

Rodrigo de Arriaga
CURSUS PHILOSOPHICUS, DISPUTATIONES LOGICAE,
LIB. 5, DISP. 12¹
© Sydney Penner 2012

<161><<188>>

BOOK FIVE ON THE CATEGORIES.

A category (praedicamentum) is the same thing as a series of predicates (praedicatorum) drawn down from the highest genus through the intermediate genera and species all the way to the ultimate individuals, as, for example, the series of substance is drawn down through substance, body, living thing, animal, and human being, all the way to Peter. And this series is called the category of substance. Aristotle reduces all series of things to ten categories, which he discussed at great length in the present [work]. The ten categories are substance, quantity, quality, relation, action, passion, where, duration, place, habit. He does not include the ratio of being in these categories, since it is superior to all of them and consequently does not constitute a category distinct from them.

Notice, however, that, just as Aristotle sets up these ten categories, he could have set up more or far fewer categories. For he could have restricted them to two, e.g., to substance and accident. For these comprehend everything. Or if he wished to descend to lower rationes, he could have come up with far more than ten. For just as he reduces being clothed to a distinct category that he labels 'habit', why could he not have also posited being decorated (of temples and walls and so on, for example), being musical, healthy, drunk, sober, and so forth. For these can be separate just as well as habit and so on can be.

¹This is a rough, first pass translation. Though I by no means made a thorough collation (so I have presumably missed at least some variants), I consulted the 1632 Antwerp edition (the first edition and the one most often cited), the 1639 Paris edition, and the 1669 Lyon edition. The first edition can be consulted online at: <http://tinyurl.com/chkø8kv>. The 1669 edition can be consulted at: <http://tinyurl.com/cupv5zy>. My initial impression is that the 1639 edition introduces many errors. The 1669 edition is of interest because it is a revised and expanded edition. In the case of the sections on relations, some sections (e.g., the first) are left verbatim, some have a few added paragraphs, and some are new. The 1669 edition adds at least a dozen pages of new material in response to objections raised to Arriaga's account. This translation includes all the text present in the 1632 edition and some, but not all, of the added material in the 1669 edition.

In my translation, text that is centred on the page is material that is included in both the first and revised editions, text moved to the left is deleted for the revised edition, and text moved to the right is material new to the revised edition. Since the revised edition adds sections, I will follow its section numbering, with numbers in brackets indicating the numbering in the first edition in those cases where the material is not new. Numbers in single angle brackets indicate 1632 edition page numbers; numbers in double angle brackets indicate 1669 edition page numbers.

Hence, it is amazing that some people are so concerned to defend that this division is exact and entirely necessary, that neither more nor fewer than ten categories are possible, just as if the discussion is of some matter of great importance. But the discussion of this is left for elsewhere. For now I will briefly explain what these ten names signify. 'Substance' is that which exists per se and it comprehends both matter and substantial form and the union and subsistence of both. 'Quantity' is that which renders a body impenetrable to another body. 'Quality' signifies that by which something is said to be in a certain condition (quale), and it includes all the perfect accidents, such as primary qualities, qualities that result from first qualities, and more. We will talk about these three categories in the *Metaphysics*. 'Action' signifies that by which a cause produces an effect. 'Passion' that by which an effect is done. We will talk about these in the third book of the *Physics*. 'Where' signifies the existence of a thing in a place. 'Duration' or 'when' signifies the existence of a thing in a time. We will talk about these in the fourth book of the *Physics*. 'Position' signifies a disposition of a body in relation to place (sitting or standing, for example). 'Habit' signifies the garments in which we are covered. We will talk about these in the *Metaphysics*. Only 'relation' remains, which Aristotle listed in the fourth place. We will place it in the present disputation, not because it belongs to logic more than the other categories but because acquaintance with it is especially necessary for almost all of philosophy, in which one hears all over the place that this is related to that, to express a relation, whether categorial or transcendental, and so on. But if we are ignorant of these terms, then we will be ignorant of many things that should be said about the actions, passions, and acts of the intellect and of the will. <162>

Notice, however, that for all these categories, as long as Aristotle discusses them in logic, he does not so much discuss the things themselves that are placed in the categories as the ten concepts in the mind that we have for these ten categories. For, as we said at the beginning of the *Logic*, it deals not so much with things or the mode of objective knowing as with the acts themselves or the mode of formal knowing. Nevertheless, because the objects of concepts are better known to us (since they are more external than the more interior and hidden concepts), one cannot, therefore, discuss the concepts themselves without discussing the objects of those concepts. We will do this when we deal with the concept of relation in the present disputation. <<189>>

DISPUTATION XII.

ON RELATION.

SECTION I [I].

What relation is.

In *Metaphysics* V.13 Aristotle dealt indiscriminately with relation, categorial as well as transcendental and *secundum dici*. We will also discuss each in this way, since the notion (*notitia*) of one will be obtained more perfectly from another. Father Rubio deals with relation here in *Logic* chapter 7, as well as the Conimbricenses and

Francisco Toletus in the same place, and Father Suárez in all of *Metaphysical Disputation* 47 and, very recently, Pedro Hurtado de Mendoza in *Metaphysics* disputation 15. We will select from them those things that are necessary for an exact notion of relation. But if something seems to be missing in their accounts, we will add it.

In the present discussion, ‘relation’ signifies the same thing as ‘respect’. Those things that do not stop in themselves but respect something else—for example, father, son, and, conversely, something similar to another similar—are called ‘relatives’. This category is also called ‘to another’ (*ad aliud*) on account of the terminus to which something is referred as along as it respects it, and it is something else from the relation itself.

This relation, since it is conceived as an accident or truly is such, must have a foundation or subject in which it is. Notice here that some people wrongly call the foundation of a relation an intrinsic principle on account of which one thing respects another thing. For this is not the foundation but it seems that it should be called the *ratio fundandi*. More perspicuously, therefore, that is called the foundation which is denominated ‘related’ or which is the subject of the relation. For this reason a relation has a terminus which it respects, likewise a *ratio fundandi*, that is, that from the positing of which a relation results between the foundation and terminus. That by which they are respected or on account of which they are respected is called the *ratio fundandi*. Peter, for example, is similar to John in whiteness. Peter and John are the related extremes, that is, the foundation and terminus, but whiteness is the *ratio fundandi*, since the relation between Peter and John arises from it.

We do not intend to define the subject or terminus of relation in the present discussion, but relation itself in the abstract is defined in this way: *Relation is the formal ratio by which one thing respects another*. This is sufficiently clear from the terms. For as one thing is referred to another, it respects that. Thus relation itself in the abstract <162, col. b> is nothing other than that by which one thing is referred to another thing, or the respect itself of one thing to another thing.

Two *rationes*—*esse ad* and *esse in*—are usually distinguished in relation. The *ratio in* is the relation itself insofar as it respects the foundation or object in which it is, but the *ratio ad* is the relation insofar as it respects the terminus. Through the *ratio in* relations agree with every other form which of itself has being in the subject; consequently, it agrees with the eight other accidental categories. Through the *esse ad* it differs from those things that are not relatives nor *ad aliud*.

There are many, perhaps useless, divisions of relation that are traditionally presented, but which it is not our mind to explain here. Hurtado de Mendoza, §110, may be consulted. I will touch on those which are of more use and which are deemed more celebrated.

SECTION II [II].

The division of relation.

Relations, then, are divided first into relations of reason and real relations. The former are those which do not exist in reality but yet are apprehended by us as being,

as when apprehending <<189, col. b>> that animal respects lower species. For since no distinction between animal and the lower species is given on the part of the thing, there cannot be a true relation, since there is no true relation except between two extremes. Therefore, this relation is fashioned by the intellect. But a real relation is one that is truly and really given on the part of the thing, as between father and son or between act and object.

Second, relation is divided into relation *secundum dici* and relation *secundum esse*. This coincides with the real relation just explained. The former obtains when we conceive a thing absolute in itself with an order to another thing, not because we fashion some order in it (for that is the relation of reason just explained) but because we explain one thing through another. As, for example, in this life we explain spiritual things in relation to material things and through their species. This is an improper relation, as is obvious.

Third, one kind of relation is physical, which causes the terminus which it respects, as action the effect and paternity the son. Another kind is merely intentional, which has no causality to its terminus, as cognitive and volitional acts with respect to their objects. For although they really respect the objects, they, nevertheless, do not produce them. Likewise, the relation of a similar thing with respect to another similar thing, which is not caused by the other similar thing. <163>

Notice that the same relation, if it is compared to different extremes, can be simultaneously physical and intentional. Action, for example, if it is compared to the effect, is physical, since it produces the effect. But if it is compared to the principle from which it arises and to which it also expresses a real relation, it is merely intentional, since it in no way causes the principle.

Fourth, each of these relations is divided into mutual and non-mutual. A relation is mutual when each extreme is respected in turn. For example, in the relation of a father, the father respects the son and the son the father. Also, the relation that is in action, since this also respects the effect and the effect the action, although not with the same necessity for the action depends essentially on that effect but the effect in no way depends essentially on numerically the same action. A relation is non-mutual when one extreme respects another but not the other way around. For example, an act of vision essentially respects the object, but the object does not respect vision, according to the common view.

Fifth, mutual relation is divided into relation of equiparence and relation of disquiparence. The former is that by which each extreme is related to the other in the same way, as two white things which are related under the aspect of white and one is white just as the other also is. A relation of disquiparence is when the extremes respect each other in different ways, as the relation of father and of son. For Peter who, for example, is the father of Antonio respects Antonio as a son. Antonio, conversely, does not respect Peter as son but as father. Consequently, they respect in different ways. Likewise, action respects effect as what is produced by it, but the effect, conversely, respects action as that which produced it.

In the sixth place, we can put the Scotistic division of relation into extrinsically occurring relation and intrinsically occurring relation, which Suárez discusses in *DM*

48.1 and Hurtado de Mendoza in *Metaphysics* disputation 15, §147, where they reject it at length. Scotus calls that an intrinsically occurring relation which results necessarily from the positing of the foundation and terminus. For example, once Peter and John are posited, the relation of similarity between them results necessarily. As a result of this connection, this relation is called an intrinsically occurring relation. Only this, he says, belongs to the category of relation. Extrinsically occurring relation is that which does not necessarily result from positing the foundation and terminus. For example, the relation of action does not result necessarily from positing the producing fire and the produced fire, for both fires could exist without one being the cause of the other. And Scotus says that the remaining categories of action, passion, habit, position, and so on pertain to this relation. These his. Some attack this view, since many extrinsically occurring relations arise necessarily once the foundation is posited. For the action by which the sun illuminates its matter necessarily arises from the form <<190>> existing in the matter. Likewise, the action by which the sun illuminates the heavens necessarily arises from the existence of the sun. Therefore. Nevertheless, this attack does not threaten Scotus. For these relations can at least be impeded divinely despite the positing of the foundation and terminus. On the other hand, a relation of similarity between two white things existing at the same time cannot be impeded even divinely. Scotus, moreover, is talking about this necessity even in relation to absolute power, according to Father Suárez in *DM* 48.1.2. As an example of an extrinsically occurring relation, he uses action with respect to a necessary cause, which <163, col. b> can be divinely impeded even if all the things necessary for acting exist. And for this reason he calls it 'extrinsically occurring relation'.

I, therefore, more easily attack Scotus in this way: for he is talking either about the proximate foundation and terminus or about the remote. If he is teaching the second, the categorial as well as transcendental relations occur extrinsically. For just as this and that fire can exist without by that fact one causing the other (and for that reason the relation of cause is said by him to occur extrinsically), so also Peter and Paul can exist without similarity, which by him is called intrinsically occurring. For if one were white and the other black, they would not be similar with respect to whiteness. But if Scotus is not talking about the remote foundation but about the proximate, then, conversely, all relations will be intrinsically occurring. For just as a relation of similarity necessarily results once both whitenesses that are the proximate foundation of similarity are posited, so also by positing cognition which is the proximate foundation of the relation to its object, that relation necessarily results. The same is the case in positing the union that is the proximate *ratio* of respecting the terminus, in positing the action, and so on.

I confirm it clearly. For the relation of a parent in one and a son in the other results no more necessarily from the entities of two human beings, e.g., Peter and John, than a relation of cause in one and a relation of effect results from two fires. For just as one fire can exist without by that fact having been produced in another, so also this human being can exist without having been produced by this his parent, but by another human being or by God alone. The argument is *a priori*: for that which

is paternity between human beings is the pure causality between two fires and two other inanimate things. Therefore, the relation of a father results no more necessarily from positing the foundation and terminus—Peter and John, for example—than the relation of cause results from positing the producing fire and the produced fire. So neither of these can better be called an extrinsically occurring relation than the other on this account.

Second, Scotus teaches wrongly that duration and ubication are extrinsically occurring relations. For these arise necessarily, even in the order of absolute power, from positing the foundation. Therefore, as far as this goes they are no less intrinsically occurring than a relation of similarity, as Hurtado de Mendoza well observes in §151.

Scotus can sustain this division if by the name ‘intrinsically occurring relation’ he means that which is adequately essential to the foundation but by the name ‘extrinsically occurring relation’ that which is not entirely essential. As such, however, it will collapse into the last division to be discussed forthwith.

Finally, one kind of relation is called ‘transcendental’, which is such that it belongs to the essence of the subject so that it is adequately identified with it. Hence, it also follows that without that it can neither completely be understood or be. For example, the relation of an act to its object, of union to a terminus, of a creature to God, and of a power to possible acts. Another kind is ‘categorical’, namely, those which are not adequately identified with the subject and for this reason can often be separated from the foundation and terminus. For example, the relation of father in Peter with respect to Antonio. For they could both exist *in rerum naturae* without Peter being the father of Antonio or conversely. Likewise, the relation of similarity with respect to whiteness, for example, between Peter and John, since either could exist without whiteness, or, more precisely, this whiteness <164> could exist without similarity to another. Hurtado de Mendoza explains this difference in almost the same way in *Metaphysics* disputation 15, §91. I said ‘almost’ because, although he thinks the same thing in reality, nevertheless, he uses terms that give occasion for a solid attack, as I will show at once.

SECTION III [III & IV].²

The distinction between categorical and transcendental relations is explained more fully.

One could object against the preceding explication that a creature categorially respects God insofar as it is similar to God. Nevertheless, this relation cannot be separated from the creature. Likewise, the relation of similarity between union and the extremes cannot in any way be separated from it. Therefore, it is no good to say that a relation that can be separated from its proximate foundation is categorical. <<190, col. b>> Someone responds that this is no obstacle, since that exigency

²Arriaga incorporates almost all of Section III and the majority of Section IV from the 1632 edition into Section III of the revised edition. The last three paragraphs of the old Section IV are kept for the new Section IV.

of relation does not arise from the concept of categorial relation as such but from a particular concept. This solution, however, is obviously rejected, since even in the case of action the essential respect to its terminus comes not from the concept of relation as such but from such a specific kind, and yet, this not having posed an obstacle, a relation of action is transcendental according to you. Therefore, although union cannot be separated from its similarity, it does not have [that similarity] from a generic concept of relation as such but from its proper particular essence, yet this suffices for it not to be a categorial relation. The reason is *a priori*, since it results from any head whatever that as a thing has some definition, that thing will absolutely have the *ratio* of the defined thing. Therefore, if the definition of transcendental relation consists in not being separable from the proximate foundation, since the similarity of a creature to God, the relation of union with an extreme, etc., have that feature, whether it arises from a generic *ratio* or a specific *ratio*, they will absolutely be transcendental relations.

I respond, then, that for this reason I said that that is a transcendental relation which is essentially adequate to the foundation, whether or not it can be separated from it. Now, therefore, although a creature cannot be separated from similarity to God, by the fact that God necessarily exists with the existing creature, nevertheless that similarity is taken in part from the creature itself and in part from God, who is not essential to a creature. Indeed, it says that I am similar to God, that I am a being, and that God is a being. And from this side this relation is extrinsic to a creature, just as I with God constitute two beings in number, although that cannot be separated from me (for by the very fact that I exist, since God exists necessarily for a different reason, I cannot not constitute two beings in number with God). Yet being two in number is not for this reason adequate to me intrinsically, since part of it is that I exist and part that God, who is extrinsic to me, exists. The reason is *a priori*, for it is not the same thing to say that some denomination is necessarily annexed to me and that it is intrinsic to me or identified with me. For many things are extrinsic to me that are inseparable from me.

Pay heed to this doctrine for what is to be said in the following disputation against those who try to prove from the fact that truth cannot be separated from some propositions that that truth is wholly intrinsic to such propositions. This consequence is bad <164, col. b> and is denied in this matter by them. We see now how others distinguish these categorial and transcendental relations.

That in this explication I am not speaking less reasonably, as Francisco de Oviedo objects to me, I will talk about a little later. Observe this doctrine for what should be said in the following disputation against those who incorrectly try to prove from the fact that truth cannot be separated from some propositions that the truth is wholly intrinsic to such propositions. This is a bad inference and one that they themselves deny here in this case.

Richard Lynch, in *Metaphysics* III, tract. 6, at the end of n. 26, rejects our view on account of the preceding argument about a creature similar to God. I am amazed, however, that he did not even mention the solution that I gave and that I judged very good. Therefore, I have nothing to add concerning this. He had also placed

another argument in the first place, by which argument he rejects the same division. For he says that not only are action and cognition transcendently referred to effect and object, but also the very thing causing and cognizing, yet to whom order to the effect and to the object is not essential. And this can be urged, if superadded modal relations are admitted. For those both essentially respect their termini and yet the subjects themselves are categorially referred through them.

I respond that the relation that is essential to cognition I call categorial with respect to the one cognizing. If Lynch also calls it transcendental to the one cognizing, then he is already speaking in another way that almost every one else. For no one said that actually to cognize the object is essential to me; rather, to be able to cognize is essential to me. For that power is intrinsic and essential to me, but the actual cognition itself is not. The author, therefore, explicates that division in the same way. First, as that is a categorial relation which adds no perfection or entity to the foundation, but that is a transcendental relation which adds perfection and entity. That the former does not add <<191>> perfection is clear, because similarity consists in a foundation and terminus without any superadded entity. But action, cognition, etc., which are transcendental, convey some perfection with themselves.

He raises some objections to himself and solves them 'here'. I do not examine these, lest I be tedious and because for the most part, if not entirely, the question is about names, namely, about the signification of those words 'categorial' and 'transcendental'. Nevertheless, one argument occurs to me that is very effective against this division, since it in no way includes all transcendental relations. For I am not now dealing with those that this author uses for his example, but I accept the transcendental relation that the soul has to its possible acts, creatures to God, matter to forms, forms to accidents, and the latter to subjects. These relations add no perfection, and yet they are transcendental in the view of everyone. Therefore.

You will respond: in fact, they express great perfection, namely, productive power, receptive power, etc. But to the contrary: for (as I immediately said in accordance with this author) a relation of similarity for this reason does not add perfection, because it is not really distinguished from the foundation. And these relations that I brought up are not superadded to the foundation. Therefore, they also do not convey perfection. I explain: the similarity that I have in my rational soul to another soul is without doubt a perfection in itself, namely, as much a perfection as is in the essence itself of the soul. But because that similarity is not distinguished from this essence, perfection is not said to be superadded according to Lynch. All of this is the same in the case of the relation that the soul has to its acts. You see, therefore, that this division is not reasonably presented.

Second, since according to this author that similarity at least virtually superadds some perfection and that this is usually called absolutely superadded by him, perhaps this division will not be good from this side either. But this pertains to a manner of speaking. Therefore, the first objection suffices. Now on to another division. Here in n. 44, then, he says that categorial relation is a genus transcendental to everything, but transcendental relations are a species just as human beings are with respect to animals. He says, therefore, that every transcendental is a categorial. But not every

categorial is conversely a transcendental, for example, cognition, action, etc. I do not see why he takes action and cognition as his example for those relations that are not transcendental, since these especially are transcendental. Perhaps he intended to say: for example, similarity, which is a relation, and yet is not transcendental. Whatever the case may be, he proves this division at length from authority and from reason.

This entire doctrine pertains, as I said, to a manner of speaking or to the signification of those words ‘categorial relation’. For if, since transcendental relations are also placed in the category of relation (which very position by no means doubtfully relates to words, for neither he who places them there removes any entity or formality from them nor does he who brings them together there remove any perfection from them, but he either employs those words ‘categorial relation’ either more strictly or more broadly), if, I say, from the fact that they are placed in a category this author wishes to call those categorial that are not, why would we deny that of him? In that case, however, it would be necessary to divide categorial relations as such into transcendental relations and non-transcendental relations, to which last member I would reduce relations of similarity and, generally, all those which are established as extrinsic denominations by us farther down. I said, I would reduce them having assumed that division, for when this author later in responding to the eight argument against him says that the relations of similarity, equality, and so on are transcendental and never in this whole doctrine will have had said which relations are not transcendental, I do not know what other species he posits so that he says that not all relations are transcendental. For this reason, so that I may acknowledge the true, I could not understand his mind as concerns the whole [doctrine] and for this reason, having supposed that meaning according to which all relations are called categorial, I posited those two species—one transcendental, the other non-transcendental—and to this latter one <<191, col. b>> I reduce similarity, equality, etc. And I proceed clearly. In fact, I judge, and most authors did not deny the name ‘categorial’ of transcendental relations for the reason that they thought that transcendental relations do not belong to the category of relation and as a result are not categorial relations, but precisely because they did not have another word for distinguishing the former from those that are ordinarily called categorial and which have adopted this common name for themselves.

I easily explain the whole matter in a word. And I say that there are some relations that are partially taken from an extrinsic denomination and others that are taken from the essence alone of a thing respecting another thing. For a distinction I call the former categorial and the latter transcendental, whether these latter are meanwhile also placed in the category of relation and from that head can also be called categorial or not. For often there is a habit of attributing a name of a generic character to one species because of a lack of proper name, as in those nations where that word ‘animal’ also signifies ‘human’ yet absolutely to say ‘animal’ is to say ‘brute animal’. And for this reason to call someone an ‘animal’ is to be despised, as if one were called a brute or beast. We may see how others explicate this division.

Some,³ against whom Father Suárez [writes] in *DM* 47.4, opine that a tran-

³The 1632 edition starts: ‘First, some ...’

scendental relation does not require distinction from its terminus in contrast to a categorial relation. For God's knowledge, they say, is really identified with God's substance and yet transcendently respects it as its object. This doctrine is evidently rejected because a real tendency or respect is repugnant except where there is a real distinction (for this seems obvious from the terms themselves). Otherwise, it could also be said that something could be really similar to itself. Nor can one come up with any disparity between transcendental and categorial relations with respect to this, namely, why the latter more than the former require a distinction from the terminus.

Thomists, according to the same Suárez, explain it differently, for they think that categorial relation is one that depends on the existence of its terminus but a transcendental relation is one that does not depend on that existence. In truth, these are also easily rejected, since action is not a categorial relation but a transcendental relation, even in their view. And union likewise. And yet an action cannot exist without a terminus and union cannot exist without the united parts, even by the absolute power of God. Therefore, a transcendental relation can also depend on the existence of its terminus and so it does not differ in this from categorial relations.

Others, with Suárez in *DM* 47.4.9, the Conimbricenses here in art. 2 and 3, and Cajetan in *De ente et essentia* cap. 5, q. 15, opine, first, that a transcendental relation is one that is not necessarily essential to the proximate foundation, contrary to those things that we just taught. They are moved, first, because God's knowledge is a transcendental relation to creatures and yet it is not essential to God who is its foundation. For if future creatures were not, the whole entity of God would still remain in the way that it is and yet the relation to the creatures would not remain. Therefore, a transcendental relation must not necessarily be essential to the proximate foundation.

To this objection I might respond in accordance with the adversaries themselves that the relations of God are not placed in the category and so it is not permissible to take from them an argument and apply it to the relations with which we are dealing. In truth, because I think there is nothing absurd in placing divine relations in the category, I therefore respond in a different way to the objection. Namely, in the knowledge of the vision of God concerning future creatures (about which the objection's discussion is), three things can be considered: *God* himself cognizing, the *cognition* itself of the creatures, and the *relation* to the creatures, as if in our reason distinct from the cognition itself. Just as in created cognition there is also considered the *ratio* of cognition, the *relation* distinct in our reason from cognition, and its *subject*. I freely grant, therefore, that the knowledge of the vision of creatures not only as a *relation* to future creatures but indeed <165><<192>> as a *cognition of them* is not essential to God, just as a created cognition is also not essential to the one cognizing. In truth, a relation of God to future creatures with respect to God himself is categorial, because it can be absent from him, as I said a little earlier against Lynch concerning a cognizing creature. But with respect to the divine knowledge itself it is transcendental, since in the way in which he will have had knowledge about future creatures, he must have a relation to creatures. Just as the relation of a created

cognition is also not transcendental but categorial to the cognizing subject, since that cognition is not essential to the subject. But it is transcendental if it is compared with the cognition itself, because the cognition cannot be without a respect to the object. Hence, I deny that a transcendental relation is not essential to that with respect to which it is transcendental. Otherwise, it could be responded that the knowledge of God concerning future creatures, just as also with all other free acts of God, does not *in esse entitatis* express a transcendental relation to future creatures, even if the future creatures were not. But *in esse denominationis* they do express it, if they are free acts. And in that case they will necessarily have a respect to those creatures. But this is enough about this matter for it touches on an unexplainable difficulty concerning the free acts of God.

From this doctrine you will understand the solution for another argument with which our explication of transcendental relations is attacked by some: namely, that a relation of paternity, even if it were distinct from the foundation and terminus, would still be a future categorial, since it would nevertheless even in that case be essential to the proximate foundation, namely, to generation; therefore, it is not of the essence of a categorial relation not to be essential to the subject. For you will gather the solution to this argument: for the relation of a father in that case can be compared either with the father or with the generation itself. If it is compared to the man who is the father, it is categorial. For the relation of a father, for example, can be separated from Peter who in fact is the father. But if that relation is compared with the generation itself, it is transcendental, since it cannot be absent from that. The same is the case with action, since if that relation of an action is compared with the cause itself, it is categorial, for it can be absent from the cause. But, on the other hand, if it is compared with the action itself, it is transcendental, like I said about cognition. Hence, it is always true that a transcendental relation is essential to that with respect to which it is called transcendental. And from this you will further gather that a transcendental relation is not distinguished, neither inadequately [nor] really, from that thing which it renders transcendentially related. For if it is essential to that, then it is not distinct from that. For nothing is distinguished from that which is essential to it.

Oviedo thinks, [*Cursus philosophicus*, ‘Metaphysics’], controv. 10, [punct. 1], that I proceeded less reasonably in this solution to that which I related above, namely, that a transcendental relation is essential to its foundation. For in this solution I seem to have said that the relation of a father with respect to generation is transcendental, while we still suppose it to be distinct from generation for this solution. I respond that Oviedo thought that I am speaking about some relation distinct from the generation itself or from paternity. But I was not thinking about that. For I was dealing with the generation itself, to which is essentially predicated to respect Peter. And to this I brought up the objection about action, since generation is a species of action. Nevertheless, although it is not essential to a cause and to the father essentially to respect numerically this effect or this son, it is nevertheless most essential to the generation and the action.

But if so far we were speaking about a relation superadded to the generation

itself, then that relation would only be transcendental with respect to the entity of that superadded thing, not with respect to the generative action, which entity I said is as it were the proximate foundation of that relation. In this point, therefore, I am of the same view with Oviedo. Hence, I concluded in my last words of the old edition, which, if this author had heeded them, he would have understood my mind as regards the whole, while they are: ‘And from this you will further gather that a transcendental relation is not distinguished, neither inadequately [nor] really, from that thing which it renders *transcendentally* related.’ From these <<192, col. b>> it is manifestly evident that I was not speaking about a relation really distinct from generation or from action, so that I would have called it transcendental with respect to generation if I had supposed it distinguished from that. And this is enough with respect to understanding the things that I once said.

You will object that the eternal Father is referred to the divine Son by a categorial relation (as I say in Section 3) and yet that relation is not distinct from the eternal Father, for it cannot be except the Father be. Therefore, it is false that every categorial relation is distinct from the subject or that it can be absent from it. I respond that the eternal Father (as I will also say below) is referred to the Son through two relations: one a transcendental relation that is essential to him and the other a categorial relation. The latter, however, is inadequately separate from the Father and is not adequately essential to him, since the Son by whom it is inadequately taken up does not compose the Father. <165, col. b>

SECTION IV [IV].⁴

The attacks of others are attacked.

Some recent authors teach⁵ that the difference between transcendental and categorial relations consists in the fact that the former respects the terminus not purely as a terminus or entirely for nothing, but by effecting something concerning it or producing it, by loving, cognizing, or uniting. But a categorial relation is one that respects its terminus entirely for nothing, exercising no function (*munus*) with respect to it. I confess that I do not know what these authors want to say nor what it is ‘to respect purely as a terminus and entirely for nothing’. For if it consists precisely in the fact that nothing intrinsic places that relation in the terminus, then certainly neither cognition nor love would be transcendental relations, as they fasten nothing to the objects. But that is contrary to the adversaries themselves. But if they say that respect to a terminus as purely a terminus is that respect by which the terminus is not extrinsically denominated, then, conversely, there would be no categorial relations, because there is nothing that does not at least extrinsically denominate its terminus. Similarity, for example, denominates both extremes similar; therefore, similarity would also be transcendental. Nor do I see in what else this respect as to

⁴Note that most, though not all, of the material from the old Section IV is incorporated into Section III of the revised edition.

⁵The first edition starts this paragraph with: ‘Second, therefore, the authors listed above teach . . .’

a pure terminus could consist, since it cannot with respect to the object hold itself in any other way than either denominating it intrinsically, extrinsically, or not at all. This distinction, therefore, between a pure terminus and a not-pure terminus at present is entirely inexplicable.⁶ Furthermore, the relation of a father is categorial, even in the view of these adversaries, and yet a father effects something with respect to the son, seeing that he produces him. Nor can one understand anything more than this: for someone will doubt whether this is more than what a cognition effects concerning its object (denominating it cognized) and yet this relation of a father is categorial. Therefore, you teach incorrectly that a categorial relation is one which effects nothing concerning its terminus.

Next, that doctrine is absolutely attacked, since a creature respects God with a transcendental relation according to the view of everyone. And yet the creature respects God as purely a terminus, since the creature exercises no function with respect to God. In fact, even if God exercised some function with respect to the creature—namely, by producing it—God does not, in their view, for that reason also transcendently respect creatures as actually existing. Finally, I argue as follows against this explication, for it more obscures a clear matter than elucidating it. For the essence of transcendental and categorial relations is more easily perceived from the fact that they are essential or accidental than according to this distinction between a pure terminus and a mixed terminus or between effecting and not effecting something with respect to the terminus.

Nevertheless, Oviedo tries to defend this difference against both Father Hurtado de Mendoza and against me in [*Cursus philosophicus*, ‘Metaphysics’, controv. 10], punct. 1, n. 8. Hurtado indeed had said that hypostatic union and cognition effect nothing concerning the terminus other than to denominate it united or cognized, which is a pure denomination since it produces nothing in the terminus. <<193>> It is, moreover, the same way in which a relation denominates its terminus similar.

Oviedo responds that from the relation of similarity that is in me, for example, no one else is denominated similar to me. Rather, that arises in him from that fact that he himself also has another similar relation of similarity concerning me. Nevertheless, in my judgement this response is nothing and utterly hollow in leaning on the foundation, since (as Oviedo himself says) that I am the son of Peter and that Peter is my parent is the same thing, differing purely in words. Hence, I also say that ‘I have similarity with Peter’ is the same in reality as ‘and Peter is similar to me’. Hence, it is repugnant to conceive my having a relation of similarity to him and he not being denominated at least extrinsically as similar to me.

I said *extrinsically*, because Oviedo did not well distinguish this. I grant (we are talking now having conceded distinct relations) that Peter is not denominated similar to me intrinsically except through a relation resulting in him, but he without doubt accepts an extrinsic denomination from my relation to him on account of the reason given above. Cognition, which only denominates extrinsically, also supplies only this in its genus. Therefore, it no more effects something concerning its terminus than a relation of similarity.

⁶1639 has ‘explicabilis’ instead of ‘inexplicabilis’.

I confirm the counterexample mentioned just a little earlier by the same Oviedo: that I am the son of Peter is the same as Peter being my parent, and vice versa. The relation, therefore, that denominates Peter my parent denominates me his son, at least extrinsically. I in turn through another second relation resulting in me and intrinsic to me am also denominating intrinsically a son. You see that Hurtado argued most properly.

I confirm it clearly (in my judgement) by an *a priori* argument. For a respect to something else is repugnant unless by that the thing in question is denominating respected, just as it is repugnant for something to cognize something else unless by that the thing in question is called cognized. That this concrete extrinsic of *cognized* is also similar in word to the word *cognition* is wholly accidental to this point. First, because I will also be able to take from that relation itself the extrinsic word derived from the relation by which the terminus is denominating. For I will say it is denominating *relatively a respect*. Second, because the fact that philosophers have not discovered these words in this case does not prove that cognition effects more *in re* concerning its object than that respect effects concerning its terminus.

Moreover, to my argument that a parent effects his son whom he only categorially respects and that creatures, conversely, transcendently respect God purely as a terminus, effecting nothing concerning him, this author responds that a parent as a producer effects something concerning his son yet not as related by a superadded relation. But a creature respects God as that from which it proceeds.

Neither of these solutions is pleasing nor does either dissolve the present difficulty in any way whatsoever. Not the last solution, because let God effect something concerning the creature itself and yet the creature not conversely effect something concerning God, and thence this creature respects God purely as a terminus. Add that in that sense I will also say that the categorial relation of a son respects his father as him from whom he proceeds, not indeed as he proceeds through the relation itself, but because that denotes the procession, as the creature itself does not proceed from God through that transcendental relation but through a superadded action. Therefore, those two relations are entirely equal in this, while one, nevertheless, is categorial and the other transcendental.

And from this it is clear that neither solution to the former counterexample is good, since the relation of a father, even if it does not effect the son, it nevertheless respects him as having been made by the parent. Just as although the respect of a creature to God <<193, col. b>> is not the action by which the creature proceeds, yet it respects God as cause.

Finally, in the view that places a transcendental relation to possible creatures in God, that relation by which such it effects nothing concerning the same creatures, let it then actually produce them through volition and omnipotence. It is obvious, therefore, that this difference between those relations is not good.

You will ask whether in the case in which categorial relations are separate (about which below) the same distinct relations that are categorial with respect to the subjects are also transcendental with one respect to something else. Recent [philosophers] deny this, since that relation is accidental to the immediate foundation. Nev-

ertheless, I think the contrary is altogether true, because if we are talking about the subject of that entity, which is relation, even a cognition is accidental to the immediate subject of the soul, namely, the cognizing human being, and yet the cognition is not for that reason a categorial relation. The same is the case concerning union <166> with respect to the extremes, to which it also is accidental. That is, it does not belong to their essence, even if it is transcendental. But if we are talking about the entity itself distinct from the relation, as about the entity itself of the cognition, then it is just as much essential to that entity of the relation to respect another correlation as it is essential to an act to respect its object. Hence, this relation depends essentially on the existence of another correlation or terminus, just as union depends on its extremes. Therefore, an intrinsic and non-distinct order to another relation cannot be denied to that distinct entity. Consequently, it cannot be doubted that it is transcendental. Nor is it repugnant (as I said) for things that are transcendental among themselves to be categorial with respect to another thing.

SECTION V [V].

A categorial relation is not separate from its foundation and terminus.

I am not discussing transcendental relations because I showed above that they are not separate from their foundations. The entire difficulty, then, is about categorial relations, e.g., about the relation of similarity, about the relation of a father, and about the rest. About these we ask whether Peter's being similar to Paul is something distinct both from Peter and Paul themselves and from the whiteness with respect to which they are similar or whether it is nothing other than Peter and Paul having whiteness.

Some, according to Suárez in *DM* 47.2.1, really distinguish relations from their foundations and termini, since whiteness, for example, can exist without being similar to another whiteness. Therefore, similarity is really distinguished from that [whiteness]. This argument establishes at most a modal distinction, not a real distinction. Just as from the fact that the extremes can exist without union, it is indeed implied that union is distinct from that, yet only modally distinct. The reason is that mutual separability of both extremes is required for a real distinction, but non-mutual separability suffices for a modal distinction. Since, however, similarity cannot be separated from the whiteness, even though this whiteness can be separated from the similarity, it follows that it does not imply that they are really distinguished, but at most that they are modally distinguished.

For this reason, Capreolus, Cajetan, and Fonseca, according to Hurtado de Mendoza in §6, and also Molina in I, q. 13, art. 7, and other Thomists commonly think that relations are only modally distinguished from their foundations and termini. For relation is an accident. For it is placed in a category of accident. Therefore, it is distinct from their foundations and termini. But Molina proves his view as follows: for divine relations are virtually distinguished from their foundations, that is, from the divine nature. Therefore, created relations must be modally distinguished. For

what <<194>> is virtually distinguished in the divine case must at a minimum be modally distinguished in created cases.

This view is wholly displeasing. Hence, I think one should say with Father Suárez, the nominalists, and many others to whom Hurtado de Mendoza refers and whom he follows in §7 that relations are distinguished from their foundations and termini at most by reason. It is proven in the first place by the authority of St. Thomas, who teaches in *De potentia* 7, art. 8, that a relation does not make <166, col. b> a composite with its subject nor is there motion to a relation. For a relation comes to be without change in that which is referred. This would not be the case (says St. Thomas) if relation signified something remaining in the subject. He teaches the same thing in *Opusculum* 48, tract. 5, [cap. 2],⁷ about the category *ad aliquid*, where he explicitly teaches that from the fact that something is India becomes white, I am similar to that thing without any intrinsic change in me.

And since it seems to follow from this doctrine of St. Thomas that the ten categories are not distinct from each other, the Angelic Doctor responds that the categories are not all intrinsically distinct from each other. But they are either intrinsically distinct, as substance and quantity are, or extrinsically, as relation from quantity, since quality of itself does not express anything except one. A relation, however—similarity, for example—necessarily expresses two qualities, namely, two whitenesses or two colours. He gives the example of a human being with respect to its soul or body. For the soul is inadequately distinguished from the human being, since the human being adds a body beyond the soul, just as the whiteness, insofar as it is similar, also adds another whiteness, not because it is distinguished from both but inadequately from whichever one. They seem to be his words according to Hurtado de Mendoza, §9 and 8, for he thus clearly explains this view, so that there may be no doubt about his mind nor is it necessary further to explain it.

But if sometimes the same St. Thomas seems to teach that relations add something above and beyond the foundation, one should understand (as he himself explains) that that something is the terminus itself, which is also included in the *ratio of similar*, just as a soul, insofar as it preserves the human being, adds body, but not because similarity adds some mode distinct from the foundation and terminus. Therefore, moreover, St. Thomas denies this relation of God, not because God would be changed (for no creature is changed through this relation) but because God is not⁸ in the same genus as creatures. This last [claim] is perhaps not true. St. Anselm relates the same view most elegantly and clearly in *Monologion* cap. 24 where he says explicitly that by the birth of someone else I, without any change on my part, am similar, equal, and so on to the other person. Hence, he also grants these denominations in the case of God *de novo*, since no intrinsic variation in God follows from them.

Our view is proven, second, by reason: for precisely by the fact that two white things exist, they are similar, even if no really distinct relation result in them. There-

⁷This work, also known under the title *Summa totius logicae Aristotelis*, was falsely attributed to Aquinas; it is now sometimes thought to be by Hervaeus Natalis. It is perhaps noteworthy that Suárez cites the same work in trying to claim Aquinas for his side. See *DM* 47.2.13.

⁸1639 omits this 'non'.

fore, there is no point in positing a distinct relation in which similarity consists. The consequence is evident. The antecedent, moreover, is proven: for Peter, for example, to be similar to John in whiteness is nothing other than for him to be white and for John to be white. But by the fact that each of them is white, even if no distinct relation results, Peter is white and John is also, Peter, therefore, is similar to John. Therefore, the relation of similarity is not distinguished from both white extremes.

It is confirmed: this distinct mode that they imagine does not make Peter and Paul belong to the same human nature; therefore, it does not make them be similar. The consequence follows from the fact that being similar in human nature is nothing other than belonging to the same human nature. The antecedent, moreover, is proven: for that mode is not human nature nor a complement of it nor something that belongs to it. Therefore, that mode cannot constitute Peter in the same human nature with John. <167>

Some respond that those two human beings were only fundamentally similar before the distinct relations, but not formally similar. But, first, obviously to the contrary: for whence can you have a foundation for positing another similarity beyond the one that you call fundamental? Certainly not from experience, since you cannot see that formal similarity in itself and no <<194, col. b>> effect proceeds from it by which it could be known *a posteriori*. Why then posit it?

You will say: because Aristotle posited it. I respond that the antecedent is false, since these ten categories do not always signify distinct things (as you yourself admit according to the mind of Aristotle). For Aristotle assigns action and passion to distinct categories, yet you yourself do not distinguish them in reality. The same is the case with position, which is not really distinguished from ubication.

Second, I attack that solution: for you could say in the same way that in humanity beyond the soul and body united to each other there is also one modal form by which they are formally or radically constituted in the *ratio* of humanity. For you have just as meagre [support] from your foundation as if you were to say this second thing. And the same thing could be imagined for other composites. Moreover, I ask, finally, whether the authors of this word 'similarity' attended to some resulting relation or whether by the fact that both extremes are, for example, white, both are black, etc. Whence, therefore, do you now imagine that this word 'similar' formally signifies this relation constructed by you?

Our view is proven, second, with the case of dissimilarity, which is also a categorical relation. Who, moreover, will deny that a white thing and a black thing are different from each other or diverse in *ratio* without any mode superadded to them?

Can it be that in order to conceive the difference in colour which there is between an Ethiopian and a European I need some new modally distinct entity that is superadded to them?

Certainly, superadded relations do not add differences to them. They would more add agreement. For those two relations agree more with each other than a white thing and a black thing do, than God and creature do, and so on.

Third: Hurtado de Mendoza nicely argues for the same intended [view] with a case of inequality. For two bricks being formally equal to each other consists in the

fact that one does not have a longer, deeper, or wider form than the other. Nor can that difference between radical and formal equality be invented here. For who will deny that a pair of scales are equal in weight if they lack those modes? And equality is a kind of similarity. A relation of similarity, then is not a superadded mode.

SECTION VI [VI].

*Other proofs for our view are added.*⁹

Fourth, it can be attacked from absurdity. Although some think that this argument is tribunal, that is, it is more for the masses than philosophical, I wish to ask these authors whether argument from absurdity is sometimes senatorial, consular, or philosophical. For here and there these and all philosophers argue from absurdity.

Moreover, if ever something was seriously absurd, that certainly is what is implied by this view. For it follows from the very fact that something white is produced among the Indians that some new real mode is produced in every white thing in the entire universe; indeed, in every entity of the whole universe, <167, col. b> since everything is similar to it at least in the *ratio* of being.¹⁰

In addition, the same absurd thing would follow on any change whatever, whether accidental or substantial. Hence, new intrinsic modes would be produced in an angel, in all the blessed in heaven, in any instant according to the slightest motion of a fly because of the production of a new ubication. <<195>>

Innumerable modally distinct from each other would result at once in every creature with the occurrence of any change whatever, whether intrinsic or extrinsic.

In fact, in every point of prime matter there will be just as many distinct modes of similarity as all the substantial and accidental beings put together and as all the points of material things taken together (to which any point is similar). Hence, in turn, with Aristotle's view about the continuum, it follows that in any angel there are, without qualification, infinite modes of similarity, since the angel has similarity with every point and even with every proportional part. These modes of similarity, moreover, are not communicated among themselves but are determinate and distinct one from another without qualification. Therefore, they will be infinite without qualification. To whom does that not seem most absurd?

I note here, incidentally, that John Punch cites me as if I said that more modes of relation would exist in an angel than there are points on the continuum to which I referred. And he says that he is amazed that what I said would have come into my mind. I respond that I am amazed that he attributes to me something that I do not even dream about. I did not say that there would be more relations, but that those modes of relations would not communicate with each other, since they cannot make a continuum in an angel. Hence, they are said to be infinite strictly speaking.

⁹First edition: 'Other proofs for our view.'

¹⁰Cf. Pierre Gassendi, *Exercitationes paradoxicae adversus Aristoteleos*, lib. II, exercit. 3, art. 121.

Second, I attack that production of modes, since no cause¹¹ can be assigned to produce those modes. Certainly not the white thing produced in India, since it is distant from all those things in which those modes are produced. Nor by the white thing that is in Spain, for example, since it does just now have a greater power or application than before nor does it know what was newly produced in India or what was there before so that it knows how many modes it must produce in itself. Nor by God, since even if God *per impossibile* had not become aware of the production of that white thing, that relations of similarity would still have resulted. Moreover, God could not produce those modes, because he would not be aware for what reason or on account of what end they should be produced, or why these should be produced rather than those diverse one, or how many should be produced. That production of so many modes is, then, incredible, indeed, even impossible, according to every good reason.

Fifth, because some two things are given that are similar to each other without a distinct relation. Therefore, it seems that the same can be said about all other cases. The consequence seems good: for if those two things do not require a distinct relation in order to be similar, how would the remaining beings require it? The antecedent, moreover, is proven with the case of relations themselves, which are similar to each other without any superadded relation. Otherwise, there would be an infinite regress.

Perhaps you will respond that this argument is not persuasive, for the difference between the similarities of subjects and the subjects themselves is obvious. Similarity to another relation is essential to a relation, for one cannot exist without the other. But similarity is not essential to the subjects. Hence, it is no surprise if the relation is distinguished from the subjects but not from the relations themselves. Just as we likewise say in *Physics* II that the following consequence is not valid: ‘since action is produced through itself without any distinct action, so also is the terminus’.

But the contrary is obvious, since this difference is nothing and the example about action is not to the point. The reason why action does not come about through another thing distinct from it is that it is repugnant for that to exist *in rerum natura* and not to be produced by this cause. This reason does not work in the case of the effect. For the effect could exist, either naturally or at least divinely, yet not arise from this cause. Therefore, this which is to arise actually is something distinct from that and from the cause. See here, then, why action proceeds through itself <168> while effect does not. But in the present case the whole reason that can be thought of in the case of distinct relations themselves for their not being referred through another superadded thing, the whole reason, I say, is found in the extremes themselves before the relation. Relation, therefore, either must not be distinguished from the extremes or it must <<195, col. b>> also be distinguished from relations themselves. The consequence is obvious. I prove the minor, in which the only difficulty is: for just as those relations cannot both exist without being similar to each other, so also two white things cannot exist at the same time, not even divinely, without being similar to each other. For they cannot exist, not even divinely, except there be one whiteness

¹¹First edition starts: ‘Besides that, no cause ...’

and another whiteness, both are seen separately, both are productive of species, both are accidents, both (in a word) are of the same species. Therefore, similarity is no less separable from each than from two relations. I urge the obvious point: these two relations are not similar to each other in any other way than because they are of the same species. One is a relation just as the other is. This, moreover, is also what those two whitenesses have of themselves most formally before every superadded relation. Therefore, they are most formally similar by themselves, without a distinct relation, no less than those relations. Or if the extremes still require a distinct relation, then all superadded relations will also require the same, and thus we will have an infinite regress. Or perhaps they wish to swallow up even this absurdity and to say that this argument from the absurdity is tribunal.

Nor is it satisfactory to say that the difference still obtains in virtue of the fact that similarity can at least be absent from one extreme as a result of the other extreme being destroyed, while similarity cannot be absent from one relation by the fact that it essentially demands another relation. This, I say, does not stand in the way. For I do not contend that similarity is not distinguished from one extreme alone, but from both taken at the same time or from the complex [of both]. To remove similarity from this [complex] is just as repugnant as removing it from the relations. Therefore, that similarity is no more distinguished from both extremes than it is distinguished from both relations. Just as, even though Peter can exist without constituting two in number, if he exists alone, still, no one will, I believe, for that reason ever dare say that in order for Peter and John to be two human beings formally they require some mode that is *ex natura rei* distinct [from them]. For to assert that would be utterly mad.

Perhaps you will say, second, that the extremes can be separated divinely from formal similarity, but from which those relations cannot be so separated, and therefore it is distinguished from the extremes but not from the relations. But this would be an egregious begging of the question. For I contend by this argument that either the extremes by themselves are formally similar or that the relations are not similar to each other, by the fact that the extremes are just as much of the same *ratio* as these relations are. But you respond by denying the consequence because the relations are through themselves formally similar, but the extremes are not. Which is just your very conclusion. Second, this distinction between formal and radical similarity was sufficiently rejected above. Third, since I clearly prove by that argument that two relations, even if they are of the same species as each other and result in formally similar subjects, nevertheless require something superadded in order to be formally similar to each other, just as the extremes, however much they are of the same species, require that according to you. Nor can any other difference be contrived with respect to this. <168, col. b>

The same infinite regress can be shown in the case of relations compared to the subject. For Peter is diverse from the relation by which he is similar to Paul. Therefore, it holds distinct through another relation of diversity. This relation in turn is diverse from another relation of similarity existing in Paul and so through another superadded relation of diversity, which in turn is diverse from the first similarity

that is in Peter, and so through another relation, and thus to infinity. Some recent philosophers use this argument against this view. Nevertheless, the Thomists can respond that these superadded relations in themselves have two [functions]: both to refer Peter and Paul as similar to each other and also to refer themselves to the subjects as inadequately similar and inadequately dissimilar. But this solution should be attacked by repeating everything that was done in the preceding argument. For this reason I desist from this argument, <<196>> since the infinite regress was shown more clearly in the preceding argument and the solution that can be used in the preceding argument can also be used here.

Recent philosophers also attack this view in another way by supposing that a form must always have as a *by which (quo)* a formal effect that it furnished to the subject as a *what (quod)*. For whiteness must be the *ratio* of the dispersing of vision (*disgregandi visus*), etc. From this they further argue as follows: since the relation of identity between Peter and Paul is an accident it does not agree with them in the identity of nature. Therefore, it cannot make them the same in nature, just as union cannot be the *ratio* of the uniting of matter and form to each other except it itself is united with them. I think this argument is entirely useless, first, because of that which is said of form, which in itself must have as a *by which* that which the subject has as a *what*. Either the question is about the word or includes falsehood, as was manifestly shown elsewhere. For hatred is a form bestowing a habit towards hatred on a subject, and in no way does it have hatred towards hatred, but rather it is loved. And cognition bestows the cognized object on a subject, although it itself in no way is cognized. Therefore, the relation can render those human beings similar to each other even if it itself is not similar to them. I said 'or it is a question over names', because it could also be said that a relation 'is that by which [something is] similar', that is, it is that by which the extremes are rendered similar, just as it can also be said about hatred that it 'is that by which [something has] a habit towards hatred', that is, it is that by which the subject is held towards hatred. But one must not go on to infer from this that hatred itself in fact is held towards hatred, as they infer in the case of relations. But this matter [is discussed] more thoroughly in *De anima* disp. 8, from n. 85. Second, the adversaries can respond that that superadded relation does not bring it about that Peter is one human being just as John is another human being. For they have this from themselves and it cannot be bestowed on them by relation, which is an accident. But it precisely brings about that those two formally respect themselves. The relation itself has this, the relation which through its own essence respects those extremes and brings it about that they respect themselves mutually, just as union through itself is united with the extremes and unites them to each other. The Thomists, therefore, are hardly pressed at all by that argument.

The same point, then, is better urged by those recent philosophers with the example of God, in whom such relations are most properly given without any intrinsic change, as Hurtado de Mendoza well proves from Anselm and others from §18. For real relations not distinct from God himself are given, even if they could be absent from him, <169> for example, the relation of being Lord or creating, which are true and real relations, since God truly and really is Lord and creating. These relations

would not be in God if he had not produced creatures. And whenever he produces a new thing or destroys something, a new extrinsic relation of being Lord [and] of creating results or one that was before passes away, if a creature is destroyed. And yet these relations are not some modes really superadded to God. Therefore, a relation does not consist in a superadded mode. Nor does the infinity of God help with respect to this. For similarity to me is contingent in God just as similarity to Peter is contingent in me, and it begins in time in God just as in me. Therefore, just as it begins there without any mode that is distinct in reality or by reason,¹² so also in us. For a more thorough confirmation of this argument, see the passage from Hurtado de Mendoza cited above.

SECTION VII.¹³

The view of Father Lynch is presented and refuted.

Before I resolve the opposing argument, the view of Father Lynch should be struck down ... <<col. b>>

SUBSECTION I.

The view is rejected.

... <<196, col. b, to 198, col. a>>

SUBSECTION II.

Father Lynch's arguments are satisfied.

So far thus. For if the relation of a father, for example, on the part of the thing consisted precisely in the existence of Peter, of Paul, and of the preceding generation, then the relation of paternity would be <<198, col. b>> identical to the relation of filiation. But that is entirely repugnant, since the relation of a father has a different terminus and foundation from the relation of filiation. For the former relation respects Peter as foundation and Paul as terminus. But the latter, conversely, does not respect Peter as foundation, but rather Paul. Otherwise, Paul would also be the son of himself and Peter would be the parent of himself, which is obviously false. Therefore, these relations must be really distinguished, or at least virtually.

What was posited in the third place reduces to this argument: for it is taken from the fact that if the constituents of each relation are the same, then there is only a single relation, contra Augustine, who posited two. Therefore, these relations must be distinguished at least virtually. For it reduces to this, which it is customary to raise frequently as an objection: if the similarity of Peter to John, for example, is the same as that by which John is similar to Peter, then the result is that Peter is similar to Peter or to himself, just as it results that John is similar to Peter. And in the same way it results that John is similar to John just as Peter to John.

I easily respond to this argument in its various forms, since there is no greater difficulty in it than there is in the fact that through the same most formal vision I am denominated seeing, for example, whiteness and the whiteness is said to be seen.

¹²The denial of a distinction of reason is odd; perhaps an error in the text?

¹³All the material in this section is new to the revised edition. Section VII of the first edition becomes Section IX of the revised edition.

Moreover, these different comparisons of the one seeing with vision and of the whiteness that is seen with the same vision Augustine calls different relations. For the son insofar as he respects the parent as generating constitutes one relation and the parent insofar as he is the principle of the same generation of Peter is said to have another relation. For one and the same indivisible entity also virtually denominates two things, one the agent and the other the act, which matter is most clear after the terms have been explicated. And from this is quite clear that it does not in any way follow that Peter will be similar to himself as it does not follow that if the same whiteness must also be denominates as seeing itself if vision denominates Peter as seeing whiteness. And the same is the case with action, which, although it denominates the thing produced, nevertheless does not for that reason denominate the cause as producing itself. I do not ignore that this author everywhere (as I said above) introducing these virtualities in every act of cognition, of love, in every action, union, etc., introduces those two virtual cognitions of action and son on, one active and one passive, and he wants those different denominations to arise from these. In truth, as I already said just a little earlier, this is nothing other than to refuse to understand a most clear matter except through the most obscure. These two cognitions, passive and active, are more thoroughly rejected in dealing with objective precisions, where it is also shown that the difficulty is not avoided by admitting them. For that very formality itself of an active cognition must necessarily denominate something cognized. For it is repugnant in terms to conceive myself actively understanding except of something or to be conceived actively a killer except of something. And it is entirely the same conversely of passive denomination. For also the denomination cognized as virtually distinct denotes something cognizing; and hence that virtuality already one in a different way than another. What, then, is strange about a preceding generation having arise from my parent denominating the parent generator and me generated without any superadded virtualities? I note here in passing that it was not necessary for what he intended for this author also to posit two virtualities in the human beings themselves. Those two virtualities that he admits otherwise in the generation itself (for as active it would have Peter as its foundation but the same generation as passive would have had Paul for its foundation) would have sufficed. And then that disagreeableness that we considered a little earlier about infinite relations of a father, mother, son, etc., would have ceased. The difficulty that he touched on that follows from our view (that Peter is the father and the son of himself) would also have ceased.

I respond to the argument in form that it is indeed the same parts that compose paternity and filiation, just as it is the same ubications that make me right and [Peter]¹⁴ left. And it is not the case that two virtualities are placed in my ubication, one which respects me and another which respects Peter, since my ubication takes no regard for Peter or his ubication and yet two different denominations of left and right are given. In the same way, therefore, the preceding generation <<199>> arising from my parent in me denominates him a parent and me a son. In the denomination of parent we posit *in recto* the one generating and *in obliquo* the one generated. In the denomination of son, conversely, we accept him *in recto* and the one generating

¹⁴Latin text has 'Antonium' but Arriaga goes on to use 'Peter' for the rest of the example.

in obliquo. And this is what we intended when we said that the denomination of father has for its foundation the one generating but the denomination of son has for its foundation the one generated. That is, we conceive two subjects of that action, one who is generating and who is denominated father but a second who is begotten and who is denominated son. How, I ask, does it follow from this that the same one is a son and father of himself or similar to himself, since we must always conceive similarity as to another thing?

I have already clearly answered the argument. Now I will show what I promised, namely, that the disagreeability that this author intended to flee is not avoided. For does that virtuality alone holding itself on the part of my parent adequately constitute paternity or only partially? Conversely, does that virtuality holding me from my part alone constitute me a son or do both concur partially for anything whatever from these denominations? What I say about paternity, I also say about Peter's virtuality of similarity to me and of mine to Peter; hence, I speak indiscriminately now of this and now of that.

This having been posited, if it is said that each virtuality concurs formally for that relation (as this author in a true matter teaches when responding to a certain objection made against him in n. 254, where he expressly constitutes those relations from two virtualities, one in one extreme, the other in the other, which in themselves also express absolutes), if, I say, this is said, I have already preserved the whole of what I intended. For filiation will be composed of entirely the same parts that paternity is composed of and, conversely, paternity of the same parts that filiation is composed of. And thus they will return every disadvantage that he pressed against us. I know that he later suggests that the similarity of Peter to John is one pair of formalities but the similarity of John to Peter is another pair of formalities, on the basis of which he says that one similarity is not. I know, I said, that this is what is taught by him. But, nevertheless, as I in truth admit, I do not understand on what basis he accepted those two pairs of formalities, unless in order that I be similar to Peter he places two virtualities in whichever one of us you please: one which refers me to him and another one by which I am passively respected by him. But that is to multiply formalities through new infinities of them without any necessity. For I ask: which of these two formalities in me makes me similar? Which terminates the relation of Peter in me or both at once? If both at once, then it is not one pair but all four virtualities that constitute that similarity, and so the argument that the same things constitute my similarity to Peter and Peter's to me will return again. I prove the second consequence, for the second is clear. Since as a matter of fact this author expressly admits that that similarity is constituted also from the virtualities of another. For if that thing does not exist there is no similarity. Therefore, if the two that are in me must concur, then also on the part of that thing the two must concur. And hence all four must concur. Therefore, he is not saved from that disagreeability that he wished to avoid. But if for that reason it is nothing but that the active formality that is in me constitutes me similar to Peter and consequently that active formality that is in Peter constitutes him similar to me, then I will be assimilated to him and he to me through those active formalities alone, and the other two formalities will be

entirely useless. And then my argument—namely, that those two active formalities constitute both similarities—will again have its force. And it will always be true that the same things are constituents of my similarity to Peter and of Peter's to me. The same argument can be made, if it is said conversely that only the passive formality in me constitutes that similarity. For then it is inferred that the active formality is superfluous and that the whole similarity is in the two passive formalities. And hence that is the form by which I am rendered similar to him and he to me. Moreover that that similarity is formed from the same formalities according to him but according to the same natures or substances according to us is obviously irrelevant to the point of the present difficulty.

But if in order to avoid that someone says to me that I am similar to Peter precisely through the virtuality that is in me and that my father is denominated a parent precisely through the virtuality existing in him, so that the virtuality of filiation that is in me is not a part of that paternity, then, besides the fact that this is expressly contrary to this author, I would infer as follows: therefore, the whole integrated paternity will survive the death of the son and so the father will be a father in entirely the same way that he was when the son was alive. But this author does not want to grant this. Nor can a solution be found in saying that for that denomination the existence of the son is required as connotated, for one would already have returned to extrinsic connotata for denominations, a doctrine which this author rightly abhors. For according to what we said, when all the parts that constitute the whole remain, the whole must also necessarily remain.

You see, as I had said, that the difficulty of the argument is not solved through these virtualities.

SUBSECTION III.

I respond to the remaining arguments.

... <<199, col. b, to 201, col. a>>

[last paragraph] ... Second, I respond that even if similarity were not a true relation, the category of relation would not despite that have been removed. For the category would still remain for transcendental relations and for those that express action, for example, father, son, etc. ...

SECTION VIII.¹⁵

Another singular opinion is quickly struck down.

Father Francisco Bona Spes,¹⁶ in tract. 5, disp. 3, has a singular opinion about relations, which he deals with extensively. It is, moreover, in my judgement wholly purely about nothing other than words and a manner of speaking and it should have been rejected by him for that reason, since it is obviously contrary to the sense of every human being, learned or ignorant. The entire substance of his doctrine, however, consists in this: that formal similarity between a white Peter and a white John does not consist in their both being white but in our intellect combining them or

¹⁵All the material in this section is new to the revised edition. The material from Section VIII of the first edition becomes Section X in the revised edition.

¹⁶A Reformed Carmelite also known as François de la Bonne Espérance and François Crespin.

cognizing them in one act. From this he says later that similarities do not require the existence of either extreme ...

... <<201, col. a, to 202, col. b>>

SECTION IX [VII].

*I respond to the arguments for a modal distinction for categorial relations.*¹⁷

It remains to satisfy the opposing arguments insofar as they have difficulty. To the first—taken from the separation of similarity from its foundation—I respond that I am convinced by that argument to distinguish similarity from its foundation alone. But I am not convinced to distinguish similarity from the foundation and terminus. For it is repugnant for similarity to be separated, even divinely, from both of them existing at the same time *in rerum natura*. Hence, the argument is nothing. Just as someone would be arguing very badly if trying to prove that two human beings existing is a distinct mode from the existence of each of them from the fact that one can exist without the other. For although Peter, for example, can exist alone without making two in number, yet Peter and John cannot exist at the same time without making two human beings. For this reason *being two* is inadequately distinguished from either but in no way from both. I include, moreover, the duration of both at the same time, without which they are not at the same time. And it is right to distinguish this in all composites, which are inadequately distinguished from any part, yet not from all of the parts taken at the same time.

To the second argument I respond that relation is placed in a category of accident for the reason that since the coexistence of the terminus is not essential to the foundation (the existence of John is not essential to Peter), therefore similarity to Peter is called accidental with respect to John absolutely. It is not because there is some accident inhering in Peter, as St. Thomas rightly noted in the passage referred to above.

You will argue that *in re* one category is removed.

But what of it? Is it possible to remove a Sacrament from the Church or a precept from the Decalogue? The adversaries themselves, as I said above, remove passion and position, which are not distinguished from action and ubication. Why should I not also remove one category *in re*? I say '*in re*' because with respect to modes of speaking, which is what is intended with these categories, it is not removed but retained, as I say below.

But I responded to this argument when I dealt in Section [VII,¹⁸ Subsection III,] with Father Lynch's argument.

To Father Molina's argument concerning divine relations I respond that it rather proves our view. For just as the relation of the divine Father <<203>> is not really distinguished from paternity, indeed not even virtually in the common view, so also

¹⁷First edition: 'The contrary arguments are resolved.'

¹⁸Latin text says Section VIII, but that is the section in which Arriaga discusses Francisco Bona Spes.

a created relation is not distinguished from the foundation and terminus. I add that not all things that are virtually distinguished in the divine case <169, col. b> must be really distinguished in the case of created things. Hence, although we concede to Father Molina that the relation of Father is virtually distinguished from the Father himself, we are not for that reason compelled really to distinguish in the created things. You will say that the relation of Father is adequately intrinsic to the Father himself, so therefore a created relation will also be wholly intrinsic to the foundation. Some concede the consequence (we discuss this in sect. 5), but I now deny it. For the relation of the eternal Father is transcendental. As a result, it is no surprise if it is wholly intrinsic to the Father. Paternity in creatures, however, is not a transcendental relation, but a categorial relation. And for that reason it is not wholly intrinsic [in creatures], as we will say further down.

You will perhaps finally admit that the relation of the *similar* is not distinguished from the foundation and terminus for the reasons stated, but you will say that it cannot be denied that the relation of a father is distinguished, because Peter and Paul, who are the foundation and terminus, can exist *in rerum natura* and yet not have the relation of father and son. I respond that Peter and Paul are not the adequate foundation of the relation of father, but both of them and the generation arising from Peter [would be the adequate foundation].¹⁹ All these, however, cannot exist without Peter being the father of Paul. Hence, it is always true that a relation cannot be separated—and therefore cannot be distinguished—from the whole foundation and terminus.

Nevertheless, you will object to this point with John Punch in the little logic, who, although he holds our view, still is very inclined to the contrary. Therefore, he objects as follows in disp. 15: if these relations are not given, one cannot say why I, for example, am more similar to Peter than, for example, to a horse. I am amazed that this argument is presented, since even the most uncultivated peasant would respond at once that it is *because Peter is a human being and I am also a human being, but the horse is not a human being*. And reasonably just as he himself most rightly teaches that from the fact that a wall, for example, is called seen and a fire is called the cause of another fire, nothing deeply of a new entity results. And every human being knows that for a wall to be seen is nothing other than to have a vision of wall. Thus I say more clearly to this point: every human being without any thought about distinct relations knows that one egg is just like another (which is what it is formally to be similar to another). And hence there was no reason why he predicated any (I leave unmentioned how great) difficulty in that argument.

SECTION X [VIII].

*The view of connotations is struck down.*²⁰

¹⁹Note the use of ‘foundation’ here to designate more than just one of the relata.

²⁰First edition: ‘A categorial relation does not formally consist in the foundation alone while connoting the terminus.’

Having rejected every real, modal, and virtual distinction for categorial relations, an old disagreement with some others concerning the constituents of this relation remains for us.

SUBSECTION I.

The view of Father Suárez.

Suárez, in *DM* 2.2.25 and in many other places, whom some recent philosophers follow, thinks that a relation is adequately identified with its foundation, yet it requires a terminus, not as a formal part of the relation but as something obliquely connoted essentially, so that the *ratio* of the similar is preserved. He shows this, first, from St. Thomas, where he earlier asserted that the similarity of Socrates is the whiteness itself of Socrates as it holds itself to the whiteness of Plato.²¹ But I am amazed that these doctors claim St. Thomas for themselves, since he explicitly teaches that similarity expresses the foundation and terminus, just as human being expresses soul and body, and that similarity is inadequately distinguished from the foundation. Father Suárez and those who follow him directly oppose St. Thomas as long as they say that a relation is adequately identified with its foundation. Moreover, in the words quoted by Suárez, St. Thomas does not contend that similarity is adequately preserved in the foundation itself but only that it is not distinguished from the foundation as a mode of it. Moreover, those words ‘as it holds itself to the whiteness’ <<203, col. b>> express (*sonant*) that the whiteness of the foundation as it expresses the whiteness of the terminus. This is more clearly said: each whiteness is similarity, because that phrase ‘as it holds itself to another’ also reduplicates over another, not precisely as a terminus, but also as a part. Just as when it is said ‘the wall as having whiteness is dispersing of vision (*disgregativus visus*)’ it is reduplicated <170> over the whiteness not as connoted of a white thing but as an intrinsic part of the thing.

Father Suárez proves his view, second, by reason. For the terminus of a relation must be something in addition to the relation itself, since a relation does not respect itself. Rather, the entity of another white thing is the terminus of the relation. Therefore, it must not be a part of the relation. Therefore, a relation is adequately distinguished from the terminus. Therefore, it consists of the foundation alone. It is confirmed, first, because it is truly said that Peter is similar to John. But if Peter as similar were to include John, this would be the same as to say that Peter is similar to himself. But that is repugnant. Therefore, the *ratio* of similarity is adequately preserved in the foundation. It is confirmed, second, because the Father is not constituted, even inadequately, in the divine relation of the Son, but is only the terminus of that relation. Therefore, in created things the terminus likewise must not constitute the relation as a part of it.

²¹Both 1632 and 1639 erroneously say ‘Socrates’ instead of Plato. Suárez discusses this bit in *DM* 47.2.13; note that it is not actually from Aquinas, but from the *Summa totius logicae Aristotelis* that was spuriously attributed to Aquinas.

These are not persuasive. In the first place, I already sufficiently addressed the example of the divine case in Section VII, where I showed that paternity is a transcendental relation, which is preserved in the foundation alone. But the present discussion is about categorial relations. But if you wish also to posit a categorial relation there (which I judge very probable), then you will say that the categorial relation of the Father is constituted from both the paternity and the filiation, in the way in which we say about created things below.

I respond to the argument that the terminus of a transcendental relation must be distinguished from the relation itself, yet I deny this in the case of categorial relations. The reason is that categorial relations are not relations in a strict sense. For I do not have some respect or order to a wall just because it is white. But if similarity is called a relation, that is because something similar cannot be conceived as similar except another extreme is conceived to which it is said to be similar; not because one extreme respects the other, but because as similar it expresses each. Moreover, neither can be conceived without the other, as is *per se* obvious. Just as, although Peter does not respect Paul nor, conversely, Paul Peter, yet as constituting two in number, one cannot be conceived without the other, since two in number expresses both. Nor can it be said for this reason that a respect between Peter and Paul is given in virtue of the fact that they constitute two in number. I say exactly the same thing about similarity, which is nothing other than consisting of two beings, two white things, two animals, two human beings. Hence, I think that categorial relations are only relations *secundum dici*. I respond to the first confirmation that Peter is said to be similar to John *secundum se*, but I deny that he is said to be similar to John as similar. John, moreover, *secundum se*, does not include Peter, which is why it does not follow that he must be called similar to himself. I admit that similarity includes both. This is why in a strict sense, although one can say that ‘Peter is similar to John insofar as he is white’, one cannot, nevertheless, say that ‘Peter as similar is referred to John as similar’. For the ‘as similar’ already includes John, who is not referred to himself and is not similar to himself. All this pertains only to the manner of speaking. Therefore, it should be said, first, that the mentioned view of Suárez is not true as it is defended by himself and more recent philosophers. I refute them by their own doctrines, by first explaining it more thoroughly. Consequently, they concede that the whole *ratio* of similarity is entirely intrinsic to the foundation and that it <170, col. b> remains even with the passing away of the terminus, although it does not remain under the formal denomination of similar. Not, they say, because it lacks something that constitutes similarity as a part of it, but because it lacks something connoted. Peter, for example, is adequately called similar through his own whiteness and, although this remains even with the passing away of Paul, he is, nevertheless, not called similar because of a defect of the connoted thing, namely, Paul. Other recent philosophers use this doctrine in various places in philosophy and theology, and they claim <<204>> to explicate God’s freedom with its help: namely: by positing it God can without any change in himself now love and cognize future creatures, which he would not recognize or love while remaining entirely the same, if they were not future only on account of a defect of the connoted thing, namely, the creatures.

This is what they say, which must once and for all be thoroughly overturned, so that we do not bump into this doctrine again and again.

SUBSECTION II.

This view is rejected.

First, therefore, I argue against it as follows: according to you, with the removal of the terminus, there is something intrinsic that does not pass away nor that which belongs formally, and inadequately to the *ratio* and essence of similarity. Therefore, the denomination of similarity remains even with the removal of the terminus. Therefore, presently this wall is similar to every possible white thing. But this is absurd and contrary to your doctrine. I prove the consequence, because this wall presently formally and intrinsically has in itself all of that through which afterwards it is said to be similar. Therefore, by that it should also be said to be similar presently. You will respond that the wall presently has all of that through which afterwards it is said to be similar in *esse entitatis*, that is, the whole entity, but it does not have that in *esse denominationis*. And for that reason it is said to be similar afterwards but not now. I reject this solution most clearly, for it is obviously begging the question. I prove that in virtue of the fact that it has the whole entity of similarity, it should be called similar. But you respond that it should be called such, because although it has the whole entity in *esse entitatis*, it should nevertheless not be denominated, that it, it should not be said to be similar. For ‘to be denominated similar’ and ‘to be said to be similar’ are synonymous. See, then, how you respond that ‘it is not said to be similar because it is not denominated similar’, [explaining] the same through the same. But lest we get stuck in this, [I argue], secondly and more strongly, that ‘to pass away in *esse denominationis*’ is merely ‘to pass away in *esse vocis*’, that is, only a word passes away, or it is for ‘something distinct from the word to pass away’, something, nevertheless, signified through that word. If only the word itself passes away, then just as before the thing was similar *in re* antecedently to the word and independently of it, so also afterwards it will be similar, although it will not be called (*vocetur*) similar by us. Just as two white existences would truly be similar, even though no intellect or word were possible by which they would said to be similar. Furthermore, if the thing signified through the word remains wholly the same, it is also necessary for the word to remain [the same]. Just as because this word ‘action’ does not signify the effect but the production of the effect, which essentially respects and connotes the effect, if *per impossibile* the production were to remain without the effect, it would still be called an ‘action’. But if you say that not only does the word pass away but also something distinct from the word, then in this case the whole entity signified <171> through that word ‘similar’ does not remain. Neither, therefore, does the whole entity formally constituting the similar thing remain. This last consequence is obvious, since what is signified through the word ‘similar’ is that entity constituting the similar. But if according to you only the terminus passes away in that case, then the terminus is an entity composing and constituting the similar itself and is not purely an extrinsic condition.

Second, it is attacked *ad hominem*, since a new real denomination without a new real entity is repugnant in the view of the adversaries. By this doctrine they prove that duration is distinguished from the enduring thing, since this that ‘I endure today’ is a new real denomination which I did not have yesterday. Therefore, it must have arisen from some new and real entity which I have today but did not have yesterday. From this doctrine, which I also think is true, as I show in its place, I argue as follows: therefore it is similarly repugnant for there to be a new real intrinsic denomination without new real intrinsic entity. Therefore, it is repugnant for a real intrinsic denomination of similar to arise anew or to be lost unless some new intrinsic entity of similar is acquired or lost. This second consequence is evident. The first is proven: a new real denomination without new real entity is repugnant according to you for the reason that a real denomination is real entity. New real entity <<204, col. b>> without new real entity is wholly chimerical. But a real intrinsic denomination is also real intrinsic entity. Therefore, new real intrinsic denomination without new intrinsic entity is repugnant. I do not see what consequence could be clearer. It is confirmed: intrinsic entity no less belongs to the essence of intrinsic denomination than real entity belongs to the essence of real denomination. Therefore, a new intrinsic denomination will be no less repugnant than a new real denomination without new real entity. For new intrinsic entity without new intrinsic entity is equally repugnant to new real entity without new real entity.

You will say: nothing is proved by this argument, just as someone wanting to prove from the fact that human being formally expresses soul and body that a human being cannot newly exist except a soul and body newly exist would not argue rightly. For it is enough if the union newly exists. Therefore, although an intrinsic denomination expresses intrinsic entity, it does not follow from the fact that the intrinsic denomination newly exists that the intrinsic entity must newly exist. For it is sufficient that some entity newly exist, even if not intrinsic. But to the contrary, first: for although the consequence from the new existence of something to the new existence of every part is not sound (as is clear from the example about the human being you brought up), the consequence from the new existence of something to the new existence of the union (which formally enters into the constitution of that whole) is, nevertheless, sound. Therefore, the consequence from the new existence of a real intrinsic denomination to the new existence of some intrinsic part or union from which the intrinsic denomination is formally composed is sound. Therefore, the terminus itself by the arising of which the denomination arises and by the passing away of which the denomination passes away must in some way compose the denomination itself as a part. To the contrary, second: for although the consequence from the new existence of a whole to the new existence of a separate part is not sound, nevertheless, the consequence from the new existence of a defined thing to the new <171, col. b> existence of a definition is sound, since the consequence from definition to defined is everywhere sound. But the defined thing, namely, the intrinsic denomination, newly exists. Therefore, its definition, which is real intrinsic entity, newly exists. It is confirmed: for real intrinsic entity is not a part of intrinsic denomination but it most formally is the intrinsic entity itself. Therefore, the consequence from

the new existence of union to the new existence of something else is rightly sound. Therefore, it implies that the intrinsic denomination passes away while the whole intrinsic entity, which is the denomination itself, remains.

These authors are attacked, third: because for the greater part they think that objective precisions in creatures are repugnant in virtue of the fact that two contradictory predicates cannot be applied to one and the same entity at the same time. Hence, I argue against them: the denomination in the *esse denominationis* depends according to these authors on the connoted thing and does not depend on the *esse entitatis*. Therefore, either in the *esse denominationis* expresses something further than in the *esse entitatis* (as I contend)—this further thing will, moreover, be the connoted thing, which by the fact that it is included in the denomination as such will be something intrinsic to the denomination, but this is denied by you—or the denomination in *esse denominationis* does not express another entity than in the *esse entitatis*, in which case one and the same entity has two contradictory predicates depending and not depending on the connoted thing, but this, as I said, is denied by you of the same created thing at the same time, and rightly so.

You will respond that the denomination indeed expresses an entity more fully, yet only through the mode of connotation. But the contrary is obvious: for I ask whether the denomination insofar as a kind of whole intrinsically complete in the *esse denominationis* expresses something beyond entity or not. If not, then the denomination in the *esse denominationis* remains even with the connoted thing removed, and consequently will still truly be a denomination. Or if it passes away, two contradictory predicates will apply to the same entity, for the entity in the *esse entitatis* remains but not that in the *esse denominationis*. Yet since according to you they are wholly the same in reality, both the denomination and the entity [remain]. But if you say the second thing, namely, in the *esse denominationis* and as a kind of whole, then something else is intrinsically <<205>> included. Therefore, since there is nothing beyond the connoted thing, it evidently follows that the connoted thing itself is something intrinsic to the denomination in the *esse denominationis*. This is what I contend. And now we will in reality be in agreement, although you use words badly in calling something connoted that is in fact an intrinsic part of a relation as relation.

These authors are attacked, fourth, with the same example of the free acts of God that they bring up, for these acts are much more difficult to understand thus far than the mystery of the Trinity. Therefore, just as they are bitterly attacked in those who say that something similar to the mystery of the Trinity can be found in creatures, they, indeed, think the latter err in faith and, at the very least, to overthrow all good philosophy, as long as they attempt to argue from the infinity of God to creatures. By better right we can well be attacked in these more recent authors who wish to admit something entirely similar to the free acts of God in created beings, so that, namely, entirely the same thing, without any variation in it, can now be intrinsically willing or intrinsically not willing, similar or not similar, which we do not concede in the case of God <172> without being compelled by faith. For this reason, Father Suárez himself concedes precisely this in the case of the free acts of God but not in

the case of other necessary attributes, in opposition to Father Vazquez who extended it to omnipotence and necessary knowledge. If this extension made by Vazquez is probable, it is so because he finds the same infinity in God. To transfer that difficulty to created beings, however, is wholly chimerical and utterly overthrows all good philosophy. For I can say in the same way that a rational soul is intrinsically in a human being alone by connoting matter and union as pure termini. And hence, even if the soul remains with the perishing of the union, the human being does not remain in *esse denominationis*, yet remains in *esse entitatis*. Which is ridiculous. But once the doctrine of these more recent authors is admitted, this ridiculous argument cannot be attacked effectively. Likewise, [I can say] that quantity is intrinsically substance when it connotes the absence of a subject in which it is, but it is an accident when it connotes a subject in which it is. And other further things manifestly contradicting right philosophy, but which are evidently inferred from the attacked view.

Add, connotata of this sort cannot be admitted even in the case of those free acts of God, since those free acts are understood antecedently to those connotata, even in *ratio denominationis*. For the free acts are the causes of created things. For a created thing exists for this reason, because God wills it to exist. It is not the other way around, that God wills it to exist because it exists. Therefore, the free will of God was already there before the connoted thing existed. How then free acts of this sort should be explained is not our concern.

Finally, connotata of this sort are rejected by an *a priori* argument. For a whole is not distinguished from all of its parts taken and united at once. Hence, it is repugnant that all the parts taken and united at once remain and not remain the whole. But all the parts and the union of this whole *similar* are preserved by you in my whiteness alone. Therefore, with the whiteness remaining, the whole essence of similar remains. Therefore, similar remains, whether or not another whiteness exists. Hence, I conclude that from the mere removal of the connoted thing, which is extra to the essence of the thing if it is not admitted as some part composing that thing, that whole, beyond the essence of which that condition is, cannot perish. And I say the same thing about the denomination itself, which is a certain real whole and consequently must even in *esse denominationis* also have entities or parts from which it is composed.

SUBSECTION III.²²

The view is rejected more thoroughly.

Even if the things that I said in the first edition seemed to suffice for rejecting those connotations, something should nevertheless be added on account of Father Dicastillo . . . <<205, col. a, to 207, col. b>>

SECTION XI [IX].²³

Our view about relations.

²²This subsection is new to the revised edition.

²³Erroneously marked 'X' in the revised edition; content appeared as Section IX in the first edition.

Therefore, having rejected these views about connotata, it should be said that similarity is formally identical to the foundation and terminus, in the same way as a human being is formally identical to the soul, body, and union. For this reason, the relation of being similar is in part intrinsic to the foundation and in part extrinsic: intrinsic insofar as it expresses the foundation itself (which is intrinsic to itself), but extrinsic on the side of expressing the terminus. St. Thomas explicitly says this as was related in [the fourth paragraph of Section V]. The argument is *a priori*, for Peter being similar to John in whiteness is identical as both Peter and John being white, which formally expresses both whitenesses. Just as they are formally two men, so it formally expresses both. <172, col. b>

You will say, first, that it therefore is the same for Peter to be similar to Paul and Paul to be similar to Peter. I concede the consequence, in speaking about the thing itself. There is, nevertheless, a difference in the mode of conceiving. For when I say ‘Peter is similar to Paul’, Peter is conceived *in recto*, but Paul *in obliquo*. Conversely, however, when I say ‘Paul is similar to Peter’, Paul is conceived *in recto*, but Peter *in obliquo*. Nevertheless, each is always conceived as an essential part of the similarity. Just as when I say ‘white [thing]’, the whiteness itself is conceived as an essential part of the white thing, although it is signified *in obliquo*, according to what was said in ‘Summulas’.²⁴

You will say, second, that therefore the relation of father is composed extrinsically from the son himself, which seems absurd. I respond that father is taken in two ways. Either [i] insofar as he is the generating cause and as such something is indeed denominated extrinsically, yet only by the generation which is in the son. It is the same in the case of other causes, which are denominated causing by only the action existing in the effect, but not by the effect itself, since it is not a part of causality. Or [ii] father can be taken as categorially relative and as such I admit that he is not adequately denominated extrinsically by the son and by the generation, as one similar is denominated by another. In the way I said above that it is probable that even in the eternal Father two similar relations can be found (and likewise for the other persons among themselves), one that is transcendental and entirely intrinsic to him, by the fact that in divine persons the active production from which the relation arises is intrinsic to the one producing as I showed in the material on the Trinity, and one that is categorial, in part intrinsic arising from the Father himself and in part extrinsic taken up from the Son.

You will ask whether in the case of a created father the generation that essentially inadequately constitutes father stands as a part of paternity or an inadequate foundation of the relation or whether it rather stands as the union of the parts themselves of the relation. Certain recent philosophers, in order to show that the father remains physically in the *ratio* of father even once the generation has been transacted, have said that generation is not part of the relation, but the union of the parts. Nevertheless, it is required intrinsically and essentially for that relation, just as the union of the soul <<208>> and the body is required for the *ratio* of a human being. This

²⁴This is a reference to the introduction to logic that opens the *Cursus philosophicus*. On signification *in recto* and *in obliquo*, see Disputation I, Section IX.

view is far removed from the mind of connotating, even if at first glance it seems to fall back into those, as long as it admits that every part of paternity can remain in *esse entitatis*, for example, Peter and Antonio, and yet the denomination of father can pass away, merely through the passing away of some connoted thing, namely, generation, as would happen in the case in which Peter and Antonio exist *in rerum natura* but with neither having generated the other. This view is removed from connotata, because the authors of those do not say that the generation from whose removal Peter is not said to be a father is something beyond paternity. Indeed, they rather say that it is the union of that whole. Moreover, to say that the whole does not remain when the union is removed, although all the parts remain, is not to fall into connotata. Indeed, that cannot be denied by anyone. For a human being comes to an end on account of the corruption of union alone. And the same happens in the case of other composites, even if all their parts remain as long as the union perishes. Yet, nevertheless, although on this score they do not fall into connotata, they coincide, however, insofar as they teach that at present a relation of father can be physically given between, for example, Peter <173> and Paul, and not at present be given between Paul and Francisco, even though at present there is physically no physical difference by reason of which there could be this difference in denomination. You will respond that there is the difference that generation excels among those but not among these. But to the contrary, for a past generation at present is no more something physical than if it had never been. For this reason, therefore, Peter cannot at present physically differ from Paul. Therefore, for this reason, neither can Peter at present be physically a father but Paul not. The argument is *a priori*, for difference in past entity could only have caused a different denomination about the past, but not properly something about the present which really remains. Just as if Peter had been white yesterday, but now today he lacked whiteness, he would not for that reason today be physically similar to a white thing and dissimilar to a black thing. It is confirmed from what was said above against the connotaters: for just as there cannot be a new denomination without new entity, so also there cannot be a different physical denomination concerning the present without a different physical entity at present.

Furthermore, these philosophers improperly call generation union. For the father and son, although one causes the other, are not united to each other, not extrinsically, just as God is not united with a creature extrinsically even though he is the cause of the creature. In truth, insofar as this is concerned, the question is about a name.

Finally, this view by no means achieves what is being attempted, although we concede to them that generation is union. For that just as well implies that some whole can physically remain while the union does not physically remain as while some part does not physically remain. For union is no less essentially required for the *ratio* of the whole than any other part is required. Therefore, it is no less repugnant for paternity to remain physically without generation if this is union than it would be repugnant if this is a part. You will say that this is true in the case of intrinsic wholes but not in the case of extrinsic wholes. But to the contrary, first, because this difference is imagined wholly gratuitously. To the contrary, second, because

it is one thing to be a physical whole even if extrinsic, but another to be a moral whole. Indeed, a physical whole even if extrinsic necessarily requires physical parts and a physical union, although extrinsic. A moral whole, however, only asks for the union or part to remain morally. Just as although an army is an extrinsic whole made up of many human beings extrinsically united and whose parts are only those human beings, it nevertheless is repugnant for the army to remain physically once the union or making into one of those human beings with each other is removed, regardless how physically all those human beings who compose that army remain. Therefore, even in the case of extrinsic wholes, in order for them to physically remain, it is required not only that all the parts physically remain but also that the union of those parts remains. The argument is *a priori*, for just as whole as whole expresses union, so also physical whole expresses physical union, but moral whole expresses moral union. Nor can a satisfactory reason be given <<208, col. b>> for why physical parts rather than a physical union would be required for a physical whole, since this, as we said, is no less essential to the whole than a part itself. It is confirmed: this, that is, physically to be a father is physically to have paternity. Moreover, physically to have paternity is physically to be united to paternity. But one cannot physically be united without a physical union. Therefore, neither could one <173, col. b> physically have paternity without that. Therefore, neither physically be a father without an existing physical generation, even if this is only union.

Therefore, to the argument of these recent philosophers, I respond that the denomination of father is not wholly physical by a generation having been transacted but is in part physical and in part moral. It is physical insofar as it requires some physical part but it is moral insofar it does not require the parts, every physical part, to be actual. For one is equally called a father by people now when the generation does not exist but is past as when actually generating him. Just as Peter is absolutely called a sinner and a murderer from sin and murder that are past and not physically existing at present. And a house is called old from preceding duration which no longer exists. In fact, I add that sometimes someone is even called a father who no longer exists but is already dead, which is how we say 'the father of Philip did this' although he is already dead. It is also usual to say 'I am the son of Peter' and 'Philip is the son of Antonio'. Therefore, these words 'father' and 'son' do not always signify things physically existing, even those which you call parts. This pertains more to a manner of speaking than to the thing itself. Just as it also arises from common acceptance that some accidental names (for example, 'white', 'sweet', etc.) do not signify except the subject actually has whiteness or sweetness, but others also signify the preceding form, as is clear in the example of the old house mentioned earlier. And I am also today called prior to the Antichrist through a denomination from the same Antichrist who does not yet exist but is future. And many other such cases can be found all over the place. Also relevant here is the example in that very denomination of similar. For we very often say 'Peter is similar to his parent, brother, etc.' but never have any concern whether the other person to whom we compare Peter lives or not. Therefore, with this we say, we only contend, that Peter has such an appearance as the parent had or has. It is clear, therefore, that the fact that Peter is called

the parent of Antonio by the generation having been transacted does not entail that generation is not an extrinsic part of father, no less than the terminus in your view is a part of similarity even though the foundation is still called similar with its removal.

This argument seems to be according to Father Suárez, who constitutes relation in the foundation alone, seeing that relation is said to remain with only the foundation remaining. But neither does it favour Father Suárez: because (as I already showed a little earlier) these are not denominations strictly about the present. Second, because Suarez demands connotata just as necessarily as we demand parts. Hence, whether the terminus is a part or a connotatum, it is equally repugnant for the denomination to remain without it.

But these recent philosophers will argue against this point: generation itself belongs to the category of action. Therefore, it cannot be a part of the category of relation, since nothing can belong to two categories. This argument, if it proves anything, well proves that generation as union cannot belong to the category of relation, because union no less constitutes and belongs to the whole than any part. Next, I deny that the same thing cannot belong to two or to four categories, because the distinction between categories is not entirely strict. For place, where, and habit, which <174> by Aristotle are set up as three categories, are not distinct from each other (as I will show in the relevant place). Likewise, action and passion constitute a single category. Third, I respond that generation by itself constitutes only the category of action, but the category of relation is constituted by generation with the produced and producing persons at the same time. Just as whiteness only taken in itself belongs to the category of quality, but belongs to the category <<209²⁵>> of relation when taken at the same time with another whiteness, insofar as it thus constitutes 'similar'. This suffices for a distinction of categories, as was shown from St. Thomas in [the fourth paragraph of Section V].

Therefore, to the question especially from [the third paragraph of this section], I respond, first, that it is purely a question of names and of little importance whether, namely, generation should be called a part or a union of parts. Second, since in this case there is not a true intrinsic composition but an extrinsic composition, there cannot be a real union but at most an improper union. If in this sense you wish to call generation a union, I shall not contend against you. I would rather call it the proximate foundation or the form of that denomination. For just as a human being is called white after whiteness, so also a father after preceding generation and after the permanence of the son himself, which also is an inadequate form of that relation.

You will ask, second, whether a father who has two sons has two paternities. I respond that he has two inadequately but not two adequately. For since the father himself is included in paternity, a father who is not multiplied with the multiplication of sons, the result is that the whole paternity is not multiplied. In fact, even if the whole were multiplied, one should not say for that reason that there are multiple fathers, since father expresses *in recto* the one producing but *in obliquo* the paternity itself, just as white thing expresses *in recto* the subject but *in obliquo* the whiteness. And just as even if the whitenesses were multiplied, there would not be multiple

²⁵Beware pagination errors in the Latin text; I will only include corrected page numbers.

white things if the subject is not multiplied, so also even if paternities were multiplied, there would not be multiple fathers if the subject is not multiplied. This is more clearly seen in the view of the Thomists, who adequately distinguish paternity from the foundation and yet do not for this reason multiply fathers through the multiplication of paternities. Whence you gather that if two men at the same time through a miracle were to generate one other human being, they should be called two fathers, because what father [signifies] *in recto* is multiplied although what it [signified] *in obliquo* is not (just as father and mother are called two parents). But the human being born of them will only be one son, because what son [signifies] *in recto* will not be multiplied but only what it [signifies] *in obliquo*. And for this reason, conversely, two men born from the same parent are two sons, since what son [signifies] *in recto* is multiplied but not what it [signifies] *in obliquo*. This suffices for the multiplication of concrete things, according to what was said in ‘Summulas’ Disputation I from n. 61.

SECTION XII [X].

Whether relations require an existing terminus.

Gregory, to whom Father Suárez and Hurtada de Mendoza from §63 refer, says that it is not required. Hurtado thoroughly refutes him from §63. I think that there can be no question about the matter with respect to this point. For if in our view similarity, for example, is each whiteness, it is certain that similarity cannot be given *in re* when not both whitenesses are given, <174, col. b> namely, that which is the foundation and that which is the terminus. I say the same in the case of the relation of a father to a deceased son. If Gregory intends the contrary, he spoke improbably. It is true that with respect to the way of speaking I showed above that it is very frequently said that ‘he is the son of so and so’ even if the parent has died. And the same is true in the case of similarity. For what is more frequent among people than to say ‘he is the most proper image of his parents’ even when the parents have already died? Hence, with respect to this I do not submit to some opining the contrary. But he objects here: therefore, orphans have fathers. I respond easily that since this difficulty is only about a way of speaking, there is no good consequence from one to the other. For one is accepted but the other is not, which I show from the example itself. For although an orphan is not said to have a parent, he is nevertheless at present said ‘to be the son of so and so’. Whereby all contrary reasons are obviously overcome.

Second, I say that consequently Gregory’s view is attacked less by these. For they use universal arguments that also prove that that categorial relation also cannot arise from a past thing. For they say that if an actually existing terminus is not required for a relation, <<209, col. b>> then Christ the Lord will be a parent of other human beings and the Blessed Virgin Mary will be a natural mother of all human beings, which would be heretical. In truth, they should have noticed here that the reason that the Blessed Virgin Mary is not called our natural mother is not because we, who are the termini, do not exist actually, as they argue. For if that alone were the reason, then all actually existing human beings would be fathers, sons,

mothers, and daughters of each other. Furthermore, it should also be noticed that the Blessed Virgin Mary is called the actual mother of Christ not for the reason that the generation is actual but because it happened in the past. Whence is obviously concluded that that denomination of father or mother is taken from some thing that is not actually existing but is past. Hence just as it in order to denominate someone a father it suffices that he have generated even if there is no actual generation, so also it can suffice that he have had a son even if that son does not actually live. Nor does it follow (as the opponents contend) from my being said now to be the son of a human being who does not exist that I should be called the son of every human being. Just as even if a son is denominated after a generation that does not exist in the case of a living parent, it does not follow that for this reason I should be denominated a son after every possible generation of every human being. Therefore, this view of theirs should not be confirmed by the argument. But what they add, that relation is *ad aliud*, from which they infer that it cannot be to a terminus that does not exist, was rightly rejected earlier by Suárez. For a power is absolutely said to have a transcendental relation to possible effects that are not actually existing. It is no more necessary that a categorial relation must be to some actual other thing (*ad aliud actu*) than that a transcendental relation must be.

For this reason I think that one should say that these categorial relations, which (as I said) pertain to a manner of speaking, are not taken up from termini that are purely possible. For I am not now said to be similar to a human being who never was, even if he could exist and be similar to me, just as I am not said to be the son of everyone by whom I could have been generated. And in this I agree with Fathers Suárez and Hurtado de Mendoza. In fact, I add that these denominations are not generally taken even after future termini. <175> The reason, perhaps is that human beings do not know what the future termini would be; therefore, they do not accept denominations from future things. But I do not doubt that these denominations are taken from the past, just as they are taken from a past generation no longer existing. For in the same way that I am said to be a son now, both when a parent is living and at least when he is living, I will be denominated a son in every view; but generation does not exist at that point but precedes it. And the same thing was manifestly shown above about similarity and with other denominations, for example, prior and posterior, the matter is beyond controversy. For a house is said to be old after duration which no longer exists. And we are said properly to be descendants (*posterii*) of Adam and posterior (*posteriores*) to him. In this sense, too, with respect to future things whose future existence is certain to us, we are also said to be prior to them. Thus we are said to be prior to the Antichrist. If it were certain to us what form of appearance he was going to have and someone were found who in some way had such an appearance, there is very little doubt but that it would be said that 'he is very similar to the Antichrist'. Indeed, we usually say of a man most degenerate in morals that 'he is in the image of the Antichrist'. As is clear from this, what was said above is true, namely, that all these reduce to the manner of speaking. And for this reason we usually do not say that we are similar to future human beings as we say that we are to preceding humans. For we do not know future things as we know present and

past things, at least from histories.

In turn, it is clear that the same pertains to a manner of speaking alone. For I am called the son of parents already deceased and yet I am not said to have a parent, which *in re* is the same thing. But since the word 'to have' more denotes actuality, for this reason I am not said 'to have' except what is present. Nevertheless, I am called a son even of one who no longer is. But they finally object to us: if I am called similar to one deceased, he therefore will also be called similar to me. For I cannot be similar to him unless he is also similar to me. This is even clearer with inequality, for I cannot be equal or greater than another unless the other be equal to or lesser than me. I respond that I already said above that in these things <<210>> that pertain to manner of speaking, it is not well to argue 'this way is accepted and therefore also this'. Add that there is this disparity, since it at least seems to be required that what is expressed *in recto* in these denominations actually exist. For this reason I can be called actually similar to or the son of a deceased man, because I, who am denominated, actually exist. But the deceased man is not called a parent or similar, because he who is denominated *in recto* requires actual existence according to the custom of speaking.

Finally, I conclude from this that it is vain from these to doubt whether a relation to a terminus that does not exist can be given by the absolute power of God. For with respect to the manner of speaking it can also be given naturally, as I showed. But with respect to the thing itself and according to the whole which the denomination expresses, it certainly cannot. For if relations include the termini themselves as parts and the termini cannot exist without themselves, who will doubt but that a relation cannot be given without an existing terminus? These points are most certain in our view.

But for Thomists, who posit distinct relations, there can be a greater locus of difficulty, namely, whether a distinct relation of son can remain with the father already dead. I would say, first, that it is not repugnant that there be some relations which are essentially <175, col. b> connected with actual existence of the termini. Likewise, it is not repugnant that there be other relations which only naturally depend on termini but which could by divine power exist without the termini. They are of the same kind as material sensitive acts are commonly said to be, which by divine power can exist even without an object present but cannot naturally be without an object present, as I posit in the books on the soul.²⁶ Finally, third, I would think that there can be other relations which only require that its terminus have existed even if it does not remain as long as those durations exist. This concerns possibility. But with this having been posited, to determine which of these kinds the relations of those Thomists would be is a matter of great doubt. For it is discussed by assuming one false condition. I certainly do not see the reason why then there could not be some relations that could through divine power exist without termini. Nor is what Suárez says an obstacle, namely, that these relations do not effect anything with respect to their termini, but result merely by the termini having been posited. This, I say, is no objection, first, because (as I said above in [the eighth paragraph of

²⁶A later part of *Cursus philosophicus*.

Section IV]) cognition effects nothing more concerning its object than this relation and yet cognition cannot even naturally be about a non-existing object. Therefore, *a fortiori* there could be a relation through divine power to a terminus that does not exist. Also, because it is sufficient if that dependence is natural, just as we said about intuitive acts. But through this is not taken away that that relation could not exist without a terminus through divine power. I add, nevertheless, that he who would call those future relations of the kind which are essentially connected with their termini will not easily be convinced. But those Thomists dispute about this, because, as I said, the matter is most uncertain.

SECTION XIII [XI].²⁷

Some difficulties about relations are resolved.

The first difficulty can be whether a relation is terminated in something absolute or something relative. Since relations are of two kinds, one categorial, the other transcendental, the present difficulty can proceed about either. To which I respond that if the discussion is about transcendental relations, it should be said that some can be terminated in something formally relative, but others in something absolute. Those transcendental relations are terminated in something absolute which are terminated in absolute things in which there is no mutual respect. According to the common view, cognition, for example, essentially and transcendently respects its object, since the object, nevertheless, does not essentially respect the cognition (also according to the common view). Likewise, this action essentially respects this terminus in such a way that it cannot in any way exist without it. But this terminus does not essentially depend on numerically this action. Therefore, object and terminus are more absolute than the cognition and action that are terminated in them. Therefore, cognition and action are not terminated in something formally relative <<210, col. b>> but in something absolute. The same is true in the case of a creature's relation to God, according to the view of many, who, since they say that he is complete apart from creatures (*absolutum a creaturis*), also does not express order to creatures.

But among those relations that mutually respect each other—as, for example, the eternal Father the Son and the Son the Father and matter form and form matter—among <176> which is given a mutual transcendental relation, it should be said that these relations are formally terminated in something relative. The reason is manifest, for, since a transcendental relation is not really distinguished from that in which it is—for example, from the matter that respects the form—hence it is the case that if a relation that is in a form is terminated in matter, it is also terminated in a relation in the form itself, a relation that is identified with the matter. Likewise, the relation of the eternal Son which is terminated in the Father, from whom the relation to the Son is not distinguished, is also terminated in something relative. This doctrine finds a place in all mutual relations, as will easily be clear to anyone from the reason given.

About categorial relations there is no difficulty on our view, which denies that they are properly relations but says that they are only extrinsic denominations taken

²⁷Erroneously marked 'XI' in revised edition.

from each extreme. Hence, just as between Peter and Paul who constitute two human beings in number no respect is given, not to something absolute and not to something relative, so also no respect is given between this and that whiteness. For as similars express nothing other than the existence of both, there is not respect between the existence of one and the existence of another. That, or I prove it as follows: for however much an angel or, indeed, God himself comprehends this existing whiteness, up to this point from the comprehension of that whiteness he will by no means come to the cognition of another whiteness as actually existing, even if they are similar to each other. Therefore, there is no relation with respect to another in this whiteness; otherwise, the angel would from the relation that is in this whiteness come to a cognition of the other whiteness to which this relation is directed. Therefore, a categorial relation properly is not a relation or a respect. Therefore, one should not ask about it whether it is terminated in something absolute or something relative. And an *a priori* argument can be taken from what was said in Section IV, since a categorial relation expresses each extreme as a partner. But each extreme is not terminated in each, since nothing is terminated in itself. Hence, the result is that these relatives qua relatives, in the way in which they are, are simultaneous by nature and cognition. For as relatives they are nothing other than each extreme simultaneously. But each extreme is simultaneous with each extreme by nature and cognition.

Some at present dispute [to be] thoroughly satisfactory whether in the view that distinguishes categorial relations from foundation and terminus one should say that a relation is terminated in another relation or rather in its foundation. I would say that this question is useless for us, for we saw what should be said in our view. But what should be said in an alien view would seem alien. For it is of no interest to us to explain how something should be discussed in some other view, especially when it has already become obsolete, as has happened in the present case. Nevertheless, I respond briefly that in that view one should say against some that the relation of a similar is terminated as to a terminus both to the relation itself and to its foundation. I am moved because the relation that is in this wall, for example, not only refers this wall as similar to another wall, but also refers itself and the wall as similar to another wall and the relation existing in it. For (as I showed above in Section II) those distinct relations are also <176, col. b> similar to each other and are themselves referred. Therefore, any of these relations is not only referred to the foundation of the opposite but also to the opposite relation. Nor does a mutual priority follow from this (as those who think the opposite object); it does not follow, I say, because it is not necessary that a terminus be prior by nature to the relation itself, as is clear in the case of the relation of an action to an effect as to a terminus, which nevertheless is not prior to the action. The case is the same with the divine relations, in which the Son is not prior to the relation of the Father whose terminus he is. Therefore, it is not necessary that if an opposite relation is the terminus of this relation that it be prior to this, and, consequently, <<211>> that this in turn as terminus be prior to it. But they can in every way be simultaneous even by nature. For this reason it is commonly said that relatives are simultaneous in nature and cognition.

But notice, first, that the conclusion should be understood about mutual relations. For if there can be categorial relations that are not mutual, of the sort that some people admit in created beings with respect to God, then the categorial relation will only be terminated in something absolute. For in the terminus which it respects will not be found any relation to which it is referred, as is similar to what I said about transcendental relations in [the first paragraph of this section].

Notice, second, that in the case of mutual relations I only talked about the relation of similarity. For it seems that one should say something else about the relation of a father and of a son in the case of created things: namely, that the relation of a father formally as such is only terminated in the produced son but not in filiation. The reason is that that relation only respects that which the father formally generates. But this is not the filiation itself but the son. For filiation or the relation of filiation resulted from having produced the son. I said ‘as formally the relation of a father’ because, insofar as that relation is similar to the relation itself of filiation, it will also be terminated in it, just as I just said about other relations of similarity. And this on behalf of a consequence in an alien view.

The second difficulty can be whether the *ratio* of ‘to’ which I said at the beginning is included in relations is proper to real relations or whether it also applies to relations of reason. Cajetan and Canariensis according to Fathers Suárez (*DM* 47.3.2) and Vazquez (part I, disp. 114, cap. 1 and 2) think that the concept of relation according to being ‘to’ is abstracted from real relation and relation of reason, because even a relation of reason has being ‘to’. In truth, these doctors are easily attacked by their argument. For it is no more repugnant for the concept ‘in’ common to real relations and relations of reason to be abstracted than the concept ‘to’. But the concept ‘in’ cannot be common to real relations and relations of reason (as the adversaries also admit). Therefore, the concept ‘to’ also cannot be abstracted. The consequence is evident. The minor is a doctrine of the adversaries. The major is proven: for on the one side a relation of reason in the way that it is just as well has being ‘in’ a subject as it has being ‘to’ a terminus. Moreover each concept is fictitious in it. But a real relation is no less really ‘in’ a subject as it is really ‘to’ a terminus; consequently, in it each concept is real. Therefore, it will be no less repugnant to abstract a common concept from the concept ‘to’ which is fictitious in a relation of reason and real in a real relation, than to abstract from the concepts ‘in’ of each relation. Second, they are attacked by an *a priori* argument, <177> for no common univocal concept can be abstracted from real being and being of reason. Therefore, neither will either the concept ‘to’ or ‘in’ be common to real relation and relation of reason.

The third difficulty is whether the terminus of a categorial relation can be a being of reason. The reason for doubting is that a transcendental relation seems to be to a being of reason. For a cognition of a being of reason expresses a transcendental respect to a being of reason as to its object. Therefore, a categorial relation could also respect a being of reason. Nevertheless, this argument is not persuasive. For, first, I deny the consequence, since a categorial relation is constituted through the terminus itself. Hence, there cannot be a real categorial relation if the terminus is a being of reason, since nothing can be really composed through a fictitious part.

A transcendental relation, however, is adequately distinct from the terminus and is identified with its foundation. Hence, there does not seem to be as great a repugnance in the fact that it is real even though the terminus is not real, provided that the foundation be real, as there is with a categorial relation. Second, I respond by denying the antecedent, namely, that a transcendental relation is given that is properly to a being of reason. For a proper transcendental relation must be to something else without qualification (*ad aliud simpliciter*), but a being of reason, since properly it is nothing, cannot properly be *something else*. Therefore, there also cannot be a proper relation to it. To the counterexample from cognition I respond that it does not have a proper respect to a being of reason as to an object, because a being of reason <<211, col. b>> is not properly an object. For properly and absolutely it is nothing. Therefore, that cognition does not properly have a terminus, just as it does not have a proper object.

... <<211, col. b, to 212, col. b>>

The last difficulty is whether a concept common to all relations can be given. The reason for doubting is that if relative in general is defined, it should be defined as ‘being that which respects something else’. But this definition seems wholly to fight against the things that we have said so far about mutual relatives. For the relative that is defined comprehends every relative; therefore, that ‘something else’ that is posited as the terminus must be something distinct from every relative. Otherwise, it will not be something else from relative. And often the terminus is itself a relative; therefore, it is not ‘something else’ from relative. This reason for doubting perpetrates a great deal of trouble for Father Suárez and Rubio according to Hurtado, last section, but I think there is no greater difficulty here than in the common definition of cause, namely, ‘cause is that which inflows being into something else’. For the same argument happens here. For if cause comprehends every cause, then every <177, col. b> cause must be distinct from that ‘something else’ that is posited in the definition. But often that ‘something else’ is itself a cause, since the effect of one cause is the cause of a further thing. Behold the present difficulty! It is also the same in the definition of form, ‘a form is that which through its union with a subject perfects it’, and yet often it happens that the subject itself is at the same time a form. The same is the case in the definition of subject, in the definition of union, of cognition, etc. To which I easily respond, having passed over all the other solutions that more cloud the issue than explain it: Even if the terminus itself is a relative, nevertheless every relative always respects something different from itself, because in that case the terminus is not the relative with respect to itself but with respect to something other than itself. Therefore, the definition should not be explicated as follows: ‘relative is that which respects something else that is not a relative’. This is the sense that the objection intends and in this sense I confess the definition to be bad. But it should be explicated as follows: ‘relative is that which respects something distinct from itself’, whether that which is respected is at the same time a relative to something else or not. On behalf of this, note that the terminus that is at the same time a relative is placed in the definition twice, once insofar as relative is defined, in which case it is posited *in recto*, and secondly as terminus and then *in obliquo* through that word ‘something

else'. And the same happens when cause, form, or any other thing is defined that at the same time participates both *in recto* and *in obliquo* in the definition.

You will ask in what sense it is true what is commonly taught at present, namely, that motion to a relation cannot be given *per se* but that the relation results from the positing of a terminus and foundation. I respond that nothing else is taught by that axiom except that something producing, for example, whiteness *per se* does not intend it to constitute a similar to another whiteness. For the production of that whiteness is independent from the existence of another. For it would be produced in the same way even if the other were not produced. And in our view the matter is clearer, because since a relation formally consists in each extreme, but through any given action is not produced each extreme but only one, it follows that through no [individual] action is a relation formally produced. But it is said to result from the positing of the foundation and terminus, not because it properly and really results, since it is not really distinguished from the foundation and terminus, but because according to our reason it seems to result from each. I would rather say that it is formally produced through the production of each without any resultancy, since it is not distinguished from <<213>> each, just as two in number does not result properly from the positing of two human beings but formally is those very two human beings. And this about relations.