

44000DTE060/A440 (no date)

Without a system, there is simply a plethora of viewpoints: this one, that one, a third one, etc., etc.: Thomas, Scotus, ?, Suarez, Augustinians; phenomenology and personalism; positivists, ?? Hegelians, all in a perfect democracy where everyone says what he/she wants, in a biblical mode, or relying on the 'notes' and norms, etc.: a Babel, with order imposed only by 'de fide definita' and the Holy Office.

In a system, everything holds together, is consistent, coherent. A system explains all viewpoints. It considers things both *quoad se* and *quoad nos*, both from the standpoint of logic and from that of dialectic, both what is fixed and what is in progress, corruption, what is contingent, what is changeable. It can be expressed in basic concepts and propositions and is internally coherent.

The analogy of proportion (Latin, *proportio*; Greek, *analogia*): $A:B :: C:D :: E:F$

A: the mutual relation does not vary, but the items that are related do, either in a way that is known (A_1), where the knowable is to be known, or in a way that is unknown (A_2), where we are dealing with what is unknowable. B: the mutual relation does vary, again either in a way that is known B_1 or in a way that is unknown B_2 .

Generalizing this, we arrive at the notion of isomorphic structure, where the whole consists of its parts intelligibly connected with one another. A structure is not a local disposition, but a totality of functional relations. 'Isomorphic' refers to an equivalent totality of functional relations: $A, B, C, D, E \dots \equiv P, Q, R, S, T \dots$

Thus, for single elements A, B, \dots there are corresponding elements P, Q, \dots . Again, for single relations $AB, AD, AD \dots$, there is a corresponding relation PQ, PR, \dots and for $BC, BD \dots$ there is $QR, QS \dots$. Again, for individual sequences $A + B \rightarrow C$, there is the corresponding sequence $P + Q \rightarrow R$

(page 2)

Isomorphic structures, inquiry about the structure formally or structurally; that something is in the structure each can [know?] for oneself by indicating, experiencing [?]. The issue has to do with composite wholes that consist of elements or parts; these hold together, the elements are connected, intelligibly related. The structure regards the totality of the relations of the parts to one another and of the elements to the whole. We are not talking about a local disposition. It may be that the elements cannot be imagined. *Isos morphē*, equivalent in structure.

Thus, if there is a whole A , made up of a, b, c, \dots , and another whole P , made of p, q, r, \dots the structures of A and P are isomorphic if for each element in A there is a corresponding element in P , for each relation in A there is a corresponding relation in P , for each resultance in A there is a corresponding resultance in P . For example there are the correspondences:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a & \leftrightarrow & p \\ aR_1b & \leftrightarrow & pR_2q \\ (ab \rightarrow c) & \leftrightarrow & (pq \rightarrow r) \end{array}$$

We are not saying the elements are similar, the relations are similar, the resultances are similar, but the equivalence is found in the fact that A and P are composite wholes whose elements are

related to each other in the same way, whose relations of elements are related to each other in the same way, and whose sequences of elements are related to each other in the same way.

(page 3)

[Thus a structure, left here in Latin, which is clear:]

<p><u>Operantia</u> cognoscentia ut tota composita</p>	<p><u>Operationes</u> cognoscitivas ut tota composita prout prae-praedicativa prae-conceptualia operantia</p>	<p><u>Operata</u> cognita ut tota composita ? operata</p>
<p><u>conscia</u> empirice intellectualiter rationaliter</p>	<p>experiri intelligere iudicare</p>	<p>potentia forma actus</p>
<p><u>schemata experientiae</u> biologicum aestheticum dramaticum practicum intellectuale mysticum</p>	<p>experiri externa/interna intelligere (3) modus accumulationis sensus communis (quoad nos part.) mathesis sc. nat phil sc hum emp theol</p>	<p>(1) formas subst/accid (2) hierarchiae form.acc. genesis hier.form.acc. dialectica genesis in sc. hum.</p>
<p><u>invariants</u> si in schemate intellectuali</p>	<p>(2) methodus ≡ anticipationes classica statistica genetica dialectica (1) id quod intelligitur unitas-identitas-totum relatio iudicare Est, Non est, Nescio Certo, probabiliter</p>	<p>(3) metaphys respicit explicata</p>

(page 4)

- I. There are given (1) corresponding (2) composite wholes.
 - A. The subject is not conscious without operation, and operation does not occur without there emerging an 'operatum'
 - B. More particularly

The subject is not conscious empirically unless he experiences; nor does he experience unless something is experienced.

The subject is not conscious intellectually

unless he inquires; nor does he inquire unless there is something about which he inquires; unless he understands; nor does he understand unless there is something that is understood; unless he conceives; nor does he conceive unless there is something that is conceived;

The subject is not conscious rationally

unless he reflects, weighs evidence, judges.

C. Composite wholes:

Matter, form, act of existence are not three things but that by which one thing is composed.

Experience, understanding, judgment are not three knowledges.

Empirical, intelligent, rational consciousness are not three consciousness but three levels by which one advances to complete consciousness.

II There is given: (A) a fundamental invariant, and (B) the possibility of progress in all. The fundamental invariant that is, as it were, inevitable is the empirically, intellectually, and rationally conscious subject, that is not subject to revision, that can be better known by indefinite progress, and that is better known insofar as the operations are better known whence the operables are better known; this progress does not depend directly on the sciences but on the operations as consciously exercised.