source of motion and movement and not as some kind of creator); he functions as the highest form of concrete perfection toward which all things are striving and attending by way of a love or an attraction for that which exists as a supreme, ultimate "Good"; and (3) God as thinking upon thinking, or as the activity of pure thought (thinking about its own perfection or thinking about his own perfection: God as "thought [that] thinks itself as object in virtue of its participation in what is thought"[189]) or, alternatively, God as immediate complete self-consciousness or as Knowledge of Knowledge since, if God were to think about other things that would be other than himself, this would imply that he could be effected or, in some way, influenced by the being of these other things that he knows and so, in some way, he could be subject to change and hence lacking in the perfection which properly belongs to him as God. A knowledge of new things as a knowledge of changing, emerging things would imply a growing of knowledge which would exist in God and so, in some way, an augmenting or an enlarging of who or

188Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, pp. 89-90.

189Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1072b19, as quoted by Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 56, n. 1.

what God is. Potency would exist within God as a principle or as an element and this is something that we cannot admit since, with Aristotle, in our understanding of change, change always exists as a transition which moves from potency to act and this transition is such that it applies only to the being of contingently existing things (ourselves included) who are normally always moving from a condition of potency to a condition of act. Hence, as a species of cause, because God only knows himself and nothing else, it cannot be said that he knows the universe or that he would care about the being of the universe (if he knows nothing about it). As we have noted, as God, God has no knowledge of anything that is outside himself. In its perfect self-knowledge or in God's perfect self-knowledge, God accordingly experiences a perfection of himself that does not require or suppose any need that he should have a knowledge of other things. God's providence or God's providential government of the universe is something which cannot be conceived or thought about within this context thus given the parameters which have come to us from the rationale of Aristotle's metaphysics and how he thinks about the being of act and potency and how he then employs these principles in order to think and speak about realities which, in their own being, would transcend the powers and the capacities of our ordinary human experience as this is given to us through the being of our sensible human perceptions. If, in general, every potency is known as a given potency because of how it is related to a given act (something which exists as an act), then the primacy of act is an aforesaid obvious conclusion and so, from the primacy of act, the primacy of an act which is completely actual. It exists in an unadulterated kind of way.

Aristotle's understanding of human things

With respect to the kind of thinking which exists within Aristotle's ethics, with respect to the question of causality and why human beings behave in the way that they do, in the human situation, formal and final causes are nearly identical with each other or they exist very closely together since, in general, as our point of departure, it can be noted, as a general principle, that the goal for which something exists is to realize its own form as perfectly as this can be done. Form and freedom best exist in each their own way if each can inform and support the other. Hence, if we should have the form of a man or the form of a woman, we must realize these same forms respectively through exercises of freedom: in other words, by being as good a man as this is possible for us to be or by being as good a woman as this is also possible for us to be through the choices and decisions that we make. The formal cause identifies who or what one is as a human being although this type of cause is almost entirely lacking in any meaning if, through final causality, we do not attempt to realize the given humanity that has been initially given to us. As we have been noting, finality has an important place within Aristotle's worldview since it is of the highest importance because of a principle which says that purposefulness is imminent in the being of all things which happen to exist. No full account of life and reality can ever do without it.

In attending thus to the kind of focus which exists within Aristotle's ethics, human nature is to be identified as the principle of reality or, more strongly, we would say that the intelligibility of human nature is something which exists as a reality and that, in some way, we can come to know it. In the context of an eudaemonic ethics (*eudaimonia* as "good spiritedness," as "blessedness," or as "living a life that is turning out well"),[190] or in the context of a teological ethics (where ethical human good is measured by the realization of our distinctly human end or *telos*),[191] as human beings, we act for the

190Robert Spaemann, "Eudaimonism," *Happiness and Benevolence*, p. 18; p. 30.
191Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 43, n. 12.

sake of being happy which occurs thus whenever, as human beings, we realize ourselves through some kind of self-fulfillment where the best form of realization occurs through the exercise of our human acts of reason and intellect since this rationality is of a kind or a type that it sets us apart, as human beings, from the being of all other things. Its cultivation best advances or it best effects our human happiness, our human happiness and sense of well being being not defined by a life that is given to the pursuit of pleasure nor a life that wants to cultivate a sense of apathy or an attitude of indifference with respect to the world which exists about us in the context of our human lives.[192] A practical or a political kind of happiness which exists as the living of a virtuous life within the human civil order exists at a lower level in comparison with a philosophic type of happiness which attends the life of our minds as, there, we engage in theoretical kinds of activity.[193] Simply speaking: to have a good intellect and to exercise it in a good way is the best way for us to be happy and at peace with ourselves. As a general principle thus: "happiness or the condition of our well being exists as an activity." Our happiness, our sense of personal well-being, exists if we can be fully alive in a manner which reflects or which points to the intelligibility of our human form (a form which is to be identified with the being of our rational human souls). We are most happy if we can pursue a life that is steadfastly given to the actuation of our human condition: becoming that which we already happen to be as human beings and then being, through our activity, the good person that we have become and are. If we should realize the kind of human nature which belongs to us as human beings, nature and ethics become one if, now, the supreme norm of ethical human life is a precept which demands and states that, always, we should try and realize the nature which has been given to us.[194] Those actions which correspond with nature (with our nature) are morally good; actions which do not are morally evil.[195]

Knowing the good helps us to move toward our living and doing the good since, normally, the reasonableness or the goodness which exists within the life of our wills is conditioned by the reasonableness and the goodness which exists within the life of our minds (within the grasp and knowledge of our understanding). However, not every person is equipped or is called upon to live the life of the mind or intellect as we can see this in the life of persons who happen to be scientists and philosophers. Our understanding and knowing is not exactly the same thing as our willing and doing since, in addition to the kind of theoretical activity which belongs to the life of our minds in the kind of total dedication which belongs to the kind of study and contemplation which is required for the practice of philosophy and science, there is in our human living and doing a species of practical activity which belongs to the living of an ethically good human life. In the considerations of ethics and in the posing of various ethical questions (of one kind or another), a theoretical kind of inquiry and a practical kind of inquiry exist together in a way which points to the uniqueness of ethics as a human discipline. Understanding is mated to a life of virtue (the two condition each other) since, if we are virtuous in how we live and function as human beings, if we realize all of our potentials (all of our abilities and capacities), we can be happy in a context where, initially, as a species of universal principle that applies throughout within both the physical and human world, the good is defined as "that at which all things aim."[196] Every act, every activity, exists for a purpose that is defined as the "good" of that act. And so, we perform an act because we find that its purpose is worthwhile.

192Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 47.

193Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 10, 1178a9; 1177a12-1178a6, as cited by Hadot, *What is Ancient Philosophy?*, p. 78, nn. 6-7.

194Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1029a20, as quoted by Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 92.

195Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1029a20, as quoted by Collingwood, *Idea of Nature*, p. 92.

196Osborne, *Philosophy for Beginners,* p. 20.

Since, as noted, all human acts are directed toward happiness, we can accordingly seek happiness for its own sake and not for the sake of something else. And so, from the point of view of a larger perspective, if we are to determine the nature of this happiness, we must ask ourselves about "what is the function of the human?" which, for Aristotle, in the kind of answer which he gives, is to be known as "an activity of the soul which is in accordance with virtue and which follows a rational principle." The existence of a rational principle refers to the life of our minds and the necessity of a species of wisdom that is determined by the press of rational considerations (theoretical wisdom as *sophia*); and, following this, the existence of virtue refers to the life of our minds as our understanding moves in an outward fashion to consider the external circumstances of our human life where, now, within this larger existential context, prudent decisions need to be made about what exactly we will do: hence, the good of practical wisdom as *phronesis*. The active reason's search for virtue involves making correct choices and decisions that are defined as means which could lead us toward a desired good. When all of our faculties function together harmoniously under the guidance of our reason, we will be happy. The reference to circumstances and the necessity of prudence explains why, with ethics, we have a discipline which lacks the kind of exactness which exists among the various theoretical sciences; a discipline which occupies an intermediate zone since its practicality is tempered by a form of conditioning which refers to the value and necessity of theoretical reason as a healthy or apt point of departure before we can intelligently move into the unique type of inquiry which exists as the basis of ethics in our ethical reflections.

From the self-transcendence which exists in theoretical reasoning and knowledge, we can then move into another form of self-transcendence which exists as the achievement of moral goodness where, within this context, our human knowing and our human willing exist in a manner which points to a fundamental unity which exists between them. Willing follows knowing or, in other words, our human doing exists as a function of our knowing ("virtue is knowledge" according to the Socratic thesis) although this willing does exist in a way which is wholly determined by anything which exists within the content of our human knowing since no amount of understanding can compel a person to do an action or deed which is morally good and right. Nothing can happen in terms of moral perfection if a person is not good in the kind of person that he or she happens to be: hence, in Aristotle, the measure of ethical human goodness is the being and the having of human virtue and its incarnation in the life of a virtuous, good person. "The best good is apparent only to the good person, for vice perverts us and produces false views about the principles of actions."[197] An existential norm is defined for the living of a good human life if we should accordingly refer to Aristotle'e notion of the "virtuous man."[198] As a source of virtue, as a doer of good deeds, the virtuous man or woman becomes his or her own norm. The living of a virtuous life by a good person points to how we should ourselves live as we try, in each our own way, to live a life of virtue that is proper to each of us according to the station that we individually have and occupy in the context of our own lives.

In Aristotle's doctrine of the virtues, a virtue is defined as, functionally, a mean between two extremes as these are established by the weight of current circumstances according to our judgment and evaluation of them. Virtue is accordingly attained by a process of trial and error (and so, consequently,

---

197Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1, 2, 1094a24, 1094b14-15, as quoted by Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 46.

198Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 2, 3, 4, as cited by McCarthy, *Authenticity as Self-transcendence*, p. 62.

this kind of activity is not to be understood on a basis that is inspired by the kind of activity which occurs in philosophy and mathematics). Perhaps, we can argue that this approach points to an early form, an early appearance of situation ethics. For example, courage is neither rash aggressiveness nor is it timid withdrawal but, in fact, it is something which exists as an in between: an in between which is rationally determined. Hence, the mean of virtue exists as a rational thing. As we have been suggesting thus far, two kinds of virtue exist in Aristotle: intellectual theoretical virtue and moral practical virtue. Intellectual virtue, in its own way, leads to philosophical wisdom and practical wisdom and it develops through a combination of inheritance and education. Intellectual virtue, as or when it leads us toward the attainment of practical wisdom, produces the kind of wisdom that is necessary for us if, eventually, as a consequence of our moral deliberations, we are to make judgments that are consistent with how we should understand the nature of the good life. As noted or as we have been suggesting, philosophical wisdom exists in a manner which is scientific, disinterested, and contemplative (it is to be associated with the life of a pure form of human reasoning which, precisely as an activity, best defines however that which is most human about our being human beings). Philosophical wisdom, on the one hand, is to be regarded as the highest type of virtue because it refers to philosophical activity and because, in our human life, we can only be truly happy if our human living leads to a contemplative style of living (something which is not monastic *per se*), a manner of living which acknowledges and knows that, as human beings, we all live within a world which transcends the being of our personal existence.

In a similar way, however, but also in a different way, moral virtue or practical virtue (which leads to good moral judgment in the achievement of practical wisdom) is a quality or an attainment which arises through imitation, through practice, and through habit in a continual doing of good deeds in a context which is defined by our living within the context of a society and a given human order which is determinative of the life which exists within a given human society. No one can moral outside of living in a human social order, in a manner which would transcend the being of a given social context. Moral virtue then produces "states of character" which dispose one to act in certain ways, ways which are virtuous if they, in the end, result in acts which accord with that which exists as the "golden mean" of moderation in life (a life which avoids extremes of all kinds). Good moral judgement is conditioned by the doing of good deeds in a life of virtue and this same judgment facilitates or it leads us toward the doing of additional good deeds which, perhaps, previously, had not been thought about, pondered, or considered.[199] To illustrate with an example, the possession of wealth is not itself a species of sufficient adequate thing although, as a mean between extremes, a person cannot be happy without having a degree of wealth, without experiencing a degree of comfort. Comfort is not wealth or luxury and, at the same time, it is not poverty and deprivation. We cannot be happy if we are without a certain level of material sustenance and, similarly, we cannot be happy if we have too much in terms of a broad range of material goods.[200] Our good judgment determines the wealth that we should have and the wealth that we should avoid.

Four virtues are foundational (four virtues are cardinal) for the possible living of a truly good moral life in a living which is constitutive of our human happiness.[201] (1) Through prudence, we judge the appropriateness of possible human actions as these accord with the givenness of concrete conditions and our understanding of these conditions. (2) Through courage or fortitude, we persevere in the

199Hill, *After the Natural Law*, pp. 46-47.
200Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1, 2, 1094, as quoted by Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 47.
201Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 48.

commitments that we have made. (3) Through temperance, we exercise a degree of self-control which avoids extremes and which counsels moderation in all things. And lastly, (4) through justice, we give to each person his or her due. All favoritism is to be avoided. Prudence governs all things.

On the limitations of Aristotle's ethics, it comes across to us as something which is aristocratic in nature and character since the virtuous man requires the being of a number of necessary conditions if he is to be entirely virtuous: conditions which exist in varying degrees of wealth, health, and the exercise of political power if we are to live a truly happy life. We need a good birth, good children, and good looks: as Aristotle notes, "for the man who is very ugly in appearance . . . is not very likely to be happy."[202] We must not be very short. We must be free from the need to perform any kind of manual labor: "No man can practice virtue who is living the life of a mechanic or laborer." While, admittedly, Aristotle's ethics were set within the context of the life of the Greek state, the Greek *polis*, on the other hand, he speaks about the human moral task in a way which refers to the being of the self-sufficient kind of gentleman who does not rely on the necessity of having to meet too many social obligations. No direct mention is made of the good of charity and about how it exists as a noble moral quality.

In Aristotle's understanding of psychology, within this, he includes a treatise on aesthetics and a theory of catharsis or purification since, in the play of tragedy, we make ourselves purer (an effect which points to the value of tragedy). Unfortunately, his teaching is not that clear although, in his *Poetics*, he regards poetry as more serious a thing than history since it deals with universals. In his somewhat monistic view of the human soul, he especially singled out the importance of one faculty: our active reason and how it exists in a way that is somehow separate and distinct from our bodies and so there is something about it which points to its being immortal and divine (although, in man, he acknowledges the being of a vegetative soul or, in the other words, the being of a vegetative capacity and also the being of an animal soul or, in other words, the being of a capacity which is to be associated with the being of animal life). A woman exists as an "unfinished man" given Aristotle's understanding about the nature of human reproduction and his belief that a child only inherits male characteristics that are found in male semen.

In Aristotle's political philosophy, four differences should be noted. (1) Aristotle's ethics and politics is closely connected to the belief that we cannot live ethically within a bad state: "the same things are best for individuals and states." Since the state exists for the supreme good of the individual person, well organized states are necessary for living a good life. Our society, as organized through the being of a state, gives us our "second nature."[203] According to books 7-8 of the *Politics*, the size of a state should be that of a *polis*: it is large enough to be self-supporting and yet not too large in a way that would make good government impossible. To defend the state, soldiers should receive land both near the border and about the city to ensure that they will have a personal interest in defending the state. When a soldier ages, he could become a magistrate and later even a priest. Where the Sophists argued that the state is a purely conventional thing, for Aristotle, the state exists as a natural society: "the State is by nature prior to the individual."[204] The individual is something which emerges later within the context of the being of a particular state. "Man is by nature a political animal [*zōon physei*

202Palmer, *Looking at Philosophy*, p. 82.

203Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 30.

204Aristotle, *Politics*, 1, 2, as quoted by Hill, *After the Natural Law*, p. 30, n. 18.

politikon]"[205] since man naturally and necessarily lives within the environment of a state. As Plato also believed, "He who is unable to live in a society or who has no need for it because he thinks he is sufficient for himself must be either a beast or a god."

(2) According to Aristotle's *Politics*, the family is prior in time although it is not prior in nature to the existence of the state. Both the family and slavery are based and founded on the basis of the principle of nature. Slaves are slaves by nature since some men are marked for subjection and others, for rule. Menial and mechanical occupations unfit a man for citizenship. Aristotle later tempered his views by saying that a master should not abuse his authority albeit it is in the interest of the master to not mistreat his slaves since, otherwise, his slaves would revolt.

(3) In the *Politics*, Aristotle rejects Plato's ideal state with its communal life, its common nursery, and its guardian class since the average man needs privacy and "a child of all is a child of none." "It is better to be a real cousin than a Platonic son." The enjoyment of property is a source of pleasure. Citizens should be educated and they should not desire excesses.

(4) The *Politics* classifies good and bad constitutions (in the context of a study that collected and compared 158 different city-state constitutions). While the bad state consists of tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy, the good state consists of a contrasting set of three possibilities that exist together as constitutive elements: (1) Monarchy which is both best and ideal although the ideal can never exist since no perfect man exists for the job; (2) Aristocracy which is the next best form of government (given the extent of Greek cultural influence on Aristotle who believed that free men are best ruled by the more excellent ones among them) since an aristocracy prepares individuals for rule although this type of state is hard to realize; and (3) Polity which is perhaps the most sensible type of state in practice, the term literally meaning "constitution by excellence." Polity is the half-way house between aristocracy and democracy, existing as the reign of a middle class which functions as a mean between tyranny and democracy although Aristotle insisted that the good state should be ruled by more people: by an assembly or a multitude but not by a mob. Aristotle did not advocate popular democracy since his heart really belonged to the goods of aristocratic rule even if, using his mind, he would say that polity is best because it is the best way to avoid tyranny in a state.

In Aristotle's understanding of pedagogy, from what survives of his text, it is noted that, as a foremost consideration, education must exist as a moral thing. In education, an education in virtue is requisite and necessary if persons are to move toward the higher kind of good which exists in a life of reason that is joined to a life of virtue.

Aristotle's understanding of **natural law**

"...none of the things which are by nature and according to nature is disorderly, for nature is the *cause of order for all things*" [italics mine] [206]

While Aristotle was seen by many in the subsequent history of philosophical reflection to be the "father of natural law,"[207] it is to be admitted that his direct references to natural law are sparse; and according

205Aristotle, *Politics*, 1, 2, 1253a2-3, as quoted by Brague, *Law of God*, p. 50.
206Aristotle, *Physics*, 252a11, as cited by Grant, *Miracles and Natural Law*, p. 7.
207Rommen, *Natural Law*, p. 14.

to some interpretations, they are non-existent if we should distinguish between the idea of natural law and articulate concepts about the meaning and the identity of natural law.[208] A notion or an idea of natural law exists before a concept or a conception of natural law exists and a reading of Aristotle's texts finds or suggests the idea but not always or necessarily the concept. While, at times in different texts, Aristotle refers to "law," he more frequently refers to "nature" instead of "law." In so many many words, for instance, in *On the Heavens*, he speaks about laws which exist within nature when speaking about the achievements of Pythagorean philosophy: numerical relations exist within nature to indicate how these numerical relations exist as laws within nature, laws pertaining to numbers existing as laws that pertain to nature.[209] A close examination of the association of words and concepts in Aristotle points to Aristotle's belief in the existence of natural laws as these laws inform the being of our naturally existing universe, the physical or material world within which we happen to live and which we try to understanding and explain.

In terms then of the notion or the idea of natural law, in the *Nicomachean Ethics*,[210] in the wider context of a discussion about the meaning of political justice,[211] conventional or legal justice is distinguished from natural justice in a way which would have to suggest that the basis of natural justice is something which would exist as natural law (as in "that which is by nature unchangeable and has everywhere the same force")[212] although, for a direct reference to the being of natural law within a context that deals with the question of human ethics and morality, only one direct reference seems to come to us from Aristotle's surviving works where, within the text and the wording of the *Rhetoric*,[213] the context is a discussion which touches on the difference between particular and general law as a basis for understanding the real distinction which exists between the being of conventional, positive, legal justice and the being of natural justice. Particular law refers to conventional, positive, man-laws: "written law in accordance with which a city is administered...it is that which each community lays down and applies to its own members." This law "is partly written and partly unwritten." However, when we move toward general laws or, in other words, universal laws or common laws, we find "unwritten regulations which seem to be universally recognized." This type of law would have to exist essentially as natural law; according to Aristotle's use of words and concepts in the traditional way of speaking that he uses, they exist "according to nature," or they are "based upon nature (*kata phusin*)."[214] Bluntly put: in Aristotle's words, "there really is, as everyone to some extent *divines*,[215] a

---

208Grant, *Miracles and Natural Law*, p. 20.

209Aristotle, *On the Heavens*, 1, 1, 268a13.

210Aristotle, *Ethics*, 5, 7, 1134b18-1135a10.

211Simona Vieru, "Aristotle's Influence on the Natural Law Theory of St Thomas Aquinas," *Western Australian Jurist* 1 (2010): 117; http://www.murdoch.edu.au/School-of-Law/_document/WA-jurist-documents/WAJ_Vol1_2010_Simona-Vieru---Aristotle-and-Aquinas.pdf (accessed October 28, 2016).

212Aristotle, *Ethics*, 5, 7, 1134b18, as translated by W. D. Ross and as cited by Yves R. Simon, *The Tradition of Natural Law: A Philosopher's Reflections*, ed. Vukan Kuic (New York: Fordham University Press, 1965), p. 167, n. 2.

213Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1, 10: 1368b7-10; 1, 13: 1373b6-18. For ease of communication, I have merged differing translations as these come to us from the earlier work of W. Rhys Roberts and John Herman Randall, Jr.

214Randall, *Aristotle*, p. 283, citing Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 1, 10: 1368b7-10; 1, 13: 1373b6-18; Brague, *Law of God*, citing Aristotle, *Politics* 3, 16, 1287a28-29, 3, 13, 1284a10-14.

215Simon, *Tradition of Natural Law*, p. 132. The italics is not Aristotle's but Simon's as the

general justice (*dikaion*) and injustice (*adikon*) that is common to all, even to those who have no association or covenant with each other." The being of a general, natural justice and, conversely, the being of a general or natural injustice accordingly points towards the being of natural law as, on the other hand, conventional or legal justice and conventional or legal injustice point to the being of conventional laws. In terms of nature and law, in a manner which recalls earlier sophist teaching about the difference which exists between these, certain things as just according to nature (*physei*) and other things are just according to law (*nomos*).[216] The natural law, precisely because in some way it is *divined* – for this reason, it is first known by us through a kind of prior, inherent inclination or through an intuition which already exists within us as human beings, a kind of inclination or intuition which can be viewed as a species of *a priori* apprehension. An *a priori* apprehension of being first exists and then it can be more fully understood and known by us through a consequent order of cognition which would exist for us as human beings if we should move, through our questions, through our inquiries, toward the possible reception of new acts of understanding that would deepen or which would widen the kind of knowledge that we already have and know about the meaning and being of natural law.

As evidence thus to the effect that, as human beings, we all enjoy this kind of prior *a priori* knowledge, Aristotle accordingly notes that "it is this [law of nature] that Sophocles's Antigone clearly means when she says [in *Antigone* the play] that the burial of Polynices was a just act in spite of the prohibition: she means that it was just *by nature* [my italics]." As Aristotle cites from the text of Sophocles's play (which had been written *c*. 441 BC): "For neither today nor yesterday, but from all eternity, these statutes live and no man knoweth whence they came."[217] The normativity or the lack of relativity which exists with respect to the laws of nature accordingly explains why a lack of normativity and a kind of general relativity is to be ascribed (at times) to the being of our conventional human laws. Hence: as natural law differs from conventional law (where, here, we would speak also about conventional law as statutory law or as positive law), in the same way too, natural justice differs from the demands of legal justice. Legal justice exists at a lower, subordinate level. It is of less importance and value, relative to the reality of natural law whose point of origin is the unchanging nature or the unchanging essence of law and justice: the idea or the purpose of law and justice as such and how it exists as the foundation of our human legislation in a manner which points to the being of conventional law, grounding the being of this law and determining how this conventional law shares or participates in the being of natural law: expressing the being and the reality of natural law.[218] In the relation which

---

meaning of this verb is unpacked in a way which reveals a fuller meaning which alludes to a real distinction which exists between an implicit kind of human knowing which is pre-conceptual and pre-reflective and a later, explicit kind of human knowing which is the result of our human inquiry and any acts of sensing and understanding that can also emerge in the wake of questions which belong to the kind of activity which exists in human inquiry.

216McCarthy, *Authenticity as Self-transcendence*, p. 62.

217See Romano Amerio, *Iota Unum: A Study of Changes in the Catholic Church in the XXth Century*, trans. John P. Parsons (Kansas City, MO: Sarto House, 2012), p. 392, who refers to this line and text that can be found in Sophocles's *Antigone*, Line 456. As Amerio also notes, Sophocles also refers to natural law in *Oedipus Rex* (a play that was written later, being first performed in 429 BC). This law "walks in the high places" and forgetfulness of it does not put it to sleep. Cf. Lines 865-66; 870. In his interpretation (as Amerio refers to "the majesty of the natural law"), he notes that "the Greek world lauded the [natural] law as something inviolable, immovable, unbegotten, and indefectible." It existed as a kind of transcendental thing.

218Rommen, *Natural Law*, pp. 15-16.

exists between conventional law and natural law, human laws are always subject to the kind of higher law which exists as natural law.[219] Where gaps exist in the enactments or in the applications of conventional human law, for the sake of the good of justice and equity in the adjudication of individual cases, it accordingly belongs to the authority and the office of judges that they should make decisions which are grounded in the precepts of a natural law: applying them in a way which makes up for what could be missing in the proscriptions and prescriptions of the kind of legislation which is ordinarily constitutive of the being of our conventional human laws.[220] In both these cases, whether through the enactment of positive human laws or through the kind of judge made law which exists through the observance of equity in judicial matters, natural law exists as a kind of inner principle (in a manner which recalls how, with respect to the being of things in general in our world, within the being of changing shifting materially existing things, unchanging forms exist). The natural law retains its being or it exists in a stable, unchanging way and so, from our knowledge of it, we are encouraged to live in a manner which best enhances and which best stabilizes who we are as human beings and how we should live and exist as human beings. The rationality which exists in natural law is joined to the kind of rationality which should exist within ourselves as human beings to the degree that we are understanding, knowing beings. "Natural law is rational law."[221]

In a reference which accordingly recapitulates earlier teaching that has come to us from earlier developments in the history of Greek philosophy, in the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle concludes his discussion on natural law by referring to Empedocles and by citing him to the effect that, with regard to specifications of moral teaching and how these differ from society to society, amid these differences and despite all these differences, a higher law exists as "universal law" (as a "universal precept"). From the perspective of this higher law, the value or the goodness of our man-made conventional laws is to be evaluated and judged since, within any given set of concrete conditions, a conventional law should always prohibit actions or it should always enjoin actions which are rooted in proscriptions and prescriptions that come to us from the precepts of an already existing natural law. Conventional laws are understood in a better way if our point of departure is always the normativity of naturally existing laws and a subsequent process of discernment which determines if a conventional law is to be regarded as a law which is, in fact, really and truly binding. Does it merit our observance and obedience? Bluntly put: is its base or ground the kind of understanding and knowledge which belongs to the determinations of our rational human reason and any judgments which would also point to the imperative claims of an inner voice which would refer to the workings of our human conscience as in one should do this and one should avoid that?[222] The kind of inner principle in law which exists as natural law is matched or it is reflected by another kind of inner principle which exists within ourselves as the work and the reception of our human reason, a connatural relation existing between these two principles in a way which points to a union between the two: on the one hand, the objectivity or the transcendence of natural law and, at the same time too, its existence as an apprehension and as a grasp of our human acts of reasoning, understanding, and judgment.

All these things being said thus and by way of a tentative conclusion, if, in Aristotle, as a general

---

219Charles E. Rice, 50 *Questions on the Natural Law: What It Is and Why We Need It* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), p. 30.

220Rommen, *Natural Law*, p. 16.

221Brague, "Are Non-Theocratic Regimes Possible?," p. 5.

222Harold J. Berman, *Law and Revolution: The Formation of the Western Legal Tradition* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1983), p. 14.

principle and from the point of view of metaphysical perspective, nature is the basis for that which exists as natural law, grounding its being and stability as a fundamental point of reference, then the reference to nature can be more fully understood and appreciated (natural law can be more fully understood in all its parameters and parts) if we should refer again to the extensive discussions which we have found in Aristotle as regards his philosophy of nature: nature in terms of three distinct variables which are all related to each other in a way which moves from something that is more simple toward something which is more complex. Briefly summarizing these principles: nature in terms of (1) how it exists within things as an inner principle of movement and rest, explaining at one level the kind of movement and rest which belongs to a given thing; (2) how it exists in terms of material, formal, efficient and final causes which explain the growth or development of things as they relate to the being of other existing things; and (3) how it also exists as an identifiable intelligible order or an identifiable intelligible structure which joins the order of our human cognition to a like order which exists within the greater world of being which is known by us through the kind of ordering that is done by us within the context of our human knowing. Subjects know objects through the order of the self-transcendence which belongs to the order of our human cognition and, conversely, objects act upon us as cogitating subjects in order to elicit the acts of cognition which properly belong to us as human subjects, accordingly functioning as agents within us to bring us toward experiences and degrees of self-transcendence that we cannot effect by ourselves in a manner which would move us from a condition of potency toward a condition of act through self-actuations of that which would exist for us within a larger condition of potency.

In all these cases thus and as a larger general principle, nature is to be correlated with the meaning and being of intelligibility and not with the push or the pull of any emotions or passions that are not grounded in the kind of self-transcending desire which exists within us as a disinterested yearning for understanding and as a desire for wisdom that would function for us as a basis for a fuller kind of human life that would exist for us, in its own way, as a radiating center of transcendence. If such a thing is given to us in the context of our individual lives, it would point toward the possibilities of self-transcendence which could also exist for other persons as these same possibilities emerge as realities which would exist within ourselves as human persons, serving as catalysts to effect the actuation and realization of our self-transcendence. Nature is not to be correlated with a notion of necessity which thinks in terms of the operation and the effect of material causes and the kind of motion or movement which is determined by a mechanical or a material understanding of necessity.[223] The kind of necessity which, instead, exists in nature (the nature of things) refers to a larger, more comprehensive, flexible kind of thing, material forms of necessity existing at a lower level than immaterial or intellectual kinds of necessity that can be discovered and known by us if we should attend to the nature of intellectual reality as this exists for us if we attend to how and why our acts of understanding are not to be confused from how or why our acts of human sensing function in the way that they do. Immaterial operations in us point to the being of immaterial realities which are transcendent to the being of ourselves, the immaterial operations which exist within our understanding existing in their own right too as truly existing things.

If we are to move toward an understanding of how things exist or occur within our world in a manner which is thus truly "according to nature" or "by nature" (nature as referring to the "ordinary course of things" that exists within the greater whole which exists as Nature), an understanding is needed which knows that necessities in nature at times combine with each other in ways that would seem to point to

223Grant, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 20, citing Aristotle, *Physics*, 2, 7-9, 198a14-200b8.

absences of necessity or to measures of freedom or distance from the possible influence of a given necessity or the influence of some other necessity. The same thing or the same things do not always recur in exactly the same way as they have been previously occurring (according to the "ordinary course of things") and so, *a fortiori*, when radical departures exist in terms of how certain things occur and emerge within nature within the context of our world (Aristotle refers, for instance, to the inexplicable existence of monstrosities within nature), then the manifestation of chance variations and upsets that are also given to us in an unsettling natural way within our world all point to how certain things exist in a manner which is both "contrary to nature" (conflicting with our expectations and our past experience) and yet "according to nature" (conforming to our expectations and our past experience).[224] The kind of determinism which exists within the naturalness of nature or which is to be associated with nature and the things of nature requires an understanding of determinism which should not be defined according to a strict view of it. Yes, a degree of determinism exists. However, its manner or its form is not to be identified with points of view which would want to think that our world exists as if it were a species of machine. Although necessities exist within our world (if A, then B given what A happens to be), the larger context of these necessities is a form of indeterminism which allows for degrees of freedom and contingency which also exist within the outer larger world of nature, determining the nature of the world that we live in. Hence, in an understanding of natural laws that would come to us from an Aristotelian understanding of nature, the absence of a strict form of determinism is such that it would have to touch on the nature of natural laws, determining their significance, meaning, and intelligibility. A systematic component is to be admitted. However, a non-systematic component is to be acknowledged. It pertains to the meaning and the being of natural laws within a larger context of being which refers to the play or the influence of non-systematic components. The kind of stability which exists within our world is grounded on a number of conditions or variables which do not exist in an invariant way or which, from our viewpoint, do not seem to exist in an invariant way, although, if we could attend to some kind of new, future scientific knowledge, new systematic components could be possibly found and known in a manner which would point to the being of new recurrent patterns. The nature of our understanding is such that, in our inquiry and science, we are always seeking to put variables into an order which would point toward the being of a patterned, recurrent order which would have to exist as some kind of recurrent, self-sustaining system. If A, then B. If you have A, you will have B and if you have B, you will have C in an ordering of variables which would ultimately lead to the being of A and then from there, on to B and the other variables in a cycle or order that would be constantly repeating itself. In the larger or total context of things, nothing happens in our world in a way which conflicts with "universal nature" or the rational principle which exists as nature.[225] Somewhere, somehow an explanation exists, a reason exists for the being of all the different variables.

Plato and Aristotle: a comparison

To begin with some initial observations, in comparing Aristotle and Plato with each other about their differing conceptions of metaphysics as the science of being, the following points can be made. As a point of departure then, let us say that Plato was more interested in Being while Aristotle was more interested in the order of Becoming since, for him, for Aristotle, the changing, varying, contingent world that we experience possesses a measure of importance and some kind of reality or intelligibility

224Grant, *Miracle and Natural Law*, pp. 6-7.

225Chrysippus, reiterating the teaching of Aristotle, as cited by Grant, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 22.

is to be properly ascribed to it. Where, in his philosophy, Plato believed in an unchanging world of Forms that can be derived or which can be inferred from the legitimacy and the rightness of Socrates's inquiries and his search for the being of universally true definitions (these definitions existing as Forms or as Ideas which are to be regarded as the only true end of our human knowledge where, for example, a knowledge of Justice exists as an unchanging thing), on the other hand, in Aristotle, there exists a degree of rebellion. Aristotle rejects Plato's strictures which had viewed the material world as something that is not really real and so not legitimately an object of our scientific inquiry and knowledge since, on his part, Aristotle sought to work from a viewpoint which tried to apprehend reality as it existed within the world of our experience, this world being given to us initially through our various acts of sense perception.

In Aristotle's judgment thus: only one world exists and not two worlds and this one world is first known by us through our different acts of sense perception.[226] Hence, in contrast with Plato or more so than with Plato, Aristotle was interested in the life and the being of concretely existing individual things as these things are revealed to us initially through the deliverances of our human acts of sensing. While it is our task, as rational beings, to move toward an experience and a knowledge of objectively existing truth (the task of philosophers in the practice of philosophy), objective truths were to be found within the being of individually existing concrete things which exist (in Aristotle's language) as distinct substances, as individual realities, which were to be apprehended initially from within the context of our changeable, changing sensed world although, as noted, these concretely existing individual things are only truly known by us through our acts of understanding which exist technically as acts of abstraction: they move us from the experience of concrete instances or they move us from assemblies of data that we directly experience through our various acts of human sensing toward concepts which emerge in the wake of our later acts of understanding. Again, as we have noted: bodies are known through our acts of sensing; substances are known through our abstracting acts of understanding (our direct acts of understanding). If sensible, material traits or sensible, material characteristics define the being of a sensible, material form (for example, the melody of a song exists as a species of sensible form), immaterial traits or immaterial characteristics define the being of an immaterial, substantial form which would be commonly or universally present within or among all instances of its possible instantiation within varying instances of matter (the sum of material conditions which can be referred to by a kind of shorthand which exists when we refer to the being of "matter").

With respect to the priority of being, for Aristotle but, in a way, against Plato, ideas or forms which indicate or which lead us toward an understanding and knowledge of being do not exist essentially or innately within ourselves although, in different contrasting ways, via-a-vis Plato and Aristotle, they can be said to exist within the being of our rational souls. Within the changing, changeable world of our ordinary experience, as we have noted, according to Aristotle, we find the unchanging objects of our true knowledge, our knowledge as *episteme* (our knowledge as science, our knowledge as scientific knowledge). However, while both Plato and Aristotle attended to the being of the material, sensible world in each their own way in a way which admits or which points to the relevance of a real distinction which exists with respect to the meaning of being (being exists outside this world and being exists within this same world; hence, two kinds of being are to be distinguished from each other), on the other hand however, it can be said less ambiguously or with fewer qualifications that both firmly agreed or believed in a commonly held teaching which says that, if we are to be truly happy within the context of our present life, we must exercise our most noble faculty of reason in terms which should

226Sullivan, *Introduction to Philosophy*, p. 50.

point us (1) toward the contemplation of Being as a larger, all encompassing, transcendent reality and (2) to the value of this kind of contemplation as a species or form of human knowing. The contemplation exists as the beginning of all our real knowing in both Plato and Aristotle where Being or beingness is something which is greater and more awesome than we ourselves. It transcends our own individual being, our own individual existence. We cannot make it or produce it. We find that we are all somehow thrown into being, thrown into our individual existence (to use a manner of speaking that comes to us from the philosophy of Martin Heidegger and his notion of *dasein* as a form of "presence" or "being there" as this applies to human beings since we find that we do not decide if we should happen to exist or not). Being governs us and not we, it. In being we find our point of departure for everything that we subsequently do in philosophy and science.

In the context of his metaphysics, to some extent, for cognitional or pedagogical reasons, Aristotle rejected Plato's understanding of forms in claiming that forms as ideas are not to be regarded as separately existing substances or as separately existing things (hence as things that are entirely separated from the field and range of our sense perception) since, in Aristotle, as we have noted, by or through our sense perception, we can begin to grasp the imminent forms and essences of things (what a given thing is, these things, these essences, all existing for us as substances, as truly existing things) where, in Aristotle, a substance exists as a universalized type of individual. On the one hand, yes, it is constituted by the being of two universal principles (a universal form and a universalized notion of matter which exists as common matter). However, in an example, we can distinguish between Fido, a dog, who exists as a body when he is entirely the object of our sense perceptions and Fido, the same dog, who can also be known through our acts of understanding which move from Fido who exists as a body toward Fido who exists as a substance or thing because, as a substance or thing, he is known in a manner which transcends the being of spatial conjugates. In this notion of substance or thing, a concreteness or an individuality is specified in a way which is other or which is transcended by Plato's notion of form (and also by Aristotle's notion of form) since, in both cases, with Plato and Aristotle, form exists as a universal although, in Plato, it exists as a separately existing transcendent universal thing which differs from how, in Aristotle, it exists as a transcendent universal thing.

To press the point a bit further, if, in Aristotle, in some way, forms are constitutive of the being of essences (the essences of things that we initially implicitly experience within the context of our world: that which can be sensed is that which can be understood; the sensible is the intelligible), then, how can it be claimed that they exist in a way which is somehow apart from the things or the givens that we encounter and meet within the context of our ordinary experience? If they exist as the causes of things, how can it be claimed that they exist within a different kind of world (within a world which differs from that which is given to within the world of our sense experience)? Since ideas or forms are to be found within the order of concretely existing things (within things which exist initially as bodies within the context of our sense perception), then, in a way, truth or reality is also to be found within the concrete world of our ordinary experience, and an intellectual knowledge of things which exist within our world is something which is entirely possible and feasible for us according to the manner of our human knowing. While, in the order of the kind of thinking and exposition which exists in metaphysics, we begin with the being of substances and with how a substance exists as a fusion of matter and form from which everything else follows in the wake of our thinking and understanding, then, with respect to the study of these same substances, as we have noticed in Aristotle's understanding of human cognition, we must work with concrete givens and study and think about these givens in order to abstract and to remove the form of things in order to see what makes things exist as they are or understand why something exists in the way that it does, the kind of knowing which exists

in contemplation serving as a first start or stimulus for the later kind of cognition which exists for us whenever, through the ingress of inquiry and the asking of questions, our acts of sense can begin to interact with our acts of thinking and understanding in order to create a way, a path, or a self-assembling type of structure which should eventually lead us toward receptions of understanding and apprehensions of truth and knowledge that could be given to us at a time that we cannot know or determine.

In applying the difference which exists between potency and act to explain the change which we experience within our world, change, as Plato would have it, is not explained (by Aristotle) in terms of some kind of defective form of imitation which would refer to something which would exist in an unchanging way (as we find in explanations that come to us from Plato's thought and analysis where, imperfectly, the things of this world mirror or they participate in the perfect kind of being which allegedly belongs to an ideal world of higher, transcendent forms). To his credit however, Plato's proffered explanation is not simply wrong or contradictory if we should try to compare our experiences and judgments about being, reality, goodness, or beauty as these things exist within our world with our imagined notions of being, reality, goodness, or beauty that we can think about in ways that we cannot adequately picture or imagine. In all our particular judgments about things prior to the kind of reflections which follows from the asking of new questions and the genesis of new acts of understanding, the making of all our judgments supposes or presupposes a knowledge which exists as a species of *a priori* knowledge. Bluntly put: it allegedly already knows the truth about how reality, goodness, and beauty exist. However, in lacking the kind of sophistication that we can find within the differentiations of Aristotle's thought (as noted for example, Aristotle argues that a given thing can enjoy two different kinds of being at one and the same time in terms of potential being and actual being), in the kind of analysis that Aristotle uses, if act is act and if potency is potency and if, in change, something which exists in act moves toward another condition of act which has yet to be realized as a consequence of movement or change which has yet to occur (hence this condition would exist as a potency and not as an act), then change itself would exist as a species of incomplete act and, in this incompleteness, it would exist in an imperfect manner. In both Plato and Aristotle, we have change which is seen to exist in a way which is privative of reality. Change as a species of incomplete act lacks reality although, in its partial enjoyment of reality or in its partial inclusion within reality, its status, its reality, or, alternatively, its goodness is something which is greater within the context of Aristotle's thought than what is found to exist within a Platonic type of understanding which want to deny of change the existence of any kind of reality, truth, or goodness.

If, then, we should now turn to differences in moral philosophy, in contrast to Platonic exaggerations and Plato's primary interest in seeking to establish an objective eternal foundation (a metaphysics) for grounding the reality of ethically valid judgments (an interest in ethics grounding Plato's interest in metaphysics), Aristotle comes across to us as a more realistic type of ethicist in philosophy where he says, for instance, that "it is as inappropriate to demand demonstration in ethics as it is to allow a mathematician to use merely probable arguments." He rejects the dualism of Plato’s thought which had juxtaposed that which exists as a purely universal being and that which exists as a purely particular being or, in other words, an unbridgeable gap between the being of an ideal world and the being of a constantly shifting flux (the flux of life) since, always for Aristotle, universal elements are to be identified with the being of immanently existing essential forms which exist within the being of sensed objects. These forms can be apprehended by abstracting them from the givens of particular, concrete reality although, as noted, despite the good which exists in having an intellectual life, we can each of us be happy even if many of us are not able to exist and live as intellectuals, living an intellectual kind of

life. Where Socrates had not been able to give definitions for the being of human virtues that he was trying to understand and know, in the kind of analysis which Aristotle proposes, variant and invariant meanings can be combined with each other. Virtue is defined as a mean between extremes and this definition is invariantly true despite changes of circumstance and cultural condition although, through our acts of understanding and the preeminence of rationality in the life of human subjects and the life of human society, a degree of stability is introduced into moral decision making in a way which acts against the relativity which would exist, as a default position, if human willing were to exist in a manner which is divorced or cut off from the life of our human minds and the kind of understanding which belongs to us as human beings.

In conclusion, subsequent philosophy in its thought and reflections inherited the task of trying to synthesize the Platonic and Aristotelian viewpoints on the basis of a common tenet which holds and says that "the fully real is the fully intelligible and the fully good." Hence, for the sake of a comprehensive understanding of things, a synthesis was mainly attempted by later philosophers, of Christian belief, who appealed to both Plato and Aristotle in order to explain the Christian message in a larger more hopeful way, in a manner which could reveal how, between faith and reason, a mysterious inner connection exists where the growth or the flowering of one aspect relies on the growth or flowering of the other aspect (faith and reason going together). Plato, allegedly the romantic, was liked and appreciated because of his belief in the reality of another world which exists beyond our current world and also for his belief in a kind of universal governance that is exercised by that which exists as “the Good” while, on the other hand, Aristotle, the realist, was liked and appreciated because the Christian life of believers is something which has to be lived within a concretely existing world: *incarnately*. If we should identify a contribution which comes to us from Plato and which is most significant for the later developments which occurred in philosophy and theology, this has to be a very clear distinction that is drawn between sense and intellect (acts of sensing versus acts of understanding). The two cannot, they should not be confused with each other. And so, from this, the reality of an immaterial world is known in a way which refers to the necessity of its transcendence. It can never be sensed although, through our acts of understanding, it can be known in other ways. The transcendence of the human mind points to a natural fit or an orientation that turns human beings toward a world which exists also in a transcendent way. On this basis then or from this basis, we can to the later work of Aristotle who admitted, with Plato, that acts of sensing should not be confused with our acts of understanding (our mental acts) although, in the advance that he made, he would speak about how our acts of sensing cooperate with our acts of understanding in a way which points to the complexity of our human cognition, its lack of simplicity. Where, in Plato, human knowing within the context of our world exists essentially as an act of remembering, a remembering that is grounded in a prenatal or a pre-embodied form of seeing that exists prior to our embodied existence as human beings within the being of our world (a prior seeing that refers to a contemplation of eternal forms or ideas that are seen before a soul is joined or put within the constrictions of a human body), in Aristotle, the interaction which exists between our acts of seeing and our acts of understanding coupled with the interaction which exists between our acts of knowing and our acts of willing leads to an understanding of things in general that is informed by a larger number of distinctions. Things differ from one another in more than one kind of way and if differences are known in terms of their various kinds or grades, if differences are known in terms of how they exist in different ways, the result is a species of understanding which is less confused. Real problems are distinguished from the being of pseudo-problems and our criticisms, our understanding, and our knowledge can move into aspects and corners that, through distinctions, reveal a depth and a penetration of our understanding that, otherwise, would not be or exist.

If, in Plato, a philosophy of the human mind points to *a priori* apprehensions of being as central to the kind of cognition which best belongs to us as human beings (from these apprehensions, we can then move toward the being of other apprehensions), in Aristotle, a philosophy of mind points to *a posteriori* apprehensions of being which would seem to detract from the role and place of *a priori* apprehensions (breaking from Plato) although, with Aristotle, we admit, with him, that human acts of inquiry always begin from apprehensions of being which are somehow already given to us. They exist in an *a posteriori* kind of way. We never move from a condition of pure ignorance toward a later condition of knowledge in something that we can attain or reach towards. If prime matter is something which we can never directly know or have through our human acts of sensing and experiencing, then pure ignorance is a condition that is also not given to us in any direct kind of way. In Aristotle, an *a priori* knowledge of things is to be admitted. It is given to us as a real thing. This knowledge then grounds or it conditions our later acts of human cognition (the other kinds of human knowing which, perhaps, we have and enjoy) although, as Aristotle moves toward an understanding of these later forms of human cognition, in the account which he gives on inquiry and how acts of sensing interact with acts of understanding, the prominence that is given to all this tends to suggest that it is basic or foundational. Perhaps, too easily, we associate Plato with an understanding which is restricted to *a priori* apprehensions of being and Aristotle, with *a posteriori* apprehensions of being where, for us, a fuller viewpoint is best given to us if we should try to understand how these two viewpoints have each their own legitimacy with respect to how these two kinds of apprehension are always given to us in the context of our human life. They condition each other in each their own way and it is only by our inquisitiveness and our inquiry that we can begin to know about the existence of *a priori* apprehensions which would have to always be if or before we can move into a form of inquiry and a manner of knowing which points to our personal responsibility and a degree of self-control. We can begin to ask our own questions in a manner which turns our cognition into a form of human project (something that we do on our own) and soon we can forget how, in a manner which transcends ourselves in terms of our personal control, conditions have been already created for us in a way which grounds the kind of knowing that we associate with ourselves through how we think and exist as human subjects. If, then, we tend to think that our human cognition is something which must always move from something that is below toward something that is higher, we lessen the depth and the extent of our own understanding if we cannot attend to the possible being of a vector which moves in a downward direction toward ourselves from something which exists at a higher level, beyond ourselves (a vector which, in its own way, points to conditions and variables that we can never adequately understand though we refer to realities that make for the actuation of our understanding within a contextualizing of enabling conditions and an eliciting of new acts of understanding which occur at a lower level as our acts of inquiry and understanding interact with acts of cognition which exist as our acts of human sensing).