

is essential, how can we have precisely that intellectual notion of being that leads us to regard the only beings we know directly as mere beings by participation.

Moreover, connected with this problem, there is another. If we cannot know God by his essence in this life, ~~it also is true that we do not know even material things~~ it also is true that we know material things by their essences rarely, imperfectly, doubtfully. What ^{then} are the facts to which we can appeal to justify the assertion that knowledge is intellectual inasmuch as it includes knowledge of essence? If we have not any solid and sufficient body of fact to which we can appeal, why do we keep on talking about essences?

The answer is, of course, that human intellect is in genere intelligibilium ut potentia tantum. Unlike divine and angelic intellect, it is discursive. Its knowing is process. It is not ^{some} ~~the~~ simple matter of grasping essence and affirming existence. It is the prolonged business of raising questions, working out answers, and then finding that the answers themselves raise further questions. Dynamism, process, finality are fundamental features of our intellects and, for that reason, knowledge of things by their essence is for us, not an accomplished fact, but ^{the goal, the end,} ~~a goal, an end,~~ ~~an accomplished fact~~ the objective of a natural desire.

Accordingly, you will find that Insight introduces heuristic structures to account for scientific method and to formulate a method of metaphysics. Hence, also, it defines being as the objective of the natural desire of

→
concept from
understanding
itself to understand

2/12/48
C.F. 15-43

But further the finality of human intellect not only solves the problem of our large ignorance of the essences of material things. It also gives us a notion of being that includes the ens per essentiam. As St. Thomas argued, when we learn of the existence of God, spontaneously and naturally ~~we~~ we ask what God is; but to ask what something is, releases a process that does not stop until knowledge of essence is reached. Therefore, we have a natural desire to know God by his essence, and so the notion of being, as identical with this natural desire, includes the ens per essentiam.

Now, when the notion of being is identified with the intellect's desire to know, with the immanent ground of inquiry and reflection within us, two points arise.

^{that one must}
The first and minor point is to avoid the psychological fallacy. A description of the notion of being or of more particular heuristic structures is conceptual. But what is described is not conceptual. The dynamic reality of inquiry is prior to all concepts and judgements, to all direct and reflective acts of understanding. That dynamic reality, therefore, is not a matter of concepts and, since it is not a matter of concepts, it is sheer fallacy to describe it, as ^{either as unmet idea or} postulational. ~~The reality of our minds is not a postulate,~~ ^{One does not have to postulate questions. They are facts. Yet they are facts, not of knowledge, not of conception, but of ignorance.}

The second and major issue is this. Grant full significance to the finality of human understanding, and there is no difficulty either in holding that intellect differs from sense by its grasp of essence or that our notion of being includes the ens per essentiam. But deny that finality or its full significance, and one cannot but open the door to surrogates both for human intelligence and for a genuine notion of being.

Our third topic has to do with the objective universe of being. According to Insight this universe is to be known by the totality of true judgements and it is not to be known except by the ~~totality of~~ true judgements. I think that four main questions arise. First, is this universe of being the real world? Secondly, is it concrete? Thirdly, is it the actually existing universe or a merely essentialist universe? Fourthly, how can concrete actual existence be known on the account of knowledge offered by Insight?

The first question supposes that there is a "real world" which we know all about apart from true judgements. This supposition I consider quite correct. All animals know their real world, and men are animals. Moreover, this world is quite real: other animals know their real world very well indeed; and the same is true of the human animal, in so far as he does not become a victim of mythic consciousness. Further, all these real worlds are within the universe of being; for there are true judgements by which we affirm the existence of animals, ~~and~~ the reality for the animals of their respective worlds, and the unreality of the various worlds of mythic consciousness. However, these real worlds are real only inasmuch as they are contained within the universe of being, only inasmuch as there are true judgements affirming the existence of animals and of their respective worlds.

First, is this universe of being the real world? One must distinguish. If one means by the real world what is to be known by the totality of true judgements and ^{not without} ~~solely~~ by true judgements, then the real world and the universe of being are by definition identical in all respects. However, if one means by the real world a manifold or totality known apart from true judgements, still further distinctions are necessary. For each of us lives in a real world of his own. Its contents are determined by his Sorge, by his interests and concerns, by the orientation of his living, by the horizon that blocks from his view the rest of reality, ~~which he does not know and does not even know he does not know.~~ To each of us his private real world is very real indeed. For him/ spontaneously it lays claim to being the one real world, the standard, the criterion, the absolute, by which everything is judged, measured, evaluated. That claim, I hold, is not to be admitted. There is one standard, one criterion, one absolute, and that is true judgement. In so far as one's private real world does not meet that standard, it is error and illusion. On the other hand, in so far as one's private real world is constantly submitted to the control and correction of true judgement, necessarily it is brought into conformity with the universe of being.

→ *is it?*
concerns: how it is
related to the facts
→ in