

seeing. No doubt, that is an easy doctrine, easily taught,  
easily believed, and easily followed; but it has no other  
merit. The first step in any science or in philosophy is  
a conversion of the subject from the world of sense to the  
universe of being. It took <sup>as</sup> an extraordinarily intelligent  
person as St. Augustine years to accomplish that step

seeing. It is a disastrous policy. The first step towards a sound philosophy is a transformation of the subject, and that first step is not easy. It took an Augustine years to accomplish it; per se, it takes lesser men longer; and if anyone is not fully conscious of having accomplished it, if anyone has any doubt about the exact nature of the ~~an~~ accomplishment, then he need have no doubt whatever that he has not achieved it. doubt about the nature and implications of the accomplishment, if anyone is inclined to suppose that I am merely repeating a platitude that has no relevance to people brought up in the Scholastic tradition, then I do not think he should have any doubt that he has never experienced the transformation

seeing. It is a disastrous policy. The first step towards a sound philosophy is a transformation of the subject: as long as he remains fundamentally an animal in a habitat, he is fundamentally incapable of grasping what philosophy is about or what the better philosophers are attempting to communicate. Quidquid recipitur, ad modum recipientis recipitur. When one's basic inspiration is a perverse, obscurantist, and ~~the~~ inadequate analogy, one's mode of reception is perverse, obscurantist, and inadequate.

This contradiction lies in the relationship affirmed and denied to exist between (1) knowing the conformity of a particular act of intellect to its object and (2) knowing that it is the nature of intellect to conform to things. According to Dr. Fay, in the order of our knowing According to Dr. Fay we see the conformity in particular cases and from the particular cases we infer the general truth that regards the nature of intellect. According to St. Thomas we could not know the conformity in particular cases unless by reflection we arrived at the general truth

This contradiction arises in the relationship between particular and general, between knowing the conformity of a particular act of intellect to the thing and, on the other hand, knowing that it is the nature of intellect to conform to things. Dr. Fay holds that ontologically the cause lies in the nature of intellect to conform to things and the effects are to be Dr. Fay distinguishes the causa essendi and the causa cognoscendi: in the order of being the cause is the nature of intellect to conform, and the consequent or effect lies in the particular acts in which in fact intellect does conform; but in the order of our knowing this relationship is inverted; because we see the conformity of particular acts to particular things, we are able to invoke a general principle and infer that it is the nature of intellect to conform to things. Obviously, this interpretation is sound empiricism: we know particulars; we infer general laws. But, it happens, that St. Thomas states precisely the opposite view: the mind knows the proportion of its act to the thing; but it cannot do that ~~and~~ unless it knows the nature of the act; and it cannot know the nature of the act unless it knows the nature of the active principle, which is the intellect itself, whose nature it is to conform to things