
UNIT 2 STARTING POINT, FUNDAMENTAL NOTIONS AND PRINCIPLES

Contents

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Starting Point of Metaphysics
- 2.3 Fundamental Notions and Principles
- 2.4 Let Us Sum Up
- 2.5 Key Words
- 2.6 Further Readings and References
- 2.7 Answers to Check Your Progress

2.0 OBJECTIVES

Metaphysics is a science in so far as science provides us with sure and evident knowledge of things from their causes. Every science has its own starting point, and fundamental notions and principles. Metaphysics, as a science, has also its own starting point, fundamental notions and principles. In this Unit you are expected to understand:

- The meaning of the starting point of metaphysics
- The most fundamental notions
- The most fundamental principles and their complementarity

2.1 INTRODUCTION

A science is always a logically ordered system, i.e., the various parts of a science are logically coherent. One part is justified by another. Scientific statements are deduced from another. However, this process cannot go on to infinity. Ultimately one must arrive at premises that no longer are conclusions of a reasoning process within the limits of a given science, but have their truth established through direct observation by the senses or their foundation in another science. Somehow every science is bound to have fundamental data that can serve as the starting point. In other words, the function of the starting point is to supply the basic data concerning the object considered in the science. The physical sciences have their starting point in the concrete data of the senses obtained through observation or experimentation. The starting point of metaphysics is the sensitive-rational experience of something as it manifests itself in judgment, question and pure desire to know. These manifestations always remain in conformity with the fundamental notions and principles.

2.2 STARTING POINT OF METAPHYSICS

The question about the starting point of metaphysics comes at the beginning of metaphysics itself. The starting point must be that which comes first before everything else, and from which we begin. There are as many starting points for metaphysics as there are metaphysicians. Here, we restrict our discussion to three important positions

with regard to the starting point before we make a concluding synthesis: judgment, question and the pure desire to know.

Judgement as the Starting Point of Metaphysics (Adv: Joseph Mar'echal). Every particular act of knowledge reveals a characteristic duality when it is expressed in a judgment: *reference and assertion*. Knowledge always refers to something or someone and makes an assertion about this something or someone in either an affirmative or a negative way. To know something or someone always means to know it or one as being this way or that way or not this way or that way, i.e., as *judgment*. *Judgement* is an act of the intellect in which we say something of an object by way of affirmation or denial. Every particular judgment may be considered as a reply to the question: Is the being in question as it is asserted to be in the proposition?

Question as the Starting Point of Metaphysics (Adv: Martin Heidegger, Karl Rahner, Emerich Coreth, Otto Muck). "Man Questions". Question is something final and irreducible. Every attempt to question the question is itself another question. For, one can ask oneself whether the question concerning the starting point of metaphysics is itself a starting point which does not make any further logical and critical presuppositions. This turns the question back upon itself and discloses that the question in the beginning is unavoidable and that at least questioning in itself is given as an unavoidable and non-arbitrary beginning, for if the question concerning the starting point were itself improper or meaningless, then questioning the meaninglessness of the question concerning the starting point of metaphysics would be another question.

Pure Desire to Know as the Starting Point of Metaphysics (Adv: Bernard Lonergan). *Being* is the objective of the pure desire to know. *Desire to know* is the dynamic orientation manifested in question for intelligence and for reflection. It is the inquiring and critical spirit of man. *Pure Desire to Know* differs from other desires. This pure desire is to be known by giving free rein to intelligent and rational consciousness and not by comparing with other desires. It compels assent to the unconditioned. *This pure desire has an objective*. The objective of the pure desire to know is the content of knowing and not merely the act of knowing, i. e., *what* is to be known (that which is to be known). The fact of asking or questioning results from the pure desire. (Pure desire is prior to questioning and judging- the starting point of metaphysics). Hence, Being is all that is known and all that remains to be known. It is at the root of all that can be affirmed or conceived. It underlies all judgement and formulation, all questioning and the desire to question. In this way it is all-inclusive.

To conclude: *Experience of Something as the Starting Point of Metaphysics*. The starting point of metaphysics is the experience of 'something' as it manifests itself in various forms, especially in judgment, question and pure desire to know. For instance, it is certain that everyone has an experience of 'something'. This experience of 'something' is an inescapable experience. One may escape from a particular experience, but one cannot escape from experiencing something. The most fundamental and radical question one can ask is this: 'Is there anything at all?' The answer can either be a negation or an affirmation. If it is a negation it should be so: 'There is nothing'. Such an answer is self-contradictory as the answer affirms a negation which is again 'something'. Hence absolute negation is impossible. For, paradoxically, every absolute negation presupposes an absolute affirmation upon which the negation rests. An affirmative experience of 'something' is not 'that which is not', but 'that which is' or 'Being'. Thus, experience of 'something' or Being is the ultimate starting point of metaphysics manifest in various forms of it such as judgment, question and pure desire to know.

2.3 FUNDAMENTAL NOTIONS AND PRINCIPLES

Notion is vague and imperfect concept. *Notions are of simple mental content.* Principles are of complex mental contents. *Simplicity* is the absence of complexity and *complexity* is the union of distinct parts. Notions and principles are also the basic evidences to which thought must conform. *Principle is that from which something proceeds in any way whatsoever.* The definition implies two things: that the principle is *prior* to that which proceeds from it; that there is a *special connection* between what is called the principle and that which proceeds from it, in virtue of which the former is the principle of the latter.

There are three basic notions: Notion of Being, Notion of Action or Operation, and Notion of Self. *Notion of Being:* Being is that which is in some way or something. That which is in some way or something, is always and immediately present in human experience. This experience of Being is as undeniable as the fact of the affirmation. Experience of Being signifies immediate knowledge, the immediate presence of the known to the knower. It is the original form of knowledge. An experience which is not an experience of Being would be an experience of nothing which is an impossibility. Nothing is clearer or simpler or more evident than Being pre-apprehended in my consciousness. Hence we cannot ask what is the essence or nature of Being. For essence and nature are already ‘ways of Being’. It is the ‘essence’ of Being not to have any essence as it surpasses and includes all essences. Thus it is impossible to construct, derive, reduce, or define Being in terms of anything other than itself. *Notion of Action:* In my experience of something I know that I *experience* the experience. I am implicitly and immediately conscious of the activity of experience itself. *Notion of Self:* In my experience of something I know that I I experience the experience. I am implicitly and immediately conscious of my own self. The self is a fact of conscious experience which is both undeniable and inexplicable. When I awake in the morning, I have to admit that my remembrance of previous knowledge or of my past belong to the very same self that I am now. This identity of the self is the reason why I can synthesize the past and present. But in itself it remains an unexplained fact, a simple datum of my personal experience. Furthermore, this identity did not always exist, because forty-two years ago I did not exist.

Check Your Progress I

Note : a) Use the space provided for your answer.

b) Check your answer with those provided at the end of the unit.

1) What is the starting point of metaphysics?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2) Explain the three fundamental notions.

Principles of Truth and Affirmation

The principle of truth states that ‘*there is truth*’. Truth is conformity (correspondence) between the mind and the object. It is self-evident that truth exists; for even denying it would admit it. Affirmation is the assent of the mind to that which is. Affirmation is the primary form in which the principle of truth manifests itself to us in judgement. This affirmation can be expressed in several ways: ‘there is something’, ‘something is’, ‘something exists’. The fact of such affirmation is undeniable. I cannot sincerely doubt the fact that I formulate judgments, or that I affirm. The opposite of affirmation is negation which ultimately rests on affirmation. Negation, as we know, is the absence of positive assent (dissent). Every negation implies four elements: *A positive foundation*: A positive foundation is an affirmation. In the example that Benson is not an angel, the positive foundation is that he is a man. *Proposal to the mind*: When we say that Benson is not an angel there is a proposal or question to the mind: Is he an angel? *Comparison*: There is always a comparison of the proposal “Is he an angel?” with our previous knowledge that he is a man. *Rejection of the proposal*: Here the proposal ‘Is he an angel?’, is rejected by the mind.

Principles of Identity and Distinction

It is the fact of being one and the same. According to this principle everything is what it is. Whatever is, is; and whatever is not, is not. Everything is its own being. Everything is itself, but in a way proportionate to its nature. This principle is implied in all judgments. In the affirmative judgment I say that something is and that it is as it is. It is itself. I affirm the necessary identity of that which I affirm with itself. The particular judgment ‘this is’ or ‘I am’ contains a general judgment which embraces all judgments. *Whatever is, insofar as it is, is and is what it is*. This principle is not a mere tautology. It is not concerned with such an obvious repetition as $A=A$. For the predicate adds to the subject the mode of necessity which stems from the Being of being. The judgment about being as being reveals that Being is precisely Being, self-sufficient, self-explanatory, and not referring to anything else, and therefore unconditioned and necessary.

Distinction is the absence of identity. The principle means that every being is in some way distinct from the other. Most of our thinking implies distinctions. When we make an inference, for example, we draw a conclusion from premises. But in doing so we have to take many distinctions for granted: we have to presuppose the distinction between the premises and the conclusion we draw from them. We must also distinguish between the subjects and the predicates in both the premises and conclusions. All these are different distinctions. When we draw our conclusion, our attention is directly focused on the conclusion and marginally focused on its relationship to its several premises. But a whole series of distinctions functions in the background.

These distinctions are at work even though they are not being explicitly made at the moment we draw our inference. Indeed, just to say anything at all we have to take distinctions for granted.

Principles of Non-Contradiction and Excluded Middle

An affirmative judgment is a reply to a question regarding a proposed situation, a proposition. But a question allows two possible answers: connecting and separating, yes or no. The point is whether the judgment which affirms the connection includes a negation of the separation. The reply is that connection and separation of one and the same thing in the same respect, i.e., the same mode of Being cannot go together; for only one of the two is true. This logical principle is based on the general ontological insight that *whatever is*, insofar as it is, *is not not*, i.e., it cannot not-be, and *is not what it is not*. This principle is based on the all-embracing nature of Being. Outside Being there is only non-Being, but non-Being cannot be. Therefore, Being extends to everything. It is impossible to predicate not-to-be of any being as being. Accordingly, the all-embracing affirmation implies the impossibility of the all-embracing negation. It is absolutely impossible that there would be nothing. Hence a thing cannot *be* and *not-be* at the same time under the same respect. The distinguishing mark of the principle is the phrase: *at the same time under the same respect*. It means: from the same standpoint, in the same circumstances, under the same conditions. For instance, the statement could be true, 'it is possible for rain to fall and not to fall' if we refer to different localities, but it could not be true about the selfsame rain in the selfsame locality. It is also true that 'a boy can be a man', if we mean that he can be a man at a later period of his life; but a boy cannot be a man while he is still a boy. The validity of this principle is a pre-condition for all knowledge. However, the principle is not a mere negation. For in a genuine negation the subject is never the total unity of 'whatever is' but always a particular being. What is denied is not the Being of the subject in the absolute sense but always a particular mode of Being. I first affirm being as being and then judge that certain modes of Being are not included and perhaps even positively excluded. In this way there arises the distinction between the *one* and the *other*. Since negation always implies affirmation, human thought will be inclined to consider the principle of non-contradiction as its central principle. Just as negation implies affirmation and all-embracingness, so also the principle of non-contradiction implies the principle of identity as prior 'in itself'.

The Principle of Excluded Middle is expressed in different ways by different philosophers. It is an inference from the principle of identity and the principle of contradiction. If it is self-evident that Being is Being, and non-Being is non-Being; and if it is self-evident that a thing cannot *be* and *not be* at the same time under the same respect, then it is also self-evident that *there is no middle course possible between Being and non-Being*.

Principles of Casuality and Relation

The Principle of causality states: 'whatever happens or becomes must have a cause for its happening or becoming'. The expression '*whatever happens*' means 'whatever begins to be or to exist'; '*becomes*' means 'whatever passes from potentiality to actuality'. Hence the principle can be reformulated as follows: *Whatever passes from a state of non-existence into a state of existence must have an efficient cause for its existence*.

Meaning of cause: Action always implies a change and change implies causality. The agent is the 'cause' and the action of the agent producing the change is the 'causality'. The change produced in the patient as reaction is the 'effect'. Cause is that which produces an effect. In the traditional view, *cause is an ontological principle which exercises a positive influence in the production of something else*. There are three factors that enter into the concept 'production': that which produces, or the *cause*; that which is produced, or the *effect*; and the *positive influence* of the cause in the production of the effect, or the *causality*. Everything depends upon this positive influence in the production in order that a thing may be called a 'cause'. For this influence to be really causal, it must *affect the being* of a thing in its *production* (positive and ontological). Production means the bringing of a substantial or accidental thing from a state of potentiality to a state of actuality. Such a production evidently affects the 'being' or entity of a thing in some productive manner. This positive productive ontological (real) influence on the being of a thing is the most important factor in causality. Mere external sequence or connection on the part of two things is not sufficient to bring them into the relation of cause and effect. For example, the fact that one train follows another along the tracks establishes no causal relation between them; for the connection between them is purely extrinsic. Cause cannot be a purely *logical principle*; for a purely logical influence of one thing on another is insufficient to constitute causality. For instance, the principle of non-contradiction exerts a tremendous influence upon all our thinking. Its influence is 'logical' and not 'ontological'. This principle does *not produce* our thinking, nor does it confer anything toward the production of the *entity* of our thought. For in fact it is the intellect which actually produces our thought and as such is its 'cause'. The influence of the cause may be either corporeal (e.g., seed producing a plant) or spiritual (e.g., the intellect producing thought). But in order that such an influence partake of the nature of causality it must be *ontologically and positively productive of being* in some manner.

Main Kinds of Cause

There are four questions which can be asked of a thing, in order to explain the 'how and why' of its being. If we ask '*by what* is it made?' the answer is 'by the efficient cause.' If we ask '*out of what* is it made?' the answer is 'out of its material, its material cause. If we ask '*through what* is it made?' the answer is 'through its form, its formal cause.' And if we ask '*on account of what* is it made?' the answer is 'on account of the end or purpose which induced the agent to act.' By answering these questions we obtain the various determining factors which explain the production of the thing and make it to be what it is.

We will study these four causes further grouping them into two: intrinsic cause and extrinsic cause. An *intrinsic cause* is that which is inadequately distinct from the effect. The intrinsic causes are material cause and formal cause. An *extrinsic cause* is that which is adequately distinct from the effect. The two extrinsic causes are efficient cause and final cause. They do not enter into the composition of the being of things, but act upon them 'from without'.

Intrinsic Causes: Material Cause and Formal Cause

Material cause: When things change, there is always a *substratum* (an underlying principle) which persists throughout the process of change. This substratum is something indifferent, potential, receptive, passive, determinable, actualizable. It is that which is changed, determined, actualized. This substratum is that out of which something becomes or is made. This is called the *matter* or material cause. It is the inner principle

of potentiality and limitation. *Formal cause*: Formal cause is the correlative of the material cause. Matter and form always go together since they are related to each other as act and potency. Matter is indefinite; whereas form is definite. Matter is passive; whereas form is active. Matter is receptive; whereas form is the received.

Extrinsic causes: Efficient Cause, Final Cause and Exemplary Cause

Efficient cause is that *by which* something is produced. A being of one kind is changed into a being of another kind by means of the action of the agent or efficient cause. Of all the causes which assist in the production of an effect by means of a positive influence, the efficient cause is recognized as a *true cause* which has an unmistakable influence on an effect. When a mason builds a brick wall, one's action certainly influences its making, and the mason is the efficient cause of the wall.

Final cause is that for the sake of which an efficient cause acts. It is the end or intention which determines the action of the efficient cause in the production of something else. This intention or end *induces* the agent to act and determines the *kind* and the *manner* of action, so that the end or purpose may be achieved. For example, when a carpenter intends to make a chair, he selects the wood, cuts into proper lengths, nails them together according to a plan determined by the particular kind of chair one desires.

Exemplary cause is that in imitation of which something comes into being from the intention of an agent that determines its end for itself, e.g., drawing the picture of a flower on the board. The flower is the exemplary cause and the picture is the effect. In this definition the words, *a form in imitation of which*, indicate the idea which serves as a model since the idea is the same as the form which a thing imitates. *According to the intention of an agent* exclude the possibility that the likeness comes about by accident. *That determines its end for itself* indicate that there can be question of exemplary causality only if the agent determines the end for itself and not if the end is determined by another.

Effect

Effect is that which proceeds from another totally or partially. The effects depend upon their causes ontologically and are similar to them. *Ontologically* means according to the order of Being. *Depend* means to proceed from another in some way according to its being. *Similarity* means partial *correspondence between distinct beings*. They are two kinds: positive and negative. *Positive similarity* is correspondence according to a perfection, e.g., two persons who have equal height. *Negative similarity* is correspondence according to a defect, e.g., two persons who are blind.

Cause, Condition, Occasion, Sufficient Reason and Chance

Cause is an ontological principle which exercises a *positive* influence in the production of something else. In this way, cause is distinct from condition which does not exercise a positive influence in the production of something. A condition is only a prerequisite for the action of the cause. *Condition is that which is required in order that an efficient cause can act*, but it does not contribute any positive influence toward the production of the effect itself. The distinction between cause and condition may be illustrated by the following example. A stone of fifty kilogram is firmly held in place by the suction of mud in a swamp. The effort of a single person to lift it up is in vain. Another person comes to the person's help. Then, they lift the stone together. Both

Definition and Nature of Metaphysics

of them exercise positive influence upon the effect, viz., the change in the position of the stone. However, if one of them limits oneself to the removing of mud around the stone and leaves the rest to the other, the one would not exercise any positive influence upon the change of position. But one's action would remove the obstacle which prevents one from lifting the stone. Here, one's role is only *dispositive* and not positive.

An *occasion* exercises positive influence in so far as it helps to induce a free agent to produce an effect. *It is a circumstance or combination of circumstances which provide a favourable opportunity for the free exercise of a cause*, e.g., a crowd is an occasion for pickpocket to ply his trade. However, a free cause can exercise its causality even when there is no favourable opportunity. Hence occasion differs from condition in so far as its influence is positive and not merely dispositive. Occasion also differs from cause in so far as its influence is not necessary for the production of the effect.

The sufficient reason is also distinct from cause. Sufficient reason provides an adequate explanation for the 'being' of a thing. It does not have to be *really distinct* from the thing whose 'being' is explained by it; whereas the cause of a thing is always *really distinct* from it. Otherwise the thing *would* be the cause of itself. Hence, we can say that every being has a sufficient reason of being, but not every being is caused. If the essence of a thing is really identical with its 'being', this essence is the sufficient reason for its 'being'. But if an essence is really distinct from its 'being', the sufficient reason for its 'being' must be found outside the essence. Hence a cause is a sufficient reason for the 'being' of something else.

Chance is an effect produced by the concurrence of two or more causes which operate independently and thus produce an effect which is *unforeseen* by anyone who does not know that several causes are at work or how these causes operate.

Principle of Relation

Relation comes from the Latin word, *referre* which means bring back, the reference of one thing to another, mutual inter-directedness. It is defined *as the bearing* (reference, respect, attitude, ordination) *of one thing to something else*. 'To be is to be related'. Being is the Being of beings. As Being is the Being of beings, it is always related to beings and all beings are also simultaneously and radically related to Being (hence relative to Being). The *relative* is in opposition to the *absolute*. Recent philosophers have written more about these two concepts than about any other within the whole range of philosophy which has them as the foundation of the entire system of thought.

Factors of Relation

Every relation contains three factors: subject, term and foundation. *Subject* is the radical principle of the relation. It is *that* which is related to another, e.g., I know him. *Term* is that to which the subject of the relation is referred or related, e.g., I know him. *Foundation* is the proximate principle from which the relation springs. It is the origin or ground of the relation, e.g., I *know* him. It is the basis, the ground, the *reason why* the subject is related to the term. It is the bond which unites the subject and term together and places them 'in relation' to each other. Foundation is further distinguished into two: Immediate & Mediate. *Immediate foundation* is the foundation which is intrinsic to the subject of the relation, e.g., I *know* him. Knowledge is intrinsic. *Mediate foundation* is the foundation which is extrinsic to the subject of the relation, e.g., I

have a pen. Possession of the pen which is the foundation of the relation is extrinsic to the subject.

From this it is plain that one thing alone can never form a relation. Relation must exist *between two or more* things taken in reference to each other. The essence of 'relation,' consists in the '*esse ad*', the '*Being-toward*' of one thing to another. It is the bearing, the reference, the attitude, the ordination of one to another due to some foundation which is the necessary *condition* for a relation, but not the 'relation' itself. The foundation is present in both the subject and the term. Two white horses, for example, are similar to each other in their white color. Their whiteness is not the relation of their similarity, but only the reason or foundation of their relation by which they stand to each other in a relation of similarity. The 'relation', therefore, *results from* the presence of a common foundation in a subject and term and is considered to be distinct from the foundation, the subject, and the term.

Kinds of Relation

Relation can be grouped into two main classes: *logical and real*. *Logical relation* is the relation which exists only in the mind. It is a relation *made solely by the mind and placed by the mind between entities*. These entities may exist outside the mind or in the mind itself as concepts, judgements, and inferences. The foundation for such a relation is an *ens rationis*, a logical entity without any real foundation in the extra-mental things themselves for such a relation. The relation is strictly a product of the mind's thinking. For instance, we systematise our ideas when we study a certain branch of knowledge and in this manner bring them into relation with one another. There exists logical relation of comprehension and extension between every subject and predicate in a sentence, between the premises and conclusion of an inference, between a number of inferences in an extended argumentation; such relations are logical as they exist solely in the mind and its operations. Similarly, there are also relations between objects *outside the mind*, although these relations have no reason or foundation in the properties of the things themselves. For instance, a scepter represents royal dignity; a palm, victory; a red light, danger; a flag, a country; but the relation between these things is purely of the mind's own making and has no foundation in the things themselves.

Real relation is a relation which exists *between things, independent of the mind and its thinking*. The subject and the term are real entities in nature while the foundation of the relation is present in them *objectively* and not merely conceived by the mind as being there. There is thus a connection or bond between real things, due to something present in them, independent of all thought. Such a relation exists, for instance, between parent and offspring, between plant and flower, between two pups of the same litter, between two trees of equal height, between two houses of the same architectural style etc. A real relation may be either essential (transcendental) or accidental (categorical or predicamental). An *essential* (or *transcendental*) relation is one in which the very *essence* of one thing has a relation to something. This relation will always be present as soon as and as long as this essence is present. The essence cannot exist without this relation. Thus the relation between every being and an intellect, making this being 'true' and 'good,' is essential or transcendental; for it is an essential or transcendental attribute of all being to be true and good. Every creature owes its entire essence and existence to the creator, and thus the relation of the creature to the creator is an essential one. In the same way, the relation between body and soul in human is an essential relation since both are ordained toward each other to form a composite substance. Real Relation can also be subsistent or accidental. *Subsistent relation* is

Definition and Nature of Metaphysics

a relation which is identical with its subject and immediate foundation. *Accidental Relation* is a relation which is really distinct from both its subject and immediate foundation. An accidental (categorical or predicamental) relation is based upon an accident as its foundation. The accident is something superadded to the essence and its absence would not destroy the essence itself. For instance, two children have blond and curly hair; in this instance they stand to each other in the relation of similarity. Two men are six feet tall; they are related to each other through the equality of the quantitative measurements. Obviously, 'blond and curly hair' and the equal 'height of six feet' are accidental modifications of these persons without belonging to their essence.

Check Your Progress II

- Note : a) Use the space provided for your answer.
b) Check your answer with those provided at the end of the unit.

- 1) What do you understand by the principle of truth?
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
- 2) Explain the meaning of relation and subsistent relation.
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2.4 LET US SUM UP

Every science has its own starting point. The question about the starting point of metaphysics comes at the beginning of metaphysics itself. The starting point of metaphysics is the experience of 'something' as it manifests itself in various forms, especially in judgment, question and pure desire to know. These manifestations of starting point of metaphysics are in quite agreement with the fundamental notions and principles. The most important fundamental notions are the notion of Being, notion of action, and notion of self. Notion is vague and imperfect concept. Notions are of simple mental content. Principles are of complex mental contents. The main fundamental principles are the principles of truth and affirmation, principles of identity and distinction, principles of non-contradiction and excluded middle, and the principles of causality and relation. The starting point of metaphysics, the fundamental notions and principles are all complementary, and not contradictory.

2.5 KEY WORDS

- Being** : Being is that which is in some way or something.
- Action** : Action is the self-actualization of a being. We know what a being is from its activity (“action follows being” – *agere sequitur esse*; or, as the operation is so the being is).
- Self** : Self is the intrinsically and spiritually coordinating principle of a person.

2.6 FURTHER READINGS AND REFERENCES

Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Tr. Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947.

Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. (In: *Commentary on the Metaphysics of Aristotle by Thomas Aquinas*.) Tr. John P Rowan. Vol. I. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1961.

Bittle, Celestine. *The Domain of Being*. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1950.

Coreth, Emerich. *Metaphysics*. New York: Seabury Press, 1973.

Heidegger, Martin. *Being and Time*. Tr. John Macquarrie. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.

Lonergan, Bernard. *Insight*. New York: Longmans, 1965.

Loux, Michael J. *Metaphysics: A Contemporary Introduction*. London: Routledge, 1998.

Maritain, Jacques. *A Preface to Metaphysics*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1943.

Panthanmackel, George. *Coming and Going: An Introduction to Metaphysics from Western Perspectives*. Bangalore: ATC, 1999.

Peters, John A. *Metaphysics*. Louvain: Duquesne University Press, 1963.

2.7 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Answers to Check Your Progress I

- 1) The starting point of metaphysics is the sensitivo-rational experience of ‘something’ as it manifests itself in judgment, question and the pure desire to know.
- 2) There are three fundamental notions: Notion of Being, Notion of Action or Operation, and Notion of Self. *Notion of Being*: Being is that which is in some way or something. That which is in some way or something, is always and immediately present in human experience. This experience of Being is as undeniable as the fact of the affirmation. *Notion of Action*: In my experience of something I know that I *experience* the experience. I am implicitly and immediately conscious of the activity of experience itself. *Notion of Self*: In my experience of something I know that I *experience* the experience. I am implicitly and immediately conscious

**Definition and Nature of
Metaphysics**

of my own self. The self is a fact of conscious experience which is both undeniable and inexplicable.

Answers to Check Your Progress II

- 1) The principle of truth states that '*there is truth*'. Truth is conformity (correspondence) between the mind and the object. It is self-evident that truth exists; for even denying it would admit it.
- 2) Relation comes from the Latin word, *referre* which means bring back, the reference of one thing to another, mutual inter-directedness. It is defined as *the bearing* (reference, respect, attitude, ordination) *of one thing to something else*. 'To be is to be related'. Being is the Being of beings. As Being is the Being of beings, it is always related to beings and all beings are also simultaneously and radically related to Being (hence relative to Being). *Subsistent relation* is a relation which is identical with its subject and immediate foundation.