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INTRODUCTION

This investigation is concerned with one of the most subtle and comprehensive philosophical accounts regarding the nature and operations of the human will, viz., that developed by Francisco Suárez, S.J. (Granada, 1548- Lisboa, 1617), during the pre-cartesian period.

This dissertation intends to reconstruct and comment upon Suárez's views on will as well as his argumentation for free will. Suárez's argumentation for free-will appears within a network of assumptions and theories -among which his theory of middle knowledge played a crucial role- that constituted his compatibilist thesis (CT), i.e., the attempt to indeterministically reconcile human free-will with divine efficacy.

The theological issue of reconciliation, which prompted most scholastic philosophical endeavors at Suárez's time, relates to the contemporary dilemma that Anthony Kenny aptly expresses as 'Is there room for genuine freedom of the will in a universe governed by scientific law?'. This ultimate question, however, cannot be answered, as Kenny himself acknowledges, without determining what is this thing, the will, that is being claimed to be free?

My present research intends to show that Suárez did offer a subtle account of will, both with regard to the articulation of the issue and with regard to the
conception of will itself. First, with regard to the articulation, unlike St. Thomas, Duns Scotus, or Luis de Molina, Suárez structures his views on will not within theological treatises, but rather in diverse separate texts on metaphysics, and psychology; only the issue about the freedom of the will is treated in his theology. All the relevant texts were originally written in Latin and many have not been translated even into Spanish.

In the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, Suárez's discussion concentrates on various metaphysical issues about will; these issues are at the same time ingredients of Suárez's more general doctrine of efficient causality; in effect, the will itself is regarded by Suárez both in disputation 18, as one of the necessary conditions for efficient causal operation, and in disputation 19, as a free power which produces free acts.

In disputations 10 and 12 of *De Anima*, originally entitled, *Commentaria una cum Quaestionibus in Libros Aristotelis De Anima*, Suárez's discussions center on the nature, object, and acts of the will. This text constitutes the focus of our attention and the main source of discussion. In fact, the explicit purpose of those two disputations is strictly philosophical, viz., 'to elucidate the elicited efficient principle of the appetitive act'. For this reason the moral as well as theological concern are excluded from Suárez's psychological writings.

Although in his psychology and metaphysics of will Suárez acknowledges -and also assumes- a fundamental dependency on theology for our understanding of the freedom of the will, Suárez limits himself in both treatises to formulating simply
some of the theological questions associated with the issue of freedom. Thus, it can be seen that Suárez reserves discussion about the sort of dependency that the human will has with respect to God for his specifically theological writings. For example, in his *Opusculum Theologicum Primum* (1599), he explains the connection between the act of the *liberum arbitrium* and the motion, concurrence, or aid of God. In his *De Gratia* (1619), *Prolegomenum I*, Suárez assumes the fact of freedom and offers a conceptual analysis of the issue and its actual exercise in man. And in his *Opusculum Theologum Secundum* (1599), Books I and II, Suárez addresses the problem of reconciliation; that is, the particular reconciliation between the contingency of events and the free human actions with God's foreknowledge. In this theological context, Suárez posits his theory of Middle Knowledge. This theory constitutes one of the sophisticated devices to account indeterministically for the compatibility between human free acts and the divine knowledge.

The main philosophical advantage of Suárez's articulation of the topic on will is that it allows scholars to clearly distinguish between the meta-psychological issues about the will and the proper theological issues that supposedly are connected with the will. The difficulty, for us doing philosophy in the twentieth century is that contemporary tendencies demand not a division but rather some sort of unification of the topic.

Anthony Kenny, for instance, in his book *Aristotle's Theory of Will* presents a novel, unified account of Aristotle's views on will. The reason is that Kenny's reconstruction of Aristotle's view relates human action to ability, desire and belief.
Furthermore what really unifies these factors is that Kenny sees all of them as the "springs" of human action.

We agreed with Kenny's implicit suggestion that in our times any philosophical account of will must be somehow a unified account, or else it cannot be satisfactory.

I think, in the second place, that Suárez offers a subtle view of will precisely because of the way in which he unifies matters. In fact, Suárez's approach is two-fold, yet integrated, for he offers, (i) a metaphysical account and (ii) a psychological account. The reason is that for Suárez the will plays two basic roles. One role has to do with the proximate efficient principle or cause that will is; as such it efficaciously produces one of the most perfect human acts, namely the free-act. The other role of the will has to do with its nature, that it is one of the faculties of the soul; more precisely, an elicited vital appetitive faculty; as such it is the willing, or desiring for unpossessed goods. The elements included in both metaphysical and psychological accounts can still be gathered together because they revolve around two guiding or grounding questions, namely, (i) what is the will?, and (ii) how does it function?

I answer the latter question in Chapter II of this study. According to Suárez's metaphysical views, the will is a proximate efficient cause that operates freely; that is, it is not necessitated, nor causally determined, either by the laws of nature, or by God's causal involvement in the activities of created agents.

We shall see that Suárez's causal indeterminism regarding free acts does not have to do with the causal history of the world or with the determined tendencies of nature, but rather with the scholastic dispute regarding the intrinsic character of
God's concurrence at the very instant that the human act is produced. Suárez's theological indeterminism represents one of the most daring and genuine libertarian positions of his time. His libertarianism, as we shall see, is not of the compatibilist sort held by St. Thomas and Domingo Bañez (1528-1604), but rather of the incompatibilist sort. Suárez holds the view that freedom is self-determination and free-choice, and this self-determination and free-choice is incompatible with either God's determination or pre-determination.

To the former question, "what is the will?" we respond in Chapter III of this investigation. According to Suárez's psychological view, the will is not a straightforward 'intellectual appetite' as for St. Thomas, nor just a 'power of volitions' as for Scotus; rather for Suárez it is an 'elicited vital appetite' or a vital desiring. From the psychological standpoint the will is a special faculty of desirings which functions independently and undetermined by the typical intellectual activities, such as the apprehension, judgement, and representation of the known object. We shall see that Suárez's psychological view renders the will the 'most noble power' among the powers of the souls. The preeminence of the will over the intellect resides precisely in the features of the will's activities. These activities are immanent and vital. This means that the functioning of the will intrinsically involves the first principle of life which is the soul.

Thus, to be able to present a satisfactory reconstruction of Suárez's account on the nature of the will we need first to provide the preliminary framework of Suárez's own philosophical general psychology. Chapter I of this study offers the
conceptual background on the nature and operations of the soul itself. The general psychology of soul and the psychology of the rational soul in particular are fundamental to grasp the vital nature of will. According to the Aristotelian-Scholastic tradition to which Suárez adheres, will is taken to be, together with intellect, a faculty of the soul. Furthermore, and most importantly, Suárez presupposes just as St. Thomas did, that appetitus follows (sequitur) the sort of form that ontologically the soul is.

Chapter I of this investigation attempts to unfold the double function of the human substantial form, i.e., human soul, namely, (i) to give esse or to inform the composite entity that man is, and at the same time, (ii) to be the primary principle of action. Thus, both soul and will are essentially involved in the production of human activity: the soul in a principal and primary way, the will in a proximate and immediate way.

In another decisive point soul and will intrinsically coincide, that is, regarding the production of a sui generis spiritual kind of activity. This activity is spiritual because it proceeds not from bodily organs, but rather from an immaterial faculty. This faculty is causally independent from matter or any other created agent. So, the faculty is immaterial, if it follows nature. According to Suárez's psychological views, spiritual activities and material principles are incompatible. Thus, activity, faculty, and soul are all proportionately immaterial entities.
Suárez's psychology of soul and will is as fundamental as his metaphysics of will. Both conceptions are needed to understand and to arrive at some conclusions regarding Suárez's views on freedom and the associated issue of reconciliation.

Our approach in this research regarding soul, will, and freedom stresses that Suárez meta-psychological writings on will do constitute his initial settings for his theology of will.

My own motivation in reconstructing Suárez's views on will began with research for a seminar on the topic of middle knowledge. It should be noted that the topic of middle knowledge has been explored by some contemporary scholars of the Anglo-American analytical tradition mainly because of their interest in questions of logical analysis of concepts such as ‘possible worlds’, or because they look for an adequate semantics for subjunctive conditionals, distinctions of temporal modality and different kinds of necessity that have challenged Aristotelian logical determinism.\(^1\)

However, despite the fact that authors have done serious efforts to translate, comment and reshape the works of Luis de Molina (1536-1600) (one of Suárez's notorious competitors), there are no detailed investigations about Suárez's own central views on soul, will, freedom, and middle knowledge.\(^2\) In some cases scholars

\(^1\) Some philosophers representative of this interest are for instance: A. Freddoso, R. Stainaker, D. Lewis, N. Pike, R. Adams, C. Normore, J. Gracia, A. Kenny, et al.

\(^2\) One of the reasons that so far commentators have failed to provide an interpretation of Suárez's psychology of will is that until Castellote's edition of *De Anima* no complete edition of the Salamanca Manuscript of this treatise was
discuss some of Suárez's arguments in certain depth, but only consider them as a
'notable defense of Molinism' or worse, as 'the least clearly unsatisfactory type of
explanation for the alleged possibility of middle knowledge'.³ My hope is that the
final result of this study will offer a formally unified version of Suárez treatment of
the will itself as well as its operational settings.

In Chapter IV of this dissertation I address Suárez's compatibilist thesis,
namely, that God can foresee future events and free human acts and that this is
compatible with the contingency and freedom of what is foreknown. According to
Suárez's theological views, divine foreknowledge is insufficient to answer questions
like why did God create Peter, knowing that he would sin? By his foreknowledge
God knows that Peter will sin because it is already true by divine decree that Peter
will sin. God, however, needs middle knowledge to know that Peter would in fact
freely deny Christ if placed in a certain situation. If God lacked middle knowledge
it would follow that God did determine Peter's sinful act; but this is contrary to
divine omnibenevolence. Middle knowledge enters into the picture to safeguard the
metaphysical contingency of the act. God knows infallibly by His middle knowledge
that Peter would in fact freely deny Christ if placed in a given situation, since,
furthermore, God has antecedently predefined that Peter will be in that situation.

Predefinitions enter into play in the simultaneous concurrence of God with the free act.

Suárez's compatabilist thesis rests on at least four assumptions. These assumptions are:

S1 The human will often acts freely in the sense that it does not follow the laws of nature; and in the incompatibilist sense, viz., that an action A performed by an individual S at time t does not entail that X is determined at t.

S2 God's knowledge is clear, evident and perfect, so God can foreknow things in the sense that He can know at one and the same time what is going to occur at a later time.

S3 Future-tense propositions signifying future contingent events have determinate true-value before they come to be in time.

S4 Future subjunctive-tense propositions signifying future contingent events, that would happen if certain conditions are actualized, have determinate true-value even before they come to be in time.

In Chapters II and III we see how Suárez defends S1, in Chapter IV we see how Suárez defends S2, S3, and S4. Suárez's theory of middle knowledge is intended to justify these three assumptions. In fact, middle knowledge has a double explanatory role, viz., (i) that of showing how future contingent propositions -categorical and hypothetical- can be true, and (ii) how they can be known by God. Thus, unless Suárez succeeds in both aspects of his theory, middle knowledge cannot be claimed to be sufficient for reconciling contingency and freedom with divine foreknowledge.
We shall see that the plausibility of middle knowledge ultimately depends on two logical assumptions, that is, the principle of Bivalence and the principle known as the Conditional Excluded Middle.

If these principles hold, God knows with certainty the conditional events that result from indeterministic secondary causes. I subscribe to Alfred Freddoso's argumentation for the plausibility of both principles, but I also admit with him that these principles have to be worked out within a general semantics for the subjunctive conditional propositions.

I think that from a careful examination of the genesis of Suárez's writings it can be shown that he does hold a consistent conception on will and freedom. Suárez's views on these issues definitely conflict with those of St. Thomas in fundamental aspects. The main reason for this is that Suárez rejects the Thomist metaphysical division between potency and act and proposes instead his hybrid concept of 'virtual act'. We would like to show that in this proposal Suárez is leaning on the metaphysical conceptual background of Duns Scotus.

In this investigation I hope to show what is distinctive in Suárez's views on soul, will, and freedom, not because I had a special interest in underlining the

\[\text{This has already been noticed by Thomas Mullaney (1950). Mullaney's book concentrates on the topic of human freedom and God's motion. Throughout the chapters he contrast Suarez's views with St. Thomas's view on the issue and explains the reasons of their disagreement. I think that Mullaney is successful in pointing out and explaining those reasons that he sums up in two propositions namely, (1) reason does not enter in as a per se cause of free act; and (2) potency and act are not really distinct principles of created being. Mullaney, however, does not go further to search the sources that support proposition (2), neither he analyses Suarez's positive proposal of virtual act.}\]
historical influence of the Suarezian conceptual apparatus on modern philosophers, issue that already has been deemed a common place by serious scholars of Suárez, but because I agree with Freddoso that 'Suárez's metaphysics is fundamentally rightheaded and worthy of serious study by contemporary philosophers in general and philosophical theologians in particular.' On the other hand, I believe that Suárez's psychological views on soul and will might turn out to be fruitful for conceptual analysis of psychological terms in which the area of philosophical psychology is presently involved.

---

5 Cf. Sergio Rábade (1991), pp.73-83 ; and Heidegger (1975), p.112.

CHAPTER I

SUAREZ ON THE NATURE AND STRUCTURE OF SOUL

To reconstruct a satisfactory Suarezian account of the will we must first provide the preliminary framework of Suárez's philosophical general psychology. Suárez's philosophy of the will and related issues that particularly concern us in this work -viz., the will, its operational settings (and even the matter of its compatibility with divine causal efficacy)- are notoriously embedded not just in his metaphysical views, exposed in Disputationes metaphysicae, published in Salamanca in 1597, or in his theological works, but more directly, and significantly, in Suárez's earlier psychological investigations, which were read for the first time in Segovia in 1572, when Suárez was twenty five years old.

---

7 In preparing the current edition (1978-1991) of the treatise De Anima, Salvador Castellote did not have an autograph of De Anima, though he collated various old editions of the treatise, and two manuscripts, one from Pavia (Pm), and the other from Salamanca (Sm). The editions in chronological order are the following:

(a) Prince Lyon edition: 1621. This was prepared by Baltasar Alvarez, who was in charge of publishing Suarez's posthumous works, out of Suarez's original lectures, taught at Segovia in his philosophy course between 1572-1575 (These lectures are unedited and unknown until the present). The revision of the first twelve chapters of book I were done by Suarez himself in Coimbra, before his death in 1617. This is also unknown documentally speaking. Castellote calls the Lyon ed. L, and subdivides it into A and B or L1, and L2 which symbolized the Segovia's Lectures and Coimbra's revision.
The discussion of this chapter will focus around Suárez's treatise *De Anima*. However, I will take up arguments and conceptual analyses of psychological terms that will bear mostly on soul and will (which will be carefully studied in chapter II), leaving aside many other important topics that belong to the comprehensive Suarezian mapping of the soul, such as the epistemological account of the intellective faculty, modes of knowing, the sensitive and locomotive faculties, and most of the queries concerning the disembodied or separate soul. The themes of Chapter I are as follows: 1 Introduction to *De Anima*; 2 Metaphysics of Soul; 3 Ontological Status of Soul in General; 4 Intensional Analysis of Soul in General; 5 The Role of Dispositions; 6 Internal Structure of Soul: Compound or Simple? And Intensional Analysis of ‘Rational Soul’ in Particular.

(b) Maguncia edition: 1622;
(c) Lyon edition: 1635;

Regarding the two manuscripts, there is no doubt about their authenticity. However, the Pavia manuscript (Pm) is incomplete, presents omissions, and a different structure. For this reason and because the L edition also presents suppressions and interpolations done by Baltasar Alvarez (Cf. P. Salaverri (1950); N.Ory (1959); V. Carrera Artau (1959); Gil Colomer (1964); P. Elorduy (1948)), Castellote et al. based their translation primarily on the Sm, which is a complete text. Scholars agree that the Sm is an authentic text, probably written between 1607 and 1621. (Cf. Castellote, Introduction to *De Anima*, p. XVI).
1. Introduction to De Anima

In the treatise of De Anima inspired by Aristotle, Suárez follows a modified version of the standard scholastic procedure of study. He begins by discussing the formal object of study and the hierarchical location and properties of the science of soul. There follow fourteen Disputes which range from issues concerning the ontological and intensional analysis of soul in general, to issues of the ontological and conceptual analysis of substantial form unfolded into each particular operative faculty, and their operational functions; and finally to a discussion of certain vexing

---

8 The whole title of Suarez's treatise is: *Commentaria una cum Quaestionibus in Libros Aristotelis de Anima*. The third volume of the Salvador Castellote's bilingual (Latin-Spanish) translation of Suarez's *De Anima* has been published in Madrid: 1991, by Fundación Zubiri. The first volume of this edition was published in Madrid: 1978; the second one, in Madrid: 1981; both volumes edited by Labor.

9 In the following we list the titles of each Disputation (d.) of *De Anima*, and give the corresponding number of questions:

1st d.: On the substance of soul in general; four questions.
2nd d.: On the substance of the three souls in particular; eight questions.
3rd d.: On the faculties of soul in general; three questions.
4th d.: On the vegetative faculty of soul; nine questions.
5th d.: On the cognitive faculties in general; seven questions.
6th d.: On the senses in general; six questions.
7th d.: On the external senses in particular; sixteen questions.
8th d.: On the internal senses; two questions.
9th d.: On the intellective faculty; ten questions.
10th d.: On the appetitive faculties in general; three questions.
11th d.: On the sensitive appetite; three questions.
12th d.: On the rational appetite or will; three questions.
13th d.: On the locomotive faculty; unique question.
14th d.: On the separate soul; ten questions.
questions arising from the conception of the rational soul in a separate state from the body.

_De Animae_ itself has three major stylistic features; some have been pointed out by S. Castellote in the *Introduction* of his edition of the treatise. The first is the use of a shortened form of the scholastic method of Disputed Questions: In the beginning Suárez presents either a series of conclusions extracted from Aristotelian sources, or an abstract of the issue to be studied in the particular disputation, or both. Then, he presents some opinions -negative and positive- on the problem under consideration, which are properly justified by arguments. He adds explanations, conceptual analysis and definitions of key psychological terms. Then, he brings in his own solution or solutions to the question along with their respective proofs, mainly from reason or experience.

The second characteristic of Suárez’s psychological studies is that they are historically conditioned on the one hand, by the Aristotelian-Thomistic tradition; and on the other hand, by the philosophical features of Suárez’s own times, i. e., Renaissance-Naturalistic currents of thought. The result of Suárez’s effort to harmonize both traditions a sort of original conservationism. Yet, Suárez seems to me to be convinced that scholasticism and Renaissance can coexist and complement

---

10 The relevant works of Aristotle most frequently used by Suárez are: _Physics, On the Soul, Nicomachean Ethics, Eudemian Ethics, Generation of Animals_.

one another. His task seems to be that of explaining the old philosophical tradition in terms of present-day knowledge, as Julián Marías put it.\(^{11}\)

The third distinctive characteristic of Suárez’s writings on the soul, as Castellote suggests, is his genuine attempt at independence and innovation regarding revered and authoritative figures such as Aristotle, St. Thomas, Cardinal Cajetan, or Durand of St. Pourçain.\(^{12}\)


\(^{12}\) Particularly revealing are, for instance:

Suárez’s treatment of the psychological studies themselves. Commentators agree (See. J.M. Ibero, (1917); Parpal y Marqués, (1923); Gil Colomer, (1964)), on the one hand, that Suárez reveals himself as a modern psychologist. For he leaves aside theological concerns regarding psychological matters, and requires a unity and autonomy for this field of study in spite of the ways that authors have approached it.

On the other hand, while he advances the psychological ideas of Aristotle, Suárez appeals to the empirical method of the scientists of his time, such as that of L. Vivès and Francisco Vallés, in order to deal, for instance, with the animal soul (Cf. De Anima, d. 6, q. 6, n. 5, pp. 334-335). His position is justified with a series of arguments most from experience and observation. Thus, the titles of the sixteen questions of his d. 7 are very telling: they all concern different aspects of the sensitive life. He devotes time to the correlation between attention and fatigue; and in regard to the acts of the sensitive appetite in d.11, q.2, he gives an interesting account of mental states such as: anger, pain, sadness, joy and laugh.

Suárez’s original discussions of epistemological matters deserve additional deep consideration. His account of intentional species in d. 5, q. 1., q. 2, is one of the most complete and persuasive among the scholastics. The function of the intentional species is to unite the objects with the faculties. Suárez holds that ‘they are called ‘species’, for being representative forms, and ‘intentional’ not because they are real entities, but because they serve the concept which is usually called intention’ (Cf. De Anima, p. 286).

In opposing Cajetan views, Suárez treats in detail the sensible and the universal knowledge: the former, for Suárez, makes possible the latter (Cf. d. 9. q. 3). Moreover, in d. 5, q. 5, n. 2, he compares intuitive and abstractive knowledge. In d. 5. q. 5 by positing the question ‘Whether the act of the cognitive faculty produces some term. The mental word (de verbo mentis)’, Suárez gives an initial conceptual account of objective concepts. His answer to that question is that the mental word is coextensive with the mental concept. ‘This is first modally distinct from the
2. Metaphysics of Soul

In the *Proemium* of the *De Anima*, Suárez is explicit about his general purpose. In his psychological investigations, he is interpreting Aristotle, and at the same time, complementing the last parts of St. Thomas' *Summa Theologiae*.

In this part of the treatise, Suárez deals with two things: The first concerns the object of the science of soul or psychology. The second refers to the question about whether the investigation about man's soul belongs to the metaphysical, or to the physical sphere. Regarding the object of the study of the present science Suárez is clear: The object of the science of soul is the passive affections\(^{13}\), the parts and the principles of living things. He appeals to an analysis of the term 'living' (*vivens*) to distinguish among entities such as animal, man, and angel, but also to set the limits of the psychological studies. By 'living' thing, Suárez refers to the thing that possesses in itself the principle of any of the following three sorts of operations, viz.:

i. material operations, i. e., those performed by means of the body as an instrument, e. g., sense operations;

\[\text{intellectual action insofar as production; but not regarding the act insofar as produced quality.}\]

Then he explains:'it is not the place where knowledge occurs; neither is it the object; it is that by which the object is known as formal object of the known thing' (p. 388). The nature of these concepts is studied in disp.9, in the response to q. 3: 'whether our intellect knows singulars in the material things'. Later on Suárez will complement it with his d. 2, s. 1, n. 1 in *Disp. Met.*

\(^{13}\) Incidentally, in 1649, 28 years after the publication of Suárez's *De Anima*, the last philosophical work of Descartes entitled: *Les Passions de l'Ame* was published in Amsterdam and Paris,
ii. spiritual operations, i.e., those that have nothing to do with matter, e.g., the angel’s intellection or understanding; and,

iii. intermediate operations, i.e., those in themselves immaterial and performed without a corporeal instrument, but with some dependency on the body in which they occur, e.g., man’s intellection.

The living things that live in the way in which members of the first group live are considered to be completely material; thus, their principles -viz. matter and form-, their operations and movements, belong to the realm of physics. Suárez agrees with Aristotle that they are ‘natural beings and their souls are nature’. It is clear, according to Suárez, that every form which is an intrinsic principle of material actions is in reality a nature. The living things of the second group, are totally spiritual, thus, according to Suárez, they transcend the area of knowledge of physics. The ones that live like the third group, i.e., man, are intermediate between spiritual and material.

Given this tripartite distinction, Suárez concludes that ‘it is obscure to what science [man] belongs’, particularly, because of the difficulty regarding man’s rational soul. Indeed, Suárez would not advocate a position such as the one represented

---

14 […] haec viventia ut talia sunt, sunt propria entia naturalia, et anima eorum est natura, ut dictum est 2 Physicorum in principio; et affirmat Philosophus, lib. I De partibus animalium, cap.1, 641a 21 641b 10 […] Constat enim omnen formam, quae intrinsecum principium est materialium actionum, posse dici et vere naturam (De Anima, Proemium, p.18)

15 De Anima, Castellote (ed.), Proem., n.12, p.17

16 Suárez clearly states his intention of excluding the treatment of the human rational soul in his metaphysical studies. The reason is clear: The investigation on human soul should be addressed in the last and more perfect part of the natural philosophy. ‘In first place, because the science to which man as such belongs is the physical science […]’ (Disp. Met., d.1 s.2, n. 19, pp. 248-49).
by D.M. Armstrong (1970). Armstrong argues that the only science that can assist in the understanding of man's mind is one which could give 'a complete account of man in purely physico-chemical terms' because for him 'The mind is identical to the brain'.

Suárez's position, instead, agrees partially with that of Aristotle according to which the body, which is enlivened by the soul, must be physical and organic. But, as D. Cosme Parpal and Marqués noted, there was for Suárez in such an animated 'organic body' an entelechia or sui generis activity that can not be reduced to the physico-chemical energy, required by the theory of the mechanist monism of Suárez' own time. Nor can, we think, the Suarezian sui generis activity be reduced to Armstrong's causal analysis of mental terms, since Suárez is explicit in describing the sort of spiritual activity 'of an agent that acts', as neither purely material, nor purely spiritual, but intermediate. Ultimately, this intermediate sort of activity, which leads us to think in a "trialistic" metaphysics, is, for Suárez, a real feature of our world, and its originating principle a real subsistent entity of our world.

Suárez acknowledges that the controversy about the attempt to classify man either in metaphysics or in physics arises because of the predicates attributed to the rational soul. On the one hand, Suárez points out, rational soul is considered to be:

(a) a spiritual entity independent in its being from matter, intelligent and volitive (intelligens et volens); but on the other,

\[\text{17} \quad \text{Cf Armstrong (1970).}\]

\[\text{18} \quad \text{Cf. Parpal y Marqués (1922), p. 19.}\]
(b) a form of the body, the principle of material operations, which moreover, understands with dependence on the senses.

Now, if rational soul is regarded according to the predicates in (a), Suárez declares, philosophers -such as Aristotle, in Physics b.III, Metaphysics b.VI; or St. Thomas, in Commentaries, text 1; Philoponus in Physics 2, text 26; Avicena, in De An., p.5, ch.5; and Cajetan, who comments on the last text -all agreed that the study of the soul belongs to metaphysics. But when considered in regard to the predicates in (b), then, they maintained, the study of rational soul belongs to physics. Suárez, in turn, posits that soul can not be studied by just one science; he concludes that, strictly speaking, the study of rational soul belonged to physics.

In favor of this position, Suárez gives the following arguments: One, that man is simply a natural thing composed of true matter and form, which is included in the scope\(^{19}\) of physics; then also his rational soul belongs in Physics, for it is the form of man himself in so far as rational being (p. 24, n. 14). Two, rational soul is essentially the form of the physical body; thus, it should be defined necessarily by body and matter; and so its definition and essence belong to the physicist; and therefore also the properties that flow from it must be considered by the physicist\(^{20}\). Moreover, Suárez adds, all the properties of the soul depend on the body. For instance, the operations of the intellect depend, in their ways, on the senses and

\(^{19}\) For the meaning of the word 'nature' see n. 37 below.

body. (In this sense, he adds, St. Augustine in *Contra Julianum Pelagium*, Book 5 held that 'soul without any doubt is nature') A fourth Suarezian argument also supporting St. Augustine's view, is that: 'Rational soul is absolutely nature, and man is a natural being. The antecedent is manifest, because it is an intrinsic principle of the material operations of the being in which it is found, since these sensitive operations, even in the special way in which they are performed by man, proceed somehow from rational soul as such.' From these arguments, Suárez concludes that the rational soul with all its properties is, strictly speaking, an object of physics.

This conclusion, indeed, is echoing the Renaissance-Naturalist interpretation of man. During the fifteenth century there arose in Italy Aristotelian figures such as Pietro Pomponazzi, who, according to Castellote, favors the *soma* in the relational complex of soul and body. Pomponazzi in fact, denies any supersomatic entity. If soul is not a mere *forma assistens*, but a true *forma informans*, its true function can be realized in and from a material-somatic *substratum*. But this view leads to the conclusion that soul is *simpliciter mortalis* as Pomponazzi noticed. Considering this inconvenient result, Suárez will give a two-fold sense to the locution 'forma

---


23 Long before Pomponazzi, Nemesius in the 4th-5th century feared that soul defined as 'form of the body' carried a fatal consequence for its substantiality, and consequently, its immortality. (Cf. E. Gilson, p.183)

24 Cf. p. LXXIII.

25 According to Suárez, Pomponazzi also deems that every soul, including the human soul, is divisible. (*De Anima*, d.2, q.7, p.27).
Moreover, he will attach to rational soul the fundamental property of being 'subsistent'.

In addition, he holds that the rational soul, in a broader sense, and with a greater number of predicates, viz., the ones concerning its state outside of the body, its mode of being and knowing, belongs to the realm of metaphysics. According to Suárez, Aristotle would have agreed with this later contention, since in On the Soul, b.3, ch.7, he held that mind or soul is not an intrinsic principle of the physical movement of the thing in which it resides, but rather is a principle of intellection, which is neither movement nor physical action, (and this abstract intellection, not found in animals, is in itself independent from the senses). With this reading of the passage, Suárez is manifesting the typical tension of the spirit of his time. In order to somehow ease this tension, he concedes that the study of rational soul might belong to different sciences according to its different aspects.

Although, it is not clear that in the treatise De Anima, Suárez's purpose is to provide just a metaphysical rather than a physical account of soul, we assume that he is doing a sort of meta-psychology of soul. We assume this not only because he is addressing the issues concerning the proper and greater number of predicates about the soul that fall into metaphysics, but also because, as J. Gracia aptly notices, most scholastic metaphysical investigations were 'fundamentally concerned with the formulation of definitions and the identification of causes that bring about the fact

---

26 Cf. De Anima, Proemium, n.22, p.34.
under scrutiny. Suárez, in this respect, is not an exception. In effect, in *De Anima*, he posits a series of definitions of soul, yet it is possible to determine his essential definition for soul as well as for the rational soul in particular.

Besides, leaving theological considerations aside, Suárez provides an account of the controversial topic of the origin and beginning of soul. In this respect, Suárez, like Leibniz (Cf. *Theod.*, II, 86), describes various opinions on the soul's origin such as that of the Platonists, Augustineans, and Averroists, but ends up subscribing to the one held by the majority of the modern theologians, i.e., that of Creation by the efficient causation of God. He is particularly interested in emphasizing that soul is created without temporal priority with respect to the whole (i.e. man). This means that it begins to exist at the same time as man, since, for Suárez, it is created not for its own sake but because of man and in order to inform him. Against Plato’s view on the pre-existence of soul, Suárez argues in a Leibnizian fashion:

> Anything in the moment of being created by God must be created in the best possible state, and indeed it is that state which requires with greater urgency its own nature. Now, the state of soul that satisfies these conditions is the state of its union with the body. Therefore, it is not created unless in union with it. (*De Anima*, d.2, q.4, n.29)

---


28 In *De Anima*, Suárez holds that rational soul is produced without the concurrence of matter, since it is immaterial. Thereby, it can not be asserted that it is produced by eduction (*eductionem* from the potentiality of matter; rather it is created. (See d. 2, q.4, n.27, p. 302). In *Disp. Met.*, d. 15, s. 2, while dealing in a more general fashion with the production of the formal substance, Suarez expands the same view: That it is produced *ex nihilo* by true creation.

29 Theology is highly regarded by Suárez, but as Zubiri emphasized, he 'represents the first attempt after Aristotle to make metaphysics an independent body
The issue of the 'union' itself, unlike in Descartes\textsuperscript{30}, is not said to be "inexplicable" (letter to Elizabeth, June 28, 1643) by Suárez; as we shall see in section 5 below, he gives a conceptual analysis of the mode 'union', and addresses the soul/body union in terms of a role of dispositions.

On the other hand, I think that in \textit{De Anima}, Suárez provides us with what would now be called ontological and intensional accounts of the issue under scrutiny. As J. Gracia put it, the ontological characterization is an answer to the question 'to what ontological type does \textit{x} belong', whereas the intension of a term answers the question 'what is \textit{x}'. All this seems to argue for a metaphysical rather than a physical account of soul.

Following Suárez's own systematic scheme, we shall present first his ontological analysis of soul in general. In this context, Suárez declares himself to be concerned with investigating the \textit{genus} of 'soul'\textsuperscript{31}. In treating this issue I shall also briefly elaborate on Suárez's criterion of individuation for souls. Then, we shall undertake Suárez's intensional analysis of soul in general. This account is immediately connected with the former, for, as we shall see, it is intended to make it intelligible.


\textsuperscript{31} That is, Suárez attempts to determine the sort, class or type of Aristotelian category of being to which soul belongs. Another meaning of 'genus' for scholastics is origin, cause, gender.
3. **Nature of Soul in General: its Ontological Status.**

In the first Disputation of *De Anima: About the soul in general*, Suárez provides an ontological analysis of soul. This issue is introduced with the formulation of the first question, namely, q.1: 'Whether the soul is an act as a true substantial form'. A direct answer to this question is found in what Suárez calls the first Aristotelian definition of soul. In fact, Suárez's reading of the passage 412a in *On the Soul*, b.II, ch.I, comes to the following initial definition of soul:

\[(D1) \text{ } x \text{ is a soul of } y \text{ iff: (a) } x \text{ is first act; (b) } y \text{ is a physical organic body; and (c) } y \text{ has life in potency}\]

We propose that Suárez's *ontological* definition of soul includes just condition (a) in (D1) in the following manner:

---

32 The terms 'in general' in the present context is two fold: In one sense, it opposes the terms 'in particular'. This latter refers to the Aristotelian structure of Soul divided in vegetative, sensory and rational souls. A general definition applies univocally to all the particular souls, since they are extensionally the same with the whole soul.

In a second sense, the present analysis is general for it provides a common definition to man's and animals' souls. Angels differ from human souls for their substance is absolute, complete substance which lacks any ordination to another. The form of angel is not ordered to inform, but rather to exist *per se*. The human soul, on the contrary, is by nature something incomplete that is ordered to man's constitution. It has also subsistence, as we shall see, but partial and not complete. (See *De Anima*, d.2, q.4, n.21, p.293).

33 The passage containing Aristotle's first definition of soul says 'the soul must, then, be substance *qua* form of a natural body which has life potentially. Substance is actuality. The soul, therefore, will be the actuality of a body of this kind'. Suarez uses the terms: first act (*actus primus*) instead of 'actuality', 'in potency' (*potentia*) instead of 'potentially', and '[physical] organic body' (*corporis organici*) in place of 'natural body'.

---
(ODS1) \( x \) is a soul = \( \text{df. (a) } x \) is first act \( \text{qua substantial form.} \)

The rationale and explanation of the other two clauses in D1 constitute part of Suárez's intensional analysis of soul in general, which will be addressed in the next section. Here we shall examine the arguments for the ODS1 which constitutes the bulk of Suárez's (q.1) above.

Suárez begins his project by doing three things: First, he distinguishes 'living' things (\textit{viventia}) from the non-living things by their operation. Secondly, he defines the term 'life' appealing to Aristotle's \textit{Nichomachean Ethics}, Book X, ch.4, 1175. And in the third place, he infers the existence of soul as follows:

(i) While the living things move themselves, the non-living things lack all capacity (\textit{vim}) to move themselves\(^{34}\).

(ii) Since for Aristotle the term 'life' is the same as operation or activity, Suárez takes it that each thing that desires life (\textit{appetere vitam}), operates. Thus, 'Life' = \( \text{df. the thing's substance from which there follows operation.} \)

On the other hand, to live, for Suárez, is coextensive with the substantial being of the living thing (\textit{vivere est actus animae in eo quod est animatum}). However, this is not to say that 'life' and 'soul' themselves are intensionally identical. For, Suárez explains,

\(^{34}\) Non-living things (\textit{rebus inanimatis}) have three main features:

i. they do not exercise by themselves any activity from an intrinsic principle, but are always affected from the outside or by something else operating on them.

ii. when they operate, they do so through material qualities, which are called natural.

iii. all their activities are exercised by means of the body and are received by the body. (\textit{De Anima}, d.2, q.6, n.11, p.350)

\(^{35}\) \textit{Vita vel vivere desumptum est ab operatione, nam illud dicitur habere vitam [...] tamen nomen impositum est ad substantiam viventis significandam} (\textit{De Anima}, d.1, q.1, n.3, p.60)
'soul is the principle of life'; and the term 'life', refers to the 'abstract of the living thing which is its whole nature'.

(3) Suárez's proof for the existence of soul follows from the conditions of his definition of the term 'life'. Thus, he states:

It is manifest that in those things that live (qua vivunt) there must be some principles of life, and that is called soul. Then, it is manifest that there exist soul (Ibid).

Once the existence of soul is inferred by an a priori inference, Suárez raises the immediate question 'What is soul?'.

He goes on to answer this question by positing the ODS1. In order to justify such a formula, he constructed a series of five arguments which yield successively the following conclusions:

C1 x is a substantial entity;
C2 x is not accident;
C3 x is not matter;
C4 x is not body;
C5 x is substantial form (which has a certain distinctive feature)

The arguments themselves repeatedly invoke, in the first place, the Aristotelian view regarding the composition of natural things. Aristotle, as it is well known, analyzed reality in terms of substance. Typically, he understood

36 With the term 'natural thing', Suárez refers to the things or entities that come to be by nature. Since for Aristotle there are 'other things that come to be by art, and others come to be spontaneously' (Met., b.VII, ch.7). According to Suárez, for the ancient authors natural things were composed either of atoms or just of elements. So, since they did not count with an adequate view about the composition of natural things, the ancients were unable to know what the soul is, Suárez concludes. And he goes on to survey the respective views on the soul from Diogenes, Heraclitus, Democritus, Arcesilaus, Anaxagoras, Thales, Cicero, Plato, among others. (Cf. De Anima, d.1 n.4, p.62).
'substance' either as consisting of its parts (i.e. matter, form or the composite of both, each of them taken to be equally substance); or that there are two ways of being: substantial and accidental\(^\text{37}\).

In the second place, Suárez's own formula to define soul in general comes to be what we shall call Suárez's second ontological definition, thus:

\[
\text{(ODS2) } x \text{ is a soul} = \text{df. } x \text{ is principle of:} \\
\text{(i) life; (ii) sensation;} \\
\text{(iii) locomotion; and (iv) intellection.} \quad \text{\(38\)}
\]

\(^{\text{37}}\) The latter division, according to Suárez, results from the former, and both were suggested for the first time by Aristotle. For the twofold technical meaning of the word substance see J. Gracia (1989), p.260. For Aristotle's analysis of substance in terms of "parts", see his *Metaphysics*, b.VII, ch.7-10; and *On the Soul*, b.II, ch.2, 414a.

Regarding the analysis of 'matter' and 'form', see Aristotle's *Metaphysics* throughout ch. I, III, V, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XIII.

Regarding the word 'nature', Aristotle attached to it two senses. Either it means 'primary underlying matter of things which in themselves have a source of movement and changes', or 'the shape and form which accord with a things account'. 'The form', Aristotle adds, 'has a better claim than matter to be called nature. For we call a thing something when it that thing is in actuality, rather than just in potentiality' (*Physics*, b.II, ch.1, 193a).

Scholastics emphasized the second sense of the term to relate it to the concept of essence. On the other hand, within Aristotle's world the terms 'substance' and 'nature' are used interchangeably to answer the question of what some things consist of. This, in turn, will determine the thing's genus or its ontological status. For Suárez, a 'nature' is an essence considered as related to operation. In this sense Suárez thinks that man, his rational soul and even God are natures, however accidents would not be natures. Moreover, he deems that 'nature' and 'metaphysical form' are intentionally the same. The metaphysical form expresses the total essence of the composite things. The only point in which they differ is that while the name 'essence' is taken for its relation to being, the word 'nature' has a relation to operation. In this sense there is a talk about divine nature, angelic and human natures. (*Disp. Met.*, d.15, s.2, n.4, p.780).

\(^{\text{38}}\) This reading of Suárez corresponds to passage 412b in *On the Soul*, b.II, ch.I, wherein Aristotle says: 'It has been stated in general what the soul is, for it is substance, that corresponding to the principle of a thing'. A. Kenny (1982) notices
ODS2 is, in turn, summed up by Suárez to what he takes to be a commonly accepted contextual definition of soul, thus:

(SCDS) \( x \) is the soul of \( y = \text{df.} \) \( x \) is first principle of \( y \)'s vital operations.

In the third place, Suárez partially explains away the SCDS in simplified terms, that is:

(ODS3) \( x \) is a soul = \( \text{df.} \) \( x \) is that by which \( (a \ qu\)o) the living thing gets constituted in its being animated.

Now, What does the locution ‘that by which’ mean? A partial response will be posited by Suárez in his argument four (A4) below. But a more complete answer will be given in the analysis of the locution ‘informant-form’.

We turn now to examine Suárez's series of arguments for the ontological characterization of soul. The first argument might be stated in a standard form.

**Argument One (A1):**

(P1) Since, the animated thing is substantial, in fact most perfect among the substantial composites;
(P2) The soul is that by which the living [thing] is constituted as animate being \( (i n \ esse \ animati \ constituitur) \);

it follows that (C1) the soul is a substantial entity.\(^{39}\)

---

that for Aristotle all substances by nature are principles, and principles are causes; but not all causes are principles.

\(^{39}\) *De Anima*, n.7, p.67.

If this argument were constructed as a quasi-syllogism or a standard categorical one, it would turn out to be valid. It might have the valid form:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{MP} \\
\text{SM} \\
\therefore \text{SP}
\end{align*}
\]
Argument Two (A2):

It is stated by Suárez in a conditional definitional premiss,

(P1) Because (*quia*) the soul is the first principle of every perfection and operations of the living thing as such, then it is not an accident (p.66).

Suárez takes the consequence to be true, for, in fact, there is a logical relationship between the meaning of the antecedent and the meaning of the consequent. For Suárez, the antecedent of the conditional is true on the basis of what has been warranted by D1, ODS2 and SCDS. The consequent is also true, since Suárez argues: ‘The operations and intrinsic power (*operationes et [virtutes] intrinsicae*) are grounded (*fundantur*) in the thing’s substance’ (Ibid.) (Emphasis added).

Where the S term stands for soul, the P term for substance, and the M term for animate or living [thing]. The problem arises, indeed, when the truth of P1 is questioned. Many philosophers have done that. For instance, F. Bacon, pp.38-39); proposes a new method to conceive reality. So, for him the real constituents of realities or entities are not substances or natures, but rather events. Authors that accepts Bacon's criterion may end up accepting a functionalist conception of Mind.

On the other hand, we find the well-known criticism by Hume of the notion of substance. For him, we have no idea of substance, since none of our impressions represent a substance. Accordingly, we have no idea of substance distinct from that of a collection of particular qualities. For Hume, then, the very question about the soul's substance is absolutely unintelligible. (Hume, 1978). But what is amazing is to find out that Hume's rejection of the notion of substance might be grounded on Suarezian tenet. Referring to our inability to know any spiritual substance, Suarez writes: ‘Our intellect receives the intelligible species by mean of sensible objects and by mean of the acts that proceed from it. Now, no spiritual substance can offer itself to the senses. Then it can not impress (*imprimere*) its specie in the intellect’(*De Anima*, d.9,q.6,n.5)

If we regard this premiss alone, doubtless there is a possibility of analyzing the ontological status of soul in terms of other independent criteria.
Suárez seems to suggest here that if the operations and faculties of the soul are grounded (or inherent) in the substantial entity of the soul, then the soul itself can not be considered ontologically as an accident. For an accident in Suárez's metaphysics is a category apt by nature to 'inhere in' or to 'belong to' a substance.  

**Argument Three (A3)** might be stated as a disjunctive syllogism:

(P1) Either soul is matter, or substantial form  
(P2) It is not matter.  
(C3) Therefore, soul is substantial form.

In support of (P2) in (A3), Suárez states: 'The soul is a first principle of operations, soul cannot be matter, because matter is common to all natural things, matter is not that principle of operations' *(Quia anima est primum principium operationum; illud autem non potest esse materia, quia materia communis est omnibus rebus naturalibus, non autem talem principium.*)(De Anima n.8, p.68)).

In fact, matter cannot be a principle of operations, given that Suárez assumes the ODS1; moreover, he also relies on Aristotle's fundamental characterization of matter as pure potency; to which feature Suárez himself adds that the existence of (prime) matter 'is so imperfect, that matter can not exist naturally without form' *(Disp. Met., d. 13, s.4, n.13)*. On the other hand, when Suárez suggest that 'matter is common to all natural things', he is in clear disagreement with Aristotle. For

---

40 The concept of 'inherence' *(inhaerens)* or 'inhesion' has been subjected to various criticisms. For Hume it is subjected to a similar objection as was the notion of substance. In a different metaphysical framework, it might be thought that operations and potencies of soul are second-order properties. The soul would be a first order property of body.
Aristotle: ‘Callias and Socrates are different in virtue of their matter (for that is different)^41. This issue echoes another related problem, namely, that of an adequate criterion of individuation for substantial entities in general and for souls in particular.

Most philosophers agree that in order to deem intelligible any entity there needs be a criterion of identity for such entity. The demand for such a criterion, Joshua Hoffman and Gary Rosenkrantz explain^42, ‘is a demand for an explanation of the diversity of entities of a certain category’. The principle of individuation provided by Suárez for the diversity of substantial entities, including God, angels, souls or material composites, differs from that provided by Aristotle, Aquinas or Durandus, as J. Gracia has shown^43. In effect, for Suárez the principle that individuates all such entities -including natural things and substantial modes- is neither matter nor form as such, nor materia signata, which can not account for spiritual entities, but the entity of each thing. In Suárez’s words:

> It seems that every singular substance is singular in itself, that is, by its entity, and needs no other principle of individuation in addition to its entity, or in addition to the intrinsic principles which constitute its entity (Disp. Met., d. 5, s.6, n.1).

Relying on d.5, s.6, n.2-14, J. Gracia clearly explains:

> If the things in question are not composites, as is the case of form, [including soul in this case] matter or a mode, then their entities are the principle of individuation. (emphasis added)^44

---

^41 *Metaphysics*, b.VII, ch.9, 1034a.


^44 Ibid., p.32
Now by the entity of a thing is understood, nothing more but nothing less, than 'the essence as it exists'.

So, first, to the question What makes my soul one and individual? Suárez's response would be: Not matter, since matter is neither intrinsic principle of its own entity, nor is it the cause per se of (rational) soul; it is its own entity (per se ipsa et ex vi suae entitatis). Secondly, in the case of my soul and another similar one, that which makes them individually diverse, Suárez would say, is their entities as they exist in reality, viz., in their individual bodies, given that intrinsically soul has an individual aptitude to inform the human body (Ibid. s. 6, n. 8); and because men themselves are numerically diverse, then there would be as many (rational) souls as there are or have been men. (De anima, d.2, q.4, n.14).

This solution, however, would seem to be useless to account for individuating souls in their separate mode of existing from bodies. Yet, I believe that this is not a real challenge to the intelligibility of Suárez's notion of soul. For, in De Anima, d. 14, where he address the most suspicious issues concerning the disembodied soul, he confronts this particular difficulty. He points out, that it does not seem possible that a soul by the mere fact of not being already informing the body become unintelligible, given that whether it is informing it or not, soul possesses always identical

---

45 Cf. Disp. Met. d. 7, s. 1, n. 1, 12

46 According to Suárez, soul does not emanate (dimanate) from matter. 'Matter is rather certain occasion that, organized such body, God creates in it a Soul'. (Disp. Met. d. 5, s. 6, n. 5) So, matter is not its efficient cause, but certain "necessary condition" for the soul to be created.
spiritual entity, the same substance, and the same essence (*De anima*, d.14, q.1, n.1). It will, then, possess identical intelligibility. The explicit reason, Suárez indicates, is that,

the intelligibility proceeds from the entity, and not from the mode of existence (*Intelligibilitas enim proverdt ex entitate, non ex modo essendi*). (Ibid. q.5, n.3, p.482).

In general, it is right to deem Suárez’s view on individuation close to that of Ockham’s, to whom individuals were individual by themselves, *per se*; and insofar as their individuality belonged essentially to them. Nonetheless, unlike Ockham, Suárez does fulfill the demand for a real criterion of individuation, and in fact one which is not gratuitous. In the case of souls, it gives them identity, and consequently, entity, and intelligibility. Suárez’s criterion for individuating souls, moreover, does not involve just qualitative terms; on the contrary, it regards other entities, such as the substance, the essence, and concretely the body.

Now, returning to our discussion of Suárez’s argumentation for the ontological account of soul, Suárez introduces another proof in support of (P2), that soul is not matter, in (A3) above; which is the following disjunctive proposition:

Either the body is taken as matter with accidents, or as the composite of matter and substantial form (*De Anima*, d.1, q.1, n.8, p.68)

Arguing, then, that if the body is taken as matter with accidents, it is true that it is not a principle of life, for it is not a principle of life either through the notion (*ratione*) of matter or through the notion of accident. But, if the body is taken as a composite of matter and form, and if vital operations belong by nature to such composite, body indeed will be a living thing; nonetheless, not the whole composite
will be soul. For not all the operations of such composite are principles of life (Ibid).
The conclusion that follows is the same as before: ‘Therefore, because soul is not matter, it will be substantial form’.

Our next argument, Argument Four (A4), confirms ODS1, and at the same time, conclusions (C3) and (C4), i.e., that soul is not matter nor body. It does all this by unfolding one of the distinctive characters of form.

**Argument Four (A4):**

P1 Soul is the first principle of operations, and  
P2 Soul is that by which the living thing gets constituted in its living being  
P3 P1 and P2 do not refer to matter  
C4 Therefore, soul is substantial form.

Suárez proves (P3) in (A4), with the claim that the form constitutes the living thing by *actualizing the matter* to which it gets united (*illud principium constituit vivens actuando materiam cui unitur*). This proposition, however, will be further explained in our reference to the feature of ‘informant’ that form possesses. Now, from the union between form and matter there results a living composite, which is a true substantial entity [*ens*] and substantially *per se* unity.(Ibid)

It must be noticed that for Suárez, the primary feature of form is to be a physical principle that once united to matter makes up, on the one hand, a whole composite living thing, and on the other, an individual. Insofar as it actualizes matter, form is called form of the part, but it is also form of the metaphysical whole i.e., of the composite.
On the other hand, for Suárez, body itself can not be the act of matter (corpus autem non potest esse actus materia). This would be contradictory (Ibid., p.68). The reason seems to be that such body would be subsistent and a complete substance.

It must be explained that in Suárez's world, body is a substantial composite, and as such, it is included within the category of so called 'second matter'. The main feature of second matter is that it presupposes 'prime matter' which in turn 'may depend for its existence upon form, but it does not presuppose any previous subject' (Disp. Met., d.13, s.1, n.3). For it can be concluded from this that body, as second matter, can not actualize that which is causally prior to it. To suppose that it could, Suárez thinks, would be a contradiction. For body is causally dependent on matter, so it can not be said to be either 'subsistent' or to be an 'act' of it. We shall further explain this term in connection with the subsistence of rational soul. Moreover, that body could be a complete substance is also contradictory, for the term 'complete' refers to what per se does not lack any perfection.

Argument Five (A5):

(P1) That which is first principle of all operations and potencies of the composite is its substantial form.
(P2) But soul is in the living things the first principle of their potencies and operations.
(C5) Therefore, soul is substantial form.

(A5) relies on Aristotle's On the Soul, b.II, ch.2, 413b, wherein he says 'because of this first principle [the form], living things have life'. Moreover, (P1) in

47 See Met. Disp. d.13: "The Material Cause of Substance"
A5 has been warranted by the aforementioned (A3), and (A4). While (P2) is justified by (SCDS), and by Suárez’s qualification that ‘the operation flows (dimanat) from the thing’s essence and not from its matter, which is common’. (Ibid. p.68)\(^{48}\). The reason, according to Suárez, is that every thing operates in accordance with its own actuality and perfection, thereby a more perfect operation connotes a more perfect substance and essence (Ibid.). The conclusion that should be drawn, is that the operation is not just grounded in the thing’s material substance, but it flows from the essence of the thing which comprises both complementary principles, i.e., prime matter and substantial form.

Elsewhere, Suárez introduces a relevant distinction between matter and form. He says, ‘Matter is the same for all the generable beings (Materia enim omnium generabilium eadem est); forms, on the other hand, are distinct. In another place, he claims to have given the reasons\(^ {49}\). Suárez here is referring to what he calls the naked matter in itself. Regarding this, he says, all forms of natural things inform (or con-figure, con-form) the same type of matter, the so called ‘remote matter’\(^ {50}\). Matter, like quantity, is the same in all things, being differentiated by form. Suárez

\(^{48}\) Suárez distinguishes two sorts of ‘dimanatio’ or flow from substances. One, called accidental, requires an outside action or force to bring about the accident or property. Another called essential (per se) which does not require such external force. (Met.Disp.d. 17, s.1n, n.2, n.9). In our present case the operations of the soul should be included within the second type of dimanation.

\(^{49}\) Suárez is referring here to his work: De unitate materiae: 1 Physicorum; however, this work is lost. An alternative text to consult is: De generatione et corrupt. d.1, q.3.

\(^{50}\) Cf. De Anima, d.1, q.3, n.6, p. 94
admits accidental forms in addition to substantial forms. Accidental forms function informing an already existing essence, and giving it an accidental perfection such as color, size, heat, etc. These forms are the source of powers and qualities of the material substance. Matter, on the contrary, is the source of the quantity of that substance.\footnote{Hinc etiam recte exponi potest cur qualitas peculiari ratione dicatur consequi formam; nam quia forma est quae complet ac perficit essentiam rei, et confert principalem vim agendi, ideo qualitas quae adjungitur ad complementum utriusque perfectionis, dicitur consequi formam [...]. Quantitas vero peculiari ratione dicitur consequi materiam, quia materia est prima radix hujus molis corporeae, ad quam constituendum vel complementam peculiari modo quantitas ordinatur. (Disp. Met., d.42, s.1, n.6).}

In sum, we have seen that in a sequence of five arguments Suárez justifies ODS1. In modern terms, being a substantial form is a logically necessary condition for being a soul in general. The inclusion of this condition in ODS1 has been warranted by the Aristotelian criterion of the composition of real things, and clearly by the Suarezian commonly accepted notion of soul SCDS, according to which the intermediate specific operations of living things are attributed to a constitutive inner principle or soul. This, in turn, has been partially analyzed by Suárez in the terms contained in the ODS3. To the question what is meant by the locution ‘that by which’ in ODS3, Suárez’s response was that it referred precisely to the constituent substantial form. This, then, is what expresses the ontological status of the soul.

It might be asked further, what is packed behind the term ‘substantial form’? Suárez, initially, has pointed out that the distinctive character of it was to actualize matter and thus make up a composite enlivened or vital thing. The next section
constitutes a deeper analysis of this Suarezian answer, which is also the unfolding of the SCDS.

4. Intensional Analysis of the Soul in General

Suárez’s intensional analysis of soul comprises questions two, three and four of his first Disputation of the treatise De Anima, namely:

q.2 Whether the soul is first act and how;
q.3 Whether the soul possesses an essential relation \( (ordinem) \) to the organic body; and
q.4 Which is the essential definition of soul and how one definition is demonstrated by another.

Suárez’s answers to each of these questions is a partial answer to the question: What is Soul? They correspond to the sequential logical necessary conditions of the following intensional definition of soul, which might be formally enunciated thus:

\[
(IDS) \ x \text{ is a soul of } y \iff \begin{align*}
(i) & \ x \text{ is first act} \\
(ii) & \ x \text{ is informant form } (\text{forma informans}) \\
(iii) & \ x \text{ is primary principle by which the living thing is } (esse) \text{ and acts.}
\end{align*}
\]

We can turn, now, to what this formula means. Let us begin with the question, What is meant by saying that soul is first act? To answer it, Suárez takes us back to Aristotle’s b.II, ch.I, 412a, wherein he asserted that soul is form or act. This is what the term \textit{entelechia} meant in \textit{Physics}, Suárez remarks, and he attaches the sense of ‘perfectio’ or ‘perfector’ to it\(^{52}\). But more important to understanding the sense in

\(^{52}\) The word ‘\textit{entelechia}’ has been translated as \textit{assiduitas}, and \textit{continuatio}, which refers to the continuous movement of soul, in Plato. But ‘\textit{entelechia}’ has been
which the soul is an act (*esse actum*), is to grasp what Suárez means in the proposition that ‘only matter has the character of pure potentiality, the rest of the supervenient beings have the character of act (*illi qui superveniunt habent rationem actus*)’ (*De Anima*, d.1, q.2, n.1, p.72). To unfold this, we need to refer to what Suárez says elsewhere speaking as metaphysician. He says that it is one thing to divide being (*esse*) into *entity in potency (in ens in potentiam)*, or in *act (vel in actu)*; and another very different thing to divide *ens* which is potency, or which is act.

The former for Suárez, does not refer to a division of entities essentially diverse, but to the diverse status of the entity according to its character of existent (*entis secundum rationem existendi*). The latter division, on the other hand, refers to diverse

translated as *perfectio*, or *perfectihabia* by Leibniz, in *Theod.* I, 87; and this is exactly the way that Suárez uses it in d.15 of *Disp. Met.*, p.636. In Leibniz, it conveys the idea not only of a mere faculty for action, but also that which is called ‘force’, ‘effort’, ‘conatus’.

53 *‘Ens’* is the present participle of the latin verb *esse*, it means ‘that which is’ or ‘that which is being’. St. Thomas asserted two things about it: 1) Entity is the first thing that the intellect conceives; 2) It is that in which any other conception resolves.

According to Suárez, as the participle of the verb *esse*, it implies time and means the act of existing as exercised (*actum essendi ut exercitum*), and is the same as an actually existent (*idem quod existens actu*)

The common use of *‘ens’* is the noun ‘entity’. It can be spoken of in diverse senses, according to Aristotle, viz., (a) of that which has some being in reality -in itself or in another but in reality; and (b) of negations and privations (such as entities of reason) i.e., modes of not real being.

According to Suárez, as the noun ‘entity’ means formally the essence of the thing which has or may have existence (*ut nomen significans de formalis essentiam eius rei quae habet vel potest habere esse*). It can also be said that entity simply means existence (*esse*) not exercised in act but in potentiality (*in potentia*). But when entity is considered as a noun its *ratio* consists in being something that has real essence (*essentiam realem*), not chimerical, but truly and apt to really exists. (*Disp. Met.*, d.2, s.4, n.3-5, pp.416-18). Ultimately, thus, for Suárez the entity of a thing is nothing but its real essence as it exists outside of its causes.
essential character of entities, either as existing in act, or potency (sive existentium actu, sive in potentia).  

According to this division, then, we should understand that when Suárez speaks of matter as having the character of pure potentiality he means to say, on the one hand, that it is in pure potentiality, while the rest of the supervenient beings - i.e. the beings that are sustained by the prime subject (which is the intrinsic concept of matter) - have the essential character of esse actu, including the substantial form or soul.

On the other hand, matter is pure potentiality understood with respect to the informant formal or acting act, i.e., with respect to the sort of act that soul is, as we shall later see.

54 Cf. Disp. Met., d.31, and 43, s.5, n.1

55 The term 'Supervenient', in Suarez's context, is connected with the terms 'substare' and 'subsistere'. While Donald Davison, in analyzing mental events uses the term 'supervenient' to mean a sui generis sort of dependency, in the sense that mental properties are supervenient on physical properties; however, this sort of supervenience does not entail reducibility, neither through law nor by definition. (see "Mental Events", in 1980, p. III). In Suarez's use of the term there is also a sense of dependency. But, the dependency is because of a natural priority and certain causality among the supervenient beings.

56 Suarez's distinction between esse actu and esse in actum bears on the contemporary discussion about the different theories of actuality. For Suarez, an actual entity or in act opposes a possible entity or in objective potency. The former refers to a real, positive, entity. Although not necessarily an actual entity has the mode of existence, for 'existence' is not a mode really distinct from essence in Suarez's views. (Disp. Met., d.5, s.6, n.14).

57 Although Suárez accepts the common axiom among philosophers, viz., that prime matter is pure potency, he understands this expression in a peculiar manner. For him, 'it is one thing to say that matter is pure potency, and another very different that matter is in pure potency' (d. 13, s.5, n.12). Matter is pure potency in respect to
Returning to our first point, Suárez suggests that the set of supervenient beings that share the character of act (i.e. informant act) include entities such as substantial forms, operations, faculties and habits. But, is there any difference among them? Suárez explains that among the supervenient beings ‘one presupposes the other, and one flows from the other’ (*De Anima*, p.72). So, the former is called first act, while the one that follows from it, is called second act. However, for Suárez, the ‘second act could be first and second with respect to different things’ (Ibid. p.73).

---

The formal or acting act (i.e., with regard to the sort of act that the soul is). But matter would not be pure potency in regard to the entitative act or *secundum quid* (d. 31, s.11, n.10). He explains that to say that prime matter is in pure potency is ambiguous. For there are at least three different ways to understand that something ‘is in potency’, viz.:

(a) in passive potency, i.e., that it may receive some act, such as the case of matter;
(b) in active potency, i.e., that it is able to do or produce an act, such as the appetitive faculty;
(c) in logical or objective potency, i.e., although it may not exist, it is not repugnant for it to exist, such as the possible beings.

Matter, for Suárez, is in pure receptive potency, for it does not include in its essence any formal act. (Ibid. n.4). However, once matter has been created, it needs possess a real entity, otherwise it would not be a real receptive potency. In this sense, in disagreement with St. Thomas, who thinks that matter is simply potency for being, Suárez asserts that prime matter is or has an entitative act. For Suárez matter is an act, but an act which is pure potency totally ordered to receive an informing act. Thus, to say that matter ‘is in act’ means that it is something actual, found in reality, existing. On the contrary to say that matter is act is at least ambiguous. For *esse actum* may mean either (1) the *esse* of the formal or acting act, as in the case of soul; or (2) the *esse* of an absolute act *simpliciter*, as in the case of God, that is something actual in itself. Thus, prime matter is neither an informant or acting act, nor an absolute act *simpliciter*, perfect in itself, but rather an entitative imperfect and *secundum quid* act.

---

58 For instance, Suárez says, if habit is compared with the potency, then it is second act, and the potency, first act. But if habit is compared with act, then habit presents the character of first act, since, in Suárez’s metaphysics, habit produces act (*quia habitus elicit actus*) (Ibid.)
In order, then, to make clear his view, Suárez introduces a distinction between three types of esse act, viz.,

(1) Simply first act, or absolute first act, the one that is not second in respect to anything, such as the substantial form;

(2) Simply second act, the one that is not first in respect to anything, otherwise called last act, such as the operation [of the thing]; and

(3) Middle act, the one that is respective first or second act, such as the potencies and habits. (Ibid. 72).

According to this distinction, the soul is called absolute first act in the first sense. There arose, however, a controversy among scholastics about whether the first act is more perfect than the second. In rejecting Cajetan's view on this matter, Suárez sheds light not only on the metaphysics of the act, but also reveals the Thomistic elements in the interpretation of Aristotelian tenets.

Let us bring in Cajetan's instructive, although from Suarez's standpoint, mistaken view. Cajetan presented two arguments in favor of the claim that soul is not essentially first act. The first one states that:

The soul must be a most perfect act; but the second act is more perfect than the first, therefore the soul is second act and not first [...] the second act is like the end of the first act, and the end is more perfect.

The second one posits that:

The first act is separable from the second, but the soul is not separable from its operation, therefore the soul is not essentially first act.\(^{59}\)

\(^{59}\) Cf. De An. II 1, n.17: o.c., v. II, pp. 29. Castellote uses the Pm for translating these passages, where he notes, there is a logical gap between f. 22 v 9 and f. 272.
Both arguments present serious difficulties, according to Suárez. In the first one, Cajetan is not comparing the first act with the second act in regard to what each of them precisely confers in themselves, rather the comparison is done regarding the first and second act at the same time. Suárez agrees that it may be said that the state of the thing found in second act is more excellent, if the reference is done in respect to the state of a thing which may be found constituted either in first act or in second act. Suárez explains that the reason why it is commonly thought that the second act is more perfect, is that it has a more perfect mode of existence, for it is a 'completed' thing; for instance, the operation is like the consummation of the thing. Nonetheless, Suárez maintains, if a precise (praecise) comparison is done between first and second act, in regard to what each of them confers (unusquisque praebet), there is no doubt that the first act acts better than the second, since the first act gives primary substantial being (Ibid. p. 78).

Cajetan, in turn, based the defense of his second argument in his own distinction of two types of first act: one, which is distinct from the second act, but inseparably joined to it, such as the form of fire which is distinct from its operation, but since it operates naturally, it is always joined to the second act; and another, which is distinct from the second act, but can be found separated from it, such as the rational soul, which, moreover, can cease operating (quae cessare potest ab

---

60 This is exactly the case of happiness which, as Suárez interprets it, consists not in a state of soul but rather in an activity of soul, and in this sense it has the character of a second act. Suarez is referring here to Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics*, Book. X, ch. 6, 1176 b.
operatione). Given this distinction, Cajetan infers that Aristotle would have held that soul is first act of the second type, i.e., the one that can discontinue its operation.

But Suárez finds Cajetan's distinction of the first act superfluous. He points out that for Aristotle an act is not said to be first because it may not be separable from the second act, but rather because it is first in acting/actualizing and is the origin of the second act. He takes it that for Aristotle soul is first act, because it is simply first principle of vital operations, as is clear from (SCDS). Moreover, for Suárez, Aristotle’s distinction between the principle of operation and the operation itself is manifest in his example of the man who is asleep. Accordingly, ‘the mode of being of soul is that of the act that endures once the operation disappears’ (Ibid. p.84). In referring to Aristotle’s two kinds of acts, Leibniz seemed to mark out the same distinction as Suárez when he states,

The permanent or lasting act is nothing but the [...] substantial form (as for example soul) [and] is altogether permanent, at least according to my judgement [...]. But the altogether momentary act, whose nature is transitory, consists in action itself. (Theod. I, paragraph 87)\textsuperscript{61}

\textsuperscript{61} Leibniz distinguishes between soul, faculty and action. The substantial form or soul conveys the idea of permanent act, which is not only a mere faculty for action, and also the idea of ‘force’, ‘effort’ and ‘conatus’ from which action itself must follow if nothing prevents it. Faculty, in turn, i.e., what for Suarez is second act, for Leibniz is just an attribute of substance itself (i.e., force which is not primitive but derivative). It is a quality which is distinct and separable from substance. Leibniz also suggest that soul may be understood ‘as a primitive force which is modified and varied by derivative forces or qualities, and exercised in actions’ (Theod. I, paragraph 87).
Against Cajetan's arguments, Suárez next posits that 'the first act of any sort, insofar as it is by itself, may be more perfect absolutely than the second act'. But let us observe Suárez's defense of the pre-eminence of the absolutely first act. It rests on three arguments where Suárez expresses two ways in which the first act acts better than the second act. Moreover, first and second act are shown to be essentially different.

1st Argument:

It is a more perfect act, in the ratio actus, the one which acts better. Such is the soul and first acts similar to it [...]. Therefore, To act is to give esse (actuare est dare esse). Then, the act that gives a more perfect esse, it acts more perfectly. The absolute first act gives a more perfect esse, for it gives the substantial esse (emphasis added).

2nd Argument:

To act is to suppress the subject's potentiality; therefore, that act which suppresses a greater potentiality is more perfect as an act. Such is the absolute first act if compared with the rest, since it suppresses the substantial potentiality of matter, which is the (summa potentialitas) (emphasis added).

3rd Argument:

---

62 Ibid., p. 77.

63 Nam ille est perfectior actus, in ratione actus, qui melius actuat; sed huiusmodi est anima et similis actus primi; ergo. Probatur minor. Nam actuare est dare esse; ergo actus dans perfectius esse, perfectius actuat at vero actus simpliciter primos dat esse perfectius, nam dat esse substantiale; ergo. (De Anima, d.1, q.2, n.5, p. 76)

64 Actuare est potentialitatem subjecti tolerare; ergo actus qui maiorem potentialitatem tollit est perfectiur in ratione actus; huiusmodi autem est actus simpliciter primus comparatus ad subsequentes, nam ille tollit substantiallem potentialitatem materiae, quae est summa potentialitas; ergo. (Ibid).
Therefore, the essence of those acts and forms consists of the aptitude to actuate (aptitudine ad actuandum); therefore the more perfect form, in its essence and entity it will be more perfect as an act. (emphasis added).\textsuperscript{65}

With these arguments Suárez undermines Cajetan's distinction; and he can conclude that the first act is pre-eminent over the operation since it gives something more perfect and acts more perfectly; additionally, these passages clearly express the proper functions of the form understood as first act.

In effect, the first argument posits that soul as absolute first act primarily gives esse. To give esse, in this context, means to give existence and perfection\textsuperscript{66}. Suárez, in fact, acknowledges that St. Thomas has described esse as 'the actuality of all acts and the perfection of all perfections'\textsuperscript{67}. So, the sort of esse that the absolute first act confers includes St. Thomas's requirements, for it gives precisely the most perfect esse, i.e., the esse of substantiality. He will hold, elsewhere, that form, being a simple and incomplete substance, as act of the matter, constitutes with it the essence of the

\textsuperscript{65} Totae essentiae istorum actuum et formarum consistit in aptitudine ad actuandum; ergo forma quae in sua essentia et entitate fuerit perfectior, in ratione actus erit etiam perfectior. -Quapropoter ruit Caietani distinctio. (Ibid. p. 76).

\textsuperscript{66} Suárez adopts St. Thomas's use of the term esse. Suarez conceives four kinds of real substantial composition and one composition of reason. That is: 1) that of esse (or existence) and quidditas (or essence); 2) the Aristotelian hylemorphic composition of matter and form; 3) that of genus and specific difference, or that of specie and individual difference; and 4) that of nature and supposit (suppositio). All other compositions, he thinks, which might be thought of need be reduced to one of these just mentioned: (disp. 30, s.4, n.1, p. 379 in Disp. Met.). It is well known, however, that Suarez accepts the Thomistic composition of things, but he denies a real distinction between existence and essence. (Cf. Disp. Met., d. 31, s. 6, n.1-13, and De Anima, d.2, q. 4, n. 18, p. 286.).

\textsuperscript{67} De potentia, 1953 b, q.7, a.2, ad 9.
substance. In fact, the proper and principal mode of causality of the form consists, in constituting the composite, 'not in any way, but in its role as perfective and compleive of the essence'.

There is, though, a notorious dissimilarity between St. Thomas and Suárez's view regarding man's esse. For St. Thomas although man is a composite sort of substance, he gets his esse and substantiality just from one of its constitutive principles, namely, the form which communicate its own esse to matter. In this way the esse of man is spiritual and like soul itself. It is coextensional with the soul's esse. All this on the assumption that there is a distinction between existence and essence. The problem with this view is that it leads us to think that man's body gets its substantiality thanks to soul. Suárez, however, does not accept such distinction, so he cannot accepts St. Thomas's solution either. For Suárez it is not the case that man's esse and the soul's esse are the same thing. This is so because Suárez presupposes that matter has its own partial esse. Thus, man encompasses matter, its partial esse, and the esse of soul. In this case, soul is not the same than man, they are distinct as part and whole. Thus, if for Suárez essence and existence are the same entity, there follows that to man's essence belongs not just soul but also matter. Likewise man's existence is not just soul, but also its matter. However, the soul's existence is just identical with soul. Therefrom, and against St. Thomas, Suárez concludes that there

---

68 Disp. Met., d.15, s.5, n.1, p.682. D. 15 is devoted to the study of "The Formal Substantial Cause" which is the same informant substantial form.

69 Disp. Met., d.15, s.7, n.5, p. 695.
is a distinction between man's esse and the soul's esse (*De Anima*, d. 2, q. 4, n. 18, p. 286).

Suárez's solution avoids the objection that says that it can not be understood how the man's body may exist, or acquire its esse by a spiritual entity. On the contrary, it allows him to maintain that soul and body co-form just one substantial composite in the case of man, where soul is actualizing and perfecting body as well as completing the essence of that composite.

On the other hand, Aquinas and other Christian philosophers have been condemned for conceiving man as a mosaic of pieces put together, since body and soul are themselves substances constituting a third sort of substance that man is. This objection, nonetheless, is unfounded with respect to Suárez's views. First, because for Suárez the sort of form that constitutes man is incomplete or partial, i.e., it is not like those absolute complete forms that do not deal with bodies in any way, as the form of angels. Secondly, because, according to Suárez, the sort of union that results from soul and body is not one by aggregation, but rather a *per se* intrinsic unity (*Cf. De Anima*, d.2, q.4, pp. 261, 267, 279). Hence, it cannot be said that man is a mosaic of aggregated substances.

We can turn now to Suárez's second argument, which underlines the claim that the absolute first act functions as "suppressing" or removing the potentiality of the subject. Suárez is referring here to the potentiality of prime matter. Prime matter is also called subject but it is not a formal act; it has many substantial possibilities

---

which are realized by the substantial acts. Moreover, Suárez understands that this prime matter or subject is pure potency in the sense that its whole reality is apt to be actualized by substantial forms in some of its intrinsic possibilities.\footnote{Suárez holds that prime matter may be called pure potentiality with respect to the formal or acting act (such as the absolute first act), and also with respect to the absolute act simpliciter. For, (1) Matter is neither an acting nor an informant act as it is clear from its aspect of first subject; (2) In its intrinsic and essential concept it does not include any physical formal act, since it is a simple essence and first subject; (3) It is incapable of existing without the substantial act that actualizes it and perfects it; and (4) Its aptitude is to be receptive of the substantial form. (See José González Torres, 1957).}

In the third argument, Suárez remarks that the essence of the first act consists in its aptitude to actualize or inform. On the one hand, what the first act informs or actualizes is the physical organic body -as will be clarified in our next discussion. On the other hand, it is important to note that with this qualification of the essence of the first act, Suárez intents to mark out a *quidditative* difference that separates human soul from forms of other (heavenly) bodies and inanimate things.

In sum, what characterizes soul in its aspect of absolute first act, as properly compared and contrasted with its operation\footnote{Later on we shall address the issue about the definite distinction between first act referring to Soul, and the second act referring to the operation (*operationis*) itself. Suárez distinguishes them on the basis that the former may be conceived as first and principal principle, while the later is conceived as proximate principle. But more importantly to establish a real difference is that, for Suarez as for Leibniz, the ontological status of the second act is not that of a substantial form, but that of a quality. (Cf. *Theod*. I, 87).}, is that as first act it gives perfection and actualization to the substantial composite. Moreover, it completes the essence of that composite, and that is what distinguishes it from other forms essentially. In
addition, the first act is preeminent over the second act in the order of perfection, in being the origin of the operation, and in duration; but as we shall see not in regard to knowledge nor in definition. Suárez concludes his discussion about the preeminence of the first act over the second act by stressing that the character of being first act belongs to the essential definition of the soul. As for the characters mentioned by Cajetan, i.e., that of dominion over its operations, is not common to all the souls. In effect, as we shall see in detail with regard to the attributes of the operation of soul, this feature belongs to the mode of operation of a particular rational soul.

Returning now to the conditions in IDS given above we need to analyze Suárez’s claim that ‘soul is an informant form’. First of all, it needs be noted that Suárez was aware that this proposition is very controversial. The reason, he explains in his Met. Disp., is that it seems to result in a contradiction to asserting that form is informant (informans) and substantial altogether. For either it is a subsistent thing and does not need any subject to be sustained (subjecto sustentante), or it needs one. If the first disjunct is the case, then it can not be an informant form, since it is contradictory to assert that that which is subsistent needs to be received in another. If the second disjunct is the case, then it is an inherent form (forma inhaerens); So, it would be accidental. Consequently, there would not be such substantial form at all.73

---

73 Disp. Met., d. 15, s.1, n.1, p.634 For a commentator such as Gilson this controversial claim is responsible for the breaking away of Christian-Scholastic philosophers from the Platonist-Augustinian tradition with respect to the conception
So, if Suárez does not solve this contradiction, substantial form itself becomes unintelligible. However, he is clear about the need to include this clause as a necessary condition for the definition of soul. We shall next see why he is convinced that without such a claim the human soul 'can not be understood nor defined' (De Anima, d.1, q.3,n.1, p.90).

In Suárez's argumentation the expression ‘form is informative’ is coextentional with the expression ‘form has an ordination (ordinem)’. He begins this argument, asserting that from the Aristotelian claim that soul is first act, it follows that it has an ordination. For that which is an act must possess necessarily an ordination to that which it actualizes. Thereby, Suárez says, Aristotle defined soul by its ordination with respect to the body of which it is act. Moreover, he adds, in Aristotle, soul is not body, but something of body. From these reasons, Suárez, first concludes, that it is essential to soul to possess an aptitude to inform (or perhaps should be translated: ‘to con-form’ in the sense of structuring) body (De essentia animae est aptitudo quam habet ad informandum corpus). Thus, inspired by St. Thomas, Suárez goes on to prove his conclusion by analogy of the particular relation between soul and body, to the general relation between form and matter. He argues:

---

of soul. On the other hand, a defense of the definition of the soul as form of the body is what allows some Christian philosophers to speak of an individual salvation of man as such. For neither soul nor body taken apart from each other are man. Rather ‘man’ refers to the union of both principles as we saw above.

This thesis, Suárez notes is denied by Duns Scotus in q. 6: o.c.v. 12, pp. 127-159; and asserted by St. Thomas in Ip., q. 75, a. 7 ad 3; and in Contra Gentiles 2, ch.1.
Soul is essentially a form, and form is essentially informative (informativa)\(^7^5\). It is evident also by itself: Form is not produced because of itself, but to be an act of another, it is thus an incomplete entity. Its being act is not because of itself, but in order to be a complement of other. Therefore, the whole form by its essence requires an aptitude to inform. On the other hand, an aptitude can not be conceived of without an essential ordination (De Anima, d. 1, q. 3, n. 5, p. 92).

The claim that confirms this argument is that 'soul is essentially a part, and [that] every part is essentially ordinate to the whole, and to the other parts'. Moreover, he adds, the essential function of matter is to receive the form; it follows that the essential function of form, in turn, is to actualize matter. In the same way, just as matter in its essence is but the entity in its aptitude to receive form, so also form in its essence is but the entity in its aptitude to inform matter. Such aptitude is not something added accidentally to form, but it is what essentially characterizes form itself. (Ibid. p. 92).

Suárez's working hypothesis behind this argumentation, is that man is a substantial per se kind unity, not of two complete substances, but rather of two inseparable partial constituents of one and the same complete substance. It might be said, then, that the function of each constituent, soul and body, would be isomorphic to the functions of the constituent of the substantial composite.

The second conclusion of Suárez is that 'soul possesses an essential ordination to the organic body' (Ibid.)\(^7^6\). With this underlined locution, Suárez separates soul

\(^7^5\) The mayor premiss, is warranted, according to Suárez, because of what he said in q. 1 of disp. 1. So it is the minor, from Physics, b. 1, ch. 9, q. 1, ad 4.

\(^7^6\) We saw earlier, in n. 21, that in On the Soul, Book II, 412a, b, Aristotle speaks of 'a natural body'; in De Anima Suárez speaks of 'a physical organic body' or simply
from the forms of inanimate things. To stress such a difference, Suárez commits himself to the existential claim that there is a variety of dispositions in matter, and on the other hand, that there are formal effects produced by forms. So, for Suárez, forms differ in respect to:

(i) the dispositions that they require in matter to be able to inform it and conserve it; and

(ii) the formal effect that they produce in matter itself.

But the primary and essential difference among forms derives from the formal effect rather than from the organized second matter. The reason for this is that the former difference derives from the latter; since form informs in a distinctive manner prime matter, and it gives a specific determinate esse to the composite, that is why it requires such (determinate) dispositions (Ibid. p. 94). Consequently, for

---

of ‘organic body (corpus organicum)’. In disp. XV in *Disp. Met.*, however, Suárez speaks of ‘physical body’ (corporis physici), see s. v, n. 2; While Leibniz, in turn, speaks of soul when it is in an organic body’, (Cf. *Theod.* I, 87). It seems possible that Leibniz read some of Suárez’s *De Anima* manuscripts.

Among the forms of inanimate things, Suarez includes the assistant forms (formae assistentes) that move the heavenly bodies. These, according to Suarez, are not substantial forms. (Cf. *Disp. Met.*, d.15, s.5, n. 1., p.682). In holding this, Suarez seems to presuppose Aristotle’s criterion which denied the hylemorphic composition in the heavenly bodies.

In *Disp. Met.*, d. 15, s. 7 Suárez talks of two effects that can be attributed to the form, that is: the composite and the matter.

Second matter, for Suárez, presupposes prime matter and adds to it dispositions. Things that are considered second matter are: (a) the substantial composite in regard to accidents; (b) the composite of matter and form of corporality in regard to other substantial forms; (c) matter disposed by accidents in regard to other accidents, and (d) designate matter, i.e., prime matter determined by quantity. See J. Gracia (1989), p. 243.
Suárez, soul differs from the form of inanimate things in two ways: First, it produces in matter a nobler (nobiliorum) sort of effect, in the sense that it constitutes a more perfect composite, and it gives a better esse than the other forms do. From this difference follows a second one, viz., that soul requires a more pre-eminent organization (and dispositions) in such a matter than the other forms do. For Suárez, these differences are enfolded in the classical Aristotelian formula that 'soul is an act of the physical organic body'.

But we still do not know what exactly is meant by 'organic body'. Suárez has the merit of distinguishing at least two senses in this expression. First of all, in De Anima, recalling Aristotle's On the Parts of Animals, Book 11, 647a, Suárez calls organic body 'that which has parts distributed in various functions' (p. 94). An organ, he points out, is some part that is used as an instrument to perform some activity. Now, since there can be a double organization, viz. an accidental one, based on the existence of various accidents; and a substantial one, that consists in the manner in which the soul informs, in the same way, Suárez holds, it is possible to understand 'organic body' in a twofold sense, viz.,

(OB1) \( y \) is an organic body = def. (i) \( y \) is informed matter (by the form);
(ii) \( y \) is a bodily esse, organized in diverse parts;
(iii) \( y \)'s parts are endowed with heterogeneous dispositions according to their own functions.

---

80 Some commentators like D. Cosme Parpal y Marqués (1922), take it that Suárez draws three senses, of organic body; one physical, another formal, and still another instrumental. However, Suárez himself in Disp. Met. d.15, s.5, n. 2, p. 683, talks of two distinctions: A physical or material distinction, and a substantial or formal one.
At this point, Suárez compares soul with the form of fire, which also requires an organic matter. The evident difference being that the form of an inanimate thing requires homogeneous dispositions or dispositions of the same type, while the authentical soul requires in the diverse parts, diverse heterogeneous dispositions. But more importantly, the form of fire does not give to the composite a grade of being above the bodily corporeal level (*latitudinem corporis*), while soul, for Suárez, confers the degree of life (*conferens gradum vitae*).

On the other hand, 'body' itself in the formula is not a principle *by which* primarily there is life in us, because it is not a principle by which we realize actively our vital actions, it rather behaves as an instrument of soul. (Ib. p. 117) Now, in a second sense,

\[(OB2) \quad y \text{ is an organic body}=\text{def. (i) } y \text{ possesses substantial organization;} \]
\[\quad (ii) \quad y \text{ is a composite of matter and substantial form; and} \]
\[\quad (iii) \quad y \text{ is a living thing constituted by soul.} \]

The difference between these two senses, Suárez makes clear, is that *(OB1)* signifies the formal or material organization by accidental dispositions of the organic body before the reception of soul; whereas *(OB2)* refers to its organization by soul itself in virtue of its union with such body.

The problem that might arise from this distinction is that if there is ambiguity in the locution 'organic body', how should we know whether soul is ordinate to the 'organic body' understood as an organized matter *(OB1)* or understood as a whole *(OB2)*. Suárez's reply is that soul, in just one act, informs matter, and constitutes the
composite. So, the aptitude in an organic body for both functions would be just one although we would make a mental distinction. (Ibid. p.103)

Another objection might be that soul can not possess an ordination to the organic body understood as in (OB1), since there 'body' refers to dispositions. Now, since substance is said to be prior and more perfect than accidental dispositions, it cannot be ordinate to nor defined by those dispositions. But, soul, Suárez replies, is not ordinate to matter in the same way as it is to dispositions. For, in matter a prior existence of some necessary accidents or dispositions is required. So, it is these, that are ordinate to soul, for they prepare the subject in which the soul has to be received. (Ibid.)

Having clarified Suárez's two-fold sense of 'organic body', we can now turn to examine the term 'ordinatio', included in Suárez's second conclusion, namely, 'that soul possesses an essential ordination to the organic body'. For Suárez, such a term does not have the same meaning as the term 'relation', because a relation implies a formal dependency on the part of the entity to that to which is related. A relation, Suárez explains, can not be understood without its terms. The distinctive feature of a relation is that 'is an entity that consists essentially and formally in a respect to another thing' (Ibid. p. 92). In Suárez's framework, then, it would be inadequate to call 'relation' a mode of being ordinate to. In the case of the soul, we cannot consider it having a "relation" as such with the body. The reason for Suárez is clear: how could one explain that soul continue existing while body has been destroyed. Regarding the separability of distinct things, Suárez maintains that distinct things
such as body and soul, can be separated by divine power. The general reason is that if things are really distinct, they can also be really disjoined; and if they are really disjoined, no contradiction is involved in the notion of one of them being preserved by God without the other. For invariably there can be between these distinct things only an effective dependence or ordination rather than an essential dependence or real union. For Suárez ‘the relation and its term’ constitute an exception among distinct things that can be really separated by divine power. The reason is that a relation as such essentially and, as it were, formally depends on its term; hence it can neither arise nor be preserved without the term. The only argument for proving this, Suárez remarks, is that such is the nature of a relation.\(^1\)

Thus, Suárez's suggestion is that we should not say that soul deals with body through a relation, but rather we should talk of an ordination between them. Thus, the ordination of soul to body is not a relation, because it does not imply in soul a essential dependency on the organic body. Therefore, if we state formally what 'ordination' is according to Suárez, we should say:

\[
x \text{ is ordinate to } y \text{ iff: (i) } x \text{ is apt (apta) by its nature to its own end}^{82}; \text{ and (ii) } x \text{ is an absolute entity}^{83}.
\]

---

\(^1\) Cf.\textit{Disp. Met.}, d.50, s.2, n.7-9

\(^82\) In \textit{S T}, I, Q. 76, art. 1, regarding the soul/body union, St. Thomas holds that the human soul has an aptitude to it. This aptitude is understood by Aquinas as a natural inclination of the soul to be united to the body. The reason, he says, is that in case of being removed from its proper place, still it is able to retain this aptitude for its proper place. However, St. Thomas does not explain the union itself.

\(^83\) Suárez explains that the main feature of absolute entities, to which \(x\) belongs, is to be adjusted (\textit{coaptatione}) to another thing. \(x\), then, is adjusted not toward its terminus, but rather toward its intrinsic end for the sake of which it has been
Now we are able to understand the manner in which Suárez saves from contradiction the claims that: (1) soul is substance, and (2) 'soul by its nature is ordinate to inform the body'; for, 'to inform', 'to be ordinate', and 'to be apt' are intensionally the same. Now, this informing, ordination or aptitude is not a relation: The soul, then, is not related in the sense that is not dependent on body as if this were its terminus, what there is, instead, between them is a natural intrinsic coaptatio. So, after this conceptual analysis of the aforementioned terms, Suárez concludes that if soul is isolated from all external entities (such as bodies), it still continues being intrinsically apt, but it becomes unintelligible without that toward which it is apt, i.e., its end.

The next question to be addressed, corresponds to a phrase from q.4 of the first disputation., viz., 'which is the essential definition of soul and how one definition is demonstrated by the other'. This query seems to result precisely from the attempt to define soul through extrinsic entities such as body and operations. According to Suárez, the negative consequence of adopting such procedure is that philosophers would not be offering an essential definition of soul, but rather a series of specious ones. I think that this concern would be eased by adopting the ontological/intensional account of soul. The former treats the nature and essence of

produced. On the other hand, Suárez's way of understanding 'ordinatur' and 'aptitudo' have interesting similarities with the term 'fittingness'. Although when he uses coaptatio he is suggesting that not only soul is naturally fitted for the body, but also that body is fitted to receive life from soul.

According to Aristotle, everything that has one essence needs just one essential definition (Cf. Suárez, Ibid. 106).
the soul as form and first act. The latter deals with the attributes of the soul i.e., attributes that it will possess in virtue of its ontological status. We think that Suárez’s concern should not be formulated in terms of whether the operations of the soul and its union with the body belong in the definition of the essence of the soul. What should rather be at issue is whether the criterion for application of the term soul, presently under discussion, sufficiently determines that to which such term could be applied, -its extension.\(^5\)

As for the bulk of (q.4), Suárez’s purpose is twofold. First, to distinguish soul from other types of forms; and secondly, to give a definite answer to two related questions, viz.,:

(1) Is soul principle of being, or principle of acting?
(2) Is it more essential to define the essence of the soul in terms of its ordination to the subject, or in terms of its ordination to activity?

With regard to the first issue, following Aristotle’s ideas, in *On the Soul*, 412a-b, Suárez holds that it is essential to any kind of soul that it be *being act*. Moreover, he adds, the word ‘soul’ expresses a general and univocal concept\(^6\). Therefore, its essential definition will be also univocal. Nevertheless, if this is the case, an immediate worry arises: Is this essential and univocal definition of soul too broad,

---

\(^5\) Given that in the relatively recent philosophical literature it has been accepted that the extension of terms gets its intelligibility from their adequate criteria for application. (Cf. Ruth Garret Millikan, 1984)

\(^6\) This means that it retains a single signification (that is, that of being act) in different contexts of its use, i.e., whether it is soul in general or a particular kind of soul.
since it seems to include even what ancient philosophers—such as Plato, Proclus or Plotinus—called the world soul? Suárez's direct response is negative. He writes:

In truth if someone intends to apply the term soul to something that is not properly a soul—as for instance in the case of the heavenly intelligence,—the definition does not have univocal value. It can not be otherwise, since that intelligence is not soul in the univocal and proper sense.

But then, what is peculiar to the univocal definition of soul that does not apply to 'the intelligence that set the heavens in motion'? Suárez holds that what confers the proper specific difference to soul as such is the stipulation of Aristotelian 'organic body'; or alternatively, Suárez's own requirement that something can not be properly a soul, unless it is an 'informant act' (p. 114). Thereby, in order to justify the difference between soul as informant form and the form of other (heavenly) bodies and inanimate things in general, Suárez argues thus:

Everything acts in virtue of that which is in act, since everything that acts, acts insofar as it is in act; therefore acting and to be in act originate from one and the same principle. I say "to be acting" (operat), since it carries with it an activity (activitatem). In order that the principle of action be a genuine informant form, the action needs to proceed from the same subsistent subject as from an agent in activity. In effect, if it proceeds from an agent and it is received in a different subject, then that which is the principle of activity is not form regarding that subject which receives such action: they do not constitute the same subsistent subject. Nor may such action be attributed to that subject as a subject that acts, but at the most, as a subject that receives the action. Consequently, when Aristotle says that soul is a principle in virtue of which there is life in us he refers to the intrinsic principle by which the same alive subsistent subject acts, to which the action in its condition of agent is attributed. Such principle must necessarily be a true form, since form in the same way that it is principle of being, is also principle of acting (De Anima, d.1, q.4, n.10, p. 114).
In this passage, Suárez is first echoing St. Thomas’s definition of being, i.e., actuality. However, he is not identifying being in act with activity, he rather formally distinguishes, on the one hand, between them, and on the other, he distinguishes both of them from the principle whose role is to give esse and activity.

In second place, he describes the acting and with it the sui generis vital activity of a genuine informant form as necessarily proceeding from a subject which, being subsistent, functions itself as an agent in activity. In another place, Suárez makes explicit that it is the form of the same agent ‘that is called action insofar as it denominates the agent himself as actually acting’.

In third place, Suárez attributes the acting and activity to an intrinsic principle or inner agent which is a true form that gives esse or life to the composite and is also the principle of acting. All these features belong to the genuine substantial form, as distinct from the form that move the heavenly bodies. This latter, Suárez will explain later on, is not a substantial but rather an assistant form, that is, a form that moves the body extrinsically, and thereby does not enliven it.

Thus, the basic difference between the informant form and the celestial form is that Suárez considers the former a ‘principle by which’ (principium quo) and this is equivalent to the clause ‘it is an informant act’ (est actus informans), that is, an intrinsic constituent part of the living composite. While the latter ‘is not a principle

---

87 Cf. S T, I, 75, 2 Resp.

88 Disp. Met., d. 49, s. 1, n. 8, p. 93

89 Cf. Disp. Met., d. 15, s. 1, p. 637; and s. 5, p. 682.
by which the heaven moves itself; rather it is an extrinsic principle that set the heavens in movement'. Such movement, we may conjecture, can not be attributed to the heavens as an agent actually acting. A second difference between soul as such and the form of inanimate things is indicated by Suárez’s calling the former 'primary principle'. He states,

The soul is primary principle by which the living thing is requiring all its faculties; and through them the soul acts as principal principle.\(^{90}\)

The soul, then, is this peculiar type of form: it is primary principal principle that relates to its vital actions in a special way, viz., through immediate principles or faculties. Suárez seems to be suggesting in this passage that soul relates to action in a different way than the extrinsic principle relates to the celestial movement. In effect, on his account the extrinsic principle relates to the heavens like a motor. Besides, the proper movement of celestial bodies in Aristotle’s framework is the circular movement which is absolutely continuous. This continuity means two interrelated things, viz., that it does not stop-it is eternal- and it possesses perfect regularity. Now, the vital activity attributed to an agent actually acting seems far from being equivalent to the circular perfectly regular movement attributed to the heavenly bodies, at least in the sense that the vital activity is not necessarily continual.

\(^{90}\) *Anima est illud principium primum per quod vivens omnes potentias requirit, et per eas operatur tamquam principale principium[...] anima non est quaelibet forma, sed illa quae est principium primum vitaliter operandi.(De Anima, d.1, q.4, n.10, p.116)*
There is, moreover, another fundamental element which serves to distinguish between the aforementioned forms. Suárez points out, that the Aristotelian definition of soul, in addition to providing a general definition of soul, implicitly contains the division of soul into rational, sensorial, and vegetative. Therefore, the locution ‘that by which we live’ (quo vivimus), should be understood as referring to the activity of the vegetative soul, given that commentators such as Dionysius, interpreted Aristotle’s Topics 6, ch. 5, 148a, as holding that life is that activity which naturally serves the nutritive function. Moreover, according to Suárez, Aristotle in About Death and Life, ch. 1, 469b, also maintained that life consists in the action of hot and humidity, this seems to lead to the conclusion that Aristotle is understanding ‘vital principle’ as vegetative principle, and in such sense, opposing it to the intellective and sensitive principles. This, I think, would constitute an interesting distinction, at least, between soul as such and what the world soul was for the ancients, if the term ‘life’ for them really signified something other than the vegetative function of soul.\footnote{It is clear that for Suárez what he calls the Aristotelian essential definition of soul does not apply to what ancient philosophers called the world soul. One of the reasons seems to be that Suárez is presupposing Aristotle’s denial of an hylemorphic composition in the heavens. So ontologically speaking, the cosmic soul is not a substantial form, nor an informant form. The ontological structure of the cosmic soul for Plato himself seems to be that of an harmonic mean (Cf. Timaeus 50 c -52 a c; and Proclus, in Platonis Timaeum Comm. 185, 186 B). A mean between the intelligible reality and necessity (Cf. O. Velásquez, 1977). Or a mean between two eternal ousias: the indivisible and the divisible. The former, Velásquez aptly explains, corresponds to ‘that from which what is generated results modelled’. While the divisible essence corresponds to ‘that which, on the one hand, is generated, and on the other, to that in which it is generated’ (Timeus 50c), i.e., the phenomenal world. Thus understood, the structure of world-soul is composed of the indivisible and divisible ousias. As such, then, for Suárez, is not properly a soul, but rather what he calls an intelligence. But, prima facie, at least, it is not so obvious that ‘soul’ and...}
'intelligence' have different intensions. For there are apparent similarities between Suárez's (ODS2), viz., that 'soul is principle of life, sensation, local movement, and intellecfion', and Plato's own conception of the world's soul essence. According to some commentators, what constitutes the essence of the cosmic soul in Timaeus is precisely its life. In fact in Timaeus 30 B, Plato held that the cosmos is an intelligent living and animate being. It is the soul what makes the world a living thing. The question should be then. How is the term 'life' understood in Plato's context? On Velásquez interpretation 'life' in its essential state refers to intelligibility. (Although Plotinus held that 'time was the life of the soul' from reading Timaeus 39 D, since 'the soul generates time along with this universe' (See J. Mc.Guire and S. K. Strange (1983), pp. 262-63). Suárez, however, would have agreed with Velásquez's reading, according to which it is 'the intelligence that set in movement the heavens'. On the other hand, Plato's commentators accord that 'to move', in regard to the world-soul, means 'to know'. For instance, Velásquez comments, that the Demiurgue assigns the world with a motion that belongs to reason and intellect. And P. Thévenaz (1938), reading Timaeus 37 AB, states that 'La connaissance est un mouvement'.

From these considerations, we may conclude that Suarez's conception of the essence of the soul is quite different from Plato's conception of the world soul. This can be made evident by at least three observations. In the first place, the life of cosmic soul consists in activity, but this activity is purely intellectual. It introduces order and intelligibility into the cosmos. In effect, in Plato, for the world to be alive means that the world has a certain ordered structure. Since, according to Plato, to on which is the eternal model from which the cosmos is made- is an organic reality (Cf. Tim. 30 C, 31 A, 31 B). On the contrary, Suárez interprets Aristotle's locution 'by which we live' as including the activity of vegetative soul, as we noted above.

In the second place, although in Plato's theory, the cosmic movement of soul consists in knowledge, and in Suárez, the soul is principle of intellection, this principle of intellection is understood neither as movement nor as physical action, but rather as a vital sui generis spiritual activity of an agent that acts by himself.

In the third place, because the cosmic soul is considered to be an extrinsic principle, while the soul as such is deemed to be an intrinsic principle component of the animate thing, which in addition performs vital operations. Suárez thinks that the heavens' movement is not a vital motion. For he takes it that the motion that is received by the heavens proceeds from an extrinsic intelligence that unites itself to the heavens like a motor (De Anima, Cf. d.1, q. 1, n. 9. p. 70). Moreover, the idea that the cosmic soul is an extrinsic principle seems to come from Plato's own theory, for he locates the world's soul not only in the inner part of the world's body, but clearly in its outside part. In Tim. 34 B, Plato writes: 'And having placed the soul in the middle of this, he expanded it throughout the whole even wrapping up its outside'. Therefore, the major difference between the soul as such and the extrinsic intelligence reside in the way that these entities are said to have life and operation. According to Suárez, it can not be said that this intelligence operates vitally since
As for the second aim regarding (q.4), Suárez argues in the opposite direction from that of philosophers such as Philoponus, Simplicius or Themistius. For them, form is primary and principally ordinate to action, and if it informs body, it does it in virtue of action. For these philosophers and others quoted by Suárez, such as, Albert the Great, and Cajetan, action precedes being. Thereby, they think that the definition that expresses the soul's essence in terms of its ordination to activity is more essential than the one that expresses it by its ordination to the subject.

Suárez, instead, attributes a double function to form, viz:

(i) to give esse to the composite, and

(ii) to be the primary principle of action.

However, he regards these functions as formally distinct (Cf. p. 118) in the sense that just one of them expresses the soul's essence, while he other is a derived property of the essence. Therefore, the definition that expresses the essential function would be the essential definition of soul. But which is the essential function of form? -

According to Suárez,

being is what primary constitutes a thing, and in it takes root acting itself. Therefore, the form, which is a principle of being and acting, is ordained first to give esse, and then to act (emphasis added) (p. 120).

vital operations not only must be received in the same thing that operates, but they must be realized by the same intrinsic principles of the thing that operates (Ibid.).


93 De an. II, 6: o. c. f. XI.

94 De an. II, 2-8: o. c. 248-52.
Thus, for Suárez, there is an analogical relationship between form(soul) and matter, and act and potentiality. He denies the proposition that 'Being is because of acting' for this would mean that nature intends acting prior to being. It is rather the contrary, he holds; since 'when acting is taken apart from being, and being from acting, being itself is more important than acting; this is what nature above all intends' (p. 122). He goes on to present two arguments in defense of the classical Thomistic view that acting follows being. The first one is the direct response to (q.4) above; it revolves around the controversy of being and action, and converges on an epistemic issue. The position can be expressed concisely as follows:

1 Aristotle does not demonstrate the first definition (that is, the one that declares that soul is principle of being) of the soul through the second one (i.e. the one that declares that soul is principle of action), he just considers it more clear.
2 The second definition is not clearer in itself, but only in relation to our knowledge.
3 Aristotle's demonstration proceeds by beginning from experience and from that which is clearer in relation to our knowledge.

The interesting corollary of this passage is that if experience is left behind, it is difficult to know whether soul is principle of acting or principle of being. From these considerations, Suárez will conclude that in itself, it is clearer that soul is principle of being, for being is a necessary condition of acting, and the principle of being is prior to and the cause of other principles. However, in relation to our knowledge, things are different; for we first know actions, and only then we deduce that there must be a principle for them, which we call soul (p. 124).
Suárez is aware, thus, that this is evidently an *a posteriori* process just regarding our knowledge\(^{95}\). In this sense, it is more clear that soul is principle of activity, and we deduce from this that it is the principle of being. The main points of his second argument are these:

1. The constitutive content of essences cannot be demonstrated *a priori* by something that falls outside of the essence.
2. The first definition declares the constitutive content, the second one falls outside of it.
3. It is false that 'because the soul is principle of acting, it is principle of being'. The converse is true. For the first clause in the converse implies the second as its cause.
4. The intrinsic end of soul, to which it is ordained, is that of giving *esse* and substantial life; whereof derives its ordination to activity.
5. If this same point had to be stated in a causal proposition, this one would be true: 'Because soul is ordained to give such *esse* to the composite, it is thereby ordained to be a principle of acting in such manner regarding it.
6. Under the aspect of end, action itself, strictly speaking is ordained to perfecting being itself. It follows that, under no causal aspect, is the second definition the cause of the first.

The bottom line of this argument is that being is a causally necessary condition for acting and that acting perfects being. This same traditional position extends as far as Heidegger; for he also would agree with Suárez that if there is acting, there must first be being. Referring to the essence of action Heidegger states:

> We are still far from pondering the essence of action decisively enough. [However] [...] the essence of action is accomplishment. To

---

\(^{95}\) The first to use the expressions: *a priori, a posteriori*, seems to have been Albert of Saxony (Prantl, GLA IV, 78). Although according to Ferrater Mora the first distinction between types of knowledge that convey the concept of *a priori* is found is Leibniz and Hume. In the present text, Suárez suggests that *a posteriori* knowledge is gained by experience, while *a priori* definitions capture the essence of things. Husserl talks about categorical *a priori* intentions which intuits formal as well as material essences.
accomplish means to unfold something into the fullness of its essence, to lead it forth into this fullness -produceré. Therefore, only what already is can really be accomplished. But what 'is' above all is Being.(emphasis added) ("Letter on Humanism").

Both authors agree, thus, that being is ontologically and causally prior to act, and that acting is perfecting or unfolding being into its fullness. A similar idea is suggested by Aristotle in *On the Soul*, ch.4, 415 b. Moreover, Suárez's interpretation of that passage sheds light on the meaning of the term 'principle' which he has used repeatedly to define soul. It means 'origin', in the sense that from soul originate operative faculties and activities. Moreover, for Suárez 'principle' also means 'cause', in the sense that soul expresses three types of causes, viz.,

i. a formal cause, insofar as it gives esse;
ii. an efficient cause, insofar as it is principle of activity; and
iii. a final cause, insofar as all the faculties and actions are ordained to the soul's own perfection.

By the same token, Suárez remarks that ordination to action is not the final cause of the soul's essence considered in itself, but rather a secondary end derived from its primary end which is to give esse to the composite. This does not mean, however, that it could not be asserted that, *a posteriori*, regarding our knowledge, activity is the soul's end.

Thus far we have come to understand what soul is, how the substantial form functions, and how it differs from other sorts of forms. Its distinctiveness consists in functioning as first act. That is, in the first place, as principle naturally ordained to informing a physical organic body and as giver of substantial esse to that composite;
and secondly, that this resulting substantial composite acts precisely according to its own nature or essence.

5. **Soul and Body: The Role of Dispositions**

In the above discussion we analyzed Suárez's criterion for the applicability of the term 'soul' in general. Among, the necessary conditions for it we found that it be (i) first act, (ii) informant form and (iii) primary principle by which the living thing itself is and acts. We need now to take up the issue of how soul deals with the body which it informs. In this respect, Suárez, more audacious than Descartes, manages to give an explanation to how soul could be closely joined or united to body. He admits for this purpose the existence of dispositions, and attributes to them an explanatory efficacious role regarding the soul's union with the body.

In *De Anima*, d. 1, q. 3, n. 8, 'dispositions' are first introduced by Suárez within the context of the meaning of the term, 'organic body', as we have already seen. It is asserted that one way of understanding bodily organization is by accepting the existence of a variety of distinct dispositions in diverse parts of the body. Suárez, however, is referring here not to what are now called 'dispositions', but characteristic of inanimate objects'. Examples of them are: solubility, fragility, elasticity, hardness. Suárez would contribute to Prior's list by adding: diaphaneity, that is, the disposition of subjects like air or crystal to receive

---

96 Suárez's discussion about dispositions is found in *Disp. Met.*, d.42: The Quality and its species in general

97 In her book, *Dispositions* (1985), Elizabeth Prior characterizes philosophers' dispositions as those 'typically possessed by inanimate objects'. Examples of them are: solubility, fragility, elasticity, hardness. Suárez would contribute to Prior's list by adding: diaphaneity, that is, the disposition of subjects like air or crystal to receive
teristics such as figure, density, and heat. Dispositions of this kind are considered to be physical and have two roles: (1) to inform subjects, and (2) to be sustained by them. (*De Anima*, d. 2, q. 4, n. 20)

Given these features, and at the same time, answering the second objection referred to in section 4 above, Suárez says:

In truth, I do not see how matter could be organized without including intrinsically its dispositions or how accidents could organize matter if they are not formally inherent to it.  

To say that the organic body includes dispositions and that soul might be defined through them, for Suárez, does not mean that soul is ordinate to the accidental dispositions. On the contrary, dispositions are ordinate to soul. The reason that Suárez alludes to them is that they are (material) causally prior to soul itself, even though they are posterior in respect of perfection to the soul. That is, dispositions are prior in nature, or prior in the causal order, because it is said that they prepare the subject (or matter) in which the soul can be received. But with regard to the order of perfection, following Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, b. VII, 7-8; and *On the Soul*, b.II,
Suárez agrees that form (soul in this case) is more perfect than matter, although the composite would be more perfect than both.\footnote{100 The reasons are given by Suárez in Disp. Met., d.15, s.7, n.6-7, pp. 696-97.}

Now, if accidental dispositions are causally prior to soul -if not absolutely, at least in the sense that, they are the necessary conditions for the form to inform matter (See Disp. Met., d.15, s.6, n.5, p. 687)-, does not this amount to saying that Suárez is attaching a certain efficacy to dispositions in respect to a form such as soul? And if this is the case, do they behave as a sort of "co-producer" of soul?

Suárez's response to these puzzles is typically ingenious: The efficient cause of soul is God alone. In this sense there is no need of any other efficacious power, as Suárez asserts.\footnote{101 De Anima, d. 2, q. 5, p. 316.} However, God creates soul in organized matter. That is wherein 'dispositions' enter the picture: as accidents they contribute in a material manner to the union of soul with matter. Therefore, the efficacy of dispositions is a remote contribution in respect to the soul; that is, it is not the sort of efficacy that immediately produces soul. Rather, the dispositions merely unite the soul to matter. If dispositions were the material cause of soul, then the soul would be material, given the principle that every thing that has a material cause is material (Cf. De Anima, d. 2, q. 3, p. 167); or in modern terminology, that 'what evolves from material phenomena is material'.\footnote{102 For scientific objections to Dualistic Interactionism, see J. W. Corman, K. Lehrer, and G. Pappas (1982).}
For the claim that the union between soul and matter is not produced by soul itself, but rather is the task of the accidental dispositions, Suárez gave at least two reasons:

[...] soul does not give the intrinsic and proper esse to matter, but rather it presupposes it to be able to unite itself to matter (d. 14, s. 3, n. 18).

[...] although form is by nature apt to be united [to matter] and this -consequently- is naturally inclined to the union, it does not follow from this that it has the power to unite itself [to matter], since these are divers aptitudes or powers, and the one is not necessarily inferred from the other; the same happens with matter, which is apt to be united and in its genus is inclined to the union, however, it is not able to unite itself. (emphasis added)

If the union does not efficaciously proceed either from form or from matter, it is by no means unreasonable to suggest the possibility that such union results from accidental dispositions. However, it is not clear that Suárez's proposal avoids an infinite regress problem; nor can it explain how a material disposition may act on a spiritual entity contributing in a material manner to its union to matter.

To these difficulties Suárez might reply by explaining that the term ‘union’ in the context of the soul/body union should not be understood as a bond by juxtaposition of parts. According to Suárez, this does not occur in the case of union or composition involved in man. For (1) soul is not just an intelligence united to matter, but a form that really informs matter (or co-forms man). As we saw earlier,

103 The term ‘union’ (or unionem when it refers to the soul/body union) in Suárez has a two-fold sense. One, as a ‘nexus’ of matter and form, which becomes ‘inhesion’ in a double way: from matter to form, and from form to matter; another, as a ‘nexus’ by which (mediante) the form is sustained by matter. In this second sense, the union itself, as a mode, is a means by which the form actualizes matter and constitutes the composite (Disp. Met., d. 15, s. 6, n. 10).
for a form to inform matter is to inform substantially, so as to constitute ‘primary and essentially with matter just one complete substance, and to fulfill, so to speak, the emptiness that there was in the potentiality of matter’ (d.2, q.4, n.3). (2) Man is not composed of two complete substantial subjects. If this were the case, then there would result a unity by juxtaposition or by aggregation, as Suárez says. On the contrary, our soul is conceived as an intermediate sort of form. This means that it is an incomplete form, i.e. it partakes with the angels’ complete sort of form, in being subsistent. It also partakes with forms of inferior things because it informs matter.\footnote{Ordo rerum docet esse dandam formam aliquam informantem corpus, et ab illo independentem in esse. Nam dantur quaedam formae omniae integrae nullo habentes respectum ad corpus; et dantur aliae informantes materiam, et dependentes ad illa; ergo inter haec duo extrema datur potest forma media quae participet aliquid ex extremis; huiusmodi autem est anima nostra, quae cum formis angelicis convenit in hoc quod subsistens est; cum inferioribus autem formis in hoc quod materiam informat.\textit{(De Anima, d.2, q.4, n.6, p.262)}} From this it is inferred that the union is not by aggregation but rather of a \textit{per se} kind. According to Suárez, a unity to be \textit{per se} it is necessary and sufficient that it be the unity of a complete essence, whether that essence is complete in a simple way, or complete by being a composite made up of parts which together constitute a single essence in a given genus.\footnote{Cf. \textit{Disp. Met.} d.4, s.6, n.8} Man is this sort of complete essence.

Besides, the term ‘union’\footnote{The form or soul is not essentially united to body, it is rather apt to be united to it, so it can be separated from body. This contention allows Suarez to hold that with death what is destroyed is just the union (i.e. the mode) between soul and body, but both entities partially subsist. The union of other forms is inseparable. That is,} means, according to the Suarezian analysis, a
'nexus' in the sense that it is a mean by which the form actualizes matter and constitute the composite. The question, then of the origin and cause of the union of matter and accidental dispositions presumably should not arise, and if does arise, Suárez might also respond that matter deals with dispositions not by means of a "union" but rather by way of inherence.107

if the union disappears, in the same instant the form perishes. [...] quod actu esse unitam corpori non convenit per se animae, id est, essentialiter, sed esse aptam ad [unionem vel] informationem; et hoc non potest separari ab illa. Potest tamen dici quod actualis unio convenit animae per se, quia non accidit illi omnino extrinsece, sed est proprius status illius secundum naturam suam -sicut lapidi [per se] convenit esse deorsum; tamen quae isto modo per se conveniunt, separari possunt ab eo cui conveniunt, illo manente. Qui modus potest dici per se, tamen impedibiliter. Ex quo colliges differentiam inter animan et alias formas, quod in illis unio est inseparabilis a forma, illa manente, in anima vero, separabilis. (De Anima, d. 2, q. 4, p. 298).

107 Cf. n.101 above.
6. Internal Structure of Soul: Compound or Simple?

Intensional Analysis of the 'Rational Soul' in Particular

Suárez agrees with some ancient philosophers\(^{108}\) as well as with some ancient physicists\(^{109}\) that Plato presented a picture of the human soul as divided into three parts\(^{110}\). Nonetheless, Suárez will not himself subscribe to Plato's view on the nature of soul, for although various versions of it might be adopted, each of them is burdened with damaging problems.

If Plato's idea of the nature of the soul is interpreted in the way St. Thomas did in *Sum. Theol.*, viz., that Plato held that there are several souls in one body, distinct even according to the corresponding organs and localization, the nutritive soul located in the liver, the concupiscible in the heart, and the knowing power in the brain\(^{111}\), then it would follow that in man there are other substantial forms besides the intellectual soul; and this is contradictory to the view that soul is the form of our body\(^{112}\).

\(^{108}\) Such as Albert the Great (*De an.* b. 1, 2, ch. 15. o. c. v. 5, pp. 183 ff.), Philoponus (*De an.* 413 b, 432 a).

\(^{109}\) Such as Galenus (*De placitis*, Hipp; and *Plat.* b. 6, ch. 2, b. 9, ch. 2), Niphus (*De gen. et corrupt.* in *Recognitionibus*: o.c. pp. 31 ff.), and Valles (*Controversiarium*, b. 4, ch. 6 o. c. p. 77, col. 2; and b. 2, ch. 24, o. c. pp. 36 ff).

\(^{110}\) Usually such authors refer to Plato's *Rep.* IV, 437 b-441 c, or *Tim.* 69 c -71 a; or even *Phaedrus* 246 a-b regarding the Myth of the Charioteer.

\(^{111}\) Cf. S T, I, q. 76, a. 3.

\(^{112}\) This objection is raised by Alexander of Hales, St. Thomas noted in Ibid. I, n. 344; II, 419.
On the other hand, Suárez notes, on the interpretation that the mentioned parts of soul are not complete souls, but three parts of one soul that inform body it might still be thought that it is one soul that informs the whole body, but that there are, in addition, other partial diverse forms which inform the heterogeneous parts of body. So, these partial forms, in turn, would be informed by the entire soul or it would not. If the first disjunct is asserted, some of the difficulties that Suárez points out, are the following:

First, if partial forms are admitted in addition to the total form in the same part of the body, then one would have to admit a plurality of substantial forms. And this goes against Suarezian suppositions.

Second, if one entire soul informs all the parts of the body, then the soul does not give them one and same esse and the parts keep their heterogeneous dispositions. In this case to add more forms would be useless.

Third, unless partial forms are souls, the parts would have neither vital activities nor vital dispositions. On the contrary, these forms would be gratuitous, and again this yields an undesired plurality of souls.

Now if the second disjunct is asserted, that is, that the parts are not informed by the entire soul, but each just by its own partial form, there still follow negative consequences. For instance. First: Either these parts are mutually contiguous or they are not. If they are, there would result from them just one soul which would be divisible and extended. But this is against the Suarezian assumptions, as we shall see. If they are not contiguous, then each one of them would constitute a living subsistent
subject with accidental unity or united by aggregation of many (d. 2, q. 8, p. 36).

Secondly: If this (indivisible) soul is not in all parts, it will be in just one part. The question now is whether it is organic or not. If it is not, this form would not be act of the organic body, then it can not be said to be soul. If it is organic, it would inform the diverse parts of that part, and in the same manner it could inform the diverse parts of the whole. In this case the partial forms are superfluous.

Another query is: What part is the part informed by the soul? Not the heart, Suárez answers, but the brain. However, if this is admitted, it needs also be admitted that the same soul could inform other parts of the body. So Suárez's suggestion is that partial forms should be rejected.

Thus, given all these shortcomings, Suárez propounds a modified Aristotelian internal tripartite distinction for the human soul, which at some places he reduces to a bipartite one\textsuperscript{113}, while he evokes logical and metaphysical reasons for its defense.

In this section, since it is not possible to dwell on every substance, faculty, and vital activities of every kind of soul, I shall graphically illustrate, in the first place Suárez's picture of soul; highlighting major distinctions, definitions, and connections in the human soul as paradigmatically presented by Suárez throughout the eight questions of the second Disputation of *De Anima*. Two basic questions shall be

\textsuperscript{113} Analyzing the common features between the plant soul, the animal soul, and human soul, Suárez posits a virtual division for the general concept of soul. That is, just one vegetative soul, and another just sensorial, but this latter, in turn, divides in just one sensorial soul, and another rational soul. This divisions advantage, according to Suárez, consists in its clarity and accordance with the Aristotelian view, yet it is not presented by Aristotle in this manner. (*De Anima*, d.2, q.6, n. 9, p. 346).
discussed immediately after Figure 1, viz.: (1) What kind of distinction does Suárez propose to obtain between souls amongst themselves, as well as between the soul and its faculties? (2) Are the Suarezian distinctions/divisions compatible with the soul's simplicity? This latter concern arises from the premise that if something is distinct, it has parts, and therefore it is not simple. Further, I present Suárez's main arguments for the intensional analysis of 'rational soul' in particular.

Let us see first (in Figure 1 below) an over simplified but basically correct picture of Suárez’s mapping of the human soul.
Figure 1
Suarez's Structure of a Human Soul
Like Aristotle, Suárez concedes three mayor distinctions in the soul, that is, vegetative, sensorial, and rational. However, he insists that this is a distinction of reason, not a real distinction of separability.\footnote{A distinction of reason for Suárez is the same as mental distinction. This sort of distinction does not formally and actually intervene between the things designated as distinct, as they exist in themselves, but only as they exist in our ideas, from which they receive some denomination. Mental distinctions, according to Suárez are basically of two kinds. One, which has no foundation in reality, and is called a distinction of the reasoning reason (\textit{distinctio rationis ratiocinantis}), because it arises exclusively from the reflexion and activity of the intellect. The reasoning reason distinction can be either quasi extrinsic (\textit{quasi extrinsece}) and it intervenes between extremes or entities absolutely of reason (\textit{entia rationis}); or it can be intrinsic, which is a distinction conceived and created by the mind. According to Suárez, this is the authentic mental distinction. The other mental distinction, for Suárez, which does have a foundation in reality, is called a distinction of the reasoned reason (\textit{distinctio rationis ratiocinatae}). According to him, in this latter mental distinction various degrees are discernible. So, when the distinction has a foundation in reality, and is the result of several inadequate concepts, it can be called a formal distinction; it is so called, Suárez says referring to Scotus formal distinction, because in it there are conceived diverse definitions and formal reasons (\textit{quia diversae definitiones seu rationes formales ibi concipiuntur}). Examples of formal distinctions which are distinctions \textit{ex natura rei} but \textit{non reales} (i.e., virtual) are: existence and essence, nature and supposition, quantity and substance, and that Peter is the same as himself. This formal distinction is in turn divided either in mutual (\textit{mutua}) as between animal and rational, or in not mutual (\textit{non mutua}) as that between animal and man. Another kind of distinction is the essential distinction which is grasped by mental perception. There can be real, and mental essential distinctions. In an essential distinction the extremes can be compared according to various aspects. Suárez's gives the following examples of essential distinction: man and horse, being and substance, whole and part, differentia and species, and between co-parts such as animal and rational. The last sort of distinction that Suárez mentions is the potential distinction (\textit{distinctionem potentiale}) which is a real sort of distinction, as that given between the parts of the continuous (\textit{partes continui}).}

Besides the mental kind of distinctions, Suárez admits the real distinction between thing and thing (i.e., when one thing is not the other); this can be positive real as for instance (i) between two supposita, and between accidents that inhere in distinct supposita, i.e., between really distinct things not united to one another, or (ii)
Ultimately, in effect, he argues for the ‘unity’ of man’s soul and holds, on the one hand, that

one and unique soul is in man the principle of understanding, feeling and vegetating. (De Anima, d. 2, q. 5, n. 4, p. 322).

On the other hand, given that soul is the principle of vital activity, it needs operative faculties (potentii operativis) to perform its acts. These, for Aristotle, were five: nutritive, sensorial, appetitive, locomotive, and intellective. But Suárez reduces them to three genera of faculties corresponding to the three souls, namely, the vegetative genus of faculties, the cognitive genus which refers to the intellective and sensorial, and the appetitive genus which refers to the rational, as well as the sensorial faculties (De Anima, d. 3, q 2, n 35, p.114)\textsuperscript{115}. They are adapted to the

between matter and form, i.e. between really distinct things that are united to one another. It can also be negative real either between an entity and a non entity, or between non entities as for instance darkness and blindness.

Furthermore, Suárez admits the distinction that he calls ‘distinction from the nature of the case’ or modal distinction which intervenes invariably between a thing and its mode. The modal distinction is a "real" distinction in the sense that it is truly verified in reality, and it is not merely an extrinsic denomination of the intellect. For Suárez modes are modally distinct from things. So, for instance, the inherence of quantity is called the mode of quantity for it affects quantity, and is modally distinct from the material substance. This mode is by the nature of the case actually distinct from the thing it modifies (this means that it is found in things themselves), yet this mode is not properly distinct from the subject it modifies. Thus a modal distinction is a minor (in the sense that it is a less evident) distinction than a real distinction between thing from thing, but a major distinction than the mental distinction of the reasoning reason sort, and also major than most of the cases of formal distinctions which are not real but rather virtual.\textsuperscript{(Cf.Disp.Met., d.7, s.1)}

\textsuperscript{115} Suárez considers that ‘appetite does not constitute a special mode of life, since it is never found apart from the sensitive’. In fact, according to Aristotle’s On the Soul, 433 b, 434 a, whatever feels has appetite. On the other hand, the sensitive and locomotive are embraced by the same essential degree (De Anima, d. 2, q. 6, n. 14, p. 354).
perfect functioning or complete constitution of the living things. Besides, although they get their formal specification (distinction) from diverse objects\textsuperscript{116}, all of them originate (\textit{sunt dimanate}) from just one and the same principle.(d. 3, q. 3, n. 15, p. 139)

While the first claim is warranted by two ways of understanding the distinctions of the soul, and by an argument from experience; the second claim presupposes an 'essential intrinsic connection' and a particular unity in the soul.

Regarding the distinctions in the soul, Suárez gives two accounts of it; one, which reminds us of Leibniz's notion of 'God's complete concepts', i.e., according to its 'formal complete concept' (\textit{integra rationis formalis}); and another, according to the proper constituent of each one (\textit{proprium constitutivum uniuscuiusque}).

If considered according to its 'formal complete concept', it is a distinction of degrees\textsuperscript{117}. In this way in man's case the vegetative, sensorial and rational are ordered degrees, one perfecting, helping the other, and all constituting one subsistent subject. Therefore, all (the souls, so to speak) are included in the same complete concept of soul.

\textsuperscript{116} This means that faculties are specified by their objects. In Suárez's words 'all that which the faculty receives is in order to get adapted (\textit{coaptata}) to the function; operating on such determinate objects [...] thereby it is said that it is specified by the object, and that its essence consists of being ordained to it' (d. 3, q. 2, n. 8). Objects like truth, entity or God not only specify different faculties, but also their unity should be sought in them (Ibid. n. 9, 10, 11).

\textsuperscript{117} It is understood that such degrees behave as genus and specie in a relation of superior to inferior, and one is included in the other (\textit{De Anima}, d. 2, q. 6, p. 340).
Considered strictly or according to the latter mode, the division may have two senses. The first is a division of soul according to its activities. So understood, 'vegetative soul' means 'soul adapted to the vegetative activities', as it is the soul of plants; 'sensitive soul' means 'soul adapted to the animals' activities', and 'rational soul' means 'soul of man and his own vital activities'. In this division each soul is distinct and none is predicated from the other. Suárez discards this division because it is useless to the distinction between souls themselves.

In the second strict sense, the division is between the vegetative soul in general, the sensory soul in general, and the rational soul in general. In this account, souls do not distinguish themselves as complete distinct forms, but formally by their precise concepts, so that one may be included in the complete concept of the other. Suárez explains: 'Living thing' may be divided in plant, animal, and man, so that, each member of the division could be distinguished according to its precise constituents. The same could be done with 'soul'. Suárez considers this account of distinction of the soul more adequate than the former, and also sufficient. (d. 2, q. 6, n. 9, 10). This account seems to agree not exactly with a real or a modal distinction between the souls, but rather with a formal-mutual kind of distinction that Suárez includes within the mental rationis ratiocinatae kind of distinction. Accordingly Suárez would say that the soul has one essence and real entity, so its distinctions arise not entirely by the sheer operation of our mind, but rather from the state of affairs offered by the soul itself on which the intellect is reflecting. On the other hand, the distinction between souls arises from inadequate concepts of one and the same
Although the same soul is grasped in each particular concept (of the vegetative or sensorial souls), it is still not the case that the whole reality contained in the soul is adequately represented, nor its entire essence exhausted by those concepts. This seems to lead Suárez to posit a complete concept of the soul. (See n.114)

Another argument for the unity of the soul rests on experience. It rests on the harmony found between actions and faculties or even between different grades of human souls. So, he writes:

There could not be an harmony so perfect, if there would not exist just one principal principle and just one soul that acted through the other. We experience that the action of one faculty blunts the action of another faculty even when they belong to the same grade of soul. For instance, when some one focuses his attention for awhile in an intellectual activity, his sensitive and digestive functions get hindered [...] these phenomena indicate that they originate from one and the same soul\(^{118}\) (De Anima, d. 2, q. 5, n. 5, p. 328)(emphasis added)

On the other hand, Suárez centers his analysis of the faculties of the soul in general around three questions of Disputation three. The first question, and the only one which concerns us at this point, raises the extensive scholastic controversy on whether the faculties of the soul are distinct from its essence\(^{119}\).

\(^{118}\) This proof, Suárez refers, was developed by Valles in Controversiarium, b. IV, last ch.; o. c. f 77.

\(^{119}\) The second disputed question of Disp. III discusses whether the faculties are distinct from their acts and objects. Here the interesting topics are how faculties get specified and how acts are specified. The solution to these issues encompasses Suárez's metaphysics of action wherein he introduces the terms immanent and transient action, against St. Thomas's position. The third question addresses the order and connection between faculties. The question is: 'Whether the soul's faculties flow (fluant) from soul and if they are sustained in it?'. Of these questions, the first
He acknowledges that a positive answer to this question leads to a rejection of Ockham's razor, to make the soul the immediate principle of operations and to reduce either soul or faculties. But above all, he wants to point out, that in the scholastic tradition there is nothing certain about this issue.

He goes on to examine four varieties of opinions. The first, refers to the group of philosophers that Suárez calls *Nominales* -Gregorius, Marsilius, Albert of Saxony and Buridan-; they hold a sort of radical reductionism, i.e., that soul is its own faculties, its own intellect, etc. The second view, held by Duns Scotus, Gabriel Biel, and Thomas of Garbus, is that there is a formal but not a real distinction between them. The third opinion belongs to St. Bonaventure and Durandus of St. Pourçain.

For them the vegetative faculties and soul itself are not really distinct, but the sensitive and intellective faculties are. The fourth view corresponds to St. Thomas, viz., that the faculties of the soul are really distinct from it (q. 77, a 1, q. 54, a 3).

Suárez disagrees with the first, third, and even as he presents compelling reasons in favor of Scotus' formal distinction (Cf. *De Anima*, d. 3, q. 1, n. 10-17, pp. 66-74), he seems to adopt the established view of St. Thomas which he considers to be inferred
by induction with a high degree of probability (Ibid. n.14). Suárez’s premisses in support of the fourth view are at least two:

(P1) In creatures, acts and faculties\textsuperscript{120} (interchanged below with accidental capacities (\textit{accidentales virtutes}) are accidents really distinct from forms.

(P2) According to the scale of being, to assert a perfect unity and simplicity in the creature’s faculty, essence, and activity would imply certain illimitability\textsuperscript{121}.

In regard to (P1), it might be said, Suárez argues, that ‘faculty and act belong to the same genus’\textsuperscript{122}, if considered according to their formal concepts, but not if they are considered according to their own entities (\textit{De Anima}, d. 3, q. 1, n. 9, p. 66).

That is, the active faculty, i. e., the faculty which is primarily and essentially ordained to act, belongs to the same genus as its act, intensionally speaking. Now, ontologically, act is in itself a quality. So, Suárez claims, intellect insofar as faculty belongs to the same genus as an act of intellection. However, what the intellect is (receptive faculty) may belong to the genus of substance (Ibid. n. 9, p.66). In this sense, Suárez, could have held that it is not ontologically or extensionally distinct from soul. For, if act is quality, and faculty and soul are substance, this yields a real distinction

\textsuperscript{120} The extension of the term ‘faculty’ (\textit{potentia}) embraces that of (1) aptitude (\textit{aptitudinem}) or capacity (\textit{capacitatem}); for instance, matter has capacity to quantitatively grow, and a quantum thing (\textit{res quantam}) has capacity to be divided. These sorts of faculties or aptitudes are not really distinct from the thing itself, they are passive; and (2) that of the operative faculties of a soul’s subject.

\textsuperscript{121} It may be of interest to notice here what F.W.J. Schelling (1989, p.187) observed regarding perfections in relation to Leibniz. He says that Leibniz explained that there had to appear diverse degrees of perfections and all types of limitations, since it was impossible that God granted all perfections to man (or any other created being) without making him God Himself.

\textsuperscript{122} In \textit{Metaphysics} b. XII, ch. 5, 1075, Aristotle speaks of ‘potency and actuality are identical’.
between act, on the one hand, and faculty/soul on the other; but it yields just a formal distinction between soul and faculty, particularly because he has also posited that: (1) form as source of activity is not distinct from faculty\textsuperscript{123}, and (2) soul is not faculty by the same ratio by which it is soul\textsuperscript{124}. Nevertheless, these reasons are not strong enough to openly support Scotus’s position. Suárez, at least seemingly, decides to develop a Cajetanian argument to turn those reasons against Scotus’s conclusion.

For Cajetan\textsuperscript{125} the formal concept of soul as such, and that of faculty as such not only are diverse, but also essentially opposite. For soul, by its essence (\textit{ex propria ratione}) belongs to (\textit{competit}) to act, and at the same time it possesses its perfection which it communicates to another; whereas faculty, by its nature, is ordained to an

\textsuperscript{123} In the sense that substance is not essentially and primarily ordained to accidental activity but rather to possess its own being and substantial perfection. It is therefore active. Similarly, soul is primarily and essentially ordained to inform, and consequently it is ordained to action (Ibid. n. 8, p. 64).

\textsuperscript{124} Following St. Thomas, Suárez argues, If it were, there would be one effect insofar as soul and insofar as faculty. Now, the soul’s effect insofar as soul is something which is continuously giving as constitutive of its esse: to animate (\textit{animare}). Then also the soul’s effect as faculty would be continuously giving. Yet, Suarez suggests that even so effects oppose each other that does not imply a real distinction. \textit{Animas secundum suam entitatem est actus; ergo non potest esse immediatum operationis principium; alias qui haberet in actu immediatum principium operandi; ergo semper actu operaretur. Quod est aperte falsum. Haec ratio concludit quidem animam non eo esse potentiam, quo est anima; alias idem esset effectus animae, sed anima, ut anima, semper habet suum effectum in actu in eo in quo est, scilicet animare; ergo etiam ut potentia haberet in actu suum effectu. Quocirca concludit ratio distinctionem formalem, tamen realem non videtur concludere, nam licet eadem entitas esset principium formale et effectivum, tamen secundum rationes formales diversas et posset in actum exire secundum unam, et non secundum aliam. (De Anima, d. 3, q. 1, n. 10, p.68)

\textsuperscript{125} In \textit{Comm.} in S. Th. D. Thomae, 1 p., q. 77, a.1, X.
ulterior perfection. Suárez’s assessment of this argument is that although it implies conflicting formal concepts for the soul and faculty, it does not imply a real distinction for them (d. 3, q. 1, n.11, p. 68). Now what makes the real distinction is stated by Suárez in the following passage:

In creatures [or limited beings], besides substance, nature has endowed them with accidental capacities (*accidentales virtutes*) to perform their characteristic activity. Fire has been endowed with heat to warm, the stone with gravity so it can move, etc. Although these capacities spring from substantial forms, nevertheless, such forms, by their imperfection just come along with the principal act, which is to give substantial esse, but they do not get to develop immediately the activity of the substantial subject itself. They were thus endowed with capacities to develop accidental activity. (*De Anima*, d. 3, q. 1, n. 14, p. 72).

In this passage Suárez is positing the existence of capacities as real special entities adjusted to complete the substantial perfection with multiple activities 126. This allows him to infer that faculties, even if not distinct from activity, are distinct from form, and so from soul. By the same token, this would yield the conclusion that soul is the principal principle, and source of activities, whereas faculties are proximate principles. This latter conclusion also satisfies (P2), given that according to the hierarchical order of beings, if soul were to perform immediately by itself all the operations, this would connote illimitability or absolute perfection on its part.

Can Suárez make coherent the propositions that assert: (1) a real distinction between the soul’s faculties and soul itself and (2) the traditional doctrine of the

---

126 He also posits the existence of perfective habits in soul. They are acquired and lost many times, their function is to perfect distinct faculties or the same one according to distinct acts. For Suarez this is also sign that faculties are distinct from Soul (Ibid. n. 15, p. 72).
soul's simplicity? From just looking at (P1), and specially (P2), this would seem farfetched. For in (P1) he has established that soul and faculties are not only intensionally, but also ontologically distinct. And (P2) suggests that in God alone there is a perfect unity and simplicity. However, one would want to know whether Suárez assumes that 'perfect unity', is entailed by real indistinction. Another thing to know is what kind of unity does belong to the soul which is spiritual sort of substance\textsuperscript{127}.

With regard to the first question, Suárez thinks that it is the other way around, namely that distinction follows from (individual) unity.\textsuperscript{128} For unity is naturally prior to distinction from others. Besides, although for most theologians the ultimate test to determine the simplicity of the soul was to see whether God can separate the soul's faculties from the soul itself, given that if it were possible, it would be, above all, because they are really distinct! For Suárez, however, there is no contradiction in asserting the opposite, with the consequence that such a creature would be of great perfection; nor does he think that the test employed by the theologians is conclusive. He mentions cases such as the relation and its terms, or matter and form, which, although distinct, cannot be taken apart; the reason for this is that there is an intrinsic connection between them. And he mentions other cases such as

\textsuperscript{127} J. Gracia (1982) has made clear that Suarez distinguishes among different kinds of unities. He analyses Suarez's transcendental unity vs. individual unity, and mentions universal, material, formal, real unities, and the model sort of unity which is God's essential unity, yet he does not talk explicitly about the soul's sort of unity.

\textsuperscript{128} Cf. J. Gracia (1982)
whiteness and snow, or heat and fire, which also cannot be separated by natural means, they constitute typical examples of common accidents—which have an extrinsic cause.

In the case of faculties and essence, Suárez wants to say, like in the first examples, there is an essential intrinsic connection, but not one of dependency. And unlike the second examples, faculties are not common accidents, but properties (proprietates) which are "necessary" accidents flowing from the essence of the subject, i.e., they proceed from an essence and are essentially united to it (De Anima, d. 3, q. 3, n. 5).

Someone might say, however, that from real distinction and essential connection which is not of dependency, it is possible to infer separability of soul and faculties. In effect, just as St. Thomas129, Suárez finds it quite non contradictory to say that

[...] if the faculty [of intellect] should get apart from the soul the soul would still be intellective, not formally but radically, for it would still be the source from which the intellect springs (d. 3, q. 1, n. 22).

But our concern is with the question whether it is contradictory to assert that soul and faculties are really distinct and the soul still a simple entity. Ultimately, I believe, this would depend on how ‘simplicity’ is understood and whether ‘simplicity’ is convertible or coextensive with the sort of unity that Suárez attaches to soul and faculties. He has said that between them there is a sort of intimate unity of maximal degree (summa unio) (De Anoma, d. 3, q. 1, n. 20)

129 Cf. On Spiritual Creatures, last art., ad.; and q. 77, a. 8).
Now clearly we may conjecture that if 'unity', in Suárez's metaphysics, means 'indivisibility of being in itself' as well as 'transcendental unity' (TU), which is the most general notion of unity, and furthermore it means 'an attribute of being that adds to it a kind of privative negation of division'\textsuperscript{130}, whereas typically the term 'simple' means something that has no parts, and is thus indivisible- then these terms may have the same extension, that is, soul. The problem is that in Suárez's view 'TU' is coextensive with 'individual unity' (IU)\textsuperscript{131}, and for him every entity, -i.e., substantial forms, modes, composites, spiritual substances, accidents (except universals such as, 'human being', 'white', 'tall')- has IU, and God himself is the paradigmatic IU\textsuperscript{132}, however. His indivisibility is an essential IU.

Now, soul in itself has TU, as well as IU, but together with its faculties it has "summa unitas". For if it had an essential unity, this would go against (P2) above. The difference between God's essential unity and the soul's own unity may be explained in terms of the particular relationship with the faculties that the unity of the soul comprises.

\textsuperscript{130} Cf. J. Gracia (1982), p.11.

\textsuperscript{131} This is Suárez's more specialized notion of unity, according to Gracia. It is to be understood as 'incommunicability', that is, 'a negation of the sort of community proper to universals: an individual can not be divided into entities specifically the same as itself, while universals can'. Now if angels, purely spiritual beings, principles, and substantial forms are considered individual unities in that sense, i.e., not communicable to many suppositis, or not universals that can be instantiated, I think souls also should be included in the extension of such term.

\textsuperscript{132} God's nature, Suárez says, is one individual, since he is one in himself in such a way that it cannot be multiplied nor divided into several [beings] similar [to himself] (\textit{Disp. Met.}, d. 5, s. 1, n. 6).
Suárez holds that there is an essential intrinsic connection between soul and faculties. But what does this mean? It means that there exist a necessary connection between soul and faculties, but in the scholastic tradition there is no necessary connection without some sort of causality, that brings about such connection. Suárez, like St. Thomas, assigns not a formal, but an efficient causality to the soul with respect to faculties (De Anima, d. 3, q. 3, n. 7, 10, p. 130). But it is not just any efficient causality, but a sort of efficient causality by 'resultancy' (per resultantiam). This is the causality that an efficient cause exercises by the overflowing of its plenitude\textsuperscript{133}. That is, operative faculties are the kind of properties\textsuperscript{134} which are posterior to form but which have their origin in it.

As Suárez noted, the problem with Aquinas's account is that his view of causal efficacy between soul and faculties, or the dimanation (flowing) of faculties from soul would indicate a new action distinct from the one that creates soul, for it is separated in time and produces a new entity. From Suárez's perspective, the principal agent produces form with all the faculties that dimanate from it; so, when God creates soul it may be said that God con-creates the faculties (concreare potentias), so to speak (Ibid. n. 13, p. 134). And more importantly, the efficient causal resultancy that soul

\textsuperscript{133} Suárez's 'causal efficacy by resultancy' reminds us, on the one hand, on Heidegger's way of defining 'producere'; on the other hand, it seems to be the same mode of efficient causality that Spinoza attributed to Deus sive Natura. Sergio Rabade, (1991), has noticed that Suárez, like Spinoza, asserted that Deus ex necessitate naturae operatur (Disp. Met. 19, s.2, n.1).

\textsuperscript{134} Different from the kind of properties that dispositions are, i.e., properties within matter and naturally prior to form, not produced but just conserved by matter.
exercises upon faculties is an efficient dimanation (therefore an action) that naturally results from it. (Cf. *De Anima*, d. 3, q. 3, n.14, p. 136). It is thus possible to assert that it is just one action that produces the soul and co-produces its properties, in this case, its operative faculties. This for Suárez also indicates an essential unity in such action (Ibid. n. 12, p.132).

From all this, we understand that soul *per se* has TU, IU, and simplicity\(^{135}\), but in regard to its set of faculties it has an essential connection -i.e., the essence of the soul and the essence of properties are united in maximal degree. For it is essential to this kind of property to possess a certain union with the thing’s essence, and it is essential for the sort of causal efficacy by resultancy that holds between them. Nonetheless, it cannot be said that there is an essential unity between soul and faculties, but rather, as Suárez put it, that there is an ‘additive unity’ (*unum per aggregationem*). Because of this additive unity, we take it that the distinction between soul and faculties can not be eliminated, still the soul *per se* is indivisible and has no parts, therefore is simple. A contemporary argument taken from Mereological Essentialism by R. M. Chisholm, will clarify my last point, and support Suárez’s view. The argument can be put as follows:

> If a thing (faculty) is part of a unity (soul), then (soul) is necessarily such that (faculty) is part of (soul). From this principle it follows that, if (soul) is possibly such that it has no parts, then (soul) has no parts and is, therefore, simple\(^{136}\).

\(^{135}\) That intensionally differs from the other terms for it adds ‘not having parts’.

The above discussion together with Chisholm’s argument, which instead of a unity, conceives of a soul as a ‘whole’, will justify the soul’s simplicity, yet Suárez would add that this is not an absolute simplicity, given (P2) above. Thereby, Suárez has drawn formal, real distinctions, and conceived of a complete individual concept for the soul, but none of these argue for a divisible, compound sort of entity.

I shall turn now to the major grades or levels of soul, and to definitions and attributes that correspond to each of these levels according to Figure 1 above.

Vegetative Soul

1. By definition vegetative soul is a power (vis) and first potency (potentia prima) by which all the living things live. This also means that it is a certain energy ordained to conserve the living things.

2. Its proper vital activity is the same action of growing, generation, and nutrition. In this sense it is said either to be faculty or principle of nutrition and growth\(^{137}\).

3. It is the first principle of all, and ground of the rest of souls.

4. It is a genuine soul. For by itself it is sufficient to constitute a living thing. It is also a genuine form and first act in a body which is organic\(^{138}\).

5. All living things, that is, plants, animals, and men possess a vegetative soul.

---

\(^{137}\) The division of the vegetative faculty in nutritive, evolutive and generative is not a division of soul and distinct potencies; rather, it is a way to explain the proper acts of the vegetative soul, Suárez explains.

\(^{138}\) While Aristotle thought that the potencies of vegetative soul reside in the heart, and Galen put them in the liver, Suárez locates the nutritive capacity of the vegetative soul not in any concrete determinate member of the body, but diffuses it throughout all members that nourish themselves vitally, for instance, flesh, nerves, membranes, veins, bones, nails, and the like (De Anima, d. 4, q. 8, n. 4, p. 253).
6. The vegetative soul is separable from the sensitive and rational souls\(^\text{139}\).

7. The vegetative soul is material and extended. (d. 2, q. 5, n. 2, p. 321).

**Sensorial Soul**

1. By definition sensorial soul is the principle of sensation (or perception), and local movement\(^\text{140}\).

2. It is separable by itself from the rational soul, although not conversely.

3. The activity of the senses is intrinsically organic and corporeal, thereby the sensorial principle constitutes the class of beings that sense, superior to the class of beings that merely vegetate, and inferior to the class of beings that reason.

4. All beings endowed with some sensation participate in sensorial soul. Insofar as soul is sensorial man is constituted as animal (d. 2, q. 4).

5. The sensorial form is genuine soul for two reasons. (1) because this form requires a very complex and organic body, and it is sign of the soul's perfection that it has as many organs as it is seen in all animals (d. 2, q. 2, n. 4, p. 153); and (2) because

\(^{139}\) The reason is that 'although the specific degree is inseparable from the generic degree, nevertheless, the generic by itself is separable from the specific. Thus, the class of the bodily things is separable from the class of the living things. Thereby, the class of the vegetable things is a genus if compared with the class of the sensible things' (De Anima, d. 2, q. 1, n. 4, p. 145).

\(^{140}\) Although Aristotle in On the Soul 413a, lists four degrees of in the human living thing: vegetative, sensorial, locomotive, and intellective, so there would be four souls; Suárez takes that the terms 'vegetative', etc, may mean the essence of the living thing and its essential degrees, in such a sense there would be three degrees of the living, for the sensitive and locomotive are embraced within one and same essential degree see Figure 1 **. The proof for his claim is that 'when two potencies are mutually subordinated, they take root in the same principle'. This is the case with sense and locomotive potencies, since they strive for the same purpose, that is, to protect the life of living thing. This purpose would not be reached given that there is sense unless there is movement, and movement unless there is sense. [...] (De Anima, d. 2, q. 2, n. 10).
it would be surprising that the vegetative principle were a genuine soul, and not so the sensorial principle which is much more perfect.

6. From Suárez’s distinction between material and immaterial forms, we take it that he would classify the sensorial as well as vegetative souls as material forms. He calls a form material not insofar as it is composed of matter and form, but insofar as matter exercises certain causality in regard to it in view of the fact that it sustains it\footnote{Material form’ is said to exist not by itself, but rather to "inexist" (inexistat) in matter. In other words, the sensitive form depends on somatic affections. \textit{Unde de ratione materialis formae est quod a materia pendeat in esse, atque adeo quod non per se existat, sed inexistat materiae. Unde immaterialis forma dicitur non quae ex materia et forma non componitur -hoc enim commune est omnibus formis-, sed illa circa quam nullam causalitatem habet materia, et consequenter illa quae habet esse independence a materia. Unde esse immaterialuem et subsistentem vel idem sunt, vel sese consequuntur. (De Anima, d.2, q.3, n.2, p. 164).}}.

7. The sensorial soul knows \textit{sensibilia} such as \textit{materi}a through organic and corporal senses. Whereas the general sense knowledge occurs through bodily organs and by a material faculty (\textit{De Anima}, d. 2, q. 3, n. 12).

Rational Soul

1. By def. \( x \) is a rational soul (RS) iff:
   (i) \( x \) is intellective principle or mind, by which we understand \textit{(id quo intelligimus)}; (ii) \( x \) is incorporeal \textit{(incorporeum)}; (iii) \( x \) is subsistent \textit{(subsistens)}; and (iv) \( x \) is immortal \textit{(immortale)} (\textit{De Anima}, d.2, q.3)\footnote{The rationale for these clauses, with exception of clause (iv), will be given in the last part of this section, and constitute what we called the intensional analysis of RS.}.

2. Other derived attributes that Suárez attaches to the RS are its spirituality, immateriality, inextensibility, and separability from body (Cf. d. 2, q. 6, n. 1).

3. One of the RS’s faculties is the intellect or cognitive faculty. Suárez uses both terms interchangeably. The cognitive faculty, in turn is genus of the intellective and
sensorial (d. 3, q. 2, n.13, p. 97). Through this latter it is connected with the rational appetite or will (voluntas), however, the will's genus is the appetitive faculty which is subjected to the sensorial soul.

4. The cognitive faculty is denominated intellect insofar as it understands and contemplates the object. It is also called mind (mens) (Cf. d. 2, q. 4, n. 10). But the same faculty is called reason insofar as it thinks, makes judgements, and inferences (discurrit). (De Anima, d. 12, q. 2, n. 12, p. 400). In general, for Suárez, the intellect's activities are: apprehension, judgement, composing, dividing, discerning, thinking, producing the acts of opinion, knowledge, and error (d. 5, q. 3, n. 4, p. 349).^143

5. Between the cognitive and appetitive faculties (specially intellect and will) of the RS, there is special causal order. It is said that 'because the RS is cognitive, thereby it is appetitive'. Here the term 'because' for Suárez, does not mean a true efficient causality, but rather a certain metaphysical causality. According to this, if one thing is posited, the other one follows. That is, the appetitive faculty originates (radix)^144 from the cognitive faculty, in the sense that appetite follows upon the knowledge of the object. That is why it is said that the origin of love is knowledge (d. 3, q. 3, n. 19, p.149)^145.

---

^143 in intellectu impossibile est intelligire illum modum, nam intellectus apprehendit et iudicat componit et discurrit, elicit actum [opinionis], scientiae, erroris, etc. (De Anima, d.5, q.3, p.348).

^144 Inter potentias cognoscitivas et appetitivas apparet quidam specialis ordo, nam radix amoris est cognitio, et ita radix et causa appetitivae videtur esse potentia cognoscitiva.

Unde haec est proprissima demonstratio: "quia est cognoscentivus, ideo est appetitivus", ubi ily "quia" non potest dicere aliam causalitatem, nisi illum qua unum ex alio oritur.

Sed dicendum, quod nec inter potentias cognoscitivas et appetitibiles est propria causalitas effectiva, sed est quaedam casualitas metaes physica, in qua uno posito sequitur aliud, quia est necesse as positionem illius, non quia sit propria causa eius, sicut ex rationalitate sequitur admiratio, et ex admiratione risus, non quia potentiae istae sese efficiant, sed quia una posita sequitur alia, quia actus unius deservit aliquo modo ad actum alterius. Et haec causalitas sufficit ad demonstrationem, / non quia una sit causa [effectiva] alterius, sed quia sese consequuntur. (De Anima, d.3, q.3, n.22, pp.148-150).

^145 Suarez's necessary conditions for metaphysical causation between the cognitive faculty (CF) and the appetitive faculty (AF) would be:
(1) Posited the CF, there follows the AF.
(2) the CF is required to the AF's occurrence.
6. The RS's activity is spiritual and not produced by some bodily organ; Suárez's main argument for this contention is the following: the faculty of such activity must also be non-organic, i.e., not grounded in body as instrument of its activity; because the faculty is proportional to the action, since it is adjusted to action as its end and also because activity is received by the faculty as in a subject. Now, it is impossible that a material faculty can produce a spiritual act; in turn it is impossible that a spiritual act had as a subject a bodily faculty. But if the faculty is spiritual, also the form of such faculty must be spiritual. Because the faculty is to the form as operative virtus, that is why it must be of the same order, thus an spiritual virtus and a material principle are not compatible. Furthermore, if the activity of our soul is spiritual, the faculty is spiritual too; and if the faculty is spiritual, the substantial principle is spiritual too, because activity follows upon the faculty and the faculty follows upon nature.¹⁴⁶

This is one of the most fundamental working theses behind Suarez's conception of the RS. It starts out from the presupposition that we can not know how our soul is in se, and so we can not produce an a priori proof for it. It need be appealed, then, to the soul's activities that we experience in ourselves. So if we know how the activity is, we will infer the character of the potency, and from the potency we might infer the nature of the principle in which the potency originates.

He sets out to prove with ten arguments that the activity of intellect is independent from matter. Three of them are the more significant ones:

The first invokes epistemic reasons. It says, that if intellect were an organic faculty it would be contained in the domain of senses, and it would not be distinct from them. But the consequence is false. This is so because the notion of general sensitive knowledge implies the notion that it occurs through a bodily organ and through a material faculty, all of which should belong to intellect if it were an organic faculty. The minor is clear, since it is evident that in reality there is a certain scale of things that know, above the scale of things that feel. Thus, God and intellect know, but not with sensitive knowledge, but with a more eminent (elevator) sort of knowledge, which consists of a knowledge realized without bodily organs. Moreover the adequate object of our intellective knowledge is all that is knowable, and all that

¹⁴⁶ [..] impossibile autem est quod potentia materialis eliciat actum spiritualem; impossibili est etiam quod actus spiritualis subjiciatur in potentia corporea; si autem potentia est spiritualis, etiam forma, cuius est potentia, debet esse spirituales. Datur enim potentia formae tamquam virtus ad operandum, et ideo debet esse proportionata illi, et eiusdem ordinis; virtus autem spiritualis et principium materiale non conveniunt. (De Anima, d. 2, q. 3, n. 7, p. 171)
participates in the notion of being, true or fictitious (*De Anima*, d. 2, q. 3, n. 12, p. 179).

The second argument is based on the self-reflective capacity of our intellect, this argument is discussed below.

A third argument is grounded on the nature of will. This, Suárez says, has completely free acts; the acts totally independent from any natural agents (*liberrimos*), thereby it can not be determined either by heavens or by any other created agent. Then such an act must be spiritual. Since there is no material action that can not be prevented by a material agent; as the sense appetite which easily turns here and there, given that when it is affected by pain, it hates and flees; while when it is delighted (*delectatur*), it loves and gets closer. On the contrary, the will is independent, because it can hate delightful things for the body, and it is not compelled either to love any object, even if the object is most persuasive, or to hate even if the object is most sad (*tristi*). Then, all this argues in favor of the immateriality of the faculty. (*De Anima*, d. 2, q. 3, n. 18, pp. 184, 186).^{147}

7. RS with its specific features applies just to human beings, for man is essentially intellective.

8. The intellective principle of man is his authentical soul. This means that it is an authentical informant form^{148}.

9. RS knows *materialia* and *intelligibilia* in the same manner, i.e., in an immaterial way^{149}.

---

^{147} These arguments, according to Suárez, were inspired by Dionysius' *De caelesti hierarchia*, ch. 11, and St. Thomas' *Contra Genies* 2, ch. 49.

^{148} In Suárez's view, 'intellective' applies either to a faculty or to man. In an absolute or strict sense, it means faculty or soul subjected to the intellective faculty. Under this aspect it is not necessarily a form of a body, since intellect and the understanding activity is independent from body (d. 2, q. 3, n. 43). In addition, in this resides the difference with the sensitive principle as such. This latter is but informant form of a body, while the intellective principle considered absolutely continues being that which it is without necessity of a body, as it is in the case of angels.

In another broader sense 'intellective' applies to human beings, talking of the substance of them; it is true that RS is form and act of the body (*De Anima*, d. 2, q. 4, n. 8). From these distinctions, it is said that the rational soul is a type of form that informs a body, but is independent in its being from that body. Thus, Suarez comes to hold that our kind of soul is intermediate (Cf. Ibid. p. 65).

^{149} Two arguments support this thesis:
The Intension of 'Rational Soul'

The formula of 'rational soul', given in (p.93) above, corresponds to an intensional definition of Suárez's notion of rational soul (RS). It is based on Suárez's third question of the second Disputation, viz., 'Whether the intellective human principle is something incorporeal, subsistent and immortal?' His positive answer to this question suggests an intensional analysis of RS.

To assert, however, condition (i) in that formula, i.e., that RS is intellective principle, by which we understand, is, to say the least, ambiguous. In effect, in Suárez's own philosophical psychology, it has two meanings, a strict sense and a broad sense. When it means the faculty or soul insofar as it is subject of the cognitive faculty, it is considered strictly in its being, and as such, it is not form of any body. For it keeps being what it is without requiring a body (just as in the case of angels). Moreover, the RS, the intellective principle, or intellect (i.e., faculty of), considered absolutely in itself, is independent from body in its actual existence, because,

First, our intellect knows spiritual entities (spiritualia) through a spiritual act. Although an angel's intellect can directly and intuitively know spiritual things, our own intellect cannot directly and intuitively capture spiritual things because of its connection with senses; nevertheless, it ascends from the material things to the immaterial ones by forming concepts of the same spiritual things. This shows that the faculty from which this activity proceeds is of the same order as that to which the angelic faculty belongs.

Second, our intellect knows materia in a spiritual way. Somehow it spiritualizes them, abstracting them from place, time, incorruptibility, and from all the sensible accidents, in order to contemplate the naked nature in the universal. This activity manifests an abstraction and independence similar to the same faculty which exercises it; and thus, it shows its spirituality (De Anima, d. 2, q. 3, n. 12, 13).
according to Suárez, the intellective activity is spiritual, not realized by bodily organs (d.2, q.3, n.7). On the one hand, intellection, under this aspect does not need body either as its subject, or as its organ, (but does not need it as mean to received species). On the other hand, such spiritual activity is given in a spiritual subject. This means that the form itself in which faculty and activities originate, is spiritual.

But, 'intellective principle', may also mean (first) act; not as a pilot in his ship, -Suárez would agree with Descartes in this\(^{150}\) but, as he explicitly argued, as informant form. So, in a broader sense, when 'intellective principle' is predicated of human beings, it is also act or informant form of a body. To prove that the intellective principle is true form of body, Suárez appeals to signs obtained from experience, for instance, he says,

> We have experience of being ourselves as the ones that understand. My intellection is my vital action, as the act of seeing, etc. Thus, the principle of that intellection is a true form. It is my soul. (d.2, q.4, n.4)(emphasis added).

Another argument refers to our way of understanding:

> We have experience that our intellection depends, some how, on the senses. If the body is exhausted and the senses injured, our soul cannot understand or else it understands with difficulty (Ibid.)

With these passages, Suárez wants to show, first, that we experience in ourselves the intellective activity (Cf. also d.2, q.3, n.12); and second, that the

\(^{150}\) There are two alternatives in which soul might be act, according to Aristotle, viz., in the manner of a pilot in his ship or in the manner of form. Descartes, in the last paragraph of Part V of the Discourse on the Method, finds the first alternative insufficient.
intellective principle is not a complete substance, absolutely independent from body, for it depends on it, at least in the sense of being its form.

On the other hand, it has been said that intellect is a spiritual faculty, given in a spiritual subject; but what is really interesting is that Suárez grounds his thesis of spirituality on the self-reflexive capacity of our intellect. The thesis is proven, he writes, because,

[...] the intellect reflects on its acts. This reflexion is shown when the intellect conceives something, and then it conceives that it has conceived, and deems and measures with what kind of certainty and how it conceived, and if necessary it reflects for second or third time on its reflective acts. But this exceeds the powers of a material being[...]. Besides, matter prevents that things operate on themselves. Therefore, that reflecting on itself argues in favor of immateriality.¹⁵¹

That the intellective principle, and the intellective activity are spiritual is warranted, in part by the self-reflexive experience of our intellect. This experience, it has been already indicated, is experienced in ourselves. Without any doubt, this is a powerful and non trivial argument that also was used by Descartes to distinguish between soul and body¹⁵². On the other hand, it constitutes Suárez's motivation which allows him to propose that if we directly know our intellective activity, we
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¹⁵¹ Id ostenditur es reflexione intellectus, nam postquam intellectus concipit rem aliam, rursus concipit se concepisse, et considerat et mensurat, qua certitudine et modo illud cognovit; et si opus fuerit iterum atque iterum reflectit supra suos actus reflexos; hoc autem supra vires est rei materialis; ergo. (De Anima, d. 2, q. 3, n. 16, p. 182, 184)

¹⁵² In Principles of Philosophy, Part 1, 8, Descartes (1985) states, 'In this way we discover the distinction between soul and body [...] our knowledge of our thought is prior to, and more certain than, our knowledge of any corporeal thing [...]'. And by 'thoughts', he understands, 'everything which we are aware of as happening within us, in so far as we have awareness of it'.
could infer the nature, the properties of the operative faculties of soul as well as the principle that originates them, which it is not possible for us to know (i.e., to observe) in itself. This is the same point around which hinges the present debate on the existence of mind. In effect, some philosophers, e.g., D.M. Armstrong, reject the idea of a direct knowledge of our mental states, and, as Thomas Nagel notices,¹⁵³ he argues as if we could just know them by description. Clearly, then, this is the premiss that leads to an skepticism in regard to an inner principle or internal cause which originates the mental activity.

From Suárez’s perspective, however, there is a double way to conceive the RS or intellective principle. In the strict sense this principle is not as such informant form of body and can exist without body; but in a broader sense it is form of it and cannot exist without being naturally ordinate to body, and we have experience of this through the direct self-reflexive capacity of our intellective faculty. But Suárez insists, RS is not a form as if it were immersed in the body, or totally surrounded by body, that is why it may have a faculty which is not an act of body (d.2, q.4, n.22). Now, if RS is not a form immersed in nor surrounded by body, in what other way may it be? This question will be cleared out by answering another related one, that is, What are the proper features of human RS? We refer to the more relevant ones now, viz., ‘incorporeality’, and ‘subsistence’.

Incorporeal Status of Rational Soul

We may continue, thus, our intensional analysis of RS by inquiring What does it mean to attribute 'incorporeality' to the intellective principle? In Suárez's metaphysics, it means to attribute a non-physical property to an entity which 'is in' a physical body (in corpore), and more exactly in a determinate body.

Is there any problem in asserting that something incorporeal 'is in ' a determinate place? -Prima facie, it seems so. Above all, there seems to be a problem if, in the first place the term 'incorporeal' is considered, as it is by Suárez, to be intensionally equivalent to the conjunction of the following three terms: (i) 'immaterial', i.e., something that is independent and indeterminate by matter (d.2, q.3, n.10; q.7, n.14); (ii) 'inextensive', that is, something that refers to that which does not have either magnitude or quantity (d.2, q.7, n.2); and (iii) 'indivisible', i.e., something without parts, or something simple. And, in the second place, there seems to be a problem if the category of 'place' is strictly associated with beings that possess quantity, or even more, if it is considered as an axiom that 'incorporeal things are not in place' (incorporalia non esse in loco). Thus, How is it possible to posit that an incorporeal soul is in this body, or in the case of disembodied souls, in heaven, in limbo, or worse off still in hell? The difficulty would be solved, Suárez suggests subtly, if the attribution of place, here or there, to the spiritual things were explained in terms of the meaning of 'being-in' (De Anima, d.14, q.2, n.10).
Suárez holds that the features of the *ubi* of spiritual things are not identical to *ubi* of corporal things, although there is a certain symmetry between them. The symmetry seems to be manifest in the union existing between the located being (*locatum*) and place (*locus*) ([d.14, q.2, n.3](#)). Therefore, the important question is to determine what type of connection has the RS with place. Clearly, it does not relate to place by occupying the space in which it is, nor by being circumscribed to it. Its connection with place, Suárez posits straightforwardly, is a certain kind of presence (Ibid. n.8). In the case of a soul *in corpore*, it is the kind of presence of a transient action as that of the body’s local motion.

Now, there would be two manners in which spiritual things move something corporal: by mean of a will, or by informing it. Angels move bodies with their wills. But human soul lacks the type of efficacious will characteristics of angels; therefore, it can not move bodies immediately. Thus the RS moves the body by informing it, and, besides, that is how it exists in connection with a bodily place ([d.14, q.2, n.4](#)). In case of a disembodied soul, it also relates to place, Suárez holds, by being present to it, more precisely, by being substantially present to it. This substantial presence would remain, Suárez adds, even if soul would lack any other relation to place, and to clarify this sort of presence he offers the following example:

If God deprived quantity from the water existing in a glass by suppressing its possibility of local motion, such a water, deprived from quantity, would lack local existence, for it would not occupy it, nonetheless, it would truly be there with substantial presence compenetrated with a possible body that would be introduced to it. (Ibid., n.8)
Whether or not Suárez's conception of 'substantial presence' is clear enough, he has indeed tried to provide a positive semantical analysis of 'being-in' a place for spiritual things. The first manner, that of 'being present in or constituting a physical body' reminds us of the manner in which other ontological categories had been said to be present (or absent) in physical objects. I am referring here to what some philosophers of the analytical tradition, call 'modal properties'. It is considered as an independent objective fact that such properties are possessed by physical objects. This is presumably what justifies the assertion of philosophers such as F. Mondadori and A. Morton, that 'modal properties are part of the physical workings of the world', although they can not be described by the basic terms of our language\textsuperscript{154}. By analogy, then, it would be legitimate to conjecture that if we directly experience certain intellective activities which, like modal properties, are not physical, it is because they are present in/con-forming a physical body, and are therefore a real part of the physical workings of the world. However, it is not known as an independent objective fact, how the RS might be possessed by a physical body; for if it were suggested to be "possessed" by a body, Suárez would reply that it would be an accident of it, inherent and sustained by it. Therefore, our next step is to investigate what does it mean to attribute 'subsistence' to the RS?

Subsistent Status of Rational Soul

In Suárez's framework, to attribute 'subsistence' to the RS means to assert without contradiction that the RS informs a physical body, and that it is a substance. To assert both propositions is possible, given that to say that substantial form might subsist in something other (matter/subject/body) does not mean that it is fixed or determined by it (d.2, q.7, n.14). The manner in which RS subsists, even united to body, is with a partial and spiritual subsistence. And 'to subsist' by definition is just 'to exist per se with independence of another that sustains it (alia sustentante)' (d.2, q.4, n.19).

Thus, for Suárez, the existing of a subsistent thing is not an existing in another as in an underlying substratum or subject, but rather an existing in another by actualizing it and perfecting it, constituting with it one nature. It may be remarked here, that the class of entities that subsist for Suárez is not identical to the class of things that subsist for Alexius Meinong, for whom only ideal objects subsist -such as numbers, judgements, or assumptions- but these in any case do not exist, nor consequently, are real. For Suárez, instead, entities subsist, for they have their own being (suum esse), and therefore, they exist in reality.

RS is subsistent, however, not just because it exists per se without being sustained by another in reality, but also because it is causally independent from matter. This means, on the one hand, that RS is created, with natural priority, before
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its union with matter. With this tenet Suárez adheres to the established scholastic
tradition, namely, that the human soul is not generated nor dimanates from matter
(d.2, q.4, n.32), matter is not its efficient cause; it could not be in any manner, since
soul is immaterial, as we noted before. Matter does not exercises any kind of
influence on RS, therefore, RS cannot be determined by matter, nor by heavenly
bodies, or other created agents in general. (De Anima, d.2, q.3, n.18)

From the Suarezian conceptual analysis of 'being-in' of the spiritual things,
and his statement of logically necessary conditions for the notion of subsistence, i.e.,
(i) to exist per se in reality without being sustained by matter, and (ii) to exist with
causal independence from matter, it is possible to draw the conclusion that what we
called the intensional analysis of RS makes intelligible and completes the initial
ontological account of it. The Suarezian concept of the human RS applies to a non-
physical entity, which may be present in, constituting a specifically determinate
composite, the substance of man, yet with an existence that is a subsistence of its
own, and that may be united by means of dispositions to the human body.

It is also possible to believe that Suárez's metaphysics is "triadistic", as we
noticed from the outset; for he admits three kinds of operations, and he talked of
three kinds of forms, the soul is considered an intermediate sort of form (which may
exist without body, but not without being apt to be in a body), and also because man
himself might be viewed as an intermediate sort of entity. Suárez himself explicitly
remarks that,

this is in truth an amazing fact, unknown to many philosophers, but
possible to the divine wisdom, and very adequate to the order of
nature, that besides just spiritual and just bodily things there be given a kind of intermediate thing between one and the other which embraces in itself both. (De Anima, d.2, q.4, n.15) (emphasis added)

It should also be noticed that from the crucial notion of subsistence, Suárez would be able to logically infer other much more controversial attributes of RS, such as its disembodied existence, and its incorruptibility. These are issues of great importance to metaphysicians of mind as well as to theologians, but which should be discussed on another occasion. However, we could not let pass unnoticed here that this notion of subsistence seems to insinuate itself as the ancestor of the notion of 'autonomy', to which many modern and contemporary authors have appealed in their description of our mental life. However, contrary to philosophers such as Kant, or Donald Davidson, Suárez would admit an autonomy not just in regard to the nomological order, but with more significance for his purposes, with regard to the material causal order.

In this chapter, I wished not so much to stress the historical influence of Suarezian language in modern or later times, an issue already explored by many scholars\(^{156}\), but rather to illustrate how fruitful Suárez's metaphysics might turn out to be in the realm of philosophy of psychology. In this realm, Suárez provided us with metaphysical evidence, along with conceptual analysis, and plausible logical argumentation to allow for the possibility of the real existence, rather than the mere invention, of a human RS. Of course, some will argue that the relevant thing is to

determine whether his metaphysical evidence is sufficient to prove the existence and peculiar characterization of the human RS.

Pursuing our discussion of Suárez further, we need to keep specially the Suarezian concept of subsistence in mind in order to examine the nature and modus operandi of one particular faculty of the soul, i.e., the will. The nature of that faculty is the central theme of our next chapter.
CHAPTER II
SUAREZ ON THE OPERATIONS OF THE WILL: METAPHYSICS

The metaphysical treatment of will implies a treatment of two basic general philosophical issues, viz., that of self-motion and that of efficient causality. The views adopted during High Scholasticism with respect to these matters were essentially based on Aristotle's discussions.

Suárez rejects Aristotle's definition of efficient cause, in *Metaphysics*, Book V, ch.2; and in *Physics*, Book II, ch.3. According to Suárez, Aristotle's definition of efficient cause is flawed and needs precise explanation. Suárez also reinterprets Aristotle's arguments against the possibility of self-motion, in *Physics*, III, 2, 202a 10-13, and in *On the Soul*, II, 5, 417a 3-9. Instead he proposes 'immanent action', and conceives of a 'potency which can be both active and passive in regard to itself', all this in favor of the existence of the self-motion of the will.

Our aim in this section is two-fold. First, to present Suárez's metaphysical treatment of the will as: (i) active-passive potency in respect to itself and (ii) as proximate efficient cause. Secondly, to show that Suárez's rejection of the Aristote-
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lian-Thomistic tradition regarding the division between potency and act is grounded in Duns Scotus’ conceptual background.

Two Aristotelian arguments were commonly invoked against the possibility of self-motion.

The first argument from *Phys.III*, 2, 202a 10-13 is:

the mover moves insofar as it is in act, and the mobile is moved insofar as it is in potency, as is evident from the definition of motion given in *Physics III*, 1201a 11-12. However, it is impossible that the same thing be at once in potency and in act with respect to the same and according to the same. Therefore, nothing can be moved by itself.

The second Aristotelian argument from *On the Soul* II, 5, 417a 3-9 is:

If something could move itself, then it would always act in such a way if it is a natural agent, because that action would not depend on anything external to the agents. And in virtue of this fact, the same thing is both the agent and the patient (*passum*). But it is clear that the consequent, namely ‘the agent would always act in such a way’ is false. Therefore, nothing can move itself.\(^{158}\)

The first argument from *Physics* establishes by the law of non-contradiction that it is impossible for one and the same thing to be at once in potency and act with respect to one and the same thing. Therefore, anything that moves must be moved by another.

The second argument from *On the Soul* applies to simple cases of apparent continuous self-motion.

\(^{158}\) These arguments are both discussed in Peter King (1991, forthcoming). King calls the first argument ‘the modal argument’, and the second one ‘the continuity argument’.
Suárez, in *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, d.29, rejects these arguments, presupposing his own account of efficient causality. In fact he maintains that,

the principle [...] ‘everything which is moved is moved by another’ has not yet been sufficiently demonstrated in every kind of motion or action; for there are many things which through virtual act seem to move themselves and to reduce themselves to formal act as can be seen in the appetite or will and in water which reduces itself to its pristine coldness.\(^{159}\)

It is interesting to note that Scotus, as Peter King points out\(^{160}\), also holds that the law of non-contradiction does not strictly apply to potency and act. In fact, in *Quaestiones Subtilissimae Super Libros Metaphysicorum Aristotelis*, IX, q.14, n.5 (hereafter *Q S M*), Scotus writes:

The proposition that nothing moves itself has no necessity, nor does its proof, [namely] that something would be in potency and in act in respect of the same, establish anything: for in this case the agent is not formally in act in the way in which the patient is formally in potency.

Although Scotus in this passage is arguing for the possibility of self-motion in general, it may be said that Suárez is advancing Scotus' position when Suárez asserts that there is no inconvenience in taking the being of a thing, under one aspect, to be both agent and patient if it is taken proportionally, viz., both in potency or both in act.\(^{161}\)

\(^{159}\) _Principium illud [...] omne quod movetur ab alio movetur ad hoc non esse satis demonstratum in omni genere motus vel actionis; nam multa sunt quae per actum virtualum videntur sese movere et reducere ad actum formalem ut in appetitu seu voluntate etinaqua reducende se ad pristinam frigiditatem* (*Disp. Met.*, d.29, s.1, n.7, p.247).


\(^{161}\) _[...] in hoc sensu non est inconveniens quod idem secundum idem constitutur agens et patients sicum proportione sumatur* (*Disp. Met.*, d.18, n.51, p.211).
From this step Suárez infers that there is no incompatibility in asserting that the same faculty may be constituted in agent and patient in act or in active and passive principle in potency if the respect is understood proportionally. An instance of such a faculty for Suarez is the will.

To establish his case for the self-motion of the will Suárez appeals to his accounts of efficient causality, (active-passive) potency, immanent act, and virtual act. In the following passage Suárez presents what we are going to call the Immanent Act.

**Argument;**

There is no contradiction, because the first act, does not formally include the second act but rather [it includes] the power to elicit the second act; this power can be possessed by the same faculty which is the receptive potency of such an act; and this is consonant with the nature of such an act, which is immanent. And this is what others say, namely, that one and the same faculty may be at the same time (simul) in virtual act and in formal potentiality.¹⁶²

To disclose Suárez's proposal about immanent-virtual act, which he recognizes to be endorsed by others (i.e., Scotus, Henry of Ghent, and Antonius Andreas), we need to discuss Suárez's underlying physical account of 'potency' and 'efficient cause'.

We turn to the former issue first.

¹⁶² *nulla est repugnantia, quia actus primus non includit formaliter secundum, sed virtutem ad eliciendum illum, quam potest habere eadem facultas quae est potentia receptiva eiusdem actus; est que hoc consentaneum naturae talis actus, cum sit immanens; et hoc est quod alii dicunt, eadem, scilicet, facultatem esse posse simul in actu virtuali et in potentia formalis* (Disp. Met., d.18, s.7, n.51, p.211).
1. The Will as Potency

According to Aristotle’s argument from *Physics* III, 2,202a, 10-13 (herefrom argument from *Phys.*), self motion is not possible, since the potency to move is an (active) potency, and by definition such potency cannot operate on itself.

In fact, if Aristotle’s definition of (active) potency in *Met.*, IX, 1, 1046a 19-28, is taken to be ‘the principle of transforming another’, then it is clear that by definition nothing can move itself.

Suárez, however, is not using that translation of Aristotle’s definition of active potency. He rather refers to *Met.* V, ch.12, where Aristotle defines active potency as ‘the principle of transforming another insofar as it is another’. This definition, for Suárez, does not rule out the possibility that an active potency operates on itself, and by itself if the definition is adequately understood.

In *Disp.Met.*, d.43, Suárez studies in depth the nature of potency and its relationship with act. He begins his discussion mentioning that Aristotle failed to give a common definition for potency which ontologically is a quality. Suárez’s purpose, thus, is to give generic as well as specific definitions of ‘potency’.

In S.3 of d.43, Suárez presents the following definition of potency we will call it Suárez’s definition of potency,
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163 In *V autem Met.* C.12, prius dividit potentiam in agentem et patientem, et deinde utramque definit, dicens potentiam activam esse principium transmutandi aliquid inquantum aliquid; passivam vero esse principium transmutandi ab alio (*Disp. Met.*, c.43, s.1, n.1, p.271).
(SDP) Potency = def. The proximate principle of some operation for which it [the potency] is, by its nature constituted and ordained.\textsuperscript{164}

As a quality the potency agrees with the other species. Suárez explains that in his generic definition, the locution 'proximate principle' expresses the ratio by which this kind of potency is quality, distinct from the substantial form, which is also principle of operation yet not proximate but principal. The term 'operation' refers to both action and reception, so it includes the active and passive potency.

The intention of the term 'potency' for Suárez is that of a 'capacity' in relationship to some act; either to an act which perfects and activates the potency, or to an act that proceeds from it by a mode of dimanation.

The generic definition of potency that Suárez elaborates, can be taken, in turn, in a two-fold sense: (i) one broad and transcendental; the other (ii) strict and predicamental.

The concept of 'transcendental potency' (TP) includes that of active force and any receptive capacity. In general TP means 'capacity' which can be considered in two ways: (1) as not real but rather logical potency which in turn includes: (i) objective potency corresponding to the logically possible; and (ii) metaphysical potency, which has objective reality just in the intellect, i.e., a simple entity of reason (ens rationis).

\textsuperscript{164} Potentia est principium proximum alicuis operationis ad quam natura sua institutum et ordinatum est.
TP as capacity can also be considered as (2) real physical potency, either active or passive. This is the potency of interest for the case of self-motion. The extension of the ‘TP’ as a capacity and real physical potency is:

(i) prime matter which is receptive potency of forms; (ii) substantial form, which is principal active principle; (iii) God as omnipotent being;\(^{165}\) (iv) accidental potencies; (v) habits as operative principles; and (vi) some qualities such as hot and cold which are proximate principles of activity.

Suárez takes it that Aristotle in *Met.* V, ch.2, did divide potency into active and passive, and also that he defined these as follows:

active potency = def. principle of transforming another insofar as it is other; and
passive potency = def. principle of being transformed by another.\(^{166}\)

However, according, to Suárez, the Aristotelian division of these potencies needs to be explained in detail on several points. First, is such division between active and passive sufficient; second, is the division between active and passive always a real distinction? Third, are these either (i) purely active potencies really distinct from the passive potencies; or (ii) purely passive potencies really distinct from the active potencies; or (iii) potencies that can be both active and passive?

\(^{165}\) That God is ‘pure act’ means, according to Suárez, that it lacks all potentiality, it is given by the name ‘act’ because it includes existence which is the first actuality of a thing. But it is not a formal acting act, rather the act which exists *in se* actually. It is called ‘pure’ to exclude the objective potency or any mode of existing just in potency (*Cf. Disp. Met.*, d.30, s.3, n.2, p.375).

\(^{166}\) *dicens potentiam activam esse principium transmutandi aliud in quantum aliud; passivam vero esse principium transmutandi ab alio.* (*Disp. Met.*, s.1, n.1, p.271)
Suárez, in the first place, claims that the distinction of potency into active and passive can be argued from the consent of the majority of philosophers, and from the *ratio* of the potency itself, because the potency as such, according to Suárez, is a certain first act with respect to the second act. However, he makes clear that the proximate immediate second act of any potency can only be either action or passion, thus the potency itself cannot be more than active or passive. The reason, for Suárez, is that an act can only regard the potency either as principle from which the act is, or in which and out of which the act is. The former constitutes action, the latter passion.  

In the second place, Suárez answers (ii) and (iii) together. He admits that there are some purely active potencies, which are essentially really distinct from the passive potencies, whether these latter are purely passive or not. The purely active potencies are *per se* and primarily ordered to act through transient actions. They are principle of such actions so they are complete in their order. Examples of purely active potencies are the active intellect, the active potency of the living being, and the magnet's potency. None of these potencies is receptive for they are not principles of immanent acts. The act that correspond to these active potencies is a "precedent"
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167 *Tamen reddi potest ratio, quia potentia ut sic, est quidam actus primus, qui dicit habitudinem ad secundum; sed actus secundus proximus et immediatus aliculius potentiae non est nisi at actio, aut passio; ergo etiam potentia tantum potest esset aut activa, aut passiva. Minor patet, quia duplex tantum habitudo actus ad potentiam intelligi potest, scilicet, ut ad principium a quo, vel in quo seu ex quo fit; ex prior constituit actionem, posterior passionem. (Disp. Met., d.43, s.1, n.6, p.273)*
(praecedens) in the mode of emanation or flowing. This means that it is either the action, the effect or end of the action.\textsuperscript{168}

With regard to the ontology of transeunt action Suárez differs from some traditional views, rejecting the position that the term ‘action’ taken in itself, means a real accident (either a quality or relation) that inheres in the agent and is really distinct from the active potency. As Freddoso explains\textsuperscript{169} Suárez agrees that an action is ‘nothing other than that special sort of dependency that an effect has on its efficient cause’\textsuperscript{170}. The causal dependency, however, can be taken in different ways, both in regard to the terms ‘action’ or ‘acting’ and in regard to the terms ‘passion’ or ‘being acted upon’. This is explained by Suárez in the following passage:

I maintain [...] that the same dependence and emanation of the form from the agent is called (i) a passion insofar as it affects the subject intrinsically and (ii) an action insofar as it denominates the agent itself as actually acting.\textsuperscript{171}

According to Suárez, thus, the relation of causal dependence exists by reference to the agent that is actually acting with respect to the patient. As such the relation of causal dependence is an entity distinct on the one hand from the agent, the agent’s causal power, and on the other hand from the patient and the form produced. Other scholastic views,

\textsuperscript{168} Disp. Met., d.43, s.5, n.5.

\textsuperscript{169} Cf. Freddoso (1991), pp. 570 - 71

\textsuperscript{170} Disp. Met., d.48, s.1, n.15

\textsuperscript{171} Disp. Met., d.49, s.1, n.8
Freddoso comments, insist that the relation of causal dependence, far from constituting the ontological reality of the action, is an additional reality which presupposes the existence of the action and which itself continues to exist after the completion of the action.

Now, Suárez also admits that there are purely passive capacities, such as matter in the genus of substance, and in a certain manner, quantity in regard to many bodily accidents. However, Suárez does not accept the existence of any quality solely constituted to receive either qualities or accidents. If a purely passive potency existed, then as quality it would be really distinct from the active potency. Therefore, he concludes that there are not purely passive potencies really distinct from the active potencies.

These are Suárez’s preliminary steps to unify the passive and the active into one entity. In regard to the question whether there is some potency that is active and passive at the same time, Suárez in disagreement with Aristotle but in apparent agreement with Scotus, does admit a potency which is neither purely active nor purely passive, but rather one which includes the rationes of both.

---

172 Suárez deems that natural qualities such as dispositions, e. g., humidity, dryness, diaphaneity, which rather inform matter to receive either the substantial form or accidents, are passive qualities, but not passive potencies. In fact, none is per se a primary passive potency. (Cf. Disp. Met., d.43, s.II, n,n 1-6, pp.279, 285)

173 *sine aliqua potentia activa simul et passiva* (Disp. Met., d.49, s.2, n.14, p.289).

According to King's interpretation of Scotus' (general) argument for self-motion, Scotus holds that it is possible that (i) something be active regarding A in the same way in which something else is active regarding A, and (ii) the same <thing> be passive regarding A just as something else is passive regarding A. Therefore, that thing in the ratio 'active' has itself as object in the ratio 'passive' just as much as <it has> something else <that is passive as its object>.\textsuperscript{175}

According to King, Scotus may be interpreted as asserting that it is possible for one and the same thing to have an active potency for \( \varphi \) and a passive potency for \( \varphi \). Therefore, it is possible for one and the same thing to be the passive per se object of its own actual causal potency.\textsuperscript{176}

In Suárez's case one and the same potency can be both active and passive at the same time in a two-fold way. First, with respect to diverse things, e.g., the passive intellect is active with respect to the act of understanding, and passive with respect to the active intellect; second with respect to itself, since one potency can have the

\textsuperscript{175} King (1991) refers to Scotus' (general) argument for self-motion as presented in Q S M, IX, q.14, n.4 (W.V VII, 584b-585a), pp.15-16.

\textsuperscript{176} Suárez seems to be conceiving the relationship between the potency and the object in a different way than Scotus does. Suárez asserts that every potency has an essential relationship to the object as well as to the operation, but in different ways: the potency looks to the object as an extrinsic end, so called \textit{finis qui} (or intended end); and the potency looks to the operation instead, as its intrinsic end, which is the \textit{finis quo} or \textit{consecutio}. Besides, these are not two distinct ends but rather two that integrate a unique end (\textit{[...] potentiam habere essentialem habitudinem ad obiectum et operationem, tamen diverso modo, nam obiectum respicit ut finem extrinsecum, qui dicitur "finis qui", operationem autem ut finem intrinsecum, qui est "finis quo", seu consecutio; qui non sunt duo fines, sed integrantes unum} (\textit{De Anima}, d.3, q.2, n.7, p.89).
power to elicit its act and yet be the principle of receiving the act it elicits. Is Suárez not applying here Scotus' premise namely, that it is possible for one and the same thing to have an active potency for \( \varphi \) (i.e., for eliciting the act) and a passive potency for \( \varphi \) (i.e., for receiving the elicited act)? However, Suárez is talking about the act and not about the object of the potency; since according to Suárez the object is always external.

The act that corresponds to the passive-active potency is the 'immanent act' (such an immanent act does not seem to appear in Scotus' context). Immanent acts are received in the same faculties which elicit them.

In another place, Suárez asserts that the active potency is a capacity to act or effect something; as such it is said of any force or active principle. Besides, as an active force it has a certain actuality. For this perspective, according to Suárez, it deserves the name of 'virtus' or 'faculty' rather than that of potency. The name of 'potency' instead is fitting because it is a faculty that it is not always in continual activity.

The potency, thus understood, can be a *virtus* eminently or virtually containing another act, and it can be formally actualizable through this act.

\[\text{Disp. Met., d.20, s.1, n.11.}\]
\[\text{Disp. Met., d.30, s.3, n.2.}\]
\[\text{[...rerum nihilominus est eamdem facultatem secundum rem esse simul potentiam activam et passivam respectu eiusdem actus et respectu suiipsius, quatenus eundem actum et recipit et elicit. Et ratio est quia illamet qualitas, quatenus habet actualem perfectionem talis speciei, potest esse virtus eminenter vel virtute continens aliquem actum, et potest esse formaliter actuabilis per eundem actum (Ibid., n.14, p.290).}\]
It should be noticed that Suárez seems to be using the term 'virtual' in the same sense that Scotus does it when he explains the sense in which the agent is in act. Scotus, according to King, writes:

any equivocal agent is in [modal act] with respect to its effect, not formally having a similar [modal] act (for then it would not be an equivocal agent), but virtually having [a similar modal act], namely because it formally has a more eminent [modal act].

Another remark against self-motion appears in Aristotle's *Met. V, 1*, 1046a 28-29, viz., 'nothing is acted upon by itself, insofar as it is naturally unified, for it is one thing and not another'. But Suárez takes it that one potency includes in a unified way the aspects of being active and passive; *per se* it is each. Suárez holds that there is no actual or *ex natura rei* distinction in such potency insofar as active or insofar as passive, for the quality includes essentially the *rationes* of both, none is separated from the other; and so this is a sign that in reality there is no distinction.

A typical instance of this mixed potency, according to Suárez, is the will, for the adequate function of the will is the production and reception of the act of willing; since production as well as reception are absolutely necessary for willing.

---

180 King (1991, n.39) is interpreting this passage from Q S M, IX, q.14, n.18 (W.V., VII, p,59, a.b), accordingly the meaning of 'virtual' can be formally understood thus:

To say that X 'virtually contains' φ, or that X is in 'virtual act' as regard to φ, is to say no more tha that X has the causal power to equivocally produce φ - that X has a certain causal power (*virtus*).

181 *Nam in re existimo nullam esse distinctionem actualem et ex natura rei inter potentiam illam ut activam et ut passivam, quia illa qualitas essesionaliter includit utramque rationem ita ut impossibile sit etiam de potentia Dei absoluta rem eillam conservari, quin utramque rationem simul habita, aut alteram ab altera separari; ergo signum est nullam esse distinctionem in re. Item quia illa entitas, verbi gratia, voluntas,
To the mixed Suarezian potencies there correspond immanent acts. In fact, Suárez’s case for the self-motion of the will includes the question about whether to each potency there corresponds its own act, and in what sense.\textsuperscript{182}

Suárez first points out that it is one thing to compare a thing in potency to a thing in act, and quite another to compare potency to act. The former compares one and the same thing insofar as possible to itself as actually existing; in this regard what is involved is the logical or objective potency. But here Suárez is considering the real physical potency, active and passive both as transcendental and predicamental.\textsuperscript{183}

Thus, Suárez asserts that to every potency, either active or passive, there corresponds its own act but in different ways. To the passive potency there always corresponds some formal act actuating and perfecting it; to the active potency as such on the other hand there corresponds no act that actuates it, but rather an action that emanates from it.

The act of the passive potency, for Suárez, can be considered according to two rationes distinct \textit{ex natura rei}. One \textit{ratio} is that of an actual passion, and another of a form \textit{in being}. Under each \textit{ratio} it is the formal act of the potency. The two \textit{rationes} are compared as becoming to being. It is crucial to understand how one and the same potency can reduce itself from potency to act.

\begin{flushright}
\textit{adaequate instituta est ad agendum et recipiendum actum volendi, quia utrumque est per se ac simpliciter necessarium ad volendum.}(Disp. Met., d.18, s.2, n.15, p.291).
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{182} Cf. Disp. Met., d.43, s.5, n.1, p.315.

\textsuperscript{183} Cf. Disp. Met., d.43, s.5, n.1, p.315.
Suárez in fact distinguishes two rationes in the passive potency; such rationes are distinct *ex natura rei*. As such they are involved in the reduction of the passive potency to act. Suárez wants to say that under both rationes the passive potency is formal act because under each ratio it is intrinsically united to the passive potency and it reduces the potency to act.\(^*\)

Suárez takes it that this is what Aristotle intended to be a definition of ‘movement’. In Suárez in fact, movement is the same as passion or the moved (*motum quod in re idem est quod passio*). Thus, according to Suárez, Aristotle referred to the movement as the act of the entity in potentiality (*motum [...] esse actum entis in potentia*), and not a potency that becomes an act. According to Suárez, Aristotle would not deny that one and the same potency could be actuated in two ways, insofar as these ways are ordered between each other. So Suárez concludes, where one thing is in virtue of another, there is only one thing, not two.\(^*\)

This is explained in terms of an analogy, namely, in the same way as becoming (*fieri*) is ordained to being (*esse*), so likewise the act or the activation of the passion is ordained to the act of form or informing act.\(^*\)

---

\(^{184}\) [*...] una est ratio actualis passionis, alia est ratio formae in facto esse. Quod enim hae duae rationes sint *ex natura rei distinctae*, et interveniant in reduzione potentiae passivae in actum (*Disp. Met.*, d.43, s.5, n.4, p.317).

\(^{185}\) *Unde Aristoteles, definiens motum (quod in re idem est quod passio), dicit esse actum entis potentia. [...] Neque repugat unam et eamdem potentiam duobus modis actuari, quia illi sunt inter se ordinati, et ubi est unum propter aliud, ibi est unum tantum* (*Disp. Met.*, d.43, s.5, n.4, p.317).

\(^{186}\) *Quocirca sicut fieri ordinatur ad esse [...] ita actus seu actuatio passionis ordinatur ad actum formae seu informationis* (*Ibid.*, p.317).
Suárez wants to hold that to each potency there corresponds an act proportionate to it, however, he also asserts that the act is always something in reality essentially and specifically distinct from the potency. The reasons are: first, because the relationship of the potency to its act is real. Secondly, and in particular, because the active potency is the efficient principle of its act.

It is true that efficiency occurs only between really distinct things. But the receptive potency is the material cause of its act, while the act is the formal cause of such potency which intrinsically effects it. Therefore such act and such potency are necessarily distinct in reality. Potency is separable from its act in reality itself; Suárez takes it that this is the sense that Aristotle should be interpreted in *Met.* VIII, ch.6, when he asserts that 'potency and act do not make many but one'. For Suárez Aristotle did not mean to say that it is one identical thing (*esse unum et idem*); but rather that they (viz., a passive potency and its act) compose one thing. This interpretation of Aristotle's text which corresponds to the version of the one cited above, i.e., 'nothing is acted upon by itself, insofar as it is naturally unified', allows Suárez to retain the unity of one thing, the potency, but at the same time also to retain a real distinction (between the passive potency and its act) required for true efficacy.

---

187 *Nam potentia est separabilis a suo actu in re ipsa; ergo distinguuntur in re. Quocirca cum Aristoteles VIII Met., c.6, ait potentiam et actum non facere multa, sed unum, non est sensus ipsa esse unum et idem, sed componere unum; loquitur enim de potentia receptiva et actu formali. Et eodem fere sensu ibidem ait, quod prius erat in potentia, postea esse in actu, non quia ipsamet potentia receptiva fiat actus, sed quia eadem quae prius carebat actu, postea sub illo constituitur (Disp. Met., d.43, s.5, n.11, p.321).*
The distinction between potency and its act, Suárez holds, is sometimes a real factual distinction, sometimes merely a modal one but it is always essential for potency and act to be distinguished in reality (secundum rem) and have diverse and opposite respects.\textsuperscript{188}

To determine when the distinction between the faculty and its act is real and when this distinction is merely modal we have to appeal to Suárez's own criterion for discerning various grades of distinction in things as he presented it in Disp. Met., d.7. There Suárez suggests that if the extremes of a distinction are actually distinct in the real order, each is a true thing having its own simple or composite entity, then we have a real distinction. But if one of the extremes of a distinction is a thing and the other is a mode of that thing, then we have a modal distinction.(Cf. Vollert's (1947, p.33 trans. of Disp. Met., d.7) Thus, the question is whether or not the act is an entity that of itself and in itself is something in the real order, in the sense that it does not intrinsically and essentially require to be always attached to something else, but is either incapable of union with another thing or at least cannot be united except through the mediation of another mode that it is naturally distinct from it.(Cf. Disp.Met., d.7, s.1, n.19). The problem, however, is that between potency and act either naturally or supernaturally, no separation has been affected, and still we perceive them to be distinct (as two qualities). Regarding this point, Suárez

\textsuperscript{188} Distinctionem hanc inter actum et potentiam non semper esse aequalem; nam interdum est proprie et in rigore reals, interdum sujicit modalis; nam etiam modus est actus per modum formae eius rei quam modificat, et potest etiam ab illa effective fieri (Ibid., n.12, p.321).
comments that the difficulty grows when we reflect that some things are inseparable even by God's absolute power, and yet are held to be really distinct. In view of this difficulty it may be said that Suárez would conclude that when the potency produces its act accidentally, i.e., the production terminates in something that is united and joined to the producing cause, then we lack a sufficient sign of real distinction. Accordingly, there will be not real but modal distinction between the potency and its immanent act. So still Suárez may claim true efficacy between the potency and act, because for him a modal distinction is not a mental distinction which has no foundation in reality, i.e., of the reasoning reason (distinctio rationis ratiocinantis) kind, but rather it is a certain actual distinction which is found in nature prior to any activity of the mind, in this sense a modal distinction is a "real" distinction because it is truly verified in reality; he also calls the modal distinction a 'distinction from the nature of the case' although he holds that it is not so "great" as the distinction between two altogether separable entities. (Cf. Vollert (1947), p.27)

The potency and the act do not belong necessarily to the same ontological category. Action\textsuperscript{189} as immediate act does not belong to the same category as its

\textsuperscript{189} In Suárez's metaphysics action and passion are modes of the same motion. In Suárez metaphysical world there are: real beings (or real substantial entities), mental entities, and modes. There will be as many distinctions as there are kinds of beings. Modes according to him (were already admitted by Durandus, In I, dist.30, q.2, n.15; and by Astudillo in De Generat., Book I, q.5, ad.1, and by Fonseca in Metaph., Book V, ch.6, q.6, s.2 ). (Cf. Disp. Met., d.7, s.1, n.19)

For Suárez modes are real and something positive which of themselves modify the very entities by conferring on them something that is over and above the complete essence as individual and as existing in nature. A mode, however, is not strictly a thing or an entity, because it must invariably be affixed to something else to which it is \textit{per se} and directly joined without the medium of another mode.
principle, which is either a substance or a quality. In case an active potency is called act will be of the same or of a different genus, depending on the agent; depending, in fact, on whether the agent is univocal or equivocal.

We have seen in this section how and why Suárez rejects the Aristotelian division between active and passive potency. He posits one kind of potency which includes the ratio of the active and of the passive. The same potency can be both active and passive even in regard to itself in the sense that one and the same potency can have the virtus to elicit its act and yet be the principle of receiving the same act. According to Suárez, Aristotle should be interpreted as conceiving an unified but integral potency. Such potency should not be thought of as a potency that becomes act, but rather as a (passive) potency which lacked act and later is constituted under formal (immanent) act. Suárez calls the act of the passive-active potency either

Examples of modes are the sitting which is joined to the sitter, the union to the things united. Suárez holds that modes are only modally distinct from things (Modos a rebus modaliter tantum distinctos). In support of this claim he presents the following argument that we call the Modal Distinction Argument:

P1 This mode (i.e., the one which is real but not a subsistent entity) is by the nature of the case actually distinct from the thing it modifies (this indicates that it is found in things themselves)

P2 Yet this mode is not properly distinct from the subject it modifies, as thing from thing

Therefore, This mode is distinct from the entity that modifies with a minor distinction than the major real distinction between thing and thing, and so most aptly called modal distinction (Cf. Ibid. n.20, p.27, and Vollert (1947), pp.31-2).

That P2 is true is justified by Suárez with two reasons. First, because a mode, considered in itself, is not properly an entity, hence it is not properly distinct as thing from thing. Secondly, because a mode necessarily includes conjunction with the thing of which it is mode. In this regard, for Suárez, a mode is unable by any power whatsoever to exist apart from the thing of which it is mode. Precisely this is a sign that the mode has some sort of identity with the thing it modifies (Cf. Ibid. pp.32-36).
immanent act, or following Scotus, virtual act. A very important instance of a potency that operates through immanent or virtual act is the will.

To investigate the nature of immanent virtual activity we need to look at Suárez's general account of efficient causality, but in particular Suárez's account of equivocal efficient causality. We turn to this discussion next.

2. The Will as Proximate Efficient Cause

In Disp. Met., d.17 Suárez treats the notion of efficient cause. He considers that Aristotle's definition of efficient cause (EC), that is, 'the first principle of transforming and rest'\(^{190}\) contains many difficulties, so it needs to have an adequate explanation.

Suárez first gives a broader definition of EC, thus:

Efficient cause = def. the essential \textit{per se} principle from which proceeds the first principle of motion, or it is an essential \textit{per se} principle by which is first produced the action.\(^{191}\)

Suárez proposes different kinds of EC, his distinctions amount to the extension of 'EC' which includes:

\(^{190}\) Suárez refers to Aristotle's definition of efficient cause as it appears in Met. V, ch.2, and in Physics II., ch.3. Suárez writes: \textit{causam efficientem in communi, definit dicens esse id unde primum principium est mutationis aut quietis. Quae definitio multa interpretatione et additione indiget ut ad verum sensu seducatur [...]} (Disp. Met., d.17, s.1, n.1, p.48).

\(^{191}\) \textit{causa efficientem esse principium per se unde est primum principium motus, dicendum erit casusam efficientem esse principium per se a quo primo est aut fit mutatio (Ibid).}
EC *per se*, i.e., that on which the effect directly depends according to that
proper being which it has in as much as it is an effect.

EC *per accidens* is not a true cause, it is called so because of either some
respect or similarity or union with a *per se* cause.

Physical EC is that which truly and really affects influence on the effect.

Moral EC. It is distinct from the *per se* physical or metaphysical cause that
operates naturally and necessarily. In another sense the moral cause is ab-
solutely distinct from the physical cause, because it does not truly produces,
in this sense it is a cause *per accident*, since it only has an attributed moral
effect.\(^{192}\)

Principal EC is that which flows into the very action by which the effect is
produced, by its own principle (even though secondary) power.

Instrumental EC is that which concurs to make an effect more noble than
itself and is beyond the measure of the perfection of the agent and the
action.\(^{193}\)

First EC is the agent's perfections and powers independent in acting.

Second EC is the agent's exercise of those perfections and powers, dependent
in acting, even if the agent acts through its own principal power.\(^{194}\)

Univocal EC, i.e., that which operating through the power of its form it
produces an effect similar to it,\(^{195}\) e.g., fire generates fire.

---

\(^{192}\) [*...] *causa moralis* [*...] *distinguetur a physica naturaliter ac necessario agente* [*...] 
*Alio vero modo sumitur causa moralis ut distinguatur omnino a physica, et dicitur de
illa causa quae per se non vere efficit, moraliter tamen ita se gerit ut ei imputetur
effectus; [*...] ita ut causa physica dicatur quae vere efficit, moralis quae tantum
imputative. Quo fit ut physice seu metaphysice haec considerando, diviso haec revocetur
ad priorem de causa per se et per accidentes.* (Disp. Met., d.17, s.2, n.6, p.59)

\(^{193}\) Ibid. n.16.

\(^{194}\) Ibid., n.20.

\(^{195}\) Ibid., n.21.
10  Equivocal EC produces an effect which is not similar to its own form.\textsuperscript{196}

The purpose of Suárez's classification of EC is to determine if every EC in order to operate must be really distinct from the subject that receives its causality. In \textit{Disp. Met.}, d.18, s.7, Suárez aims to prove that it is not necessary for an EC power to be really distinct from the recipient of its causality. So he can establish that a thing can reduce itself from potency to act (against the Aristotelian arguments).

Suárez's presuppositions are:

\textbf{P1}  It is not necessary that the agent be distinguished as supposit from the patient which receives.\textsuperscript{197}

\textbf{P2}  within a supposit the agent can be distinguished from the patient in various ways: (i) with respect to different integral parts, (ii) with respect to different substantial and essential parts; (iii) one is a faculty of acting, the other of receiving.\textsuperscript{198}

\textbf{P3}  Efficacy occurs by means of three different kinds of actions: (i) natural dimanation, (ii) physical and material movement (which is the genus of the transient actions, such as alteration, growth, local motion, and somehow the local motion of spiritual things); (iii) immanent actions of the sensitive appetite, intellect and will.\textsuperscript{199}

\textsuperscript{196} \textit{... alia vero est causa producens effectum alterius rationis, quam oportet esse nobiliorem effectu. (Disp. Met., d.17, s.1, n.21, p.75).}

\textsuperscript{197} \textit{Non esse necessarium agens distinguui supposito a passo recipiente (Disp. Met., d.18, s.7, n.6, p.175).}

\textsuperscript{198} Ibid., s.7, n.7, pp.175-176.

\textsuperscript{199} \textit{Variae actiones de quibus est quaestio [...] ergo primum numerari potest naturalis dimanatio seu resultantia; deinde motus physici ac materiales, qui ex genere suo actione transeunte perficiuntur [...] : alterationis, augmentationis et motus localis, [...] adiungi potest motus localis spiritualis rerum seipsam moventium (Ibid., s.7, n.8, p.176).}
Suárez examines each kind of action\textsuperscript{200}, but his direct concern are immanent actions (IA). In regard to IA, Suárez holds that in the EC of an immanent act it is not necessary either (i) that the principles-\textit{quo} of acting and receiving be always distinguished, nor (ii) that the principles-\textit{quo} be always distinguished.

The reason for claim (i) to be true is that IA is received in the very thing operating, so it is neither necessary that the active supposit be distinct from that which receives it, nor that it acts and receives according to diverse parts, since either often it has no diverse parts, or else the act is received into the potency which elicits it.

The reason for claim (ii) to be true is that the act remains in the eliciting potency, so nothing prohibits that there be no real distinction even in the proximate principle- \textit{quo} of acting and receiving.\textsuperscript{201} All immanent actions for Suárez belong

\textsuperscript{200} \textit{In natural dimanation} (\textit{resultantia naturalis}), the proximate efficient principle is not distinct from the recipient; rather the effect is reduced to an EC which is distinct from the patient. The proximate cause is not distinct. For example, in regard to the faculties of the soul as flowing from the soul. The soul is their principle, but it also receives them.

\textsuperscript{201} \textit{Prima pars huius assertionis est manifesta sequiturque ex ipsa ratione actionis immanentis; recipitur enim in ipso operante, et ideo necesse non est ut suppositum agens distinctum sit a recipiente, neque etiam ut secundum diversas partes agat et recipiat. Tum quia saepe non habet partes; tum etiam quia haec actio in eadem potentia recipitur a qua elicitur. Atque [...] secundae partes conclusionis; nam cum actio immanentis non solum in eodem supposito, sed etiam in eadem potentia elicente maneat, nil vetat quomirum etiam in proximo principio quo agente et recipiente illam, non inventatur in re distinctio.(Disp. Met., d.18, s.7, n.45, p.206).
either to knowledge or appetite. In the acts of sense knowledge or sense appetite the main principle-quo of acting is the soul and the principle of receiving is the body. In the acts of the intellect the main principle-quo of acting is only distinct by reason from that of receiving. In the cognitive acts, Suárez sustains, the proximate active principle is distinguished from the principle of receiving as the including is distinguished from the included (at includens et inclusum).

Regarding this, Suárez mentions one of his main reasons of disagreement with St. Thomas. In fact, in this discussion Suárez implicitly alludes to St. Thomas when he says that in the same substance there are distinct principles, given that the principle operates through the existence as act and it is received by the essence as potency. In fact, for Suárez the doctrine of the distinction in re between existence and essence is false. He maintains that even if the distinction between existence and essence is granted, this does not entail a real distinction between the principles. In this account, according to Suárez, existence is not an active principle, but a necessary condition without which the essence could not operate; in the same manner existence is a necessary condition without which the essence would not receive the operation. On the contrary, Suárez takes it that the existent essence (essentia existens) is active and receptive principle of such operation.

---

202 omnes igitur haec actiones aut ad cognitionem pertinent aut ad appetitum (Ibid., n.46, p.207).

203 Quod enim quidam aient, in ipsam substantia distinguai illa duo, quia agit per esse tamquam per actum et recipit per essentiam tamquam per potentiam, et falso supponit distictionem in re inter esse et essentiam actualiam et, illa etiam admissa, non consequenter dicitur; nam supposita illa opinione, esse non est ratio agendi, sed est
Suárez major metaphysical contention is that there is no real distinction between esse and essentia; from this he infers that the proximate active principle is only distinguished from the principle of receiving as the including from the included.

The proximate active principle of the cognitive operation is the same faculty informed by the species. But in the appetitive operation the proximate active principle is the faculty alone. From these considerations Suárez concludes that it should be granted that there is one and the same potency which through itself is the proximate principle of such an act. This is also admitted, Suárez remarks, by Scotus, Henry of Ghent, and Anthony Andrews. According to them, the law of non-contradiction does not apply to potency and act under the same aspect.

Clearly Suárez is here endorsing Scotus' view by presenting the immanent act argument to which we referred above. Suárez’s immanent act argument can be expressed thus:

P1 It is possible for one and the same faculty to be in first act and in potency to second, immanent act.

P2 The first act does not formally include the second act; rather, the first act includes the power to elicit the second act.

conditio sine qua essentia non ageret; similiter autem est conditio sine qua essentia non recipere operationem; ipsa autem essentia existens seu habet talem conditionem est principium agendi et recipiens talem operationem (Ibid, n.46, p.207).

204 The discussion on whether the known object effectively influences volition is addressed in detail by Suárez in De Anima, d.10, q.2. In Disp. Met. d.18, s.7, n.49, Suárez maintains the same view as in De Anima: De actionibus vero appetitus et voluntatis specialis est difficilas, quia hae potentiae non indigent speciebus et ita videntur per suas solas entitates esse principia agendi et recipiendi suos actus. (Ibid., pp.209-210).
P3 This power is receptive potency and immanent act.

P4 It is possible for the same faculty to be in virtual act and in informal potency. Therefore, there is no contradiction in claiming that one and the same thing is in potency and act, so the same thing can move itself from potency to act.

In support of P2 and P4 Suárez appeals to equivocal efficient causality. With regard to Aristotle's requirement of dissimilarity between the agent and patient in his argument from *On the Soul*, II, 5, 417a, 3-9, presented above, Suárez takes it that it is a dissimilarity between the efficient cause and its recipient at the beginning of the action, not at its end.

In effect, according to Suárez, an agent cause can have an effect on the patient only insofar as the patient is dissimilar to the agent, in form or in the term of the action. The reason is that an agent acts inasmuch as it is in act, and in order to act it requires a patient which is in potency. However, what is in the potency as such is unlike that which is in act as such.

In support of this premise, Suárez argues in a similar manner as he does in his *De Anima* d.1, q.4, n.10, p.114, namely, that to act is to communicate or to give **esse**. Therefore, (i) the communicating **esse** must be supposed in the agent (on the grounds that nothing can give something which it does not have in itself), so the agent acts in as much as it is in act; (ii) in communicating **esse** the agent reduces the patient from potency to act. Hence, the patient as subjected to such action is supposed as in potency.\(^{205}\) The patient, Suárez concludes, must lack the form it is

---

\(^{205}\) dicendum est enim causam agentem efficere non posse in passum, nisi quatenus est sibi dissimile in forma seu termino actionis. [...] quia agens agit quatenus est in actu,
to receive; however positive opposition and contrariety is not due to the efficient cause as such.²⁰⁶

To eliminate self-motion in Suárez’s case would mean to require that all efficient causation is univocal, since univocal causes introduce in the patient a form of the same ratio as that through which the agent acts. In fact univocal causes unite two similar kinds of forms. This is against Aristotle’s requirement for efficiency, i.e., dissimilarity in form and dissimilarity in matter; so in univocal causation it is required that external causes be acting. Suárez maintains that Aristotle was referring to univocal causation when he denied self-motion.²⁰⁷ But Suárez, like Scotus,²⁰⁸ posits the existence of equivocal causes. The equivocal causes unlike univocal causes unite two distinct kinds of form.

---

²⁰⁶ nulla alliam dissimilitudinem ex parte passi requirit, nisi quod careat tali forma [...] quod in rebus generabilibus et corruptibilibus inventiatur non solum haec dissimilitudo, sed etiam possessiva oppositio ex contrarietas, non est ex ratione causa efficiens ut sic [...] (Ibid., n.9, p.267).

²⁰⁷ Cf. Disp. Met., d.18, s.9, n.11, p.270.

²⁰⁸ Scotus writes,

I state that a univocal action never produces a connection among the active and passive <elements> agent and its effect, essentially ordered as regard a third such <effect>. Rather, there is a more essential connection due to equivocal agents and <their> effects (QSM IX, q.14, n.15 (WV VII, 593b), quoted in King, op. cit.
According to Suárez, equivocal efficient causes (EEC) suppose not formal dissimilitude in the patient but dissimilitude as the patient is subjected to and perfected by the action. Therefore, EEC supposes a lack of that similitude which can be between a form taken formally and another which eminently contains it.

Given the features of Suárez's EEC, his next move is to hold that EEC are involved in all immanent action, for such action produces something not of the same form as that of the agent, but a proportional thing, i.e., a second act consonant with the first act. The second act is the perfection of the first and contained in it not formally but virtually and eminently. The reason is that the EEC does not produce a formal, but only an eminent similitude. In this sense, it requires prior proportional dissimilitude. Since for action it is only presupposed that the form which is the terminus of the agent's action be lacking.\(^{209}\)

In Scotus' world self-motion is in general possible, according to King's interpretation when the following two conditions are satisfied:

In every case, something is only able to act upon itself when those two [conditions] occur together -namely, (i) that it possesses a form that is principle of acting equivocally, and, along with this [condition], (ii) that it is receptive of the terminus of such an action.\(^{210}\)

---

\(^{209}\) *At vero causa equivoca non inducit in passum formam eiusdem rationis, atque adeo formaliter similem suae formae per quam agit, et ideo proprie non supponit in passo formallem dissimilitudinem, id est carentiam illius formae secundum speciem quam in se habet, sed supponit dissimilitudinem inter passum ut actioni supponitur et ut per actionem perficitur, et consequenter etiam supponit in passo carentiam illius similitudinis quae inter formam aliquam formaliter sumptam et aliam quae immanenter continet illam intercedere potet* (Disp. Met., d.18, s.9, n.10, p.268).

\(^{210}\) Ibid., op. cit., p.12.
Suárez seems to be requiring Scotus’ two conditions for his case of immanent action. Thus, from his immanent act argument and his account of efficient equivocal causation, Suárez draws the corollary that the will is the proximate efficient equivocal principle of acting and receiving.

In fact, in the will the principles of acting and receiving are not really distinct, for the will acts through immanent action. Suárez holds firmly that immanent actions do not require an assimilative process, so the two principles are not distinct even in partial entity. It is precisely this way of acting, Suárez holds, that characterizes

the will in regards to its freedom, and in regard to its nature as appetite [...] The faculty which receives immanent action, can by its very self be sufficiently constituted in first act as a sufficient proximate, effective principle of the same action which it receives.211

In this section we presented Suárez’s account of the will as proximate efficient principle of acting and receiving. Suárez’s view coincides with Scotus in that

i. the principle ‘everything which is moved is moved by another’ is not sufficiently demonstrated in every kind of motion or action.212

ii. For Suárez, just as for Scotus, there is no incompatibility or contradiction in holding that one and the same thing be constituted by the same thing as agent

211 [...] respectu (inquam) talis actionis non oporteat principium agendi esse in partiali etiam entitate distinctum a principio recipiendi. Et est sane hic modus agendi satis consentaneus voluntati, tum ob libertatem eius, tum ob comumem rationem appetitus [...] facultas quae est proximum principium susciendi actum immanentem sit per seipsam sufficienter constituta in actu primo tamquam sufficiens pricipium proximum effectivum eiusdem actus (Disp. Met., d.18, s.7, n.54, p.216).

212 Principium illud [...], omne quod movetur ab alio movetur, ad hoc non esse satis demonstratum, in omne genere motus vel actionis; nam multa sunt quae per actum virtualem videntur sese movere et reducere ad actum formalem ut in appetitu seu voluntate videre licet et in aqua reducente se ad pristinam frigiditatem (Disp. Met., d.29, s.1, n.7, p.247).
and patient, provided that both of these aspects are understood proportionally. Thus, there is no incompatibility in holding that the will moves itself.

iii Efficient equivocal causality and virtual act are key elements to justify (i) and (ii).

For Suárez the principle in (i) does not apply specifically in the case of the human will, because the will is one of the things which through virtual act move itself and reduces itself from potency to formal act.

Up to this point we have concerned ourselves with the study of the potency and hence by definition with the proximate efficient cause that the will is. We need next to investigate how this efficient cause operates. It has been claimed that there are three alternatives for proximate EC to operate, viz., necessarily, contingently, and freely. The tradition to which Suárez belongs claims that the will is the proximate EC of free acts. In our next section we shall see how Suárez defends this claim.

3. Metaphysical Account of the Freedom of the Will

The topic of the freedom of the will is discussed by Suárez in d.19, ss.2-9 of Disp. Met. under the general headings of ‘On Proximate Efficient Causes that Operate Freely’. The will is regarded by Suárez throughout this disputation as the free cause of free-acts. The reason is that he is distinguishing the operations of free causes from the operations of natural causes.

Suárez’s approach to the topic of freedom is noble in at least two senses. On the one hand, unlike St. Thomas, Scotus, or even Molina, Suárez does not present
his view on the issue within theological settings, although he does formulate various theological questions 'necessarily connected' with freedom.

On the other hand, Suárez’s methodological approach to freedom is similar to that of a phenomenologist, since he sets out from the very fact of free-will and its exercise and then proceeds to describe the phenomenon itself and conditions that makes its existence possible in man. Compared with St. Thomas’s method of procedure, viz., analyzing first the structure of the soul, its faculties, and only then arguing for the free acts of the will, Suárez’s method of procedure regarding freedom has rightly been found as "peculiar."

St. Thomas deals with freedom in his *Summa Theologiae*, Part I, q.82, q.83; Scotus does it within his *commentary on the Sentences*, Book II, distinction 25; and also in *Ordinatio*, Book I, distinctions 38 and 39; and Luis de Molina writes on the reconciliation problem within his *Concordia*, disputations 51 and 52.

In the context of his premise that God's motion is not a previous required condition for the act or use of freedom, -rather, this motion is essentially included in the action of will itself-, Suárez posits the following theological questions:

1. To what kind of being belongs the motion or concurrence of God?
2. How does the motion of God exist along with the efficacy of the created will?
3. Can it be said that the motion of God is somehow prior to the motion of the will and does not injure its freedom?
4. In what manner is it in the power (potestas) of man to have the motion of God?

After formulating this set of questions Suarez parenthetically remarks: that these [theological questions] are also true and necessary to the clarification of freedom, but we shall treat them in another place already quoted'.

(Qualis autem sit hic concursus seu motio Dei, et quomodo sit simul cum influxu ipsiusmet voluntatis creatae, et an possit dici aliquo modo prior absque laesione libertatis, ac denique quomodo sit in potestate hominis habere vel non habere hanc Dei motionem (hoc enim etiam verum est et ad libertatem necessarium) dicemus in loco paulo ante citato (Disp. Met., d. 19, s. 4, n. 15, p. 367).

In this section I intend to discuss the main themes of Suárez's metaphysical account of the freedom of the will, and at the same time try to show that Suárez's conception of freedom is either of the incompatibilist type if compared with St. Thomas's so called 'soft' determinism, or strongly indeterministic if compared with Bañezianism.

The themes that I shall address here are Suárez's brief arguments for freedom; his distinction between natural cause and free-cause, his definitions of free-cause and free-act; his causal indeterministic account of freedom, and Suárez's standpoint in regard to the question whether the free-cause exercises its freedom when it acts or before it acts.

Arguments for Freedom

Suárez is not particularly concerned with providing compelling arguments for the existence of free will in disputation 19. For him freedom is simply a matter of inner experience. Elsewhere he remarks that freedom is not a property of the object but rather an intrinsic property of the man acting.\(^\text{216}\)

\(^{216}\) In *De Gratia, prolegomenon* I, ch.4, n.15, p.22, Suarez writes, *Formalis libertas non est proprietas obiecti, sed est intrinseca proprietas hominis operantis voluntatis inhaerens*. This is the very way that some contemporary philosophers of the Existentialist tradition described freedom. Humberto Giannini (1985) asserts, [...] *amar es elegir y, en consecuencia, adoptar y rechazar. La libertad no puede aislarse de la estructura total de la persona. La libertad se vive, no es un objeto.*

Suárez's proof for the existence of freedom is, *Experimento probatur assertio [...] possimus ab experientia; experimur enim evidenter si tum esse in nostra potestate aliquid agere vel omitere, et ad hoc utimur ratione et discursu ac consultatione ut in*
As W. Clarke points out, Suárez gives three rather sketchy arguments. The first is from the common consent of philosophers such as Plato, Cicero, and Augustine; they thought that man acts by free will rather than by necessity. According to Suárez, Aristotle in particular established freedom as a fundament of his whole moral doctrine. The lines of the first argument appeal to moral rather than philosophical reasons.

The second argument is based on data of consciousness. We evidently experience the fact that it lies in our power (potestas) to perform or not perform a certain action, or to perform this action instead of that, and that in doing so we use rational deliberation. Therefore, choices depend upon our judgement or decision (ergo electio posita in nostro arbitrio). In this argument Suárez concludes like St. Thomas did, viz., that if we did not have a faculty of deliberation, then advices, laws, moral projects, rewards and punishments will be pointless.

The third argument is the one that metaphysically carries the most weight. Just as in De Anima, Suárez here appeals to the perfection of knowledge in cognitive beings. He argues,

> Freedom is born from intellect, for the vital appetite follows upon knowledge. Therefore the more perfect the mode of knowledge, the more perfect will be the appetite accompanying it. Intellectual knowledge is so perfect and universal in its mode of operation that it is capable of perceiving the relation of means to an end, of weighing the good or evil, the utility or inconvenience

---

unam partem potius quam in aliam inclinemur; est ergo electio posita in nostro arbitrio; (Disp. Met., d.19, s.2, n.13, p.335).


218 ST, I, q. 83, a.1
of each means, and hence of discerning which is necessary to the attainment of the end and which indifferent. Therefore, the appetite which follows such a mode of knowledge will necessarily possess this same perfection of indifference, so it will not be constrained to tend necessarily to every good or every means, but to each one only in proportion to the degree of goodness contained within it. Hence a good which has been judged not necessary but freely. Thus, it is that free-choice follows upon rational deliberation.$^{219}$

In this passage Suárez reminds us of the Thomistic formula 'radix libertatis in judicio ratione est'$^{220}$, with the difference that Suárez stresses the word *intellegentia* instead of *ratione*; thus, 'libertas ex intelligentia nascitur'. For Suárez freedom specifically is born from the perfection of the intellect which is the intellectual knowledge. Suárez also refers to the will not as 'intellectual appetite' as St. Thomas does, but rather remarks that it is a 'vital appetite' that follows up an intellectual kind of knowledge; so the free act of such vital appetite follows up the intellectual knowledge.$^{221}$

---

$^{219}$ *Ultimo possimus argumentari ratione a priori, quae sumenda est ex modo et perfectione cognoscendi naturae intellectus; quia libertas ex intelligentia nascitur, nam appetitus vitalis sequitur cognitionem, et ideo perfectorem cognitionem comitatur perfectior appetitus; ergo et cognitionem universalem et suo modo indifferentem sequitur etiam appetitus universalis et indifferentem; cognitione autem intellectualis ita est universalis et perfect ut propriam rationem finis et mediorum perciat, et in unoquoco expendere possit quid habeat bonitatis vel malitiae, utilitatis aut incommodi; item quod medium sit necessarium ad finem, quod vero indifferentem, eo quod alia adhiberi possint; ergo appetitus qui hanc cognitionem sequitur habet hanc indifferentiam seu perfectam potestatem in appetendo, ut non omne bonum aut omne medium necessario appetat, sed unumquodque iuxta rationem boni in eo iudicatum; ergo illud bonum quod non iudicatur necessarium, sed indifferentem, non amatur necessario, sed libre; atque hac ratione, ut supra dicebam, at rationem consultationem sequitur electio libera. (Disp. Met., d.19, s.2, n.17, p.338).*

$^{220}$ *S T, I, q.83, a1.*

$^{221}$ *Cf. De Anima, d.3, q.3, n.39; d.5, q.3, n.3; Disp. Met., d.18, s.7, n.35, p.196.*
Furthermore, Suárez is suggesting that the free actions of knowing beings are typically preceded by a process of rational choice where the perfection of intellectual knowledge plays the role of apprehending and judging about the degree of goodness contained in the objects; but more importantly this higher knowledge deliberates on the means to attain ends. This latter characteristic, Suárez suggests, is proper only of human beings, not of animals. Animals, he thinks, act spontaneously and by necessity, therefore not freely.222

As human beings, after deliberating over the means, we frequently choose one rather than on other means because we want to. This, too, indicates a clear difference between our free way of acting and the animal way of acting.

Suárez attributes two different roles to the will. One is a psychological role which has to do with the kind of elicited vital appetite that will is, viz., a faculty for certain unpossessed vital desirings. An example of these unpossessed vital desirings is the pursuit of long-term goals or precise projects of life. The other is a physical role which has to do with the faculty as productive of free acts. This later role has to do with the relationship that the will has with the intellective knowledge; the faculty for free actions follows upon intellectual knowledge. We shall further see that for Suárez this knowledge is only accidentally efficacious.223

222 Circa bruta fiunt quia in potestate eorum sit agere vel non agere [...] quia diverso modo moventur, spontane quidem, ex necessitate (Ibid., n.15, p.336).

223 One of the examples is borrowed from A. Kenny (1993), p.81
Suárez begins d.19 discussing the causes that act necessarily and the required conditions that these causes need to operate. Examples of natural causes are the sun which necessarily illuminates and the fire that heats. The list of required conditions for natural causes to operate includes the following:

(i) that the natural cause possesses sufficient active power \((\text{habeat integram ac sufficientem virtutem agendi})\) to operate naturally;

(ii) it must possess a proximate passive capacity, since created agents cannot operate at a distance;

(iii) it needs an expedite mean between the agent and patient capable of the agent's action;

(iv) it needs no other power with equal or greater capacity to resist and impede the action;

(v) that the patient neither be in the end of the action nor that it have all the forms that the agent can produce;

(vi) that any natural prior action should be already a prior prerequisite before the natural cause operate; and

(vii) it needs the necessary concurrence of the first cause.

For Suárez if any one of these conditions fails to obtain, the action of a natural cause will not follow.\(^{224}\)

The first distinction that Suárez traces between natural causes and free causes is that the former are (i) irrational, and (ii) determined to only one thing. Free causes on the other hand, are typically rational and indifferent to opposite things.

\(^{224}\) Ibid., nn.2-5, pp.314-317.
The indifference in the operation is born intrinsically in the broad scope of the rational faculty. So the faculties that lack reasoning exercise their operations by natural necessity.

The necessary and sufficient conditions for a free-cause to act freely are discussed by Suárez in detail in *De Gratia*, Proleg. I. They can be formally expressed thus:

A free-cause operates freely iff:
(i) it is an active potency,
(ii) it is a potency with dominative indifference,
(iii) it is a potency with complete active dominion of its acts,
(iv) it is a potency with an active indifference not only remote, but also proximate.

Regarding (i) Suárez asserts that every free faculty is active and that it is free insofar as it is active. The potency itself according to Suárez implies action. Passion, instead cannot be free with respect to the patient but rather with respect to the action from which it proceeds, since passion follows always necessarily the action. Thus, freedom, formally considered is not found in a passive potency, but rather in an essentially active potency.

Regarding (ii) Suárez maintains that to be free the cause must be indifferent with respect to the exercise of the acts as well as with respect to the specification of them. This means necessarily that it is the power to exercise or not exercise, or to

---

225 Ibid., n.13, p.324.

226 [...] *facultates omnes quae rationis usu ommino carent naturali necessitate suas operationes exercere* (Ibid., n.12, p.323).

suspend the act, and also the power to produce a plurality of diverse or opposite acts. For Suárez, then, the disjunctive alternative is active indifference or necessity regarding the acts.\textsuperscript{228}

Leibniz\textsuperscript{229} around 1677, and currently Anthony Kenny\textsuperscript{230} would agree that condition (ii) for a free-cause is what renders a conception of freedom as 'liberty of indifference'. This is a controversial issue for even most philosophers who argue for freedom. Leibniz considers that philosophers that required 'indifference' attempt something totally conflicting because freedom is a perfection while indifference is an imperfection. The more imperfect things are the more undetermined, they are by themselves and so they have much more need of an external determination.\textsuperscript{231}

\textsuperscript{228} Cf. De Gratia, Proleg.I, c.2, n.7; Disp. Met., d.19, s.4, n.9. Suárez introduces the term 'indifference' in this passage as synonymous with the term freedom (Cf. De Gratia, Proleg. I, c.1, n.9) this term is particularly controversial, Thomists, and Duns Scotus do not agree about its meaning. The question to be asked is, of what is it indifference and, with respect to what? St Thomas's answer addresses the latter part of the question. He says with regard to it three things, i.e., respectu objecti, respectu actus,et respectu ordinis in finem. Cfr. De Verit., q.12, a.6, Resp.; and ad.4-5.

Scotus's answer addresses both parts of the question; he writes, (i) it is indifference of the faculty with respect to acts; (ii) it is indifference of the act with respect to objects; or (iii) indifference to diverse effects extrinsic to the agent. The third is consequence and posterior to my freedom.

\textsuperscript{229} Cf. Theodicy I, paragraph 46; and also Leibniz' essay "Acerca De La Indiferencia De Equilibrio (1677 -1690)" in (1990), pp.115-174


\textsuperscript{231} Here Leibniz is referring to spontaneity -that in man requires rationality- as internal principle of activity. Cf. Theodicy, s.290, 304; and "On the Indifference of Freedom" in (1990), p.117.
Leibniz, however, argues in these passages against the indifference of equilibrium. He suggests that Molinists and Scotists defended this sort of indifference. Leibniz asserts that such is the assumption of those who introduce the indifference of equilibrium in the will, as if God had willed two things at the same time, viz., a will totally indifferent toward each of the two things, and also self-determined agent.²³²

Suárez, however, is not requiring absolute indifference in the free-cause. That is the case when the will finds itself between two identical opposites so it cannot move to one part rather than to the other, as in the case of the ass of Buridan. Suárez requires an indifference of the free-cause regarding the exercise of its act. This is clear in this passage:

[...] it is called freedom of exercise because in virtue of this freedom the exercise of the act turns out indifferent. Now, since this free faculty is vital [...] it can turn into itself and on its acts. The faculty can always freely exercise some act; it does it by means of another positive act, either by the lack of that act or by not willing such act. In this way there is never freedom of exercise without some freedom of specification, for always the will can freely not love, it can also realize some other act incompatible with love. In this case there is indifference regarding the specification of the act.²³³

²³² Cf. Leibniz (1990), pp.115-122.

²³³ [...] quae solet dici libertas quoad exercitium, quia per eam ipsum exercitium actus indifferentes est. Cum tamen haec facultas libera vitae sit atque ita perfecta et spiritualis ut in seipsam et in suos motus reflectere possit, quotiescumque potest non exercere libere aliquem actum, potest etiam per alium positivum actum velle illam carentiam seu nolle exercere talem actum. Atque isto modo nunquam est libertas quod exercitium sine aliqua libertate quoad specificationem, nam quotiescumque potest voluntas libere non amare, potest etiam elicere aliquem actum, secundum suam rationem et speciem repugnamentem amoris, et ita est ibi aliqua indifferentia quoad specificationem actus. (Disp. Met., d.19, s.4, n.9, p.363)
Suárez talks of an indifference in the sense of a *potentia activa ad utrumque*. This is a sort of vital and dynamic indifference, not of equilibrium or equipoise.

In regard to (iii) Suárez requires that the free-proximate cause needs to have a complete active and total dominion over its acts in regard to which it is said to be free; otherwise it would not be able to act or not act.

With respect to the last condition (iv) that the free-cause needs have proximate active indifference, Suárez is referring to the fact that freedom belongs to the faculty at the very moment of acting, 'with all the necessary prerequisites for action', otherwise the actual exercise of freedom will never be possible and the possession itself of a free faculty would be a delusion. We shall further discuss this point below. Given the features of the free-cause we may inquire about the features of a free-act.

A free-act for Suárez is the opposite of a necessary act and it is distinct from a relatively contingent effect. An act or effect is necessary if: (i) it proceeds from a proximate secondary cause that operates naturally, and (ii) its causal chain exclude the action or lack of action of some free-cause. On the contrary, according to Suárez,

---

234 No suena a equilibrio, como si la voluntad no fuese libre sino cuando en el acto primero no se inclina más a una parte que a otra... Suena a exclusión de necesidad, y solamente pide que no haya nada positivo o negativo que haga la acción inévitable o necesaria antes de la acción u omisión. Cf. Losada, *Cursus philosophicus*, p. III, d.9, c.I, 1883.
an action is said to be free which is truly free from that necessity which
governs the operations of natural and irrational things.235

According to this definition there is no doubt that Suárez is denying that a
free-action can occur by necessity of nature. In effect, he is referring to the sense of
free-action not only as opposed to voluntary action (i.e., an action which is not
coerced), but to that which opposes necessity. He clearly indicates this sense of a
free-action when he writes:

It is about this [sense of] freedom, or non-necessity, that we are talking about
in the present question.236

Furthermore, Suárez thinks that the only causes that produce something
without necessity are men or some created intelligences (he assumes that the first
cause acts without necessity, but restrict himself to the realm of created things).237

But what is interesting to know in most causal indeterministic views about
freedom is precisely how to isolate the sense in which a free-action is causally
undetermined.238

---

235 Ac propriisimo modo dicitur actio librae quae vere libera est ab ea necessitate
quam in agendo habent res naturales et irrationalaes [...] Et de hac libertate seu non
necessitate disputamus proprie in praesenti quaestione (Disp. Met.,d.19, s.2, n.9, p.331)

236 Et de hac libertate seu non necessitate disputamus proprie in presenti quaestione
(Ibid., n.9, p.331).

237 Cf., Ibid., s.2, n.3, p.327.

238 Suárez argues that what is controversial in this point of the discussion is to
determine whether the voluntary action is mixed with necessity and determination.
Sed an in hoc ipso voluntario misceatur necessitas et determinatio [...] hoc est quod
controversiam vocatum est (Ibid).
So my next concern is to investigate the sense in which free-action is causally indeterministic on Suárez’s account and in what sense his causal indeterminism differs from that of St. Thomas or Bañez.

Suárez’s Causal Indeterministic View of Freedom

Suárez agrees with what he calls a ‘common’ definition of free faculty, viz.,

A free faculty is one which is such that, once all the requirements for action are given, can act or not act.\textsuperscript{239}

However, Suárez demands that this definition be understood as including among the ‘prerequisites for action’ not only the cognitive prerequisites of judgement or decision and what belongs to the free cause as such, but also the stipulation that among the prerequisites themselves there be included the use of the free-act.

\textsuperscript{239} \textit{recepta descriptione facultatis liberae, scilicet; Quae, positis omnibus requisitis ad agendum, potest agere et non agere} (Ibid., s.4, n.5, pp.359-360).

Alberto Bonet (1932), points out that the origin of this ‘\textit{communis et recepta’} definition of free faculty [...] goes back to Nemesius (5th Century)(Cf. A. Bonet, op., cit., p.176), and it is found in early scholastics as, Henry of Ghent (\textit{Quodlib. I}, q.16); Herveus (\textit{Quaest. I}); Duns Scotus (in \textit{Sent. II}, disp.25, q.unica, infine.); Ockham (\textit{Quodlib. I}, q.16.); Gabriel Biel (Ibid., n.3, dub. 3 et 4, et in I, d.48, c.III); Marsilius (in II, q.16, art.4.); Dionysius Cisterciensis (in II, d.25, art.2 concl.2, et art.3, concl.); it is also found in Capreolus (\textit{Illud dicitur agens naturale, quod positis omnibus requisitis ad agendum, et nullo posito impedimento, quin ipsum possit agere, necessario agit, sed in potestate eius est, ut agat, et non agat.} Cf. 1a, dist.6, q.unic, art.3, ad arg. Scoti contra 4am conclus.;) the prince of the ancient Thomist school, and in Domingo Soto (Cf. \textit{De Natura et Gratia}, c.XVI.); who takes it as generally accepted. Most of them, as noted by De Wulf (1926), were either professed Scotists or Nominalists. Suárez acknowledges that the definition is not found literally in Aristotle or St. Thomas, but it responds to their line of thought since it expresses the concept of freedom as dominion over the acts, which is found in both authors.
Technically, for Suárez, the ‘act of use’ refers to one of the typical acts of the will by which the will carries out the execution of the free-choice.

Thus, the use of the free-act cannot be determined by the laws of nature nor by the necessity of nature.

In regard to the view of some ancient philosophers (Democritus, Empedocles, and Heraclitus), Suárez rejects what he calls a fatal necessity which arises in the conjunction of all the causes and because of the influence of the stars.\textsuperscript{240}

Suárez also rejects the view of the Stoics. According to Suárez, they held that our soul is material and mortal, so they submitted our soul’s operations to the influence of the stars and believed that we operate necessarily.\textsuperscript{241} Suárez’s answer to these ‘fatal necessitarian’ views is that

the heavens may possess influence on man’s body and on corporeal faculties, but neither on the operations of the intellect or on the will, since these faculties are spiritual. Besides, our soul, which informs our body is not immerse in the body; thus, the will can resist and dominate the influence of the heavens.\textsuperscript{242}

The majority of Christian medieval theologians and philosophers from St. Thomas to Bañez as well as Molinists, in fact deny that a free action may occur by a necessity of nature; for this reason they were indiscriminately called libertarians.

\textsuperscript{240} \textit{In hac ergo re fuit antiquus quorundam philosophorum erro, qui dixerunt omnes effectus et actiones causarum universi, etiam humanarum voluntatem, necessitate quadam fatali provenire, orta ex connexione causarum omnium et caelorum ac stellarum influxu. Ita refert Augustin, IV, lib. Confess, c.3 [...] signat Democritum, Empedoclem, et Heraclitum (Disp. Met., d.19, s.2, n.10, pp.331-332).}

\textsuperscript{241} Cf. \textit{De Anima}, d.12, q.2, n.4, p.385.

\textsuperscript{242} Cf. \textit{De Anima}, d.12, q.2, n.18, p.405.
On the other hand some contemporary compatibilists hold that it is possible for a free-action to occur by a necessity of nature. Neither Suárez nor St. Thomas, nor Bañez are compatibilist in this modern sense; rather they all are libertarians.

St. Thomas, however, is characterized by some commentators as a sort of compatibilist because he does believe in some sort of determinism. In fact, St. Thomas has been interpreted by Garrigou Lagrange as well as by Anthony Kenny as holding the view that freedom is self-determination, but this self-determination is compatible with determination by God. Kenny quotes, in his Book *Aquinas on Mind*, the following passage in support of St. Thomas theological determinism:

> By free decision a human being moves himself into action; but it is not essential to freedom that the free agent should be its own first cause, just as in general to be the cause of something one does not have to be its first cause. God is the first cause which activates both natural and voluntary causes. His action on natural causes does not prevent their activities from being natural; equally, in activating voluntary causes he does not take away the voluntariness of their actions. On the contrary, it is he who makes their actions voluntary; for he works in each thing in accord with its own characteristics.

Thus, according to Kenny, St. Thomas asserts that self-determination is essential, but it is compatible with divine determination. In the recent philosophical literature if some compatibilist does believe in some sort of determinism, she is commonly called a ‘soft’ determinist as opposed to ‘hard’ determinist who believes not only that determinism is true but also that free will is an illusion. The typical

---


244 S T, I, q. 83, d.3.

representative of 'hard' determinism during Suárez' time was Luther\textsuperscript{246}, while a modern hard determinist is Spinoza\textsuperscript{247}.

The determinism of Domingo Bañez is rather a theological pre-determinism and refers to God's physical predetermination of the human will. Bañez's views are expressed in the following passage:

Physical premotion is motion which belongs to the physical order; with it God antecedently (in the causal and in the temporal order) determines without fail the nature of the operation. This physical motion is absolutely necessary to every operation be it necessary or free, and it is called 'predetermination', because it moves a determinate act. In regard to the free act [...] it is a divine physical motion prior to the will, and without this predetermination the will cannot operate\textsuperscript{248}

Bañez's theological pre-determinism seems much stronger than St. Thomas' determinism, since St. Thomas usually holds that God predetermines and pre-moves our will to incline us firmly and easily to assent to his grace, but God's motion for St. Thomas is not quite physical but rather a moral sort of motion.\textsuperscript{249}

\textsuperscript{246} Luther's views, according to Suárez, are driven by the belief that man is necessarily forced to sin. So he held that 'after the fall liberum arbitrium is a matter of name, or a fiction in reality. Suárez is referring here to De Servo Arbitrio in Bulla Exurge Domine: Mansi XXXI 1051 (Cf. De Anima, d.12, q.2).

\textsuperscript{247} In Ethics, Book I, Spinoza writes:
Given a determinate cause the effect follows of necessity, and without its cause, no effect follows. Besides, Spinoza holds that the will is a concept with explanatory power.

\textsuperscript{248} D. Bañez, In 1, q.14, a.13 concl.6 ad argum. 1. um. p.534, Salamanticae, 1585; Nulla causa secunda potest operari, nisi sit efficaciter a prima determinata. This passage has been quoted by José Sagües (1948), p.707.

Suárez rejects St. Thomas' and Baez's theological determinism. He maintains that the will by itself produces its free act. In the first sections we saw that Suárez argued for the self-motion and self-determination of the will to act. Nevertheless, Suárez does not deny that the will as a created cause depends on God. In fact, for Suárez all created agents depend on the first cause with respect to (i) production, (ii) conservation, and (iii) their operations. However, for Suarez God does not determine the operation of the free cause. This is clear when Suárez explains the way that God offers his concurrence to the free-cause, thus:

God, in virtue of that will by which he decreed to offer concurrence to a free cause, does not determine absolutely that a free cause performs that act; nor does he simply will that act to be, but rather wills that act to be under an implied condition, as much as it is from itself and from divine concurrence which He decreed to offer; and to that act it applies by the power of such will if the will of the second cause determines itself and attempts that act.

Suárez is not denying God's cooperation in the free act of the secondary cause; he is rather asserting that God offers His concurrence by a kind of will which includes a condition. Suárez seems to be asserting that God's bringing about the act through the proximate cause depends upon the performance of the free secondary cause.

---

250 Cf. Dis. Met., d.22, s.1, n.1, p.453.

251 Deus, ex vi illius voluntatis qua statuit praebere concursum causae liberae, non omnino absolute statuit ut causa libera illum actum exerceat, neque simpliciter vult illum actum esse, sed quasi subintelecta conditione vult illum actum esse, quantum est ex se et ex parte sui concursus, quem praebere statuit, et at illum ex vi talis voluntatis applicat potentiam suam, si tamen causa secunda seu voluntas creata ad illum etiam se determinet et in illum influat (Dis. Met., d.22, s.4, n.14, p.669).
cause. For some commentators this is tantamount to asserting that God is determined instead of determining.

What seems to be clear is that Suárez is rejecting in the passage the view held by Bañez. This is even more clear when few lines below he writes:

If God offered a concurrence with an absolute and efficacious will physically determinative and productive of such act, God necessarily would drag along with him the second cause; and necessity will be absolute with respect to that cause, because God's efficacy would be prior and efficacious and so the second cause would not be able to resist it in any way.\(^{252}\)

Thus Suárez, like Molina in Part II, disputation 25 of his *Concordia*, disagrees sharply with St. Thomas and Bañez about the exact kind of God's concurrence with human free act. For Suárez God's cooperation with the free cause and involvement in the production of the free acts does not mean either determination or predetermination.

In addition when confronted with Scotus' objection, namely, that created will cannot act without being moved by God. But if it is moved by God, then the will moves necessarily, so that its movement is never really free,\(^{253}\) Suárez responds that it is true that the will cannot not move; however, divine motion does not take away

\(^{252}\) *Si Deus offerret concursum absoluta et efficaci voluntate physice determinativa et effectiva, talis actus necessario secum traheret causam secundam; quae necessitas esset absoluta respectu talis causae, quia, licet esset ex aliqua suppositione, illa tamen esset omnino antecedens, et ita efficax ut interior causa nullo modo posset et resistere (Disp. Met., d.22, s.4, n.16, p.670).*

\(^{253}\) *Fundamentum Scoti est supra tactum in primo argumento, scilicet, quia causa secunda non agit nisi mota a prima; unde si prima necessario agit et movet, secundam eadem necessitate moveri et agere necesse est (Disp. Met., d.19, s.3, n.2, p.344).*
the use of freedom, since such a motion is not one of the prior requisites for action, rather it is included in the action of the will itself.

Regarding 'prerequisites for action' Suárez holds that they can be of two types: (i) there are prior prerequisites for action; they are called antecedents and affect the potency as such, either as principle of the action, or as prior conditions, or in any other way; and (ii) there are prerequisites essentially included in the action itself; they are called concomitant and affect the free act from which they are not distinguished.

With this proposal, which is part of Suárez general concurrentism, Suárez is able to do two things, viz., (i) he allows for a strong legitimate secondary causation, and at the same time, (ii) he allows for God's intimate involvement in the production of natural acts. Free acts, thus, depend on God but they are caused indeterministically by second causes. In this sense we can say that Suárez' account of free causes, free acts, hence of freedom, is of the incompatibilist sort, i.e., (i) free actions do not occur by necessity of nature, and (ii) the self determination of the will is incompatible with theological determinism.

It can be said, thus, that Suárez holds an incompatibilist definition of free will, such as this:

---

254 'Natural' act does not imply 'necessary' act, since for Suárez and St. Thomas to move naturally means the same as to move by a natural propensity. The natural movement of the will corresponds to its natural inclination and this inclination is compatible with freedom (Cf., Ibid., s.8, n.18, pp.416-417).
(IDF) X is a free-will =def. (i) X often acts freely in the sense that it does not follow the laws of nature, and (ii) X acts freely in the incompatibilist sense, viz., that an action A performed by an individual S at time t does not entail that A is determined at t.

Suárez also rejects other forms of determinism, such as psychological determinism. This is supported by Suárez's psychological treatment of the will. As an intrinsic vital faculty the will produces its own act without the efficacious involvement of any extrinsic factor. This point is developed in the sections devoted to Suárez's psychology of will. In disputation 19 Suárez insists against Durandus that formal freedom is not in the intellect but in the will alone.\(^{255}\)

Another issue that supports Suárez's IDF, and at the same time shows Suárez's agreement with Scotus and his disagreement with St. Thomas and Ockham, is the question about whether the free cause exercises actual freedom in the moment of the act or prior to his act. The difficulty lies in that if the will already acted, it acts necessarily; but if freedom always look into the future, then no actual act in reality will be free. With respect to this issue, Suárez defends the Scotist view that

a free cause S at the very instant t at which it wills something X has potentiality not to will X.\(^{256}\)

This means for Suárez that the freedom of the will is exercised properly in the same instant and upon the same present act as it is realized or exercised. According to

\(^{255}\) *libertatem formalem non esse in intellectu, sed in sola voluntate* (*Disp. Met.*, d.19, s.5, n.11, p.377).

Suárez Ockham held the opposite view, viz., if S wills X at t, then S is not able at t not to will X.

According to Suárez, Ockham's view is founded in a fallacy of equivocation of terms, because Ockham did not distinguish between temporal priority and priority by nature. For Suárez S is able prior in nature at t not to will X, whereas later in nature, but at the same instant of time t, S has already determined his will to X. So it is only "then" that S is no longer able at t not to will X. Suárez concludes that simultaneously and in a same instant it is given one and the other power, but not to realize both acts together but rather separately, i.e., either one or the other according to the agent's choice. So even when the agent exercises one part of that power, e.g., to realize X, he still conserves the power to do not-X.

This question seems to be connected with the claim (iv) above, that the free cause is a power with an active indifference remote and proximate, i.e., it belongs to the faculty at the very moment of acting.

In this section we distinguished between natural and free causes. We observed that Suárez holds that only rational agents are capable of freedom; we also explained Suárez's definition of free cause; and we isolated Suárez's sense in which a free action is causally indeterministic, namely in regard to the laws of nature, in regard to God's motion, and in regard to intellectual activities. For these reasons, we consider Suárez's view on freedom as libertarian and incompatibilist. We agree with what Freddoso thinks about Molina's indeterminism; that since the time of Molina and Suárez indeterminism has cropped up in disciplines such as physics, chemistry,
and biology; the consequences however of a genuine metaphysical indeterminist position is that God does indeed play dice with the Universe. In the next part of this study we discuss Suárez's psychology of will.
CHAPTER III
SUAREZ ON THE NATURE OF THE WILL: PSYCHOLOGY

1. Will as Vital Appetite

In d.10 of De Anima Suárez proceeds as follows. First, he presents a selection of Aristotelian theses regarding appetite (orexis), as Aristotle presented them in his discussion of the faculty that has to do with local movement in Book III of On the Soul, ch. 9-12, 432a, 15-435a 10. This text seems to be Suárez's model for developing his own views on the topic. Secondly, he posits three questions, namely:

q.1 Whether a special appetitive faculty is required in every cognitive being?
q.2 Whether the object desired or willed must necessarily be some good?
q.3 Whether the act of desiring and is produced by the appetitive faculty alone, and what is produced through it?

In the context of these questions Suárez displays his own views on appetite, its object and its act.

The most peculiar feature that we find in Suárez' account of the will understood as an appetitive faculty of the rational soul is that he does not take the will to be a straightforward 'intellectual appetite' (appetitus intellectualis) as St. Thomas did in his Sum. Theol. I, q. 82, nor just a 'power of volition' as Scotus did in his commentaries on the Sentences, dist. 25; rather, Suárez conceives will as a 'vital
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appetite'. In effect, in his attempt to grasp what appetite is we observe Suárez emphasizing the physical element of movement conjoined with a variety of psychological elements such 'inclination' (inclinatio), 'directness' (intendere), 'intentionality' (intentionaliter), 'apprehension' (apprehensionem), 'consecutio' 'executio' 'capacity', (potentia, virtus) 'desire' (desiderium), and above all else 'vitality' (vitaliter).

This last psychological feature is seen as the grounding feature of all else.

The problem is that Suárez adds the ingredient 'vital' or 'vitality' not just to the appetitive faculty. 'Intellection' is also referred to by Suárez as 'my vital action'. 'Cognition' and 'understanding' are likewise characterized by the term 'vital'. 'Feeling' (sentire), for Suárez, is a 'vital' operation too. A vital operation is one that depends intrinsically on the first Principle of Life. We notice that Suárez's use of, and references to, the term 'vital' come from the very outset of the treatise, since his project announced in the Proemium was to interpret Aristotle's views on the soul. Suárez takes these to be a sort of metapsychological study whose object is the composite living being among which are included human beings. He also stresses from the first disputation of his De Anima that for Aristotle the name 'life'

---

257 [...] unde intellectio mea est operatio vitalis mea (De Anima, d. 2, q. 4, n. 4, p. 256)

238 Cognoscere nihil est aliud quam vitaliter operari formando quodammodo rem ipsam cognitam: illa ergo actio formans idolum seu verbum est ipsa cognitio (A. 3, 5, 6, L. Vives ed. and p. 118 Castellote ed.). While 'understanding' is to produce an intellection and to receive it vitally: intelligere est intellectionem efficere, et illam vitaliter recipere (De Anima, d. 2, q. 4, n. 4, p. 258)

259 [...] quia sentire est operatio vitalis intrinsece dependens a primo principio vitae [...] (De anima, d. 3, q. 3, n. 4, p. 120 Pavia Manuscript 144)
meant the substance of the living being from which there springs the activity, and that 'living' is the very substantial esse of the living being.\(^{260}\)

In his second disputation, following Aristotle closely, Suárez defined soul as the principle of life, more yet, as that by which there is life in us.\(^{261}\) Thereby it is not surprising that in the third disputation of his De Anima he sees all the faculties of the soul as being ordained to the perfect constitution, conservation and functioning of the living being.\(^{262}\)

Thus, given that for Suárez every faculty of the human soul, including as we shall see the appetitive faculty, produces some kind of vital activity, the question for us is to determine what are the distinctive features that belong to the 'vital appetitive faculty' and its vital act, and do not belong to the other faculties of the soul (such as understanding, cognition and sense). Let us see now how the aforementioned physical descriptions conjoined with the psychological descriptions figure in the Suarezian conception of will as vital appetite.

The opening statement of Suárez in his d. 10 relates the appetitive faculty to movement. He asserts that for Aristotle the appetitive faculty is distinct from the

\(^{260}\) [...] tamen nomen impositum est ad substantiam viventis significandam, a qua profuit operatio. Et hoc modo vivere est ipsum esse substantiale viventis. Here Suarez is referring to On the Soul 413 a 20 ff (De Anima, d. 1, q. 1, p. 60. Pavia Manuscript. 18 V)

\(^{261}\) Referring to On the Soul 412 a 22; a 25; 413a 4-7. Suarez reads: [...] anima esse [id] quo vivimus...[etc] (De Anima, d. 2, q. 4, n. 4)

\(^{262}\) [...]et tandem omnes istae potentiae ordinantur ad perfectum viventis statum, conservationem et regimen (De Anima, d. 3, q. 3, n. 17, p. 142)
vegetative, the sensitive and the intellective faculties of the soul but has great affinity with the locomotive faculty (De Anima, d. 10, n. 1, p. 278). He also notices that for Aristotle the principles of local movement are the practical intellect, fantasia and appetite. So, appetite has a role in the movements of animals in general. It is one of the three elements involved in such a movement. It is the element that being moved by the desirable (appetibile) object 'moves the movement' itself (movens motum). So it is both 'moved' and 'what moves'.

However, advancing Aristotle's views, Suárez is referring to the 'movement' that occurs within the psychological context. So he does not mean a natural spreading around (dimanatio), nor a physical and material movement (such as alteration, augmentation or even the local motion understood as change of place), rather he means the typical movement of human beings, i.e., action or activity; but more yet he is talking of a vital activity that somehow proceeds not from the body

\[\text{\textsuperscript{263}}\] According to Suárez there are three elements in the animal's motion for Aristotle, they are:
\begin{itemize}
  \item[(a)] that which moves; it is of two types: one that is unmoved -i.e., the good, object of action; and another that moves the movement -i.e., the appetite moved by the appetibile object.
  \item[(b)] that which it is moved is the animal
  \item[(c)] that by which the appetite moves is an instrument proper to the appetite and it is attributed to the body and it must be placed where the principle and terminus of the movement resides. (Unum immobile -et hoc est bonum quod sub actione cadit- aliud est movens motum -et hoc est appetitus, qui ab appetibili movetur. Quod movetur est animal. Quo appetitus movet est quoddam instrumentum ipsius appetitus, quod quidem corpori attribuendum scilicet est, et ibi collocandum, ubi est principium et terminus motus) (De Anima, d. 10, p. 280, Sm. 243)
but from an intrinsic active principle. It is this vital activity and not simply local motion which is involved here (see d.13, p.437).

Before determining the features of the vital activity of the appetitive faculty, let us consider what Suárez says concerning appetite itself.

First of all, in the answer to q.2 above, Suárez starts out discussing the issue of the existence and the kinds of appetites. If ‘appetite’ is the same as ‘inclination’ (appetitus autem et inclinatio sunt idem, he suggests), then appetite is a real faculty that belongs not just to the preeminent knowers; rather, appetite belongs both to animate and inanimate beings. In fact, for Suárez, everything possess appetite understood as an inclination. But to explain the diversity of inclinations that are actually found, he insists that one must distinguish between a natural appetite and an elicited appetite (est necessaria distinctio appetitus in naturalem et elicitum). His definition of ‘natural appetite’ comes to the following formula:

\[ x \text{ is a natural appetite} = \text{def. } x \text{ is any inclination that a thing possess towards its own good.}\]

He adds a further important characterization:

---

264 Suárez holds that all the vital activities originate in the soul and none in the body, because the soul is the first principle of life, so there is not vital activity proper to the body. All the vital activity is somehow proper to the soul (operationes vitales omnes habent originem ab anima, et nulla a corpore, quia anima est primum principium vitae, et ita nulla est vitalis operatio propria corporis, sed omnis operatio vitalis est animae aliquo modo) (d. 2, q. 3, n. 39, p. 214 F 62). Moreover he also holds that it is essential to the vital action to be the effect of an intrinsic active principle (de ratione actionis vitalis est quod fiat a principio intrinseco activo, De Anima, d.5, q.3, n.3, p.346)

265 Dicitur enim appetitus quaebet propensio quam quaecunque res habet in suum proprium bonum (De Anima, d.10, q.1, p.282, Sm. 243v).
i. X is not a special faculty nor it is produced by some action of the desiring thing itself.

ii. X is just the natural adjustment that each thing has with the other toward which it is ordained.266

iii. X does not involve nor has (incohaed kind of) knowledge (cognitionem) by itself; knowledge is rather instilled by nature in X and it tends towards its own well-being (commodum).

iv. X does not necessarily strive for the well-being of the parts, rather it strives always for the well-being of the whole.267,268

Understood in this manner, for Suárez 'the natural inclination or propensity that each thing has toward its own well-being' is not appetite in the strict sense but only in a metaphorical sense. Even in this sense, which does not denote a special kind of appetite, it is clear that appetite is a sort of directedness toward the other, though this directedness seems to be guided by a sort of innate knowledge.

Suárez's first conclusion is that there are as many natural appetites as there are natural inclinations and that there are as many natural appetites as there are tending things (res appetitae). From this one might think that even the inert matter

---

266 sed solum est coaptatio naturalis quam unaquaeque res habet cum alia ad quam ordinatur.

267 appetitus naturalis non semper respicit necessario bonum partis sed bonum totius (De Anima, 6, 10, 2 L. Vives ed.).

268 Dicitur enim appetitus quaelibets propensio quaquamque res habet in suum proprium bonum. Quae propensio non est proprie appetitus, sed metaphorica. Neque est specialis potentia neque fit per aliquam actionem ipsius appetentis, sed solum est coaptatio naturalis quam unaquaeque res habet cum alia ad quam ordinatur. Unde talis appetitus non supponit cognitionem nec habetur ap ipso appetente, sed illi datur a natura et ad proprium commodum tendit (De Anima, d.10, q.1, p.282). The signs ' [' or '] ' indicate that the translator has introduced literally another source into the Salamanca manuscript.
possess 'a natural inclination towards its own well-being'. In effect, for Suárez the natural inclination of prime matter (which is an instance of a passive potency) would be its aptitude to receive some kind of form.

The elicited appetite on which Suárez focuses his attention in d.10 and in which we are most of all interested, is a peculiar faculty that exists just in cognitive beings (i.e., in being that behave not blindly nor by mere inchoated knowledge but according to a higher kind of knowledge). The initial contention of Suárez regarding the elicited appetite is precisely that

Besides this natural appetite there is in every knowing being a special faculty of the soul by which it tends, desires vitally, by a proper act. ²⁶⁹ (emphasis added)

This first contention contains Suárez's first definition of 'elicited appetite'. The definition might be stated thus:

(DEVA1) x is an elicited appetite = def. x is a special faculty of the soul by which it tends or desires vitally by a proper act.

For Suárez, thus, the appetitus elicitus that exists in knowers is a faculty of desiring which functions in a vital manner producing its own typical activity. From here on we will refer to this appetite as 'elicited vital appetite' (EVA, for short).

In the second place, Suárez goes on to justify the existence of this kind of appetite, putting forth a sequence of five arguments. The first of them reminds one of St. Thomas' passages in S1, q.80, a.1, and it might be stated thus:

²⁶⁹ Præter hunc appetitum naturalem est in qualibet re cognoscente specialis potentia animae pe quam appetit proprio actu vitaliter (De Anima, d.10, q.1, n.2, p.284).
Argument 1

P1 The appetite follows (sequitur) the form.

P2 From diverse modes and rationes of forms there follows diverse ratio of appetite.

P3 Inanimate beings are informed by their own natural forms, thereby they possess just the natural inclination derived from that form. On the contrary, cognitive beings are, in addition, informed by (knowledge/cognition of) the forms of others things in a superior manner. This means that the things themselves are known vitally and intentionally. Therefore, knowing beings posses a superior (altiorem) vital appetite derived from knowledge (consequitur cognitionem).²⁷⁰

In P2 Suárez speaks of 'diverse rationes of forms'. The form -as Suárez conceives it in d.15 of Diputationes Metaphysicae- has a common and abstract ratio. The common ratio of form must be either (i) 'the principal constituent of the

²⁷⁰ Haec conclusio constat experientia, cuius rationem reddit { D. Thomas, nam appetitus sequitur formam, et ideo iuxta diversum modum et iuxta diversam rationem formae sequitur diversa ratio appetitus. Res autem in animata re informantur forma sua naturalis, et ideo tantum habent inclinationem naturalem consequentem illum formam. Res autem cognoscentes informantur etiam per cognitionem formarum aliarum rerum altiori quoddam modo, et fiunt res ipsae cognitae vitaliter et intentionaliter.} Et ideo habent altiorem appetitum vitalem, qui consequitur cognitionem. The sign '{ }' is used by the translator of Suarez's De Anima to indicate repeated passages that textually appear in the Controversies of the Pavia manuscript. See the Introduction in v.I.

²⁷¹ In Disp.Met., d.15 Suárez takes up 'De Causa Formali Substantiali', he explains that although the form is called 'physical', since it is the principal constituent of the nature of things, it is not out of the scope of metaphysics. The reasons according to him are that ratio formae communis est et abstracta, and that the form constitute the essence (Introd. of d.15, pp. 633-34)
nature of things' or (ii) 'the entelechia, i.e., the perfection or the perfective activity
of a thing\textsuperscript{272}, or both.

Suárez also talks in P2 as if there were different kinds of forms. Among
these kinds he has named the substantial form, the accidental form, the assistant
form, the separate form, and the natural form or form of the inanimate beings.\textsuperscript{273}

The different kinds of form seem to indicate that they differ in their way of
operating. However, all the natural beings, according to Suárez, fall under the
common ratio of form. In effect, he has presupposed that every natural thing (i.e., the
things that are generated and are corruptible) that has a subject or matter also have
a substantial form which perfects and actualizes that subject.\textsuperscript{274} Thus, not only
men but also animated beings in general, inanimate natural beings and common
natural elements as well, fall under the scope of the ratio of form. But, as we already
noticed in the first part of this study (Chapter I, s.5), in addition to substantial forms,
natural things are endowed with faculties or powers and instruments to perform their

\textsuperscript{272} Although Suárez considers the term 'entelechia' to be broader than the term
‘form’, because it means a perfection or an act properly perfecting a thing (\textit{proprie
perfectionem seu actum perficientem rem}), it is attributed to the substantial form.

\textsuperscript{273} With these denominations Suárez does not intend to hold that forms multiply
in virtue of the \textit{quidditative} predicates; he argued in favor of the unity of the form,
as we noticed in chapter I. Besides, universals, for him, are not really distinct from
the particular beings; nor are the \textit{genera} really distinct from the species. Therefore,
his conclusion is that if the predicates of form multiply just by abstraction and for the
sake of our intellect's precision, it is unjustified to think that to the particulars in
reality there correspond forms really distinct from them (\textit{Disp. Met.}, d.15, s.10, n.4,
p.728).

\textsuperscript{274} Cf. d.15 in \textit{Disp. Met.}
typical activity. All this tells us that appetite is one of these faculties. In natural not-knowing beings, however, the appetite conjoined to their natural form is in fact nothing but the same natural substantial form as inclined toward its own well-being; such natural form, however, does not operate with a vital activity.\textsuperscript{275}

In contrast to them, beings such as men, naturally capable of knowing, posses a substantial form with a set of special operational faculties, and one of these faculties knows the form of other things in a vital intentional way. For Suárez this higher way of operating not only indicates the existence of a higher sort of vital appetite (which correspond to the higher way of knowing); it also is what precisely determines a decisive difference between the natural and the elicited appetites.

A second argument also supports the claim that there is a special EVA in a knowing being by stressing where its activity takes place. It might be put thus:

\textbf{Argument 2}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{P1} Knowing beings strive for their own good prior to seeking and prior to attaining the means to gain that good.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{275} Suárez indicated in d.2, q.6 of \textit{De Anima}, three features of the natural form of an inanimate being:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item It operates by mean of totally material qualities, which are called natural qualities.
  \item It performs by bodily means and it is received by the body.
  \item This activity is not \textit{per se} and \textit{ab intrinsecos}, but rather externally affected by extrinsic agents.
\end{enumerate}

All these features indicate, accordingly, that the activity of the natural forms is not a vital activity.
P2 In the activity of striving, the knowing beings are led (ducuntur) by knowledge. Therefore, there need be a faculty of desire to gain those goods.\(^{276}\)

This argument suggests -although Suárez does not explicitly says so- a process of striving for another (beneficial thing) with the intention of capturing it. In this process, knowledge indeed plays a primary role. But appetite -not intellect- is the necessary condition and also the cause of the execution (executionis) in the striving itself. Suárez is clear on this when he writes:

It is useless to know things unless they are desired; if there were no appetite, there would be no follow-up of (consecutio), because appetite is the cause of executionis.\(^{277}\)

In the process or activity of striving, the factors involved are: knowledge, appetite and gain. For the appetite is located between [intentional] knowledge and attainment (executionis); that is, the appetite follows up knowledge and precedes attainment’ (Ibid). Put simply, in the process of striving, one first is aware of something, then one desires what one sees (the desire is associated with conatus and concupiscentia), and in a final step one may choose to go for it.

---

276 Res cognoscentes prius quaerunt propria bona quam quaerant et exequantur illa media quibus illa bona sunt consecuturae; unde in suis operationibus cognitione ducuntur; ergo est necessaria potentia ad appetendum illa bona quae debent consequi (De Anima, d.10, q.1, p.284).

277 [...] res cognoscentes prius quaerum propria bona quam quaerant et exequantur illa media quibus illa bona sunt consecuturae; unde in suis operationibus cognitione ducuntur; ergo est necessaria potentia ad appetendum illa bona quae debent consequi. Parum enim sufficeret res cognoscere nisi illas appeterent, nam si non esset appetitu non esse consecutio, nam appetitus est causa executionis. Mediat enim inter cognitionem et executionem; illam sequitur et hanc praecedit. (De Anima, d.10, q.1, p.284)
The next two arguments underline features either of the knowledge that belongs to knowing beings, or features of the vital elicited appetite EVA itself. Suárez argues first that beings with knowledge apprehend what is damaging for each of the parts and also for the whole of the animate being. This would indicate that there need be an EVA which, following up knowledge, is capable of striving for what is beneficial and fleeing from what is damaging for the whole and also for every part of the cognitive being.

This characteristic is important for it points out a difference between the two kinds of appetite that Suárez is positing: the elicited and the sensitive (sensitivus). For Suárez, the appetite of a sense organ such as the eye is ordained to a particular good; namely, to see. Instead the EVA looks for things beneficial to each part as well as for things beneficial to the whole well-being.

Another difference between knowing and non-knowing beings pointed out by Suárez is this. One cannot say, strictly speaking, that the non-knowing things move; rather, one should say that they are moved or directed by their natural weight toward the perfections that they lack. Knowing beings, on the contrary, move themselves by their natural weight and by their knowledge.\textsuperscript{278} Knowledge here is considered to be the "origin" of the appetite's activities (\textit{ex tali cognitione oritur in illis pondus aliquod seu appetitus}). But appetite is that in virtue of which something moves. It might be said that the term 'origin' is used by Suárez to mean a source, the root or

\textsuperscript{278} Cf. d.10, q.1, p.286.
even a condition for the appetite's activities to occur but it is not the strict cause of its activity.

The last argument presented by Suárez in favor of his first contention regarding the existence of a special EVA brings up the issues of the function and the order of subordination of that EVA in respect to the other faculties of the soul. He argues:

In animals there are diverse faculties and instruments of actions. Therefore, there need be a faculty that works, putting the rest of the faculties into their actions; and this is the appetite.279

So far, the distinctive features of the EVA put forward by Suárez might be stated formally thus:

x is a vital elicited appetite iff:

i. x follows a vital, intentional, apprehensional kind of knowledge.

ii. x is the cause of the execution in the striving process.

iii. x strives for the beneficial and flees away from what is damaging for each part as well as for the whole of the animal.280

iv. x puts the faculties of the soul into activities.

279 Nam in animalibus sunt diversae potentiae et instrumenta operationum; est ergo necessaria una potentia applicans omnes ad operationes suas; et hoc est appetitus (De Anima, d.10, q.1, p.286).

280 Nam res cognoscentes apprehendunt quid sit nocivum toti animali et singulis eius partibus, ut capiti, pedi, etc; ergo necessaria est una potentia specialis animae quae hanc cognitionem sequantur et ordinetur ad consequendum bonum et fugiendum malum totius et singularium partum; [...] At vero appetitus elicius est specialis potentia respiciens bonum totius et singularium partium (De Anima, d.10, q.1, n.2, pp.284-286).
The features of the EVA seem to correlate by opposition to the features that Suárez figured out for the natural appetite, the latter he does not take to be a special kind of appetite.

In what follows Suárez presents and defends his second contention, this time regarding the existence of two kinds of appetites, the so-called sensitive appetite (SA) and rational appetite (or elicited vital appetite; I shall keep referring to the rational appetite as EVA, because for Suárez the EVA and the rational appetite are the same thing, he only calls it rational to distinguish it from the sensitive appetite). He argues like this:

P1 Diverse degrees of knowing being accord with diverse degrees of appetites.

P2 There are two degrees of knowing beings: the sensitive and the intellectives.

It follows, that there are two appetites: the sensitive and the rational, the material and the spiritual.281

The second conclusion was entailed by the first claim, which maintained that knowledge is the root and origin (radix et origo) of the appetite. Thus, from diverse types of knowledge there follow diverse types of appetite.

Suárez appeals to the different objects of these types of appetites as sign of their distinction. In effect, the objects of the SA are material and singular things. The EVA that follows the intellective knowledge cannot be inferior to this...

281 Secundum diversos gradus rerum cognoscentium sunt etiam diversi gradus appetituum. Unde sicut duplex est gradus cognoscentium, scilicet sentientium et intelligentium, ita duplex est appetitus: sensitivus et rationalis, materialis et spiritualis (d.10, q.1, n.3, p.286.)
knowledge, and this means that the objects of the EVA can be spiritual and universal things. Experience, for Suárez, indicates a distinction between these appetites. The SA strives for the sensible (sensibilium). The rational appetite strives for the divine and supernatural (supernaturalia et divina). Objects, however, are not for Suárez decisive in the distinction between the faculties of the soul, as we shall see in the next section.

In his former d.3, q.2, n.8 of De Anima, Suárez had contended that every faculty of the soul is intrinsically specified by its adjustment to operate on its object, and precisely this is what distinguishes one faculty from the others. The "specification" (specificatum intrinsica), however, did not amount to a real distinction between the faculties. Here in d.10, he emphasizes that it is not certain at all that the appetites (the EVA and SA) are really distinct faculties neither between themselves nor with regard to the soul. What is certain, he remarks, is that there are powers in us to produce the distinct acts of one and the other appetite, whether or not the entities are really distinct.

Still it might be said that there are two distinct appetites in the sense in which concupiscible and irascible appetites are distinct. Thus, Suárez goes on to explain that

---

282 On the object of appetite (obiectum appetibile) cf. d.10, q.2, pp.290-302.

283 The sensible appetite is the same than sensualitas which includes two powers. One, concupiscibilis, the other irascibilis. (De Anima, d.11, p.320).

284 Advertendum tamen non esse de fide hos appetitus esse entitates realiter distinctas inter se et ab anima -non enim ad opiniones pertinet -, sed tantum est certum esse in nobis potentias ad efficiendos actus utriusque appetitus sive sint distinctae entitatis sive non (d.10, q.1, n.3, p.288).
SA belongs to animals, the EVA belongs to angels, and both of them belong to human beings, because only in human beings are sensitive and intellectual knowledge connected.

To determine whether there is an EVA in God, who is a knowing nature, Suárez distinguishes between two senses of EVA. One sense conveys Suárez’s strict second definition of the EVA. It can be phrased thus:

(DEVA2) $x$ is an elicited vital appetite = def $x$ is a desire for a good which is not yet possessed.\(^{285}\)

In this strict sense, Suárez says, there is not EVA in God; it would imply indeed an imperfection.

For Suárez ‘a vital desire for a good which is not yet possessed’ seems to be the act of ‘desiring’ that indicates the need and lack of absent goods, for which the desiring being has to strive after. Precisely, this is one of the notorious roles of the human will, producing desirings for a variety of things. Such desirings certainly could not be ascribed to God.

The other sense that Suárez does want to attribute to God is expressed in his third definition of the EVA, and might be put as follows:

(DEVA3) $x$ is an elicited vital appetite = def. $x$ is the ability ($\textit{virtus}$) to love vitally.\(^{286}\)

\(^{285}\) \textit{Appetitus ut sic videtur significare desiderium quod est debitum bono non habito (d.10, q.1, n.3, p.288)}.

\(^{286}\) \textit{[...] Ut sic significat virtutem amandi vitaliter aliquod bonum (Ibid. p.290)}}
The DEVA3 includes the notion of vitality but emphasizes on ability to love, and not the activity of desiring. God does have this ability and it is the same as his essence, so he loves himself and therefore the creatures. However, God does not have the activity of striving after something external to him that he does not posses.

The DEVA3 allows Suárez to assert that in every knowing being, there is a special EVA, distinct from the natural appetite. In human beings Suárez would say there is the natural appetite, the special EVA as in DEVA3, and the EVA as in DEVA2. It is not clear at this point in Suárez's account of appetite whether in human beings there is a real distinction between the EVA3 and the EVA2. Later on, as we shall see, he will explicitly hold that acts are qualities distinct from faculties.

Summing up Suárez’s characterization of will as appetite, he first describes a non special appetite which turns out to be the natural inclination that each thing has toward its own well being. But in opposition to this natural inclination, Suárez argues for the existence of a special appetite, which we identify as EVA. The EVA, one might say, involves the notion of ‘vitality’ to separate the knowing from non-knowing beings. It also follows up elements that typically belong to intellectual knowledge: intention and apprehension; and it precedes the attainment in the process of striving after the unpossessed things. This process, in addition, involves a movement which takes place in the desiring process itself. This last element is clearly depicted by Suárez in a passage of his d.13 about the locomotive faculty. He writes:
The appetite is a faculty of tending to another; therefore it so agrees with that other that it is moved to attain it. For it belongs to one and the same faculty to tend towards the end as well as the effort (conatus) for attaining it.\footnote{appetitus est potentia inclinans ad aliud; ergo consonum illi est ut etiam moveatur ad illud consequendum, nam eiusdem potentiae est tendere in finem et conari ad consecutionem illius. (De Anima, d.13, q.unique, n.14, p.430).}

The movement that Suárez is describing in this passage does not seem to be quite "local movement" as understood by Aristotle and St. Thomas\footnote{In d.13 of De Anima Suárez lists the necessary factors involved in local movement such as: (1) bodily members, (2) appetite and (3) sensitive cognitive faculty. The appetite, however for Suárez, does not realize the local movement immediately; rather it commands (imperat) this movement, while the practical intellect directs it and the locomotive faculty itself realizes it (exequitur). According to Suárez's interpretation of Aristotle in lib. De Communi animalium motu and of St. Thomas in 1p., q.75, a3, ad3 (according to the Rome edition), they hold that the appetite is the principle of local movement, or that appetite is the efficient power of that movement.}, but rather the vital activity that includes a motus progressivus as expressed in the way of directedness and effort to attain something not yet possessed. To the Suarezian characterization of the production and termination of the activity of the EVA we turn now.


In q.2 of d.10 of his De Anima, Suárez deals with the question whether the act of desiring (actus appetendi) is produced by the appetitive faculty alone, and what is produced by it? The wording of q.2 in d.10 seems similar to Scotus' question...
'Whether anything other than the will causes effectively the act of willing' as it appears in Book II, distinction 25 of his Commentary on the Sentences.²⁹⁹

This is important to note at this point, because it is a sign that Suárez has surveyed Scotus' commentaries on the Sentences. Suárez is reacting to typical medieval concern about will and free will. He is presupposing that if the will produces its act by itself, it could be said that will is free in regard to the production of its act. But, as we shall see, Suárez's view on this matter dissents from that of Scotus and also from St. Thomas.

It should also be noted at this point that Suárez's account of the act and object of the appetitive faculty amounts to an account of the act and object of the EVA that ultimately will is. In this section we shall see that the EVA and the will are the same in regard to the production of acts.

Suárez clearly indicates his aim in addressing q.2 in d.10, viz., to inquire about the principle and 'terminus' of the act of desiring. By doing so he is investigating the production and effect of the act of the will; and in general, the manner in which the will functions.²⁹⁰

²⁹⁹ Quoted by Douglas C. Langston (1986, p.33).

²⁹⁰ In De Anima d.10, q.2, p.302 Suárez indicates his aim thus: Quaere, hoc supposito, dicendum est de principio et termino huius actionis.

Here Suárez is using the term 'terminus' in a technical manner. In various places he interchanges it with the term 'effect'. For instance, he says, 'the immanent action does not have a lasting 'terminus' (cf. d.5, q.5, Ibid., p.413). Sometimes, however, he uses 'terminus' to refer to the 'productive' act itself which is produced by the faculty. An illustration of this use may be seen in Suárez's account of the 'verbum mentis'. He asserts that this verbum is the terminus produced by the intellect to represent an object when the object is really absent. He takes it, however, that
The ontological status of the act is treated in detail by Suárez in his d.5, q.3 with respect to the case of the cognitive act. There he claims that acts are really or modally distinct from the faculties of the soul, they are real qualities. So he is assuming that the act of desiring is modally distinct from the EVA.

As we saw above, the modal distinction, for Suárez is a real distinction truly verified in reality and also a distinction secundum rem. Thus, the act of desiring is actually distinct from the EVA which it modifies, but not distinct from the subject it modifies. This amounts to a modal distinction between the desiring and the EVA, since the desiring has no proper entity of its own and it is always affixed to the appetitive faculty. It may be said, thus, that the desiring is real not by reason of being

the *verbum* is not distinct from the intellective cognitive act itself which function as a mirror (cf. d.5, q.5, p.386). Furthermore, Suárez uses 'terminus' to distinguish between the *ratio* of action and that of the passion. Action and passion, he explains, 'tends toward the *terminus*, but in a different way. Action produces the *terminus* according to a requirement imposed by the principle from which the action proceeds, since the *terminus* is the same as certain primary and essentially to the principle itself; hence, to the *terminus*. Passion, instead imprints on the subject (*licet officiat subiectum*), but it does it by putting something new in it; and this is the *terminus* (d.3, q.2, n.25, p.107).

The defense of this claim is presented by Suárez in *De Anima*, d.5, q.3, n.3,4, pp.344-346.

In *Disp. Met.*, d.18, s.5, n.10-12, Suárez clearly explains that the act is always something in reality, essentially and significantly distinct from the faculty. The real distinction is clear, for the respect of potency to its act is real. An active faculty is an efficient principle of its act, a true efficiency can only take place between things really distinct, the real distinction is sometimes a real distinction, sometimes modal but it is always essential for a potency and act to be distinct in reality (*secundum rem*) and have diverse and opposite aspects.
Suárez is supposing that they are one and the same thing.

Suárez begins by surveying different opinions concerning the question what is the elicited efficient principle of the elicited act (of desiring).^293

The first opinion -attributed to Godfrey by Scotus, according to Suárez- maintained that what produces the act of desiring is the apprehended desired object, while the act is received by the appetite which is considered to be simply passive.

The second opinion, attributed to "others" by Suárez, holds that an active appetite produces the desiring and that the act is received by another passive appetitive faculty. Suárez partially accepts this second view as probable on the grounds of his own tenet, viz., that the act of love (actus amandi) is vital and immanent. This means that the act must be produced efficaciously by the same faculty that receives the act. This view will be explained below.

The third opinion is shared with different variations by Gregory of Rimini, Gabriel Biel, Paludanus, Henry of Ghent and Cajetan. They claim that the object

---

293 Suárez talks of the 'elicited principle' and 'elicited act'. For he maintains that the vital appetitive act (i.e., the tendency or desiring) can be elicited or commanded (elicitus et imperatus). The act of seeing, according to Suárez, is elicited by the faculty of sight which produces the act directly and physically. The elicited act is called so, Suárez says, in respect to a faculty of similar or equal perfection. The same elicited act, however, is called commanded in respect to a faculty of superior perfection from which the act proceeds morally by its command and consent. Suárez explains that he is not concerned here with what morally causes the desiring, but with what efficaciously produces it (Cf. De Anima, d.10, 3, 5, p.304).

294 Est enim actus amandi vitalis et immanens, et ideo necessario debet effective fieri ab ipsa potentia in qua recipitur (De Anima, d.10, 3, 3, p.304).
concurs efficiently in the production of the act. According to Suarez, some of them would say that the object concurs in the production of natural appetitive acts but in the production of free-acts; others contend that the object concurs efficiently with the act under its ratio of being apprehended, and Cajetan asserts that the object concurs efficiently not with regard to the realization, but just in regard to the specification of the act. Suarez rejects all but Cajetan's versions of the third opinion, and he accepts Cajetan's view only with certain modifications. In particular, Suarez does not agree with Cajetan on the latter's claim that the desired-known object has an efficient role in the production of the act. Suarez's own position is precisely that

the appetitive faculty alone produces its proper act without the efficacy of the desired-known object.

295 Here Suarez quotes Cajetan's Commentaries on St. Thomas, 1, q.80, a.2

Sola potentia appetitiva absque efficientia appetibilis cogniti elicit actum suum (A. 10, 3, 6, p.306).

According to Suarez this position was also held by Scotus in 2, d.25, q.1; and by St. Thomas in ST 1, q.82, a.4, and in De Veritate, q.22, a.12; by Capreolus in 2, d.24-25, and by Silvester of Ferrara in Contra Gentes, ch.44.

But it is not obvious that St. Thomas and Scotus held straightforward this position as presented by Suarez. D.C. Langston, in op. dt., presents a different interpretation of both of St. Thomas' and Scotus' positions. For St. Thomas, according to Scotus, Langston refers, 'the moving cause of the will is the object known by the intellect' (cf. op., cit., p.34). While Scotus' own view, according to Langston, is that 'the intellect, the known object, and the will are all cooperating partial causes of volition. The will, however, is the principal agent of the three partial causes' (Ibid. p.34).

Suarez would reject both positions in this interpretation. Because, for Suarez, St. Thomas is talking metaphysically or morally in regard to the moving (final) cause but not physically about the principle of action (D. Thomas ubicumque de eo loquitur. Et quando finem vocat pricipium actionis, loquitur moraliter, non physice) (A.10, 3, 11, p.316).

Regarding Scotus' position, Suarez says without explicitly referring to Scotus, that the view is unjustified if it meant to say that the appetitive faculty and the object
Suárez proceeds to defend his position by distinguishing the meanings of the sentences in Cajetan's position. The first of Cajetan's sentences may be explicated as Sentence A,

's the object concurs with the production (exercitium) of the act'; or as Sentence B,

'the object produces the act in its specification'.

According to Suárez, Sentence A may mean either that

A1 'the object moves efficiently the potency to act', or that

A2 'the object concurs efficiently to the realization of the substance of the act'.

Sentence B, according to Suárez, means either that

B1 'the object does not move the potency into act, unless the potency by itself produces and moves to an act of such species', or that

B2 'the object produces the specific difference in the act without producing the generic difference or the rest of its substantial features'.

Suárez will show that neither A1 nor A2 justifies the claim that the desired-known object is efficiently involved in the production of the act.

To prove that A1 is false, Suárez argues in a reductio ad absurdum fashion like this: Suppose that the object efficiently moved the appetite from potency to act, then

do not concur in the production of the act as potency and active form, but simply as two partial agents. Because Suárez contends that the appetite ex se has a sufficient inclination toward the object, so it is sufficient ex se to produce the act. (Quodsi dicas potentiam appetitivam et obictum non concurre tamquam potentiam et forman actuantem, sed tamquam duo partialia agentia, hoc primo, sine ratione fingitur, quia cum ipse appetitus ex se habeat sufficientem inclinationem ad obiectum, ex se est sufficiens elicere actum, et superfluum est fingere efficientem in objecto. (A.10, 3, 7, p.308)
it would do it either in the manner in which the object moves the cognitive faculty, producing something in the appetite which constitutes it in first act, or not by producing anything in the appetite, but rather by moving it into second act. But the first disjunct is impossible, according to Suárez. The reason, he argues, is that

the desire (appetitio) is a vital and actual inclination toward the object; the appetitive faculty is by itself inclined toward the good, hence, it is by itself constituted in first act, so it does not need any form that would constitute it in first act. Furthermore, if the object were to produce something in the potency, this would be a likeness (similitudo) [...] but the likeness is something strange to the appetite, since the act of desiring is not performed by assimilation, but rather by inclination to the desired thing.

The reason alluded to by Suárez in this passage is fundamental to understanding how the appetitive faculty functions, and what is that in virtue of which is distinct from the intellective faculty.

---

297 Here Suárez refers to St. Thomas’s S T, I, 24, 4 in support of his position. However, St. Thomas’s point, according to T. Mullaney, is that the intellect is in act because the object known is in the intellect, according to its likeness, through a species. But the will is an act not through the presence in the will of the thing willed. Mullaney (1950, p.5) remarks that St. Thomas neither says nor implies that the will needs no form in order to be constituted in act.

298 Si obiectum cognitum ita moveret appetitum, vel hoc esset efficiendo aliquid in appetitu -per quod constitueretur in actu primo, ad modum quo obiectum potentiae cognoscitiae movere illam-, vel id esset nihil producendo.

Primum dici non potest. Potentia enim appetitiva ex se est in actu primo constituta, ut notavi D. Thomas, S T, I, q.27. a.4. Et ratio est, quia appetitio est quaedam vitalis et actualis inclinatio ad objectum; potentia autem appetitiva de se inclinata ad bonum, et ideo de se est in actu primo constituta, neque eget forma per quam constituta, nisi forte habitu aliquo, non simpliciter, sed ad melius esse.

Item, si obiectum aliquid efficere in potentiam, id esset aliqua similitudo, nam quid aliud potest efficere? Huismodi autem similitudo impertinens est appetitui, nam appetitio non fit per assimilacionem, sed per propensionem in rem amatam. (De Anima, d.10, 3, 6, p.306)
In order to reject the competing positions and to establish his own conclusion about the role of the object in the appetite act, Suárez presupposes his accounts of immanent action, and of vital act. The former is presented in his De Anima, d.3, q.2, in d.5, q.4., and expanded in *Disp. Met.*, d.18, s.7, while the latter is exposed in De Anima, d.5, q.4, in respect to the efficient production of the cognitive act. In what follows we will make a digression from d.10, q.2 to sketch Suárez's views on these issues.

Traditionally it was understood that in every cognitive faculty one should distinguish two really distinct faculties: one that produces the act, and another that receives it. The grounds for this strict distinction was the principle that one thing cannot be active and passive in the same respect. So, to separate the active and passive principles authors distinguished sense as active and sense as passive, and the same for intellect and the appetite.

For Suárez this view has no probability regarding immanent actions. He raises questions such as this: which of the separate faculties knows, (which of the separate faculties desires) the one that produces the act or the one that receives it?\(^\text{299}\) It cannot be the one that receives it, he answers, because to know is to act vitally; to desire is also to act vitally. To act vitally, for Suárez, implies intrinsically the action. The faculties cannot be purely active either, since knowledge and desire, are for Suárez, intrinsic forms of the cognitive being. He thinks that it is impossible that a faculty be cognitive (or appetitive) without being informed by the acts of

\(^{299}\) Cf. *De Anima*, d.5, q.4, p.351.
knowledge (or desire). Thus, he concludes that it is impossible to totally separate and attribute to different faculties the function of acting and that of receiving (agere et recipere)\(^{300}\) For these reasons he posits his theory of immanent actions.

The faculties of intellect and will, for Suárez, are active faculties, i.e., ordained to activity, that produce and receive in themselves their acts of knowledge or desire. The faculties themselves are conceived as potencies and active forms altogether, because they act with immanent actions.

Immanent actions (IA) are contrasted by Suárez with transient actions (TA). These latter are also produced by active faculties. IA and TA agree in at least two features, and differ in at least other three features.

For Suárez, IA and TA agree on the following:

1. In both, action, passion (or reception), and the terminus are one and the same thing.
2. Both act upon something else.

But IA and TA differ on that:

1. TA act upon something other that behaves as a subject producing in the subject certain similar form.

IA do not act upon the subject, for they do not produce anything in it, rather IA look at the subject as object either known or desired.

2. The *terminus* produced by the TA is not ordained to other object, e.g., illumination and light.

\(^{300}\) C.f. Ibid.
In IA the *terminus* itself is ordained to the object; also the faculty since it is the mean by which the object is known.

Traditionally the difference between TA and IA was attributed to the fact that TA (common to inanimate beings) produces a lasting terminus in the subject, while the IA does not produce anything. Suárez, however, sees the main difference in that an IA, unlike a TA, is a vital action. The reason, he asserts, is that vital actions posit from within the actual concurrence of the first vital principle.\(^{301}\)

This contention allows Suárez to reject the view according to which the faculties of intellect and appetite do not produce the acts but receive them from the object, and thus the action proceeds from an extrinsic principle.

In the Aristotelian-Thomistic tradition it was understood that faculties are potentialities, and that their essence is possibility (St. Thomas uses these expressions in s.1, q.87, a.1, to refer to Aristotle's *On the Soul* Book III, 4, 429). Thus, since they are potency, they are apt to receive, rather than have any activity; in order to have activity a faculty needed something other which makes it move from pure potentiality to metaphysical act. For this reason St. Thomas held that

the intellective faculty is an act because the object known is in the intellect, according to its similitude, through a species (s.1, 24, 4).

\(^{301}\) Cf. *De Anima*, d.3, q.2, n.16, also d.5, q.5, n.31: *Actiones immanentes sunt vitales, et ideo ab intrinseco postulant actuadem concursum primi principii vitae.*
For Scotus, according to Suárez, the cognitive act is effect of the intellective faculty altogether with the species, both are partial causes that integrate one active principle; but what constitutes the faculty in first act is the species. For Suárez these views deny activity to the faculty itself. According to Suarez's position, instead, activity is not in the species alone, but above all it belongs to soul and its faculties. In fact the role of the faculties of intellect and will is to exercise an immediate specific activity on their own acts.

The traditional views, namely, that of St. Thomas, Cajetan and Scotus, according to Suárez, accept the principle according to which 'one thing cannot reduce ex se from potency to act'. In Scotus's case Suárez takes it that he holds that the appetitive faculty and the object do not occur as potency and active form, but like two partial causes that act. Suárez rejects Scotus' position on the ground that for him the appetite itself has a sufficient inclination toward the object, so by itself suffices to produce the act without need of a cooperating efficient cause.

Confronting St. Thomas, Suárez rejects the strict division between potency and act. Instead, he has posited the concept of virtual act, as we saw above, namely, a reality or potency which is not pure potency, because from its own potentiality it can become actual, i.e., a formal reality. The will is this reality represented with the

---

302 Cf. De Anima, d.5, q.4, n.7, p.356, where Suárez refers to Scotus' 1, d.3, q.7, n.20, in o.c., 4.3, pp.361-364, and q.8, pp.398-403.

303 [...] quia activitas vere non est in sola specie, sed potissime in anima et potentiis (De Anima, d.5, q.4, n.5, p.354)

304 Cf. De Anima, d.10, q.3, p.308.
Suarezian concept of virtual act. Virtual act, vital act, and immanent action are Suárez's distinctive characterization of will.

Turning to our discussion above, regarding the species, Suárez, unlike Cajetan, distinguishes the faculty from the species and from its act qua quality. The faculty, according to Suárez, relates to the species in its receptive aspect, i.e., receiving it; and it relates to the cognitive act in its active aspect.

Suárez will not deny that the species exercises some activity on the cognitive act. He in fact agrees with the classical proposition 'knowledge is performed by an act of assimilation of the object by the knowing being'. He concludes that the cognitive faculty needs a form that functions as principle of assimilation; such a principle is the species.

Suárez's view is that the faculty informed by the species constitutes the integral unitary instrument of the soul by which it acts. The species, Suárez maintains, is not an instrument of the faculty; if it were, it would by itself produce immediately the cognitive act. The species, thus understood, is not what constitutes

---

305 In *De Anima*, d.5, q.3, n.1-9, Suárez is interestingly concerned with the problem of reducing the faculty to its acts, or to the species. He suggests that this would amount to reducing the soul itself to its own activities. He opposes, however, the sort of reductionism put forth by Cajetan.

306 *Nam cognitio fit per assimlationem cognoscentus ad rem cognitam* (*De Anima*, d.5, q.4, n.14, p.364.)
the faculty, either in first or in second act. It rather informs the faculty so it can
produce a better sort of cognitive act, if the species itself is clear. 307

Now one can see that for Suárez the difference between the cognitive and
appetitive faculties reside precisely in that the cognitive faculty needs the species to
assimilate the object. The faculty informed by the species produces the act of
knowledge. The appetitive faculty, instead, does not operate by assimilation, rather
the faculty itself along with its vital immanent act are ordained by way of inclination
toward the desired object. 306 The appetite, thus, does not need any form to be in

307 The nature of ‘intentional species’ of the cognitive faculty is discussed by
Suárez in De Anima, d.5, q.2. For Suárez the intentional species are formal
similitudes of the object. To be a similitude belongs to the essence of the quality that
the species is. The species is constituted in its esse qualitatis, Suárez holds, because
of its feature of being representative (Cf. pp.328, 325).

In d.5, q.3, Suárez agrees with authors like Paulus Venetus, Niphus, Cajetan,
John of Ripa, Gabriel and others whom Suárez considers nominalists, and who
maintain that the species can be received in the faculty in two ways:

(1) as dying away (quasi mortu) so to speak, like in the case in which the
    faculty does not focus its attention in the reception of the species;

(2) as vitally received by the faculty, i.e, when the soul focuses its
    attention.

Notice that this distinction seems a quasi ancestor of Hume’s distinction
between ideas and impressions, respectively.

[...] species dupliciter potest recipi in potentia: uno modo quasi mortue,, ut
quando potentia non atendit receptionen speciei, quomodo recipitur species in oculo
quando, ad alia atendens, homo non videt. Qui dicitur mortuus modus, quia illo etiam
modo recipitur in aere vel in speculo. et in hoc omnes conveniut, quod actus cognoscendi
est aliquid distinctum ab hac receptione speciei, ut in sensu interiori et intellectu patet,
ubi species manent in potentia absque actuali cognitione. Alio ergo modo recipitur
species in potenti, nempe vitaliter, ut quando anima atendit. Quae attentio nos est
aliquid distinctum re ab anima et potentia, sed modus quidam illius (De Anima, d.5,
q.3, n.1, p.340).

308 Faculties and acts, according to Suárez, are adjusted or ordained to
the objects. This is what it means to say that objects specify the acts (Cf. De Anima, d.3,
q.2, n.8, p.91).
first act, it is by itself in first act. To be first act for Suárez means that the appetite is an active principle able to produce an immanent vital act. In regard to its vital act of desire it is said that the appetitive faculty is constituted in first act.\(^{309}\)

The second disjunct, i.e., that the desired object would efficiently move the potency to act, not producing anything in the appetite, but rather moving it to second act, is also unacceptable to Suárez, because

the stimulus of the object on the potency can be understood only in an objective way, in which there is no efficacy involved. Furthermore, the faculty would behave simply in a passive way by receiving the act of the object.\(^{310}\)

The object, according to Suárez, does relate to the faculty, but if its stimulus (\textit{impulsio}) is understood as objectively present to the appetite, it means that it is represented by a formal concept (in the way of a word or a common \textit{ratio})\(^{311}\) which does not function efficaciously.

On the other hand, we already pointed out that in Suárez the faculty of appetite is not merely passive; if it received the act from the object, this would deny the essence of the vital act.

Therefore, Suárez justifies his rejection of the claim that the object produces the act in its \textit{exercitium}; viz., Sentences A and A1 above must also be rejected.

\(^{309}\) [... \textit{actus appetendi est actus vitae et respectu illius est potentia posita in actu primo}.\)

\(^{310}\) \textit{Secundum etiam dici non potest. Illa enim impulsio potentiae ab obiecto facta non potest intelligi, nisi obiective, in quo non includitur aliqua efficientia.} \textit{(De Anima, d.10, q.3, n.7, p.308)}.\)

\(^{311}\) Cf. \textit{Disp.Met.}, d.2, s.11, n.8, n.14, pp.377-383
Against A2, i.e., that the object concurs efficiently in the production of the substance of the act Suárez argues as follows:

P1 The only thing that efficiently concurs to the substance of the act of a faculty is that which constitutes the faculty in first act.

P2 The faculty is *ex-se* constituted in first act, not by the object.

Therefore, it is the faculty itself, apart from the object, that produces the act.

In support of P1, he consistently insists that it is the form that constitutes the thing in act, and so is its active principle.\(^{312}\)

In favor of his conclusion Suárez invokes a special feature of his notion ‘vital’.

Consider the following passage:

By being a vital act the appetition can only be produced by the faculty of which it is act; if another cause had to concur, this would be something prior to the faculty, insofar as the faculty itself makes use [of the object]; in this consists the essence of the vital. But appetite cannot make use of the known object or of the formal apprehension of the object, since it is given in another faculty.\(^{313}\)

Suárez's conclusion is that neither the object nor the apprehension of the object is involved in the production of the substance of the appetitive act.

In regard to Sentence B, whether the object produces the act in its specification, Suárez does concede to the object a role in the specification of the acts.

---

\(^{312}\) *Forma est principium agendi quae rem in actu constituit (De Anima, d.10, q.3, n.7).*

\(^{313}\) *Item, id videtur impossibile, quia cum appetitio sit actus vitalis, non potest elicit nisi a potentia cuius est actus, et si aliud deberet concurrere, id esset actus potentiae primus, ut potentia ipsa utitur illo. In hoc consistit ratio vitae. Appetitus autem non potest uti obiecto cognito neque ipsa formali apprehensione obiecti, cum sit in alia potentia; haec ergo non concurrit effective ad substantiam actus. (A. d.10, q.3, n.7, p.308)*
and faculty itself, however, not in the sense conveyed by Sentence B2. The reason, he explains, is that whatever is the physical cause of the entity of the thing is also the cause of all that which belongs to its essence, and vice-versa. Besides, the arguments already alluded are also relevant against B2. For, according to Suarez, the appetitive act even about such species, is a vital act, with regard to which the appetitive faculty is constituted in first act.\(^{314}\)

Suárez's own position is expressed Sentence B1: the object produces the act in its specification if the object does not move the potency into act, unless the potency by itself produces and moves to act.

In a passage of De Anima, d.3, q.3, Suárez has shown that his view conflicts with St. Thomas's position on this issue. According to Suárez, St. Thomas holds that the faculty is not specified by the act; rather, the act is specified by the faculty, especially if the active faculty is involved.\(^{315}\)

The difficulty of St. Thomas's view can be seen in Suárez's counterexample about the case of (the action of) heating. Heating is specifically the same in the sun and in fire, although the active principles from which heating proceeds are

\(^{314}\) [*] quia actus appetendi, etiam prout est in tali specie, est actus vitae et respectu illius est potentia posita in actu primo. (De Anima, d.10, q.3, n.8, p.311).

\(^{315}\) [*] in quantum actio -inquit- specificatur a principio activo a quo procedit. (De Anima, d.3, q.3)

Suárez refers here to St. Thomas S T, I, 2, q.1, a.3. Suárez considers St. Thomas's view false and it is in tension with what St. Thomas says in ST, I, q.77: Iuxta quam doctrinam, non potentia specificatur per actum, sed potius actus a potentia, et maxime in potentia activa, quae est principium agendi, a quo actio ut sic sumit speciem [secundum] D. Thomam. Hoc tamen falsum videtur, et contra eundem Ip., q.77 (De Anima, d.3, q.3, n.15, p.98)
specifically different. To correct and broaden St Thomas's view, Suárez proposes his novel tripartite account of the immanent action in *De Anima*, d.3, q.2. From such an account the following corollary is drawn:

Immanent action as action and as quality is specified by the object although under different aspects which depend on two ways in which the object relates to the faculty.

One way in which the object relates to the faculty is as a principle that alters (*immutantis*) the faculty, determining it to *elicit* such act. Thus understood, the object concurs to specify the action as action. The second way in which the object relates to the faculty is as the *terminus*, that which terminates (*terminantis*) the immanent act. Thus understood, the object specifies the act insofar the act is quality (*qualitas est*).

Considering the first way in which Suárez relates the object to the faculty, it is not obvious at all that he is denying the efficacy of the object. He replies, however, that he takes efficacy in a metaphorical rather than the strict sense when he said that

the presented object moves the appetite toward the object of such determinate species by moving it toward the act that acts on such determinate object.

---

316 According to Suárez the immanent action receives its specification with respect to (i) its production, i.e, as action *ut sic*; (ii) passion or reception (*a quo passio*); and (3) act or quality; modally or really distinct from the faculty.

317 [...] *concurrat ad specificationem actionis, ut actio est* (Ibid.).

318 Cf. *De Anima*, d.3, q.2, pp.100-103.

319 [...] *si non intelligatur de efficientia propria, sed metaphorica, id est quod objectum praesens movet appetitum ad objectum talis species, quia movet ad actum circa tale objectum* (Ibid., n.8, p.310).
But if ‘efficacy’ is taken strictly, Suárez remarks, the thesis comes out simply false. His contention on the specification of the acts bears on the natural and free acts. On the natural acts, because the faculty is inclined toward them. And on the free acts, because the faculty has dominion over them. This explains, according to Suárez, that such acts cannot be efficaciously produced by an extrinsic principle.

Regarding the initial question, what is produced by the act of will, it was usually presupposed that the act of the appetite produces something and that something has to be really distinct from the act. In respect to this issue, Suárez agrees with St. Thomas, in S T, I, q.27, a.3, and q.37, a.1, maintaining that in the appetitive act there are two aspects: one of acting (operationis), and another of being acted upon (operari); and also that in such act there is a terminus and a way to it. The usual reason is that where there is a new quality produced, there must also be production of it.

Suárez admits that the appetitive act is a quality. But he holds that it is not the case that necessarily the action produced is really distinct from the act as quality. He proposes, instead, that what is produced by the appetite is the terminus (or what terminates) the act of desire, or love.

This view is a result of Suárez’s account of the appetitive act as an immanent act. In immanent acts there is no real distinction between action-passion and terminus. This account, we think, constitutes a break down of the Thomistic strict separation between potency and act.
In Suárez’s world the desired object becomes the terminus, and hence a moral final cause of the desiring. As a final cause the object cannot function as the efficient cause of the desiring. On these premises Suárez establishes that the will alone is the origin and efficient cause of its own acts.

To advance in our understanding of Suárez’s account of the nature of the acts of will we need to discuss, first, how many kinds of acts of will there are, and second whether these acts are free. To these matters we turn next.

3. Analysis of Freedom in *De Anima*.

In d.12 of *De Anima* -entitled ‘rational appetite or will’- Suárez presupposes his accounts on the nature of the faculties in general\(^\text{320}\), his account of the sensitive appetite\(^\text{321}\), and his account of the act and nature of the will as EVA. So in this disputation he concentrates on three important issues connected with will, organizing his thoughts under three headings, viz.,

q.1 Objects and acts of will.
q.2 Are the acts of will free?
q.3 Which faculty is more perfect, intellect or will?

\(^{320}\) As are presented in d.2, q.3.

\(^{321}\) Presented in *De Anima*, d.11. In this disputation Suárez answers three questions, viz., q.1, whether there are various faculties in the sensitive appetite with different objects?, q.2, how many and what kind are the acts of the sensitive appetite?, q.3, whether the operations of the sensitive appetite are subjected to the motion of will and reason. It should be noticed that Suárez refers to the will as rational appetite only in contrast to the sensitive appetite.
Our discussion in this section centers on question two for two reasons. The first one is that I intend to determine in what sense Suárez may be regarded as a libertarian, and what is the sense of 'to be free' that he endorses. The second reason is that the contents of this question up to now have not been commented upon, because the question did not appear in previous editions of Suárez's *De Anima*. In addition, a review of these writings is needed to complement Suárez's account on freedom in d.19 of his *Disputationes Metaphysicae*.

The discussions by Suárez presented here revolve around various metaphysical categories of acts of will, various ascriptions of the word 'liberum arbitrium', the definition of a free faculty, and the 'formal' versus 'radical' origin of freedom.

In the discussion one can see that Suárez struggles to leave out the common theological concerns. In fact, from the very start he acknowledges that the question on freedom has a fundamental dependency on theology, and he formulates various theological questions\(^\text{322}\); but it is clear that his purpose is to study the question exclusively on its own grounds.

\(^{322}\) To a perfect clarification of freedom, he asserts, it is necessary to know:

1. How God can know with certainty the free operations without suppressing freedom? (*Quomodo Deus posset certo cognoscere operationes liberas, non auferendo libertatem*);
2. How can divine providence and concurrence -and especially the prevenient grace- be compatible with the freedom of choice (*quomodo Dei providentia et concursus -et potissime quodomo illius praeveniens gratia- stet cum libertate arbitrii*);
3. How is it possible that predestination and confirmation in grace do not suppress freedom? (*quomodo praedestinatio et confirmatio in gratia non tollat libertatem*).

*Quaestio de libertate voluntate [...] de theologia potissime pendent, nam ad illius perfectam divisionem necesse est scire quomodo Deus posset certo cognoscere operationes liberas, non auferendo libertatem*. (*De Anima*, d.12, q.2, n.2, p.382).
As for the treatment of question two itself, Suárez proceeds in a traditional scholastic fashion. First, he presents eight arguments representative of competing positions. Next, he distinguishes different senses of the concept of freedom. In third place, he posits his own thesis and the defense of it. Finally he offers responses to specific arguments against the view that the will is free in its acts.\footnote{Suárez's response to the necessitarian arguments will be addressed in the final part of this work.}

We shall focus on Suárez's classification of the acts of will, his conceptual analysis of key terms, 'origin' of freedom, and Suárez's sense of "to be free" in regard to the acts.

The first thing that Suárez notes regarding the acts of will is that every act found in the sense of appetite is also found in the will in a higher manner, because in the will the acts are spiritual, i.e., without dependence on the natural somatic affections. One of Suárez’s arguments in support of the spirituality of the faculty of will and its acts is found, as we mentioned in Chapter I, in De Anima, d.2, q.3, there he writes:

The will has free and independent acts; for this reason cannot be necessitated either by the heavens or by any other natural agent. Thus such act must be spiritual, because there is not any material action that cannot be hindered by a material agent, like the sense appetite which turns in this or that direction, since when it is affected with pain, it flees and hates, while when it is delighted it loves and gets close. The will, however, is independent because it can even hate things delightful for the body. Nor is the will compelled either to love any object, even if the object is the most persuasive, or to hate it, even
if the object is the most sad. Thus, all these facts argue in favor of the immateriality of will.\textsuperscript{324}

The discussion of this section will revolve on the independence of the acts of will from the rational activities of the intellectual faculty of the soul. In our further section devoted to the relationship between intellect and will, the discussion revolves more directly on the causal indetermination of the will with respect to the intellect.

In the Figure 2 given below we represent the acts found either in sense appetite or in will in the way that Suárez relates them to their objects, i.e., good or evil, or to the way that the appetite tends toward them, i.e., in the present or in future dimensions.

In the will the distinction between irascible (\textit{irascibilis}) and concupiscible (\textit{concupiscibilis}) is not real as it is in the sensory appetite; it is rather a distinction of reason, because the faculty is immaterial and universal in its own genus.\textsuperscript{325}

In the will these acts could be considered either as means or as ends. Both categories regard the good. The end could be regarded as an absolute good, as a

\textit{De Anima}, d.12, p.368.

\textsuperscript{324} \textit{Habent enim [voluntas] actus. Habet enim actus liberrimos et independentes ab omni creatura; unde neque a caelo, neque a cuoqunque alio agente creato necessitari potest; talis autem actus necessario debet esse spiritualis. Nulla est et actio [materialis] quae non possit a materiali agente impedire, ut appetitus sensitivus facile [huc] illucque convertitur, nam si afficitur dolore, refugit et odit; si delectatur, amat et perfertur; voluntas vero independens est, nam ipsa delectabilia corporalia odio habere potest, neque ab objecto ullo, quantumvis vehementi, necessitatur ad amandum, neque ab objecto, quantumvis tristi, necessitatur ad odio habendum; ergo haec immaterialitatem arguunt in tali potentia.}(De Anima,d.2, q.3, n.18, pp.184-86)

\textsuperscript{325} De Anima, d.12, p.368.
good to be possessed (*prout habendum*), or as a habit already possessed (*iam habitum*). As an absolute good, the end is considered an intended end; as a habit the end is considered fruition (*fruitio*) or joy.

On the other hand, a means may be viewed in a two-fold sense. In one sense, a means is considered only a means; as such it is not desirable in itself but is only desirable for the sake of obtaining another thing or end. In a second sense, a means
mediates between an ultimate intended end and a prior means; in regard to the prior means it is an end, but in regard to the ultimate end it is simply a means.\footnote{Suárez’s classification of the acts of will has implications for ethical theories. John L. Treloar (1991, pp. 387-405), has clearly shown that Suárez’s classification of the acts of will is connected with Suárez’s ethical theory in general, and with his doctrine of virtue in particular.}

Next Suárez goes on to classify the acts of will according to the category of means as means. An act of will that attains a means as means is choice (electio); another is use (usus). According to this distinction the rational process described by Suárez might be summed up in two steps: (i) the will intends some end, and (ii) the intellect deliberates on an adequate means to present them to the will.

The activity of will about these means is of two sorts. First, it consists in accepting some of the means. This is to consent or to choose (consentire vel elegere). ‘Consenting’ in a broad sense, Suárez explains, means any volitional act either about an end or a means. In the strict sense consenting means the application of the will to some determinate means. This act is the result of a prior deliberation of the intellect.

Second, if the act of accepting is efficacious and it isolates the favorite means it is called ‘choice’. After the choice is made, the third step is to carry out the execution (executionis) of the act. This is the role of the act of use. Thus understood use is an act of will by which the will applies every faculty to its operation. The reason, according to Suárez, is that a means is chosen for the sake of execution. So, if the execution turns out to be the "executive hand", then the will possesses power
to apply this executive hand to operation. He adds, given that will tends toward the universal good, it must have an efficacy that influences every force \((vim)\) of the soul to apply them to their functions. This is called use.\(^{327}\)

As a result of this earlier analysis, Suárez brings up a complementary distinction between elicited and commanded acts of will \((elicitos et imperatos)\). An elicited act proceeds immediately from the will. A commanded act proceeds from another different faculty which submits to the use and motion of the will. Vegetative acts, the continual movement of our heart, and natural movements of our body such as growth, are not commanded acts, because they are not under our power \(\textit{non sunt in potestate nostra}\).\(^{328}\)

The classification of acts of will under the categories of means as means, elicited and commanded acts provide a basis for the answer to Suárez's question: Are the acts of will free?

This question however has two senses according to Suárez. They are:

(A) Is our will absolutely free? and

(B) Does the will exercise its freedom with respect to all its acts or just in respect to some, and which are they?\(^{329}\)

\(^{327}\) \([\ldots]\) \textit{si est manu exequendum, habet voluntas potestatem ac applicandam manum ad operandum.} \textit{(De Anima, d.12, q.1, n.4, pp.372-374)}.

\(^{328}\) Ibid., n.5, p.374.

\(^{329}\) \([\ldots]\) \textit{est an, hoc dato, [voluntas] exerceat hanc libertatem in omnibus actibus suis an in quibusdam tantum, et qui sunt illi} \textit{(Ibid).}
To answer these questions, Suárez begins distinguishing three different senses of the term 'freedom' (*libertatem*). First, 'freedom' is opposed to 'slavery' (*servitut*). Second, 'freedom' is opposed to 'necessity'. We already discussed this most proper sense of the term freedom in regard to Suárez's d.19, s.2 of his *Disputationes Metaphysicae*. Third, 'freedom' is opposed to 'compulsion'; someone who is coerced is also necessary forced.

Suárez's analysis of the word 'liberum' in the locution 'liberum arbitrium' concerns the latter sense of freedom insofar as the etymology of the word. 'Liberum', according to Suárez, derives from the word 'libet', i.e., 'pleasing', or 'I want to'.

According to Suárez, in this sense a 'free' agent would be called free if it acts with spontaneity.\(^\text{330}\)

But if Suárez endorses this definition of 'free' agent he should not be called a libertarian, for he would fail to fulfill what philosophers in the recent literature stipulate as necessary and sufficient conditions for being called libertarian. The first condition is to hold that an agent is free if it has the ability to perform an action and to refrain from performing an action. The second condition is that the agent must have the opportunity to exercise his ability to refrain from performing the action.\(^\text{331}\) According to this criterion if Suárez's account fails any of these conditions, he cannot be considered as libertarian relative to the action.

\(^{330}\) *Nam liberum arbitrium, ut Soto, cap.15, lib. 5, notavit, a verbo 'libet' dictum est, quasi ille dicatur liber quia sponte quodlibet operatur (De Anima, d.12, q.2, n.5, p.388).*

\(^{331}\) This is the criteria used by D. L. Langstom (1989, p.36) to determine whether Scotus can be labeled a libertarian.
I think, however, that the second condition cannot be applied in Suárez's case given the questions A, B in which he frames his views. So my concern here is to determine the sense in which the will is free regarding its actions on Suárez's account.

Suárez, however, agrees with the first necessary condition for being called a libertarian for in explaining in what 'liberum arbitrium' consists, he writes freedom consists in that given all the necessary conditions for action, the faculty can still move on to act or it can not move on act.\(^{332}\)

Suárez explains his definition by offering an example according to which the eye would be called free if in the presence of a visible object and with its eye-lid opened, it could see or not see to elicit the act of seeing. In fact the eye has a faculty to elicit the act of seeing but does not have the ability to choose to see or not to see the object.

Suárez's answer to question A, Is our will absolutely free? is expressed in a thesis, viz.,

will possesses freedom and dominion (dominium) over its operations or acts.\(^{333}\)

The proof by induction for this thesis is expressed in this passage,

\(^{332}\) *Libertas consistit in hoc quod potentia possit exire in actum, et non exire, positis omnibus requisitis ad agendum, ut sic, proposito objecto visibili, et palpebris discoopertis, possit oculus videre et non videre, esset liber.* (De Anima, d.12, q.2, n.5, p.388).

\(^{333}\) *Voluntas habet libertatem et dominion suarum operationum seu actionum* (De Anima, d.12, q.2, n.7, p.390).
Man, by its own nature, is the lord of his actions; his dominion consists precisely in that he could exercise or not exercise its acts freely; therefore man is free.\(^{334}\)

It can be said that Suárez has distinguished between two senses of 'power' in regard to the will. In one sense Suárez talks of the faculty of will. The will is understood as a power or potency able to produce by itself its acts. In a second sense, Suárez stresses that will is dominion and interchanges this term with 'potestas'. Thus understood will is power over, mastery over, appropriation of one's own act. This is his first required condition for the possibility to exercise or not to exercise one's action.\(^{335}\)

The condition of ownership and dominion is also needed to decide what to choose and how to use one's own actions; and thus, Suárez's answer to question (A), is that our will possesses dominion over all its actions.

To prove that dominion over actions implies the ability to operate and suspend the operation when one wills, Suárez elaborates a series of brief arguments as in *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, d.19. Some arguments are based on the common consent among men, particularly philosophers. Others appeal to moral reasons, viz., that to eliminate freedom is to destroy the order of state, religion, and compassion; still another argument involves the theological concern with evil. Moreover, there is

\(^{334}\) *Homo ex natura sua est dominus suarum actionum; quod dominium in hoc consistit quod possit pro libertate sua illas exercere et non exercere; ergo est liber. Probatur antecedens, nam homo est dominus aliarum rerum [...] quod homo est capax dominii* (*De Anima*, d.12, q.2, n.8, p.392).

\(^{335}\) *quo dominium in hoc consistit quod possit pro libertate sua illas exercere et non exercere ergo, est liber* (Ibid, p.393).
an argument based on data of consciousness. Suárez argues that we see that we
operate and suspend our operations as we will/wish. This, according to him is what
makes the difference between men and animals, between the insane and the judicious
men.\(^{336}\)

Next Suárez goes on to discuss in what sense the freedom of the will
originates in reason.

He lists a series of opinions from the Thomist tradition. All these views stress
that reason is the *radix* of freedom. Some of the Thomistic views might be formulated
as follows:

1. Man is free because he is rational, and no other animal is free. This is a sign
that freedom consents with man in virtue of his rational faculty which
overcomes animals.

2. Man experience freedom in himself insofar as he uses his reason.

3. The rational soul is the spiritual part of man, so freedom belongs to a
spiritual realm.

4. For St. Thomas 'liberum arbitrium' is a power of will and reason.\(^ {337}\)

5. Although it is understood that faculties are natural powers, the phrase ‘of will
and reason’ is added, because freedom under one aspect is rooted in reason,
under other aspect in the will.

6. Another common Thomist explanation, according to Suárez, is that freedom
of will originates in the indifference of the intellect. This means that freedom
in the will originates from the indifference and freedom of judgement of the
intellect. So freedom will be in the intellect with priority and greater
perfection.

\(^{336}\) Cf. *De Anima*, d.12, q.2, n.8, p.392.

\(^{337}\) Suárez refers here to S1, q.83, a.2, and 1,2 q.1, a.2, 2, d.24, ch.5.
Suárez explains, that the advocates of these views assert that the possibility that we will love or not love a determinate thing resides in the intellect. For the intellectual faculty is not compelled to judge that such a thing is better; rather, the intellect can discover an aspect of good or an aspect of evil in the object, hence the intellect can love it or hate it.

From a view held by Silvester of Ferrara in *Contra Gentes* 3, last chapter; and Soncinas in *Metaphysica* 9, q.14, it is inferred that will must always choose that which the intellect judges as the best and most convenient. The foundation of this view (similar to the one later held by Leibniz in *Theodicy*), according to Suárez, is that the freedom of the will should be kept within the scope of its object which is the good. Suárez rejects this view on the basis that it yields the consequence that if the will always follows the intellect's judgement, it has to choose that which the intellect judges as best. But if the intellect is not free, then the will is not free, either.

Soncinas' view, according to Suárez, is permeated by Durandus' opinion. Durandus maintained that freedom is formally in the intellect.

Suárez rejects this view and suggests that the Thomistic formula 'the root of freedom is in reason' needs to be explained.

Suárez's question is phrased: How from reason originates the freedom in the will? Suárez, unlike St. Thomas, does not say: 'radix libertatis in ratione est', but

---

338 *Sentences* 11, d.24, q.3, OC, 17IV.

339 *Sed oportet in particulari exponere quo modo ex ratione oriatur libertas in voluntate* (*De Anima*, d.12, q.2, n.10, p.394).
rather: *libertas ex intelligentia nascitur*.\(^{340}\) In effect, for Suárez the origin of freedom is not simply reason, but rather the *intellective* act of knowledge.

He suggests that freedom originates in knowledge (*ex cognitione oritur*), since the kinds of appetites originate in the kinds and properties of knowledge.\(^{341}\)

In another argument Suárez clearly holds that freedom of will originate in intellectual activity. He argues:

the role of intellect is to apprehend the aspects of good and evil as well as to judge in what aspect and mode each thing is eligible and good; and thus the appetite which follows upon such knowledge can love the known good under the aspect and mode under which each thing is lovable, and to that extent freely.\(^{342}\)

Suárez is explaining in the passage that the freedom of the will has its origin in the intellect, but not in the indifference of the intellect, but rather in its perfection, which is the knowledge of the object. With this argument Suárez is rejecting Durandus' view which holds that freedom resides *formally* in the intellect because freedom of the will springs from indifference and freedom of intellect. But this would mean for Suárez that the will is determined by the intellect.

---


\(^{341}\) Cf., d.12, q.2, n.9, p.395.

\(^{342}\) *Nam voluntas sequitur potentiam rationalem et discursivam; ergo est libera. Tenet conclusio, quia libertas arbitrii sequitur ex intellectu et ratione, nam, ut ex dictis probatur {intellectus apprehendit rationem boni et mali et de una quaeque re iudicat qua ratione et modo eligibilis et bona sit; ergo appetitus, qui talem cognitionem sequitur, potest amare unumquodque bonum cognitione ea ratione et modo quo diligibile est adaeque adeo libere} (De Anima, d.12, q.2, n.11, p.398).*
In the following sequential steps I would like to show the weaker Suarezian sense in which it might be said that freedom is rooted in the perfection and universality of knowledge. It is interesting to note here the "Cartesian" language used by Suárez.

1. The knowledge of intellect perceives not in a confused but rather in a clear and distinct way what thing is agreeable (*conveniens*).

2. It perceives in a distinct manner the particular aspect of convenience.

3. It isolates the aspect of good from other conflicting aspects.

4. It considers the thing in its degree of desirability.

5. In the presence of any good the will may love the thing in virtue of its goodness or not love it.

Things presented as good by the intellect, are loved by the will not necessarily but freely. This is the sense in which from the perfection of the intellect there follows the perfection in will, i.e., its freedom. What Suárez wants to say is that the faculty of reason generally taken is the source of freedom, not what produces the free act. On the other hand, knowledge specifically is from what the free act follows

---

343 [...] *Quod voluntatis libertas oritur ex intellectu, non tamen ex indifferentia illius, sed ex perfectione et universalitate. In hoc enim superat intellectus alias potentias sensitivas, quod cognoscit non tantum confuse hoc esse conveniens, sed distincte percipit rationem conveniens, separando illum ab omnibus aliis rationibus/quibus coniungitur, et considering quantum sit appetibilis; et ex hac perfectione cognitionis oritur perfectio in appetitione voluntatis, nam sicut intellectus percipit in unaquaque re quanta sit illius bonitas vel malitia, ita voluntas illam amare [potest] prout eius bonitas exegerit. Et ideo res illae, quae apparent bonae, non amantur necessario, sed libere. Et huiusmodi sunt omnes particulares res, quae in hac vita occurrant. Numquam enim in particulari apprehenduntur necessariae, vel quia beatitude non ponitur in eo quod debet poni, vel quia non consideratur actu, vel certe quia hic actus et hoc obiectum numero non consentuntur necessaria. Hinc ergo oritur libertas voluntatis.* (De Anima, d.12, q.2, n.10, p.396)
upon, but knowledge of the object as such does not causally determine the will to choose the best, since freedom as such is formally in the will alone.

The distance between will and reason comes up even more clearly when Suarez concerns himself with the issue about whether liberum arbitrium (LA) is the same as will. Suárez’s response does not assign a direct role to reason. He considers that will and LA are the same thing and have the same ratio. He establishes the identity of will and LA by an analogy with intellect and reason. He writes,

First and absolutely the intellect is called intellect insofar as it understands and intuits the object, but the ratio of intellect includes deliberation; and as such it is called reason. In the same way the will is called will insofar as it is cause of volitions or as it tends to an end; it is called liberum arbitrium insofar as it is free-choice about the means [to attain the object].

In Suárez’s analysis LA is not a faculty of will and reason, rather it is the faculty of will alone. Suárez’s way to put this is that LA under one aspect is rooted in reason -which means for him knowledge- and under another aspect it consists in the will. (In will as in the object formally free)

In the above passage Suárez seems to say that the will and LA are extensionally the same power whose ratio picks out the features of (1) being a cause of an

---

344 Ex quibus etiam probatur quod voluntas et liberum (arbitrium) sunt idem re et ratione. Distinguuntur sicut intellectus et ratio, nam sicut intellectus dicitur intellectus primo [et] absolute, quatenus intellegit aut quatenus simpliciter res intuetur, ratio vero dicitur prout discurrit, ita voluntas dicitur talis vel in quantum vult, vel in quantum simplici modo tendit in finem, liberum arbitrium dicitur in quantum libera electione circa media versatur (De Anima, d.12, n.12, p.400).

345 Additum tamen "voluntatis et rationis", quia libertas partim in ratione, partim in voluntate consistit in illa tamquam in radice; in hac tamquam in subiecto formaliter libero (Ibid).
act of volition, and (2) being a free-choice about the means to attain the object. Given that features are constituent of things, the first feature describes the ability of the faculty to produce volitional act. The second feature seems to describe the capacity of the faculty to exercise the ability. In Suárez the ability and capacity belongs to the same active faculty, so he can say that will and LA are extensionally the same.

To answer question B above, viz., Does the will exercise its freedom in respect to all its acts?, Suárez appeals to the distinction between freedom in regard to the exercise of an act and freedom in regard to the specification (species) of an act. Suárez's account of this distinction is this:

There are two types of will: (i) will of exercise which consists in the possibility of positing the act or interrupting it; and (ii) will of specification which consists in the possibility of positing this act or the opposite one; e.g., an act of either love or hate.346

Bearing this distinction in mind Suárez answers that the will is free in regard to good or happiness in general with respect to its exercise, but not insofar as its specification. The reason is that the ratio of good in general does not include evil

346 De Anima, d.112, q.3, n.13, p.400. The will of exercise is equivalent to what Molina calls freedom of contradiction: An agent has freedom of contradiction with respect to an object A at time t if S is at t able to will A and able not to will A. The will of specification is equivalent to Molina's freedom of contrariety: An agent S has freedom of contrariety with respect to A at t if S is able to will A and not-A.

According to Freddoso, the freedom of contrariety has two features: (1) it entails freedom of contradiction, but not vice versa, and (2) implies a power to resist the object in question positively (by willing its opposite), and not just a power to resist it negatively (by refraining from willing it or its opposite). Cf. Alfred Freddoso, (1988, p.225)
which the will may hate. Still the will is free in regard to exercise because the love of good in general is never offered in this life as absolutely necessary.

The will is free in regard to good in particular; for it is not necessarily forced on any one particular good, neither insofar as its exercise nor insofar as its specification is concerned. For the ratio of good is not just one: in every particular thing good and evil are mixed, and so the will is always free to love or not to love it even if the object appears as evidently good.

However, if man attains the vision of God after this life his will is necessarily force to love Him regarding exercise and specification. The reason is that in God there cannot be any evil aspect and necessarily always has the aspect of good.\footnote{Cf. De Anima, d.12, q.2, n.12, pp.399-401.}

According to these considerations the conclusion to be drawn is that Suárez does not hold the typical twentieth century libertarian view on freedom mentioned above. In De Anima, q.12, he holds a definition of free-agent that agrees with the first necessary condition for being classified as libertarian; this is very clear when Suárez states,

Given that all the necessary conditions in the first act are fulfilled, the will can still move or not move to the second act.\footnote{[...]positis omnibus requisitis in actu primo, potest voluntas exire et non exire in actum secundum. (De anima, d.12, q.2, n.15, 402)}

This definition, besides, is consistent with Suárez's definition of a free faculty given in d.19 in Disputationes Metaphysicae. Suárez's definition, however, fails the required second condition to be a libertarian regarding the action, in particular in
respect to the act of loving God. Despite this result one still can maintain that Suárez argued for the freedom of the will and not for determinism. In fact, the act of the will is causally undetermined by reason, because reason is the origin of this act, in the sense that the act of will is born in knowledge, but neither reason nor knowledge is the cause of the will’s act.

The sense of to be free with respect to acts in Suárez is to have dominion over one’s own acts. In this sense the will is free to choose and intend the good in this life.

To be free with respect to an object for Suárez means to have an appetitive faculty that follows an intentional apprehensional kind of knowledge in virtue of which the will is capable of deciding to choose without being necessarily forced by that object. For Suárez, as for Molina \textsuperscript{349}, the agent has usually three alternatives: (i) to elicit an act of willing the object, (ii) to refrain from either willing or dissenting, and (iii) to elicit an act of dissenting from or rejecting the object. In these senses every free action involves a free choice.

In Suárez, however, the freedom of the will should be placed within the scope of the subject, and not of the object (which is good in general). In q.2 of \textit{De Anima} Suárez has stressed the role of the subject in the following sense:

Freedom is formally in the will alone as in a subject. Freedom is \textit{dominion} over one’s own acts. Freedom is the ability to choose the means to attain the object.

\textsuperscript{349} Alfred Freddoso (1988, p.25) distinguishes these aspects in regard to Luis de Molina.
These conclusions conduce with what Suárez asserted above, namely, that freedom resides intrinsically in the human will, and so it is not an object.

The issue about the independency and causal indetermination of the will from intellectual activities is more directly seen in Suárez's discussion on the relationship between intellect and will; to this we turn immediately.

4. Intellect and Will

In De Anima d.12, q.3, Suárez addresses the scholastic dilemma: what faculty of the soul is more perfect, intellect or will? To address this question it is important to determine to what philosophical tradition Suárez belongs: to the Thomistic-intellectualist or to the Scotistic-voluntarist, or perhaps to his own?

As it turns out we cannot give a categorical answer to this question until we answer another question, viz., does Suárez propose an intellectualist conception of the will or is the will in Suárez's account dependent on the intellectual activities? I would like to say that Suárez's psychology of intellect and will are permeated by his technical concept 'vital'. The significance of this concept, nonetheless, does not imply that Suárez belongs to a third different philosophical tradition.

In discussing question three: 'What faculty of the soul is more perfect, intellect or will?' I will endorse John L. Treolar's conclusion in his article "Moral Virtue and

---

350 Quaenam sit perfectior potentia, intellectus an voluntas (De Anima, d.12, q.3, p.408).
the Demise of Prudence in the Thought of Francis Suárez. That is, Suarez makes the will the superior power among the faculties of the soul in the context of concrete actions in our present circumstances. The answer to our question about Suárez's conception of the will adds additional arguments to support this conclusion.

Suárez first presents four arguments, defended by Suárez's predecessors, to establish that will is superior to the intellect:

Argument 1: The will has a more noble object than the intellect; the will's proper object is the good, i.e., the primary and fundamental perfection of the esse of a thing, as opposed to the true (which is the object of the intellect).

Argument 2: The will is more perfect than the intellect, because the most perfect act of the will is love of God, but the most perfect act of the intellect is knowledge of God.

Argument 3: Freedom is the supreme perfection, and it is the will rather than the intellect that is the faculty by which freedom is exercised.

Argument 4: Will is what makes the whole human being good or evil, the knowledge of the intellect is not what makes a man good or evil.

Next, Suárez points out that St. Thomas and Duns Scotus disagreed on the issue of the primacy of will over intellect. He concludes at this point that St.

---


352 Cf. *De Anima*, d.12, q.3, n.1, p.409.

353 Suárez refers here to Scotus in 4, d.49, q.4: o.c.v. 21, pp.125-164, and pp.97-100, and to St. Thomas in S T, q.82, a.3, the authors that advocate Thomas' view, i.e., that knowledge is absolutely more perfect, although will supersedes in particular acts; see Durandus in 4, d.49, q.4: o.c. pp.416 ff; *Paludanus* in q.3, sent. IV, d.49, q.3, a.1:
Thomas's theory seems more probable, so he claims: Intellect is the more perfect faculty. He goes on to prove this thesis with a set of Thomistic arguments based either on the nobility of the object -its simplicity, abstraction and immateriality-, or on the general character and genus of both faculties.

Despite this conclusion and Suárez's defense for it, Suárez continues developing answers against the Thomistic arguments. He concludes that the objects of intellect and will considered with respect to the reality of things are both of the same grade of perfection, so both faculties are equally universal and spiritual. However, if the objects are considered absolutely, the intellect's object is superior. From this point on Suárez uses two different approaches to compare the faculties with each other, viz.,: (i) the faculties can be compared absolutely, and in this regard the intellect always logically precedes the will; and (ii) they can be compared under the concrete condition in which they are found, i.e., operating in this life here and now; and according to this latter criterion, Suárez establishes that the will functions as the more perfect power. This is clear when he argues thus:

Nevertheless it seems to follow that in natural things an act of love which will can have by its own power is more perfect than a natural cognition of the intellect; for that love is drawn toward God as He is in Himself, and it loves God above all else. This cognition, however, is imperfect and obscure. And hence it appears to follow that will is more perfect than intellect, for

---

354 This is offered as Suárez's first contention. Cf. De Anima, d.12, q.3, p.410.
perfection of power is to be measured by things which it is naturally capable of doing.\textsuperscript{355}

Suárez elaborates other arguments for the superiority of the will. For instance, he argues that the intellect has a superior object to the will absolutely speaking. However, will is more perfect than intellect, because it produces free acts and also because the will is able to move efficaciously other powers.

Another argument found in q.1, d.12 for the superiority of will over the intellect is based on the fact that will is able to move the intellect efficaciously; he writes:

\textit{Intellect moves will in the manner of a final cause, applying it to the object, but will moves the intellect as an efficient cause, applying it to operation.}\textsuperscript{356}

One can see that Suárez is not really adopting a conciliatory position with regard to the intellectualist and the voluntarist scholastic schools. He admits the superiority of the intellect in regard to the object, and he admits that intellect is preeminent among the rational powers in virtue of its genus. This last contention will make Suárez coincide with St. Thomas's intellectualist position. St. Thomas, in effect, deems the intellect the most important faculty of the soul. However Suárez's reason for supporting St. Thomas's view implies the opposite. Notice the following passage:

\textsuperscript{355} \textit{Tamen in naturalibus videtur sequi quod actus amoris, quem voluntas potest habere propius viribus, perfectior \[ est \] quam cognitio naturalis intellectus, nam ille amor fertur in Deum prout in se est et amat Deum super omnia; haec autem cognitio est imperfecta et obscura. Et hinc videtur sequi voluntatem esse perfectiorum intellectu, nam perfectio potentiae ex his quae naturaliter potest pensanda est (De Anima, d.12, q.3, n.6, p.418).

\textsuperscript{356} \textit{Intellectus movet voluntatem per modum causae finalis, applicando objectum; voluntas vero movet intellectum effective, applicando scilicet illum ad operandum.}
The reason is that the appetite is a certain inclination of the person who has desires; it is an inclination that tends always to a greater good, but it never exhausts the perfection of the good in its operation. Instead the cognitive faculty in knowing its object, totally exhausts the perfection and immateriality of the known thing. Through the operation of this faculty, the knowing thing becomes somehow the very thing known. Thus, intellect by its genus is a more perfect faculty.\(^{357}\)

The question is, if the cognitive faculty exhausts the known thing, while the will is this sort of continual effort to a greater good that is never exhausted, then can it be said that the intellect is a "nobler" faculty?

Treloar points out\(^{358}\) that when Suárez compares the acts of the faculties with each other, he gives the preeminence to the will over the intellect in the concrete circumstances in which we find ourselves in this life. Suárez holds that if it is considered in the status of searching \((in\ statu\ viae)\), the act of the will is more perfect than the act of the intellect with respect to the superior things.\(^{359}\)

The reason is that love of God is more perfect than knowledge (of God) because love tends to things as they are in themselves.

---

\(^{357}\) *Nam appetitus tantum est quaedam inclinatio appetentis; unde ex vi et modo operationis appetitus operans non explicat perfectionem suam in illo operé neque etiam potentia illa ad hoc principaliter ordinatur, sed tantum ad quaerendum bonum; at vero potentia cognoscitiva de se est vis quaedem explicans maxime perfectionem et immaterialitatem rei cognoscens, nam per hanc virtutem res cognoescens fit quodammodo res ipsa cognita; unde cognitio ex suo genere magis propter se est quam appetitus; ergo magis perfecta potentia est ex suo genere (De Anima, d.12, q.3, n.2).*

\(^{358}\) Cf. op. cit., p.394.

\(^{359}\) *Si considerentur in statu viae, actus voluntatis est perfectior actu intellectus respectu rerum superiorum.*
We agree with Treloar's conclusion that, making the appropriate distinctions in Suárez's account, the will is rendered as the 'most noble power' in the context of our concrete situation.\(^{360}\)

Now, on these grounds, can we assert that Suárez is endorsing Scotus' voluntarism rather than St. Thomas's intellectualism? The most we can say up to this point is that Suárez gives a preeminent place to will's activities within the psychological realm. The preeminence of the will over the intellect resides precisely in the very way the will operates and acts.

The real key to determining whether Suárez is either an intellectualist or a voluntarist, I believe, is to look at his conception of facts of will. Does he hold an intellectualist conception? or is the will dependent and determined by intellectual activities? If so, in what sense? In what way does the will accompany the intellect? Do intellect and will produce one indivisible, though composed human act?

If by an intellectualist conception of the will it is understood that intentionality, representation, knowledge, apprehension, judgement, ideas (species) are essentially connected with operations of the will, then most philosophers after Aristotle should be called so, including Suárez.

For Suárez, in fact, the elements mentioned above are indeed necessary conditions for appetition. The intellect not only represents and apprehends the desired object, it also presents it to the appetitive faculty. However, as we already saw above none of those elements intervene in the production of the act of will. The

\(^{360}\) Cf. Ibid.
will for Suárez is independent of as well as causally undetermined by proper intellectual activities, and independent of the object of the intellect too. Intellect and object move the will as final, but not as efficient causes. The will, instead, is a unique, primary and intrinsic factor which influences the other faculties. The will, Suárez says, can be compared to the heart: just like the heart is first principle of bodily movements, so the will is the first principle of human operations.  

Furthermore, Suárez holds the will to be a spiritual faculty that accompanies intellect. How so? -we may ask. If we look at the particular act of choice, Suárez (unlike St. Thomas) does not hold that choice is the result of both intellect and will. For Suárez intellect exerts no efficient causality on the choice itself, it simply prepares it.

In De Voluntario Suárez comes up with an answer to our question: How will and intellect accompany each other? This is shown in William N. Clarke’s summary of Suárez’s view on the rational process of choice, thus:

i. Intellect and will both have a role in regard to the free act, but successively, not simultaneously.
ii. The intellect first presents the possible alternatives for action, it deliberates, and it proposes motives for each alternative.

iii. These motives are sufficient so that the will can act rationally, but not determined, as if it must act.

iv. The will remains actively indifferent up to the very moment of its own choice. Here the role of the intellect ceases.

v. Now the will enters in and freely chooses one of the alternatives; it chooses solely through its own inner autonomy and dominion over its acts.

vi. Next, and only in virtue of the act of the will, the practical intellect enters to judge. This is not absolutely necessary but aids in the speed and efficiency of the execution. Thus the intellect prepares and makes possible the election; the will alone chooses.  

With regard to the divine intellect and will, Suárez interestingly holds that the will overcomes the intellect, because it belongs to the will's competence to execute the actions, since the will has more force of impulse than the intellect. In God's case the intellect is not absolutely preeminent over the will, since both faculties possess their own efficacy, without affecting each other's realms. Thus, knowledge, even if it is practical, far as its role to direct action, since knowledge is representative and illuminative, whereas the role of the will is to love, to intend, to choose, and to use and, for these reasons to apply the other potencies to the operation.

The question now is what is Suárez's metaphysical ground for conceiving a sequential order, rather than simultaneity of activities of volitional and intellectual operations or acts?

\[365\] Cf. *De Voluntario*, d.8, s.1, n.1; also *Disp. Met.*, d.19, s.6. n.7-10.
W. Clark suggests that it is Suárez’s implicit acceptance of separation of intellect and will. Suárez explicit reason, however, is that he conceives the nature of the action of will as a unified simple entity. In fact, in d.30 in *Disputationes Metaphysicae* Suárez holds the same view as in d.18, where he writes:

> It cannot be said, as some suggest, that intellect and will are simultaneously the same executive potency, [...] because we conceive the action of the will endowed with the simple and unified nature.  

So, Suárez makes explicit that the act of will is the act of will not produced by the intellect which has its own acts. In addition Suárez insists that whether faculties are really distinct or not, what is certain is that the potencies produce distinct acts. The fundamental reasons underlying this view are found not only in Suárez’s metaphysics of the act, but also, I think, in the features of Suárez’s psychological concept of ‘vital’. These features are clearly expressed in these propositions:

366 Ibid.

367 *Alliunde vero supera voluntas intellectum quia ad illam pertinet executio operum, quia est magis impulsiva quam intellectus. [...] probatur, tum quia non est, absolute loquendo, maior ratio de una potentia quam de allia, tum etiam quia in neutra est sufficiens ratio ut ei executio tribuatur, quia neutra sine alter est sufficiens ad efficiendum, et unaquaegue in sua ratione habet proprium causalitis modum, quem non transcendit, praecise stando in suo concepto et ratione formali, sed in ilo habet infinitatem suam. Scientia enim ut scientia, quantumvis practica, solum habet dirigere actionem; est enim scientia repraesentans et quasi illuminans, unde hoc munus habet in agente per intellectum, dirigit enim actionem eiusmodi. [...] voluntatis vero munus est diligere intendere, eligere et uti, et hac ratione applicare ad opus alias potentias eiusdem appetentis. [...] Nec vero dici pprotest, quod quidam insinuant, intellectum et voluntatem simul esse ipsam potentiam executivam, tum quia actio huius potentiae unius ac simplicis rationis a nobis concipitur, et ideo fieri non potest ut p potentia praecise concepta includat intellectus et voluntatis actum (Disp. Met., d.30, s.17, n.46, pp.730-731).

368 Cf. *De Anima*, d.10, q.1, p.289.
A The act of a vital faculty does not produced by the act of another faculty.\textsuperscript{369}

B The act of love is vital and immanent, therefore necessarily produced efficiently by the same faculty that receives it.\textsuperscript{370}

C A vital act necessarily is produced by the same power that receives it.\textsuperscript{371}

These are the reasons that make it impossible for the intellect and will to produce an indivisible though composite human act. The will, thus, is independent of and causally undetermined by the proper activities of the intellect.

It can be concluded that the position of Suárez regarding will and intellect seems to have Scotist affiliations, given that Suárez admits a gap between the faculties in particular with respect to their acts. Although, if Suárez is voluntarist; his voluntarism is different and more strict than that of Scotus’s voluntarism, since Suárez does not admit either the object’s or the intellect’s efficacy in the production of its act. For Suárez the will alone produces its act, and it alone chooses. The underlying reason seems to be that the will is a vital faculty which produces an immanent-vital act.

In this section we have discussed the issue of the preeminence of the will in its relationship to the intellect within the psychological realm. We conclude that for Suárez the will is psychologically undetermined, i.e., it is causally undetermined by the intellectual activities. In Chapter IV of this study, the issue to address is the

\textsuperscript{369} Actus unius potentiae vitalis non efficit actum alterius potentiae (De Anima, d.10, q.3, n.9, p.312).

\textsuperscript{370} Actus amandi vitalis est immanens, et ideo necessario debet effective fieri ab ipsa potentia in qua recipitur. (De Anima, d.10, q.3, n.3, p.304).

\textsuperscript{371} Cf. De Anima, d.3, q.3, n.39, p.214
question about the "independence" and "indetermination" of human will with respect to God's activities.
CHAPTER IV

SUAREZ ON RECONCILIATION: THEOLOGY OF WILL

If God does not causally determine the free acts of the human will how is it that He knows them with infallibility and certainty before they are realized? How is God's foreknowledge to be reconciled with the contingency of some future events? How can He order human free acts according to the general plan of His providence? To solve these fundamental problems -raised directly from the concept

---

372 This question is essential to understand why there is a problem of foreknowledge in the first place. The belief in divine foreknowledge, in fact, derives from the theological doctrine that God is perfectly provident. It is in regard to the concept of providence that Suárez and Molina differ mostly. Strategic theoretical pieces for reconciling providence (and foreknowledge) with free will are the concepts of (1) freedom of active indifference; (2) simultaneous concurrence; and (3) middle knowledge. But according to Suárez, who disagrees with Molina, providence requires in addition; (4) preordination or 'predefinition' of all the free acts of man. Unlike Molina and Lessius, Suárez requires divine predefinition of all the free acts of human beings for God's providence. According to Suárez, 'predefinition' is an 'eternal decree of the divine will through which God establishes in an absolute way that some thing occurs in time. For example that Peter will perform an act of contrition in such a time and in such a place. Cf. Opusc.1, Lib.1, c.XVI, n.2, p.80. This predefinition implies an antecedent decree with respect to the foreknowledge of the future act by which God, before He sees that Peter will make that act of penitence, He decreed absolutely (which does not mean that God predetermines) that Peter made it. Ibid., n.2, p.81.

In the recent literature Freddoso presents an excellent account of providence which emphasizes both its cognitive and volitional aspect. I should partially quote it here:
of providence and the defense of the free will theory - Molinists, particularly Molina, Lessius and Suárez, appealed not only to divine foreknowledge but also to "middle knowledge". For divine foreknowledge is not sufficient to answer questions like, why did God create Peter knowing that he would sin? God needs middle knowledge to know that Peter would in fact freely deny Christ if placed in certain situation. If God lacks middle knowledge, it follows that God did determine man's fall, but this is contrary to the divine omnibenevolence. Therefore, if man has free-will, i.e., he is not causally predetermined by God, then middle knowledge is indispensable as action-guiding aspect of cognition; that is, in Suárez's words, middle knowledge is essential for divine providence and governance of this world.

---

The doctrine of divine providence involves the thesis that God, the divine artisan, freely and knowingly plans, orders and provides for all the effects that constitute His artifact, the created universe with its entire history, and executes His chosen plan by playing an active causal role sufficient to ensure its exact realization. Since God is the perfect artisan, not even the most trivial details escape His providential decrees. Thus, whatever occurs is properly said to be specifically decreed by God; more precisely, each effect produced in the created universe is either specifically and knowingly intended by Him (providentia approbationis) or in concession to creaturely defectiveness, specifically and knowingly permitted by Him, only to be then ordered toward some appropriate good (providentia concessionis). A. Freddoso, Luis de Molina on Divine Foreknowledge, Cornell U P, 1988, p.3.

373 I.e., a theory that man acts freely if he is neither logically nor causally determined to exercise its acts.

374 This is one of Suárez's justifications for middle knowledge, that is: talis scientia videtur esse necessaria ad summam perfectionem providentiae et prudentiae, quae in Deo semper cogitanda est. Cf. De Gratia, Proleg.II, c.VII, n.23, p.95.
Following Suárez's disputations 19, 30 in *Disp. Met.;* the Treatise on Grace, Proleg.II; and the second Opusculum, Books I and II,\(^{375}\) I shall present the relevant details of Suárez's theory of middle knowledge which differs in important aspects from pure Molinism.

The plausibility of middle knowledge ultimately depends on two logical assumptions, that is, the Principle of Bivalence and the Principle known as the Conditional Excluded Middle.

If these principles hold and God is omniscient, then God knows with certainty the conditional events that result from indeterministic secondary causes. I subscribe to Alfred Freddoso's argumentation for the possibility of both principles being true, but I also admit with him that these principles have to be worked out within a general semantics for the subjunctive conditional propositions.

Suárez's own theory has a double explanatory role, viz., that of showing how future contingent propositions -categorical and conditional- can be true; and how they can be known by God. Thus, unless he succeeds in both aspects of his theory, middle knowledge cannot be claimed to be sufficient for reconciling contingency and freedom with divine foreknowledge.

The plan of Chapter IV proceeds as follows: Section 1 is about Suárez's account of the nature of contingency; section 2 draws a distinction between absolute

---

\(^{375}\) Hereafter I will abbreviate the Opusculum II, Book I: *De Scientia Dei Futurorum Contingentium Absolutorum,* as DSDAFC, and Book II of the same Opusculum: *De Scientia Futurorum Quam Deus Habet De Futuris Contingentibus Sub Conditione Propositis, Prius Ratione, Quam De Ipsa Conditione Alliquid Absolute Decernat,* as DSDCFC.
and conditional future contingent events, and discusses Suárez's crucial notion of ‘future'; section 3 examines briefly on what depends the possibility of foreknowledge of future contingent events; section 4 analyzes divine knowledge: here middle knowledge enters into play; section 5 sets Suárez’s argumentation for a compatibility thesis; section 6 reviews the Suarezian grounds for the truth of categorical future contingent propositions; section 7 discusses Suárez’s foundations for the truth of conditional subjunctive contingent propositions; finally section 8 deals with divine intuition and representation of conditional contingent events.

1. Contingency

To understand why is there an epistemic problem concerning some future contingents we need to sketch an account of contingency. In section 10 of disputations 19, Suárez himself provides us with such an account. Contingency is attributed to effects that result from the action (or failure of action) by free causes, i.e., either of God who is the paradigmatic first free cause or, of secondary causes who somehow participate of the divine free operations. Suárez maintains that in a strict sense, the ratio of contingency is found in the freedom of the proximate secondary cause and in some exercise of it, but its primordial (or remote) source is the freedom of the first cause.\textsuperscript{376}

\textsuperscript{376} Loquendo de contingentia simpliciter, immediata illius ratio posita est in libertate causae proximae et aliquo usa eius [...] primordialis autem radix eius est libertas causae primae. Cf. Disp. Met., d. 19, s.10, n.13, p.432-3. In Opusc. II, DSDAFC, c.II, n.4; De
Basically, for Suárez, an effect is contingent in two different ways. On the one hand - and speaking very strictly - when it is produced accidentally, i.e., without the agent's intention (*quia casu et praeter intentione agentis fit*), and it joins a *per se* effect of some cause. An example of an accidental contingent effect might be that someone who is digging the ground discovers a treasure.\(^{377}\) Fortune and chance are typical cases of accidental contingency, even though they might also be regarded as contingent causes. On the other hand, the term 'contingent' - and this is the interesting account for us - refers, in its logical meaning, to a modal proposition which may denote either the proposition or the attribute of the predicate about the subject as something that is not necessary nor impossible. In this Aristotelian sense it involves also the ontological existence of an effect or event or state of affairs which is such that it is possible that it exists and also is possible that it does not exist. In this latter, ontological sense, Suárez notes that an effect might be compared to its *proximate cause* in two ways: (i) to the intrinsic power itself, if it is so compared, the effect is called *intrinsically* contingent\(^{378}\), or (ii) to the proximate cause conjoined to the concurrence or opposition of other causes (such as the first cause or just the

---

*Gratia*, Prol.II, c.VII, nn.15-17. Suárez posits that the source of contingency in the world is the created and uncreated wills.

\(^{377}\) Suárez explains this example by saying that the gold proceeds *per se* from some cause, and the digging of the ground is carried out *per se* and intentionally by some man, but the conjunction of both actions is accidental because it does not have any *per se* created cause. (*Cf. Ibid.* s. 10, n. 1; s. 12, n. 2)

\(^{378}\) For it proceeds from a cause that by its intrinsic faculty or virtue can give contingency to the effect. This contingency does not inhere in the same effect; its name derives from the power and way of operation of its cause, and it concerns just free causes. *Cf. Ibid.* n. 4, p. 427.
series and orders of secondary causes) which in the whole order of the universe may oppose or concur with the effect; if it is understood in this sense, the effect is called extrinsically contingent.\textsuperscript{379}

Three Suarezian contentions lead us to distinguish between contingent and necessary effects. First, according to Suárez, all effects in general, if compared to the first cause, are contingent, i.e., they have the possibility of not occurring since they depend on the divine concurrence which may perfectly well be denied in virtue of God's own freedom.\textsuperscript{380} Secondly, the effect —in respect of the proximate (secondary) cause that operates by natural necessity— compared with the whole order and series of causes of the universe, and if among these causes there is any cause that operates freely, then the effect is neither contingent nor necessary\textsuperscript{381}. So, an effect will be necessary only if:

\textsuperscript{379} For its lack of necessity derives from external impediments. Such contingency does not depend on the freedom of any cause, not even on the freedom of the first cause since it consists only in its reference to the proximate cause which can be obstructed. This reference is the same whether the free causes participate or not, and even if God acted by natural necessity. \textit{Ibid.} n. 4, p. 427. Suárez holds with Duns Scotus that even if the first cause operated by natural necessity, it would neither hinder the exercise of freedom nor would it eliminate all the contingency of the effects produced by secondary causes; for even if various causes concur to only one act, it is sufficient for the freedom of the act that the proximate cause be free and able to retain its natural way of operation by the cooperation of another [first] cause (\textit{Cf. Disp. Met.} 19, s.10, n.12, p.353).

\textsuperscript{380} On this point Suárez writes: 'Concerning the first cause there is no effect produced by absolute necessity ... all effects are such that they may or may not be'. \textit{Ibid.} p.425.

\textsuperscript{381} \textit{Ibid.} s.10, n.5, p.427.
(i) it proceeds from a proximate secondary cause that operates naturally, and
(ii) its causal chains exclude the action (or lack of action) of some free cause.

From this account we may infer that if free causes did not intervene in any way in the collection and series of all the causes, then everything in the universe would happen by necessity; even though, Suárez remarks, the deterministic collection of causes is still subordinated to the divine will.\(^{382}\)

Finally, Suárez claims that any way in which the free cause intervenes - either as *per se* or *per accidens* cause, applying the agent or the matter or remaining an impediment- in the series of natural causes, the effect will be absolutely contingent, even if it is compared with the series of all the causes. This is proven because a contingent effect is that which can exist or not exist in virtue of its cause. But such an effect compared to all the collection of its causes, absolutely can exist or not exist only because of the fact that among these causes there intervenes a free cause in virtue of whose free choice may occur that either:

(i) the matter is not disposed to such effect, or
(ii) the proximate and *per se* cause is absent, or
(iii) some other similar impediment may intervene.

Any of these factors, then, is sufficient for the effect not to follow.\(^{383}\) An example of absolute contingent effect might include the case of Peter freely sinning at t. An example of a natural contingent effect might the case of this seed growing; but its

\(^{382}\) He writes, all this necessity [that of the causal series] is subordinated to the divine will [...] [therefore] has the possibility of not occurring (Ibid., n.5, p.427).

\(^{383}\) *Disp. Met.*, d.19, s.10, n. 8, p.429
natural growing will not occur even if it rains and all other causes concur to its growing, unless the farmer prepares the soil.\textsuperscript{384} If the farmer does not prepare the soil, he is free to do so, the natural effect will not follow.

Accordingly, we may say that an effect is contingent iff: somewhere in the collection of its causal series there mediates the action (or failure of action) of one free cause, either in a proximate or more remote way.\textsuperscript{385}

This conceptual analysis, however, seems to render, ultimately, all the effects produced in the universe contingent. Is there, then, any significant distinction to be traced between natural contingent effects and absolute contingent effects? Suárez's answer is that the natural effects are relatively contingent with respect to one or many causes, but not with respect to all the causes considered collectively. Whereas the free contingent effects are absolutely contingent, i.e., either if they are compared to each one of the causes or to all of them simultaneously.\textsuperscript{386} It follows, then, that the absolute free effects pose a particular epistemic difficulty, i.e., they may be known beforehand and with certainty far less than the necessary effects.\textsuperscript{387} That is, the natural effect - insofar as contingent - cannot be known in its cause as certainly

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{384} This is Suárez's modified example; Ibid. n. 8.
\item \textsuperscript{385} Suárez clearly writes, there can not be any contingency in the effects, unless in such a set of causes there intervenes some free cause. Ibid. n. 6.
\item \textsuperscript{386} Ibid. n. 9.
\item \textsuperscript{387} Suárez explains, that the reason is that it is very difficult at least for man, to know all the causes, not only because some are far away from the senses and somehow hidden to us, but also because they are a plurality and their conjunctions and oppositions differ; finally, because these causes do not operate without matter whose disposition is variable and often unknown (Ibid. n.7).
\end{itemize}
future, i.e., in its proximate cause alone, but it can be known in the collection and comparison of all the causes; in this sense, then, it is known not as contingent but as necessary. By contrast, the absolute contingent effect cannot be known beforehand with certainty as future, neither in one nor in all the causes at the same time, since from both points of view it is absolutely contingent, and hence, in virtue of the causes, it is indeterminate and indifferent to exist or to not exist. At this point, thus, we confront one of the problems involving contingent effects as futures, viz., can one hold that such future effects are contingent and at the same time foreknown?

Suárez alludes to the possibility of middle knowledge to solve this dilemma when he concludes that unless there exists another way to foreknow the sufficient free determination of the effect by the cause, there is no way in which the contingent effect as future could be known prior to its happening with certainty just in virtue of the causes. We shall explore the possibility of foreknowledge of contingent events precisely as future in section 3 below.

---

388 Ibid. n. 9.


390 [...] et ideo nisi aliunde cognoscatur libera determinatio causae sufficiens as determinatem effectum, nullo modo potest ex vi causarum certo praecognosci (Cf. Ibid., n.10, p.430).
2. Absolute and Conditional Future Contingents

Ordinarily theorists consider the expression 'future contingent' in its metaphysical sense, i.e., as future event or state of affairs (produced by secondary causes) that now obtain, or as a present event or state of affairs that will obtain some time in the future, that Peter will sin, is an example of the latter case. Suárez refers to it as an absolute future contingent effect (or event) or simply as *futura absoluta* (hereafter, AFCE). This event is signified in the future-tense categorical proposition - 'Peter will sin.' On Suárez's view, then, the event itself insofar as contingent by nature is unknowable, but the future-tense proposition signifying the AFCE is 'determinately true' and so is knowable by God. As we shall argue below, this is Suárez's leading motive for his defense of God's knowledge of the true future contingent propositions.

The absolute future contingent event might be the result of a prior hypothetical event. In such a case it is called conditional future contingent effect or event, or simply *futura conditionata* (hereafter CFCE). Suárez's examples include cases such

391 By 'categorical' medievals understood an event described in a simple subject predicate sentence; while by 'hypothetical' they meant an event described in a compound sentence, specially conditional, but also disjunctive, conjunctive, causal, etc. See Freddoso and Schurman (1980), p.65.

392 [...] videndum est an in propositionibus, significantibus de futuro has effectus contingentes, sit determinata veritas, quae in eis cognosci possit, et cognoscatur a Deo. Cf. DEDAFC., c.II, p.290.

393 et ex vi verborum, illam esse hypotheticam, quia ex hypothesi tantum affirmat, et quia illa hypothesis non significatur ut ponenda in re, ideo habet formam et modum conditionalis (Cf. DSDCFG., c.5, n.10, p.358).
as: 'If Peter is created on such occasion, he will sin'; 'If Peter were alive, he would sin'; another case involving a negative case is 'If Peter were under certain circumstances called by God, he would not consent'. The common feature of all these cases is that if the hypothesis $H$ - represented by the antecedent part of the conditional - were to obtain at $t$, then the future contingent event would be the case. Events of this sort are signified in subjunctive (or alternatively indicative) conditional future contingent propositions (hereafter CFCP). Generally, they have the form 'if $P$ were to happen, $Q$ would happen'.

The controversial point in Suárez's view arises from his own defense of these categorical and conditional propositions. He argues that both the categorical and the conditional propositions are 'determinately true', and so are known by God. As we shall further see, Suárez defends his view with both theological and philosophical

---

394 In his article "Four Kinds of Conditionals" in American Philosophical Quarterly, vol.12, 1975 pp.51-59, Pollock discusses the main features of four types of subjunctive conditionals. The conditionals that Suárez explores could be classified under the category of the 'simple subjunctives' but they are not true because of a necessitating connection between antecedent and consequent. This is clearly stated by Suarez when he writes 'Si Petrus hodie viveret, in hac occasione hoc faceret, non affirmamus Petrum esse talis virtutis aut conditionis, ut necessario hoc esset facturus, vel ut ex ejus existentia talis effectus necessaria illatione inferatur; sed solum affirmamus tales effectum de facto fuisse conjungendum cum illa causa, si exitisset' (Cf. Opusc. II DSDCFC, c.5, n.8, p.357).

Suárez is rather positing that the antecedent's being true would somehow "involve" the consequent's being true. This characteristic belongs to what Pollock calls "Even if" subjunctives. But it is easy to see that they entail simple subjunctives. E.g. 'Peter would not consent, even if God did call Peter under certain circumstance' entails 'If God called Peter under certain circumstance, Peter would not consent'. The kind of conditionals that presumably represent a problem for the advocates of middle knowledge are the counterfactual conditionals.
arguments. But before considering Suárez’s own position, we ought to note some objections brought out by his adversaries and his own replies to them.

Banzezians, in effect, attack Suárez’s argumentation from different flanks. They claim that the conditional proposition, ‘If Peter is constituted in such circumstance, he will consent’ is not determinately true. Notice, however, that Banzez has in mind an indicative conditional which is utterly thought to be very different from a subjunctive conditional, this was pointed out to me by C. Normore.

In disputing Suárez’s contention Banzezians seem to assume their own view, that is, ‘there cannot be a transition of freedom to act unless there first exist a premotion. They appeal, then, to a standard definition of absolute or conditional ‘future’ to make their point. A future (event) is a being (or an event) which is still enclosed in its cause. But if the future (event) is included in a contingent cause, then some true or false judgement cannot validly originate from such a cause. So, Banzezians insist, the indecision of the cause only ends when the first motor decrees which future will exist and which one will not. Therefore, it is not possible to know any future choices or effects before knowing the predeterminations and premotions from which the future effects will arise.395

---

395 Nec sufficit respondere ante decretum divinae voluntatis, hanc propositionem, Petrus, si constitutau intalibus circumstantiis, consentient, esse determinate veram ... Haec in quam, responsio non valet, quia licet voluntas sit causa proxima se movens et determinans ad particularem operationem, non tamen potest esse prima radix simpliciter, nec prima causa suae determinationis; quoniam a causa contingenti, in quantum est contingens, non exit determinatus actus, nisi ab aliquo alio determinatur illum. Cf. Alvarez, De Auxil. 1, II, disp. VII, n.13 in P. Dumont, op. cit., pp. 214 f.
Bañezians are thus concerned with the fact that metaphysically contingent events would and could not possibly occur unless they are causally and post volitionally determined to do so.

Suárez, in turn, takes a different approach. He responds at this point with an elaborated definition of ‘future’ which ultimately will hinge on his explanation of ‘future contingent’ as such. Suárez first notices that the Bañezian argument relies on what they deem to be a strict similitude between the expressions: *esse futurum* and *esse in causa*. On the one hand, he points out that when the effect is enclosed in its cause it is not future but present. Some effects are destined to be produced by their cause some day, but while they are contained in the cause, there is an identity between cause and future, their existence is actual. On the other hand, it is possible that by accident or by the opposition of other powerful force, it occurs that an agent who is destined by nature to a precise operation, simply does not execute it. Thus, this operation in a given moment is found in a determinate cause without being future thereby. Thus, Suárez infers that being future and being in a cause are not always synonymous notions. The idea of presence in a cause does not coincide strictly with the notion of future. Suárez thinks that it is essential for being a future to be included in a cause, but it is not a sufficient condition for it. The concept of future includes, in addition, an element of relativism and dynamism, as Dumont puts

\[\text{Intelligitur ergo de causa determinata in actu primo: sic autem esse causam determinatam, et effectum esse futurum non sunt formaliter idem; tum quia illament duas propositiones non sunt synonymae, ac proinde in ipsis significatis est aliqua diversitas (Cf. De Gratia, Proleg.II, n.4, p.87).}\]
it (Cf. 1936). Being future, Suárez maintains, consists in a sort of inclination which by itself is about to result in existence. The state of future, therefore, is neither just potentiality, nor just actuality; more exactly, it is a metaphysical state of tendency (or disposition) which moves from being in potentiality to be in actuality later on in time.\(^{397}\)

This precise definition of future is significant for Suárez’s own account of ‘future contingent’. The cause from which the future contingent event depends is indeterminate, indifferent to act or not to act. The future event itself should not be considered identical with the natural activity of the cause, otherwise there would be no reason for the name ‘future’.\(^{398}\)

The future ought to be seen as existence to come, as destined to result from its cause. So that on this account, the future contingent is found really determined in an agent who himself is not. It is in this sense that it could be the object of an infallible knowledge, in the intentional order, and so it is always ‘present’ with regard to God. Suárez states that ‘future contingent is not that which it will be or it will not be, indeed this disjunction is not contingent but necessary and inevitable; therefore one part should be determined; hence future contingent seen positively is that which

\(^{397}\) *Dico ergo esserem futuram formaliter in transitu quodam ab esse quod habet in causa, ad esse, quod in seipsa aliquando habitura est; unde est quasi tendentia quaedam ab esse in potentia ad esse in actu, quae in re ipsa ponenda est* (Cf. *De Gratia*, proleg.II, c.VII, n.7, p.88).

\(^{398}\) *De ratione contingentis futuri est indifferentia in causa, et non in effectu futuro: determinatio* (Ibid. p.89).
will happen, although it may not happen; and seen negatively, it is that which will not happen, but may happen'.

Suárez's analyses of 'future' and 'future contingent' elucidate in what sense an event is called 'future' and in what way the future is contingent, i.e., as the indetermination of the cause. The analysis also suggests that by penetrating the content of the causes, God could grasp with epistemic certainty the metaphysically uncertain future contingent event. However, we noted above that Suárez explicitly rejects the idea that future contingent events could be known previously and with certainty just in virtue of their causes. We need, then, to find out what else count as necessary conditions for foreknowledge of AFCE.

3. Possibility of Foreknowledge of Future Contingent Events

Foreknowledge of future contingent events is possible in Suárez's scheme; first of all because of God's 'omniscience', that is to say, God knows "everything" including future, present, and past events, with the only specification that these things

---

399 *Futurum contingens non dicitur tale, quia evenit vel non evenit, hoc enim disjunctum non est contingens, sed necessarium et inevitabile; oportet ergo alteram partem determinare; ergo futurum contingens positivum dicitur quod evenit, quamvis posset non esse; negativum autem dicitur quod non eveniet, licet posse evenire* (*De Gratia*, Proleg.II, c.7, n.9, p.89).

400 *... quod objectum est cognoscibile, scientia est possibilia est sit est possibilis, inest Deo: at si objectum illud esse potest verum sine repugnantia, eo ipso cognoscibile etiam esse; ergo etiam est possibilis ejus scientia* (*De Gratia*, Proleg.II, c.7, n.22, p.95).
be intelligible or cognizable.\(^{401}\) So if there is something that cannot be known, for example, any false proposition, then not even an omniscient God can know it. For God cannot know the unknowable as He cannot produce the impossible.\(^{402}\)

For Suárez, in addition, God’s omniscience means that He knows all true propositions. And Suárez maintains that true contingent propositions that signify future contingent events are either true or false. Hence, God knows them. We will return to this point further on.

4. Analysis of Divine Knowledge: Middle Knowledge

According to the traditional Thomistic view, there is only one simple and universal knowledge in God.\(^{403}\) This knowledge contains formally and eminently

\(^{401}\) Since God is infinitely intelligent, He has power to know all the intelligible ... Moreover, it is impossible that God ignores a reality that He might create, since He does not do anything except as an intellectual agent [...] (Cf. Disp. Met., d.30, s.15, n.22, p.623).

\(^{402}\) For Suárez there is no contradiction in asserting that God can know future contingent events since God’s knowledge is like God’s omnipotence. For a refined discussion of the notion of omnipotence see Ivan Boh, "Divine Omnipotence in Early Sentences" (1985, pp. 185-211).

\(^{403}\) According to Suárez, God’s knowledge is absolutely one and simple because: (i) there is no real distinction in His knowledge itself; moreover this *scientia* is formally constitutive of God’s own essence; and (ii) it refers to God Himself who is the most simple object, so it must be unique and simple, and it is the same one that embraces all the creatures as possible and as existent (Cf. Disp. Met., d.30, s.15, n.37, p.632). God’s knowledge, on the other hand, is perfect and universal because: (i) it is that knowledge that includes a plurality and variety of things with a unique principle or act, since it cannot be imagined a universal science by predication or abstraction, for all science is about some singular reality.
all the perfections of an intellectual perfection. But in order to explain divine knowledge, theologians divided it. Before the late sixteenth century, the conceptual division is two-fold, viz., God has knowledge of:

(i) **Simple intelligence** (*scientia simplicis intelligentiae*), and

(ii) **vision** (*scientia visionis*). The first sort of knowledge, has as its object the possible future contingent events. Through it God knows the things that Peter might do if he lived under certain circumstances. This knowledge is abstractive, necessary, and natural, for it is based on the knowledge that God has of his own divine essence. And God could not have known otherwise than He actually knows. Thus, it is also called natural knowledge (or *scientia naturalis*). Moreover, it is prior to the decisions of God’s will. God’s knowledge of vision has as its object the actual or absolute

---

404 Suárez defines ‘perfect’ following Aristotle as that which does not lack anything. In God there cannot be any privation of perfection.

In *Disp. Met.*, d.30, Suárez explains how a reality is eminently contained in another. He writes: ‘to contain eminently is to have such a superior perfection by nature that it contains virtually all that there exists in the inferior perfection [...]. For this reason all the perfections of the creatures insofar as they are eminently in God, are the same creative essence of God. [...] Thus, the following causal proposition is true, ‘Because God contains eminently all the perfections of the creatures, He can produce them [...]’ On the other hand, it is said that God possesses formally some of the creature’s perfections, because He possesses a certain formal similarity with the creature. But when there is not such similarity nor formal denomination, and there exists just the efficiency of the divine power, then it is said that there is an eminential contingency’ (nn. 10-12, pp.352-353).

405 Through knowledge of simple intelligence, Suarez explains, God knows necessarily in a comprehensive way the possible creatures, because God knows comprehensively His potency. The creatures in their possible being are in necessary connection with God’s potency. Therefore, once the potency is comprehensively known, which contains in an eminently way the total effect, the possible effect is also
future contingent events. Through it God knows that Peter will in fact live in such
circumstance and will in fact sin. It is also called free knowledge since the future
existence of the events depends on the free will of God to create them in time. It
is subsequent to the decisions of God’s will. Later, Molina introduced a third type
of divine knowledge, i.e., (iii) Middle knowledge, Suárez usually refers to it as
‘conditional knowledge’. 406

The objects of middle knowledge according to Suárez, who apparently
defended it by 1590 407, are the true subjunctive conditional propositions which


406 The expressions that Suárez normally uses are: scientia quasi simplicis
intelligentiae, quasi conditionis, scientia conditinalium contingentium, scientia
conditionata. And according to Dumont (1936), Suárez used the term ‘middle
knowledge’ for the first time in Opusc. I, Lib. I, De Concursu Dei cum Voluntate, c.
XV, n. 2, p. 76.: Et haec scientia vocari solet conditionaleum contingentium, et nonnullis
appellatur scientia media, inter simplicem intelligenti et scientia visionis. In the same
passage Suárez goes on to justify middle knowledge, he writes, it seems to me
impossible to deny God’s knowledge of the conditional futures and at the time not
to raise any doubt about His existence. I am convinced that this knowledge is
extremely necessary to God’s government and providence: ut perfectam Deoque
(uignam R ectu m omnium juturorum providentiam et gubemationem habere possit.

407 Among Suárez’s commentators there is disagreement about whether Molina
influenced Suárez or Suárez influenced Molina. For instance, F. Stegmüller (1933,
pp.39-41) thinks that Suárez in his youth was skeptic about the possibility of middle
knowledge. This impressions are based on the notes of a Suarezian student. Accordingly in his lectures at Rome (1582-83), Suárez found difficulties in accepting
that God knows that if God were to place a man in such circumstance, he would
freely consent to His grace. P. Dumont (1936, pp.164-170), on the contrary, suggests
that Suárez might have influenced Molina in defending the truth of conditional
propositions. Dumont holds that Suárez’s written doctrine, that of 1590, is the same
as his teachings at Rome (1584-85) and Alcalá (1585-86). He comments that there
is no proof to show that Suárez knew Molina’s Concordia, since between 1585 and
1588 there was just one manuscript of the text, which was not sold until 1589, so it


signify future contingent events that would happen if certain conditions were actualized. Through middle knowledge God knows that Peter will (or would sin) on the condition that he be here today. Unlike the knowledge of vision, but like the knowledge of simple intelligence, God's middle knowledge is prior to any determination of His decrees, otherwise God would not be really provident. For this reason also, the content of middle knowledge is independent of the divine will and outside of his control; it rather depends on the free choices of the creatures.

The name 'middle knowledge' derives from the fact that it partakes from the features of both initial knowledge, but it also differs from them. Like the knowledge of vision, the object of middle knowledge is contingent; and like the knowledge of simple intelligence, it is prior to God's decrees. Yet it differs from them, because through it God sees in his essence and from eternity, not only the things that a free agent actually will do and possibly could do, but also the things that he would do in the infinite order of hypothetical circumstances in which the agent might be placed.

More precisely, God has middle knowledge only if He knows all the true conditional future contingents, as Freddoso puts it. This necessary condition

seems difficult to establish any communication between the book and the public. For a discussion of this unsettled issue see P. Dumont (1936).

408 By 'all the true conditional future contingent' events that might be signified by different types of singular subjunctive or indicative true conditional propositions, i.e., God knows: (i) counterfactual conditionals, in which antecedent and consequent are false, e.g., 'If David stayed in Keilah, Saul would besiege the city'; (ii) semifactual conditionals, in which the antecedent is false, but the consequent is true, e.g., 'If Peter lived, he will deny Christ'; and (iii) factual conditional, in which both antecedent and consequent are true, e.g., 'If Adam were placed in the garden, he would sin' or 'If there were a
nevertheless is not sufficient, for Bañezians denying middle knowledge still assert that God knows conditional future contingents just as He knows the absolute ones, i.e., in the decrees of his will. Thus, unlike Bañez and also unlike Molina who requires God's prevolitional 'super comprehension' of the conditional future contingents.

Suárez will say that God has middle knowledge iff: (i) He knows all the determinately true conditional future contingents, and (ii) He has immediate intuitive and intentional representation of the true conditional future contingents. Given these necessary and sufficient conditions for middle knowledge, in the two books of the second Opusculum, Suárez takes over the double task of showing how future contingent propositions can be true, and how they can be known by God. If Suárez succeeds in the explanatory aspects of the theory, middle knowledge is plausible, and contingency and freedom are compatible with divine foreknowledge. That is, Suárez's Compatibilist thesis logically will follow. In the last two sections of this Chapter, I will discuss the fundamental aspects of Suárez's scheme.

Another sort of confusion is the question about whether the locution 'middle knowledge' denotes the same objects as 'foreknowledge'. It is clear, though, that...

---

war in the Middle East, the price of oil will not rise'.

409 Comprehending an entity means, according to Freddoso's interpretation of Molina, grasping the metaphysical modality of every state of affairs involving it - so it corresponds to God's natural sort of knowledge. But comprehension does not include any knowledge of conditional future contingents. 'Supercomprehension', then, includes the task of 'surpassing in perfection by an infinite distance' the entity in question. More precisely, Freddoso explains, 'one who supercomprehends must be able to have epistemic certitude regarding states of affairs that do not (at least yet) have metaphysical certitude' (Cf. Freddoso (1988), pp.50-52).
middle knowledge is not simple foreknowledge since it does not refer to the future itself but rather to the hypothetical future. Now if it is foreknowledge it is not insofar it is properly foreknowledge of the future, but insofar as it would be if the condition obtains that it becomes foreknowledge. On Suárez’s account, knowledge of causes which means knowledge of the divine and human wills that produce contingent effects, and knowledge of His own decrees; that is to say, middle knowledge, is the ground of God's foreknowledge of future contingents, since middle knowledge is the only mean to foreknow the emanation of the effects from their

---

Regarding this problem there exist the question about whether middle knowledge is ‘conditional foreknowledge’. According to Suárez Agustine discussed the issue about conditional foreknowledge in *Predestinatione Sanctorum*, chs.12, 13 and 14; and to *De Origin. an.*, Book I, ch.12. For Suárez, the confusion seems to reside in the ambiguity of the word ‘foreknowledge’. He writes, *Deus praescivit quod futurum erat, id est quod ei mortem immaturam fuerat largitur ut tentationem subtraheretur incerto [....] Deus non praescivit quod futurum non erat [...]* (Cf. *De Gratia*, Proleg.II, c.4, 1,2,3,4, pp.66-68).

The bottom line of this passage is that God is unable to foresee those events that will never occur. Another passage emphasizes the literal sense of the word ‘foreknowledge’; Suarez, thus, states, ‘It is most certain that God’s knowledge like God Himself in its duration precedes the existence of all created things. Therefore, if the prefix ‘fore’ simply refers to this precedence, then it will be most certain that there is foreknowledge in God’ (Cf. *Opusc.* II, DSDAFC, c.7, n.18, p.326). Thus, Suárez understands that God has literal foreknowledge of the objects destined to exist, i.e., of the absolute futures. But the case of the conditional futures is different. If they are doomed to remain nothing, they will never be really ‘posterior’ to God’s knowledge. It is unacceptable, then, to conceive them as ‘foreseen’ objects. Thus, strictly speaking, conditional foreknowledge is a vacuous expression. In this sense, Suárez repeats ‘God knows the futures which will be, and not the futures which will not’. According to this, Suárez would argue for God’s middle knowledge of indicative or subjunctives on an antecedent condition. But not for middle knowledge of strict counterfactuals which never did or never will occur.
causes. But why in the first place do scholars of all times find it so problematic to either deny or assert foreknowledge of future contingent events? To this question we turn now.

5. Compatibility of Foreknowledge and Future Contingent Events

First of all, the consequences of denying God's foreknowledge of future contingents turn out to be extremely problematic for medieval theists. For if God does not foreknow the outcome of future free choices, then, given that God exists, either God does not know the consequences of future free choices or there are no free choices (or both). But if God did not know the outcome of future free choices, then it seems that God would not know completely the future and God's omniscience would be undermined; alternatively, if there were no free choices, then it seems that God would be clearly responsible for the moral evil of this world since agents would be unable to do otherwise; moreover, God's punishment and rewards of human actions would be unjust and unintelligible.\footnote{It is through middle knowledge, God sees the range of the total and exhaustive development of every and each one of the orders of providence that he can create. Every free will appear in these orders with all and every one of its own determinations, not only with the possible ones, but also with those that the free agents would really make, even though if they freely make them, they have the real possibility of making the opposite. Then, God chooses some of such determinations and organizes them within a general plan of the world, and He forms in his will the decree to create them in time and He concurs with the human action already foreknown.}

\footnote{Anthony Kenny brings forward some of these dilemmas in (1979).}
From a different point of view some scholars think that to assert that God has foreknowledge of future contingents involves a contradiction. According to Suárez, perplexities arise from the argument that 'God could not know from eternity all the things that are produced in time, unless He also had known previously all that which somehow will happen in time; therefore, if something happened contingently, He also knew it beforehand.\footnote{Non enium potuit Deus ex aeternitate scire omnia quae in tempore fiunt, nisi etiam praesciverit quidquid quocumque modo in tempore futurum fuit; si ergo aliquo contingente futura fuere, etiam illa praescivit (Disp. Met., d.30, s.15, n.31, p. 629).}

More obvious contradictions arise if it is thought as some fatalist do that:

i. Until that which is contingent has not happened, the proposition about it would not be known to be determinately true.\footnote{Suárez formulates the problem of this argument in a \textit{reductio ad absurdum} style. He writes, 'If before being realized the contingent effects do not have in their causes a determination to exist or to not exist, then there cannot be any determined truth in the propositions in which one of the two things is enunciated as future [...]. But thereby it follows that any of the two parts, either the one that affirms or the one that denies that such effect will occur, can be foreknown as determinately true, not even by God, because that which is not true is not knowable, but then that which is not determinately true cannot be known as determinately true either'. (Cf. \textit{Disp. Met.}, 19, s.10, n.10, p.430).}

ii. If God's own knowledge is necessary, then it is also the cause of the futures, thus their contingency is eliminated;

iii. There cannot be found any way or procedure through which these future contingents could be known.
These arguments for fatalism, Suárez thinks, are not a good basis for denying God's foreknowledge of future contingents. Thus, sharing the view of the majority of Christian medieval theologians, Suárez is convinced that God is able to foresee the future and that this is not contradictory to but rather compatible with the contingency of what is foreknown. This is his 'compatibility thesis' (CT) for which he poses three main arguments that at the same time try to defuse the above arguments (i), (ii), (iii) respectively, as follows:

A1 [...] Even though [future contingents] are not determined in their causes, that is, in virtue and manner of a proximate cause, nevertheless, in the thing itself either of the two parts of contradiction is future, and given though we do not know it, God has intuitive knowledge of it from eternity.

---

415 According to Suárez, some ancient philosophers eliminated the dilemmas by asserting that all the effects and actions, including the human will, in the universe proceeded from a fatal necessity which arise in the conjunction of all the causes and from the influence of the stars. This claim is found in Agustine's Confessions, Book IV, where he is referring to Democritus, Empedocles and Heraclitus ... qui dixerunt omnes effectus et actiones causarum universi, etiam humanarum voluntatum, necessitate quadam fatali provenire, or ta ex connexione causarum omnium et caelorum ac stellarum influxu (Disp. Met., d.19, s.11, n.10, p.331). Others, as Cicero have chosen to deny divine foreknowledge, and Agustine comments, in Book 5, De Civitate Dei, c.9, that 'to make humans free, he made them sacrilegious'; Ut homines faceret liberos, fecit sacrilegos. On the other hand, Peter Abelard, without denying that secondary causes proceeded from the divine will, attached to them a total necessity, for he thought that God operates by natural necessity. Wyclef also maintains that all things happen by an inevitable necessity that not even God could create things otherwise than He did nor can He govern otherwise than he does; and from the things thus created and governed there cannot be produced other actions than the ones that are produced (Ibid., nn. 1,2,3).

In early modern times, we find Spinoza who denies all contingency in nature when he says, 'given a determinate cause the effect follows of necessity, and without its cause, no effect follows' (Cf. Ethics, Book I).

416 [...] licet in suis causis non habeant determinationem, id est, in virtute et modo operandi causae proximae, tamen, in re ipsa altera pars contradictionis futura est, quam, licet nos ignoremus, Deus tamen ex sua aeternitate intuetur (Disp. Met., d.30, s.15, n.32,
A2  God imposes no necessity on the things known by foreknowledge; since foreknowledge as such is not the cause of things nor is it necessary. It rather supposes, from the part of God and from the part of other causes of the contingents effects, all the efficacy which will take place in the proper time.\footnote{Suárez compares God's intuitive knowledge with our way of seeing the truth of an existent thing. We do not need any means in which such truth gets demonstrated, but rather we contemplate it immediately in itself. For instance, that Peter is white, since we see the whiteness conjoined to him, but only because it so happens in fact. In the same way, God does not need any means except His light to see those truths in themselves, because with his eternal vision He is more efficacious, than ourselves, to contemplate all the times and all the things produced in it.}

A3  God does not need an extrinsic medium to know future contingent events, but rather always reaches all times with his infinite light and eternal vision. He sees what there is in each thing, which receives the denomination of future or past with respect to the parts of time, while with respect to the divine vision itself it is in all moments objectively present as if it always existed.\footnote{\textit{Neque hinc etiam fit ut per hanc praescientiam Deus imponat necessitatem aliquam rebus sic cognitis, quia haec scientia ut sic non est causa earum, immo supponit, tam ex parte Dei quam ex parte cuiusvis alterius causae necessariae ad talem effectum, totam efficaciam seu concursum suo tempore futurum, et Deus per hanc scientiam intuetur res futuras ut suae aeternitate praeentes (Ibid).}}

The first argument (A1) poses one of the major difficulties of future contingents, viz., whether there is determinate truth-value in the propositions that signify them. Below I will address this question in detail considering a relevant conception of 'determination.'

The second argument (A2), is a reply to the Bañezian scheme. They agree that God has within Himself the sources to know all future contingent effects with
certainty, but their reason is that God causally predetermines the future contingents, and so He foreknows them. Thereby, they claim because 'God knows, through His foreknowledge that these things are future, they are'. Thus, the proposition 'the Antichrist will be born' is true, because God knows that Antichrist is going to be born. Suárez disagrees. Foreknowledge is not simple "free knowledge". It cannot be said absolutely that God's epistemic activity is neither "the cause" of things nor that it imposes necessity on the things foreknown. Rather Suárez contends 'Quia hoc futurum est, ideo Deus illud praescit', that is, not because God knows that something will be future, it will be; by contrast, because that will be future in virtue of its causes, that is the reason why God knows it as future. In the same way astronomers know an eclipse of the sun, so they predict it, but the eclipse does not happen because they know that it will take place. Suárez is thus asserting a logical rather than causal priority of future events to God's knowledge of them. To justify why foreknowledge neither causes nor imposes necessity on the things foreknown, Suárez

\[\text{\textsuperscript{419}}\text{Cf. Alvarez, \textit{De Auxil}, d.16; Bañez argues that 'the Antichrist will be' is simpliciter contingent, since this effect by nature and by its proximate cause is contingent; but it is necessary secundum quid in respect to God's knowledge and will who efficaciously determines all secondary causes to their effects. The voluntary act is free simpliciter but necessary secundum quid. Cf. Bañez, in I p., q.14, art 13, col 618 ff. On the other hand, Thomists presupose that 'If God knows that something will be, it necessarily follows that thing will be', They assert that the antecedent of this conditional is necessary because God's knowledge is in the past. Hence, the consequent is also necessary.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{420}}\text{According to A. Kenny (1979, p.72), Erasmus and Luther argue in a similar manner, claiming the authority of Lorenzo Valla's \textit{Dialogue on Free Will}. Even though this example is a case of a natural event.}\]
appeals to the theory of ‘efficacious grace’ and to the notion of the composite sense (de sensu composito) of ‘necessity’. Let us turn to consider this latter crucial

Unlike Bañezians who assent that ‘efficacious grace’ is a call that predetermines and pre-moves the human will to assert to His grace, for Suárez ‘efficacious grace’ should not to be understood as physical predetermination, but rather as an aid or call which acts as a principle -it has a peculiar force and efficacy to induce the human will to consent- of operation, not as the operation itself (Cf. Opusc. I, Book III, c.6, n.8, pp.175-176). He also asserts that God wills the acts of humans’ will conditionally, viz., His influence is given on the condition that humans will cooperate. The theory holds that the efficacy of God’s call consists in that ‘God, in His infinite wisdom seeing what each cause or will shall do in every event and occasion, if placed in it, also knows when and to which call each will shall give assent if it (the call) is given [to the will]. Thereby, when God wills to convert a man He wills also to call him at that time and in that way in which He knows he will consent, and such a call is named efficacious because, although of itself it does not have an infallible effect, yet insofar as it is subject to such divine knowledge, infallibly it will have it (the effect). The efficacious grace can be with or without congruity; its efficacy is moral, not physical, and is to be sought not in the vocation itself but rather as it proceeds from God and is under His direction. It does not imply necessity in regard to the cause but rather certitude and infallibility, which looks to foreknowledge. The will does not resist it, yet it can, since foreknowledge does not remove the power of doing the opposite of what is foreknown. Efficacious hujus vocationis in hoc consistere, quod Deus, infinita sua sapientia, praevidens quid unaquaesque causa seu voluntas in omni eventu et occasione operatura sit, si in ea constituatur, etiam cognoscit quando et cui vocationi sit unaquaesque voluntas essensum praebitura, si ei detur. Unde, quando vult hominem convertere, vult etiam illum vocare illo tempore, et modo quo novit illum consessorum, et talis vocatio appellatur efficax, quia licet ex se non habeat infallibilem effectum, tamen, ut subest tali scientia divinae, infallibiliter est illum habitura, quod interdum poterit accidere cum speciali congruitate et efficacia morali talis vocationis [...]. Unde fit hanc efficaciam non esse physicam, sed moralem, neque esse spectandum in ipsa vocatione secundum se [...]; sed prout progradit a Deo, et est sub intentione ac scientia seu directione ejus [...] (Cf. Opusc. I, Book III, c.14, n.9, pp.224-225). Suárez’s account of efficacious grace emphasizes that God knows -through middle knowledge- which graces would be suited to elicit from any person a free and positive response. This account is a step to reconcile grace and foreknowledge with the results of free choices.

A proposition is understood in sensu composito if its mode (in this case ‘necessary’) has as its scope the entire non modal counterpart of the original proposition. E.g. ‘Necessarily God knows that Peter will sin’ which could be represented as □ Kg(Peter > sin). On the contrary, if this proposition is taken in the
Molina suggests that in a proposition like ‘God knows that if Peter were place under certain circumstance, Peter will sin’ (hereafter proposition $P$), the necessity of the antecedent is not validly carried over the consequent. Suárez adopts a different strategy. First, he distinguishes three types of necessity: simple, absolute and hypothetical; then, he applies the standard conception of necessity in its composite sense to proposition $P$. Suárez notices that proposition $P$ is not simply necessary\textsuperscript{423},

\textit{\textsuperscript{423} Suárez’s proposal is that the truth of proposition $P$, which includes the future tense proposition Peter will sin (hereafter $Fp$), depends on the truth of $Fp$, and $Fp$ is hypothetically necessary only if $p$ (a present event) obtains. Moreover, on Suárez view a proposition is simply necessary (or intrinsically necessary) if: (i) its truth is inseparably attached to it without any supposition; (ii) it is true in virtue of the connection of its terms alone (i.e., it seems equivalent to an analytical proposition): $Dicitur autem propositio ab intrinseco necessary quae ex intrinseca connexione terminorum habet [...] simili modo dicitur propositio simpliciter necessaria quae nullam hypothesim seu suppositionem requirit, at habeat inseparabilem veritatem.}$

\textit{Cf. Opusc. II, DSDAFC, c.IX, n.12, p.336. Past-tense propositions like ‘Adam was’ lack intrinsic connection in their terms, so they are not simply necessary, for they could be false unless one presupposes the truth of its correspondent present-tense version, i.e., ‘Adam is’.

By contrast, a proposition is absolute necessary if it retains at once its truth inseparably: $Propositio autem de praeterito veritatem quam semel habet, inseparabilem retinet; et ideo dicitur absolute necessaria.$ Ibid. p.336. So that absolute necessity is a proper characteristic of true past-tense propositions. Thereby the axiom ‘Ad praeteritum non est potentia’. Since things in the past are for once determined to one alternative and have proceeded from their cause, no cause has it within its power to make them not to have them. In this sense, necessarily what is now true, it will be always true in the past.}
but rather that is absolutely necessary. The Thomistic-Bañezian objection is that since $P$ is absolutely necessary, 'Peter will sin' ($Fp$) is also absolutely necessary. Suárez's answer is that the necessity of the antecedent is carried over the consequent in the sense that it is certain that Peter will sin, however, the consequent itself, i.e., $Fp$ cannot be said to be absolutely necessary, since future-tense propositions, like 'Peter will sin', become false once the predicted event happens, and truth is not inseparably retained by it. So the necessity that properly corresponds to $Fp$ is a hypothetically necessity, while $P$ is absolutely necessary, but merely in the composite sense. In the divided sense the event $p$ itself is not necessary and can fail to happen, and if it does

The case, however, of the contingent present-tense propositions and that of the contingent future-tense propositions is not exactly the same as the case of the true past-tense propositions. The propositions in the former two cases can later be false since what they signify can cease to exist; likewise, once the events predicted by future-tense propositions take place, the propositions themselves can become false. In this sense even if they have been always true, they cannot be said to be absolutely necessary.

W. Craig (1988, p.220) holds that in Suárez's account absolute necessity 'appears to be a necessity of immutability'; Craig writes, 'If a logically contingent proposition is unalterably true, then that proposition is said to be absolutely necessary'. The problem with Craig's temporal or 'unalterability' reading of the 'absolute necessity' is that Suárez explicitly rejects it in the context that the necessity of immutability should not contradict God's free will. Suárez writes: 'Necessity of immutability is not absolute necessity but rather relative, i.e., by hypothesis and this should be admitted in God's will': quae dicitur [necessitas] immutabilitatis, quae revera non est necessitas absoluta, sed secundum quid, seu licet ex suppositione [...] (Cf. Disp. Met., d.30, s.14, n.32-33, pp. 662-663). Thus, either necessity of immutability is not equivalent to absolute necessity or as Suárez explains there is hypothetical necessity just in regard to us; for that which for us is an instant is eternity in God; or in Suárez's words 'that which in our act is a hypothetical necessity in relation to that instant in which it presumably exists [since it is necessary given the condition that e.g., $p$ obtains] it is in God necessity of immutability for all its eternity'. Ibid.
fail, God would not have foreknown it. The following passage sums up Suárez's response to the relevant objections:

I concede thereby the antecedent reasons, that there follows some necessity in the consequent, not, however, a *simpliciter* or absolute necessity, but a necessity "on the assumption that", which does not contradict contingency. This is best said to be necessity in that composite sense which does not contradicts contingency or freedom of act or effect, because truly it is here not said to be a necessity of composition merely because of the supposition of divine knowledge, but rather because the divine knowledge itself presupposes the futurition (*futuritionem*) or actual truth of the future thing [...]. Therefore, as is commonly said, on the supposition that God knows a thing to be future, it is possible for it not to be future in the composite sense; therefore, it is true without contradicting freedom or contingency, for in that supposition of knowledge the supposition of its object, that is, its future truth, is mediately included. Therefore, that supposition is not merely extrinsic nor is it at all independent of the free power of the proximate cause, but rather it presupposes its future determination in such a way that if it were not future, it would not have been known by God.424

On Suárez's account, then, God's knowledge presupposes some future event which is logically prior in regard to His foreknowledge. God's knowledge, as W. Graig correctly points out, is *a posteriori*, and therefore, even if necessary it does not impose a necessity of consequent concerning the thing foreknown, but only a necessity of consequence.

On Suárez's scheme, then, past things are absolutely necessary for their potentiality has been reduced to actuality. Hence it lies within no one's power to bring it about that the past effect did not exist.425 By contrast, with regard to future

---

424 Cf. *Opusc.* II DSDAFC, c.9, n.16, p.338.

425 *Nam respectu praeteritii jam potentia fuit omnino reducta in actum, ita ut jam ille actus ab illa non pendet quantum ad hoc quod est effectum illum aliquando fuisse; et ideo jam non manet in tali causa vera potestas aut libertas ad faciendum ut ille effectus non fuerit, propter quod etiam ille jam dicitur absolute necessarius, ut supra*
effects the cause are in potentiality to their production and so they have absolute power and freedom to bring about their effects [...].\footnote{At vero respectu effectus futuri, causa est simpliciter in potentia, et effectus in ipsa nondum est extra virtutem ejus, ideoque talis causa absolute habet potestatem et libertatem ad non faciendum illum effectum pro quodlibet tempore futuro, et quod libet instanti ejus (Ibid).} It follows then, that even if the proposition ‘It is necessary that God knew that Peter will (or would) sin’ is true, it still depends on Peter’s own free choice to sin or not to sin. On Suárez’s solution, God’s foreknowledge is, thus, certain and infallible because the event will most definitely occur and in this sense is necessary, but necessary in the composite sense which imposes no metaphysical necessity on the future event itself.

Moreover, God’s knowledge is immutable as He Himself remains immutable, the necessity of his immutability, however is hypothetical; So God’s knowledge being based on the future events themselves is capable of being otherwise if the future contingent events do not occur.\footnote{If necessity of immutability is understood as hypothetical necessity then Suárez could reconcile God’s immutability with the change in truth value of tensed propositions, given that future contingent propositions become false once the events occur. This solution, though, suggests that God’s knowledge while not increasing, seems to change with time.} With these distinctions and conception of necessity, Suárez’s theory is contributing toward certainty of divine foreknowledge of future contingent events, and also toward the compatibility of the contingency of things and the freedom of causes with divine foreknowledge.

Turning back, now, to Suárez’s argumentation for the compatibilist thesis (CT), his third argument (A3) above, refers to what Calvin Normore (1992, p.358)
calls the theological problem of future contingents, viz., How the knowledge of an immutable God can be reconciled with the contingency of some future events? Suárez's answer to this question involves two different issues, that is, the characterization of God's own knowledge of future events which according to Suárez is intuitive rather than propositional or discursive -we shall treat this matter in the last section 8 -and, Suárez's view on eternity and time. Let us examine here this latter view.

Suárez holds that God possess from eternity -for Suárez immutable things are eternal- knowledge of all creatures that are produced in time. For Suárez it is necessary that God possesses His knowledge simultaneously, in its totality without succession, because God cannot admit variation in Himself, otherwise He would change and this is unacceptable by definition. Moreover, it follows from (A3) that in God's mind the future things are not cognized as future, but as present in His eternity. This would suggests that Suárez adopts an atemporal interpretation of eternity, that is to say, the adequate measure of the divine being is eternity rather

---

428 A detailed discussion on eternity and immutability is found in Disp. Met. d.30, s.8; d.50, s.3, nn. 3-6; and about God's eternity and future contingents in Opusc II, DSDAFC, c.7, nn.9-20. See also the distinction between 'necessity' and 'immutability' discussed by Normore, C. in "Future Contingents", The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy (1982), pp.358 ff.; and the analytic discussion of the concept of 'eternity' in Kretzmann, N. and Stump, E.,"Eternity", Journal of Philosophy, v. pp. 429-558


430 A similar argument is found in De Gratia, Proleg.II, c.9, n.25.
than everlasting time. However, Suárez, unlike St. Thomas, does not invoke 'atemporal eternity' to account for the compatibility between God's foreknowledge and future contingent events. Most commentators, as A. Freddoso felicitously points out, interpret that 'St. Thomas holds that God knows all future contingents with certainty solely because future entities, although they do not yet exist 'outside their causes' in time, nonetheless exist in eternity and so are present to the divine vision. Further their existence in eternity is real and not just objective.

The problem with this standard interpretation of St. Thomas is that if it is correct, then it is subject to serious objections of both Bañez and Molina. Bañezians, on the one hand, charge that this account of eternity cannot explain God's knowledge of all future contingents. Particularly, it cannot be a foundation for the certitude of counterfactual conditionals which signify future contingent events that never will or would occur in time, thus they do not occur in eternity either. On the other hand, Molina notices, as Suárez himself acknowledges, that "the proposition 'from

431 The atemporal conception of eternality is traditionally held by Boethius and St. Thomas. Boethius' definition of eternity says: 'quod sit interminabilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possesio'. That is, 'eternity is the perfect and total possession, in a simultaneous way, of an interminable life'. Cf. Consol. Lib.III, pros.2. Suárez explains in details this definition in Disp.Met., d.50, s.3, n.6, p.157. By contrast Ockham conceives eternity as 'sempiternity', i.e., existence at all times. Thus, God is eternal iff: God has always existed and always will.


433 In his attractive and comprehensive discussion of eternity and future contingent events, Suárez writes: quod coexistencia dicit simulaneam existentiam utrusque extremi; sed alterum extremorum non habuit existentiam aeternam seu ab aeterno; ergo nec coexistential (Opus. II, DSDAFC c.7, n.9, p.323). The whole Chapter 7 is devoted to: Realem ac aeternam praessentiam seu coexistential cum Deo non convenire rebus creatis, neque in ea fundari posse scientiam futurorum
eternity all things coexist with God or are present to God with their own existence outside their causes' contributes nothing to the certitude of divine foreknowledge concerning future contingents.\textsuperscript{434} For, Molina explains, 'a moment of time cannot be present to God before it exists (since co-presence is a dyadic relation requiring the existence of both terms).\textsuperscript{435} Suárez, then, holding an atemporal conception of time responds to both objections. First, he conceives eternity itself as a necessary, infinite and immutable duration, that admits no succession, i.e., neither before nor after, since God is indivisible. It is an infinite duration for He has neither a principle nor an end given His intrinsic necessary existence. Moreover, Suárez explains, in God's eternity there is no flux and hence no past, nor future, except by a denomination taken from the coexistence of His eternity with our time but according to our way of conceiving.\textsuperscript{436}

In addition, Suárez contends that even though God's eternality is atemporal it is also omnipresent (spatially) with every moment of our time. This does not mean, however, that finite creatures can co-exist with God's eternity. Suárez precisely maintain that,

\begin{quote}
God coexists with every temporal moment, but He exceeds each moment. Created things, having finite duration cannot coexist with God from or even in eternity. Nevertheless, neither do they coexist with only a part of it, since it is indivisible. Hence, things which do not exist or have not existed do not
\end{quote}

\textit{contingentium.}

\textsuperscript{434} Cf. \textit{Concordia}, d.49, s.15, in Freddoso translation (1988).

\textsuperscript{435} Freddoso, Op.cit. p.32.

\textsuperscript{436} Cf. \textit{Disp. Met.}, d.30, s.8.
coexist with eternity, but when they come to exist in time they will come to exist in eternity. Things thus come to exist successively for God, but since He receives no new relations, there is no intrinsic succession in God's eternity. Things are present to God from eternity only in being present to the divine knowledge (Emphasis added).\textsuperscript{437}

So that Suárez's account differs from St. Thomas's in that future event as future does not really exist, they just have objective (or conceptual) existence in God's intellect. We recall from above that for Suárez 'being future' consisted in a certain 'transition from the being which a thing has in its cause to the being it will have in itself at some future time'. And that 'the being which an effect has in its cause is the only foundation of its being future'.\textsuperscript{438} It follows then, that the future events which do not exist yet, do not co-exist with the divine eternity. But as things pass from potentiality to actuality, they successively come to exist in the divine knowledge which antecedes all created things, and which is eternal as God Himself.\textsuperscript{439}

\textsuperscript{437} \textit{Quod est in duratione creata, et per illam coexistit aeternitati, consequenter coexistere omnibus aliis rebus vel temporibus; ergo signum est nullam durationem creatam adaequate coexistere aeternitati, sed hanc semper excedere [...] res quae in se non existit, et quando in se non existit, non potest dici existere in aeternitate; sed res creatae, ab aeterno non extiterunt in seipis, et in propria existentia et duratione; ergo neque ab aeterno existerunt in aeternitate; ergo neque ab aeterno coexisterunt, vel coexistiterunt realiter aeternitati (Opusc.II, c.7, nn. 9-20, pp.323-327).

\textsuperscript{438} \textit{Esse quod effectus habet in causa solum est fundamentum futuri esse (De Gratia, Proleg.II, c.7, n.8, p.88).}

\textsuperscript{439} Suárez seems to confirm that God has literal foreknowledge of all created things when he writes, \textit{Deinde, in omni etiam proprietate, certissimum est scientiam Dei, sicut et Deum ipsum, duratione antecedere rerum omnium creatorum existentiam: ergo, si illa particula, praes, solum denotet hanc antecessionem, certissimum erit esse in Deo (Opusc.II DSDAFC, c.7, n.18, p.326).}
By now presumably we should have little doubt about the possibility of compatibilism between divine foreknowledge and future contingent events. We have seen how Suárez accounts for the notions of 'contingency', 'future', 'absolute necessity' of the past, 'hypothetical necessity' of the future, atemporal eternity and objective rather than real existence of the futures. However, in truth, the complete success of the argument for the CT still depends upon other more controversial factors, those that we mentioned in (A1), i.e., whether propositions of the type that are supposed to be known by middle knowledge can be true, and in (A3) how those propositions can be known. We now turn to these matters.

6. Grounds for the Truth of Categorical Future Contingent Propositions

The fundamental step in Suárez's argumentation for infallible foreknowledge of future contingent events (AFCE) lies in his assertion that categorical future-tense propositions signifying them have 'determinate' truth. In this contention Suárez is in accord with Ockham but in disagreement with Aristotle and St. Thomas.

---

\[440\] Suárez states:

\[Haec futura contingens, quae a nobis per propositiones de futuro significantur, antequam in tempore fiant atque ab aeterno habent determinatam veritatem, secundum quam cognoscibilia sunt et a Deo praesciuntur (Opusc. II, Book I, c.2, n.6, p.297).\]

\[441\] In regard to the question whether propositions about future contingent events are determinately true, Ackrill reads in *De Interp.* c.9, pp.19-39, that: 'It is not necessary that of every affirmation and opposite negation one should be true and the other false'. And this amounts to denying the necessity of future contingent singular propositions, because the events they describe have neither occurred nor are actually determined (Cf. Aristotle's *Categories and De Interpret.*, transl. by J.L. Ackrill, Oxford
Suárez, unlike other Aristotelian commentators, thinks that Aristotle was not denying that singular future contingent propositions are 'necessary true' or 'evidently true'; rather Aristotle only maintains that these propositions are neither true nor false.\textsuperscript{442}

1987, p.139). Suárez in turn believes that Aristotle committed three basic errors, viz: (i) that future contingent propositions lack determinate truth; (ii) that a future contingent does not have such truth as to be known certainly and infallibly; (iii) that God does not foreknow future contingents with certainty. Cf. De Gratia, prol.II, c.VII, n.13, p.90. Most Aristotelian commentators, in fact, are convinced that Aristotle was confused in his arguments and his conclusion was false. Quine talks about the 'Aristotelian fantasy' in "On a so Called Paradox," (1953). The origin of the confusion seems to arise from Aristotle's 'peculiar notion of necessity' as Ackrill puts it. According to Ackrill in Aristotle '... is necessary' means something like '... is intellectually settled'.

St. Thomas's own answer to the relevant question turns out to be controversial. In The Tractatus De Praedestinatione Et De Praescientia Dei Et De Futuris Contingentibus of W. Ockham, p. , Boehner deems that St. Thomas's response is affirmative. He quotes the following passage: Quod futurum Deo præsens et íta est determinatum ad unam partem quamcumque; sed dum futurum, sic est ad utrum libet. Again in De Verit., q.2. a.12. (R.W. Mulligan transl. 1952): we read 'Although a contingent is not determined as long as it is future, yet, as soon as it is produced in the realm of nature, it has a determinate truth. It is in this way that the gaze of divine knowledge is brought upon it' (p.120). But according to Garrigou-Lagrange (in Predestination, p.148) St. Thomas agrees with Aristotle, denying determinate truth in the relevant propositions, so they are not in themselves knowable. The relevant thing to note here is that St. Thomas attaches a determinate truth-value to future contingent propositions for different reasons than Suárez does. St. Thomas states that since 'every true event is present to the eternity of God, for this reason it is determined to be, if it is, or not to be, if it is not' (Boehner, op.cit., pp.76-77). The consequence, as Boehner rightly comments, is that if one abstracts from the presence of future events to God's eternal vision, then no such events are determined to either side, so that the future contingent propositions would be neither true nor false, i.e., indeterminate. Thus, on St. Thomas's view the meaning of the word 'determined' comes from God's knowledge of vision associated with God's atemporal eternity. It follows that St. Thomas is compromising contingency because future contingent events by nature are determined to occur or not to occur. In this sense for St. Thomas, unlike Suárez, compatibilism means that contingency and determination are compatible.

\textsuperscript{442} Alii vocant determinate veram, quae vel nobis, vel naturaliter est evidenter vera. Sed haec omnia sunt conficta, et contra mentem Aristotelis, qui non solum usus est illa
By using the term ‘determinate’, Suárez does not mean ‘necessitated’ in a
metaphysical sense; i.e., the determinate truth of ‘Peter will sin’ is neither necessitating
nor bringing about the event that Peter will sin; nor does it mean ‘necessary
true’. Instead, for Suárez a proposition \( Fp \) has determinate truth iff: it is true;
while a proposition \( Fp \) has indeterminate truth iff: it is not true, or it is suspended
between and indifferent to truth or falsity. So that, like Ockham, Suárez is using
‘determinate’ as ‘determinate verum vel falsum’ -here determinate should be translated
by ‘definitely’ which has an epistemic connotation- that is to say, Suárez is simply
endorsing the law of Bivalence, i.e., of any pair of propositions like: ‘Peter will sin’,

\[ \textit{particula determinate, sed absolute dixit has propositiones nec veras nec falsas esse} \] (Opusc.II, Book I, c.2, n.10, p.299).

Since it is unlike the categorical universal proposition ‘If X is a man, X is
mortal’ which is necessary because it is true for any possible value of X, or true
under all circumstances.

Explaining that Aristotle and Cicero denied a determinate truth in singular
future contingent propositions, hence they cannot be known, Suárez clearly states, ‘a
proposition which is not determinately true is not true, for it is still, as it were,
suspended and indifferent to truth, and falsity’. That is: quia quod non est, non scitur;
erto quod non est verum non potest scire esse verum; sed proposition quae non est
determinate vera, non est vera, quia adhuc est quasi suspensa, et indifferentis ad
veritatem et falsitatem; ergo non potest scire ut vera, alioqui talis cognitio esse formis

According to Boehner, the expression ‘determinate verum vel falsum’ does not
mean that ‘a verum or falsum (proposition) is necessarily true, but only that a
proposition is true, so that it is not false; or false, so that it is not true. Hence, every
true contingent proposition is determinately true, and every false contingent
proposition is determinately false (Cf. op.cit. p.48). Suárez consistently uses the term
indefinitas as synonym of indeterminatas. E.g., he writes ‘quod hanc posteriori
determinat, verum esse hujusmodi conditionalis indefinitas non cognosci a Deo, nisi
quatenus in sui singularibus et ratione illorum veritatem habent (Opusc.II, DSDCFC,
c.6, n.4, p.362).
‘Peter will not sin’ exactly one is determinately true. For, Suárez argues, if any of the two parts, neither the one that affirms nor the one that denies that such effect will occur, is determinately true, then they cannot be foreknown even by God as determinately true; for that which is not determinately true cannot be known to be determinately true either.\textsuperscript{446} Now, since such propositions are determinately true or determinately false, they are knowable to God. The problem of divine foreknowledge, therefore, hinges not exactly on the cognitive powers of God’s mind\textsuperscript{447}, as Molina likes to emphasize, but more notoriously on whether the propositions about future contingent events have a knowable determinate truth.\textsuperscript{448}

Suárez, then, grounds his conclusion that such propositions can be determinately true by appealing, on the one hand, to the logical principles of Bivalence, and of Excluded Middle and to the Correspondence theory of truth, and, on the other hand, theologically, he invokes biblical prophecy of contingent events. The main lines of Suárez’s argument would be:

\textsuperscript{446} \textit{Ex hoc antem uterius sequitur neutram partem, affirmantem vel negantem huius modi effectum esse futurum, posse praesciri ut determinate veram, etiam a Deo, nam quod non est verum, non est scibile; ergo quod non est determinate verum non potest etiam scire ut determinate verum} (Disp.Met., d.19, s.10, n.10, p.430).

\textsuperscript{447} Craig (1988, p.209) comments that Suárez is fond of comparing God’s omniscience with His omnipotence. God’s knowledge and power are infinite. If we want to find out whether something is within God’s power, we investigate not God’s power but the thing itself, to see if it is possible to be done. Likewise, in order to find out whether future contingents are known by God, we must investigate not God’s knowledge but future contingent propositions to see whether they are knowable.

\textsuperscript{448} \textit{In propositionibus de futuro contingenti esse sufficientem veritatem determinatam, secundum quam a Deo praesciri possint} (De Gratia), Proleg.II, c.7, n.1, p.85). \textit{Si in conditionatis propositionibus est veritas, illa sine dubio cognoscitur a Deo.}
(i) If God says (or if a prophet says), for example, 'Peter will sin', this proposition is simply and actually true; therefore it is determinately true. God foreknows future events because that is how the events will occur; but if they will so occur then propositions about them are determinately true or false. (Theological demonstration for the Bivalence Principle).\(^449\)

(ii) It is impossible that contradictory opposite future contingent propositions both be at the same time determinately false. That is, the disjunctive 'Peter will sin or Peter will not sin' is a (logical) truth. Therefore, one part is determinately true.\(^450\) But we cannot possibly discern which one. (This is the logical demonstration of the Principle of Excluded Middle).\(^451\)

(iii) A proposition must be conformed to its object in order to be true (Correspondence Theory of Truth).\(^452\)

Therefore, future-tense propositions are determinately true, so knowable by God.

The obvious and most serious objection arises from (3), viz., how can a proposition about a not yet existent event be conformed to its object? There is no metaphysical ground for a correspondence view of truth. Suárez replies to this objection with a different set of arguments. He holds:

\(^449\) *Nam Deus cognoscit haec futura et ea revelabat, et dicit: Petrus peccabit [...] hoc est simpliciter et actualiter verum, et hoc est esse determinate verum [...] Deum praescire haec futura, quia illa futura sunt; si ergo illa futura sunt, propositio enuncians illa esse futura, determinata vera est. Nam, ex quo eo quod res est, vel non est, propositio vera vel falsa est (Opusc.II, DSDAFC, c.2, n.7, p.298).*

\(^450\) In (A1) above Suárez states that future contingent propositions are determined to one alternative.

\(^451\) *In illis propositionibus dantur propositiones contradictorie oppositae, quae non possunt esse simul falsae [...] illud disjunctum esse verum, et necessarium Petrus peccabit, vel non peccabit, quamvis fortasse a nobis discerni non possit (Ibid., n.8).*

\(^452\) *Nam si est illi conformis est vera, sin minus, est falsa, qualemunque fuerit esse, quod habeat in causa (Ibid).*
(i) Truth is not the exclusive property of actual existents. Past, present, future and possible beings are susceptible of it. All that which participates of being may be an object of an act of knowledge and thereby may be affirmed with certainty by knowledge.\(^\text{453}\)

(ii) The things that do not yet exist do not yet coexist with the divine eternity. But as they pass from potential into actual being, they successively come to exist in the divine eternity.\(^\text{454}\) Their truth, though, has an objective presence in God's eternal intellect.

(iii) True future-tense propositions are from eternity determinately true.\(^\text{455}\)

(iv) Future events are determinately true in their causes. They have the *habitudo* of being future events.\(^\text{456}\)

\(^{453}\) *Aristoteles distinxit duplex ens: unum quod vere est; aliud quod, licet non sit, sufficit ad veritatem propositionis; ita hic dicere possimus hoc etiam futurum, quamvis ab aeterno non sit, habere tamen quemdam modum entis, in quantum sufficienter fundare potest veritatem judicij aeterni seu enunciationis, et terminare actum intelligendi, qui vi sua terminari potest ad quodlibet, quacunque ratione participans rationem entis, sive praesentis sive futuri, praeriteri aut possibilis (Opusc.II, DSDAFC., c.8, n.8, p.329).*

\(^{454}\) Ibid., c.VII, n.18; ex dictis quid sit praesentia objectiva, de qua supra locuti sumus (Ibid. n.9, p.329).

\(^{455}\) Sit veritas hac, seu enunciationes de futuro contingenti esse ab aeterno et determinate veras, et quidnam sit aeterna eorum veritas, cum ipsa res tunc nihil sit; propie enim veritas illa ac formaliter solum est in intellectu divino (Ibid., c.8, n.8, p.329).

\(^{456}\) *Aliquid esse simpliciter futurum, significatur determinata habitudo esse potentialis ad esse actuale in aliquo tempore praesentialiter ponendum (Cf. De Graia, Prol.II, c.7, c.9, p.89); this 'habitudo' ('Habitus') from the term 'habitus' is used by Suárez as a principle and as a name. As a name it means: (i) a dress; (ii) a disposition; or (iii) a quality); in the agents it is two-fold, according to Suárez: una est principii, altera quasi termini. Priori modo est verum non esse in objecto divinae scientiae inquirendum entitatem seu realitatem per quam possit esse principium talis scientiae; quia scientia Dei non sumitur ab hoc objecto [...] Posteriori autem modo possunt futura contingentia terminare divinam scientiam, etiamsi ab aeterno non habeat existentiam aeternam ad Deum, sed tanti pro suis temporibus; quia hoc terminare non est aliquid reale intrinsecum in objecto determinante scientiam, sed est denominatio extrinseca proveniens ab ipsa scientia (Ibid. c.8, n.6, pp.328-329).*
In sum, to the question what is the metaphysical ground for the truth of propositions like \( Fp \), Suárez’s realist way out is to hold (iv), i.e., that for the truth of a future-tense proposition it is sufficient that some agent has in itself a determinate \textit{habitudo} (or disposition) to being future. Then, the proposition \( Fp \) corresponds or fails to correspond to such a "disposition". It is also this "disposition" what the divine knowledge grasp.

But the characteristics of these dispositions in agents are not clear enough on Suárez’s view. What does it mean that it is a ‘determinate disposition’? Could it be, for instance, that Peter has always had the disposition to deny Christ since he existed, and there is no future time in which Peter exists but does not have such a disposition? An affirmative answer would indicate that Peter’s disposition to deny Christ is essential, which is counterintuitive; so it must be a contingent disposition as C. Normore correctly suggests.\footnote{C. Normore, (1982), p.381.} Then, on Suárez’s account, dispositions come to be like ‘future contingents’ themselves, i.e., they could be found determined in agents who are not. In this way they become \textit{termini} of God’s knowledge. The problem is that, in addition, Suárez considers that these dispositions are atemporal, so God can foreknow them. It would follow that dispositions are not in agents but rather intentionally in God’s intellect.\footnote{R. Adams (1977, p.112) considers that Suárez defense of middle knowledge is ‘of the least clearly unsatisfactory type’ because Suárez appeals to that sort of \textit{habitudo} (or property, as Adams translates) in agentes. He argues that if God has an idea of this ‘property’ in creatures, the consequence is a compromise of the creature’s free will.} Then, how could they be considered adequate...
metaphysical ground for the truth of propositions like $Fp$? In addition he cannot admit any sort of disposition in God on the grounds that God, as pure act, excludes all potentiality and hence all dispositions. Moreover, God cannot have dispositions because His mode of existence is atemporal eternity, and dispositions belong to beings which might be doing something at some future time that it is not doing now. Dispositions have to exist somehow in potentiality, otherwise, why the name of disposition? 459 Should we, consequently, infer that because Suárez subscribed to a problematic ontology about dispositions, that propositions of the form $Fp$ cannot be true if the correspondence theory of truth is assumed? An affirmative answer to this question seems not too farfetched.

The proper response to the question about the possibility of truth of such propositions, I think, ascribing to Freddoso's opinion, depends not only upon a satisfactory metaphysics but also on the reconstruction of an adequate semantics for the relevant propositions. To this task, in reconstructing Molina's theory of Middle Knowledge and without invoking any sort of dubious ontology, Freddoso contributes to undermine the metaphysical grounding objection. In the same way, Freddoso argues that it is possible to consider that there are now adequate metaphysical grounds for the truth of a past-tense proposition like 'Socrates drank hemlock' because there were at some past time adequate metaphysical grounds for the truth of its present-tense counterpart, i.e., 'Socrates drinks hemlock'. Likewise, Freddoso writes,

a realist about the absolute future will claim that there are now adequate
metaphysical grounds for the truth of a future-tense proposition $F_p$ just in
case there will be at some future time adequate metaphysical grounds for the
truth of its present-tense counterpart $p$. So in order for propositions about the
past or the future to be true now, it is not required that any agent now be
causing them to be true. Rather, it is sufficient that some agent has caused or
will cause the corresponding present-tense propositions to be true.  

This argument is similar to Suárez's own argument (iii), that is, $F_p$ is really
determinately true from eternity. If it is now true that 'Peter sins', then prior to the
present moment the future-tense version, 'Peter will sin' was determinately true.

The reason, according to Suárez, is that $F_p$ does not begin to be true at the moment
when Peter sins; indeed, it is then false. $F_p$ has always been conformed to its object
since Peter's sin was really going to be. Therefore, $F_p$ does not newly become true
when Peter sins; rather in that moment we begin to discern its antecedent truth.
Prior to the present moment it was the case that Peter was going to sin or Peter was
not going to sin.  

After all, the metaphysical grounding objection does not seem to be conclusive
for the truth of $F_p$ if its alternative logical fundaments i.e., the principles of Excluded

---


461 Petrus peccat, ostenditur propositionem antea prolatam de tali futurouisse
veram; ergo antea etiam fuit determinate vera, et ab aeterno fuit talis (Opusc.II,
DSDAFC, c.2, n.9, p.298).

462 quia illa propositionio non incipit esse vera in eo instanti in quo Petrus peccat,
immo tunc potius quodammodo jam desinit ejus veritas, et incipit veritas de praesent;
tum etiam quia illa fuit semper conformis suo objecto, quia revera ita futurum fuit [...] 
ergo existentia talis rei non dat de novo veritatem propositionis, sed ostendit nobis eam
quae antea erat [...] Petrum esse indifferentem ad peccandum, vel determinate
peccaturum (Ibid., c.2, n.9, p.298).
Middle and Bivalence stand. How do these logical principles behave in regard to the conditional subjunctive propositions? This is our next topic.

7. **Grounds for the Truth of Conditional Subjunctive Contingent Propositions**

Suárez introduces the issue of God's knowledge of conditional future contingent propositions (CFCP) by justifying why God needs middle knowledge, and then he goes on to argue for the determinate truth of the CFCP. The theological justification of middle knowledge considers that not a probable but rather an infallible knowledge is indispensable: (i) to understanding of the divine providence and governance of the world; (ii) to the explaining of God's predestination and grace, without invoking the theory of premotion; for through it God knows which graces would be suitable to elicit from every person a free and positive consent; (iii) to harmonizing God's providence with all the operations of the human will.\(^{463}\)

Then, through middle knowledge, God knows with absolute certainty conditional events such as:

- **If some people that are now virtuous in character and have righteous dispositions were to live longer, they would acquire corrupt character and vicious dispositions.**

- **There would be more moral good than moral evil in the world if God created Adam and Eve.**

- **Saul would have invaded the city of Keilah if David had stayed in it.**

[^463]: *De Gratia*, Proleg.II, c.7, n.27, p.25; DSDCFC, c.4, n.1.
Peter would deny Christ if certain circumstances obtain.

The philosophical justification of middle knowledge is that the conditional propositions which describe these sorts of events can be known because they have a determinate truth. Truth as truth is the proper object of intellect and knowledge, thus the propositions can be known. Using a scheme similar to the one for the analysis of AFCP, Suárez argues that the possibility of divine middle knowledge depends ultimately on whether those conditional propositions are determinately true.

Particular problems arise in regard to counterfactual conditional propositions. Unlike categorical future contingent propositions that refer to events which will exist, counterfactual conditionals refer to events which may not have any existence whatsoever. For instance, there never was nor will be an actual invasion of the city of Keilah by Saul, nor an actual remaining of David in it. So the correspondent counterfactual: 'If David remained in Keilah, Saul would have invaded the city' cannot be true. There are, as Suárez acknowledges, two different views denying the truth in counterfactual conditionals. He writes,

1. Some commentators (Dialecticians) claim that such propositions are both false and impossible, hence they cannot be known. In this conditional nothing is

---

464 Videtur per se manifestum, quia omnis veritas ex se scibili est, quia verum ut verum, est proprium objectum intellectus et scientiae; immo eatemus aliquid verum est, in quantum esse potest conforme intellectui seu scientiae (DSDCFC, c.5, n.4, p.356).

465 Solum ergo videndum nobis superest, an in his propositionibus sit determinata veritas, ut, hoc ostendo, demonstratum etiam sit Deum earum scientiam habere (Ibid., n.5; De Gratia. Proleg.II, c.8, n.1).
affirmed, except that the consequent follows from the antecedent. If the inference is not good, the conditional is false. For them the truth of conditionals consists in a necessary connection between antecedent and consequent. So if the inference is good, the true conditional is necessarily true. But the inference in these counterfactuals is not good, and it is thus obvious that such propositions are not necessary, therefore they cannot be true.  

2. According to others, counterfactual conditional propositions are neither determinately true nor determinately false. Instead they are reducible to another quasi modal status of truths, viz., 'If this is, then that will happen' commonly, frequently, probably or rarely. The reason is that the effect which proceeds from a free cause is not at all determinate, but the truth of a proposition depends on the determinateness of its object, in being conformed to it. But in the case of counterfactuals, the event is indifferent [in its cause] and indeterminate [in itself], since it never existed actually in time nor in eternity.  

By contrast, Suárez's view is that counterfactual conditionals are neither impossible nor indeterminately true or false, but rather they are either true or false [i.e., bivalent], yet we often cannot discern when they are determinately true or false. Before presenting Suárez’s own justification for his contention we should see how he responds to the views of his objectors. In regard to the first, Suárez

\[\text{Ibid. n.5, p.356.}\]

\[\text{R. Adams' argument against the possibility of middle knowledge is a combination of these two contentions. According to Adams, middle knowledge is not possible basically because the counterfactual conditionals cannot be true. The reason is that the basis offered for their truth is not necessitating. The propositions which may be true on those basis, Adams says, are rather of the sort: 'If David stayed in Keilah, Saul would probably besiege the city. Cf. Op.cit.}\]

\[\text{Cf. Ibid., n.6, p.357.}\]

\[\text{[...] has propositiones neque esse impossibilis, neque etiam quasi suspensas quaod veritatem vel falsitate, sed ad alienutram esse determinatas, quamquam a nobis discerni non possit quando determinata sit locutio ad veritatem, quando vero ad falsitatem (Ibid., n.7).}\]
affirms that such counterfactuals are not intrinsically false nor impossible. They do not assert a necessary connection in the inference from the antecedent to the consequent for they are not true in virtue of their terms. On the contrary, they just assert that if this is posited, then that will follow. Then propositions such as ‘If Peter lived, he will sin’ are not impossible. For example, Suarez contends, negative propositions such as ‘If Peter were called by God in certain circumstances, he would not convert’ refer to a non actual existent event yet they are true or false. Hence, counterfactual propositions do not require a referent in the subject for being true. In respect to propositions about events that do not happen in time, there is no need for the subject to have a referent which has existed, or does, or will exist, but only that this referent be the essential or possible being of such subject. In these counterfactuals, even though neither the antecedent nor the consequent is posited in being at any time, for their truth only the conjunction of both antecedent with consequent is required. Thus, an actual referent is not required but only a conditional one. What Suárez has suggested in these passages has had important consequenc- es for the contemporary analysis of subjunctive conditionals. For he has noticed that for the truth of counterfactuals there is no need of a logical nor a causal connection

---

470 Cf. Ibid., n.11, p.358.

471 *Propositiones negativae, seu de negativo effectu, ut: Si Petrus in tali occasione vocetur a Deo, non convertetur; in hac enim nihil affirmatur, sed potius negatur aliquid de tali subjecto; ergo, quamvis demus esse de subjecto non supponente, poterit esse vera aut non falsa. Secundo et ad rem dicitur, in unaquaque locutione, ut vera sit, subjectum debere supponere sua exigentiam copulæ* (Ibid., n.12, p.359).

472 Ibid., n.12, p.359.
between the antecedent and consequent. This suggestion, however, as Freddoso points out, cuts against the spirit of the standard possible-world semantics for subjunctive conditionals. The reason, Freddoso writes, is that it is usually assumed that similarities among possible worlds invoked on such semantics are conceptually prior to the acquisition of truth-values by the subjunctive conditionals themselves. The intuitive idea seems to be that the truth-value of a subjunctive conditional \( p \) depends asymmetrically on the categorical (including causal) facts about the world at which \( p \) is being evaluated, so that until the full range of such categorical is in place, the truth-value of \( p \) is still indeterminate. On this view, then, the determination of the true conditional future contingents is posterior to the determination of which possible world is actual.\(^{473}\)

Freddoso observes that this is exactly one of the Kenny's objections to middle knowledge, and then goes on to quote from Kenny:

Prior to God's decision to actualize a particular world those counterfactuals [about the behavior of free humans] cannot yet be known for their truth-value [it] depends [...] on which world is actual [...] the problem is that what makes these counterfactuals true is not yet there at any stage at which it is undecided which world is the actual world. The very truth-conditions which the possible-world semantics were introduced to supply are absent under the hypothesis that it is undetermined which world the actual world is.\(^{474}\)

Whether or not the possible world semantics for subjunctive conditionals presupposes that the acquisition of truth-values by the relevant conditionals is conceptually posterior to and dependent on the determination of which world is actual, Suárez's relevant response will be that,

actual existence which is going to be at some time in the future is the basis of the truth of absolute assertions about the future, and in the same way keeping this analogy, actual existence which \textit{ex hypothesi} would be future is


\(^{474}\) Kenny, (1979), p.70.
the fundament of the truth of a conditional assertion. And therefore truth in either case can be known in the manner of the present, since God does not acquire knowledge from things such that His knowledge would depend upon the actual existence of the object.\footnote{Respondeo actualem existentiam, aliando futuram, esse fundamentum veritatis absolutae assertionis de futuro, eodemque modo servata propositione existentiam actualem, quae ex hypothesi esset futura, esse fundamentum veritatis conditionatae assertionis, et ideo utramque veritatem posse cognosci ad modum praesentis, quia Deus non accipit scientiam a rebus, at ab actu actualis existentia objecti pendeat (Cf. De Gratia, Proleg.II, c.8, n.25, p.96).}

Responding to the second view against the truth of counterfactual propositions, Suárez justifies his own position. He, in fact, appeals to the Correspondence Theory of Truth, the law of Bivalence and to the principle known as Conditional Excluded Middle (CEM). First, he argues, counterfactual conditionals are themselves determinate to truth or falsity just as they conform or fail to conform to the things they signify.\footnote{[...] has propositiones non esse indeterminatas et quasi suspensas quoad veritatem vel falsitatem, sed alteram determinate habere in se, et aliquando esse veras, aliquando falsa, juxta conformitatem vel difformitatem ad id quod significant (Ibid., n.13, p.359).} That is, a counterfactual conditional proposition is determinately true iff: what it asserts would be the case were the hypothetical circumstance expressed in the antecedent to obtain; otherwise it will be determinately false. The subsequent objection is, how the conditional proposition about a never existent event can conform to it? Now if the metaphysical ground comes to the peculiar contingent/atemporal 'disposition' in the agents,\footnote{According to R. Adams (1977), Suárez's view amounts to the following: consider a possible free creature, c, who may not ever exist, and a possible free action, a, which c may freely do or refrain from doing in a possible situation $s$ ... According to Suárez, c has a property (a \textit{habito}, as Suárez puts it) which is either the property of being a possible agent who would in $s$ freely}
Normore points out, of how could even God knows the properties that non-existent agents have?

The crucial logical foundation, though, upon which the truth of conditional subjunctive propositions is based is the (CEM) principle, formulated by Normore in "Future Contingents" (1982) as follows: Of any pair of conditional subjunctives, e.g., 'If Peter is created in such circumstance, he will sin', and 'If Peter is created in such circumstances, he will not sin' (where the antecedent is a complete specification of a context) exactly one is true. This principle, Suárez asserts, is sufficient foundation for the determinate truth or falsity of the conditional subjunctive propositions. Suárez argues for the principle of CEM in the following passage from DSDCFC:

If God (for instance) sees Peter sinning under certain circumstances, then the following conditional proposition is true: 'If Peter is created in such circumstances, etc.'

---

Suárez states: in omni autem contradictione, necesse est unam partem esse veram, et alteram falsam; ergo quantum est ex significandi modo, est ibi sufficiens fundamentum ad veritatem vel falsitatem determinatam (Ibid., n.13, p.369).
circumstances, he will sin'. Even if the proposition is said prior to God's creating Peter, that proposition is determinately true. The consequence is proved by the fact that it would then already have had conformity with the thing signified, for this one He did not make but rather it is shown and made manifest by the subsequent effects that follow, after God willed to create Peter, etc.; therefore for the same reason every similar conditional understood or contemplated under that sign, before God will have decreed or willed anything about antecedent taken under the condition, is determinately true or determinately false; for as soon as God wills to put into existence that antecedent, it is absolutely determined what will or will not follows from it; therefore the same thing which was said before under a condition was determinately true or determinately false, depending on the requirements of the object.479 (Emphasis added).

It seems, then, that on Suárez's argumentation, in the contradictory pair, viz.,

'If Peter is created in such circumstance, he will sin' or

'If Peter is created in such circumstance, he will not sin',

the truth of the whole disjunction (exclusive) is a logical truth for exactly one disjunct is true, supported by the rule \( (P \implies Q) \& (P \implies \neg Q) \), therefore \( \neg P \). Accordingly, it would seem that the conclusion should be: Peter is not created in such circumstance.

Now which of the disjuncts is true depends upon the correspondence view of truth, that is, if the condition in the antecedent obtains, the event signified by the consequent would obtain. But the condition in the antecedent need not actually exist yet the conditional proposition be true. The hypothetical event in the antecedent might have just objective existence in God's intellect.480 In this way God knows what event follows as a consequent. So it seems that if the hypothetical antecedent

479 Ibid.

480 Quamvis nihil reale sit actu existens, hoc tamen non obstat quominus esse possit aliquid objective existens in aliquo intellectu, quod satis est rationem entis veri, seu veritatis (Ibid. n.13, p.360).
event obtains objectively in God’s mind, then God knows whether or not the event (represented in the consequent) occurs.

Many scholars, however, dispute the validity of the principle of Excluded Middle. They assert that it is simply false. First, because it is wrong to obtain the contradictory of: ‘If it were to be that P, it would be that Q’ by just denying the consequent, i.e., ‘it would be that not-Q’. The correct procedure is to deny the whole conditional, i.e., It is not the case that ‘If it were to be that P, it would be that not-Q’. Secondly, Pollock \(^{481}\) presents the following counterexample: ‘insofar as there are different things that might be the case if P were the case, it can happen that neither Q nor not-Q would be the case’.

If we consider, however, Freddoso’s suggestion, viz., that the hypothetical situation described in the antecedent of the conditional should include a total description (even a causal history) of the circumstance, then the principle of CEM would not be totally doomed. For, Freddoso writes,

a Molinist can consistently hold that the obtaining of a potential conditional future contingent is always relative to a total causal context of this sort. \(^{482}\)

---

\(^{481}\) Pollock (1975).

\(^{482}\) I.e., only if the hypothesis posited in the antecedent ‘includes a total description of the causal history and contemporaneous causal circumstances of any exercise of indeterministic causation which figures directly in the consequent’, p.50. Freddoso formally proposes:

Let S be a present-tense categorical state of affairs and \(F(S)\) the state of affairs of its being the case that \(S\) will obtain at \(t\), where \(t\) designates a time; and let \(F'(S)\) on \(H\) be the state of affairs of its being the case that \(S\) would obtain at \(t\). Then, \(F'(S)\) on \(H\) is from eternity a conditional future contingent iff:

(i) \(F'(S)\) on \(H\) obtains from eternity;
in much the same way that the obtaining of, say, a past-tense state of affairs is always relative to a time.\footnote{Ibid. pp.50-51.}

In addition, we may also say following Freddoso’s analysis that Suárez’s view in particular can get by just as well by adopting the weaker assumption that for any event of state of affairs of the form $F'(S)$ on $H$, either it or not-$[F'(S)$ on $H]$, obtains\footnote{This alternative, Freddoso (1988, p.51) points out, is posited by Flint, "The Problem of Divine Freedom".}, insofar as we accept that God possesses ‘positive’ information about the activity of free secondary causes in various hypothetical circumstances.

Ultimately, then, if one grants this sort of divine information and that at least the principle of Bivalence stands, the conditional subjunctive propositions might be known by God. But we must admit that even though the ontological and logical grounding objections against Suarez’s case for the theory of middle knowledge are not conclusive ones, the theory itself is not yet clearly viable. For it depends not only on an appropriate metaphysics but more essentially on principles, either Bivalence or CEM, which need to be worked out within a general semantics for subjunctive conditionals. These overwhelming tasks, as Freddoso points out, have hardly begun.

Now we turn to the problem of whether it is possible to explain the way by which conditional events might be known.

\begin{itemize}
\item[(ii)] $S$, $H$, and $F'(S)$ on $H$ are all metaphysically contingent; and
\item[(iii)] it is true from eternity that if $H$ were to obtain at $t$, then $S$ would be a contingent effect produced by secondary causes. (Cf.Freddoso (1988), p.22.
\end{itemize}
8. **Intuition and Representation of Conditional Future Contingent Events**

The final objection posited by middle knowledge retractionists—as we acknowledge in section 5 above—is that even if a determinate true-value in the CFCP prior to any decree of God’s provident will is granted, the very nature of such propositions, i.e., the fact that they are not ‘simply’ necessary, (i.e., there is any intrinsic connection in their terms as Suárez puts it),\(^485\) renders inexplicable the manner by which they can be known. In fact, Bañezians insisted: ‘It is a mystery [...] we must give up explaining the how of this divine knowledge [...] of conditionals’.\(^486\) Suárez, however, did not give up; nor did he accept the Bañezian or the Molinist solution to the problem. For Suárez, God’s positive decrees seemed determining\(^487\), whereas super-comprehension seem gratuitous, since it presupposes that God’s intellect surpasses in its perfection all created free will, i.e., that it understands more

\(^485\) Cf. DSDCFC, c.7, n.2, p.364.


\(^487\) Bañez maintains that ‘God knows the future contingents in their particular causes insofar as they are subject to the determination of the divine knowledge and will that is first cause’ (Cf. In. I, q.23, a.3) in Bonet op.cit. Whereas Zumel and Alvarez posited that God sees conditional future in a subjectively absolute and objectively conditional decree. That is, God sees from eternity the decree that would govern conditionals if the conditions were given. From God’s part the decree is absolute without any condition, from the object’s part it is conditional since it depends on the condition. As the decree is determinatant, it binds itself with the predetermine effect (i.e, the conditional future) in an infallible way. Thus it is an infallible medium to know them (Cf. Alvarez, *Responsium*, Lib.I, c.IV). Suárez rejects these views in DSDCFC, c.VII, n.8, p.367.
about them than would be required just to comprehend them. What bothers Suárez in this "excess of comprehension" thesis is that what free creatures would do under various possible situations is not there objectively to be known, but God's perfect mind knows it anyway. Commentators agree that this is the weakest point in the Molinist account of Middle Knowledge. Suárez's own alternative emphasizes, like the Nominales, that the solution lies in the admission that conditionals have determinate truth, no other thing is required for their knowledge.

Suárez's own proposal is that,

God knows the conditional futures penetrating immediately the truth which exists in themselves. So God does not need any other medium to know them. God, thus, knows such conditionals immediately intuitions the truth in them. This way of knowledge supports the view held by Alensis, Bonaventure, (see c.III, p.353), those who maintain that God knows the futures in the infinite representation of His ideas [...] God's immutable judgment reaches not only that which is future with some real different of time, but also that which is future in any different of time possible, in the supposition that God had willed to create it.

From the objects' part there is no need for any medium, since truth is seen in itself by God without any mediation, because He has no other medium; neither does it require a real entity except the one that it has objectively in the divine intellect; because it does not concur to this knowledge as a

---

488 In effect, Molina writes, 'to see which part a free being will turn itself toward it is not sufficient that there be a comprehension of the being ... rather, what it is required is an absolutely profound and absolutely preeminent comprehension. d.52, nn.11-17, pp.171-177 in Freddoso's translation. Suárez's answer to this thesis is found in DSDCFC, c.7, n.6, pp.366-367.

489 Nominales, qui affirmant omnibus propositionibus de futuro unam esse determinate veram, et ad scientiam divinam de hujus modi veritate nihil amplius requirant (Ibid. c.3, n.2, p.352).

490 Suárez's alternative to explain how God knows the FCE is also the one adopted by Fonseca (1528-1599), Lib.VI, Metaphys., c.II, q.4, s.2; Lessius, op.cit. c.XX; Martinez, Deus Scien, contro.4, disp.3, sec.3; F. de Sales Tratado del Amor de Dios, Lib.III, c.V, p.3; Ruiz de Montoya, disp.75, in Bonet op.cit.
principle but merely as a term, to which the actual existence is unnecessary, if the cognizer possesses sufficient force.\footnote{DSDCFC, c.VII, n.15, pp.369-370.}

What seems striking on Suárez’s account is that he asserts that the intuitive - highest form of knowledge- involves the view of those who hold that God knows conditional events through the representation of His ideas. What he means is clear from another passage, that is,

God’s essence which is identical to God’s intellect not only includes the power by which we understand being and the power of penetrating or intuiting the intelligible object, but also certain way of intentionally represent the intelligible things.\footnote{Nam ita est intellectio ut sit ipsa substantia intellegens, in qua esse intelligimus et vim penetrandi seu intuendi objectum intelligibile, et rationem aliquam continendi intentionalis (Disp. Met., d.30, s.15, n.13, p.616).}

And with respect to those things that will not exist but could exist, Suárez explicitly adds,

God could know these things if they existed; the ‘could’ nonetheless should be understood not physically but logically because it neither means the active or passive potency nor the first act, but a second act; and this is sufficient to represent those things if they will existed some time. Thus, even if God does not yet represent them, He would not suffer a diminution, and when He represents them, He would not have a real increase, but only a new relation of reason. And since it is always necessary that one part is true, i.e., that the thing happens or does not happen, God from eternity sees in which one resides the objective truth.\footnote{Ibid. p.612.}

On Suárez’s proposal God intuits the truth of conditional propositions, but also has a conceptual intentional representation of the ‘things that would not exist
but could exist' (his knowledge is in second act). And yet Suárez wants to say that God does not need any medium to know the truth of such propositions because He has no medium. The question is why the most perfect conception of the cognitive ideal -intuition- would require in addition a sort of inner mental representation of what will or would be seen? An inner mental representation seems a distorting medium in God's mind. Beside we might think that possessing a higher form of cognition exclude lower forms. If the truth is grasped intuitively by God's mind, there is no point for Him in representing the events. It is true that the counterfactuals have no existence, so the only way to access them would be by an objective representation of them. But this is the way creatures in our condition proceed. We need representations of some sort in order to be able to think about absent events, since it is difficult for us to have the events immediately present in our mind. But God is not in our position and so He has no need of representations or perhaps the representations have to be of a specific sort. It seems to me that Suárez's account of how God has middle knowledge of conditional future events is inadequate. It lacks a definite conception of intuition as such. In certain cases he simply seems confused, particularly, when he compares God's intuitive knowledge with our way of seeing, for instance, the truth of Peter is white. The reason, he says, is that 'we see the whiteness conjoined to him'. But for us to contemplate the fact that P is X we need to divide the concept of X by using our capacity to recognize that something as being

---

Presumably, God's intellectual capacity does not need to deploy the things to be known.

In effect, the traditional conception of divine knowledge is not propositional (like the contemporary Anglo-American view of knowledge as justified true belief, JTB), but rather intuitive. It is from St. Thomas's own exposition of God's intuition of His essence that Suárez's confusion seems to arise. St. Thomas holds that God's knowledge consists wholly of His simple intuition of His own essence; this includes, however, anything that could be 'enunciated' (the enuntiabilia), i.e., expressed in propositions. St. Thomas writes:

Now just as He knows material things immaterially, and composite things simply, so likewise He knows what can be enunciated, not after its manner, as if in His intellect there were composition or division of enunciations, but He knows each thing by simple intelligence, but understanding the essence of each thing.

But Suárez would render this account insufficient for knowledge of counterfactuals since knowledge of simple intelligence is about necessary truths, even though Suárez admits a divine comprehensive grasp of individual essences. Consequently, there is an obvious need for a better version of what it is for God to know conditional future events. The most suggestive version - and one in the spirit of Suarezianism - that I have is that of C. Normore. That is:

Imagine that God's mind contains a perfect model of each possible thing - a complete divine idea of a particular or, if you like, an individual concept. Imagine that God simulate possible histories by thinking about how

---

495 W. Alston, (1989), argues against the view that God has JTB in these lines.

the being which is A would behave under circumstance C -i.e., he simulates C and 'sees' how A behaves. Now if there is a way in which A would behave in C, a perfect model should reflect it, so if conditional excluded middle is valid, such a model is possible and God knows the history of the world by knowing that model, i.e., by knowing his own intellect and his creative intentions.

But would the belief 'state' which God would be in on the basis of such a model be a state of knowledge? Would it not rather bear to knowledge much the same relation which veridical hallucination bears to perception? Here we have a particular striking form of another problem of divine omniscience. How can God be transcendent on the one hand and, on the other, know what transpires in the world? It seems to me that anyone who claims that a transcendent God knows contingent facts will have to admit significant disanalogies between divine and human knowledge. It also seems to me that supposing God's knowledge of the world to be like veridical hallucination locates these disanalogies in the right place. First it goes some way toward accounting for the intuitive (as contrasted with discursive) character of divine knowledge; God knows contingent facts intuitively because He 'sees' rather than infers that they obtain. Second by admitting counterfactual connections (however mysterious) between divine belief and its mundane objects, such an account preserves at least some of the intuition that God knows and is infallible. Third by making these connections indirect it suggests a way one might also admit divine impassibility. Moreover almost any medieval writer would have considered the counterfactual connections suggested weaker than true (Aristotelian) causal connections.497

Normore's perfect model/veridical hallucination version of middle knowledge surpasses Suárez's explanation. It seems to me a richer cognitive mechanism since it replaces the distorting representations by a perfect organic sort of device in which the ideal whole of the intelligible things can be even simulated. St. Thomas would say, that what God knows is simply His model which is not really distinct from Himself. This is not incompatible with God's knowing everything, since it might contain the likeness (or simulation) of everything including the individual essences.

Yet ultimately the working of the perfect model depends on the dubious principle of Excluded Middle.
CONCLUSION

Suárez's two-fold meta-psychological analysis of the nature and activities of the will is sophisticated and comprehensive, showing that he approached matters with a new spirit in the sense that he makes metaphysics and psychology independent bodies of philosophical rather than theological doctrine, but at the same time, he managed to conserve the main tenets of the Aristotelian/Scholastic tradition.

One might be tempted to conclude that Suárez's views on soul, will and freedom are essentially dependent upon Aristotle or St. Thomas or Duns Scotus or Luis de Molina, but such a shallow inference would have canceled the aim of this dissertation from the very outset. The great thinker, as Heidegger points out (1961, p.35), 'is one who can hear what is greatest in the work of other "greats" and transform it in an original manner'.

In this dissertation we hope to have shown Suárez's original conservationist perspective. We saw him using the Aristotelian technical apparatus; in particular, he thoroughly endorses Aristotle's hylemorphic theory of material substances, as taught by Aristotle himself and by his great exegete St. Thomas, to explain both the ontological status of soul and the nature of human beings as consisting of form and matter.
Suárez argued for the existence of a soul present in the physical organic body of the living thing that man is, and he conceived of man’s soul as a real entity that, ontologically is a substantial form. As such it has the property of being an absolute first act that gives actualization and perfection to the substantial composite of body and soul that man is. What the form actualizes or literally informs is the physical organic body organizing it and making it be the sort of unique thing that it is, i.e., a human being rather than a stone, a tree, or an angel. In the case of material substances like men, soul and body relate as form and matter, but Suárez originally emphasizes that substantial form and prime matter are incomplete or partial constituents of man; for this reason the substantial form is essentially ordained to be the form of the human body, or in this regard the form actualizes, perfects and completes the essence of the substantial composite making it be not an aggregate of two complete substances, but rather a complete per se intrinsic unity.

Contemporary philosophers of mind would question, however, that besides hylomorphism, Suárez wanted to maintain that the soul is some sort of spiritual entity capable of subsistence apart from the body and causally undetermined in its being by matter. Although they would have to admit that Suárez had a powerful argument to prove that the intellective principle, and its activity are given in a spiritual subject, viz., the self-reflexive capacity of our intellect -an issue still relevant for the actual debate about the existence of mind and the possibility of directly knowing our mental states.
Contemporary philosophers of mind such as D. Armstrong would simply reject Suárez's contention that the soul is capable of disembodied subsistence, because the mind is reduced to the brain. Likewise, a physicalist monist such as Gilbert Ryle (1964, pp.245-262 and 276-287) holding that mind is at most an epiphenomenon of the body would also deny Suárez's contention, by the same token, neither of the philosophers need posit hylomorphism either to explain the essence of soul or the substantial unity of soul with the body.

Suárez also conceived of the soul as a physical intrinsic principle that gives esse to, or enlivens the composite, but he also recognizes it as the primary principle of acting, more specifically, of vital activities. This latter property of the soul is also shared by the soul's faculties. Soul and faculties, respectively, are the primary and the proximate principles which generate immediately the typical vital activities of man; that is, those activities that proceed not from the body but from intrinsic active principles.

In our chapter on Suárez's psychology of will we have shown that for Suárez the most important and the most nobler power of soul is the will. He came to compare the will to the heart. The heart is the first principle of bodily movements while the will is the principal proximate principle of human vital activities. So the will is the efficient principle that not only accompanies other powers of the mental life, but overcomes other powers. Suárez main reason for believing this is that the will is capable of efficaciously moving the other powers of the soul to produce their own
acts, and that the will not only produces the more perfect acts, that is, the free acts, but has dominion over its acts.

Suárez's conception of the will, however, does not render his view simply voluntarist, because Suárez, unlike Scotus, does not deem the will as the rational faculty of the soul *par excellence*. Suárez's sort of voluntarism is more subtle than that of Scotus since he stresses that the will is causally undetermined by any sort of state of affairs external to itself.

Suárez originality in his conception of will in regard to his predecessors consists in at least two points. First, in that he viewed will as an elicited vital appetite; as such, will is that in virtue of which we are directed toward things. We seem, nonetheless, to be directed toward the things not only by the EVA, but also by the intentional representational knowledge of things. But for Suárez the will as EVA plays no role in the latter way of being directed toward something, since by the intentional representational knowledge we are directed toward the things and yet we let the things be just as they are. While the proper directness implied in the willing of the will seems almost a physical tending toward things not yet possessed.

The second Suarezian original characterization of the activity of the will is that it is an immanent desiring or willing. In this regard the will not only is that by which we reach out toward things, but also that by which we tend toward ourselves. The best example that we can think of in which the will tends toward itself is Suárez's own characterization of will as *potestas*, understood as inner autonomy, dominion or mastery over its own acts.
I think that Suárez's originality of speculation is best illustrated in his view of freedom and the defense of his compatibilist thesis. In regard to freedom, unlike St. Thomas, Suárez thinks that self-motion, self-determination, and free choice are incompatible with theological determinism, and unlike Scotus as interpreted by Langston, Suárez endorses a straightforward libertarian view of freedom, which not only admits ability to act or to not act but also includes the exercise to apply such an activity.

Suárez theology of will including his theory of general concurrentism allows for a strong authentic secondary causation and at the same time for God's necessary and intimate involvement in the action of secondary causes. The major difference between Bañez's theistic predeterminism and Suárez's simultaneous concurrentism is that in Suárez God's motion is not involved with priority in the will or in the production of the acts of will, but rather it is included in the same acts of the will, therefore it is external to will itself.

Suárez's metaphysics, psychology and even his theology of will are paradigmatically indeterministic, the will internally determines itself to produce its own act without the efficacious involvement of literally any external state of affairs, be it laws of nature, intellectual activities or up to God Himself.

Suárez's defense of the compatibilist thesis also shows originality in regard to his predecessors because he elaborated on the theory of middle knowledge to make God's foreknowledge coherent with contingent events and free acts of the human will. However, Suárez's reconciliatory theological enterprise fails, because on the one
hand he grounds middle knowledge in dubious logical principles, and on the other, because Suárez's account of God's intuition and intentional representation does not seem adequate to answer the question of how the future contingent propositions can be known.

Be that as it may, Suárez's substantial contribution to current discussions and interests on the philosophical and theological issues about soul, will and the various aspects related to freedom cannot be denied. This dissertation attempted offer an unified analytical approach, suitable to contemporary standards, not only of Suárez's metaphysical and theological views (which have been well recognized), but also of his neglected psychological contributions still relevant to the philosophical psychology discussions.
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