

CHAPTER 6

PROPERTIES OF BEING: TRANSCENDENTALS In General, and Unity

Relation of the Transcendentals to Being

Truth, q. 1, art. 1

The Problem under Discussion Is Truth, and in the First Article We Ask: What Is Truth?

Difficulties:

It seems that the true is exactly the same as being, for:

1. Augustine says: “The true is that which is.” But that which is, is simply being. The true, therefore, means exactly the same as being.
 2. It was said in reply that the true and being are the same materially but differ formally. —On the contrary the nature of a thing is signified by its definition; and the definition of the true, according to Augustine, is “that which is.” He rejects all other definitions. Now, since the true and being are materially the same, it seems that they are also formally the same.
 3. Things which differ conceptually are so related to each other that one of them can be understood without the other. For this reason, Boethius says that the existence of God can be understood if for a moment we mentally separate His goodness from His existence. Being, however, can in no way be understood apart from the true, for being is known only insofar as it is true. Therefore, the true and being do not differ conceptually.
 4. If the true is not the same as being, it must be a state of being. But it cannot be a state of being. It is not a state that entirely corrupts—otherwise, this would follow: “It is true. Therefore, it is non-being” —as it follows when we say: “This man is dead. Therefore, this is not a man.”
- Similarly, the true is not a state that limits. If it were, one could not say: “It is true. Therefore it is.” For one cannot say that a thing is white simply because it has white teeth. Finally, the true is not a state which contracts or specifies being, for it is convertible with being. It follows, therefore, that the true and being are entirely the same.
5. Things in the same state are the same. But the true and being are in the same state. Therefore, they are the same. For Aristotle writes: “The state of a thing in its act of existence is the same as its state in truth.” Therefore, the true and being are entirely the same.
 6. Things not the same differ in some respect. But the true and being differ in no respect. They do not differ essentially, for every being is true by its very essence. And they do not differ in any other ways, for they must belong to some common genus. Therefore, they are entirely the same.
 7. If they were not entirely the same, the true would add something to being. But the true adds nothing to being, even though it has greater extension than being. This is borne out by the statement of the Philosopher that we define the true as: “That which affirms the existence of what is, and denies the existence of what is not.” Consequently, the true includes both being and non-being; since it does not add anything to being it seems to be entirely the same as being.

To the Contrary:

1. Useless repetition of the same thing is meaningless; so, if the true were the same as being, it would be meaningless to say: “Being is true.” This, however, is hardly correct. Therefore, they are not the same.
2. Being and the good are convertible. The true and the good, however, are not interchangeable, for some things, such as fornication, are true but not good. The true, therefore, and being are not interchangeable. And so they are not the same.
3. In all creatures, as Boethius has pointed out, “to be is other than that which is.” Now, the true signifies the existence of things. Consequently, in creatures it is different from that which is. But that which is, is the same as being. Therefore, in creatures the true is different from being.
4. Things related as before and after must differ. But the true and being are related in the aforesaid manner; for, as is said in *The Causes*: “The first of all created things is the act of existence.” In a study of this work, a commentator writes as follows: “Everything else is predicated as a specification of being.” Consequently, everything else comes after being. Therefore, the true and being are not the same.
5. What are predicated of a cause and of the effects of the cause are more united in the cause than in its effects —and more so in

God than in creatures. But in God four predicates —being, the one, the true, and the good— are appropriated as follows: being, to the essence; the one, to the Father; the true, to the Son; and the good, to the Holy Spirit.

Since the divine Persons are really and not merely conceptually distinct, these notions cannot be predicated of each other; if really distinct when verified of the divine Persons, the four notions in question are much more so when verified of creatures.

Reply:

When investigating the nature of anything, one should make the same kind of analysis as he makes when he reduces a proposition to certain self-evident principles. Otherwise, both types of knowledge will become involved in an infinite regress, and science and our knowledge of things will perish.

Now, as Avicenna says, that which the intellect first conceives as, in a way, the most evident, and to which it reduces all its concepts, is being. Consequently, all the other conceptions of the intellect are had by additions to being. But nothing can be added to being as though it were something not included in being—in the way that a difference is added to a genus or an accident to a subject—for every reality is essentially a being. The Philosopher has shown this— by proving that being cannot be a genus. Yet, in this sense, some predicates may be said to add to being inasmuch as they express a mode of being not expressed by the term being. This happens in two ways.

First, the mode expressed is a certain special manner of being; for there are different grades of being according to which we speak when we speak of different levels of existence, and according to these grades different things are classified. Consequently, **substance** does not add a difference to being by signifying some reality added to it, but substance simply expresses a special manner of existing, namely, as a being in itself. The same is true of the other classes of existents.

Second, some are said to add to being because the mode they express is one that is common, and consequent upon every being. This mode can be taken in two ways: first, insofar as it follows upon every being considered absolutely; second, insofar as it follows upon every being considered in relation to another. In the first, the term is used in two ways, because it expresses something in the being either affirmatively or negatively. We can, however, find nothing that can be predicated of every being affirmatively and, at the same time, absolutely, with the exception of its essence by which the being is said to be. To express this, the term **thing** is used; for, according to Avicenna, "thing differs from being because being gets its name from to-be, but thing expresses the quiddity or essence of the being. There is, however, a negation consequent upon every being considered absolutely: its undividedness, and this is expressed by **one**. For the one is simply undivided being.

If the mode of being is taken in the second way—according to the relation of one being to another— we find a twofold use. The first is based on the distinction of one being from another, and this distinctness is expressed by the word **something**, which implies, as it were, some other thing. For, just as a being is said to be one insofar as it is without division in itself, so it is said to be something insofar as it is divided from others. The second division is based on the correspondence one being has with another. This is possible only if there is something which is such that it agrees with every being. Such a being is the soul, which, as is said in *The Soul*, "in some way is all things." The soul, however, has both knowing and appetitive powers. **Good** expresses the correspondence of being to the appetitive power, for, and so we note in the *Ethics*, the good is "that which all desire." **True** expresses the correspondence of being to the knowing power, for all knowing is produced by an assimilation of the knower to the thing known, so that assimilation is said to be the cause of knowledge. Similarly, the sense of sight knows a color by being informed with a species of the color.

The first reference of being to the intellect, therefore, consists in its agreement with the intellect. This agreement is called "the conformity of thing and intellect." In this conformity is fulfilled the formal constituent of the true, and this is what the true adds to being, namely, the conformity or equation of thing and intellect. As we said, the knowledge of a thing is a consequence of this conformity; therefore, it is an effect of truth, even though the fact that the thing is a being is prior to its truth.

Consequently, truth or the true has been defined in three ways. First of all, it is defined according to that which precedes truth and is the basis of truth. This is why Augustine writes: "The true is that which is," and Avicenna: "The truth of each thing is a property of the act of being which has been established for it." Still others say "The true is the undividedness of the act of existence from that which is."

Truth is also defined in another way—according to that in which its intelligible determination is formally completed. Thus, Isaac writes: "Truth is the conformity of thing and intellect," and Anselm: "Truth is a rectitude perceptible only by the mind." This rectitude, of course, is said to be based on some conformity. The Philosopher says that in defining truth we say that truth is bad when one affirms that "to be which is, and that not to be which is not."

The third way of defining truth is according to the effect following upon it. Thus, Hilary says that the true is that which manifests and proclaims existence. And Augustine says: "Truth is that by which that which is, is so shown," and also: "Truth is that according to which we judge about inferior things."

Answers to Difficulties:

1. That definition of Augustine is given for the true as it has its foundation in reality and not as its formal nature is given complete expression by conformity of thing and intellect. An alternative answer would be that in the statement, “The true is that which is,” the word *is* is not here understood as referring to the act of existing, but rather as the mark of the intellectual act of judging, signifying, that is, the affirmation of a proposition. The meaning would then be this: “The true is that which is—it is had when the existence of what is, is affirmed.” If this is its meaning, then Augustine’s definition agrees with that of the Philosopher mentioned above.

2. The answer is clear from what has been said.

3. “Something can be understood without another” can be taken in two ways. It can mean that something can be known while another remains unknown. Taken in this way, it is true that things which differ conceptually are such that one can be understood without the other. But there is another way that a thing can be understood without another: when it is known even though the other does not exist. Taken in this sense, being cannot be known without the true, for it cannot be known unless it agrees with or conforms to intellect. It is not necessary, however, that everyone who understands the formal notion of being should also understand the formal notion of the true—just as not everyone who understands being understands the agent intellect, even though nothing can be known without the agent intellect.

4. The true is a state of being even though it does not add any reality to being or express any special mode of existence. It is rather something that is generally found in every being, although it is not expressed by the word being. Consequently, it is not a state that corrupts, limits, or contracts.

5. In this objection, condition should not be understood as belonging to the genus of quality. It implies, rather, a certain order; for those which are the cause of the existence of other things are themselves beings most completely, and those which are the cause of the truth of other things are themselves true most completely. It is for this reason that the Philosopher concludes that the rank of a thing in its existence corresponds to its rank in truth, so that when one finds that which is most fully being, he finds there also that which is most fully true. But this does not mean that being and the true are the same in concept. It means simply that in the degree in which a thing has being, in that degree it is capable of being proportioned to intellect. Consequently, the true is dependent upon the formal character of being.

6. There is a conceptual difference between the true and being since there is something in the notion of the true that is not in the concept of the existing—not in such a way, however, that there is something in the concept of being which is not in the concept of the true. They do not differ essentially nor are they distinguished from one another by opposing difference.

7. The true does not have a wider extension than being. Being is, in some way, predicated of non-being insofar as non-being is apprehended by the intellect. For, as the Philosopher says, the negation or the privation of being may, in a sense, be called being. Avicenna supports this by pointing out that one can form propositions only of beings, for that about which a proposition is formed must be apprehended by the intellect. Consequently, it is clear that everything true is being in some way.

Answers to Contrary Difficulties:

1. The reason why it is not tautological to call a being true is that something is expressed by the word true that is not expressed by the word being, and not that the two differ in reality.

2. Although fornication is evil, it possesses some being and can conform to intellect. Accordingly, the formal character of the true is found here. So it is clear that true is coextensive with being.

3. In the statement, “To be is other than that which is,” the act of being is distinguished from that to which that act belongs. But the name of being is taken from the act of existence, not from that whose act it is. Hence, the argument does not follow.

4. The true comes after being in this respect, that the notion of the true differs from that of being in the manner we have described.

5. This argument has three flaws. First, although the Persons are really distinct, the things appropriated to each Person are only conceptually, and not really, distinct. Secondly, although the Persons are really distinct from each other, they are not really distinct from the essence; so, truth appropriated to the Person of the Son is not distinct from the act of existence He possesses through the divine essence. Thirdly, although being, the true, the one, and the good are more united in God than they are in created beings, it does not necessarily follow, from the fact that they are only conceptually distinct in God, that they are really distinct in created beings. This line of argument is valid only when it is applied to things which are not by their very nature one in reality, as wisdom and power, which, although one in God, are distinct in creatures. But being, the true, the one, and the good are such that by their very nature they are one in reality. Therefore, no matter where they are found, they are really one. Their unity in God, however, is more perfect than their unity in creatures.

Summary chart of modes of being

Being in itself — **Substance**

Common & consequent upon every being:

Absolutely, something in the being:

Affirmatively, the essence — **Thing**

Negatively, undivided being — **One**

In relation to another:

Based on the distinction of one being from another — **Something**

Based on the correspondence one being has with another:

To the appetitive power — **Good**

To the knowing power — **True**

BOOK IV: THE SUBJECT OF METAPHYSICS

Lesson 2: *Metaphysics also treats of “being-one”.*

548. Here he proceeds to show that the study of **common attributes** such as one and many and same and different belongs to the consideration of one and the same science; and in regard to this he does two things. First, he shows that this is true of each attribute taken separately by arguing from proper or specific principles. Second (570), he shows that this is true of all attributes taken together by arguing from common principles.

In regard to the first he does two things. First, he shows that the philosopher ought to investigate all these attributes. Second (568), he tells us how to investigate them.

In regard to the first he does two things. First, he shows that it is the office of this science to consider **unity and its species**. Second (564), he shows that it is the office of one and the same science to consider all opposites.

In regard to the first he does two things. First, he shows that it is the office of this science to consider unity. Second (561), he shows that it also belongs to it to examine the species of unity.

He therefore says, first, that being and unity are the same and are a single nature. He says this because some things are numerically the same which are not a single nature but different natures, for example, Socrates, this white thing, and this musician. Now the terms one and being do not signify different natures but a single nature. But things can be one in two ways: (1) for some things are one which are associated as interchangeable things, like principle and cause; and (2) some are interchangeable not only in the sense that they are one and the same numerically [or in subject] but also in the sense that they are one and the same conceptually, like garment and clothing.

549. Now the terms *one* and *being* signify **one nature according to different concepts**, and therefore they are like the terms principle and cause, and not like the terms tunic and garment, which are wholly synonymous. — Yet it makes no difference to his thesis if we consider them to be used in the same sense, as those things which are one both numerically

and conceptually. In fact this will “rather support our undertaking,” i.e., it will serve his purpose better; for he intends to prove that unity and being belong to the same study, and that the species of the one correspond to those of the other. The proof of this would be clearer if unity and being were the same both numerically and conceptually rather than just numerically and not conceptually.

550. He proves that they are **the same numerically** by using two arguments. He gives the first where he says, “For one man,” and it runs as follows. Any two things which when added to some third thing cause no difference are wholly the same. But when one and being are added to man or to anything at all, they cause no difference. Therefore they are wholly the same. The truth of the minor premise is evident; for it is the same thing to say “man” and “one man.” And similarly it is the same thing to say “human being” and “the thing that is man;” and nothing different is expressed when in speaking we repeat the terms, saying, “This is a human being, a man, and one man.” He proves this as follows.

551. It is the same thing for man and the thing that is man to be generated and corrupted. This is evident from the fact that generation is a process toward being, and corruption a change from being to non-being. Hence a man is never generated without a human being being generated, nor is a man ever corrupted without a human being being corrupted; and those things which are generated and corrupted together are themselves one and the same.

552. And just as it has been said that being and man are not separated either in generation or in corruption, so too this is evident of what is one; for when a man is generated, one man is generated, and when a man is corrupted, one man is also corrupted. It is clear, then, that the apposition of these [i.e., of one or being to man] expresses the same thing, and that just because the term one or being is added to man it is not to be understood that some nature is added to man. And from this it is clearly apparent that unity does not differ from being, because any two things which are identical with some third thing are identical with each other.

553. It is also evident from the foregoing argument that unity

and being are the same numerically but differ conceptually; for if this were not the case they would be wholly synonymous, and then it would be nonsense to say, “a human being,” and “one man.” For it must be borne in mind that the term *man* is derived from the quiddity or the nature of man, and the term *thing* from the quiddity only; but the term *being* is derived from the act of being, and the term *one* from order or lack of division; for what is one is an undivided being. Now what has an essence, and a quiddity by reason of that essence, and what is undivided in itself, are the same. Hence these three—thing, being, and one— signify absolutely the same thing but according to different concepts.

554. Then he gives the second argument, which has to do with sameness or identity of subject. This argument is as follows. Any two attributes which are predicated essentially and not accidentally of the substance of each thing are the same in subject, or numerically. But unity and being are such that they are predicated essentially and not accidentally of the substance of each thing; for the substance of a thing is one in itself and not accidentally. Therefore the terms being and one signify the same thing in subject.

555. That the terms being and one are predicated essentially and not accidentally of the substance of each thing can be proved as follows. If being and one were predicated of the substance of each thing by reason of something added to it [i.e., accidentally], being would have to be predicated also of the thing added, because anything at all is one and a being. But then there would be the question whether being is predicated of this thing (the one added) either essentially or by reason of some other thing that is added to it in turn. And if the latter were the case, then the same question would arise once again regarding the last thing added, and so on to infinity. But this is impossible. Hence the first position must be held, namely, that a thing’s substance is one and a being of itself and not by reason of something added to it.

556. But it must be noted that Avicenna felt differently about this; for he said that the terms being and one do not signify a thing’s substance but something added to it. He said this of *being* because, in the case of anything that derives its existence from something else, the existence of such a thing must differ from its substance or essence. But the term being signifies existence itself. Hence it seems that being, or existence is something added to a thing’s essence.

557. He spoke in the same way of *one*, because he thought that the one which is interchangeable with being and the one which is the principle of number are the same. And the one which is the principle of number must signify a reality added to the substance, otherwise number, since it is composed of ones, would not be a species of quantity, which is an accident added to substance. He said that this kind of one is interchangeable with being, not in the sense that it signifies the very substance of a thing or being, but in the sense that it signifies an accident belonging to every being, just as the ability to laugh belongs to every man.

558. But in regard to the first point he does not seem to be right; for even though a thing’s existence is (+) **other** than its essence, it should not be understood to be something added

to its essence after the manner of an (~) **accident**, but (+) something **established**, as it were, by the principles of the essence. Hence the term being, which is applied to a thing by reason of its very existence, designates the same thing as the term which is applied to it by reason of its essence. [Existence is later clarified as the act of essence.]

559. Nor does it seem to be true that the one or unity which is interchangeable with being and that which is the principle of number are the same; for nothing that pertains to some special class of being seems to be characteristic of all beings. Hence the unity which is limited to a special class of being—discrete quantity—does not seem to be interchangeable with universal being. For, if unity is a proper and essential accident of being, it must be caused by the principles of being as being, just as any proper accident is caused by the principles of its subject. But it is not reasonable that something having a particular mode of being should be adequately accounted for by the common principles of being as being. It cannot be true, then, that something which belongs to a definite genus and species is an accident of every being.

560. Therefore the kind of unity which is the principle of number differs from that which is interchangeable with being; for the unity which is **interchangeable with being** signifies being itself, adding to it the notion of *undividedness*, which, since it is a negation or a privation, does not posit any reality added to being. Thus unity differs from being in no way numerically but only conceptually; for a negation or a privation is not a real being but a being of reason, as has been stated (540).

However, the kind of unity which is **the principle of number** adds to substance the note of a measure, which is a special property of quantity and is found first in the unit. And it is described as the privation or negation of division which pertains to continuous quantity; for number is produced by dividing the continuous. Hence number belongs to mathematical science, whose subject cannot exist apart from sensible matter but can be considered apart from sensible matter. But this would not be so if the kind of unity which is the principle of number were separate from matter in being and existed among the immaterial substances, as is true of the kind of unity which is interchangeable with being.

561. Then he concludes that it is the business of the philosopher to consider the parts of unity, just as it is to consider the parts of being. First, he proves this; and second (563), he shows that there are different parts of philosophy corresponding to the different parts of being and unity.

He says, first, that since being and unity signify the same thing, and the species of things that are the same are themselves the same, there must be as many species of being as there are of unity, and they must correspond to each other. For just as the parts of being are substance, quantity, quality, and so on, in a similar way the parts of unity are sameness, equality and likeness. For things are the *same* when they are one in substance, *equal* when they are one in quantity, and *like* when they are one in quality. And the other parts of unity could be taken from the other parts of being, if they were

given names. And just as it is the office of one science, philosophy, to consider all parts of being, in a similar way it is the office of this same science to consider all parts of unity, i.e., sameness, likeness and so forth. And to this “starting point,” i.e., unity, “almost” all contraries may be referred.

562. He adds this qualification because in some cases this point is not so evident. Yet it must be true; for since one member of every pair of contraries involves privation, they must be referred back to certain primary privatives, among which unity is the most basic.

And plurality, which stems from unity, is the cause of otherness, difference and contrariety, as will be stated below. He says that this has been treated “in our selection,” or extract, “of contraries,” i.e., a treatise which is the part selected to deal with contraries, namely, Book X (2000-21) of this work.

563. Here he shows that the **parts of philosophy** are distinguished in reference to the parts of being and unity. He says that there are as many parts of philosophy as there are parts of substance, of which being and unity chiefly are predicated, and of which it is the principal intention or aim of this science to treat.

BOOK X: Lesson 3 *Being and unity convertible*

1974. Since he had given the same argument for being and for unity, he now shows that unity and being somehow signify the same thing. He says “somehow” because **unity and being are the same** in their subject and differ only in meaning. For unity adds to being the note of undividedness, because what is one is said to be an indivisible or undivided being. He gives three reasons why unity signifies the same thing as being.

1975. (1) The first is that unity naturally belongs to **all of the different categories** and not just to one of them; that is, it does not pertain just to substance or to quantity or to any other category. The same thing is also true of being.

BOOK IV: Lesson 3 *Opposites*

565. Now there are two kinds of **negation**: (1) **simple negation**, by which one thing is said absolutely not to be present in something else, and (2) **negation in a genus**, by which something is denied of something else, not absolutely, but within the limits of some determinate genus. For example, not everything that does not have sight is said absolutely to be blind, but something within the genus of an animal which is naturally fitted to have sight.

And this difference is present in unity over and above “what is implied in negation”; i.e., it is something by which it differs from negation, because negation expresses only the absence of something, namely, what it removes, without stating a determinate subject. (1) Hence simple negation can be verified both of a non-being, which is not naturally fitted to have something affirmed of it, and of a being which is naturally fitted to have something affirmed of it and does not. For unseeing can be predicated both of a chimera and of a

And because the parts of substance are related to each other in a certain order, for immaterial substance is naturally prior to sensible substance, then among the parts of philosophy there must be a **first part**. (1) Now that part which is concerned with sensible substance is first in the order of instruction, because any branch of learning must start with things which are better known to us. He treats of this part in Books VII (1300) and VIII of this work. (2) But that part which has to do with immaterial substance is prior both in dignity and in the aim of this science. This part is treated in Book XII (2488) of this work.

Yet whatever parts are first must be continuous with the others, because all parts have unity and being as their genus. Hence all parts of this science are united in the study of being and unity, although they are about different parts of substance. Thus it is one science inasmuch as the foregoing parts are things which correspond to “these,” i.e., to unity and being, as common attributes of substance. In this respect the philosopher resembles the mathematician; for mathematical science has different parts, one of which is primary, as arithmetic, another secondary, as geometry, and others following these in order, as optics, astronomy and music.

1976. (2) The second reason is that, when a man is said to be one, the term **one does not express a different nature** from man, just as being does not express a different nature from the ten categories; for, if it did express a different nature, an infinite regress would necessarily result, since that nature too would be said to be one and a being. And if being were to express a nature different from these things, an infinite regress would also follow; but if not, then the conclusion of this argument must be the same as that of the first one.

1977. (3) The third reason is that everything is said to be one inasmuch as it is a being. Hence when a thing is dissolved it is reduced to non-being.

stone and of a man. (2) But in the case of privation there is a determinate nature or substance of which the privation is predicated; for not everything that does not have sight can be said to be blind, but only that which is naturally fitted to have sight. Thus since the negation which is included in the concept of unity is a negation in a subject (otherwise a non-being could be called one), it is evident that unity differs from simple negation and rather resembles the nature of privation, as is stated below in Book X (2069) of this work.

566. But it must be noted that, although unity includes an implied privation, it must not be said to include (~) the privation of plurality; for, since a privation is subsequent in nature to the thing of which it is the privation, it would follow that unity would be subsequent in nature to plurality. And it would also follow that plurality would be given in the definition of unity; for a privation can be defined only by its opposite. For example, if someone were to ask what blindness

is, we would answer that it is the privation of sight. Hence, since unity is given in the definition of plurality (for plurality is an aggregate of units), it would follow that there would be circularity in definitions. (+) Hence it must be said that unity includes the privation of **division**, although not (~) the kind of division that belongs to quantity; for this kind of division is limited to one particular class of being and cannot be included in the definition of unity. (+) But the unity which is interchangeable with being implies the privation of **formal division**, which comes about through opposites, and whose primary root is the opposition between affirmation and negation. For those things are divided from each other which are of such a kind that one is not the other. Therefore being itself is understood first, and then non-being, and then division, and then the kind of unity which is the privation of division, and then plurality, whose concept includes the notion of division just as the concept of unity includes the notion of undividedness. However, some of the things that have been distinguished in the foregoing way can be said to include the notion of plurality only if the notion of unity is first attributed to each of the things distinguished.

(**Book X:** 1997. Now the division which is implied in the notion of that kind of unity which is interchangeable with being is not (~) the division of continuous quantity, which is understood prior to that kind of unity which is the basis of number, but is (+) the division which is caused by contradiction, inasmuch as two particular beings are said to

BOOK V: DEFINITIONS

Lesson 8 *Kinds of unity*

876. Then he gives another way of dividing unity, and this division is rather from the viewpoint of **logic**. He says that some things are one in number, some in species, some in genus, and some analogically.

Those things are one in **number** whose matter is one; for insofar as matter has certain designated dimensions it is the principle by which a form is individuated. And for this reason a singular thing is numerically one and divided from other things as a result of matter.

877. Those things are said to be one in **species** which have one “intelligible structure,” or definition; for the only thing that is defined in a proper sense is the species, since every definition is composed of a genus and a difference. And if any genus is defined, this happens in so far as it is a species.

878. Those things are one in **genus** which have in common one of the “figures of predication,” i.e., which have one way of being predicated. For the way in which substance is predicated and that in which quality or action is predicated are different; but all substances have one way of being predicated inasmuch as they are not predicated as something which is present in a subject.

879. And those things are proportionally or **analogically** one which agree in this respect that one is related to another as some third thing is to a fourth. Now this can be taken in two ways: (1) either in the sense that any two things are related in

be divided by reason of the fact that this being is not that being.

1998. Therefore what we first understand is *being*, and then *division*, and next *unity*, which is the privation of division, and lastly *multitude*, which is a composite of units.

For even though things which are divided are many, they do not have the formal note of a many until the fact of being one is attributed to each of the particular things concerned. Yet nothing prevents us from also saying that the notion of multitude depends on that of unity insofar as multitude is measured by one; and this already involves the notion of number.)

567. Here he shows that it is the business of the philosopher to consider **contraries**, or opposites; for plurality is the opposite of unity, as has been said (564), and it is the office of one science to consider opposites. Hence, since this science considers unity, sameness, likeness and equality, it must also consider their opposites, plurality, otherness or diversity, unlikeness and inequality, and all other attributes which are reduced to these or even to unity and plurality. And contrariety is one of these; for contrariety is a kind of difference, namely, of things differing in the same genus. But difference is a kind of otherness or diversity, as is said in Book X (2017). Therefore contrariety belongs to the consideration of this science.

different ways to one third thing (for example, the term healthy is predicated of urine because it signifies the relationship of a sign of health [to health itself]; and of medicine because it signifies the relationship of a cause to the same health); (2) or it may be taken in the sense that the proportion of two things to two other things is the same (for example, tranquillity to the sea and serenity to the air; for tranquillity is a state of rest in the sea, and serenity is a state of rest in the air).

880. Now with regard to the ways in which things are one, the latter types of unity always follow the former, and not the reverse; for those things which are one in number are one in species, but not the other way about. The same thing is clear in the other cases.

881. From the ways in which things are said to be one he now derives the ways in which things are said to be **many**. He says that things are said to be many in just as many ways as they are said to be one, because in the case of opposite terms one is used in as many ways as the other.

(1) Hence some things are said to be many because they are not continuous, which is the opposite of the first way in which things are one.

882. (2 & 3) Other things are said to be many because their matter is divisible in species, whether we understand by matter “the first,” i.e., their proximate matter, or the final or ultimate matter into which they are ultimately dissolved. Indeed, it is by the division of their proximate matter that

wine and oil are said to be many, and by the division of their remote matter that wine and a stone are said to be many. And if matter be taken both for real matter and for conceptual matter, i.e., for a genus, which resembles matter, many in this sense is taken as the opposite of the second and third ways in which things are said to be one.

883. (4) And still other things are said to be many when the conceptions which express their essence are many. And many in this sense is taken as the opposite of the fourth way in which things are said to be one.

884. (5) But the opposite of the fifth way in which things are one does not have the notion of many except in a qualified sense and potentially; for the fact that a thing is divisible does not make it many except potentially.

Lesson 11 *The “same”, “per accidens” & “per se”*

908. He says that things are said to be accidentally the same (*idem per accidens*) in three ways. (1) In one way they are the same in the sense that two accidents are; thus “white” and “musical” are said to be the same because they are accidents of the **same subject**. (2) Things are accidentally the same in a second way when a **predicate** is said to be the same as a **subject** inasmuch as it is predicated of it; thus when it is said that the man is musical, these (man and musical) are said to be the same because musical is an accident of a man, i.e., the predicate is an accident of the subject. (3) And things are accidentally the same in a third way when the **subject** is said

BOOK X: UNITY

Lesson 2 *Unity as a measure*

1937. Having explained the various senses in which unity is predicated of things, and having stated what its essential note is, to which all its usages are reduced, i.e., being indivisible, here the Philosopher infers a property of unity from its essential note, namely, that it is a measure. This is divided into two parts. In the first he shows how the notion of a measure belongs to unity and to the various classes of accidents. In the second (1961) he shows how unity in the sense of a measure is found in substances (“It is necessary”).

In regard to the first part of this division he does two things. First, he indicates the class of things in which unity in the sense of a measure is primarily found, and how it is transferred from this class to the others with the proper notion of a measure. Second (1956), he explains how it is transferred figuratively to the other classes (“And for the same reason”).

In treating the first part he does two things. First, he indicates the class of things in which unity in the sense of a measure is first found, and how it is transferred from this class to the others. Second (1950), he makes a study of measures (“However, a measure”).

In regard to the first he does three things. First, he shows **how unity as a measure is found in quantity**, and how it is transferred from this category to the others. Second (1939), he indicates the species of quantity in which it is first found (“And that by which”). Third (1940), he shows how it is

to be the same as an **accident** inasmuch as it is predicated of it. For example, when it is said that the musical thing is a man, it is understood that the man is the same as the musical thing; for what is predicated of some subject is identified with that subject. And sameness in this sense means that the subject is an accident of the predicate.

911. Then he gives the ways in which things are said to be essentially the same (*idem per se*). He says that things are said to be essentially the same in the same number of ways in which they are said to be essentially one. Now all of the ways in which things are said to be essentially one are reduced to two. (1) Thus, in one sense, things are said to be essentially one because their **matter** is one, whether we take the matter to be the same in species or in number. The second and third ways in which things are one are reduced to this. (2) And, in another sense, things are said to be one because their **substance** is one, whether by reason of continuity, which pertains to the first way in which things are one, or by reason of the unity and indivisibility of their intelligible structure, which pertains to the fourth and fifth ways. Therefore some things are said to be the same in these ways too.

BOOK X: Lesson 4 *Diverse, unlike, unequal*

2000. And the contraries of these, *diverse, unlike* and *unequal*, pertain to plurality. For those things are diverse whose substance is not one; those are unlike whose quality is not one; and those are unequal whose quantity is not one.

transferred to other species of quantity (“And the measure”).

1938. He accordingly says, first, that, since the essential note of unity consists in being indivisible, and what is indivisible in each genus is somehow the measure of that genus, unity must be said to be in the highest degree the first measure of each genus. This is said to apply most properly to quantity, and it is from this class that the notion of a measure is transferred to other classes of things. Now a measure is nothing else than that by which a thing’s quantity is known, and this is known by the unit or by a number: by a unit, as when we say one furlong or one foot; and by a number, as when we say three furlongs or three feet. Again, every number is known by the unit because the unit taken a certain number of times gives a number. It follows, then, that every quantity is known by unity. To “quantity” he adds “as quantity,” intending that this be referred to the measure of quantity; for the properties and other accidents of quantity are known in a different way.

1939. Then he indicates in what species of quantity unity or measure is primarily found. First, he makes it clear that the notion of a measure is primarily found in **discrete quantity**, which is number. He says that that by which quantity is first known is “unity itself,” i.e., the unit which is the principle of number. For in other species of quantity the unit is not unity itself but something of which unity is an attribute, as when we speak of one hand or of one continuous quantity. Hence it follows that unity itself, which is the first measure, is the

principle of number as number.

1940. Second, he shows how unity is transferred to **other species of quantity**; and in regard to this he does two things. First, he indicates the species of quantity to which it is transferred. He says that it is from this class, i.e., from number and from the unit, which is the principle of number, that the notion of a measure is transferred to other quantities as that by which each of them is first known. And whatever is the measure in each class of things is the unit in that class.

1941. He gives examples of this in three classes of things, i.e., in dimensions—length, breadth and width; in weight, or in what he calls heaviness; and in speed, or in what he calls rapidity, which refers to the measure of time.

In the case of dimensions no one doubted that they were quantities and that they were properly susceptible to measurement, but in the case of weight and of speed there could be a difficulty because these seem to be qualities rather than quantities.

1942. He therefore explains how these pertain to the genus of quantity, and how they are susceptible to measurement. He says that **heaviness and rapidity** have something in common with their contraries because one contrary is found in the other; for what is heavy is in some sense light, and the reverse; and what is rapid is in some sense slow. For each of these terms is used in two senses. (1) In one sense the term *heavy* is used without qualification of anything that has an inclination to be borne towards the center of the earth, without taking into consideration how great its inclination is; and in this sense heavy does not refer to the category of quantity, and it is not susceptible to measurement. (2) In the other sense it is used of one thing in comparison with something else, namely, of what **exceeds** something else in terms of the abovementioned inclination; for example, we say that earth is heavy in comparison with water, and that lead is heavy in comparison with wood. Therefore it is by reason of this excess that some notion of quantity and measure is found.

The term *rapid* is similarly used in two senses. In one sense it is used without qualification of anything that has any motion; and in a second sense it is used of anything that has an excessive motion. And in one respect the notions of quantity and measure properly apply to it, and in another respect they do not.

1943. With a view to clarifying his statement about the condition of heaviness and rapidity in reference to contraries he adds that rapidity is found in something that is slow inasmuch as what is simply and unqualifiedly slow is more rapid in comparison with something that is slower than itself. And in a similar way heaviness is found in light things; for example, air is light in comparison with earth, and heavy in comparison with fire.

1944. Then he shows how the notion of a measure is transferred from number to other kinds of quantity. He immediately makes this clear, first, in the case of **dimensions and in that of weights**; and second (1947), in that of the rapidity of motions (“And they also measure”).

He accordingly says, first, that the notion of a measure is transferred from number to the other kinds of quantity in this way that, just as the unit which is the measure of number is indivisible, so too all the other kinds of quantity have something that is one and indivisible as their measure and principle. For example, in measuring lines men use “the foot measure,” i.e., the measure of one foot, as something indivisible; for wherever something indivisible is sought as a measure, there is something simple either in quality or in quantity; in quality, as whiteness in the case of colors, which is in a sense the measure of colors, as will be mentioned below (1968); and in quantity, as the unit in the case of numbers, and the foot measure in the case of lines.

1945. Further, he points out why a measure must be something indivisible. The reason is that an exact measure must be something which can be neither added to nor subtracted from. Thus the unit is the most exact or certain measure, because the unit which is the principle of number is altogether indivisible, and whatever unity is not susceptible either to addition or to subtraction remains one. The measures of the other classes of quantity resemble this unit which is indivisible inasmuch as men take some smallest thing as a measure to the extent that this is possible. For if anything large were taken, as the furlong among distances and the talent among weights, it would escape our notice if some small portion were subtracted from or added to it. And this would always be more true of a larger measure than of a smaller one.

1946. Hence all men take this as a measure both in the case of liquids, such as oil and wine, and in that of solids, such as grain and barley; and also in that of weights and dimensions, which are designated as heaviness and continuous quantity. And this is first found to be such that nothing perceptible can be subtracted from it or added to it that might escape our notice. And men think they know the quantity of a thing exactly when they know it by the smallest measure of this kind.

1947. Then he makes the same thing clear with regard to the **rapidity** of motions. He says that men also measure motion “by that motion which is simple,” i.e., the motion which is uniform and quickest, because it takes the least time. Hence in astronomy they take such motion as the basis of measurement; for they take the motion of “the first heaven,” i.e., the daily motion, which is regular and quickest, and they judge and measure all other motions by this.

1948. And because the low and high pitch of sounds results from the quickness and slowness of motions, as is established in the science of music, he adds as an example the measurement of sounds. He says that in music the first measure is the “*diesis*,” i.e., the difference between two half tones; for a tone is divided into two unequal half tones, as is proved in the science of music. And similarly in speech the measure is the letter, because the shortness or length of a word is a natural consequence of the quickness or slowness of a motion.

1949. Now all these something one, not in measures are the sense that some measure is common to all, but in the sense

that any measure in itself is something one, as has been pointed out.

1952. Having said this he brings this part of his discussion to a close by summarizing what has been said above, namely, that unity constitutes the measure of all things. The reason for this is that unity is the term of division. And those principles which constitute the substance of each thing are known by the division or dissolution of the whole into its component parts, whether they are quantitative parts or specific parts such as matter and form and the elements of compounds. Therefore what is one in itself must be indivisible since it is the measure by which a thing is known, because in the case of singular things whatever is first in the process of composition and last in the process of dissolution is indivisible, and it is by means of this that the thing is known, as has been explained.

1953. Yet indivisibility is not found in all things in the same way. (1) Some things are **altogether indivisible**, such as the unit which is the basis of number, whereas (2) others are not altogether **indivisible** but **only to the senses**, according as the authority of those who instituted such a measure wished to consider something as a measure; for example, the foot measure, which is indivisible in proportion [to the things measured] but not by nature. “For perhaps everything continuous is divisible”; and he says “perhaps” because of the difficulty facing those men who claimed that continuous quantity is composed of indivisible elements, or that natural continuous quantities are not infinitely divisible, but only mathematical quantities. For it is possible to find the smallest amount of flesh, as is mentioned in Book I of the *Physics*.

1954. Then he gives the second point that has to be investigated about a measure. He says that “the meter,” i.e., the measure, should always be of the same kind as the thing measured, i.e., of the same nature or measure as the thing measured; for example, a continuous quantity should be the measure of continuous quantities; and it is not enough that they have a common nature, as all continuous quantities do, but there must be some agreement between the measure and the thing measured in the line of their special nature. Thus a length is the measure of lengths, a width of widths, a vocal sound of vocal sounds, a weight of weights, and a unit of units.

1955. “For this is the view which must be taken” in order that we may speak without being criticized, “but not that number is the measure of numbers.” Now number does not have the notion of a first measure but unity does; and if unity is a measure, then in order to signify the agreement between the measure and the thing measured it will be necessary to say that unity is the measure of units and not of numbers. Yet if the truth of the matter be taken into consideration, it will be necessary to admit also that number is the measure of numbers or even that the unit may be taken in a similar way as the measure of numbers. But it does not seem equally fitting to say that the unit is the measure of units and number of number or unity of number, because of the difference which appears to exist between the unit and number. But to observe this difference is the same as if someone were to say that it is fitting for units to be the measure of units but not the unit, because the unit differs from units as things expressed

in the singular differ from those expressed in the plural. And the same argument applies to number in relation to the unit, because a number is nothing else than a plurality of units. Hence to say that the unit is the measure of number is merely to say that the unit is the measure of units.

1956. Then he shows how the term measure is transferred in a **figurative** way to another class of things. He says that, since it has been stated that a measure is that by which the quantity of a thing is known, we may say that intellectual knowledge is the measure of that which is knowable intellectually, and that sensory perception is the measure of that which is perceptible; because we know something by means of them, namely, sensible objects by means of perception and intelligible objects by means of intellectual knowledge; but we do not know them in the same way as we do by a measure. For something is known by a measure as a principle of knowledge, whereas in sensation and knowledge we are measured by things that are outside ourselves.

Lesson 6 *Kinds of opposition* (Cf. Book V, lesson 12)

2040. Then he proves his thesis, namely, that the primary contrariety is privation and possession; and he does this in two ways: first, by a syllogism; second (2054), by an induction (“This also”).

In regard to the first he does two things. First, he shows that contrariety is not contradiction. He says that among the four kinds of opposition between two things—(1) contradiction, as sitting is opposed to not-sitting; (2) privation, as blindness is opposed to sight; (3) contrariety, as black is opposed to white; and (4) relation, as a son is opposed to his father—the first is **contradiction**.

2041. The reason is that contradiction is included in all the other kinds of opposition as something prior and simpler; for in any kind of opposition it is impossible that opposites should exist simultaneously. This follows from the fact that one of two opposites contains the negation of the other in its notion; for example, the notion of blind contains the fact of its not seeing, and the notion of black, of its not being white. And similarly the notion of son contains his not being the father of him of whom he is the son.

2042. Moreover, it is evident that there is no intermediate in contradiction; for one must either affirm or deny, as has been shown in Book IV (725). However, it belongs to contraries to have an intermediate; and thus it is clear that contrariety and contradiction are not the same.

2043. Then he shows how privation is related to contradiction by indicating the way in which they are alike and that in which they differ. He says that privation is a kind of contradiction; for the term privation is used in one sense when a thing does not have in any way some attribute which it is capable of having, for example, when an animal does not have sight. And this occurs in two ways: (a) first, if it does not have it in any way at all; and (b) second, if it does not have it in some definite respect, for example, at some definite time or in some definite manner, because privation is used in many senses, as has been stated in Books V (1070) and IX

(1784).

2044. It is evident from what has been said, then, that privation is a kind of contradiction; and this is shown from the fact that a thing is said to be deprived of something because it does not have it.

2045. That it is not a simple contradiction but one of a sort is evident from the fact that according to its meaning a *contradiction* requires neither (~) the aptitude nor the existence of any **subject**; for it may be truly affirmed of any being or non-being whatsoever. Thus we say that an animal does not see, and that wood does not see, and that a non-being does not see.

A *privation*, however, necessarily (+) requires some **subject**, and sometimes it also requires **aptitude** in a subject; for that which is a non-being in every respect is not said to be deprived of anything.

2046. He says, then, that privation “is found either in a determinate potency,” i.e., one with a capacity for possessing something, or at least “is conceived along with something that is susceptible of it,” i.e., along with a subject, even though it has no capacity for possessing something. This would be the case, for example, if we were to say that a word is invisible, or that a stone is dead.

2047. (~) Contradiction, then, cannot have an intermediate, whereas in a sense (+) privation has an intermediate; for everything must be either equal or not equal, whether it is a being or a non-being. However, it is not necessary to say that everything is either equal or unequal, but this is necessary only in the case of something that is susceptible of equality.

2048. Hence the opposition of contradiction has no intermediate whatsoever, whereas the opposition of privation has no intermediate in a determinate subject; but it is not without an intermediate in an absolute sense. And from this it is evident that contrariety, which is such as to have an intermediate, is closer to privation than to contradiction. Yet it still does not follow that privation is the same as contrariety.

2049. Third, it remains to be shown that contrariety is privation, and in regard to this he does two things. First, he shows by a syllogism that contrariety is privation. He argues as follows: everything from which a process of generation arises is either a form (i.e., the possession of some form) or the privation of some specifying principle (i.e., some form). He says “everything” because generation is twofold. For things are generated absolutely in the genus of substance, but in a qualified sense in the genus of accidents; for generations arise from contraries in matter. Hence it is evident that every contrariety is a privation; for if in any process of generation one of the two extremes is a privation, and each of the contraries is an extreme in the process of generation (because contraries are generated from each other, as white from black and black from white), then one of the two contraries must be a privation.

2050. Here he proves another assertion made above, that not every privation is a contrariety. He says that the reason for

this is that there are many ways of being deprived; for a thing that is capable of having a form and does not have it in any way can be said to be deprived of it, and it makes no difference whether it is proximately or remotely disposed for that form.

Now a contrary is always remotely disposed; for contraries are the sources, in the sense of extremes from which changes arise. Hence it was said above (2038) that they are farthest removed from each other. For whether a thing is yellowish or of some other color, it is said to be deprived of whiteness if it is not white. But it is not on that account called a contrary except when it is farthest removed from whiteness, namely, when it is black. Thus it is clear that not every privation is a contrariety.

2051. And since privation requires nothing else than the absence of form (merely presupposing a disposition in a subject without conferring upon that subject any definite disposition through which the subject is close to a form or distant from it), it is evident that privation does not designate any positive reality in a subject, but presupposes a subject with an aptitude. But a contrary requires a definite disposition in a subject, by which it is farthest removed from a form. Therefore it necessarily designates in a subject some positive reality which belongs to the same class as the absent form, as black belongs to the same class as white.

2052. It should also be noted that privation is of two kinds. (1) There is one which has an immediate relationship to the subject of the form (as darkness has an immediate relationship to the transparent medium), and between a privation of this kind and its opposite form there is (+) reciprocal change; for the atmosphere passes from a state of illumination to one of darkness, and from a state of darkness to one of illumination. (2) And there is another kind of privation which is related to the subject of the form only by means of the form, since it has the nature of a corruption of form; for example, blindness is the corruption of sight, and death the corruption of life. In such cases there is no (~) reciprocal change, as has been pointed out in Book IX (1785).

2053. Therefore, since it has been shown here that *contrariety* is the privation arising from reciprocal change which involves contraries and privation and form, it is clear that contrariety is not the type of privation which is the corruption of a form, but that which has an immediate relation to the subject of the form. Hence the objection raised in the *Categories*, that it is impossible to revert from privation to possession, does not apply here. But contraries are changed into each other.

2058. He proves the same point by reducing the other contraries to the primary ones. He says that in order to show that one of two contraries is a privation it is enough if this is found to be true in the case of the **primary contraries**, which are the genera of the others, for example, *one and many*.

That these are the primary contraries is evident from the fact that all other contraries are reduced to them; for equal and unequal, like and unlike, same and other, are reduced to one and many. Moreover, difference is a kind of diversity, and

contrariety is a kind of difference, as has been said above (2017; 2023). Hence, it is evident that every contrariety is reducible to one and many. But one and many are opposed as the indivisible and the divisible, as has been pointed out above (1983). Therefore it follows that all contraries include privation.

Lesson 7 *Equal, large, small*

2066. Here he establishes the truth about this question; and in regard to this he does three things. First, he shows that the equal is opposed to the large and to the small in a way different from that of contrariety; and he draws this conclusion from the arguments given above on each side of the question. For the first set of arguments showed that the equal is opposed to the large and to the small, whereas the second showed that it is not contrary to them. It follows, then, that it is opposed to them by some other type of opposition. And after having rejected the type of opposition according to which the equal is referred to the unequal but not to the large and the small, it follows that the equal is opposed to the large and to the small either (1) as their negation or (2) as their privation.

2067. He shows in two ways that in the latter type of opposition the equal is opposed to both of the others (the large and the small) and not merely to one of them. First, he says that there is no reason why the equal should be the negation or the privation of the large rather than of the small, or vice versa. Hence it must be the negation or the privation of both.

2068. He also makes this clear by an example, saying that, since the equal is opposed to both, then when we are making inquiries about the equal we use the term *whether* of both and not merely of one; for we do not ask whether one thing is more than or equal to another, or whether it is equal to or less than another. But we always give three alternatives, namely, whether it is more than or less than or equal to it.

2069. Second, he indicates the type of opposition by which the equal is opposed to the large and to the small. He says that the particle *not*, which is contained in the notion of the equal when we say that the equal is what is neither more nor less, does not designate a (~) negation pure and simple but necessarily designates a (+) privation; for a negation pure and simple refers to anything to which its own opposite affirmation does not apply; and this does not occur in the case proposed. For we do not say that everything which is not more or less is equal, but we say this only of those things which are capable of being more or less.

2070. Hence the notion of equality amounts to this, that the *equal* is what is neither (~) large nor (~) small, but is (+) naturally capable of being either large or small, just as other privations are defined. Thus it is evident that the equal is opposed to both the large and the small as a privative negation.

2071. Third, in concluding his discussion, he shows that the equal is **intermediate between the large and the small**. In regard to this he does two things. First, he draws his thesis as

the conclusion of the foregoing argument. For since it has been said that the equal is what is neither large nor small but is naturally capable of being the one or the other, then anything that is related to contraries in this way is intermediate between them, just as what is neither good nor evil is opposed to both and is intermediate between them. Hence it follows that the equal is intermediate between the large and the small. But there is this difference between the two cases: what is neither large nor small has a name, for it is called the equal, whereas what is neither good nor evil does not have a name.

2072. The reason for this is that sometimes both of the privations of two contraries coincide in some one definite term; and then there is only one intermediate, and it can easily be given a name, as the equal. For by the fact that a thing has one and the same quantity it is neither more nor less. But sometimes the term under which both of the privations of the contraries fall is used in several senses, and there is not merely one subject of both of the privations taken together; and then it does not have one name but either remains completely unnamed, like what is neither good nor evil, and this occurs in a number of ways; or it has various names, like what is neither white nor black; for this is not some one thing. But there are certain undetermined colors of which the aforesaid privative negation is used; for what is neither white nor black must be either gray or yellow or some such color.

Lesson 8 *Many & few, one & many*

2090. Now it must be noted that plurality or multitude taken absolutely, which is opposed to the one which is interchangeable with being, is in a sense the genus of number; for a number is nothing else than a plurality or multitude of things measured by one.

Hence one, (1) insofar as it means an indivisible being absolutely, is interchangeable with being; but (2) insofar as it has the character of a measure, in this respect it is limited to some particular category, that of quantity, in which the character of a measure is properly found.

2091. And in a similar way (1) insofar as *plurality or multitude* signifies beings which are divided, it is not limited to any particular genus. But (2) insofar as it signifies something measured, it is limited to the genus of quantity, of which number is a species.

Hence he says that number is plurality measured by one, and that plurality is in a sense the genus of number.

2094. And because the nature of these relative things is such that one of them can exist without the other, but not the other way around, this is therefore found to apply in the case of the one and number. For wherever there is a number the one must also exist; but wherever there is a one there is not necessarily a number. For if something is indivisible, as a point, we find the one there, but not number.

But in the case of other relative things, each of which is said to be relative of role of something measured; for in a itself, one of these does not exist without the other; for there is no master without a servant, and no servant without a master.

2096. Then he shows that an absolute plurality or multitude is not opposed to a few. He says that it has been stated before that insofar as a plurality is **measured** it is opposed to the one as to a measure, but it (~) is not opposed to a few. However, *much*, in the sense of a plurality which is **excessive**, (+) is opposed to a few in the sense of a plurality which is exceeded.

Similarly a *plurality* is not opposed to one in a single way but in two. (1) First, it is opposed to it in the way mentioned above (2081), as the divisible is opposed to the indivisible; and this is the case if the one which is interchangeable with being and the plurality which is opposed to it are understood universally. (2) Second, plurality is opposed to the one as something relative, just as knowledge is opposed to its object. And this is the case, I say, if one understands the plurality which is number, and the one which has the character of a measure and is the basis of number.

Lesson 9 *Intermediaries of contraries*

2098. ... He accordingly says, first, that all intermediates belong to the same class as the things of which they are the intermediates. He proves this by pointing out that intermediates are defined as that into which a thing undergoing change from one extreme to another first passes.

2099. He makes this clear by two examples. First, he uses the example of sounds; for some sounds are low and some are high and some are intermediate. And strings on musical instruments are distinguished by this distinction of sounds; for those strings which yield low pitched sounds are called “top-strings” because they are the basic ones, and those which yield high pitched sounds are called “bottom-strings.” Hence, if a musician wishes to proceed step by step from low sounds to high ones, and so to pass through an intermediate

register, he must first come to the intermediate sounds. Second, he makes this clear by using colors. For if a thing is changed from white to black, it must first pass through the intermediate colors before it reaches black. The same thing is true of other intermediates.

Lesson 12 *Corruptible & incorruptible are generically different*

2137. The second premise is that the corruptible and the incorruptible are contraries. He proves this from the fact that the incapacity opposed to a definite capacity is a kind of privation, as has been stated in Book IX (1784). Now privation is a principle of contrariety; and therefore it follows that incapacity is contrary to capacity, and that the corruptible and the incorruptible are opposed as capacity and incapacity.

But they are opposed in a different way. For if *capacity* is taken (1) according to its **general** meaning, as referring to the ability to act or to be acted upon in some way, then the term corruptible is used like the term capacity, and the term incorruptible like the term incapacity. (2) But if the term *capacity* is used of something inasmuch as it is incapable of undergoing something for the worse, then contrariwise the term *incorruptible* is referred to **capacity**, and the term *corruptible* is referred to **incapacity**.

2137a. But although it seems necessary from these remarks to conclude that the corruptible and the incorruptible differ specifically, he concludes that they differ generically. And this is true because, just as form and actuality pertain to the species, so too matter and capacity pertain to the genus. Hence, just as the contrariety which pertains to form and actuality causes difference in species, so too the contrariety which pertains to capacity or potency causes difference in genus.