Studia Gilsoniana

A JOURNAL IN CLASSICAL PHILOSOPHY

Studia Gilsoniana

A JOURNAL IN CLASSICAL PHILOSOPHY

3 (2014)

A FESTSCHRIFT IN HONOR OF
JUDE P. DOUGHERTY

ISSN 2300-0066

CONTENTS

Peter A. Redpath
Rector, Adler-Aquinas Institute
Chair, St. John Paul II Thomistic Studies
Graduate Concentration in Christian Wisdom,
Holy Apostles College and Seminary
USA

FOREWORD

Why This Festschrift for Jude Patrick Dougherty?
Why in *Studia Gilsoniana*?

That a festschrift should be given in honor of Jude P. Dougherty by an international journal focused on classical philosophy and the philosophical thought of Étienne Gilson needs no explanation considered in itself. In his masterly biography of Gilson, Fr. Laurence K. Shook makes a stunning statement about Gilson: that he was "an Erasmian humanist at heart, he wanted to end all wars and to liberate men to work out their own salvation in the context of personal freedom."[1] Shook claimed Gilson had thought that "medieval universalism, or 'true humanism' as Maritain called it, held the key to ultimate health in the human condition."[2] In making this reference to Gilson, Shook noted twelve lectures that Gilson had conducted during 1939 entitled "Roman Classical Culture from Cicero to Erasmus" in which Gilson traced the ideals of "Cicero's *doctus orator* ('the man of learning and eloquence') and Quintillian's *vir bonus dicendi peritus* ('the good man who speaks from practical knowledge') . . . from the beginning of Christianity to the sixteenth century as they rose, fell, rose again, and were transformed."[3] I mention these lectures by Gilson and the influence of classical humanism on him to make evident why this festschrift in honor of Jude Dougherty by *Studia Gilsoniana* should be evident considered in

---

[1] Laurence K. Shook, *Étienne Gilson* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1984), 254.
[2] Id., 239.
[3] Id.

itself: Nothing is more fitting than for a journal devoted to classical humanism to honor a Ciceronian and Erasmian humanist.

Jude Dougherty is very much a Renaissance man, a humanist in the Ciceronian and Erasmian tradition. As such, like many of the colleagues he has esteemed throughout his professional career (Ralph M. McInerny, Fr. James V. Schall, Jacques Maritain, Étienne Gilson, Mortimer J. Adler), he is a lover of individual liberty, "a good man who speaks from practical knowledge," and a "man of learning and eloquence." His intellectual confrère Ralph McInerny has well described the classically "cosmopolitan" ideal of a philosopher and "lover of wisdom" for which Jude is famous for being, "His is a household name in philosophy worldwide, and it can be said that he is the more esteemed by his secular colleagues because he is so unequivocally a Catholic philosopher."[4]

More. As McInerny has rightly noted, in his person, Jude eminently captures the classical spirit of *pietas*, a man with a sense of unswerving honor and duty sorely missing within most of the contemporary world. A prime example of this eminent quality of soul was displayed by Jude in 1971 for which all students of Gilson and the International Étienne Gilson Society owe him a lasting debt. During that year, the School of Philosophy of the Catholic University of America, of which Jude was then Dean, had "unanimously submitted Gilson's name for an honorary degree." Learning that the nomination had been quietly dropped at the committee stage and had not reached the academic senate, "Dean Jude Dougherty . . . expressed surprise that the unanimous nomination of a man of Gilson's stature and service in the Catholic community had been dropped. The senate listened and in a secret ballot gave Gilson the highest number of votes of all candidates proposed that year."[5]

Dougherty's intervention on Gilson's behalf did not stop there. Learning that, while Gilson had been invited to receive an honorary degree in human letters, and was pleased to accept, Gilson had not been offered, and could not afford, travel expenses for the transatlantic journey, Jude expressed surprise, contacted the University president, and had the oversight corrected. Beyond this, he lobbied for Gilson to be invited to give the University's convocation address. When this request was turned down,

---

[4] Ralph M. McInerny, "Endnotes: The Dean Emeritus," *Crisis Magazine* (September 1, 1999): http://www.crisismagazine.com/1999/end-notes-the-dean-emeritus, accessed on 30.12.2014.
[5] Shook, *Étienne Gilson*, 386.

Dougherty wrote Gilson, still in France, and unaware of all this by-play, inviting him to deliver a "post-commencement" address for the School of Philosophy on the afternoon of Saturday, 15 May in Keane Auditorium. Gilson accepted and brought from France and address on the theme closest to him this year, 'Evolution: From Aristotle to Darwin and Back.' Dougherty sent out invitations to the faculty and students of Catholic University and of the other universities and colleges in the Washington area. As he expected, even though it was the day after the convocation and a Saturday afternoon, a wide spectrum of listeners came from all corners of Washington and remained with rapt attention right through to the end of the question period.[6]

On the intellectual side, Jude is through and through a student of St. Thomas in the best sense of the word. While celebrated for his decades-long work as editor of the *Review of Metaphysics* and trusted for the soundness of his scholarship and his reliability to produce scholarly work of the highest caliber, Jude is more than a scholar. As the bibliography contained within this volume indicates, Jude is not s thinker who parrots St. Thomas or a manual Thomist. He is an original thinker, a Christian philosopher, who, like Gilson and St. Thomas, mines the work of the ancients to discover the truth about things and share it with others.

All the above makes evident to readers unfamiliar with him and his work (if any exist) why *Studia Gilsoniana* should devote this festschrift to Jude Dougherty. But other reasons exist beyond those already mentioned about which readers should be made aware. One is the fact that this journal was founded in Poland with the assistance of several students heavily influenced by the work of Gilson. While many Westerners have heard of the Lublin School of Thomism, few are aware of the influence that Gilson exercised on members of that School, including on the former rector of the Catholic University of Lublin (KUL) and colleague of Pope John Paul II, Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec. During Pope John Paul's youth, Gilson had had a heavy influence among members of the Lublin School of Thomism and other philosophers at KUL. Through this School, that influence helped shape the philosophical character of St. John Paul II.

Jude Dougherty's friendship with St. John Paul II is legendary. Jude knew John Paul II when he was Cardinal Archbishop of Kraków and had

---

[6] Id.

traveled to the United States. One anecdotal report is that, soon after he had become Pope, had landed in America and had kissed the ground, the first question he had asked was, "Where is Jude Dougherty?" Whether this story is true or not, I do not know. I have never asked Jude to confirm or deny it.

But another tale told by Ralph McInerny drives home just as forcefully the strong affection between these two students of Gilson and St. Thomas:

> I begin with an anecdote. Some years ago, at a meeting in Rome, Jude was called away to Castel Gondalfo for lunch with the pope. I saw him driven off in a car bearing Vatican plates and was waiting for him when he returned. I don't think I ever imagined anyone I knew would be whisked away to the papal table.
>
> And, of course, my first question was the obvious one: "What did he say?" Jude thought a while and then said, "I did most of the talking."
>
> That was not his first meeting with Karol Wojtyla. The future pope had been the guest of the Doughertys when he visited Washington while still a cardinal. A photograph of him taken on that occasion was proudly displayed on a wall of the dean's office. Later when, as pope, he returned to the city and received American academics, John Paul II called Jude up from the audience and embraced him with unfeigned affection before the assembly.[7]

Jude Dougherty is truly a man for all seasons, an exemplar of just the sort of person Catholic education in its highest form should produce: A Catholic Gentleman. I consider it an honor to have been asked to write the "Foreword" for this festschrift. I hope that Jude and others who view the contents contained herein will experience as much joy in reading it as those of us have experienced in composing it.

---

[7] McInerny, "Endnotes: The Dean Emeritus."

THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF
JUDE P. DOUGHERTY

1959. "Recent Developments in Naturalistic Ethics," *Proceedings*, American Catholic Philosophical Association, 97–108.

1960. *Recent American Naturalism* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press). Abbreviated version of doctoral dissertation.

1962. "John H. Randall's Notion of Substance," *Proceedings*, American Catholic Philosophical Association, 91–102.

1963. "Metaphysical Roots of Contemporary Restlessness," *Proceedings*, American Catholic Philosophical Association, 187–196.

1964. *The Theological Directions of the Ecumenical Movement*, ed. Jude P. Dougherty (Louisville, Ky.: Bellarmine College Press).

1966. "Naturalistic Ethics," *Approaches to Morality*, ed. Jesse Mann and Gerald Kreyche (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World).

1966a. *The Impact of Vatican II*, ed. Jude P. Dougherty (St. Louis: B. Herder).

1966b. "Nagel's Concept of Science," *Philosophy Today*, 212–221.

1968. "American Naturalism," "American Idealism," "American Realism," "John Dewey," "James M. Baldwin," *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: McGraw Hill).

1969. "Lessons from the History of Science and Technology," *Studies in Philosophy and the History of Philosophy*, ed. John K. Ryan, vol. IV (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press).

1974. "Randall's Interpretation of Religion," *Filosofia*: *Anais do VIII Congresso Interamericano de Filosofie E V Da Sosiedade Interamericana de Filosofia* (Instituto Brasileiro de Filosofia: Sao Paulo).

1975. "The Finding of Law," *Proceedings*, American Catholic Philosophical Association, 49, 1–12.

1977. "Dewey on the Value of Religion," *New Scholasticism* 51:3, 303–327.

1978. "Determination of Moral Norms," *Proceedings*, American Catholic Philosophical Association, 39–51.

1979. "Potentiality: From Aristotle to Rescher and Back," *Studies in Honor of Nicholas Rescher* (Dordrecht: Reidel Publishing Company), 109–122.

1979a. "The Uses of History in the Teaching of Philosophy," *Teaching Philosophy*, 13–21.

1980. "Appropriating the Catholic Tradition," *Social Thought* (spring), 19–30.

1980a. "Appropriating Tradition," *Proceedings*, *Eighth International Conference on Unity of Sciences*, 289–298.

1980b. "Dewey on Religion," *Two Centuries of Philosophy in America*, ed. Peter Caws, (London, Basil Blackwell), 174–181.

1981. "The Work Ethic of John Paul II," *Papal Economics* (The Heritage Foundation, 6), 1–7.

1981a. "Human Rights," *Droits Humains: Enseignement et Recherche Internationale Des Universites Catholiques* (Salzburg, Austria), April 22–25.

1981b. "La Religion como Objecto de Estudio Filosofico" ("Religion as an Object of Philosphical Study"), *Annuario Filosofico* (Universidad De Navarra: Pamplona, Spain), 14:2, 71–85.

1981c. "The Notion of 'Entitlement' in Human Rights Debate," *Human Rights*: *Abstracts of Papers from the Tenth Interamerican Congress of Philosophy* (Tallahassee: Florida State University), October 8–23.

1981d. "Potentiality in Aristotle and Some Contemporary Thinkers," *Proceedings of the World Congress on Aristotle*.

1982. "Intellectuals With Dirt Under Their Fingernails: Attitudes Toward Science and Technology and the Difference They Make," *Communio* (fall), 225–237.

1982a. „Maritain on Church and State," *Communio* (winter), 389–403.

1982b. "Secular Ethics and Nonbelief," *Ateismo e Dialogo* (Rome: Segretariato per i non credenti, 1982), 7:4, 211–215.

1983. "Toward a Thomistic Philosophy of Religion," *Proceedings*, American Catholic Philosophical Association, 105–115.

1983a. "Maritain su Chiesa e Stato," *Jacques Maritain*: *Vita Pensiero* (Milan: Publicazioni della Universita Cattolica), 425–440.

1983b. "Keeping the Common Good in Mind," *Studi Tomistici*: *The Ethics of St. Thomas Aquinas*, (Rome: Pontificia Academia di S. Tommaso), vol. 25, 188–201.

1984. *The Good Life and Its Pursuit*, ed. Jude P. Dougherty (New York: Paragon House).

1984a. "Assessing The Value Of Religion," *Homiletic & Pastoral Review* (July), 22–27.

1984–1985. "Tener en menteel bien comun," *Ethos*, 145–160.

1985. "Von Ketteler, Leo XIII, and John Paul II on the 'Social Question,'" *Catholicism in Crisis* (April), 24–31.

1985a. "Substance as Controlling," *Essays in Honor of Allan B. Wolter*, ed. W. Frank and G. Elzkorn (St. Bonaventure, N.Y.: Franciscan Institute Publications), 117–129.

1986. "The Thomistic Element in the Social Philosophy of John Paul II," *Proceedings*, American Catholic Philosophical Association.

1986a. "The Concept of Person in American Legal Theory," *The World and I* 1:12 (December), 655–666.

1987. "Marx, Dewey and Maritain: The Role of Religion in Society," *The World and I* 2:3 (March), 679–692.

1987a. "Puritain Aspiration, Puritan Legacy," *The Journal of Law and Religion* 5:1, 109–123.

1987b. "The Interior Life," *Crisis* (May), 19–23.

1987c. "Aquinas on Punishment," *Studi Thomistici* 30 (Rome: Libreria Vaticana), 157–170.

1987d. "Separating Church and State," *The World and I*, 2:12 (December), 675–687.

1988. "Von Ketteler, Leo XIII and John Paul II on the 'Social Question,'" *Servo Veritatis* 229 (Krakow, Poland: Jagielllonian University), 179–196.

1988a. "John Paul II's Global Village," *The World and I* 3:7 (July), 663–679.

1988b. "Separating Church and State in the U.S.A: Original Intent V. Everson," *Aspecten van de machts regulering*, ed. E. Meulemans (Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven), 89–101.

1988c. "Amplificando la Voz del Ser," *Philosophica* 40 (Valparaiso, Chile), 157–168.

1988d. "Average Superiority Will Do," *Analecta* 2 (Holy Apostles College and Seminary), 1–8.

1989. "One Church: Plural Theologies," *Catholic Perspectives on Medical Morals* (Kluwer Academic Publishers: Dordrecht, The Netherlands), 169–172.

1989a. "Episcopal Authority and the Teaching of Morality," *Creative Love*: *The Ethics of Human Reproduction*, ed. John F. Boyle (Front Royal, Va.: Christendom Press), 197–214.

1989b. "Amplifying the Voice of Being," *CCICA Annual*.

1989c. "Shifting Philosophical Sand and Legal Structures," *The Personalist Forum*, 1–19.

1989d. "Maritain on Creative Intuition," *Of Scholars*, *Savants*, *and Their Text*, ed. Ruth-Link Salinger (New York: Peter Lang), 77–95.

1989e. "Charles Habib Malik," *American Philosophical Society Year Book*, 235–239.

1990. "Collective Guilt," *The American Journal of Jurisprudence* 35, 1–14.

1990a. "Abstraction and Imagination in Human Understanding," *L'atto Aristotelico e le Sue Ermeneutiche* (Herder: Universita Lateranese, Rome 1990), 1–14.

1990b. "John Courtney Murray On The Truths We Hold," *The World and I* 5 (May), 495–509.

1990 "What Was Religion," *Modern Age* 33:2 (Summer), 113–121.

1991. "What Was Religion," repr., *Vital Speeches* 57:10 (March 1), 316–320.

1991a. "On the Justification of Rights Claims," *Collana Dialogo di Filosofia* 8 (Rome: Herder, Universita Lateranense), 1–14.

1991b. "Abortion and Protection of the Human Fetus: Legal Problems in a Cross Cultural Perspective," review article, *Journal of Comtemporary Health Law and Policy* 7, 437–443.

1991c. "Sobre la intuicion creativa en Maritain," *El Hombre*: *Inmanencia y Transcendencia* (Pamplona:Servicio de Publications de la Universidad de Navarra), 1267–1289.

1991d. "Accountability Without Causality: Tort Litigation Reaches Fairy Tale Levels," *Catholic University Law Review* 41:1 (Fall), 1–18.

1991e. "On The Justification of Rights Claims," *Human Rights*: *Christians*, *Marxists*, *And Others In Dialogue* (New York: Paragon House), 49–60.

1992. "The Example of John Courtney Murray," *The Future of Thomism*, ed. Deal W. Hudson and Dennis W. Moran (Notre Dame, Ind.: American Maritain Association, distributed by University of Notre Dame Press), 265–278.

1992a. "Christian Philosophy: Sociological Category or Oxymoron," *The Monist* 75:3, 283–290.

1992b. "Edith Stein: The Convert in Search of Illumination," *Crisis* (December), 39–43.

1992c. "Edith Stein: The Convert in Search of Illumination," *Euntes Docete* (Krakow: Papieska Akademia Teologiczna, 1993), 293–301.

1992d. "Superior Education Needed for Priest to Fulfil Teaching Office," *L'Osservatore Romano*, weekly edition, 35 (September 2).

1993. "The Necessity of Punishment," *The World and I* 8:1 (January), 557–569.

1993. "Intellectual or Moral Failure?," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter* 16:3, 6–8.

1993. "Two Accounts of Jewish Morality," *Crisis* (October), 52–55.

1993. "George Santayana och religionens roll i samhället," *Ràpport* Nr. 16 (Stockholm).

1994. "George Santayana on the Role of Religion in Society," *The World and I* 4:3 (March), 429–439.

1994a. "Analysis in Search of Wisdom," *Proceedings*, The American Catholic Philosophical Association, 1–8; *The American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 68, 19–26.

1994b. "Thomism, The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas," *Encyclopedia of Catholic Doctrine*.

1994c. "Staying Catholic," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter* 17:4 (September), 12–19.

1994d. "Maritain at the Cliff's Edge: From Antimoderne to Le Paysan," *Crisis* (November), 40–45.

1994e. "Wilsonian Morality," *Crisis* (November), 51–52.

1994f. "A Man of Hope," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter*, 18:1 (December), 47.

1995. "Il ruolo della religione nella società in Santayana," *Discorse e Verità* (Milan: Jaca Book, Edizioni Universitarie).

1995a. "Thomas More as Exemplar," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter* 18:3 (July), 33.

1995b. "Unerschütterlicher Respekt," *Die politische Meinung* 40:311 (October), 47–49.

1995c. "Santayana on the Role of Religion in Society," *Modern Age* 37:2 (Winter), 116–123.

1995d. "100 Years of Philosophy by The Catholic University of America," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter* 19:1 (December), 2–10.

1996. "Maritain as an Interpreter of Aquinas on the Problem of Individuation, *Thomist* 60:1 (January).

1996a. "The Virtues of Tradition," *Sursum Corda* (Spring).

1996b. "Jacques Maritain e il precipizio. Dall'Antimoderno al Contadino della Garonna," *Jacques Maritain e la filosofia dell'essere*, ed. Vittorio Possenti (Venice, Italy: il Cardo).

1996c. "Rethinking Liberalism," *The World & I* (August), 254–259.

1996d. "Ecology of the Human Spirit," *L'Osservatore Romano* 42 (October), 10–11.

1996e. "Thomism," *Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics* (October).

1996e. "Professional Responsibility," *The World & I* (October).

1997. "Nova et Vetera: Maritain as Critic," *Postmodernism and Christian Philosophy*, ed. Roman T. Ciapalo (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1997), 1–11.

1997a. "The Ordinary and Extraordinary in Priestly Formation," *Seminarium* (Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, 2nd ed.), (March 4).

1997b. "The Way It Was," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Newsletter* (Summer).

1997c. "Why Thomism?," *Maritain Newsletter* 5:2 (September 15).

1997d. "The Rule of Law," *The World & I* (October), 301–315.

1997e. "Proud of the Faith," *Dossier* 3:6 (November / December).

1998. "Western Creed: Western Identity," *The World & I* (January), 329–341.

1998a. "Do Majorities Have Rights?," *Modern Age* 4:4 (Fall), 33–43.

1998b. "Anno Domini," *Dossier* 4:6 (November / December).

1999. "*Sans* Metaphysics, *Sans* Beauty," *Modern Age* (Summer).

1999a. "The Failure of Positivism and the Enduring Legacy of Comte," *Recovering Nature*: *Essays in Natural Philosophy, Ethics, and Metaphysics in Honor of Ralph McInerny*, ed. Thomas Hibbs and John O'Callaghan (Notre Dame: Ind. University of Notre Dame Press), 25–36.

2000. "Tom Wolfe's Epictetus," *The World & I* (February), 333–341.

2000a. "Worthy Priests Remembered," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* (March), 19–22.

2000b. "John Rawls and Jacques Maritain on the Law of Peoples," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly*.

2000c. "Tolerance: Virtue or Vice?", *Modern Age* (Summer), 235–238.

2000d. "John Paul II: Defender of Faith and Reason," *Faith and Reason*, ed. Timothy L. Smith (South Bend, Ind: St. Augustine Press), 4–10.

2000e. *Western Creed*: *Western Identity*: *Essays in Legal and Social Philosophy* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press).

2001. "Jacques Maritain: La Vie Intellectuelle," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* (March), 63–66.

2001a. "Moral Aspects of Immigration Policy," *Crisis* (April).

2001b. "Professional Responsibility," repr., *Mind and Heart Renewed*, ed. Thomas F. Dailey (Lanham, MD: University Press of America), 9–22.

2001c. "Maritain on the Church of Christ," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* (November), 28–32.

2002. *The Logic of Religion* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press).

2002a. "Indestructible Islam," *Modern Age* 4:4 (Fall), 324–332.

2003. *Jacques Maritain: An Intellectual Profile* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press).

2003a. "Moral Aspects of Immigration Policy," *Immigration und Integration*, ed. Anton Rauscher (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, vol. 15 of the series *Soziale Orientierung*), 41–48.

2003b. "Il Bisogno di Cristo" (Italian title of translation of "Indestructible Islam,") *Liberal* (Rome: April / May), 46–56.

2003c. "Tony Hillerman's Benedictine Library," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* (July 2003), 54–56.

2003d. "Wretched Aristotle," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* (August / September), 20–27.

2003e. "Happiness," *The World & I* (Fall).

2003f. "The Fortunes of the Humboldt University in America," *Erfurter Universitätsreden*, ed. Wolfgang Bergsdorf (Universität Erfurt, Germany), 93–105.

2003g. *Religion Gesellschaft Demokratie: Ausgewählte Aufsätze* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, vol. 16 of the series *Soziale Orientierung*).

2004. "Does National Identity Matter?," *The World & I* (March), 267–280.

2004a. "Socialist Man: A Psychological Profile," *Modern Age* 46:1 & 2 (Winter / Spring), 15–22.

2004b. "The Unelectable Catholic Politician," *Culture Wars* (September), 8–9.

2004c. "The Secularization of Education in the United States," *Di Bedeutung der Religion für die Gesellschaft: Erfahrungen und Probleme in Deutschland und den USA*, ed. Anton Rauscher (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, vol. 17 of the series *Soziale Orientierung*), 211–220.

2005. "A Nation in Decline," *Modern Age* (Spring), 99–103.

2005a. "Phenomenology as *Ancilla Theologiae*," *Angelicum* 82:2, 389–398.

2005b. "A Rational Preamble," *Pensare Cristiano* (November 12), in Italian and English.

2006. "Conservatism," *Modern Age* (January 18).

2006. "Tony Blair in Denial," *The Wanderer* (April 13).

2006a. "The Ontology of the Artifact," *Homiletic & Pastoral Review* 106:5 (February), 17–21.

2006b. "The Fragility of Democracy," *Modern Age* (Spring), 119–129.

2006c. "A Rational Preamble," *Homiletic & Pastoral Review* 106:9 (June), 20–23.

2006d. "Aristotle in North America," *Fenomenologia e Società* 29:1, 135–142.

2006e. "National Identity," *Nationale und kulturelle Identität im Zeitalter der Globalisierung*, ed. Anton Rauscher (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, vol. 18 of the series *Soziale Orientierung*), 13–23.

2006f. "Newman vs. Humboldt and the Vision of Leo XIII," *Human Nature in Its Wholeness*: *A Roman Catholic Perspective*, ed. Daniel N. Robinson et al. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press), 182–193.

2006g. "Social Cohesion: Its Roots and Cultivation," *The Wanderer* (October 12), 1.

2007. "Multifaceted Islam," *The Wanderer* (January 25), 4.

2007a. "Using the Past to Rescue the Future," *Modern Age* 49 (Winter), 3–11.

2007b. "Sarkozy's France," *The Wanderer* (February 8), 4.

2007c. "Why I am a Conservative," *Modern Age* 49 (Summer), 218–223.

2007d. "Benedict on the Nature of Scientific Enquiry," *The Wanderer* (September 6).

2007e. "L' Idea di Religione Nella Modernità," *La verità della religione*: *La specificità cristiana in contesto*, ed. Giuseppe Tanzella-Nitti and Giulio Maspero (Rome: Pontificia Università della Santa Croce), 93–109.

2007f. "Uso e Abuso della Metafora," *Scienza*: *Fede e Ragione*, 24–29

2007g. "Physics and Philosophy," *Wisdom's Apprentice*: *Thomistic Essays in Honor of Lawrence Dewan, O.P.*, ed. Peter A. Kwasniewski (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press), 201–213.

2008. "Boethius on Faith and Reason," *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* 108:4 (January), 12–17.

2008a. "Red States, Blue States: The Fragility of Democracy," *The Wanderer* (February 7), 4.

2008b. "Modern Interpretations of Religion: The Legacy of Hume and Kant," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 31:1 (Spring 2008), 25–30.

2008c. "Then and Now: Pius II and Benedict XVI," *The Wanderer* (April 10).

2008d. "Maritain in Context: A Selection from *Man and State*, " *Logos* 11:2 (Spring), 158–162.

2008e. "The Natural Foundation of the Theological Virtue of Hope," *Annals Australasia* (September), 23–27.

2008f. "Newman vs. Humboldt and the Vision of Leo XIII," *Practicing Intellectual Charity*: *Essays in Honor of Most Rev. Thomas J. Welsh on the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of The Catholic Distance University*, ed. Russell Shaw (Arlington, Va.: Catholic Distance University).

2008g. "Defenseless Europe," *Annals Australasia* 119:9–1 (November / December 2008), 35–38.

2008h. "Tolerance," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 31:4 (Winter), 17–20.

2008i. "Wretched Aristotle," *On Wings of Faith and Reason*: *The Christian Difference In Culture and Science*, ed. Craig Steven Titus, *The John Henry Cardinal Newman Lectures*, vol. 2 (Arlington, Va.: The Institute for the Psychological Sciences Press), 56–67.

2009. *Wretched Aristotle*: *Using the Past to Rescue the Future* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books).

2009a. "Tolerance" (National Humanities Institute, online), *Epistulae* 6 (February 23).

2009b. "de Jouvenal on Power," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 32:2 (Summer), 5–8

2009c. "Moderate Islam," *Annals Australasia* (August 2009), 13–17.

2009d. "Morality with and without God," *Angelicum* 86, 589–598.

2009e. "Mileposts along the Road," *The Wanderer* (September 17), 4.

2009f. "Family Matters," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 32:4 (Winter), 15–17.

2009/2010. "Umiarkowany islam," *Człowiek w Kulturze* 21, 217–229.

2010. "Two Treatises on the Acquisition and Use of Power," *Modern Age* (Spring).

2010a. "al Qaeda Bogeyman: Understanding the Threat," *The Wanderer* (March 4).

2010b. "The Relevance of Leo XIII," *The Wanderer* (September 23), 4.

2010c. "Cultural Identity," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 34:4 (Winter), 21–22.

2010d. "Ancients and Moderns on the Subject of Property," *Journal of Law*, *Philosophy*, *and Culture* 14:1, 101–109.

2010e. "On the Amphibolous Character of Existence: Matter and Its Negation in the Thought of George Santayana," *Review of Metaphysics* 64:2 (December), 361–371.

2011. "Benedict XVI on Cultural Identity," *Annals Australasia* (March), 7.

2011a. "Cultural Identity," *The Wanderer* (January 6), 4.

2011b. "The Open Society and Its Enemies," *The Wanderer* (March 3), 4.

2011c. "Property as a Condition of Liberty," *Modern Age* 53:4 (Fall), 83–88.

2011d. "Morality with and without God," *Truth and Faith in Ethics* (Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic), 41–51.

2011e. "The Loss of Maritain's America," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 34:4 (Winter), 23–24.

2011f. "The Relevance of Leo XIII," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 34:1 (Spring), 40–41.

2011g. "Whence Morality," editorial, *The Wanderer* (April 28).

2011h. "The Relevance of a Neglected Volume: Maritain on The Church of Christ," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 34:4 (Winter), 53–54.

2011i. "The Seven Cardinal Virtues of Ralph McInerny," [tribute] *O Rare Ralph McInerny: Stories and Reflections on a Legendary Notre Dame Professor*, ed. Christopher Kaczor (South Bend, Ind.: St. Augustine's Press), 24–26.

2011j. "The 'True Opinion' of Paul Craig Roberts," *The Wanderer*, June 3.

2011k. "Social Justice," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 34:3 (Fall), 34–36.

2011l. "Thomism," *The Encyclopedia of Applied Ethics*, 2nd ed. (New York: Elsevier B.V.).

2011m. "Cameron: The Liberal Society and Its Defense," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholar*s *Quarterly* 34:4 (Winter), 22–23.

2011n. "Anarchists among Us" *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 34:4 (Winter), 25–26.

2011o. "Ancients and Moderns on the Subject of Property," *Journal of Law*, *Philosophy, and Culture* 4:1, 73–81.

2011p. "Higher Education," *The American Conservative* (November), 38–41.

2012. "Holy Sacrifice of the Mass," *The Wanderer* (May 3), 4A.

2012a. "Poetry: The Revelatory Act," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* 35:1 (Spring), 32–36.

2012b. "Citizenship," *Annals Australasia* (June 11).

2012c. "Unifying a People," *The Wanderer* (September 6), 5B.

2012d. "Paul Ryan's Austrian Tutors," *Fellowship of Catholic Scholars Quarterly* (Summer), 21–23.

2012e. "Wisdom of the Church," *The Wanderer* (October 25).

2012f. "The Journey of the Magi," *Annals Australasia* (November / December 2012), 48–49.

2012g. "The Loss of Maritain's America," *Modern Age* 54:14 (Winter / Fall), 203–206.

2012h. "Gilson and Rémi Brague on Medieval Arabic Philosophy," *Studia Gilsoniana* 1 (2012), 5–14.

2013. *The Nature of Scientific Explanation* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press).

2013a. *Briefly Considered: From the Mainstream*: *Notes and Observations of Western Culture* (South Bend, Ind.: St. Augustine's Press) (in press for 2014).

2013b. "Wisdom of the Church," *Annals Australasia* (April / May).

2013c. "Citizenship" *Modern Age* (Summer), 81–86.

2013d. "Vladimir Putin's Russia," *The Wanderer* (April 18), 5A.

2013e. "Liberal Convictions and Their Consequences," *The Wanderer* (June 20), 4A.

2013f. "Lumen Fidei: A Reading," *Annals Australasia* (August 2013), 9.

2013g. "Europe Adrift: The Fate of Self-Government in Europe," *The Wanderer* (August 8), 5–6.

2013h. "Vaclav Klaus: The Practical Wisdom of a Senior Statesman," *The Wanderer* (October 3), 4A.

2013i. "A Fragile Distinction," *The Wanderer* (October 17), 5A.

2013j. "Property as a Condition of Liberty," *Das Eigentum al seine Bedingung der Freiheit*, ed. Anton Rauscher (Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, vol. 22 of series *Soziale Orientierung*), 13–20.

Reviews of books by Santayana, Randall, Romanell, Boas, Dennes, Hook, Edel, E. M. Adams, Jenkins, Currie, Cogley, Pols, Hooper, Miller McCool, Best, Wilson, Miller, Sandel, Marty, Rorty, Rawls, Simon, Boileau, Pipes, Robinson, Rist, Kass, Kekes, Wallace, and others appear in the *New Scholasticism*, *The Modern Schoolman*, *Perspective*, *The Review of Metaphysics*, *Crisis*, *Modern Age*, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, *The World and I*, *Acta Philosophica*, *Annals Australasia*, and the *American Journal of Jurisprudence*.

VARIA GILSONIANA

Richard Fafara
Adler–Aquinas Institute
Manitou Springs, CO, USA

GILSON AND PASCAL

In this paper I highlight aspects of Étienne Gilson's (1884–1978) understanding of Blaise Pascal (1623–1662) to argue that in a fundamental sense Gilson became Pascal's heir.

Pascal played a prominent role in Gilson's choice of career by showing him that he could expect more of philosophy than the "amazingly gratuitous arbitrariness" Gilson found in the idealism of Descartes and Léon Brunschvicg:

> I loved Pascal and I knew whole pages of his *Pensées* by heart. True enough, Pascal was known to me as an author in literature, and it was as such that I had learned to admire him. But Pascal was also a philosopher, though I always found him writing, not about notions or "ideas" like Descartes, but about real objects, things, actually existing beings. No one was less inclined "to think about thinking." It was in this direction, as I believed, that one should look to avoid despairing of philosophy. So I gave up the dream of a life devoted to the study and teaching of the humanities . . . and I went to study philosophy at the Faculty of Letters in the University of Paris.[1]

---

[1] Étienne Gilson, *The Philosopher and Theology*, trans. Cécile Gilson (New York: Random House, 1962), 18. Gilson's discussions of his professors at the Sorbonne (Id., 20–41) leave little doubt that, as a student, he was repeatedly exposed to Pascal's thought. Gilson followed Professor Delbos' course on French philosophy which included Pascal. See Victor Delbos, *La philosophie française* (Paris: Plon-Nourrit, 1921), 49–90. Frédéric Raugh, another of Gilson's professors, authored an important article on "La philosophie de Pascal," *Annales de la Faculté de Bordeaux*, 2 (1892), reprinted in *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* 30:2 (1923): 307–344. Professor Brunschvicg, who edited Pascal's works and taught at the Sorbonne while Gilson was a student there, interpreted Pascal as a practical rather than a rational genius, interested in the specific and the concrete. See Léon Brunschvicg, *Le Génie*

The young Gilson "was already plagued with the incurable meta-physical disease they call '*chosisme*,' that is cross materialism" or thinking about things, not ideas.[2]

Gilson loved to read Pascal.[3] When Gilson was a prisoner of war, he lectured on him;[4] he cited Pascal frequently throughout his long career to make precise, or illustrate, philosophical points;[5] and he published a few articles on Pascal in the 1920's and 1930's. But Gilson waited until he was almost eighty years old to provide us his most extensive treatment of Pascal dealing with his life in an article entitled "Pascal le Baroudeur" ("Pascal the Combatant"), published in 1962[6] and devoting a chapter in his *Modern Philosophy: Descartes to Kant*, published the following year to discuss Pascal's thought.[7] Gilson concentrated on five main areas of Pas-

---

de Pascal (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1924), 50. Gilson's more mature treatment of Descartes' "idealism" became more nuanced: "The world, the structure of which Descartes intends to explain, is not to him a product of his own mind; in this sense, his philosophy is a realism. On the other hand, his interpretation of the universe goes from mind to things; . . . to that extent, then, it shares in the nature of idealism. Those who like labels could perhaps call Cartesianism a methodological idealism, or an idealism of method. Whether, in philosophy, an idealistic method can justify realistic conclusions is of course a problem beyond the competence of mere history" (Étienne Gilson and Thomas Langan, *Modern Philosophy: Descartes to Kant* (New York: Random House, 1963), 59–60).

[2] For Gilson's "*chosisme*," see Kenneth L. Schmitz, *What has Clio to do with Athena? Étienne Gilson: Historian and Philosopher*, The Étienne Gilson Series 10 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1987), 7–14.

[3] Armand Maurer, "The Legacy of Étienne Gilson," in *One Hundred Years of Thomism: Aeterni Patris and Afterwards, A Symposium*, ed. Victor B. Brezik (Houston: Center for Thomistic Studies, 1981), 43.

[4] When taken prisoner at Bois de Ville-devant-Chaumant in February 1916, Gilson was detained at Burg-bei-Magdeburg. He "entertained the officers in both camps with lectures on Bergson, in which he contrasted Aquinas, Descartes, and Comte, who make a rational 'effort to exhaust the real,' with, Bonaventure, Pascal, and Bergson, as philosophers who attempt 'to attain the real' suprarationally" (Francesca Aran Murphy, *Art and Intellect in the Philosophy of Étienne Gilson* (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, 2004), 68).

[5] For example, the numerous references to Pascal in Étienne Gilson's: *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy,* trans. A. H. C. Downes (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937); *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1938); *Reason and Revelation in the Middle Ages*, The Richards Lectures at the University of Virginia 1937 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941); and *God and Philosophy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941).

[6] *Les Nouvelles Littéraires* (12 July 1962): 1, 7.

[7] Gilson and Langan, *Modern Philosophy*, 108–126. Although this collaborative volume makes no mention of who authored which chapters, "[t]he following were written by Langan: Montaigne, Bacon, Hobbes, Descartes (ethics section), Malebranche, Spinoza, Leibniz, Cambridge Platonists, Newton, Berkeley, Hume, d'Alembert, Diderot, Lessing, Herder,

cal's thought which I will explore. My concluding section asesses the similarities between Pascal and Gilson.

Method

Pascal's method of geometry operated within a realism. It became a major distinguishing characteristic between Pascal and Descartes. Like Descartes, Pascal thought that the true method to natural knowledge was mathematical. But unlike Descartes, who used algebraic geometry to try and solve all problems, Pascal was not interested in trying to develop a speculative science of nature and deduce it *a priori*. "Pascal wanted to think mathematically *within* experienced physical reality."[8] Gilson considered this one of the "deepest tendencies" of Pascal's mind, a mind that proceeded "step by step in its investigation of a fundamentally *unpredictable* nature." Pascal did not pursue Descartes' *a priori* geometry because he was not interested in the results it allowed one to achieve, a theoretical physics. Instead of following Descartes and making all knowledge as evident as mathematics, Pascal imposed upon all knowledge the limitations of geometry itself. Human knowledge assumes the certainty of geometry if it limits itself to strictly demonstrating consequences that are demonstrable, starting from principles that are naturally evident. But, Pascal maintained, we cannot define all terms either in geometry (e.g., "number," "space," "motion"), or in all the other fields of knowledge (e.g., the philosopher's definitions of "man," "time," "motion").[9]

Spirit of Finesse and Spirit of Geometry

For Pascal the highest quality of the mind is universality and the ideal man is the perfect "honnête homme," a truly integrated, or all around man equally at home speaking of mathematics or literature, of ethics and theology, and never making a show of his knowledge. Usually men do not enjoy such universality and are divided into two classes. Some possess the spirit of geometry and are gifted in mathematics while others enjoy the spirit of *finesse* and are gifted in conducting the human affairs of everyday.

Kant. Gilson wrote all the rest" (Letter of Armand Maurer to Richard Fafara, 27 Nov 1998 (unpublished)).

[8] Gilson and Langan, *Modern Philosophy*, 109.

[9] Blaise Pascal, *De l'esprit géométrique*, in Blaise Pascal, *Pensées et Opuscules*, ed. Léon Brunschvicg (Paris: Hachette, 1897), 164–169.

In so far as the mind apprehends principles by a sort of simple, comprehensive, instinctual sight, it does so by "*coeur*" or "heart," the source of understanding and loving in the human person. Those with the spirit of geometry have hard, inflexible views. Once they *see* the principles far removed from common use, they see them clearly, and since they are clear it is hard to go astray in reasoning about them. The difficulty is *seeing* the principles first. The reverse is true with the spirit of finesse. Principles are in common use and there for everyone to see, but they are subtle and so numerous that it takes good eyes to see them. It is almost impossible to miss some of them and, as we know, omitting one principle inevitably leads to error.

Trying to open up the minds of those having a spirit of finesse to the truths of geometry is difficult. Take, for example, the notion of the infinite, a fundamental notion, signifying a property common to all things in nature. It can only be grasped by the heart and not demonstrated. When grasped, it divides into two infinities present in all things: an infinity of magnitude and an infinity of parvitude. Infinite magnitude is found in motion, space, and time, for example, but each one of these also contains infinite parvitude and can also be conceived as still smaller than it is. The infinity of parvitude is not easily conceived and some, because they cannot picture a content divisible to infinity, conclude that it is not actually divisible.[10] This is man's natural disease, i.e., believing that he always grasps the truth directly and denying all that he cannot understand. Gilson commented that in arguing for the reverse it seems that Pascal's epistemology was tainted by his Jansenism.[11] Because this twofold infinity generally belongs to all

---

[10] Shortly after he published his volume on *Modern Philosophy*, Gilson made the point that some consider philosophy as reaching arbitrary positions, "and indeed it does, because it is reaching the primitive facts that are principles . . . Paul Valéry detested metaphysics and stopped short at the moment of crossing its threshold, so he included all such certitudes in a class of his own making, which he ironically called that of the 'vague things.' Now these notions are not vague, but primary and therefore necessary, which is something different. They are not clearly seen precisely because they are what makes us see. Each one of them is 'an impossibility-of-thinking-otherwise' which gives access to a distinct order of intelligibility. Principles should be accepted for the light they shed just as, in the darkness, a lamp brightens itself along with the rest" (Étienne Gilson, *The Arts of the Beautiful* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), 76–77).

[11] The bareness of Pascal's ideas can "cause them to appear as the products of a Jansenist mind," but if Pascal has "a Jansenist temperament" he never submits "to a pure Jansenist belief" (Wallace Fowlie, *Clowns and Angels: Studies in Modern French Literature* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1943), 57–58). Gilson concluded that while there are certainly obscure texts in the *Pensées*, Pascal disagreed with the core of Jansenism itself: "Jésus-Christ

things, because it belongs to number which Scripture tells us is found in all things (Wis., 11:21), one can say that all things are found between nothingness and infinity and, more importantly, at an infinite distance from these two extremes. These truths, the very foundations and principles of geometry, cannot be demonstrated; they must be seen. Pascal's philosophy was an extension of his scientific view of the world in which everything was intelligible except for the principles "from which is derived its very intelligibility."[12]

Pyrrhonism and Dogmatism

Not only does man himself lie between two infinities, above all does his knowledge. Truth lies in neither skepticism nor dogmatism. Not all is uncertain, and arguing that nothing is known is false. The principles of demonstrations apprehended, or seen to be true by the "heart," are absolutely certain and more than enough to overcome skepticism such as that entertained by Descartes. The natural evidence of principles renders Descartes' doubting whether he was awake or asleep impossible.[13] As for dogmatism, it is not the case that every proposition is rationally demon-

---

est mort pour tous les élus, non pour tous les hommes." Gilson's method for dealing with the question of whether or not Pascal was a Jansenist consisted in separating the case of Jansenius from that of Port Royal, defining Jansenism by the doctrine of Jansenius himself, and comparing the text of Pascal's *Pensées* with that of Jansenius' *Augustinus*. See Étienne Gilson, review of Jacques Chevalier's *Pascal* (Paris: Plon, 1922) in *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'étranger* 97 (1924): 309–311.

[12] Gilson and Langan, *Modern Philosophy*, 116. See Pascal, *De l'esprit géométrique*, 173–184.

[13] Pascal, *Pensées*, trans. & ed. A. J. Krailsheimer (Maryland, Penguin Books, 1966), #110, and #282 in Brunschvicg's edition (Pascal, *Pensées et Opuscules*). Gilson considered Brunschvicg's edition to be "accessible and priceless," but scholars now consider the arrangement of Pascal's fragments in M. Louis Lafuma's edition of the *Pensées* (Pascal, *Oeuvres completes*, Préface Henri Gouhier (Paris: Seuil, 1963)) to be closer to the original order of Pascal, knowing full well that no order can ever be final because only with publication does the form of a work become fixed. Henceforth, I cite the *Pensées* by fragment number from Krailsheim's (K) edition (who based his ordering on Lafuma's) followed by the number in Brunschvicg's (B) edition. The unfinished and fragmentary nature of the *Pensées* does not mean that more so than with other texts all interpretations of the fragments must be partial and tentative. Gilson can be seen as approaching them in the "right spirit" and finding an underlying coherence to them by describing Pascal's method and finding "not only recurrent problems but also reappearing lines of attack on them, tendencies that bespeak something conscious and deliberate" (Hugh M. Davidson, *Pascal and the Arts of the Mind* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1993), xiii).

strable since the principles cannot be demonstrated even though they are true. Not being able to prove everything, such as that we are not dreaming, simply shows the weakness of our reason. It does not prove the uncertainty of all our cognitions as the Pyrrhonians pretend it does. Thus, Pascal stands in the middle—as a skeptic to the dogmatist and a dogmatist to the skeptic.

The Human Condition: Man in the Middle

Like all of creation, man bears the mark of God's infinity and infinity is twofold, that of parvitude and magnitude. Man finds himself situated between these two infinities. Man is nothing when compared with infinity yet a giant compared to the smallest of known insects or atomic particle, a whole when compared to that nothingness which is impossible to reach. Man finds himself suspended between the two abysses of infinity, between two mysteries: the nothingness from which he was created and infinity in which he is drowned between two infinitely distant extremes in all orders of reality and of knowledge. Both man's origin and his end escape his sight.

"[O]ur intelligence holds, in the order of intelligible things, the same rank as our body in the order of nature." Just as our senses can perceive neither extreme in their objects, so also too much truth blinds the mind which is why prime principles are so hard to grasp. And since nothing can stabilize finite man, always infinitely distant from two extremes, whether or not we have a little more or less of anything, including knowledge, doesn't matter.[14]

Man and God

Endowed with a body like beasts, and with a mind like angels, man, for Pascal, is neither angel nor beast. These two components of human nature are not equal. By his body man is an exceedingly small thing in nature, whereas by his mind he can encompass nature. Frail as a reed as a material being, man is still a thinking reed and, although he can easily be crushed by the universe, he is still greater than that which can crush him because he would know that he is being crushed, whereas the universe knows nothing about it. Man's greatness lies in thought, admirable in its nature but ridiculous in its defects.

---

[14] *Pensée*s, K #199, B #72; Gilson and Langan, *Modern Philosophy*, 119.

For this reason, man's greatness can be seen from his misery and *vice versa*. In 1646, at the age of twenty-four, Pascal entered into sickness and suffering and underwent his first conversion while discovering God. He renounced all other studies to concentrate on studying the law of God and living only for God. In the remaining fifteen years of his life, Pascal deepened that discovery, and concluded that sickness placed him in his natural condition because it is there that God wished him to be so as to summon him more surely to Him.[15] Pascal's sister summarized the thought of her illustrious brother as follows: knowing Christ is not only knowing God and our misery but rather knowing, with our misery, the God who delivers us from it.[16]

By nature man wants to be happy and rid himself of his misery. Pascal argued that the universality of this desire coupled with man's inability to achieve fulfillment must have a reason, namely, that man once had true happiness but now has merely a vestige of it. Having possessed perfect happiness, man now tries in vain to fill the void caused by the loss of this infinite which can never be regained via the finite objects of diversion at man's disposal.

For Pascal, only religion and the doctrine of original sin can account for the contradictions inherent now in human nature. Many refuse this answer because they find no acceptable demonstration of God's existence. But the truth of God's existence, Pascal maintained, is a principle not a conclusion. God is perceived by the "heart" of man, not his reason; such is faith.[17] As for original sin, it is "an astounding thing that the mystery the farthest removed from our knowledge, which is that of the transmission of

---

[15] Gilson, "Pascal le Baroudeur," 1, 7. In commenting on Henri Gouhier's *magnum opus*, *Blaise Pascal: Commentaires* (Paris: Vrin, 1966, 2nd edition 1971) Gilson wrote his former student on 9 June 1966: "Ne l'ayant retrouvé dans aucun livre où j'ai parlé de Pascal, j'en viens à penser que ce doit avoir été dans un article sur Pascal écrit pour *Les Nouvelles Littéraires*. Je ne sais plus où est cet article, mais je crois me souvenir que je faisais de lui un barouder et, un peu comme Jacques Maritain, une sorte d'aventurier de l'esprit" ("Lettres d'Étienne Gilson à Henri Gouhier," choisies et présentées par G. Prouvost, *Revue Thomiste* XCIV: *Autour d'Ètienne Gilson: Études et documents* (1994): 476, n. 3). When Gilson discussed Pascal, he remained true to his principle that "the very substance of a history of philosophy is philosophy itself" (Gilson and Langan, *Modern Philosophy*, viii). Each chapter in each volume of his *History of Philosophy* emphasized the doctrinal content of each philosopher in the text. Biographical and bibliographical information limited to what is needed to embark on any one of the philosophers, schools, or periods represented was relegated to the back note section of the book.

[16] *La vie de Monsieur Pascal écrite par Madame Périer, sa soeur*, Pascal, *Pensées et Opuscules*, 21.

sin, be a thing without which we can have no knowledge of ourselves!" How Adam's sin could have rendered guilty men so utterly foreign to it is a mystery; but supposing it true renders the rest clear. Pascal concluded that "man is more inconceivable without this mystery, than this mystery is inconceivable to man."[18]

Gilson understood the opposition between skepticism and dogmatism as the basic philosophical problem for Pascal**.** Dogmatists like the Stoics considered man uncorrupted so they sought refuge in pride; others like the skeptics considered human nature so corrupt that they could not help surrendering to evil. Only another supreme mystery—Jesus Christ and the grace of redemption—could liberate man from this inner contradiction, the source of many others. Only the Christian religion can cure these two vices.

> For it teaches the just, whom it raises up to participation in the divinity itself, that even in that sublime state, they still bear the source of all corruption which exposes them, throughout their whole lives to error, misery, death, and sin; and it cries out to the most ungodly that they are able to receive the grace of their Redeemer . . . Who can refuse belief and worship to such heavenly enlightenment?[19]

For Gilson, only the author of such a philosophy could write, along with his essays on the method of geometry, sublime pages on the *Mystery of Jesus*, and carry on himself the *Mémorial*[20] as a perpetual reminder of his greatest mystical experience on the night of 23 November 1654. The *Mémorial*, sewn in the lining of his garment and transferred when he changed clothes, was found after his death. Pascal's sister considered the collection of fragments called the *Pensée*s, the scraps of paper, the "debris" found on the floor of the room in which Pascal died, as parts of his war machine against atheism.[21] Gilson concluded that Pascal's life was a for-

---

[17] *Pensée*s, K #424, B #278. See Henri Gouhier, "Le coeur qui sent les trois dimensions," in *La Passion de la raison: Hommage à Ferdinand Alquié* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1983), 203–216.

[18] *Pensée*s, K #131, B #434. "Pascal persists in remaining for the French, the clearest utterance which has been given to Christian psychology, and his thoughts, perhaps by their very incompleteness, appear inexhaustible and incapable of being fathomed in any absolute sense" (Wallace Fowlie, *Clowns and Angels*, 54).

[19] *Pensée*s, K #208, B #435.

[20] Id., K #919, B #553. The text of the *Mémorial* (K, #913; Pascal, *Pensée*s et *Opuscules*, 142–43) was found sewn into Pascal's coat after his death.

mal summons that engages each one of us.[22] Unfortunately, Pascal's fundamental experience is our own. What response should we propose if we refuse that which he gave? There scarcely remains the refusal, "No, I will never be your man because your man is a thinking reed."[23] Regardless of what man is made of, in the end each of us breaks, and the thought of that end is not agreeable to us. Each of us responds to Pascal as he pleases but, inevitably, all respond because in this combatant there is a *provocateur*.[24]

Pascal and Gilson

Citing Pascal's apparent disdain for philosophy—"we do not believe the whole of philosophy to be worth one hour's effort"[25]—some deny that Pascal was a philosopher.[26] Gilson disagreed. Pascal was a philosopher,

---

[21] After discussing the unedited work that we today call the *Pensées*, originally entitled *Apologie de la religion Chrétienne*, Mme. Périer wrote: "Je vous renvoie donc à cet ouvrage, et j'ajoute seulement ce qu'il est important de rapeller ici, que toutes les différentes réflexions que mon frère fit sur les miracles lui donnèrent beaucoup de nouvelles lumières sur la religion . . . et ce fut à cette occasion qu'il se sentit tellement animé contre les athées, que voyant dans les lumières que Dieu lui avait données de quoi les convaincre et les confondre sans resources, il s'appliqua à cet ouvrage, dont les parties qu'on a ramassées nous font avoir tant de regrets qu'il n'ait pas pu les rassembler lui-même, et, avec tout ce qu'il y aurait pu ajouter encore, en faire un composé d'une beauté achevée" (*La vie de Monsieur Pascal*, Pascal: *Pensées et Opuscules*, 19).

[22] Pascal "speaks to us as a human being. He confronts the problems that pose themselves to every human being, and he uses the language of every man. He does distinguish himself by writing magnificently and he pushes questions further than most. There are so many learned men who string together complicated words and who avoid the essential. Pascal takes problems head-on, and he does not stop halfway. He belongs to those who are not afraid" (Philippe Beneton, "Elements of an Apologia," *Perspectives on Political Science* 31:1 (2002): 27).

[23] *Pensées*, K #200, B #347.

[24] "Pascal is one of those writers who will be and who must be studied afresh by men in every generation. It is not he who changes, but we who change . . . The history of opinions of Pascal and of men of his stature is a part of the history of humanity. That indicates his permanent importance . . . I can think of no Christian writer, not Newman even, more to be commended than Pascal to those who doubt, but who have the mind to conceive, and the sensibility to feel, the disorder, the futility, the meaninglessness, the mystery of life and suffering, and who can only find peace through a satisfaction of the whole being" (T. S. Eliot, "Introduction," in Blaise Pascal, *Pensées* (New York: Dutton,1958), xix).

[25] *Pensées*, K #887, B #78.

[26] See, for example, Henri Gouhier (*Henri Gouhier se souvient… Ou comment on devient historien des idées*, eds. Giulia Belgioioso and Marie-Louise Gouhier (Paris: J Vrin, 2005), 49–50; "Pascal et la Philosophie," *Pascal: Textes du Tricentenaire par François Mauriac, Louis de Broglie, Daniel-Rops, Henri Massis...* (Paris: Fayard, 1963), 323; and *Les Grandes*

a Christian philosopher, as Gilson understood that term, i.e., the starting point of Pascal's meditations and the whole spirit thereof, even as a philosophy, is inseparable from Christian revelation.[27] For Gilson, a deep religious life, a soul in search of the divine, was at the origin of Saint Thomas Aquinas' powerful philosophical theses and the same held true of Pascal.

In his famous debate with Professor Brunschvicg on the notion of Christian philosophy, Gilson specified "the impact of Christian faith on Pascal's philosophical positions." For example, Saint Paul had known what Pascal called "the misery of man." Gilson thought that this notion, Pascal's point of departure, could have been introduced by a non-philosophical route; while there was not philosophy in the text of Saint Paul, it could have generated a philosophy.[28] Gilson also cited Pascal's speculations on the two infinities which certainly are of a philosophical order and can only be explained in a Christian universe because the notion of a positive infini-

---

Avenues de la Pensée Philosophique en France depuis Descartes (Louvain: Universitaires de Louvain, 1966), 33–35, 46–47); Emile Bréhier (*Histoire de la philosophie*, (Félix Alcan, Paris 1929), II, 127) and Fredinand Alquié (*Signification de la philosophie* (Paris: Hachette 1971), 129). "Pascal did not want to be a philosopher;" he "did not want to think of himself as one, and it is probably fair to say that he wasn't one at least not in the sense in which the term was used in his day" (Leszek Kolakowski, *Why is there Something Rather than Nothing? 23 Questions from Great Philosophers*, trans. Agnieska Kolakowska (New York: Basic Books, 2007), 123, x). Nevertheless, Kolakowski included Pascal in his book about "great philosophers." Vincent Carraud (*Pascal et la philosophie* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1992), 26–28) argued that the attribution of a philosophy to Pascal is a pseudo problem for three reasons. It is at least paradoxical to do so when Pascal derides philosophy; the insufficiency of philosophy cannot be established in philosophy. If one extends the notion of physics and identifies it with philosophy the question of the status of philosophy in Pascal is not raised. Finally, if philosophy is taken to mean a general vision of the world or a conglomeration of knowledge, the question is already resolved. Victor Delbos, who had a significant impact on Gilson's thought, placed Pascal beside Descartes as one of the great representatives of a different line of French thought. "[S]i pour lui [Pascal] il n'a pas voulu être philosophe, ses *Pensées* n'en constituent pas moins une philosophie, et il apporte des vues nouvelles en étudiant la physique, le géométrie, et surtout l'homme" (Delbos, *La philosophie française*, 50). Frederick Copleston considered a variety of possible interpretations of Pascal and, like Gilson, concluded that Pascal is not "a Christian thinker simply in the sense that he is a thinker who is Christian: he is a Christian thinker in the sense that his Christianity is the inspiration of his thought and unifies his outlook on the world and man" (Copleston, *A History of Modern Philosophy*, IV: *Modern Philosophy: From Descartes to Leibniz* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 173).

[27] Gilson and Langan, *Modern Philosophy*, 87.

[28] Gilson, "La notion de philosophie chrétienne," Session of 21 March 1931, *Bulletin de la Société française de Philosophie* (31): 56.

ty had no sense among the Greek philosophers. The notion of perfection and infinity is a Christian notion.[29] In addition, Pascal's acceptance of a supernatural order engendered a philosophical framework because it distinguished the order of thought from the order of charity which is infinitely superior to it.[30] Gilson recognized Pascal's so-called contempt for philosophy as the right of "one of the greatest philosophers, one of the greatest scientists, and one of the greatest artists of all times" to disdain what he surpasses "especially if what he disdains is not so much the thing loved as the excessive attachment which enslaves us to it. Pascal despised neither science nor philosophy, but he never pardoned them for having once hidden from him the most profound mystery of charity."[31]

Philosophically, both Pascal and Gilson were realists, placing the emphasis on "*choses*" or things, not on our ideas of them. Both Pascal and Gilson were convinced that revealed faith stimulates arguments for realism better than any non-Christian philosophy can reach.[32] Both denied the

---

[29] See Leo Sweeney, *Divine Infinity in Greek and Medieval Thought* (New York: P. Lang, 1992). In the early 1950's, Gilson initiated Sweeney's work by seeking why medieval authors spoke of God's "being" as itself infinite, a statement found neither in Judaeo-Christian Scriptures nor in Greek philosophers. See also Emilio Brito, *Philosophie Moderne et Christianisme* (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), II, 54–62.

[30] Pensées, K #423, #424; B #278, #279, and Gilson, "La notion de philosophie chrétienne," 82. After arguing that recent scholarship on Pascal (e.g., that of Jean Luc Marion and Vincent Carraud) has "not given Pascal his full due as a theological thinker," Wood contends that Pascal's account of subjectivity is "theologically rich," so much so that "we can read the *Pensées* as a theological text from beginning to end" (William Wood, "What is the Self?: Imitation and Subjectivity in Blaise Pascal's *Pensées*," *Modern Theology* 26:3 (2010): 417–18).

[31] Étienne Gilson, "The Intelligence in the Service of Christ the King," in *A Gilson Reader: Selections from the Writings of Étienne Gilson*, ed. Anton C. Pegis (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1957), 38–39.

[32] "[F]aith, through the influence it wields from above and over reason as reason, makes possible the development of a more fruitful and truer rational activity" (Étienne Gilson, *Thomism: The Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas*, trans. Laurence K. Shook and Armand Maurer (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2002), 20). Methodologically Gilson followed Saint Thomas as he remained in the Augustinian tradition of *fides quaerens intellectum*. "[O]ne may err because in matters of faith he makes reason precede faith, instead of faith precede reason, as when someone is willing to believe only what he can discover by reason. It should in fact be just the opposite. Thus Hillary says: 'Begin by believing, inquire, press forward, persevere'" (Thomas Aquinas, *Commentary on the De Trinitate of Boethius*, Q. 2, a.1, resp. in *Faith, Reason and Theology*, trans., with introduction and notes, Armand Maurer (Montmagny: Les Éditions Marquis Ltée, 1987), 38). See also, Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* II–II, q. 2, art. 4: "Is it necessary to believe what can be proved by natural reason?" The answer is in the affirmative: "We must accept by faith not

possibility of philosophical systems in the sense that we intuit principles on which we construct a house of reason, be it a Cartesian or Thomistic one.[33]

only what is above reason but also what can be known by reason." The Augustinianism of Thomas Aquinas is often neglected, partly because he does not go to great lengths to prove his theological pedigree—it is assumed in many places. Del Noce described Gilson as infusing an "Augustinian spirit into Thomism." Gilson would have agreed with Del Noce that in the relationship between faith and reason, "the process must go from faith to reason because the God of faith is not the god of reason *plus something else*. There is a leap because all the philosophical cognitions about God added together cannot get us to the redeeming God. For this reason, rather than speaking of a faith that is superimposed on rational knowledge, we ought to speak of a faith that *saves* reason by setting it free from the idolatry of itself, from rationalism" (Augusto Del Noce, "Thomism and the Critique of Rationalism: Gilson and Shestov," *Communio* 25:4 (1998): 734). In discussing Gilson's existential Thomism with an Augustinian spirit, Del Noce wrote: "I said 'infusion of Saint Augustine,' and I was just about to write 'Pascal.' In fact, if we look carefully at Gilson's position, we see that it strikes a blow against the habit of Catholic philosophers who, in the name of a certain Thomism, eliminate Pascal from the history of philosophy and relegate him to apologetics" (Id., 744). Del Noce was convinced that Gilson recognized the "extraordinaire actualité" of Pascal because he admitted "un acte de foi original qui s'accomplit ainsi dans la pensée religieuse comme dans le rationalisme, à la difference que dans la première il est reconnu et declaré, dans le second non." (Augusto Del Noce, "Fede e filosofia secondo Étienne Gilson," AA. VV., *S. Tommaso nella storia dei pensiero* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vatican, 1982), 306–307). For a conceptual comparison of Gilson and Del Noce, see Massimo Borghesi's "Introduction," in Augusto Del Noce, *Mon Cher collègue et ami: Lettres d'Étienne Gilson à Augusto Del Noce* (Paris: Parole et Silence, 2011), 7–59.

[33] ". . . Thomism is not a system if by this is meant a global explanation of the world deduced or constructed, in an idealistic manner, from *a priori* principles" (Étienne Gilson, "The Spirit of Thomism," in *A Gilson Reader*, 248). Because of the title of the first three editions of Gilson's classic work *Le Thomisme: Introduction au système de Thomas d'Aquin*, (Strasbourg: Vix, 1919; Paris: Vrin, 1922; Paris: Vrin, 1927), some mistakenly have maintained that initially Gilson interpreted Saint Thomas as having a "system." Gilson used the term to refer to "the hierarchic order of beings reaching from the lowest up through the angelic substances towards God. He was concerned above all to distinguish the Thomistic hierarchy from various Neo-Platonic ones (*Le Thomisme* (1919), 170–174). As to the use of the word 'system' to describe the order of the universe as Saint Thomas understood it, Bréhier (*Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'étranger* 92 (1921): 147–149)—with the tighter more idealistic meaning of the term 'system' in mind—had already declared it to be no system, but (quoting Gilson's own words (*Le Thomisme* (1919)) 'an ensemble of philosophical demonstrations.' And Gilson himself,—as he became more aware of his own orientation towards the concrete, and perhaps less satisfied with the modern implications and connotations of the term 'system,'—eventually abandon it entirely in the subtitle of *Le Thomisme*" (Schmitz, "What has Clio to do with Athena?," 7–8). In 1920, Gilson may have maintained that philosophy is a systematic representation of the universe, but he also cautioned that "la cohérence parfaite vers laquelle tendent les systèmes philosophiques est une limite idéale que ne rejoint jamais la réalité" (Étienne Gilson, "Essai sur la vie intérieure," *Revue philosophique de la France et de l'étranger* 89 (1920): 71–74; see also Gilson's "La paix de la sagesse,"

Both viewed the universe as a creation of God and, hence, ultimately ineffable because it originated from a source that surpasses human understanding. Pascal, who knew the nature of scientific explanation, concluded that "[a]ll things hide some mystery; all things are veils which hide God."[34] Gilson agreed and cited Saint Thomas' statement that "God is in all things, in their very depths."[35] With a universe peopled with living essences sprung from a source as secret and rich as their very life, Gilson maintained that Aquinas' world, "despite many superficial dissimilarities," was "continuous with the scientific world of Pascal rather than that of Descartes. In Pascal's world, the imagination would more likely grow weary of producing concepts than nature will tire of providing them." Pascal's physics governed by geometry reduces the ontological reality of the natural world to its quantitative aspects; it does not depend on, or receive help or direction from, either the principles of being used by metaphysics or the principles of substance from natural philosophy. Aquinas regarded the mathematized sciences as a distinct type of science— "intermediate sciences" whose principles are obtained directly through

---

Aquinas 3 (1960): 38, n. 5). Following Aristotle and Saint Thomas, philosophy, for Gilson, is a perfection of the mind, a *habitus*, acquired through repeated acts enabling its possessor to demonstrate truths through their causes or principles. See Étienne Gilson, "The Education of a Philosopher," in *Three Quests in Philosophy*, ed. Armand Maurer (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Study, 2008), 21–22. See the excellent discussion of this issue by Rev. Gerald B. Phelan, Co-Director of the Institute of Mediaeval Studies and later the first President of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies (1939–1946), in his "Being and the Metaphysicians," in *From an Abundant Spring*, ed. The Staff of the Thomist (New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1952), 423–447. Gilson's pupils agreed with him: "Metaphysics is . . . first and foremost . . . a living habit of thinking (in the Aristotelian sense of *habitus...*). Metaphysics is primarily a vital quality and activity of the intellect, and not a collection or systematic organization of data either in print or in the memory. In its own nature metaphysics exists solely in intellects, and not in books or writings, though the name may be used, in a secondary sense, to denote a body of truths known through the metaphysical *habitus*, and to designate a treatise or a course in which metaphysical thinking is communicated" (Joseph Owens, *An Elementary Christian Metaphysics* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1963), viii–ix, 25, n. 1). See also, Leo Sweeney, *A Metaphysics of Authentic Existentialism* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1965) 8, 13–14, and Armand A. Maurer, "The Unity of a Science: St. Thomas and the Nominalists," in *St. Thomas Aquinas, 1274–1974, Commemorative Studies* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1974) 2, 269–292.

[34] "Toutes choses couvrent quelque mystère; toutes choses sont des voiles qui couvrent Dieu" (Pascal, "Extraite des Lettres à Mlle de Roannez, fin d'octobre 1656," in *Pensées et Opuscules*, 215).

[35] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 8, a. 1.

observation and abstraction. As such, Pascal's physics can find a place within Thomism.[36]

Gilson's profound appreciation of Pascal resided in his seeing in Pascal's critique of rationalism a bridge that joins Saint Thomas' unity of philosophy and theology. Both Pascal and Gilson considered mystery as the hinge on which reason turns while distinguishing philosophy from religion. Pascal wrote about the infinite distance that separates thought from charity. Gilson propounded an existential Thomism infused with the Augustinian spirit of faith preceding reason and denied that philosophy leads to a redeeming God, or that natural theology transforms faith into knowledge.[37] Both maintained that the Incarnation is the only means for us to understand ourselves,[38] and both shared the view that God's existence is largely independent of philosophical demonstrations that one gives of it since the God of faith is so much more than the God of reason.[39]

Intimately familiar with the charge of giving primacy to faith over reason, Gilson did not find Pascal guilty of fideism. Gilson granted that "it is difficult to know if Pascal would admit, in the present condition of man, demonstrations of the existence of God." Pascal regarded Descartes'

---

[36] Gilson, *Thomism*, 425; Joseph Owens, "Saint Thomas Aquinas and Modern Science," in *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, I, Series IV, June 1963 (Ottawa: Royal Society of Canada, 1963), 283–291. For shortcomings of Pascal's overall philosophy made from a Thomistic perspective that Gilson did not note, see James Collins, *God in Modern Philosophy* (London: Routledge, 1960), 331–340.

[37] Étienne Gilson, *Constantes philosophiques de l'être* (Paris: Vrin, 1983), 221. For Gilson's antipathy towards rival versions of twentieth century Thomism (Conceptualist-Suarareian, Roman, and Louvainiste), see Murphy, *Art and Intellect*, 49–62.

[38] Gilson, *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*, 216.

[39] Pascal, Pensées K #417, B #548, and Gilson, *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*, 227–228. After 1960, Gilson became less interested in the "ronde des preuves" for God's existence because he was convinced that no philosophy, no natural knowledge of God, could put us in possession, whether it be by one or five ways, of a knowledge of God's existence that belongs to the economy of salvation. "It is true that if the God of revelation exists, he is the Prime Mover, the First Efficient Cause, the First Necessary Being, and everything reason can prove about the First Cause of the universe. But if Yahweh is the Prime Mover, the Prime Mover is not Yahweh. The First Efficient Cause never spoke to me by his prophets, and I do not expect my salvation to come from him. The God in whose existence the faithful believe infinitely transcends the one whose existence is proved by the philosopher. Above all, he is a God of whom philosophy could have no idea . . . The God of reason is the God of science; the God of faith is the God of salvation" (Étienne Gilson, *Christian Philosophy*, trans. Armand Maurer (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1993), 11). See Richard Fafara, "A Change in Tone in Étienne Gilson's Christian Philosophy," *New Blackfriars* 94:1051 (2013): 267–277.

philosophy as "useless and uncertain."[40] For Pascal, Descartes' so-called philosophical proofs of the existence of God were not worth very much, both because of their metaphysical intricacy, which is of use to very few, and because the proofs do not imply a knowledge of Christ. For Gilson, this meant not that Pascal had no interest in the rational aspect of the problem but that his real aim was to convince atheists of good reasons for admitting the existence of God.[41] Pascal's famous wager supposes that reason is as unable to prove there is a God as to prove there is not a God. In the absence of proofs, Pascal takes stock of the fact that we have to bet in saying there is no God as much as saying that there is one. "By betting there is a God I gamble finite goods for an infinite one. No hesitation is possible."[42]

---

[40] *Pensée*s, B #78, K #887.

[41] Gilson and Langan, *Modern Philosophy*, 483, n. 23. The charge of fideism or an attenuated version of it has been leveled frequently against Pascal. See, for example, Richard H. Popkin, "Fideism," in *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 3 & 4, ed. Paul Edwards (New York, Macmillan, 1967), 201–202. "Yet in avoiding a rigorous fideism, he [Pascal] himself never makes use of the metaphysical proofs [for the existence of God], nor does he analyze in detail how the natural knowledge of God is obtained. He seldom mentions this knowledge without adding a word of warning about the attendant moral and religious dangers. Instead of approving of such knowledge as supplying a solid groundwork for the life of grace, he invariably treats it as an obstacle to the reception of faith" (Collins, *God in Modern Philosophy*, 330). For an interpretation of Pascal's position on faith and reason being "exactly what Aquinas says," see Peter Kreeft, *Christianity for Modern Pagans: Pascal's Pensées Edited, Outlined, and Exlained* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), 235–244. McInerny charged Gilson with blurring the line between philosophy and theology and thus undermining the very cornerstone of Thomas Aquinas' intellectual project. According to McInerny, Gilson suggested that Aquinas' supposedly philosophical insights were really drawn from Biblical revelation and were thus based on faith, making it impossible for Thomistic philosophy to address itself to non-Christians and pushing it into something akin to fideism. See Ralph McInerny, *Praeambula Fidei: Thomism and the God of the Philosophers* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2006), ix, and Joseph White, *Wisdom in the Face of Modernity* (Washington, D.C.: Sapientia Press, 2009), xxxii, 225. "One can raise the question of whether a kind of fideistic methodology has entered into Gilson's later thinking, since he seems to make the natural, philosophical specification of the human intelligence directly dependent upon the objects we know by the light of faith" (Id., 130–31). Gilson commented: "Le phénomène le plus extraordinaire que je connaisse en ce sens est *Doctor Communis* [an Italian philosophical review] . . . Quand je leur cite du saint Thomas sur la foi, ils m'accusent de fidéisme. Non! Mais de 'pencher dangereusement vers le fidéisme'" (Lettre à H. de Lubac, 1er avril, 1964, *Lettres de M. Étienne Gilson au père de Lubac* (Paris: Cerf, 1986), 54).

[42] After bringing nonbelievers to the edge of a decision, Pascal realized that a person's very constitution—composite nature and concurrence of bodily habits and feelings—prevents one from taking the practical step to place one's life on the side of God. Pascal's advice to the

As one of the last century's most dynamic apologists for Christianity, Gilson drew on Pascal "for his description of the vocation of the Christian intellectual" and how to place "intelligence in the service of Christ." This meant "showing the world that a man can be a man of science, because he is a man of God" with everyone realizing that Catholicism itself is the source of his greatness.[43] This certainly held true of Gilson who, much like a laboratory scientist, examined philosophy within the lab of its history. As one of the best historians of his generation, Gilson authoritatively delineated "the fumblings and the follies of the human mind" which ensure that reason is helpless without religion.[44] He expressed little confidence in the autonomous powers of the intellect.[45] Towards the end of his long career, after disagreeing with excessively rationalist versions of Saint Thomas' thought[46] and propounding what some have

---

interested was to follow the example of other people who have committed themselves to a Christian way of life. "This will quite naturally bring you to believe, and will make you more docile" [vous abêtira] (*Pensée*s, K #418, B #233). See Étienne Gilson, "Le sens du terme 'abêtir' chez Pascal," *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse* 1 (1921): 338–344; republished in *Les idées et les lettres* (Paris: Vrin, 1932), 263–274.

[43] Murphy, *Art and Intellect*, 4, 7, 159; Gilson, "The Intelligence in the Service of Christ the King," 43.

[44] This is the main lesson of Gilson's *God and Philosophy*; see Anton C. Pegis' review of this work in *Thought* 17 (1942): 329. Gilson thought that "simply by believing what God has said they [Christians] were finding themselves possessed of all that which they needed in the way of philosophical truth . . . [T]he great majority of Christians who are not philosophers in the technical sense of the word . . . find in the Christian revelation a view of the world, of man, and of his destiny that gives full satisfaction to their reason" (Étienne Gilson, "What is Christian Philosophy," in *A Gilson Reader*, 179). While admitting that it is an exaggeration, some thought Gilson's limited confidence in the autonomous powers of the intellect and Pascal's antipathy toward a natural theism could trigger the thought that in this respect both were tinged by Jansenism; see Maurice Nédoncelle, *Is There a Christian Philosophy?*, trans. Illtyd Trethowan (London: Burns and Oates, 1960), 87. For Gilson's own account of a reviewer of his work *Christianisme et philosophie* (Paris: Vrin, 1936) finding in it "a concealed Jansenism," see his *The Philosopher and Theology*, 82. On Jansenism in Pascal, see note 11 above.

[45] In the sixth and final edition of his lifelong work *Le Thomisme*, Gilson recognized the current paradoxical situation: the proofs for the existence of God St. Thomas wanted to be simple and elementary have become "a 'mystery' for our time; disagreement exists even among Thomists as to their meaning and value; and anyone following St. Thomas' position today that very few can understand the proofs for the existence of God "is suspected of fideism or semi-fideism" (Gilson, *Thomism*, 75).

[46] Pope Benedict XVI did not endorse "the neoscholastic rationalism that was trying to reconstruct the *preambula fidei*." He thought "the approach to faith, with pure rational certainty, by means of rational argument that was strictly independent of any faith, has failed;

called a Pascalian Thomism—because of his taking Thomism into a faith-based theology[47]—Gilson found himself increasingly isolated and excluded "from the society of philosophers."[48] But at the same time, he found himself among good company while maintaining such positions—Saint Thomas and Blaise Pascal being in agreement with him. Both were believers who thought by means of their faith. Neither was willing or tried to separate reason from faith any more than one can separate nature from grace.

GILSON AND PASCAL

SUMMARY

Gilson's early admiration for Pascal as a literary figure evolved into a deep appreciation of him as a Christian philosopher. Pascal showed Gilson that one could expect much more of philosophy than the idealism of René Descartes and Léon Brunschvicg so rampant in France during Gilson's days as a student. Gilson's existential Thomism, which highlighted Augustinian elements in St. Thomas' thought, shares Pascal's realism, his critique of rationalism, his situating philosophy within theology, and his view that the God of faith's existence is largely independent of philosophical demonstrations that one gives of it. Despite many superficial dissimilarities, Gilson found Pascal's scientific worldview continuous with the world of St. Thomas. Pascal, for Gilson, remained a model for the vocation of the Christian intellectual.

KEYWORDS: Gilson, Pascal, Christian philosophy, Thomism, fideism.

and it cannot be otherwise for any such attempts to do that kind of thing" (Joseph Ratzinger, *Truth and Tolerance: Christian Belief and World Religions*, trans. Henry Taylor (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2004), 136).

[47] Murphy, *Art and Intellect*, 10, 158. The French publisher of Gilson's *oeuvre* also characterized him by using Pascal's terminology when describing Gilson's *Les Idées et les lettres* as "le divertissement d'un philosophe qui sut aussi être 'honnête homme': celui dont le nom reste attaché à des textes plus austères n'a pas négligé de relire, au soir des journées passées sur des commentaires médiévaux d'Aristote, certaines pages de Villon, de Dante, de Rabelais ou de Rousseau, et de les éclairer d'une lumière nouvelle . . ." (www.vrin.fr/book.php?code=9782711680825&search_back=gilson&editor_back=%; accessed on 27.01.2015).

[48] Gilson, *The Philosopher and Theology*, 8.

VARIA CLASSICA

Leo J. Elders, S.V.D.
The Pontifical Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas
Rome, Italy

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON

Professor Jude Dougherty whom we honor by this special collection of essays has devoted his entire career as dean of the faculty of philosophy at the Catholic University of America and as the author of many publications to the study of Western culture, religion and science, and has shown a great affinity with the thought of the illustrious English historian and philosopher Christopher Dawson. As Dawson had done before him, Dougherty in all his works stresses the overruling importance of the classical, humanistic education and the central place and role of religion in our Western culture. One of his latest books, *The Logic of Religion*, presents an examination of the role of religion from a historical and philosophical point of view[1]. Well known are also his *Western Creed, Western Identity* and *The Nature of Scientific Explanation*,[2] in which he shows the value of Aristotle's understanding of nature and, at the same time, his own capacity of presenting a masterful overview of complex philosophical issues. Characteristic of Jude Dougherty is the wide range of his reading, something we admire also in Christopher Dawson: a huge historical knowledge and an amazing acquaintance with all relevant literature. As Dawson was for many years the editor of the *Dublin Review*, Jude Dougherty has for more than thirty years directed *The Review of Metaphysics*.

Christopher Dawson was born in 1889 in Wales, and educated at Trinity College, Oxford, and was lecturer in the history of culture at Uni-

---

[1] See Jude P. Dougherty, *The Logic of Religion* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003).

[2] See Jude P. Dougherty's two books: *Western Creed*: *Western Identity*: *Essays in Legal and Social Philosophy* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2000), and *The Nature of Scientific Explanation* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013).

versity College, Exeter. In his numerous books he studies the factors which
determine the character of the great cultures and analyzes their different
components. In order to do so, it is not enough, he said, to apply categories
of the philosophy of history but we must also use the laborious work of
social anthropologists.[3] In his deepdelving studies of the great world cul-
tures Dawson himself has done so and provides a wealth of information
which provokes the admiration of his readers. He passed away in 1970.

In his first book *The Age of the Gods* (1928), Dawson describes the
material and spiritual life of man from the oldest civilizations up to the
beginning of the Greek organization of city living and its developing edu-
cation. The book has been called the best short account of the life of pre-
historic man. Dawson himself sees the book as an attempt not to present
a series of isolated facts, but to describe the ancient cultures as living reali-
ties and as the result of many interacting spiritual and material impulses.

Dawson's perhaps best known book is his *The Making of Europe*
(1932), where we read that it is one of the great merits of the study of the
history of religion and science that it takes us beyond the present moment,
helps us to overcome parochialism and to discover realities otherwise un-
known to us. From the very beginning of the book he declares that it is
from the Greeks that we derive all that is most distictive in Western as
opposed to Oriental culture. This spiritual heritage came to us through the
Romans: after Caesar and Augustus Central and Western Europe were
subjected to a process of progressive romanization for 400 years. As the
poet Prudentius said, the Roman peace has prepared the road for the com-
ing of Christ. It was to Rome that the new peoples owed the very idea of
a common civilization.[4] In this great book which made Dawson famous,
are successively described the foundations of what was to become Europe:
the Roman Empire, the Catholic Church, the classical tradition and the
"barbarians" who invaded the Empire and, at last, its downfall. The author
next examines the influence of Byzanthium and the expansion of Moslem
culture to turn in Part III to the conversion of the barbarians and the caro-
lingian renaissance, the rise of mediaeval unity. Dawson sees the eleventh
century as a turning point in European history: the Dark Ages come to an
end and Western culture emerges. He points out that the merits of the study

---

[3] Cf. Christopher Dawson, "Arnold Toynbee and the Study of History", *International Affairs*
CXXXI (1955): 402.
[4] See Christopher Dawson, *The Making of Europe. An Introduction to the History of Euro-
pean Union* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2003), 20.

of the history of culture and religion is that it takes us out of ourselves and makes us discover realities otherwise unknown to us and helps us to become aware of our heritage. The Catholic Church had a pervasive influence on European unity; before being subjects of a duke, count or king, people were Christians, and the Church promoted the same ethical categories of thought and introduced through the use of Latin a common way of thinking; for almost 2000 years young people were educated in the classics, read the same books and learned the same standards of conduct.

What made Christopher Dawson even better known all through the English speaking world were his Gifford Lectures of 1947 and 1948.

The first series of 10 lectures had as its title *Religion and Culture*. Natural theology and the elements of religion—God, the supernatural—and their relation to culture are discussed. Dawson admits that among professional historians there still is some distrust of the term *culture* as not having a very precise meaning. He himself considers culture as the building of a common way of life by a community of people, in consideration of its physical environment and economic needs.

A basic point of departure is the observation that the Divine encloses the whole of nature. The rest of what makes up the religions has been added later, often in a mythical form. It appears that religions have a creative role with regard to culture. Not to speak only of the role of Christianity in the making of Europe Dawson points to the influence of Buddhism on Tibet and on the Mongols; that most aggressive warrior people of Asia gradually changed their habits under the influence of a religion of non-aggression, which appears to have contributed to the cessation of the age-old drive of the peoples of the steppes to East and West. On the other hand, the native way of life and the religion of the peoples of the steppes influenced on their turn Buddhism and their gods became members of the Buddhist pantheon.

After dealing with the sources of religious knowledge and the religious organs of society, prophets, priesthood and sacrifice, Dawson describes how the king has always been distinguished from the tyrant or magistrate by the possession of a sort of divine mandate. In a next lecture we hear about sacred science and initiation in the knowledge of the tribe or the people. Every culture develops its own techniques for coordinating the life of the society with the order of nature. With the observation of the solstices and the development of a solar calendar there was an increasing awareness of the order of nature. The more people observed the stars, the more they became impressed with a celestial order. Dawson reminds us that astral

theology acquired immense prestige and quotes a text from Book XII, ch. 8 of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*:

> Our forefathers in the most remote ages have handed down to us, their posterity, a tradition in the form of a myth, that these substances are gods and that the divine encloses the whole of nature . . . Later they saw these gods in the form of men or like some of the other animals . . . but that they thought these first substances to be gods, we must regard this as an inspired utterance.[5]

In fact the conviction or feeling prevailed that the sea and the land are full of the divine. The sun and the moon give signs to us that it is time to wake up and to do our work and to rest; the seasons of the year tell us the time for sowing and harvesting. Behind these natural powers at work there is a common ruling principle and man's kinship with this divine principle was acknowledged and celebrated.

In his next lecture, chapter 8, of *Religion and Culture* Dawson reflects on the importance of law in the history of culture, law as hallowed custom and as divine decree. China has preserved the ideal of a sacred order, which remained a living force for the Chinese people down to our time. But one wonders what will happen now that the country opened the gates first to the Marxist ideology and subsequently to the invasion of modern technological culture.

In chapter 9 we read that in almost all civilizations religion and intellectual culture have been practically inseparable. There has been a general quest for enlightenment. If prayer is natural to man, we should not reject the efforts of introversion by which the soul seeks the way to a transcendent absolute reality. In this connection Dawson quotes a text from St. Thomas: "True happiness does not consist in physical or social goods or in moral virtues. The final good of man is to be found in the contemplation of God and it is to this act that all human activities seem to be directed as their last end."[6] The final lines of the chapter are worth quoting:

> Religion is like a bridge between two worlds by means of which the order of culture is brought into conscious relation with the transcendent reality of spiritual being. But in religions of negation and pure contemplation the bridge is open in only one direction. It is a way of

---

[5] Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, XII, 8, 1074b1–10, trans. W. D. Ross.
[6] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles*, III, 37.

escape from the city into the wilderness and the spirit that goes out does not return again. Thus the world of culture is gradually weakened and finally deserted, like the great Buddhist cities of ancient Ceylon where the jungle has returned and swallowed up palaces and monasteries and irrigation tanks, leaving only the figure of Buddha, contemplating the vanity of action and the cessation of existence.[7]

In the last chapter of his book Dawson turns to religion and cultural change. After listing examples of this influence of religious beliefs on man's life, he draws attetion to the flowering of Western culture and institutions in the twelth and thirteenth centuries under the influence of religious factors: the creation of Gothic architecture, the intellectual synthesis of Christian Aristotelianism, the birth of the medieval cities and the rise of universities, the development of new orders such as the Franciscans and the Dominicans. However, it was not a lasting achievement: the Reformation period destroyed the cultural unity of the medieval world. What happened in Europe shows that religion is not only a unifying force, but that it can also become disruptive. Movements arose which as such were disruptive and other-worldly but which were at the same time a factor of economic enterprise. A religious movement, however, which adopts a negative attitude to culture becomes a force of destruction.

Dawson lists the conditions which make a fruitful cooperation between religion and culture possible: the assertion of the absolute transcendent spiritual claims of religion must not be interpreted as a denial of the circumscribed, historically conditioned and temporal values of culture. In the second place these limited, historically conditioned values of particular cultures must not be regarded as possessing universal religious validity. The great world religions such as Buddhism, Christianity and Islam actually created spiritual unities which transcended the limits of a particular culture. In our own age the development of cultural and scientific life is introducing a new common way of life. At this point of his lecture Dawson quotes Cardinal Newman:

> Considering, then, the characteristics of this great civilized Society [of our Western culture] . . . I think it has a claim to be considered as the representative Society and Civilization of the human race, as its perfect result and limit, in fact, those portions of the race which do

---

[7] Christopher Dawson, *Religion and Culture* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 149.

not coalesce with it being left to stand by themseves as anomalies, unaccountable indeed, but for that very reason not interfering with what on the contrary has been turned to account and has grown into a whole. I call then this commonwealth pre-eminently and emphatically Human Society, and its intellect the Human Mind, and its decisions the sense of mankind, and its disciplined and cultivated state Civilization in the abstract, and the territory on which it lies the *orbis terrarum*, or the World.[8]

Although over the past century and half many things have changed, the process of scocial and economic unification still continues. The emphasis is today on Western techniques. But this modern scientific culture is devoid of all positive spiritual content. It is a body without a soul while religion is becoming a spirit without a body. Man has achieved control over his material environment by science and technology, but this control has coincided with the abandonment of the principle of spiritual order. Man's powers have been made the servants of economic acquisitiveness. Dawson, however, hopes that this total secularization presents only one aspect of our modenr cultural life and that there will be a return to unity.

Christopher Dawson also delivered his second series of the Gifford Lectures (1948–1949) in the University of Edinburgh, in which he took up several themes dealt with or touched upon in his *The Making of Europe*, such as "The Church and the Barbarians," the medieval city, the gilds, schools and universities, but the first chapter is new: "The Significance of Western Development."[9] The study of the great world religions is difficult: often we cannot trace them to their source, although the history of Christianity is an exception: we know exactly where it arose, we have the letters of the founders of the different churches and we can trace the stages of their development. But in his *Understanding Europe* (1952) Dawson complains that nowadays the interaction of religion and culture in the life of Western society has been almost forgotten. First, new ideologies arose—national socialism and fascism, on the one hand, and communism, on the other. Subsequently, after the downfall of these forces which terrorized many nations for several decads, the picture has changed: after the spreading of a certain prosperity, the irruption into people's life of technical gadgets, on the one hand, and the fading of distances between cities and

---

[8] John Henry Newman, *The Idea of a University* (London: Forgotten Books, 2013), 253-254.
[9] Christopher Dawson, *Religion and the Rise of Western Culture* (London: Sheed & Ward: 1950).

countries as well as the easy accessibility by modern means of transportation of other continents, on the other, we witness a loss of depth, of common purpose. A separation has occurred between religion and culture. Over a thousand years a dynamic force has been at work, *scilicet* Christian religion which gave people a direction and the consciousness of personal responsibility. In those past ages Europe was not a political creation, but a community of peoples who shared the same faith, had a common spiritual tradition that had its origin three thousand years ago in the Eastern Mediterranean.[10] When the Greeks became aware of their separation from the Asian world, when they realized that they possessed a different way of life and a different standard of values, as free and self governing men, Europe was born. As Dawson had explained in his *The Making of Europe*, Christianity became the spiritual force, inspiration and moral ideal of the Greek-Roman civilization. Christianity gave a new spiritual purpose, initiated the discovery of the transcendent Principle and taught a new morality. But now that the influence of the Christian religion has become much weaker, Dawson is looking for a dynamic purpose which should animate the European peoples and lead to the birth of new spiritual forces. For no culture can survive by its technique alone. By the restoration of the triple relation between spiritual ends, moral values and social action, Europa can overcome its present cultural crisis, which is due above all to the groth of technical power and the loss of spirituality.[11] "It is only as parts of a larger whole that the states of Western Europe can survive, whether they are great or small. Europe is a society of peoples and can only survive as such."[12]

In order to explain what Europe has become, Dawson sketches the development taking place in the nineteenth century when Prussia was instrumental in reducing the power and influence of Austria. But the different national states lost their awareness of being a Chrisian commonwealth. However, in order to survive the European nations must form a supernational community and find a delicate balance between the centrifugal force of nationality and the common spiritual traditions. In chapter V we find a fine survey of the cultural and political forces which during the past 500 years shaped tzarist and communist Russia. As a rival communist country China has become a most influential factor in the balance of power. In the next two chapters Dawson argues that in Asia the education

---

[10] Christopher Dawson, *Understanding Europe* (London: Sheed & Ward: 1952), 26.
[11] Id., 223.
[12] Id., 55.

and thought have been formed and conditioned by the rites, customs and ceremonial forms, the Chinese classics, the Vedanta and the Koran.

The question arises to what extent the present technological revolution and its side-effects shape and influence the minds of people.[13] Dawson describes the relationship and cultural differences between Europe and Asia and turns to consider Europe overseas and the New World of the United States of America. "America is essential to the existence of Europe, but it is also an essential part of Western civilization."[14] For the European immigrants America meant great freedom and liberation from the economic and political servitudes of the Old World. The conquest of the Western part of the United States and the influx of immigrants from Italy, Germany and Poland caused important cultural changes. The newcomers generally separated themselves from their countries of origin, but risked to lose their original spiritual orientation in their restless quest for wealth and comfort. At this point of his text Dawson quotes from De Tocqueville who sees "An innumerable multitude of men, all equal and alike, incessantly endeavouring to procure the petty and paltry pleasures with which they glut their lives; . . . above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratification."[15] This power spares them the trouble of thinking and facilitates the acquisition of means to procure pleasure. An age of unparalleled economic expansion and material prosperity has been accompanied by the neglect and loss of the spiritual resources on which the inner strength of a civilization depends. Wealth loses its relation to labour[16]. He quotes Charles Peguy who writes: "There has never been an age in which money was to such a degree the only master and god. And never have the rich been so protected against the poor . . . and never has the temporal been so protected against the spiritual; and never has the spiritual been so unprotected against the temporal."[17]

In the following chapters Dawson shows that Europe has lost its position of leadership.

---

[13] Id., 128.

[14] Id., 159.

[15] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, vol. 2, part 3, ch. 6, in Richard C. Box, *Public Administration and Society: Critical Issues in American Governance* (Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 2014), 88.

[16] Dawson, *Understanding Europe*, 180-182.

[17] Charles Péguy, *L'argent suite*, 170-171, quoted in Christopher Dawson, *Christianity and the New Age* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1931), 3.

There arose a movement which denied the eternal truths of Christianity. He sees a succession of attitudes of the people which brought about far-reaching cultural changes: first cultural nationalism, then social revolution and finally the denial and rejection of higher cultural values.[18] Industrialization detached the societies most completely from their cultural roots. It demonstrates that no culture can live by technique alone, but it is by the restoration of the triple reaction between spiritual ends, moral values and social action that Europe can overcome its present cultural crisis, which is due above all to the growth of technical power, the loss of spiritual aims and, one might add, the sweet attractiveness of comfort and limitless entertainment. The real evil is the breach that has taken place between the technical development of our civilization and its spiritual life.[19] There has never been a society so totally absorbed in the technique or more forgetful of the ultimate spiritual values for the sake of which the human race exists. Dawson illustrates what he is saying by comparing the construction of a medieval cathedral like that of Chartres or Amiens with the building of a modern skyscraper. The first is an expression of spiritual values and evokes the spiritual history of mankind, referring at the same time to man's final destination, the modern high rise building is just an expression of technical prowess and may even lack the harmonious fitting in with its environment which is an element of beauty.[20] While in the past both the British and American ways of life were influenced and guided by the Bible, there is now a spiritual void. The war in business affairs and profits absorbs most energies. In the past Christian education was also an initiation into another world. Today there is no place for a divine revelation. "Modern civilization today seems to be following the same road as the ancient world under the Roman Empire: on the one hand, a vast development of natural resources and luxury—above all luxury for the masses, bread and games and baths and theaters; on the other hand, the presence of unlimited power in the hands of the masters of the world."[21] Nevertheless, Dawson sees in Christian humanism a force which can reshape Western culture.

In his *Christiamity and the New Age* Dawson argues that attempts to eliminate Christianity or restrict its social influence cut the roots of human-

---

[18] Dawson, *Understanding Europe*, 213.
[19] Id., 231.
[20] Id., 232.
[21] Id., 251.

ism's own source. He points to the affinity between Christianity and science. For the Catholic researcher and scientist the scientific organization of the world and the study of the powers hidden in matter are to be examined and their progressive rationalization is the natural vocation of the human mind. "It is not at all a matter of chance that science has come to its full fruition in a culture whose basic values have been formed by Christianity."[22] Dawson also stresses the central place of Christian humanism, which finds its roots in natural law, that is, in the order of creation, and when humanism is stripped of its basic source in Christian religion, it may grow wild, turn into corruption and indifference. A further characteristic stressed by the author is the searching of the transcendental and the presence of messianic elements which give it a dynamic character. In this line he draws attention to the conversion of the nations, the promotion of education, the building of schools and hospitals.

A particularity in the thought of the 19th and 20th centuries is the prominent place of some Jews in introducing new elements: Marx, Freud, Einstein. Dawson suggests an explanation: the Jews while sharing in our civilization, have nevertheless their own way of life, as if they can observe the world from the outside.

There is an absolute and metaphysical foundation for religion. In all religions there is an aspiration to become the savior which rescues the people. Somewhat further on in this book the author points out that in the Western world religion has come to be considered as one among a number of competing interests. The Protestant Reformation contributed to this insofar as it tended to eliminate the metaphysical element in the Christian tradition, abolished asceticism and monasticism and subordinated contemplation to action, intelligence to will.[23] The general conviction tried to impose itself that this world is all important and is all that one has—a feeling which is antagonistic against the nature and role of Christianity.

Somewhat later on in this book Dawson comes to speak of the Christian doctrine of Christ as uniting in his divine person both human nature and his divine nature. This union of created reality with divinity is a stumbling block between the Oriental mind and the Christianity.[24] Christianity which is now threatened by the materialism and mechanicism of our

---

[22] Dawson, *Christianity and the New Age*, 94 ff.
[23] Id., 61.
[24] Id., 82.

modern civilization, has been the main source of the spiritual achievement of the European civilization.

But "at the very moment that man was at last acquiring control over his material environment," he was abandoning the ideal of a spiritual order and leaving the new economic forces to develop uncontrolled, without any higher social direction. Economic activity was no longer regarded as a function of society as a whole but as an independent world in which the only laws were purely economic.[25] The scientific accomplishments we have reached "are providing us with countless unnecessary objects and endowing mankind with new means of self destruction." Dawson, then, concludes by saying that we must make our choice between the ideal of a spiritual order animated by charity and a material organization of the world which absorbs our whole life.[26]

In his *The Movement of World Revolution* (1959), published as one of his last books, Dawson draws attention to the spread of Western ideologies and the Western way of life, something which exercises its influence on the other cultures. The world has to a certain extent been unified by European trade and colonization, and more recently by science, education and the media. The people of Asia have been forced into a new cosmopolitan society which is predominantly Western in its principles and its values. In a sense communism in China is also a gigantic undertaking of Westernization, directly by certain of its ideas and its organization, indirectly by the yearning of individual freedom and spiritual values it provokes.

> In the past religion has been the greatest of the powers that formed the mind and developed the culture of the Asiatic peoples. At the present moment it is in eclipse owing to the wave of secular influences that has accompanied the spread of Western culture. But it is too soon to say how far this eclipse will go . . . Neither the technological progress that is forcing Est and West together nor the insurgence of nationalist forces that is tearing them apart can save the modern world . . . Salvation can only come from some power capable of creating a spiritual unity which will transcend and compre-

---

[25] Id., 93–95.
[26] Id., 102.

hend the material unity of the new world order. And where can this power be found save in religion?[27]

A last question which arises in connection with our theme is whether the Second Vatican Council in its *Constitution on the Church in the World Today* professed a view of the contemporary cultural situation close to that of Christopher Dawson as we have analyzed it in this essay. Although many experts at the council were optimistic and welcomed recent developments in our civilization, several Fathers spoke of a pervasive spirit of atheism spreading through our Western societies. Shortly after the closure of the council Pope Paul VI called the rupture between the Gospel and contemporary culture the drama of our time.[28] One may think here of the spreading of contraception, the decline of the population in Western countries, the weakening of the traditional family, the loss of direct contact with man's natural environment so that his access to the Creator is obscured; technical products do not possess a direct reference to God, but, as St. Paul says, from this visible world, the creation of God, that we must come to know the invisible God. The natural order is corroded by anthropocentrism and the spreading conviction that man can remold natural structures, as some try to do in the gender theory. Christopher Dawson predicted that modern Western man might be devoured by all his technical inventions, to the point of losing his soul. The Constitution avoids to mention these dangers but speaks of the harmony between the Christian faith and the natural order, substituting for culture the term natural order.

Among the theologians who took a lively interest in the proceedings at the Council some voices advocated that the Church abandon the vestment of classical culture; they demanded a de-hellenization of the expression of the formulae of the faith, but in the text of the Pastoral Constitution the council Fathers, while admitting that the great cultures of the world may enrich our Christian life, declared that it is inconceivable that the Church abandons what it has made its own by its inculturation in the Greco-Roman world.[29] Behind this declaration obviously stands the firm

---

[27] Christopher Dawson, *The Movement of World Revolution* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1959), 76–77.
[28] *Evangelii nuntiandi* (Apostolic Exhortation of His Holiness Pope Paul VI, December 1975), 20.
[29] *Gaudium et Spes* (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, 7 December 1965), 72.

conviction that human reason must collaborate in the formulation of the creed and the moral law.

The Pastoral Constitution, however, notices that in our modern world positivism dominates and that what is not strictly empirical is rejected. Modern life underwent sweeping changes in its cultural and social aspects.[30] Certain elements of the Christian Western culture spread through the world, so that a certain planetary culture is emerging. But the text warns that culture must remain subordinated to the good of the human person.

*****

In his far reaching study *The Logic of Religion* which we mentioned at the beginning of this esay, Professor Jude Dougherty examines the positions of Greek and Roman authors, of Christians, Aquinas and the Reformers, as well as those of some later influential philosophers and oriental religious systems. In the final part of his noteworthy and stimulating exposé he deals with the unity of religious experience, returning in a way to Christopher Dawson's *Religion and the Rise of Western Culture.* To illustrate this narrow relationship I quote the following sentences: "Western civilization is so bound up with Christianity that it is difficult to separate the two."[31] Together with Dawson and Pope Benedict Dougherty calls attention to the great role of the Benedictine monasteries in the development of Western culture. Dougherty also mentions the enormous cultural impoverishment in the area where radical communist ideology has been imposed. "The type of philosophy one espouses implicitly or explicitly either opens one to faith or closes faith as an intellectual option."[32]

Christopher Dawson's most important analysis of our Western civilization and his demonstration of the central role of Christianity continues to bear fruit and lives on in the important studies of such philosophers as Jude Dougherty.

---

[30] Id., 54.
[31] Dougherty, *The Logic of Religion*, 164.
[32] Id., 166.

CHRISTOPHER DAWSON

SUMMARY

Inspired with Jude P. Dougherty's works in which he stresses the overruling importance of the classical, humanistic education and the central place and role of religion in the Western culture, the author presents Christopher Dawson's analysis of the Western civilization and his demonstration of the central role of Christianity in it. The author traces the premises on which was based Dawson's opinion that modern Western man might be absorbed by his technical inventions, to the point of losing his soul.

KEYWORDS: Dougherty, Dawson, Western civilization, religion, Christianity.

William A. Frank
University of Dallas
Irving, Texas, USA

CICERO, RETRIEVING THE HONORABLE

> Pleasure is the beginning and
> the end of the blessed life.
> > – Epicurus, *Letter to Menoeceus*, 129a

> To recognize a person means preeminently
> to restrain my own potentially unlimited urge
> for self-expansion . . . to resist the inclination to
> see the other only as a factor in my own life-
> project.
> > – Spaemann, *Persons*, 186

Modernity, as a philosophical and ethical project, stretching from at least the 16th into the 21st century, has been self-conscious of superseding its spiritual and intellectual past. Among its predominant ideological characteristics, intellectual historians, from Max Weber to Brad S. Gregory, identify forms such as secularism, enlightenment rationalism, political liberalism, and scientific naturalism. If there is a unifying thread, perhaps it is expressed in the phrase: "the disenchantment of the world." A godless and indifferent cosmos forces man upon himself alone in dealing with the large questions about life's meaning. The idea of man's fragility and isolation in a purposeless universe is often accompanied by an anthropology committed to the primacy of self-interest in human interactions. The modern period, however, has always included its critics. Chief among them are those committed to projects of retrieving and renewing strains of wisdom to be found in the premodern philosophies of Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus and Christian thinkers such as Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus. Among contemporary philosophers who work within this enduring intellectual tradition, we can count Jude P. Dougherty, whom we celebrate in this festschrift. The extensive body of his philosophical writings are

invariably grounded in the full range of the Western philosophical tradition, a tradition capable of absorbing within it the genuine achievements of the contemporary natural and social science. In what follows I shall join this project of retrieval and renewal in order to shed some critical light on modernity's near axiomatic commitment to individualism.

The primary intention of the essay is to draw out from Marcus Tullius Cicero's philosophical writings a modest network of ideas that informs his understanding of what it means to be a good man. The Latin term he uses is "*vir bonus*," which had for him the specific meaning of one who lives properly as both man and citizen according to intelligible principles grounded in nature.[1] His idea of the good man has an attractiveness that I think can have its appeal even today. Taken together, his notions of *ratio*, the *honestum*, *officium*, and *societas* constitute what I have elsewhere referred to as his civic metaphysics.[2] We find in Cicero the idea of a befitting mutuality among four distinctively human capacities: a faculty for inquiry into and love for truth manifest in words and actions (reason); a disposition for the recognition of and attraction to things of worth beyond self-interest (the honorable); an acute sense of one own spheres of responsibility along with facility for speaking and acting appropriately within them (appropriate action), and fostering and extending the bonds of mutual personal relations grounded in justice and benevolence (society). I wish to carry forward these ideas and pose them for consideration anew. To a remarkable extent Cicero's analysis of and hope for Rome's moral-political culture in 1st century BC can shed light on the current situation of Western European moral-political culture.[3] Even more, I think it can provide a basis for an attractive alternative to a social philosophy grounded in autonomous individualism.

---

[1] On the concept of the "good man," see Roberto Fiori, "The *Vir Bonus* in Cicero's *De Officiis*: Greek Philosophy and Roman Legal Science," in *Aequum Ius*, ed. A. M. Shirvindt (Moskva: Statut, 2014), 200; on natural law, see esp. Cicero, *De Legibus* 1.16–17.

[2] "Cicero's Civic Metaphysics As a Basis for Responsibility," in *Verantwortung in einer komplexen Gesellschaft / Responsibility: Recognition and Limits*, ed. Anton Rauscher (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2010), 175–191.

[3] My approach to Cicero's teachings is somewhat like what Robert Sokolowski has called recapitulation. "To recapitulate is to repeat, but also to select, to summarize and to put into hierarchic order, with the more important distinguished from the less." As I bring forward Cicero's ideas, they are "abridged, rearranged, and . . . slanted." However, despite the shuffling and resituating of the original texts, they have not been lost, but neither are they simply repeated. *Phenomenology of the Human Person* (Cambridge et al: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 78–79 fn 10.

I

One might ask what there is in Cicero's Rome that bears comparison to the undergirding civic culture of modern nation states in Western Europe and North America. I propose that they have in common an attraction to Epicureanism. It is well known that much of Cicero's philosophy is developed in dialectical encounters with Epicurean teachings. He thought that Epicurus's hedonism was grounded in a false view of cosmic necessities and was corruptive of the sort of personal commitments required for engagement in political life and its service to the common good. For the past century or more scholars have cast doubt on Cicero's interpretation of Epicureanism. In a recent study, however, Walter Nicgorski has defended Cicero's criticism as insightful and fair minded. In the process of his study, he offered an explanation for a longstanding scholarly rejection of Cicero's criticism. "The Epicureanism within us [citizens of modern liberal democracies] . . . make it difficult to hear the voice of Cicero."[4] This is to say that behind a prevailing scholarly posture lies our modern "sober and seemingly virtuous, calculated pursuit of self-interest, that which is often considered self-interest rightly understood, and that which is particularly and intentionally turned loose in modern societies."[5] It is the principled elevation of self-interest in both ancient Epicureanism and the political liberalism of modern democracies that makes Cicero's view of especial interest in the 21st century when the critics of democracy and self-interested individualism are legion but with no attractive alternative to offer.[6]

Epicurean dispositions, however, are not newly arrived with the civic culture of late modernity. In fact, the broader philosophical commitments that support Epicurean hedonism are remarkably similar to those at the origin of modern political liberalism. In what follows I shall set beside

---

[4] Walter Nicgorski, "Cicero, Citizenship, and the Epicurean Temptation," in *Cultivating Citizens: Soulcraft and Citizenship in Contemporary America*, ed. Dwight D. Allman and Michael D Beaty (Lanham et al: Lexington, 2002), 19.

[5] Nicgorski, "Cicero, Citizenship," 4.

[6] In his *An Intellectual History of Liberalism*, trans. Rebecca Balinski (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), Pierre Manent considers individualism one of the principal ideas of liberalism. What he means by "individuals" here are inhabitants of a state "that have become ever more autonomous, ever more equal [to each other] and have felt themselves progressively less defined by the family or social class to which they belong" (id., xvi). It is an idea that starts out as a work of the imagination, whether as single human beings conceived in Hobbes's state of nature or Rawls's original position. But this "imaginary" individual "has tended to become more and more reality"(id., xvi).

one another sketches of ancient Epicureanism and that of Thomas Hobbes's modern liberalism as they appear profiled against the rejection of key elements in the anthropology of classical political philosophy.[7] Their commonality will be readily evident. What is especially important for the purposes of this essay is to note the common denial of political space for the expression of human dignity and the pursuit of what is noble. This denial is of a piece with their insistence on pleasure and self-interest as the *summum bonum*. It stands in stark contrast with Cicero's idea of the *vir bonus* who distinguishes himself in the public pursuit of what is noble. Acting on behalf of the noble or the *honestum* is only possible inasmuch as persons are not defined by the imperatives of self-interest and species preservation. Deeds done in such moments of self-transcendence show forth the dignity of human persons.[8] Moreover, an approach to social-political life with an understanding of the human persons ordered to the splendor of the *honestum* and fidelity to *officium* provides an attractive alternative to the sort of individualistic anthropology sanctioned by the liberalism passed on to us by Hobbes. All of this, however, remains to be seen.

II

Before advancing to the central argument of the essay, I wish to recount four practical scenarios from *De Officiis* that Cicero had put before his readers in 44 BC, only months before he was assassinated. The point here—if I am right—is that each of these narratives puts before the reader judgments regarding the moral integrity or the immoral turpitude of actions. There is an interesting rationale to Cicero's use of the real exemplary actions. They are illustrative and perhaps inspiring, but I think they also serve a rhetorical purpose more essentially tied to his insistence on recog-

---

[7] The comparison is commonly noted. For one prominent instance, see Leo Strauss's treatment of Thomas Hobbes in *Natural Right and History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 165–202. Also, Walter Nicgorski in "Cicero, Citizenship" calls attention to Thomas Jefferson's preference for Epicurus's philosophy and to the influence Jefferson had on the development of an American public philosophy with a prominent place in it for the idea of "the virtuous, calculated pursuit of self-interest" (id., 4) Permit me also to recall that over forty years ago Professor Thomas Prufer would teach a graduate course on Epicurus and Hobbes in the School of Philosophy at The Catholic University of America. A decoction of his course appears as an essay, "On Nature" in his *Recapitulations: Essays in Philosophy* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University Press, 1993), 22–26.

[8] See Robert Spaemann, *Persons: The Difference between 'Someone' and 'Something'* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 115, 186, and *Love & the Dignity of Human Life: On Nature and Natural Law* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmanns, 2012), 32.

nizing the primacy of what is honorable in all instances of appropriate behavior (*officium*).

The reader might be expected to encounter in them the truth of a noble action with a kind of immediacy somewhat like the way our reason encounters the impossibility of a contradiction between two beliefs or the necessity of a *modus ponens* inference or the way we verify a predication such as *The tablecloth is stained* in the presence of a stained tablecloth. In each of the three cases, the truth claim faces the immediacy of the truth claimed. I do not mean to say the statements of what is impossible, necessary, or being a fact need to be secured as true on their being asserted. They can be called into question. But if they are called into question and subsequently confirmed, then the confirmation simply restores the immediacy of the unmediated awareness of the contradiction's impossibility, inference's necessity, or fact's truth. Put otherwise, the truth of these claims cannot be reduced to logically prior truths. But even if, *per impossibile*, they could, the reductions would eventually have to rest on some other immediate claims of truth. There is a comparable immediacy to recognizing an action as noble or honorable, as possessed of a worthiness that transcends any measure of self-interest. In addition to making the nobility of the action evident, Cicero's scenarios cause one to marvel at a man's capacity to marginalize what is beneficial to his own self-interested purposes. They force, as it were, our recognition of "the honorable" (*honestum*) in contradistinction to "the beneficial" (*utile*). Let us consider four of Cicero's many exempla.[9]

Themistocles's dishonorable plan (3.49). After the victory of the combined forces of the Athenians and Spartans in the Persian war, Themistocles announced he had a plan that would preserve Athenian greatness. He needed the Athenians consent, but it was necessary that the plan not become common knowledge. The people put forward Aristides as their representative who would entertain Themistocles's plan but keep it to himself.

---

[9] Through Cicero's exempla, drawn from mythology and Greek and Roman history and sketched with a few swift strokes, shine the forms of the honorable and the shameful. The stories are recorded in *De Officiis* book 3. In addition to the ones cited, others include: the house vendor (3.54), Pythius sells Canius a vacation resort (3.58–9), Quintus Scaevola buys a farm and then pays extra (3.62), Gaius Marius becomes consul by slandering Quintus Metellus (3.79), Marius Gratidianus claims honor due the six praetors for himself alone (3.80), Gaius Fabricus returns a deserter assassin to King Pyrrhus (3.86), Ulysses feigns madness (3.97), Hercules's extreme service (3.25), Brutus deposes Tarquinius Collatinus (3.40), and Romulus kills Remus (3.41).

Themistocles told him that the plan involved secretly setting afire the entire Spartan fleet drawn ashore nearby. With Spartan power crushed, Athens would thrive. When Aristides heard this he went into the assembly who gathered around him amid great expectation. He said that the counsel offered by Themistocles was extremely beneficial, but not at all honorable. The Athenians considered that something that was not honorable was not even beneficial, and on Aristides's authority they rejected the plan completely, although they had not even heard it.

The corn merchant (3.50). A good man brought a ship load of corn from Alexandria to Rhodes at a time when corn was extremely expensive among Rhodians due to shortage and famine. If he were to know that several more merchants would soon likewise set sail for Rhodes with boats laden with corn, would he tell the Rhodians? Or, would he keep silent so as to produce as high a price as possible for his corn? Cicero's evaluation (3.57): The corn dealer ought not to have concealed anything from the Rhodians. It cannot be said that the seller is just silent and does not actively deceive his buyer. The actual situation is that the buyer wants those in whose interest it would be to know something that he himself knows to remain ignorant of it, so that he may profit. What sort of man acts this way? Certainly not one who is open, straightforward, upright, just or good, rather one who is a twister, mysterious, cunning, tricky, ill-intentioned, crafty, roguish, and sly. It is not beneficial to subject oneself to such allegations of viciousness.

Dance in the forum (3.93). Suppose someone makes a wise man heir to 100,000,000 sesterces on the condition that he promise that on receipt of the inheritance he will dance in the forum in open daylight, an insult to the republic and a grave violation of public decorum. Should he do what he promised? Cicero's response: It would be best if he did not make the promise. But if he promises, and because he knows it dishonorable to dance in the forum, he would act more honorably by breaking his promise and taking nothing of the inheritance. Alternatively, he could keep the promise, accept the money, and give it to the republic to meet some important contingency, for then the dancing would be in the interest of the country which would not be dishonorable.

Regulus returns to Carthage (3.99–100). Marcus Atilius Regulus, as consul for the second time, was captured in an ambush by Hannibal's Carthaginian forces. He was sent to the Roman Senate, having sworn to return to Carthage in the event that certain Carthaginian nobles held captive in Rome are not returned. Regulus arrives and sees the benefit to himself and

his family: to remain in his own country, to be at home with his wife and children, to maintain his rank as ex-consul, counting the disaster that had befallen him as common to the fortunes of warfare. So reads the case for "the beneficial." Who can deny it? Cicero's evaluation: Greatness of spirit and courage deny it! Entering the Senate, Regulus revealed his instructions; then he refused to vote himself, saying that so long as he was held under oath by the enemy, he was not a senator. He even argued that it was not to Rome's benefit to restore the captives to the enemy: for they were young men and good leaders. The authority of Regulus prevailed, and the captives were not restored to Carthage. Regulus returned to Cathage, held back by love neither for his country nor his family and friends. He knew well that he was going to a very cruel enemy, one most sophisticated in torture. And so, even while he was dying through enforced wakefulness he was better off than if he had remained at home, a consular but elderly, captive, and foresworn.

In each of these exemplary stories Cicero appeals to his readers good sense—a good sense that readily distinguishes the good that is intrinsically worthy from the good that is beneficial or expedient. One is meant readily to recognize what is honorable and what is shameful. Were the reader not to see the difference between the honorable and the shameful or to be doubtful of the preference of the honorable over the expedient, it is not clear that there are arguments which would prevail without eventually appealing to the immediacy of distinguishing the honorable/shameful and preferring what is honorable to what is expedient. Cicero means for us to see the honorable in human actions, and he wonders what kind of man it is who would prefer either the shameful or the beneficial to the honorable.

> Unravel and sift your understanding in order to see the form and concept of a good man (*vir bonus*) that is there [in an exemplum just recounted]. Does it become the good man to lie or slander for his own profit, or to usurp or deceive? Is there any matter so valuable or any advantage so desirable that you would abandon the name and splendor of a good man for it?[10]

III

In what follows I return to the consideration of the Epicurean disposition. It has its ancient form with which Cicero was familiar. It also has its

---

[10] *De Officiis*, 3.81.

modern form with which we are more familiar, aptly characterized earlier as that "sober and seemingly virtuous, calculated pursuit of self-interest, that which is often considered self-interest rightly understood." The previous section brought forward the notion of the good man as one who recognizes the *bonum honestum* and has the ready disposition to prize it above the goods of his private, personal self-interest. In order to draw out this Ciceronian notion of man, I shall first develop as a foil brief sketches of the ancient Epicurean and modern Hobbesian views of self-interested man. Against this backdrop, I shall then introduce a fuller view of key elements of Cicero's civic philosophy.

In Epicurean thought man finds himself part of a purposeless universe. The system of nature amounts to a vast set of complex combinations of matter in motion. At the foundation lie indivisible atoms and the void.[11] The many worlds of the universe come into and fall out of existence in an unending sequence with no overarching pattern or reason.[12] Indifferent to human life, the cosmos provides no support for human ends and aspirations. Death, however, is inevitable. Fear of death, founded on childish beliefs in an afterlife and vengeful gods, is the chief hindrance to happiness.[13] The gods, like anything else, are contingent composites of mindless matter and motion. Oddly though, they are immortal, and a condition of their blessedness is that they take no interest in the fate of worldly or human affairs.[14] Human civilization is best conceived as a wall erected against the depredations of restless, mindless nature. Those things that are specifically human, especially friendship and systems of justice or social order, give some measure of stability in the here and now. Social and political structures, however, are matters of pure artifice,[15] and the prudent way to happiness is to avoid the attachments of politics and civil society with all the anxieties that come with them. The wise alternative is to withdraw from the city and live the private life of friendship in the pursuit of

---

[11] Epicurus, *Letter to Herodotus*, 33c–45b (Eng. 10–13), from *Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, Bk 10, 128–129a; English translation from *Letters, Principle Doctrines, and Vatican Sayings*, trans. Russel M. Geer (NP: Library of Liberal Arts Press, 1964), 55–56.

[12] *Letter to Herodotus*, 45b, 73b–74a (Eng. 13, 28–29).

[13] *Letter to Menoeceus*, 124b–127a (Eng. 54–55).

[14] *Letter to Phythocles*, 97 (Eng. 41–42); *Letter to Menoeceus*, 123–124a (Eng. 53–54); *Letter to Herodotus*, 76b–77 (Eng. 30–31).

[15] *Principal Doctrines*, XXXI–XXXVIII, 150–153 (Eng. 63–64).

the refined pleasures of life.[16] Though knowledge of nature has its own pleasures, it is especially useful in allowing us to make terms with our finitude so that we might confidently give ourselves over to a lifetime of contentment: "Do not think that knowledge about things above the earth, whether as treated as part of a philosophical system or by itself, has any other purpose than peace of mind and confidence. And this is true of the other studies."[17] In his *Letter to Menoeceus*, Epicurus writes that "gaining health of body and peace of mind . . . is the final end of the blessed life. To gain this end, namely, freedom from pain and fear, we do everything . . . We say that pleasure is the beginning and end of the blessed life."[18] John Rist offers an apt summary of Epicurus's variety of hedonism:

> It is a form of the theory that the end is pleasure; but the distinguishing feature is that pleasure equals freedom from pain combined with safety, whether from fear of the gods or of death or of any other mortal affliction, or from the purely 'fleshly' inconveniences of life . . . [T]he unimpeded activity of the organism is pleasant in so far as it is unimpeded.[19]

Anticipating the subsequent contrast with Cicero, several features of Epicurus's hedonism stand out. The first is the instrumental character of the political order which provides safety and convenience, but only at the cost of drawing people into the anxieties, passions, and conflicts of the active life. Secondly, in the quiet of the private life the good life is taken up very much with care for the condition one's own self. Finally, there is no moral place in the Epicurean world for finding ultimate meaning in the truth of speech and action which would allow us to rest in a good outside of our own private interests.

IV

Modernity has its own form of hedonism.[20] Ingredient to Thomas Hobbes's self-consciously new political philosophy is the rejection of

---

[16] *Letter to Menoeceus,* 131b–132a (Eng. 57); *Principle Sayings*, XIV, XXVII–XXVIII, 142, 148 (Eng. 6, 631); *Vatican Sayings*, LVIII (Eng. 70). See John Rist, *Epicurus: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 122–126.

[17] *Letter to Pythocles*, 85b–86 (Eng. 36); *Principle Doctrines*, XII, 143 (Eng. 61).

[18] Epicurus, *Letter to Menoeceus*, 128–129a (Eng. 55–56).

[19] Rist, *Epicurus*, 125–126.

[20] Leo Strauss argues that Hobbes was the "creator of political hedonism" and "the founder of liberalism." *Natural Right and History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 169,

premises fundamental to the then received view of political thought as we find them, for instance, in Aristotle or Cicero. The new understanding that Hobbes installed has become for us the received view. To appreciate its novelty it's enough to identify in Hobbes five ideas that directly conflict with the doctrine common to the tradition of classical political philosophy that historians call civic republicanism.[21]

First, Aristotle holds that political communities are creations of nature (1253a2, 26–27) and that men are by nature political beings. In other words, we do not choose life in community, for outside of it we would not be men. "He who is unable to live in society, or who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must be either a beast or a god . . . A social instinct is implanted in all men by nature."[22] By contrast, Hobbes's man, as man, is innately a-social and a-political.[23] The fact that he lives in a society overarched by a political order is a function of a unique kind of choice, namely, man's acquiescence to the social contract.

Second, for Aristotle, life in political communities draws out from its citizens the best that men are capable of. To be a good citizen in a good state is the ideal situation. It is what a man would be were he to be an instance of human nature at its best (1293b5). Political life elevates and ennobles citizens. By contrast, the move into political society provides the Hobbesian man protection and security against the threat of violent death, chiefly at the hands of other men. It does not open up avenues for pursuing goods greater in kind than what he could have attained in the a-political state of nature, with the exception the great good of peace. Fear of violent death is "the most fundamental of natural desires" and "the desire for self-preservation is the sole root of all justice and morality."[24] Hobbes's first law of nature: "Peace is to be sought after, where there it may be found; and where not, there to provide for ourselves help for war."[25] Peace is here

---

181. He devoted the first half of his account of modern natural right to Thomas Hobbes. Throughout this section I will adopt a number of his ideas.

[21] Peter Riesenberg, *Citizenship in the Western Tradition: Plato to Rousseau* (Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press, 1992); J. G. A. Pocock, "The Ideal of Citizenship Since Classical Times" in *Theorizing Citizenship*, ed. Ronald Beiner (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), 29–52; Derek Heater, *A Brief History of Citizenship* (New York: New University Press, 2004).

[22] Aristotle, *Politics*, 1.2 (1253a28–31), trans. Benjamin Jowett, in *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941), 1130.

[23] Strauss, *Natural Right*, 169, 183; Hobbes, *De cive*, 1.2.

[24] Strauss, *Natural Right*, 181.

[25] Hobbes, *De Cive*, 2.2, in *Man and Citizen* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1972), 123.

understood as the negative condition of avoiding the worst, rather than a positive achievement of the best.

Third, Aristotle holds that the community exists for the sake of noble actions and not merely for the safety and convenience of living in common (Aristotle, *Politics*, 1281a2). Noble actions require a measure of self-forgetfulness on the part of the agent. For Aristotle, man's dignity lies in the freedom he has to marginalize his own private self-interests so as to serve for their own sake the good of others and the common good of a community. The Hobbesian civil state, however, exists in order to cut out a sphere of operation where each member of the community can pursue his individual interests without undue interference from others. This is not to reduce morality to a kind of crude egoism; it does, however, reject a hierarchy of goods in which some goods are of greater intrinsic worth than others. Hobbes denies that "the noble and the just are fundamentally distinguished from the pleasant and are by nature preferable to it."[26]

Fourth, for Aristotle, citizens in a good political community participate in the activities of ruling and being ruled (1262a16, 1277a25–28, 1277b14–20); they serve in the state's legislative and judicial offices (1275a22–23, 1276a4–5). It is no accident of nature, therefore, that man is endowed with the gift of speech, which Aristotle understands as the power "to set forth the expedient and inexpedient, and therefore likewise the just and unjust . . . [For] it is characteristic of man alone that he has any sense of good and evil, just and unjust and the like, and the association of living beings who have this sense makes the family and the state" (1253a9–17). The innumerable acts of free men deliberating, judging, and acting on behalf of the people's common interests establish and sustain the state. Yet for Hobbes, the central political act is the primordial ceding of authority for judgment and the power for administration to an absolute sovereign. The social contract establishes conditions of security against the prospects of suffering a violent death at the hands of one's neighbors. Men are thus free to pursue their private interests, within the limits laid down for society by the sovereign will. The rights men enjoy in the Hobbesian civil order "hallow everyone's self-interest as everyone sees it."[27]

Fifth, the ordered cosmos of Aristotelian natural philosophy has in it a distinctive place for mankind in its hierarchy of beings. Endowed with reason, men are capable of informing their choices and governing their

---

[26] Strauss, *Natural Right*, 167.
[27] Id., 182–183.

passions so that they might bring to perfection their innate potentialities for truth and moral virtue. The dynamics of nature include formal and final causality alongside efficient and material causality. This means that it is no matter of chance or external intentionality, whether of choice or artifice, that certain goods we seek are perfective of the kind of being we are. Written into nature is the standard for what it is for a man to look back and judge whether he has led a good life. Public speech debates the objective good of situations calling for action. By contrast, Hobbes situates human beings within a natural order of things that is of itself unintelligible and indifferent to human interests which must be secured against nature's forces.[28] We may call our scientific theories true only to the extent that they are beneficial, permitting us to channel nature's power to our own purposes and projects. Beyond the good of self-preservation there is no common measure for the goods men seek. Public law is the work of sovereign will, not the function of common or prevailing opinions fashioned in public discourse.

As a practical matter Hobbes's views can seem more the extreme effect of a radical thought experiment than the prudent assessment of man's historical experience in political life. Nevertheless, they do provide an articulation of the theory of liberalism in which the political order is not the sphere in which men seek the greater human good. Rather the state is an overarching order that sets the limits within which individuals are at liberty to autonomously pursue each his own private interests.[29] In liberalism, man's pursuit of the good life is very much an individual thing.

Common to the Epicurean moral-political philosophy, whether of the ancient or the modern sort, is the primacy of the pursuit of self-interests, the good of which is measured by pleasure and the absence of pain. Any public action or law has its worth to the degree to which it serves the pursuit of pleasure or the avoidance of pain. The fact that the experience of pleasure and pain are preeminently individual and incommunicable is emblematic of a self-contained individualism which is consistent with the essentially extrinsic character of interpersonal ties. Hedonism flattens values; it denies that there is any especial dignity to be found in the care for others and for the common good. Men may have shared interests, but their

---

[28] Id., 175.

[29] "We may call liberalism that political doctrine which regards as the fundamental fact the rights, as distinguished from the duties, of man and which identifies the function of the state with protection or safeguarding of those rights . . . " Id., 181–182.

"common" good is nothing more than the sum of individual hedonistic goods.

<center>V</center>

Cicero was not unaware of ideas such as Hobbes's.[30] He encountered their analogues in Epicureanism, which has its attractions. Among many of his well-to-do contemporaries it provided a rationale for their political apathy and withdrawal from political affairs. Cicero's understanding of civic life and the role it plays in the life of a good man differs from both Epicurus and Hobbes, though in different ways. Epicureans retreat from the city in order to flee trouble and anxiety, and Hobbesian man turns to the city seeking refuge from a brutal state of nature. Both Epicurus and Hobbes, however, agree that the good life takes the form of untroubled self-interest enjoyed in private, non-political activities. In contradistinction to both, it is in the active life of the republic that Ciceronian man, through speech and action, can pursue the *bonum honestum* from which proceed acts of virtue, and especially acts of justice and benevolence. He comes to the *summum bonum* by de-centering self-interest in preference to the honorable good, which we can see in the scenarios recounted above. Such deeds manifest the dignity of man, that quality that calls forth in us reverence, awe, honor in the face of a person responsible for good that exceeds any measure of self-interest. We also recognize that such actions protect and strength the bonds of civil society. Trust, the moral bond of a good society, is established on our capacity to act for the sake of the honorable.

Four concepts play a large role in Cicero's understanding of the social, political nature of man: *honestum*, *officium*, *ratio*, and *societas*. Together they generate a picture of the human person whose life as a citizen is integral to his perfection as a man. In one of his last works, *De Officiis*,[31] he advises his reader that

---

[30] Portions of this section revisit topics I have treated earlier in "Cicero's Civic Metaphysics As a Basis for Responsibility," 175–191.

[31] *De Officiis*, 1.4. In this book, Cicero directly addressed his son Marcus. But the work also targets a wider readership, a point noted by Andrew R. Dyck, who observes that since the year 58, Cicero had been "shut out of any meaningful role in politics. As the confrontation with Marc Antony took shape in the fall [of 43] . . . he was counting on the willingness of young nobles to defend the Republic . . . This was evidently the intended audience for the political message of *De Officiis* . . . Cicero aimed at reforming the political culture of Rome, which he saw veering dangerously from the traditional patriotism toward the kind of egotis-

no part of life, neither public affairs nor private, neither in the forum nor at home, neither when acting on your own nor in dealing with another, can be free from appropriate action (*vacare officium potest*). Everything that is honorable in a life depends upon its culti-vation, and everything dishonorable upon its neglect (*in eoque et colendo sita vitae est honestas omnis et neglegendo turpitudo*).[32]

In this passage Cicero focuses upon the good man's responsibility to notice the many circumstances of life that call for appropriate action (*officium*). He also insists that what is honorable in life depends on the cultivation of appropriate action. Moreover, the interpersonal bonds that constitute society are established in actions on behalf of the honorable good, and it is nature's gift of reason that capacitates men for the recognition and judgment necessary for actions that befit a good man. To elaborate this picture I shall comment on each of the four key terms.

Honestum. In a primary sense, the *honestum* is an objective quality or attribute that belongs to a certain category of human action. Were one to say, for instance, that a person has performed a noble or honorable action, this would mean that the person, the agent, has displayed a capacity to act on behalf of a kind of good that cannot be reduced to the attractions of pleasure or the value of utility.[33] The proper response to its recognition is admiration and praise. *Honestum* is Cicero's rendering of the Greek *kalón* (the noble, beautiful, splendid) and as such it connotes an inherent attrac-tiveness. Cicero's Latin word is derivative of the Latin *honos* which is

---

tical quest for glory and self-aggrandizement . . ." *A Commentary on Cicero,* De Officiis (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996), 31.

[32] I have taken all English translations of *De Officiis* either from Cicero, *On Duties*, ed. Miriam T. Griffin and E. Margaret Atkins (Cambridge et al: Cambridge University Press, 1991), or from Cicero, *De Officiis*, trans. Walter Miller (Cambridge MA and London: Harvard University Press, 1913). In some instances I have made minor adjustments to their translations.

[33] *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*, 2.45. By *honestum* Cicero means "that which is of such a nature that, though devoid of all utility, it can justly be commended in and for itself apart from any profit or reward." Cicero considers this a good definition, but because of its formal character, it is little indicative of its lived reality. He therefore thinks it useful to look to the experience of men of high character who do good deeds just "because of their propriety, justness, rightness (*quia decet, quia rectum, quia honestum est*)." Man "was not born for self alone, but for country and for kindred, claims that leave but a small part of him for himself." I have used, with modest changes on my part, H. Rackman's English translation in Cicero, *De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 1931).

drawn from the social sphere and signifies "public standing."[34] English translators render it as "the honorable," "the morally good," and "intrinsic worth." I think it is fair to say that there is something transcendent and other-regarding to the experience of *honestas.* It is counterpoised to a secondary species of the good called *utile*, which names the sort of goods that are beneficial or expedient or useful. Examples of beneficial goods are health, wealth, and fame. Cicero says that "things that are *utile* . . . help man to withstand the vicissitudes of fortune."[35] It is interesting to note that the goods of *utile* are not wholly or securely in our control; the forces of fortune and evil can both give them and take them away, our best efforts notwithstanding. But the achievement and maintenance of *honestum* in one's person cannot be given by any other, nor can it be taken away, save by one's personal surrender. In his emphasis upon the desirability, even the beauty, of honorable and noble actions, Cicero also puts before us what I think is a quite contemporary idea of human dignity.

Appropriate action (*officium*), achieved in the innumerable circumstances of life calling for some personal decision, judgment, or interchange, whether high or low, domestic or civic, simple or complex, provides the opportunity for manifesting what is honorable. And it is precisely in this pursuit of the honorable that virtues come into play. For, as he writes, "The honorableness (*honestum*) that we seek is created from and accomplished by" the search for truth and the pursuit of what is just and lawful, of greatness of spirit, and of seemliness. "Even if it is not accorded acclaim, it is still honorable, . . . and even if no one praises it, it is by nature worthy of praise" (1.14). The virtues, in other words, each in its own sphere of human involvement, confer the integrity, the luster of *honestum* upon a man or woman's words and deeds. They are "the very face and form, so to speak, of the honorable (*formam quidem ipsam . . . et tamquam faciem honesti*)" (1.15). The polar opposite of *honestas* is *turpitudo*, that which is ugly and shameful.[36]

Attraction to beneficial, expedient goods that can only be attained at the expense of the honorable good tempts one to shameful deeds. The gravity of the moral error is measured by Cicero's claim that "when men separate benefit from honorableness they subvert the foundations of nature"

---

[34] Dyck, *Commentary*, 69.

[35] *De Officiis*, 2.19–20.

[36] Moral sensibility plays a foundational role in Cicero's moral psychology; see Walter Nicgorski, "Cicero's Paradoxes and His Idea of Utility," *Political Theory* 12:4 (November 1984): 561–563.

(3.101).[37] To be shameful is the worst harm (that is to say, maximal *inutile*) that can befall a man. It de-humanizes him. It violates his reason, which is to say, his capacity by word and deed to build up and sustain the web-of-human-relationships. No man, he seems to think, can be incognizant of his inhumanity when he does shameful things. He cannot equitably endure not being trusted or honored by others. Such inhuman solitariness is an unsustainable experience.

Officium. The second word, *officium*, is often translated as "duty," which for many is misleading to the extent that the translation bears a Kantian connotation of an imperative necessity. Other translations include "proper function," "befitting action," and "appropriate behavior." *Officium* is Cicero's rendering of the Greek Stoic term *kathékon*.[38] He defines *officium* as an "action for which a persuasive rationale can be given."[39] It signifies the sort of behavior or action that is appropriate to, or befits, or is due from, a particular person in the given circumstances of life that call for action. We would not go far wrong to imagine an actor playing the role of a character in a play: he would be expected to speak and act as

---

[37] If the attainment of a beneficial good involves the violation of a *bonum honestum*, then Cicero will say that that *bonum utile* is mirage or even deceit: "Nothing is so contrary to nature as dishonorableness" and "nothing is so much according to nature as the beneficial" (3.35). "Separation of the beneficial from the honorable is the origin of daggers, poisons, and forged wills, of thefts and embezzlements of public funds and the pillaging and plundering of allies and citizens. It is the origin of excessive wealth, unacceptable power, and monarchy in free cities" (3.36). "Each should attend to what benefits himself, so far as it may be done without injustice to another" (3.42). "A good man will never, for the sake of a friend, act contrary to the republic, to a sworn oath, or to good faith (*fides*)" (3.42). "In friendships, when that which is beneficial is compared to that which is honorable, let the appearance of benefit lie low, and let honorableness prevail" (3.45). "The force of the honorable is so great that it eclipses the appearance of benefit (*speciem utilitatis*)" (3.47). "The rule of what is beneficial and of what is honorable is one and the same" (3.74). "Nothing is either expedient (*expedire*) or beneficial (*utile esse*) that is unjust" (3.76). "For one man to take something from another and to increase his own advantage at the cost of another's disadvantage is more contrary to nature than death, than poverty, than pain and anything else that may happen to his body or external possessions . . . It would shatter that which is most in accord with nature, that is, the fellowship of the human race . . . Nature does not allow us to increase our means, our resources and our wealth by despoiling others" (3.21).

[38] Norbert Wazek, "Two Concepts of Morality," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 45:4 (1984): 591, notes that Seneca translated *kathékon* as *convenientia* in which the note of befittingness stands out more prominently than it does in Cicero's *officium*.

[39] *De Finibus*, 3.18.58; *De Officiis*, 1.3.8. See Dyck, *Commentary*, 3, 74–81. On the scholarly controversy concerning *kathékon* in Stoic thought, see for instance John Rist, *Stoic Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

appropriate to the character he assumes. Take the notion a step further by imagining someone dignified with a political or religious office: he would be expected to speak and act in ways appropriate to that office. I think it is too much to say that Nature or Life is a theater or a nation or a church in which men and women play their different roles. There is something to the notion, however, that as Cicero would have it, the concrete the concrete circumstances of life—the grand and the common—present every human person opportunities for acting appropriately. Human dignity rests in this capacity for appropriate action. The idea here is that we express or actualize our human nature by not permitting ourselves to be lost in impulse or sensibility, but instead by bringing to direction to sensibility through reasoned judgment in the pursuit of honorable and beneficial goods.

> [T]he power of the spirit, that is its nature (*vis animorum atque natura*), is twofold: one part of it consists of impulse (*in appetitu*), called in Greek *horme*, which snatches a man this way and that; the other of reason, which teaches and explains what should be done and what avoided. Reason therefore commands, and impulse obeys. All action should be free from rashness and carelessness; nor should anyone do anything for which he cannot give a persuasive justification: that is practically a definition of appropriate action (*De Officiis*, 1.101).[40]

The sort of self-command manifest in one's capacity for appropriate action is a mark of Cicero's good man. In his involvements in the world, he is capable of discerning what befits the various goods, characters, and circumstances relevant to the occasion. And, such judgments make a claim on him: they are the measure of a good man's behavior.

Societas. Cicero's *vir bonus*, the honorable man, is preeminently rational and social. The common end of intellectual creativity and reason's wit is the ever more fruitful and stable life-of-one-with-another in society. The well-being of one's community enjoys priority over the autonomy of the individual. Cicero has no sympathy for the common misperception that social life is somehow derivative of ends and purposes more fundamentally individual. He observes that "it is not true, as some claim, that men embarked upon communal life and fellowship in order to provide for life's

---

[40] See *De Finibus*, 3.58. Nicgorski's commentary on this notion is helpful; "Cicero's Paradoxes," 262–263.

necessities just because we could not manage, without others, to provide ourselves with our natural requirements" (*De Officiis*, 1.157).

If that were the case, then Cicero wonders what would happen "if everything needed for sustenance and comfort were provided by a magic wand, so to speak." Wouldn't any reasonable individual drop his business affairs? Wouldn't he abandon his efforts aimed at maintaining society and its network of relationships? If the social fabric of human existence is a means to an end and the end is amply and securely achieved by other means, then society and its structures would be useless.[41] A man detached from the web-of-human-relationships, a human isolate, would be an unnatural aberration. For Cicero, individual perfection and a flourishing community are not *pieces* that have their independent logics and can be entertained separately of one another. The excellences of citizenship and of humanity are moments to one another, and what unites them is the pursuit of the honorable.

Ratio. Moreover, natural priority of the "social" is closely tied to Cicero's understanding of human rationality. He thinks of reason, man's specific difference, as the social faculty.[42] Being rational and being social are equally ends of being human; man's sociability is constituted in his being rational. The more perfectly men and women live the life of reason, the more their common life-with-one-another flourishes. He writes that reason "reminds man that . . . he was not born for self alone, but for country and for kindred, claims that leave but a part of him for himself" (*De Finibus*, 2.45).[43] In the very act of living rationally, men and women find themselves bound to one another. By its very nature, reason's inner structures are largely ordered to the practical and interpersonal categorialities of

---

[41] E. M. Atkins notes that for Cicero "*societas* is not simply another *utile* that contributes to the maintenance or comfort of life. It is the goal that defines the virtue that limits other goals." "*Domina et Regina Virtutum*: Justice and Societas in *De Officiis*," *Phronesis* 35:3 (1990): 271. On the natural finality of human sociability, see: *De Officiis*, 1.11–12, 1.22, 1.50, 1.154, 1.157–8, 3.21–8. I have discussed these ideas more fully in "Cicero's Civic Metaphysics As a Basis for Responsibility,"175–191.

[42] *De Officiis*, 1.11, 1.50; *De Finibus*, 2.45; 2.133.

[43] Also *De Officiis*, 1.22: "We are not born for ourselves alone, to use Plato's splendid words [*Letter* IX, 358a], but our country (*patria*) claims for itself one part of our birth, and our friends another." He continues: "men are born for the sake of men . . . we ought in this to follow nature as our leader, to contribute to the common needs (*communes utilitates*), by giving and receiving expertise and effort and means, to bind fast the society of man with one another (*devincire hominum inter homines societatem*)." Society attends to common needs; of greater significance is its binding of men to one another.

social existence.[44] Just as the seedling matures into a fruit-bearing vine, so the child grows into a spouse, parent, friend, and citizen. But whereas the vine matures through nature's work in the sun and earth and in the vine's own vegetative powers, the child grows into society, if I may put it so simply, by virtue of education: the extending, strengthening, and subtilizing of reason, a continuum of cultural and societal processes that are the fruit of individual and collective acts of deliberation, judgment, and volition.

The linkage between reason and society is brought out more fully when one sees the cardinal virtue of justice as the middle term, as it were. After asserting that man is not born for himself alone, Cicero then writes that although "Nature has . . . engendered in mankind the desire for contemplating the truth . . . which is most evident in our hours of leisure," when we often find ourselves thinking about the most speculative matters (*De Finibus*, 2.46), that same love of truth spills over into non-theoretical, practical concerns. The instinct for reason's truth impels us "to love all truth as such, that is, all that is trustworthy, simple, and consistent, and to hate things insincere, false and deceptive, such as cheating, perjury, malice and injustice" (*De Finibus*, 2.46). Truth's movement toward justice is what interests us here. Love of truth manifests itself in the words and actions in the midst of one's life-of-one-with-another just insofar as these words and deeds express justice. It is the work of the cardinal virtues, and especially justice, to transform reason's truth into the presence of intrinsic goodness (*honestas*) in the midst of society. The bonds of human fellowship are built up and sustained when men's words and deeds are formed in the light of intrinsic goodness (*honestas*).

Of the natural principles that bond men in fellowship and community foremost is reason and speech (*ratio et oratio*) which, in the activities of "teaching, learning, communicating, debating, and making judgments, conciliate men with one another and join them into a sort of natural society (*conciliat inter se homines coniungitque naturali quadam societate*)" (*De Officiis*, 1.50). Reason and speech unite men in society because it makes possible "justice, fairness, and goodness (*justitiam, aequitatem, bonitatem*),"[45] which "conciliate" men. Society, therefore, subsists as an active

---

[44] It is important to note how Cicero safeguards a dimension of reason for interests that are not caught within the practical categories of human social and communal life (*De Finibus*, 2.46). Reason does have its natural tendency to speculative, theoretical inquiry that seeks truth simply for its own sake. It does not, however, predominate, and ought always to cede precedence to serious moral and political interests (*De Officiis*, 1.157).

[45] *De Officiis*, 1.50.

network of many minds with their various interests and desires acting together in a harmony or mutual accord that is fashioned in speech and reason by its members. Cicero does not believe in any hidden hand that mysteriously harmonizes the independent, autonomous action lines of self-interest. The community or society of men is not the work of natural instincts; it is not the effect of chance; nor is it the work of divine intervention. It is the work of individual men and women who exercise the virtues of practical wisdom, justice and generosity, greatness of spirit or courage, and temperance.[46] Virtuous action needs also to be complemented by effective rhetoric, which is the great mover in political life.[47]

Conclusion

What emerges in Cicero's system of thought is an "active humanism," in which human excellence and moral action are essentially tied to the sort of behavior that enriches and sustains the web-of-human-relationships. One fashions these relationships in appropriate actions, in the midst of the multitude of life's circumstances calling for action. Such circumstances provide occasions to stand forth as honorable, whether in the attainment or in the privation of many beneficial things of life. I believe a recapitulation of these ideas to be timely and appropriate to contemporary moral and social conditions of Europe and the United States of America. If it is the case that autonomous individualism is the prevailing anthropology in our moral and political self-understanding, then a retrieval of the splen-

---

[46] Cicero's four cardinal virtues: (1) *Wisdom* and *prudence*, capacities for searching after and discovering truth, belong to one who swiftly and accurately sees things and explains their reasons (developed 1.18–19; also 1.153). The remaining virtues, *justice* and *beneficence*, *greatness of spirit* and *courage*, *seemliness* (*decorum*) and *temperance*, deal with the procuring and conserving the necessities of life. These necessities divide into three broad fields; (2) preserving fellowship and bonding between men, governed by *justice* (developed 1.20–41) and *beneficence* (1.42–60); (3) allowing excellence, *greatness of spirit* and *courage* to shine out, not only in advancing resources and advantages for self and one's own, but also in one's disdain of them (developed: 1.61–92); and (4) securing measure, order, constancy, and moderation in mental activity but especially in action: *seemliness*, *temperance* and *modesty* (developed 1.93–151).

[47] Walter Nicgorski has shown how Cicero redirects the central focus of political philosophy away from the Greek concern with the theoretical question of the best regime to the practical consideration of the highest standards of able statesmanship, its realistic responsibilities and limits. See "Cicero and the Rebirth of Political Philosophy," *Political Science Reviewer* 8 (1978): 63–101, and "Cicero's Focus: From the Best Regime to the Model Statesman," *Political Theory* 19:2 (May 1991): 230–251.

dor of honorableness and the beauty of nobility might loosen the axiomatic commitment to the primacy of self-interest in our way of thinking and speaking of ourselves.

CICERO, RETRIEVING THE HONORABLE

SUMMARY

From Marcus Tullius Cicero's philosophical writings, the author first draws out a modest network of ideas that informs his understanding of what it means to be a good man (*vir bonus*). Then, he finds in Cicero the idea of a befitting mutuality among four distinctively human capacities: a faculty for inquiry into and love for truth manifest in words and actions (reason); a disposition for the recognition of and attraction to things of worth beyond self-interest (the honorable); an acute sense of one own spheres of responsibility along with facility for speaking and acting appropriately within them (appropriate action), and fostering and extending the bonds of mutual personal relations grounded in justice and benevolence (society). Against the background of deep commitments in modernity to hedonism and autonomous individualism, the author proposes a retrieval of the virtue of the honorable as an attractive alternative.

KEYWORDS: Cicero, honorableness, vir bonus, society, virtue, politics, autonomous individualism, hedonism, modernity, officium.

Paweł Gondek
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Poland

THE PLACE OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE CONTEMPORARY PARADIGM
FOR THE PRACTICE OF SCIENCE

For man the explanation of reality is a natural process that results from man's existential situation. Man makes a space for himself to live by intellectually discovering the world and by determining his own needs. Even the most simple operations involve man in the sphere of the intellect, and the process of learning about the world allows man to perfect his own existence. From experience comes knowledge, and knowledge appears in the form of the various domains of science. The fact that there are many sciences is the result of the fact that there are many aspects of the apprehension of things. The aspective character of knowledge is a consequence of the relation between reality and the subject who knows it. That allows us to discern and organize domains of knowledge that will serve as the foundation for the formation of the various kinds of the sciences. Contemporary tendencies in the practice of the sciences tend to practicism in which knowledge is that which can be applied (*scire propter uti*). The ideal of theoretical knowledge as the leading kind of knowledge is no longer mentioned. Among the theoretical sciences, philosophy seems to be the most useless; it sets for itself the goal of knowing the truth about the world (*scire propter scire*) and strives to discover the ultimate causes.

The reflection presented here is intended to present arguments for the cultivation of philosophy as "sapiential" or wisdom-oriented knowledge whereby human knowledge is realized most fully. Philosophy has indispensable heuristic value because it considers the understanding of the world and man in the context of the question "why." Philosophy consists in the discovery of the cause of existence. The search for an answer to this fundamental question is an expression of the human person's natural incli-

nation to explain the reality in which he lives. Classical philosophy concentrates on explaining man's place in the world. John Burnet expressed this precisely: "Philosophy is the progressive effort of man to find his true place in the world."[1] That is how the ancient pioneers of philosophical knowledge understood it, and that is how the task of philosophy as it is classically understood is still understood to this day. Classical philosophy is not only the explanation of the context of reality, but it is a way of forming man. Therefore it is a proposal for a method of philosophical education that is an interesting alternative to contemporary forms of practicism.

The "sapiential" or wisdom-oriented way of cultivating philosophy is especially typical of the realistic current, which reached back to the Peripatetic tradition (Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas) and was rediscovered in the twentieth century by J. Maritain and É. Gilson. In Poland in the second half of the twentieth century, realistic philosophy acquired an important scientific center in the form of the Lublin Philosophical School, which not only continued that tradition of the cultivation of philosophy, but also engaged in discussion with other currents (such as positivism and Marxism). That bore fruit in the development of a cohesive philosophical system that tried anew to show the place of man in the contemporary world.[2]

Types of Human Knowledge

Man's cognitive attitude does not constitute a uniform way of acquiring knowledge. Knowledge, as it has gradually been discovered and formulated, leads us to discern three fundamental types of knowledge, namely everyday knowledge, scientific knowledge, and philosophical knowledge.

Ordinary knowledge (also called common-sense knowledge) is an attempt to respond to the problems that result from present needs of life. It is a collection of information resulting from daily needs that affect the problematic and character of acquired knowledge. Therefore it is knowledge about concrete things or processes; it is not methodically organized and is often discovered unintentionally or for the purposes at hand. It arises on account of shortcomings or shortages seen in man's living environment. It is not solely practical knowledge (although the practical element is

---

[1] J. Burnet, *The Socratic Doctrine of the Soul* (London 1916), 3.

[2] On this topic, cf. M. A. Krąpiec, A. Maryniarczyk, *The Lublin Philosophical School* (Lublin 2010). The reflections below have been based on the legacy of this school.

dominant), because at that level we see constant rules that operate in man's relation to the world and to other persons. However this type of knowledge becomes insufficient with respect to the possibilities of the human intellect.

Scientific knowledge is a type of knowledge that is much broader in content and much more cognitively systematized. Since the beginning of history, the cultivation of science was closely connected with philosophy and was one of the conditions for the formation of philosophy. The transition from the perfected form of practical knowledge (*technai*) and the first form of scientific knowledge (*epistemai*) was due to the exception experience in apprehending the world that was started by the ancient Greeks. They noticed that reality is cognitively accessible to man, and the principles discovered in reality can be rationally organized. That allowed for the formation of the first sciences (such as astronomy and geometry) but also allowed for the formation of knowledge concerning the nature of the world in general.[3] That cognitive paradigm was basically in operation until the times of R. Descartes.

Modern natural science became the actual model for contemporary scientific knowledge. Mathematics as the ideal of theoretical knowledge (as considering what is constant) was joined with natural sciences, and so were the particular natural sciences that formed the model for the cultivation of the empirical sciences. That model took the dominant role in contemporary tendencies in sciences, and especially in the aspect of technological development. Scientific activity is important insofar as it is reflected in practical applications. The precision we encounter in the natural sciences arouses a justified admiration for their investigative abilities. The results, however, are material for the formulation of minute pieces of information about the world. The cognitive results and the laws formulated on that basis influence the rise of specialized domains that have application in daily life. The practical dimension of the sciences gains for them social recognition because they have influence on the formation of the world in which the postulates of technological progress have application. Technological development has become the paradigm for the practice of the sciences and for the interpretation of social phenomena.[4] If we use instruments that are constantly refined and help man in various domains of life,

---

[3] Cf. G. E. R. Lloyd, *Early Greek Science: Thales to Aristotle* (New York 1970), Chapters I and II.

[4] N. Postman showed this in an interesting way in his work, *Technopoly: the Surrender of Culture to Technology* (New York 1993).

the importance of the sciences that produce them seems to be beyond doubt.

The technological perspectives for the cultivation of the sciences determine the way it functions and the areas in which it functions. It is noteworthy to show man's place in the technological paradigm. Man is not a subject who is qualitatively set apart in the world, because he has been reduced to the order of nature and is subject to the same laws. On the one hand man is presented as the reference point for deliberate changes in nature. However, like all nature, man ultimately is merely material to be transformed. Man is a biologically constituted organism. In this context, life determines the power and mode of man's existence. Therefore, as they seek man's essence, they indicate structural factors that perform vital functions. Man is set apart from the background of other natural beings only by his different biological structure and the functions it performs (e.g., mental functions and functions that produce culture). Those functions are not treated as the consequences of personal acts that integrally belong to man because they go beyond the organic order and are not subject to the methods of research in the natural sciences. Naturalism presents a standard exposition of scientific research in which technology is an expression of utility. Technology is precise in its methods, it is useful, and progress is visible in technology.[5]

In this context philosophy does not fit among the particular sciences. Philosophical knowledge is definitely different from the technological paradigm, and the aim of philosophy is not utility. However, human cognitive possibilities are not fulfilled by stopping at the level of the production of useful goods. The need for philosophy springs from the nature of man, from his ability of intellectual knowledge and free action. Therefore philosophy constitutes another type of knowledge, and it cannot be reduced to the particular or productive sciences.

In the ordinary way of understanding, philosophy constitutes a specific desire for something that seems to be indefinite, unknown, but also all-encompassing. This somewhat psychological description is not intended to take away the scientific dimension of philosophy, but to indicate an experience that is not easy to describe. It is a desire resulting from the need

---

[5] The treatment of technology as a paradigm for science was started by Francis Bacon. P. Jaroszyński described this phenomenon in *Science in Culture* (Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi B. V., 2007), 129–175.

to satisfy man's natural ability to gain knowledge.[6] It refers to reality, which astonishes us with its mode of existence, its variety, and its dynamism. At the same time, reality puts man in a situation that constitutes a cognitive challenge to interpret and organize the contents he discovers. The cognitive act is not only the engagement of the intellect, but it is also a reaction to discovered reality. The way the natural desire to know is realized is therefore the starting point for the rational explanation of reality. Contemplation (Gk. *theoria*—beholding, investigation, contemplation) is the cognitive act proper to the philosophical apprehension of reality. Contemplation is a type of knowledge that consists in the intellectual apprehension of the structure of things in order to show the causes of existence and the elements that constitute the structure of things. The uniqueness of the cognitive act does not reside in the apprehension only of what is given as the proximate cause, but this act also investigates the ultimate reason for existence. Philosophy is the rational interpretation of the causes of the existence of things and for this reason it becomes theoretical knowledge to the highest degree.

Today the term "theory" is associated more with mathematics or natural science. Without doubt those sciences spring from the act of knowing the world in the aspect of the discovery of the laws that operate in the world. However, at the same time they enter into the area of applicability and in this way become the proper foundation for the creation of technological progress. The dominant tendency, and even the postulate of the high status of science is the application of science. The combination of the theoretical order with the order of the application of knowledge determines the value of science. It seems unscientific to practice the sciences without the possibility of the practical application of the sciences. This causes an attitude that wants to make knowledge particular to narrow aspects of applications. Man is not in a position to apprehend the world as a whole. Knowledge is always affected by some aspect in view of which we apprehend the object. This is not an artificial operation but results from the specific character of human knowledge. The aspective character of knowledge results from the structure of the knowing subject. However, the need to understand the world as a whole, and the act of showing its reason for existence and end or purpose do not lose their position in man's cognitive field.

---

[6] Aristotle expressed this in the first sentence of the collection of books called the *Metaphysics*: "All men by nature desire to know." Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, I–II, ed. W. D. Ross (London 1997), 980 a 20.

The question of the meaning of existence remains constantly relevant. Therefore only philosophy in a proper sense is purely theoretical knowledge, knowledge that investigates the fundamental principles and causes of the world's existence.

In contemporary philosophy there is a tendency to combine philosophy and the particular sciences into one realm of knowledge concerning the world. It is proposed that philosophy in order to explain the world should consider the findings of the particular sciences. Philosophy is often understood as a group of contents concerning the world. Philosophy then takes the form of a synthesis of the sciences, that is, knowledge understood as the accumulation of various pieces of methodically arranged and organized information. Philosophy is in a position critically to analyze the foundations of the other sciences, but that does not mean that this is the proper task of philosophy. The accumulation of prepared results of research sometimes loses cognitive value because it constitutes a methodologically varied group of data about the world. However, such an approach leads to a loss of neutrality in the object of research, because if at the foundation we have research material that has already been constituted, we are not explaining reality, but only explaining the thought of the other sciences on reality. Such an approach reduces philosophy to a discipline that organizes the sciences. Meanwhile, philosophy appears as the need for knowledge that explains (and not merely describes or leads to production), and philosophy constitutes man's response to the riddle of existence.

What is Philosophy?

To explain what philosophy is we must indicate the basis for singling it out as a separate discipline and the ways in which it is practised. This will allow us to understand the meaning of philosophical questions and answers. Philosophy is the rational explanation of reality that is given in experience. Philosophy strives to discover what determines that reality exists, that it is something that acts, and that it is the cause of something. Such knowledge is called philosophy. It is not practical knowledge, a sort of knowledge that exploits its results for some particular application, but it is knowledge that strives to find an essential explanation of the world and to indicate the causes of the world's existence.[7]

---

[7] Philosophy can also engage in thinking about practical matters, about moral activity, politics, art, and education, by indicating the general reasons for those actions (why they occur), but philosophy does not concentrate on presenting concrete modes of action.

Philosophy is an expression of the ability to acquire knowledge and to reason. That ability allows us to seek the ultimate reasons for the existence of what is. The way of explaining the world realized in this way constitutes a systematic body of knowledge that possesses its own autonomous object and its own independently developed methods of research. By investigating causes, we can cognitively apprehend the thing itself (in that which constitutes its essence) and discover the reasons for its existence. We can rationally explain what something is like and why it is. This aspect, singled out in this way, of research on reality is not taken up by any of the particular sciences. Philosophy starts from a broad perspective in which it shows the causes of everything that exists, and thereby it becomes the most general body of knowledge. As we more precisely define the object of philosophy as it is so broadly understood, we arrive at the term "being," which is a kind of cognitive shorthand, and at the same time it is the formulation of a specific domain of knowledge. The term "being" was formulated on the basis of the infinitive form of the verb "to be" ("to exist"). The accepted noun-form of "being" means "that which is." The emphasis on the existential aspect constitutes the fundamental meaning of the formulation, which despite different connotations was primarily ordered to existence.

The ancient definition of the object of philosophy emphasized that philosophy considered being as being, and what being is in itself. Being as "that which is" constitutes the object, the field of research of which concerns the existence of everything that is. For this reason the object of philosophy is something real (that which exists) and universal (as everything that exists). Understood in this object, the object is beyond denotation because only non-being, or that which is not, can be the boundary of being (although non-being as something constitutes only an intellectual construction). However, universalization does not mean the unification of the object. The universalist mode of research has a twofold meaning in philosophy. It is the broadest conception in terms of denotation, with respect to the aspect of existence (everything that is constitutes the object of philosophy). At the same time, it shows the universal foundations for the particularized apprehensions of reality that appear in the particular sciences.[8] In the context of the above properties, the postulate of philosophy as an autonomous

---

[8] Therefore philosophy in many conceptions is understood only as a methodological reflection on a particular discipline, and it is reduced to the level of a metasciences. The universalism of the object is realized by the discovery of the ultimate reasons of being of everything that exists.

body of knowledge appears even more strongly. If the object of philosophy is the broadest in denotation, it cannot be considered on the basis of something that is narrower in denotation. Therefore the object of philosophy must be neutral and cannot present the findings of the other sciences at the starting point.

The way the object of philosophy is formulated as "that which is" already appears rarely in contemporary research. This is because all theses and terms that have a strong assertive aspect are avoided. Today, the consideration of being as the object of philosophy is reduced to a reflection on the concept of "being," the content of that concept, and the semiotic regions connected with that concept. Instead of really existing reality as the fundamental reference for philosophical enquiries, most often they bring in language, the structure and meaning of which are treated as the only meaningful field for the cultivation of philosophy.[9] The cultivation of philosophy is often reduced to attempts to formalize language, and the existential aspect of things completely disappears. The popularity of the linguistic method today became the reason why philosophy was transformed from a theoretical science into the practical knowledge of the analytic investigation of language. Although it is a useful method, it cannot replace the philosophical explanation of reality. The linguistic method is what analytics was for Aristotle, that is, a tool (*órganon*) needed for the cultivation of philosophy.

Philosophy is also often reduced to pure thought and treated as speculation "divorced" from reality. Such an approach accents the role of the subjective factor in knowledge and sees in the subjective factor the guarantee for the adequate knowability of the world in the act of thinking (idealism). Philosophy is reduced to the subjective mode of perceiving contents that constitute intellectual representations of the states of things. The absolutization of cognitive intellectual contents causes philosophy to be reduced to the analysis of internally non-contradictory structures of thought. Meanwhile, there is an essential difference between thinking and knowing. Thinking is exclusively an intellectual operation on signs (concepts) that are the result of knowing. Philosophy, however, is a method for knowing reality. Only knowledge (and sensory knowledge in particular) allows us to read the states of things. Without that content there would be

---

[9] Cf. R. Harris, *Language, Saussure and Wittgenstein. How to Play Games with Words* (London and New York 1990).

no cognitive contents for operations of thought, and there would be no possibility of explaining reality.[10]

The term "speculation" appears in philosophy, but it does not mean operations of thought leading to the search for something inaccessible, or leading to the construction of a model of the world. The Latin term *speculabile* means "that which is knowable" and corresponds to the Greek term *theoria* or contemplation. Philosophy as speculative knowledge is a "reading" of the nature of things, and it is the process of discovering on that basis the principles that constitute the nature of things. As it follows from the etymological definition of philosophy (the love of wisdom), wisdom is the proper end of philosophy. Wisdom here is not supposed to be the accumulation of information about the world. Aristotle accurately described wisdom in philosophy as the knowledge of the first causes and principles of things.[11] Philosophy is the highest kind of knowledge because it concerns everything that exists, and it is a kind of knowledge that it independent, that is, worthy to be chosen, not on account of something else as a tool, but for its own sake—*scire propter scire*. Philosophy understood in this way is not a game divorced from the world and from human life, but a process that uses reason and discovers reality; it is the process of discovering "what it is as it is." At the same time, philosophy is the most difficult kind of knowledge because it concerns the intellectual discovery of something that we do not find in any of the particular sciences. Aristotle described knowledge thus understood as first philosophy (*prote philosophía*). The wisdom for which philosophy strives is its maximalism, that is, a universal, holistic, and harmonious apprehension of knowledge concerning the world.[12] The importance of the purpose of philosophy is expressed in this. That purpose in the context of the technological paradigm that goes with the contemporary sciences must be faithful to the ideal of *theoria*.

With respect to the object and end of philosophy, a method of knowledge is formulated that unites philosophical discourse into a whole. The method becomes a tool to provide rational justification for the permis-

---

[10] Cf. M. A. Krąpiec, "Knowledge and Reality," *Forum Philosophicum* 11 (2006): 29–35.

[11] Aristotle indicates this in the first book of the *Metaphysics* (cf. 981 b 28–29, 982 a 2, and ff), and in other writings (cf. *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1139 b 17).

[12] "It seems that, while ascribing to philosophy a depth of knowledge and a supratemporal view of the object, metaphysics should be treated not as a route to be taken towards wisdom, but also as knowledge provoked by wisdom." S. Kamiński, "Wisdom in Science and Philosophy," in *Studies in Logic and Theory of Knowledge*, ed. L. Borkowski, S. Kamiński, A. B. Stępień, vol. 1 (Lublin 1985), 96.

sible source of knowledge. The object is the fundamental guarantee for the right choice of the method of knowledge. This does not mean that the object in the act of knowing is something that has been constructed, because it is the object and the end that determine the method of knowledge. The investigation of the conditions for philosophical discourse is the rational demonstration of the causes of the occurrence of the process of knowledge. The context in which philosophical knowledge arises and reaches a reflected form becomes important. In realistic philosophy, reality is that context. The discovery of the truth about what we know (the truth about the world, about man, and about relations) is the indication of the factors that determine the reason for the existence of what is (being) and the way it exists. The specific character of the philosophical way of knowing the world is that it shows the factor without which that which is could not exist. For that reason, the existence of being and the way it is cognitively apprehended form the central point of philosophical enquiries.

Philosophy as the body of knowledge that explains reality can, at the same time, make knowledge itself its object, and it can reflect critically on the method for engaging in discourse. This practical knowledge of how to look at the act of knowledge is an expression of the universality of philosophy and its maximalist approach to reality. The investigation of the relation of agreement of intellectual conceptions with what is in reality is the business of logic, which in philosophy is an auxiliary discipline. The correctness of scientific discourse is a condition for engaging in it properly. Therefore the significance of the act of knowledge is a necessary but insufficient condition for a sound explanation of reality. However, here the relation to reality becomes the final reference point. Philosophy must first of all show what reality is, and then show how reality can be adequately apprehended.[13] In this context we can see the fundamental purpose of philosophy.

Despite the contemporary domination of meta-philosophical thought, which goes together with the development of the philosophical knowledge of reality, meta-philosophical thought is not the only or final guarantee of the rationality of enquiries. The potential of man's intellectual abilities is still ordered to the object of knowledge, which in order to be known must correspond to the nature of the intellect. The actualization of

---

[13] Cf. S. Kamiński, "The Methodological Peculiarity of Theory of Being," in *Theory of Being. To Understand Reality*, ed. S. Kamiński, M. Kurdziałek, Z. J. Zdybicka (Lublin 1980), 7–23.

cognitive abilities occurs when the object is real (when it exists as something), knowable (when it is intelligible and non-contradictory in its existence), and rational (when it actualizes the intellect cognitively). Also, we cannot assume realism. Only the discovery of existence and of the rationality of reality allows us to explain it and to provide a rational justification for it. Therefore, the basic condition for the rational explanation of reality is not that we set forth the conditions for reality as such, but that we reconcile them with reality. This is the fundamental postulate of philosophical realism.[14]

Conclusion

Most types of knowledge show the wealth of man's possibilities in the process of his perfection of himself and of the world around him. Those types of knowledge are the foundation for organizing information concerning the world and for discovering the causes of the world's existence. They release creative possibilities in man that develop culture and the technical tools needed for live. However, this can be achieved under the condition that we consider man's role as the subject of all knowledge. In this context, the problem of the domination of technological tendencies in the practice of science is clearly seen. The divergence of ends between philosophy (*scire propter scire*) and the technological paradigm of the sciences (*scire propter uti*) leads to a loss of balance in man's cognitive life. The measurable results of technological development permit us to think that the only scientific progress that occurs is due to the method it uses (praxism). Philosophy, on the other hand, is reduced to the role of an instrument for organizing the particular sciences. Meanwhile, it is not only a question of changing the world, but a question also of knowing the world rationally and of showing man's place in the world (realism). In this aspect, philosophy performs a systemically justified role in relation to all the sciences.

The remarks presented on the way philosophy is cultivated are only an introduction to a problematic that requires the detailed investigation of research procedures and the rational justifications of theses that are presented. Such enquiries have been made in the Lublin Philosophical School in which a system of realistic philosophy has been developed. Philosophy expresses man's relation to everything around him. This is knowledge, or

---

[14] Gilson showed this well in his work *Methodical Realism*, trans. P. Trower (Front Royal 1990), especially in the chapter *The Realist Beginner's Handbook* (127–145).

cognition, understood as a method for acquiring a body of knowledge about the world and for the rational justification of that body of knowledge. Therefore the task that philosophy performs today is the same as it was two and half millennia ago, to explain reality rationally.

**THE PLACE OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE CONTEMPORARY PARADIGM
FOR THE PRACTICE OF SCIENCE**

SUMMARY

The article is intended to present arguments for the cultivation of philosophy as "sapiential" or wisdom-oriented knowledge whereby human knowledge is realized most fully. The author claims, first, that philosophy has indispensable heuristic value because it considers the understanding of the world and man in the context of the question "why;" the search for an answer to this fundamental question is an expression of the human person's natural inclination to explain the reality in which he lives. Secondly, he argues that classical philosophy is not only the explanation of the reality, but it is a way of forming man; therefore it is a proposal for a method of philosophical education that is an interesting alternative to contemporary forms of practicism. The reflections are based on the legacy of the Lublin Philosophical School (Poland).

KEYWORDS: philosophy, science, knowledge, realism, practicism, Lublin Philosophical School.

Catherine Green
Rockhurst Jesuit University
Kansas City, USA

DISTINGUISHING THE SCIENCES:
FOR NURSING

Nursing is a practice discipline as are politics and morality. Further, each participates in significant systematic inquiry into the nature, meaning and execution of its activities. However, a question arises about the nature of these investigations. Are they truly scientific inquiries? Does their scope of inquiry encompass a truly universal realm? If they are not sciences, in what way can the knowledge generated be understood to be generalizable and thus useful in a variety of situations? If they are sciences, in what is found the ground or source of the universality and certainty of their findings? This article will explore this problem and suggest that, in fact, there are several kinds of nursing science. Following the lead of Jacques Maritain and Yves R. Simon, I will begin with an account of the distinguishing characteristics of theoretical knowledge, to which the term "science" has historically been applied, and distinguish it from practical knowledge or prudence. This discussion offers a guide for our investigation. Next I will review Maritain and Simon's discussion of two intermediate levels of inquiry that share some characteristics of both science and practical knowledge. Finally, using the writings of several nurse theorists whose seminal ideas in this area have established a basis for nurse theorist's discussion of these issues, I will distinguish four kinds of nursing inquiry which range from the very theoretical to the very practical. It is hoped that this discussion will lay the groundwork for a more nuanced account of the science and methods necessary to answer the varied kinds of questions that arise in nursing theory and practice. It also suggests a philosophical foundation for these accounts.

Yves R. Simon spent much of his career investigating the meaning and kinds of scientific and practical inquiry and applying the results of this

research to his examinations of a number of contemporary social problems as seen in his books *Philosophy of Democratic Government*, *A General Theory of Authority*, and *Work Society, and Culture*.[1] In most of these writings Simon followed the lead of his teacher, mentor and friend, Jacques Maritain who had argued for two levels of practical sciences analogous to theoretical science itself. Maritain called these "speculatively practical" and "practically practical" sciences.[2] However, just prior to his death in 1961 Simon carried on a correspondence with Maritain in which he questioned and ultimately rejected Maritain's account of a practically-practical science.[3] A review of Simon's account of the sciences with attention to this debate is helpful in clarifying the various kinds of inquiry carried out by those participating in practice disciplines such as nursing. Simon examines the various kinds of inquiry in terms of their goal, their processes, their quest for certainty and their quest for truth. This discussion will follow a similar format.

I will begin by reviewing Maritain and Simon's account of theoretical science, identifying and explaining the hallmarks and methods and distinguishing it from purely practical inquiry known as prudence. Here Simon and Maritain are in complete agreement. This will provide the limiting poles within which we can situate our investigations.

Speculative knowledge or Science as Such

The Goal

In order to develop a standard by which to evaluate other kinds of knowledge, Simon distinguishes the simply theoretical from the simply practical realm, that is, science from prudence.[4] Theoretical knowledge answers questions about the natures of things, their principles and causes, simply for the sake of understanding. An important characteristic of theoretical knowledge is that it is sought simply for its own sake and not for

---

[1] Yves R. Simon, *Philosophy of Democratic government*, vol. 324, Charles R. Walgreen Foundation Lectures (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1951); *A General Theory of Authority* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1962); *Work, Society, and Culture* (New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 1971).

[2] Jacques Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, trans. Gerald B. Phelan, *The Collected Works of Jacuqes Maritain*, vol. 7, ed. Ralph McInerny, Frederick Crossen and Bernard Doering (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1934/1995), 330–338.

[3] Published as Chapter 3 of Yves R. Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, ed. Robert J. Mulvaney (New York: Fordham University Press, 1991).

[4] Id., 41–87.

a product that might arise from it.[5] For example, when we wonder why the sky is blue or how the universe began we are looking for an answer that might satisfy our wonder but will not be useful to solve any particular problem of daily life. In another context Simon reminds us that the kind of activity that is characteristically understood to be unique to human persons is the ability to use our rationality (to the extent possible) to seek explanations and understanding.[6] According to Simon, no activity carried out by human persons really quite qualifies as human activity unless it is directed at some level by a rational understanding of its meaning and role in human life. The search for understanding simply for its own sake then, is an essential aspect of our human nature. While these questions are not directed to some further use or product, the knowledge may certainly, as a by-product, prove useful later on. In modern terms theoretical science is best exemplified by a field such as theoretical physics or by "bench" research where the investigators pursue questions that interest them without specific thought to the practicality of any answers they might discover. As it happens in our contemporary cost-cutting culture there is less and less funding for this kind of truly theoretical research and more emphasis on research for the sake of some useful or marketable product.

The Methods

Simon also tells us that the search for theoretical knowledge occurs in an analytic process. That is to say, it looks for explanations in terms of causes and principles, primarily tracing effects to their causes and consequences to their principles.[7] The term "analytic" here has two related and slightly different meanings.[8] The first is the search for first principles and causes. For example, the laws of nature would constitute first principles while the force of gravity would be understood as a cause of the moon's orbit around the earth. The second and more common meaning of analysis in contemporary thought is to divide a thing into its various parts. For example, in grammar school we learned to analyze sentences into their parts of subject, verb, object etc. This second meaning is only necessarily an aspect of analysis where the object of study is not a unitary whole, but is composed of parts. In that case analysis, to search for causes and princi-

---

[5] Id., 56.

[6] *The Definition of Moral Virtue*, ed. Vukan Kuic (New York: Fordham University Press, 1986), 33.

[7] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 52–53.

[8] Id., 5–7.

ples, also entails decomposition into parts.[9] Since most things are composed of parts, most analysis includes both aspects. Questions of the kind, "What is the nature of nursing or of caring?" might seem to be examples of such theoretical inquiry. Theoretical inquiry not only examines the thing in terms of its parts in order to understand the whole, but it more importantly examines the relations of cause and effect or consequence to principle.[10] Thus, theoretical knowledge looks for primary causes, principles and concepts.

The Quest for Certainty

Another characteristic of theoretical science is its quest for certainty. Here the investigator abstracts away from the particular situations and contingencies of daily life and the motion associated with physical beings. For example, the law of the conservation of matter and energy, that neither matter nor energy are created or destroyed but rather merely change form, probably began with observations of reality, perhaps the burning of wood or coal. The theorist, then, abstracted from the particular instances of the situation to posit a theory that has been supported by subsequent experience. What we mean by contingency is the situation where chance occurrences or the intervention of an action arising from a person's exercise of free will can alter an otherwise predictable action that is directed to achieve a particular goal. Further, motion causes problems in science because things in motion are changing place, situation and the like. Thus, what is studied at one point is not exactly the same even a few seconds later. This makes absolute knowledge of it impossible. Heraclitus, the 5th century BC philosopher, saw this problem in his famous aphorism, "You cannot step twice into the same river."[11] He suggested, then, that no true knowledge is possible. He was right to a certain extent. That is, certainty is only possible if we can abstract away from motion and contingency. Theoretical inquiry thus carries out such abstraction in order to investigate the characteristics of individual things or actions that are stable over time and across diverse circumstances. What is sought is universal understanding that applies in all cases and results from the analysis of the issue into its most basic and self-evident principles.

---

[9] Id., 7, 52–53.

[10] Id., 6.

[11] Heraclitus, Fr. 10.65 in Richard D. McKirahan Jr., *Philosophy Before Socrates* (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, 1994), 122.

The Quest for Truth

The goal of theoretical inquiry is truth, that is, an account of reality that conforms to a factual state of affairs. For example, the account of the nature of black holes developed by theoretical physicists, that they exist, that they attract objects into them and so on is understood to be an accurate account of reality supported by various scientific discoveries. This understanding holds not usually or often, but in all cases. The thing is understood in its essence or nature. Such an understanding will be accurate while not giving a complete account of any particular thing that exists in the world. An example of such an account would be the Pythagorean Theorem which explicates the nature of the angles of a square or the account of a perfect circle. Since perfect squares and circles only exist in theory, abstracted away from the reality of real boxes or circles, the principles would apply universally. Particular squares and circles, however, are more or less square or round depending on the situation. Thus, their precise measurements will be slightly different. So, theoretical sciences give us a very accurate and dependable but also rather limited account of reality.

In review, the distinguishing characteristics of theoretical knowledge are: (1) its goal is simply the knowledge itself; (2) its analytic method searches for principles and causes, often, but not necessarily, entailing decomposition of the subject; (3) its search is for certainty regardless of contingent circumstances; (4) its truth is consonant with fact or is an accurate account of reality.

Practical Knowledge or Prudence

The Goal

Practical knowledge on the other hand seeks an understanding of things in order to have some effect on those things, to create, to control, to alter and perhaps to destroy. The goal of practical knowledge is *always* for the sake of its use. In contrast to theoretical knowledge which is sought to satisfy our wonder, practical knowledge is sought to help us know how to act. For example, scientists are vigorously searching for an understanding of the virus that causes Ebola in order to both formulate a vaccine to prevent the disease and to formulate medicines that would be effective in treating it. Or in nursing, a male nurse assigned to care for a Muslim woman requiring a bladder catheterization would need to know about aseptic technique, maintenance of privacy and the like along with particular cultural and religious practices of this woman to decide whether he should

carry out the procedure or request a female colleague to do it, even though he is completely competent and sensitive to her situation. Prudence must make its own rule in each situation. Because such situations are marked by unique characteristics the nurse cannot expect rules to give exact direction.

The Methods

In this sense because practical knowledge brings together knowledge and use it can be understood as synthetic rather than analytic.[12] Simon calls this the synthesis of realization where knowledge is wedded to an act to be carried out. Knowledge gives the form or nature to the action itself. This synthesis of knowledge and action is actually the beginning of action itself and is the only synthesis that belongs exclusively to prudence.[13] Maritain tells us that practical judgments entail a very different way of proceeding. Rather than abstracting away from particular changing circumstances, practical judgments seek to determine the best action in this concrete and specific circumstance.[14] Because in a practical judgment the question is, "What should I do in this particular situation," the investigation must yield knowledge that will determine the nature of the action. For example, the nurse practitioner gathers knowledge of pathophysiology, pharmacology, chemistry and the like into a judgment that identifies a particular change in a patient's situation as an indication of a serious drug reaction requiring specific immediate intervention. Where theoretical inquiry abstracts away from the particular and the contingent, practical inquiry seeks precisely to determine action in the presence of particularity and contingency. Rather than searching for principles and causes, the practitioner searches for particular actions in concrete, changing and contingent situations.

The Quest for Truth

As a result, the truth of a practical inquiry will be a truth of direction rather than a truth of fact.[15] What this means is that the nature of the goal of the action correctly identified and meticulously pursued will determine the truth of the action even where the actual outcome might end up not being the best. For example, a researcher studying the effects of a certain activity on the successful rehabilitation of patients with strokes identifies

---

[12] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 52.
[13] Id., 5, 54.
[14] Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, 334.
[15] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 17.

study participants, and carefully screens them for any indication that the proposed exercise might be detrimental before beginning the study. Unfortunately one patient accidently tips over a glass of water just as he begins the activity and falls, suffering a serious hip fracture. Here a chance occurrence has intervened to prevent achievement of the desired goal of successful rehabilitation following a stroke. The researcher, however, is not held responsible because of her conscientious development of the protocol and because of her attempts to assure the best outcome for the patients. The truth of her judgment was a truth of direction. Needless to say, as Simon points out, such a search for truth in these practical inquiries relies in important ways on the character of the investigator. She must be virtuous in the sense that she is conscientious to gather all pertinent information, meticulous in the design of the study and always determining her actions by the good of the patient rather than perhaps by the prestige she might enjoy as a result of a successful study.

The Quest for Certainty

It is worth noting that an important mark of practical wisdom is the reality that *all* pertinent information is *never* available to the agent. Thus, practical decisions are always clouded by a certain level of ignorance and uncertainty. As well, chance or the intersections of some unforeseen cause resulting from the action of a person exercising his or her freedom to make choices can also intervene and disrupt the situation. Further, the complexity of human biology in its particularity in each precise patient in time and space introduces myriad unknowns into the situation. For this reason general rules that obtain in many, even most cases simply cannot be expected to apply in all cases. The person of practical wisdom must accept this and makes good judgments about what information is necessary and when it is appropriate to stop searching for new information in order to act in a timely fashion. Finally, because contingency and unique differences are always a factor in particular situations the action achieved can only aspire to a level of probability rather than to certainty. The judgment that determines the action is certain by way of direction but the outcome remains only probable due to the reality of contingency and chance. Practical inquiry, imbedded as it is in the concrete, particular and often rapidly changing world is often a messy business.

Finally, there is an important way in which the practical judgment, the one that determines the action is radically incommunicable.[16] It is true that often we are able to explain our judgments in a manner that is persuasive to a listener. However, usually this ability arises not from the nature of the judgment but from the salient features of the situation that may be similar enough to allow the listener to understand. Simon calls this "a host of inconclusive considerations."[17] But these considerations are not the cause of the certainty of the judgment and will not be persuasive in the face of profound opposition. The certainty arises from the direction of the judgment, the inclination or goal to carry out an action that will be the best suited for this occasion. As noted, that certainty remains even where the outcome is not the best. In reality each practical judgment occurs in the context of a radically unique and unrepeatable situation such that the right or wrong of the judgment that determines the action is likely to resist complete justification. Every concrete action occurs in a specific time and place and under unique circumstances in the sense that this precise time, place, circumstance and connection of unique persons will never be repeated. Because of these particular realities the precise judgment about how to proceed must itself be unique in its nature. While principles and rules may guide us, each new situation raises differences that require a judgment about how, or to what extent a rule applies… if it applies at all. Given this radical singularity of the reality it is really more surprising that we often can explain our judgments to others.

In review, the hallmarks of practical knowledge are: (1) rather than being a search for knowledge as such, practical knowledge has for its goal the guidance of action that arises from the knowledge; (2) no longer an analysis of essences into principles and causes, it is a synthesis or union of both knowledge and action; (3) its judgment achieves certainty by its direction to a good end while its outcome remains only probable; finally, (4) its truth is a truth of direction rather than consonance with fact.

Given that nursing is essentially a practice discipline, nursing's knowledge would seem to be practical knowledge. But that is not the end of the problem. Clearly there is an important distinction between the kind of knowledge generated and used by the nurse theorist and the knowledge generated and used by the nurse scientist or nurse clinician. Nurse clinicians regularly complain that much of what is known as nursing theory has

---

[16] Id., 23–25, 71–76.
[17] Id.

little or no bearing on their daily practice. Others would argue that much, if not all, of nursing inquiry does not reach the level of "science."[18]

Simon and Maritain spent much energy investigating the nature of the practical sciences and their analysis is instructive. Maritain argues that there are four distinct kinds of knowledge, three of which can rightly be called "science."[19] Maritain's argument is that while inquiries that pursue knowledge for the sake of action are not strictly sciences, they share important similarities with scientific investigations and thus should be understood to be limited kinds of science. Simon examines these kinds of science in terms of their scientific character, paying particular attention to the two middle areas that Maritain called "speculatively practical science" and "practically practical science."[20]

Theoretically Practical Knowledge

The Goal

Maritain argues that political and ethical inquiries belong to what he calls "speculatively practical science." Simon uses the term "theoretically practical" knowledge due to his concern about the somewhat pejorative connotation that accrues to the term "speculative" in contemporary discourse.[21] In theoretically practical inquiry, the problem is not simply what to do but rather why we should act as we do. Thus, there is a clear direction to action which gives it its practical character while its explanatory function accounts for its theoretical character. Maritain argues that the mode of investigation here makes it truly a science.[22] That is, it is a function of our intellectual and cognitive abilities as we examine the world of practical action from the point of view of their "*raison d'être* and their intelligible structures."[23] We are interested to discover why action must be of a certain type to be true and good and what precisely accounts for such actions being right in particular situations.

---

[18] Steven D. Edwards, "The Idea of Nursing Science," *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 29 (1999).

[19] Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, 330–338.

[20] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 41–87.

[21] In this paper the term "theoretical knowledge" will be used except where there is a direct reference to Maritain's account.

[22] Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, 331.

[23] Id., 331–332.

Simon agrees with Maritain, arguing that the goal of ethical or political theory is to explain the things that pertain to the particular area and to answer theoretical questions. Their primary goal is to understand ethical or political actions in their essences. Because nursing is an essentially practical endeavor even the most theoretical questions, like those of political and ethical theory, are ultimately directed to understanding the practice discipline itself. Thus, the questions about the nature of nursing itself or of issues like caring in nursing would more likely belong to this realm of theoretically practical inquiry.

The Methods

In this inquiry the theorist abstracts from the particular aspects of specific situations, for example hospital or clinic nursing in America or Africa, to identify the structures of nursing or of caring that would apply to all different nursing and caring situations. This level of thinking, Maritain and Simon argue, seeks to develop principles and rules and to direct action from afar.[24] It directs action apart from the particulars and contingencies that are a distinguishing characteristic of practical judgments. While students of ethics, politics and nursing regularly seek rules that will directly determine their particular actions in specific situations they are often, perhaps usually, frustrated in this desire. This is precisely because the principles and rules developed at the level of theoretically practical knowledge are abstracted away from many of the particulars of day to day situations.

Simon goes so far as to suggest that the distance between the last rule of moral action and the practical judgment in a specific situation may be almost infinite.[25] In fact, that moral, political or nursing rules and principles do guide action in particular situations is because the salient specifics of many particular situations are themselves similar while the differences of the particular situation do not significantly alter the best course of action. If we think about the situation of inserting a venous catheter, the usual principles of sterile technique and the like will certainly apply but the situation might be quite different if the situation were a life or death emergency where sterile supplies were unavailable such as in a chaotic war situation.

---

[24] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 101; Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, 332.

[25] See also Yves R. Simon, *A Critique of Moral Knowledge*, trans. Ralph McInerny (New York: Fordham University Press, 2002), 42; *Practical Knowledge*, 79.

Simon also argues that inquiry at this level is analytic in two important ways.[26] First, when we understand analysis to mean to explain something in terms of its principles and causes we see that theoretically practical inquiry is an analytic activity. Thus, nursing theory seeks to understand the essence of nursing to understand whether it is a unitary or a complex phenomenon.[27] It also seeks to identify and explain principles and causes of various nursing outcomes that are found in a variety but not all nursing practice situations. Thus, it searches for unique principles of community nursing that might differ from those of hospital based nursing or distinguish nursing practiced in developed countries from nursing in remote aboriginal situations. Further, when we understand analysis in its more contemporary meaning of decomposing a complex whole into its essential parts, this level of theorizing is understood as analytical again. That is, where we seek to understand the facets of nursing such as caring, ethics, and professional intimacy, for example, we examine nursing into its constituent aspects.

The Quest for Certainty and Truth

Finally, insofar as theoretically practical inquiry abstracts from the particulars and contingencies of specific situations and actions and insofar as it achieves an intelligible account of essences, principles, and causes its knowledge achieves a level of certainty that is a hallmark of science. The certainty of the theoretically practical judgment arises from the fact that the judgment follows necessarily from axiomatic principles. Simon notes that in any area of scientific inquiry the areas where such axiomatic certainty actually pertain are very limited.[28] This is because the knowledge needed to support such complete agreement is not yet available. Slowly over time such principles are identified and added to this small nucleus of knowledge from which new questions continue to be spawned and around which less certain principles continue to reside. The truth here is theoretical truth rather than truth in a more limited sense. It is either true or not, consonant

---

[26] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 53.
[27] P. G. Reed, "Nursing: the ontology of the discipline," *Nursing Science Quarterly* 10:2 (1997); B. Riegel et al., "Moving beyond: a generative philosophy of science," *Image J Nurs Sch* 24:2 (1992); M Rogers, "Science of Unitary Human Beings," in *Explorations on Martha Rogers' Science of Unitary Human Beings*, ed. V Malinski (Norwalk, CN: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1986); C. Roy, H. Andrews, *The Roy Adaptation Model*, second ed. (Stamford, Connecticut: Appleton & Lange, 1999).
[28] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 70.

with a real state of affairs or not.[29] For example, nursing is either an ethical activity or not. If this is true, it is true of all nursing in all contexts and over all times when nursing is practiced.

To review, then, theoretically practical inquiry seeks knowledge for its own sake that is not necessarily directed to specific action when it searches for essences and intelligible structures. In addition, insofar as it is directed to areas of endeavor that are essentially practical its inquiries always carry something of this practical goal. It is analytic in that it analyzes complex situations into constitutive parts and insofar as it seeks an understanding of causes and principles while retaining something of its practical flavor as its knowledge is directed to a practice discipline. It abstracts away from contingent and particular circumstances in order to achieve an understanding of immanent principles and essences and thus achieves a level of certainty consistent with science. Finally, its truth is a truth of consonance with reality rather than a truth of direction.

Practically Practical Inquiry

Much ethical, political and nursing research is directed to rather strictly practical questions of the sort, "Will the intervention change the outcome or the ethical character of this kind of situation?" This level of inquiry is certainly predominant in nursing literature and due to funding issues is increasingly the focus of most biological and "scientific" research. It is this sort of inquiry that Maritain argues deserves the name of science, albeit a limited kind of science, and Simon argues is an important kind of inquiry between theoretically practical science and prudence itself but lacks the characteristics of scientific inquiry. For Maritain, the issue is largely about the vast universe of knowledge found in the various professions including medicine, banking, architecture, military strategy and the like. Such knowledge does not seem to fit comfortably into the traditional range of knowledge identified by Aristotle and Aquinas which speaks about science and prudence. Yet, such inquiry is abundant, important and worthy of our attention.[30] He argues that this knowledge has some characteristics of both science and prudence and thus calls for an analogical expansion of our account of science to address this reality.

---

[29] Id., 69.
[30] Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, 334–335.

To understand this debate I will review Maritain and Simon's discussion of practically practical inquiry with particular attention to the characteristics of science identified in the previous sections which include the goal, the methods, its certainty and its truth.

The Goal

Maritain and Simon agree that the goal of practically practical inquiry is primarily practical. That is, it is to guide and form action. Maritain points out, however, that this level of inquiry is not to determine concrete specific action. Its role is to guide the professional in his/her action and requires a prudential judgment about the "fit" of any particular rule or guide in a given situation. Maritain notes that the results of this inquiry does not issue an imperium "Do this," but rather issues a guide "This is what is to be done" [in these kinds of situations].[31] Simon points out that the goal here is not a theoretical one as in theoretically practical inquiry where we are searching for principles and axioms that account for why things are as they are or why certain actions are right or wrong.[32] The goal now is to identify what action to carry out and how to best achieve it. Because the goal is so crucial to the identity and character of the inquiry Simon sees the goal as the pivotal issue. It determines the methods, the certainty and the truth.

The Methods

In their discussion of the methods of practically practical inquiry both authors pay particular attention to the role of concepts and explanations as well as to the kind of synthesis found here. Maritain tells us that practically practical inquiry is synthetic in the sense that it gathers prior knowledge, experience and pertinent information together to organize it from a new point of view, that is to use it to guide action.[33] He argues that here the investigator uses scientific principles and rules as she inquires into the reasons and explanatory structures of the actions and goals in question.[34] In fact, practically practical science relies on the principles and causes identified by theoretically practical science as the basis for its investigations. He notes that the scientific nature of the practically practical inquiry is indicated by the "universality and cogency of the *raisons*

---

[31] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 108; Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, 334, n. 12.

[32] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 100–101.

[33] Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, 334.

[34] Id.

d'être."[35] That is, using universal principles from science as well as data from particular experience the investigator identifies specific actions that will effect specific results in particular kinds of situations. When this plan of action is systematically developed using its data well and following the rules of scientific investigation and logic, its rules of action will be persuasive and reasonable. While the focus is on specifics of both action and situation it nevertheless abstracts from many particulars of the concrete situation where it will be enacted. It is focused on particular actions and yet does not/cannot completely determine them. Maritain notes that this kind of inquiry is permeated by knowledge by connaturality or inclination.[36] The virtue of the investigator in terms of strict focus on the good goal at issue radically affects the way the investigator gathers the data, evaluates them and identifies appropriate action. Further, and at least equally important, this inclination also helps him recognize related useful universal principles and experiential data and then put them together in practically appropriate ways.[37] Maritain agrees with Simon that the kind of explanation that is found here is practical. It is about what works or what is to be done or avoided.

Methods: Synthesis

In his usual probing and enlightening way, Simon examines in some depth the types of synthesis, the kinds of concepts and the role of explanation in these various kinds of inquiry. The mark of prudential judgment is what he calls the "synthesis of realization." Here the judgment, "This is to be done in this concrete situation" is wedded to a particular action becoming the specific form of the action itself. This kind of synthesis is the mark of prudential judgments and is not found in other kinds of inquiry. A second type of synthesis that he sees as a qualified synthesis of realization brings together not a principle with action but rather the various conditions necessary for action.[38] A third type is a synthesis of connection bringing together various principles and experiential data in order to understand the nature of things. This would be one of the kinds of synthesis Simon suggests could be found in theoretical inquiry. Simon notes that practical judgments as such could use both the synthesis of realization and the quali-

---

[35] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 107.
[36] Id.
[37] Id., 107–108.
[38] Id., 54.

fied synthesis.[39] It makes sense to suggest that theoretically practical inquiry could use both the qualified synthesis of realization insofar as it is directed toward guiding action and synthesis of combination insofar as it seeks the nature of particular actions.

Methods: Concepts

Continuing in this attempt to clarify the issues associated with practically practical action Simon distinguishes three types of concepts that are used. In his earlier work *Critique of Moral Knowledge* originally published as *Critique de la Connaissance Morale*, Simon quotes Maritain noting that the way we conceptualize issues is determined by the kinds of questions we are trying to answer.[40] He goes on to point out that philosophical concepts are used to speak about the natures of things and the principles that define those natures. What he and Maritain call "emperiological" principles are used to speak about how one could identify a particular thing, what we would see or hear or measure in order to distinguish one kind of being from another. For example, Darwin's finches were identified by their various beaks which allow them to access food from very different kinds of plants or flowers. Practical concepts on the other hand are used to help one understand how to achieve a goal. Focus, for example, is the concept that is used to help athletes, musicians and dancers to achieve their various arts. Discussing the practically practical sciences, Maritain's account tells us that in the theoretical sciences including moral philosophy in its theoretical aspect, concepts are achieved as a result of abstraction in order to make intelligible the natures of things.[41] For example, the nursing account of caring is abstracted from the many kinds of caring that are found in life. Simon calls that answering the question, "What are the things? However, in the practical sciences concepts answer the practical question is, "What ought we to do?"[42]

Methods: Explanation

Simon also examines the role of explanation in the sciences.[43] Simon notes that one might wonder if there could even be a practical explanation. It might seem that explanations are essentially theoretical. However, if we examine the explanations sought in practical situations we find

---

[39] Id., 52.
[40] Simon, *A Critique of Moral Knowledge*, 50–51.
[41] Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, 346.
[42] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 82.
[43] Id., 83.

that they are practical rather than theoretical. When we are late for a meeting, for example, we aren't looking for a causal account which might include that my watch was slow because its battery was running low because batteries only last a limited period of time, etc. But that isn't really the issue. Rather, the problem is how not to be late the next time. Now the chain of reasoning includes identifying a low battery and ends with replace the battery soon. Explanations here are not about principles and causes but about how to act in the future.[44]

Simon follows Aristotle in the *Posterior Analytics* in his definition of science, where explanations are certain and certainties are explanatory.[45] He points out that the discipline that employs purely practical explanation enjoys a different intellectual *habitus* than that of a theoretical *habitus*.[46] Its goal of inquiry would be in search of right action rather than in search of certain knowledge. In such a case Simon tells us the science and its explanations would at best be understood to be "theoretical by priority and practical by posteriority."[47] That is to say, the theoretical principles that provide the basis for the science and its explanations would be prior to the explanation that guides the action.

As we saw, Maritain argues that practically practical inquiry depends on speculatively practical knowledge. For example in nursing, the principle that states that skin integrity is important to protect from infection can be seen as a theoretical principle expressing an important truth about the nature of human skin and its role in preventing infection. This principle serves as the basis for many standard nursing practices which include: turning patients from side to side, keeping their skin clean and dry and so on. The principle, then, is theoretically prior to the standards of nursing care both essentially as their theoretical foundation and temporally as the precursor of such standards.

In his reply to Simon's letters of February 11th and 15th, 1961, Maritain agrees that the kinds of explanations that are achieved in the practically practical sciences are practical in their nature. He also notes that

---

[44] Id., 83–84.

[45] Id., 85.

[46] Simon uses the term *habitus* to speak about a habit of the mind and of action that is thoughtfully directed to a goal. Thus a theoretical *habitus* would arise from a consistent use of intellectual actions in search of theoretical knowledge. Practical *habitus* would follow from a consistent use of intellectual and practical actions in search of right action. See *The Definition of Moral Virtue*, 55–61.

[47] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 85.

such practical explanations are not "totally individualized as [they are] in the case of prudence."[48] A certain level of abstraction is necessary for these rules to be developed, to function and to guide concrete action. Maritain goes on to say that "it suffices that the explanations be certain and proceed from *universal* and cogent *raisons d'être* for them to pertain to a science."[49] Thus our previous examples of the role skin integrity and preventing infection would arise as a result of theoretically practical inquiry and provide a universal guide and it is a reasonable and persuasive explanation of the particular standards of nursing care around mobility and cleanliness.

The Quest for Certainty

As we saw, Maritain's position is that it is sufficient to a practically practical science that the explanations are certain and arise from "*universal* and cogent *raisons d'être*."[50] Simon argues that the presence of both certainty and explanation alone are not enough to satisfy the requirements of a science.[51] Again he refers to his definition of science where explanations are certain and certainties are explanatory. He points out that the meaning of scientific certainty refers "not to the perfect establishment of any kind of truth, but definitely to the firmness of explanation."[52] Thus, it would not be enough that our principle of skin integrity be certain but also that the explanations about how and when to act arising from it must also be certain. Such certainty would be impossible in the world of contingency that is found in practical activities even those that are abstracted some distance from the practical action itself. That is, the explanation of the actions to be regularly taken to protect skin integrity can at best be generally likely to achieve their goal of preventing skin breakdown and subsequent infection. Other factors such as the presence of debilitating diseases or inadequate nutrition are also implicated in the issue.

Simon argues that certainty arises from only two sources, analysis into principles and causes or self-evident truths, which Maritain agrees cannot happen in practically practical inquiry, or "right inclination of the appetite" of the agent.[53] We noted above that Maritain agrees that the practically practical inquiry is permeated with the need for the good inclination

---

[48] Id., 107.
[49] Id.
[50] Id.
[51] Id., 101.
[52] Id., 86.
[53] Id., 102.

of the heart that he calls connatural knowledge. It functions both to assure the nature of the action toward the goal and to open or alert the mind of the investigator to principles and truths that would apply.[54]

It is worth noting that Maritain argues that perfect or complete virtue is not absolutely necessary for inquiries into science and art as it is in ethical action as such. That is, the goal of an art or a science is what forms and determines the *habitus* and the actions of the agent. There is a distinction between the goal of the art or practical science and the goal of human actions as such. The goal in nursing is the good of the patient. Every nursing intervention is directed to this end. The goal of human action as such is to achieve human happiness or a good life. This means that actions required of nurses acting for the good of their patients must also be good for the nurses as persons. In practically practical science the goal of good science must be to achieve a goal that is scientifically sound and which will then also be good for the researcher as a human person. So, for example, the medical research done in Nazi Germany on Jews might have been good science but it was destructive of the nature of the researchers themselves because it was destructive of the persons who were used as human subjects. While perfect virtue is not necessary in the practical sciences and the arts, significant virtue is nevertheless needed.[55] Insofar as the practical science is seeking rules for action abstracted from concrete situations the good of the science itself is the main issue. Insofar as the science is seeking rules for action to be carried out by human persons the virtue necessary to determine the person's good action is also required. What this means is that in terms of the science itself the investigator must be clear about the goal and committed to pursue that goal without interference by other competing goals. Further, the researcher must keep in mind her own human good and the good of the clinicians who will carry out these procedures. Thus, some strength of will and courage are often needed to stay true to the goal in difficult situations. For herself, she must be aware that where funding is an ever important factor, investigators might be pushed by their funding agency to alter or suppress some of their data and she must resist the temptation. For the clinicians she must develop policies that do not put them at risk of harm; for example, she must develop careful procedures to prevent exposure to toxic chemicals in carrying out cancer chemotherapy protocols.

---

[54] Id., 107–108.
[55] Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, 334.

Simon concludes, then, that it is not enough that inquiry have both explanation and certainty. The explanation must itself be the source of the certainty.[56] The goal is crucial in his account of the nature of the enterprise.[57] Because the goal of practical inquiry is to answer questions about how to act or refrain from acting the nature of the concepts, the synthesis and the explanation are also primarily practical. Because theoretically practical science is primarily theoretical with the goal of directing actions from afar it can qualify as a science. However, according to Simon since the primary goal of practically practical inquiry is to guide action with the resulting practical concepts, explanation and synthesis, it is not enough to count on its limited abstraction from concrete situations and its reliance on theoretically practical science for the principles to guide its explanation as adequate reasons to justify its designation of science.

The Quest for Truth

Beyond the goal and the methods of practically practical inquiry, Simon and Maritain examine the kind of truth that can be found here. Maritain points out that there is "no question here of resolving a truth, even a practical truth, into its reasons and principles."[58] Since we are talking about the truth of an action rather than the truth of a nature or an entity we must look to the direction of the action to assess its true nature. The issue is the way truth is achieved in this sort of inquiry. He reminds us that it is a synthetic procedure gathering everything that is already known, "all the explanations, principles and *raisons d'être*" to organize them for concrete action.[59] Causes and principles will be multiple and distinct and as such will not allow for a unified understanding of the essence of the thing. Thus the nature of any concrete action can only truly be assured by the inclination of the agent.

Simon gives a nice discussion of the problem of truth in the practically practical sciences in *A Critique of Moral Knowledge*.[60] He reminds us that theoretical truth expresses a consonance between the knowledge and the facts of reality where practical truth expresses a consonance between the direction of the will of the agent and the good goal or end to be achieved. He notes that in prudent judgments these two kinds of truth,

---

[56] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 101.
[57] Id., 103.
[58] Maritain, *The Degrees of Knowledge*, 334.
[59] Id.
[60] Simon, *A Critique of Moral Knowledge*, 56–57.

theoretical and practical may not always coincide. An example might be where a researcher is investigating the efficacy of a certain medication in helping patients tolerate higher levels of activity in the face of significant heart failure. After carefully testing the medicine in the laboratory with animals in heart failure she cautiously begins a clinical trial. She carries out all appropriate testing on the research participants prior to beginning the trial. Unknown to her or to the patient one of the participants has a rare genetic mutation such that the investigation drug causes a cardiac arrest. The facts of the reality were not consonant with the goal of the research or with the virtuous direction of the will of the researcher. Yet, no one knowing the facts would blame the researcher for the bad outcome. We all know that unforeseen circumstances can always interfere with our best intentions and actions.

Simon notes that in practically practical science, theoretical and practical truth should always coincide. However, problems arise. Speaking of moral philosophy which he understood to belong to theoretically practical science, he tells us that the practitioner "who aspires to *scientific* direction of conduct has no business formulating a maxim that may turn out to be disastrous."[61] There are two issues here. One is the goal of the science and the right direction of the investigator's actions to achieve accurate knowledge of the reality she is studying. The other is the goal of directing human action. Because the investigator is committed to good action and gives the direction for action from that good will, Simon says that where the protocol has carefully followed the rules of good science research while the end result turns out to be bad, the researcher would be innocent both as a scientist and as a person. But because we are talking about scientific knowledge and scientific direction of action, the investigation must be thorough and precise enough to prevent the promulgation of action guidelines that might cause harm to patients or the clinicians who carry them out.

Simon goes on to say that if we could permit any dissociation between theoretical and practical truth, it would be in a very limited sense.[62] "A practically true concept . . . can be speculatively false only in the sense in which a concept emperiologically true can be ontologically false."[63] An emperiological truth expresses knowledge about how we can know or

---

[61] Id.
[62] Id., 57.
[63] Id.

measure a thing. Ontological truth speaks about the nature of the thing. For example, a ray of light can be understood to be either a wave or a particle depending on the method one uses to measure it. Modern scientists tend now to believe light to have a dual character, both wave and particle, each evident in different situations.[64] Thus, the emperiological truth of the measurement is rather different from the reality of the light itself. An example in nursing might be that fairly rare instance where the patient's electrocardiographic tracing shows a normal sinus rhythm (emperiological truth), while the patient's heart is actually in cardiac arrest (ontological truth).

In a note to this discussion Simon points out that due to the nature of practically practical science and its goal of action there arise situations where the result of carrying out a rule of action may be disastrous and yet not be the fault of the investigator either as a person or scientist. What he indicates are rather frequent issues of interpretation. He suggests that it is the case that practical maxims can be taken as theoretical and thus mistakes can be made about the nature of the thing in question. Here he refers to the problems of Manichaeism and similar mistakes that arise from various misunderstandings of the nature of the writings of the mystics.[65] In *Practical Knowledge* Simon also suggests the opposite problem where a maxim of guidance is taken as a maxim of concrete direction requiring no further reflection.[66] As we know, rules of direction both in morality and in scientific knowledge are often seen as applying to all situations where they can rightly only apply in certain particular circumstances. Because the rules or guidelines set out by practically practical sciences are abstracted, at least to some extent, from concrete situations their use in concrete situations always requires a prudential judgment by the agent seeking to apply the guideline.

In conclusion, then, the goal for Maritain in positing practically practical inquiry as a kind of science was to identify a place in the range of human inquiries for this rational, systematic investigation into reality that is found in the many and varied professions and that is increasingly becoming the dominant kind of inquiry. There must be a place between science and prudence for this important work. Because it abstracts from the par-

---

[64] Kenneth R. Spring and Michael W. Davidson, "Physics of Light and Color," *Optical Microscopy Primer* (2003) [http://micro.magnet.fsu.edu/primer/lightandcolor/particleorwave home.html, accessed on 05.08.2014].

[65] Simon, *A Critique of Moral Knowledge*, 57 n.

[66] Simon, *Practical Knowledge*, 54.

ticular and contingent reality, inquires into reasons and explanatory structures, and issues guidelines for practice that require prudence for their execution, according to Maritain, its distinction from prudence and its nature as a limited kind of science can be seen.

For Simon, on the other hand, the practical goal of practically practical inquiry rather strictly determines the kinds of synthesis it uses, the qualified synthesis of realization and the synthesis of connection, as well as determining its concepts and its explanations. They are all directed to the question, "What should be done" in the future and in rather concrete cases. He argues that there is not enough of the scientific nature to justify even an analogical relation to science. According to Simon, while he acknowledges that these inquiries are widespread, important and worthy, he is increasingly clear that they are not sciences.

This author is very sympathetic to Maritain's point that there is a real need to give a philosophic account of these inquiries and to identify their place and role in the search for human knowledge. They are systematic, they abstract from reality to a greater or lesser degree, thus they all allow a kind of certainty and for some predictions about future beings or situations, and perhaps most important, their overall goal is for understanding… true, understanding for action, but understanding nonetheless. On the other hand, Simon's careful examination of the differences between practical and theoretical science is very persuasive.

To think about this again I turned to an earlier writing by Simon, "On Order in Analogic Sets."[67] Here Simon tells us that beginners in logic always hope that there is, in an analogic set, some meaning, however small, that the analogates share in common.[68] But, he tells us, they are bound to be disappointed. He goes on to say that in proper proportionality there is one form that is "intrinsically present in all the analogates."[69] But, "this form is not the same in any two cases . . . when a feature is but analogically common, there is not in it anything that be common purely and simply."[70] Perhaps the search for understanding which is predicable of all the inquiries Maritain calls science is the common form in all these inquiries, theoretical, theoretically practical and practically practical. The significant differences in the way that each must be carried out to achieve their

---

[67] "On Order in Analogic Sets," *The New Scholasticism* 34:1 (1960).
[68] Id., 6.
[69] Id.
[70] Id.

differing goals would reflect the important differences that call for an analogical account of the relationship. Simon later points out that the sciences are qualities relative to objects.[71] They are qualities of the mind, a relation between the investigator and the object of this search for understanding. That is, they are a *habitus* of the mind that seeks understanding of their various objects. If this is correct it seems reasonable to suggest that the investigator searching for understanding of how to carry out specific actions to achieve the highest good would develop a scientific *habitus* of his mind that supports his searches. Thus, perhaps Maritain is correct to argue that practically practical inquiries can be analogically classified with the sciences. In any case we now have a much better account of the various kinds of inquiry that will be helpful as we investigate the search for understanding of the sciences and practices that are found in the nursing literature.

Nursing Theory/Sciences

In the late 1960s a series of conferences were held to explore the meaning and role of theory in nursing. Nursing education was moving away from training that was hospital-based, often largely physician taught, toward education in university settings taught by nurses. As a part of this transition there was a desire to identify nursing as an independent profession with its own knowledge base and research trajectory. These conferences, then, were the beginning of a serious and ongoing attempt to understand the different kinds of inquiries that would provide the knowledge base necessary to educate future nurses.

Two significant accounts of the kinds of theories appropriate and useful in nursing practice set the stage for the discussion that continues today. In the first account by James Dickoff, Patricia James and Ernestine Wiedenbach published in 1968 the goal of some kinds of theory is to quiet "the mind's demand for a conceptual grasp on reality."[72] Nonacademic theories were those that were "for a purpose beyond mere understanding."[73] Thus, in the nursing literature the term theory indicates the result of a search for understanding either in itself or for some practical goal. Alter-

---

[71] Id., 23.

[72] James Dickoff, Patricia James and Ernestine Wiedenback, "Readings from Nursing Research I: Theory in a Practice Discipline," in *Approaches to Nursing Research and Theory Development* (New York, NY: The American Journal of Nursing Company, 1969), 430.

[73] Id.

natively in general, the term "science" used in nursing literature is used in the more contemporary sense of empirical investigations using a hypothetical-deductive method. A second account was developed in 1983 by Lorraine Olszewski Walker and Kay Coalson Avant and updated in 1995. These two accounts of theory each identify four levels of theory that bear striking resemblance to the account of the sciences discussed by Maritain and Simon. Walker and Avant were certainly aware of the difficulties posed by theory that is directed specifically at practice.[74]

In the first theory of nursing theories, Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach identified four levels of nursing theory which include: factor isolating, factor relating, situation relating and situation producing.[75] They identified situation producing theory as the highest kind of nursing theory and suggested that this kind of theory depends on all the other levels. In a beautiful way this theory of theories emphasizes the ultimate goal of all nursing theory as in some way supportive of practice.

First, factor isolating theory, also known as naming theory, is conceived of as a way of classifying various realities, of articulating concepts and distinguishing one reality from another. In an early note to this discussion the authors point out that these various inquiries require philosophic skills or habits of the mind that allow the theorist to make distinctions and to keep distinct things that are separated while also seeing relationships between realities and situations that are important.[76] While they do not speak about the quest to understand the nature of things as such, it is clear that in order to achieve accuracy the process of making distinctions requires an understanding of the nature of the things involved. Clearly, abstraction from particular reality and analysis of the beings in question are also necessary.

According to Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach, factor relating theories are where concepts that have previously been isolated are identified in

---

[74] Lorraine Olszewski Walker, Kay Coalson Avant, *Strategies for Theory Construction and Nursing* (Norwalk Connecticut: Appleton and Lange, 1995; repr., Third), 12.

[75] Dickoff et al, "Readings from Nursing Research I: Theory in a Practice Discipline," 430–435. One point worth bearing in mind is that the language used by these authors to speak about the theories is often abstract and vague. They speak about inventing concepts and creating theories as if they are simply a product of the mind rather than an account of naming realities and understanding their natures. However, the authors do speak of their most abstract level, factor isolating theory, as a kind of naming and of distinguishing realities. Thus, it does not seem that this can be understood as a simply nominalist account.

[76] Id., 425.

their various static relationships to other concepts. The authors also use the term "situation depicting" to indicate their attention to the realities of the issue.[77] At the simplest level correlations are identified between factors though more complex relationships are also investigated. Simon and Maritain would likely see this as an investigation into the nature of certain relationships again abstracted from motion and particulars. The authors call this a kind of predictive theory and say little more about it as they suggest that is it well understood and thus does not require significant elaboration. Situation relating theory on the other hand examines dynamic relationships and is abstracted from some particulars and contingencies but is much closer to specific cases.[78] Here they seek to understand causal relationships and to identify catalytic or inhibitory factors that affect these dynamics.[79]

Most of Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach's attention is focused on situation producing theories which they call the highest level of theory and the level for which all the other kinds of theories are developed. They note that this level of inquiry is also known as prescriptive, normative or value theory as here the "goal content of the situation producing theory serves as a norm or standard by which to evaluate activity."[80] At this level the theorist brings together knowledge gained from the prior levels and uses it to identify specific goals and activities to be carried out by nurses in various situations. They argue that there are three important aspects of this kind of inquiry. First, it identifies a goal for specific activity, for example, to reduce pain or prevent infection. Second, they provide a prescription for the actions needed to achieve the goal. And finally, they argue that a survey list is necessary to assist the clinician to decide when and where this prescription might be helpful. Important about the survey list is that it emphasizes the gap between knowledge and practice and reminds the clinician that prudent judgment is necessary before enacting the prescription.[81]

It is not too difficult to suggest how this theory of theories can be understood in light of the kinds of science identified and discussed by Simon and Maritain. Because factor isolating and factor relating theories and their inquiries abstract away from particular reality and seek to understand factors such as pain or caring or fear, it would seem that they would belong to the category of science as such; however, because they are spe-

---

[77] Id., 431.
[78] Id.
[79] Id., 433.
[80] Id.
[81] Id., 434.

cifically and intentionally directed to the practice of nursing itself it is clear that they must belong to the category of theoretically practical science. Here as in moral philosophy and other similar inquiries the gap between understanding and practice is often seen to be great. Nurse clinicians regularly complain that nursing inquiries of this sort have no real meaning for them.

Situation relating theories would also likely fit into the category of theoretically practical science. Like moral philosophy they examine the issue of human use. How does a good nurse act to achieve the goal of good patient care? Here the analysis is for the sake of understanding various relationships in order to predict which actions are likely to achieve the more general goal of good care. As in moral philosophy, the areas where certainty can be achieved remain rather limited but increase as more investigations are carried out. The truth, where it is found, will be a truth of fact consonant with reality. For example, actions designed to reduce or prevent infection are always an aspect of nursing care.

Situation producing theory seems clearly to fit into the category of practically practical inquiry. Like Maritain, they stress that there remains a gap between prescriptive action and the specific action necessary in particular concrete situations. Here a qualified synthesis of realization is achieved as the theorist brings together the knowledge from other levels of theory with knowledge from other disciplines and data from experience to identify goals for care and specific actions to achieve these goals. Truth here will depend rather completely on the goodwill of the theorist whose commitment to both the good of the patient and the good of the nurse who will enact these protocols is always kept clearly in focus. The theorist must always allow the goal to completely determine the specifics of the actions envisioned.

The second theory by Walker and Avant also posits four levels of theory with a slightly different emphasis.[82] They point out that if the relation between factor isolating theory and practice theory in Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach's theory is not kept clearly in focus, the term "theory" in practice theory would be a "rather generous extension of the usual meaning of theory."[83] They also suggest that it is helpful to clarify the links between the levels of theory. In this theory the most abstract kind of theory is called meta-theory and is followed by grand, mid-range and practice theories.

---

[82] Walker et al, *Strategies for Theory Construction and Nursing*.
[83] Id., 12.

According to Walker and Avant, each level interacts with other levels, often those adjacent, by informing and being informed. Thus, meta-theory clarifies the methods and roles of the other levels and is provided material for analysis and clarification by each.[84] Grand theory guides and suggests heuristic methods for addressing the phenomena that are at issue in mid-range theory. In return it is provided material for refinement and clarification. Mid-range theory identifies goals and provides rules and guidelines for practice theories which indirectly evaluate them.

In a recent article drawing very heavily from the work of Walker and Avant, Patricia Higgins and Shirley Moore review and discuss the theory.[85] They point out that the goals of these inquiries are usually either explanatory or predictive.[86] They suggest that meta-theory, the most abstract and universal, is a philosophical inquiry rather like philosophy of science. It uses logic and analytic reasoning and produces knowledge about knowledge rather than identifying theoretical frameworks that describe or explain the world itself.[87] Here also is found theories about issues that cannot be explained by empirical science such as those around death and dying. They also suggest that Barbara Carper's *Fundamental Patterns of Knowing in Nursing* would be understood to be meta-theory.

The next level, grand theory includes "global paradigms of nursing science" such as the account of the nature of nursing by Florence Nightingale.[88] Here the goal is to distinguish nursing from other healthcare professions. As such they abstract from all particular reality and speak about the universal features of nursing. Because of this degree of abstraction they are seen as rather useless to practicing nurses. The authors note that there has been some significant debate about how to classify various theories citing specifically Jean Watson's *Philosophy and Science of Caring*. Is it philosophy as such or grand theory?[89]

Perhaps a way to clarify this debate is to recall that the goal of philosophy and science as such is the search for knowledge for its own sake. Insofar as an inquiry such as Carper's *Fundamental Patterns of Knowing...* is abstracted away from all particularity including that of nursing, it would

---

[84] Id., 13.
[85] Patricia A. Higgins, Shirley M. Moore, "Levels of theoretical thinking in nursing," *Nursing outlook* 48:4 (2000).
[86] Id., 56.
[87] Id., 57.
[88] Id., 58.
[89] Id., 59.

be a philosophical essay. But insofar as it uses information from nursing and speaks specifically about nursing as its title suggests, *Fundamental Patterns of Knowing in Nursing*, it is, in important ways, determined by its goal of understanding how nurses know. It is quite abstract but it is not universal. This suggests that both meta-theory and grand theory which are clearly directed to nursing issues would belong to theoretically practical inquiry rather than to philosophy of such.

The final two levels, midrange theory and micro range theory are distinguished largely by their scope and level of abstraction. Midrange theory is designed to explain the empirical world of nursing and its relation to philosophical theories is indirect.[90] Its goal is to guide practice rather generally such that the rules for action would function across many particular kinds or places of nursing practice. Examples might include theories and resulting guides for infection control or nutrition support or support of the patient who is dying. Because situations make a difference in practices such as infection control or nutrition support, these theories would be applicable in some but not all situations. The principles that ground these theories, they note, would come from a different kind of theory, perhaps from grand theory or from theories arising in other disciplines such as biology or psychology. These theories would be verifiable. Their goal is to "define or refine the substantive content of nursing science and practice."[91]

Micro range theory, then, is the most limited kind of inquiry and is composed of two levels. The higher-level is much like midrange theory but examines a more limited field, perhaps one or two concepts, and examines a limited area or kind of situation.[92] The authors suggest that theories related to care of decubitus ulcers might be an example. While Walker and Avant among others would call this "practice theory," Higgins and Moore disagree. They point out that all nursing theory is relative to nursing practice. Thus, to use the term "practice theory" to speak of this limited kind of theory would be too restrictive. They also speak about a second level of micro theory that would happen at the level of the individual nurse patient interaction. Here a nurse might assess a patient using all empirical data available and make a working hypothesis that the situation is X. For example, a nurse might notice that a patient with a perineal burn has begun to develop epithelial buds indicating healing. He hypothesizes that a particu-

---

[90] Id.
[91] Id., 59.
[92] Id., 59–60.

lar nursing procedure will enhance the healing process and initiates such a procedure.

By using Maritain and Simon's accounts of knowledge we can clarify some of the difficulties encountered in this account. In terms of meta-theory and its inquiry, where the questions are truly universal rather than restricted to nursing, such as the question Higgins and Moore posit around issues of death and dying, "Is death best understood as a process or a product?," the inquiry and resulting theory would be philosophical. Where the questions are related to nursing but abstracted away from particular patients and situations, use an analytic method, develop concepts for the sake of understanding the nature of the issue, and seek truth as an accurate and adequate account of reality as in grand theory, the inquiry would be theoretically practical. Where the search is for guides to specific behavior in rather specific situations it would be practically practical as in midrange and the higher level of micro range theory. Finally, the second level of micro range theory, the more immediately practical inquiry that uses all available information for the identification of action in a specific situation, would be called prudence or good clinical judgment.

In conclusion it seems reasonable to suggest that in nursing literature one might find all levels of science identified by Maritain and Simon, though perhaps not all would be called "nursing inquiries" as such. The level of theory identified by Walker and Avant as meta theory seems very much like the traditional account of theoretical science in that it is highly abstract and uses the traditional scientific methods of conceptualization and explanation. However, its relation to nursing as a practice discipline suggests that it is as Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach argue ultimately for the sake of nursing practice. It seems reasonable to suggest, however, that some investigations found in nursing literature might be by nurses and useful in certain ways to nurse theorists without being directed to nursing itself. For example, Carper's account of the ways of knowing, which bears some interesting similarities to Maritain's account of knowledge, were it not so directly tied to how nurses know, might be of this sort. Or this author's "A Comprehensive Theory of the Human Person from Philosophy and Nursing," which attempts to give a coherent account of the human person that was inspired in part by nursing theories but speaks about persons generically might be classified as such a theoretical endeavor.

At the level of theoretically practical inquiry would be found factor isolating and factor relating theories of Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach and grand theory of Walker and Avant where issues such as the nature of

nursing and its important aspects such as caring, and other factors of nursing and situations are examined and clarified. Practically practical inquiry would, then, include the higher level of micro range theory of Walker and Avant as well and situation producing theory of Dickoff, James and Wiedenbach. Here the goal is to investigate and understand rather specific issues and practices in nursing care in order to give significant direction to the actions of clinicians. Finally, the lower level of micro range theory identified by Walker and Avant seems clearly to fit into the realm of prudential action, that kind of action that makes up the bulk of nursing practice.

By keeping in mind the goal of the inquiry and the way it uses abstraction, concepts and explanations, we are able to see more clearly how these various kinds of nursing inquiry function in our quest to understand nursing. We are thus able to understand more about the nature of nursing itself, the meaning and role of its various aspects and practices, to provide guidelines for nurses as they study nursing and to develop sound policies and procedures to assist clinicians to achieve their goal of good patient care.

DISTINGUISHING THE SCIENCES:
FOR NURSING

SUMMARY

The article explores the problem of nursing as a practical discipline and suggests that there are several kinds of nursing science. Following the lead of Jacques Maritain and Yves R. Simon, the authoress begins with an account of the distinguishing characteristics of theoretical knowledge, to which the term "science" has historically been applied, and distinguishes it from practical knowledge or prudence. Next she reviews Maritain and Simon's discussion of two intermediate levels of inquiry that share some characteristics of both science and practical knowledge. Finally, using the writings of several nurse theorists whose seminal ideas in this area have established a basis for nurse theorist's discussion of these issues, she distinguishes four kinds of nursing inquiry which range from the very theoretical to the very practical.

KEYWORDS: nursing, science, Maritain, Simon.

Małgorzata Jałocho-Palicka
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Poland

THOMAS AQUINAS' PHILOSOPHY OF BEING AS THE BASIS FOR WOJTYŁA'S CONCEPT AND COGNITION OF HUMAN PERSON

The purpose of this article is to show the crucial role of Thomas Aquinas' theory of being in Wojtyła's philosophy of person as presented in his major anthropological work, *Person and His Action*[1] (*Osoba i czyn*[2] known in English under a misleading title *The Acting Person*[3]). This task needs to be undertaken not only for the sake of fair analysis of a chief philosophical enterprise by Karol Wojtyła (John Paul II), but also in order to balance some overemphasis on the influence of phenomenology on Wojtyła's study of human person[4] which seems to be largely caused by some

---

[1] We suggest translating the title *Osoba i czyn* as *Person and His Action*, or *Person and Act*. To decide which English version of the title is better would need longer discussion. Undoubtedly, the word "Act" in *Person and Act* demonstrates a strong connection between Wojtyła's conception of person's acting with classical *actus–potentia* theory. However, we have decided to stay with *Person and His Action*, because the Polish word "czyn" is more common much like the English word "action" and it means, more or less, the same. Also, it seems important for us to put the word "His" for the reasons which will become obvious after reading the whole article (it is a specific person who is the source and cause of *his own* actions). Another reason for including "His" in the English title is of linguistic nature: while in Polish a possessive adjective is usually omitted as being self-evident from the context, in English it is commonly used. For example, a Polish teacher would say "show homework" ("pokaż pracę domową") whereas an English teacher says "show me *your* homework."

[2] Kardynał Karol Wojtyła, *Osoba i czyn* (Kraków: Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1969).

[3] Cardinal Karol Wojtyła, *The Acting Person*, trans. Andrzej Potocki (Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1979).

[4] Unlike the translator of *The Acting Person*, Andrzej Potocki (further mentioned as A.P.), we deliberately do not use a definite article "the" before "human person" when using the notion in a general sense, because there is no such being as "the human person" (existing in the same way as "the sun", "the moon," etc.). There are only specific, concrete persons:

inadequacies, omissions[5] and unjustified additions[6] in the English transla-
tion of *Osoba i czyn*. The most visible and thus most suggestive inade-

___

John, Mary, Tom, etc. We think that putting "the" in front of "human person" would suggest
the "essentialistic" approach to being—i.e., treating the essence of person as some autono-
mous existence—which we want to avoid, since it is incompatible with Wojtyła's Thomistic
approach to the fact of *being* (existence, *esse*).

[5] Obviously, this short paper is not meant to be a thorough analysis of the English transla-
tion, but let us have a look at just one very important example of omission: the words "Po-
zostając na gruncie filozofii bytu" ("Staying on the ground of the philosophy of being") are
missing in the English translation (compare Wojtyła, *Osoba i czyn*, 25, to Wojtyła, *The
Acting Person*, trans. A.P.). These words ("Staying on the ground of the philosophy of be-
ing") sum up the passage about the philosophy of being and the philosophy of consciousness.
Wojtyła declares there that he appreciates and he wants to make use of some achievements
of the philosophy of consciousness, but it is the philosophy of being that will be the funda-
ment of his conception and analysis of human person. Here is the whole sentence expressing
this conclusion: "Pozostając na gruncie filozofii bytu, skorzystamy z tego wzbogacenia [o
pewne odkrycia filozofii świadomości]" ("Staying on the ground of the philosophy, we will
make use of this enrichment [contributed by the philosophy of consciousness]"). In the
English translation (*The Acting Person*, trans. A.P.) there are subtle shifts in the meaning of
the whole passage so as to suggest that Wojtyła treats the philosophy of being and the
philosophy of consciousness just as the expression of the two aspects of human experience
(the inner and the outer). These subtle changes in the translation of the passage, together with
the omission of its final crucial words "Pozostając na gruncie filozofii bytu" ("Staying on the
ground of the philosophy of being") depart far away from its original meaning. Treating the
philosophy of consciousness and the philosophy of being as the two aspects of human ex-
perience actually puts the whole philosophy in the paradigm of the philosophy of conscious-
ness whose sole object is (conscious) experience. This paradigm is totally different from the
paradigm of the philosophy of being whose object are whole specific, really existing beings
(together with consciousness if any particular kind of being has it).

[6] In the English translation of *Osoba i czyn* (*The Acting Person*, trans. A.P.), there are many
subheadings added which do not appear in the original Polish text. Some of them do not
match the content of the subheaded passage even in the English translation, not to mention
the original Polish version. One example: "The Argument Begins with the Assumption that
'Man-Acts' Is Phenomenologically Given" (*The Acting Person*, trans. A.P., 9). First, there is
no such subheading in the Polish original. Second, for Wojtyła a whole "Man-Acts" is not an
"assumption," but a *fact*. This is blurred in the first sentence of the passage where the Polish
word "facts" (fakty) is translated as "data" (of consciousness); again the paradigm of an
objective being-fact is changed into the paradigm of subjective human consciousness and the
data appearing in it! Third, in the whole passage there is no reference to "phenomenology"
or "being phenomenologically given;" actually, in the whole first methodological chapter, in
which there is the mentioned passage, the word "phenomenology" appears just once to point
out that, unlike modern empiricism, phenomenology is very empirical in treating experience
as a sensual-intellectual whole. Encountering such added subheadings and the crucial
changes in terminology ("data" instead of "facts") in the very first sentence under a subhead-
ing, one cannot help recalling the rule that subheadings and the first sentences strike readers

quacy in translation is the English title *The Acting Person*. As indicated above, the adequate translation of the Polish title *Osoba i czyn* would be *Person and His Action*. Placing the word "Acting" as the first and the word "person" as the second distorts, at the very beginning, the whole content and meaning of Wojtyła's work. In this work a person, unquestionably, holds the first place—he or she is a substantial being (*individua substantia*) who is the real cause and the real source of his or her actions. Without a real human being—that is without a real concrete person (i.e., John, Mary, Zosia, Martin)—there is no his or her human actions. Being precedes acting or, more precisely, *being* (*esse*) proceeds *act*. *Being* (*esse*) is not empty (as existentialists imagine). Every *being* (*esse*, existence) is filled with some definite content—the essence (*essentia*). As Thomas Aquinas points out, every real being, including human beings, is composed of existence (*being*, *esse*) and essence (*essentia*).[7] Wojtyła studies human person within this framework of the basic structure of being—*esse* and *essentia*—discovered by Thomas Aquinas. This has far-reaching consequences for Wojtyła's conception of human person. We are going to mention some of them: man's contingency, his transcendence over his actions and society, etc. In the second part of this sketch we are going to talk about the theory of act and potency in the terms by which Wojtyła analyzes human person. This theory testifies to actual-potential character of all beings of the world and in the view of some thinkers "leads us at once to the heart of Thomistic philosophy,"[8] so Wojtyła's use of it as the fundament of his method of cognizing and analyzing human person is another evidence for the strong impact of Aquinas on the Cracowian Cardinal's anthropological thought.

---

most and have the greatest influence on how they interpret the text, so greater importance is attached to them by those who want to suggest a certain interpretation of facts or texts.

[7] See Andrzej Maryniarczyk, S.D.B., *Realistyczna interpretacja rzeczywistości (Realistic Interpretation of Reality)* (Lublin: PTTA, 2005). See also Andrzej Maryniarczyk, S.D.B., *Odkrycie wewnętrznej struktury bytów (The Discovery of the Inner Structure of Beings)* (Lublin: PTTA, 2006). I am greatly indebted to those two books as well as Fr. prof. A. Maryniarczyk's lectures given at CUL (the Catholic University of Lublin). They were for me the main source of knowledge and understanding of Thomas Aquinas' philosophy of being.

[8] Edith Stein, *Potency and Act*, trans. Walter Redmond (Washington, D.C.: ICS Publications, Institute of Carmelite Studies, 2009).

Composition of Being from Existence and Essence as the Framework for Wojtyła's Concept of Human Person

Existence (*Esse*)

1. *The Primacy of Existence* (*esse*). To emphasize the primacy of existence (*esse*) Wojtyła quotes four times an old scholastic maxim, *operari sequitur esse*,[9] and translates it like this: "first something must exist and only then it can act," or like that: "in order to act, something must first exist."[10] The maxim applies to all really existing concrete substantial beings, especially those which are alive. It points out to the most basic fact that all beings' dynamism (*operari*) is preceded by its real existence (*esse*). What is true about all beings is also true about human beings: "*Esse* itself . . . stands in the beginning of the whole dynamism, proper to man"[11]— continues Wojtyła after quoting the maxim (*operari sequitur esse*). Talking about *esse* preceding *operari*, Wojtyła refers to Thomas Aquinas and his concept of existence (*esse*) as "the basic constitutive aspect of every being."[12] Thus the author of *Person and His Action* draws our attention to the philosophical roots of his anthropology.

Esse is in the centre of Thomas Aquinas' philosophy of being (which is always important to remember, even in a Gilsonian journal, at our time of the prevailing *cogito* philosophy and the "forgetfulness" of *esse* philosophy[13]). Aquinas was the one who discovered *esse* as the constitutive

---

[9] *Osoba i czyn*, 75, 85, 86, 157. Wojtyła calls a maxim *operari sequitur esse* "our great sentence" ("nasze kapitalne zdanie *operari sequitur esse*"): see id., 86. This "great [Latin] sentence," quoted four times by Wojtyła, is omitted in *The Acting Person*, trans. A.P.

[10] *Osoba i czyn*, 75, 85, trans. Małgorzata Jałocho-Palicka (further mentioned as M.J.-P.).

[11] Id., 75, trans. M.J.-P. In *The Acting Person*, trans. A.P., the respective quotation (with some added words at the beginning which we put in *italics*) goes like this: "*And yet it seems that in the perspective of our investigations* existence lies at the origin itself . . . of all dynamism proper to man." No comment as to the words added at the beginning of the sentence! What interests us here is that the Latin term *esse* is not used in the English translation (in this quotation and elsewhere), though Wojtyła uses it quite often, especially when discussing person as a substantial being and an objectively existing subject (*suppositum*). *Esse* is the key term to mean (and to be immediately associated with) the whole paradigm of Thomistic philosophizing where *esse* (*being*, existence) plays the central role, connecting the Absolute Being (*Ipsum Esse*, the Giver of *esse*) with contingent beings (the receivers of *esse*). To exclude the Latin word *esse* from the translation is to cut off Wojtyła's anthropology from its roots—from the tradition it belongs to and from the paradigm it is built within.

[12] *Osoba i czyn*, 76, trans. M.J.-P.

[13] For the distinction between the two paradigms of philosophizing: *esse* philosophy and *cogito* philosophy, see John Paul II, *Memory and Identity*: *Personal Reflections* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 2005), 8–9. The term "*cogito* philosophy" is, more or less, an

component of every real being as being. His ancient predecessors, Aristotle among them, considered the world—or, more precisely, some element in it (water, fire, first matter, form, idea)—to be ever-lasting; thus the very existence (*esse*) of the world did not pose any problem to them. Thomas Aquinas noticed that with no being of the world is existence (*being*, *esse*) necessarily connected. All beings in our world stop existing: they die or perish, or get destroyed. So why does the world exist if it does not have to exist? The Aquinas' answer is that there must be *Ipsum Esse*—the Absolute Being whose existence is necessary, who exists by itself. He is the cause and the *ratio* of all existence; without Him existence would be incomprehensible. He is the Giver of existence to all beings of the world who are contingent, because they do not "possess" existence—they received it from the Absolute Being.[14] In theology the Absolute Being is called God—He explained that He is *Ipsum Esse* when He said to Moses that His name is "I AM."[15]

2. *A Human Person as a Contingent Being Called to Existence by the Absolute Being* (*Ipsum Esse*). Wojtyła, following Aquinas in the emphasis on the primacy of *esse* (existence), puts his whole concept of human person and his action within the horizon of the Giver of existence: the Absolute Being who is the source of existence to a contingent human being. Wojtyła does not expand on this, because he is not a metaphysicist; the field of his detailed study is philosophical anthropology. Yet, here and there, he reminds us in some clear statement, maxim or comment that he philosophizes about man as a contingent being existing thanks to the Absolute Being. Without having this in mind we are not able to fully comprehend what it means for Wojtyła to be, to be human and to act in a human way. Accusations made by some, who ignore the Thomistic background of Wojtyła's anthropology—for example, Michael Baker writes that "[a]ccording to Cardinal Wojtyła's philosophy . . . *be follows do*"[16] and

---

equivalent to "the philosophy of consciousness," while *esse* philosophy is much more accurate name for what Wojtyła means by "the philosophy of being"—it is not any philosophy of being but *esse* philosophy in which *esse* (*being*, existence) is the central category and the central object of cognition. We will discuss briefly the difference between the two paradigms in later parts of the article.

[14] See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, 2, 3.

[15] *Exodus* 3,14: "God said to Moses . . . «Thus you shall say to the Israelites 'I AM has sent me to you.'»" *The Holy Bible*, Catholic Edition (London: Darton, Longman and Todd Ltd, 2005).

[16] Michael Baker, *The Loss of Methaphysics*, 13 [http://www.superflumina.org/PDF_files/metaphysics.pdf, accessed on 20.10.2014].

therefore "a man is the product of his own actions"[17]—are totally un-grounded. However, such accusations become understandable when we consider a strange case of the English translation of *Osoba i czyn*. Certainly, to a Polish-speaking reader of the original Cracow 1969 edition of *Osoba i czyn* (*Person and His Action*), it would never occur that "[a]ccording to Cardinal Wojtyła's philosophy . . . *be follows do*" and thus "a man is a product of his own actions." It is perfectly clear (for such a reader) that, according to the author of *Osoba i czyn*, *be proceeds do* (or, in other words, *do follows be*: *operari sequitur esse*). This implies that a human person is a contingent being who does not owe his *being* (i.e. his existence) to himself and to his actions but to the Absolute Being.

A human person's contingency, springing from the contingency of his existence, affects all aspects of his being, including the essential ones: his free will and his reason. Except for "not possessing existence," contingency means "not being perfect," "not being fully actualized," "having inherent shortcomings." As a contingent being, man has imperfect will and imperfect reason. Although man's will always aims at the good, it may not want the good strongly enough to be determined to perform good actions; another possibility is that a man's will may not want the true good, but the false good, because the guide of man's will—namely man's reason—is imperfect, too, and it may not recognize what is truly good for a person. So a human person, instead of fulfilling (actualizing) himself through performing morally good actions may destroy himself as a human being through acting in a morally evil way. Such a threat of not doing the good and therefore not fulfilling oneself is called by Wojtyła "an ethical aspect of [man's] contingency."[18] He introduces this concept ("ethical aspect of contingency") after stating clearly and straightforwardly that "man is a contingent being."[19] And here we are: we would not know the meaning of the notion "contingent being" without knowing the notion "the Absolute Being." Both concepts are inseparable: one assumes the other and one explains the other. Both of them are the key concepts in Thomas Aquinas' *esse* philosophy. With the statement that "man is a contingent being" Wojtyła brings us to the whole metaphysical tradition of Thomas Aquinas' *esse* philosophy which notes that all contingent beings received existence from

---

[17] Id., 13.
[18] *Osoba i czyn*, 161, trans. M.J.-P.
[19] *The Acting Person*, trans. A.P., 154.

the Absolute Being who, unlike them, is perfect and fully exists in every aspect, conceivable and inconceivable to man.[20]

3. *Existence and a Human Person as an Individua Substantia*. Exploring further the problem of existence (*esse*), we must stop for a while at Wojtyła's starting point for his conception of human person: a classical Boethian definition of person, adopted and developed by Thomas Aquinas, who never hesitated to draw on other philosophers' achievements if he found even a "grain" of truth in them.[21] The definition states that *persona est rationalis naturae individua substantia*. Let us follow Wojtyła and leave out for a moment the words *rationalis naturae* to reflect on the remaining part of the definition: *persona est . . . individua substantia*[22] (a person is an individual substance). These few words mean so much. Behind them there is a whole realistic, substantialist conception of being, according to which every being is an individual, concrete substance: John, Mary, dog-Fido, etc. The fundamental characteristic of an individual substance (*individua substantia*) is that it exists in itself with its own existence and not with the existence of someone or something else.

Accidents of a being-substance, its various aspects, qualities and parts, exist in a totally different manner: they do not exist with their own existence, but with the existence of the substance they belong to. Such accident, for example, as a relationship between people, does not exist on its own, but with the existences of the people making the relationship. The marriage of John and Mary exists by John's and Mary's existences—without them their marriage would not exist. Such relational entities as a state, society, a nation, would not exist either, but for substantial, real existences of the people of whom those entities consist of. Also numerous aspects or parts of a specific person—e.g., John's consciousness, John's

---

[20] From the fact that the Absolute Being is the *ratio* for the existence of contingent beings does not follow that we know who He is.

[21] Karol Wojtyła's approach to philosophy reminds us very much of Thomas Aquinas' openness to every "grain" of the truth in the achievements of other philosophers. A good example here is phenomenology. Though Wojtyła rejected the basic assumptions of phenomenology (see not only his *Osoba i czyn*, but also his second doctoral dissertation on Scheler, etc.), he nevertheless tried to find a good side of it and use it for the enrichment of his own philosophy of person.

[22] See *Osoba i czyn*, 76: "Osobą jest konkretny człowiek – *individua substantia*, jak głosi w pierwszej części swej klasycznej definicji Boecjusz" ("A person is a concrete human being—*individua substantia*, as Boetius proclaims in the first part of his classical definition." Trans. M.J.-P.).

will, John's head, John's leg—do not exist separately in themselves, but with John's existence.

Talking about the primacy of existence over a human person's action we must specify that it is a *substantial* and *real* existence of a specific, concrete human person that precedes his or her specifically human actions. This is not to say that human actions do not exist—they do but not in the same way as a substantial human being (*individua substantia*). Human action is one of the accidents of a substantial, individual human being, and as such it exists only with the existence of its doer.[23] Human action does not have any autonomous existence and therefore cannot be analyzed separately from a substantial, real human being. "The Acting Person" is not some kind of independent entity to be distinguished from a really existing substantial human person who is the real source and the real cause of his actions.

4. *The Substantialist Conception of Person and a Person's Transcendence over Society and His Actions*. The substantialist conception of human person, adopted and confirmed by Wojtyła, stands apart from many modern non-substantialist conceptions of man. Marx, for example, and his followers, whose ideology was well-known to the Cracovian Cardinal in Communist Poland, conceived of man as the aggregation of socio-economic relations. Thus a relation which, in Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy, is just one of the accidents of a substance, in Marxism becomes the key to defining man. Consequently, a man, deprived of his own independent, substantial existence, looses all his transcendence over society, over a state and over his socio-economic class—he becomes totally conditioned by the web of social and economic interdependencies. John Paul II called such a non-substantialist conception of man an "anthropological error."[24]

---

[23] See *Osoba i czyn*, 86: "Istnienie działania jest zależne od istnienia człowieka – właśnie tu tkwi właściwy moment przyczynowości i przyczynowania. Istnienie działania jest przyporządkowane i zarazem podporządkowane istnieniu człowieka w sposób przypadłościowy, jako *accidens*" ("The existence of action is dependent on the existence of man—it is here that the proper moment of causing and causation resides. The existence of action is preordinated by and subordinated to the existence of a man in an accidental manner, as *accidens*." Trans. M.J.-P.).

[24] See his *Centessimus Annus*, 13. See also *Osoba i czyn*, 303, where Wojtyła, in a chapter about a person's living and acting with others in communities, says that, talking about human communities, we must not forget that it is not a community, but a concrete, specific person who is a proper substantial subject of being and acting.

Wojtyła, a Catholic priest and future Pope, was always exceptionally sensitive to a human person's transcendence in all its dimensions. In *Person and His Action* (*Osoba i czyn*), while making us aware of the importance of our human morally good actions for our self-realization and self-fulfillment, Wojtyła never allows us to forget that a substantially existing human being, as a being, infinitely transcends his actions; thus his human dignity comes, first of all, from his superior ontic position in the world and from having his ontic origin in the Absolute Being. What, or rather who, a human person *is* transcends by far everything he *does*.

5. *The Susbstantialist Conception of Person and the Primacy of a Person's Whole Being over His Parts and Aspects*. Another consequence of adopting the classical substantialist conception of human person is acknowledging the primacy of his whole being over his parts and aspects. As we said, John's leg, for example, exists only with the existence of John and it is absurd (nonsensical) even to talk about John's leg without John. Also John's will does not have any existence independent and separate from John. The same is true about all the physical parts and the immaterial aspects of John. Parts and aspects are subordinated to a whole substance-being both in an ontological and epistemological order. Their *cause* and *ratio* is a whole substance-being. As we know, in classical, Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy, the cause of causes is the final cause. The final cause of the parts and the aspects of a whole specific substance-being is to serve the goodness of the *whole* substance-being (John, Mary, dog-Fido, etc.). As Aristotle observed, the existence and non-conflicting, concerted acting of heterogeneous physical parts of an organism (such as heart, liver, eyes, etc.) can only be explained by the final cause—that is the goodness of a *whole* organism. So, according to the substantialist conception of being, a whole being-substance builds itself, so to speak, "from above:" it exists as a whole from the beginning together with all of its parts and aspects whose purpose is to develop and to enhance the goodness of the whole being. This is a totally different conception of being from the evolutionary one where beings develop "from the bottom" in the mode of successively adding material parts, by means of natural selection through trial and error (not for the final cause), so that the end product is the sum of its material parts. The final and formal causes are eliminated from the philosophy of evolution.

Wojtyła never allows us to forget that the object of his study is a whole, really existing human person. Only the nature of human cognition makes us "divide" the object of anthropological study into aspects and

investigate them one by one. While reading *Osoba i czyn* one cannot help
feeling of admiration for Wojtyła's exceptional ability to keep a reader's
attention on a human person as a whole being. One of his ways to do this is
his warning against the absolutization[25] of any aspect of a human person.
He especially alerts a reader against the absolutization and "substantializa-
tion" of a human consciousness, i.e., against making it into a sort of
autonomous, "substantial" subject.[26] The absolutization and substantializa-
tion of a human consciousness is particularly dangerous, because this leads
to replacing the analysis of a real whole human being with the analysis of
a human consciousness and its content. In other words, absolutization and
"substantialization" of a human consciousness is the source of different
forms of idealism:[27] instead of really existing beings, it is a human con-
sciousness and its content—its structure, its ideas, its constructs, beliefs—
that become the object of cognition. Then a real, objective being is either
considered to be unknowable (agnosticism) or it is identified with the con-
tent of a subjective human consciousness (*esse est percipi*).[28] Wojtyła re-
jects idealism and, following Thomas Aquinas, takes the realistic stance.
Hence he puts us on our guard not to absolutize or "substantialize" a hu-
man consciousness. A human consciousness cannot become the only object
of cognition (like in the epistemological philosophy of consciousness) to
the exclusion of a whole human being, neither can it be mistaken for him.
A human consciousness, however essential, is just one of a human being's
aspects.

---

[25] See *Osoba i czyn*, 33: "Aspekt nie może zastąpić całości ani też nie może jej wyprzeć
z naszego pola widzenia. Gdyby tak się stało, mielibyśmy do czynienia z absolutyzacją
aspektu, co zawsze jest błędem w poznaniu złożonej rzeczywistości" ("An aspect may never
replace a whole nor can it push the whole out of our sight. If that happened, we would have
to do with the absolutization of the aspect, which is always an error in the cognition of any
composite reality." Trans. M.J.-P.).

[26] See id., 37: "Świadomość sama nie istnieje jako 'substancjalny' podmiot aktów świado-
mościowych . . ." ("Consciousness does not exist by itself as a 'substantial' subject of con-
scious acts . . ." Trans. M.J.-P.).

[27] See id., 40.

[28] See id., 48: "Świadomość jest związana z bytem, tzn. z konkretnym człowiekiem . . . Tego
bytu świadomość nie przesłania ani też nie absorbuje sobą, jakby wynikało z podstawowej
przesłanki myślenia idealistycznego *esse=percipi* . . ." ("Consciousness is connected with
being that is with a concrete man . . . This being is not veiled by consciousness neither is it
absorbed by it, as it follows from the basic presumption of the idealistic thinking*:
esse=percipi* . . ." Trans. M.J.-P.).

Essence (*Essentia*)

Thomas Aquinas discovered that every being-substance, including every personal human being, is composed of the existence (*esse*) and the essence (*essentia*). Substantial existence, though constitutive for every real being as being, never exists without substantial essence, i.e., without some substantial content. The existence as such is inseparable from the existence of some substantial definite content: the dogness of a dog, the catness of a cat, the humanness of a human being. This substantial definite content which makes a dog a dog, a cat a cat, a human being a human being, etc., is called essence. Aquinas' pierced much deeper than Aristotle into the structure of being: not only did he discover the existence as such but he also looked more profoundly than the Stagirite into the question of essence. For Aristotle only the form of a being-substance constituted its essence. Thomas placed also matter on the side of essence,[29] so in his theory of being both form and matter constitute the essences of the worldly, contingent beings. This has important implications for a conception of human person: with such a profound view on essence a person is realistically seen as the unity of the substantial spiritual soul[30] and the material body. In every person a specific substantial spiritual soul is a form of the body of the person. In an analogical, imperfect way, we may say that each substantial spiritual soul when called into existence immediately forms for itself the substantial body proper for fulfilling on the earth both general (essential) and the specific vocation of this person. We can compare the forming "work" done by a concrete spiritual soul to the work of an artist whose invisible project gets materialized on the picture.

1. *The Essence of Man as the Object of Wojtyła's Lifelong Investigation. The Human Person's Essence Revealed Best by His Actions.* The essence of human person—investigating it and living it—was Woj-

---

[29] See Thomas Aquinas, *De ente et essentia*, II, in Andrzej Maryniarczyk, S.D.B., *Odkrycie wewnętrznej struktury bytów* (*The Discovery of the Inner Structure of Beings*), 172.

[30] It is important to note that for Wojtyła (the embodied) spirituality (i.e., the essence) of man is not any abstract, airy phenomenon connected with another enigmatic phenomenon called "spiritual-self." A person's spirituality comes from a substantial spiritual soul. Thomas describes a person's soul as an incomplete substance which completes itself the moment it is called into existence and comes to the womb to form the person's body. Of course, we can express it only in an imperfect metaphorical analogy: in fact there is no time gap between creating a soul and creating the respective body. Together with a body a spiritual soul constitutes a complete substance-person. See *The Acting Person*, trans. A.P., 186: "It is to metaphysical analysis that we owe the knowledge of . . . human soul as the principle underlying the unity of the being and the life of a concrete person."

tyła's (John Paul II's) lifelong passion. The very title of the first book by a young Cracow priest—*Rozważania o istocie człowieka*[31] (*Reflections on the Essence of Man*)—bears testimony to this. And so it was until his last anthropological opus magnum *Mężczyzną i niewiastą stworzył ich* (*Man and Woman He Created Them*) where he proposes a project of an "adequate anthropology" and realizes the project himself.[32] The adequate anthropology, he says, "seeks to understand and interpret man in what is essentially human."[33] In this spirit of studying the essence of man, Wojtyła also wrote *Person and His Action* (*Osoba i czyn*). The author observes there that the rational, moral and dynamic essence of a human person is best revealed by his actions.[34] That is why the author of *Person and His Action* analyzes human person through his specifically human actions.

To show the essence of man a Cracow Cardinal chooses human action and not human consciousness as Cartesius and his followers do. In a human person's acting all his essential aspects—his consciousness, his (self-)cognition, his free will, his emotions (psyche) and his human body—are united and thus the ontic unity of soul and body discloses itself most prominently. Wojtyła was an ardent defender of this ontic unity of a human person and, consequently, an opponent against dualistic Cartesian anthropology. Cartesian exclusion of the human body from the essentially human moral laws inscribed in man's soul—and, at the same time, submitting the body merely to mechanistic laws of matter—leads to

---

[31] Karol Wojtyła, *Rozważania o istocie człowieka* (*Reflections on the Essence of Man*) (Kraków: Wydawnictwo WAM, 2003). This book consists of the lectures given at church by a young Fr. Wojtyła to Cracow students in 1949—the darkest period of Stalinist terror in Poland due, in part, to the forbidding of teaching anything at universities but a Marxist, purely materialistic conception of man. Wojtyła proves there that the essence of man is a spiritual soul. In his reasoning he uses a classical principle of causality with its basic claim that the effects (i.e., immaterial free will and reason) must be caused by something of a higher ontic order than themselves. So immaterial free will and reason cannot be caused by matter but by spiritual soul.

[32] Actually, Wojtyła realizes his own project of building an adequate anthropology not only in *Man and Woman He Created Them*, but in all his anthropological writings.

[33] John Paul II, *Man and Woman He Created Them. A Theology of the Body*, trans. Michael Waldstein (Boston: Pauline Books & Media, 2006), 178. There is also a chapter *Man in Search of His Own Essence* in which John Paul II observes that "*the created man* finds himself from the first moment of his existence *before God* in search of his own being . . ." (id., 149).

[34] See *Osoba i czyn*, 14: "[C]zyn stanowi szczególny moment ujawnienia się osoby. Pozwala nam najwłaściwiej wglądnąć w jej *istotę* i najpełniej ją zrozumieć" ("Action is a key moment whereby a person is revealed. Action gives us the best insight into the *essence* of person and allows us to understand it most fully." Trans. M.J.-P.).

body merely to mechanistic laws of matter—leads to degradation, reification and, eventually, destruction of a whole human being. For a person to fulfill himself through specifically human, morally good actions, his human body and emotions should be lifted to the level of immaterial human reason and reasonable will—the manifestations of spiritual soul and its essentially moral character. This moral obligation (to lift the body and emotions to the level of the soul) springs from the very essence of man who is an embodied spiritual soul and a spiritualized soul-full body. Wojtyła (John Paul II) did a lot to expel from our culture the demon of Cartesian (and Manicheistic) dualistic anthropology[35] and to bring back Thomas Aquinas' vision of an internally and externally unified human person manifesting his integration through morally good actions.

2. *The Essence of Man Is Not Comprehended by Particular Sciences but by Philosophy*. As we indicated, viewing man through his essence is seeing him as an integrated[36] unity of soul and body. Generally, it is the essence that penetrates, integrates and constitutes the recognizable, specific identity of every contingent being, also a human being. Particular sciences—whether the sciences of man or natural sciences—do not reach the essence of Being as such (*Ipsum Esse*, the Absolute Being) or the essences of contingent beings, especially the essence of human being. Anatomy, for example, may exactly describe all the muscles of man, but in this description there is not a word about the *essence* of man. To say so is not to blame the sciences—such is their nature: they have to make a methodological assumption that a studied object is made only from matter so that they are able to divide it into their respective "parts" (formal objects of scientific research) and examine those "parts" in empirical, sensually perceivable, repeatable experiments in terms of their natural functions or quantitative (not qualitative) mathematically expressible natural laws. By their nature, sciences divide and fragment the objects of their scientific research. This is especially dangerous in the case of man. A fragmented man becomes sort

---

[35] Most prominent and best-known expression of this anti-Cartesian and anti-Manicheistic spirit is John Paul II's theology of the body presented in *Man And Woman He Created Them.*

[36] Wojtyła, being himself, an exceptionally integrated person, wanted such integrity for all people. George Weigel, Wojtyła's biographer, was one of those who were struck by Wojtyła's (John Paul II's) integrity. In his post-mortem memory *The Pope in Private*, Weigel writes: "In an age in which personalities are often assembled from bits and pieces of conviction (politics here, religion there; morals from here, artistic interests from there) Wojtyła could be startling. He was the most integrated personality I have ever met . . ." *Newsweek* (April 5, 2005): 37.

of a "sack" for unconnected, material parts each of which is governed by its own laws and functions. As a result, he loses his inner integrity; he is swayed here and there by innumerable bits and pieces of scientific information, media news, his own disordered psychosomatic emotions and drives. Not knowing his essence he does not know what is most important (essential) for him and therefore he is not able to find the ultimate goal and the direction of his life.

Wojtyła appreciates the great contribution of the sciences to the knowledge of man, but he points out that, by their nature, they are not able to grasp the essence and thus the *integrum* of man.[37] The task of seeking and investigating the essence of man belongs to philosophy.[38] However, it is not any philosophy that can perform this task. It must be the philosophy that does not "[a]bandon . . . the investigation of being,"[39] but "dare[s] to rise to the truth of being."[40] Such philosophy is not afraid to "ask radical questions" about the ultimate foundations of the existence and the identity of a human person and his place in the hierarchy of beings. Such philosophy "is strong and enduring because it is based upon the very act of being [i.e., existence, *esse*], which allows full and comprehensive openness to reality as a whole, surpassing every limit in order to reach the One who brings all things to fulfillment."[41] In such philosophy "metaphysics should not be seen as an alternative to anthropology, since it is metaphysics which makes it possible to ground the concept of personal dignity in virtue of their spiritual nature [i.e., essence]."[42] Let those words from the encyclical *Fides et ratio* suffice for explaining what kind of philosophy was consid-

---

[37] See Wojtyła, *Rozważania o istocie człowieka* (*The Reflections on the Essence of Man*), 19. The example with the anatomical description of man's muscles is taken from there.

[38] See id., 20.

[39] John Paul II, *Fides et ratio*, 5.

[40] Id.

[41] Id., 97. I added the words in brackets because in Polish (the language John Paul II used when writing encyclicals) there is the word "istnienie" which means "existence, esse" and not the word "byt" ("being"); so the exact counterpart of the Polish words "akt istnienia" is "the act of existence" rather than "the act of being." By observing that philosophy "based upon the very act of existence is open to all reality," John Paul II refers to a realistic concept of reality, shared by him with the Lublin Philosophical School (LPS). According to the LPS, to be real is to exist. The first act of cognition concerns the act of existence, and it is expressed in existential propositions such as: "John exists," "a thought exists," "an action exists." Only after such basic existential statements can we go further in cognition and seek answer to such questions as: Why does this exist? How does this exist? What is this? (the question about essence), etc.

[42] Id., 83.

ered by Wojtyła (John Paul II) to be suitable for investigating the real essence of man. Those words undoubtedly refer to the philosophy of being developed by Thomas Aquinas whom John Paul II gives unstinted praise in the encyclical.[43]

3. *Essence Really Existing under a Real Existence*. So much interested in the essence of man, Wojtyła commends phenomenology for its pursuit of essence (*eidos*). However, he makes a very important reservation: while admitting that in *Osoba i czyn* he wants to adequately describe the *eidos* (i.e., the essence) of human person, he clearly states that "[i]t is out of the question [for him] to follow Edmund Husserl's phenomenological method of excluding essence from an actual existence (*epoche*)."[44] This idealistic Husserlian method stands in total contradiction to Wojtyła's realistic approach to essence (*eidos*) according to which a specific essence exists only under a specific existence of a specific being-substance: the dogness exists only under a specific existence of a specific dog (Lessie, Fido, etc.), and the humanness exists only under a specific existence of a specific human being (John, Mary, Kate, etc.). Essence is not some abstraction dwelling only in human consciousness neither can it be "substantialized" and treated like some autonomous being. Essence does not exist without existence and vice versa. They are both inseparable components of every being-substance. This fact is obvious for a realistic tradition of philosophy started by Aristotle, fully developed by Thomas Aquinas and creatively continued by The Lublin Philosophical School[45] of which Wojtyła was a framer[46] as a CUL professor of 24 years. Phenomenology, proposing to "suspend" existence in the procedure of *epoche* (transcendental reduction) and to deal only with the *eidos* of the phenomenon appearing in human consciousness, enters the Platonic tradition of idealism where the content of human consciousness—ideas, notions, essences—is separated from real existence, substantialized, absolutized, and then mistaken for being (e.g. Berkeley's idealism) or else considered to be the only realm

---

[43] See id., 43–44.

[44] Wojtyła's words quoted here come from the footnote added in the CUL edition of *Osoba i czyn*: see Karol Wojtyła, *Osoba i czyn oraz inne studia antropologiczne* (Lublin: TN KUL, 2000), 62, trans. M.J.-P. There are the Polish words: "[N]ie ma mowy o znamiennym dla metody fenomenologicznej Edmunda Husserla wyłączeniu istoty spod aktualnego istnienia (*epoche*)."

[45] See Mieczysław A. Krąpiec, O.P., Andrzej Maryniarczyk, S.D.B., *The Lublin Philosophical School*, trans. Hugh McDonald (Lublin: PTTA, 2010).

[46] See id., 45, 50, 57.

accessible to cognition (e.g. phenomenology, agnosticism, philosophy as the analysis of language).

4. *The Essences of Beings Are Grasped by Their Names. Wojtyła's Cognitive Realism*. Part of the problem of the ungrounded separation of existence from essence might be caused by the fact that existence itself is not grasped by language, i.e., by names and notions. Though the existence of something is the first and the fundamental object of cognition (see footnote 38), we cannot say much about it. We just acknowledge it in existential propositions: I exist, John exists, etc. Much more can be said about essence because it is grasped by names and therefore by definitions and descriptions. Philosophy whose proper medium is language can forget or "suspend" existence and get "essentialized." On the other hand in some modern and postmodern trends of philosophy we encounter something like "existentialization" of philosophy which denies essence, especially the essence of man (Sartre and other existentialists), and treats philosophy as the expression of subjective, individual experiences, moods and feelings.

Wojtyła avoids both extremes: he neither "essentializes" nor "existentializes" his philosophy of man. His balanced attitude towards the existence and the essence of a human person is strictly connected with a realistic, Thomistic conviction that names and their respective meanings refer to really existing beings and they grasp the really existing essence under the existence of each specific being. By calling a specific, really existing being "human" (e.g. "John is a human being"), we indicate that this being (e.g. John) is, in his essence, human[47]—he is not an animal or a stone. We, obviously, touch here upon the basic philosophical problem—the problem of universals; there is no need to go deeper into this problem here. What we want to stress is Wojtyła's cognitive realism which goes together with his metaphysical realism. Out of the three positions in the discussion of the problem of universals—nominalism, idealism and realism—Wojtyła is definitely a representative of realism. By the way, in the realistic approach towards essence grasped by names, to state that one is going to study "the essence of human person through his actions" is the same as to declare the intention to examine "human person through his actions." Taking, realistically, their identical meaning for granted, Wojtyła uses both expressions—"the essence of human person" and "human person"—interchangeably. In fact the latter one (i.e., "human person") is used by him much more, perhaps for the sake of simplicity, but considering the whole context of his

---

[47] See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I, 13, 1.

metaphysical and cognitive realism, we must remember that examining "human person" (through his actions) means, for him, the same as examining "the essence of human person" really existing under a specific, real existence of a specific person: John, Mary, etc. (so we must keep in mind that the object of his study is *not* some abstract phenomenon inhabiting consciousness, conventionally called "human person;" having that in mind does not cause any difficulty when we read the original Cracow 1969 version of *Osoba i czyn*). In a similar way, a flamboyant question often associated with Wojtyła's (John Paul II's) adequate anthropology—what does it mean to be human?[48]—amounts to a more modest but more adequate question: what is *essentially* human?

Act and Potency Theory as the Ground for Cognition and Analysis of Human Person

1. *Act and Potency as Existence–Act and Essence–Potency*. Act and potency theory embraces all being—the Absolute Being and all contingent beings. The Absolute Being is the Pure Act (*Actus Purus*): there is nothing potential in Him, He is fully actualized; He is full and absolute Existence in all aspects (conceivable and inconceivable for man): Existence is His Essence. Unlike Him, all contingent beings are composed of act and potency: they are not fully actualized,[49] their contingency involves constant actualization of their inherent potentialities. The condition for all those actualizations is the first and basic act: coming into existence, starting to be (*esse*). The existence-act—i.e., the act of coming into existence—is, in a way, perfect and complete: there is nothing to be added to this act of existence of a specific, concrete being—John, Mary, etc.—i.e., there is no potential left out as far as the very existence is concerned; there is one

---

[48] See, for example, Rev. Benjamin P. Bradshaw, *The Theology of the Body according to Pope John II* (http://www.frben.com/documents/Theology_of_the_Body_Conference_Hand out_Number_4_of_4.pdf, accessed on 20.10.2014). By the way, the term "the theology of the body"—given to a whole and comprehensive conception of man presented in *Man and Woman He Created Them*—seems to me a bit reductionist. The term "adequate anthropology" is much more adequate. However, I can see the merits of the former term: it stresses the elevation of the human body, makes it attractive and catchy for people; and most importantly, it is used by John Paul II himself.

[49] See *Osoba i czyn*, 161. The immense ontological gap between the Absolute Being as Actus Purus and contingent beings having always potential-actual character is implied by this sentence: "Każdy byt, który musi dochodzić do własnej pełni, który podlega aktualizacji – jest przygodny" ("Every being who has to go a long way to reach his fulfillment, who is the subject of actualization—is contingent").

actual existence[50] of one John—no other substantial existence can be added to this one actual existence of this one John throughout all his one life, John cannot have two or three actual existences. This sort of complete actuality does not take place in the case of a being's essence: the essence of a human being, for example, especially at the beginning of his life, is almost wholly potential.[51] So, while a new-born baby-John (or, earlier, a baby-John in his mother's womb) already exists and will exist with the same actual existence all his life, the baby-John's essence is not actualized yet: it is, so to speak, almost all hidden in the state of potency. John's essence will be getting actualized, and thus revealed to (self-)cognition through his countless acts during all his life. Gradually John himself and other people, observing him, will learn who he is, how (and whether) he realizes his essential potency, namely his humanness, how (and whether) he subordinates his other potentialities—physical, emotional, intellectual—to the development of his humanness.

2. *Act and Potency Theory as the Key to Cognition and Analysis of any Being*. Act and potency theory—explaining all dynamism of all beings: from their coming into existence to constant actualization of all their essential and accidental potentialities—is, at the same time, the key to cognition of every being. This is because, first, only being (something that exists) can be cognized; non-being equals non-cognition.[52] Secondly, every being is knowable and actually cognized through its acts.[53] The way a plant grows

---

[50] See id., 101. Wojtyła points out here that a concrete specific person "[only] once came into a substantial existence."

[51] For a comprehensive discussion of existence as act and essence as potency, see Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec, *Struktura bytu* (*The Structure of Being*) (Lublin: RW KUL, 2000), 303–328.

[52] See footnote 38 where we say that the first and fundamental act of cognition is to state that something exists ("Mom exists," "action exists," etc.) and only then we can go further in cognition, answering questions about the cause of existence, the essence of an existing being, etc. See also Thomas Aquinas' great sentence: "knowledge can be concerned only with being, for nothing can be known, save what is true; and all that is, is true" (*Summa Theologiae* I, 1, 1, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province).

[53] See *Osoba i czyn*, 91. Wojtyła here points out that any act happening within a man or consciously caused by a man is directly and experientially given to cognition whereas the basis and the source of those acts (i.e., a man himself) is given only indirectly. In other words, we can only cognize a man (and any other being) through his acts. This is one of the axioms of the classical philosophy of being. Contrary to this, in the philosophy of consciousness, there is an idea that man can have a direct cognitive access to himself, without any mediation of his acts (which actually means that a man can cognize himself without the mediation of the body—the proper site of human direct experience).

from a seed, the course of an animal's development and behavior, shows to a botanist or a biologist what kind of plant or animal it is, what are its essential properties. The inner and outer movements (acts) of matter enable a physicist to discover the structure and the laws governing matter, and so on and so forth. Let us imagine the unimaginable—that all beings are completely static, devoid of any kind of dynamism (acts): let us imagine that there is no movement, no behavior, no growth, no change—then we would not be able to gather any knowledge of any being, ourselves included. All beings not only realize their potentialities through their acts, but, at the same time, through those very acts they sort of come out of hiding and make themselves known, observable, available to experiential cognition. Needless to say that in the chronological order of realization *potentia* comes first while in the order of cognition *actus* (as a medium of cognition) comes before *potentia*.[54] Wojtyła expresses appreciation for act and potency theory both as an adequate description of the dynamic character of beings and as the key to gaining knowledge about them. Here are his enthusiastic words about act and potency:

> We may with justice say that at this point [of act and potency theory] metaphysics turns out to be the intellectual soil wherein all the domains of knowledge have their roots. Indeed we do not know and we do not have as yet any other conceptions and any other language which would adequately render the dynamic essence of change—o f a l l c h a n g e w h a t e v e r o c c u r r i n g i n a n y b e i n g— a p a r t f r o m t h i s o n l y c o n c e p t i o n a n d t h i s o n l y l a n g u a g e t h a t h a s b e e n g i v e n t o u s b y t h e p h i - l o s o p h y o f potentia-actus. B y m e a n s o f t h i s c o n - c e p t i o n a n d w i t h t h e h e l p o f t h i s l a n g u a g e w e c a n a d e q u a t e l y g r a s p a n y d y n a m i s m that occurs in any being. It is to them we also have to revert when discussing the dynamism proper to man.[55]

---

[54] Since we talk in this part mainly about cognition, we usually put "act" first ("act and potency" and not "potency and act"). Additionally, in the order of existence (which is so important in this article) the act (of coming into existence) comes first, so the sequence "act–potency" is proper in this context as well.

[55] See *Osoba i czyn*, 65–66, trans. M.J.-P. See also the respective words in *The Acting Person*, trans. A.P., 64. The translation by A.P. was of some help to me; however, I had to change a lot. In this one longer quotation I preserved the original graphic emphasis. Wojtyła by emphasizing that the conception of actus–potentia grasps *all* dynamism of any being

And so Wojtyła does: he reverts to *potentia-actus* when discussing the dynamism proper to man.

3. *Actus Humanus as the Way to Cognizing (the Essence of) Human Person*. The Polish word "czyn" ("action"), used by Wojtyła in *Osoba i czyn*, has the same meaning as the Latin *actus humanus* (human act),[56] called also *actus personae* (person's act). Both Latin terms mean specifically human (or human person's) action—that is the action that is voluntary and conscious (i.e., rational). The concept of *actus humanus* is rooted in Christian and Thomistic personalism which holds it as an axiom that every human person is endowed with free will and reason (rational consciousness, the ability to cognize and act rationally, i.e., according to the cognized truth). As we said, the dynamic essence of person—and here we mean his free will and rational consciousness (the manifestations of soul)—is best disclosed by his, inner and outer, free and rational actions. A person's action, freely chosen and caused consciously by the person, opens his inner ontic structure to insight. Through specifically human action Wojtyła studies (the essence of) person and discovers such specifically human structures as reflective consciousness, intentional cognition, self-cognition and self-knowledge (which is not the same as self-consciousness), self-owning and self-ruling. A person is someone who is both cognizing and cognized, both owning and owned, both ruling and ruled. Thus a person is both a subject and an object of cognition, ownership, ruling. Self-knowledge, self-owning and self-ruling make the ontic[57] basis for self-

---

means also what he calls "the first dynamization" ("pierwsze zdynamizowanie") of any being—i.e., its coming into existence. Considering Wojtyła's emphatic praise for *potentia–actus* theory, we must remember that in Communist Poland an obligatory theory of dynamism was Hegelian–Marxist dialectics. According to this dialectics the principle of all being's (matter's, man's, history's etc.) dynamism is contradiction and extreme conflict: thesis-antithesis-synthesis. Also some other theories of being's dynamism, mentioned below, were not accepted by Wojtyła.

[56] See *Osoba i czyn*, 31: "[C]zyn jest tym samym, co *actus humanus* . . ." ("Action is exactly what *actus humanus* is . . ." Trans. M.J.-P.).

[57] The person owns himself and rules himself whether he wants it or not—these are his ontic structures: self-owning means that, as a whole substantial being, a person cannot be another substantial being; self-ruling means that a person decides about who he becomes through his actions even if he does not devote any conscious attention to what he does; also self-knowledge is here an ontic structure meaning that every being knows something about himself even if this knowledge is "limited" to non-conceptualized knowledge that "*I am I*." These fundamental ontic structures of person make the basis for conscious, rational choices in the acts of self-governance.

governance[58] in which a person is also someone who governs and who is governed—he is a subject and an object of self-governance.

The ability to objectivize[59] oneself (in self-cognition, self-owning, self-ruling and self-governance) is essentially human; other beings are, so to speak, imprisoned in their subjectivity; they cannot stand apart and look at themselves in an objective way. As such they are closed only in horizontal transcendence while a person, thanks to his potential for self-objectivization, is inherently capable of vertical transcendence. An animal transcending itself only horizontally is merely interested in reaching outside (horizontally) for the object of his instinctual desire whereas a person can also "look down" upon himself and his future actions from a higher perspective of true values and ultimate ends (vertical transcendence). Actually, in the case of a person, vertical transcendence precedes horizontal transcendence—a person first decides who and what he wants to be (e.g., a teacher, a good father, a saint) and then he directs himself horizontally towards the goals that will enable him to be the person he wants to be (e.g., he goes to university, he cares for his child, he decides not to deny his faith in Christ though he knows he is going to be tortured and killed for that). These are some of Wojtyła's interesting insights into (the essence of) person, based on inner and outer experience of one's own and other people's actions. It is worth noting that, unlike philosophers of consciousness, Wojtyła stresses this unique ability of a person to see himself as an objectively existing being among other objectively existing beings—this is possible thanks to a person's unique potential for self-objectivization and for vertical transcendence both in the aspect of reason (self-cognition, self-knowledge) and in the aspect of will (self-owning, self-ruling and self-governance).

4. *Potency and Act as the Two States of Being. Wojtyła's Opposition to Some Other Theories of Human Dynamism.* Potency should not be identified with nothingness or non-being. Potency is an objectively real state of every contingent being which is different from the state of act;[60] potency

---

[58] I suggest a different translation of the terms than A.P. I would use "self-owning" instead of "self-possession," "self-ruling" instead of "self-governance," and "self-governance" instead of "self-determination."

[59] We use this neologism to distinguish "objectivization" from "objectifying" or "objectification."

[60] See *Osoba i czyn*, 65. Wojtyła defines here potency and act as "dwa zróżnicowane, a zarazem wzajemnie do siebie przylegające stany bytu" ("two differentiated, but at the same time mutually adjacent states of being," trans. M.J.-P.).

may be described as non-act. The two states are inseparable and correlated; each state of an act assumes the state of a correlated potency and vice versa; some definite potency is indispensable "material" out of which a specific act is (and can be) made. Aristotle, who was the first philosopher to note actual-potential character of being and to conceptualize it into the act and potency theory, gives an illustrative example of the realness of those two states, especially of the less obvious realness of potency—the example is known as the *oikodomos* argument against the Megarian school.[61] The Megarians, following Plato, believed that real being is fully actual and therefore unchangeable (like Platonic ideas); they rejected change and therefore potentiality, mistaking the latter for non-being. Aristotle observed that the expression "house-builder" (Gr. *oikodomos*) implies not merely the act in which the house is built but also the possibility of building a house; otherwise we would be forced to accept an absurd statement that someone is a house-builder only at the moments of actually building a house, but when he eats or sleeps he stops being a house builder altogether, which is tantamount to saying that while doing something else or sleeping he somehow loses all his ability (potency) to build houses. The "house-builder" argument shows that denying the realness of the state of potency leads to denying real human abilities (potentials) to create buildings, art, science, culture; also natural potencies are denied in such actualistic conceptions: for example, the potency of a seed to become some specific plant. After all, according to these conceptions, what is potential *is not*: so there is no future plant in the seed (and there is no human being in an embryo).

Wojtyła's draws our special attention to the fact that *potentia-actus* are the two inseparable correlated states of a human being. This means that a person does not create himself through his actions out of nothingness; a person creates himself, in a certain relative way, through his actions, from his essence-potency which already exists but not in the same way as act. Creating oneself out of nothingness is what Sartre preaches and believes. Sartre, the guru of many existentialists, claims that a human person does not have any inborn essence-(nature)-potency; in the opinion of this French philosopher, having any essence-potency would limit man's absolute, unlimited freedom, and such "empty" freedom is considered by him

---

[61] See Mieczysław A. Krąpiec, O.P., "Act and Potency," in *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* (Lublin: PTTA, 2001–2009): www.ptta.pl/pef/haslaen/a/actpotency.pdf, accessed on 15.10.2014.

the only characteristics of man. Consequently, Sartre ascribes to man a god-like prerogative of creating himself out of nothingness in any way man wishes; the absolute freedom is the only measure of man's actions and his human self. Wojtyła implicitly opposes Sartre[62]—the Polish philosopher admits that a human person creates himself in some relative sense, but not *ex nihilo*; a human person creates himself through his actions from his essence-potency given to him together with his existence.

Another philosopher who seems to be implicitly opposed by Wojtyła is Max Scheler. Scheler's philosophy was well-known to Wojtyła who wrote his habilitation thesis about the German phenomenologist. Wojtyła observes in his thesis that "for Scheler a person is not a substance or a subject in a metaphysical or physical sense of the word."[63] So Scheler, like most of modern and post-modern *cogito*-philosophers, rejects the traditional, substantialist theory of person. As a result, "he adopts the actualistic theory of person."[64] In this theory, "person" is defined as some entity who is all in an act of conscious experience of some phenomenon or phenomena flowing through consciousness and who experiences oneself as the subject of this act. When the act of conscious experience disappears then the experienced subject of it called a "person" disappears as well and only some purely carnal, animal-like creature remains. A dangerous consequence of such actualistic conception of person (as a "stream of consciousness") is that someone who does not have actual conscious experiences, who is not actually in a state of consciousness—a baby, a man in coma, or someone who sleeps—is not regarded as a person (just like a house-builder was not regarded by the Megarians as a house-builder when he slept). In contrast to actualistic conception of person, the unquestionable advantage of the *potentia-actus* approach of *esse* philosophy is that the dignity of a human person stems from his *being* a person (which we have already mentioned above); so someone must be treated as a person, equal to all

---

[62] See *Osoba i czyn*, 15, where Wojtyła mentions Sartre and his book *L'etre et neant* (*Being and Nothingness*), and then, id. 66, Wojtyła says that a being "doesn't become out of nothingness, but in some relative sense, i.e., on the basis of a being already existing, within the limits of its inner structure."

[63] Karol Wojtyła, "Ocena możliwości zbudowania etyki chrześcijańskiej przy założeniach system Maxa Schelera" ("An Evaluation of the Possibility of Building a Christian Ethics on the Principles of the System of Max Scheler"), in Karol Wojtyła, *Zagadnienie podmiotu moralności* (*The Question of the Subject of Morality*) (Lublin: TN KUL, 2001), 28, trans. M.J.-P.

[64] Id., trans. M.J.-P.

other persons, independently of the actual state and level of his conscious-ness, just because he *is* a person. As far as consciousness is concerned, according to actualistic-potentialistic *esse* philosophy, it is always present in every really existing human being at each stage of his life, even if it is hidden in the state of potency and never actualized (at least in visible ex-ternal acts) due to some severe psychosomatic disorders like coma or men-tal retardation.[65]

5. *Potency-Act and Becoming* (*Fieri*). Until now we have dealt with the structure of a human being who, like every contingent being, is com-posed from *esse* and *essentia*. Then we have mentioned actual-potential character of being which first manifests itself in the very coming into being as *actus-esse* and *potentia-essentia*. After the act of coming into existence, the human essence-potency is constantly actualized in every specifically human action (*actus humanus*). *Actus humanus*—free and conscious hu-man action—does not only actualize the essence of human person, but also opens him to cognition and analysis. Therefore, *actus-potentia* conception is both a theory of being and a method of cognition. Besides showing us the structure of a contingent being and its two states (potency and act), the *actus-potentia* method gives us access to another dimension of being, namely, becoming (*fieri*). In becoming we accentuate not a finished act as a result of some potency but the dynamic moment of transition from po-tency to act. A human person, drawing on his innumerable potencies, con-stantly becomes on all levels: somato-vegetative, emotional, intellectual. However, a specifically human becoming, integrating psychosomatic level, is of a moral[66] nature: through morally good actions a man becomes good as a man, through bad actions man becomes bad as a man.[67]

In the course of the history of philosophy the fundamental differ-ence between *being* (*esse*) and *becoming* (*fieri*) got blurred to the point that *esse* and *fieri* were treated identically. Hegel is a good example here—for him the Absolute is not the One Who *Is* (*Ipsum Esse*) but some abstract

---

[65] See Wojtyła's interesting conception of subconsciousness as a person's potency for being conscious: *The Acting Person*, trans. A.P., 90–99.

[66] Man's moral essence-nature embraces his freedom (free will) and rationality. As St. Augustine put it, "No one does good when forced, even though good is what he does" (*Con-fessions*, I–XII, trans. M.J.-P.). Action must be freely chosen to be morally good. Second, a morally good action is an action which agrees with reason (see Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, II, 1, where he defines ethics as the science of the agreement of our actions with our rational essence-nature).

[67] See *The Acting Person*, trans. A.P., 98–99.

"absolute spirit" that *becomes*, that constantly changes and develops through thesis-antithesis-synthesis; then the synthesis becomes new thesis and so on. Other evolutionary theories, whether spiritualistic or materialistic, identify being with becoming as well. Karol Wojtyła, for whom Thomas Aquinas was the master of the philosophy of being, would never equate *being* (*esse*) with *becoming* (*fieri*). It is clear from his *Osoba i czyn* (*Person and His Action*) that, ontologically, becoming is connected with essence (*essentia*) rather than existence as such (*esse*).[68] Specifically, human becoming is the realization of person's moral and rational essence. What we have just said implies that from a metaphysical perspective a person is always a person, a human being is always a human being. But from moral perspective a human being might not be human at all: he might not act in a human way, he might not realize his inborn essence, namely, his humanness. In other words, a human being is never bad in the aspect of being, but he may be bad in the aspect of human doing and therefore becoming. That is why Thou Shalt Not Kill—you can never ever destroy a human being, even if he is bad as a human-doing-and-becoming. No reason, no ideology can even try to justify the destruction of any human being (i.e., any human *esse*). Wojtyła who experienced two totalitarian systems, like all Poles of his time, was exceptionally sensitive to the fifth commandment (*Thou Shalt Not Kill*), so he could not overlook the fundamental difference between man's *esse* and man' *fieri,* i.e., between a human being and a human becoming.[69]

Conclusion

In our analyses we emphasized that Thomas Aquinas' philosophy of being played a fundamental role in Karol Wojtyła's concept of person presented in his major anthropological work *Osoba i czyn* (known in English as *The Acting person*). Aquinas discovered that every being is composed of existence (*being*, *esse*) and essence (*essentia*). Wojtyła builds his philosophy of personhood within this framework of *esse* (being, existence)

---

[68] It is true that in *Osoba i czyn* Wojtyła writes, here and there, about an "existential" dimension or meaning of morality (i.e., of becoming morally good or bad), but he uses the word "existential" in a modern sense of something being essential for man's existence. Existentialism contributed considerably to changing the original classical meaning of such words as "exist" and "existence." This is another reason why the Latin term *esse*, used by Wojtyła quite often, should be preserved in a translation of *Osoba i czyn* into any language.

[69] Nevertheless, implicitly or explicitly, Wojtyła is accused of this (of identifying being with becoming): see, for example, Baker, *The Loss of Metaphysics*, 2, 13.

and *essentia* (essence). The moral and rational essence of human person, according to Wojtyła, is best revealed by specifically human, free and conscious, actions. That is why Wojtyła analyzes human person through his actions and discovers such essential structures of human reason and free will as self-cognition, self-knowledge, self-owning, self-ruling which make the ontic basis for self-governance. The immediate ground for Wojtyła's analysis of person through his actions is the act and potency theory, developed by Aristotle and redefined by Thomas Aquinas in the light of the composition of being from *esse* and *essentia*. Every act reveals a correlated potency which otherwise would remain hidden and unknown. Potency-act theory characterizes not only two real states of every being, but also it is the adequate tool to describe every being's becoming. It is not becoming out of nothingness, but on the ground and within the limits of already existing potency. A specifically human action (*actus humanus*) discloses a specifically human potency-essence. Through his actions a man becomes good or bad as a man, depending on the moral quality of the actions. Having all those insights into man's essence presented by Wojtyła, we are once in a while emphatically reminded of the absolute primacy of a man's existence (*being*, *esse*) over his actions and over his becoming. *Being* (*esse*) precedes *acting* and *becoming*. Without *being* (*esse*) there would be no acting and no becoming (*operari sequitur esse*—first something must exist and only then it can act). Thus we are reminded that we are contingent beings and as such we do not owe our existence to ourselves but to the Absolute Being (*Ipsum Esse*). Our human dignity stems, first of all, from our being, not from our doing. This obliges us even more to discover the essential truth about ourselves and to act according to our true human essence we were given together with our existence. As contingent, imperfect beings we must make every effort to become worthy of such incredible gifts. Philosophizing about man on the fundament of Thomas Aquinas' philosophy of being means viewing and analyzing man within the horizon of the Giver of those amazing gifts: man's *esse* and man's *essentia*.

**THOMAS AQUINAS' PHILOSOPHY OF BEING
AS THE BASIS FOR WOJTYŁA'S CONCEPT AND COGNITION
OF HUMAN PERSON**

SUMMARY

The article makes a claim that Thomas Aquinas' philosophy of being plays a fundamental role in Karol Wojtyła's concept of person presented in his major anthropological work *Osoba i czyn* (known in English as *The Acting person*). Aquinas discovered that every being is composed of existence (*being*, *esse*) and essence (*essentia*). Wojtyła builds his philosophy of personhood within this framework of *esse* (being, existence) and *essentia* (essence). The moral and rational essence of human person, according to Wojtyła, is best revealed by specifically human, free and conscious, actions. That is why Wojtyła analyzes human person through his actions and discovers such essential structures of human reason and free will as self-cognition, self-knowledge, self-owning, self-ruling which make the ontic basis for self-governance. The immediate ground for Wojtyła's analysis of person through his actions is the act and potency theory, developed by Aristotle and redefined by Thomas Aquinas in the light of the composition of being from *esse* and *essentia*. Every act reveals a correlated potency which otherwise would remain hidden and unknown. Potency-act theory characterizes not only two real states of every being, but also it is the adequate tool to describe every being's becoming. It is not becoming out of nothingness, but on the ground and within the limits of already existing potency. A specifically human action (*actus humanus*) discloses a specifically human potency-essence. Through his actions a man becomes good or bad as a man, depending on the moral quality of the actions. All these insights into man's essence presented by Wojtyła emphasize the absolute primacy of a man's existence (*being*, *esse*) over his actions and over his becoming. *Being* (*esse*) precedes *acting* and *becoming*. Without *being* (*esse*) there would be no acting and no becoming (*operari sequitur esse*—first something must exist and only then it can act). Thus, as a contingent being, a man does not owe his existence to himself but to the Absolute Being (*Ipsum Esse*); and his human dignity stems, first of all, from his being, not from his doing.

KEYWORDS: esse, being, existence, essentia, essence, Absolute, contingency, individua substantia, act, potency, actus humanus, human action, fieri.

Natalia Kunat
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Poland

THE GOOD AS THE MOTIVE OF HUMAN ACTION ACCORDING TO MIECZYSŁAW ALBERT KRĄPIEC

From ancient times up to the present, people have pondered the question of the good in various domains of man's personal life. The importance of this question is seen especially in philosophy. We encounter the problem of the good mainly in ethics, or axiology. The good is one of the fundamental categories at the level of ethics. In that field we understand the good as the ultimate end of man's life and as the criterion for the moral evaluation of an act. At present, the conception of the good as value is dominant (axiology). Moreover, the good is considered in the domain of economic life, where goods as means that are of special importance to man are produced. They determine man's existence, allow him to extend his life, and to make his life good. However, we encounter the fundamental conception of the good primarily in metaphysics, where the good, along with the truth and beauty, is one of the universal properties of beings. In modern and recent times the metaphysical conception of the good has been negated and has been reduced to other spheres, e.g., to the sphere of law and duties, and to the sphere of happiness (I. Kant, J. S. Mill). To guard against such reductionism, we should appeal to the philosophy of being, or metaphysics, which formulates a fundamental understanding of the good. As it turns out, philosophy still has much to say in the search for reasons and nature of the good. In connection with this, in this article, we will present the understanding, which appears in metaphysics, of the good as the motive of human action. Such an interpretation of the good is a new and more profound conception that looks to the position of Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas, and has been elaborated by Mieczysław A. Krąpiec, O.P.

M. A. Krąpiec, who was one of the founders of the Lublin Philosophical School, started a deep and holistic approach to the leading questions in realistic philosophy (reaching to the thought of Aristotle and Thomas). The metaphysical understanding of reality became the foundation for the Lublin Philosophical School. At the source of the fact that metaphysics was given the leading character lay the belief that methodical teaching also depends on metaphysics in other philosophical realms, which have their roots in metaphysics.

Being as the Good is the Object of Action

The analysis of the fact of action is an important element in the interpretation of the good. On the basis of this analysis the understanding of the good as end-motive of action is seen. In the process of action, it is precisely the good-motive that performs the most essential function. According to M. A. Krąpiec, three fundamental elements (or factors) are part of the structure of human action. They are first, the causation of the end (the motive-end), then exemplar causation (the directing and determination of action), and efficient causes (the factual character and realization of action).[1] They are the necessary reasons that appear in every process of concrete action.

With reference to the causation of the end, man's real actions, as well as all other kinds of actions that occur in the world, are not necessary but are contingent. According to M. A. Krąpiec, such actions sometimes appear and sometimes are absent. Therefore if an action that did not previously exist begins to exist, there is a real reason for which the action came into existence. Hence the faculty of the will will be the essential factor in action in the structure of the human being. Man's voluntary actions are dependent on whether we want to act or not. If we want to act, then the action must be directed to "something," that is, to some object, since there is no objectless action. Desire is always the desire for "something" (an object). Then the good is the object of desire (the will); the good appears as the end of action, and so the good and the end are identical to each other.[2]

---

[1] See Mieczysław A. Krąpiec, *I-Man. An Outline of Philosophical Anthropology*, trans. M. Lescoe (and others) (New Britain, Conn.: Mariel Publications, 1983), 206–213.

[2] See Mieczysław A. Krąpiec, "The Nature of Human Freedom," in *Freedom in Contemporary Culture*, vol. 1, ed. Z. J. Zdybicka (and others) (Lublin: The University Press of the Catholic University of Lublin, 1998), 40. St. Thomas wrote in the *Summa theologiae*: "Manifestum est autem quod omnes actiones quae procedunt ab aliqua potentia, causantur ab ea

In all man's actions, the causation of the end plays the main role, since it is the ultimate reason for the coming-into-existence of the action. The reason why the action came into existence is the end as the motive (Lat. *finis cuius gratia*). The end or motive is the reason that throws the faculty of action out of passivity and neutrality.[3] According to M. A. Krąpiec, the function as such of final causation possesses two factors: the cognitive, and the appetitive factor. Hence in his *Metaphysics* Krąpiec writes of the "different intentional directions" due to which we can describe the differences that appear between knowledge and appetite. In knowledge, this direction is from known reality to the known object, that is, reality, as it were, enters into the cognitive apparatus. In turn, in appetite, the movement must be out from the object toward the desired thing. Thereby a real "unification" occurs with the thing as with good (or end) of action. Action is thus a necessary but not sufficient element for final action (or causation).[4]

The end is realized differently in the sphere of beings that do not possess intellectual knowledge (animals and plants). In the action of animals, the end as the motive of action is determined by the nature of those beings. Animals can recognize their own environment and they react to impulses that come from outside of them, but we cannot see in them the formation of the motive of action. In like manner, the motive of action is set by nature in vegetative life, but in a much greater degree. Here also determination (from the outside) appears, and we cannot speak of anything voluntary. However, in man's action, the end as the motive of action is fulfilled in one way in the moral in moral action, and in another way in "poietic" action. If we look at man's moral action, the foundations of moral action are acts of decision. In connection with this, acts of decision are inseparably inscribed in the structure of man's personal action. They have an inalienable character. Because of them, the process of self-determination and of the constitution of the subject as the source of action occur. Moreover, in moral acts we can observe conscious, free, real, and purposeful action that depends on the freedom of the subject. In turn, in man's "poietic" or productive action, we cannot speak entirely of the sub-

---

secundum rationem sui obiecti. Obiectum autem voluntatis est finis et bonum. Unde oportet quod omnes actiones humanae propter finem sint." S. Thomae de Aquino, *Summa Theologiae*, I–II, 1, 1, *resp.* (textum Leoninum Romae 1888 editum).
[3] See Krąpiec, "The Nature of Human Freedom," 41.
[4] See Mieczysław A. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics. An Outline of the Theory of Being*, trans. T. Sandok (New York: Mariel Publications, 1991), 439–440.

ject's freedom of action. This follows from the fact that a particular object, e.g., a work of art, that is produced by a maker imposes its own objective rules, as it were. Thus the process of "poietic" action does not have a completely voluntary character. According to M. A. Krąpiec, the creative process of action is expressed in the fact that in the choice of the motive we are dealing with a subject that is translated into the finality and freedom of the action. It is the subject who determines whether the concrete action is performed or not.[5]

Man is set apart from the world of nature by the fact that he knows the nature of the good, and as a rational and free being he tends to the good as to an end. In connection with this, by an analysis of the causation of the end, it must be said that the good "throws" man "out of passivity," his volitional (appetitive) acts are directed to the apprehended good, and in turn this good attracts the appetite to itself and becomes "first love." On this account Krąpiec described the motive as first love.[6] In the analysis of final causation, it should be said that ultimately the good (the end) as the motive is the first and most important factor in the objective explanation of human action.

The second factor that is part of the process of action is exemplar causation, which determines action and gives it a direction. It can be observed both in man and in other natural beings (animals and plants).[7] In the world of nature, the determination of action is connected with the very nature of being. In animals, determination appears at the level of sensory knowledge. Animals with the help of instincts react to impulses that come from outside of them. In turn, in man, as was mentioned above, the determination runs one course in moral action, and another course in "poietic" action. This is because in the domain of productivity action there is no complete freedom of action, because both the object and its rules must be

---

[5] See Krąpiec, "The Nature of Human Freedom," 35–36.

[6] See Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 441: "Our desire, as soon as a good is presented to it, is 'shaken' out of its passivity and 'moved,' so to speak, by the perceived good . . . And precisely the act of the faculty of desire (the will), insofar as it is, in the first phase, moved by the good perceived in cognition, insofar as it has been in a certain way internally directed toward the good and 'weighted' toward it, is that act of 'first love' . . . The first act of 'love' is the motive that is the reason of being activity . . ."

[7] The element or line of determination was already taken up in the analysis of the causation of the end when the formation of the motive of action was discussed.

taken under consideration. However, man's moral conduct is always unde-termined and depends completely on man's free will.[8]

In the context of the analysis of exemplar causation, it should be said that it occurs in the intellect that knows. M. A. Krąpiec presents the example of a tree which bears fruit; this best depicts the course of the realization of purposeful action. Each of the phases of the tree's bearing of fruit is ordered, and nothing here happens chaotically. The first phase of action is dependent on the next, and for this reason we can see a certain regularity here. The entire process of action is fulfilled when it occurs in the knowing intellect as that which plans the model for the action. The intellect orders action, which is always determined and directed. To summarize, this determination and directing of action is derived from the intellect's exemplar causation.[9]

The third factor is efficient causation, which indicates the factual character of action. Efficient causation occurs in one way in vegetative nature (plants), in another way in non-rational nature (animals), and in yet another way in rational nature (man). The coming-into-existence of action in the vegetative world can be simply presented on the basis of a plant's development. A plant begins to function, or to realize intense developmental processes, when there are favorable climactic conditions for this. In animals, however, the process of purposeful action depends on external stimuli that set the action in motion. In man, a movement of the will is a necessary element for the coming-into-existence of action; by the will man can perform or not perform certain actions in relation to what "he wants" or "does not want" to do.[10]

The analysis of the fact of human action presented above is based on the harmonic action of three major factors: the end, the exemplar, and the agent or efficient cause. Without them, human action would not come into existence and would be unintelligible. Among these three elements, the main role is played by the good, understood as the end that is the motive due to which action has come into existence rather than not. What "throws" man "out of passivity" is described as the end-motive. The motive by necessity always appears as the good.[11]

---

[8] See Mieczysław A. Krąpiec, *U podstaw rozumienia kultury* (*At the Foundations of the Understanding of Culture*) (Lublin: RW KUL, 1991), 61.

[9] See Mieczysław A. Krąpiec, *Ludzka wolność i jej granice* (*Human Freedom and its Limits*) (Lublin: PTTA, 2004), 242–243.

[10] See Krąpiec, *U podstaw rozumienia kultury*, 64.

[11] See Krąpiec, "The Nature of Human Freedom," 41.

The Good as a Universal Property of Being

The end-motive is identified with the good as the universal property of being that ultimately provides the rational justification for all action. An analysis of the good as a transcendental property of being first requires us to explain what is behind the term "good." The term "good" corresponds to the Latin word *bonum*, which corresponds to the Greek word *agathós*. The word has many meanings, e.g., well born, noble, nice, manful, valiant, as well as benefit. The good since ancient times has been connected with ethical, aesthetic, economic, and useful values. The most important meaning of the word for our reflections is the nominal form *to agathón*, which means "the good" (and also a whole).[12] We encounter the understanding of the good in various domains of philosophy. We can distinguish between the good in an ethical sense and in an aesthetic sense. Each of the above mentioned ways of understanding the good possesses a certain qualification. The moral qualification of a man's act (an evaluation of moral conduct) corresponds to the good in an ethical sense, while the act of giving to things a certain value corresponds to the good in an aesthetic sense, e.g., a good picture. However, the conception of the good in the metaphysical sense as a universal property of being performs the fundamental role.[13]

In the question of the analysis of the good as a transcendental property of being, we should show at the outset how this property is discerned. On the basis of the analysis of spontaneous knowledge we see that by spontaneous knowledge we affirm not only the existence of things, but we also experience a sort of contact with the thing that involves love. A thing that is known by man is desired or not desired by man in some way. Then in making this transcendental explicit, we should appeal to the method of metaphysical separation. One consequence of the method of separation is exhibition of the transcendental character of the good, and so, that all really existing beings are bearers of the good.[14]

A being is a bearer of the good, that is, a being is from the will of a maker or the Creator. The Absolute creates beings because the Absolute

---

[12] See *A Greek-English Lexicon*, compiled by H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, (Oxford: University Press, 1996), 6.

[13] See Andrzej Maryniarczyk, *Racjonalność i celowość świata, osób i rzeczy* (*Rationality and Finality of the World, Persons, and Things*) (Lublin: PTTA, 2007), 84.

[14] See id., 85–86.

"wants to," and therefore His freedom to create is not limited by anything.[15] As M. A. Krąpiec remarks,

> If, therefore, beings are derived, they are the work of the Absolute's free will—its love, since love is the name we give to the will's inclination toward good. Consequently, just as the intelligibility of being testifies to its ordination to the Intellect of the Absolute, so, too, the real existence of being, i.e., the derivation of being from the Absolute, testifies to the connection of being with the will of the Absolute.[16]

One consequence of this connection of being with the will of the Absolute is precisely the transcendental good, and so, the universal good. In understanding the transcendental character of the good, the moment of the contingency of being is worth emphasizing. M. A. Krąpiec mentions this in his *Metaphysics*. This contingency is expressed in the fact that man feels that his existence can be lost. Analogically, contingency can be considered in all the beings that in any way surround man. With the help of two metaphysical principles, namely the principle of non-contradiction and the principle of the reason of being, we can assert that the contingent existence of a being is not identical with the essence, since the essence is always necessary. Therefore that existence is from the Absolute, or more precisely, from His will, or wanting. Krąpiec calls the act of wanting, thus understood, the love of the Absolute.[17]

One more factor concerning the transcendental character of being, which Krąpiec mentions, is worth a thorough analysis. That is the psychological factor. In this aspect, man's acts perform the main role. By various actions, man extends his existence in the world. As mentioned earlier, man as a contingent being perceives the fragility of his existence, and on this account he tries to give reality to this existence. Over time, however, he feels the limited character of his existence. The fact that he experiences limitation causes him to desire various goods, which are for him ends of his action. As a result, man sees himself, his existence, as an object of appetite, that is, as a good, and all other domains of beings that are at the

---

[15] See Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 153.
[16] Id.
[17] See id., 153–154.

same time goods become for him an object of appetite on account of man himself.[18]

It should be asserted that the good appears as the object of every action. This kind of apprehension of the good commands us to interpret the good as the universally attractive good, and so as the transcendental good. The good remains inseparably connected with the fact as such of action.[19] The transcendental understanding of the good becomes the basis for distinguishing between various domains of goods with regard to their relation to an end. The connection of being with the good consequently leads to the conclusion that the world that surrounds us is a world of goods, that is, beings subordinated to the will of a maker or of the Creator.

The Distinction Between Domains of Goods

From the apprehensions of the good as a transcendental property it follows that everything that exists is good. We live in a world in which various goods surround us. Each of our actions is also directed by a good. Therefore it should be noted that the good as the motive of action is shown through specific functions. In the forefront is the good understood in the context of an end. The good as an end elicits all action, both in beings that possess rational knowledge, and in those that do not possess such knowledge.

M. A. Krąpiec indicates that an end can be understood in the following ways: (1) as the term of action, or *finis qui*, (2) as an activity through which one reaches the good—*finis quo*, (3) as the subject to which the desired good is ordered by the factor that has appetite, or *finis cui*, (4) as the motive due to which action begins—*finis cuius gratia*.[20] The distinction between the end as the term of action and the end as the motive of action is of crucial importance for the interpretation of action. The end that is the term is identified only with the conclusion of action, and in connection with this it does not constitute the ultimate reason for the rise and existence of action. Unlike the end-term, the fundamental factor on account of which

---

[18] See id., 155: "Hence, the most diverse spheres of being—the cognized God, humans and other subsistent animate beings, subsistent inanimate beings, intentional and even purely possible beings—everything becomes an object of my desire. If, therefore, an object of desire is called a good, then whatever is a being is also a good. Everything manifests itself as loved and desired by someone, and even if it is not actually loved, it has in itself the power to be loved by the person cognizing it. In a word, beings are good."

[19] See id., 161.

[20] See id., 438–439.

action has come into existence rather than not is called the motive. Hence, the end as motive is the rational explanation of all action. Krąpiec notes that from a human perspective this motive designates the acquisition of an "inclination" toward a good apprehended as the object of our actions. This good is a prelude to the will's act of appetition, also called "first love," which is expressed in the aiming at a known good. In this aspect, first love becomes the motor of action in relation to a recognized good.[21]

In connection with this, man as a rational being is in a position to recognize what good are more or less suited (or beneficial) for him. Each good has the power to attract one toward itself. Thus everything that attracts us is a good. In connection with this we can distinguish between various kinds of goods. In the scope of the metaphysical understanding of the good, three areas of the good are discerned, namely the useful good (*bonum utile*), then the pleasant good (*bonum delectabile*), and the real good, which is called the honest or authentic good in the philosophical tradition (*bonum honestum*).[22] The above division of goods was made with respect to the motive of appetite (the end).[23]

The object of appetite, which is a good for its own sake, is the motive for the appetite for the honest good. The person is such a good. Man desires another person not on account of something else, but for the sake of that person himself. The good of the person is the end-motive for the acting subject, and is not a means.[24] There are also goods that are performed by man for the sake of performance (e.g., the act itself of eating apples causes pleasure). We are dealing with pleasure when the good is realized for the sake of the activity itself. To consider this in a different way, the action as such, and not the subject is the end. This description applies to the pleasant good. The useful good is another kind of good. It is desired as a means to acquire another good, that is, it is subordinated to another end (e.g., eating is desired in order to satisfy hunger).[25]

---

[21] See id., 441.

[22] We encounter the above division of goods in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* and in Thomas Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*. St. Thomas also borrowed that division from St. Ambrose's work *De officiis* (see Étienne Gilson, *Elements of Christian Philosophy* (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, 1960), 140).

[23] See Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 191.

[24] See Edmund Morawiec, Paweł Mazanka, *Metafizyka klasyczna wersji egzystencjalnej. Podstawowe zagadnienia z metafizyki* (*Classical Metaphysics of the Existential Version. Fundamental Questions from Metaphysics*) (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo UKSW, 2006), 205.

[25] See Krąpiec, *U podstaw rozumienia kultury*, 76.

In the three types of goods listed (the honest, pleasant, and useful), the accent was put on the object and on the mode of appetition. M. A. Krąpiec in his *Metaphysics* also indicates another division where the subject who desires and the mode of the subject's action plays the main role. We can indicate various kinds of appetites and goods also in this respect. In this way, "natural desire," or the natural good, is discerned. Each existing being possesses a necessary natural inclination due to which it longs to preserve (or also to pass on) its existence. Love is the next desire or appetite. Hence M. A. Krąpiec distinguishes between sensory desire, otherwise called sensory love, which is a consequence of sensory cognitive forms, and intellectual desire (the will), which is spiritual love, the result of which are intellectual cognitive forms.[26]

With regard to intellectual appetite, we should indicate one more important problem, namely moral appetite or desire (the moral good). The moral good appears when an elicited act (a conscious and voluntary act) is in agreement with the conscience (or in disagreement) as with the rule of morality. Besides the natural and moral good, the ontic good (the good of being) plays an important role in metaphysics, and it is a property of the object. The ontic good by its essence is the transcendental relation where being is ordered to the will of a maker or of the Creator.[27] The Creator through His love created man and the entire world that surrounds him. As Krąpiec remarks, "For if a being exists because the Absolute desires, wills, that it exist, and if the measure of its being is the Absolute's love, then in the being itself there appears a necessary connection with this love."[28]

All the domains of goods discussed above motivate man's actions. The good that affirms man's value and is worthy only of man we call the honest or authentic good, because, as M. A. Krąpiec remarks, it preserves the rational order of things.[29] In any case, this does not mean that the other goods, that is, pleasant and useful goods, are in some sense evil, but on the contrary, they are good under the condition that they do not squander the fundamental end of the honest good, which is the human person. According to Krąpiec, the honest good, which is the good of the human person, is the main motive of action.[30]

---

[26] See Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 165–166.
[27] See id., 166.
[28] Id.
[29] See Krąpiec, *U podstaw rozumienia kultury*, 76.
[30] See id., 76–77.

In the context of the discernment of the domains of goods, the above mentioned ontic good, or the transcendental property of being, performs the most important role in metaphysics. On this account also we can indicate three main aspects of the good. The first aspect concerns the good apprehended as a perfection of being (the harmony of a being with the will of the Creator). This perfection of being is dependent on what sort of good man makes an end of action for himself. The next aspect is the good apprehended in the formal dimension, that is, the necessary and transcendental ordering of being to the will of the Creator. According to M. A. Krąpiec, "This ordination is necessary and transcendental and permeates the whole of being, such that it cannot really be 'detached' from being without annihilating being itself."[31] The third and final aspect concerns the good as the end of appetite by man and other beings.[32] As emphasized already in an earlier part of the article, man on account of his limited character desires various goods, which are for him ends of appetition. He also perceives his existence as an object of appetition, that is, as a good. In an analogical way, all other kinds of beings that are for man goods and ends become objects of appetition.

Conclusions

By the reception of the known world as a world of goods, a fuller reading is made of reality and of action, which implies the acceptance of specific attitudes in the cognitive sphere. The good of being is the exemplar, cause, end of existence, action, and perfection of being. This is connected with specific implications. The good that in each instance becomes the end of human action influences the perfection of man's personal life. Hence the good is the end of action in each instance; the proof of this is the fact of the causative action of the end. Although the end and the good, on account of different functions of causation, are apprehended in different ways, they remain identical to each other. The fact of the causation of the end is expressed by the act of "first love" with respect to the known good, being directed to the known good, and the desire to be united with it. The act of "first love" is the foundation of each action. The good makes the dynamic order of reality and at the same time constitutes part of the fabric of all human acts, and moreover it is the motive of all action. This recep-

---

[31] Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 167.
[32] See id., 166–167.

tion of the good as presented by M. A. Krąpiec makes it possible to apprehend more fully the existence and action of beings, accenting the question of the good as the reason for the purposefulness of the world and the motive of all human action. The negation of this fact takes on a dehumanizing dimension, leads to the instrumentalization of man, and takes away subjectivity from man. In connection with this, reflection on the problematic of the good constitutes in philosophy a question that is constantly relevant and fundamental. Therefore we should also ask about the good, about the nature of the good, and about its necessary connection with reality.

THE GOOD AS THE MOTIVE OF HUMAN ACTION
ACCORDING TO MIECZYSŁAW ALBERT KRĄPIEC

SUMMARY

In this article the authoress has presented the understanding of the good as the motive for human action on the basis of the position of M. A. Krąpiec. At the beginning, the authoress has concentrated on an analysis of the fact of action, which includes three major factors: the end, the exemplar, and the efficient cause. The good-end here performs the most essential function. The good-end is the motive due to which action has come into existence rather than not. That "which throws" man "out of passivity" to action is described as the motive that appears as the good. In the next part of the article, the good is presented as a fundamental transcendental property of being. The connection of being with the good shows that the world that surrounds us is a world of goods, that is, of beings ordered to the will of a maker or of the Creator. The transcendental good thus understood constitutes the foundation for all action. In the final part of the article, an analysis is made of the functions that are shown by the good that constitutes the motive for action. The first of these functions is the cognitive apprehension of the good understood in the context of the end—the motive of action. At the end, the domains of goods are listed, in which the ontic good, which is a transcendental property of being, plays the most important role.

KEYWORDS: metaphysics, good, action, motive, Mieczysław A. Krąpiec.

V. Bradley Lewis
The Catholic University of America
Washington D.C., USA

DEMOCRACY AND CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING: CONTINUITY, DEVELOPMENT, AND CHALLENGE

My topic is the relationship between two phenomena that have been of long-standing interest to Jude Dougherty as scholar and public intellectual.[1] They came together rather dramatically during the main years of his career, the time he served as dean of the School of Philosophy at the Catholic University of America. The University's birth certificate, as it were, was the 1889 encyclical *Magni nobis*, promulgated by Leo XIII ten years after *Aeterni patris*, which initiated the Thomistic revival, and two years before *Rerum novarum* began the modern tradition of Catholic Social Teaching. The founding of the university and, in 1895 its School of Philosophy, was of a piece with Leo's initiation of a confident address to the modern world in the wake of the political and social turbulence unleashed by the French Revolution. Leo's project was one of vigorous intellectual engagement in which philosophy had an important role to play. No subsequent pontiff embodied this more than St. John Paul II, who had visited Catholic University at Dean Dougherty's invitation as the cardinal-archbishop of Krakow and then again as pope, a pope identified not only with the principles of the Gospel, but as a champion of both reason and political freedom. His papacy represented the culmination of a process by which the Church's social teaching assessed with increasing nuance the character of democratic politics, moving from a diffidence rooted in the

---

[1] See especially the essays collected in *Western Creed, Western Identity: Essays in Legal and Social Philosophy* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2000); and "The Fragility of Democracy," in *Die fragile Demokratie—The Fragility of Democracy*, ed. Anton Rauscher (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2007), 13–27.

disorder of the post-revolutionary age, through a confrontation with totalitarian ideologies that rejected both the transcendence of God's authority and popular government, and finally to not merely acceptance of democracy, but a kind of preference for it as the form of government that—rightly understood and established—fits best with integral human development as conceived by the tradition of Catholic social doctrine.

In the first part of my paper, I discuss the origins and meaning of democracy relative to the development of Christian political thought through the modern period; it is important here that democracy means something different in the ancient world than it does in the modern. In the second part I discuss the view of democracy proposed in the formative period of modern Catholic Social doctrine, especially from the pontificate of Leo XIII to the Second Vatican Council. The third part treats what seems to me the apogee of Catholic thinking about democracy, that is, in the political thought of St. John Paul II. In the fourth part I want to talk about some remaining tensions and problems related to democracy that are articulated partly also in John Paul II's thought, but in a sharper way in the thought of Pope Emeritus Benedict and one quite prominent challenge to the Catholic view of democracy in the phenomenon of pluralism. One can see in this history that the Church has gradually come to appreciate democracy not simply as an acceptable form of government, one that is not intrinsically at odds with Christianity, but in a positive sense, as an opportunity for human beings to achieve a level of moral development not available in other regimes. But there remain challenges associated with democracy to government and social life consistent with the natural moral law and to Christian faith.

I

Democracy means first and foremost a form of government. The Gospel, however, says nothing about forms of government. It says very little at all about politics. Jesus enjoins us to render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's (Mk, 12:17), a crucial text to be sure, since it establishes the distinction between the spiritual and temporal orders. Similarly important, although somewhat more in need of interpretation, is St. Paul's statement, "Let every soul be subject to higher powers: for there is no power but from God, and those that are ordained of God" (Rm, 13:1). But neither of these statements tells us anything about what form this power might or should take. Christian political

thought was worked out by theologians largely through the adaptation of pagan political philosophy to the Gospel in the particular conditions they faced.

Democracy was an invention of the classical Greeks; it means literally "rule of the people."[2] We need to note two things about this original, classical understanding of democracy. It was, at once, both more democratic and less democratic than we think of a democracy today.[3] It was more democratic in the sense that it was direct government by the people. The main legislative body for the city was the Assembly, which was made up of all the citizens and which directly voted on the most important matters.[4] In Athens during the fourth century before Christ the assembly met in the open air about 40 times a year, every week and a half or so, and its meetings began with a herald asking, "Who wishes to speak?"[5] Any citizen could then address the meeting and votes were taken by show of hands. The city also needed officials to carry out the Assembly's orders and administer aspects of city life. These officials were not elected, however, because election is not really democratic. That may seem odd to us, but an Athenian of the fourth century before Christ would ask: for whom does one vote in an election? Usually one votes for the person she takes to be the "best" candidate. This is really aristocratic, however, since aristocracy is rule by the best. The presupposition of democracy is equality and if one really believes in equality, the equality of citizens with respect to political things, then one must fill offices in a way that recognizes this equality. You must fill them by lot and this is what the Greeks did. Basically they drew names out of a hat (they used potsherds).[6] We still do this with one political office, that of juror, and for the same reason: the task of a jury is to determine the facts as related to the defendant's guilt or innocence and we hold that with respect to determining the facts in a trial any adult citizen is as well qualified as any other, and so the judgment of any randomly selected twelve (or whatever the number) jurors carries the day. This is democracy in its pure form.

But Greek democracy was also less democratic than modern democracy in an important respect: all the citizens participated directly in politi-

---

[2] See Thucydides, 2.37.1, 6.39.
[3] The best modern account of Athenian democracy is Mogens Herman Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991).
[4] Aristotle, *Politics*, 1275a22–34, 1317b28–29.
[5] Demosthenes, 18.170.
[6] Aristotle, *Politics*, 1298b13–26.

cal decisions, but only about ten per cent of the people who lived in a city counted as citizens. Women were excluded as were the quarter or so of the city's population made up of slaves. Still, the number of citizens who were entitled to vote in fourth-century Athens was probably about 30,000 and there was a quorum in the Assembly of 6,000.[7] Now if we wanted to do this today, it would be quite difficult, and the difficulty is part of the reason representative democracy developed in the early modern period, but there were other reasons why some thinkers, even in the ancient world, did not think highly of democracy, and this leads to the second thing we need to note about classical Greek democracy.

Aristotle classified the different forms of government or "regimes" (*politeia*) in the third book of his *Politics*. He made his classification along two axes: the number of rulers—one, a few, or many; and their end in ruling—the common good (true regimes) or the good of the rulers themselves (perverted regimes). This yields three true regimes: monarchy, aristocracy, and a generic regime, that is, one with no name of its own; and three perverted regimes: tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy.[8] Now two quite striking things emerge from this classification immediately. First, and, to us, the shocking view that democracy is among the perverted regimes; and second, that its good equivalent has no proper name of its own because it does not have the kind of distinctive character of the others, but is a fusion of two of the perverted regimes, democracy and oligarchy.[9] Democracy is a perverted regime because it is the rule of the many for their own goods and Aristotle thinks this regime often undermines its own existence, since the many, who are the poor, expropriate the goods of the few wealthy, which creates disloyalty among the latter group, but also destroys the economy.[10] The correlate good regime, the generic regime, is a fusion of democracy and oligarchy and thus of rule by the poor and the rich, since those two groups always exist and always have different interests. It is also crucially influenced by the presence of a middle class and adheres to the rule of law. The best chance for a stable and decent government is to achieve a compromise between the few rich and the many poor under these conditions.

---

[7] See Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*, 90–94.
[8] Aristotle, *Politics*, 1279a22–b11.
[9] Id., 1293b33–34; 1294a15–17, 22–23; 1307a7–9.
[10] Id., 1281a11–24, 1318a21–26.

These aspects of classical democracy led many thinkers to harshly criticize, if not reject it (Plato, Xenophon, Aristotle). But this rejection of democracy continued even into the modern period, even in the United States. Most of the American founders were not advocates of democracy precisely because what they knew of it they knew from ancient history. They carefully distinguished democracy, direct rule by the people, from republic, rule by representatives of the people. They saw democracy as impractical for reasons of size, but also because they thought democratic regimes were dangerously unstable. James Madison famously wrote in the tenth *Federalist*:

> A pure democracy can admit no cure for the mischiefs of faction. A common passion or interest will be felt by a majority, and there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party. Hence it is, that democracies have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have, in general, been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.[11]

Madison also thought the country would be better served by representatives who were themselves distinguished by prudence and superior judgment, thus rejecting the strict conception of political equality held by ancient democrats.[12] So it is that we have come to a very different conception of democracy, one in which the few rule putatively in the interest of the many, who, every few years, have the opportunity to turn them out of office.[13]

The form of government or regime was the central concern of classical Greek political thought. It was not so important to Christian political thinkers. This was due first and foremost to the fact that the moral horizon of human affairs now definitely transcended the boundaries of the city. The stakes of politics could no longer be as high as they were for the pagans. During the first few centuries of the Church's history one can distinguish three main attitudes towards politics. One was a kind of harsh rejection of it. This was partly because some Christians expected the immanent return

---

[11] Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison, *The Federalist*, ed. Jacob E. Cooke (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1961), 61, n. 10.

[12] Id., 62.

[13] For a characteristic contemporary defense of (a version of) this notion of democracy see Thomas Christiano, *The Rule of the Many: Fundamental Issues in Democratic Theory* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1996).

of Christ and so considered most earthly things unimportant distractions. Second, there was what one might call Christian imperialism, the notion that the political problem would be solved if only one could convert the Roman emperor to the faith; there would be a precise symmetry between the Christian Church and a Christian Empire. The greatest spokesman for this view was Eusebius of Caesarea, especially in his writings about Constantine.[14] While it became particularly influential in the eastern churches, this view largely died out in the West and was explicitly rejected by the greatest early Christian thinker, St. Augustine of Hippo. Augustine himself held to a kind of minimalist political theory that accepted the legitimacy of even pagan governments that maintained a social order useful to Christians as well and to the extent that the freedom of the Church to carry out its evangelical task was allowed.[15] He was in some of his political views influenced by Cicero and some of the Stoics and his view constituted a foundation built upon by later theologians into what could be called Christian classicism, the greatest representative of which was St. Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274).

Aquinas nodded to the idea of regimes occasionally and held in the most important passage discussing the idea that a mixed regime with elements of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy blended (as he claims it was in the government of Biblical Israel).[16] But he was always more concerned with the issue of the legitimacy of political power itself and the moral parameters of its use. This concern was also evident in the later medieval and renaissance thinkers who were followers of Aquinas. The medieval Catholic thinkers distinguished three different ways in which authority made its way from God to political life.[17] One was the theory of divine right, but in another way this was not at all a medieval Catholic view of politics because the only leader who they generally held to have been chosen this way was the very first pope, appointed by Christ Himself. The two real options were what came to be called "designation" theory and "transmission" theory. Designation theory held that political power came directly from God, but that the community could, by some mechanism, designate who would hold it. While some thinkers held that the designation theory

---

[14] See V. B. Lewis, "Eusebius of Caesarea's Un-Platonic Political Theology," forthcoming in *Polis*.

[15] See, e.g., *On the City of God*, 1.8, 4.33, 5.17, 15.22, 20.2.

[16] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I–II, 105, 1c.

[17] See Heinrich Rommen, *The State in Catholic Thought* (St. Louis, MO: Herder, 1950), ch. 19.

described the origin of political power, the theory better explains the papacy after Peter and so it is perhaps unsurprising that the most important later Thomists (e.g., Cajetan, Suarez, Bellarmine) tended to support the transmission theory, which held that power passed from God to the community and thence to political officials according to the community's determination, which implied a kind of natural democracy, since the community could transfer political authority wholly, partially, or—at least in theory—not at all. It would be going too far to call this a positive theory of democracy, but it was no simple rejection of democracy and could be used to formulate a specifically Thomistic account of democracy, as it eventually was.[18]

But this was a later development. During much of the eighteenth and nineteenth century the Church seemed strongly opposed to democracy. The context of all this is very important. A great deal of the Church's view of democracy was related to the events during and immediately following the French Revolution that broke out in 1789. The revolutionary regime there clashed with the Church very early on and, while some historians of the Revolution, like Alexis de Tocqueville, argued that the Church was not itself the original object of revolutionary anger, it did become the target of harsh persecution, perhaps largely because of its close association with pre-revolutionary royal absolutism. In 1790 the revolutionaries promulgated the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, which made all priests employees of the state and required them to swear an oath of loyalty to the new regime. In September of 1792 hundreds of Catholic priests were massacred in Paris; the next year, following the execution of the king, the Reign of Terror was unleashed, again, partly against the Church. In 1798 Pope Pius VI was arrested by Napoleon's troops and was forced into exile. His successor, Pius VII, returned to Rome and negotiated a treaty with Napoleon in 1801, only to be arrested himself in 1809. After the Revolutions of 1848 Pius IX had to flee for a time, and this led to his increasingly negative attitude towards all things modern culminating in his 1864 "Syllabus of Errors." In 1870 Germany was unified by Bismark, who then launched his Kulturkampf against the Church. That same year the unification of Italy, animated by a harshly anti-clerical nationalism, led to the abolition of the Papal States.

---

[18] See especially Yves R. Simon, *Philosophy of Democratic Government* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 158–178.

It was in this hostile environment that many Catholic thinkers rejected democracy. The counter-revolutionary thinkers of the nineteenth century like Joseph De Maistre, Juan Donoso Cortés, and Louis de Bonald all defended a throne and altar political theory. They shared something else that is important in seeing why the Church's view seemed to change in the twentieth century. They made their arguments from the perspective of a kind of sacred history and not on the basis of philosophy. Unlike Cajetan, Suarez, or Bellarmine, they were not Thomists.[19] This changed with the pontificate of Leo XIII, who initiated both the modern tradition of Catholic social teaching and the revival of Thomistic philosophy in the Church. It is not often enough noted that these two initiatives were intimately related with one another.

II

Leo XIII was the first pope not to enter on his papacy as a temporal ruler in over a thousand years. The abolition of the Papal States in 1870 presented challenges that led him to invent the modern papacy. He made himself a kind of global public intellectual and his long pontificate was devoted mainly to teaching through the vehicle of over eighty encyclicals.[20] In his second, *Aeterni Patris* (*On Christian Philosophy*, 1879), he called for a revival of Thomistic philosophy as a basis for Catholic education, but also for vigorous engagement with the non-Catholic world. Leo saw the travails of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as rooted in bad philosophy and he thought the only adequate answer could be grounded in good philosophy. He had absorbed Thomism in the early days of the Thomist revival that began in Italy[21] when he was a seminary student and made it the centerpiece of his efforts at educational reform in Perugia, where he served as archbishop. He continued his efforts as pope on a far vaster scale.

Leo's papal writings manifested his intense concern with political and social issues. About Leo's efforts here two things deserve particular

---

[19] Bossuet's *Politique tirée des propres paroles de l'Ecriture Sainte* (published posthumously in 1709), a chief target of enlightenment critics and inspiration for later counter-revolutionaries, never cites Aquinas.

[20] See Russell Hittinger, "Pope Leo XIII," in *The Teachings of Modern Roman Catholicism on Law, Politics, and Human Nature*, ed. John Witte, Jr. and Frank S. Alexander (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 39–48.

[21] See Gerald A. McCool, S.J., *Nineteenth-Century Scholasticism: The Search for a Unitary Method* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1989), 17–58.

notice: first, his teaching on politics is thoroughly grounded in the thought of Aristotle and Aquinas, so it is an explicit attempt to apply classical political ideas to the modern environment. Second, however, Leo never completely abandoned some of the Church's characteristically less transferable ideas about political authority, especially the more immediate sense in which it was thought to participate in divine authority à la *Romans* 13. So, for example, in a single paragraph (no. 3) of his 1885 encyclical letter, *Immortale Dei* (*On the Christian Constitution of States*), Leo both emphasized the Aristotelian thesis that man is by nature a social and political animal and held that the only true foundation of political authority was rooted directly in the authority of God, citing in support *Romans* 13:1.[22] Similarly he devoted part of the encyclical to reaffirming the necessity of states to recognize true religion.[23]

With respect to democracy, the most important element of Leo's teaching was his many statements that the Church neither endorsed nor condemned any particular form of government, which left open the possibility—a possibility that many Catholic thinkers had treated as unthinkable earlier—that democracy was a legitimate option.[24] This idea was strengthened in Leo's 1892 encyclical on Church and State in France (*Au Milieu des Sollicitudes*), in which he repeated the freedom of states to adopt any form of government provided that it was directed to the common good and then explicitly approved Catholic participation in the politics of France's republican regime.[25] In a 1901 encyclical on the Christian Democracy movement, *Graves de Communi Re*, however, Leo combined his neutrality between forms of government with a judgment that Christians should not aim to change the existing form. He distinguished genuine Christian democracy, which emphasized work to benefit the lower classes of society from socialism and any doctrine endorsing class struggle and revolution.[26] There were, then, limits to Leo's embrace of modernity.

---

[22] *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 18 (1885): 163.

[23] Id., nos. 6 and 14, pp. 163, 166–67,. See also *Libertas* (On the Nature of Human Liberty, 20 June 1888), no. 21, *A.S.S.* 20 (1887): 604–605.

[24] See *Diuturnum* (On the Origins of Civil Power, 29 June 1881), no. 7, *A.S.S.* 14 (1881): 5; *Immortale Dei*, nos. 4, 36, 48, pp. 162, 174, 179; *Libertas*, nos. 12, 44, pp. 600, 613; and *Sapientiae Christianae* (On Christians as Citizens, 10 January 1890), no. 28, *A.S.S.* 22 (1889–1890): 396.

[25] *Au milieu des sollicitudes* (On the Church and State in France, 16 February 1892), no. 14, *A.S.S.* 24 (1891–1892): 523.

[26] See *Graves in Communi Re* (On Christian Democracy, 18 January 1901), nos. 5, 7, 9, *A.S.S.* 33 (1900–1901): 387.

Those limits can be seen in sometimes rather negative statements about democracy. However, read in context, the criticisms are consistent with his tacit approval of democracy. In 1878 Leo condemned the view that public authority derives from the will of the people.[27] The view was expressed again in later encyclicals.[28] What Leo objected to was the notion that majority opinion is the basis and legitimating principle of political authority. He held to the Romans 13 view that authority had its source in God, acknowledging that popular participation in government was not itself wrong and that the people could designate the person or persons to exercise the authority that came ultimately from God.[29] This was not a ringing endorsement of democracy, but neither was it a condemnation of democracy as such. Leo seems to have taken a cautious and narrow view of democracy as a procedure for choosing public officials that allowed for the participation of citizens and that could be taken as consistent with the view that political authority itself was a participation in divine authority, the legitimacy of which was certified by adherence to the natural law itself. His apparent condemnation of democracy, then, was in fact nothing more than a condemnation of moral relativism, or the false view that morality was reducible to majority opinion, and it could just as well apply to monarchy if the monarch overstepped his authority by violating the natural moral law.

Pius XI repeated Leo's principle that the Church had no favored political regime.[30] He also repeated the thesis that authority came from God and condemned again the view that its source was the will of the majority.[31] In this respect, however, Pius XI's most important legacy may be his establishment of the Feast of Christ the King in his 1925 encyclical letter, *Quas primas*. The feast recognized Christ's real and not merely metaphorical status of king, a power that extends to all matters and all people and obligates both individuals and communities to render true worship.[32] The

---

[27] *Quod apostolici muneris* (On Socialism, 28 December 1878), no. 2, *A.S.S.* 11 (1878): 373.
[28] *Diuturnum*, nos. 6, 11, pp. 4–5, 11; *Immortale Dei*, nos 24, 31, 35, pp. 170, 171–72, 174; *Libertas*, nos. 15–16, p. 601.
[29] See especially *Diuturnum*, no. 6, pp. 4–5.
[30] *Ubi arcano Dei consilio* (On the Peace of Christ in the Kingdom of Christ, 23 December 1922), no. 12, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 14 (1922): 678; *Quadragesimo anno* (On Reconstructing the Social Order, 15 May 1931), no. 28, *A.A.S.* 23 (1931): 683.
[31] *Ubi arcano Dei consilio*, no. 29, p. 683.
[32] *Quas primas* (On the Feast of Christ the King, 11 December 1925), nos. 17–18, *A.A.S.* 17 (1925): 600–601.

kingship of Christ, however, does not entail monarchy as an earthly regime: Pius held that Christ's kingship was the source of political authority for princes *and* magistrates "duly selected" (*legitime delectis*),[33] thus tacitly accepting the possibility of democratic government by leaving open the means of selection. Again, the thrust of his statement is that authority itself has its basis in God's authority and the natural law and must be exercised within those limits.

The tacit acceptance of democracy was increasingly acknowledged between the two world wars as the Church reacted to the rise of increasingly virulent political ideologies. The culmination of this movement was Pius XII's 1944 Christmas Message, which, while not explicitly endorsing democracy, laid down criteria by which one could distinguish true democracy from false and destructive versions, thus implying that "true" democracy was an acceptable possibility.[34] In particular he distinguished in a strikingly Tocquevillian manner between the people as a body of citizens and simply a mass: the former is characterized by a variegated structure including secondary associations and a consciousness of rights and duties; the latter is an undifferentiated multitude open to manipulation by demagogues.[35] He also held that a "healthy democracy" (*sana democrazia*) must be based on the principles of the natural law and of true religion.[36] During and after the Second World War Catholic political philosophers like Jacques Maritain and Yves Simon were publishing books that offered explicitly Thomist interpretations and defenses of democracy as the form of government that, when properly constituted, best ensured the protection of human dignity and the promotion of the common good.[37] This movement was more publicly embraced by St. John XXIII, who affirmed the source

---

[33] Id., no. 19, p. 602.

[34] A.A.S. 37 (28 January 1945): 12. While Pius is often quoted as describing democracy in this speech as a "postulate of nature imposed by reason itself," he actually qualified the formulation as an expression of what "appears to many" (*apparisce a molti*, id., 13). It is altogether possible that he did himself think this, but he held back from pronouncing it in his own name, probably because of the often repeated neutrality of the Church with respect to forms of government in themselves, which he himself repeated in the same speech (id., 12).

[35] Id., 13–14.

[36] Id., 17.

[37] See especially Jacques Maritain, *Christianity and Democracy*, trans. Doris C. Anson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1944), and *Man and the State* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951); Simon, *Philosophy of Democratic Government*; and discussion in John P. Hittinger, *Liberty, Wisdom, and Grace: Thomism and Democratic Political Theory* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2002), especially 35–60.

of authority in God in his 1963 encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*, but then hastened to add that this teaching in no way precluded democracy;[38] indeed, he also held that participation in public affairs, to the degree that the country's level of development allowed, was a human right.[39] This point about participation was subsequently endorsed by the Second Vatican Council[40] and Pope Paul VI.[41]

The principle of participation, endorsed also by John Paul II,[42] marks a real development, but one consistent with important principles articulated during the "pre-democratic" era, that is, it in no way contradicts the idea that authority ultimately comes from God, whether we take this as some direct or indirect form of transmission or as an implication of the eternal and thus the natural law. What seemed a great hostility to democracy, then, was rooted in the Church's reaction to the violence and social disorder that followed the French Revolution and the century of political upheaval that succeeded. During that time a slow reconsideration proceeded of how permanent principles of morality could be applied to political life as it continued to develop in the twentieth century. The culmination of this process was the pontificate of St. John Paul II.

III

John Paul II's unique personal history and philosophical formation led him to focus on democracy in a way no previous pope had done.[43] In his most important social encyclical, *Centesimus Annus* (1991), he reaffirmed the teaching that the Church privileged no one regime,[44] but then came very close to an endorsement of democracy. He made it clear that the most important test of any political regime was its ability to protect human

---

[38] *Pacem in terris* (On Establishing Universal Peace in Truth, Justice, Charity, and Liberty, 20 April 1963), no. 52, *A.A.S.* 55 (1963): 271.

[39] Id., nos. 26, 73–74, pp. 263, 278–279.

[40] See *Gaudium et spes* (Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, 7 December 1965), Arts. 31, 75, and cf. 68.

[41] *Octogesima adveniens* (Apostolic Letter, 14 May 1971), nos. 24, 47, *A.A.S.* 63 (1971): 418, 435–437.

[42] *Solicitudo rei socialis* (For the Twentieth Anniversary of *Populorum Progressio*, 30 December 1987), no. 44, *A.A.S.* 80 (1988): 576–577.

[43] See George Weigel, *The End and the Beginning: Pope John Paul II—The Victory of Freedom, the Last Years, the Legacy* (New York: Doubleday, 2010), chs. 1–4.

[44] *Centesimus annus* (On the Hundredth Anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*, 1 May 1991), no. 47, *A.A.S.* 83 (1991): 852.

dignity,[45] but also that human dignity was rooted in man's living in both freedom and truth, which for him are always connected.[46] Democracy, therefore, is understood along three dimensions: first, the participation of citizens in political decision-making; second, elections and the consequent accountability to the voters of political officials; and third, the notion that democracy is more likely to pursue the common good as distinct from the good of the rulers only.[47]

What John Paul called "authentic democracy" (the phrase evoked and the encyclical frequently cited Pius XII's 1944 Christmas message) rested on a number of conditions:

> Authentic democracy is possible only in a State ruled by law, and on the basis of a correct conception of the human person. It requires that the necessary conditions be present for the advancement both of the individual through education and formation in true ideals, and of the "subjectivity" of society through the creation of structures of participation and shared responsibility. Nowadays there is a tendency to claim that agnosticism and skeptical relativism are the philosophy and the basic attitude which correspond to democratic forms of political life. Those who are convinced that they know the truth and firmly adhere to it are considered unreliable from a democratic point of view, since they do not accept that truth is determined by the majority, or that it is subject to variation according to different political trends. It must be observed in this regard that if there is no ultimate truth to guide and direct political activity, then ideas and convictions can easily be manipulated for reasons of power. As history demonstrates, a democracy without values easily turns into open or thinly disguised totalitarianism.[48]

By the subjectivity of society, John Paul meant a free civil society that afforded a widespread opportunity for participation in the goods only available to persons through cooperation. In a crucial sense, this referred to the same reality technically called subsidiarity, the necessary pluralism of social life that allows for the fulfillment of potentialities latent in human nature. Relativism is rejected precisely as a false view of morality that also

---

[45] Id., nos 3, 11, pp. 795–796, 807.
[46] Id., no. 4 and cf. 11, 27, 46, 61, pp. 797, 807, 826, 851, 866.
[47] Id., no. 46, p. 850.
[48] Id.

undermines democracy, since it evacuates democracy's moral basis. Truth is ultimately independent of any social or political institutions or popular decisions, a point reinforced later. The moral basis of democracy included the protection of human rights (the presence of the rule of law is crucial here), which include the right to life, the rights of the family, the freedom of education and thought, the freedom to work, and most importantly of all, religious freedom, itself rooted in the connection between freedom and truth.[49] Religious freedom is the most important freedom because it implicates the very dignity of the human person rooted in her supernatural destiny.

These conditions are themselves constitutive of "coherent vision of the common good." This is "not simply the sum of particular interests; rather it involves an assessment and integration of those interests on the basis of a balanced hierarchy of values; ultimately, it demands a correct understanding of the dignity and rights of the person."[50] This all seems to go further than previous popes in an important sense. As noted earlier, some of the groundwork for these developments was prepared by earlier Thomist philosophers, especially those who wrote about democracy during and immediately after the Second World War. Most famously, Jacques Maritain argued that the development of democracy was a fruit of the Gospel itself and its unfolding in history. Maritain endorsed a kind of progressive account of history tied to divine providence. If pursued by Christian nations, constantly purified by the spirit of the Gospel, democracy would promote the full development of human personality in justice and charity aimed towards the realization of a fraternal community, an almost eschatological culmination.[51] By contrast, Maritain's former student and close friend, Yves Simon saw democracy as a way to prevent the exploitation of the ruled by their rulers; he rejected what he considered overly optimistic or romantic views of democracy in favor of a hard-headed sense of democracy as the institutionalization of the people's right of resistance against

---

[49] Id., no. 47, pp. 851–852.
[50] Id., no. 47, p. 852.
[51] Maritain began this train of thought before the war. See especially *Integral Humanism*, trans. Joseph Evans (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1968; orig. pub 1936), 236–240, 255–268, 280, 304f.; *The Rights of Man and Natural Law*, trans. Doris C. Anson (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943), 87, 95, 131; *Christianity and Democracy*, 21–34; *Man and the State*, 61, 111, cf. 204–209.

tyranny. That is, he embraced what one might consider a moderately negative view of democracy.[52]

What is suggested, although not fully developed, by John Paul II is a view of democracy that is neither as positive as that of Maritain, but still essentially positive, as against Simon's more negative view, a kind of middle road between these two great Thomists. He wrote, "The Church values the democratic system inasmuch as it ensures the participation of citizens in making political choices."[53] This isn't simply a check on tyranny or bad government. Nor is it the sort of naively optimistic view of democracy rejected by Simon (and embraced by Maritain?). To unpack it is to see that in a certain very realistic sense, one not seen by Aristotle or any of the ancients, nor by the medieval thinkers in any explicit way, that democracy (in its distinctly modern form) can be considered not just a regime, but in some sense, the best regime. This is not because the existence of democratic political institutions automatically guarantees good government; it certainly does not. But the successful operation of democracy indicates something, something perhaps dimly perceived by some of the modern philosophers who inspired the revolution against which Leo XIII was responding in the development of Catholic social teaching. Jean-Jacques Rousseau himself wrote that democracy was a form of government suitable only to "gods or the children of gods," but that in all actual human societies it would be impossible.[54] Now, by democracy Rousseau meant much more the day-to-day administration of government meant by the ancients, not representative democracy, but I think we can see what he was driving at.

The very notion of self-government must assume a certain level of moral development, of virtue and prudence among citizens. Only among a people that achieves a high degree of education, a populace in whom the cardinal virtues of courage, moderation, justice, and prudence, are widely cultivated, can democracy really succeed. Self-government means precisely that: the government by the people of themselves in both their personal lives and in the common life of the political community. Democratic thinking has always been susceptible to a high degree of utopian exaggeration, in the case of Maritain, one might even suggest, of political millennialism, albeit of a relatively mild sort. It was just this against which Simon

---

[52] See especially *Philosophy of Democratic Government*, 72–103.

[53] *Centesimus annus*, no. 46, p. 850.

[54] *Du Contrat social*, bk. 3, ch. 4, *Oeuvres complètes de Jean-Jacques Rousseau* (Paris: Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 1964), 3: 406.

reacted in his more realist view. What John Paul II seems to have suggested, however, was that the advocates of democracy must expect a very high degree of moral achievement if democracy is really to work and that in a successful democracy one would expect to see a very great realization of the potentialities in human nature for excellence. One might, from this perspective, affirm (a revised version of) Rousseau's judgment: democracy is a regime fit for the children of God, provided that phrase be interpreted in an explicitly Christian sense to mean that those adopted children of God who have cultivated the moral and theological virtues are best fitted of all for self-government.

This view seems to contradict that of the ancients that I discussed above, but that is not simply the case. Here is a brief, but fascinating section of Aristotle's *Politics* that suggests something similar.[55] In the third book of that work Aristotle famously discusses the question whether the virtues of the good man are the same as those of the excellent citizen. His answer is that this is only the case in the best political regime. In most cities the rulers are those who have cultivated the virtues most fully and so it remains for the citizens to obey. At the same time, the claim for monarchy is precisely that the king is so manifestly superior in virtue to the people that it would be unjust for anyone else to rule. If the citizen body is largely equal with respect to virtue it would be unjust for them not to share in ruling. If one takes seriously the emphasis on social and economic development in Papal statements, especially since St. John XXIII, one can see a connection to democracy as well. Democracy is the political analogue to development precisely because it is only natural and just for those who have achieved a certain level of education—both moral and intellectual—to participate in public affairs. Moreover, this would not only be for the sake of their own continuing development as persons, but for the sake of the common good since the sort of manifest superiority that could justify monarchy (or aristocracy) would be less common. Democracy requires a high degree of moral and intellectual development,[56] but also, once such a level has been achieved, it is difficult to justify any other regime.

---

[55] Aristotle *Politics*, bk. 3, ch. 10–16.

[56] This is the core of the now common half-truth that democracy is very difficult to sustain in any community that has not achieved a certain per capita gross domestic product, usually thought to be around $15,000. For a sophisticated account (in that it considers development as much more than GDP) of the idea see Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel, *Modernization, Cultural Change and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Just this view of democracy seems implied by two later encyclical letters of John Paul II. In his 1993 letter on moral theology, *Veritatis Splendor*, the pope mounted a powerful defense of the traditional Thomist teaching that certain human acts are morally wrong not only relative to their ends or circumstances, but in their very objects. The fundamental norms of morality bind not only individuals but society as well, and not one type of political regime, but all of them:

> [O]nly by obedience to universal moral norms does man find full confirmation of his personal uniqueness and the possibility of authentic moral growth. For this very reason, this service is also directed to *all mankind*: it is not only for individuals but also for the community, for society as such. These norms in fact represent the unshakable foundation and solid guarantee of a just and peaceful human coexistence, and hence of genuine democracy, which can come into being and develop only on the basis of the equality of all its members, who possess common rights and duties. *When it is a matter of the moral norms prohibiting intrinsic evil, there are no privileges or exceptions for anyone.* It makes no difference whether one is the master of the world or the "poorest of the poor" on the face of the earth. Before the demands of morality we are all absolutely equal.[57]

In one sense this idea is very democratic: all are bound by the same morality, no matter how high their station. But in another way, it is a limit on democracy. No act that is immoral is any less immoral because it is the result of democratic political procedures or the decision of democratically-elected political officials. The whole notion of *raison d'État* is here sweepingly rejected for democracy just as much as for monarchy.

Similarly, John Paul wrote in his 1995 encyclical on life issues, *Evangelium vitae*, about the role of public opinion in the culture of democratic polities. "Democracy cannot," he wrote, "be idolized to the point of making it a substitute for morality or a panacea for immorality." Democracy is fundamentally a "system" and, therefore, a "means and not an end." He went on to write,

---

[57] *Veritatis splendor* (On Some Questions of the Fundamental Moral Doctrine of the Church, 6 August 1993), no. 96, *A.A.S.* 85 (1993): 1209.

Its "moral" value is not automatic, but depends on conformity to the moral law to which it, like every other form of human behavior, must be subject: in other words, its morality depends on the morality of the ends which it pursues and of the means which it employs. If today we see an almost universal consensus with regard to the value of democracy, this is to be considered a positive "sign of the times," as the Church's Magisterium has frequently noted. But the value of democracy stands or falls with the values which it embodies and promotes. Of course, values such as the dignity of every person, respect for inviolable and inalienable human rights, and the adoption of the "common goods" as the end and criterion regulating political life are certainly fundamental and not to be ignored.[58]

The reference to the "signs of the times" points back to *Gaudium et Spes* and thus, again, an indication that democracy represents an authentic moral development and that one can prefer it as indicative of a level of excellence and human development that is itself a goal towards which all should work.

The very foundation of such moral excellence, however, is the natural law, and the natural law is not the result of a majority vote, nor does it change with changes in public opinion. The civil law of any political regime is evaluated by reference to the natural law and this is just as true in democracies as in any other form of government and an unjust law is no less unjust for having been enacted by a democratic majority, even a very large one. At the very moment, then, that the Church in some sense embraces democracy not simply as an acceptable form of government, but as one to be preferred, the superiority of the natural moral law as a limit on all political action is also reaffirmed, and this in a particularly strong way given the tendency of democracy to hallow public opinion with a degree of moral legitimacy never enjoyed by earlier, often quite defectively just, political regimes. This aspect of democracy presents a particular kind of moral challenge, one particularly emphasized by Benedict XVI.

IV

The question of the place of democracy in Catholic social teaching for Benedict XVI is perhaps best understood in light of a phrase made

---

[58] *Evangelium vitae* (On the Inviolable Good of Human Life, 25 March 1995), no. 70, *A.A.S.* 87 (1995): 482.

famous by and closely associated with the pope emeritus, "the dictatorship of relativism."[59] Benedict shared with John Paul II a pre-eminent concern for the protection of human dignity. For Benedict the greatest threats to that dignity are to be seen first, in the possibilities presented by modern science and technology divorced from the constraints of moral reasoning, and second, in political processes divorced from that same reasoning. In the first case he saw the possibility of a kind of dictatorship of technical reasoning that could lead to manipulation and oppression; in the second the famous dictatorship of relativism, which could, of course, also lead to the first. For Benedict the very heart of authentic democracy was the protection of human rights, themselves a part of the natural moral law. Without a consciousness of the moral law, democracy cannot be sustained and degenerates into the dictatorship of relativism or what Tocqueville famously called the "tyranny of the majority."[60]

These themes all find expression in Benedict's social encyclical, *Caritas in Veritate*. Democracy is less a theme of that document than a kind of assumption, that is, it is treated as something all peoples desire; in the first of these places he refers to "true" democracy and the test of this is of much greater concern to him. So he repeatedly emphasizes the necessity for political institutions to be directed to the common good, for them to follow the natural moral law, and to protect fundamental human rights.[61] He also points again to the paradoxical sense in which democratic mores can, by embracing the theory that public opinion determines truth, undermine human rights. The only sure guarantee here is found in a conception of freedom as tied integrally to truth, a point frequently made by John Paul II as well. This was also a key point of the very controversial 2006 Regensburg Lecture[62] as well as in a number of Benedict's other important public speeches, for example his 2008 address to the United Nations General Assembly[63] and his 2011 speech before the German Bundestag.[64]

---

[59] The statement was made by then-Cardinal Ratzinger in his homily at the mass celebrated at the beginning of the conclave that elected him pope. See *A.A.S.* 92 (2005): 5–9. He had expressed similar thoughts a number in earlier writings, e.g., *Values in a Time of Upheaval*, trans. Brian McNeil (New York: Crossroad, 2006), 27, 49, 53–72.

[60] *De la Démocratie en Amerique*, vol. 1, pt. 2, ch. 7, in Tocqueville, *Oeuvres* (Paris: Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, 1992), 2: 287–300.

[61] See *Caritas in veritate* (On Integral Human Development in Charity and Truth, 29 June 2009), nos. 41, 73, *A.A.S.* 101 (2009): 676–677, 704–705.

[62] *A.A.S.* 98 (2006): 728–739.

[63] *A.A.S.* 100 (2008): 331–338.

[64] *A.A.S.* 103 (2011): 663–669.

Here one confronts the ubiquitous objection from pluralism: this insistence on the accompaniment of democracy by a natural moral law that also constrains it, many reject on the grounds of the pluralism of modern societies. It is a large problem that cannot be adequately dealt with quickly; I would like mainly to suggest a few distinctions and precisions that are helpful in thinking about the question. This is needful because pluralism can mean a number of different things. At one level pluralism can refer to the many different kinds of social bodies or forms of association within the most comprehensive community, usually known as the political. Social pluralism has been a recognized topic in Catholic social teaching at least since the time of Leo XIII and its roots go back very far indeed and they must because there are always at least three different but basic forms of human community: the family, the Church, and the political community.[65] Pluralism at this level is always present, but problematic only to the extent that the various forms of community must be made to relate to one another appropriately, in ways that follow the natural moral law.

Pluralism, however, can also refer to a pluralism of goods or values and this in two different senses. It can mean that there are a number of different goods or values that can explain human action, that is, a number of distinct ends that people pursue and that cannot be reduced to one another or anything more primitive (except, perhaps to God). So friendship and knowledge are goods that can explain a person's actions, i.e., one acts for the sake of one or the other and the statement of that end is enough to fully explain the act; nothing more need be said. There can be tension between the different goods; one pursues one and not another, but this needn't imply any irreducible or unavoidable rivalry between them. But choices are choices and if one pursues one good that means one cannot necessarily pursue another or pursue others to the same extent. One can be a philosopher or an artist, but rarely both. This kind of pluralism is simply the recognition that there are many goods and that one must make choices. However, one can push things further as some philosophers have done (the most well-known is the late Isaiah Berlin) and argue that there is necessarily a conflict among goods and that what pluralism really means is that there can be no really true morality, no natural moral law.[66] One cannot

---

[65] See Russell Hittinger, "Reasons for Civil Society," in *The First Grace: Rediscovering the Natural Law in a Post-Christian World* (Wilmington, DE: ISI Books, 2003), 265–283.

[66] See especially Berlin's "The Pursuit of the Ideal," in *The Crooked Timber of Humanity* (New York: Knopf, 1991), 11–19.

pursue some goods without acting against others both individually and as a society. This suggests that the very coherence and integrity of human affairs is radically limited and that one's most important choices and commitments are ultimately arbitrary. There is no squaring this view with the classical or Christian view of things; it is at the heart of a certain kind of contemporary liberalism. It is different from both the social pluralism I began with and from the first kind of moderate value pluralism mentioned. Sometimes, when contemporary people cite pluralism as an argument against the account of democracy I have been discussing, this is what they mean.

But they can, and, I would say, usually do, mean something a bit different. Usually pluralism means a kind of disagreement among people about religious or moral truths. People disagree about abortion, same-sex marriage, capital punishment, the morality of drug use, etc. The disagreements are themselves rooted in deeper disagreements about religion, the nature of morality, human nature, or metaphysics. I think the implications of this are pretty clear: people disagree. At one time there was less disagreement on the most important truths of morality; now there is much more. Pluralism in this sense is a matter of fact, like the weather—there is no getting round it and so we must live with it. Some philosophers have gone beyond this to make of pluralism a kind of value in itself, something to be celebrated and promoted, not regretted, within society, even to argue that people should internalize pluralism, become pluralistic in their own souls. Walter Cardinal Kasper has helpfully distinguished between "empirical" pluralism and "ideological" pluralism.[67] The former is the matter of fact about disagreement in society; the latter sees pluralism as a value to be celebrated and promoted.

Empirical pluralism does seem to me to be regrettable: surely it would be better if people agreed on the most important moral questions and about the most important truths of religion. Pluralism means not only disagreement, but widespread error, and to embrace it puts one dangerously close to indifference about the truth, the very problem that concerned the popes of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, leading them to express reservations about democracy. The fact of empirical pluralism precludes society from doing certain things, for example, establishing an

---

[67] Walter Cardinal Kasper, "The Church and Contemporary Pluralism," in *That They May All Be One: The Call to Unity Today* (New York: Continuum, 2004), 178–179,185. The lecture was originally delivered at the Catholic University of America in 2002, where I heard it.

official church or even affirming the good of religion and effectively regulating certain kinds of conduct. There are ways that societies face the challenge of pluralism, practices of toleration like the granting of exemptions and conscientious objector status to some laws. These are all matters of political prudence and they must be made by political officials and voters in democratic regimes acting to promote the common good, including the protection of fundamental human rights.[68] Ideological pluralism is something else again. It converts a regrettable necessity into something praiseworthy, even heroic on some views.[69] This is an error and it is ultimately unsustainable, not least because the universal internalization of pluralism would have as an effect the elimination of pluralism. Beyond that, and before it swallowed itself, it would result (and it has resulted) in an enormous amount of unhappiness and moral damage to persons and societies.

V

The recent history of Catholic social teaching, therefore, issues in the following general view of democracy. Human beings associate with one another in view of common goods, including the good associated with the comprehensive form of society that we call political. The common goods and the common good are real goods for persons and related to their direction to the ultimate supernatural good that is the ultimate basis of human dignity. As John Paul II made clear, the very root of Catholic social teaching is the protection of this dignity. Democracy is a form of government that, when soundly established and practiced (e.g., recognizing the integrity of other non-political human associations, limited by the rule of law), in conformity with the natural moral law, is uniquely suited to the development of human personality because it affords citizens the opportunity to develop and exercise their natural capacities for deliberative judgment. The essential context for all this is a recognition that this deliberation is carried out on the basis of the goods, virtues, and rules that form the

---

[68] I have discussed some of these questions at greater length in "Natural Right and the Problem of Public Reason," in *Natural Moral Law and Contemporary Society*, ed. Holger Zaborowski (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2010), 195–234; and "Religious Freedom, the Good of Religion, and the Common Good: The Challenges of Pluralism, Privilege, and the Contraceptive Services Mandate," *Oxford Journal of Law and Religion* 2 (2013): 25–49.

[69] E.g., Stephen Macedo, *Liberal Virtues: Citizenship, Virtue, and Community in Liberal Constitutionalism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), especially 234–240.

natural because rational horizon of human action or, one might say, that are the self-evident truths that make self-government a human possibility.

At the same time, democracy requires genuine development to have already reached a certain point and its continued health requires the protection of human dignity via the full panoply of human rights and duties. This is not merely a matter of immunities from certain kinds of coercion—as important as those are—but also the preservation of what is sometimes referred to as the community's moral ecology, including things like responsibility in the acquisition and use of wealth, the maintenance of an adequate civic education, standards of public discourse, and the culture of marriage. There are also important structural limits on democracy like the rule of law, often now sorely strained by activist courts intervening in the political process in ways that are neither democratic nor in conformity with the natural law. In this sense the Church's embrace of democracy during the pontificate of St. John Paul II can also be seen as a challenge to the practice of democracy in the contemporary world, one formulated with particular acuteness by both John Paul and Pope Emeritus Benedict. Any appreciation of the justifications for and the possibilities of democratic government must necessarily be accompanied by an awareness of its fragility, a topic about which Jude Dougherty has been teaching us for many years, and only one reason for our gratitude for his wisdom and example.[70]

**DEMOCRACY AND CATHOLIC SOCIAL TEACHING:
CONTINUITY, DEVELOPMENT, AND CHALLENGE**

SUMMARY

The first part of the paper discusses the origins and meaning of democracy relative to the development of Christian political thought through the modern period; it is important here that democracy means something different in the ancient world than it does in the modern. The second part discusses the view of democracy proposed in the formative period of modern Catholic social doctrine in especially from the pontificate of Leo XIII to the Second Vatican Council. The third part analyzes the political thought of St. John Paul II which seems to be the apogee of Catholic thinking about democracy. The fourth part discusses some remaining tensions and problems related to democracy that are articulated partly also in John Paul II's thought, but in a sharper way in the thought of Pope Benedict XVI and one quite prominent challenge to the Catholic view of democracy in the phenomenon of pluralism. One can see in this history that the Church has gradually come to appreciate democracy

---

not simply as an acceptable form of government, one that is not intrinsically at odds with Christianity, but in a positive sense, as an opportunity for human beings to achieve a level of moral development not available in other regimes. But there remain challenges associated with democracy to government and social life consistent with the natural moral law and to Christian faith.

Eugene Thomas Long
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC, USA

PERSONS, COMMUNITY
AND HUMAN DIVERSITY

It is with a deep sense of honor, respect and affection that I accept the invitation to contribute to this *Festschrift* for Jude Dougherty, distinguished philosopher, educator, editor and long time Dean of the School of Philosophy at the Catholic University of America. As a valued friend and discussion partner, he has provided me with many stimuli and opportunities that otherwise may not have come my way. Since meeting for the first time en route to a conference in Brazil in 1972, we have been friends in spite of our differences in philosophical and theological traditions. A person of moral and intellectual integrity, Jude Dougherty is a strong and articulate representative of what I would call the traditional Catholic or Thomist philosophical tradition, and he has done much as a philosopher and administrator to insure that this tradition has its voice in the world of contemporary philosophy. I share some of Dougherty's concerns with what in *Western Creed, Western Identity* he calls our socially turbulent times, and his call for a kind of moral foundation or criterion that comes before all particular rules and laws and upon which our human associations depend and are judged. While he will probably find much with which to disagree in the following brief discussion of persons, community and diversity, I hope that in some ways it may complement his more extended discussion and call for an approach to Western identity anchored in the classical tradition before the advent of modernity.

I

We use the term "community" in a variety of ways and underlying each form of community is a conception of the human person.[1] The Western understanding of the self or person as free individual has its roots in the Greek world and was given a particular twist in Christianity. Neither the Greek nor the Christian idea of freedom meant following one's subjective desires of the moment. For both the Greek and Christian traditions, individual freedom meant freedom of self from dependence upon any motive or force, external or internal, that would detract from the wholeness of human being and freedom for the fullness of selfhood. Freedom of self in the Christian tradition, however, is focused less on persons in the Greek sense of mind and more on persons as historical beings creating themselves in encounter with whatever they confront at a given time. Persons are understood primarily as agents or centers of activity. Further, for Christianity, more emphasis is placed upon freedom as a gift of divine grace than freedom in relation to the law of reason. Both the Greek and Christian conceptions of freedom contribute to the Western understanding of persons, sometimes in close alliance and at other times in tension.[2]

Perhaps the concept of person first came into clear focus for me in the work of the personal idealists where emphasis is placed upon persons understood as centers of activity as opposed to theoretical beings with fixed essences. In their judgment the concept of person is the highest value in our experience and the concept of person provides the fundamental clue to reality. Following World War I personalism became more independent of the idealist tradition, and its emphasis upon freedom and action often brought it into close proximity to the existentialists in which human beings or persons are understood not as spectators but as agents. In contrast to some existentialists, however, personalists believe mutuality or the relation of self to others is fundamental. The word "person" as I use it in this essay refers at least in part to self or ego that is the conscious, unifying and purposeful characteristic of what it means to be human. Persons are theoretical beings, but they are more than that. They are also agents who act in ways that distinguish them from so-called natural events. To use the language of Heidegger, temporality, not substance, is the basic structure of self. Think-

---

[1] For further discussion of the concept of person, see my "Quest for Transcendence," *The Review of Metaphysics* 52 (September, 1998): 3–19.
[2] See Rudolph Bultmann, *Essays Philosophical and Theological* (London: SCM Press LTD, 1955), 305–325.

ing or reflection is taken up into self as a moment within the activity of self. Persons intend or project, they transcend forward in time so that we can say that a person has the capacity to be more or less than his or her most authentic self.

Yet, as John Dunne wrote, "No man is an island, entire of itself . . ."[3] Persons find themselves already thrown into a world in relation to persons and things. In their freedom persons transcend towards others and in the fullness of their being they are at one and the same time individual and social, fully themselves only in transcending towards others, whether in struggle or agreement, and ultimately towards a wider range of being. Persons might be said to be striving towards a fuller humanity in which self and other give recognition to each other, enable each other to be fully human. This is not to say that this striving towards our most authentic self in relation to others is always a reality. For example, we may choose to negate others as persons, to relate to them as objects for what might be called more objective or scientific purposes, and in some cases we are subject to loss of our fullest humanity when others fail to acknowledge us as persons. Our most full or authentic personhood depends upon our conscious striving towards the goal of human relations in which persons and others enable each other to achieve their fullest humanity. We are in process of becoming our most authentic existence as we choose to live in mutuality with other persons in our more immediate relations and in the wider history of humankind.

Because self is in process of becoming in relation to others, authentic selfhood is not something accomplished with finality, not a possession in the sense of an acquired skill or knowledge. It is not an essence. Persons become their most authentic selves only in striving forward into the future, in openness to the future, and this depends on a kind of commitment, faith or trust beyond what he or she brings to the moment. History and tradition on this account have less to do with authority and dependence and more to do with awareness of the possibilities of existence. This seeking to live in relation to others in ways that enable self and other to realize their fullest humanity is a moral striving and may be said to provide an ontological ground for human behavior that is presupposed in our particular or historical ethical traditions. To put this in another way, it provides a norm for

---

[3] John Dunne, "Meditation XVII," in *Devotions upon Emergent Occasions* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1959).

measuring our particular historical ethical codes, a norm that may be shared by different religious and non-religious persons alike.[4]

II

Persons as described above are individual and social. The reality of persons we might say is a mutual reality and this becomes clear when we focus on the notion of persons and community. There are many forms of community including, for example, the community of family and friends, the community of persons sharing common histories and traditions, and communities founded upon religious faith and belief. Perhaps the first kind of community that comes to mind when discussing persons and communities is what might be called our more intimate communities. Such communities depend upon immediate relationships of openness and trust, the kind of communities typically founded on love and respect among members of a family or friends. We might call this kind of community an intimate community and such communities in the best sense of the word depend upon persons treating others as persons. Persons might be described as centers of freedom or to put this in another way, the fundamental characteristic that distinguishes persons from mere animal life is freedom. As mentioned above, however, freedom as understood here is not what might be called subjective freedom, but freedom to create, to give shape to the self or person. In what I have called intimate communities the fundamental notion is that we free others to be persons, to give shape and form to their humanity as they free us to be persons. Free surrender for the sake of the other is at the heart of what it means to be a person in a family or among friends. Martin Buber gave a classic expression of this person to person relation in speaking of the I–thou in contrast to the I–it relation, thus putting his own stamp on the words of the nineteenth century philosopher, Ludwig Feuerbach, who wrote, "Where there is no *thou* there is no I."[5]

We are both individual and social and when the individual pole is separated or withdrawn from the social pole, the individual may be understood as a negative movement, a withdrawal from the social. The ego we might say negates the other as a person. We may witness this among

---

[4] See John Macquarrie's proposal for a revised theory of natural law based on a contemporary understanding of changing human nature and an inner drive towards a fuller, more personal human existence in *Three Issues in Ethics* (London: SCM Press, 1970), chapter four.

[5] Ludwig Feuerbach, *The Essence of Christianity* (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), 92.

friends or members of a family when the sense of the other, the love and mutuality for which we hope, is distorted. In more extreme cases one might think of ideological attitudes and actions that set one person, one nation or one religion against another, the Nazis in Germany, or some of the slave owners in the United States where love and marriage among the slaves, who worked in the fields and cared for the children and the sick, were considered on a par with the breeding of horses and cattle. In less extreme cases we may find ourselves welcoming persons who are different from us only to the extent that they conform to us, to the extent that they share our views or speak, act and dress as we do. It is no accident that persons who fail to be recognized as persons often "act up," refuse to be made an object in the image of the other.

To the extent that we are able to realize what Martin Buber called the I–thou among persons in our family or immediate circle of friends we might be said to be most free. To the extent that is, that the individual is taken up into the positive intentions of the personal, to the extent that we live for the sake of the other, we may be said to be free of that kind of self centeredness and defensiveness that comes about when we believe ourselves threatened by or in competition with others. This kind of community can be found only when we transcend our egoism, when we are open to and reveal ourselves to each other without fear. Perhaps it was something like this that Robert Frost was trying to get at in his poem, *The Death of A Hired Hand*, when he said, "Home is the place where, when you have to go there, they take you in. I should have called it something you somehow don't have to deserve."[6]

III

It might be argued that we should reserve the word "community" to refer to what I have called the intimate community in which relations between persons are more direct or immediate as in the case of families and friends. We recognize, however, that there are other forms of community in which our personal relations are more indirect than direct. We often find ourselves speaking of the community of our town, our city, our state, our nation or even the global community. The basis of such communities is found in common experiences, tasks, histories and traditions. These larger

---

[6] Robert Frost, "Death of a Hired Hand," in *North Boston* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1914).

communities might be called societies to distinguish them from the forms of community where human relations are more immediate or direct. In larger communities or societies we often find ourselves relating indirectly to persons whom we do not know, even persons whom we have never met and are likely never to meet. Communities or societies of this kind are based more on common histories and experiences, shared ideals and tasks, and less on intimate relations and personal devotion to others. Presumably we still seek the freedom and unity that we may find in the more immediate circle of family and friends and that promotes human flourishing, but this is much more difficult in the case of societies where our human relations are more indirect than direct. In such cases my freedom may clash or appear to clash with the freedom of others who are different from me. And in such cases it is justice rather than love that dominates our relations with others. It is the impersonal character of law that protects persons from each other in the context of society where, unlike intimate communities, relations are more indirect. However, law is not or should not be an end in itself. Law is unable to provide the kind of freedom that we seek in our immediate communities that depend on free persons united in their intentions to encourage or enable the freedom of self and others. And where law is contrary to the flourishing of persons we have a moral obligation to refuse to conform to it. This does not or should not mean that we can or should rely on individual conscience in society where our relations are indirect and we are incapable of considering all the consequences for just and fair relations between persons. Should we be directed by conscience to refuse to conform to the laws of society we should do so in such a way as to preserve the place of law and justice for all as a means for adjusting our relations with others in a fair and just manner. It is something like this that is expressed in the so-called classical theory of civil disobedience.

The larger historical communities or societies seeking the unity and freedom of persons depend upon organization and structure. And speaking historically there have been two primary tendencies or theories of organization, one emphasizing the individual pole of persons and the other the social pole of persons. Thomas Hobbes, for example, argued that our societies are composed of individuals with diverse interests that are threatened by the competing interests of others. These individuals are understood to use whatever resources they have to further their own freedom, interests and satisfactions. Nevertheless, it is argued, we can learn to understand each other and live together in order to accomplish our long-range goals. This requires some agreement limiting individual aggressiveness for the

sake of long-range interests. Law backed by the power of state, nation or world of nations is understood as a device for protecting each person from the self-interest of others.

This theory and some of its variations is widespread. For example, it was supported by many moderates in the early stages of efforts to bring about a more racially integrated society in the United States. And as a device of practical politics it may have been effective, at least in the short run. Nevertheless, relations between persons from this point of view are essentially negative. The individual and social poles of persons in relation are split asunder. Persons are assumed to be ego-centered, or even aggressively related to each other. In the United States in the 1950s and 1960s, many of the persons who welcomed the laws that required the integration of races recognized that without a change of heart, a change of intentions toward others in which one seeks to free the other to be himself or herself, there would never be free and open relations among persons of different racial and ethnic backgrounds. Some of these persons looked to the religious communities to change the intentions of persons but many despaired for the religious communities were often among the most segregated communities. Religious communities as well as religious individuals were in need of change.

Theories of society that emphasize the individual pole of persons seem in the final analysis to work against the intention of persons to live together in communities where persons are united in freedom, where persons seek to enable the freedom or flourishing of others and to live in openness and responsibility towards others. In contrast to more libertarian theories, idealist theories such as provided in the work of Rousseau emphasize the social pole of persons. The goal may be freedom of individuals, but this is approached by way of the general or social will of the community. Persons, it may be argued, are essentially well intentioned and in time conditions for all will improve. In the meantime it is essential that we identify with the general will and perform our duty in accordance with our position in the community. In this way, each of us will have maximum freedom possible and will avoid the pain associated with conflicts between individuals. From this point of view organizations and laws are prerequisite to living with others, but they are a function of consent and their authority is limited by the general will of the persons in the community. On this account the state and its laws are not ends in themselves but functions of the general will. They exist for the purpose of judging between claims of individuals, for adjusting individual wills to the general will. On the sur-

face such theories seem to have much to contribute to diverse individuals living together in social contexts. In practice, however, there appears to be an inherent conflict between the individual and social poles of persons in such theories, a conflict between the freedom of the persons and the general will of the people. And often the result is that the individual is submerged into the collective person and robbed of his or her selfhood or freedom. When carried to its extreme we have the totalitarian state.[7]

Persons are in need of social, political and legal structures in order to live peacefully in a world in which persons are required to relate to others in more indirect ways. Yet this seems to be something of a catch twenty-two. The very striving to live in free and creative relations with others, to enable self and others to realize their fullest human possibilities often gets caught up in organizations, structures and ideologies that work counter to persons achieving their fullest humanity. The very social and political organizations that we require to insure justice, to enable persons to live freely, may lead away from the kinds of human relations where persons free each other to realize their fullest humanity. This may appear to be less of a problem in cases where persons want to emphasize either the individual or social pole of what it means to be fully human. But it does raise a problem for those who strive for a moral ideal where persons live in such a way that individuals are not limited by their historical experiences and traditions, where persons transcend their more limited histories and traditions in order to enable others to realize their fullest humanity. To put this in another way, law and justice that are essential to cooperative relations between persons should not have their final purpose merely in maintaining law and order, in keeping the peace, but in enabling human flourishing, in helping to make possible free and creative relations among persons so that they may achieve their fullest humanity. In society, community may be understood as a potential way of being and law and justice should be understood in such a way as to enable or make possible community among persons if and when they confront each other in more direct or intimate relations.

---

[7] In this section I am indebted to John Macmurray's Gifford Lectures, *Persons in Relation* (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1961). I have discussed his analysis in *Philosophy and Civil Law: Proceedings of the Catholic Philosophical Association*, vol. XLIX (1975), 125–137.

IV

Religious communities differ from societies and intimate communities as we have discussed them above in being what we might call communities in the transcendent. Traditionally religion has often been understood in terms of an authoritative tradition and in some cases authoritative tradition as expressed in sacred scriptures. Religious communities looked to tradition and/or scriptures for their origins, justification and authority. Religion in this sense was widely challenged in the Enlightenment and continues to be challenged today where religion and religious communities no longer have an unchallenged authority or place in human life. This challenge did not always and need not today mean a denial or rejection of history and tradition. Indeed, I would argue that this challenge is itself an important part of the Western tradition and allows for a critical appreciation and appropriation of history and tradition in the context of persons as creative and future oriented beings seeking the flourishing of self and others.[8] Tradition is important to our self-understanding, but this need not result in our becoming enslaved by it. I agree with Hans-Georg Gadamer, who finds an analogy for the hermeneutical experience of tradition in our experience of the other person as thou, in which we stand open, letting the other really say something to us. On Gadamer's account in *Truth and Method*, understanding tradition is conceived as part of the event in which the meaning and truth of historical tradition is formed, actualized and handed down. Interpretation culminates in the openness for experience that distinguishes the experienced person, the person of wisdom from the person of a dogmatic frame of mind. However, as David Brown has argued, even those traditions that are held most dear should not be free of critical examination challenging their prejudices and perspectives.[9]

I would argue that religion is viable today only in the sense that it is understood to be part of the human transcending towards the world and others and ultimately towards transcendent reality, understood both as challenging the human tendency to believe that persons can fulfill themselves through their own resources, and as opening up new possibilities of self, world and others, freed from the limitations of self dependence. On

---

[8] See the insightful analysis of what he calls the boosters and knockers of modernity in Charles Taylor, *The Ethics of Authenticity* (Cambridge: Harvard University press, 1991).

[9] I have discussed Gadamer in *Twentieth-Century Western Philosophy of Religion* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003), 425–429. See also David Brown, *Tradition and Interpretation: Revelation and Change* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 9–59.

this account the fundamental difference between the religious and non-religious and between one religious believer and another may have less to do with whether or not one believes the proposition that a transcendent entity called God exists and more to do with whether or not one believes that reality is such as to enable or free persons to fully realize their self-hood.

Religious communities have many purposes, including the moral purpose of calling themselves and others beyond the limitations of their human organizations and structures, including religious organizations, and opening up new possibilities of being, calling and encouraging persons to frame social structures that help bring about conditions in which persons may realize their most authentic personal being. An ideal of religious communities is a universal community of friendship, of persons freely relating to each other in such a way as to make possible the full realization of persons as free for self and others. In the Christian tradition this is expressed in terms of the grace of God and the love of Christ in which the authentic self is understood to be free from his or her past and open to a new future in the event of grace in the word of Christ. Since persons are always in process of transcending or becoming, always on the way towards selfhood, this is not a goal achieved once and for all through knowledge or effort. Individuals may become themselves only in constant openness to others, in being enslaved to nothing that he or she already is or has. This is a way of being that can be won or lost and a goal that may be shared in part by religious and non-religious persons as well.[10]

Persons of many religious traditions might learn much from Karl Jaspers' proposal for philosophical faith, his understanding of *Existenz* and *Transcendence*, the historicity of religious beliefs, boundless communication and what he calls the axial period of history common to the whole of humankind. For some more liberal protestant Christian thinkers philosophical faith might even be seen as an alternative to more traditional Christian faith and belief.[11] Most religious persons, however, will come to understand transcendent reality within their particular traditions and in most cases traditions they have inherited as a result of accidents of birth. Reli-

---

[10] See my essay, "An Approach to Religious Pluralism," in *Being and Truth: Essays in Honour of John Macquarrie*, ed. Alistair Kee and Eugene T. Long (London: SCM Press, 1986).

[11] For further discussion of philosophical faith, see my *Jaspers and Bultmann: A dialogue between philosophy and theology in the existentialist tradition* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1968).

gious histories and traditions might be said to both make possible and set limits to human efforts to give expression to a more universal account of existence and ultimate reality. Without institutions, moral codes and beliefs, religious communities have little significant content. Yet, religious communities are constantly at risk for degenerating into institutions that forget their historicity and their role in calling persons to their fullest selfhood in relation to others, at risk for replacing religious faith with institutional belief that emphasizes orthodoxy more than the call of religious faith to ultimate reality and human flourishing. In the case of Christianity, for example, traditional belief may become an idol or ideology separated from the encounter with persons who are other by way of tradition, religion, ethnicity, gender or sexual orientation. In such cases religious faith has more to do with authoritarian belief and less to do with faith as trust in and the transformation of self in relation to divine reality and others. In the Christian tradition the liberation of self for others is understood in terms of divine grace and the love of Christ, but the goal of persons living together in agreement or struggle in such a way as to be free for self and others is a goal that may be shared with persons of other religious and non-religious traditions.

Although religious communities may share much in common with societies, as discussed in the second part of this essay, they should not be confused with societies. Human transcending and flourishing, as we have described them, depend upon a kind of faith or trust in the future, a kind of confidence or hope that reality makes sense. In religious communities, however, this basic confidence or trust is rooted in reality that transcends the particular histories and traditions of societies and even the particular religious histories and traditions in which ultimate reality is experienced and comes to expression. In other words, religious communities are distinct in being grounded in transcendent reality that calls the self beyond the limits of historical societies understood in terms of law and justice and towards a universal community of friendship, a community of persons radically transformed in such a way as to be free for self in relation with others. In this sense the intentions of religious communities share something in common with what we have called more intimate communities. However, the goal of human flourishing in religious communities in which persons in relation to transcendent reality are called to relate freely and openly with others cannot without contradiction be authoritatively imposed upon societies. Societies have the important role of adjudicating and balancing the claims of the diversity of persons who may or may not share the

moral or religious beliefs of particular religious communities. Here, I agree with Keith Ward, that religious communities that have the goal of a universal community of friendship will have to encourage this while recognizing or being open to the diversity of persons in society, both religious and non-religious.[12]

Although religious communities often seem to be part of the problem rather than the solution, the function and duty of religious communities rooted in transcendent reality should be that of opposing injustice and oppression and encouraging the positive intentions of the personal beyond the minimal level of fairness and justice found in societies, pointing ultimately to a universal community of persons in relation. As suggested above, however, religious communities cannot authoritatively impose such a universal community of friendship upon others without contradicting the idea of community. Nor can they realistically engage in sheer optimism or utopianism, a blind faith that all works out for the best which ignores the painful checks to hope. Religious communities may, however, find in their hope for and encouragement of a fuller humanity and a flourishing of persons common ground with other religious and humanistic communities.[13]

PERSONS, COMMUNITY AND HUMAN DIVERSITY

SUMMARY

This article explores the topic of persons, community and human diversity. Tracing the roots of the western conception of persons to the Greek and Christian traditions, the author develops a conception of persons as agents and as free and flourishing in mutuality with other persons. Arguing that persons are both individual and social, the author considers persons in intimate communities, societies and religious communities. He argues that seeking to live in relation to others in ways that enable self and other to flourish provides an ontological ground for human behavior that is presupposed in our particular ethical traditions and provides a moral basis for human behavior that may be shared by diverse religious and non-religious persons.

KEYWORDS: person, freedom, community, diversity, ethics, law, justice, tradition.

---

[12] Keith Ward, *Religion and Community* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 237ff.
[13] I much appreciate comments made on an early draft of this essay by Jeremiah Hackett, James Mclachlan, William Power and Jerald Wallulis.

Peter A. Redpath
Rector, Adler-Aquinas Institute
Chair, St. John Paul II Thomistic Studies
Graduate Concentration in Christian Wisdom,
Holy Apostles College and Seminary
USA

THE ESSENTIAL CONNECTION BETWEEN MODERN SCIENCE AND UTOPIAN SOCIALISM

I take as the starting point for this paper a claim that, toward the end of his excellent, recently-published book, *The Nature of Scientific Explanation*, Jude P. Dougherty makes about F. A. Hayek. Dougherty says that Hayek had concluded a connection exists between modern science, or perhaps better, scientism, and socialism. Dougherty states Hayek "believed that the positivism associated with the Vienna Circle led directly to a dangerous socialism."[1]

If that is what Hayek maintained with no qualification, I disagree with him. He has the relationship between modern positivism and modern socialism backwards. If the positivism of the Vienna Circle caused any dangerous socialism, it did so secondarily, as a species of a higher, more dangerous socialism: a utopian socialism generated chiefly by Jean-Jacques Rousseau and his progeny.

In my opinion, for much of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, with some exceptions, Western institutions of higher learning (chiefly colleges and universities) were, and still are, largely socialist re-education camps mostly "unwittingly" inclined to propagandize unsuspecting students into accepting the metaphysical principles of the Enlightenment masquerading as different theories of knowledge (like positivism and pragmatism) and grandiose historical systems of consciousness (like Rousseauean-

---

[1] Jude P. Dougherty, *The Nature of Scientific Explanation* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 101.

ism, Kantianism, Hegelianism, Marxism). These theories and schemes falsely proclaim that the whole of truth is contained within (1) science generically understood (the utopian socialist fictional account about human nature and history of human consciousness: the science of man) and (2) science specifically understood: the ability to apply mathematical/physical theories about the physical universe to force nature to submit to desires of the human will.

In short, I maintain that the whole of modern and contemporary science as popularly understood and generally presented to Western college and university students is essentially connected to, essentially depends upon, utopian socialism as a historical/political substitute for metaphysics to justify the false claim that the whole of truth is contained within modern science generically and specifically understood.

In the contemporary age, the popular Western understanding no longer considers truth to be a property of the intellect. In the West today, the popular understanding tends to identify truth with a property of the mathematicized, and socialistically and technologically regulated and restrained, will. In addition, science is no longer chiefly considered to be a habit of the human soul, an intellectual or moral virtue. Instead, violent, technologically-imposed restraint and regulation by centralized bureaucrats, number crunchers, tends to replace science as intellectual or moral virtue.[2]

To understand how this radical change has slowly occurred over the past several centuries, we need to start by remembering that, when René Descartes first inaugurated modern philosophy "falsely-so-called" (to borrow a phrase from my friend John N. Deely), he did so by famously limiting truth to clear and distinct ideas. Hearing this many students of Western intellectual history mistakenly think that Descartes located truth chiefly in ideas.

He did not. Descartes located truth principally in strength of a free will, like his, powerful enough not to over-extend its judgment beyond the capacity of human reason (human imagination emerging into pure reason). By strength of free will attached to the idea of the one true God arresting the human imagination's inclination to wander, by forcing unrestrained

---

[2] For a detailed defense of this claim, see Peter A. Redpath, *A Not-So-Elementary Christian Metaphysics*: *Written in the Hope of Ending the Centuries-old Separation between Philosophy and Science and Science and Wisdom* (Manitou Springs, CO: Socratic Press, Adler-Aquinas Institute Special Series, vol. 1, 2012).

imagination to "attend" to what is in front of its sight, Descartes maintained that, indistinct images of human imagination can gradually become transformed into clear and distinct ideas of pure reason (imagination thereby becoming transformed into pure reason).[3]

While Descartes starts his *Discourse on the Method* by noting the equitable distribution of reason among human beings, while he considers reason to be present whole and entire within each individual human being, he says that having the ability to judge rightly is not enough to guarantee we will do so. What we think about and the method we use to think about it eventually cause an accidental difference among human beings that enables some of us to make better progress than others in the pursuit of truth and making right judgments.[4]

In Meditation IV of his *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Descartes explains that what eventually causes unequal excellence in use of reason is chiefly a person's deliberating faculty, which Descartes identifies with the human "will." He does not think the chief cause of making mistakes lies in will or in reason. It lies in a relationship between them initiated by a failure on his part to restrain his will within the same limits of his reason, or understanding. When he restrains his will within the narrower scope of his reason, he says he understands perfectly, never makes mistakes (somewhat like people accustomed to accept their fate to occupy their proper lower level on Plato's divided line, or a seeker after truth about which Averroes speaks who has the good sense to remain content not to try to rise above his class of understanding).[5]

Properly speaking, Descartes claims that making a judgment or choice (affirming or denying, pursuing or avoiding) is an act of will and reason, but chiefly an act of free will. He adds that when we freely restrain the will within the limits of personal understanding, we do not feel as if our choice is imposed upon us by an external force.[6]

---

[3] René Descartes, "Meditation Four," in his *Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy*, 3rd ed., trans. Donald A. Cress (Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Co., 1993). For an extensive critique of Descartes's teaching about truth and falsity, see Peter A. Redpath, *Cartesian Nightmare: An Introduction to Transcendental Sophistry* (Amesterdam and Atlanta: Editions Rodopi, B.V., 1997).

[4] René Descartes, *Discourse on Method*, in *Discourse on Method and Meditations on First Philosophy*, 1–3.

[5] Descartes, "Meditation Four," 82–84. See Plato, *Republic*, Bk. 6, 509D–511E. For a summary of Averroes's different classes of seekers after truth, see Étienne Gilson, *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (New York: Random House, 1955), 218.

[6] Descartes, "Meditation Four," 83–84.

He claims that free will is the only human power within him that he cannot conceive to be greater than it is. In contrast to his faculty of understanding (which he finds "small and quite limited"), he finds the idea of his will much greater, even infinite. From the fact that he can form an idea of so perfect a faculty, he maintains he knows that free will belongs to God. He adds that it is chiefly this faculty that enables him to know that he bears "a certain image and likeness of God."[7]

As an example of the power that the will exercises over making true and false judgments, Descartes notes that, in his prior meditations, when attempting to determine whether anything existed in the world, while the fact *he* was examining this question made evident to him that fact of his own existence was the conclusion *he had to* draw, no external force compelled him to do so. Instead, a strong inclination of his will following upon "the great light" of his understanding caused his assent.

Descartes claims that misuse of his free will constitutes the privation in which all his mistakes reside. Such being the case, right use of his free will must constitute the perfection in which all his right judgments reside.

Descartes says he has no right to complain that God has not given him a greater power of understanding because the natural light of his understanding shows him that he will always act rightly if he suspends his judgment about whatever he does not apprehend clearly and distinctly. He maintains that every clear and distinct apprehension is something necessarily produced by God. Hence, it must be true. As a result, Descartes concludes that, whenever he restrains his will to make judgments about those things his understanding clearly and distinctly apprehends, he can never be mistaken.[8]

According to Descartes, in the true God lie hidden all the treasures of the sciences and wisdom from which all progress in knowledge starts. Hence, as Descartes thinks about other things, so long as he has the strength of will to focus attention on God, the divine light illumines his mind with revelations (clear and distinct ideas that replace his confused ones).[9] This activity closely resembles what Richard Taylor describes as Averroes's account of human knowing in which *by will* "a transcendent, external, and ontologically distinct agent intellect" (in Descartes's case, God's divine light) that contains "a single collection of intelligibles in act"

---

[7] Id., 84.
[8] Id., 84–88.
[9] Id., 82.

(in Descartes's case, a system of clear and distinct ideas) comes to exist "in the soul" and becomes "the form for us" by which each individual knows.[10]

Whatever be the case of an Averroistic influence upon Descartes, the transition he helped cause of truth from an act of intellect to that of will radically altered subsequent Western intellectual history and higher education. Following Descartes, in an attempt to defend and repair Descartes's false claim that, generically understood, science consists in a logical system of clear and distinct ideas, all the major proponents of modern philosophy and science locate truth in the will, or in emotionally-held convictions, thereby destroying the power of the intellect to be a repository of truth (consequently totally destroying the natures of truth and the intellect), and radically transforming the nature of education.

By transforming Averroes's three classes of seekers after truth from speculative observers of truth into practical seekers of a yet-to-be achieved scientific system that can only be effected through union of the unenlightened individual will with the enlightened General Will, more than anyone else, Jean-Jacques Rousseau became the chief shaping force of this modern intellectual history and revolution in higher education.[11]

Since, in other works, I have discussed in detail how this relocation of truth from the intellect to the will, or emotions, was precisely effected in thinkers like David Hume, Thomas Hobbes, Rousseau, Georg Hegel, and Immanuel Kant, I will not take time to go into detail about this issue here.[12] Suffice it for me to reinforce the truth about what I have been saying by referring to some startling statements about modern science made by Albert Einstein, Mortimer J. Adler, and Étienne Gilson.

---

[10] Richard Taylor, "Aquinas and 'the Arabs': Arabic/Islamic Philosophy in Thomas Aquinas's Conception of the Beatific Vision in his *Commentary on the Sentences* IV, 49,2,1," revision of an article initially presented at the annual spring conference sponsored by the *Commissio Leonina* and *Aquinas and 'the Arabs' Project*, "Thomas d'Aquin et ses sources arabes/Aquinas and 'the Arabs'" held at the Bibliothèque du Saulchoir 27–28 March 2009. I thank Richard Taylor for providing me with a revised version of this excellent article.

[11] For an extensive analysis of Rousseau as a neo-Averroist and his extensive influence upon the development of utopian socialism, see Peter A. Redpath, *Masquerade of the Dream Walkers*: *Prophetic Theology from the Cartesians to Hegel* (Amsterdam and Atlanta: Editions Rodopi, B.V., 1998), 68–99. See, also, Peter A. Redpath,"Petrarch's Dream and the Failed Modern Project: A Chapter Gilson Did not Write," Part 1 of 2, in *Contemporary Philosophy* 25:5-6 (2003): 3–9; Part 2 of 2, in *Contemporary Philosophy* 25:5-6 (2003), 52–57; and Redpath, *A Not-So-Elementary Christian Metaphysics*, 9–23.

[12] Redpath, *Masquerade of the Dream Walkers*: *Prophetic Theology from the Cartesians to Hegel*.

In an article entitled "The Scientist's Responsibilities," Einstein observed about contemporary scientists that

> the man of science has slipped so much that he accepts slavery inflicted upon him by national states as his inevitable fate. He even degrades himself to such an extent that he helps obediently in the perfection of the means for the general destruction of mankind.[13]

The situation Einstein describes above is analogous to the one that, in the *Gorgias*, Socrates had described to Gorgias, Polus, and Callicles. Once we divorce science from virtue, especially justice and wisdom, the knowledge that had been science becomes reduced to a pandering to tyrants like Archelaus. The knowledge that had been science becomes essentially divorced from pursuit of the human good (human happiness) and becomes essentially violent, humanly destructive routine.

In "The Great Conversation Revisited," the introductory article for the book *The Great Conversation*: *A Reader's Guide to the Great Books of the Western World*, Mortimer J. Adler identified four goods of the mind: "information, knowledge, understanding and wisdom."[14] Glaringly absent from this list is "science."

Moreover, a couple of things that their author says about the Great Ideas number 101 ("Wisdom") and 83 ("Science") in *The Syntopicon*: *An Index to the Great Ideas* suggest that the omission was intentional because, like Jacques Maritain, Adler knew that modern and contemporary science had separated themselves from the pursuit of wisdom.[15]

Regarding Adler's knowledge of modern and contemporary science separating themselves from the pursuit of wisdom, the *Syntopicon's* discussion of the Great Idea "Wisdom" indicates the author is well aware of this occurrence. It reads in part:

---

[13] Albert Einstein, "The Scientist's Responsibilities," in *What's the Matter?*, ed. Donald H. Whitfield and James L. Hicks, science consultant, (Chicago: The Great Books Foundation, with support from Harrison Middleton University, 2007), 501.

[14] Mortimer J. Adler, "The Great Conversation Revisited," in *The Great Conversation*: *A Reader's Guide to the Great Books of the Western World*, ed. Robert McHenry (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. 5th printing, 1994), 24.

[15] See Jacques Maritain, "Allocution du Président à la première séance plénière de la deuxième session de la Conférence générale de l'Unesco, 6b novembre 1947, Son Excellence Jacques Maritain, Chef de la Délégation française," in *Célébration du dentenaire de la naissance de Jacques Maritain*, *1882–1973*, no editor listed (New York: UNESCO, 1982), 9–33.

In the tradition of the great books, the moderns usually assert their superiority over the ancients in all the arts and sciences. They seldom claim superiority in wisdom. The phrase "modern science" needs no elucidation, but if anyone were to speak of modern wisdom, he would have to explain his meaning. As "modern" seems to have an immediately acceptable significance when it qualifies "science," so "ancient" seems to go with "wisdom," and to suggest that, with the centuries, far from increasing, wisdom may be lost.[16]

Clearly, the above paragraph suggests Adler accepted the claim that modern science had become separated from the pursuit of wisdom. And what the author of the Great Idea "Science" says about contemporary science strongly suggests that Adler did not precisely know where to locate contemporary science within the human person. Within that exposition, the attempt to explain just what modern science is belies Adler's claim that the phrase "modern science" needs no elucidation.

On the one hand, the *Syntopicon*'s exposition of science tends to identify science with the property of a theory to fit the facts. On the other hand, it appears to identify fitting the facts with scientists collectively agreeing that a theory is beautiful. That is, for scientists, theories appear to be forms of scientific expression analogous to forms of artistic expression, both of which are linguistic categories through which, over the centuries, scientists have come to talk about remote parts of reality. If this be so, a scientific theory would appear to be a subjective feeling; and scientific theories would appear to be true because scientists have agreed to talk about them as expressions of scientific beauty.

Even if Adler maintained that contemporary scientific theories are true because they fit the facts, contemporary "scientists" and "philosophers" of science tend to agree that contemporary science is essentially nominalistic, that no forms (principles of intrinsic unity) exist in things, including human beings, other than individual differences of quantity and mathematical, or mathematically relatable, qualities. If that be the case, then, since these same thinkers agree that scientific knowledge is "of the universal," social contract, the way scientists (systems of feelings, not facultatively-possessed substances) have agreed to talk about things, would

---

[16] Mortimer J. Adler, "101 Wisdom," in his *The Syntopicon*: *An Index to the Great Books of the Western World*, vol. 2 (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 3rd printing, 1992), 873.

determine the universality of scientific statements (precisely what are the universal facts, "the right way of naming things").

The people (systems of feeling) who finally determine word use in such a universe would not be mathematical physicists. Ultimately, they would be the sophists involved in determining the nature of science understood as a genus, those involved in determining the proper use of words (especially the use of "abstract" words), semanticists who inhabit Social Science, Psychology, Literature, and misnamed "Philosophy" departments at colleges and universities and the politicians to whom they pander.

I make the claim I do in the preceding sentence because these are the main cultural groups that control the meaning of words used in public discourse, who determine "politically" and "scientifically" correct speech. These are the groups who determine how to express in native language precisely what is a fact and to whom, along with the political minds they conceive, contemporary "scientists" chiefly have to pander for their jobs and foundation grants.

The truth of the claim in the last sentence of the paragraph immediately above is evinced in Einstein's article entitled "The Scientist's Responsibilities," in which Einstein observed about contemporary scientists slipping into a form of slavery.[17] What Einstein said strongly suggests that the scientific aesthetic about which the *Syntopicon* speaks is little more than sophistry, political correctness, that eventually places scientists falsely-so-called in the position of pandering to despots.

Just why contemporary mathematical physics would necessarily tend to slip into this sort of slavery is easy to understand. Once we replace intellectual and moral virtue as the chief, proximate, intrinsic principles of science within a human being with socialistically-enlightened and mathematically-regulated-and-restrained efficiency of will, what had been real science becomes essentially separated from natural pursuit of the human good, human happiness, and becomes essentially subordinated to the arbitrary social agreements of utopian socialists: to sincere, enlightened, feelings that some self-appointed intellectual elite (like university presidents and politicians) agree they share. In such a situation, by nature, human beings no longer incline to pursue science. Science must be imposed upon us against our natural inclination, by collective political fiat, collectively-determined, mathematically-regulated technologies of violence.

---

[17] Albert Einstein, "The Scientist's Responsibilities," 501.

Beyond what Socrates says in the *Gorgias*, the situation Einstein described chillingly matches what Gilson had to say about science shortly after World War II in an article entitled "The Terrors of the Year 2000." In that work, Gilson maintained that, with the bombing of Hiroshima, "The great secret that science has just wrested from matter is the secret of its destruction. To know today is synonymous with destroy."[18] He prophesied that, in the future, "science, formerly our hope and joy, would be the source of greatest terror."[19]

Gilson considered this bombing to be a dramatic sign revealing the essentially Nietszchean nature of contemporary science. He considered Nietzsche's declaration of God's death a declaration that signaled a metaphysical revolution happening in the West more destructive than the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. From time immemorial, all Western cultural and intellectual institutions, including science, had presupposed the existence of gods or a God. No longer. From now on Nietzsche was signaling, "We shall have to change completely our every thought, word, and deed. The entire human order totters on its base."[20] If the entirety of Western cultural history had rested upon the conviction of the existence of God, or gods, "the totality of the future must needs depend upon the contrary certitude, that God does not exist."[21]

The implication is clear, "Everything that was true from the beginning of the human race will suddenly become false."[22] To build the brave, new scientific world order, the West will first have to destroy every vestige of the old one. "Before stating what will be true, we will have to say that everything by which man has thus far lived, everything by which he still lives, is deception and trickery."[23]

Modern man's project has thus become universal surrealism, total release of human reason, of creative free spirit, from all metaphysical, moral, and aesthetic controls, including those enlightened aesthetic feelings that might have guided Einstein: the poetic spirit, the spirit of the artist gone totally mad with the intoxicating, surrealistic power of destruction. Once we destroy everything, nothing can stop us. Since the beginning of recorded time, God has gotten in the way of the artistic human spirit, has

---

[18] Étienne Gilson, *The Terrors of the Year 2000* (Toronto: St. Michael's College, 1949), 7–9.
[19] Id., 7.
[20] Id., 14–16.
[21] Id.
[22] Id., 16–17.
[23] Id., 17–18.

been the "eternal obstructor" to us being total self-creators. Now the tables are turned. With the advent of the postmodernity falsely-so-called announced by Nietzsche, we have entered "the decisive moment of a cosmic drama."[24] Protagoras and Musaios have become Dionysus.

"Everything is possible," Gilson tells us, "provided only that this creative spark which surrealism seeks to disclose deep in our being be preceded by a devastating flame." Since "the massacre of values is necessary to create values that are really new," André Breton's description of "the most simple surrealist act" becomes perfectly intelligible and throws dramatic light upon the increasingly cavalier and mass destruction of innocent life we witness in our own day: "The most simple surrealist act consists in this: to go down into the streets, pistol in hand, and shoot at random for all you are worth, into the crowd."[25]

Part of that destruction essentially involves radical alteration of the subjects, methods, and chief aims of study of contemporary Western colleges and universities. In the US and most of Europe that change started in earnest during the early part of the twentieth century. During that time the chief aim of learning changed from learning for the sake of learning (to improve the quality of our knowing and choosing faculties) to learning for the sake of success as envisioned by utopian socialists.

In the process, especially during the 1960s, traditional colleges and universities started to dismantle, or radically alter, the nature of classically-rooted Theology, Philosophy, and History departments and studies in the liberal arts in general and to replace these with Humanities and Social Science divisions. These would now teach students about the Enlightenment vision of the "science of man" as conceived by illuminaries like Rousseau, Hume, Comte, Freud, Kant, Hegel, and Marx. Presently, these disciplines are becoming increasingly indistinguishable from each other. In addition, what replaced the liberal arts started to become increasingly reduced to what, today, is commonly called "political correctness" or "tolerance."

In this new educational world order, instead of science residing in illumination of an individual intellect and will by an Agent Intellect as it did for Averroes, modern science resides in an enlightened social will: one scientific will for the entire human race manifesting itself in terms of tolerant feelings, feeling the same way about something as other people with enlightened feelings feel.

---

[24] Id., 20.
[25] Id., 21–22.

The chief reason for this change is easy to understand. Modernity has moved truth out of the individual human intellect and relocated it within the socialist will-to-power (socialistically-enlightened and mathematically-regulated-and-restrained efficiency of will). The traditional liberal arts curriculum was chiefly designed as a handmaiden to speculative philosophy, especially metaphysics, those habits of knowing that most liberate human beings from ignorance and propaganda. Training the will to become docile to taking direction from enlightened despots is no fitting role for the traditional liberal arts, or classical philosophy, especially metaphysics. But it is precisely what the enlightened colleges and universities of the new world order demand.

"Tolerance" in this modern sense has nothing chiefly to do with classical morality. It is not chiefly a moral category in the classical sense. It has nothing to do with the classical moral virtue of justice, which someone violates when treating another person in a vicious way. In its socialistically-enlightened meaning, "tolerance" is a metaphysical, hermeneutical quality for training the will or the human emotions, with which the will is largely identified today (in which truth, and, with it, science, have now been relocated) passively to accept whatever utopian socialists (who are the only ones who determine science, truth, and freedom) tell us about reality, especially about how to read history.

For, in the new world order, metaphysics is reduced to a quality of will that readily accepts Rousseau's neo-gnostic narrative (fairy tale) that the whole of science is the historically progressive project of emergence of human conscience from backward states of religion to enlightened states of ever-inclusive feeling, of love for the utopian-socialist vision of humanity (a mindset I call "neo-Averroism"). And anyone who does not accept this narrative is essentially unjust, a bigot.[26]

No place exists in this new world order for classically-oriented, liberal arts colleges and universities. From the new world order perspective, such institutions are backward, unscientific, medieval. What is needed in the new, global, "enlightened" college and university system is a vocational-training institute for success, in the utopian-socialist sense, within the new world order.

---

[26] For a detailed examination of this new understanding of "tolerance," see Peter A. Redpath, "Justice in the New World Order: Reduction of Justice to Tolerance in the New Totalitarian World State," *Telos* 157 (2011): 185–192.

To create such a global, secular college and university system, during the twentieth century, and even before, utopian socialists pushed for the creation of tax-subsidized government colleges and universities in the West. In the US and some other places, these colleges and universities, and private ones, which subjected themselves to periodic review by governmentally-approved accreditation agencies, could then control the curriculum content of colleges and universities, and offer students low interest-rate student loans for attending the programs of these institutions. Non-accredited programs were then generally stigmatized as inferior, and transfer of credit from these programs to other college and universities was generally impossible.

No knowledge that divorces itself from essential connection to the pursuit of wisdom and of improving the quality of the soul of the knower can possibly be science. It is foolishness. Science presupposes the existence of a moral culture rooted in minimum levels of professional honesty (professional ethics), especially justice, as a necessary condition for its existence. As Plato and Aristotle realized centuries ago, absent an individual knower who produces science through psychological habits that act as proximate, internal first principles of science advancing the knower closer to wisdom and happiness, no way exists to explain how the individual act of science exists and is generated by an individual knower and is humanly worth pursuing by nature or otherwise.

If science is a social system consisting of shared feelings of utopian socialist elites, and if possession of science must precede possession of truth and freedom, as well as the ability to make mistakes and lie, then we can well understand why this neo-Averroistic mindset of utopian socialism inclines to produce modernity's most simple surrealist act of mass murder: going down into the streets, pistol in hand, and shooting at random for all you are worth into the crowd.

If no individual human being possesses truth or freedom, if these consist in social-system feelings of an enlightened General Will, Pelagius was right: no one of us possesses original sin. Worse, unlike Pelagius, who thought that the natural human will could choose between good and evil, as individuals all of us in the new world order are immaculately conceived, innocent, and remain so throughout life. Any wrongdoing we might appear freely to cause is something totally determined by the Western social system.

If only modern scientists as social wills possess truth and freedom, then only modern scientists are the cause of all lies, all moral evil. For to

be able to lie or commit other moral evils, a person must first know the true and the good and refuse to tell the truth or choose the good. If such is the case, as the first principle of all modern science, the scientific culture of the West, the Western social "system" must be the only cause of all modern evil. Hence, shooting blindly into the crowd becomes perfectly comprehensible, makes logical sense.

The existence of politicians, husbands who cheat on their wives, and the existence of myriads of other examples of non-scientists who know how to lie, make evident that science has no monopoly on generating truth, freedom, falsehoods, and lies. Truth and freedom do not presuppose science. Science presupposes truth and freedom, as well as individual virtue.

In Book 1 of his *Republic*, through the character of Socrates, Plato maintained that, without virtue, without the habit of justice being practiced between or among them, human beings could accomplish nothing collectively powerful. Virtues are psychological qualities, internal first principles, that enable a facultative act to be exercised in an essentially powerful, or more powerful, way. For virtues advance the power of faculties of the human soul toward secure union with their proper objects, external first principles, thereby advancing human beings toward wisdom and happiness. Hence, some level of individual justice is a necessary cultural condition for the generation of science.[27]

In the *Gorgias*, in his critique of Polus' claim that sophists and tyrants have great power, Socrates argues that sophists and tyrants cannot have great power because they are fools, men without intelligence doing what appears best to them. While they do what they please, they do not do what they chiefly want, what they chiefly will by nature: advancement of their own human good. Their foolish actions cause them to conflate pleasure and natural desire and act against their own natural best interests. As Plato well understood, nothing is worse for a human being than for a fool to get what he wants. A person without intelligence doing what appears best to him, what he pleases, is no human success story, is not powerful in any properly human sense, and certainly not in a scientific sense.[28]

Properly speaking, human power, the power of human science, is not brute animal force, nor the violence of Mother Nature. It is not like that of a bull in a china shop. It does not consist in pushing people around, nor in the ability, like Sir Francis Bacon thought, to force nature to reveal her

---

[27] Plato, *Republic*, Bk. 1, 351C–352B.
[28] Plato, *Gorgias*, 466A–480E and 491D–522E

secrets.[29] It works cooperatively, not despotically, with the natures of things to cause them to reveal their secrets. It is not Machiavellianism applied to the physical universe, even if directed by sincere, Enlightenment feelings.

Toward the start of his *Metaphysics*, following the historical progression of human knowledge in antiquity and individual human life, Aristotle realized that advance from sense knowledge and experience to wisdom follows a natural, architectonic order of human desire involving the sequential development of arts of manual labor; through the generation of habits of leisure and moral (religious) culture; to generation of the speculative habits, or arts, of the *quadrivium* and the *trivium*; to the birth of the speculative philosophical sciences of physics, mathematics, and, finally, metaphysics.[30] In his *Nicomachean Ethics* he unites this natural human desire of practical and productive forms of human knowledge progressively to generate the speculative sciences of physics and mathematics so that the scientific habit of metaphysics can come into being to advance the natural human pursuit of happiness (something that, in Book 7 of his *Republic*, Plato had seen as a role also played by the habit of mathematics) that consists in possession of wisdom.[31]

Modern socialism is not chiefly a political or economic theory that generates scientific positivism. Modern socialism, utopian socialism, is chiefly a metaphysical/historical fairy tale about the progressive evolution of human consciousness from backward states of religious and philosophical consciousness that attempts rationally to justify contemporary scientific reductionism by displacing the true description of scientific progress as growing out of a natural human inclination to liberate ourselves from ignorance through increasingly more perfect habits of knowing higher causes. Failure to recognize modern socialism for what it chiefly is (a metaphysical, not economic or political, fraud) is one of the most dangerous mistakes made by modern Western culture.

While the metaphysical teachings about human science of Rousseau and Thomas Hobbes will generally incline to generate totalitarianism more quickly than will those of John Locke, rationally consistent application of Locke's teachings will eventually tend to produce totalitarianism as well.

---

[29] Sir Francis Bacon, *Novum Organum*, Bk 1, "Aphorisms," n. 98.

[30] Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Bk. 1, ch. 1, 980a20–983a25.

[31] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, Bk. 10, ch. 6, 1176a29–1179a34; Plato, *Republic*, Bk. 7, 525A–527D,

After all, if Locke knows not what a substance is, Locke knows not who or what possesses science, other than some enlightened, social system of feelings. Scratch Locke hard enough metaphysically and underneath you will find a nominialist and skeptic.[32] This helps explain why, unmoored from proper metaphysical foundations, even self-professed conservative Republicans and Democrats who tend to look upon modern natural rights theories championed by thinkers like Locke as bastions of defense against socialism, often wind up eventually pandering to dictators like Archelaus.

We human beings tend to be slow learners. While we have gotten out of the habit of talking about moral principles like "natural law," we still hold onto its vestige in our enlightened, secularized appeals to natural rights. Such appeals help us to pretend not to understand the catastrophic consequences of the grandiose sophistry of the postmodern project falsely-so-called. If we pretend long enough that this sophistry does not exist, perhaps it will go away.

Unhappily, it will not. Gilson tells us that the father of our contemporary existential project is Sisyphus, not Prometheus. Our modern destiny has become "the absurd" and "truly exhausting task" of perpetual self-invention without model, purpose, or rule. Having turned ourselves into gods, we do not know what to do with our divinity or unlimited freedom.[33]

But what will happen to us when more of us start to realize that, without conviction of the existence of a human nature really existing in things, natural rights are a reflection of nothing, convenient illusions moderns have created to maintain the intoxicating joy of our own poetic and sophistic project? Even drunkards, at times, tire of their alcoholism.

Gilson admonishes us that our modern story is really quite old. He recounts the story from the *Book of Samuel* (8:7–22) in which the Jewish people, tired of being free, asked the aging prophet Samuel to make them a king to judge them, like all other nations had. While Samuel was saddened by their request and saw it as a rejection of him as a judge, God told him to grant the people's wish with the forewarning of the sorts of bondage that would beset them once their wish was fulfilled.[34]

---

[32] For my critique of Locke as a nominalist, see my *Masquerade of the Dream Walkers*: *Prophetic Theology from the Cartesians to Hegel*, 33–36.
[33] Gilson, *The Terrors of the Year 2000.*, 21–25.
[34] Id., 26–27.

Having refused to serve God and traditional natural law, we have no one left to judge the State, no arbiter between us and the totalitarian State. Hence, Gilson tells us in 1948:

> In every land and in all countries, the people wait with fear and trembling for the powerful of this world to decide their lot for them. They hesitate, uncertain among the various forms of slavery which are being prepared for them. Listening with bated breath to the sounds of those countries which fall one after the other with a crash followed by a long silence, they wonder in anguish how long will last this little liberty they still possess. The waiting is so tense that many feel a vague consent to slavery secretly germinating within themselves. With growing impatience, they await the arrival of the master who will impose on them all forms of slavery starting with the most degrading of all—that of mind.[35]

Finding ourselves totally free to engage in the perpetual task of endless self-creation, Gilson thinks we resemble a soldier on a twenty-four hour leave with nothing to do: totally bored in the tragic loneliness of an idle freedom we no longer know how productively to use.[36] While we cannot create anything, we now possess the intoxicating power to destroy everything and the desire to have someone else tell us what to do. As a result, feeling totally empty and alone, we offer to anyone willing to take it what remains of the little freedom we no longer know how to use, "ready for all the dictators, leaders of these human herds who follow them as guides and who are all finally conducted by them to the same place—the abbatoir" (the slaughterhouse).[37]

While many, perhaps most, contemporary Western intellectuals, artists, and politicians might not think of ourselves as being propagandists promoting the cause of political totalitarianism and preparing the slaughterhouses of the future, as Gilson has well observed, we human beings think the way we can, not the way we wish.[38] Quite often the principles we apply to solve problems and difficulties often produce effects worse than the problems and difficulties we had initially intended to cure.

---

[35] Id., 28.
[36] Id., 24.
[37] Id., 28–29.
[38] Étienne Gilson, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 19675), 302.

Just as no human being can with rational consistency defend as *definite* the claim that nothing in the universe *is definite*, no human being can, with rational consistency, be metaphysically a utopian socialist and scientifically, politically, or economically a defender of individual liberty. Metaphysical and historical experience teach that no form of nominalism or skepticism about moral and metaphysical principles inclines to promote science and individual freedom. Eventually, all forms of nominalism and skepticism about moral and metaphysical principles incline their proponents to adopt in their absence social practices that tend to generate political totalitarianism.

Consequently, nothing short of a total rejection of the popular modern reduction of truth to science generically and specifically understood as socialistically-enlightened efficiency of will can stop the tide of Western culture toward totalitarianism and all its attendant evils, including destruction of the individual freedom and the natural family, and a tendency to generate mass murder.

Human beings do not generate science by universal methodic doubt possessed by some amorphous collection of ideas nominalistically feeling themselves into a logical system, nor by Kantian impossible dreams, the Hegelian historical march of Absolute Spirit, the Marxist historical dialectic, nor any of the other fictions created by modern sophists to divorce the natural connection of science to human virtue, especially to wisdom. Science is an essential, natural, habitual stepping stone along the way to wisdom. Separating knowledge from wisdom and from habits of the human knower that generate science and wisdom eventually destroys science and individual liberty. Yet, this separation is precisely what modern scientists "falsely-so-called" have championed—and continue to champion. It is about time for students of St. Thomas to to follow the lead of Jude P. Dougherty and to challenge their false claim to be scientists and to help better explain to modernity precisely what is the nature of science and scientific explanation.

THE ESSENTIAL CONNECTION BETWEEN
MODERN SCIENCE AND UTOPIAN SOCIALISM

SUMMARY

The chief aim of this paper is to demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt how, through an essential misunderstanding of the nature of philosophy, and science, over the past several centuries, the prevailing Western tendency to reduce the whole of science to mathematical physics unwittingly generated utopian socialism as a political substitute for metaphysics. In short, being unable speculatively, philosophically, and metaphysically to justify this reduction, some Western intellectuals re-conceived the natures of philosophy, science, and metaphysics as increasingly enlightened, historical and political forms of the evolution of human consciousness toward creation of systematic science, a science of clear and distinct ideas. In the process they unwittingly wound up reducing contemporary philosophy and Western higher education largely into tools of utopian socialist political propaganda.

KEYWORDS: agent intellect, ancient, artist, colleges, creative free spirit, creator, destroy, explanation, false, fairy tale, force, freedom, general will, God, great idea, history, humanities, idea, illumine, imagination, intellect, light, Literature, meditation, metaphysics, modern science, modern socialism, morality, nature, philosopher, philosophy, positivism, propaganda, psychology, pure reason, reality, reason, science, scientific, scientist, seeker, self-creator, sight, social science, social system, socialism, sophistry, speculative, surrealism, system, theology, tolerance, totalitarianism, truth, universal methodic doubt, universities, utopian socialism, Vienna Circle, violence, violent, virtue, West, will, wisdom.

Robert Sokolowski
The Catholic University of America
Washington, USA

HONOR, ANGER, AND BELITTLEMENT IN ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS

Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, as well as his other ethical writings, offer both a phenomenology and an ontology of human moral action. In these writings Aristotle shows us how ethical phenomena present themselves in our experience of human conduct, but he also shows how these various ethical dispositions and performances activate the human being. The *Nicomachean Ethics* does not simply provide moral guidelines; it is also a philosophical anthropology. It shows what we are as human beings, and how we are at our best and worst. We cannot understand what we are as human beings unless we also appreciate how we should and should not be: that is, how we succeed or fail as human beings, or how we achieve or fail to achieve happiness. Our *eidos* and *telos* are inseparable. We cannot understand the one without understanding the other. Our form as human beings is simply the potential for our end or *telos* and it is not intelligible apart from it.

One way of commenting on the *Ethics* is to examine the large-scale categories of human conduct, such as virtue, vice, pleasure, pain, and happiness. Another is to delve into the fine grain of ethical phenomena. This second approach has much to recommend it, and it will be followed in this essay. The small scale of things is often the more realistic because it is more concrete and hence more verifiable. If we get down to very detailed phenomena, we can be more easily convinced that what we are talking about is truly there. For example, in *Nicomachean Ethics* VII, 7, Aristotle discusses various kinds of what is often called incontinence or lack of self-restraint (*akrasia*). The topic of incontinence has been extensively discussed in recent decades of scholarly writing on Aristotle's ethics and in moral philosophy generally. The incontinent agent is the one who reasons

correctly in regard to ethical issues but is not able to resist his emotions and desires. Consequently, he does what he does not really want to do. He thinks and even knows he should not do something and yet, in the presence of the thing, he does it anyway. His moral reason is overcome by his desires or aversions.

But Aristotle does not stop with this rather general description. He fine-tunes his analysis of incontinence. At the end of chapter 7 (1150b19–28) he divides incontinence into two kinds: weakness (*astheneia*) and impetuosity (*propeteia*). The weak are people who carry out practical thinking and come to a decision, but their reason is so feeble or "sickly" that it is not able to withstand the force of their emotions. They do exercise their reason, they think, know, and deliberate, and may even come to a conclusion; but they cannot hold their ground when their emotions kick in. The impetuous, in contrast, suffer from a deficiency in their moral reasoning itself. Their problem is not that their moral thinking gives way after arriving at a decision; rather, their reason is inconclusive or even fails to get started. Aristotle brings out the phenomenon of impetuousness by further distinguishing it into two subcategories, the keen (*hoi oxeis*) and the excitable (*hoi melancholikoi*). Keen people think too much and they think too quickly; their reason is flighty; it flutters around, going here and there, making too many distinctions; it's too smart for its own good ("Maybe I'll do this; no, I'll do that; no, wait a minute, maybe this other thing; etc. etc. etc."). Finally, emotion just takes over and the person behaves incontinently. The excitable, in contrast, do not think at all; their emotion is so strong and fast—it is choleric, explosive—that in a practical situation it surges up before they begin to deliberate. Their reason is overcome before it gets started. In both cases reason is not so much conquered as preempted.

Aristotle, therefore, does not just define incontinence and leave it at that; he divides and subdivides it, and these analytical descriptions serve to verify his theorizing of moral action. He gets down to particular kinds of people that we can easily recognize in our own experience of moral agents and that we can contrast with other kinds. The detail of his distinctions guarantees the truth of what he says. The very fact that he can make these distinctions and subdistinctions shows that what he is talking about is real.

Honor and Human Happiness

I wish to consider the phenomenon of honor (*timē*) in this manner: to examine Aristotle's description of it and its role in ethical and political life, and to appreciate what he has to say about it. The study of honor will be our major concern in this essay, but it leads naturally to two related phenomena, anger (*orgē*) and belittlement or contempt (*oligōria*). Examining them will help us define honor more precisely.

Honor appears early in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Aristotle begins the work by reminding us that all human actions and activities are geared toward some good. Most of the good things we act for are in turn ordered to other goods, but by the logic of goods there must be some end (*telos*) that does not point beyond itself toward yet a further good. There must be something for which all actions are done, something we are looking for in everything that we do. Nothing would be good if there were not an anchor for all the derivative goods. What could this be? Since it is the most comprehensive human good, it will be sought in the most comprehensive human community and by the most comprehensive human knowledge and art, which, he says, is the political. These thoughts about goods and ends are expressed in chapters 1 and 2 of book I, which are followed by a chapter on the precision we can expect in moral thinking and the need for experience if we are to engage in it.

In chapter 4 he returns to the question of the good. He says that most people agree about the name of this good beyond which there is no other (*onomati men oun schedon hupo tōn pleistōn homologeitai*): both "the many" (*hoi polloi*) and "the better people" (*hoi charientes*) call it *eudaimonia* or happiness (1095a17–19). The fact that there is a name used by practically everyone to designate this good is important. It shows that somehow almost everyone has a sense that there is a point to life; they even use the same word for it. The linguistic fact has an anthropological significance; it is not trivial that there is a name for what everyone is ultimately looking for. Aristotle says, however, that although most people agree on the name, and even agree on a verbal definition—they take it to mean "to live well and to do well (*to d' eu zēn kai to eu prattein*)"—they disagree on what *eudaimonia* is (*peri de tēs eudaimonias ti esti amphisbētousi*).

The contrast between agreement on the name and its verbal definition and disagreement on what the named thing is deserves consideration. People in general use a name in common to designate what life is all about, and they can even agree on an abstract paraphrase of what they mean by it;

but what they concretely take it to be differs. Words should adhere to what they name, but in this instance the name and the thing fall apart. Aristotle immediately goes on to spell out this difference in understanding by distinguishing two groups of human beings: "the many" (*hoi polloi*) do not give the same account as "the wise" (*hoi sophoi*). The many, he says, take the good to be something that is obvious and easy to see, something tangible right in front of us, such as pleasure or wealth or honor (*hēdonēn hē plouton hē timēn*). These people will often marvel when they are told about "something big" (*mega ti*) and "beyond them" (*kai huper autous*), precisely because their own tangible candidates for the substance of the happy life—pleasure, wealth, honor—are so variable, multiple, and unreliable: we want health when we are sick and wealth when we are poor. The others, "the wise," in contrast, take it to be something else; in fact, he says that these people speak about a good that is somehow beyond the many goods that we can easily identify (*para ta polla tauta agatha*); they say it is simply good in itself (*allo ti kath' hauto*) and the cause of all the diverse goods.

This passage in chapter 4 contains the first mention of honor in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Honor is introduced, along with pleasure and wealth, as one of the obvious candidates that people propose as the substance of human happiness. At this point Aristotle does not define what he means by honor; he assumes that we have an idea of what it is from our normal experience of life. He will define it, not in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, but in the *Rhetoric*. The *Ethics* remains with ordinary language and its understandings.

In the next chapter of the *Ethics*, chapter 5, he says that "the many" generally choose to live a life like that of cattle.[1] However, a certain kind of people—those who are gentlemen and who are active, that is, those who get important things done (*hoi de charientes kai praktikoi*)—choose honor, and, he says, honor is pretty much the *telos* of political life, the life that is led in the most comprehensive human community. For political actors,

---

[1] The relationships in the text between "the many" (*hoi polloi*) and "the better people" (*hoi charientes*) are confusing. In chapter 4 the many are first distinguished from the better people, and Aristotle says that both groups use the word *eudaimonia* to name the final good, and that both define it as living well and doing well. But then he distinguishes the many from the wise, and says that the many place happiness in obvious things such as pleasure, wealth, and honor. Thus, when Aristotle mentions honor for the first time, he does so while saying that it is the many who consider it as a final good (he does not mention the better people here). In chapter 5, however, he says that in general the many live for vulgar and bodily pleasures, while the better and active people seek honor.

honor seems to be the good beyond which nothing better or greater can be wished for. This brief introduction of honor as the terminal human good is, however, followed by a quick and elegant refutation of that opinion. Aristotle criticizes the understanding that the better and active people have, and in a few concise sentences he undermines honor as the final human good. He does not do his to disparage honor; he just shows, by the simple logic of the thing, that there must be something better. He unfolds the way honor is, the properties that it has, and thereby shows that it cannot be the good beyond which there is no other. He sharpens ordinary language and the opinions embedded in it.

He gives two reasons why honor cannot be the ultimate human good. First, honor depends on other people, and therefore it is not truly our own; it exists more in those who honor and not in those who are honored. Certainly our greatest good should be something that is our very own (*oikeion ti*) and not easily taken away. If it depends on others it could hardly be the thing that makes us happy. We would be held hostage by others and their changing opinions. Second, people seem to seek honor (*eoikasi tēn timēn diōkein*) so that they can believe that they are good (*hina pisteusōsin heautous agathous einai*). The honor reassures them that they are indeed good (hence that their lives are worth while and that they have achieved happiness). We might say that the bestowal of an honor on someone allows him to construct a syllogism that demonstrates even to himself his goodness and success in life: if we are being honored, we must be good. We seem to need the approval of others to prove to ourselves that we are happy; we do not seem able to know this through our own evidencing.

For this reason, Aristotle says, we seek to be honored (a) by those who have practical wisdom (*hupo tōn phronimōn*), (b) in the presence of those by whom we are known (*par' hois ginōskontai*), and (c) on the basis of our virtue (*kai ep' aretēi*). The triplet in this sentence is exquisitely concise and leads to a climax. Even the three prepositions build tension in the sentence: *hupo*, *para*, *epi*: by, before, upon. Honor depends on others, but not on any others. Serious honor—as opposed to celebrity—must come from those who have moral intelligence. Next, the honor is given to us in the presence of people by whom we are known, people who can recognize and applaud the honor. It is not bestowed in solitude or before strangers; who would want to be honored in the presence of people who do not know him? And finally honor is appropriate only if we truly have the virtue that is being recognized; otherwise we would be frauds and shamed rather than

honored.[2] Honor is, therefore, essentially directed beyond itself toward an excellence that calls forth the honor. Aristotle said that we seek honor so that we can believe that we are good; this very need for assurance shows that we already know implicitly that our virtue is a greater good than the honor itself. This analysis of the properties of honor—the predicates that belong essentially to it but not as its definition—is both metaphysical and phenomenological. Honor is the acknowledgment of virtue and it would not exist without it, and so, consequently, virtue is a greater good than honor, that on which honor depends. Honor depends both on other people and on our own virtue. It is penultimate and not ultimate.

We should observe that in Aristotle's analysis virtue becomes a candidate for being the final good, not by itself, but only through honor. Virtue is not one of the standard things that people propose as the substance of happiness; Aristotle brings virtue into his argument, not on the basis of pleasure or wealth, the other two things that people spontaneously recognize, but through honor, the third thing they acknowledge and the most noble of the three. We might have thought that virtue could have been mentioned in the original list of obvious goods—pleasure, wealth, honor, and virtue—but it was not. It came into view only by contrast with honor, not by its own evidence. The very non-finality of honor allows virtue to emerge as that which enables honor to be good.

Therefore, Aristotle says, virtue seems to be the telos of political life and not honor. But even virtue seems incomplete, because it needs to be exercised and we may lack the opportunity, and it may be accompanied by great misfortunes and suffering. He then alludes cryptically to the theoretic life and says he will consider it later. He concludes the chapter by turning to the life dedicated to wealth and says that it could not be the happy life; wealth is not the good that we are looking for (*to zētoumenon agathon*) because it obviously is for the sake of something else. The point does not need an argument, as honor did. He says finally that the other things we just spoke about—honor and virtue, presumably, and perhaps pleasure— seem rather to be the ends of human life in contrast with wealth, because they are in fact loved for themselves whereas wealth obviously is not. But even they seem insufficient. The question about the final human good is

---

[2] Honor is given by people who have moral intelligence (*phronimoi*) but celebrity can be bestowed by people who have perverse reasons to make us famous. Honor is given in the presence of people who know us but celebrity wants to be recognized by everyone and anyone, anywhere. And honor is an acknowledgment of virtue whereas celebrity is an empty suit, a fabricated appearance with no substance inside.

left dangling in book I. In this book Aristotle simply raises questions that will be dealt with in the rest of the work.

The Definition of Honor

In *NE* I, 5, Aristotle describes some of the properties of honor but he does not yet define it. The definition is given in book I chapter 5 of the *Rhetoric*. What is the context for it? Aristotle understands rhetoric as skill in using the available means of persuasion. He distinguishes three kinds of rhetoric: the political, which deals with deliberation about what is to be done; the forensic or legal, which deals with judgments about things that have been done; and the epideictic or ceremonial, which deals with praising and censuring persons and events. Political rhetoric deals with the future, forensic with the past, and epideictic with the present.

Aristotle presents his definition of honor during his treatment of political rhetoric. He says that political rhetoric deals with things that are to be done, and the speaker or rhetor must know how to address an assembly as it deliberates about what to do then and there, in the situation in which the community finds itself. To do this effectively, the speaker must show that he understands human goods in general. To help him acquire such knowledge, Aristotle restates his claim about happiness as the good that everyone is seeking, and he lists fourteen or fifteen component parts (*merē*) of happiness (1360b19–24), things such as good birth, many friends, good friends, wealth, good children, many children, old age, and the like. The final three in the list of components are honor, good luck (*eutuchia*), and virtue. Again, virtue has the dignity of coming last, beyond honor, but the presence of good luck between them is noteworthy. Aristotle then goes on to discuss each of these components. When he reaches honor (1361a27–28), which comes right after good reputation (*eudoxia*), he gives his definition. He says, "Honor is a sign (*timē d' esti men sēmeion*) of fame for great service (*euergetikēs doxēs*)." It is a sign that people believe that you have done something important and beneficent. It is not just a sign that you have in fact done something good; it is, rather, a sign that you are known and famed for having done the good and great deed: the word *doxa* has the sense of public manifestation and reputation, the sense of glory. If people honor you, they do something that indicates that they recognize that you have done great service. There is, therefore, a double intentionality in this definition. The first intentionality is located in the sign that is performed, the *sēmeion*: the sign indicates the opinion people have of you. The second

intentionality is in the *doxa* itself, which is directed toward what you have done.

Aristotle goes on to say that usually and most justly honor is given to people who have already done their noble service (*hoi euergetēkotes*), but it is sometimes given on the basis of the potential of doing good in the future (*kai ho dunamenos euergetein*). In the latter case, a man would be honored because of what he seems capable of doing when he is appointed to do it. To illustrate these two cases, we might think, first, of a retirement banquet when a person concludes a career in a position of responsibility and everyone agrees that he has done a good job; and, second, a banquet held when a talented and respected person is newly appointed to an office and people expect him to do well. Both the *energeia* and the *dunamis* are recognized and honored.

Aristotle lists some of the achievements for which people are honored. He mentions first of all things "related to protection (*eis sōtērian*)," especially preservation of the very existence (*hosa aitia tou einai*) of those bestowing the honor; this would certainly include heroism or success in defense of a community. He also lists some components (*merē*) of honor (1361a34), the kinds of signs that serve to honor someone: religious sacrifices, written memorials in poetry or prose, privileges, pieces of land, front seats, public burial, statues, and public support. He says that among the barbarians prostrations (*proskunēseis*) and standing aside (*ekstasis*) are used as signs of honor; he seems to take them as excessive and demeaning. He concludes the list by saying that in all nations gifts (*dōra*) are a suitable way of honoring people, because they are both honorific and useful to the recipient. These are wonderfully exact descriptions of things that are still done and always will be done to honor people so long as we retain our humanity; we might think of solemn military funerals, medals, encomia, portraits, and public pensions.

When Aristotle says that honor is a sign that the recipient is known for having done some service, he gives the definition of honor. This predicate is not one more property, like the three that were examined in *NE* I, 5. The properties are not on a par with the defining feature; rather, they "flow from" it. Because honor is by definition a sign, there must be someone who signals the honor by performing the sign, and in the *Ethics* Aristotle says that you want people who have moral intelligence (*hoi phronimoi*) to bestow the honor, that is, to make the sign that you are recognized for having done some service. If you are being honored for heroism, it is appropriate that you have a reputable official with the proper authority to bestow the

medal on you. The nature of the person who bestows the honor does not define what honor is, but it is a property that flows from the definition and it is essential, not accidental. Likewise, if you are being honored it should be in the presence of people by whom you are known, so that they can understand the sign appropriately. They are the ones to whom your deeds are known. And finally, you should be honored on the basis of your virtue, which enabled you to perform the service for which you are known and honored. You should, for example, not be honored simply because the ruler is your father. These three features are properties of honor. They are not accidental to it, and we can understand their necessity by seeing how they flow from the definition of honor as a sign of service rendered.

Honor Compared with Friendship

We have examined the introductory remarks Aristotle makes about honor in *NE* I, 4–5, where he relates it to the final human good. He also speaks about honor in an unexpected context, during his treatment of friendship in books VIII and IX. What he says about it there is meant to clarify the nature of friendship but it illuminates honor as well.

The first half of *NE* VIII, 8 (1159a12–b1) is devoted to the question whether it is better to be befriended (*phileisthai*) or to befriend (*philein*). Most people (*hoi polloi*), Aristotle says, wish more to be befriended than to befriend, and they wish this because of the love of honor (*dia philotimian*) or ambition.[3] He then compares both being befriended and being honored with being flattered; this is, we might observe, a rather unflattering comparison, since flattery deals with untruth and pretense. The comparison degrades both being befriended and being honored. A flatterer, he says, presents himself as a friend in an inferior position (*huperechomenos gar philos ho kolax*) who wants more to befriend than to be loved. This sudden introduction of the flatterer is quite interesting; the flatterer turns out to be a parody of both friendship and honor. He unifies both within himself and vitiates them. He presents himself as a subordinate friend and in his words he pretends to honor his target, but in both dimensions he is not what he seems to be. Aristotle concludes this sentence by saying that being befriended is like being honored, and this is what the many want, but he also

---

[3] The use of the word "wish" (*boulesthai*, *boulēsis*) in this passage is noteworthy. As Aristotle points out in III, 2, we can wish for three things: for impossibilities; for things that can be done only by other people; and for things that we ourselves can do but not here and now, only through deliberation and choice. Wishes are always for something that lies at a distance.

implies that the many are not good judges in these matters, as he will show in what comes next.

In the next stage in his argument, Aristotle spells out his understanding of honor and its logic at greater length (1159a17–27). He talks about how the many (*hoi polloi*) seek honor; they do not seek it for itself (*di' auto*) but only incidentally (*kata sumbebēkos*). They want honor for something that is attached to it. Specifically, they want honor from people who are in powerful positions (*hupo tōn en tais exousias*), because such honor gives its recipient hope (*dia tēn elipda*) that he will get good things from these important people. The honor becomes, says Aristotle, a sign (*sēmeion*) of benefits to come. Here, honor is no longer a sign that we have done something good for the community, as it was in *NE* I, 5; it is now a sign that we hope to get something good for ourselves out of the community. This is how the many look at honor; they want it for their own advantage. We might note that Aristotle did not discuss how the many viewed honor when he treated it in *NE* I, 5. There he only described how the better and active people considered it.

Next in *NE* VIII, 8, Aristotle turns away from the many and speaks about people who want honor, not from the powerful, but from people who are better (*hupo tōn epieikōn*) and knowing (*kai eidotōn*), and they want such honor in order to strengthen their own opinion about themselves. They too do not want honor for its own sake, but for something attached to it; in this case they do not want favors from the powerful, but they want reassurance about themselves. They rejoice in the fact that they are good (*chairousi dē, hoti eisi agathoi*), believing in the judgment (*pisteuontes tēi krisēi*) of those who speak about them. This second point is basically the same as Aristotle's analysis of the role and logic of honor in *NE* I, 5, where he discusses the way in which the "better and practical" people seek honor.

No more is said about honor in the section of *NE* VIII, 8 that we are discussing. After the material we have considered, Aristotle returns to the theme of friendship. He says that although people want honor for reasons beyond the honor itself, they delight in being befriended or being loved for its own sake, not for anything beyond it. It is interesting to note that Aristotle does not say that being loved somehow confirms our own opinion of ourselves or our own goodness; he simply says that we want it for its own sake and it is desirable in itself. Being befriended, he says, shows up as "stronger (*kreitton*: mightier, more powerful) than being honored (*tou timasthai*)." It seems, therefore, to be like a final good. But then Aristotle drops the contrast with honor entirely, and recalibrates his argument by

focusing simply on the contrast between being befriended and actively befriending.

His argument now takes a different turn; he appeals to an instance of *philia* that shows that active befriending is more of a perfection than being befriended. He uses the example of mothers who love their children and are willing to give them up to be raised by others, and so long as they see the children prospering, do not want to be loved in return. This is the single argument Aristotle provides, and as edifying as it might be, it seems rather particular in contrast with the other more general arguments he gave in regard to honor. It seems strange that on the basis of this single example he can come to the conclusion of this issue. And yet, this is such a pure instance of active *philein* without any *phileisthai*, and it is so universally and easily understandable, since almost all of us know the nature of a mother's love, and it is so contrary to what Plato presents in his description of the common possession of children in the *Republic*, that it does have a certain power to show the difference between loving and being loved and to reveal the superiority of the former. Aristotle says, finally, that since the substance of friendship lies more in the befriending (*mallon de tēs philias ousēs en tōi philein*), and since those who love their friends are praised, it seems clear that befriending is *the* virtue of friends (*philōn aretē to philein eoiken*; 1159a33–35). The strongest instance of friendship, its highest human excellence and its highest exercise of reason, lies in befriending rather than in being befriended.

Anger, Belittlement, and Dishonor

We have examined Aristotle's treatment of honor in *NE* I, in the *Rhetoric*, and in *NE* VIII. We now turn to his most extensive treatment of honor, which is found in *NE* IV. Aristotle defines virtue in *NE* II and then discusses human action and responsibility in the first five chapters of book III. Then he goes through the various virtues and vices in the rest of book III and in book IV. In *NE* III he treats courage (chapters 6–9) and temperance (chapters 10–12). These are the two foundational virtues; they deal with establishing ourselves as agents pure and simple, with ordering our desires and aversions and enabling us to be there at all as entities that are capable of human action. They deal, respectively, with the painful and the pleasant. It is noteworthy that courage comes first; just to stand forth as human beings we need to overcome opposition, danger, and affliction; even to stand upright we need to overcome the pull of gravity. We must be

disposed to stand fast; being so disposed is being courageous. Once we are on our feet, however, we also need to moderate our desires and pleasures, so that we are not disordered in the way we move outward in our engagements with things. Courage needs to be complemented by temperance. Aristotle says that temperance deals specifically with bodily desires and pleasures, with eating and drinking and with reproduction, that is, with bodily preservation and procreation, with staying alive: maintaining our own identity and replicating it in offspring. Temperance is the specific virtue of the rational *animal*. It brings our animal nature into a human condition. Courage and temperance are, therefore, the elementary human virtues. They are treated in book III.

In the nine chapters of *NE* IV Aristotle deals with eight other virtues and with shame. All these dimensions of human agency are built upon and presuppose the courage and temperance of *NE* III. They move to a higher and more complex level in *NE* IV. The first two virtues, generosity and magnificence, deal with wealth. Generosity shows how we can be virtuous with wealth on a more ordinary scale, while magnificence involves great wealth and great expenditures. The third and fourth chapters deal with honor, and here the scale is reversed. In contrast with his treatment of the virtues dealing with wealth, Aristotle discusses the virtues of large-scale honors first and ordinary-scale honors second. Thus, chapter 3 deals with *megalopsuchia* or greatness of soul and chapter 4 deals with *philotimia* or love of honor. *Philotimia* is often translated as ambition and *ho philotimos* as the ambitious man. The translations are not inaccurate, but they are deficient in that the English terms "ambition" and "ambitious" lose the explicit reference to honor that is found in the Greek *philotimia*. I should also recall Aristotle's remark in *NE* I, 4, in his initial discussion of human happiness and the final good, where he said that most people think that happiness is found in something obvious and tangible, such as pleasure, wealth, or honor. This sequence appears again here in his more complete treatment of the virtues, where the discussion of temperance, which deals with pleasure, is followed by his discussion of generosity and magnificence, which deal with wealth, which in turn is followed by the discussion of *megalopsuchia* and ambition, which deal with honor. Both the great-souled man and the ambitious man are concerned directly with honor, which Aristotle in chapter 3 calls the greatest of the external goods (*megiston tōn ektos agathōn;* 1123b20–21). In fact, the *megalopsuchos* is beyond honor; he is so confident of his own virtue and superiority that honor seems like an unnecessary supplement. He does not need the reassurance that most people derive from

being honored. He is, Aristotle says, somewhat pleased by great honors given by good men, but looks down on tributes from ordinary people. For a recent historical example of such a personage one might think of Charles de Gaulle.

I would like, however, to move on to chapter 5, in which Aristotle deals with the passion of anger and with the virtue of good temper. This chapter and this discussion are something of an anomaly in *NE* IV. All the other virtues in this book are presented in pairs or triplets, but this one stands alone (it also stands alone in the brief list of virtues in *Nicomachean Ethics* I, 7). Thus, Aristotle treats generosity and magnificence in chapters 1–2, greatness of soul and love of honor in chapters 3–4, good temper in chapter 5, and finally the triplet of amiability, truthfulness, and ready wit in chapters 6–9. The virtue of good temper, which deals with anger, is not joined with any other virtue. One might ask why it is not linked with the two that precede it, because in a way this virtue also deals with honor. Exploring this question will allow us to discuss several interesting and detailed points in Aristotle's treatment of honor.

For a definition of anger we must again turn to the *Rhetoric*, as we did for the definition of honor. Aristotle's definition of anger, however, cannot be treated just by itself. It needs to be complemented by a discussion of one of its components, namely, *oligōria*, the activity of belittling, slighting, or holding in contempt, the definition of which is also given in the *Rhetoric*. We will, therefore, need to present this analysis of anger in two stages, corresponding to the two definitions, of anger and of belittling. For purposes of clarity, I will textually isolate the two definitions, and then I will discuss the two of them jointly.

1. Aristotle defines anger in *Rhetoric* II, 2 (1378a31–33), as follows: "Let anger be (*estō dē orgē*): a desire accompanied by pain (*orexis meta lupēs*) for a manifested retribution (*timōrias phainomenēs*) for a manifested belittlement (*dia phainomenēn oligōrian*) of things affecting oneself or one's own (*tōn eis auton hē tōn autou*), done by someone who has no business to belittle them (*tou oligōrein mē prosēkontos*)." This is a marvelous definition. Anger is a response, not to the hurt, but to being belittled or slighted, to the implication that you are insignificant; we resent, not the injury, but the insult enclosed in it. Anger is a response to something like a moral annihilation. I would also draw attention to the double use of *phainomenon* here, the Greek term for appearing or manifestation. The belittlement shows up; it is not held secret in someone's heart. The offender displays his offense, and the person offended wants a manifest restitution.

I should also mention that some English translations make the text say that the slight is directed toward "oneself or one's friends," but "friends" is not mentioned in the Greek.[4] The belittlement might be directed to oneself or to anything of one's own; this can include one's friends, but it could also include other things, such as one's nationality, one's favorite sports team, or one's attempt at painting a landscape, and the like. You might belittle "me or mine," anything of my own, not just "me or my friends." If you show me a painting you have done and I start giggling, or if I ridicule the school you attended, I belittle something of yours.

2. Most English translations use "slight" and "to slight" as the translations for *oligōria* and *oligōrein*, but these words are not strong enough to convey what is described here. It would be better to use "holding in contempt" or "belittlement." The Greek words contain the term *oligos*, which signifies few, little, or small, and hence "belittle" is especially appropriate, while "contempt" conveys the force of the action. We have looked at Aristotle's definition of anger; let us now look at his definition of *oligōria*, "belittlement," "contempt," or "slighting," which he gives a few lines after his definition of anger (1378b10–11). It is a remarkable definition. He says, "Holding in contempt is (*epei d' hē oligōria estin*) the actualizing of an opinion (*energeia doxēs*) about something that shows up as being worth nothing (*peri to mēdenos axion phainomenon*)." He goes on to say that both good things and bad things are taken seriously; we respect them; but "things that are just nothing or trifling (*hosa de mēden ti hē mikron*) we take to be worthy of nothing (*oudenos axia hupolambanomen*)." If I slight you or hold you in contempt, I show you up as being worth nothing to me. Being able to make you seem like nothing is a unique human possibility, and anger is the distinctive human reaction. Belittling someone is like erasing him as a respected human agent. It is even worse than dishonor.

There is a phrase in Aristotle definition of belittlement that I wish to hold up for admiration. It is the phrase *energeia doxēs*, the actualizing of an opinion. This expression is a wonderful mixture of metaphysics and moral philosophy. It signifies what occurs when an opinion that I have, one that has been lying dormant in me, suddenly bursts into existential actuality. The opinion is enacted. I do something that actualizes or expresses the *doxa* lying within me. What had been latent in *dunamis* now exists in *ener-*

---

[4] For example, the Loeb translation reads "for a real or apparent slight affecting a man himself or one of his friends," and the W. Rhys Roberts translation has "to slight oneself or one's friends."

geia. Because it is an opinion that gravely concerns you, this enactment reverberates between you and me and everyone around us. This is what I have been thinking about you (or your skill as a painter) all this time. I activate my opinion that you (or your artistic product) are worthless; that is how you show up to me. I do something or I say something that shows actively what I think of you, and I display this for all to see. The metaphysics of *dunamis* and *energeia* reveals here its great power to explain things philosophically. Furthermore, as Aristotle states in his definition of anger, I have no business doing this. I am not obliged at the moment to evaluate you or your work; I am not, for example, a person who has been commissioned to give you a grade for your performance or to put a price on your landscape. I do it just because I want to. I perform a gesture that reduces you to zero or something close to it, and I do it for its own sake. Would you not be angry with me for having done this, and would you not want to have the contempt avenged? Would you not want the justice of retribution, not simply in private but conspicuously, just as the contempt was open and public? This is, furthermore, a highly personal event, and in following up on his definition of anger Aristotle says, "The angered man must be angered (*anagkē ton orgizomenon orgizesthai*) always toward a particular individual (*aiei tōn kath' hekaston tini*), such as Cleon and not man (*hoion Kleōni all' ouk anthrōpōi*; 1378a34–35)." It was Cleon who activated this opinion, and it is with Cleon that the aggrieved person is angry, not with humanity at large. Aristotle's phenomenology of anger is a masterpiece of philosophical writing.

He goes still further in his analysis. He takes the act of belittling as a genus and distinguishes three forms (*eidē*) within it. Contempt does not occur in the abstract; it occurs in three particular ways (1378b13–31). This subdivision resembles the specifications of *akrasia* that we considered at the beginning of this essay.

The first kind of slighting or contempt is disdain (*kataphronēsis*), which has the sense of looking down or "thinking down" on someone (*kata*, *phronein*), of understanding them to be lowly and insignificant. In disdain we do not perform a full-blown action; we merely show what our opinion is by the attitude we take, our tone of voice, or the pose we strike. We show that you appear in a certain way to us but we do not do anything to you. The second kind of belittlement is spite (*epēreasmos*), which Aristotle defines as putting obstacles in the way of the other person's wishes, that is, preventing him from obtaining what he wants, and doing so not for any advantage of one's own, but simply to thwart him, just for the fun of it.

If I spite you, Aristotle says, I show that I am not afraid that you will be able to do anything about it; that is, I show that I think you are insignificant and helpless, practically nothing (*mēden ti hē mikron*, from his definition of contempt). I also show my low opinion of you by implying that you are so insignificant that you could not possibly be of any use to me, for if you could be helpful at some time, I would not alienate you in this way. Spite is more active than disdain because it involves doing something that thwarts you, whereas disdain is more a matter of an attitude, expressed perhaps simply in my demeanor or in what I fail to do. The third kind of contempt is *hubris*, insult, and it is a still more affirmative action. Spite merely keeps you from getting what you want, but *hubris* positively inflicts injury or pain (*blaptein kai lupein*), but of a kind that involves disgrace (*aischunē*) to the recipient. I do not just injure you; I do so in a way that belittles you. This is done, moreover, not for any advantage to the doer, nor even as revenge for something done previously, but simply for the pleasure of disgracing the target. Aristotle says that people do this in order to show, by doing harm, that they are superior (*autous huperechein mallon*), and he says that the young and the rich insult others in this way (*hoi neoi kai hoi plousioi hubristai*). As an illustration of this on a small scale, one might think of bicyclists who force pedestrians to scamper out of the way, just to show who is superior (and the pedestrians react with anger).

Chapter 2 of Book II of the *Rhetoric* is very long and it gets into the fine grain of *oligōria* or belittlement and the anger that responds to it. Aristotle says, for example, that we get angry at people who speak badly about and disdain (*kakōs legousi kai kataphronousi*; 1379a33) things that we take very seriously, such as philosophy if we fancy ourselves to be philosophers, and we get all the more angry if we are unsure of our proficiency in it; if we are confident of our ability we will be less irritated. We get angry with people who used to honor us but no longer do so. When we are deprived of something that we need and want (we may be in bad health, or indigent), we become angry with people who will not help us or who disturb us in other ways. We are angered when we are in dead earnest about certain things and others treat it with irony, "for irony is something disdainful (*kataphronētikon gar hē eirōneia*; 1379b31–32)." We might get angry even if people forget our name, because such forgetfulness (*lēthē*; 1379b36) seems to indicate contempt. In these and many other descriptions Aristotle verifies his analysis of honor, belittlement, and anger. It is noteworthy that these descriptions are carried out in the *Rhetoric*. Aristotle is not telling us what anger feels like or how we can manage it, but describing

how it shows up in human discourse and how it can be used when we speak with others in our deliberation about what to do. His analysis is done for the rhetor, not the psychologist, but it can be helpful to the latter as well.

How is all this related to honor? We saw in *NE* IV, 3 and 4, that the great-souled and the ambitious man both deal with honor that they either possess already or hope to acquire, but here in IV, 5, in the treatment of anger, honor comes into play by its absence or its deprivation. If we belittle others, we take away their honor or prevent them from having any, and we make a public show of it. It would not be disdain, spite, or an insult if it were not manifest. We show that in our opinion they are not worthy of any sign of recognition that they have done some service. Aristotle uses not the positive term honor but the negative term dishonor (*atimia*) in his discussion of anger and contempt. After speaking of the hubris of the young and the rich, he says "Dishonoring belongs to hubris (*hubreōs de atimia*), and someone who dishonors holds another in contempt (*ho d' atimazōn oligōrei*), for that which is worthy of nothing (*to gar mēdenos axion*) has no honor (*oudemian echei timēn*), whether as good or as bad (*out' agathou oute kakou*; 1378b29–31)." Honor is present precisely in its absence. It is specifically what is taken away or withheld from the one who is slighted. Holding in contempt is not, strictly speaking, shaming someone; it is not as though we expected better from him and he failed to perform or performed badly. It is more negative than that; the opinion is enacted (*energeia doxēs*) that we do not expect him to be able to perform at all. He is openly registered as a cipher, not even a negative number. Aristotle shows that the very absence of honor can illuminate what it is.

Conclusion

Two final points can be made about Aristotle's treatment of honor. In *NE* VIII, 14, he makes an interesting remark about the relationship between honor and wealth. We recall that when he discussed happiness at the start of the *Ethics*, he said that pleasure, wealth, and honor were the three popular candidates for the final human good. Now, in VIII, 14, he discusses friendships between unequal persons. He says that despite their difference in status, a kind of equality comes about among such friends; each obtains something different from the friendship, but each gets what is appropriate. The superior acquires honor, which he deserves, while the inferior obtains assistance, which he needs. Aristotle says, "For honor is

the award for virtue and benefaction (*tēs men gar aretēs kai tēs euergesias hē timē geras*), whereas aid is the gain appropriate to need (*tēs d' endeias epikouria to kerdos*; 1163b3–5)."[5] He goes on to say that an analogous reciprocity can occur in political communities (*en tais politeiais*). Honor is not given to a man who does nothing for the common life (*ou gar timatai ho mēden agathon tōi koinōi porizōn*), but it is bestowed "on the man who does good for the common (*tōi to koinon euergetounti*; 1163b7)." Aristotle then makes an interesting remark about the kind of goods a person can obtain from the political community. He says, "For you cannot simultaneously become enriched from the community and be honored by it (*ou gar estin hama chrēmatizesthai apo tōn koinōn kai timasthai*; 1163b8–9)." If you serve the community but acquire wealth by doing so, you have your reward and you therefore have no claim to honor. The reason Aristotle gives for this is that no one wants to have the smaller share in all respects: if someone loses wealth by serving, he is given honor, and if he accepts gifts or bribes, wealth is what he gets (*tōi dōrodokōi chrēmata*) but not honor. This sort of equalization of dissimilars, he says, "preserves the friendship (*sōizei tēn philian*; 1163b12)." These remarks spell out how wealth and honor interact in human affairs. It is also interesting that pleasure, the third popular candidate for the final good, is not mentioned as one of the awards that the political community can give. It is not a public good.

The other point to be made is that honor can be the object of *akrasia* or incontinence. In *NE* VII, 4, Aristotle distinguishes between a simply incontinent person (*tis haplōs akratēs*) and one who is incontinent "in part" (*kata meros*) or in a qualified way (1147b20–21). A simply akratic person is such in regard to food and sexuality, that is, in regard to bodily needs and their pleasures and pains. Such things are involved in the maintenance of bodily life; they are necessary for life (*ta anagkaia*; 1147b24) but there is no nobility in them. They are not sought in themselves. Other goods, such as victory, honor, and wealth, can be sought for themselves, and yet it is possible that people will pursue them in excess and beyond right reason (*para ton orthon logon huperballontas*; 1147b32). We do not call such people simply incontinent (*haplōs men ou legomen akrateis*); rather, we add a qualifier (*prostithentes*) and we call them "incontinent in regard to riches and gain and honor and anger (*chrēmatōn akrateis kai kerdous kai*

---

[5] I used the translation by Bartlett & Collins for the last part of this sentence. See *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Robert C. Bartlett and Susan D. Collins (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011), *ad loc.*

timēs kai thumou), but not simply (*haplōs d' ou*; 1147b33–34)." When Aristotle says that we call such people by these names (*legomen*), he is not just adverting to linguistic usage; he is saying that people exist in this manner and we use these names to identify them as such. The vocabulary is brought forth in response to the being of things. We should also note that this form of excess is incontinence; it is not the same as the vices described in *NE* IV. The man who is incontinent in regard to wealth, for example, is not the same as the avaricious man of *NE* IV, 1, nor is the one who is incontinent in regard to honor the same as the excessively ambitious man of *NE* IV, 4, or the vain man of *NE* IV, 3. Even in such cases, presumably, the incontinent person regrets his actions when the immediate situation has been cleared away, whereas the vicious man does not. The akratic man acts more under impulse than by deliberation and choice. As Aristotle says a bit further on, "These choose, those do not choose (*hoi men proairountai hoi d' ou proairountai*; 1148a17)."[6]

<center>***</center>

Our study of honor has shown how densely interwoven Aristotle's ethical theory is. The examination of a single topic, honor, illuminates such diverse things as the human good; political life and friendship; virtue, vice, and incontinence; flattery, and wealth and pleasure. It even shows how the metaphysical principles of *dunamis* and *energeia* are at work in human affairs. It treats the passion of anger as well as the moral attitude of contempt that provokes it, and it situates both within the study of rhetoric. Aristotle's philosophy displays the richness of both being and human being.

It is appropriate to discuss honor in a volume dedicated to Jude P. Dougherty. These essays have been written to acknowledge the virtue (*aretē*) and works (*erga*) that mark the life he devoted to the School of Philosophy and The Catholic University of America, as well as to the discipline of philosophy and the intellectual heritage of the Catholic Church. In keeping with Aristotle's definition of honor, they are a sign that he is recognized for having done great service for these communities and fields of knowledge. They are also an expression of personal friendship and gratitude.

---

[6] We might also note that in *NE* VII, 6, Aristotle provides an extended treatment of incontinence in regard to anger. It would be an interesting project to compare that chapter with his treatment of anger and belittlement in the *Rhetoric*.

HONOR, ANGER, AND BELITTLEMENT
IN ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS

SUMMARY

The author considers the phenomenon of honor (*timē*) by examining Aristotle's description of it and its role in ethical and political life. His study of honor leads him to two related phenomena, anger (*orgē*) and belittlement or contempt (*oligōria*); examining them helps him define honor more precisely. With his examination of honor the author shows how densely interwoven Aristotle's ethical theory is; he illuminates such diverse things as the human good, political life and friendship, virtue, vice, incontinence, flattery, wealth and pleasure; he shows how the metaphysical principles of *dunamis* and *energeia* are at work in human affairs; he treats the passion of anger as well as the moral attitude of contempt that provokes it, and he situates both within the study of rhetoric.

KEYWORDS: Aristotle, honor, ethics, politics, anger, belittlement, contempt, friendship, virtue, vice, incontinence, flattery, wealth, pleasure, rhetoric.

Anne M. Wiles
James Madison University
Harrisonburg, Virginia, USA

FORMS AND PREDICATION RECONSIDERED

In *Western Creed, Western Identity*, Professor Dougherty notes the seminal influence of Greek philosophy on the western identity. While both Plato and Aristotle contributed to western culture and identity, the present paper concentrates on the contribution of Plato, with specific reference to the forms and the importance of predication in philosophical discourse.

Plato's account of the existence and nature of forms has been variously interpreted—and criticized. In the first section of the dialogue, *Parmenides*, Parmenides and Zeno raise objections that may be, or perhaps had been, pressed against the theory, or rather against certain ways in which the account of the forms had been, or might be, stated. Aristotle, in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the *Metaphysics*, and perhaps, in the fragmented *Peri Ideon*,[1] also treated some criticism of the forms.

In Anglo-American academic circles, the approach to Plato's account of forms has been predominately analytic. The analytic approach is not monolithic, but generally those who work in this tradition, even if they recognize the systematic nature of Plato's work, tend towards a genetic-historical interpretation of the theory of forms. They assume, for example, that the "separable" forms are not present in the dialogues they consider to be early dialogues, and that the theory of forms in the middle dialogues is quite distinct from the "later" theory, somewhat on the model that one speaks of an "earlier" and "later" Wittgenstein. This assumption is sometimes coupled with the claim that Plato abandoned earlier versions of the theory because he came to recognize they were logically flawed. The so-

---

[1] See Gail Fine, *On Ideas: Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's Theory of Forms* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993) for an extended treatment of the fragments of Aristotle's essay, *Peri Ideon*.

called flaws[2] usually mentioned are those against which the criticisms in the first part of the *Parmenides* are directed. The inherent danger of the analytic approach is that the very narrowing of the focus that gives sharpness and clarity to the arguments may blur the connections between the individual arguments and the wider context of Plato's thought. Yet, it is this wider context, containing myth, irony, and indirection, that provides the resonance needed for understanding the individual argument.

The central questions addressed in this paper are: (1) how are forms related to predication? And (2) what role do forms and predication play in the discovery and articulation of truth? In the first section of the paper, I provide—in broad strokes—a synopsis of Plato's account of the Forms. In the second section, I consider predication in relation to forms and conclude that the existence and nature of forms is a necessary condition for predication and that Plato's account of predication is consistent with, in fact, *anticipates,* Aristotle's treatment of reality in the *Categories*. A further conclusion is that forms and predication are central to philosophical hermeneutics, to the discovery and articulation of truth.

The approach I take in interpreting the dialogues is roughly based on the work of Hans-Georg Gadamer. In his major work on hermeneutics, *Truth and Method*, Gadamer, following Heidegger, says that the interpretation of a text must attend to and be guided by the object being interpreted and avoid imposing a pre-determined *method* or *procedure* on the work. The Socratic dialogue, while it is *addressed* to interlocutors, is concerned primarily with the opinions they *express*, with the logic of the subject matter that is unfolded in the dialogue. From the dialogue what emerges is the truth of the *logos*, "which is neither mine nor yours."[3] There is an expectation that the work being interpreted has an immanent unity of meaning, that it is intelligible. While Gadamer's treatment of hermeneutics does not offer a *method* of interpretation, it does provide a *criterion* of an adequate interpretation: "The harmony of all the details with the whole is the criterion of correct understanding. The failure to achieve this harmony means that understanding has failed."[4]

---

[2] For a detailed analysis of some of the more prominent criticisms, see my *Plato's Theory of Forms: A Critical Analysis* (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1974).

[3] Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 2nd revised ed., translation revised by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall (New York: Continuum, 1975), 361.

[4] Id., 291.

Synopsis of the Theory of Forms

If the term 'system' is not taken too narrowly, it is evident that Plato has a systematic philosophy of which the theory or account of forms is the lynchpin. The central theses that unify the dialogues are: (1) that intelligible objects are ontologically and epistemologically distinct from sensible objects; (2) that knowledge is distinct from belief; (3) that the soul is improved by knowledge and destroyed by ignorance; (4) that intellect guides and directs all; (5) that good intelligence directs well, and bad intelligence does so poorly; and (6) that the human intellect is both cognitive and conative, from which arises the necessity for both dialectic and rhetoric.

To provide a framework for discussion of Plato's account of predication, a brief reminder of the essential characteristics of the forms will suffice. Plato uses the terms 'form' (εἶδος) and 'idea' (ιδέα) interchangeably. In this essay, I use the word 'form' for either expression, and also for 'kind' or 'class' in the *Sophist*. Forms are intelligible, incorporeal, and unchangeable in essence; each form is objective, single, and self-identical. These essential characteristics are mentioned throughout the dialogues. Forms are contrasted with particular things, which are sensible, corporeal, and subject to generation and corruption. Forms are "present in" particulars; particulars "participate" in forms.

Forms are both transcendent and immanent. They function as standards in two ways: first, they provide a basis on which a particular may be classified as a kind or type; second, they are prescriptive standards for the embodiment of a form in particulars. As prescriptive standards, they are essential for the activity of the philosopher-king—or for ordinary mortals who try to bring about justice in a historical state—and for the Demiurgos who *looks to*, but does not *create*, the transcendent forms in order to create the cosmos.

At *Republic* (506), Socrates states the general principle that there is a single form for each set of things called by the same name—with the restriction that the name must indicate a real class and not merely a part. On this basis, the following classification may be made of the forms discussed in the dialogues: (1) forms or kinds of very wide application, such as Sameness, Difference, Existence, Motion, Rest, One, and Many; (2) moral forms such as Courage, Temperance, Justice, Piety, and Friendship; (3) mathematical forms such as Circle, Triangle, Equal, Odd and Even; (4) forms of nonmoral qualities such as Quickness and Tallness;

(5) forms of arts such as Medicine, Rhetoric, and Education; and (6) forms of artifacts and physical things such as shuttle, bed, clay and finger.[5]

Two forms, the Good and the Beautiful, do not fit into this classification. In the *Republic* (508e–09a), Plato says that the form, Good, "exceeds all other forms in beauty and power." This might lead one to think that the form of the Good is God, an assumption that is understandable but totally inconsistent with the role that the Good plays in Plato's account of forms. Instead of being a genus of which all other ideas are species, the Idea of the Good is a species under the genus of Idea. It shares with other Ideas the essential characteristics of being—unity, stability, and intelligibility, while at the same time having a distinctive function, associating it closely with the Idea of the Beautiful.

Each form marks some natural division of reality; so too, does the Good, but the Good is also connected with each form as a kind of regulative principle. If we know the good of something, we know its function, nature, or essential structure. Nettleship, in *Lectures on The Republic*, states the point succinctly: "The good or end of any thing is the immanent principle which we have to suppose in it in order to explain it, and which is involved in calling it a whole at all."[6]

The Idea of the Good is an ontological good that does not necessarily correspond with the moral or personal good for anyone. The ontological good is that which, as formal cause, makes a thing "that which it is and not another thing." Each idea is good in the sense that each idea is definite, limited, structured, and therefore intelligible. While evil may be considered a privation of good, the *Idea* of Evil partakes of the Good because, as Dante has so clearly shown in the *Commedia*, each kind of evil has its own essential structure—for example, Greed is essentially different from Gluttony. To know the ontological good of anything is simply to know the thing in its tendencies.

The Beautiful has a regulative function similar to that of the Good. In the *Greater, Hippias* (290d–91b), Socrates says that a ladle made of figwood is more beautiful in a pot of soup than one made of gold—because the wooden ladle is more *appropriate* for dipping soup. The clear implica-

---

[5] This list differs from that given by Anders Wedberg in *Plato's Philosophy of Mathematics* (Stockholm: Almquist and Wiksell, 1955), 32–33, in that his list does not include forms of nonmoral qualities or forms of the arts. Also, Wedberg lists the ideas of Good, Just, and Beautiful under a classification titled "Ethical and Esthetical Ideas."

[6] Richard Lewis Nettleship, *Lectures on the "Republic" of Plato* (London: Macmillan, 1961), 222–223.

tion is that beauty follows function; thus, the Beautiful is necessarily connected with the Good.

Knowledge of the forms may be attained by various methods—definition, hypothetical reasoning, argument by analogy and example, division by genus and species—and underlying all, the double process of collection and division, of which Socrates says in the *Phaedrus* (265d) "I am myself a lover of these divisions and collections, that I may gain the power to speak and to think."

Forms in Relation to Predication

Predication is a central topic throughout the dialogues. In the following account, I will use the term 'predication' to refer to any combination of predicate and subject that makes a statement. It encompasses what in the contemporary literature is referred to as the 'is' of predication and the 'is' involved in real definition, but not the 'is' of identity; it also includes what Plato refers to as 'participation' and what he describes in the *Sophist* as the "communion" or "weaving together" of kinds. Participation is a kind of predication. Plato uses several expressions for the relationship identified as 'participation.' In some dialogues, he speaks of particulars "having" certain qualities, or of qualities being "present in" particular things. In the *Symposium* (211b), the multitude of beautiful things are said to "partake" of absolute Beauty. In the *Phaedo* (74d), a particular equal is said to be an inferior copy of the form, Equality. Plato argues there are good reasons for distinguishing common natures from particulars, yet even in the dialogues in which he is said to have "separated" the forms from particulars, he consistently maintains that there is a strong connection between common natures and particulars that have the same name. Plato holds that the exact description of this relation is less important than the realization that it is because of the forms that particular things are what they are (*Phaedo*, 100c–101c). This "because" is the cause we have been taught by Aristotle to call 'the formal cause.'

In the *Sophist* (251c), the Eleatic Stranger makes fun of those "late learners" who deny that one particular thing can be many, and "delight in forbidding us to speak of a man as 'good;' and say we must only speak of a good as good, and of the man as man." The short response to the late learners is that predication does not imply *identity* of subject and predicate, but only that

> when we speak of a man we give him many additional names; we
> attribute to him colors and shapes and sizes and defects and good
> qualities; and in all these and countless other statements we say he is
> not merely a "man" but also "good" and any number of other things.
> And so with everything else, we take any given thing as one and yet
> speak of it as many and by many names (*Sophist*, 251b).

Although Plato does not give a complete classification of the different
ways a man can be—or linguistically, all the different things that can be
said of one, his statement shows he is aware of the distinctions that under-
lie Aristotle's categories, or possible predicates.

A passage in the *Lysis* (217e) shows that Plato also distinguishes
different kinds of predicates. In this passage, Socrates discusses how
whiteness could be said to be "present in" the now golden locks of Lysis.
He mentions two possibilities. Lysis's hair could be dyed with white lead,
or it could grow white with age. The color of the dyed hair would not differ
in color from the naturally white hair, yet the *manner* in which the color is
present in the hair, or the cause of its presence, is not the same in the two
cases. The distinction is easier to make in Aristotelian terminology: natural
whiteness is a *property* of the hair when one grows old, but an *accident* of
the hair if the color is set there by dye.

Definition is a type of predication. In a real definition, the subject
term is a form and the predicate is a combination of forms. Throughout the
dialogues, Socrates seeks such definitions. In fact, since the dramatic set-
ting of the *Parmenides* shows a young Socrates already accepting that there
are forms and being brought along by Parmenides and Zeno, it is reason-
able to conclude that Socrates, early in his search for definitions, presup-
posed the existence of forms. Moreover, given the "knowing look" of ap-
proval that passes between Parmenides and Zeno[7] and the comments of
Parmenides as Socrates is struggling to give an adequate account of forms,
it is reasonable to assume that Plato is both endorsing *some* account of the
forms and giving credit to "father" Parmenides for the importance of forms
in philosophical reasoning.[8]

---

[7] At *Parmenides*, 130a, 5–9, "While Socrates was speaking, Pythodorus said he was expect-
ing every moment that Parmenides and Zeno would be annoyed, but they listened very
attentively and kept on exchanging glances and smiles in admiration of Socrates."

[8] In a passage often overlooked when the "criticisms" of the forms are being considered,
Parmenides remarks, ". . . if, in view of all these difficulties and others like them, a man
refuses to admit that forms of things exist or to distinguish a definite form in every case, he

Plato assumes that it is possible to give a real definition of *any* form. However, as he notes in the *Phaedrus* (263a), definitions are called for only when sense impressions arouse reflection. When someone utters the word 'iron' or 'silver,' we all have the same object before our minds and no definition is called for, but of such things as justice, goodness, and love, of which we have no simple sensible image, it is difficult, yet important, to give a definition, or a formal account of these objects.

That forms can be in a subject-predicate relation in definitions is presupposed in every attempt to construct adequate accounts of such terms as 'knowledge,' 'justice,' 'wisdom,' 'courage,' 'temperance,' etc. The formal account of Justice in the *Republic* can be taken as an extended exemplification of how forms are related in definition. Other examples of such predication are plentiful in the dialogues, for example, the theoretical account in the *Lysis* of friendship, in the *Phaedrus* of rhetoric, and in the *Philebus* of what constitutes a good human life.

The *Parmenides* is a rich source for Plato's views on predication, but the ironic play in the first part presupposes considerable skill in logic and dialectic. It is precisely because Plato knows the area so well that he is able to argue from within different positions in order to show their shortcomings and indirectly suggest distinctions that need to be made. The *Parmenides* ends in an apparently inconclusive manner, but the conclusion is ironic since within the dialogue various ways are suggested in which something can be—or, linguistically, the possible kinds of predicates that can be attributed to a subject; the dialogue, at the same time, illustrates the dialectical method by means of which truth is attained.[9]

The technique illustrated by Parmenides is not quite the same as that of Zeno. Zeno constructed paradoxes against the critics of Parmenides, that is, on one side of the question only. The technique illustrated in the second half of *Parmenides*—tracing out the consequences of what can be said on *both* sides of the question[10] is a technique more suited to the discovery of truth than to mere refutation. The two techniques also differ in purpose. In the second part of the *Parmenides*, Parmenides does not try to reduce the hypotheses to absurdity, but only indicates, indirectly, that predicates

---

will have nothing on which to fix his thought, so long as he will not allow that each thing has a character which is always the same, and in so doing he will completely destroy the significance of all discourse."

[9] Gadamer remarks that Aristotle's account of dialectic in the *Topics* "corresponds exactly to what we find . . . in Plato's *Parmenides*." See Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 358.

[10] For an insightful comment on this procedure, see Aristotle, *Topics*, I, 2, 101a34–36.

which appear contradictory are really compatible—if careful distinctions are made between various aspects of being, unity, sameness, difference, motion, and rest.[11]

There are eight hypotheses in the second half of the *Parmenides.* For the first hypothesis, which assumes that nothing is real except the One, Parmenides considers whether this One could have limit, extension, shape, place, motion, rest, sameness, and difference (like-unlike, and equal-unequal), and whether it is temporal. He concludes that if nothing is real except the One, there are no available predicates so knowledge of this One is not possible and nothing can be said about it. Indirectly, Hypothesis 1 shows that although a form may be described as "just by itself," this does not imply that a form is completely and in every way isolated from all other forms; if it were, one could not have knowledge of it, or make any statement about it. Moreover, Hypothesis 1 shows that nothing can be an object of knowledge unless the contraries, the One and the Many, are in some sense predicable of it.[12] Even a form is one in essence, but is many in that several names may be predicated of it, for example, 'being,' 'unity,' 'incorporeal,' and so on.

For the second hypothesis—if extension in space and time are assumed—in addition to the predicates of unity, being, and plurality, the One will also have shape, position, and the contrary predicates of being both at rest and in motion. The One will have various *relations* to itself and to others, including the relations of sameness/difference, likeness/unlikeness, in contact/not in contact, and equal/unequal. A spatially extended thing will have the predicate of quantity, and will stand to other extended ones in a quantitative relation of being smaller than, greater than, or equal to itself (*Parmenides*, 149d–51b); it will also stand in certain temporal relations to itself and others (*Parmenides*, 151e–55c).

In the remaining six hypotheses, which need not here be treated in detail, Parmenides uses the same list of predicates to consider each different 'One.' Whether and in what manner these possible predicates are applicable serves to distinguish various ways of being. The list is comprised of the same predicates Aristotle identifies in the *Categories*, and may be taken

---

[11]For a discussion of the similarities and differences between the technique of Zeno and that of Parmenides, see Francis M. Cornford, *Plato and Parmenides* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1939), 105–115.
[12] For further treatment of this passage, see id., 134.

as evidence that Plato had already distinguished various senses of being that Aristotle later systematized in the *Categories*.

In the first part of the *Parmenides*, Zeno suggests that a form cannot have contrary predicates, and Socrates agreed that he would be "surprised" to find that it could. However, in the second half of the *Parmenides*, it is demonstrated that any One that has being *must* have contrary attributes. This does not lead to a contradiction so long as the aspects in which the terms are predicated are carefully distinguished.

One way to avoid ambiguity is to specify what the predicates mean, or under what conditions they may be applied. At *Parmenides* (161e), being is said to be predicable of anything of which a true statement may be made. At 139e–40b, the terms 'like' and 'unlike' are defined with reference to predication. Two things are said to be 'like' when the same statement can be truly made about both, and 'unlike' when a statement true of one is not true of the other. At 146d, Parmenides says about difference "Now, all things which are 'not One' must be different from the One, and the One also must be different from them." This passage anticipates the demonstration in the *Sophist* (257b) that 'is not' can mean merely 'is different from.'

Hypothesis 2 shows that if anything has being, it must necessarily have both Unity and Plurality, since "One and its being are different from each other" (*Parmenides*, 143b). At 144b, the parts of being are said to be "not more numerous than those into which unity is distributed, but equal in number; for nothing that *is* lacks unity, and nothing that is *one* lacks being." This is essentially the same claim found in the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle (1003b) that there are as many species of being as there are of unity.[13] The forms are not mentioned in this hypothesis, but the attributes of being, unity, and plurality are predicable of anything that has being, and *a fortiori* are applicable to forms.

The hypothesis bearing most directly on what can be said of the forms is Hypothesis 5 (*Parmenides*, 161e–62b) in which Parmenides shows that a "nonexistent" entity may yet have being and can be distinguished from other nonexistent entities. A nonexistent entity has being since if anyone makes two statements such as "smallness does not exist" and "largeness does not exist," it is plain that he is speaking of two different things and can distinguish them from each other. Paradoxically, this argument opposes the view attributed to the historical Parmenides that

---

[13] See id., 142.

what *is not* is unknowable and cannot be thought, spoken of, or named, but its importance goes beyond this. The argument shows that statements about what does not "exist" can nonetheless be meaningful; that something which does not exist in one way can have being in another way, for example, as the subject of a sentence; that such "nonexistent" entities can be known and distinguished from each other; and that "nonexistent entities" may have various other predicates. A conclusion drawn is that this "nonexistent" One has the characters of being "that" and "something," and of being related "*to* this" or "*to* these," and all other such characters.

One of the most surprising and important points developed in Hypothesis 5 is that a nonexistent one can have the contrary predicates of being both at rest and in motion. This is surprising because one does not ordinarily think of nonphysical or "nonexistent" things as moving, probably because locomotion and the double process of generation and corruption are the most familiar sorts of motion. However, at *Parmenides* (162b–c), after having argued that a nonexistent one has the *being* of nonexistence and the *nonbeing* of existence, Parmenides makes the statement: "Now a thing which is in a certain condition can not-be in that condition only by passing out of it. So anything that both is, and is not, in such and such a condition implies transition; and transition is motion." On this basis, he then argues that "the non-existent One has been shown to be a thing that moves since it admits transition from being to not-being."[14] Immediately following this passage, other kinds of motion—locomotion, alteration, or internal change of character—are all ruled out as possible kinds of motion for nonexistent entities, so the only kind of motion of which a nonexistent entity is capable is the transition from some condition to another condition. But what kind of transition could this be and what kind of condition? How could a nonexistent "round square" *move* from non-existence to existence, or vice-versa? Parmenides comments do not rule out this sort of transition. To avoid the absurdity of asserting that a round square could exist in a space-time continuum, the implicit suggestion is that one must distinguish various kinds of being—for example, being as the object of knowledge and subject of a sentence from being as existent in a time-space continuum.

The sort of transition to which Parmenides is referring would apply to *every* nonexistent entity. In fact, if *knowledge* of things that do not exist is possible, this transition would *have* to apply to every nonexistent entity, so long as the nonexistent entity is the subject of a statement. Any nonexis-

---

[14] See id., 226–28, for a discussion of the difficulties in translating 162b–163b.

tent entity may move from not being the subject of a statement to being a subject, from not being distinguished from other nonexistent and existent entities to being distinguished from these, from not being known about to being known about. All these movements are transitions from one kind of nonbeing to a corresponding kind of being, and so fit the description for transition from one condition to another. They are not movements in space; we may think of them as logical movements.

In the *Sophist*, many of the distinctions developed in the *Parmenides* are presupposed, used, and sometimes explicitly mentioned; for instance, the distinction between the One and the Many, developed in Hypothesis 5, is used extensively. The predicates (time, place, quantity, etc.) discussed in the second part of the *Parmenides* are also used in the *Sophist.* These predicates perform essentially the same function as the categories of Aristotle, marking ways in which something can be, or kinds of being.

The really new point about predication introduced in the *Sophist* (254d–55c) is that there are certain Forms, namely, Existence, Sameness, and Difference that do not mark divisions *within* being, but are predicable of each and every being, including themselves. Delineating the connections and distinctions among the forms directs attention to the logic and ontology of the forms.

That some of the topics treated in the *Sophist* are less controversial now than in fifth and early-fourth-century B.C. Greece is partly a result of Plato's treatment of predication in the *Sophist.* At *Sophist* (241d), the Eleatic Stranger urges that "what is not, in some respect has being, and conversely, that what is, in a way is not." The demonstration of this claim concludes at 257b in the Eleatic Stranger's statement: "when we speak of that which is not, it seems that we do not mean something contrary to what exists but only something that is different." The general point is that any statement of the type "x is not y" *may* mean only "x is different from y." This statement, together with the corresponding discussion from the *Parmenides*, helps resolve the quandary of how statements about nonexistent entities can yet be meaningful. Other metaphysical questions discussed in the *Sophist* are of continuing interest, among which may be mentioned the following: Of what may the term 'real' be appropriately predicated? Which forms are predicable of which others? What is the philosophical importance of predication?

The first question is discussed in the context of a battle between the giants who think only physical things are real and the gods who think only forms are real. At *Sophist* (247e), the Eleatic Stranger proposes, as a suffi-

cient mark of real things, "the presence in a thing of the power of being acted upon or of acting in relation to [another thing]." The giants (materialists) might go so far as to admit that the soul is real, but when it comes to wisdom or other such things they are not willing to say either that these are not real or that they are all bodies. The gods ("friends of the Forms") would have to deny the possibility of knowledge since being acted upon would change what is known and they hold that a form must be changeless. The philosopher, on the other hand, realizing that the knowing mind and the object known both change in the act of knowing, although they are (in some way) still the same, will accept neither the doctrine that all reality is changing or the doctrine that all reality is changeless, but "Like a child begging for 'both,' he must declare that reality or the sum of things is both at once—all that is unchangeable and all that is in change."[15]

Discussion of the second question, "which forms are predicable of which?" begins at *Sophist* (251d) with the consideration of whether Existence, Motion, and Rest can combine with any other Form. Three possibilities are considered: (1) no Form combines with any other; (2) every Form combines with every other; (3) some pairs of Forms will combine while other pairs will not. The first alternative is ruled out since it is self-refuting and would make all predication and knowledge impossible. The second alternative is rejected by Theaetetus[16] on the ground that some forms such as Rest and Motion could not combine, presumably because the combination would result in a statement that is self-contradictory. The philosopher must accept the third alternative.

Not all kinds are considered in the ensuing demonstration of the dialectical method, but only five of the most important kinds: Existence, Rest, Motion, Sameness, and Difference. Each of the five is shown to be a distinct form, and Existence, Sameness, and Difference are shown to be "all-pervading," that is, each can be predicated of every form, including each other, thus each one is also self-predicable. In a careful analysis of this passage, Ackrill[17] has argued that Plato not only recognized the ambiguity

---

[15] The account of the battle between the gods and the giants occurs at *Sophist*, 246a–49d.

[16] That this alternative is rejected by Theatetus and not the Eleatic Stranger may be significant since there is good reason to think that, in some way, Rest may combine with Motion. Perhaps since Theaetetus is only a mathematician, he has not thought how the two may be combined.

[17] John L. Ackrill, "Plato and the Copula: 'Sophist' 251–259," in *Studies in Plato's Metaphysics* ed. R. E. Allen (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965), 201–218. But see Lam-

of 'is,' but that he clearly distinguishes statements of identity and statements of attribution from the existential 'is.'

In the text, there is some basis for the claim that Plato distinguishes these various senses of 'is,' and that he also distinguishes between predicates that are "relative" and those that are not. At *Sophist* (255e), the Eleatic Stranger says that among things that exist, "some are always spoken of as being what they are just in themselves, others as being what they are with reference to other things." In the context of the *Sophist*, Existence, Sameness, Motion, and Rest, when predicated of anything, retain the same sense, but Difference, when used as a predicate, is a "relative" predicate for whatever is "different" is different only with reference to something else.

It is clear why Plato would consider Existence, Sameness, and Difference as important kinds, but why did he also choose Rest and Motion? A possible answer is that they were the natural choices given the two views of reality being considered, but another possibility suggests itself: Rest and Motion are important because knowledge depends both upon the stability (rest) of the Form and the knower's apprehension of the Form, which act *moves* the Form from the condition of being unknown to being known. The point is developed in Hypothesis 5 of the *Parmenides* that even a nonexistent entity can move from one condition to another, and this point is explicitly related to knowledge in the Eleatic Stranger's statement (*Sophist*, 248e) that "If knowing is to be acting on something, it follows that what is known must be acted upon by it, and so, on this showing, reality when it is being known by the act of knowledge must, in so far as it is known, be changed owing to being so acted upon." The consequence is that every form, including Motion and Rest, both changes and does not change. It does not change in its essence, but it does change in relation to a knower.

This brings us to the third question: What is the philosophical importance of predication? On the most obvious level, as the Eleatic Stranger points out, discourse itself depends upon the possibility of predicating one form of another. A statement (*logos*) refers to things past, present, or future and connects a noun with a verb. Noun and verbs name, or designate, something, but some combinations of these words make sense (yield a *logos*) while others do not (*Sophist*, 262b–d).

---

bertus M. de Rijk, *Plato's "Sophist:" A Philosophical Commentary* (Amsterdam: North Holland, 1986), 114 for criticism of Ackrill's view.

Examples of combinations that do not make sense are: "Walks, runs, sleeps," and "Lion, stag, horse." Neither of these strings of words makes a statement because they "do not signify any action performed or not performed or nature of anything that exists or does not exist" (262c). The Eleatic Stranger points out that even a simple statement such as "'a man understands' . . . gives information about facts or events in the present or past or future . . . and gets you somewhere [states something] by weaving together verbs with names" (262d).[18]

Concerning predication, the Eleatic Stranger sets out some of the now familiar elements of Aristotelian logic. Certain combinations of verbs and nouns make a true statement, for example, "Theaetetus sits," while other combinations make a false statement, for example, "Theaetetus flies." Since any descriptive statement is about something, it must be either true or false—true if it states things that are (or the facts as they are), false if it states things that are not as if they were. Judgment is said to be a conclusion of thinking that asserts or denies one thing of another, that is, it is predicative.

Plato is giving this account of predication to show that the sophist deals in false statements that are deceptive semblances of true ones. At the same time, he is also showing that some combinations of forms make a true statement, while others do not, and that the test of truth in both cases is whether the statement reflects the structure of the reality to which it refers.

Because there are necessary connections and divisions among concepts, the statement "Existence is different from Sameness" is true, but the statement "Existence is *essentially* the same as Difference" is false; "Justice is a species of virtue" is true, but the statement "Virtue is a species of justice" is false. Every science, including metaphysics, is possible only because there are discernible conceptual connections and divisions in the nature of the subject itself. The scientific intelligence of the philosopher, using due measure, connects the connectible, and predicates the predicable. The *ostensible* purpose of the *Sophist is* to define the sophist. Of equal or more importance is the task of defining the philosopher, a task that is actually completed before the sophist is captured.

The Eleatic Stranger and Theaetetus, having concluded that forms do combine, are about to embark on the task of determining which forms

---

[18] See Gabriel Nuchelmans, *Theories of the Proposition* (Amsterdam: North Holland Linguisic Series, 1973), 14–21, for a clear and useful discussion of these passages.

combine. The Eleatic Stranger has been pointing out that only one skilled in grammar will know which letters will blend with which, and that only a musician will know which sounds can blend with which, and then Theaetetus suggests that there must be some special science, "perhaps the most important of all," needed to determine which forms "blend with" [can be predicated of] which. At this point, in a passage too well marked to be missed, the Eleatic Stranger exclaims, "Good gracious, Theaetetus, have we stumbled unawares upon the free man's knowledge and, in seeking for the Sophist, chanced to find the philosopher first?" (253c). The evident answer is "Yes" since the Eleatic Stranger immediately gives the description of the dialectician familiar from the *Republic*, the *Phaedrus,* and the *Philebus*:

> Dividing according to kinds, not taking the same form for a different one or a different one for the same—is not that the business of the science of dialectic . . . that means knowing how to distinguish, kind by kind, in what ways the several kinds can or cannot combine. . . . And the only person, I imagine, to whom you would allow this mastery of dialectic is the pure and rightful lover of wisdom (*Sophist*, 253d–e).

Plato did not write a dialogue titled *The Philosopher* that he said, perhaps ironically, he intended to write; however, the portrait of the philosopher is drawn in every dialogue, and especially in the *Sophist*. The philosopher is the negation of the sophist. The philosopher is a scientist and a lover of wisdom, dealing not in images, but in realities, a dialectician adept at using the processes of collection and division to discover truth. The philosopher resembles the sophist in the ability to refute others by discovering contradictions, except that the philosopher discovers real, not pseudo, contradictions. The philosopher uses refutation to get rid of false opinions and to purify the soul so it can begin the positive activity of dialectic.

Conclusion

The not too surprising conclusion is that forms are necessary for knowledge, either of metaphysics or of ethics—or for that matter of any other discipline or state of affairs. This does not, of course, imply that this is *all* that is needed. Experience is necessary, as is openness to what is "there" (being) and the mental capacity to reflect on being. Knowledge

depends upon one's ability to use language, or rather, as Gadamer would say, to recognize that we always already find ourselves in a language game, and have to discover *real* questions.[19] Responding to real questions requires predication, and predication depends upon stability in forms.

We write footnotes to Plato because of the depth and breadth of his understanding. Plato understood, as did Aristotle, that science is of the universal, that order and intelligence is present in the universe and can be apprehended by the human mind, that there is a need for truth and a natural human desire to know, and that the search for truth is both a joy in itself and of use in living a good life.

FORMS AND PREDICATION RECONSIDERED

SUMMARY

The central questions addressed in this paper are: (1) how are forms related to predication? And (2) what role do forms and predication play in the discovery and articulation of truth? The first section of the paper provides—in broad strokes—a synopsis of Plato's account of forms. The second section considers predication in relation to forms showing that the existence and nature of forms is a necessary condition for predication, and that Plato's account of predication is consistent with, in fact, *anticipates*, Aristotle's treatment of reality in the *Categories*. The conclusion of the paper is that forms and predication are central to philosophical hermeneutics, to the discovery and articulation of truth.

KEYWORDS: forms, predication, truth, Plato, Gadamer, philosophical hermeneutics.

---

[19] For the hermeneutical importance of asking an *authentic* question, see Gadamer, *Truth and Method*, 356–362.

EDITIO SECUNDA

Imelda Chłodna-Błach
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Poland

THE CRISIS OF AMERICAN EDUCATION AND REFORMS PROPOSALS ACCORDING TO ALLAN BLOOM

For most of us, the United States is synonymous with prosperity—"a paradise on Earth"—and is considered to be the greatest economic and military power of the modern world, a country distinguished by its superior technology and economics. It is so not only by large-scale development of specialised research, democracy, freedom, and cultural pluralism but also by the striving for continuous improvement by all institutions seeking to make life easier for ordinary citizens and providing specialists with the possibility of even better performance. In addition, the entire lives of Americans are driven by a desire to create equal opportunities for all citizens, which is particularly evident in the field of upbringing. The philosophy of American life can be perceived, to some extent, as faith in democracy that ensures, along with unanimous aspirations and cooperation, the happiness of society understood in general, political, and economical terms.[1] Combining this with faith in unlimited influence and possibility to improve and learn, based on the enormous natural wealth of the country and welfare, has resulted in providing access to schools for everybody, regardless of their social and economic position or place of residence.[2] The universal state education system and the so-called mass

---

This article was originally published in Polish: Imelda Chłodna, "Kryzys edukacji amerykańskiej i propozycje jego naprawy w ujęciu Allana Blooma," *Cywilizacja* 18 (2006): 61–74.

[1] See M. Ziemnowicz, *Nauczanie i wychowanie w Stanach Zjednoczonych Ameryki Północnej* (Lwów 1934), 14.

[2] After 1945, the number of people with higher education has dramatically increased in the United States of America. On the basis of the relevant Act called the "G. I. Bill," the doors

culture (creating desirable patterns of thinking and behaviour for itself) have become fundamental tools to exert impact on society.

On the one hand, the words "success" and "improvement" constitute the fundamental watchword of American life that is reflected, among others, in ever-increasing role of schools and universities. To a large extent, this development is possible thanks to the results of scientific research that condition even the improvement of social relations as well as solving any complicated issues. On the other hand, it is paradoxical that this progress, so clearly noticeable in the field of American technology and economics, unfortunately does not go hand in hand with the level of culture, and particularly education. This is reflected both in science and upbringing.

Symptoms of the Crisis of American Education and Upbringing

It is typical of the American educational system that in the name of the principles of pragmatism and utilitarianism that dominate in the American society, the higher education has been dominated by the polytechnic education. Technical knowledge and practical skills have become more important than wisdom and moral integrity. Particularly, the universities lose their primary function which is exploration and transmission of truth. Nowadays, the task of the universities is to ensure all students a free development, whereas imposing a certain point of view is considered to be a manifestation of authoritarianism. Currently, in line with liberalism and dominance of the idea of equality, an individualistic vision of man is cultivated in the United States. In line with its objectives, the need for freedom and self-realisation is emphasised, which can be satisfied thanks to science, school, and university. Nevertheless, truth and its perfecting role in human life as well as the good of the man as a person is no longer the objective of these institutions. Their purpose is usability. There is no room for education understood as perfecting man in what is appropriate for him as a person. However, there is room for becoming aware of one's

---

of universities have opened to all demobilised soldiers wishing to study. Many millions of demobilised soldiers have benefited from the opportunity to get an education at the expense of the Government. See K. Michałek, *Na drodze ku potędze. Historia Stanów Zjednoczonych Ameryki 1861–1945* (Warszawa 1991), 409.

needs and interests and for professional formation that is to provide financial means for the realisation of one's desires.[3]

That poor state of American education is the subject of reflection of American educators, psychologists, and philosophers. Allan Bloom[4] is one of many prominent American and British intellectuals who have addressed this issue. His book entitled *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students* (1987) has been translated into many languages and aroused strong responses not only among the representatives of the American academia but also in Europe.

The analyses conducted by Bloom suggest that the crisis in science is mainly visible at the higher-education level. Its main symptom is the division of university structures into autonomous university faculties. The former organisational model reminding every faculty of its "incompleteness" and the fact that it is a part of a larger whole has disappeared. Universities have broken up into smaller units that demand their rights and own teaching canons, or even are "at war" with each other.

Nowadays, the most jeopardised faculty of an American university is faculty of humanities. It is dominated by historicism, relativism, a lack of respect for tradition, and the cult of utility. It acts as a depositary of the classics, but its claims to describe the whole world and the place of man in it, to make judgements about this whole and to seek the truth about it have been rejected. Therefore, the humanities are the only specialisation using non-specialist books and posing questions about the whole—the questions ignored by the rest of the university. The natural sciences treat the humanities as an art that cannot claim the right to truth. The scholars experience the greatest difficulty in justifying the importance of their field of knowledge. In many cases, professors lecturing on classical texts are not willing to defend their authenticity because they are not interested in it or try to

---

[3] See P. Skrzydlewski, "Prawo człowieka do edukacji," in *Filozofia i edukacja*, ed. P. Jaroszyński, P. Tarasiewicz, I. Chłodna, (Lublin 2005), 135–137. For more information on the sources of the crisis of American education see I. Chłodna, "Allan Bloom i antychrześcijańskie źródła edukacji amerykańskiej," *Człowiek w Kulturze* 16 (2004): 197–206.

[4] Alan Bloom (1930–1992)—American political philosopher, theorist and cultural critic. He was also known as a translator and interpreter of the works of Plato and J. J. Rousseau (*The Republic of Plato* (New York 1968), and J. J. Rousseau, *Emile, or On Education* (New York 1979)). He received many awards, including the Clark Distinguished Teaching Award in 1967, the Jean Jacques Rousseau prize at the International Book Fair in Geneva in 1987 for the French translation of *The Closing of the American Mind*, and the Charles Frankel Prize in 1992 for his contribution to studies in the field of humanities in the United States.

update these works, treating them as material serving the authentication of one of the contemporary theories: cultural, historical, economic, or psychological. The humanities departments that are least dependent on the content of classical works (i.e., linguistics, archaeology, music and fine arts) are in the most favourable situation.

Another sign of the crisis is a hierarchy of knowledge that differs completely from the one in antiquity and the Middle Ages. Today, when an American student comes to the university he or she sees a number of disciplines, each of which is autonomous and seemingly equally important. It has been questioned if one university discipline may claim to be superior to any other discipline, even in terms of the disciplines previously treated as privileged, such as theology, philosophy or art theory.[5] This "democratic order" has led to the abandonment of the true *universitas* and encouraged students to escape into specialisations that create prospects for future careers, but not for spiritual growth. Therefore, despite the official proclamation of the principle of equality among scientific disciplines, the methods of organisation in higher education teach students to believe that it is better to choose specialised majors designed to provide them with knowledge that will be useful in their future careers than to choose humanities. Thus, they are forced to study for "the usefulness" and not for exploring and understanding the world of people and things. The universities have replaced the concern for the discovery of truth with concern for its effectiveness and application.

The greatest manifestation of the crisis is the fact that universities have ceased to be an enclave of intellectual freedom, a place of a joint pursuit of truth and judging whether a given idea, theory, or proposition is true or false.[6] The place of truth has been replaced with freedom and equality leading, consequently, to the destruction of the model of a rational man who discerns good from evil, truth from falsehood, and who is critical towards the theories and views presented in the academic world. This goal may be achieved by means of particular modification of educational legal regulations, artificial forcing of estimation for all minorities at the university, discrediting the Christian religion and culture based upon Greek

---

[5] "In America, it is disputed whether to teach only Shakespeare, Dante and Goethe, or to teach as well about works of a Peruvian singer or a Puerto Rican poet in the name of multi-culturalism that invalidates the hierarchy in the spirit of political correctness." M. Król, "O zimnej demokracji," *Tygodnik Powszechny* 21 (1998): 8.

[6] A. Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (Polish translation by Tomasz Bieroń entitled *Umysł Zamknięty*), 373–374.

thought, Roman law, and Christianity. Properly profiled curricula provide an opportunity to manipulate the society, bringing it into conformity with *ad hoc* political or social needs.

Therefore, university curricula are dominated by cultural relativism and dogmatic scepticism proclaiming the relativity of all truth. Religion, as the basis for moral education, has disappeared from public education. It is believed that the truth preached by religion may hinder the possibility of interpersonal communication. University lectures are dominated by the view that no religion, culture, country, idea, or person has the right to proclaim the objective truth since it does not exist. Contemporary American education does not require the student to be critical and demanding with respect to the surrounding reality. On the contrary, it tells him to be open to all attitudes, lifestyles, and ideologies. Current trends are more important than truth.

In addition to the learning and teaching crisis, a crisis may be observed as well in the sphere of morality. The attitudes of American youth present the lack of imperative goals for the future while breaking ties with the past. There is no generally accepted morality, or a sense of respect for the requirements of a harmonious society or respect for legitimate authorities. And the promotion of freedom is understood negatively as a *freedom from* any restrictions, while questioning the objective system of values. These habits are grounded in one of the most striking features of American students, which is egalitarianism.[7]

Almost all students also support the idea of meritocracy, i.e., they believe that every individual should have the opportunity to realise his or her specific (non-egalitarian) ability, regardless of race, gender, social and national origin, religion, and wealth. Egalitarianism has gradually led to the provision of access to education to all young people, which is admirable, but on the other hand, it has reaffirmed the belief that education must be identical for each person, regardless of their abilities. These changes resulted in the fact that people with superior intellectual abilities were not required to do more than any average student.[8] In consequence, the level of education has decreased.

The postulate of universal equality in all forms and in all ways is integrally related with relativism that imprints its mark especially in the

---

[7] Id., 102.
[8] See R. H. Bork, *Slouching Towards Gomorrah. Modern Liberalism and American Decline* (New York 1996), 252.

sphere of morality. Bloom perceives this phenomenon as a serious threat to the intellectual life of students and a strength that adversely affects the American educational system. For students, the relativity of truth is a kind of moral requirement—a necessary condition for the freedom of society. What they fear most is intolerance.

Manifested in an open denial of objective truth and good as the basis for human cognition and action, relativism leads ultimately to bondage of man. Acknowledging any good would be tantamount to acknowledging evil, which is contradictory to the open-to-everything democracy. Its consequence is the cognitive and moral relativism that ultimately leads, through scepticism and agnosticism, to nihilism. Bloom ironically states that:

> Relativism is necessary to openness; and this is the virtue, the only virtue, which all primary education for more than fifty years has dedicated itself to inculcating. Openness—and the relativism that makes it the only plausible stance in the face of various claims to truth and various ways of life and kinds of human beings—is the great insight of our times. The true believer is the real danger.[9]

The idea that we should give up the belief that anyone can be right is instilled in the students as an irrefutable axiom. Of course, they cannot defend their opinion which is further compounded by the fact that their knowledge is not too impressive. In fact, their previous education (before higher education) was not to make them erudites but to provide them with a "moral virtue—openness."[10]

According to Bloom, there are two mutually exclusive types of openness: indifferent and seeking. The first one has two objectives—to deprive man of intellectual aspirations and allow him to be who he wants to be provided that he does not want to be a learned man. The second type stimulates fascination and constitutes an openness to knowledge provided by history and a variety of cultures. This is a true openness that does not allow man to succumb to the temptation to accept the present completely. However, the contemporary meaning of openness is a life pandering to current tastes and imitating the most primitive patterns. It encourages to

---

[9] Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind*, 28.
[10] Id.

"go with the flow," to adapt to the present whiling ignoring the doubts about the rules that govern the system.[11]

Therefore, the American student's mind is closed in a false openness. It has become passive, self-centred, egalitarian in its limited sense. The students have no readings where they can see behaviour patterns. Renouncing reading good books weakens their sense of reasonable perception and strengthens their belief that there is nothing but "here and now."[12] Lack of proper education means that they look for "enlightenment" where it is readily available and are unable to distinguish solemnity from intellectual rubbish, wisdom from propaganda. They usually turn to films that are characterised by ignorance and manipulation.

Another feature of young generation is egocentrism resulting from a significant atomisation of American society. Today's students do not have great moral aspirations; when asked about great ethical issues, they speak ironically. They present a certain passivity, lack of a wide perspective regarding the future. Heroism, as an admirable quality, has been replaced with a "self-preserving" and self-serving morality. The universal issues are no longer present, as they are not directly related to the students' lives. They do not see a reason to knowingly participate in civic life.

The inevitable individualism is further exacerbated by the collapse of the family. Children lose contact with their parents while still in a significant state of development, because when they leave home, the parents have little influence on their offspring. Young people usually settle far from the family. As a result, young Americans are often incapable of building lasting relationships. At any time they are ready for a change, ignoring the cost of separation from their loved ones. Since childhood, they are instilled with the belief in a boundless freedom identified with the possibility to make any choices. They are brought up to freedom, but with no positive purpose and not understood as being rooted in responsibility. Therefore, there is no necessity, social pressure, or cult of heroism for young people. They do not have nor need heroes or authority. They may choose between being a believer or an atheist, being straight or gay, to cohabitate or marry (including a vision that considers divorce as licit), to found a family or to not have children, to raise offspring or choose professional work instead. The breakdown of marriage is almost a norm. Many children have experienced the divorce of their parents; therefore, the value of the

---

[11] Id., 47.
[12] Id., 73.

family is foreign to them. They are strengthened in their conviction that divorce is only a dissolution of the agreement between spouses. They transfer this pattern into their adult lives. Consequently, in their later lives, students prefer cohabitation and avoid any long-standing commitments. Their actions are driven solely by their desire to achieve success and an inaccurate understanding of the relationship about responsibility and happiness.

Individualism is related to the American conformism that means that other people are not necessary and causes the loss of hope that in other times and places there were great sages, authorities, wise books, from which one may learn a lot about life. People do not have a common goal, a common good that can be achieved only by means of mutual cooperation. This phenomenon is exacerbated by multiculturalism that is typical of the United States, where we deal with many nationalities, races, and religions.[13] This results in the fact that the culture existing in this country is not the culture of all communities living in it. Culturally and mentally different worlds collide here; thus, it is difficult to find a universal reference to truth, goodness, and beauty.

When discussing the issues of upbringing, it is worth paying attention to another aspect of the American students' mentality. There are three types of illiteracy described by Ronald H. Nash, a professor of history and philosophy at the University of Kentucky, in his work entitled *The Closing of the American Heart*. The first of them known as functional illiteracy is the inability to understand written words that are in common use. 13% of all seventeen-year-olds (about 24 million people) are functional illiterates. Meanwhile, in 1910, only 2.2% of American children aged between 10 and 14 years could not read or write. Ronald Nash cites the opinion of Karl Shapiro of the University of California who states that: "What is really distressing is that this generation cannot and does not read. I am speaking of university students in what are supposed to be our best universities their

---

[13] In connection with the phenomenon of multiculturalism, at the time of colonialism, the metaphor of a melting pot was promoted in the United States, indicating that immigrants should try to adapt to the dominant culture in such a way that their otherness does not go beyond the private and family life. In time, however, the process of a forced assimilation of immigrants into the Anglo-Saxon culture began. It resulted in replacing the *melting pot* with a *salad bowl* presenting the new situation when minority groups are not willing to assimilate into the dominant culture, but wish to maintain their distinctiveness, at the same time demanding respect for their rights. See A. Szahaj, M. N. Jakubowski, *Filozofia polityki* (Warszawa 2005), 171.

illiteracy is staggering . . . We are experiencing a literacy breakdown which is unlike anything I know of in the history of letters."[14]

Another problem is cultural illiteracy. This term describes students who can read but are unable to thrive in the modern world because they lack the information necessary to interpret the material they read. Dr. E. D. Hirsch, Jr., is the most prominent thinker associated with this concept of cultural illiteracy. Both he and Nash state that modern educational theory deserves much of the blame for causing cultural illiteracy. Hirsch argues that educators often believe that a child's intellectual and social skills will develop naturally without regard to the specific content of education. Educators are more interested in how children learn rather than what they learn. Because of this belief, children fail to store away enough information to become culturally literate.

Teachers and educators will grudgingly admit to the problem of functional and cultural literacy, but they confirm, without a shadow of a doubt, the more and more frequent occurrence of the so-called moral illiteracy. Nash defines the problem of moral illiteracy as a cultural war between those who are religious and support traditional values and those who are secular and advocate anti-traditional or modernist values. This problem affects not only the Christians. Will Herberg, an American professor of Jewish origin, claims that: "We are surrounded on all sides by the wreckage of our great intellectual tradition. In this kind of spiritual chaos, neither freedom nor order is possible. Instead of freedom, we have the all-engulfing whirl of pleasure and power; instead of order, we have the jungle wilderness and self-indulgence."[15] In contrast, John Silber, the Boston University president, said that:

> In generations past, parents were more diligent in passing on their principles and values to their children, and were assisted by churches and schools which emphasized religious and moral education. In recent years, in contrast, our society has become increasingly secular and the curriculum of the public schools has been denuded of almost all ethical content. As a result universities must confront a student body ignorant of the evidence and arguments that

---

[14] See Ronald H. Nash, *The Closing of the American Heart: What's Really Wrong with America's Schools* (Richardson, Tex.: Probe Books, 1990). See also D. Closson, *The Closing of the American Heart* (Probe Ministries International, 1993).
[15] Closson, *The Closing of the American Heart*.

underlie and support many of our traditional moral principles and practices.[16]

Taking into consideration the aforementioned reflection, it is clear that the crisis of American education is very deep and has penetrated both the structure of curricula and academic staff as well as the students themselves, their knowledge, customs, and culture.

Return to Advantages of Education
in the Field of Liberal Arts

In the face of threats observed by Bloom in today's academic life and manifested, among other things, in a significantly diminished quality of reflection on life and the purpose of man, Bloom believes that the only serious solution to this problem is to create a good base of studies in the field of philosophy and the humanities, which requires a genuine study of the history of great philosophical questions and problems and attempts to answer them.[17] Therefore, Bloom seeks to restore the ideal of an educated man shaped by great literary works and works of the greatest thinkers. He defines this type of education as liberal education, where the word "liberal" is used in the context of *artes liberales* (liberal arts). Liberality, that is the freedom of this type of education, consists, *inter alia*, in the fact that it is not subordinated to the demands of utility and practicality, but only to truth. Its goal is not acquiring education within a narrow specialisation, but a broadly humanistic education, the so-called *universitas*.

Bloom's views on liberal education are largely shared by the late Mortimer J. Adler, a former professor at the University of North Carolina,

---

[16] Id.

[17] Thereby Bloom is part of a direction in the philosophy of education called perennialism. Perennialism is one of the oldest and most conservative philosophies of education. It refers to the past, especially to what has gained a widespread recognition, to universal knowledge and values that are most respected by society. In this way, one may justify the stability of knowledge that has passed the test of time, as well as the stability of values retaining their invariable moral, spiritual and physical shape. It is assumed that the nature of world and man is invariable, as well as the nature of truth, virtue, beauty, etc. Perennialism has revived with the publication of Mortimer Adler's *Paideia Proposal* (*The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto* (New York 1982); *Paideia Problems and Possibilities* (New York 1983); *The Paideia Program: An Educational Syllabus* (New York 1984)). A. C. Ornstein, F. P. Hunkins, *Curriculum: Foundations, Principles, and Issues* (Polish translation by K. Kruszewski entitled: *Program szkolny. Założenia, zasady, problematyka* (Warszawa 1998), 64–66.

author of one of the most important works devoted to this issue.[18] In the chapter entitled *Liberalism and liberal education*, he draws attention to the necessity to distinguish between the terms "liberal" and "liberalism," especially in terms of the concept of freedom hidden in each of them. Liberalism, inspired mainly by the philosophy of Locke, Voltaire and Rousseau, puts an emphasis on choosing the "system of values," underlining the importance of freedom that brings personal beliefs to the fore and at the same time deprecates the existence of objective values such as truth, goodness, and beauty. The cult is reflected in the thesis proclaiming the existence of basic freedoms, such as personal freedom, physical integrity, freedom of religion, conscience, association and assembly as well as in aversion towards collectivism, as a belief in the dominance of what is of an individual nature. Free and uninhibited activity of individuals is, therefore, a source of harmony, progress in social life and general well-being. Liberalism understood in that way is one of the main reasons for the poor state of American education described in the previous section of this paper. Since freedom is understood here as *freedom from* and not as *freedom to*. Liberalism challenges the natural human freedom—the freedom of the hu-man will in the act of choice. Liberalism replaces it with freedom from any superior power and the lack of submission, in one's principles of behaviour, to will or legislative authority of any man. This individual freedom—independent from variable, uncertain, unknown—is merely the arbitrary will of another man as an absolute good.

In contrast, in the case of classical education, freedom is understood differently. One of the meanings (a traditional meaning) of the term "liberal education" is training in the field of the liberal arts. However, in this case, the term may be also used to underline the difference between humanistic education and vocational training.[19] Therefore, this term should not be limited only to intellectual education or "cultivation of the mind." This aspect of liberal education is underlined also by Bloom who claims that chaos reining among university disciplines discourages students preventing them from making a rational choice of the offered disciplines. Therefore, they frequently decide to undertake specialised majors with a specific mandatory curriculum and with a particular vision of a future

---

[18] See M. J. Adler, *Reforming Education. The Opening of the American Mind* (New York–London 1988).
[19] Id., 96.

career.[20] In this perspective, education other than purely professional or technical training is perceived as unnecessary and burdensome for the university curriculum.

This utilitarianism can be prevented by means of creating an atmosphere at the universities encouraging students to feel the need for humanistic education satisfying their love of truth and passion to live a good life. It can be achieved only by a good liberal education programme.

According to M. Adler, such an education covers three aspects distinguished in regards to the types of a man's development: intellectual, moral, and physical. He understands all the three aspects of liberal education, as opposed to vocational training. However, in his opinion, this belief is not opposed to the concept of liberal education understood solely as mental development, since all the above-mentioned spheres of human life also play a very important role here. He claims that: "The direct product of liberal education is a good mind, well disciplined in its processes of inquiring and judging, knowing and understanding, and well furnished with knowledge, well cultivated by ideas."[21]

Authentic liberal education radically changes the entire life of a student, influencing his actions, preferences, and choices when his current views are subject to re-examination and assessment. Bloom says even more: ". . . liberal education puts everything at risk and requires students who are able to risk everything . . . it can only touch what is uncommitted in the already essentially committed."[22]

This type of education should primarily help students find the answer to the most important, according to Bloom, question: "What is man?" whose life is stretched between the noblest aspirations and low, common needs. It is typical of this education to give answers that often oppose the tendencies of our nature or do not follow the spirit of our times. Liberally educated persons can resist easy answers or commonly promoted fashions just because he or she knows other, more valuable and worthwhile considerations and solutions.

An important part of classical education is constituted by the so-called "Great Books" approach referring to a specific curriculum and list of books developed on its basis,[23] that have been created as a result of the

---

[20] Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind*, 402–403.

[21] Adler, *Reforming Education*, 110.

[22] Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind*, 443.

[23] The original list compiled by John Erskine contained sixty items. In the 1920s, it was considerably extended in connection with the organisation of this kind of seminars by such

discussion between American scientists and theorists of education, among others: Robert Hutchins, Mortimer Adler, Stringfellow Barr, Scott Buchanan, Alexander Meiklejohn. Allan Bloom argues that working with students on the basis of contents of the books belonging to the canon is one of the most important ways of preventing risks associated with the problem of relativism. Although he is aware that education cannot come down to a mere book knowledge, Bloom emphasises that knowledge is essential especially in times when everyday life provides few role models to be followed.

Bloom also draws attention to the fact that American universities (in response to a noticeable crisis in the humanities) attempt to supplement the university education of students, which is reflected in the creation of the so-called framework programs. They are supposed to provide university education with certain subjects constituting a basic humanistic education, as well as the relevant requirements. In practice, a student is obliged to pass at least one course from basic disciplines: natural sciences, social sciences or philosophy and humanities. It is done in the name of the so-called broadening of cognitive "horizons."[24] However, this does not meet the requirements of the postulate of comprehensive knowledge set earlier by Bloom. These courses are necessarily superficial and detached from the whole. Eminent professors from a particular field are not interested in them since their very nature constitutes certain "surrogates" of teaching. Thus, their levels are low and do not fulfil their function properly. Nevertheless, university education is impossible without considering relevant, fundamental, and universal questions and answers.

The second way to resolve the deadlock was to create the so-called "integrated courses."[25] It is an attempt to replace framework programmes that were created for the purposes of general education. They would consist in classes (within the framework of one subject) with a broader look at

---

schools as: Columbia University, University of Chicago, St. John's College, Notre Dame, St. Mary's College. All subsequent studies contained ¾ of the titles proposed by Erskine. The books included in this approach constitute a publishing series entitles "Great Books of the Western World," which is known to many Americans. Individual items have been approved by M. J. Adler and other members of the Great Books Foundation. Many of the works included in this collection were translated into English specifically for the needs of this approach.

[24] Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind*, 408–410.

[25] The problems of these courses are highly diverse, for instance: "Man in Nature," "War and Moral Responsibility," "The Arts and Creativity," "Culture and the Individual." See id., 409.

the specific issue. According to Bloom, their advantage would be forcing professors to go beyond their particular specialisation, whereas, their disadvantage could be the lack of explicit requirements and following the changing fashions.[26] None of these models, however, completed the objective of "comprehensive" knowledge set by Bloom, i.e., none of them presented a comprehensive vision of the human world to students. "Liberal education should give the student the sense that learning must and can be both synoptic and precise."[27] This objective cannot be achieved because there is no unity of sciences, and few of those in power at universities believe in the improvement of this situation. Another problem is that since the studies do not lead to posing and answering universal human questions, the courses described above constitute only "interludes," a temporary escape into other issues. There is no way students may notice their meaning and relationship with the whole of their studies. Hence, the proposed solutions, although they are fundamentally noble, do not lead to the restoration of logos and ethos of university education.[28]

Therefore, Bloom suggests to replace the selective system of current curricula of secondary schools and universities with formal courses teaching students about classical literature and allowing them to realise that "philosophy, not history or anthropology, is the most important human science."[29]

In his opinion, such an education has to rely on reading selections, generally known classical texts, aimed at the discovery of important philosophical questions that can be found there. As he says: "[w]hat each generation is can be best discovered in its relation to the permanent concerns of mankind."[30] He also warns against treating these works merely as specific historical products. The method of reading "great old books" suggested by Bloom allows students to participate in the rich heritage of human thought. Bloom states that:

> wherever the Great Books make up a central part of the curriculum, the students are excited and satisfied, feel they are doing something that is independent and fulfilling, getting something from the uni-

---

[26] Id., 410.

[27] Id.

[28] See A. Maryniarczyk, "O zapomnianej misji uniwersytetów europejskich," *Człowiek w Kulturze* 16 (2004): 54–55.

[29] See G. McNamee, *Lost in the Stacks: Bloom's 'Closing of the American Mind,'* June 2005.

[30] Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind*, 19.

versity they cannot get elsewhere. The very fact of this special experience, which leads nowhere beyond itself, provides them with a new alternative and a respect for study itself. The advantage they get is an awareness of the classic—particularly important for our innocents; an acquaintance with what big questions were when there were still big questions; models, at the very least, of how to go about answering them; and, perhaps most important of all, a fund of shared experiences and thoughts on which to ground their friendships with one another. Programs based upon judicious use of great texts provide the royal road to students' hearts . . . A good program of liberal education feeds the student's love of truth and passion to live a good life it is the easiest thing in the world to devise courses of study, adapted to the particular conditions of each university, which thrill those who take them. The difficulty is in getting them accepted by the faculty.[31]

This idea is not enthusiastically received by the various departments of the university.[32] They all have a positive attitude towards philosophical and humanistic education, provided that those studies do not take their students away and do not take up too much time. However, they are not interested in this field and they focus their entire attention on solving immediate problems. Natural sciences, the most successful field at universities, treats the "books" with indulgence, provided they do not take up too much valuable time devoted to solving current issues. Social sciences do not treat the old works as a waste of time. Their rejection of the classics is based more on fear that students may challenge social sciences in general, as they may, by chance, discover the greatness of old matters and, at the same time reject the little value of solutions proposed by the new field. Moreover, only a few "Great Books" could be presented by those sciences—Bloom mentions here only Weber and Freud. Bloom puts the greatest emphasis on the question why the humanities have adopted hostile attitude towards the "Great Books" approach. Despite their actual dependence on this type of works, they are not interested in what is inside them. An example he gives is philology, the interests of which focus on the linguistic rather than substantive sphere. Another reason is the lack of competence of scholars who do not understand what has been said by Aristotle,

---

[31] Id., 411–412.
[32] Id., 412.

Plato, and others. Finally, some of them want to join the ranks of "special-ised sciences," breaking away from the very roots. When analysing the causes of the collapse of the status of the humanities, Bloom refers to the events in the 1960s, when the humanities found themselves in the desired centre of events. As the first discipline, the humanities sought to take into account students' demands.[33] Bloom believes that such actions had their sources in the penetration of this field of science by the ideology of radical European left wing. Transferring the Nietzsche's philosophy into the lan-guage of the left wing was to bring a fresh breeze of new interpretations (Marxism, Freudianism, etc.). This is the source of active revolutionary attitude of scholars. In consequence, they have deprived their field of knowledge of the position it had occupied in the old order. Moreover, the humanities have lost social approval. As noted by Bloom, today's humani-ties lack faith in themselves—the transmission of tradition (which is not respected by democracy) was abandoned decades ago, although for centu-ries it was the task and source of greatness of the humanities. Whereas democracy desires to replace the eternity postulated by humanists with immediate usefulness, the humanities resemble "the great old Paris Flea Market where, amidst masses of junk, people with a good eye found castaway treasures that made them rich . . ."[34]

Therefore, Bloom is of the opinion that the most important element of education should be classical formation (liberal education) that uses important texts belonging to the canon of literary and philosophical thought of the West in a considered and reasonable way. He claims that the so-called "Great Books" cover a 2500-year reflection on the most enduring and important questions strongly related to both individual and social life of every human being. According to him, it is impossible to live one's life fully without a serious study of this type of texts. The salvation of culture,

---

[33] This rebellion of flower people was to bring a certain renewal. Unfortunately, capitulation of universities and acceptance of all the demands of students have completely deprived the higher education from its former objectives. The content of this ideology was to engage in values. Universities have waived their right to explore them and inform about them. This right has been given to the "spirit of the times"—commonly known as fashion. 1960s ap-pealed to a different morality (that had nothing to do with the old canon) based on the oppo-sition to the law in the name of higher values. Former hippies emphasise the role of students in the fight against racism or for human rights with fondness, at the same time forgetting that much earlier, this cause had been ingrained in universities that they managed to successfully destroy. See J. Emilewicz, "Allana Blooma próby otwierania umysłów," *Pressje* 1 (2002): 127–141.

[34] Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind*, 445.

and therefore of man, should be sought, in his opinion, in the rebirth of universities as places of unbiased search for truth. They should become schools of an independent thought where the search for knowledge is an end in itself, unrelated in any direct way with the temporariness of social and political life. The proper task of academic education is encouraging a selfless love of wisdom.

Bloom's analyses are not sufficient, but still significant. He aptly states that what threatens the modern university (as a result of knowing its essence) is depreciating humanistic knowledge, a departure from the classical model of education as well as ideologisation. Due to the fact that the disease of American education is penetrating Europe as well, it is worth to pondering upon. Therefore, the reflections of this author can be considered extremely necessary. They should constitute an inspiration for reflections on the state of education not only in America.

**THE CRISIS OF AMERICAN EDUCATION
AND REFORMS PROPOSALS ACCORDING TO ALLAN BLOOM**

SUMMARY

The article is focused on Allan Bloom's thought about American education. First, while investigating the symptoms of the crisis of American education and upbringing, it sees them manifested both in the structure of university curricula and academic staff as well as the students, their knowledge, customs, and culture. Secondly, while analyzing advantages of education in the field of liberal arts—where the word "liberal" is used in the context of *artes liberales*—it presents Bloom's belief that the only serious solution to the crisis of American education is to restore the ideal of an educated man shaped by great literary works and works of the greatest thinkers.

KEYWORDS: America, education, liberalism, liberal arts, university, student, relativism, freedom, society, Allan Bloom.

Tomasz Duma
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Poland

TO KNOW OR TO THINK—THE CONTROVERSY OVER THE UNDERSTANDING OF PHILOSOPHICAL KNOWLEDGE IN THE LIGHT OF THE STUDIES OF MIECZYSŁAW A. KRĄPIEC

There is general agreement among historians of philosophy and philosophers on the beginnings of the appearance of philosophical knowledge in our cultural circle. It is astounding that in general there are no great differences in the interpretation of how the first philosophers understood philosophical knowledge. Serious differences of opinion begin only in regard to the great philosophical systems, beginning with Plato and Aristotle. While we can point to many common elements in interpretations concerning earlier times, such as the identification of philosophy with wisdom, that philosophical knowledge was given a universal character, and that philosophical knowledge was related to some sort of metaphysical dimension of reality, yet in our time all the elements that could be generally recognized as essential properties of philosophical knowledge have been eliminated one after another. For this reason, both philosophical knowledge and philosophy itself become something completely relative, even arbitrary or accidental. One example of this is the postmodernist description of philosophy as "a certain way of writing," "the art of holding conversation," or the "most recently read book."[1] In this light, the terms "philosophy" and "philosophical knowledge" basically mean nothing except a vague description in the framework of ordinary language for some-

---

This article was originally published in Polish: Ks. Tomasz Duma, "Poznawać czy myśleć – spór o rozumienie poznania filozoficznego w świetle studiów Mieczysława A. Krąpca," *Studia Ełckie* 10 (2008): 41–62.

[1] Cf. M. Kwiek, *Rorty i Lyotard. W labiryntach postmoderny* (*Rorty and Lyotard. In the postmodern labyrinths*) (Poznań 1994), 42–46.

one's attitude or approach to something. Thereby the enormous domain of knowledge upon which people have worked for millennia loses its place and meaning in culture as culture is broadly understood, and thereby in the intellectual life of the man of our time; the consequences of this appear in the sphere of morality, higher education, primary education, politics, art, and even religion.

It seems that the present loss of confidence in this field of knowledge is caused not so much by the planned questioning of its significance in culture, as it is caused by various aberrations within philosophy itself. To restore to philosophical knowledge its original rank, we should take up once again the problem of the specific character of philosophical knowledge. This cannot be done unless we look in a precise manner to the entire philosophical tradition especially to the most eminent achievements of that tradition. However, not many thinkers in our time have decided to pursue the classical understanding of philosophical knowledge.[2] Most often, people stop at minimalism, or they develop some sort of subjective vision of the world. However, this does not mean that interest in the classical approach to philosophy has completely died. Evidence of this is found in the achievements of Fr. Mieczysław Albert Krąpiec, the leading representative of the Lublin School of Philosophy, which in this field has distinguished itself not only in Polish philosophical literature, but beyond.[3] In his many works, Fr. Krąpiec worked to show the specific character of philosophical knowledge.[4] He thought that to do this, we should reach to the very foundations of cognitive operations that cause a fact such as philosophical knowledge to come into existence, and which consequently demarcate the

---

[2] Cf. A. Bronk, S. Majdański, "Klasyczność filozofii klasycznej" ("The classical character of classical philosophy") *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 39–40 (1991/1992, no. 1): 367–391.

[3] M. A. Krąpiec (1921–2008)—philosopher, theologian, humanist, rector for many years of the Catholic University of Lublin. In his philosophical system he worked to explain the whole of reality accessible to human knowledge. He did this in investigations in general metaphysics, the methodology of metaphysics, the metaphysics of knowledge, philosophical anthropology, the philosophy of law, the philosophy of politics, the philosophy of culture, the philosophy of language, moral philosophy, and the philosophy of the nation. Cf. *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* (*Universal Encyclopedia of Philosophy*), vol. 6 (Lublin 2005), 43–48.

[4] The most important works that deal with this problematic are as follows: *O rozumienie filozofii* (*On understanding philosophy*) (Lublin 1991); *Odzyskać świat realny* (*To regain the real world*) (Lublin 1993); *Poznawać czy myśleć. Problemy epistemologii tomistycznej* (*To know or to think. Problems of Thomistic epistemology*) (Lublin 1994); *O filozofii* (*On philosophy*) (Lublin 2008).

entire profile of the knowledge that arises by describing the essential moments of that knowledge. If this preliminary stage in investigations on the nature of philosophical knowledge is forgotten, this will always lead to reliance on certain assumptions, with the result that the knowledge gained in this way, despite its general character, will not essentially differ from knowledge in other domains. The imposed framework of assumptions would weigh very heavily on the role of philosophy in the establishment of human knowledge, or in general it would deprive philosophy of that task or role. All the more, philosophy thus understood would not be in a position to provide a realist, and at the same time ultimate explanation of reality, that is, an explanation that looks to the world that exists independently of the human intellect and has such a form that we no longer need to look to anything else to explain this world.

As we keep in view the need to grasp the specific character of philosophical knowledge, we should look at man's original or first cognitive operations. Because, as Fr. Krąpiec believed, it is crucial to make a distinction between knowing and thinking for these inquiries, the analysis we are making will focus on this problem.

Thinking Instead of Knowing

Because of the initial close connection between philosophy and religious thought, especially Oriental thought, philosophical knowledge was excessively concentrated on various forms of thinking about reality, and philosophical knowledge was often divorced from the really existing world. The domination of thought followed from the fact that, unlike real knowledge, thinking by itself allowed people rather easily to explain the origin and beginning of the world and of man. The connection between religious thought and philosophical thought appeared most clearly in ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, and in the Far East.[5] One particular expression of this was the interpretation of the whole of reality that appeared in ancient India, in light of which the entire world appeared as an emanation of the Absolute-Brahma, understood as pure thought. In this conception, the Absolute was the only real being, and everything else possessed only the appearances of being. A special place was given to the human soul (atman) on account of its ability to think and know; consequently the soul was identified with the Absolute; this followed from the idea that all objectivity

---

[5] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 7.

in knowledge was only the "showing" of something to the subject of think-ing, as a result of which that subject remained the only real being.[6] What-ever appears to the subject is only an emanation of the subject's thought. According to Krąpiec, this philosophical and religious thought of the East left a permanent mark on the history of philosophy. The most important consequence was that human knowledge was divorced from the real object, and an object that was only an emanation of thought took the place of the real object. In this way, operations of thought became the chief way of knowing; the measure of operations of thought was no longer the existing object, but only the laws of logic.[7]

Such an approach to human knowledge found many adherents in ancient Greece. One of the first philosophers who clearly took up this way of philosophizing was Heraclitus. In his conception of reality, he empha-sized the fundamental role of the Logos. The Logos was the eternal princi-ple that governed the entire cosmos, and which despite universal mutability gives meaning to everything.[8] The next great supporter of the priority of thought over knowledge was Parmenides. He concentrated on the univer-sality of the laws of thought so much that he was inclined to call into ques-tion all change in the world. This philosopher was the first in the history of the philosophy of the West to identify directly being with thought. This found expression in a popular maxim attributed to him: "for it is the same to think and to be" (*to gar autó noéin te kaì éinai*).[9] On this basis, he for-mulated a paradigm of philosophical knowledge that assumed that the fea-

---

[6] "These two concepts, the objective and the subjective, Brahman and Atman, the cosmic principle and the mental principle, are regarded as identical. Brahman is Atman . . . The transcendent conception of God accepted in the Rig-Veda here has been transformed into an immanent conception. The infinite is not outside the finite but within it. The subjective character of the doctrine of the Upanishads caused this change. The identity between the subject and object was considered in India before Plato's birth . . . This identity of subject and object is not a hazy hypothesis, but is a conclusion that follows in a necessary way from all thinking, feeling, and wanting" (S. Radhakrishnan, *Filozofia indyjska* (*Indian philoso-phy*), vol. 1, Polish trans. Z. Wrzeszcz (Warszawa 1958), 186–187).

[7] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 10.

[8] Cf. K. Mrówka, *Heraklit. Fragmenty: nowy przekład i komentarz* (*Heraclitus. Fragments: a new translation and commentary*) (Warsaw 2004), 345: "Heraclitus is convinced that an absolute truth exists: the Logos—Thought, the One, the Wise, the Law . . . he saw that in the world everything happens because of the rational Logos that rules, governs, and unifies the whole cosmos. He also saw that the human soul possesses the ability to know the Logos; that the same rational logos that rules the cosmos dwells in the soul."

[9] Cf. *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* (*Universal Encyclopedia of Philosophy*), vol. 8 (Lublin 2007), 28–29.

tures of thought must correspond to the properties of the object of thought. Having stated that generality, necessity, and immutability were features of thought, he thought that the object of knowledge also had such properties. Almost all later Greek philosophy took up this paradigm, and that is why it was so difficult for Greek philosophy to free itself from understanding real being after the manner of thought. According to Krąpiec, the Orphic beliefs, besides Heraclitus and Parmenides, also had a strong influence on that philosophy. The Orphic beliefs emphasized the divine character of the human soul, and held that by nature the soul is perfect and eternal, and the soul's happiness consists in beholding the divine world of truth.[10] When as the result of a fall, the soul loses its happiness and is incarnated in a human body, it can free itself from the world of matter by proper thinking, and can return to the beholding of being itself. In the light of this, man is really only a spirit-thought, which means that knowledge of the material world will not have any greater significance for him.

Plato's philosophy was the culmination of those views. For Plato, noetic knowledge (*nóesis*—intuitive thought) was the highest level of human knowledge. Noetic knowledge consists in the immediate and pure intellectual vision of the world of ideas.[11] Dianoetic knowledge (*diánoia* — discursive thought), although concerned this dimension of the world, could be reduced to operations on the ideas of mathematical beings, and in a certain sense, also the weakest form of knowledge, or doxal knowledge (*dóxa*—opinion) concerned this dimension of the world. Although doxal knowledge concerned corporeal beings, it was based on the anamnesis of ideas.[12] According to Plato, as Krąpiec notes, knowledge there consists in

---

[10] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 11; cf. A. Krokiewicz, *Studia orfickie. Moralność Homera i Hezjoda* (*Orphic studies. The morality of Homer and Hesiod*) (Warsaw 2000), 71–72: "All this (the Orphic mysteries) happened in the name of the divinity of man, or man's soul. Herodotus called the belief described 'immortalizing' (*athanatizousi*). He adds that some of them even have lamentation when someone is born, and joy when someone dies . . . It is difficult to suppose that such a strong metaphysical belief arose spontaneously in barbarian Thrace. We would rather say that it have had roots either in Hindu culture (the Upanishads) or in Minoan culture, which perhaps is closer to the truth . . . According to Minoan beliefs, the soul existed in complete independence from the body, which was not the case in other ancient beliefs, for example, in Egyptian beliefs."

[11] "And the soul is like the eye: when resting upon that on which truth and being shine, the soul perceives and understands and is radiant with intelligence" (Plato, *Republic*, trans. Benjamim Jowett, bk. VI).

[12] "[T]hey were speaking of those numbers that could only be realised in thought . . . this knowledge may be truly called necessary, necessitating as it clearly does the use of the pure intelligence in the attainment of the pure truth" (Id., bk 7). "And do you not know also that

the "contemplation in thought of the intellectually seen necessary truth that constitutes the content of an idea."[13] An idea that contains a general, necessary, and unchanging content is thereby a source of truth. Since this content is perfect, it can be imparted by participation to sensible things; from those things the content is known by way of anamnesis; according to Krąpiec, anamnesis performs the role of special apperception that guarantees that the individual thing can be known. This means that real knowledge is realized only at the level of thought, and it is the work of the spirit-soul, which "brings forth from itself, as from a subject, truth-oriented thought that transcends mutability, time, and individuality."[14] This is done in acts of conceptual knowing that show the content of being as unchanging, necessary and general. Since this content existed in the soul before it was joined with the body, knowledge in principle may be reduced to the remembrance of that content. On this account, the operation of reminiscence is a special apperception, which is the reason for knowledge and knowability. The content of reality presented in an idea is intelligible in itself. The only element that hinders self-intelligibility is matter. Matter limits the perfection of ideas and becomes the basis for cognitive error.[15] One consequence of the opposition of ideas and matter was a dualistic vision of reality, in the light of which one should look for "real reality" in

---

although they make use of the visible forms and reason about them, they are thinking not of these, but of the ideals which they resemble . . . the forms which they draw or make, and which have shadows and reflections in water of their own, are converted by them into images, but they are really seeking to behold the things themselves, which can only be seen with the eye of the mind?" (Id., bk. VI).

[13] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 12.

[14] Id., 15.

[15] "Has the reality of them ever been perceived by you through the bodily organs? or rather, is not the nearest approach to the knowledge of their several natures made by him who so orders his intellectual vision as to have the most exact conception of the essence of that which he considers?
Certainly.
And he attains to the knowledge of them in their highest purity who goes to each of them with the mind alone, not allowing when in the act of thought the intrusion or introduction of sight or any other sense in the company of reason, but with the very light of the mind in her clearness penetrates into the very fight of truth in each; he has got rid, as far as he can, of eyes and ears and of the whole body, which he conceives of only as a disturbing element, hindering the soul from the acquisition of knowledge when in company with her—is not this the sort of man who, if ever man did, is likely to attain the knowledge of existence?" (Plato, *Phaedo*, trans. Benjamin Jowett, 65e–66a).

the order of thought, while the order of material things was only a shadow of the real world.

All later philosophies that emphasized the role of the subject in human knowledge were shaped on the basis of Plato's philosophy. Even in Christianity, Platonism was regarded as the doctrine closest to the revealed truth. In large measure, Neo-Platonism contributed to this. Neo-Platonism strongly influenced ancient Christian thinkers. As Krąpiec thought, the philosophical and religious current of Neo-Platonism contributed to a deeper connection between philosophy and the thinking subject, after the model of the systems of the Orient.[16] All being appears only through thought; thought is treated more as a being than as a cognitive operation. The beginning of being is from the One. We can only speak of the One in a negative way, what it is not, e.g., that the One is not something divided, and even that it is not a being, because only what is knowable can be a being. Since the One is beyond the bounds of all thought, no positive predicate can be ascribed to it. Spirit (*nous*) comes forth (or emanates) from the One. Spirit thinks itself and causes a doubling or split into the one who thinks and what is thought. On the one hand, this means a directing toward the One (it is the image of the One). On the other hand, it is directed "downward," encompassing in ideas the plurality of the necessary contents of being. This leads to the third phase of the process of emanation—the emergence of the Soul of the world, which is a thought that contains all multitude. Thus thinking and being are unified in the Spirit that contains all ideas and forms, as well as the forms of individual things. Hence the Spirit is the essence of everything that is, and the being of the Spirit is expressed in thinking. In this way, as J. Disse remarks, the Parmenidean identity of being and thinking is transferred to the plane of the Spirit.[17] As in Platonism, here we find a certain dualism of the world of matter and spirit, which is most clearly seen in the human being, who is *de facto* a spirit accidentally connected with a body.

According to Krąpiec, Arab philosophy was another important moment in the increasing domination of thought in philosophical knowledge. Although a special combination of Plato's and Aristotle's philosophy was made in the framework of Arab philosophy, yet the main conclusions were

---

[16] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 28.
[17] *Metafizyka od Platona do Hegla* (*Metaphysics from Plato to Hegel*) (Kraków 2005), 105.

made in a Platonic and neo-Platonic spirit.[18] On the basis of the Aristotelian conception of substance, the Arab philosophers thought that neither a substance understood as a concrete thing, nor a concept (a "second substance") could be an object of metaphysical knowledge. Only a substance in the sense of an object of definition knowledge ("what a thing was and is"), which comprehends a group of necessary elements that constitute the essence of a thing (a "third nature") could be an object of metaphysics. Thus the "third nature" is the object of metaphysical knowledge. The third nature is an arrangement of essential-necessary factors that exists separately from concrete things and knowing minds, which means that its way of being is not determined by individuality or by generality. The intellectual knowability of things is decided only by essential-necessary content, which thereby is the reason for the truth of knowledge.[19] The principle of knowability is the "agent intellect" or "active intellect," which since it is the manifestation of the first intelligence that knows necessary natures in eternal knowledge is separate from the proper human intellect (passive and acquired intellect). The agent intellect makes necessary things accessible to the human intellect, and thereby it makes it possible to reach the very foundations of reality, to things in themselves.[20] In this light, even the existence of things appeared as an additional accident because it only performed the function of one of the predicates of an essence. Thereby the logical order also became confused with the metaphysical order.

According to Krąpiec, the next stage in the increased tendency to base philosophical knowledge on structures of thought was medieval essential ontologism, which was a continuation of the main movements of Arab philosophy (esp. Avicenna). Duns Scotus took over the conception of the "three natures" and ordered it according to generality into a definite hierarchy (being—substance—body—animal—man—John), which was not the result of a cognitive abstraction, but was the necessary foundation of reality. Nature in itself is neither general nor individual, since the individualizing factor (*haecceitas*) is what first makes a nature the nature of the concrete thing, and the knowing mind makes it the nature of a general con-

---

[18] "[P]rimarily, the conception of the emanation of the intelligences from God; . . . the gradation of the intelligences according to perfection; the recognition of the human intellect as the lowers of the intelligences, and so its transcendence, its independence from individuals, and its unity for all human beings" (S. Swieżawski, *Dzieje europejskij filozofii klasycznej* (*History of classical European philosophy*) (Warsaw–Wrocław 2000), 547).

[19] Cf. W. Stróżewski, *Ontologia* (*Ontology*) (Kraków 2003), 138.

[20] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 52–53.

cept. What is essential in knowledge is that the mind does not start from a concrete thing, but from a common nature on the basis of which it makes a general concept.[21] In this concept, we also see a confusion of the real order with the logical order. The truth of knowledge is based on the nature of the mind alone that creates the act of knowledge. The real thing only performed the role of a passive object to which the cognitive activity of the mind referred. William Ockham drew radical conclusions from this position.

Ockham said that general concepts do not have any real foundation in things, and therefore they are nothing other than conventional signs, and the only "place" where they exist is the mind. This is because in things there is nothing that would be general, and so generality cannot be the result of a copying or reproduction of reality, but only of mental processes governed by the rules of logic. For this reason as well, necessity does not have an ontological character, but only a logical character.[22] The result of this conclusion was that only a mental status was attributed to all forms of relations, both in things themselves, and between things. The most important effect in its consequences of this was that the principle of causality was called into question.[23]

Francis Suarez continued this line of thought. Suarez concentrated his philosophy on the analysis of being's essence and believed that in the framework of that analysis he could express the whole of being. He apprehended essence in the concept of being, and he attributed to this concept a subjective or an objective form. The subjective form concerns the act of thought through which the intellect apprehends a thing, and in the objective form it is a question of the content of the thing known in a subjective concept. This solution led to the rise of "representationism," which was the most typical approach to human knowledge in the modern epoch, and consisted in this: in the act of knowledge we do not know the thing itself di-

---

[21] M. A. Krąpiec, *Byt i istota* (*Being and essence*) (Lublin 1994), 182.

[22] P. Prechtl, *Wprowadzenie do filozofii języka* (*An introduction to the philosophy of language*), Polish trans. J. Brehmer (Kraków 2007), 39.

[23] D. Hume finally questioned the principle of causality. Hume said that the causal connection that our mind chooses is only the result of associations resulting from the habit of transferring the occurrence of certain facts from one object to others. Kant, when he tried to rescue causality, moved causality to the plain of the categories of the mind, which *de facto* robbed causality of any objective foundations. Cf. Krąpiec, *Poznawać czy myśleć*, 284.

rectly, but we know only a cognitive form that mediates between the thing and the mind.[24]

Descartes radicalized Suarez's position and gave the status of objectivity to the cognitive data of the subjective concept. As a result, the ideas-thoughts of the intellect became the only object of intellectual knowledge. The value of knowledge was dependant upon the clarity and distinctness of those data. In this way, as Krąpiec remarks, there was a complete separation of human knowledge and reality because the ideas contained in the mind were the only actual object of knowledge.[25] A new type of philosophy, which would dominated modern times, often called the "philosophy of the subject" or the "philosophy of consciousness" arose on the basis of this solution. This is because it was a philosophy completely based on human cognitive acts, or more precisely, it was a philosophy that was the result of reflection on our own cognitive acts.[26]

Unlike realistic philosophy, which starts from wonder caused by the external world, this type of philosophy most often starts from methodical doubt, which is an operation that is limited to thought alone.[27] In it the critique of knowledge, which investigates the conditions of valuable knowledge, plays the dominant role. Reflection (thinking) is the main cognitive operation. Reflection encloses knowledge within consciousness. This approach took away from knowledge the intersubjective controllability that would appeal to real things external to consciousness. The assertion of the truth of a judgement, on account of the lack of any possibility to verify its conformity with a thing, ultimately had to be based on an act of the will that recognizes or did not recognize a particular judgement.

Later modern philosophy as a whole could not deal with the problem of representationism. Leibniz first asserted that an idea was not identi-

---

[24] It should be emphasized that in Suarez's conception, a subjective concept (*species impressa*) is really different from an objective concept (*species expressa*). Representationism occurs through a movement of the mind, the efficient cause of which is the *species impressa*, which causes an intentional representation. Cf. W. N. Neidl, *Die Realitätsbegriff des Franz Suarez nach den Disputationes Metaphysicae* (München 1966), 27–28.

[25] Krąpiec, *O rozumienie filozofii*, 76.

[26] "[T]he starting point for the entire epistemological problematic was the psyche—as the proper psyche of the object. Not only in Descartes' rationalism, but also in Locke's empiricism, the significance of priority was given to one's own psyche . . . The modern theory of knowledge here is the concealed foundation of methodical solipsism" (G. Gottfried, *Teoria poznania od Kartezjusza do Wittgensteina* (*The theory of knowledge from Descartes to Wittgenstein*), Polish trans. T. Kubalica (Kraków 2007), 144).

[27] Id., 20.

cal to an act of thought. He regarded the act of thought only as a disposition as such to become aware of what is really innate to the knowing subject, but which is given unclearly. This disposition is found beyond all perception, and so it is found outside of any reception of data "from the outside." It follows from this that conceptions and principles exist in the mind in the manner of apperception that provides evidence that the mind is an active faculty that enables the human spirit to live independently.[28]

I. Kant contributed in large measure to the further subjectivization of knowledge. Krąpiec believes that Kant reduced reality to the mental explanation of reality. In this approach, all reality is contained in the act of thinking; the act of thinking is the result of a synthesis of categories and cognitive forms that exist *a priori* in the knowing mind, along with given impressions; thereby the thinking subject gives meaning to reality. Thereby all the rationality of knowledge is reduced to the realm of consciousness. One consequence of this was that the fact of the objectivity of knowledge was identified with reality that is independent of knowledge.[29] This provided the foundation for later phenomenological considerations in which thought was regarded as a thing in itself. Since thought has an intentional nature, this proposal was supposed to resolve the problem of opposition between knowledge and reality, since intentional being makes a synthesis of thought and reality. The analysis of thought was supposed to lead to the discovery of the reason of being. As Krąpiec notes, for this reason Heidegger understood being "'as be-ing' in the subject of thought, thought that is extracted from the contents of the imagination of what exists."[30] In this light, "be-ing" appears only to *Dasein* (to man), receiving the form of *Seiende*, because only man is a subject capable of thinking about what exists. The imagination is the source of this thought. The imagination determines and defines *Seiende*. In this way, the essence of being is reduced to the constitution of *Dasein*, because the world is only that which appears in the thinking of *Dasein*.

The most destructive consequence of the idea that thought was prior to knowledge was the subjectivization of knowledge. The subjectivization of knowledge, in its most extreme form, is the creation by the knowing subject of an object of knowledge, along with that object's existence. In

---

[28] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 64.
[29] Cf. *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* (*Universal Encyclopedia of Philosophy*), vol. 7 (Lublin 2006), 93.
[30] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 69.

knowledge, thus understood, no intersubjective verifiability of the known being was possible, because each subject creates an object of knowledge in his own way.[31] Krąpiec remarks that such an approach "destroys the very meaning of knowledge, which precisely is the understanding of reality, and not performing operations on known contents expressed in the images of the imagination and in conceptual signs."[32] This happens because such operations are *de facto* an imposition of a special network of abstract concepts on reality; reality in this way is rationalized on the basis of thinking that is constructed *a priori.* Meanwhile, according to Krąpiec, "abstract-logical and *a priori* constructions can only be myths or a mythical way of knowing." History knows many such "failed attempts to create a new ideal world given to 'thinkers' to rule, attempts that make man happy by methodologically correct ideological thought far from the toil of knowing the world of really existing things and persons."[33] By basing philosophy on thought, philosophy is made into ontology; ontology sees its object in an abstract concept of being in which real being appears only as one of the modes of existence. For the correctness of philosophical thought, the laws of logic are sufficient by themselves, because the laws of logic guarantee non-contradiction.[34] As a result, justifying thought by referring to things is replaced by logical and methodological reasons. It is not important whether thinking is the result of knowledge of the real world, but what is imporant is what sort of laws rule it and what sort of ways of thinking are possible. In the modern epoch, "thinking about being" supplanted realistic metaphysics and became the foundation of philosophical knowledge. Meanwhile, as Krąpiec states, "true knowledge is born in philosophy as metaphysics, and not as ontology as a cognitive pseudo-philosophical mythology, the mother of ingenious errors that strike at really existing man, when he regards mythology (ontology) as metaphysics and philosophy."[35]

---

[31] "[T]he world of consciousness and of conscious experiences became an object of 'philosophical' analyses, of the construction of theories that were unverifiable by any reference to the reality of really existing beings" (Id., 83).

[32] Id., 71.

[33] Id., 83.

[34] "However by logic we can never prove the truth of our knowledge of the world. Logic can only stand guard over the truth of our thinking, but it can never prove anything in relation to the real object of our human knowledge" (Krąpiec, *Poznawać czy myśleć*, 244).

[35] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 86.

Realistic Knowledge

Realism in philosophy relies, among other things, on the fact that operations of thought are regarded as a secondary phase of the process of knowing. An idea and the content of an idea are constructs of the human reason that arise in the process of knowing the really existing; the reason apprehends the wealth of content of really existing things only partially and in some aspects. Thus the concepts that are produced are not an object of knowledge, but are signs of things themselves, and as a result they are a mode of knowing the things.[36] Aristotle began this conception of knowledge. In light of this conception, the human intellect is a "blank slate," while all the contents of knowledge are from really existing things. The conception of the intellect that Aristotle proposed excluded any sort of apriorism with respect to acts of knowledge, since consciousness is made only by acts of knowledge.

The process of knowledge begins from sensory impressions (at first, these are acts of the external senses, then of the internal senses), and on the basis of these impressions, acts of intellectual knowledge arise; these acts apprehend the object "cognitively and by reasoning" in concepts and judgements, and consider the object in reflection and reasoning. Such knowledge is the process of the interiorization of the really existing object; the object is "impressed" into the knowing subject, causing the production of an image-sign (a mental image); on the basis of that image-sign, the intellect formulates a concept, which is a reflection of the content of a real object.[37] The content apprehended in this way is not, of course, equal to the content of the thing itself, not only on account of the fragmentary and aspective character of the intellectual apprehension, but also on account of the fact that the thing's real existence has been left to the side; that exis-

---

[36] "Concepts as produced signs are, as it were, a pair of glasses that increases our aspective vision of the known thing, but they are not the object itself of knowledge in our acts of spontaneous knowledge. The identity of the content of a thing apprehended in a concept and of that content as really existing in a real being is only aspective, and from the side of the concept alone, not from the side of the thing" (Id., 16).

[37] "The thing itself is the object of knowledge (understanding), and a 'generality' of the thing, which is only a sign-based mode of knowledge. However, in reflected knowledge we can objectify this mode of our knowledge and make it precisely an object of reflected knowledge. This happens because when we know we organize in ourselves out of our acts that know, a 'transparent intermediary' as a selective sign (selective with respect to things), through which as through eyeglasses we can know and understand things" (Krąpiec, *Poznawać czy myśleć*, 296).

tence is a simple act that is not subject to conceptualization. Thus we can say that from the side of the concept, the content contained in the concept is identical with the content of the real object, while from the side of the content of the thing itself, identity does not occur, since the real thing is infinitely richer that the intellectual apprehension of it. On this account, conceptual knowledge must be completed by judgemental knowledge, since only judgemental knowledge, according to Krąpiec, makes it possible to apprehend a thing's act of existence (in existential judgements), and to apprehend the arrangement or system of the thing's properties which make up the created concept (in subject-predicate judgements). Because of this, there is a 'connection' of the cognitive apprehension with the known thing, since "the thing's content represented in the concept indicates what in the thing itself has been perceived and apprehended cognitively."[38]

This means that the formulated concept cannot be treated as an object of knowledge, but only as an instrument by which the factors that constitute a real being's content are known. The thing's content apprehended in this way can be preserved in the memory, made precise in further acts of knowledge, or subjected to reflection. However, it must be a previously known content. Acts of reasoning or reflection are not spontaneous knowledge of really existing things, but they are operations based on cognitively apprehended contents of a really existing being.[39] Operations on contents separated from real things are more "thinking" than they are the actual act of knowing things, hence they should be qualified as belonging to the realm of "art," not to the realm of philosophical knowledge. Although they are rational operations, it is only the rationality of the thinking subject and of the laws of logic, as a result of which the operations mentioned above do not go beyond the sphere of consciousness.[40] If in their framework, explanations and rational justifications occur, in this it is a question only of rea-

---

[38] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 80.

[39] Id., 81: "Reflected knowledge is not natural knowledge of a thing itself, but it is knowledge of the knowledge of a thing in an apprehended and produced image-sign of a thing, which represents a being's real content . . . reflective knowledge occurs through an idea and analysis apprehended from the content of a thing, which by the very fact that the content is depicted is already separated from the content of the really existing being."

[40] Id., 85: "[T]he loss of real contact with reality and the cognitive turn, not to really existing being, but to its image-sign, as the intentional representation of a being, is the first separation from the truth of knowledge, truth that is accessible, verifiable, intersubjectively meaningful, and it is a situation of being closed in the trap of reflection in the field of consciousness. The subjectivization of philosophy, which is typical of 'thought' alone, became a chronic illness and deformation of philosophy."

sons concerning the field of thing (*ratio mentis*), and so, it is a question of logical or psychological reasons. However, this does not concern the rationality of being as such that would allow us to understand and explain being.

Basing human knowledge on really existing things guaranteed cognitive realism and intersubjective verifiability. Really existing things, that is, independently existing substances, were the object of philosophical knowledge. The main type of philosophical knowledge—metaphysical knowledge—had the task of investigating the essential properties of substances, the fundamental compositions, and the causes of generation and action. The search in things themselves for necessary factors that would explain the state of affairs such as it found is directed by the question "why?" which thereby becomes the leading scientific question, the question, in other words, that creates scientific knowledge. This question protects philosophical knowledge from becoming separated from real things, and from being limited to a description of the process of knowledge alone, or the logical mode of reasoning, as takes place in the case of the other scientific or science-forming question "how?". To understand things as profoundly and legibly as possible is the task of real and verifiable knowledge. Metaphysics, which works to discover the ultimate reasons of being for known things, and which explains why things are such and not otherwise, reasons without which knowledge would be exposed to insurmountable errors and would have no purpose, provides such knowledge.[41]

St. Thomas Aquinas took over and completed the Aristotelian conception of knowledge. Starting from common-sense knowledge, Thomas arrived at the discovery of the most important principle of his own conception of knowledge. That principle states that we should not seek the fundamental reason for reality in aspects of content, but in their act of existence.[42] A content of being without an act of existence is not a real content,

---

[41] *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* (*Universal Encyclopedia of Philosophy*), vol. 7 (Lublin 2006), 92–93.

[42] Aristotle did not concern himself with the problem of the existence as such of things, and in that he was in conformity with the entire Greek philosophical tradition. Even when he distinguished between the functions of the propositional copular 'is' he did not take the existential meaning under consideration. Cf. C. H. Kahn, *Język i ontologia* (*Language and ontology*), Polish trans. B. Żukowski (Kęty 2008), 63: "The theory of predication is thus supposed to absorb the idea of existence, and the expression of this idea in language is supposed to occur with the help of joining applications of the verb . . . for both Aristotle and Plato, existence is *einai ti*, to be this or that, to be something definite."

hence existence is the original condition for all knowledge. On this account, Krąpiec remarks: "The affirmation of existence is the threshold of our cognition process of the world-being, it is the cognitive reason of being for knowledge itself."[43] Since existence in real things is unrepeatable (there is no common or shared existence), there is also no real common or shared content. The common elements of content are only the result of the work of the intellect, which "separates" them from things in the process of abstraction and apprehends them in a general concept. The metaphysical knowledge of things themselves can only have an analogical character that allows us to apprehend reality in its most important constitutive factors: essence and existence.[44]

Krąpiec thought that St. Thomas Aquinas was the only thinker who saw in actual and real existence the ultimate reason of being. The recognition of the leading role of existence allowed him to discover the ultimate reason for the existence of the world, that is, the Absolute Being. At the same time, it made it possible for him to describe the nature of this Being; that nature is "Pure Existence." Since the connection of the Absolute with the world "begins" from the most perfect factor of being—existence, it will also permeate the other planes or levels that determine being. In this way, St. Thomas rationally justified the world's rationality and teleology. Things can be known intellectually and truly because the rationality and finality, or teleology, as realizations of the ideas of the Divine Intellect, were contained in things by the act of creation.[45]

Because of the perception of the role of existence in being, it was possible to resolve the problem of the relation of the real object of knowledge to the contents of cognitive apprehensions. This is one of the key moments of human knowledge. The objectification of the concept leads to subjectivization, and to the separation of knowledge from things, and another result is that everything that is knowledge becomes true.[46] Mean-

---

[43] Krąpiec, *Poznawać czy myśleć*, 261.
[44] Cf. M. A. Krąpiec, *Struktura bytu* (*Structure of being*) (Lublin 1995), 286f.
[45] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 41.
[46] This problem clearly appears already in Plato's *Cratylus* where the question of the correctness of language was raised. Plato presents two extreme positions: one position holds that each thing possesses by nature a true name, while the other position is the belief in the conventional character of language. The weakness of the first position is that it is difficult to show in what way the author of concepts would have acquired the knowledge of reality to make concepts on the basis of reality, since reality is known through concepts. The second position, on the other hand, would lead to the situation that what appeared to someone as true would pass for true. Cf. Prechtl, *Wprowadzenie do filozofii języka*, 13–14.

while, concepts make it possible to know an object, but they are not the known object in natural human knowledge.[47] Therefore the cognitive results depend on a cognitive effort, not on something that is prepared and given to an immediate viewing. Only in a concept can contents be subjected to reflection at a further stage of knowledge. The solution of the problem of the relation of concepts to the known object became possible by applying a new method of philosophical knowledge, which is metaphysical separation; by metaphysical separation a discernment (a separation, but not a separation of the sort that occurs in abstraction) is made of the factors of being without which a being could not exist.[48] Such factors have a necessary and general (transcendental) character and cannot be cognitively "separated" from being. The foundation of our knowledge of them are judgemental apprehensions that directly refer to the existing thing without any intermediary or medium. Thereby metaphysical knowledge concerns real being and cannot be reduced to an analysis of explanation of concepts, as is the case when only the method of abstraction is used, which does not reach real things but halts at intermediaries (concepts).[49]

Since human knowledge is always objectified, so also the thinking that composes human knowledge will have its object. That object can be the content as such of thought or the content of a really existing thing. However, the objectivity as such of knowledge, as Krąpiec remarks, does not constitute the realism of knowledge, because the ultimate reason for knowledge is the really existing being. Thus the objectivity of knowledge is constituted by all the verifiable acts of the knowledge of real being.[50] The fact that a being is real is not determined by its content alone, but by real existence, since a really existing concrete content is a being. Therefore

---

[47] "It should be said that intellectual-cognitive images are to the intellect as that through which the intellect knows" (Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologica*, I, 76, 2).

[48] Cf. *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii*, vol. 7, 111–112. For further information, cf. A. Maryniarczyk, *Metoda metafizyki realistycznej* (*The method of realistic metaphysics*) (Lublin 2005).

[49] "Metaphysical knowledge (based on abstraction) really becomes the knowing of the general essences of things (and not of individual things). Moreover, in the process of further particularization, this knowledge will be further and further from the concrete thing, and it will focus on an analysis of concepts and operations on abstractions" (A. Maryniarczyk, "Spór o przedmiot metafizyki realistycznej" ("Controversy over the object of realistic metaphysics"), in *Zadania współczesnej metafizyki. Metafizyka w filozofii* (*Tasks of contemporary metaphysics. Metaphysics in philosophy*), ed. A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stępień (Lublin 2004), 75).

[50] Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 69f.

the role of existence in knowing things is so important, because it is existence that causes knowledge to refer to real things and not to abstractions that exist in the mind. For this reason, the first phase of knowledge has a transcendental character, because it encompasses the universal properties of being, on the basis of which the transcendental concepts are formulated; the transcendental concepts are the most elementary "eyeglasses" through which man sees reality. Knowledge through the transcendentals is not separated from the concrete thing, but it allows us to see in the concrete thing the universal properties that belong in a necessary but analogical way to each and every being. Thus the reading of the fact that the existence belongs to something is called "being," and when something existing is at the same time a determined content, it is called "thing;" again, something that exists in itself and is different from anything else is called "separate," and something that exists in itself as undivided is called "one." When the fact is read that something that exists is in a necessary relation to a knowing intellect, then the being is the "truth," and when it is so related to the will, it is a "good;" when it is so related to the intellect and to the will, it is "beauty." If, however, the transcendental "concepts" of being are expressed in judgements (the assertion of a necessary state of affairs[51]), then they take the form of the principles of knowledge—identity, non-contradiction, the excluded middle, the reason for being, finality, and personal fulfillment.[52]

Knowledge based on the transcendental properties of being and on the first principles of being and knowledge leads to the understanding of reality through the discovery of the ultimate reasons that provide a rational justification for the most essential manifestations of mutable being and the dynamic world. Those reasons are the factors discovered in each and every concrete being, factors without which a given universal manifestation of being would not be intelligible, and moreover, that manifestation of being could not exist at all without them. Thus dynamism is explained by the factors of act and potency; material mutability is explained by the factors of substance and accidents; the coming-into-existence of being is explained

---

[51] "It is the structure of being (not the accidental structure, but the essential structure) that constitutes the ultimate reason for the necessary character of conceptual knowledge and organized rational knowledge . . . not only language or accepted conventions" (Krąpiec, *Poznawać czy myśleć*, 302).

[52] For more extensive information, cf. A. Maryniarczyk, *Zeszyty z metafizyki IV. Racjonalność i celowość świata osób i rzeczy* (*Notesbooks on Metaphysics IV. Rationality and finality of the world of persons and things*) (Lublin 2000).

by the factors of essence and existence. Transcendental properties, first principles, and compositions within being do not belong to beings in a univocal way, but they are realized analogically in each instance of being.[53] Therefore, in order to understand reality, it is necessary to appeal to the analogy of being and the analogy of knowledge whereby in the infinite variety and plurality of beings we can see factors without which being itself and the essential manifestations of being would not be intelligible. This is because reality, as Krąpiec remarks, is not known

> as in physics by observation and different forms of measurement, but by intersubjective cognitive forms, which are the most primary, 'divide being from non-being in knowledge,' and indicate a factor (or factors) the negation of which is an absurdity or contradiction, or consequently leads to cognitive contradiction.[54]

Only cognitive realism allows us to preserve the objective aim of philosophy, which is the wisdom-oriented understanding of reality. The choice of the way to acquire knowledge of this reality determine what sort of philosophy it will be. Support for the priority of knowledge over thought guarantees that it will be a philosophy open to the wealth of reality, and a philosophy that takes into account the laws that govern this reality. The really existing upon which the truth of knowledge will depend will be the object measure of knowledge. Existing things are the only source and measure of cognitive truth. The objectivity of knowledge follows from the fact that knowledge possesses

> a really existing object as knowable and given to many persons in knowledge, as verifiable for many when they compare features apprehended in knowledge with the very content of the really existing being. Really existing and known objects are the same objects before they are known and after they are known, always constituting a reference for the verification of the known thing.[55]

---

[53] "Analogy as the way of the real and individual being of concrete things that are internally composed of real factors and correlates of one and the same structure of being indicates the relations within being and between beings that form the analogy of being. The analogy of being is the foundation for the analogy of knowledge and predication in realistic knowledge" (Krąpiec, *O filozofii*, 94).

[54] Id., 89.

[55] Id., 77–78.

The Absolute Being in turn will be the ultimate guarantee for the measure contained in things; the Absolute Being imparts existence to every being, and thereby makes being intelligible, that is, capable of being known.[56]

The emphasis on the role of knowledge in philosophy must always preserve its objective character, because otherwise, when the cognitive faculties are made the starting point of the cognitive process, the danger that knowledge will be separated from the real world can appear, and thereby that knowledge will be reduced to mental processes alone.[57] Meanwhile the task of philosophy is not "to think about the world," but to know and understand the world within possible and verifiable limits.[58] Therefore the way of philosophical knowledge is developed in meta-physics; metaphysics as classically understood is the leading type of human rational knowledge, because real being is the object of metaphysics. For this reason, Krąpiec holds that the other domains of philosophy should borrow the metaphysical mode of knowledge, since it alone is verifiable by reality itself. This means that the fundamental cognitive method in the other sections of philosophy must also be the metaphysical method if they are to retain the character of philosophical knowledge that concerns the understanding of being as existing.[59] This is because all knowledge that claims to be philosophical knowledge must start from the knowledge of really existing being; really existing being in subsequent stages of knowledge is apprehended in more and more detail and with increasing

---

[56] "Sic ergo intellectus divinus est ut mensura prima, non mensurata; res autem est mensura secunda, mensurata; intellectus autem noster est mensuratus et non mensurans" (Thomae Aquinatae, *In Libros Sententiarum I*, 19, 5, 2).

[57] Krąpiec, *Poznawać czy myśleć*, 245: "Knowing reality itself (or being), only secondarily do we know the act itself of intellectual knowledge whereby we know the object (*secundario cognoscitur ipse actus, que cognoscitur ipse intellectus*), and finally through that act of intellectual knowledge we arrive at knowledge of the source of that knowledge, which is the intellect itself (*et per actum cognoscitur ipse intellectus*)." Cf. Tomasz z Akwinu, *Suma teologiczna*, I, 5, 2.

[58] "The temptation of a purely intellectual cognitive life was always and is strong among many thinkers, since it makes man independent of sensory experiences, from empirical knowledge, and it gives illusions of precision of thought" (Krąpiec, *Poznawać czy myśleć*, 241).

[59] In the metaphysical method, the focus is mainly brought into a question of decontradictify-ing explanation, which consist in showing a factor of being such that its negation would mean either the negation of the very fact that is being explained, or the recognition of it as contradictory or inexplicable in itself. Cf. M. A. Krąpiec, *Metafizyka* (*Metaphysics*) (Lublin 1985), 64f (*Metaphysics. An Outline of the History of Being,* trans. Theresa Sandok (New York, 1991), 43f).

precision, beginning from the universal properties and principles, followed by its structure and categorical properties, and then individual features and actions. For this reason it is clear for Krąpiec that "in the process of knowledge, the loss of contact with real reality, and the turn to the image-sign of a thing as the thing's intentional representation is a manifestation of a separation from the truth of knowledge accessible to the intellect."[60]

Conclusion

On the basis of the realistic knowledge as outlined above, we can draw out certain features of the kind of philosophy that uses this type of knowledge; Fr. Krąpiec most often called it realistic philosophy. It is first of all a question of a kind of philosophy that takes into account the wealth of the real world and sees the basic factors that affect man who exists in this world. It is a philosophy that has the purpose of knowing really existing, plural, and varied being; being is rational and thereby knowable to the extent that it exists. It is a kind of philosophy that recognizes man's cognitive ability, especially the power of the natural sight of the reason, which underlies man's entire conscious life. It is a philosophy that, in order to understand and explain the most essential dimensions of reality strives to discover the principles without which those dimensions would remain either inexplicable or contradictory in themselves. It is a philosophy that aims at ultimate explanations, that is, explanations that are fully sufficient for a complementary understanding of the world, and in its framework, of man, and above which there is no need to appeal to anything else, to any sort of cognitive *a priori* or to irrational factors. It is a philosophy that understands truth universally; it does not stand in opposition to the truth contained in religion, but strives by the power of the natural human reason to investigate even those truths that concern objects that exceed the human reason, up to the Highest Truth—God. Finally, it is a philosophy that has a wisdom-oriented or sapiential character, which means that the knowledge formulated in its framework cannot be reduced to theoretical ends alone, but always has in view practical ends as well.

A philosophy based on "thinking about being" cannot meet such conditions. The interest of that sort of philosophy is not focused on real things, but on the modes, possibilities, or conditions of our knowledge of them. In such a philosophy, the knowing mind and the laws of logic are the

---

[60] Id., *O filozofii*, 96.

source and measure of the rationality of such knowledge. Although in that philosophy the natural light of the human reason, which is connected with the active and the passive aspect of the intellect, does not play any greater role, but the active power itself of the reason, a power connected with the imagination, which forms the field of consciousness, in the bounds of which man's entire cognitive life is enclosed, plays a great role. That philosophy does not strive to decontradictify the essential states of affairs already there, but rather it assumes non-contradiction as the necessary and sufficient condition for valuable knowledge. It is not interested in ultimate explanation, because it always starts from defined assumptions that have the purpose of guaranteeing and maximizing the effectiveness of explanations. Hence also the understanding of the truth will not have a classical character, but only a coherent and pragmatic character. The meaning of such a philosophy for human life will be reduced basically to the expansion of man's domination over the world and so, to the generation of progress in technology, but from the subjective side, it will be reduced only to the perfection of the laws of thinking and imagination. Since it is universally known that the spheres mentioned are present in the domain of the particular and formal sciences, philosophy thus understood basically loses its reason for being.

TO KNOW OR TO THINK—THE CONTROVERSY OVER THE UNDERSTANDING OF PHILOSOPHICAL KNOWLEDGE IN THE LIGHT OF THE STUDIES OF MIECZYSŁAW A. KRĄPIEC

SUMMARY

The article concentrates on the specificity of philosophical cognition. Referring to Mieczysław A. Krapiec's study, the author proves that the process of thinking is not to be necessarily identified with the process of cognition, as in fact the former is merely a secondary phase of the latter. When identified with thinking, the philosophical cognition would undermine the very sense of cognition, which means the understanding of reality. When based on thinking alone, philosophy does not grasp real things, but operates with abstracts of being and being's representations (concepts). As for the correctness of philosophical thinking the laws of logic, with ensuring non-contradictory operations, are sufficient enough. However, any knowledge that aspires to be philosophical has to start from really existing beings. In the next phases of cognition, such beings are grasped more and more particularly and precisely—starting from their transcendental properties and principles, then their structure and categorial properties, and finally their individual characteristics and actions. The very first act of cognition is directed to real beings, which are immediately grasped in respect of their existence and real

essence. The second act of cognition deals with signs. The precedence of being in human cognition makes the philosophy charged not with a task of thinking about the world, but with the task of knowing and understanding it within possible and verifiable limits. Therefore, according to Krąpiec, the very first philosophical discipline is metaphysics, which has real beings as its object. Thus, philosophical cognition should preserve its objective character, as this is the only way to guarantee its realism.

Arkadiusz Gudaniec
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Poland

LOVE AS THE PRINCIPLE OF
THE DYNAMISM OF BEINGS
(AN ANALYSIS OF THE ARGUMENTS OF
ST. THOMAS AQUINAS)

It would be no great discovery to say that love is one of the most important and meaningful facts of man's life. Nonetheless, we rarely consider that although love is something that is universally experienced and known, love in fact remains a very mysterious fact that is difficult to explain. Love accompanies man at almost every moment of his life, especially at the most vitally important and decisive moments. Nonetheless love really remains un-intelligible for us, and we also do not often try to delve more deeply into it. This peculiar paradox will possibly be less acute when we try to make at least an elementary reflection on the nature as such of love, and so, when we resort to the ways in which love has been explained in the history of human thought.

In ancient times, people pondered "cosmic love" (*eros*, *philotes*, *thymos*), i.e., the universal power that underlies the phenomena of the universe. The force of love extends to all things, including man and his action. Philosophers remarked rather early that love is, as it were, the foundation for the phenomena and actions that are experienced. As love is both of the character of a source and is strongly present in its manifestations, it turns out to be something that, on the one hand, is best known, but on the other hand, not easy to understand. In parallel, people also considered the strictly

---

Extensive passages of this paper, in a somewhat changed form, were earlier published as part of the artice: Arkadiusz Gudaniec, "Miłość dobra jako podstawa dynamizmu bytowego," in S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Quaestiones disputatae de bono, de appetitu boni et voluntate – Dysputy problemowe o dobru, o pożądaniu dobra i o woli*, trans. into Polish by A. Białek (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2003), 283–298.

personal form of love—*philia*, whereby people are joined with each other in a special relation, which is friendship (Aristotle started this conception).[1] The analogical scholastic conception of love was an interesting combination of those two tendencies; love is the foundation of action and in the metaphysical order it becomes the principle that explains the domain of being that we call dynamism. Thomas Aquinas developed this doctrine in his groundbreaking metaphysics, and I would like to refer to this proposal in particular in this work.

At the beginning, one additional remark seems necessary. When we speak of love as a fact that underlies the dynamism of being, we have in mind being in general, i.e., reality as a whole, including man (and man in a particular way). The dynamism of the human being, which obviously has its own unrepeatable specific character, in the aspect of being, which is what we are interested in here, is analogical in relation to other active beings that possess their own determined nature. For this reason as well, the essential questions concerning the connection between love and the dynamism of being are considered upon the background of acting being as such, i.e., in the case of appetitive action that is analyzed here (*appetitus*), upon the background of beings that know in general (i.e., animals and human beings), with a consideration of the knowledge and intellectual appetite (will) that sets apart the human being. Also, sometimes the scope of the consideration of dynamism takes in the whole of reality, in which the nature of beings is the principle of action. The order of considerations, in accordance with the function that St. Thomas attributes to this aspect, is thus fundamentally metaphysical, and is only secondarily anthropological.

In order fully and soundly to understand being in the dynamic aspect, i.e., most generally speaking in the relation of being to the good, the consideration of the fact of love turns out to be indispensable. This is because love is especially important on account of its priority in the order of appetite and action. Love is the first and fundamental act of appetite, hence love's fundamental role is the real connection of the subject with a good, so that there may be an appetitive movement to that object and action of whatever kind in relation to the object. In *Summa theologica*, question 26, article 1, Aquinas calls love the "principle of motion (action) aiming at

---

[1] On various conceptions of love in the history of philosophy, and also in connection with the philosophical understanding of love as such, cf. A. Gudaniec, M. A. Krąpiec, "Miłość" ("Love"), in *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* (*Universal Encyclopedia of Philosophy*), vol. 7 (Lublin 2006), 237–251.

a loved end" (*principium motus tendentis in finem amatum*).[2] An analysis of certain essential questions in the article should indicate what the role of love is in the context of the dynamism of being, and may also throw more light on how being as such and the action of being should be understood. Since the explanation of many metaphysical questions (such as the general understanding of nature, the good, knowledge, and appetite) that are necessarily raised when we consider the aspect that interests us is not possible here, we should assume that the reader possesses sufficient knowledge of these questions to gain an adequate perception of the questions raised below.

The first intuitive perceptions concerning the phenomenon of love as it is ordinarily understood are sufficient to present the general thesis on the essential connection of love with action, or more precisely, the connection of love with causal action. This is because action occurs as the realization of desire or as the expression of appetite. In each case, the object of action is the end of action, i.e., the object is wanted, or more broadly speaking, it is loved. Love therefore turns out to underlie action as the cause of action. Here we should make a distinction between relations of causation in two different systems of relations: (1) causal relations between the act of love and the action that is a consequence of the act (*motus tendens in finem amatum*); (2) causal relations between the act of love and the factors that call forth that act and act it as conditions. Although in the act of love, both systems of relations sometimes occur together when one explains them, yet it seems necessary to separate logically the fact of the causation of action because of love[3] from the cause of the causation of love itself at the moment the act is brought forth.[4] This analysis will first concern the first question (love as the principle of action), with a special con-

---

[2] "Amor dicitur illud quod est principium motus tendentis in finem amatum," *Summa theologiae*, I-II, 26, 1, cited according to the edution: *Sancti Thomae de Aquino Opera omnia iussu Leonis XIII P. M. edita*, vol. IV–XII (Roma 1888–1906) [further cited as: S.Th.].

[3] Efficient causality is an essential source of action, and therefore here it is a question of the factors that influence the bringing forth from the subject of real action (in the sense of the efficient causation of effects—although this meaning does not always adequately describe efficient causal action, even though it is in connection with the very word efficacy (or efficient causality)).

[4] Here it is a question of facts that really influence the will (appetite) in the bringing forth of the will's proper action, which is love. Also, the will as the direct source of the action of the soul (i.e., as a faculty of the soul) is the subject of a special efficient causality connected with the soul's nature.

sideration of the context of the end and of knowledge, and then the second question, providing a broader understanding of the general nature of love.

Love and Action

Love, considered in the broad context of the action of being, shows its nature in connection with other facts that underlie action. How love is understood in this aspect thus acquires an essential and indispensable "background" of a functional ordering to the subject as to the substantial whole. Love is a fact that is given for explanation and which appears in the life of the subject-substance. Therefore how this fact is understood must by necessity be referred to this subject, which is a being in a fundamental sense. By putting love in this way in the context of the acting subject we can connect the way we understand love with the fact of the subject's action.

Every real being, according to the measure of its actualization, possesses the ability to act. To act means to lead to the rise of a new being of some sort ("to cause a being"). The efficacy, or efficient causality, of a being has its source in the being's act of existence (*esse*), since, as we know, "operatio sequitur esse."[5] Therefore we can say that action is a prolongation of existence, and that it is the moment of being through which a being perfects itself.[6] However, we cannot speak of action without a metaphysical understanding of the structure of being, i.e., the composition of being out of act and potency. An important manifestation of this composition is the special actualization of being, that is, the aspiration or appetite to achieve a fitting act. This aspiration (*tendere*) is an inseparable manifestation of every composite being insofar as the being exists.[7] We call this same manifestation of being, considered in the dynamic order, "appetite" (*appetitus*). As we know, we make a distinction between "natural appetite," which is nothing other than the very nature of beings as that

---

[5] "A being and its action are two moments of one and the same actuality," since an action is a "second" act of a being (existence is the first act). É. Gilson, *Elementy filozofii chrześcijańskiej* (*Elements of Christian philosophy*), Polish trans. T. Górski (Warsaw 1965), 225.

[6] Cf. M. A. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics. An Outline of the History of Being*, trans. Theresa Sandok (New York, 1991), 152–153.

[7] "The act of being of each substance is that same act of 'aspiration to:' esse est tendere" (Gilson, *Elementy...*, 226).

nature aspires to (has an appetite for) its own perfection, and "conscious appetite" (sensory and rational appetite).[8]

In such a conception of the dynamism of being, action turns out to be coupled with appetite, in this way expressing the ordering of being to its own perfection. Appetite and action, which express essentially the dynamism of being, describe two different and opposing orders of being: appetite describes the order of intention, and action describes the order of execution. Ultimately we can say that "to be, to act, and have appetite for some end possess the same meaning for each being."[9] If we add yet another cognitive moment, one that is necessary for appetite (and so for action), since appetite is dependent upon knowledge, we obtain the following relation of dependence: knowledge and appetite, as two "branches" of the subject's contact with reality, are "intermediaries" between the being-subject as the first act (*esse*), and the action through which the being is manifested (i.e., the second act of the being).[10]

Action is in fact the most evident manifestation of the dynamism of beings and of their appetite for perfection. Action, as it is a property of beings, is their most perfect manifestation, and it is identified with the causing of effects, that is, with a certain "power of being." However, we should forget that if action means efficient causality, then in knowledge and in appetite there are constituted exemplarity (exemplary causality) and finality (final causality), which are moments without which action is impossible.

Action, as an expression of the being-subject's efficient power, has its source in appetition. Thus the end to which appetite moves is the motive for action, since action happens only on account of some desired good. This is because action is inconceivable without some sort of end, i.e., a motive for the action. Moreover, according to the scholastic principle, *ab indeterminato nil sequitur*, the determination of action to one sort of content and not some other is necessary. This is because action must have a certain plan that directs the execution of the intended work. That plan is

---

[8] Cf. (among others) J. Paszyński, "Appetitus," in *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* (*Universal Encyclopedia of Philosophy*), vol 1 (Lublin 2000), 301–303.

[9] Gilson, *Elementy…*, 226.

[10] This situation thus mainly accents action, which is directed to outside of the subject, leaving aside the fact that knowledge itself and appetite are also certain actions that are manifestations of a being's nature. However, at that moment it is a question of efficacy, or efficient causality, in a narrower sense, i.e., as the causing of effects (external effects); in the constitution of that efficient causality the cognitive and appetitive moments play a role.

an idea-exemplar, that is, a cognitive form that performs the function of determining action in one and not some other direction.[11]

All these moments, i.e., both reasons of action (the end and the exemplar), and the efficacious power itself, essentially "collaborate" with each other, and therefore each of them is found in a certain relation to love as the fundamental act of appetition.

Love and the End

"Amor dicitur illud quod est principium motus tendentis in finem amatum" (love is the principle of motion that aims at a loved end). This proposition is a special "definition" of love that we find, along with other definitions or descriptions, in the above mentioned question from St. Thomas' *Summa* (S.Th., 26, 1). This concept of love connects love first with the end of desire, and second, it ascribes to love a fundamental role (*principium*) in the awakening of desire itself. Love is the principle of a motion that aspires to a loved end, and therefore love makes the subject, at the moment of its first appetitive movement, begin to act, to be inclined to an object that as the end was loved in the act of love. This desire or aspiration is manifested in various acts that express various ways or stages of the aspiration. The appetitive movement itself can pass (and this usually occurs) into another motion (an "extra-appetitive" or "non-appetitive" motion) that corresponds to the achievement of the given good. In connection with this, it should be noted that in the above definition, the expression "motus" means first the motion as such of appetite; that motion refers in a strict sense to its movements, the special mental motions which are the feelings or the acts of the will.[12] Second, this expression means action of any sort insofar as it flows from appetite and aims at a loved end in the act of love.

---

[11] Cf. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 417–420. St. Thomas speaks of the necessity of the soul-subject's movement in terms of its twofold potency with respect to many things: "Dupliciter autem aliqua vis animae invenitur esse in potentia ad diversa: uno modo quantum ad agere vel non agere, alio modo quantum ad agere hoc vel illud . . . Indiget igitur movente quantum ad duo; scilicet quantum ad exercitum vel usum actus, et quantum ad determinationem actus" (S.Th., I–II, 9, 1).

[12] The motion of appetite thus determines all movements of appetite that realize the aspiration for the object (the good) that can cause the real action of other faculties.

Thus love is the principle of all other acts of appetition[13] and of every action that the moving faculty commands (i.e., the will in the case of man, or sensory appetite in the case of animals).[14] The commanding of actions of this type is another act, which performs the role of a certain cause in relation to the actions.[15] Every action aims at an end and is commanded with regard to an end that has been loved (and thus in some way has been connected with the subject) in an act of love. This is precisely what the definition that we are analyzing states, and it is said directly in the *Summa theologica*, I–II, question 28, article 6: "every agent, whatever it be, does every action from love of some kind."[16]

Love, as it joins all action with an end, is not only the beginning of action, but is the cause (or principle) of action, and it "sets" the goal for action. It is thus the cause that causes action generally to come into existence, since there is no action without an end or purpose. This means that love must be something that is the real and sufficient reason for action's coming into existence or being elicited. Indeed, we find this element in the definition we are now analyzing. It is the "finis amatus," the end insofar as it has been loved.

Each thing insofar as it exists is a good. For this reason it is "desirable" or "appetible," that is, it is capable of arousing the appetite of other beings that need their perfection.[17] When some good is found "in the field of perception" of a suitable subject, that good will become a good of the subject (i.e., a bond is formed in the form of complacency, the state of being pleased). This means that the good becomes the end of appetite and action.[18] This is because the end or purpose is the good insofar as the good

---

[13] "Omnes aliae affectiones animi ex amore causantur" (S.Th., I–II, 27, 4, s.c.). "[O]mnes alii motus appetitivi praesupponunt amorem, quasi primam radicem" (Id., I, 20, 1).

[14] Acts commanded by the will are based on the will's elicited acts, of which the first and fundamental act is love. Cf. M. A. Krąpiec, *I-Man*, group trans. (New Britain, Connecticut, 1983), 202–204.

[15] Action is commanded with regard to a good to which other feelings or acts of the will also refer; their object is a given good apprehended in a certain aspect. They are then proximate causes of the action, but love always remains the first cause. Cf. S.Th., I–II, 28, 6, ad 2.

[16] "Omne agens, quodcumque sit, agit quamcumque actionem ex aliquo amore" (Id., corpus).

[17] All beings as finite are incomplete, and so are capable of receiving completion from other beings. Cf. Gilson, *Elementy*..., 227.

[18] Still with reference to the end and to finality, which operate at various ranges of being analogically (and so not in one and the same way for what are called natural beings, animal beings, and rational beings), it is necessary to accept one most evident exemplar of finality, which is the human being. Finality, as strictly connected with intelligibility, is most evident in the human world, where the end is understood and is freely chosen. The treatment of this

is actually desired, i.e., insofar as the good is loved. Love, of the first adaptation (*coaptatio*) of the subject to the object, which has been "recognized" as a good (for the subject), makes a particular being the end of the subject's appetite and action.[19] Thus if the good is the objective reason for action, since there is no action that does not aim at a good,[20] then love is the subjective reason. Therefore we can say that insofar as a good actualizes a subject, love dynamizes the subject. This is because by virtue of this adaption, or by virtue of a certain "experience" of correspondence (between the object and the subject), which precisely is love, a given being becomes really and actually an end, arousing appetite and the corresponding action of the subject. Love is the first and fundamental act of appetite, consisting in the transformation of the faculty into an operation of living. Therefore actual appetition simply designates love (including other acts, as rooted in love and coming from love).

In the light of the assertion in this formulation, the thesis that St. Thomas draws out in another way seems clear, that action (i.e., efficient causality) is elicited by the end, in other words, the final cause moves the efficient cause.[21] This is because the end performs the function of reason

---

type of finality as the model when discussing "universal finality" (i.e., the transfer of it to other levels of being) is thoroughly justified in metaphysics, since we discover the essential elements of purposeful action, evident in the case of man, in all beings (although those elements of finality are realized differently: analogically). The object that the laws of human thinking have been extended to reality is removed by the metaphysical principle of the identify of the laws of thought and of being. Cf. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 439–440.

[19] The fact that appetition is accompanied by the desire or appetite for an end was expressed by St. Thomas by the comparison of desire to love; desire expresses a certain movement, while love the principle of that movement and cannot be apprehended except in desire, which requires its own principle, just as do appetite and action. Cf. S.Th., I –II, 26, 2, ad 3, and id., 25, 2, ad 1.

[20] "Furthermore, every agent acts in so far as it is in act, and in acting it tends to produce something like itself. So, it tends toward some act. But every act has something of good in its essential character, for there is no evil thing that is not in a condition of potency falling short of its act. Therefore, every action is for the sake of a good." *Summa contra gentiles*, III, 3, 6 (trans. Vernon J. Bourke, accessed at: http://dhspriory.org/thomas/ContraGentiles3a.htm), cit. after: Gilson, *Elementy...*, 227–228.

[21] Cf. S.Th., I, 5, 2 & 4, and id., I–II, 1, 2: "Prima autem inter omnes causas est causa finalis. Cuius ratio est, quia materia non consequitur formam, nisi secundum quod movetur ab agente: nihil enim reducit se de potentia in actum. Agens autem non movet nisi ex intentione finalis: si enim agens non esset determinatum ad aliquem effectum, non magis ageret hoc quam illud. Ad hoc ergo quod determinatum effectum producat, necesse est quod determinetur ad aliquem certum, quod habet rationem finis."

for the aspiration to the good.[22] Second, if we consider action from the side of the subject, we can speak of the motive of action (i.e., the reason why action is elicited in the subject), and that is precisely love.[23] The commensurability (*proportio*) of the subject to the end, which establishes or makes real love in the subject, designates the appetition or desire (actual appetition) for this end.[24] However, appetition is not the perfect possession of the end, and the being by its nature is predestined to this. Therefore the act of appetition (love) elicits immediately a tendency to the real possession of the end, and so, to possess the end in a perfect way, that is, it elicits the being's action oriented to a given end-good.[25]

The above remarks lead to the following conclusions. To explain action, or to explain a being in the dynamic aspect, the power as such to cause effects is insufficient, a power that is contained in a being "according to the measure" of its existence.[26] The final cause is still needed as the reason that elicits action. In the most general sense, the good is this cause, since anything can only aspire to or tend to a good. Let us repeat that on the objective side the act of loving the good, or complacency in the good, adaptation to the good, and so love, is this cause. This cause, however, is the motive for the fact that action comes into existence in the subject, that an aspiration or tendency to the end comes into existence, insofar as the motive becomes somehow "its own" personally loved motive. Love thus becomes the principle of aspiration or tendency to a beloved end, and love becomes this as an act of the will (appetition) that fully engages a given subject.

On this basis we can assert that in the act of love, final causation occurs from the side of the good; that causation elicits action (efficient causation) in the being that is the subject. This is because the efficient agent, or being (through its faculties) is the source of motion. The subject (the potential efficient cause or agent) passes into act, i.e., it actualizes its own po-

---

[22] Cf. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 439–440.

[23] Latin *motivum*—a factor that moves something, that elicits action.

[24] Namely, the act of love causes a given being to become an object of desire in its "successive" acts, which are affected by additional aspects of the object that are apprehended in cognition.

[25] See S.Th., I–II, 16, 4: "Sed sic habere finem est imperfecte habere ipsum. Omne autem imperfectum tendit in perfectionem; et ideo tam appetitus naturalis quam voluntarius tendit ut habeat ipsum finem realiter, quod est perfecte habere ipsum."

[26] According to the doctrine of Aristotle, the efficient cause is not an internal perfection of a being, but it is a perfection that produces effects in direct contact with its object. It is therefore in potency to something else, i.e., to the end that direct the subject to a given object.

tency insofar as sufficient conditions have been met. These conditions are first, a good that becomes an end in the act of love, and second, an internal (subjective) aspiration or tendency to the end, that is, love as a motive.[27]

Love and Knowledge

In order for a real and determinate action to exist, one more condition must be met, a condition of which we have already spoken. This is the moment of the determination of action in the efficient factor or agent, which takes place in the act of knowing, because the cognitive form performs the function of exemplar causation. In the natural course of things, acts of knowledge always occur along with acts of love, interweaving with them in various bonds that affect each other. However, they are structurally different acts that at many moments are opposed to each other, or if we look from another viewpoint, they complete each other.

1. The relations between love and knowledge are considered in various places, including the article *Utrum cognitio sit causa amoris* (S. Th., I-II, 27, 2). In the text of this article we notice at least two interesting assertions. First, which is very important, knowledge, although it precedes each act of love, is not in the strict sense a cause of love. The role of knowledge is only to "unveil" the good so that the good can be loved by the subject who has appetition. The good cannot be loved unless it is first known.[28] This is because knowledge in an original and fundamental way puts us in touch with a thing, and therefore no act of the subject in relation to any sort of thing is possible without making cognitive contact. Knowledge is therefore a condition for love[29] in the sense that it "opens access" to the good, to

---

[27] For more on the connection of love with final causation, see my article: "Miłość jako forma przyczynowania celowego" ("Love as a form of final causation"), in *Spór o cel* (The controversy over the end), ed. A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stępień, P. Gondek (Lublin 2008), 139–162.

[28] "[Bonum] non potest amari nisi cognitum" (S.Th., I–II, 27, 2). However, we should remember that the appetitive and cognitive faculties form one thing in one being-subject. Therefore, although in terms of things (in a structural apprehension) it is right to say that *nil amatum nisi praecognitum*, however temporally (in the functional apprehension), knowledge and love are elicited at the same moment. Cf. my article: "Piękno i miłość. Relacja między miłością a poznaniem" ("Beauty and love. The relation between love and knowledge"), in *Spór o piękno* (*Controversy over beauty*), ed. A. Maryniarczyk, K. Stępień, Z. Pańpuch (Lublin 2013), 409–442.

[29] On the dependence of love on knowledge, Thomas writes: "intellectus movet voluntatem, sicut praesentans ei obiectum suum" (S.Th., I–II, 9, 1); "intellectus regit voluntatem, non

being, which as known becomes interesting for the subject (i.e., it arouses corresponding action). On the other hand, knowledge is necessary since otherwise the proper cause of love, which is the good, could not act on the subject.

Moreover, not all known things arouse love: knowledge without any judgement concerning good or evil does not arouse love.[30] Complacence, being pleased, in the object occurs only when the practical reason[31] makes the "concrete judgement that a given object is good and suitable for the knowing subject . . . since the fittingness of the object for the subject is the concrete good of the latter."[32] Love thus depends on what knowledge considers in the object.[33]

2. We find the next important statement in the same article in response to the second objection, where Aquinas compares love and knowledge with regard to perfection. Namely, knowledge needs more for its perfection than does love, i.e., love becomes perfect more quickly than does knowledge, upon which love is dependent. This is because for knowledge, knowledge of a thing as existing or as being in itself (*res prout in se*) is sufficient, while knowledge requires a deep and detailed acquaintance with a thing. Thus despite love's essential dependence on knowledge, the perfection of love does not depend on the perfection of knowledge, since "minimal" knowledge that apprehends a thing scarcely as existing in itself is sufficient for perfect love. As St. Thomas says further on, it is precisely love that is the impulse that arouses the subject to know the beloved thing further, also showing here its "power" of the principle of action and aspiration to the end, which is the beloved good.[34] Thus between love and knowledge there is a peculiar disproportion, which makes love have its

---

quasi inclinans eam in id in quod tendit, sed sicut ostendens in quod tendere debeat" (*Quaestiones disputatae de veritate*, 22, 2, ad 5).

[30] "[S]icut imaginatio formae sine aestimatione convenientis vel nocivi non movet appetitum sensitivum, ita nec apprehensio veri sine ratione boni et appetibilis" (S.Th., I–II, 9, 1, ad 2).

[31] In the case of non-rational beings, the faculty of sensory estimation (*vis aestimativa*).

[32] M. A. Krąpiec, *Psychologia racjonalna* (*Rational psychology*) (Lublin 1996), 250.

[33] "[S]ecundum diversas rationes obiecti apprehensi, subsequuntur diversi motus in vi appetitiva" (S.Th., I–II, 40, 2).

[34] "Amans vero dicitur esse in amato secundum apprehensionem inquantum amans non est contentus superficiali apprehensione amati, sed nititur singula quae ad amatum pertinent intrinsecus disquirere, et sic ad interiora eius ingreditur" (S.Th., I–II, 28, 2). The object, becoming an end (i.e., being loved), elicits in an object action toward itself. However, for that action to be able to come into existence, there must take place a more precise knowledge of the object (in order to determine action).

own autonomy, as it were, and love "is ruled" by its own laws, since it is not completely dependent on knowledge. Moreover, since love is at the source of every feeling, appetition, and action, love is not a conscious act, and cannot even be apprehended in concomitant reflection. Love eludes the control of the intellect and therefore, as M. D. Philippe says, "love as such is found above consciousness."[35]

The next remark that the analyzed response to the second objection sets forth concerns the assertion already mentioned that knowledge of a thing *prout in se* is sufficient for perfect love. The reason for this is the essential character of love as an act of appetition. This is because love, unlike knowledge, aspires to the thing as it is in itself ("respicit rem secundum quod in se est"). This means that love does not need deeper knowledge, but original and spontaneous knowledge of a thing as something that exists is sufficient for love. This is because existence, or the being as such, is the "measure" of the good that elicits love in the subject.

3. In other words, a being known as existing (as a real thing) is a good for appetition, and thereby it already arouses the first act of appetition, which is love.[36] This is the subject's response to a being that is known as good and becomes in some sense the end or purpose of the subject.[37] In the act of love, the good as such (*absolute*) becomes loves, just as in spontaneous knowledge, being as such is apprehended. The next naturally appearing acts of knowledge add new elements also to the "concept" of the good, and in this sense they determine the known good. These acts are accompanied by successive movements of the cognitive powers, and love is the root of those movements. Those movements are the most proximate causes of the concrete actions for which love, however, remains the first

---

[35] M. D. Philippe, *O miłości* (*On love*), Polish trans. A. Kuryś (Kraków 1995), 98.

[36] Just as a being that apprehended fittingly for the faculty (e.g., an individual-material being in the case of sensory knowledge, and being as being in the case of the intellect) falls right away under the corresponding faculty of knowledge, so the good, apprehended at the same moment in which knowledge "grasps" being, right away falls under the appetitive power. Of course, here we are assuming that a judgement concerning the good is contained in this spontaneous knowledge of being as the first elementary ordering of being to the subject (the good of the subject).

[37] Love and the recognition of a being as a good flow from the fact that being as existing is capable of enriching the (fragile) existence of every being-subject. Cf. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 155–156. The real existence of being means the origin of that being from the Absolute, that is, its connection with the Will of Absolute (being, since it exists, is wanted by God). Cf. id., 153–145.

cause and principle.[38] This is because concrete action is elicited as the result of the determination of the object that occurs in particular acts of knowledge.[39]

In this way we have established the entire course of the process whereby action arises, in which love and knowledge perform a dual function, as it were. Along with the first spontaneous act of knowledge, love is elicited, which according to our earlier conclusions, constitutes the motive for action, i.e., the reason why any sort of action exists at all in relation to a germinally known object. The following detailed acts of knowledge have the character of an exemplar cause, i.e., a cause that determines action. Thus they are the reason why one sort of action and not some other occurs; the action is caused by a concrete appetitive "response" that accompanies a given act of knowledge. Love is constantly presented in these detailed cognitive acts; love inclines the subject to aspire to the end; love does so as the impulse that establishes the term of the will's operation.[40] Love is the term of the motion of appetition (i.e., loving) and is present in every act of appetition.

Both moments that make efficient causation, or the subject's real action, possible have thereby been discussed. The first of these is the causation of the end, and so love as the motive, and the second is the causation of the exemplar (i.e., of an external and "objective" form); in that causation knowledge plays a role as it has a fundamental influence on the kind and character of the good, and the factors that as conditions affect the good,

---

[38] "[O]mnis actio quae procedit ex quacumque passione, procedit etiam ex amore, sicut ex prima causa. Unde non superfluunt aliae passiones, quae sunt causae proximae" (S.Th., I–II, 28, 6, ad 2). Therefore it should be established in what causal order love is the cause of other feelings and acts of the will. Only the material cause comes into play, since the other causes should be firmly excluded (St. Thomas excludes the formal cause in: id., 26, 1, ad 2, saying that love is not essentially, i.e., formally identical to other feelings; it cannot be the efficient cause since it is not a faculty (an active potency) or a substance; the good is the final cause, the subject itself, as the reason for every act of appetition). In the proper sense, the appetitive faculty itself is the material cause of feelings; in the case of love St. Thomas speaks of the adaptation or preparation of matter (for the reception of concrete forms), i.e., material disposition (*dispositio materialis*), which is a secondary material cause, i.e., insofar as it sets the "species" of the new form that will appear in concrete matter (in the subject). Cf. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 336–353.

[39] For example, the presence or absence of the object, the privation of a good, etc., which are determinants that play the role of criteria in the division of feelings. Cf. S.Th., I–II, 23.

[40] A very interesting question is connected with this: the way love exists in the subject, as opposed to the way a concept exists in the subject. I have written more on this in the article: "Piękno i miłość," op. cit.

which has already become the end.[41] Both these moments, i.e., love and knowledge, constantly accompany each other and in a special way they affect each other.[42]

The Place of Love in the Order of the Causes of Action

The culmination of these reflections is the problem of how the act as such of love becomes a cause at the moment it is elicited. The conclusions gained in this way should constitute the rational justification for the above statements on love's connection causation (upon the background of the structure of love's act), and should also constitute the rational justification for the unity of this act in relation to the passive-active character that it possesses. This sort of "antithetical" character is proper to all feelings, and moreover it is proper generally to all acts of any faculty whatsoever, since from the side of the object the act is something passive, and from the side of the subject it is an active element as flowing from it as an efficient cause.[43] This is because we may speak of love as of an act (action) or as

---

[41] "In noncognitive conditions, we can also perceive the presence of these same three factors, which are, however, proportional to the nature of the noncognizing being. Thus we perceive the existence of: (1) A subject of activity [the English text reads "object" but the word here is "podmiot"—"subject"]; (2) A factor determining the direction of activity—in this case, the acting being's own nature . . . form, conceived as either a substantial or accidental element *organizing matter* to be "this here kind" of content; (3) . . . [T]he "natural inclination" (love) of a given acting being. This natural inclination is a necessary consequence of the presence of form in the existing being" (Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 159–160).

[42] I also discuss the specific character of this relation at greater length in the article: "Piękno i miłość," op. cit.

[43] This is because very operation is active as coming from its source (its subject), and passive as "set" upon a certain object, from which it takes its form: "Hoc idem ipsum est de ratione actus, ut scilicet sit ab aliquo quantum ad actionem, et ut sit ad aliquid quantum ad passionem" (S.Th., I–II, 1, 3, ad 1). In a special way, this passivity and activity concerns appetition (esp. in comparison to knowledge), since, first, appetition is subordinated to the thing as such, as the thing is in itself, without imposing anything upon the thing (in knowledge, the subjective way in which the thing as an image is apprehend is "imposed"), and so, we may say, it is completely passive. However, on the other hand, such passivity makes appetite become more active that the other faculties in the sense that the thing as such (and not, for example, the image of the thing) elicits an aspiration or tendency for it: "vis appetitiva dicitur esse magis activa, quia est magis principium exterioris actus; et hoc habet ex ipso ex quo hoc habet quod sit magis passiva, scilicet ex hoc quod habet ordinem ad rem, prout est in seipsa; per actionem enim exteriorem venimus ad consequendas res" (Id., 22, 2, ad 2). Therefore also, love as the source-act of appetition should provide the explanation by its internal structure for the two aspects so clearly seen in appetition.

a movement (a motion), i.e., something active, and on the other hand we may speak of love as a feeling or complacence, i.e., as something passive. The basic question that arises in this context is this: in what way can the will (appetition) simultaneously act in relation to its object and passively receive movements (influences) from the object? In realistic metaphysics, the rational justification for every fact consists in showing a corresponding factor or cause that explains the fact in a given order. The indication of all four causes is a complete rational justification.

The problem concerns precisely the external causes of the act of love, since we have in view its reference to the subject and to the object.[44] Thus we need to investigate in what order the will is active, and in what order it is passive, and what role knowledge plays. This question was finally resolved by the commentators on St. Thomas in the seventeenth century. In the controversy between Cajetan, Sylvester de Ferrara (Francis de Silvestris), and John of St. Thomas, the position of John of St. Thomas ultimately prevailed. I will limit myself here to an account of the basic positions.[45]

Following St. Thomas, the basis of our reflections is that we hold that there is a difference between the execution (or eliciting, *exercitio*) of an act, and the act's specification (*specificatio*). Cajetan said that the active and the passive element of love both belong to the order of the efficient cause, since just as the will is the efficient cause of the execution of its act (the will is the active element), so also the object causes the act's content (specification), of course through the mediation of knowledge (the passive element). Francis Sylvester de Ferrara defended the freedom of the will in this conception and recognized the will's activity in both orders (i.e., in the performance and in the specification of the act); he ascribed passivity of love to the exemplary cause, which only suggests or presents the model of content (for the object). In turn, such a position contradicts the experiential

---

[44] If it is a question of internal causes, it is enough to say that in each of its acts, the faculty-subject is connected with its object as matter with form (or potency with act), and constitutes a new being: the action (i.e., the matter of an act is its subject, and the form is the object). The essence of action is thus determined in principle by the subject and the object, and in various ways in various orders.

[45] This controversy is analyzed precisely by H. D. Simonin, "Autour de la solution thomiste du problème de l'amour," *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et litteraire du moyen âge* 6 (1931): 174–276. On the position of John of St. Thomas, see among other works, M. Forlivesi, *Conoscenza e affettività. L'incontro con l'essere secondo Giovanni di San Tommaso* (Bologna 1993), 253–290.

facts of the will's dependence on an object (which is not explained by an exemplar cause). For that reason, this conception comes too close to the existential aspect (the will's connection with the thing itself as existing) and the content-aspect (the apprehension of the thing as known) of the act of love, erasing the act of love's essence in relation to knowledge.

John of St. Thomas' conception, which was developed in polemics with the other two mentioned above, is today regarded as an exhaustive and final solution to the problem. The central point of his position is that love is connected with the causation of the end (which we discussed earlier), and that this causality is generally explained in the manner of love.[46] He accepted from Sylvester the proposition that the will has an active character in the order of the efficient cause (against Cajetan), and also the proposition concerning exemplar causation from the side of the object (as known), and he remarked that in the order of the eliciting and specification of the act, the will is passive in some aspects, while the active principle is in reality the same, i.e., the good. Thus if the separateness of both these orders should be preserved, as St. Thomas clearly emphasized, then it is necessary to hold that there are separate ways of causation in both orders. Since the reason for the specification of the act is the object in the order of the exemplar cause, then the reason for the eliciting of the act is the good as the end, and so, in the way of the final cause.[47] Passivity in relation to the object that acts in the order of the efficient cause is one thing (it is connected with the physical reception of the effect of action), and passivity in the order of final cause is another thing (where the object becomes an end only due to a change in the subject, which is connected with a special sensitivity of the latter). John of St. Thomas uses terms that refer to Aristotle to describe the influence of the end (cf. *On generation and corruption*, 324b15), since in St. Thomas there are no considerations of this type. He uses the following and other descriptive terms: *modo intentionali*, *motione metaphorica*, *modo metaphorico*, *metaphorice*.[48]

---

[46] According to John, the texts: *Quaestiones disputatae de veritate*, 12, 2, and S.Th., I–II, 28, 6, allow us to draw precisely such conclusions. Cf. Forlivesi, *Conoscenza…*, 255f.

[47] "The known good does not move the will in the order of the true and real physical cause, but only as an objective principle of specification, which belongs to the order of the exemplar cause, and in the order of the final cause, which also cause metaphorical or moral, since it is only an incentive that attracts the subject to itself" (John of St. Thomas, *Cursus Philosophicus*, I, 13, 1).

[48] Cf. id., a. 1–3.

In this way, John of St. Thomas provided a rational justification for the unity of the act of love, showing that the opposing passive and active elements contained in it concern different orders of causation, in keeping with the scholastic principle: "effectus pendet a causa secundum quod causa" (the effect is dependent on the cause in the aspect in which it is the cause of the effect).[49] Thus the act of love is in its essence a product of the efficient cause and the final cause (the efficient cause expresses the subject's ability to act, and the final cause expresses the determination that flows from the object as the end). Such a consideration convincingly shows that the act of love depends on the simultaneous action of the end and of the corresponding faculty. Since this is so, then the influence as such of the end on the subject should be explained by an appeal to love as what is called *first love*, which has the form of the passive movement of the will.[50] This movement is expressed in feeling (analogically understood), and so John of St. Thomas also calls it *passio* or *spiratio*.[51]

The stages of love obtained by way of such an analysis (first love, as the action of the end, and "second" love, as the act elicited by the will)[52] allow us to apprehend the internal structure of the act of love, in which feeling (*passio*), i.e., passive movement consisting in the adaptation (*adaptatio*) of appetition to the known good (even germinally known), and in

---

[49] Cf. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 441–442. On several occasions Aquinas imples such a solution, for example, when he speaks of how the subject and the object of love are contained (*contineri*) in each other: "[amatum] est impressum in affectu per complacentiam" (the moment of final causation, the first stage of love—complacence), "amans sequitur . . . illud quod est intimum amati" (the moment of efficient causality, the aroused subject elicits an act of aspiration toward the object) (S.Th., I–II, 28, 2, ad 1). In the first stage, the object is contained, as it were, in the subject (the subject's passivity), then the subject is contained in the object (the subject's activity): "nihil enim prohibet diverso modo esse aliquid continens et contentum" (Id.).

[50] "Metaphorica motio, qua finis dicitur causare secundum veritatem, est *primus amor* finis, ut passive pendens ab appetibili, non ut active elicitus a voluntate" (*Cursus Philosophicus*, I, 13, 2, emphasis A.G.).

[51] The second description of the two comes from St. Thomas' thoughts on the origin of the Persons of the Holy Trinity. John relates them to human love, where it expresses the aspect of love apprehended as an act that comes from its object, and is set in opposition to *processio*, i.e., the act in the aspect of its origin from the efficient cause (the subject), where the act is understood as a motion toward an object. This second aspect has often been called in his work simply *amor*, designating an act that is actively emanated by appetition. Cf. Forlivesi, *Conoscenza…*, 274f.

[52] This distinction or difference is also present in metaphysical analysis concerning the end and finality. Cf. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics*, 440–441.

a certain tendency or direction toward it (as an end).[53] It has the form (when the cognitive aspect is emphasized) of *complacence*, or a state of being pleased, which in appetition becomes the motor that inclines the will or inspires it to elicit its own act.[54] This act, as the term of the operation of loving directed toward the good, is already a real action of will that expresses the will's power as an efficient cause. It has the form of an impulse that provides an inclination to action, i.e., to the eliciting of successive appetitive and non-appetitive acts in relation to the object-end.[55]

At this moment, a proper relation and bond with the object is formed; that relation is expressed from the side of the subject. In the faculty of appetition, i.e., in its first act, which is love, we are thus dealing with like a completion of the elements of the object's action (or passion) and the subjective "response" to being; the faculty is capable of that response by nature. This is the specific form of the cooperation of the subject with the object; this form in its own way determines the essence of the act of love.[56] Here finally we can speak of the proper way to understand love—as an act (or expression) of the entire being-subject. Love-complacence as a spontaneous act is independent of consciousness and freedom of choice, and so it does not join the entire subject with the good, but only joins the will as such (appetition), as it finally becomes the incentive, as John of St. Thomas saw, for such a full (free) engagement of the subject.

The act of love in its highest (and most interior) form is manifested in the human being (or, in general, in a rational being) in the form of personal love. Therefore metaphysical considerations on the nature of love in general are the foundation for an understanding of love where love is a special expression of personal life. At the level of personal love, the elements of love as such that are drawn out in a metaphysical analysis are brought to the highest perfection (hence metaphysical propositions turn out not only to be helpful, but indispensable). The specific character of the

---

[53] However, it seems that we should distinguish first love as the causation of the end from love as a passion, since despite the real identity of those moments, they indicate different aspects of love: *first love* (*spiratio* is a good word to describe it) concerns the cause of action, while *passio* indicates the passivity of the subject. However, adaptation is the reason for aspiration and here it converges with the meaning of *spiratio*.

[54] On complacence as the first phase of love, and on the connection of complacence with knowledge, see my article: *Piękno i miłość*, 418–424.

[55] Cf. id., 425–433.

[56] "The good attracts us and arouses love in our interior, so that we can respond to its action on us. In this way we become «partners» of the good . . . to love is to be a partner of the good" (Philippe, *O miłości*, 100).

human person's dynamism, which is manifested in typical personal actions, should obviously be considered along with a consideration of the original data proper to the human person, i.e., the personal experience of the "I," which constitutes the starting point for philosophical anthropology—nonetheless the metaphysical order, which unveils corresponding aspects of action as such and explains the essential factors of dynamism, remains the fundamental order in this case.[57]

LOVE AS THE PRINCIPLE OF THE DYNAMISM OF BEINGS
(AN ANALYSIS OF THE ARGUMENTS OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS)

SUMMARY

In ancient times, people pondered "cosmic love" (*eros*, *philotes*, *thymos*), i.e., the universal power that underlies the phenomena of the universe. The force of love extends to all things, including man and his action. Philosophers remarked rather early that love is, as it were, the foundation for the phenomena and actions that are experienced. As love is both of the character of a source and is strongly present in its manifestations, it turns out to be something that, on the one hand, is best known, but on the other hand, not easy to understand. In parallel, people also considered the strictly personal form of love—*philia*, whereby people are joined with each other in a special relation, which is friendship (Aristotle started this conception). The analogical scholastic conception of love was an interesting combination of those two tendencies; love is the foundation of action and in the metaphysical order it becomes the principle that explains the domain of being that we call dynamism. This article discusses Thomas Aquinas' doctrine of love; first, it analyzes love's relationship with action, end, and knowledge, then, secondly, investigates the place of love in the order of the causes of action.

KEYWORDS: love, being, dynamism, action, knowledge, end, cause, metaphysics, Thomas Aquinas.

---

[57] On the specific character of philosophical anthropology in the realistic conception, and in connection with how its dependence on metaphysics is understood, see S. Kamiński, "Z metafilozofii człowieka" ("On the meta-philosophy of man"), in his *Jak filozofować* (*How to philosophize*) (Lublin 1989), 257–262; S. Kamiński, "Antropologia. Wątki systematyzujące" ("Anthropology. Systematizing elements) [part of an entry], in *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* (*Universal Encyclopedia of Anthropology*), vol. 1 (Lublin 2000), 261–263; M. A. Krąpiec, A. Maryniarczyk, "Metafizyka" ("Metaphysics"), in *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* (*Univeral Encyclopedia of Philosphy*), vol. 7 (Lublin 2006), 114–116.

Piotr Jaroszyński
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Poland

ONTOLOGY: UNREAL REALITY

While words such as "essence," "substance," and "form" belong to the language of philosophy as technical terms, and they are understood most often in accordance with some particular philosophical system where one or another meaning is attached to them, the word "thing" (*res*) and "reality" (*realitas*), which is derived from "thing," are words that belong primarily to ordinary language, and it seems perfectly obvious how they should be understood. This is because when we refer to a thing, and above all, when we refer to reality (perhaps even to a greater degree than in the case of the word "being," which is a technical term) we have in mind that which really exists. We contrast reality to what which does not really exist because it is found only in our thoughts or imaginings, or something that does not exist at all. At the level of common-sense knowledge, the difference between reality and thinking about reality is very strongly marked, and it is even treated as an impassible chasm. This is because reality exists, whereas the act of thinking about something is merely thinking when something is not real and cannot be found on the side of reality. Every normal man sees the chasm between the act of eating an apple and the act of thinking about an apple, because an apple that is only in our thought cannot be eaten; the mental apple does not exist, that is, it does not exist as a real apple, which amounts to the same thing. The question whether something is in the waking state or only the product of a dream is a dramatic question because it expresses the tension of a thought that at some moment loses its ground and is unable to distinguish between intentional states and real states.

This paper was originally published in Polish as a chapter of my book: *Metafizyka czy ontologia?* (*Metaphysics or Ontology?*) (Lublin: PTTA, 2011), 331–343.

Meanwhile it turns out that in the framework of ontology the meaning of the terms mentioned above (both "thing" and "reality") were so greatly modified that reality ceased to be real from the point of view of common sense. This question was not well known among philosophers, and especially among metaphysicians. This means that what is not real for a normally thinking man who is not a philosopher is real for an ontologist.

In ontology, thought and its content become legitimate reality, and they are even treated as more real than reality, or even as the only reality. Then the question of reality loses its common-sense meaning in ontology, since in response it indicates something that cannot be regarded as reality in common-sense knowledge, e.g., the content of a concept as a content in itself. This is because in common-sense knowledge when we ask about an apple we are not interested in information about the content of a concept, which for ontology is already real, but we want to know about a true apple.

How did it happen that the concept of reality was subjected to such a perverse intellectual operation? Behind this situation are certain conclusions that appeared in medieval philosophy.

A "thing" (*res*) in medieval philosophy was a technical term and it meant one of the "transcendental properties" of being. Plato had spoken of truth, the good, the beautiful, and the one in a dimension that encompassed all reality, and he had in mind the highest ideas in which lower ideas and the material world participated, while Aristotle in his *Metaphysics* spoke of what belongs to being as being.[1] In that passage Aristotle was concerned primarily with unity, since being and one are the same.[2] In the subtext of such a formulation his intention was to refute the Platonic theory of ideas, since there is no unity as an idea, but unity is being apprehended from a certain point of view. However, Aristotle did not develop his theory of the properties of being any further. The theory was developed in the middle ages. Philosophers were interested in the properties of being that exceeded the scope of the categories, and so they began to call them the "transcendentals" (*transcendere*—to go beyond). The transcendental properties could be predicated of an entire being, or of an aspect of a being that did not comprehend the entire being, but at least transcended the categories.[3]

Avicenna introduced "thing" to metaphysics. Thomas Aquinas and Suarez later looked to Avicenna. All the more it is worth examining what

---

[1] Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1003 a 20–21.
[2] Id., 1004 a 23–25.
[3] Chancellor Philip was the author the first treatise on the trancendentals (twelfth century).

Avicenna understood by "thing" and in what context he discussed it in metaphysics. The term "thing" appears in the first treatise of the *Book of First Philosophy* in the chapter "On the Meaning of Thing and Being and on Their First Divisions, which should Be Mentioned in Order to Understand Them" (*Capitulum de assignatione rei et entis et de eorum primis divisionibus ad hoc ut exciteris ad intelligentiam eorum*).[4]

Avicenna began his exposition with the assertion that a thing, a being, and necessity find their original reflection in the soul. This means that they do not come from other concepts.[5] This first sentence presents certain points that merit our attention. Here we are dealing with the order of knowledge, not the order of being, because Avicenna is speaking about the way being is known. The next point is that "thing" is mentioned before "being." Finally, the three transcendentals differ in the way they pertain to being, because insofar as being as a whole is being, being as a whole is not necessary. At this stage Avicenna is concerned with connecting certain properties of being with our knowledge of being, where the most important thing in the process of knowledge is to establish what is first and what does not presuppose the possession of any prior concepts.

In the second passage, Avicenna again mentions "thing" and "being" (in that order), but the third term that appears is not "necessity" but "one."[6] Here also the order of knowledge comes into play. The triad mentioned is something that we can most quickly understand in itself. However, here Avicenna says that they are common to everything (*communia sunt omnibus rebus*). He could not have said this earlier since necessity is not common to everything, since some beings are possible and not necessary.

We see that Avicenna was more committed to showing the accidental properties of being as being with respect to their role in knowledge more than he was interesting in providing a complete list of those properties. Yet, what is a "thing?"

---

[4] Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de philosophia prima sive scientia divina. I–IV*, I, 5, 31; Goichon, *La distinction de l'essence et de existence d'apres Ibn Sīnā (Aicenna)* (Paris 1937), 3–4.

[5] "Dicemus igitur quod res et ens et necesse talia sunt quod statim imprimuntur in anima prima impressione, quae non acquiritur ex alii notioribus se . . ."(Avicenna Latinus, *Liber de philosophia prima sive scientia divina. I–IV*, I, 5, A29, 1–4, éd. crit. de la trad. latine médiévale par S. van Riet (Louvain 1977)).

[6] "Quae autem promptiora sunt ad imaginandum per seipsa, sunt ea quae communia sunt omnibus rebus, sicut res et ens et unum, et cetera" (id., A 30, 25–28).

Avicenna explains that a thing is that about which one can truly state something.[7] Right away he notes that in this statement expressions such as "one can something," or "truly state" are not as well known as "thing."[8] This would show that a thing is something cognitively prior and original. This is because each of those expressions indicate a thing, or something, either this or that.[9] Those expressions are simply different words that mean "thing."[10]

Avicenna observed that the concept of being and the concept of thing have different meanings. On the one hand, "being" (*ens*) and "something" (*aliquid*) are different names that have the same meaning. On the other hand, "thing" (*res*) and "whatever" are different names that also have the same meaning, are different from both the preceding names ("being" and "something"). "Thing" and "whatever" in all languages describe the certainty that something is precisely what it is, e.g., a triangle is a triangle, whiteness is whiteness.[11] "Something" is that which we treat as most proper to being. What is it? It is "something" that gives us certainty, and the essence is this "something."[12] Hence when we want to affirm the identity of something, it is more fitting to say that certainty is a thing, and by "thing" we understand "being," than to say that the certainty of "something" is the certainty that something is.[13] Avicenna in his examples explains what his point is: one thing is our certainty concerning "*a*" and our certainty concerning "*b*" is another thing. If something were not what it is, it would not be a thing.[14]

When Avicenna described being with the help of "thing," his intention was to emphasize the being's identity, that this being is this being.

---

[7] "[R]es est id de quo potest aliquid vere enuntiari . . ." (id., 37).

[8] "[C]erte *potest aliquid* minus notum est quam *res*, et *vere enuntiari* minus notum est quam res" (id., 38–40).

[9] "Igitur quomodo potest hoc esse declaratio? Non enim potest cognosci quid sit *potest aliquid* vel *vere enuntiari*, nisi in agendo de unoquoque eorum dicatur quod est res vel aliquid val quid vel illud . . ." (id., 39–44).

[10] "[H]aec omnia multivoca sunt nomini rei" (id., 42); "[I]d et illud et res eiusdem sensus sunt" (id., A 30, 47).

[11] "Sed res et quicquid aequipollet ei, significat etiam aliquid aliud in omnibus linguis; unaquaeque enim res habet certitudinem qua est id quod est, sicut triangulus habet certitudinem qua est triangulus, et albedo habet certitudinem qua est albedo" (id., A 31, 54–57).

[12] "[U]naquaeque res habet certitudinem propriam quae est eius quidditas" (id., 63–64).

[13] "Quod igitur utilius est dicere, hoc est scilicet ut dicas quod certitudo est res, sed hic res intelligitur ens, sicut si diceres quod certitudo huius est certitudo quae est" (id., 71–73).

[14] Id., A 32, 73–84.

Since the word "being" has many meanings, "thing" reveals in being the identity of the being, or what Avicenna called the certainty (*certitudo*) that this being is this being.

In his treatise *Summa de bono*, which was important for the theory of the transcendentals, Philip the Chancellor did not mention "thing," and the reason was that the treatise was written from neo-Platonic positions. The term "thing" did appear in the work of Albert the Great. Albert treated the transcendentals not merely as modes of our knowledge of being (*primae intentiones*), but also as modes of the being of being (*modi essendi entis*).[15]

Duns Scotus held a completely different conception of the transcendentals. First of all, being understood as *natura commune* does not possess any property, because it is completely undetermined.[16] However, the *passiones entis*, that is, the properties of a being, are virtually contained in a being. Between them and a being there is no mental difference, but there is a formal difference that results from the nature of things. For example, the truth and the good are aspects that are really different from being. They are not being, but are qualifications of being.[17] They are divided into absolute (*unicae*), and these include unity, good, and truth, and disjunctive (*disiunctae*), and there we find pairs such as independent–dependent, absolute–relative, infinite–finite, prior–posterior, simple–composite, one–many, cause–effect, the determining end and that which strives for the end, that which is an efficient cause and that which is caused by an efficient cause, higher–lower, substance–accident, act–potency, similar–different, equal–unequal.[18] We see that "thing" is not mentioned among the first ones or the second ones. Did Scotus then not consider at all "thing" as a transcendental, whether in an absolute sense, or as the member of a pair in an opposition? Not completely. We find "thing" elsewhere in an analysis of intellectual knowledge.

Scotus makes a distinction between two acts of intellectual knowledge. The first act apprehends its object without investigating whether the

---

[15] A. Maryniarczyk, "Transcendentalia" ("Transcendentals"), in *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii* (*Universal Encyclopedia of Philosophy*), vol. 9 (Lublin 2008), 534.

[16] L. Iammarrone, *Giovanni Duns Scoto metafisico e teologo. Le tematiche fondamentali della sua filosofia e teologia* (Roma 1999), 109.

[17] Id., 111–112.

[18] Jan Duns Szkot (John Duns Scotus), *Traktat o pierwszej zasadzie* (*Treatise on the first principle*), trans. into Polish, introduction and commentary by T. Włodarczyk (Warszawa 1988), 107, footnote 8.

object really exists or whether it is really present. One example would be the universals that we apprehend as essences of things; we know the universals whether or not they are present.[19] In the second type of knowledge, the object is apprehended independently of its existence apart from the knowing subject and independently of real presence. This is abstract knowledge. The second type of knowledge is intuitive, and without mediation it reaches the existing concrete thing, the *haecceitas*, which is the ultimate reality of being (*ultima realitas entis*).[20]

Despite such a clear description of the status of the existing concrete thing as the most important reality, "thing" and "reality," according to Scotus, can also refer to that which exists only in the intellect. This happens when we refer to the concept of being, which is not apprehended from the physical viewpoint, but from the logical or metaphysical viewpoint. It is then non-contradiction, which exists only in the intellect. However, Scotus also calls it "reality" (*realitas*).[21] Scotus adds precision and says that this reality is indefinite because it does not contain any internal determination (*modus intrinsecus*); it is an imperfect thing (*res imperfecta*), but nevertheless is it a reality.[22]

This presentation of the matter, also at the level of the concept of being, a concept that is supposed to include all reality, opens the way for the concept as such of being, and not simply being as such, to be reality. This concept as being-concept is found at the antipodes of reality, because after all it is not reality but a thought about reality, yet in spite of everything it is regarded as reality.

In that case, if the concept of being is reality, then what stands in the way for other concept with a narrow range of predication to become such a reality? Something that we apprehended cognitively becomes a thing (*res*), but with regard to whether a really existing thing does or does not correspond to that thing. The etymological interpretation of the word "*res*"

---

[19] "Unus indifferenter potest esse respectu objecti existentis et non existentis, et indifferenter etiam respectu objecti non realiter praesentis, sicut realiter praesentis; istum actum frequenter experimur in nobis, quia universalia, sive quidditates rerum intelligimus, sive habeant ex natura rei esse extra in aliquo supposito, sive non, et ita de praesentia et absentia" (Ioannis Duns Scotus, *Opera omnia*, vol. 12: *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, VI, 1, 18 (Lugduni 1639); Jean-F. Courtine, *Suárez et le système de la métaphysique* (Paris 1990), 157.

[20] Courtine, *Suárez et le système de la métaphysique*, 160.

[21] T. Barth remarks on this (E. Zieliński, *Jednoznaczność transcendentalna w metafizyce Jana Dunsa Szkota* (*Transcendental univocity in the metaphysics of John Duns Scotus*) (Lublin 1988), 43).

[22] L. Honnefelder emphasizes this aspect (id., 67).

presented by Henry of Ghent tended to such an approach (that interpretation is completely different from the Polish etymology of the word "thing" (*rzecz*), and therefore it is difficult to accept that line of reasoning).

Henry of Ghent connected "*res*" with "*reor*," which means "to think" or "to believe."[23] In that case, that which exists in itself and independently of our knowledge is not reality, but that about which we think is reality. This etymological interpretation allowed the philosophical concept of reality to be separated from true reality.

Scotus also went by the same road, and this is even more explicit in his system; because of the continuing influence of that notion, the belief could persist that a thing is something that does not have to exist, and so reality is not something that really exists. Concepts, which as concepts possess their own reality and their own existence, are such a reality.

A position of that sort was liable to a nominalistic interpretation. William Ockham said that the science concerning reality is not the science concerning what we know directly, but about what occurs as a representation of things.[24] In that case, concepts and representations alone become the reality known by science. Reality becomes identified with what is known without regard to any further relation to the reality that is found beyond the concept and beyond the representation.

In this way the ground was prepared for the future ontology, and Francis Suarez was the figure who gave the finishing touch to this conception of reality and things. Suarez also mentioned "thing" among the six transcendentals (*ens*, *res*, *aliquid*, *unum*, *verum*, *bonum*).[25] He defined "thing" as that which indicates the essence of a thing, as that essence is apprehended in the formal aspect. That essence is the real essence of a being.[26] However, precisely because a thing refers to an essence, some thought that "thing is more an essential predicate than a counterpart of being itself."[27] When Suarez discussed "thing" he looked to Thomas Aqui-

---

[23] Courtine, *Suárez et le système de la métaphysique*, 158; O. Boulnois, *Être et représentation. Une généalogie de la métaphysique moderne à l'époque de Duns Scot (XIIIe–XIVe siècle)* (Paris 1999), 434–452.

[24] "Dico quod scientia realis non est semper de rebus tamquam de illis quae immediate sciuntur, sed de aliis pro rebus supponentibus" (Guilhelmi de Ockham, *Super quattuor libros sententiarum subtilissimae quaestiones aerumdemque decisiones* (Lyons 1495), I, 2, 4, M); Courtine, *Suárez et le système de la métaphysique*, 175.

[25] Suárez, *Disputationes metaphysicae*, III, 2, 1.

[26] "[R]es solum dicit de formali rei quidditatem, et ratam seu realem essentiam entis . . ." (id.).

[27] "[U]nde multi censent magis essentiale praedicatum esse rem quam ipsum ens" (id.).

nas, who in his opinion followed Avicenna and separated "thing" from actual existence so as to denote only essence with the help of "thing." Meanwhile "being," a name derived from "*esse*," denotes an actually existing being. Hence Thomas supposedly treated "thing" not as a transcendental property, but as an essential predicate because it does not indicate being but indicates essence.[28]

Suarez saw that the meaning of the transcendental "thing" was weakened because it lacked a connection with existence, and because consequently it became a predicate and not a property of being, since "thing" refers to essence, not to the entire being, while the transcendentals are supposed to encompass the entire being. However, as he continued his discussion of the various views, Suarez weakened the understanding of being as he looked to another position, the position that being is not only that which actually exists, but also includes what is capable of existence. This was in the context of his analysis of "thing." Then the distinction between "being" and "thing" would mean that being is the first property of a thing. However, Suarez regarded this as unproven because in the first concept of real essence is contained the ability to exist, and here a distinction was made between real essence and unreal or thought-of essence. In turn, Suarez thought that Averroes had asserted that "thing" denotes not only a real thing, but also a thing that is thought of.[29]

As Suarez presented his own position, he emphasized that "thing" does not formally contain a negation because it is found in the truth (when we say that a true being is one that is not merely thought of), or it is found in unity (*unum*), or again in separateness (*aliquid*). In the last case, the point is that one being is separate from another, and thereby it is also separate from being that is merely thought of.[30] If a thing contains something

---

[28] "Quod si velimus haec duo in eo rigore distinguere quo D. Thomas supra ex Avicenna illa distinxit, quod res praescindat ab existentia actuali et meram quidditatem significet, ens autem sumptum sit ab esse et solum dicat ens actualiter existens, sic constat rem non significare passionem entis, sed esse praedicatum maxime quidditativum" (id., 4).

[29] "Si autem, iuxta opinionem quamdam supra tractatam, ens non solum ut dicit actu existens, sed etiam ut dicit aptum ad existendum, distingueretur a re, prout absolute dicit habens quidditatem realem, sic ens esset prima passio rei; sed hoc supra improbatum est, quia in prima ratione quidditatis realis intrat aptitudo ad existendum, et in hoc primo distinguitur quidditas realis a non reali seu ficta. In his ergo duobus nulla passio entis continetur. Scio Averr., in sua paraphrasi, c. de Re, dicere *rem* significare non solum rem veram, sed fictam; sed hoc commune est enti, et solum est secundum aequivocam significationem" (id.).

[30] Id., 13.

positive, then that is precisely a relation or reference to essence, while a being contains a reference to existence.[31]

Suarez rejected Averroes' position. Averroes said that a thing could refer to a thing that was thought of. Suarez emphasized that he was concerned with a real essence. However, what does "real" mean? For Suarez, a real essence is not only an essence that actually exists, but one that does not reject existence, and one that can exist.[32] At that moment, "thing" as a transcendental refers to essence, and an essence does not need actually to exist because it is enough if it is possible. It is the "thing" understood in just this way that was associated with essence, and this paved the way to essentialism. In essentialism, reality is something that does not actually exist, and so it is only possible reality. That is to say, something is real because it is possible. In this way, speculations on the transcendental "thing" bring the concept of thing and the concept of reality to the antipodes of realistic thought; there, reality is not only something that is possible, but even something that can be set in opposition to what is real. When someone is drowning, possible help is an absence of help; possible help is not help, and it ends in a drowning.

Since Suarez's position would be treated as authoritative for scholasticism as a whole, it is not surprising that his position would appear in the first ontologies as crucial for understanding being. Thus Clauberg said that what philosophers call a being is described in ordinary language as a thing or as something.[33] When Clauberg then explained what a thing is, he said that a thing is a substance to which accidents are opposed. However, already in *Logic*, a thing, albeit in a strict sense, is a substance that does not exist *per se*, but also in a broad sense it is something that is simply something (*aliquid*), that is, it is not nothing.[34] Thus a thing is some-

---

[31] "Et ita distinguuntur res et ens, quia hoc ab esse, illud a quidditate reali sumptum est" (id., 10).

[32] Suarez's free connection of the real with the possible also concerns the important question of the object of metaphysics. This is because when Suarez mentions six different positions, he evidently supports being as real being ("[E]ns in quantum ens reale . . ."—id., I, 1, 1, 26; id., II, 1, 1), but in the end he also includes mental beings (*entia rationis*) and the possible under real being (J. J. E. Gracia, "Suárez," in *Concepciones de la metafísica*, ed. J. J. E. Gracia (Madrid 1998), 106–110).

[33] "Quod a vulgo res et aliquid . . . a philosophicis etiam ens apellatur" (Clauberg, *Ontosophia*, 6; quoted after: Brosch, P. Brosch, *Die Ontologie des Johannes Clauberg* (Greifswald 1926), 20–21).

[34] "Res enim seu Ens sumitur vel generaliter et latè pro omni eo, quod est aliquid, non nihil; vel propriè et strictè pro eo, quod per se existit, et aliter vocatur *Substantia*, ein selbständig

thing that is not nothing. The thing can be presented on a par with an object, and an object in turn is that of which one can think (*quod cogitari potest*).[35] To summarize, "thing" and thereby "reality" are the sphere of what can be thought of. The possibility of being thought of is sufficient for it to be reality.

The definition of "thing" that Wolff presented was located in the current discussed, but with the lack of precision typical of the author. Wolff wrote that "everything that is or can be understood bears the name of thing, which is something; therefore a thing is defined as that which is something. Therefore in the scholastics, reality and essence are synonyms."[36] Wolff identified a thing with separateness (*aliquid*), while "thing" and "separateness" formally express different things. The thing is shifted from the sphere of being to the sphere of knowledge, and finally it is identified with essence, and this is the case not only with a thing but also with all reality. To summarize, reality consists of all essences that can be thought of.

When at the beginning of the twentieth century, Edmund Husserl called for a return to things themselves (*zurück zu den Sachen selbst*), not only did he not have in mind the real world of things, but on contrary they were things already after the procedure of taking away reality, that is, after *epoché*; they were things that did not really exist, as a condition for the philosophical investigation of them.[37] Husserl went a step further than did ontology. When ontology opened up itself to what is possible, at least it did not eliminate what is real. Here, however, the elimination of what is real (*epoché*), was the condition for discovering things themselves. If we translate this position into the language of common sense, we may say that only that which is not real is a thing in the phenomenological sense.

Ding . . ." (J. Clauberg, *Logica contracta*, par. 14, in his *Opera omnia philosophica*, cura J. T. Schalbruchii, ps II (Amstelodami 1691), 913).

[35] Brosch, *Die Ontologie des Johannes Clauberg*, 21.

[36] "Quicquid est vel esse posse concipitur, dicitur *Res*, quatenus est aliquid: ut adeo *Res* definiri possit per id, quod est aliquid. Unde et *realitas* et *quidditas* apud scholasticos synonima sunt" (C. Wolff, *Philosophia prima sive Ontologia*, 3. Nachdr. (Hildesheim 2001), I, 3, 2, par. 243).

[37] E. Husserl, *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to Phenomenological Philosophy*, transl, F. Kersten (The Hague 1983), I, 67.

Let us return, then, to Thomas Aquinas and how he explained the meaning of the transcendental "thing."[38] After some preliminary explanations to show what role the transcendentals play in reference to a known being, Thomas emphasized first that everything is contained in being, and so the transcendentals cannot add anything because anything they could add would still be being. However, in the case of the transcendentals the point is something else. The point is to express clearly what is not directly set forth in the concept of being.[39]

The clear expression is made in two ways, in a particular way, and in a general way. The particular way of expression consists in recognizing the various degrees of being and the various modes or ways of being, such as in the case of substance and the other categories. The general way of expression retains its own generality, and that generality comprehends being as a whole. In addition, the act of expression can be performed in two ways, positively or negatively. When we are speaking of being as such and of a thing, being as taken in itself (*ens in se*) is viewed positively.

In every being, says Thomas, the essence is apprehended. The transcendental thing is supposed to render the meaning of being as that which possesses an essence. Thomas looks to Avicenna and explains that the word "being" (*ens*) comes from the act of existence (*sumitur ab actu essendi*), while the word "thing" (*res*) expresses something or the essence of a thing (*nomen rei exprimit quidditatem vel essentiam rei*).[40] The point is that in the concept of being we can put the emphasis either on existence or on essence. When the accent is on existence, then the transcendental being appears, and when the accent falls on essence, then we have the thing. The Latin terms are helpful because in their etymology they indicate these two different aspects. We see how up to his time the explanation is situated in a framework that we already know, and as it continues, Suarez's exposition does justice to Thomas' position.

In this case, let us try to delve more deeply into the etymology of the word "thing" (*res*) that Thomas presents. Here matters become complicated, because in another work Thomas does not present one etymology,

---

[38] S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Summa theologiae*, I, 39, 3, 3; J. O'Callaghan, "Concepts, Beings, and Things in Contemporary Philosophy and Thomas Aquinas," *The Review of Metaphysics* 53:1 (1999): 84–94.

[39] "[S]ed secundum hoc aliqua dicuntur addere super ens, in quantum exprimunt modum ipsius entis qui nomine entis non exprimitur" (S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Quastiones disputatae de veritate*, cura et studio Fratrum praedicatorum, vol. 1 (Romae 1970), 1, 1, resp.).

[40] Id.

but two different ones. The first etymology agrees with what Suarez calls to attention, but the second etymology does not. In one case, a "thing" is something that refers to each and every being, including mental being (*ens rationis*). This happens when the word "thing" is derived from "*reor*, *re-ris*," that is, to have an opinion. "*Res*" is simply something about which we have some opinion, and so it is something that does not have to be real, but it is enough for us to think about it. In the second case, the etymology is more restrictive. "*Reatus*, *rata*," or "guilty" and "responsible" comes into play here. In this case, "*res*" pertains only to a real being, not to a being of which one thinks, a being that is non-contradictory, as the successors of Avicenna and Scotus thought. Possibility is not enough to determine any real responsibility. In the case of legal responsibility, it must be determined whether the fault is probable or factual, that is, real, and the verdict depends on this.[41] This is because a possible fault, or a fault that can be thought of, is not in any case a foundation for the court to reach a verdict. A fault must be actual and real.

As we see, etymology allows us to translate the word "*res*" in two ways, either as merely what we think, or as something that is in the real world independently of our opinion.[42] The problem with this is that neither Henry of Ghent nor Suarez considered this second interpretation, and so they found a facilitated transition from real being to possible being, so that possible being would acquire the status of real being.

Ultimately, however, while etymology can lead us to certain meanings, it does not resolve any questions. This is because "what a thing is" as a philosophical question already depends on the philosophical context in

---

[41] S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum Magistri Petri Lombardi Episcopi Parisiensis*, I, 25, 4, resp.

[42] Polish etymology connects the word "rzecz" (thing) with the verb "rzec" (to say), although this connection is no longer perceptible. Thus, the Polish noun would be closer to the Latin *reor*, *reri*, that is, an opnion, or what is stated (Brückner, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego* (*Etymological dictionary of the Polish language*) (Warszawa 2000), 475). M. S. B. Linde (*Słownik języka polskiego* (*Dictionary of the Polish language*), vol. 5 (Warsaw 1995), 186–189) indicates that in the Slavic languages a "rzecz" is a language, a speech, a discourse, an accusation, the judicial system, etc. The German noun *Ding* means a gathering (*Volksversammlung*) or a session of a court (*Gerichtsversammlung*) (H. Köbler, "Ding," in his *Deutsches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* (1995), 85, online: http://www.koeblergerhard. de/der/DERD.pdf, accessed on 13.05.2011). In turn, in the English language, the word "thing" can be predicated of fictions such as a monster or a golden mountain, while we are aware that they are not real things (J. O'Callaghan, *Concepts Beings, and Things in Contemporary Philosophy and Thomas Aquinas*, 90).

which not only being as being, but also the other transcendentals, are described. When Thomas included "thing" in the series of the transcendentals, he had in view a cognitive accent on essence, but on essence as a non-independent element of being. Here we find the main difference between Thomas and Avicenna, Duns, Scotus, and Suarez. Thomas was not concerned that an essence by the fact that it is a thing could become a being, but that a real being is composed of essence and existence, which are really different elements but are also subordinated to each other; because they are different elements, then without isolating them from the concrete being that those elements constitute, we can put the emphasis in knowledge on one or the other element, and this is the case also in the framework of the formation of the "transcendentals."[43]

However, as soon as the composition of being from essence and existence is treated as purely mental (in Scotism) or real, but in a "reified" way (for Giles of Rome, essence and existence were independent elements), then essence as essence becomes a thing, and then simply becomes a being, or what is called reality. Both versions in how the relation between essence and existence is understood, in which the real difference disappears or in which the road leads to "reification," influence the treatment of essence as independent, where essence as thing fills the field of reality. However, since essence is only possibility, the reality also is merely possible. However, if it is called reality, then even though it is possible, it remains reality, while really existing reality is pushed to the background or it becomes completely superfluous.

At that moment we become aware of how the realistic field of philosophical terminology has been curtailed. There are no terms to emphasize the difference between reality and possibility. Being does not differ from the concept of being, reality does not have to be real, and a thing does not need to exist really, to be called being and reality. This is all because the various philosophical distinctions and theories allow realistic terminology to be washed clean of its realism. Therefore it is so important to trace the philosophical context along with its assumptions that allow us to recognize the reasons why the new "realism" lost support in reality, or why it is not really realism. The new realism determines the field of enquiries for ontology; there is still room for reality in ontology, but

---

[43] M. A. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics. An Outline of the History of Being* (New Haven 1991), 109–118; O. Blanchette, "Suárez and the Latent Essentialism of Heidegger's Fundamental Ontology," *The Review of Metaphysics* 53:1 (1999): 8.

only as an instance of possibility (up to Wolff), and later possibility becomes the only reality, in which the fact that reality is possibility, and not that reality is real being, will be most important. Then in a peculiar way ontology becomes divorced from metaphysics. The clearest sign of this tendency will be that traditional metaphysical terminology disappears, and the object takes of the place of being and reality. This will be, as it were, a new incarnation of the ontology that separated knowledge from real being.

Each stage in the history of philosophy where there is a departure from knowledge of reality, whether in the name of the concept of being, of essence, or of the object, is celebrated as another step forward and as proof of the development of philosophy. Yet it is truly an expression of how philosophy has lost its main task that the ancient creators, the Greek thinkers, set for philosophy in the framework of the civilization they created. Thus philosophy does not develop, but the name "philosophy" is all that is left, just as the term "reality" is left while reality is lost, and the term does not mean "reality" at all.

ONTOLOGY: UNREAL REALITY

SUMMARY

The article examines the difference between ontology and metaphysics. It shows that as soon as the composition of being from essence and existence is treated as purely mental or in a "reified" way (where essence and existence are independent elements), then essence as essence becomes a thing, and then simply becomes a being, or what is called reality. Both versions in which the real difference disappears or in which the road leads to "reification," influence the treatment of essence as independent, where essence as thing fills the field of reality. However, if essence was only possibility, then (1) the reality also would be merely possible, (2) the realistic field of philosophical terminology would get curtailed, and (3) there would be no terms to maintain the difference between reality and possibility, between metaphysics and ontology.

KEYWORDS: metaphysics, ontology, reality, possibility, thing, essence, existence, Aristotle, Avicenna, Thomas Aquinas, Duns Scotus, Henry of Ghent, Francis Suarez, Clauberg, Edmund Husserl.

Andrzej Maryniarczyk, S.D.B.
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Poland

BONUM SEQUITUR ESSE

In order to take a closer look at the problem of the connection of the good with being, and at what the expression "*bonum sequitur esse rei*" means, (1) we will briefly consider the history of the word "good" to see what is hidden behind it and to what we should direct our thoughts and searches. (2) We will then look at the beginning of inquiries on the nature and sources of the good. (3) We will do this so that then we can better see the originality of one of the most interesting solutions in this controversy, which appeared in the thirteenth century and which was contained in the short sentence, "*bonum sequitur esse rei*"[1]—"the good is a consequence of the existence of a thing."

On the History of the Birth of the Word "Good"

The Greeks used the noun "ἀγαθόν" (*to agathon*) to mean benefit, gain, possession, property, or inheritance. The Romans enriched the meaning of the noun "*bonum*" with meanings such as good fortune, success, happiness, merit, or virtue (Plaut. Rud, 639, CIC, Quint. 25). As an adjective, the term "ἀγαθός" (*agathos*) was used to mean something that is useful, salvational, valuable, or profitable. It is therefore not strange that the meaning of the word "good" at the sources of its birth was connected with economic values and useful things.

This article was originally published in Polish: Andrzej Maryniarczyk, S.D.B., "Bonum sequitur esse rei," in: S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Quaestiones disputatae de bono, de appetitu boni et voluntate – Dysputy problemowe o dobru, o pożądaniu dobra i o woli*, trans. into Polish by A. Białek (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2003), 185–198.

[1] This expression presents the essence of Thomas Aquinas' understanding of the truth, and it is a paraphse of an expression that refers to the truth and probably is from Book IX of Avicenna's *Metaphysics*.

Plato gave the first philosophical meaning to the word "good." In one of his dialogues on the creation of language, the *Cratylus*, he wrote that "the first men who gave names were no ordinary persons, but high thinkers and great talkers."[2] At the same time, he argues that the word "ἀγαθόν" (*agathon*) is composed of two words: from the word "εκ του αγαστου" (*ek tou agastou*), which means something that is admirable, and the word "θοος" (*thoos*), which means something fast. Plato provides a commentary on this fact: the name "good" (ἀγαθόν) "is intended to denote the admirable (ἀγασθω) in all nature. For since all things are in motion, they possess quickness and slowness; now not all that is swift, but only part of it, is admirable; for this name ἀγαθόν is therefore given to the admirable part of the swift."[3] Thus as we make a whole out of these words, like a medley, we can interpret the good as something that "moves us unexpectedly and quickly," "something that attracts us suddenly to itself."

Thus it is not strange that the conception of the good as "something that has the power suddenly to grab us and attract us to it" came to the forefront in philosophy. However, philosophers were still left with a controversy to resolve, whether man or the gods are the source of good, or conversely, whether the good is the principle of the existence of the world, of human beings, and of the gods. Also, what was the scope of the good? Is the good present everywhere, or only here and there? Therefore let us try to trace at least one fragment of this controversy and take note of proposed solution, in order better to see the accuracy of Thomas' solution in which the good appears as a consequence of the existence of being, and for that reason is interchangeable with everything that really exists.

Ancient Conceptions of the Good

I will present four selected visions of how the good has been understood, and four ways it has been connected with being.

Man as the Measure of the Good
(*homo boni mensura*)

The doctrine we encounter in philosophy on the topic of the good is that "*homo boni mensura est*" (man is the measure of the good). This means that man makes himself the source of being and the good, and thereby man puts himself above the good and being.

---

[2] Plato, *Cratylus*, 401b (this and subsequent translations of Plato are from www.perseus.tufts. edu/hopper/collections).
[3] Platon, *Cratylus*, 412c.

In the fifth century BC in the school of the Sophists, who broke away from the Ionian *philosophesantes* and moved in the direction set by the *philosophoi*, they taught the principle that "man is the measure of all things, of the existence of the things that are, and the non-existence of the things that are not."[4] The principle "*homo mensura*," formulated by Protagoras, became not only a principle of being and so a principle of the existence of things, but also an "agathonic" principle, a principle of the good. Man makes himself not only the measure of existing things, that they exist, and non-existent things, that they do not exist, but man also makes himself the measure of the existing good, and of the non-existent good, that it does not exist. Is the principle "*homo mensura*" the "*Magna Charta*" of the relativism of being, the true, and the good? Let us leave the answer to this question to historians, who are still arguing about it.

Plato in the *Theaetetus* also commented on the principle of "*homo mensura*." Protagoras says that "that individual things are for me such as they appear to me, and for you in turn such as they appear to you—you and I being 'man.'"[5] It is the same situation with the good? "The good is such an elusive and diverse thing," says Plato through the mouth of Protagoras.[6] Aristotle in turn comments on this principle in book XI of the *Metaphysics*:

> he [Protagoras] said that man is the measure of all things, by which he meant simply that each individual's impressions are positively true. But if this is so, it follows that the same thing is and is not, and is bad and good, and that all the other implications of opposite statements are true; because often a given thing seems beautiful to one set of people and ugly to another, and that which seems to each individual is the measure.[7]

In this way at the very birth of philosophy, man declares himself to be the measure of the good: "*homo boni mensura*." Man connects the good with himself. In modern and recent times, some philosophers have drawn abundantly from this doctrine.

Aristotle sees the source of views of this type in the fact that those who said such things (Sophists and others) had separated themselves form reality, had looked to the opinions of the physiologists (*physiologon*), and

---

[4] Sextus Empiricus, *Adv. Math*, VII, 60; Plato, *Theatetus*, 151e–152a.

[5] *Theaetetus*, 152a–b.

[6] Platon, *Protagoras*, 334b–c.

[7] Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, 1062b13–19, trans. Hugh Treddenick (accessible at www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/collections).

based their ideas on subjective human feelings or sensations, which could be different with respect to the same thing (for some people, something is cold, for others it is warm; for some, something is good, for others it is evil, etc.).

The Good as the Measure of Man and God
(*bonum dei et hominis mensura*)

The good is the measure of gods and men. As a measure, the good is above all being. This is how the presentation begins of the second doctrine that we encounter in Plato's philosophy, a doctrine that would later take a more radical form in the philosophy of Plotinus. The world in which we live lacks the good as an immanent property of it. At most, a shadow of the good falls upon the world, but it also quickly disappears.

In his quest for the good, Plato leads us beyond the world of men, gods, and things, and leads us to a place called Hyperouranion, "the region which is above the heaven."[8] Plato writes that the beauty of that place "was never worthily sung by any earthly poet, nor will it ever be . . . For the colorless, formless, and intangible truly existing essence, with which all true knowledge is concerned, holds this region and is visible only to the mind, the pilot of the soul."[9] Among the objects of true knowledge, along with the beautiful and the true, there is the good. They are divine elements by which the gods and the souls are nourished.[10] The good has the power to make gods gods and to make human souls divine.

In what way does the good exist? The true good exists separately from all particular goods and things. It is the good through itself or the idea of the good, and everything is good by participation in it, as Aristotle comments on Platonic doctrine, and as Thomas Aquinas does following Aristotle.[11] The idea of the Good is above all a "paradigm," a primordial model for all goods and all things.

The idea of the Good is not a Platonic god, as G. Reale reminds us in his commentary on Plato, but that god is the Demiurge understood as the Supreme Mind (the best of all rational beings), while the idea of the good

---

[8] Platon, *Phaedrus*, 247c–d.
[9] Id.
[10] Id., 246d–e.
[11] Aristotle, *Ethics*, 1096b8–1097a14; Thomas Aquinas, "De Bono," in *Quaestiones disputatae. De veritate* (Taurini 1964), 21, 2, resp.

is "something divine" (*to theion*).[12] For this reason, Plato puts the "good" (or the idea of the Good) above every being, and he makes the ultimate reason for what is "really real." The Platonic idea of the Good is also the highest rule by which the god is inspired, and he tries to realize it at all levels of being.[13] G. Reale comments on Plato's thought: "God is good in the highest degree precisely because He acts in view of the idea of the Good, that is, Unity and the Supreme Measure."[14]

The Good is nothing other than UNITY, MEASURE, and ORDER. To bring MEASURE, UNITY, and ORDER into that which is unordered, plural, and indefinite is to produce good. In the *Timaeus*, Plato writes of this constantly:

> For God desired that, so far as possible, all things should be good and nothing evil; wherefore, when He took over all that was visible, seeing that it was not in a state of rest but in a state of discordant and disorderly motion, He brought it into order out of disorder, deeming that the former state is in all ways better than the latter.[15]

Therefore measure, unity, and order are the essence of the good, and are the good in itself; they are the divine principles of action. Order, unity, and measure hold the entire world in existence, and therefore the world is a "cosmos" and not a chaos. The cosmos is a good, and chaos is an evil. This is because the good is most perfect measure, and according to measure the world is brought out from chaos to cosmos, from plurality to unity, and from non-being to being.

From the Platonic presentation of the good we learn that in the world, *bonum sequitur ordo, mensura et unitas* (good is a consequence of order, measure, and unity). This means that neither the world nor individual things bear the good in them. The good is given to them from the outside, from measure and from order.

The Good as the End of All Appetite or Desire
(bonum est quod omnia appetunt)

Aristotle provided us the third presentation in the history of philosophy of how the good is understood. Aristotle connected motion with be-

---

[12] Cf. G. Reale, *Historia filozofii starożytnej* (*A History of Ancient Philosophy*), II, Polish trans. I. E. Zieliński (Lublin 2001), 186 ff.
[13] Id., 186.
[14] Id., 187.
[15] Platon, *Timaeus*, 30a–b.

ing—unlike his predecessors, who either put motion before being (Heraclitus), or thought it was apart from being (Parmenides, Plato)—and Aristotle searched for a key to resolve the riddle of the dynamism of the world of people, animals, plants, and things, and the universal phenomenon of motion. The key is the good, understood as the reason for all appetite or desire. Aristotle's answer was that the good is always present in action.[16] Wherever there is action, there must also be a good, and conversely, wherever there is a good there is a reason for action. Thus there is no action apart from the good. Everything that acts, acts for some sort of good. The good of the agent is realized in action, and the good is the reason for all action.

What is the good that manifests itself in action? The good is the end and purpose of all action. The discovery of the end as a previously unknown cause is one of the most important discoveries that Aristotle made. That discovery allowed him to explain in ultimate terms why the world is at all, and why the world is a cosmos rather than a chaos.

What is that end? Aristotle at the same time remarks that "the final cause is not only the good for something but is also the good which is the end of some action."[17] So it is also a good for something (a means), and the good is an end in view of which all action is undertaken.

The end-good of the action of individual beings is the specific form composed in them; the individual beings are supposed to achieve the specific form as their good and perfection. However, the individual exists for the sake of the species, and therefore the good of the individual is the good of the species, and not the good of the individual alone. Thus the good is an immanent property of individually existing things, but it is a transcendent property. Individual things are not good by a goodness contained in them, but by a goodness that is inherent in the species. The good is not a consequence of existence, but at most it is the reason (or end) of the action and appetite of beings. *Bonum sequitur action*—the good is a consequence of action, since *bonum est quod omnia appetunt*—the good is what is desired by all things.

The second important element in the Aristotelian doctrine of the good is the discovery of the good as the "end of all becoming and motion."[18] The good is not really interchangeable with the being of things, but

---

[16] Aristotle, *Met.*, 1078a32.
[17] Id., 1072b3–4.
[18] Id., 983a33.

it is interchangeable with the scope (or end) of their appetite. The good as the end is not before or above being, but it is written into the dynamism of being (and the world), and in some way it is the foundation for that dynamism. The entire cosmos strives for the good, and all beings strive for the good, "Every art and every investigation, and likewise every practical pursuit or undertaking, seems to aim at some good."[19]

However, to unite different actions into a whole and to give them unity, there must be one end for the entire world, and end is the Supreme Good. For this reason, the first science is that "which knows for what end each action is to be done; i.e. the Good in each particular case, and in general the highest Good in the whole of nature."[20]

The Good as the Consequence of the Existing of Things
(*bonum sequitur esse*)

In the quest for the good, Thomas leads us out into the "fields of things that are," to use a Platonic metaphor.[21] He shows the things that are as "*inter duos voluntates constitutae*"—set between two wills. One is the will of the Creator, and the other is the will of man. The will of the Creator is the will, the freedom of which is manifested in calling beings to existence and in creating the good.[22] The being that is called to existence by an act of intellect and will is the bearer of the truth and the good. The truth is nothing other then the realized thought of the Creator, and the good is the Creator's realized will. The fact of the being or existence of a thing primarily manifests "the realized will of the Creator," and also manifests by the Creator's will the end written in things by the will of the Creator (or of the human maker in case of beings that are products). Thomas explains:

> [E]ach thing will be called good by reason of an inherent form because of the likeness of the highest good implanted in it, and also

---

[19] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1095a12–15.

[20] Aristotle, *Met*., 982b5–8.

[21] Thomas writes: "An essence is denominated good in the same way as it is denominated a being. It is good by participation. Existence and good taken in general are simpler than essence because more general, since these are said not only of essence but also of what subsists by reason of the essence and even, too, of accidents." *De veritate*, 21, 5, 6, translation from St. Thomas Aquinas, *The Disputed Questions on the Truth*, vol. III, 27, trans. Robert W. Schmidt SJ (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954).

[22] Thomas explains: "A creature is from God not only in its essence but also in its act of existing, which constitutes the chief characteristic of substantial goodness; and also in its additional perfections, which constitute its absolute goodness. These are not the essence of the thing." *De veritate*, 21, 5, ad 5, translation from *The Disputed Questions on Truth*.

because of the first good taken as the exemplar and effective cause
of all created goodness . . . We say, therefore, following the com-
mon opinion, that all things are good by a created goodness formally
as by an inherent form, but by the uncreated goodness as by an ex-
emplary form.[23]

The good is therefore the consequence of the existence of a thing—
sequitur esse rei. Let us take note of this as a typical element of Thomas'
doctrine on the good and its nature. The very fact of the existence of each
thing is the GOOD.

The will of the Creator (and of the human maker in beings that are
products) is the will that establishes and determines the good, just as it
establishes and determines being. Therefore an existing being is a good in
two senses: first, by the very fact that it exists, and second by the fact that
it is the bearer of the will of the Creator (or a human maker), whose "de-
sire" was written in beings under the form of the end. Thus the measure of
the good was established in existing beings under the form of the end, and
the measure of the good assigns the end's status of being and power.

The human will is the will that when directed by the good of things
becomes "free in a good way" (*recta voluntas*), that is, free in the selection
of the good and of action toward the good. However, the difference be-
tween the will of the Creator and the will of man is fundamental. The Crea-
tor acts by virtue of his free will, which as it acts creates the good. The will
of man acts by virtue of the good of existing beings. The good of being
establishes or constitutes the will of man, and by the good of beings, man
actualizes his will. *Recta voluntas*, or right will, is will that is directed by
the good of existing beings. Let us also ask, in what does the nature of the
good manifest itself?

The Perfective Power of Being-Good

Thomas remarks that a being can be perfective in two ways.

[First,] it can be so just according to its specific character. In this
way the intellect is perfected by a being, for it perceives the formal
character of the being. But the being is still not in it according to its
nature existence. It is this mode of perfecting which the true adds to
being. For the true is in the mind, as the Philosopher says; and ever
being is called true inasmuch as it is conformed or conformable to

---

[23] *De veritate*, 21, 4, resp.; *The Disputed Questions...*, 20.

intellect. For this reason, all who correctly define *true* put intellect into its definition . . . [Second,] a being is perfective of another not only according to its specific character but also according to the existence which it has in reality. In this fashion the good is perfective; for the good is in things . . . Inasmuch as one being by reason of its act of existing is such as to perfect and complete another, it stands to that other as an end . . . First of all and principally, therefore, a being capable of perfecting another after the manner of an end is called good; but secondarily something is called good which leads to an end (as the useful is said to be good), or which naturally follows upon an end (as not only that which has health is called healthy, but also anything which causes, preserves, or signifies health).[24]

Let us take note here of two important observations. First, the good is a perfection composed in things. Second, beings-goods exist in order to perfect others.

This aspect in the understanding of the good is the most original aspect for Thomas' lectures on the good. The conception that was in first position for Aristotle, namely the conception of the good as that "*quod omnia appetunt*," is in a secondary position in Thomas' presentation. That which perfects all things—"*bonum est quod omnia perficiunt*"—is in first place.

Why Does the Good "*sequitur esse rei*?"

From the response, we learn that "since the essence of good consists in this, that something perfects another as an end, whatever is found to have the character of end also has that of good."[25] Now, the nature of an end includes two elements. First, that the end is always "sought or desired by things which have not yet attained the end," and second, "it must be loved by the things which share the end, and be, as it were, enjoyable to them." Taking this into consideration, Thomas explains:

> Existence itself, therefore, has the essential note of goodness. Just as it is impossible, then, for anything to be being which does not have existence, so too it is necessary that every being be good by the very fact of its having existence, even though in many beings many other aspects of goodness are added over and above the act of existing by

---

[24] *De ver.*, 21, 1, resp; *The Disputed Questions…*, 7.
[25] *De ver.*, 21, 2, resp.; *The Disputed Questions…*, 10.

which they subsist . . . It is impossible for anything to be good which is not a being. Thus . . . good and being are interchangeable.[26]

Cognitive Consequences

First, the discovery of the universality of the good as a consequence of the existence of things reveals before us the world as the natural environment of various goods marked by an end (or meaning). Secondly, the discovery of individual finality or purposefulness in individual beings is the foundation for the discovery of an understanding of the love-based action of all beings, and of the whole world. Thirdly, the good of existing things indicates the love-based aspect of the fulfillment of being. In this way, we place the accent on the power of the perfective action of being, in which acts of love are inscribed in the nature of each being. This has especially essential significance for the fulfillment (of the existence) of the personal being.

For this reason, as Aristotle writes in the *Exhortation to Philosophy*, or *Protrepticus*,

someone who does not use a plumb line, or another tool of that type, but takes the measure from other builders, is not a good builder. So it is with a legislator or one who manages the affairs of a state who looks at and imitates the way things are managed by others . . . for the imitation of what is not good cannot be good, and likewise the imitation of what is not divine and constant in its nature cannot be immortal and constant . . . Therefore only he who lives with his sight directed to nature and what is divine, like a good helmsman, fixes his life strongly in what is eternal and unchanging, castes anchor there, and lives according to his own will.[27]

BONUM SEQUITUR ESSE

SUMMARY

The article discusses the connection of the good with being along three steps. First, it briefly considers the history of the word "good" to see what is hidden behind it and to what one

---

[26] Id., 11.

[27] Arystoteles (Aristotle), *Zachęta do filozofii* (*Exhortation to philosophy*), Polish trans. K. Leśniak (Warsaw1988), frg. 49–50.

should direct his or her thoughts and searches. Second, it looks at the beginning of inquiries on the nature and sources of the good. Three, it analyzes the originality of one of the most interesting solutions in this controversy surrounding the good, which appeared in the thirteenth century and which was contained in the short sentence, "*bonum sequitur esse rei*"—the good is a consequence of the existence of a thing.

Zbigniew Pańpuch
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Poland

THE FOUNDATIONS OF CLASSICAL THOUGHT ON THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE STATE

The Civil Foundations of Sovereignty (Plato)

Classical political reflection had its birth in ancient times and found expression in the political writings of Plato and Aristotle. The problem that we call today the sovereignty of the state occurs in two contexts: first, the military practice, which was universal in ancient times, that prisoners of war would be captured and made into slaves, which was gradually formalized to become a sort of "institution of slavery," and second, self-sufficiency (autarky) and independence (economic and political) from others.

Plato was renowned in the history of culture for, among other things, presenting an outline of his conception of the "ideal state" or an ideal system of state government, since the problem of the imperfection of politics was expressed especially starkly by the condemnation "of the best of men" (who were then living)—the condemnation of Socrates to the death sentence in the democratic "parliament" of that time as the result of false accusations and testimonies, and slanders by citizens who disliked Socrates. After making lengthy analyses and presenting his own plan for a political system (in the dialogue *Republic*), he stated finally that it would be enough to find one or a few points, the fewer the better, concerning the constitutions of the time whereby the political systems did badly, and such that if some of them were changed, a particular state could be managed

---

This article was originally published in Polish: Zbigniew Pańpuch, "Podstawy klasycznego myślenia o suwerenności państwowej," *Cywilizacja* 40 (2012): 39–54.

according to the plan. One such change, though not small or easy, was that philosophers would be made kings, or that kings would be made capable of philosophy.

Plato clearly presented this proposal or wish that politics and philosophy would be united as a necessary condition for stopping evil in politics.[1] According to Plato, this is difficult to understand, but there is no other way to achieve happiness both for the individual and for the community. Without this, it would not be possible for the human race or for a political system to be reborn to see, insofar as this is possible, the "light of the sun." This enigmatic metaphor is explained in the myth of the cave where a man is freed from the bond imposed on him by life on the body, by his submission to his passions, to habits of upbringing, and to social relations. Plato completed this dramatic proposal by describing in detail who was a true philosopher.

It turns out that he who loves the truth in its entirety,[2] under the form of all the sciences, and who is insatiable in the love of truth, is not satisfied merely with fragments of the truth. This is because he who loves something, loves the whole, and does not merely love something from the object.[3] The true knowledge and vision of "the most true" allows philosophers like painters to transmit to the state what is right, beautiful and good, and if they need to do so, to preserve in the state what still endures. The philosopher wants to comprehend the whole and everything that is divine and human. He sees the entire scope of time, all being, and sees the right proportions of life and death; death is not so terrible from such a perspective.[4] He loves the truth and aspires with all his strength for what truly

---

[1] Cf. Plato, *Republic*, 473c11, f.

[2] Cf. id., 475e7.

[3] Cf. id., 474c9. Lovers of the truth differ fundamentally from practitioners, technicians, and those who love to hear beautiful tones, or love to view beautiful colors or shapes, or all the products made from them. This is because they can approach beauty as such and behold it (see id., 476b10). To see beautiful things and to take them as beauty itself is, as it were, life in a dream and it is like possessing a mere illusion that one is seeing true beauty. He who sees in addition beauty itself lives in a wakeful state and possesses knowledge. The knower must know something, and what he knows must be something that exists. That which exists perfectly is perfectly knowable, and what does not exist in any way cannot be known. Something that exists between being and non-being is knowable in the way of opinion. Thus philosophers love true being. They love things that truly exist, that are always the same and immutable, and then they are lovers of wisdom and not of opinion (see id., 480a11).

[4] The dialogue *Phaedo* shows a true philosopher's attempt to overcome the fear of death; for Plato, Socrates was certainly such a philosophy. Cf. commentary by R. Legutko in: Platon, *Fedon* (*Phaedo*), Polish trans. R. Legutko (Kraków 1995), 28.

exists. He does not stop in his aspiration until he touches the essence of each existing thing. As he approaches and joins himself with what truly exists, he gives birth to reason and truth, he lives truly, and nourishes himself with this.[5]

However, Plato lamented that the best possible occupation would only with difficulty find respect among those who were occupied in something completely opposite.[6] Here also is probably hidden the greatest problem with the possibility of achieving his proposals: it is almost impossible not only to recognize that philosophers must rule (which could still happen), but also close to impossible that they actually would be recognized as rulers and entrusted with political authority.[7]

If this proposal somewhere were to succeed, then in a good political system not only would it become possible for a philosopher to flourish most greatly, which would be the achievement of his own fulfillment in the good through virtue, but a serious portion of the common good would be

---

[5] Cf. Plato, *Republic*, 490b3. Plato added an attitude of living to this theoretical aspect. In this way he created the ideal of the philosopher and sage, not a theoretical philosopher or scientist; for him, injustice, cowardice, and savagery have no access: he is noble. He learns easily, remembers everything, and in his conduct he holds to the proper measure. He possesses perfect virtue, and (as we may suppose) he is able to achieve it in his life, and is able to act in accordance with it in the *polis*. No one can raise any objections against such virtues or against such a nature (see id., 487a, f). The objections that people have against philosophers and philosophy come from the fact that the wrong people engage in philosophy, distorting the meaning of philosophy and propagating a false image of philosophy. The true philosopher is like a helmsman who looks at the stars and, while he says much, his skill as a helmsman saves the people and the ship. Plato compared what was happening in politics at the time to the situation of a ship in which the passengers do not want to submit to the helmsman's skill and argue with him; when the helmsman's commands are not to their liking, they lock him up or kill him, because they do not believe that the knowledge and skill of a helmsman can be learned, and they treat the captain as their own equal. But neither the helmsman can ask the sailors to obey or listen to him, nor can a physician ask his patients to heed him. It is the subject who should ask the ruler to govern them, insofar as he is worthy, adds Plato.

[6] Cf. id., 489c.

[7] Another difficulty is the fact that truly philosophical natures are subject to manifold threats from the environment and the political system. The analysis of these social influences ends with the rather pessimistic conclusion that only a very small number of people, who worthily concern themselves with philosophy (see id., 496a11) and who would be able to abide with philosophy, would remain. In an improper political system, in an atmosphere of general demoralization and savagery, they are unable to do much for themselves or for the *polis*, and the life of a lover of wisdom is more to be compared with a constant hiding, or rather, constant avoidance of evil, the avoidance of human injury and affronts to the gods, rather than doing the good in fullness.

rescued for all citizens.[8] When a true philosopher would find himself in the best political system, just as he is the best, it would turn out that he would be divine, and all else would be merely human.[9] The state, the political system, and man can become perfect only when true philosophers are concerned with political matters, and when the state becomes obedient to them, or when love for true philosophy inspires the sons of the rulers of the day, or inspires the rulers themselves.[10] The lover of wisdom, the true philosopher, as he has familiar communication with what is divine and orderly, becomes for his own part as divine and orderly as is possible for human nature. This is because it is impossible not to imitate something at which one lingers with enthusiasm. Then he implants the thing to which he has dedicated himself on to individual or public customs; he implants the the thing to which he has dedicated himself in contemplation on to individual or public customs; he does not only shape himself, but he becomes a craftsman who produces temperance, justice, and all kinds of public morality.[11] He is the one who leads the prisoners out of the cave of ignorance and desires into the light of the truth and of being, and he shows life to the measure of that light.

Plato thought that it would be best for each person if he were ruled by the rational and divine element, and it would be best for everyone to have such an element in him. If that element were absent, he should command it, as it were, "from the outside," from someone who possesses it, so that everyone could be similar, joined in friendship, and governed by the same thing.[12] This is because only under the mastery of reason can beliefs be reconciled somehow with each other, can there be mutual understanding, and only the reason makes true friendship possible. This is because if desires are dominant, which are different for different people and are directed in each person to something different, this can only lead to discord and a split in the state, both internally and at the international level.

Thus for someone who had a weak rational element in himself, even slavery would be permissible and fitting in comparison with someone in whom the rational divine element rules, so that for the weak person it would be as if he tasted the direction of reason. When such a person really found himself under the rule of a truly rational man, such a dependence

---

[8] Cf. id., 497a4.
[9] Cf. id., 497b7.
[10] Cf. id., 499b2.
[11] Cf. id., 500d4.
[12] Cf. id.

certainly would not be harmful to him.[13] Aristotle took this notion up and developed in the first book of the *Politics* in the conception of slavery by nature.[14]

Thus the true philosopher along with the entire state, insofar as it is rightly ruled (that is, it is under the rule of reason), performs the role of completing the rational element in each mean, and in this the true philosopher helps people to live rationally and to master their passions. Only in such a political system does it make sense to take up matters of politics, but in others it does not make sense because their purpose is not to educate people or lead them to the fullness of personal development. This conception of politics and the achievement of the tasks set forth are not impossible, although difficult. This would require belief on the part of those people who according to Plato are not all evil by nature, but only discouraged from philosophy by irresponsible people who cultivate philosophy in a dishonest way. However, if they knew a true philosopher, they would be convinced and would not hinder him in exercising government.[15]

The fundamental matter for Plato, then, so to speak, is the personal sovereignty[16] of each man; that sovereignty is achieved by independence from lower aspirations such as bodily and sensual desires, the desire for property, riches, or honor, and that a man's life should by directed by reason; also, the reason in turn should be referred to the objective good, the truth, and beauty, which it reads in real reality. All slavery begins with the loss of internal freedom and with submission to the appetites of the lower human faculties, above all the appetitive faculties. According to Plato, the spiritual situation of the individual citizens is carried over almost in a direct manner to the political situation of the state of which they are parts. It depends on this situation whether they will bring themselves to introduce a prudent political system, which on the one hand makes development possible for them, and on the other, provides them with that development

---

[13] Cf. id., 590c9.

[14] Cf. Z. Pańpuch, "Problem niewolnictwa u Arystotelesa" ("The problem of slavery in Aristotle"), in *Wierność rzeczywistości. Księga pamiątkowa z okazji jubileuszu pracy naukowej na KUL O. prof. Mieczysława A. Krąpca* (*Fidelity to reality. Memorial book on the occasion of the jubilee of Fr. Prof. Mieczysław A. Krąpiec's academic work at the Catholic University of Lublin*) (Lublin 2001), 509–526.

[15] Cf. Plato, *Republic*, 499e, ff. It is difficult to say why Plato wrote theses words, because after all the truest philosopher had appeared, namely Socrates. Was the point only that people did not recognize him? Or perhaps the majority were evil by nature, since Socrates was sentenced democratically?

[16] Cf. M. A. Krąpiec, *Suwerenność... czyja?* (*Sovereignty... whose?*) (Łódź 1990).

or guarantees it, brings prosperity to the country, and under favorable conditions even brings political power.

Autarky (Self-Sufficiency) as the Foundation of
Sovereignty According to Aristotle

At the beginning of the *Nichomachean Ethics*,[17] Aristotle made a synthesis of two Platonic elements: the idea of politics as a directive or managerial science from the *Statesman*, and the proposal from the concluding sections of the *Laws* that the guardians of the law should be directed by and look to one thing when establishing laws,[18] namely, the goodness of the citizens achieved by a virtuous life, which ultimately bears fruit in fulfillment, which is happiness. Aristotle in his inquiries completed the thought of his predecessor and considered all human cognitive, practical, and productive activity from the point of view of the good, which always appears as the purpose of every desire or aspiration. Since activities and their products are subordinated to each other, and the leading managerial science in the state is politics, the object of politics is the ultimate good, and the purpose of politics, as superior to the purposes of the other sciences, is man's highest and ultimate good.[19]

However, in comparison with Plato, who regarded the good of state as a certain unity, or even an organism, as the first and highest good,[20] Aristotle identified the purpose of politics with the purpose or end of the individual man. That end is happiness, and Aristotle thought that everyone was in agreement at least as far as what the word meant.[21] The philosopher defined happiness with the general statement that happiness is to live well and to act well. He presented more precisely in the later parts of his *Nicomachean Ethics* his responses to the question of what it means to live and act well, and what happiness is. At the beginning he only remarked that happiness is the highest good for the individual and the state, but that state seems greater and more perfect, both if it is a question of achieving happi-

---

[17] Ethics, along with economics and politics, was for the philosopher part of "practical philosophy," which was devoted to man's action (rational action).

[18] In addition, he even indicates the use of the very same metaphor of archers shooting in one direction.

[19] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1094a28.

[20] At least this should be the end and purpose of the statesman and or the rulers, that they should have in view the entire political community, and not merely one particular social group.

[21] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1095a15.

ness and of preserving it. For the individual, happiness is only worthy of love, but it will be more beautiful and more divine for the nation (a group of human beings, society), and for the state.[22] In the *Politics* he added that all are agreed that happiness for the individual and for the entire political community are the same thing.[23] Thus when we are thinking of the community, we must at the same time look at individuals and their good, and with a view to them we should shape the state.

Aristotle pondered what the best political community would be for all those who would like to live most according to their wish (or desire),[24] and he considered a state that would most greatly make possible a life for people who wanted to live according to what pleased them. The danger arises that by this statement Aristotle would be close to contemporary conceptions of a liberal state where the freedom of individuals becomes an end in itself. However it is clear that in the above mentioned likings or wishes of people, only those are permissible that according to the philosopher have the feature of rightness. In other words, the state should make it possible to live according to the measure of all the right demands or requirements of individuals who want to achieve happiness in a virtuous life. This

---

[22] Cf. id., 1094b7. G. Reale thinks that this statement clearly shows the subordination of ethics to politics, which is evoked by Plato's views and by the typical character of the Hellenistic conception, that "was unable to look at man except as a citizen of the state, and put the state completely above the family and above the particular individual" (G. Reale, *Historia filozofii starożytnej* (History of ancient philosophy), Polish trans. E. I. Zieliński, vol. 2 (Lublin 1996), 475. M. Kurdziałek presented another opinion in his article "Platońska koncepcja cnót obywatelskich i jej dzieje" ("The Platonic conception of civil virtues and its history"), in *Filozofia. Materiały z XXXIII Tygodnia Filozoficznego* (*Philosophy. Materials from the 33rd Philosophical Week*) (Lublin 1993), 31. Kurdziałek writes that "Plato certainly thought that Democritus was right . . . that the task of philosophers it to make politics ethic, that is, to make it moral." In Plato's case we cannot speak of subordination, but at most of the parallelism and mutual dependence of the state and the human soul, and so of politics and ethics, and if so, then the converse: we can speak of a certain priority of ethics, in accordance with Socrates' postulate that one should be concerned above all with the soul. With regard to the passage from the *Nicomachean Ethics*, the good of the *polis* is greater insofar, as Aristotle added, as it is a question of the achievement and preservation of that good, because we are no longer striving for the good of particular individuals, but for every good that forms the *polis*, evidence of which is the word *ethnos* added by the philosopher. According to the Liddel-Scott Dictionary, it means: 1) a number of people accustomed to live together, a company, body of men; *ethnos laon*—a host of men; also of animals, swarms, flocks; 2) after Hom., a nation, people; in Ntest. *Ta ethne*—the nations, Gentiles, i. e., all but Jews and Christians; 3) a special class of men, a caste, tribe.
[23] Cf. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1324a6.
[24] Cf. id., 1260b27.

qualification is necessary, since if the citizens were to have the sort of possibility that Aristotle granted them, i.e., to form (or choose) for themselves a political community according to the measure of their wishes, then what would become of the state if their desires were not good[25] and they did not want to live virtuously?

After explaining these key questions concerning the relation of the individual to the state, Aristotle described the nature of the state, which he understood as a certain community. Every community arises because of some sort of good that is the fundamental reason why it came into existence. In this way, the rise of the community is only a particular case of the general principle of the finality or purposefulness of action. This is because each one seems to act always because of some sort of good. Thus all communities aspire to achieve some sort of good, and most of all, the most important community that encompasses all communities does so and strives for the greatest good. That community is the state, called the political community.[26] The purpose of that community, in keeping with the earlier conclusions from the *Nichomachean Ethics*, is superior to all sciences and arts.[27]

The community of gender is the first community in the hierarchy and it is natural already at the biological level, as in other animals and plants, because its necessity results from the natural desire to leave offspring after itself. The philosopher emphasizes that this does not happen by choice. The second community with a necessary character is the connection between one who rules by nature and one who is subject to authority, because the natural ruler by thinking can foresee and give commands, the the subject performs those commands by physical strength, and from there comes their common benefit, and even the survival of the subject, as the philosopher wrote.

---

[25] Aristotle's use of the expression "*kat' euchen*" in the above passage from the *Politics* indicates more the principle of assumption of good intentions or wishes because the first and fundamental meaning of the word "*euche*" is "prayer, the swearing of an oath," and so "wish" is put, as it were, in a religious context, whereby by assumption, as it were, it excludes dishonesty and evil.

[26] Cf. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1252a1.

[27] The philosopher engaged in polemics with Plato, who regarded the statesman, the king, and the economist, or slave-owner as the same, and saw between them differences in the number of subjects over whom they had authority. Aristotle here would certainly have liked to remark that it is a question of the rank and character of the good at which they should aim in their actions. Those goods and the communities that arise because of them are hierarchically ordered: the lower ones become part of the higher ones, ultimately forming the *polis*.

Both these communities form a household, that is, a community existing by nature of daily life.[28] The next community, namely the village (a small settlement), that is, the first community that goes beyond the satisfaction of daily needs and arises because of benefit, its also natural in character.[29] Finally, many small settlements or communities form the perfect community, the state. The perfection of the state consists in the fact that it has achieved its term, a state of autarky, which according to the definition from the *Nicomachean Ethics* consists in the fact that in such a state of society, the life of human beings becomes worthy of choice (and does not come into existence by coercion or biological necessity) and in it nothing is lacking; then one can speak of happiness.[30] The political community arises because of life, and it exists so that life may be good.[31] In this way, the political community becomes the end and purpose of all other communities, and as such it is natural, because nature is the state achieved by any being at the term of its development.[32] The philosopher came to the conclusion that in connection with this man is by nature a political being destined to social life,[33] and this is true of man more than of any other animals that live in groups. Someone who lives outside of society is not suited for anything (i.e., he lacks certain elementary skills needed for social life), or he is a superhuman being who does not require anything else for the fullness of his own being.

The fact that man possesses speech is evidence of his social nature. Speech serves not only to express sorrow or joy, as in other animals, but also to describe what is beneficial and harmful, or just and unjust. It is typical of man that only man knows good and evil, just and unjust things, and other things of this sort. A community of such beings forms a homestead and a state.[34]

It is the condition for a good life and is the purpose or final stage in the organization of human beings into a society; without a society a good life would be impossible for them, and a good life does not become a reality without virtue. The properly shaped political society is thus a necessary condition for the fulfillment of man's life: his happiness—*eudaimonia*.

---

[28] Cf. Aristotle, *Polityka*, 1252b13.
[29] Cf. id., 1252b16.
[30] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1097b14.
[31] Cf. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1252b29.
[32] Cf. id., 1252b33.
[33] Cf. id., 1253a5.
[34] Cf. id., 1253a15.

This is because no one can be good for himself without regular economic management (home management) or political life.[35]

This conception of the Greek *polis* differs rather radically from modern conceptions of the state. If we wanted to describe the *polis* in contemporary terms, the most closely corresponding description perhaps would be the state (or perhaps a society) with its entire cultural life, customs, tradition, religion, speech, and history. The state as it is known today has become synonymous with an institution, organization, or bureaucratic structure, which while it has grown in the soil of the nation, yet very often stands in opposition to the good and the development of the nation. The state has ceased to be identified with the nation, and many people even regard the state as their enemy. This breakdown, a sort of alienation of the function of the state from the life and good of the individuals that form the nation, has become the reason for the rise of liberal movements[36] that in

---

[35] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1142a9. E. Fink remarked on this essential aspect of virtue connected with magnanimity ("the man who is the opposite of both of these, who being worthy of great things claims them as his desert, and is of such a character as to deem himself worthy"—Aristotle, *Eudemian Ethics*, 1233a3, f., accessible at http://www.perseus. tufts.edu; cf. also Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, 97b17), and said that only the *polis* is the proper field for the life of a free man. The polis is a challenge and a task. This is because, on the one hand, individual and familial life are not sufficient for the true autarky of the human being. Man cannot deal with his limitations and fragility in individual life alone, which is obvious, but the community of family life also turns out to be insufficient for this. Only a higher and more perfect organism that is in some way a whole can be in the proper sense the ultimate completion of the individual's limited and fragile existence. On the other hand, this organism also constitutes a challenge for rationality and human virtue. To refuse, on the one hand, the help of the *polis* in the rational fulfillment of life, and on the other hand, to fail to meet the tasks and requirements it places on the individual, would first of all be stupidity, and second, it would be pusillanimity (insofar as one is worthy of such challenges), and it would be denial of the spirit of nobility, the very essence of aristocracy. The best man must set for himself great requirements, and the domain of life in the *polis* is truly great and essential; in the *polis* one often puts one's life in the hands of fate, and the fate of all citizens together is determined. It is the task suited for a full and complete man, that is, a man of the best sort, to meet the demands of a prudent life in the case of ordinary citizens, and to shape that life in accordance with the demands of reason in the case of those who wield power. When there are extremely difficult conditions, such as poverty, disasters, or war, one speaks of heroism, immortal reverence, and glory. Cf. E. Fink, *Metaphysik der Erziehung im Weltverständnis von Plato und Aristoteles* (Frankfurt am Main 1960), 245, f.

[36] Cf., e.g.: "The state is a necessary evil, and the cultivation of it should not be multiplied over the necessary measure"—K. Popper, *W poszukiwaniu lepszego świata* (*In search of a better world*), Polish trans. A. Malinowski (Warsaw 1997), 180; also A. J. Nock, *Państwo – nasz wróg* (*The state—our enemy*), Polish trans. L. S. Kolek (Lublin 1995). This work analyzes political authority from the society (or nation) to the state, and the results of this

their radical forms call for a minimal role for the state, and say that the state is superfluous or even harmful. Such a "schizophrenia" or alienation of the nation (or, in abstract terms, of society), would have been the worst state of affairs for Plato and Aristotle; it would suggest a degenerate and tyrannical state, something that they opposed to and tried to remedy with all their strength.

In connection with the determination of the state by certain conditions related to its operation, the state has gained, as it were, a certain normative status: not every community that claims this name can be or is really a state. Just as according to the Platonic conception only one proper state could exist, and all others were a better or worse imitation of it, so also Aristotle clearly wrote that it remains clear that concern for the virtuous life should exist in a true state, and not only in what is a state by name.[37] Likewise it is not enough to make a military treaty between citizens (that would then be a military league), nor is common concern for material prosperity or the honoring of mutual agreements enough (in that case it would be a business company or firm). If we are to be able to speak of a *polis*, then a community of the good is needed, a community that encompasses households and clans, a community that exists in order to shape and achieve an autarkic (perfect) life,[38] so that in this way, including also villages (small communities), to lead them to a happy and morally perfect life.[39] In that community, the aim is not only common life, as Plato defined the original or primitive *polis*, but also, and perhaps above all, the aim is beautiful acts,[40] that is, the achievement of virtue. It follows clearly from this that if the political community does not perform this basic function, and does not make this possible for the citizens, it can be most rightly dissolved, or it can disintegrate completely of its own accord without any official declaration, which provides the same result. Hence the good life, the beautiful acts, and the happiness of the citizens testify that a political society has actually come into existence.

---

process. W. Galston (in his *Cele liberalizmu* (*The ends of liberalism*), Polish trans. A. Pawelec (Kraków 1999), 23) remarks that a certain radical form of political liberalism is based on the belief that the state must be neutral not only to religious beliefs but also to all individual conceptions of the good life, in order to guarantee the maximum of freedom of choice to the citizens.

[37] Cf. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1280b6.
[38] Cf. id., 1280b32.
[39] Cf. id., 1281a2.
[40] Cf. id., 1281a5.

The second conclusion is that the people must want to be realized in the good by a virtuous life, using the community in this, and being in the community. Thus the existence of structures alone, or even of the means suitable for a good life, and so wealth, laws, institutions, or a political system, do not make a community into a true state. Hence we see that it is a certain dynamic and relational reality that joins together people who are realized in the good life and in happiness. Thus if the end is a virtuous life, and through that, the fulfillment of the individual, and the individual for this needs a good ("true") state as a necessary condition, then there is a necessary connection between the goodness of the citizens and the state.

Aristotle emphasized that by nature man possesses a desire for such an autarkic community, and the one who first coordinated such a community is the cause of the greatest good. This is because just as a refined and perfected man is the best of the animals, so a lawless man without any feeling of justice is the worst of all the animals.[41] Justice as a virtue is therefore political, because justice and what is right are the order of the political community, and the political community is based on the allocation and distribution of what is right and fitting.[42] It is very important that the political community (or state), while it is from nature, is not natural in the manner of animals, as in the cause of other animals that live in groups. A drive for an autarkic community, a community that is sufficient for the good life (i.e., the happy life) and makes that life possible, is natural to man as a moral being that distinguishes between good and evil.

Thus the sentence in the philosopher's texts about the person who first organizes such a community as the creator of the greatest good is not accidental. As in the case of an organism or a home, the whole is not composed of parts by itself, but a proper cause must act, some agent or mover, so the political community must first be set in order by someone; human beings only possess the potency to create the political community; that potency is expressed in the drive of which the Stagirite wrote. However, he did not describe who organized the political community. It can only be supposed that the Aristotelian First Mover (the Absolute, God), who performs the function of the final cause and is the reason for all organization and all purposeful movements, is ultimately responsible for all good, order, and generation. It is precisely the common good, the ultimate good, that is the reason for the organization of the community.

---

[41] Cf. id., 1253a30.
[42] Cf. id., 1253a39.

Only a harmonized political community, or as should be written, one that has been called into existence, is primary and original, keeping in view the perfection of the individual and the individual's achievement of happiness. This is because here it is not a question of the existence of human beings, of which the state would be the consequence, because it also possible for man to live in a familial community or perhaps in some sort of settlement of families, and even to live in some sort of community that seems somewhat political but does not fully deserve the name of a state. However, according to Aristotle that would not be a good life to the measure of man, it would not be autarkic, and so it would not become a happy life, for which the state and man exist. However, without the achievement of happiness, human life would be a contest with constant difficulties and oppositions from the world of nature. It would be a constant "struggle for existence" like the life of animals, a life scarcely made palatable by any admixture of pleasure, and lived only for the sake of arduously won benefits, but not able to rise above them.

The aspiration to form such a community seems to be only a particular formation of the general aspiration that every being has for the good that suits it, for the end that is the realization of the being's own nature. Since man is capable of happiness—the fulfillment of his own life, only when he lives in a community that makes this possible, the community then becomes, as it were, the common good of all the members of society; without the common good they will not achieve happiness, that is, the improvements and constant realization of their own nature. If we keep in mind the normative character of the political community (the state), then we can start to understand that Aristotle wrote of the order of that community, which is justice and the dimension of justice. Otherwise there would be not true state.[43]

---

[43] The question of the formal element of the *polis* as a discontinuous whole requires completion. On the side of the human subjects, it is the above mentioned universal feature of social character of nature, but it is of a potential character. On the side of the object, it is the common good, which unites the existing community. It is a certain act in which and through which both individual human potencies and social human potencies are actualized, and at the same time it is a whole. Thus against the opinion of the author we are discussing, the category of potency to act in the relation of the citizen to the *polis* here would find its application. Thus the whole man is not in potency to the *polis*, and he is not in potency to the *polis* in his existence, but only in his completion and development (or actualization), as the philosopher wrote—in his autarky, which is not possible without the *polis*.

Where and how does the political community exist? Obviously it only exists in relations between human beings, and only in the sort of relations that produce a good and fulfilled life. For example, it exists in friendship, love, and the other relations that lead to this and are a means to this, e.g., justice. Thus if people will be properly oriented in their actions to the true good and happiness, and everything in their activity will be subordinated to such a fulfillment of their life, then the political community will encompass the whole of their life with all the material, territorial, geographic, and other conditions that go along with it. The mere fact that people are gathered in one territory, that they possess a common speech, and make agreements, and so that they live together, does not make them a full and perfect political community. This is because all this is only a condition or means. It is a necessary but not a sufficient condition. It follows from this that Aristotle saw his own community optimistically as a *polis*, and so as a true state that was suited to the realization of the citizens' happiness in itself (and perhaps he saw some other states in the same way).

The rational justification for the identity of the happiness of the individual and of the state allowed Aristotle to move to the consideration of the external conditions and foundations necessary to achieve a state that would be organized in accordance with the best wishes. This is because just as the happiness of the individual would be impossible without certain external conditions, so the best political system would not arise without commensurate means.[44] As his master did earlier, the philosopher mentioned the analogy of the politician's (or lawmaker's) action with the activities of a weaver or shipbuilder, considering the quality of the material that determines the beauty of a work of art. The first and fundamental conditions for the state are people, the number and quality of the people, and also the size of its territory, and its properties.

General opinions often identified a happy state with its maximum size, but it is still unclear what the size would be. In this case, the first idea would be to identify the size with a great number of people. Meanwhile Aristotle emphasized that we should consider more their power, since the state like any man has its own task to perform. Therefore the most powerful state would be one that could perform that task to the greatest degree and in the best way.[45] The power of a state, then, should not be estimated by the number of people who live in it, because that does not determine

---

[44] Cf. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1325b36.
[45] Cf. id., 1326a14.

a state's power. Only those who are its proper parts, of which the state's power is composed, as it were, determine the power of a state.[46] In this sense, the measure of a state's power would be the number of people who realize themselves in happiness.

The postulate of the political community's autarky was made concrete in reference to territory as a necessary condition for its existence. A territory that could provide all the means necessary for a good life would be recommended, since autarky in this aspect would be expressed in the possession of everything so that nothing needed would be lacking.[47] Of course, the criterion for the state's greatness is that it makes life possible for free people who can enjoy the rest that is necessary for happiness, although it would be at the same time a temperate life. The postulate of temperance plays an essential role here because the excessive pursuit of luxury and excess, on the one hand, causes neglect of the virtuous life, and on the other hand, it necessarily leads to the excessive increase of territory and the consequences already known from Plato's *Republic*.[48]

The philosopher also made a few remarks on the properties of a citizen's character that citizens should show by nature. As in the case of the previous conditions for a good political system, he indicated some inclinations observed in certain nations: a predominance of spirit and severity that is manifested in a combative spirit, along with a lack of ability for the sciences and arts in the peoples of the north, and on the other hand intellectual and creative abilities in the Asian peoples, but a lack of courage, which was the reason they lived in a state of slavery and dependence. While the people of the north maintained freedom, their excess of spirit made it impossible for them to live together in a state and to rule over others clemently.

Citizens who can be led without difficulties to virtue by lawmakers should by nature have intellectual abilities and be full of temperament.[49] In this way, the Stagirite repeated, as it were, (involuntarily or voluntarily) the idea of his Master: first, concerning the desirable features of perfect guardians from the *Republic*, and second from the *Statesman* concerning the true statesman who joins courageous characters with temperate charac-

---

[46] Cf. id., 1326a17.

[47] Cf. id., 1326b29.

[48] The need to obtain more and more workers to satisfy the needs of others, although they are difficult to civilize, an increase in various desires, the need to acquire new territories, and consequently war with other states that live in a similar way.

[49] Cf. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1327b38.

ters and, for particular positions, chooses people who combine both those features.

Conclusion

If we look from today's point of view, without doubt one of Plato's achievements was that he called attention to the imperfections connected with in a "state of law" and the dangers that resulted from that for the individual and for his individual good. The desperate attempt to create a conception of a statesman-king who goes beyond the limits of a life according to the law could also have had as its background the drama of the death of Socrates, who to the end remained faithful to the laws of his *polis*. The drama became more powerful because of the contradictions seen in it: the efficient and blind execution of law was a threat to the *polis* and its citizen, while it was even worse to leave things to run their course (that is, anarchy—the absence of government authority). That existentially difficult situation would be absolutely exploited by sophistic politicians who made it difficult for people to acquire true virtue, who with the help of imitative poets and rhetoricians pandered to the tastes of the masses and upheld the *status quo* of Plato's cave (that is, a sort of virtual *matrix*, to speak in contemporary terms).

The philosopher's response was to unmask such a state of affairs and to develop a conception of a *polis* based on laws directed to human virtue, which became easier to understand by a detailed exposition. Plato emphasized the proper shaping of the political and emphasized the importance of harmony and the adaptation of man's own efforts, and the external conditions that affect those efforts, since only then will it be possible to acquire virtue and to acquire virtue in the the fullest possible degree. It seems that when people ignore their own activity or disregard external conditions (such as the political system), this makes it impossible to achieve this goal. Virtue acquired without proper education or upbringing because it is compelled by the structures of the state will be illusory, but without a proper political system virtue will become the heroic accomplishment of a small number of individuals, while for the most part people will fall into disorder and chaos under the influence of deteriorating external conditions.

In Plato and Aristotle, the *polis* turns out to be an important co-factor that determines human goodness, or even we may dare to see, the most important co-factor. In Plato, the *polis* is an essential instrument for

educating man in the hands of the philosopher who holds power in a perfectly shaped political community. Only in such a special environment and climate can man be fulfilled in a rational life. A properly shaped political community is a sort of medium between the order of the cosmos and the soul that is supposed to mirror the cosmos in itself. The *polis* must be built first in the souls of the citizens—this was one of Plato's more important discoveries. As a result, both the ruler and each man becomes similar to God and, as it were, a continuator of God's work; that work consists in bringing order, and so also reason, into the chaos of matter. The ruler sets in order relations between human beings in the *polis*, leads contrary characters to harmony, and intertwines them, and each man brings harmony into the functioning of his three centers of activity: the appetitive, irascible, and rational center, and makes them submit to the rational center. In this sense, each man can become the ruler in his own kingdom and so can fulfill his ambitions for authority.

In Aristotle, the political community appears as a necessary element of human existence that makes it possible for the citizens of that community to complete their own fragile and partial existence and to shape their own life to be morally beautiful. Someone without a political community will not achieve his ultimate end, which is happiness; there will be nowhere to develop his highest potentialities or to realize them in a community of free and equal people. However, for the community to perform its functions and remain itself, the community must be shaped as a "well cultivated field." Man's transcendence and rule over social reality appears here: changes in the political system are possible, and it may be shaped for better or worse, since in social life everything depends on the goodness of the people who give social life a suitable shape.

While the existence of the political community is necessary and follows from human nature, which tends to fulfill itself in happiness, where the *polis* appears as a necessary means to this end and joins all people in the aspiration to the same end into an autarkic whole, yet the organization of the political community is an expression of the human search for the mearning and most perfect form of shared existence. This quest can even lead to the disturbance of old structures and to liberation from the bonds they have produced so that they are redefined and rebound.[50] Man's freedom to some degree seeks novelties because it seeks the good, or something better, because ultimately its purpose is something best. To fully

---

[50] Cf. Fink, *Metaphysik der Erziehung...*, 272.

understand man, it is not enough to know his structure as a being. Man still needs to be seen in his fulfillment, in the fullness of development and action, in the performance of his best possible functions, in keeping with the definition that "the definition (or essence) of something that exists in potency is its act (fulfillment)."[51]

However without law, justice, or virtue, man will become the worst of the animals, the most impious, the most savage, and the most wicked by dissipation and voracity.[52] This will be all the worse when man uses for evil his natural intellectual abilities and capacities to act, which are his natural weapons, and there is nothing worse that injustice that is armed.[53] Then he will become completely unpredictable and unintelligible in his action, since we can err and miss the mark in different ways, but we can only be good or hit the target in one way, as Plato and Aristotle metaphorically expressed themselves.

The reflections of the two philosophers on the nature and role of the *polis* was for them only the result of a shift in attention from the individual man to the whole of social relations that surround him. Just as man's life in the biological dimension depends on whether he encounters around himself favorable conditions for nourishment, shelter, and longer life, so man's spiritual life depends on how the political community has been shaped, which is man's natural spiritual environment. A badly formed political community makes it impossible for man to live well or find fulfillment, and in an extreme case, as in the example of Socrates, it can even put him to death. For that reason, Plato and Aristotle examined the nature of the *polis*, tried to understand it, and to plan its functioning so that it would best serve virtue and man's fulfillment. Ultimately, only such a *polis* ultimately can be called sovereign.

---

[51] Cf. Aristotle, *On the soul*, 415b14 (author's translation).
[52] Cf. Aristotle, *Politics*, 1253a32.
[53] Cf. id., 1253a33.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF CLASSICAL THOUGHT ON
THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THE STATE

SUMMARY

The article discusses Plato's and Aristotle's writings on the sovereignty of the state. It claims that the reflections of the two philosophers on the nature and role of the *polis* was for them only the result of a shift in attention from the individual man to the whole of social relations that surround him. Just as man's life in the biological dimension depends on whether he encounters around himself favorable conditions for nourishment, shelter, and longer life, so man's spiritual life depends on how the political community has been shaped, which is man's natural spiritual environment. A badly formed political community makes it impossible for man to live well or find fulfillment, and in an extreme case, as in the example of Socrates, it can even put him to death. For that reason, Plato and Aristotle examined the nature of the *polis*, tried to understand it, and to plan its functioning so that it would best serve virtue and man's fulfillment. Ultimately, only such a *polis* ultimately can be called sovereign.

KEYWORDS: sovereignty, state, Plato, Aristotle, politics, authority, nature, man, virtue.

Peter Simpson
City University of New York
USA

ARISTOTLE ON NATURAL JUSTICE

In *Nicomachean Ethics* book 5 chapter 7 (or *Eudemian Ethics* book 4 chapter 7),[1] Aristotle introduces the topic of natural justice. His brief and elliptical discussion has provoked much controversy.[2] It seems to confuse the issue rather than do anything to clear it up. The natural just, if there is such a thing, must be the same everywhere, for nature is the same everywhere, as Aristotle concedes with his example of fire that burns upwards here and in Persia. Yet he goes on to argue that there is nothing naturally just the same everywhere for everyone, but that the natural, at least for us human beings, always changes.

There are clues in the passage in question that scholars have focused on in order to unravel Aristotle's meaning. But there is one clue that scholars have hitherto almost entirely ignored (an exception is Dirlmeier,[3] who

---

A longer version of this article appeared in *Estudios Publicos*, a journal published in Chile: Peter Simpson, "Aristotle on Natural Justice," *Estudios Públicos* 130 (Autumn, 2013): 1–22.

[1] Further on, the *Nicomachean Ethics* will be cited as *NE*, and the *Eudemian Ethics* as *EE*.

[2] In particular L. Strauss, *Natural Right and History* (Chicago 1953), 157–164, who, after discussion of the views of Aquinas and Averroes, adds his own corrupt interpretation. See also Oscar Godoy Arcaya, *La Democracia en Aristóteles: Los Orígenes del Régimen Republicano* (Santiago de Chile: Ediciones Universidad Católica de Chile, 2012), VIII, 1, sect. 3, F. Dirlmeier, *Aristoteles, Nikomachische Ethik, übersetzt und kommentiert* (Berlin 1959), 420–421, and F. Dirlmeier, *Aristoteles, Magna Moralia, übersetzt und erlaütert* (Berlin 1958), 323–324, R.A. Gauthier and J.Y. Jolif, *L'Ethique à Nicomaque* (Paris 1958/59), 392–396, S. Broadie and C. Rowe, *Aristotle Nicomachean Ethics. Translation, Introduction, and Commentary* (Oxford 2002), 348–349. Broadie says nothing on this passage in her *Ethics with Aristotle* (Oxford 1991). The passage in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (1373b2–8) where mention is made of a law according to nature is of doubtful significance for Aristotle's own views since he there seems merely to be reporting kinds of rhetorically useful arguments and not endorsing any of them on his own account.

[3] F. Dirlmeier, *Aristoteles, Nikomachische Ethik*, 420–421, where he simply repeats, without comment, what *MM* says (further on, the *Magna Moralia* will be cited as *MM*). His discus-

however does little more than refer to the fact). For Aristotle has left us another discussion of the always changing natural just, and this other discussion is in some ways clearer. It certainly contains clues that the *NE/EE* discussion omits. There is a ready explanation for the neglect by scholars of this other discussion. For it is contained in a work, the *Magna Moralia* (or *Great Ethics*), that most scholars dismiss as spurious. Fully to examine the reasons given for *MM's* inauthenticity would here take us too far afield. Suffice it to note, first, that the majority of scholars who have devoted serious study to *MM* (notably Von Arnim and Dirlmeier) do think it genuine, and, second, that *MM* itself contains a passage that is almost a self-confession by the author that he is Aristotle. The passage (1201b24–26) is a reference to the *Analytics* and to something "we said" in that work. If the *Analytics* is the *Posterior Analytics* of Aristotle, then here is Aristotle saying directly in *MM* that he wrote *MM*. The reference can be explained away, for perhaps the *Analytics* is the lost work of the same name by Theophrastus;[4] or perhaps the author is pretending to be Aristotle in order to win an audience. The burden of proof, however, is on those who deny *MM* to Aristotle, since, apart from the internal reference just mentioned, the work is universally attributed to Aristotle by the ancient tradition, and, as Rowe wisely remarks,[5] we should accept the tradition unless we have compelling reasons against it. That there are no such compelling reasons has been extensively argued elsewhere.[6] It will be enough for present purposes if the passage in *MM* gives us clues for making sense of the parallel passage in *NE/EE*, and indeed a sense that, on careful consideration, that passage itself can be seen to point to.

The Relevant Texts

To begin with, then, here are translations of the relevant texts, first from *NE/EE* and second from *MM*.

---

sion directly of the *MM* passage (*Aristoteles, Magna Moralia*, 323–324) is brief and misses what, in this paper, is argued to be its chief significance for understanding the *EE/NE* passage.

[4] Pierre Pellegrin, "Preface," in C. Dalimier, *Aristote. Les Grandes Livres d'Éthique (La Grande Morale)* (Paris: Arléa, 1992), 23.

[5] C.J. Rowe, *The Eudemian and Nicomachean Ethics: A study in the development of Aristotle's thought* (Cambridge 1971), 12.

[6] The matter has been dealt with at length in the Introduction to Peter L.P. Simpson, *The Great Ethics of Aristotle* (Transaction 2014).

NE/EE 5/4, 7, 1134b18–15a3:

Of the political just there is the natural and the legal: natural being what has everywhere the same force and not because it is thought so or not thought so; legal being what makes no difference this way or that at the start but does after people lay it down, as to charge a mina for a ransom . . . Some think everything is of this sort because what is by nature is unchangeable and has everywhere the same force, as that fire burns both here and among Persians, but they see just things changing. This is not how it is, except in a way, though at any rate with the gods perhaps it is not so at all. With us there is something that is by nature. Everything may be changeable but yet one thing is by nature and another not by nature. Which sort is by nature, given that things can also be otherwise, and which sort is not but is by law and contract, if indeed both are changeable, is likewise plain. In fact, the same definition will fit the other cases. For by nature the right hand is stronger, yet there are some who could become dexterous with both. What is by contract and what is of advantage in things just are like measures. For measures of wine and grain are not everywhere equal but greater for buying and less for selling.

MM 1, 33, 1194b30–5a6:

Among just things some are by nature and some by law. But one should not take this in such a way that they are things that never change. For even things that are by nature partake of change; I mean, for example, that if all of us were to practice always throwing with our left hand we would become ambidextrous. Yet by nature, at any rate, it is a left hand, and right-handed things are no less by nature better than the left hand even if we were to do everything with our left hand as with our right. Nor is it because things change that they are therefore not by nature. But if it is for the most part and for the longer time that the left hand stays thus being a left hand and the right hand a right hand, then this is by nature. The same with things that are just by nature: it is not the case that, if they change because of our use, therefore there is no just by nature. On the contrary there is; for what persists for the most part, that is on its face just by nature. For what we set down and accept as law, that is both precisely just and we call it just by law; therefore what is by nature is a better just than what is by law.

Discussion of the Passages

It is standard Aristotelian doctrine that things by nature are things that happen always or for the most part. Things that happen for the most part exist by nature even though sometimes they do not happen or happen differently. Scholars generally suppose[7] that in the passage of *NE/EE* and in that of *MM* Aristotle has this point in mind. For he gives an example of things by nature that can change or happen differently, namely the dexterity of the hands. The left and right hands are naturally different and are naturally fitted to do different things, but it is possible, by repeated practice, to make them do the same things and become ambidextrous. This point is, of course, not refuted by the existence of naturally left-handed people. For the same natural difference between the hands appears in them too, only the other way round, and it is their left hand rather than their right hand that is naturally more dexterous. Skill, we may say, naturally goes with one hand, and this natural differentiation remains the natural differentiation even if practice can bring the other hand up to the skill of the first. The reason, Aristotle adds in *MM*, is that the left and right hands are differentiated as left and right for the most part and for the longer time, or, in other words, that most people have the right hand more dexterous than the other and can only become ambidextrous after much practice. The same applies to justice as to hands, that the changes we make in naturally just things do not mean that there is no just by nature, for here as there what is for the most part is by nature.

The implication seems to be, then, that the just by nature is only what holds for the most part, so that occasions can arise where the just by nature no longer holds, or where, as it seems, what it is just to do here and now is other than what is naturally just. The further implication, then, seems to be that there is nothing that by nature is always and everywhere unjust to do, for occasions can arise where what it is just to do is what ordinarily or naturally it is unjust to do. Hence seduction or assassination, say, which are ordinarily or naturally unjust, might in special cases be just.[8]

In fact, however, Aristotle's remarks do not have this implication. He has earlier in *MM* distinguished his discussion of justice into three topics: the 'what' of justice, the 'in what' of justice, and the 'about what' of justice (1193a39–b1). As is made evident by how his analysis proceeds in

---

[7] See note 2.
[8] The interpretation insinuated by Strauss, op. cit.

the following pages, he means by the 'what' of justice equality (1193b19–30): the unjust man wrongs by taking more of the good and less of the bad and the man whom he wrongs is wronged by having the opposite, so justice is the equal that brings the more and the less into the mean of the equal. The 'what in' of justice is the persons and the things in which there is equality, and this equality, since it involves at least four terms (two persons and two shares), is an equality of proportion: as A is to B so C is to D. The 'what in' of justice, therefore, is persons and things as equalized through this proportion (1193b30–94a18). The 'about what' of justice, by contrast, turns on whether justice, which is a relation to another, is about relations to all others or only to some. For there are relations between masters and slaves and fathers and sons, and there is, by the same token, a just that exists in this relation. Aristotle dismisses justice in these cases as equivocal with the political just (1194b10–28). The political just exists in equality, which he then explains means the equality of the citizens in all being alike in their nature as citizens (even if they differ in other respects, 1194b5–10). He then adds (b28–30) that, since the just exists properly in the political community, justice is "about" the political just. Hence the 'about what' of justice refers to what goes on between citizen equals and not, say, to what goes on between fathers and sons or masters and slaves.

But what is it that goes on between citizens? Or what are the things that citizens have political justice about? Here is where the extended passage quoted from *MM* above begins (and analogously where the parallel passage in *NE/EE* begins), and where Aristotle introduces his distinction between just things by nature and just things by law (1194b30ff.). His remarks are thus less cryptic than they may seem. For since he is not talking now of what justice is (equality), nor of what justice is in (persons and things related by proportion), but of what it is about, the just things that justice is about must be the things that citizens share with each other (and in respect of which they seek the equality of proportion that is the 'what' and 'in what' of justice). But there is clearly plenty of variation here. In some cities these things are shared and not those, and shared with these people and not those (or these people are treated as citizens to share with and not those), while in other cities the things shared and the persons sharing (those counted as citizens) are different, or at any rate include more or fewer people and things. The fact of such variation is obvious, and any study, even today, of comparative politics and comparative anthropology would be rich in discovering examples of it.

Now some of these variations will turn out to be rare and some to be more common, or to exist for the most part. These variations will also reflect the different usages of different peoples and places. But "it is not the case that, if they [things just by nature] change because of our use, therefore there is no just by nature," for "on the contrary there is; for what persists for the most part, that is on its face just by nature" (1195a1–4). Accordingly those customs about who shares what and with whom that exist for the most part in political communities will be the natural ones. When Aristotle continues, therefore, by saying that what we set down and accept as law "is both precisely just and we call it just by law; therefore what is by nature is a better just than what is by law" (1195a4–6), his meaning is that, while all communities lay down their own customs as law and call these customs just, yet the customs that are by nature (those that are for the most part) are better. Why are they better? Because they are in line with what holds for the most part; for thus they will not need any extra effort or time to develop. They will, on the contrary, arise spontaneously, as it were, in the way that people are for the most part right-handed and naturally develop skill in their right hand, becoming ambidextrous, if at all, only by some extra and unusual practice. But it does not follow that other customs, which are not by nature, are thereby not just or even that they are less just (or it does not follow for this reason).[9] All that follows is that they are not the norm and require special effort and exercise in order to be established. The natural ones are therefore better (though not thereby more just), because they are easily and more effectively reached and are equally good or equally serve the purpose (as is also true of not bothering to become ambidextrous).

The passage in *EE/NE* about the natural and the political just can be seen to be saying the same thing. It follows a previous discussion of the 'what' and 'in what' of justice (5/4 chapters 1–6), and it also uses the same example of right and left hand. Further, it adds a remark about contracts and advantage in things just, that there are variations here according to variations in utility. These variations are clearly good because they enable us to go on achieving what is advantageous despite changes in need and circumstance. The end, we may therefore say, is everywhere the same, namely the good of common life, but the ways of getting there, whether by

---

[9] Customs about who shares what with whom could be natural or unnatural, and just or unjust, relative to the regime where they are found. For regimes are natural or unnatural, just or unjust.

sharing these things or also those, whether by using these measures or others, vary considerably (even if some are more common than others). Such variation in achieving the end is a feature of human life, because human life is subject to change.

The distinction, then, in both ethical works between what is by nature and what is by law (because it concerns the 'about what' of justice and not the 'what' or the 'in what') is not the distinction between the just and the unjust. It is the distinction between the usual and the unusual. The distinction between the just and the unjust is what Aristotle explained earlier, namely the distinction between what accords with equality and what does not. But the particular things and persons 'about' which this equality is realized are no longer a question of the just and the unjust but of the usual and the unusual.

Implications of the Discussion of Natural Justice

We should not therefore conclude, as some scholars have done (Strauss in particular), that in the *EE/NE* passage Aristotle is implicitly denying the central claim of doctrines of natural law that there is an unchanging justice with respect to certain kinds of acts, as that murder, deceit, and the like are wrong always and everywhere. He plainly is not. For the absolute wrongness of murder, say, is a matter of the 'what' or 'in what' of justice. It is not a matter of the 'about what.' But only as regards the 'about what' does Aristotle allow for relativity. Moreover, that he only uses the term natural just in his discussion of the 'about what' does not mean that he would reject the idea of a natural or absolute unchanging just in the case of the 'what' and the 'in what.' On the contrary he makes it very plain that he does accept such an absolute just. An obvious example he gives is adultery, which he says in both *NE* (2, 6, 1107a8–28) and *EE* (2, 3, 1221b18–23), and also in *MM* (1, 8, 1186a36–b3), is always and everywhere wrong, or always and everywhere at the vicious extreme and contrary to the virtuous mean. He explains why adultery is at the vicious extreme when he talks expressly of the 'what' and 'in what' of justice. For he talks of adultery in his discussion of commutative justice, or justice in exchange (NE/EE 5/4, 5, 1131a6). The point is relatively straightforward. Adultery is an inequality in spousal exchange. The adulterer is taking what belongs to someone else (sexual relations with another's spouse) and so has taken more than his share (for his share is to have no such relations with another's spouse).

This distinction (a distinction between the just and unjust in particular actions) is the one we normally have in mind when we speak of natural right or natural law. For we mean by the natural in this case the just, and by the merely legal we mean what may in fact be unjust. Aristotle has this distinction but, as the example of adultery shows, he does not thematize it as the natural; he thematizes it as the mean of virtue. Adultery is by its name, he says, an extreme, that is, something always and everywhere wrong. Why is it always and everywhere wrong? Clearly because it includes wrongness in its idea or, as we might say, in its nature. The act itself is *per se* wrong, and such *per se* or intrinsic wrongness is precisely what doctrines of natural law have declared to be wrong by nature always and everywhere. This wrong in the case of adultery is the inequality in what is due as between the parties to the act (for acts of sex are not due as between those who are spouses of someone else).

Aristotle mentions many such kinds of intrinsic wrongs in his discussion of the mean of commutative justice. As he says (*NE/EE* 5/4, 5, 1130b33–31a9):

> One sort of justice is that which sets exchanges right. Of this latter there are two parts. For of exchanges some are voluntary and some involuntary, the voluntary being such things as selling, buying, lending, pledging, using, depositing, hiring (they are called voluntary because the principle of these exchanges is voluntary), and the involuntary being in some cases by stealth, as burglary, adultery, poisoning, seduction, alienating of slaves, assassination, slander, and in other cases by force, as assault, restraint, death, plunder, mutilation, insult in words, insult in deeds.[10]

The latter or involuntary kinds of exchange are clearly wrong in their very name or, as natural law theorists would say, contrary by their very nature to what is right and just. They are by nature contrary to what is just because they are a grasping of what is more over and above what is

---

[10] Other examples outside this list, as say homosexual acts, would be analyzed, not as violations of the virtuous mean of justice, but instead as violations of some other virtuous mean, as the virtuous mean of temperance. Note, however, that the violation of any mean of virtue is a violation of justice when justice means universal justice, for universal justice is the practice of all the virtues in respect of other people, *NE/EE* 5/4, 1. Political crimes, by contrast, as tyranny, would be analyzed under the idea of distributive justice, for distributive justice is about the correct distribution of rule in the city, and this distribution is violated by tyranny and by other deviant regimes.

due, namely over and above the equal of commutative justice. The cases Aristotle mentions in addition to adultery, as burglary, assassination, plunder, mutilation, insult, are all plainly things that, by their name, are at an extreme, the extreme of the 'more' beyond the mean of the 'equal.' That there is a right by nature here is plain from the way Aristotle speaks of this sort of justice and of how to calculate the equal in the several kinds of exchange. What conflicts with commutative justice is always and everywhere unjust (it is a taking of the more beyond the equal). Certainly such is Aristotle's plain teaching in the context.

Now the idea of commutative justice is in general clear (equality of exchange), but what it is in the case of this or that particular exchange need not be. The instances Aristotle lists are reasonably straightforward. But, regardless of whether any case or instance is straightforward or not, the answer will be found in the same way: by thinking through the things being exchanged and the persons between whom they are being exchanged and how equality with respect to them can be preserved or restored. These things and persons are the 'in what' of justice and equality is the 'what' of justice. In the case of burglary, for instance, we must examine the nature of burglary—that it is the taking (by stealth) of another's possessions. Such taking is clearly a taking of what is more than the equal, since the taker has more after the taking and the one from whom he took has less. The nature, then, or the definition of the act tells us how to understand the relevant equality.

We might nevertheless wonder why Aristotle does not thematize this topic of a right by nature under the idea of natural law, or why it was left to the Stoics to be the first so to thematize it. A first answer may be rhetoric. Aristotle had no need to introduce the idea of natural law to make his point, since the idea of the mean of virtue was enough for his purposes. The Stoics, by contrast, seem to have found an express appeal to natural law more effective in propagating their teaching among the educated elites of the day. A second answer may be a desire on Aristotle's part to avoid confusion. Natural law as used by the Stoics, and by others since, refers to the 'what' and 'in what' in Aristotle's analysis of justice. But it is not the case that the just in this sense exists for the most part. On the contrary, what most people do most of the time is not just, for most people most of the time try to get for themselves more than the equal. Since, then, nature is what happens always or for the most part (as that fire always go upwards), to say that there is a natural just in the case of the 'what' and the 'in what' of justice looks like saying that the actions of most people most of the time

are just, which however is either false or implies that the justice of actions is relative and that whatever anyone does is just or, as the common phrase has it, 'just for him.' Indeed people often still argue today against doctrines of natural law on the grounds that there is no such thing because what people do varies enormously from place to place and from time to time. Aristotle prudently refrains, therefore, from speaking of a natural just in respect of the 'what' and the 'in what' of justice so as to avoid this confusion and this argument. He speaks only of a natural just in the case of the 'about what' of justice, where indeed there is no conflict between the just and what happens for the most part because they here mean the same thing.[11]

ARISTOTLE ON NATURAL JUSTICE

SUMMARY

The article discusses the problem of natural justice which has been considered by Aristotle in his (1) Nicomachean and Eudemian Ethics and (2) Magna Moralia. In his Nicomachean and Eudemian Ethics Aristotle says of natural justice that it is changeable and not the same everywhere. The implication seems to be that no action, not even murder, is always wrong. But, as is evident especially from his Magna Moralia, Aristotle distinguishes justice into the "what" (equality), the "in what" (proportion between persons and things), and the "about what" (what things are exchanged with which persons). The article concludes that Aristotle allows for variability only in the "about what," while in the "what" and the "in what" he allows for no variability.

KEYWORDS: justice, natural justice, Aristotle.

---

[11] 'Nature' is said in more than one way. In the case of justice and right it means first what happens always or for the most part, as Aristotle has explained. Second it means the end set up by nature, as that the life of virtue is by nature the human end. That this life is the natural end is true for all men always and everywhere, but not all men pursue it always and everywhere. The end men pursue they pursue by choice, and choice does not operate by nature but by desire and thought (Aristotle defines it as deliberative desire, *NE* 3, 2, 1113a10–15). So choice need not operate the same always and for the most part. One must speak with some care, therefore, when speaking of the good or just by nature. Aristotle chooses to exercise this care in one way, the Stoics in another.

Katarzyna Stępień
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Poland

SYNDERESIS AND THE NATURAL LAW

The term "synderesis" is going out of use more and more in ethical analyses and analyses in the philosophy of law, as is the term "conscience" in the Thomistic intellectualism. In contemporary culture and philosophy, completely different concepts of conscience are in use, where conscience is not connected with the acts of reason and hence is not regulated by the truth of things. It is worthwhile therefore to familiarize ourselves with the discussion on conscience and synderesis and to discover in that discussion echoes of medieval controversies that were dictated by concern for man's personal development in the light of man's final end, and by the desire to give man the cognitive instruments he needed to acquire the constant habitual formation of all his faculties to act in conformity with reason (*habitualis conformitas potentiarum ad rationem*).

What Is Synderesis?

Sometimes moralists translate "synderesis" as "conscience," and sometimes as "pre-conscience." The term *synderesis* was introduced by St. Jerome.[1] It is from the Stoic Greek term συντῆρησὶ (syntéresis) and means "preservation," "safekeeping," "keeping something in mind," and "warning." The term was popular in the ethics of the scholastics to mean man's ability (*habitus*) to know the first moral principles as the foundation for the judgements of conscience. In order to designate the pre-conscience they

---

This article was originally published in Polish: Katarzyna Stępień, "Synestreza a prawo naturalne," in S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Quaestiones disputatae de synderesi, de conscientia – Dysputy problemowe o synderezie, o sumieniu*, Polish trans. Aleksander Białek (Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL, 2010), 129–145.

[1] Cf. H. Majkrzak, "O prasumieniu według św. Tomasza z Akwinu" ("The pre-conscience according to St. Thomas Aquinas"), *Człowiek w Kulturze* 13 (2000): 123.

also used terms such as the following: *intellectus primorum principiorum operabilium*, *naturale iudicatorium*, *scintilla animae*, *scintilla conscientiae*, *scintilulla rationis*, *superior scintilla rationis*, and *ratio naturalis*. Metaphorical terms for synderesis such as "spark" or "sparkle" bring us to certain features ascribed to synderesis as a sudden flash of light by which we immediately see the good. Synderesis thus would be a kind of immediate (intuitive) knowledge.[2] The terminology concerning the criterion of human conduct, as it turns out, is not univocal, just as in the golden age of scholasticism, but St. Thomas explains this doubt. The reason is the most important human faculty (*potentia*). This faculty has two natural habits or abilities (*habitus*): the habit of reading the first principles of knowledge—*intellectus principiorum*, and the habit of reading the first principles of moral action—*synderesis*.[3] As natural habits they belong to every rational being. When we apply the first principles in the order of practical knowledge, we obtain knowledge of "self-knowing" (conscience), which is expressed in the ability to pass a practical judgement of the theoretical reason regarding a concrete deed. Thus synderesis is prior to conscience. As a constant non-acquired habit (*habitus naturalis*) that affects that act (or judgement) of conscience, syndersis is the principle of the act of conscience. Therefore Aquinas says that just what we often call a cause by the name of its effect, so we call synderesis pre-conscience from its effect, which is conscience.

The pre-conscience, which, following St. Basil, Thomas called the "natural courtroom," and, following St. Jerome, called the "spark of conscience" ("[S]ynderesis is the highest thing that can be seen in the judgement of conscience; on the basis of this metaphor we call synderesis the spark of conscience—*scintilla conscientiae*[4]). Following St. John Damascene, Thomas calls it the "law of our reason,"[5] and it inclines us exclu-

---

[2] Cf. P. S. Mazur, *W kręgu pytań o człowieka. Vademecum antropologiczne* (*In the circle of questions about man. An anthropological vademecum*) (Lublin 2008), 150.

[3] Cf. S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Summa theologiae*, cura et studio P. Caramello, vol. 1–3 (Torino 1962–1963), I, 79, 12, resp. "Synderesis non est potentia, sed habitus naturalis" (Id.).

[4] St. Thomas Aquinas, *De veritate*, 17, 2, ad 3: "[I]ta synderesis est illud quod supremum in conscientiae iudicio reperitur; et secundum hanc metaphoram synderesis scintilla conscientiae dicitur. Nec oportet propter hoc ut in omnibus aliis se habeat synderesis ad conscientiam sicut scintilla ad ignem."

[5] S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Summa theologiae*, I–II, 94, 1, ad 2. "Synderesis is said to be the law of our mind, because it is a habit containing the precepts of the natural law, which are the first principles of human action."

sively to the good in conformity with the nature of things.[6] It is the general criterion for the evaluation of acts as good or evil, and it is the foundation for the judgements of the conscience. It is an ability that includes in its object the precepts of the natural law—the first principles of human conduct motivated by the good as the end.[7] Synderesis, as it is the "reflected light of God in the human soul," enables us to read those principles, and thereby it binds the conscience to judgements regarding particular and singular facts of moral action, to recommend, prohibit, praise, or reprove them. Synderesis sets the ends for moral actions, and in particular it moves prudence (*synderesis movet prudential sicut intellectus primorum principiorum scientiam*), which is called the "virtue of the well-formed conscience" ("[T]he act of synderesis is not an act of virtue in the primary sense, but it is a preamble to the act of virtue, just as natural things are preambles to infused and acquired virtues"[8]).

Thomas' conception of synderesis was shaped in discussion with other thinkers.[9] St. Bonaventure, in the spirit of St. Augustine, connected synderesis with man's will, which is a natural power that directs one to the moral good (*pondus*—the natural gravitation of the will). He thought that as natural will synderesis is infallible, but it can err in concrete performance, when it succumbs or yields to the blindness of the soul, passion, or obstinacy of the will. St. Albert the Great divided synderesis from the will and located it in the domain of the reason, which announces the principles of practical action (*naturale iudicatorium rationis vel synderesis*—the natural judgement of the reason or *synderesis*). We find just this line of thought in Aquinas. However, why did St. Thomas link synderesis with the reason, and not with the will?

According to St. Thomas, synderesis always inclines us to the good.[10] To explain the specific character of synderesis, he compared human knowledge with angelic knowledge: "[T]he human soul, with respect to what is highest in itself, reaches something about that which is proper to angelic nature, namely, that it has knowledge of some things suddenly and

---

[6] Cf. É. Gilson, *Tomizm. Wprowadzenie do filozofii św. Tomasza* (*Thomism. Introduction to the philosophy of St. Thomas*), Polish trans. J. Rybałt (Warsaw 1998).

[7] Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, 94, 1, ad 2.

[8] Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *De veritate*, 16, 2, ad. 5: "[A]ctus synderesis non est actus virtutis simpliciter, sed praeambulum ad actum virtutis, sicut naturalia sunt praeambula virtutibus gratuitis et acquisitis."

[9] Cf. Majkrzak, *O prasumieniu...*, 121–125.

[10] Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *De veritate*, 16, 1, 7.

without inquiry."[11] Synderesis is the habit of the reason for reading the first principles of action: "Just as in the human soul there is a certain natural ability whereby man knows the principles of speculative knowledge, which we call the understanding of principles, so also there is in it a certain natural ability to understand the principles of action that the natural principles of the natural law, and this habit pertains to synderesis."[12] Synderesis always incites us to the good, and murmurs at, or recoils from evil.[13] It is striking that St. Thomas emphasizes the natural and innate character of synderesis. The reason in man reads the first principles in a natural manner, that is, the principles concerning the speculative order, the practical order, and the moral order. It is a question here of principles that are not acquired by the process of abstraction or inference, but are known in a natural manner. Those principles therefore do not belong to the competence of any separate faculty or power.[14] The ability to read those principles belongs to a special habit of the reason; by that habit the intellect is capable of reading the principles of the speculative reason and the principles that refer to the practical domain.

Synderesis is therefore a habit, and the faculty of reason is the subject of synderesis.[15] St. Thomas asserted: "The act, however, of this natural habit, which is called synderesis, is to oppose evil and to incline one to the good; and so man is capable of this act by nature."[16] Now, nature is that "which in all its works aims at the good and at preserving that which comes into being by nature's action. Therefore the principles of all nature's actions are constant and unchanging, and they preserve what is right . . ."[17] The function of synderesis is therefore to direct one to the good, and

---

[11] Id, resp.: "Unde et anima humana, quantum ad id quod in ipsa supremum est, aliquid attingit de eo quod proprium est angelicae naturae; scilicet ut aliquorum cognitionem habeat subito et sine inquisitione …"

[12] Id.: "Sicut igitur humanae animae est quidam habitus naturalis quo principia speculativarum scientiarum cognoscit, quem vocamus intellectum principiorum; ita etiam in ea est quidam habitus naturalis primorum principiorum operabilium, quae sunt universalia principia iuris naturalis; qui quidem habitus ad synderesim pertinet."

[13] Cf. S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Summa theologiae*, I, 79, 12.

[14] Cf. id.

[15] Cf id., ad 3.

[16] Cf. S. Thomae Aquinas, *De veritate*, 16, 1, ad 12: "Actus autem huius habitus naturalis, quem synderesis nominat, est remurmurare malo, et inclinare ad bonum: et ideo ad hunc actum homo naturaliter potest."

[17] Id., 2, resp.: "natura in omnibus suis operibus bonum intendit, et conservationem eorum quae per operationem naturae fiunt; et ideo in omnibus naturae operibus semper principia sunt permanentia et immutabilia, et rectitudinem conservantia."

"judgement is twofold: in the universal, and then it pertains to synderesis, and in the particular deed that can be done, and this pertains to a free choice . . ."[18] Why did St. Thomas emphasize the dimension of synderesis as directing one to the good? Here is the explanation: "Hence in human works, for there to be any sort of rightness in them, there must be some permanent principle that has immutable rightness, in reference to which all human works are examined, such that this permanent principle will resist all evil, and assent to all good."[19] Thus the good is that which should be done, and evil is that which should be avoided. Thus synderesis is a habit of the knowledge of natural law.

In the literature, conscience has sometimes been identified with pre-conscience (e.g., St. Jerome),[20] but St. Thomas puts great emphasis on making a distinction between them. He writes: "conscience is an originating from the natural habit of synderesis . . ."[21] The role of synderesis is to indicate to the conscience how one should in order to do good and avoid evil. The conscience is a practical judgement whereby we are in a position to apply the judgements of synderesis to a concrete act. St. Thomas writes: "[T]he entire power of the conscience that makes examinations or advises depends on the judgement of synderesis, just as the entire truth of the speculative reason depends on first principles."[22] As the habit of the reason concerning the first principles of action, synderesis is directed to the good as such (the universal good), and so a judgement of the conscience is necessary in order to relate the judgements of synderesis to singular cases, a definite time, place, and circumstances. However, while conscience can err, synderesis cannot err: "Synderesis never errs with respect to the universal. However, in the application of a general principle to a particular case, error can occur because of false deduction or a false assumption. Therefore [in the gloss], it does not say that synderesis simply fails, but

---

[18] Id., 1, ad 15: "iudicium est duplex, scilicet in universali, et hoc pertinet ad synderesim; et in particulari operabili, et est hoc iudicium electionis, et hoc pertinet ad liberum arbitrium, unde non sequitur quod sint idem."

[19] Id., a. 2, resp.: "Unde et in operibus humanis, ad hoc quod aliqua rectitudo in eis esse possit, oportet esse aliquod principium permanens, quod rectitudinem immutabilem habeat, ad quod omnia humana opera examinentur; ita quod illud principium permanens omni malo resistat, et omni bono assentiat."

[20] Cf. S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Summa theologiae*, I, 79, 13.

[21] Aquinas, *De Veritate*, 17, 1, ad 6: "conscientia sit actus proveniens ex habitu naturali ipsius synderesis."

[22] Id., ad 1: "tota vis conscientiae examinantis vel consiliantis ex iudicio synderesis pendet, sicut tota veritas rationis speculativae pendet ex principiis primis."

that conscience fails, which applies the universal judgement of synderesis to particular works."[23] In question 17, St. Thomas says: "This is because the name *conscience* means the application of knowledge to something. Hence to be conscious (*conscire*) means to know together (*simul scire*). But any knowledge can be applied to a thing. Hence, conscience cannot denote a special habit or power, but designates the act itself, which is the application of any habit or of any knowledge to some particular act."[24] However, in what way is knowledge applied to an act so that the act will be right?

Thomas explains that there are two ways:

There is one according to which we are directed through the habit of scientific knowledge to do or not to do something. There is a second according to which the act, after it has taken place, is examined with reference to the habit of knowledge to see whether it was right or not. This double course in matters of action is distinguished according to the double course which exists in things speculative, that is, the process of discovery and the process of judging. For the process by which through scientific knowledge we look for what should be done, as it were taking counsel with ourselves, is similar to discovery, through which we proceed from principles to conclusions. The other process, through which we examine those things which already have been done and consider whether they are right, is like the process of judging, through which we reduce conclusions to principles. We use the name *conscience* for both these modes of application. For in so far as knowledge is applied to an act, as directive of that act, conscience is said to prod or urge or bind. But, in so far as knowledge is applied to act, by way of examining things which have already taken place, conscience is said to accuse or cause remorse, when that which has been done is found to be out of harmony with

---

[23] Id., 16, 2, ad 1: "synderesis nunquam praecipitatur in universali. Sed in ipsa applicatione universalis principii ad aliquod particulare potest accidere error, propter falsam deductionem, vel alicuius falsi assumptionem. Et ideo non dixit quod synderesis simpliciter praecipitetur; sed quod conscientia praecipitatur, quae universale iudicium synderesis ad particularia opera applicat."

[24] Id., 17, 1, resp.: "Nomen enim conscientiae significat applicationem scientiae ad aliquid; unde conscire dicitur quasi simul scire. Quaelibet autem scientia ad aliquid applicari potest; unde conscientia non potest nominare aliquem habitum specialem, vel aliquam potentiam, sed nominat ipsum actum, qui est applicatio cuiuscumque habitus vel cuiuscumque notitiae ad aliquem actum particularem."

the knowledge according to which it is examined; or to defend and excuse, when that which has been done is found to have proceeded according to the form of the knowledge.[25]

Both conscience and synderesis allows us to know the natural law: "Conscience is called the law of our understanding because it is a judgement of reason derived from the natural law."[26] By synderesis we have the ability to discover the fundamental principle of the natural law—*bonum est faciendum, malum vitandum*, and by conscience we have the ability to apply this principle to a concrete case. In what way are the principles of the law and acts of conscience identical? Aquinas writes: "One is said to be conscious within himself through the natural law, in the sense in which one is said to deliberate according to principles, but he is conscious within himself through conscience, in the sense in which he is said to deliberate by means of the very act of consideration."[27] Thomas writes that the "conscience binds only in virtue of a divine command, either in written law or in the law inherent in our nature."[28] What is nature, and how is nature expressed?

Nature as the Source of Action

The term "nature" has many meanings. The original Aristotelian sense, as Thomas remarks, connected nature primarily with the coming into being of living beings. *Natura dicitur a nascendo*, and so nature means that which has come to birth.[29] However, Thomas explains that "because this kind of generation comes from an intrinsic principle, this term is extended to signify the intrinsic principle of any kind of movement."[30] The *principium*, or principle, of this beginning may be formal or material, hence "since this kind of principle is either formal or material, both matter and form are commonly called nature."[31] The function of matter is to be in potency to something. However, "the essence of anything is completed by

---

[25] Id. Translation from Aquinas, *The Disputed Questions of Truth*, Vol. II, by James McGlynn (Chicago 1953).

[26] Id., ad 1.

[27] Id., ad 2.

[28] Ibid., 5, resp.

[29] Cf. S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Summa theologiae*, I, 29, 1, ad 4, and III, 2, 1, resp.

[30] Id., I, 29, 1, ad 4, translation from http://newadvent.org by Fathers of the English Dominican Province.

[31] Id.

the form; so the essence of anything, signified by the definition, is commonly called nature."[32] Thomas thinks that nature is substance, but in what sense? A substance is a nature insofar as it acts, and insofar as it has an ordering to the action proper to itself.[33]

Here, what sort of action is involved, or does this concern any sort of action? This concerns the purposeful action of a substance, and so it concerns the fact that a substance in action aims directly at an end, at the definite protection proper to the substance. The purposefulness of action, says Thomas following Aristotle, depends on a being's form. Thus nature designates a thing's essence insofar as it is ordered to purposeful action proper to the thing. In the case of all acting beings, the will be a natural ordering to the end or good, whether that ordering will be instinctive or, as in the case of man, the specific character of the action of the personal faculties of reason and will must be considered.

The conception of nature is generally connected with necessity. Nature constitutes the cause of the action of beings and determines them in a necessary way. Nature is responsible for the constancy and definite character of actions that occur.[34] The fact that each thing has an essence or nature that is this necessary principle of its action has evidence in the fact that a certain regularity occurs in the things and in their actions. While we recall this conception of the natural as necessity, we should not forget the specific character of free action in the case of man. As Fr. M. A. Krąpiec, O.P., indicated, they designate the same thing. They designate being, but they each mean something different: substance is the subject for properties, and essence is the apprehension of necessary elements in a definition. Nature is the "sort of being that is the source of orderly and necessary activity,

---

[32] Id.

[33] "[O]mnis substantia est natura. Tamen naturae nomen hoc modo sumptae videtur significare essentiam rei secundum quod habet ordinem ad propriam operationem rei, cum nulla res propria operatione destituatur . . ." (St. Thomas, *De ente et essentia*, in M. A. Krąpiec, *Byt i istota. Św. Tomasza „De ente et essentia" przekład i komentarz* (*Being and essence. St. Thomas' "De ente et essentia" translation and commentary*), ed. 2 (Lublin 1994), 11).

[34] É. Gilson remarks: "In pre-Socratic philosophy, the idea of necessity is dominant . . . Its main problem is thus the definition of a stable substance from which everything is born and to which everything returns; for it, that archaic substance is nature: *phisis* . . ." (*Duch filozofii średniowiecznej* (*The spirit of medieval philosophy*), Polish trans. J. Rybałt (Warsaw 1958), 335, n. 3).

which leads in a constant way—of itself . . . to the results toward which the being is determined from within."[35]

In summary, we may ask, what therefore will be natural to man? The action of the subject who aims at the proper end seen by the reason will be natural. Thomas cautioned that the human reason is not the norm of things or the measure of what originates from nature. However, it has principles that are innate by nature. Those principles are general norms and measures of what man ought to do. The natural reason is the norm and measure of action. The natural reason's end is always some sort of perfection.

The next step is to indicate what is natural for man with respect to his specific nature and his individual nature. The Latin adage stated that *ab indeterminato nil sequitur*—no action flows out of what is not determined to action.[36] This determination can occur at the level of pure φῦσὶ (physis), in animals as the action of instinct, or in man at the level of intellectual knowledge, that is, man will consciously be an exemplar cause.[37] In Thomas' metaphysics, man is understood as a person, as understood from Boethius definition that Thomas analyzed in the *Summa theologiae*, Part I; that definition states that man is an individual subject of a rational nature ("[P]*ersona est rationalis naturae individua substantia.*"[38]). By his spiritual powers or faculties (the reason and will), the person is capable of knowing in a human and rational way. In the case of man, rationality is the nature that determines the way of action proper to man. The rational nature gives man the inclination by which are realized the natural appetite for the good, the act of distinguishing between good and evil, and action to the end that the reason presents as the good and perfection that conform to the structure of the being.[39]

To summarize, nature is thus the internal cause and the principle of action and motion.[40] Thus natural action is always action that necessarily

---

[35] M. A. Krąpiec, *Metaphysics. An Outline of the History of Being*, trans. Theresa Sandok (New York 1991), 163.

[36] Cf. M. A. Krąpiec, *U podstaw rozumienia kultury* (*At the foundations of the understanding of culture*) (Lublin 1991), 61.

[37] Id., 62.

[38] S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Summa theologiae*, I, 29, 1, arg. 1.

[39] "Sicut . . . ens est primum quod cadit in apprehensione simpliciter, ita bonum est primum quod cadit in apprehensione practicae rationis, quae ordinatur ad opus, omne enim agens agit propter finem, qui habet rationem boni" (Id., I–II, 94, 2, resp.).

[40] "Et sicut non est contra rationem naturae quod motus naturae sit a Deo sicut a primo movente, inquantum natura est quoddam instrumentum Dei moventis . . ." (Id., 6, 1, ad 3).

belongs to thing on account of the fact that it is what it is.[41] The fact of action as such, however, is not explained by the element that exists in beings and is the source of action,[42] but is explained by an external factor or impulse toward which nature turns—the proper end for a particular being as the motive or reason for a particular action (in this sense, nature demarcates an end).

Inclinations of Rational Nature

Rational nature shows itself through inclinations.[43] Apart from the knowledge of what something is, a second element appears: the element of aiming at or gravitating toward something. This appetite is realized in man's case in a rational and free way, unlike beings that do not have spiritual faculties and by this privation are only capable of acting in a necessary way. As was mentioned, the good is the end that the will desires. The good is the motive for all action, and therefore it appears in the first principle of the practical reason, according to which the good is that which every being desires. On the basis of this first principle, Thomas formulated the first principle of the natural law: the good should be done, evil should be avoided;[44] this principle is present in every human action, and it joins man with the motive of his action and ties together various inclinations and planes of action. This is because Thomas thought that all things that in themselves are different from each other can constitute on, insofar as they are ordered to something common.

Human activity is composed of two different modes of action, which are the result of both biological and rational nature: determined action, and

---

[41] "[N]ature, if nothing hinders it, always acts in one and the same way. This reason for this is that each thing acts in accordance with its nature, so that as long as it remains itself it always acts in the same way; hence everything that acts by nature is limited to one way of being; and so nature always performs one and the same action" (Gilson, *Tomizm*, 153).

[42] The possession of a source of motion does not mean an ability to pass from a state of rest to a realized state (according to Aristotle nothing passes from potency to act by its own power).

[43] One consequence of any nature will be the inclination proper to that nature (Lat. *Inclino*— to turn) to action proportional to a particular being.

[44] "[P]rimum principium in ratione practica est quod fundatur supra rationem boni, quae est, bonum est quod omnia appetunt. Hoc est ergo primum praeceptum legis, quod bonum est faciendum et prosequendum, et malum vitandum" (S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Summa theologiae*, I–II, 94, 2, resp.).

action that is conscious and free.[45] Specific personal actions—intellectual knowledge (the use of reason), moral conduct (the use of the will), and productive action—which belong only to a rational nature, demarcate the proper realm of human life, in which natural law is realized in a strict sense. Here we do not encounter natural determinations to univocally determined actions, but a choice of both the end and the means to the end should be made. In this domain, man is open and undetermined, i.e., man has the ability to know reality and has the possibility of a choice, of wanting something that he regards as a good. This openness is manifested in the necessity of self-determination,[46] in order that action may follow. This always occurs on the basis of a fundamental recognition of the good by synderesis. Since synderesis cannot err, it is what allows us to apprehend the natural law and its object.

We arrive at knowledge of the natural law in the context of the really existing world, in the context of the really existing content of being, the nature of being, and the fact that some beings are found in manifold relations to other beings.[47] The reason works with the will and apprehends for the will the goodness of the known object (the truth about the good), making the choice of that goodness possible. Thus, although the good is the proper object of the will (it is potentially directed toward the good), then the actualization of this directing depends on the reason.[48]

In this context, we can understand Thomas' description of law as the rule and measure (rational measure) of action, a rule and measure that occurs in acting subject in two ways: when the being directs itself according to a known rule and measure, or when it is governed according to a rational law that it does not formally establish. In the first case, it is a question of

---

[45] Cf. M. A. Krąpiec, "Prawo naturalne a etyka (moralność)" ("Natural law and ethics (morality)"), in *Filozofia prawa a tworzenie i stosowanie prawa* (*Philosophy of law and the making and application of law*), ed. B. Czech (Katowice 1992), 42–43.

[46] Cf. id., 43.

[47] "Relations can be recognized only rationally, since they do not fall under sensory knowledge. They can be understood, but cannot be heard, seen, or touched. One mark of the use of the reason is the recognition of existing relations. This is because a special kind of being—the weakest in its existence . . . Such a weak way of being is legible only for the reason, which can apprehend two subjects (or correlates) of a relation in one, and can grasp the links of various kinds that exist between them: a necessary or unnecessary relation, a real or purely mental relation" (M. A. Krąpiec, *Ludzka wolność i jej granice* (*Human freedom and its limits*) (Lublin 2008), 197).

[48] Cf. K. Wojtyła, *Wykłady lubelskie* (*Lublin lectures*), ed. T. Styczeń [et al.] (Lublin 1986), 136.

law in the strict sense as having its subject in a rational being, natural and positive law; positive law must be subject to the rule or rules of natural law; those rules manifest the necessary and transcendental ordering of particular acts to an end and good.

The rational nature, which has at its disposal the faculties of reason and will, thus recognizes the arrange of natural relations and inclinations, and it orders the agent to the end, and ultimately acts toward this end. The internal directing to the good that is apprehended in the most important precept of the natural law, "good should be done," becomes the internal rule of concrete action that is undertaken in view of a real good and end. The rational nature is the internal source that is responsible for the arrangement or system of the human inclinations whereby undertaken actions are determined and directed to the achievement of perfection.

The first judgement, upon which the other principles are based, is the affirmation of the transcendental character of being and the good. Being apprehended as good forms the field of practical knowledge. The specification of the main principles occurs in an appeal to the series of the goods of the person; man aims at or strives for these goods as to his ends (in accordance with his nature).[49] What are these ends and goods?

Man's rational nature is manifested in three fundamental inclinations that direct man to specific goods.[50] St. Thomas, in a text that has become canonical, wrote the following:

> Since, however, good has the nature of an end, and evil, the nature of a contrary, hence it is that all those things to which man has a natural inclination, are naturally apprehended by reason as being good, and consequently as objects of pursuit, and their contraries as evil, and objects of avoidance. Wherefore according to the order of natural inclinations, is the order of the precepts of the natural law. Because in man there is first of all an inclination to good in accordance with the nature which he has in common with all substances: inasmuch as every substance seeks the preservation of its own being, according to its nature: and by reason of this inclination, what-

---

[49] Human nature here is the priciple of personal actualisation. Cf. K. Wojtyła, "Osoba ludzka a prawo naturalne" ("The human person and the natural law"), *Roczniki Filozoficzne* (1970, no. 2): 53–59; M. A. Krąpiec, *Człowiek i prawo naturalne* (*Man and natural law*) (Lublin 1994), 207–216.

[50] Cf. M. Piechowiak, *Filozofia praw człowieka* (*Philosophy of man's rights*) (Lublin 1999), 297.

ever is a means of preserving human life, and of warding off its obstacles, belongs to the natural law. Secondly, there is in man an inclination to things that pertain to him more specially, according to that nature which he has in common with other animals: and in virtue of this inclination, those things are said to belong to the natural law, which nature has «taught to all animals» [Pandect. Just. I, tit. I], such as sexual intercourse, education of offspring and so forth. Thirdly, there is in man an inclination to good, according to the nature of his reason, which nature is proper to him: thus man has a natural inclination to know the truth about God, and to live in society: and in this respect, whatever pertains to this inclination belongs to the natural law; for instance, to shun ignorance, to avoid offending those among whom one has to live, and other such things regarding the above inclination."[51]

Thomas answered the question of the unity and plurality of natural laws as follows: "All these precepts of the law of nature have the character of one natural law, inasmuch as they flow from one first precept."[52] And likewise: "All the inclinations of any parts whatsoever of human nature, e.g., of the concupiscible and irascible parts, in so far as they are ruled by reason, belong to the natural law, and are reduced to one first precept, as stated above: so that the precepts of the natural law are many in themselves, but are based on one common foundation."[53]

The inclinations (human life, procreation, knowledge of the truth about God, life in social relations) are the first realizations of rational nature and are expressions of that nature. To be realized integrally and in parallel, man must read and understand the good that corresponds to them and way that good is realized. With the help of the practical reason, on the basis of the main principle "good should be done," man makes a determination concerning the concrete good. Here, the criterion is rationality—the good is realized when the deed is performed in conformity with reason, because reason is empowered with a habit by synderesis and is in a position to apprehend the good. One result of this action will be the achievement of perfection—the actualization of being. As M. Piechowiak writes:

---

[51] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I–II, 94, 2, resp.
[52] Id., ad 1.
[53] Id., ad 2.

The natural inclinations as such are not the ultimate reference point in knowing what is due, and hence the possible objections that man has extremely varied natural inclinations (in the sense of spontaneous inclinations), e.g., an inclination to crime, are not the point. When we hear of natural inclinations, it is not a question of all inclinations to action that appear spontaneously. Natural inclinations are those that lead to that which actualizes being, and as such having a foundation in the nature, broadly understood, of being, as the constitutive elements of the being, as everything in the subject that independently of the will or a decision determines the ways of the being's actualization.[54]

The natural inclinations make it possible to determine with greater precision the human potentialities ordered to actualization. Thereby "it is possible to determine the constant structures of being that occur in the case of the human being . . ."[55] The inclinations show what is common to many beings, and among them, to man. "They are the foundation for determining what is destructive to man, what makes the development of being impossible or difficult."[56]

The Latin term "*inclinare*" is translated as "to incline, to bend, to lean, to turn." So also, the inclinations of a rational nature should be understood in this way: on the one hand it is a fact that certain types of potentiality occur, and on the other it is a fact that a being is ordered to their realization as modes of the actualization of the whole of the personal being. The criteria for these actualizations are fully determined, but in a certain scope they are dependent on the person's conscious and free decisions. This ar-

---

[54] Piechowiak, *Filozofia praw człowieka*, 299.

[55] Id.

[56] Id. "The natural inclinations do not constitute a sufficient basis for a positive and unambiguous determination of the way of acting that corresponds to man, or for determining the concrete ends that lead to his actualization" (Id., 299–300). In the case of irrational beings, natural inclinations univocally and necessarily demarcate actions in harmony with each other that aim at the realization of nature. "[I]n the case of the personal being, there is an entire series of actions that, although they are in conformity with natural inclinations, are not univocally determined by them, and thus the actions proper to a personal being (that lead to his actualization) are different in different individuals. The end of the person is the realization of the nature of the species, but it is actualization in what is specific with regard to the person . . . The mode of this actualization is not univocally set by the natural inclinations proper to man's nature as a species, or—more broadly—also not by that which is common to human beings as persons. Therefore there is not one mode for all for the actualization of action, on the basis of knowledge of the structures of being common to all human beings and circumstances" (Id., 300).

rangement of things to an end requires free choice, in addition to the knowledge of man himself and the circumstances of action. "Knowledge sets the directions of development and the limits of what is not allowed. By free will, man considers and chooses for his own part the ends of action, and often this choice for the first time constitutes something as an end of action in conformity with man's nature, an end that is what fully determines action, and so is fully a law."[57] And also: "Knowledge of a man's chosen end of action, insofar as that end corresponds to who the man is, is knowledge of the natural law. At the same time, in many case, it is choice that first co-constitutes the object that is the end, which among various possible ones, really actualizes the agent."[58]

Knowledge of the nature of a being and the inclinations of that nature is knowledge of its dynamic (purposeful) aspect. This bears with it a certain axiological message (what helps man achieve a natural end is valuable for man), and it bears a normative aspect (one should act in a specific way to achieve the *optimum potentiae*). Reflections on nature and the natural lead to the question of the function of synderesis in apprehending the natural law. The emphasis is interesting that the scholastics and Thomas put on the idea that synderesis never errs, that it is not speculation on whether something is good and something else is evil, but it absolutely sets the direction to the good. By synderesis we find the ultimate grounding for the natural law and morality.

The Principles of Natural Law

St. Thomas understood synderesis as the natural habit of reading the principles of action, which are in conformity with the principles of the natural law. We draw Thomas' conception of law, as is known, mainly from the *Summa theologia*, I–II, questions 90–97, and II–II, questions 57–61. We should mention some major lines of thought from the rich set of problems in the treatise on law and on justice concerning law and right in the sense of *lex* (*lex aeterna*, *lex naturalis*, and *lex positiva*), and in the sense of *ius* (*ius naturale*, *ius positivum*, *ius gentium*, and *ius civile*). As has been mentioned, St. Thomas primarily emphasizes that law (*lex*) is something that is from the reason (*aliquid rationis*), because it is a rule and

---

[57] Id., 302.
[58] Id., 304.

measure of action,[59] and the reason (*primum principium actuum humanorum*) performs the functions of this regulation and measurement, since the reason performs an ordering to an end (*primum principium in agendis*).

St. Thomas when he explained the specific character of the action of the practical reason, compared it to the theoretical reason: "[I]n the acts of reason, we may consider the act itself of reason, i.e., to understand and to reason, and something produced by this act."[60] The definition is first in the speculative reason, then the premise, and finally the syllogism or argumentation. Since

the practical reason makes use of a syllogism in respect of the work to be done, as stated above (13, 3; 76, 1) and since as the Philosopher teaches (*Ethic*., VII, 3); hence we find in the practical reason something that holds the same position in regard to operations, as, in the speculative intellect, the proposition holds in regard to conclusions. Such like universal propositions of the practical intellect that are directed to actions have the nature of law. And these propositions are sometimes under our actual consideration, while sometimes they are retained in the reason by means of a habit.[61]

Thus St. Thomas showed that, analogously to the speculative sphere, at the level of action appears a sort of syllogism, *quidam syllogismus*. It is not a syllogism in a strict sense, but a *syllogismus in operabilibus*, and so synderesis will occur in it as an innate habit of reading the first principles of action and law. Thus two elements are necessary for a concrete solution: the natural law, and synderesis as the habit of reading them.

St. Thomas writes further: "Now as reason is a principle of human acts, so in reason itself there is something which is the principle in respect of all the rest: wherefore to this principle chiefly and mainly law must needs be referred. Now the first principle in practical matters, which are the object of the practical reason, is the last end"[62]—the happiness of many people belonging to a community. Thus the law will concern the way that leads to happiness, and the end or purpose is first in the domain of law. St. Thomas wrote concerning the action of the practical reason: "Just as noth-

---

[59] "[L]ex quaedam regula est et mensura actuum, secundum quam inducitur aliquis ad agendum . . ." (S. Thomae Aquinatis, *Summa theologiae*, I–II, 90, 1, resp.).
[60] Id., a. 1, ad 2.
[61] Id.
[62] Id., a. 2, resp.

ing stands firm with regard to the speculative reason except that which is traced back to the first indemonstrable principles, so nothing stands firm with regard to the practical reason, unless it be directed to the last end which is the common good: and whatever stands to reason in this sense, has the nature of a law."[63] Thus law (*lex*) is an ordering of the reason (*ordinatio rationis*) for the common good,[64] and it is a judgement (a directive) of the practical reason (*dictamen practicae rationis*).[65]

St. Thomas pondered natural law in response to the following objection:

> Further, by the law man is directed, in his acts, to the end, as stated above (Question 90, Article 2). But the directing of human acts to their end is not a function of nature, as is the case in irrational creatures, which act for an end solely by their natural appetite; whereas man acts for an end by his reason and will. Therefore no law is natural to man.[66]

Thomas responded that

> Every act of reason and will in us is based on that which is according to nature, as stated above (Question 10, Article 1): for every act of reasoning is based on principles that are known naturally, and every act of appetite in respect of the means is derived from the natural appetite in respect of the last end. Accordingly the first direction of our acts to their end must needs be in virtue of the natural law.[67]

However, how does this happen? Thomas thought that one property of the reason was "to lead from one thing [premise] to another. Wherefore just as, in demonstrative sciences, the reason [by inference] leads us from certain principles to assent to the conclusion, so it induces us by some means to assent to the precept of the law."[68] This is the natural judgement of synderesis, and so, it is the judgement of which the man is capable by nature,

---

[63] Id., ad 3.
[64] Cf. id., a. 4, resp.
[65] Cf. id., 91, a. 1.
[66] Id., a. 2.
[67] Id., ad 2.
[68] Id., 92, a. 2, resp.

without deliberation or inference.[69] Thomas also thought that "synderesis does not denote higher or lower reason, but something that refers commonly to both. For in the very habit of the universal principles of law there are contained certain things which pertain to the eternal norms of conduct, such as, that God must be obeyed, and there are some that pertain to lower norms, such as, that we must live according to reason."[70]

On this occasion there appears an argument for the existence of synderesis and the essential feature of synderesis. Aquinas was convinced that

> for probity to be possible in human actions, there must be some permanent principle which has unwavering integrity, in reference to which all human works are examined, so that that permanent principle will resist all evil and assent to all good.[71]
>
> A thing is said to be unchangeable because of the necessity of a truth, although the truth may concern things which according to their nature can change. Thus the truth: every whole is greater than its part, is unchangeably true even in unchangeable things. Synderesis is said to refer to unchangeable things in this way.[72]

The first principle by which the practical reason guides itself is drawn from the fundamental understanding of the good:

> «[G]ood is that which all things seek after.» Hence this is the first precept of law, that «good is to be done and pursued, and evil is to be avoided.» All other precepts of the natural law are based upon this: so that whatever the practical reason naturally apprehends as man's good (or evil) belongs to the precepts of the natural law as something to be done or avoided.[73]

The reason formed habitually by synderesis therefore apprehends the principle that "good should be done, and evil should be avoided," and "it is from the precepts of the natural law, as from general and indemonstrable

---

[69] Cf. Thomas Aquinas, *De veritate*, 16, 1, ad 12. "A habit together with a power is enough for the act of that habit. But the act of the natural habit called synderesis is to warn against evil and to incline to good. Therefore, men are naturally capable of this act" (Id.).
[70] Id., ad 9.
[71] Id., a. 2, resp.
[72] Id., a. 1, ad 9.
[73] St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, I–II, 94, 2, resp.

principles, that the human reason needs to proceed to the more particular determination of certain matters."[74]

The question arises: how is a proper judgement that determines one to act chosen from among many judgements? Thomas wrote:

> Now there is much uncertainty in things that have to be done; because actions are concerned with contingent singulars, which by reason of their vicissitude, are uncertain. Now in things doubtful and uncertain the reason does not pronounce judgment, without previous inquiry: wherefore the reason must of necessity institute an inquiry before deciding on the objects of choice . . .[75]

The determination of action comes from the reason insofar as the reason by a practical judgement determines itself to action. As the reason reads the content of the good presented in a practical direction, it gives direction to the action and sets it in order. Finally, however, it is the thing that is known, as it informs us of its goodness and nature, that gives direction to our action.

The first fundamental motive of human action is the ordering to the good. Hence the vision of this ordering of the good and connection with the good is manifested in the chief judgement of the practical reason, that is, the reason as it directs human action: "good should be done," "do good" (ultimately with regard to the contingency and potentiality of being). The content of a chosen practical judgement (judgement of decision) stands in a necessary relation to the content of theoretical judgements about the good of things themselves. If there is a relation of agreement between them, and so, if my conduct as the result of a decision corresponds to my theoretical conviction concerning the goodness of a thing, then the moral good is enacted. If, however, theoretical judgements present themselves in one way, but practical judgements or the action itself present themselves differently, then moral evil is enacted.

The most important motive in the selection of a practical judgement is always a good, which is a concrete being, and it is at the same time an analogical good. Hence also, the main judgement of the natural law, "do good," is at the same time a precept and an analogical and analogically realized norm. This is because in each case the good must be free of shortcomings or privations that would eliminate the nature of the good. This

---

[74] Id., 91, 3, resp.
[75] Id., I–II, 14, 1, resp.

was well understood in scholasticism, when they remarked that the good is present when it contains in itself all its integral factors, and any sort of lack of them is an evil (*bonum ex integra causa, mala ex quocumque defectu*).

The choice of a practical judgement concerning the concrete good (the realization of the natural law—"do good"), which is the end and motive, releases real and ordered action, action that is such and not otherwise.

Thomas completed his reflections on *lex* by more precisely describing law or right as *ius*. The fundamental description of law or right as *ius* ("[I]us sive iustum naturale est quod ex sui natura est adaequatum vel commensuratum alteri"[76]) expresses at its source the meaning of law and right as the real relation—which has its subject in the very structure of being—of adaptation, measurement, and being ordered to render to another what is due to him in order to actualize his potentialities. The apprehension of oneself in relation to another occurs by the reason capable of apprehending the relational reference and the reason why it came into existence. Thus law or right, which is the ordering of a thing to its optimal and real good, has its source in the natural structure of things and in relations between beings. Thomas emphasized the connection between law in the sense of *ius* and justice—*iustitia*—as the virtue that brings order in matters concerning others, and which habitually forms the will to render to each what is due to him. The foundation and measure in determining what is due and just is the reason as the *medium rationis*, but the reason is measured by the measure of things, that is, with respect to the state of being to which actions refer (*medium rei*).[77]

The Affirmation of Synderesis, or Juridical Nihilism?

Vittorio Possenti analyzed the juridical or legal culture of the twentieth century and intruded an interesting description of juridical nihilism as the most recent form of contemporary nihilism.[78]

---

[76] Id., II–II, 57, 3, resp.

[77] "[Q]uandoque contingit quod medium rationis est etiam medium rei, et tunc oportet quod virtutis moralis medium sit medium rei; sicut est in iustitia . . . Cuius ratio est quia iustitia est circa operationes, quae consistunt in rebus exterioribus, in quibus rectum institui debet simpliciter et secundum se, ut supra dictum est, et ideo medium rationis in iustitia est idem cum medio rei, inquantum scilicet iustitia dat unicuique quod debet, et non plus nec minus" (Id., I–II, 64, 2, resp.).

[78] Cf. V. Possenti, "Nihilizm" ("Nihilism"), Polish trans. A. Fligel-Piotrowska, in *Powszechna encyklopedia filozofii* (*Universal encyclopedia of philosophy*), ed. A. Maryniarczyk, vol. 7 (Lublin 2006), 654–655.

Possenti describes juridical nihilism and discerns the follow features: (1) juridical or legal problems are completely separated from the problem of justice in the sense that *ius* and *lex* are centered on themselves, self-referent, and completely eliminated from justice; (2) law is treated exclusively as an expression of the will to power; (3) law or right as such is identified with positive law; (4) the existence of natural law is denied, that is, the existing of anything that is wright or wrong by nature is denied; (5) it is thought that law and legal acts do not constitute an act that orders, or that is found at the level of *ratio*, but they are only from the level of the will; (6) it is thought that laws or rights to not belong to man by nature, but they are decrees of tolerance that can always be repealed: the political authority ratifies them, and the political authority can take them away.[79]

According to Possenti, legal or juridical nihilism is connected "with forgetting the concept of justice (*ius* and *iustitia*), with forgetting the natural law, and with the limitless raising of the will, which desires only itself. The law as a whole has a positive character, that is, it is established by the will, and the result is that neither legitimate rule of law nor injustice exist."[80]

In the context of our reflections on Thomas' understanding of conscience and synderesis as the infallible habit of reading the first principles of action, we see that forgetfulness of natural law and justice, which is the main manifestation of modern nihilism in the domain of law, is ultimately rooted in the negation of the occurrence of synderesis. However, if we have confidence in the *opinio communis* of the scholastics on the immutability, infallibility, and inextinguishable voice of synderesis, that forgetfulness cannot be entire. This is because we have, as human beings, the ability to discover without discursive thought what is good and the ability to read the fundamental direction to the good, and we are also capable of ordering laws and rights to the real good of man, and so we are capable of excluding every *nihil* from the domain of law.

---

[79] Cf. id.
[80] Id, 655.

SYNDERESIS AND THE NATURAL LAW

SUMMARY

The article discusses St. Thomas Aquinas' understanding of synderesis as the infallible habit of reading the first principles of action. It also considers the *opinio communis* of the scholastics in the light of which the voice of synderesis is not only infallible, but immutable and inextinguishable as well. It concludes that we have, as human beings, the ability to discover without discursive thought what is good and the ability to read the fundamental direction to the good, and so we are also capable of ordering laws and rights to the real good of man.

KEYWORDS: synderesis, conscience, natural law, Thomas Aquinas, ethics, good, law, right.

Paweł Tarasiewicz
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Poland

THE SERVIENT CHARACTER OF POLITICAL POWER ACCORDING TO ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

Service seems to differ from political power merely by the very political character of the latter. For a more obvious example of service seems to be the responsibilities of a doctor, firefighter or soldier than those of a member of the Diet, prime minister or president.[1] Does this mean that political power does not have anything to do with service? Should we not expect actions that truly serve others from those executing political power?

Political power, though inherently related to political authority, maintains its distinctness from the latter. On the one hand, there is a social difference between power and authority. For while authority derives from the recognition of the right of some individual, group, or institution to exercise power, power denotes the ability of that individual, group, or institution to control, coerce, or regulate others. Those who hold power can also enjoy having authority, if they are recognized as legitimate power holders by those over whom their power is exercised. The coincidence of power and authority, however, seems to minimize the significance of power and testify in the favor of authority, because if "[t]here is an element of trust, faith, and recognition on the part of those following authority that the per-

---

This article is a revised version of the paper originally published in Polish: Ks. Paweł Tarasiewicz, "Władza polityczna jako służba. Uwagi na kanwie myśli św. Tomasza z Akwinu," in *In rebus divinis atque humanis servire – Niektóre aspekty służby w rzeczywistości Boskiej i ludzkiej*, ed. Ks. Wojciech Guzewicz et al. (Ełk: Wydawnictwo Diecezjalne Adalbertinum, 2014), 491–509.

[1] Cf. Tobi Walker, "The Service/Politics Split: Rethinking Service to Teach Political Engagement," *Political Science and Politics* 33:3 (2000): 647.

son exercising it possesses some quality (for example, wisdom, expertise, or the fact that the person was elected by the people) that ought to be deferred to . . . then authority, rather than simple power, exists and must be followed, adhered to, and, within limits, obeyed." On the other hand, there is a lawful difference between power and authority that can be evidenced by an ancient Latin distinction, according to which, while the *ius* is the object of the *auctoritas* (authority), the *lex* is the fruit of the *potestas* (power).[2]

This paper attempts to explain the thesis of the servient character of political power. The first part of our considerations will be focused on the tasks of power, while the second—on those who wield this power. The basic material comprising the subject of this analysis will include selected political writings of St. Thomas Aquinas, namely his treatise *De regno ad regem Cypri* and his commentary *Sententia libri Politicorum*.[3] This selection of references is made due to philosophical reasons.[4] For the metaphysical way of treating the issue of political power by Aquinas makes his works enduringly pertinent, and therefore still valid.[5]

---

[2] Gregory W. Streich, "Authority," in *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, vol. I, ed. Maryanne C. Horowitz (Detroit et al.: Thomson Gale, 2005), 181. See also María Alejandra Vanney, "Potestas, auctoritas y estado moderno. Apuntes sobre el pensamiento político de Álvaro d'Ors," *Cuaderno* 109 (Febrero de 2009): 32–41.

[3] Thomas Aquinas, *De regno ad regem Cypri (On Kingship to the King of Cyprus)*, trans. by Gerald B. Phelan, revised by I. Th. Eschmann, O.P. (Toronto: The Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1949), re-edited and chapter numbers aligned with Latin by Joseph Kenny, O.P. [http://dhspriory.org/thomas/DeRegno.htm#1, accessed on 24.03.2014, further quoted as *De regno*], and Thomas Aquinas, *Sententia libri Politicorum* [www.corpus thomisticum.org/cpo.html, accessed on 25.03.2014, further quoted as *Sententia*].

[4] On theological implications of the Thomistic understanding of political power as *servire non dominare*, see Adam Machowski, *Teologia polityczna sw. Tomasza z Akwinu* (*The Political Theology of St. Thomas Aquinas*) (Torun: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UMK, 2011), 225–248.

[5] On the timelessness of metaphysics, see Moses I. Finley, "Myth, Memory, and History," *History and Theory* 4 (1965, no. 3): 287: "Hesiod is foreshadowing the step from *mythos* to *logos*, and that step was not mediated by history. It bypassed history altogether. It moved from the timelessness of myth to the timelessness of metaphysics"; *Zapatrzenie. Rozmowy ze Stefanem Swiezawskim* (*Musings. Talks with Stefan Swiezawski*), ed. Anna Karon-Ostrowska, Jozef Majewski, Zbigniew Nosowski (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo WIEZ, 2006), 108: "Just as the great mysticism is timeless and always valid—e.g. the letters of St. Benedict despite being centuries old, have lost nothing of their freshness and validity—the great metaphysics will always remain valid and timeless;" *Streszczenie rozpraw doktorskich, magisterskich i seminaryjnych* (*Summaries of Doctoral, Master's, and Seminar Dissertations*), ed. Mieczyslaw Gogacz (Poznan: Pallottinum, 1956), 11: "[T]he philosophy of Tho-

What does political power serve?

Political power, though subordinate in its performance to the provisions of the law of a given State,[6] can be used to achieve one of two objectives. It can be subordinate to the interests specified in the field of an ideological struggle between people or to the objectives stemming from the personal nature of man. In the first case, the indispensable measure to achieve the intentions of power appears to be the status of the electoral winner, which ensures him dominance at the political level.[7] In the second case, it is ultimately the search for philosophical knowledge, which guarantees a principled understanding of the full range of man's natural needs.[8]

What kind of life does human nature predispose us to? Individual or social? Man is by nature predisposed to living in a community. This is corroborated by the fact that, after being born, a child does not have anything that would facilitate her or his independent life and development. Therefore, it is something natural (necessary and right) that man, during the period of maturation, lives in a human society. This does not mean, however, that after reaching personal maturity, living in a society becomes less important. Indeed, it would appear that in the case of a mature man, single life outside a community is possible, and this possibility should be facilitated by his developed reason. Nevertheless, even if one man could "attain knowledge of the particular things necessary for human life by reasoning from natural principles," he would not be able to comprehend by reason everything that can benefit or harm him. He is therefore forced to live together with other people "so that each one may assist his fellows,

---

mas Aquinas, though fully 13th century in its character, is timeless and lasting, as every genuine, however necessarily partial, truth."

[6] See *Sententia*, I, 1: "Civitas autem duplici regimine regitur: scilicet politico et regali . . . Politicum autem regimen est quando ille qui praeest habet potestatem coarctatam secundum aliquas leges civitatis". See also Mark C. Murphy, "Consent, Custom, and the Common Good in Aquinas's Account of Political Authority," *The Review of Politics* 59:2 (1997): 323–350.

[7] Por. Leslie I. Hill, "Power and Citizenship in a Democratic Society," *Political Science and Politics* 24:3 (1991): 495–496: "[T]he context of power is a competitive marketplace where self-interested individuals engage in an essentially adversarial relation. The winner—by virtue of dominating the process through skill or superior resources—asserts his (sic) view of the common good, making use of the resources of government."

[8] Por. Anton H. Chroust, "Aristotle's Criticism of Plato's *Philosopher King*," *Rheinisches Museum* 111 (1968): 17: "Aristotle said that it was not merely unnecessary for a king to be a philosopher, but even a distinct disadvantage. What a king should do was to listen to and take the advice of true philosophers."

and different men may be occupied in seeking, by their reason, to make different discoveries."[9]

Is there a form of social life that would be able to meet the needs of man? Unfortunately, there is no such social structure that would on its own fully ensure the personal development of man. Cooperation is needed, at least between the family, village, city and the entire country. A family which is self-sufficient for life "insofar as it pertains to the natural acts of nourishment and the begetting of offspring and other things of this kind" needs to be supported by a village "with regard to those things which belong to the trade of one guild," a city "which is the perfect community and exists with regard to all the necessities of life" and the whole country "because of the need for fighting together and mutual help against enemies."[10]

Does social life require power? No form of social life can do without power. Of course, if man were to live and develop on his own "he would require no other guide to his end. Each man would be a king unto himself, under God, the highest King, inasmuch as he would direct himself in his acts by the light of reason given him from on high."[11] However, man, by living outside a society, cannot fulfill himself as a person. On the other hand, by living as part of a group, he can devise plans and pursue his own good, which can often conflict with the plans and activities of other members of the community. With no power above them, people would certainly turn against one other and scatter.[12] Therefore, it becomes appar-

---

[9] *De regno*, I, 1 [6]: "Homo autem horum, quae sunt suae vitae necessaria, naturalem cognitionem habet solum in communi, quasi eo per rationem valente ex universalibus principiis ad cognitionem singulorum, quae necessaria sunt humanae vitae, pervenire. Non est autem possibile quod unus homo ad omnia huiusmodi per suam rationem pertingat. Est igitur necessarium homini quod in multitudine vivat, ut unus ab alio adiuvetur et diversi diversis inveniendis per rationem occupentur, puta, unus in medicina, alius in hoc, alius in alio." Cf. *Sententia*, III, 5: "[U]tilis est vita communis etiam propter ipsum vivere, dum unus in communitate vitae existentium alii subvenit ad sustentationem vitae et contra pericula mortis."

[10] *De regno*, I, 2 [14]: "Habetur siquidem aliqua vitae sufficientia in una familia domus unius, quantum scilicet ad naturales actus nutritionis, et prolis generandae, et aliorum huiusmodi; in uno autem vico, quantum ad ea quae ad unum artificium pertinent; in civitate vero, quae est perfecta communitas, quantum ad omnia necessaria vitae; sed adhuc magis in provincia una propter necessitatem compugnationis et mutui auxilii contra hostes."

[11] Id., I, 1 [4]: "[N]ullo alio dirigente indigeret ad finem, sed ipse sibi unusquisque esset rex sub Deo summo rege, in quantum per lumen rationis divinitus datum sibi, in suis actibus se ipsum dirigeret."

[12] Id., I, 1 [8]: "Multis enim existentibus hominibus et unoquoque id, quod est sibi congruum, providente, multitudo in diversa dispergeretur, nisi etiam esset aliquis de eo quod ad bonum multitudinis pertinet curam habens . . ."

ent that as man's nature demands life in society, so also social life demands power aimed at the common good of the entire community.

What is the common good of social life, and, at the same time, the ultimate goal of power? It is the most possibly fullest realization of the personal nature of man. If man's nature not only predisposed him to development, but also stimulated this development, generating, for example, needs, we should acknowledge that the goal of political power is nothing other than the fulfillment of human needs—just as Jean-Jacques Rousseau wanted.[13] In turn, if the nature of man, on the one hand, demanded development, and, on the other hand, was unable to explicitly point out the direction of its achievement, we should ascertain that the goal of political power is the creation of its own model of fulfilling it—as Karl Marx saw it.[14]

The personal nature of man, however, does not, on its own, stimulate his development through needs, as these are not always conducive to it, nor does it expect power to provide ideas on its fulfillment, because it, on its own, points at virtue as the correct direction of its dynamism.[15] The principal task of political power is thus neither the fulfillment of human needs, nor the establishment of the goal of social life, but rather the governance in the field of measures for the realization of the goal that is compatible with the nature of man. As the goal of human life peculiarly stems from the nature of man, so the objectives of human communities stem from their *natures*.[16] In other words, the ultimate goal of human society should be equated to the purpose of man—a life of virtue.[17]

---

[13] See Jean-Jacques Rousseau, "Umowa spoleczna" ("The Social Contract"), Polish trans. Antoni Peretiatkowicz, in *Antologia tekstow dotyczacych praw czlowieka* (*An Anthology of Writings on Human Rights*), ed. Jerzy Zajadlo (Warszawa: Biuro Rzecznika Praw Obywatelskich, 2008), 156.

[14] See Will Wilkinson, "Capitalism and Human Nature," *Cato Policy Report* 27:1 (2005): 1: "In the spring of 1845, Karl Marx wrote, *the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of social relations*. Marx's idea was that a change in *the ensemble of social relations* can change *the human essence*."

[15] On virtue, see Zbigniew Panpuch, "Cnoty i wady" ("Virtues and Vices"), in *Powszechna Encyklopedia Filozofii* (*The Universal Encyclopedia of Philosophy*), vol. 2, ed. Andrzej Maryniarczyk, S.D.B. (Lublin: PTTA, 2001), 216–231.

[16] Artur Andrzejuk, "Wladza wedlug sw. Tomasza z Akwinu" ("Power According to St. Thomas Aquinas") [www.tomizm.pl/?q=node/27, accessed on 19.03.2014].

[17] *De regno*, I, 15 [106]: "It is, however, clear that the end of a multitude gathered together is to live virtuously."

What means lead to the achievement of the goal of power? The de-
velopment of a virtuous life among citizens requires that political power
achieve its specific tasks, among which the pursuit of social peace, activi-
ties promoting the good and providing an abundance of earthly possessions
appear to be particularly important.[18] Any possible shortages in respect to
these goods and measures would bring disharmony to social life and could
seriously hinder their achievement. Therefore, it is the obligation of power
to establish these measures on the basis of real social relationships, and
where they already exist—to pursue their preservation and change for the
better.[19]

Peace is a form of social unity[20] whose existence constitutes the
foundation and guarantee of the many benefits of life in common.[21] One of
the important benefits of such life is the moral development of its partici-
pants—free people.[22] No moral progress would be possible if not for the
freedom of individual members of society. Hence, genuine care for peace
is, at the same time, a guarantee of human freedom. It is freedom that
makes the purpose of government the preservation of peace, being the
common good of people composing a given community. Power that ne-
glects its responsibility for keeping peace would be a contradiction in ser-
vice for the benefit of the achievement of the personal nature of man. This
is because disregard for human freedom could easily transform into treat-
ing free people as slaves.[23] Indeed, the specificity of power over free men

---

[18] Id., I, 16 [118]: "Sic igitur ad bonam vitam multitudinis instituendam tria requiruntur.
Primo quidem, ut multitudo in unitate pacis constituatur. Secundo, ut multitudo vinculo pacis
unita dirigatur ad bene agendum. Sicut enim homo nihil bene agere potest nisi praesupposita
suarum partium unitate, ita hominum multitudo pacis unitate carens, dum impugnat se ipsam,
impeditur a bene agendo. Tertio vero requiritur ut per regentis industriam necessariorum ad
bene vivendum adsit sufficiens copia."

[19] Id., I, 16 [117]: "[Q]uod quidem studium in tria dividitur, ut primo quidem in subiecta
multitudine bonam vitam instituat; secundo, ut institutam conservet; tertio, ut conservatam
ad meliora promoveat."

[20] See id., 16 [118]: "[M]ultitudinis autem unitas, quae pax dicitur, per regentis industriam
est procuranda."

[21] Cf. id., 3 [17]: "Bonum autem et salus consociatae multitudinis est ut eius unitas con-
servetur, quae dicitur pax, qua remota, socialis vitae perit utilitas, quinimmo multitudo
dissentiens sibi ipsi sit onerosa."

[22] Cf. Linda C. Raeder, "Augustine and the Case for Limited Government," *Humanitas* 16:2
(2003): 104.

[23] Andrzejuk, "Wladza wedlug sw. Tomasza z Akwinu:" "[N]owadays, treating a naturally
free man as a slave consists in treating him as a thing, tool, object or an animal."

cannot consist in anything other than care for the benefit of all those subject to this authority.[24]

In turn, social activities for the sake of the good appear to be directly proportional to the level of virtue of a given society. Virtuous men, by performing and multiplying what is good, affirm their membership in a given group, since "only those who render mutual assistance to one another in living well form a genuine part of an assembled multitude."[25] Cooperation *in virtue* and *for virtue* lies at the heart of social prosperity: from the correct functioning of the family, to being successful in business and getting suitable rest.[26]

Friendship is an exceptionally valuable fruit of a virtuous life.[27] It is a natural counterweight to physical coercion, which almost by definition appears to accompany political power. The stronger the friendship binding a given society, the less needed is the use of means of coercion vested in the political power at the level of social life.[28] Of course, it is impossible for all members of a given society to be characterized by virtue and mutual friendship. Therefore, the existence of the means of physical coercion is necessary. We might ask, however, whether the restoration of virtue, in addition to the restoration of peace, can be the reason for using physical coercion. We should highlight that, if the restoration of virtue is to be a reason for resorting to forcible corrective measures, this probably does

---

[24] *Sententia*, III, 5: "[P]rincipatus qui est supra liberos ordinatur principaliter ad utilitatem subditorum." See also *De regno*, I, 2 [10]: "Si igitur liberorum multitudo a regente ad bonum commune multitudinis ordinetur, erit regimen rectum et iustum, quale convenit liberis."

[25] *De regno*, I, 15 [106], and further: "Si enim propter solum vivere homines convenirent, animalia et servi essent pars aliqua congregationis civilis. Si vero propter acquirendas divitias, omnes simul negotiantes ad unam civitatem pertinerent, sicut videmus eos solos sub una multitudine computari qui sub eisdem legibus et eodem regimine diriguntur ad bene vivendum."

[26] Cf. Andrzejuk, "Wladza wedlug sw. Tomasza z Akwinu."

[27] *De regno*, I, 11 [77]: "[Amicitia] namque est quae virtuosos in unum conciliat, virtutem conservat atque promovet. Ipsa est qua omnes indigent in quibuscumque negotiis peragendis, quae nec prosperis importune se ingerit, nec deserit in adversis. Ipsa est quae maximas delectationes affert, in tantum ut quaecumque delectabilia in taedium sine amicis vertantur. Quaelibet autem aspera, facilia et prope nulla facit amor; nec est alicuius tyranni tanta crudelitas, ut amicitia non delectetur." It can also unite those wielding power with those subject to it, see id., I, 11 [78–79]: "Sed boni reges, dum communi profectui studiose intendunt et eorum studio subditi plura commoda se assequi sentiunt, diliguntur a plurimis, dum subditos se amare demonstrant . . . Et ex hoc amore provenit ut bonorum regum regnum sit stabile, dum pro ipsis se subditi quibuscumque periculis exponere non recusant . . . Non est ergo facile ut principis perturbetur dominium, quem tanto consensu populus amat . . ."

[28] Cf. Raeder, "Augustine and the Case for Limited Government," 103.

not aim at the restoration of virtue in a good man (*virtus boni viri*), as the virtue of a good man can be achieved only in freedom, and not by coercion.[29] Therefore, it appears that all forcible interventions of power can serve only to restore the virtue of a good citizen (*virtus boni civis*),[30] that is, introduce the unruly individual to discipline and obedience to the rules of social life. Coercion to virtue is justified only when a citizen did not manage to internalize it in the process of his education, and is striking at the unity of the community by his behavior. The necessity to use means of coercion, however, always testifies to a civilizational crisis in a given society.[31]

Finally, the care of political power for the common abundance of earthly possessions among people boils down to actions that make it possible for them to lead their lives at the level of affluence appropriate for the practice of virtue.[32]

What difficulties can political power encounter in the service of living in virtue? The first hindrance political power should take into account is the transience of a human life. It entails the impossibility of establishing the social good once and for all, and thus the necessity of constant care for it. "Men, on the other hand, cannot abide forever, because they are mortal. Even while they are alive they do not always preserve the same vigour, for the life of man is subject to many changes, and thus a man is not equally suited to the performance of the same duties throughout the whole span of his life." So it is the obligation of power to ensure the compatibility of generations ensuring the stability of social life, and also the preparation of successors for those currently in charge of various posts and offices in the community.[33]

---

[29] Cf. *De regno*, I, 11 [81]: "Timor autem est debile fundamentum. Nam qui timore subduntur, si occurrat occasio qua possint impunitatem sperare, contra praesidentes insurgunt eo ardentius quo magis contra voluntatem ex solo timore cohibebantur." And also Raeder, "Augustine and the Case for Limited Government," 103: "[O]nly freely willed love can engender that reordering of the soul essential to any genuine spiritual regeneration and thus to genuinely virtuous behavior."

[30] On the topic of distinguishing between the virtues of a good man and those of a good citizen, see *Sententia*, III, 3. Cf. Tomasz Kuninski, "Dobry czlowiek a dobry obywatel w ujeciu *Polityki* Arystotelesa" ("Good Man and Good Citizen in *Politics* by Aristotle"), *Diametros* 12 (2007): 60–75.

[31] See Raeder, "Augustine and the Case for Limited Government," 103

[32] *De regno*, I, 16 [118]: "Ad bonam autem unius hominis vitam duo requiruntur: . . . aliud vero secundarium et quasi instrumentale, scilicet corporalium bonorum sufficientia, quorum usus est necessarius ad actum virtutis."

Another difficulty is the possible perversity of members of society. This can manifest itself in a person being too lazy to "perform what the commonweal demands" or in actions "harmful to the peace of the multitude because, by transgressing justice, they disturb the peace of others." The task of power here is to skillfully, i.e. [by its] "laws and orders, punishments and rewards," restrain citizens from "wickedness" and lead them "to virtuous deeds."[34]

Military aggression of an external enemy, which disturbs peace and social unity, can be the third hindrance on the road to achieving the power's objective. Therefore, the mission of power is to keep the community "safe from the enemy, for it would be useless to prevent internal dangers if the multitude could not be defended against external dangers."[35]

Who should wield political power?

It appears that every citizen can be a potential participant in political power. Though not every citizen can be a member of a parliament or of a judicial tribunal, a characteristic that distinguishes each citizen is his ability to cooperate with the government by performing counseling functions.[36] Furthermore, the participation of citizens in power is even advisable, due to the necessity of public support for the government and its initiatives. The possibilities of civil involvement in this regard are not restricted to merely advisory privileges, but also include electoral rights: for those who are to wield power should be elected by and from among citizens (*ad populum pertinet electio principum*).[37]

Whom should people entrust with power? If the ultimate goal of social life were the health of its participants, then, undoubtedly, power should be entrusted to experienced physicians. Were monies to be the goal, then leading businessmen would be the most befitting to wield power. And were common life to consist in exploring the fields of knowledge, then power

---

[33] Id., 16 [119].

[34] Id., 16 [120]. Cf. id., 10 [71]: "[M]agis laudandus est ab hominibus et praemiandus a Deo, qui totam provinciam facit pace gaudere, violentias cohibet, iustitiam servat, et disponit quid sit agendum ab hominibus suis legibus et praeceptis."

[35] Id., I, 16 [120].

[36] *Sententia*, III, 1: "Et ex hoc potest esse manifestum quid sit civis: non enim ille qui participat iudicio et concione, sed ille qui potest constitui in principatu consiliativo vel iudicativo."

[37] See Douglas Kries, "Thomas Aquinas and the Politics of Moses," *The Review of Politics* 52:1 (1990): 92.

should be wielded by the best teachers.[38] Since, however, human communities ultimately exist to live a life of virtue, it appears that those who wield power should first and foremost be characterized by appropriate virtues.[39]

So what virtue should characterize a man wielding power? He should be a good and, above all else, a prudent man. This means that he should be comprehensibly equipped with moral virtues (*vir bonus*), and especially with the virtue of prudence, which not only helps a man to lead himself, but also predisposes him to ruling others. Were, however, a man in power to possess prudence allowing him to merely fulfill the duties of a citizen, meaning prudence making up the virtue of a good citizen (*virtus boni civis*), he would not yet have appropriate competencies for those who govern the community (*virtus boni principis*). This is because power requires greater prudence—such prudence which is a result of a special upbringing and which can bear the burden of both individual and social life.[40] The necessity of people in power to be prudent is also corroborated by the gravity of their obligations and the nature of means they have at their disposal. Taking reckless actions or carelessly using the means of coercion might lead to undesirable and very dangerous situations. Prudent power is thus necessary for the broadly understood safety of those subject to it.[41]

---

[38] *De regno*, I, 15 [106]: "Si igitur finis hominis esset bonum quodcumque in ipso existens, et regendae multitudinis finis ultimus esset similiter ut tale bonum multitudo acquireret et in eo permaneret; et si quidem talis ultimus sive unius hominis sive multitudinis finis esset corporalis, vita et sanitas corporis, medici esset officium. Si autem ultimus finis esset divitiarum affluentia, oeconomus rex quidam multitudinis esset. Si vero bonum cognoscendae veritatis tale quid esset, ad quod posset multitudo pertingere, rex haberet doctoris officium."

[39] Cf. id., I, 10 [68]: "Sic igitur maior virtus requiritur ad regendum domesticam familiam, quam ad regendum se ipsum, multoque maior ad regimen civitatis et regni. Est igitur excellentis virtutis bene regium officium exercere; debetur igitur ei excellens in beatitudine praemium."

[40] See *Sententia*, III, 3: "Et hoc ideo, quia non est eadem virtus principis et civis . . . Magnum enim principatum exercere addiscit homo, et per subiectionem et per exercitium in minoribus officiis. Et quantum ad hoc bene dicitur in proverbio, quod non potest bene principari, qui non fuit sub principe". See also St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, 2a2ae, 47, II, vol. 36: *Prudence*, ed. Thomas Gilby (London: Blackfriars, 2006), 36: "[E]t ideo in virtute boni viri includitur etiam virtus boni principis."

[41] Cf. C.W. Cassinelli, "Political Authority: Its Exercise and Possession," *The Western Political Quarterly* 14:3 (1961): 646: "The governor's exercise of political authority is always accompanied by his implicit threat to punish disobedience, and his possession of political authority is always accompanied by his governed's belief that he should have this coercive power. However, the threat of physical coercion must be quite divorced from the situation where political authority is exercised, while the governor would not possess political authority at all if he were not recognized as having the right to make such a threat."

To the virtue of prudence the man wielding power adds magnanimity.[42] It makes him such that "he does seek honour and glory, but not as something great which could be a sufficient reward of virtue. And beyond this he demands nothing more of men, for among all earthly goods the chief good, it seems, is this, that men bear testimony to the virtue of a man."[43] Thus, generosity of spirit focuses the attention of power on virtue to the extent that beside virtue it does not see any other reason for its existence and any other reward for its service. A dislike of distinctions, however, does not stem from the virtue of prudence; it is one of the virtues of a good man, which one in power should possess. "[F]or it is the duty of a good man to take no account of glory, just as he should take no account of other temporal goods. It is the mark of a virtuous and brave soul to despise glory as he despises life, for justice's sake."[44]

People wielding power are not always "virtuous and strong in spirit" enough to treat it only as a service towards a virtue-based life. Many of them, though virtuous before being granted power, neglect their virtues after their election to office. The office they hold weakens their moral condition and turns out to be a trial too hard to bear.[45] This of course does not mean that power always demoralizes those who wield it.[46] Rather, it means that coming into power requires previous preparation. A candidate for power should learn how to be the servant of virtue before actually accepting authority, so that power itself would eventually become a virtue worth developing. It appears that power that serves virtue and is a virtue is the only guarantee of governance free from corruption. The more power drifts apart from serving virtue and being virtue, the more it puts those whom it should serve and those who should be serving at risk of demoralization.

---

[42] *De regno*, I, 8 [56]: "Nihil autem principem, qui ad bona peragenda instituitur, magis decet quam animi magnitudo." While discussing other virtues of the king, "Thomas enumerates justice, gentleness and graciousness" (Andrzejuk, "Wladza wedlug sw. Tomasza z Akwinu").

[43] *De regno*, I, 8 [60].

[44] Id., I, 8 [57]. St. Thomas further states: "[U]nde fit quiddam mirabile, ut quia virtuosos actus sequitur gloria, ipsa gloria virtuose contemnatur, et ex contemptu gloriae homo gloriosus reddatur."

[45] Id., I, 10 [73]: "Multi enim ad principatus culmen pervenientes, a virtute deficiunt, qui, dum in statu essent infimo, virtuosi videbantur."

[46] For instance, an opposite position was taken by Lord Acton, who wrote in 1887: "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men, even when they exercise influence and not authority" (Martin H. Manser, *The Facts on File Dictionary of Proverbs* (New York: Infobase Publishing, 2007), 225).

What vices does power generate when it stops serving virtue? Such power appears to be conducive to the development of vices characteristic of ancient tyrants.[47] Exercising tyrannical power makes those who govern covetous and envious, and thus insatiable in their drive for the multiplication of glory and wealth, even for the price of blatant injustice.[48] Their virtueless lives make them distrustful and perverse, ready to hinder all progress among other citizens. Their own ill fame makes them fearful of the spread of a virtuous life within the community; for if their subjects became "virtuous from acquiring valour and high spirit," then they might "want to cast off their iniquitous domination" and depose them.[49] For corrupt power, however, there is nothing worse than the specter of losing authority.[50] Therefore, in order to maintain control over society, they fight against friendship, upset peace, sow discord, prohibit marriages and meetings, and even spread poverty.[51] Instead of a society they would like to see a mass of individuals, and instead of citizens—listless and mute servants, incapable of deeds that require courage and perseverance.[52] Ultimately, fear is the foundation of their degenerated power, so they try hard to make all their subordinates live in constant uncertainty and threat.[53]

How can citizens defend themselves against demoralizing power? It appears they can do this in three ways. First, they should make every effort to give power to people with no inclination towards tyranny.[54] This is not an easy task. It is difficult to avoid unctuous people, who after taking over

---

[47] See *De regno*, I, 2 [11]: "Si igitur regimen iniustum per unum tantum fiat qui sua commoda ex regimine quaerat, non autem bonum multitudinis sibi subiectae, talis rector tyrannus vocatur, nomine a fortitudine derivato, quia scilicet per potentiam opprimit, non per iustitiam regit: unde et apud antiquos potentes quique tyranni vocabantur. Si vero iniustum regimen non per unum fiat, sed per plures, siquidem per paucos, oligarchia vocatur, id est principatus paucorum, quando scilicet pauci propter divitias opprimunt plebem, sola pluralitate a tyranno differentes. Si vero iniquum regimen exerceatur per multos, democratia nuncupatur, id est potentatus populi, quando scilicet populus plebeiorum per potentiam multitudinis opprimit divites. Sic enim populus totus erit quasi unus tyrannus."

[48] Id., I, 4 [26].

[49] Id., I, 4 [27].

[50] Cf. *Sententia*, III, 5: "[S]ed postea homines, propter utilitates quae veniunt ex bonis communibus quae sibi principantes usurpant et quae veniunt etiam ex ipso iure principatus, volunt semper principari, ac si principari esset sanum esse, et non principari, esset infirmum esse. Sic enim videntur homines appetere principatum, sicut infirmi appetunt sanitatem."

[51] *De regno*, I, 4 [27]. Cf. Andrzejuk, "Władza według sw. Tomasza z Akwinu."

[52] *De regno*, I, 4 [28]: "Naturale etiam est ut homines, sub timore nutriti, in servilem degenerent animum et pusillanimes fiant ad omne virile opus et strenuum."

[53] Id., I, 11 [81].

power turn out to be tyrants.[55] It is difficult to get to know a person's character before letting him or her wield power—indeed, "authority shows the man."[56]

Next, power should be subordinate to legal restrictions preventing its deviation into tyranny.[57] Limiting the terms of office for those who wield political power appears to be an effective measure in this respect. On the one hand, it allows the society to repay its moral debt to those in power, so that those who took care of the well-being of other people can, after stepping down, experience care for their own welfare by the new political power.[58] On the other hand, it ensures that citizens do not assign all responsibility for the common good to those in power, as is often the case when power holders hold their positions for too long, but rather become magnanimously involved in the life of the community, treating the common good as their own.[59]

And last, citizens should procure the possibility of defying political power, and even overthrowing it, if those holding it resort to tyranny.[60] This is required by the common good of the whole community, as immoral power does not retain evil within the boundaries of itself, but spreads it to other people by transforming their degenerate customs into law.[61]

---

[54] Id., I, 7 [42]: "Primum autem est necessarium ut talis conditionis homo ab illis, ad quos hoc spectat officium, promoveatur in regem, quod non sit probabile in tyrannidem declinare." Cf. Kries, "Thomas Aquinas and the Politics of Moses," 91.

[55] Cf. *De regno*, I, 11 [83]: "Nullus autem verius hypocrita dici potest quam qui regis assumit officium et exhibet se tyrannum."

[56] Id., I, 10 [73]. "Ααρχη ανδρα δείξει" (Bias) (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, V, 2, 1130 [www.perseus.tufts.edu, accessed on 26.03.2014]. Cf. a quote from Abraham Lincoln: "Nearly all men can stand adversity, but if you want to test a man's character, give him power" (William E. Davis, *Peace and Prosperity in an Age of Incivility* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2006), 15).

[57] *De regno*, I, 7 [42]: "Deinde sic disponenda est regni gubernatio, ut regi iam instituto tyrannidis subtrahatur occasio. Simul etiam sic eius temperetur potestas, ut in tyrannidem de facili declinare non possit."

[58] See *Sententia*, III, 5: "A principio enim ipsi qui principabantur quasi aliis servientes reputabant dignum, sicut et erat, ut ipsi in parte ministrarent aliis intendentes utilitati aliorum, et iterum alio tempore aliquis alius principaretur qui intenderet ad bonum eius, sicut ipse prius intenderat ad bonum aliorum."

[59] See *De regno*, I, 5 [31]: "Plerumque namque contingit, ut homines sub rege viventes, segnius ad bonum commune nitantur, utpote aestimantes id quod ad commune bonum impendunt non sibi ipsis conferre sed alteri, sub cuius potestate vident esse bona communia. Cum vero bonum commune non vident esse in potestate unius, non attendunt ad bonum commune quasi ad id quod est alterius, sed quilibet attendit ad illud quasi suum."

Conclusion

The above considerations attempted to elucidate the thesis of the servient character of political power. In the light of above analysis, two conclusions appear to be especially established. First, as the personal nature of man requires living in society, and as this fact demands the existence of political power, the ultimate goal of service fulfilled by this power should be identical with the natural goal of every human being, meaning a life of virtue. Service to the cause of citizens' virtue, in turn, requires that the fundamental duties of power include the protection of public peace, the promotion of actions towards the good, and striving for a common abundance of worldly possessions. Second, since virtue is to be the greatest good in social life, then it appears that another necessary condition for electing those in political power is to make sure that aspirants to such are characterized by the appropriate level of virtuous development. Each candidate should be first and foremost a person possessing a high moral quality (*virtus boni viri*), where prudence and magnanimity appear to be virtues especially fitting power (*virtutes boni principis*). Both the aforementioned conclusions seem to justify not only the legitimacy of understanding political power as a service, but also the need of treating it in this way in real social life.

THE SERVIENT CHARACTER OF POLITICAL POWER
ACCORDING TO ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

SUMMARY

The author attempts to justify the thesis of the servient character of political power. By his analyses, he arrives at two conclusions. First, the ultimate goal of service fulfilled by political power should be identical with the natural goal of every human being, meaning a life of virtue. Hence, service to the cause of the citizens' virtue requires that the fundamental duties of power include the protection of public peace, the promotion of actions towards the com-

---

[60] See id., I, 7 [49]: "[S]i ad ius multitudinis alicuius pertineat sibi providere de rege, non iniuste ab eadem rex institutus potest destitui vel refrenari eius potestas, si potestate regia tyrannice abutatur."
[61] Cf. id., I, 12 [89]: "Adiicitur autem ad eorum impoenitentiam quod omnia sibi licita existimant quae impune sine resistentia facere potuerunt: unde non solum emendare non satagunt quae male fecerunt, sed sua consuetudine pro auctoritate utentes, peccandi audaciam transmittunt ad posteros, et sic non solum suorum facinorum apud Deum rei tenentur, sed etiam eorum quibus apud Deum peccandi occasionem reliquerunt."

mon good, and striving for a common abundance of worldly possessions. Second, to elect those in political power it is necessary to make sure that aspirants to such are characterized by the appropriate level of virtuous development. Each candidate should be first and foremost a person possessing a high moral quality (*virtus boni viri*), where prudence and magnanimity appear to be virtues especially fitting power (*virtutes boni principis*).

John F. Wippel
The Catholic University of America
Washington, USA

MARITAIN AND AQUINAS
ON OUR DISCOVERY OF BEING

As regards the title of my paper, I might note that there is some ambiguity in the meaning of the English term "being" when it is applied to the metaphysical thought of Thomas Aquinas. It is all too often used to translate the Latin term *esse* and thus carries with it an ambiguity in that it may refer to the act of existing viewed as an intrinsic ontological principle in every existing entity, a principle that is distinct from its essence; or it may simply refer to being understood as "that which is" or "that which has *esse*." When discussing Aquinas's own position here, therefore, I will restrict my usage of the term "being" to signify the Latin *ens* (which, he writes, signifies "that which is" or "that which has *esse*"),[1] and I will use the expression "act of existing" or "act of being" to signify *esse* taken as the intrinsic principle that actualizes essence in every existing thing and hence is required to account for the fact that an individual entity or being actually exists. Regarding this latter usage some ambiguity may still remain, however, because Thomas at times uses the verb *esse* or *est* simply to signify the fact that something exists ("Socrates is"). At other times he uses it to signify the intrinsic *actus essendi* that he posits to account for that

---

[1] See, for instance, Aquinas's *In De Hebdomadibus*, 2, ed. Leonine 50, 271:57–59: "ens, sive id quod est;" *ST* I–II, q. 26, a. 4, ed. Leonine 6, 190: "ens simpliciter est quod habet esse;" *In duodecim libros metaphysicorum Aristotelis expositio* IV, n. 535, ed. M.-R. Cathala, R. M. Spiazzi (Turin 1950), 151: "Dicit ergo primo, quod ens sive quod est, dicitur multipliciter;" *Quaestiones disputatae De potentia*, q. 7, a. 7, ed. Paul Pession (Turin-Rome: Marietti, l965), 204: "substantia est ens tamquam per se habens esse."

fact. Although this crucial distinction is not clearly recognized by all Thomistic scholars, it should be, and Cornelio Fabro should be given credit for having emphasized its importance very effectively.[2]

For my purposes here I am interested in presenting and comparing both Maritain's and Aquinas's accounts of our discovery (1) of being (*ens*) as existing; and (2) of being as being (*ens inquantum ens* or *ens commune*)—the subject of metaphysics.

Our Discovery of Being as Existing

There are important texts in Aquinas where he refers to our discovery of *esse* as occurring not in the intellect's first operation—abstraction taken in the strict sense, whereby we know what something is, but at the level of the intellect's second operation—judgment, whereby we recognize intellectually a thing's *esse*.

Consider, for instance, *In I Sent.*, dist. 38, q. 1, a. 3, sol.:

> Since in a thing there are two [factors], the quiddity of a thing and its *esse*, to these there correspond two operations on the part of the intellect. One which is called by the philosophers *formatio* whereby it apprehends the quiddities of things, which is also called by the Philosopher in *De anima* III the 'understanding of indivisibles.' The other grasps (*comprehendit*) the *esse* of a thing by composing an affirmation because also the *esse* of a thing composed of matter and form, from which it takes its knowledge, consists in a certain composition of form with matter or of an accident with a subject.[3]

---

[2] See his "Elementi per una dottrina tomistica della partecipazione," in his *Esegesi tomistica* (Rome 1969), 435: "Perciò l'autentica nozione tomistica di partecipazione esige di distinguere *l'esse* come atto non solo dall'essenza ch'e la sua potenza, ma anche dall'esistenza ch'e il *fatto* di essere e quindo un 'resultato' e non un principio metafisico . . ." For some texts where Thomas uses *esse* or *est* in judgments of existence expressing facticity, see his *Expositio libri peryermenias*, rev. ed. Leonine 1*1, II.2, 88:36–40: "hoc verbum 'est' quandoque in enuntiatione praedicatur secundum se, ut cum dicitur 'Sortes est,' per quod nichil aliud intendimus significare quam quod Sortes est in rerum natura;" *ST* II–II, 83.1, arg. 3: "secunda vero est compositio et divisio, per quam scilicet apprehenditur aliquid esse vel non esse" (ed. Leonine [Rome l889], vol. 9, 192). In the latter text, see ad 3 for confirmation that Thomas himself accepts this usage.

[3] "Cum in re duo sint, quidditas rei, et esse eius, his duobus respondet duplex operatio intellectus. Una quae dicitur a philosophis formatio, qua apprehendit quidditates rerum, quae etiam a Philosopho, in III De anima, dicitur indivisibilium intelligentia. Alia autem comprehendit esse rei, componendo affirmationem, quia etiam esse rei ex materia et forma composi-

It is clear from this text that one discovers *esse* not by means of abstraction and the intellect's first operation whereby it understands a thing's quiddity, but by means of judgment, the intellect's second operation and thus one understands (*comprehendit*) it. And thus one can account for the complexity involved in our understanding of being (*ens*) or "that which is" with its quidditative side being grasped by the intellect's first operation, and the existential aspect grasped by its second operation—judgment. But one may still ask whether *esse* as it is used here refers to a thing's intrinsic *actus essendi* (act of existing), or only to the fact that it exists. At the very least it must refer to grasping a thing's existence in actuality (facticity), but it may well also refer to grasping its act of existing. For earlier on in this same work Thomas has already introduced his view that there is a composition (and hence distinction) of essence and *esse* in creatures (see dist. 8, q. 1, a. 1; q. 5, a. 1, sol.; and a. 2), and therefore at this point he can take that issue as now given.

In his *Commentary on the De Trinitate*, in q. 5, a. 3, Thomas recalls from Aristotle's *De anima* these same two operations of the intellect. He writes:

> And these two operations correspond to two [factors] that are present in things. The first operation looks to (*respicit*) the very nature of a thing, according to which the thing understood holds a certain grade among beings, whether it be a complete thing, such as some whole, or an incomplete thing, such as a part or accident. The second operation looks to (*respicit*) the very *esse* of the thing, which results from the union of the principles of a thing in composites, or accompanies the simple nature of the thing, as in simple substances.[4]

Here Thomas uses the same Latin verb (*respicit*) to refer to the intellect's first operation in grasping a thing's essence or nature, and its second operation in grasping its *esse*. And he does the same in another text from

---

tae, a qua cognitionem accipit, consistit in quadam compositione formae ad materiam, vel accidentis ad subjectum." *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum*, I.38.1.3.sol., vol. 1, ed. Pierre Mandonnet (Paris 1929), 903. Translations into English are mine unless indicated otherwise. For Aristotle, see *De anima*, III, c. 5 (430a 26–28).

[4] "Et hae quidem duae operationes duobus quae sunt in rebus respondent. Prima quidem operatio respicit ipsam naturam rei, secundum quam res intellecta aliquem gradum in entibus obtinet, sive sit res completa, ut totum aliquod, sive res incompleta, ut pars vel accidens. Secunda vero operatio respicit ipsum esse rei; quod quidem resultat ex congregatione prin-

his *Commentary on I Sent.*, dist.19, q. 5, a. 1, ad 7: "the first operation looks to (*respicit*) the quiddity of a thing; the second looks to (*respicit*) its *esse*."[5] In these two texts it seems more likely to me that he is using *esse* as explicitly signifying actual existence taken as facticity. And he is also assigning to judgment some apprehensive function—the ability to grasp *esse*. But if we follow the order of discovery, once Thomas has established the distinction and composition of essence and the act of existing in every finite being, when he uses the term *esse* he may then also have in mind the act of existing.

Another aspect of Aquinas's theory of knowledge must also be taken into account, namely his view that all of our knowledge begins with sense experience.[6] Any Thomistic account of our discovery of being as existing must, therefore, respect this aspect of his theory of knowledge, and presumably will also have to recognize a certain role for some of the internal senses as well, especially of the imagination and its production of phantasms or sense images in providing potentially intelligible data upon which the abstracting power of the intellect can operate by rendering it actually intelligible and submitting it to the possible intellect. The possible intellect then can understand what something is, and can also form judgments about it. These judgments may simply involve the attribution of a predicate, grasped by the intellect's first operation, to a subject, apprehended by the same operation, or the denial of this. But for Aquinas there is also another kind of judgment in which the intellect affirms explicitly that the subject itself is or exists such as "Socrates is" or "Socrates exists." And it will be incumbent on such a theory to explain how such judgments—existential judgments—can occur.[7]

Finally, I have found it necessary to distinguish within Aquinas's account of our discovery of being as existing and, for that matter, our dis-

---

cipiorum rei in compositis, vel ipsam simplicem naturam rei concomitatur, ut in substantiis simplicibus." *Super Boetium De Trinitate*, q. 5, a. 3, vol. 50, ed. Leonine, 147:96–105.

[5] See *Scriptum super libros Sententiarum*, ed. Mandonnet, vol. 1, 489: "prima operatio respicit quidditatem rei; secunda respicit esse ipsius."

[6] See *Super Boetium De Trinitate*, q. 6, a. 2, ed. Leonine 50, 164:71–76: "Principium igitur cuiuslibet nostrae cognitionis est in sensu, quia ex apprehensione sensus oritur apprehensio phantasiae, quae est 'motus sensu factus' . . . a qua iterum oritur apprehensio intellectiva in nobis, cum phantasmata sint intellectivae animae ut obiecta." Also *Quaestiones disputatae de veritate*, q. 12, a. 3, ad 2, ed. Leonine 22.2, 378:379–382: "Sed quia primum principium nostrae cognitionis est sensus, oportet ad sensum quodam modo resolvere omnia de quibus iudicamus."

covery of the notion of being (*ens*) itself, between an understanding of being that is common to every thinking human being, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the metaphysical notion of being as being which, according to Thomas, is the subject of metaphysics. It is well known that, on a number of occasions, he refers to being (*ens*) as that which is first known to the intellect and, presumably, to every thinking human being.[8] At times he indicates that this primacy of being applies to the order of resolution and hence by implication not necessarily to the chronological order.[9] By saying this he means that whatever we may grasp with our intellects, if analyzed carefully, it may be reduced to being taken as "that which is." Hence, whatever is required to account for our knowledge of "that which is" will also be required to account for our discovery of this prephilosophical notion of being, or with what Maritain himself refers to as the "vague being of common sense."[10]

At the same time it is also important to recall how difficult Thomas thinks it was for philosophers to arrive at a consideration of being as being. Indeed, in *ST* I, q. 44, a. 2, he finds them passing through three stages. (1) The earliest philosophers, being cruder (*grossiores*) in their thinking, posited only sensible bodies as beings, and proposed only accidental motion and causes of the same. (2) Others reached a higher level and distinguished between form and matter and posited more universal causes such as Plato's ideas or Aristotle's ecliptic circle of the sun. But both groups still viewed being only as "this being" (*hoc ens*) or "such being" (*tale ens*).

---

[7] For texts where Thomas refers to the use of *est* or *esse* in judgments of existence, see note 2 above.

[8] For references to a number of such texts, see my *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas: From Finite Being to Uncreated Being* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 2000), 41, n. 56–59.

[9] See *De veritate*, q. 1, a. 1 (ed. Leonine 22.1, 5:100–104): "illud autem quod primo intellectus concipit quasi notissimum et in quod conceptiones omnes resolvit est ens, ut Avicenna dicit in principio suae Metaphysicae." Also see *ST* I–II, q. 94, a. 2 (ed. Leonine, vol. 7, 169–70); *In De Trin.*, q. 6, a. 1 (ed. Leonine, vol. 50, esp. 162:374–82). For discussion of these, see my *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, 42–44, and the supporting notes.

[10] My translation. For a slightly different English translation ("*vague* being known to common sense"), see Maritain, *Existence and the Existent* (New York, N.Y.: Pantheon, 1948), translation from the French *Court Traité de l'Existence et de l'Existant* of 1947, 26, For the French I am using *Jacques et Raïssa Maritain: Oeuvres Complètes*, vol. 9 (Fribourg Suisse: Editions Universitaires, 1990), 34: "Plus on médite sur ce sujet, plus il apparaît que c'est de cette façon que l'intelligence conceptualise l'existence, et qu'elle se forme idée de l'être,—de l'être *vague* du sens commun." (Further on, the *Existence and the Existent* will be cited as "EE English," and the *Court Traité de l'Existence et de l'Existant*—as "EE French.")

(3) Finally, some arrived at a knowledge of being as being and hence investigated the causes of beings not only insofar as they are "these" or "such," but insofar as they are beings.[11] This text is surprising in that here Thomas does not place Plato and Aristotle at the highest level—among those who grasped being as being, even though a year or so earlier in his *De potentia*, q. 3, a. 5, he had written: "Still later philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle came to a consideration of universal *esse* itself."[12] If we may set aside that issue, however, the text from *ST* I, q. 44, a. 2, makes it clear that Thomas does not think that every human being reaches a knowledge of being as being, the subject of metaphysics. Hence, one should distinguish between his account of our discovery of being at what I will call the prephilosophical or premetaphysical level, and the discovery of being as being, the subject of metaphysics.

As for Maritain's account, one can find most of the elements I have mentioned in Thomas's own theory in the French philosopher's *Existence and the Existent,* along with supporting references he himself gives from some of his earlier writings. Of course, he also says much about an intuition of *l'être*, especially in his *Existence and the Existent* and that will require additional attention. Finally, I will compare what he says there with his last treatment of all of this in his "Réflexions sur la nature blessée."

In *Existence and the Existent*, Maritain observes that our knowledge is "immersed in existence" and that "existence—the existence of material things—is given us at first by sense." Hence sense perception attains an object as existing by reason of the real and existing influence such an object exercises on our sense organs. But, he continues: "Sense attains existence in act without itself knowing that it is existence" and delivers it to the intellect without sense knowing that it is intelligible. And the intellect knows existence and "calls it by its name, which is *being*" (French: *l'être*).[13]

---

[11] See ed. Leonine, vol. 4, 457–58. Note page 458: "Et ulterius aliqui erexerunt se ad considerandum ens inquantum est ens: et consideraverunt causam rerum non solum secundum quod sunt *haec* vel *talia*, sed secundum quod sunt *entia*. Hoc igitur quod est causa rerum inquantum sunt entia, oportet esse causam rerum, non solum secundum quod sunt *talia* per formas accidentales, nec secundum quod sunt *haec* per formas substantiales, sed etiam secundum quod sunt *haec* per formas substantiales, sed etiam secundum omne illud quod pertinet ad esse illorum quocumque modo."

[12] See *De potentia*, q. 3, a. 5, in *Quaestiones disputatae*, ed. Pession, vol. 2 (Turin-Rome: Marietti, 1965), 49: "Posteriores vero philosophi, ut Plato, Aristoteles et eorum sequaces, pervenerunt ad considerationem ipsius esse universalis; et ideo ipsi soli posuerunt aliquam universalem causam rerum, a qua omnia alia in esse prodirent."

[13] See EE English, 11, and EE French, 22.

Maritain then notes that the intellect disengages intelligibles from sense experience and through the process of abstraction reaches natures or essences which it grasps apart from their material existence at a given space and time. It does this in order to restore them to existence through judgments asserting that "it is so" (*ita est*) such as "the earth revolves around the sun," meaning thereby that "the earth *exists* in physical existence as characterised by the movement described." Hence even such judgments have an existential function if they are expressing something that is true.[14]

Maritain then discusses the intellect's first operation (simple apprehension) and describes its object as "the intelligible density of an existent subject, rendered transparent in act to the mind and identified with the mind's vital activity by and in the concept." Or, as he also writes, "what the intellect lays hold of is the natures or essences which are in existent things or subjects."[15]

As he turns to judgment, he emphasizes the point that the function of judgment is existential, and that judgment restores essence—the objects of thought "to existence or to the world of subjects."[16] Maritain recalls that he had written in his *The Degrees of Knowledge* that when one forms a judgment, one accomplishes on one's *noemata* (objects of thought) "an operation that has meaning only because it relates to the fashion in which they exist (at least possibly) outside my thought."[17] As he continues in *Existence and the Existent* to quote from *Les Degrés du Savoir*: "The function proper to judgment thus consists in transposing the mind from the plane of simple essence, of the simple *object* presented to thought, to the plane of the *thing*, of the subject possessing existence (actually or possibly) and of which the predicate-object of thought and the subject-object of thought are intelligible aspects."[18]

Shortly thereafter Maritain again quotes in *Existence and the Existent* from his *Degrees of Knowledge* to this effect: "Judgment is not content with the representation or apprehension of existence. It affirms existence, it projects into it, as effected or effectible outside the mind, the objects of [the] concept apprehended by the mind."[19] And here in *Existence and the*

---

[14] See EE English, 11–12, and EE French 22–23.

[15] EE English, 13, 15; EE French, 24, 25.

[16] EE English, 16; EE French, 26.

[17] EE English, 16–17; EE French, 26–27, citing *Les Degrés du Savoir*, 7th ed. (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1963), l88.

[18] EE English, 17; EE French, 27, quoting *Les Degrés*, 188–89.

Existent he also indicates that existence as affirmed by and in the mind corresponds to the act of existing exercised by things outside the mind, and he refers to this act of existing as act or energy par excellence.[20]

But, as Maritain also rightly insists, existence itself is not an essence but belongs to an entirely different order. It is not an object of thought (or of the mind's first operation) in the way essences are. Maritain refers to it as a trans-objective act. And here he quotes from his earlier *De Bergson à Thomas Aquin*: "The intelligibility with which judgment deals is more mysterious than that which notions or ideas convey to us; it is not expressed in a concept but in the very act of affirming or denying. It is the super-intelligibility, if I may put it so, of the act of existing itself, either possible or actually given."[21]

From this description of judgment's relationship to the act of existing of extra-mental things, Maritain moves on to a section entitled "The Intuition of Being" ("L'intuition de l'être").[22] And so here *l'être* is translated as "being." This is interesting because Maritain has just been speaking of existence taken as the act of existing. As one follows his discussion of the intuition of *l'être*, one wonders whether he has in mind an intuition of *ens* or an intuition of *esse*. He begins by noting that Thomas places at the roots of metaphysical knowledge:

> the intellectual intuition of that mysterious reality disguised under the most commonplace and commonly used word in the language, the word *to be* (*être* in the French text), a reality revealed to us as the uncircumscribable subject of a science which the gods begrudge us when we release in the values that appertain to it, the act of existing which is exercised by the humblest thing.[23]

Granted that Maritain is speaking almost poetically here, he also knows that for Thomas *esse* (the act of existing) is not the subject of metaphysics, but that *ens inquantum ens* is. And then in an oft-quoted remark he writes: "A philosopher is not a philosopher if he is not a metaphysician. And it is the intuition of being (*l'intuition de l'être*) […] that makes the

---

[19] EE English, 17; EE French, 27, citing *Les Degrés*, 191, n. 1.

[20] EE English, 18; EE French, 27–28.

[21] See EE English, 18–19; EE French, 28, citing *De Bergson à Thomas d'Aquin, Jacques et Raïssa Maritain. Oeuvres Complètes*, vol. 8 (Fribourg-Suisse: Editions Universitaires, 1989), 157.

[22] EE English, 19; EE French, 28.

[23] EE English, 19; EE French, 28–29.

metaphysician." But almost immediately after this he writes that by this he means the intuition of being *secundum quod est ens* (*l'intuition de l'être secundum quod est ens*). And the reader wonders again whether this is an intuition of *esse* or an intuition of *ens*. He continues with the important observation that being (*l'être*) as used here is not the vague being (*l'être*) of common sense and which, I would add, therefore seems to be very close to what I understand as a prephilosophical notion of being.[24] Rather, Maritain continues:

> It is being (*l'être*), attained or perceived at the summit of an abstractive intellection, of an eidetic or intensive visualisation which owes its purity and power of illumination only to the fact that the intellect, one day, was stirred to its depths and trans-illuminated by the impact of the act of existing (*par le choc de l'acte d'exister*) apprehended in things.[25]

Maritain goes on to list a number of different paths that may lead to this intuition, no one of which is more legitimate than any other, because here we are dealing with what he calls a primary fact. And he refers to what Aquinas calls the "judgment of sense" and notes that this "blind existential perception" plays a primordial and indispensable role, but one that is only preliminary. Among the avenues or paths leading to this intuition on the part of the intellect Maritain mentions that it might be owing to "the innate gift of an imperial intelligence" combined with a "pure and delicate flesh" and a "perfectly balanced sensibility," as seems to have been true of Aquinas himself; or it might spring up unexpectedly like a species of natural grace prompted by the sight of a blade of grass, or perhaps at one's perception of oneself, or perhaps from the implacability with which the being (*l'être*) of things independent from ourselves suddenly becomes evident to us; or one may move toward it by an inner experience of duration (here the implicit reference is to Bergson), or in still other ways. But whatever the path, what is important is that one takes the "leap, to release, in one authentic intellectual intuition, the sense of being (*l'être*), the sense of the value of the implications that lie in the act of existing (*l'acte d'exister*)."[26] And, as will be noted below, he thinks that very few, even

---

[24] Id. In note 8 he refers to Aquinas's *Commentary on the Metaphysics* IV, c. 1 (ed. Cathala, nn. 530–535, mistakenly listed as pages in EE) where Thomas identifies *ens secundum quod est ens* as the subject of metaphysics.

[25] EE English, 20; EE French, 29–30.

[26] EE English, 21; EE French, 30.

among the greatest philosophers, have managed to do so in the formal sense.

But then a new section in his book begins with this title in English "The Concept of To-exist (*esse*) and that of Being or of That-which is (Ens)" or in French: "Le concept de l'existence ou de l'exister (*esse*) et celui de l'être ou de 'ce qui est' (*ens*)." Here, then, we have an important clarification: Maritain is using two terms in French to render the Latin *esse*, namely *l'existence* and *l'exister*, and two other words or expressions to translate the Latin *ens*, namely *l'être* or *ce qui est*.[27] He begins by noting a paradox: he has said that the intelligible apprehended in our ideas is essence, and that existence is not an essence. And so one may ask: How can existence be the object of the intellect, or be expressed by a concept?

In responding to this Maritain steps back for the moment from his discussion of the metaphysical intuition required to make the metaphysician to a consideration of how one arrives at what he will call the vague being known to common sense. As a premonition of his answer he recalls that he had said that essences are the objects of the intellect's first operation, and that it is the act of existing (*acte de exister*) that judgment confronts. He continues: because the intellect is present in each of its operations, in the initial upsurge of its activity arising from the world of sense experience, it apprehends and judges in one and the same instant. And so it "forms its first idea (that of being [*de l'être*]) while uttering its first judgment (of existence [*de l'existence*]), and utters its first judgment while forming its first idea . . . [I]t thus lays hold of the treasure which properly belongs to judgment in order to envelop it in simple apprehension itself." And thus it expresses this in an original idea that does not result from simple apprehension alone but also from that which the intellect grasps through judgment—the act of existing—and makes this an object of thought.[28]

Here, then, Maritain speaks of a "concept of existence" (*l'existence ou l'exister*) and warns that it "cannot be *cut off* from the absolutely primary concept of being (*l'être = ens, ce-qui est, ce-qui existe, ce-qui a pour acte d'exister*)" because the judgment and affirmation of existence which provides content for this concept itself involves the composition of a subject with existence. It affirms that "something exists" (actually or possibly, simply or with some added predicate). Hence Maritain writes that this con-

---

[27] EE English, 22; EE French, 31.
[28] EE English, 23; EE French, 32.

cept of being (that which exists or can exist) in the order of "ideative perception" corresponds to this affirmation of existence in the order of judgment. Maritain also emphasizes that the concept of existence cannot be visualized completely apart from the concept of essence, for the two of them make up one and the same analogous concept, that of being.[29]

Maritain observes that being is the first of all concepts, although not explicitly formulated as such, because it "springs into the mind at the first awakening of thought, at the first intelligible coming to grips with the experience of sense" and transcends sense perception. Thus, when one points one's finger at an object and the eye sees and the sense power perceives in its blind fashion that "this exists," at this same instant the intellect judges that "this being is or exists" and expresses "being" in a concept.[30]

Maritain also brings out the reciprocal priority between this concept of being and the judgment "this being exists" in the sense that the idea of being ("this being") is prior to the judgment of existence in the order of material or subjective causality, whereas the judgment of existence is prior in the order of formal causality. This, he concludes, is the way one arrives at the idea of the "*vague* being known to common sense."[31] In an important footnote he explains that here he is not speaking of "verbally formulated operations, or even of operations explicitly thought. The essential thing is that they be there implicitly." He adds that some primitive languages lack the word "being" but comments that the idea of being is implicitly present in the minds of those using such languages, and also that the first idea formed by a child is not the idea of being but that the idea of being is implicit in the first idea the child has. Here one may recall my earlier remark above about Aquinas's references to being as that which is first in the order of resolution rather than in the chronological order.[32]

In another lengthy footnote, Maritain proposes in outline fashion the steps involved in arriving at this vague common sense notion of being. In the text which this note annotates, he is now ready to move on to what he calls "the higher intuition" which he will require for one to reach the subject of metaphysics. Hence this implies that formulation of the vague common sense notion of being also involves an intuition of being, although not the metaphysical and higher intuition which is restricted to only a few

---

[29] EE English, 24–25; EE French, 32–33.
[30] EE English, 25; EE French, 33–34.
[31] EE English, 25–26; EE French, 34.
[32] EE English, 25, n. 12; EE French, 34, n. 12. See note 9 above and my coresponding text.

human beings.[33] In the note itself he remarks that the extramental existence of a thing was given to the intellect from the very start in the intuition and concept of being, which I again take to refer to the common sense notion of being.[34] He distinguishes the following steps:

1. "Judgment" improperly so-named of the external senses and the aestimative power (French: *cogitative tel qu'il se trouve chez l'animal*, 35, n. 13), bearing upon a sensible existent that is perceived. This, he says, is "in the sphere of sense (with its treasury of intelligibility in potency, but in no wise in act) the 'blind equivalent' of what we express in saying, 'this exists.'"

2. Formation in a simultaneous awakening of the intellect and judgment of an idea ("this being" or simply "this thing" in which the idea of being is implicitly present) and a judgment that composes the object of thought with the *act* of existing itself (by asserting that "this thing exists" or "this being exists"). Maritain also explains that the intellect knows the subject as individual indirectly by "reflection on phantasms" but does not thereby affirm that it exercises the act of existing. It affirms this only "by and in this 'judgment' itself' and in this intuition of sense which it grasps by immaterialising it. And thus the intellect reaches the *actus essendi* (in judging)—as it reaches essence (in conceiving)—*by the mediation of sensorial perception*."

3. Formation of the idea of existence. From the moment when, conjointly with the first judgment of existence the idea of being emerges ("that which exists or can exist"), the intellect "grasps the *act* of existing affirmed in the first judgment of existence and makes of the act of existence an ob-

---

[33] Already in his earlier *A Preface to Metaphysics* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1948, but first published in 1939), Maritain had distinguished sharply between the notion of being first attained by the intellect (the being of common sense) and *ens secundum quod est ens* (the subject of metaphysics). See id., 18–19; and especially 27–33. See id., 29–31 for his reference to the vague being of common sense as "pre-scientific knowledge" and as 'infrascientific knowledge" and, following Cajetan and John of St. Thomas, as being the object of *abstractio totalis* or of what one may call "extensive abstraction." Also, while in this book he does not spell out in detail the steps involved in the intellect's discovery of either the common sense notion of being or the metaphysical notion of being, he does refer to both as gained by intuition. There, in response to Gabriel Marcel's rejection of an intuition of being, Maritain refers to "the obscure intuition of being possessed by common sense, the perception of which I have termed vague being. It is only when the metaphysical intuition of being has occurred that this assurance refers to it also" (id., 60, end of the long note 1 beginning on id., 59).

[34] EE English, 27, n. 13; EE French, 35–36, n. 13.

ject of thought by formulating a concept or notion of existence (*existentia ut significata*).[35]

Here I pause to compare this account with that of Aquinas as best as one can reconstruct his own position on the basis of his rather scattered references. I would first note that, at least on my reading of Thomas, both he and Maritain distinguish between a pre-metaphysical or prephilosophical notion of being and the metaphysical notion of being as being. As regards Maritain's three steps:

1. Both Thomas and Maritain argue that all of our knowledge begins in some way from sense experience. Maritain has referred in passing to the role played by the aestimative/cogitative power in our moving on to judgments of existence. Without rejecting some possible role for the cogitative power, here I would emphasize the role of the first internal sense power, the *sensus communis*. For Aquinas this internal sense has two functions: (a) it distinguishes objects reported by different external senses appropriately such as this sound, as different from this color, this odor, etc.; (b) it enables a higher animal or a human being to be aware when such an agent is actually perceiving something with one or more external sense.[36]

2. Both Thomas and Maritain distinguish between the intellect's first operation which apprehends the essences or natures of things, and its second operation—judgment—which looks to a thing's *esse*; and I also think that Maritain's reference to this as a simultaneous awakening of both of these operations is a defensible presentation of Thomas's position.

3. While Maritain recognizes with Aquinas that the intellect knows the subject as individual by reflecting back on the phantasms preserved at

---

[35] Id. Note that Maritain lists as step 4 the thinking subject's discovery of first principles and only as step 5 the subject's explicit awareness or consciousness of its own existence. I pass over additional consideration of these steps here in the interests of space, but would call the reader's attention to Therese Scarpelli Cory's recently published very thorough and helpful examination of Aquinas's own understanding of self-awareness: *Aquinas on Human Self-Knowledge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

[36] See *Sententia libri De anima*, II.24, ed. Leonine, 45.1, c. 13, 120, lines 99–105 (note especially: "sensu enim communi percipimus nos videre et discernimus inter album et dulce"); c. 26, 178, lines 8–14: "huiusmodi actiones sunt duae: una est secundum quod nos percipimus actiones sensuum propriorum, puta quod sentimus nos videre et audire; alia est secundum quod discernimus inter sensibilia diversorum sensuum, puta quod aliud sit dulce et aliud album." Also see. c. 27 where Thomas finds Aristotle beginning to investigate the common sense by basing himself on the fact that we perceive that we see and hear ("ex hac operatione qua sentimus nos videre et audire" [182:1–5]) and then throughout this chapter by appealing to the fact that the common sense distinguishes sensible objects from one another in order to show that there is one common sense.

the level of the imagination, I do not think that, according to Aquinas, in the order of discovery one should hold that in its first judgment or judgments of existence the intellect explicitly grasps *esse* in the sense of the *actus essendi.* To recognize that there is such an act of existing requires some sophisticated metaphysical analysis, for instance, showing that one can reason from the fact that something exists to the presence of some ontological principle within that thing to account for that fact.[37]

But when an individual subject is explicitly recognized as existing in actuality, I see no textual warrant in Aquinas for saying that either its act of existing, or the notion of being itself is grasped by an intellectual intuition such as that described by Maritain. In accord with Aquinas's theory of knowledge, it is by turning back (*per quamdam reflexionem*) to its own act, and then to the species which is the principle of its act of understanding, and then to the phantasms at the level of the imagination from which the species was abstracted and by reuniting the abstracted universal nature or essence with its individuating characteristics, that the intellect itself becomes aware of the object as individual and here I would add, going beyond Maritain, by adverting to the common sense's awareness that one or

---

[37] Interestingly, in his later *The Peasant of the Garonne* (Eng. Paperaback ed., Toronto: McMilllan, 1969; originally published in French in 1966), Maritain seems to recognize this: "It is in a judgment (or in a preconscious act equivalent to an unformulated judgment), and in a judgment of existence, that the intellectual intuition of being occurs. The philosophical concept of the *actus essendi,* of the act of existence, will only come later" (id., 163). There again he insists that this intellectual intuition of being has nothing to do with Bergsonian intuition which he thinks was spoiled by a quite accidental anti-intellectualism. Moreover, it did not focus directly on being, but on duration, which is only one of the aspects of being "which served him as a kind of substitute for being." But, adds Maritain, through the experience of duration it was actually being (*esse*) which Bergson attained without realizing it. For more on his earlier critique of Bergsonian intuition and Bergsonian philosophy more generally, see his *Bergsonian Philosophy and Thomism*, in *The Collected Works of Jacques Maritain*, (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007), vol. 1, 29–30 (from the Preface to the second edition of the French original *La Philosophie Bergsonienne* published in 1913) and id., 150–171, from the main text itself including helpful remarks concerning Maritain's own view on intuition. For more on intuition in Maritain's account, see below. On the difference between the intuition of being and the discovery of the *actus essendi*, also see B. Rioux, "L'intuition de l'être chez Maritain," in *Jacques Maritain: The Man and His Metaphysics*, ed. John Knasas (Mishiwaka, Indiana: The American Maritain Association, 1988), 96: "Par ailleurs, si le jugement situe la saisie de l'être au plan de l'exister, cela ne signifie pas que nous avons accès d'emblée à l'exister comme l'acte des actes et perfection des perfections, antérieur et supérieur à tout l'ordre des essences qui deviennent alors des puissances d'exister et qui sont comprises comme une *proportio ad esse* d'òu derivent leur être même et leur intelligibilité."

more external sense is perceiving the object, that the intellect judges that such an object exists.[38] On the basis of one or more such existential judgments, the intellect then forms the general notion of being as "that which is."

For Aquinas our knowledge of an individual and hence of the subject of an individual judgment of existence is not direct, but indirect, and not unmediated but mediated through sense experience and so, too, it seems to me is its ensuing judgment (or judgments) of existence leading to a prephilosophical notion of being, disputed though this indeed is by certain interpreters of Aquinas.[39] Maritain himself, followed on this by a number of those who would find his intuition in Aquinas, cites in support our understanding of first principles such as non-contradiction and identity.[40] For Aquinas, however, one's recognition of a principle such as non-contradiction as self-evident presupposes, at least in the order of nature, that one has already discovered the premetaphysical notion of being on which that principle is based. Such texts do not indicate that the discovery of being itself is based on an intuition. To put this another way, for me to recognize that being is not nonbeing presupposes that I have already reached a notion of being.

Our Discovery of the Subject of Metaphysics
(ens inquantum est ens)

In *Existent and the Existent*, after having described the process whereby the intellect forms an idea of the "vague being known to common sense," Maritain distinguishes from this the higher intuition whereby:

---

[38] See, for instance, *De veritate*, q. 10, a. 5: "Et sic mens singulare cognoscit per quandam reflexionem, prout scilicet mens cognoscendo obiectum suum, quod est aliqua natura universalis, redit in cognitionem sui actus, et ulterius in speciem quae est sui actus principium, et ulterius in phantasma a quo species est extracta; et sic aliquam cognitionem de singulari accipit" (ed. Leonine 22.2, 309, lines 73–81). Also see *In IV Sent.*, 50.1.3 (ed. Busa, 1.3, 704). There Thomas explicitly refers to this knowledge of individuals on the part of the intellect as indirect. On this, see George Klubertanz, "St. Thomas and the Knowledge of the Singular," *New Scholasticism* 26 (1952):135–166, esp. 149–151. Cf. Robert Schmidt, "The Evidence Grounding Judgments of Existence," in *An Etienne Gilson Tribute*, ed. C. J. O'Neil (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1959), 228–244.

[39] For some who defend the presence of an intuition of being in Aquinas, see in *Jacques Maritain: The Man and his Metaphysics*: John Hittinger, "The Intuition of Being: Metaphysics or Poetry?" 71–81; John Knasas, "How Thomistic is the Intuition of Being?" 83–91; Bertrand Rioux, "L'intuition," 93–102; also, James Hanink, "In Defence of the Intuition of Being," in *Distinctions of Being*, ed. Nikolaj Zunic (American Maritain Association [Wash-

the intellect disengages being (*l'être*) from the knowledge of the sensible in which it is immersed, in order to make it the object or rather the subject of metaphysics; when, in a word it conceptualises the metaphysical intuition of being . . . what the intellect releases into that same light is, here again, first and foremost, the act of existing.[41]

Here again Maritain seems to put the cart before the horse because on my reading of Aquinas, it is within the science of metaphysics itself that one becomes explicitly aware of *esse* understood as the *actus essendi*. Maritain notes that according to "classical Thomism," it has now reached the third degree of abstraction.[42]

Here in another long footnote in *Existence and the Existent*, Maritain quotes from a note in L. B. Geiger's *La Participation dans la philosophie de saint Thomas d'Aquin* first published in 1942.[43] There Geiger cites excerpts from Thomas's extremely important *Commentary on the De Trinitate of Boethius*, q. 5, a. 3, taken from a transcription of the autograph, that is to say, of the manuscript in the extremely difficult handwriting of Thomas himself, which was made available to Geiger by Fr. A. Dondaine.[44] There Thomas distinguishes between abstraction when it is taken broadly so as to signify any way in which the intellect can distinguish, and when it is applied strictly so as to signify distinguishing by the intellect in its first operation.[45] And so, Thomas writes, the intellect distinguishes one

---

ington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013]), 167–179; Joseph Owens, "Maritain's Three Concepts of Existence," *The New Scholasticism* 49 (1975): 295–309. Knasas is more critical of Maritain's intuition account in his *Being and Some Twentieth-Century Thomists* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2003), 61–65.

[40] See *Bergsonian Philosophy and Thomism*, 152–154.

[41] EE English, 26; EE French, 34–35.

[42] EE English, 27–28; EE French, 35–36. For another brief reference to the distinction between the "obscure being possessed by common sense" and the metaphysical intuition of being, see *A Preface to Metaphysics*, 60, n. 1.

[43] Paris: J. Vrin, 1942; 2nd ed., 1953.

[44] For these excerpted texts, see Geiger, 318–319, n. 1.

[45] See *Super Boetium De Trinitate*, q. 5, a. 3 (ed. Leonine, vol. 50, 146:86–147:95). "Responsio. Dicendum, quod ad evidentiam huius quaestionem oportet «videre» qua «liter» intellectus secundum operationem abstrahere possit. Sciendum est igitur quod secundum Philosophum in III De anima duplex est operatio intellectus: una quae dicitur intelligentia indivisibilium, qua cognoscit de unoquoque quid est, alia vero qua componit et dividit, scilicet enuntiationem affirmativam vel negativam formando." Note that this particular text is not cited by Geiger and hence apparently was not available to Maritain in the corrected version taken from the autograph.

guishes one thing from another in different fashion in accord with its different operations. According to the operation whereby the intellect composes and divides (judges), it distinguishes one thing from another by understanding that one is not present in the other. But in the operation by which it understands what things are, it distinguishes one thing from another by understanding what that thing is without understanding anything about the other, neither that it is united with it or separated from it in reality. Because of this Thomas observes that this way of distinguishing on the part of the intellect should not be described as "separation" (*separatio*). That name should be reserved for the operation whereby the intellect distinguishes through judgment. It should rather be described as "abstraction," but only when one of those things that is distinguished by the intellect is in reality united with the other. Here, therefore, he is taking the name "abstraction" strictly rather than in the broad sense in which he had used it earlier in this article.[46]

Thomas then goes on to subdivide abstraction taken in the strict sense into abstraction of a whole from a part (abstraction of a universal from an individual) and abstraction of a form (abstraction of the accidental form of quantity from sensible matter). He associates the first of these especially with natural philosophy and the second with mathematics, meaning thereby that by means of the first one reaches the subject of natural philosophy (*ens mobile*) and by means of the second one reaches the subject of mathematics (*ens quantum*).[47] Thomas contrasts these with another way in which the intellect distinguishes, this time only at the level of judgment by a negative judgment—*separatio*, and connects this with our discovery of the subject of metaphysics. In other texts within this same article Thomas writes: "In those things which can be divided in the order of

---

[46] See id., 148:159–171: "Sic ergo intellectus distinguit unum ab altero aliter et aliter secundum diversas operationes: quia secundum operationem qua componit et dividit distinguit unum ab alio per hoc quod intelligit unum alii non inesse, in operatione vero qua intelligit quid est unumquodque, distinguit unum ab alio dum intelligit quid est hoc, nihil intelligendo de alio, neque quod sit cum eo, neque quod sit ab eo separatum; unde ista distinctio non proprie habet nomen separationis, sed prima tantum. Haec autem distinctio recte dicitur abstractio, sed tantum quando ea quorum unum sine altero intelligitur sunt simul secundum rem."

[47] For his presentation of these, see id., 148:180–149:238. Note his summarizing remark (149:239–244): "Et ita sunt duae abstractiones intellectus: una quae respondet unioni formae et materiae vel accidentis et subiecti, et haec est abstractio formae a materia sensibili; alia quae respondet unioni totius et partis quae est absractio universalis a particulari, quae est abstractio totius . . ." Also see the text quoted in note 49 below.

existence, separation obtains rather than abstraction," and also states: "Substance, however, which is the intelligible matter of quantity, can exist without quantity. Therefore to consider substance without quantity pertains to the genus of separation rather than that of abstraction."[48] As Maritain describes this: "It is in a judgment declaring that being is *not* necessarily linked to matter nor to any of its conditions that the intellect abstracts [here since he is commenting on q. 5, a. 3, he should have written 'distinguishes'] being from all matter and makes for itself the metaphysical concept of being as being."[49]

One should recall here that in q. 5, a. 1, of this same treatise Thomas had distinguished the three theoretical sciences in accord with the differing degrees to which the objects they study (*speculabila*) depend on matter and motion. In the case of metaphysics he writes that metaphysics studies the kind of *speculabilia* that do not depend on matter *secundum esse* either in the sense that they are never present in matter (God and angels), or in the sense that they may or may not be present in matter. As examples of the latter he lists substance, quality, *ens*, potency, act, the one and the many, etc.[50]

In my fuller discussions of *separatio* elsewhere I have referred to the first kind as positively immaterial, meaning thereby that they are never

---

[48] See id., 149:256–258: "In his autem quae secundum esse possunt esse divisa magis habet locum separatio quam abstractio;" id., 149:270–274: "Substantia autem, quae est materia intelligibilis quantitatis, potest esse sine quantitate; unde considerare substantiam sine quantitate magis pertinet ad genus separationis quam abstractionis."

[49] Also see near the end of the corpus: "Sic ergo in operatione intellectus triplex distinctio invenitur: una secundum operationem intellectus componentis et dividentis, quae separatio dicitur proprie, et haec competit scientiae divinae sive metaphysicae; alia secundum operationem qua formantur quidditates rerum, quae est abstractio formae a materia sensibili, et haec competit *mathematicae*; tertia secundum eandem operationem, universalis a particulari, et haec competit etiam physicae et est communis omnibus scientiis, quia in omni scientia praetermittitur quod per accidens est et accipitur quod per se est" (id., 149:275–286). For Maritain's comment, see EE English, 29, n. 14; EE French, 37, n. 14. [I have italicized the term *mathematicae* in Thomas's text because in the 2nd printed edition of this work (in 1488 in Milan), which served as the prototype for the subsequent non-critical editions (see ed. Leonine, *Introduction*, 51, n. 3), the term *metaphysicae* was mistakenly introduced into the printed textual tradition instead of *mathematicae*. See Thomas Aquinas, *Opuscula*, ed. Paulus Soncinas (Milan: Benignus and Joannes-Antonius Fratres de Honate, 1488), f. 239va. This misleading error is still present in the 1954 Marietti ed. (*Opuscula theologica*, v. 2, 373)]. Although Maritain apparently in the original EE French version dating from 1947 did not have access to a much longer discussion of the role of *separatio* and the subject of metaphysics by Geiger in an article which also appeared in that year, he was able to formulate a fundamentally accurate understanding of Thomas's discussion from the limited corrected

present in matter, and to the second kind as negatively or neutrally immaterial, meaning thereby that they may or may not be present in matter, but need not be.[51] Thomas includes being (*ens*) in this class, and in replying to obj. 6 in this same q. 5, a.1, he identifies being (*ens*) as the subject of metaphysics. Hence in noting that metaphysics is based on *separatio*, he is also speaking of one's discovery of its subject. As he again states explicitly in q. 5, a. 4, its subject is being insofar as it is being (*quae habet subiectum ens in quantum est ens*). Or as he also explains there, being and substance are separate from matter and motion in the sense that it is not necessary for them to exist in matter and motion although they may be present there.[52] It is this negative or neutral characteristic of being that is recognized and expressed by the negative judgment (*separatio*). Through this judgment one recognizes that that by reason of which something enjoys being need not be restricted to that by which it enjoys any particular or restricted kind of being, such as material being or quantified being or living being or dead being. And thus, by negating any such limitation or restriction of being, by

---

text which he took from Geiger's book. For Geiger's fuller treatment, see "Abstraction et séparation d'après s. Thomas *In de Trinitate*, q. 5, a. 3," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 31 (1947): 3–40.

[50] See ed. Leonine, vol. 50, 138:141–167. Note especially: "Quaedam vero speculabilia sunt quae non dependent a materia secundum esse, quia sine materia esse possunt, sive numquam sint in materia, sicut Deus et angelus, sive in quibusdam sint in materia et in quibusdam non, ut substantia, qualitas, ens, potentia, actus, unum et multa et huiusmodi . . ." (lines 154–160).

[51] See my *Metaphysical Themes in Thomas Aquinas* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1984), 69–82; *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2000), 44–51. Dispute continues on the part of Thomistic scholars concerning whether in order to justify this negative judgment (*separatio*) and thereby discover the subject of metaphysics one must first have demonstrated the existence of some positively immaterial being such as a First Mover or God or a spiritual soul. For my own detailed discussion and rejection of any such claim both on historical and philosophical grounds, see *Metaphysical Themes*, 82–104; *The Metaphysical Thought of Thomas Aquinas*, 51–62.

[52] For his reply to obj. 6 in q. 5, a. 1, see ed. Leonine, 141:322–333. For the text from q. 5, a. 4, see id., 154:182–197: "Utraque [metaphysics and the theology based on Sacred Scripture] autem est de his quae sunt separata a materia et motu secundum esse, sed diversimode, secundum quod dupliciter potest esse aliquid a materia et motu separatum secundum esse: uno modo sic quod de ratione ipsius rei quae separata dicitur sit quod nullo modo in materia et motu esse possit, sicut Deus et angeli dicuntur a materia et motu separati; alio modo sic quod non sit de ratione eius quod sit in materia et motu, sed possit esse sine materia et motu quamvis quandoque inveniatur in materia et motu, et sic ens et substantia et potentia et actus sunt separata a materia et motu, quia secundum esse a materia et motu non dependent sicut mathematica dependebant . . ."

negating any such negation, one may say, one discovers the notion of being as being, the subject of metaphysics.

Credit should be given to Maritain for having recognized the role of *separatio* in the improved text of Aquinas's account. At the same time, he was so attached to the theory of three degrees of abstraction in the classical Thomism of Cajetan and John of St. Thomas that he mistakenly claimed that the difference between their approach and that of Aquinas himself in the text from q. 5, a. 3, of the *Commentary on the De Trinitate* was only verbal.[53] And so even in *Existence and the Existent* he unfortunately continues to refer to the third degree of abstraction rather than to *separatio* in presenting his understanding of Thomas's position. Thus he writes:

> If metaphysics is established at the highest degree of *abstraction*, the reason is precisely that, unlike all the other sciences, in concerning itself with being as being, as a proper object of analysis and scientific disquisition, it concerns itself with the very act of existing . . . In virtue of the type of *abstraction* which characterises it, metaphysics considers realities which exist, or are able to exist, without matter. It *abstracts* from the material conditions of empirical existence, but it does not abstract from existence! (Italics mine)[54]

Hence, after having referred to Aquinas's introduction of *separatio*, and its distinction from abstraction taken strictly, he seems to have set it aside for all practical purposes.

This becomes much more evident in Maritain's final treatment of all of this in his *Refléxions sur la nature blessée et sur l'intuition de l'être*, which was prepared for a seminar he held with the *Petits Frères de Jésus* at Kolbsheim on July 21, 1967, and was first published in the *Revue Thomiste* in 1968.[55]

---

[53] See *Existence and the Existent*, 30, continuation of the long note 14. There he notes that this *separatio*, since it ends in an idea, can be called an abstraction "in the general or rather proportional meaning of the word (but which is not produced in the line of simple apprehension of essences!)." The danger of referring to *separatio* as an abstraction without some such qualification consists in this that readers may conclude that the resulting notion of being has been abstracted from the differences that obtain between beings and thereby treat it as univocal.

[54] EE English, 31; EE French, 39.

[55] See *Revue thomiste* 68 (1968): 5–40; reprinted in Maritain's *Approches sans entraves* (Paris: Librairie Arthèm Fayard, 1973). Here for the French version I follow the *Revue thomiste* text and for the English translation "Reflections on Wounded Nature," in *The Collected Works of Jacques Maritain*, vol. 20: *Untrammeled Approaches* (Notre Dame, Ind.:

There in a section entitled "A Digression on the Intuition of Being (*L'être*): The Concept of Existence," Maritain speaks first of two concepts of existence, and then of three. He had anticipated this in the preceding section by referring to an intellectual intuition of being which, he writes, is not the "peak of philosophical wisdom" but the "indispensable condition for attaining it."[56] He had singled out a number of philosophers who failed to reach this intuition of being such as Descartes, Hegel, and even Aristotle who, he says, did so only virtually and in implicit fashion.[57]

In this "Digression" Maritain insists that with the intuition of being one leaves the world of simple apprehension and enters that of judgment because this intuition is produced by a positive judgment of existence such as "I am" or "Things exist." Again Maritain distinguishes this kind of judgment from those in which the verb "is" functions simply as a copula by which an attribute or predicate, grasped in the manner of an essence understood by abstraction, is connected to a subject. But in the case of the intellectual intuition of being (*l'être*), the idea or concept of existence is not prior to the judgment of existence but comes after it and arises from it.[58] In this case it is the subject itself which is posited or affirmed in the mind just as it exists outside the mind and "to produce this judicative act, by really *thinking* it, is, for the intelligence, in the very heart of the spiritual intimacy of its own operation, to grasp intuitively, or to *see* the being (*l'être*), the existence (*l'exister*), the extra-mental *esse* of that subject." And this, writes Maritain, is the intuition of being (*l'être*).[59]

And, Maritain continues, after the intelligence has reached this intuition through judgment, it can by "a reflexive return" (*une reprise reflective*) of the intellect's first operation (simple apprehension) whereby it

---

University of Notre Dame Press, l997), 207–242. (Further on cited as "Ref. French" for the French version and "Ref. English" for the English version.)

[56] Ref. French, 14; Ref. English, 216. In terms of context, here Maritain wants to trace the failure of most philosophers to reach this intuition back to a wound of the intellect following from original sin.

[57] Ref. French, 16–17; Ref. English, 218–219.

[58] Ref. French, 17–18. There is an unfortunate mistake in the English translation, which I here present in corrected form: "but this judgment [read "*is not like*" rather than "*like*"] *those others* in which a subject endowed with a certain essence is linked, by the copulative *is*, to some attribute or predicate *by mode of essence*, that is, by means of an idea born of the abstractive operation" (Ref. English, 220).

[59] Ref. English, 220; Ref. French, 18. Maritain immediately adds this comment which I quote in French: "Par elle je plonge dans le monde de l'exister, en m'évadant du monde des essences et de leurs relations."

reflects on this intuition, produce an idea or concept of the *esse* that has originally been grasped through judgment and form what he will now call the "second concept of existence." This is what one means, he explains, when one says, for instance, "The soul communicates to the body its own *existence* or its own *esse*." Here, therefore, Maritain is holding that one grasps the act of existing itself through such a judgment of existence and intuition of being, and not merely the simple fact that something exists.[60]

Maritain stresses that this concept of existence is entirely different in origin from another concept, also called existence, that is produced from the intellect's first and abstractive operation in the way all other ideas are drawn from phantasms through abstraction. He now refers to that as his "first concept of existence" and laments having to use the same word "existence" to signify both. More important for our purposes, though, is the fact that he now seems to allow no place for judgment in the intellect's formation of this first concept of existence. He also says that it is formed before the intuition of being whereas the second concept is formed after that intuition. This first concept of existence seems to have replaced his earlier account of the formation of the vague and common-sense notion of existence which he had presented in *Existence and the Existent* and in which judgment would play an essential role. In this respect, therefore, this account now departs much more significantly from Aquinas's own position than that offered by Maritain in that earlier writing. To illustrate the difference between the first concept of existence and the second Maritain notes the difference between one's saying that "the existence of a spy in our services *is* beyond doubt" (italics mine) and that "the soul communicates to the body its own *existence* or its own *esse*."[61]

Maritain also writes that Gilson seems to have been so fascinated by the intuition of being that, if Maritain recalls correctly, he wrote that there is no concept of existence,[62] a remark to which Gilson would respond

---

[60] Id.

[61] Ref. English, 220–221; Ref. French, 18.

[62] For Maritain, see Ref. English, 221; Ref. French, 18. In the second edition of his *Being and Some Philosophers* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, l952), Gilson published as an Appendix a critique of certain aspects of his position by L.-M. Régis that had originally appeared in *The Modern Schoolman* 28 (1951): 121–127. The first (id., 217–218) critique responds to Gilson's denial that existence or "to be" can possibly be conceived and his rejection of a concept of existence (see id., 3, 202, 213–214). In light of certain texts taken from Aquinas himself and offered by Régis against this reading, in his response to Régis Gilson granted that in making this claim he was not using the language of Thomas himself and that for him every intellectual cognition is a "conception" (id., 222) and might

rather sharply in 1974 as will be noted below. Against this claim Maritain comments that there are two concepts of existence, as he has just distinguished them and in a note he indicates that there is even a third as he will explain below and which like the first is of abstractive origin, but at the third degree of abstraction.[63] Neither the first concept nor the third plays any role in the intuition of being. He also points out that even those who have reached the intuition of being will use the first concept of existence in their ordinary speech, for instance when they say: "A visitor is *here*." For this, according to Maritain, is to use "is" as a copula that joins "here" to a subject and indicates that this subject is present to what Maritain refers to as "my world."[64]

Maritain points out that some true metaphysicians who have experienced the intuition of being will use the concept of existence arising from judgment and following upon the intuition as designating "an intelligible—*esse* or 'the act of existing'—*which was not drawn from phantasms by the abstractive operation, like all the other objects of concepts*."[65] But if this is true, Maritain asks rhetorically, how can the act of existing, which is material in the things our eye, for instance, sees, "become proportioned to the intelligence, and spiritualized, in such a way that the intelligence might come to *see* it, and *see it within itself*" by an act of judgment? Here Maritain indicates that he will proceed carefully in what he calls these "rather hasty notes."[66] He proposes three stages.

In the first stage there is perception on the part of the external senses. For example, an act of the external sense of sight brings within my sense of sight the color of a rose by means of a sensible species received from without. Maritain explains that this "enters the mind by means of an intentional form which transfers into the sense the particular way in which the surface of the petals reflects the light acting on the organ (retina and cerebral center)." But at the same time it brings into the sense of sight the act of existence (*exister*) on the part of the rose without that sense "know-

---

even be called a *conceptus* when that term is taken broadly. Also see Gilson's *L'Être et l'essence*, 2nd ed. (Paris: J. Vrin, 1962), 351, where he again addresses this issue, but warns that this should not be taken as meaning that one can have a "concept quidditatif de l'*esse*." Maritain himself was apparently referring to the position taken by Gilson in texts such as these, but without identifying what particular text or texts he had in mind.

[63] Ref. English, 221, n. 29; Ref. French, 18, n. 1.
[64] Ref. English, 221; Ref. French, 19.
[65] Ref. English, 222; Ref. French, 19–20.
[66] Ref. English, 222; Ref. French, 20.

ing what is going on." It does this not by means of a sensible species [presumably because there is no sensible species of the act of existing itself], but by an "intentional action exercised on the sense when it receives the *species* of the color of the rose."[67] Here I would again note Maritain's failure to distinguish between one's discovery of the fact that something exists, and the act of existing itself (*exister*), and also that unfortunately, in the interests of simplicity here he now bypasses the role of the internal senses. As I have pointed out above, both the role of phantasms produced by the imagination and the role of the common sense are essential to Aquinas's account.

In presenting stage two Maritain writes that my intelligence does not need the imagination and its phantasms in order for it to be aware that *I am seeing* when my eye sees something. (But for Aquinas it does need awareness of the action of the common sense, as I have already noted.) For, Maritain continues, intelligence is present to the external sense and "penetrates with its own life" the life of the external sense. And it becomes conscious not only of the color of the rose that is perceived, but also of its own "seeing of that rose." The act of existing is made present in the sense of sight (though not perceived by that sense), owing to the intentional action the sense undergoes in receiving the sensible species, and is "made present to the intelligence (in a *totally implicit* way and without being grasped by it as of yet), as implied in *the rose*, […] which it knows that *I see*." This occurs at the level of the first degree of abstraction where the intelligence says in its interior word: "That rose is there," which, says Maritain, is the *Dasein*, as he adopts a Heideggerian term, but only in the way a Thomist must understand this expression—meaning that the rose is present to me.[68] Maritain denies that at this point the intelligence says: "The rose is" and so he continues to deny that a judgment of existence is involved in this stage. And so at this moment the rose's act of existing or *Sein* (another Heideggerian term, but again as understood by a Thomist) is not yet explicitly perceived but only potentially and implicitly. To repeat, it is only declared to be "present to me."[69]

As for the third stage, once the eye sees the rose and intelligence says "The rose is there," the intelligence may pass, as if by a miracle which, Maritain writes, is really not a miracle but rather a "stroke of good

---

[67] Ref. English, 223; Ref. French, 20–21.
[68] Ref. English, 223–224; Ref. French, 21.
[69] Ref. English, 224; Ref. French, 21–22.

fortune" and a gift of nature, to a higher level. This level is not merely at the third degree of abstraction, but at "a moment of natural contemplation in which thought is freed from abstraction." This is the intuition of being, which may happen supra-consciously in a child, or more or less supra-consciously in a poet, or consciously in a philosopher. Maritain describes this as follows:

> At this moment the intuition of being suddenly flashes in the mind like a bolt of lightning, and the rose's *act of existing* already intentionally present in the intelligence but only as spiritualized in proximate potency, or as implicitly and blindly contained in 'the rose is there' which the intelligence utters at the first degree of abstraction, is unveiled explicitly now as an object grasped, *spiritualized in act*, and made proportioned in act to the intelligence.[70]

And this privileged insight, this intuition, Maritain reminds us, is brought about by a true judgment of existence, asserting that "this rose, or this thing, exists" which Maritain also views as an affirmation of *Sein*.[71] The result from this intuition and the intellect's return of simple apprehension to reflect on it and on the judgment of existence that produces it is Maritain's "second concept of existence."[72] But missing from this account is any explicit mention of the role of *separatio*, which Maritain had at least recognized in *Existence and the Existent* as present in Aquinas's *De Trinitate*, q. 5, a. 3, and which, as we have indicated above, according to Aquinas is required for us to discover being insofar as it is being—the subject of metaphysics.[73]

---

[70] Ref. English, 224–225; Ref. French, 22.

[71] Ref. English, 225; Ref. French, 23.

[72] See Ref. English, 226; Ref. French, 24. On id., 227, there is another very misleading mistake in the English translation. One should read: "On the contrary, when we come to the second concept of existence, the one which [read: *proceeds from* instead of *precedes*] the intuition of being, we are in the register of [delete: "the"] *Sein*." See id., 25, for the French version of the mistranslated text: "celui qui procède de l'intuition de l'être."

[73] In the immediately following context, the need for some reference to *separatio* becomes very evident. Still referring to his second concept of existence which proceeds from the intuition of being and a real judgment of existence, Maritain writes: "Here being is grasped as such . . . It is no longer taken in its relation to the sensible world; it is taken absolutely, in its limitless and intrinsically differentiated universality which embraces everything that *is* (and *is* in irreducibly varied ways)." Ref. English, 227–228; Ref. French, 25. Perhaps Maritain had now concluded that his proposed intuition of being could accomplish all that Aquinas had attributed to *separatio*.

Maritain subsequently goes on to argue that many "great" philoso-phers have failed to reach this intuition, and that other truly great ones have reached it only in virtual fashion even though they were true or real meta-physicians, but seemed to be lacking something. He mentions Bergson here and writes that he did experience the intuition of being, but did not reach "the formal intuition of being in its full light" but only in a "disguised fash-ion, or by means of a substitute—*duration*," and that following from this his metaphysical thought suffered from a "doctrinal deviation."[74]

He then considers Aristotle who, he says, did have an admirable sense of the analogy of being but one still incomplete and deficient because even though he had a real experience of the intuition of being, this was only virtually and "not formally and in full light." And in the course of developing the point that Aristotle never got "beyond the wall of es-sences," Maritain finds Aristotle reaching a third concept of existence, in addition to the two Maritain had already proposed. This third concept, he says, is of abstractive origin, like the first one and not based on a true judgment of existence, but now at a higher level, the third degree of ab-straction, but which continues to treat *esse* in the manner of a "*quid* or of an essence or in the manner of essence or of quality," and so his metaphys-ics suffers from a grave deficiency.[75] But since Maritain does not attribute this third concept of existence to Aquinas, and since here I am interested in comparing Maritain and Aquinas, I will pass over any additional remarks about it.

Conclusion

I have already remarked that Maritain's final presentation of how one discovers the subject of metaphysics—being as being—suffers greatly from the absence of any appeal to Thomas's negative judgment of separa-tion. Moreover, in his consideration in this writing of what he calls the first concept of existence, Maritain is less Thomistic than was his presentation in *Existence and the Existent*. He omits and even explicitly rejects any role for judgments of existence in one's discovery of a prephilosophical and premetaphysical notion of being (or the "vague being of common sense," to use Maritain's earlier terminology).

---

[74] Ref. English, 232; Ref. French, 30.
[75] Ref. English, 234–236; Ref. French, 30–34.

But is there a doctrine of an intellectual intuition of being in the texts of Aquinas? Earlier on I have already expressed my reservations about finding such a doctrine in Aquinas himself. In connection with this I now turn to Gilson's response to the following remark by Maritain, mentioned above in passing: "Etienne Gilson seems to have been so fascinated by the intuition of being that he wrote, if I recall correctly, that there is no such thing as a *concept* of existence."[76] As will be recalled, to this Maritain had immediately replied that there two such concepts and even three.

In his "Propos sur l'être et sa notion," Gilson quotes this text and responds that he also believes that he had written such a statement and affirms that he still holds such a view. He comments that he finds it somewhat scandalous that two followers of Thomas Aquinas, that is, Maritain and Gilson himself, after having spent so many years as members of his school, should disagree on such a fundamental point as the notion of being (*l'être*). But to say that there is no concept of existence and to hold that there are two or even three such concepts are incompatible propositions. Gilson points out that to ask whether there is a concept of existence may be taken in two ways—whether there is a concept of being (*conceptus entis*) or whether there is a concept of *esse*—and points out that he has not found Aquinas raising either of these questions in these words in his texts. And by speaking of a concept of existence, Gilson warns that one introduces a *conceptus existentiae* that is foreign to the language of Aquinas himself.[77]

As regards a concept of existence, Gilson responds along the lines of his earlier concession to Régis that in general there is a conception (*conceptio*) for every object of thought since to think is to conceive, and to conceive is to engender objects of thought. If therefore one wishes to name every object of this kind a "concept" then, if we grasp the meaning of the words "existence," "to be" (*être*), or "being" (*étant*), and understand the term concept in this broad sense, we may apply it to them.[78]

As regards intuitions of beings, Gilson acknowledges that we have sensible intuitions, but emphasizes very strongly that a sensible intuition of a being is not an intellectual intuition of its *esse* (*être*). He writes that for someone to see a being is to perceive something of which one knows that it has an *esse*, but that we do not have a distinct concept of that which makes

---

[76] Ref. English, 221; Ref. French, 18.

[77] In *San Tommaso e il pensiero moderno*, ed. Antonio Piolanti (Citta Nuova: Pontificia Accademia Romana de S. Tommaso d'Aquino, l974), 7–17. See id., 8.

[78] See id., 9. See note 62 above for Gilson's reply to Régis.

it exist. While the most extensive quidditative concept is that of being (*ens*), or "that which has *esse*," Gilson comments that from the *esse* of a being one can only abstract the notion of *esse commune*. And the object of the notion of *esse commune* exists only in thought as a being of reason, not in reality as the act of a being. As he also expresses it, *esse* is that which makes of an essence a being. Here he is speaking of the *actus essendi*. And this, he points out, has no proper existence in itself apart from that of the substance which it makes a being. This is why, he continues, "one cannot have an intuitive understanding of the *esse* of a being (*de l'être d'un étant*) because it is only perceptible to us in the sensible perception of the substance which it actualizes."[79] And as regards *esse commune*, he repeats his point that it exists only in the intellect and cites *Summa contra gentiles* I, c. 26: "Much less, therefore is *esse commune* itself something outside of all existing things except in the intellect alone."[80]

To reinforce his rejection of any intellectual intuition of *esse*, Gilson recalls that if one wants to speak of degrees of abstraction, our apprehension of being will still be an abstraction based on sense experience. According to Aquinas the human intellect cannot think without images (phantasms). Since there is no image of being insofar as it is being, which is a pure intelligible, intellectual intuition of this is not possible in the present life even for the most experienced metaphysicians. Gilson also recalls that for Thomas it is the "that which," the quiddity of a being, that is the proper object of the human intellect in the present life.[81]

---

[79] See "Propos," 10: "C'est même pourquoi on ne saurait avoir d'intellection intuitive de l'être d'un étant, parce qu'il ne nous est perceptible que dans la perception sensible de la substance qu'il actualise." He continues: "De l'acte de percevoir tel ou tel étant, nous pouvons abstraire la notion abstraite d'être, cet être commun et universel attribuable à tout ce qui est, mais l'être propre à chaque étant ne nous est connu que comme cause immanente à ce qu'il fait être."

[80] See id., 10. For Thomas, see: "Multo igitur minus et ipsum esse commune est aliquid praeter omnes res existentes nisi in intellectu solum" (ed. Leonine man., 27). Trans. mine.

[81] See "Propos," 11–12. On page 12 Gilson cites *ST* I, q. 17, a. 3, ad 1, for support and then quotes from Thomas's Commentary on the *Liber de causis* in a French translation apparently based on a faulty Latin edition rather than on the critical edition by H. D. Saffrey, which I quote here: "Sed secundum rei veritatem causa prima est supra ens in quantum est ipsum esse infinitum, ens autem dicitur id quod finite participat esse, et hoc est proportionatum intellectui nostro cuius obiectum est quod quid est ut dicitur in *III° De anima*, unde illud solum est capabile ab intellectu nostro quod habet quidditatem participantem esse . . ." See *Sancti Thomae de Aquino Super librum de causis expositio* (Fribourg: Société Philosophique, l954), 47:11–17.

Near the end of his article Gilson returns to Thomas's view that it is impossible for the human intellect, in the state of the present life whereby we are joined to a body, to understand something in actuality except by turning itself back to phantasms (*ST* I, q. 84, a. 7). Gilson concludes that because this rule is based on (human) nature, it admits of no exception.[82]

I myself regret the fact that, to the best of my knowledge, Gilson himself did not incorporate into his discussion of this issue and his account of how one discovers being as being the role of *separatio* in Aquinas's thought. And I have already criticized Maritain for omitting this from his final account of all of this. But concerning the presence of an intuition of being or of existence in the texts of Aquinas, I agree with Gilson in noting that I myself have not found it there, and that it is not compatible with Thomas's theory of knowledge.

**MARITAIN AND AQUINAS
ON OUR DISCOVERY OF BEING**

SUMMARY

The author presents and compares Maritain's and Aquinas's accounts of our discovery (1) of being as existing; and (2) of being as being (*ens inquantum ens* or the subject of metaphysics). He finds that especially in his final discussion of how one discovers being as being, Maritain's account suffers greatly from the absence of any appeal to Aquinas's negative judgment of separation and also from the omission of reference to the role of judgments of existence in one's discovery of a premetaphysical notion of being. Wippel finds no evidence in Aquinas's texts for Maritain's defense of an intuition of being or of existence.

---

[82] See "Propos," 16. For Thomas, see: "Impossibile est intellectum nostrum, secundum praesentis vitae statum quo passibili corpori conjunimur, aliquid intelligere in actu, nisi convertendo se ad phantasmata" (ed. Leonine, vol. 5, 325). On page 17 Gilson notes that Maritain himself acknowledged that while the intuition of being had been lived *in actu exercito* by Thomas (and by the good Thomists), Maritain had not found any treatise or disquisition where Thomas had studied it *in actu signato*. Gilson comments rather wryly that another reason to account for the absence of any explicit discussion of this in Aquinas's texts may rather be that he held no such doctrine.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS