St. Thomas Aquinas's Philosophical-Anthropology as a Viable Underpinning for a Holistic Psychology: A Dialogue with Existential-Phenomenology

Eugene M. DeRobertis, Ph.D.
Brookdale College

In this article, the philosophical-anthropology of St. Thomas Aquinas is examined. In particular, the non-dualistic aspects of his anthropology are explicated and shown to have the potential to provide an underpinning for a holistic approach to psychology. In the course of this examination, parallels are drawn between Thomism and existential-phenomenology. The article concludes with an exploration of the ways in which a dialogue between existential-phenomenology and Thomism might benefit both traditions of thought, particularly as regards their relevance to metapsychology.

Introduction

Both existentialism and phenomenology can be viewed as reactions against the spirit of modern philosophy as initiated by Descartes. Nonetheless, I often think back to my days as a student of existential-phenomenological psychology and wonder why so little of my studies involved a more substantive dialogue with pre-Cartesian thought. After all, existential thought was not entirely unprecedented in the history of Western philosophy. For example, Maurice Friedman (1964) traced the origins of existentialism as far back as Heraclitus of Ephesus and the Old Testament. Interestingly, both Maritain (1948, p. 134) and Solomon (1988, p. 175) found the root of modern existentialism in its popular, Sartrean form to be rooted in Cartesianism, while Maritain considered "true" existentialism to be rooted in Thomism. Moreover, it might be argued that the phenomenological movement was ushered in by Edmund Husserl's famous dictum, "To the things themselves." The student of Thomism will recognize in this dictum a striking similarity to the epistemological view of St. Thomas. For St. Thomas, the soul represents our direct contact with the world of things and others. In Magee's (1996-1999) words:

> The identity of knower and known, then, is to be distinguished from the view that what we know are ideas or sense impressions that are caused by extra-mental realities. The Thomistic view is stronger than the view that our ideas are impressions that are similar to, or the same in kind with, the object of which it is the idea. This other theory (ala

John Locke) is often called "indirect realism" because it claims that we do not have direct access to extra-mental reality, but only indirect access, through impressions and ideas. Thus, on the Lockean view, there is a chain of causality: things affect us and our senses producing sense impressions and ideas, and these produce knowledge.

Before Cartesian dualism and the emergence of the strict mind-body dichotomy in John Locke's philosophy, St. Thomas Aquinas (reviving Aristotle's ideas) vehemently insisted that a human is a singular being rather than two beings. Aquinas was familiar with the threat of dualism spanning from Plato to St. Augustine. As Copleston (1950) put it, "We have seen that St. Thomas rejected the Platonic-Augustinian view of the relation of soul and body and adopted the Aristotelian view of the soul as form of the body, emphasizing the closeness of the union between the two" (p. 383).
In many ways, the basic positions of existential-phenomenology and Thomism with respect to the history of philosophical-anthropology are very much the same. To demonstrate, consider the following excerpt from Brennen's Thomistic Psychology (1941):

> Philosophers who have tried their hand at a solution of the problem of ideogenesis have been committed to one of three great traditions, all of which have come down from the Greeks. The first is the tradition of sensism. It may be said to begin with Democritus. It is materialistic in character. In its description of the birth of the idea it represents an overemphasis of the object of knowledge, which is material, at the expense of the subject of knowledge, which is immaterial. The second tradition is that of intellectualism. It may be said to begin with Plato, in whose writings we find its first complete exposition. It is idealist in character. In its account of the birth of the idea it represents an overemphasis of the subject of knowledge, which is immaterial, at the expense of the object of knowledge, which is material. Finally, there is the tradition of moderate realism. It begins with Aristotle. It is partly materialistic and partly intellectualistic in character, since it requires both sense and intellect for the generation of the idea. (p. 176)

Approximately two decades later, Adrian van Kaam spearheaded efforts to found an existential-phenomenological psychology program at Duquesne University. In his seminal work Existential Foundations of Psychology

(1966), van Kaam summed up the proposed philosophical-anthropological position of Duquesne's psychology department in the following way:

> Neither the positivist nor the rationalist view fully represents man as I actually experience him in daily life, although each of these perspectives uncovers real insights into essential aspects of his nature. When I observe man as I meet him in reality, I realize that he is neither a mere thing like other things in the universe nor self-sufficient subjectivity which maintains itself in splendid isolation from the world. He is not locked up within himself as mere thought and worldless self-presence. Instead he is already outside himself and in the world…. (p. 6)

Notice that both Brennen and van Kaam renounced materialism (i.e., "sensism" or "positivism") and idealism (i.e., "intellectualism" or "rationalism") in favor of anthropological positions that avoid the extremisms of the aforementioned viewpoints. This is but one example of how there is an inherent harmony between Thomism and existential-phenomenology. However, while existential-phenomenology is widely accepted as a holistic underpinning for psychological theory and research, Thomism has yet to make a significant impact on contemporary psychology, especially in the United States. Thomistic psychology is far more recognized in philosophy than in psychology. Nevertheless, St. Thomas's philosophical-anthropology is a viable underpinning for a holistic psychology. With this in mind, this article aims to show how St. Thomas's work contains a non-dualistic anthropology, one that is intrinsically harmonious with existential-phenomenology.

The Holistic Foundation of St. Thomas's Philosophical-Anthropology

Existential-phenomenology is, in part, a reaction against anthropological dualism in philosophy and psychology. While St. Thomas's work is sometimes mischaracterized as a form of dualism (e.g., Brett, 1967, p. 286; Hunt, 1993, p. 56), in fact, nothing could be further from the truth. For St. Thomas, a human being is an "integer" (Brennen, 1941, p. 64), a composite or amalgam that consists of body and soul. St. Thomas insisted that the body and soul are merely dimensions of a singular being. He saw a human being as one being without proposing any form of monism. He saw humans as embodied without proposing any form of materialism. A human soul can only actualize vital life functions when brought together

with a body. As Levinas (1969) observed, "The body does not happen as an accident to the soul" (p. 168). However, a body is animated by a soul. This interconnectivity between body and soul is essential for St. Thomas. Body and soul are not two separate, self-sufficient substances, as one finds in Descartes. As Kenny (1993) observed:

> It is thus that human sensation falls, for Descartes, within the boundaries of the mental, whereas for the pre-Cartesian it fell without. When we come to look closely at Aquinas' account of the mind, we have therefore to realize that he not only describes it in a way different from Descartes, but has from the outset a different concept of the phenomenon to be described. (p. 18)

From a position of materialistic monism (a position that is quite present in reductionistic, positivistic psychology), one might be tempted to accuse St. Thomas of creating a dualism. However, from a Thomistic point of view, both spiritual and materialistic monisms operate within a dualistic conceptual framework, trying to overcome dualism by totalizing one aspect or constituent of the human composite. Monistic viewpoints begin with the assumption of dualism (i.e., that mind and body are not only distinct, but self-sufficient) and thus can only claim victory over the dichotomy of body and soul by offering a bastardized form of dualism.

For Thomas, it makes no sense to refer to concrete worldly existence in terms of a body without a soul or a soul without a body. Thomism holds that it is only possible to stop, reflect, analyze, and explicate the characteristics of "body" and "soul" because we have already encountered both in their original, holistic, synthetic form as "human being." It is the human existent that one encounters in the real life world of day-to-day experience, never a body, never a soul. Thus, in common vernacular, to have encountered "a body" is to have found a corpse. To have encountered "a soul" or "a spirit" is to have seen a ghost. To consider body and soul in isolation from each other in relation to a living human being is something that can only be done mentally by abstracting from concrete experience.

This notion of the soul is fundamentally different than the post-Cartesian notions of "mind" or "consciousness" in that so-called "embodiment" is a given. As Kenny (1993) put it:

> What Aquinas is really arguing against Averroes is that the property
> of being material, the form of corporeality, is something included in
> humanity, not something separate from it and inessential to it. This is
> ground which will be extensively revisited in question seventy-six. We
> may surely agree with Aquinas against Averroes that human beings
> are, by definition, bodily beings. (Kenny, 1993, p. 138)

To be embodied is an essential characteristic of the earthbound soul. For
the soul to have to "reside" in specific physiological localities by way of
something like the pineal gland was foreign to St. Thomas. According to
St. Thomas, the soul is the very form of a body in potency to life, meaning
that body and soul do not have any "real life" existence in isolation from
each other (Aquinas, 1948, p. 293). In this particular regard, St. Thomas's
notion of the soul is unabashedly Aristotelian. As Irwin (1985) noted of the
Aristotelian view of the soul:

> Aristotle defines psuchē as the first ACTIVITY of a living body. If an
> axe were alive, then cutting…would be its soul. For a living organism
> the soul is the characteristic functions and activities that are essential
> to the organism and explain…the other features it has. (pp. 425-
> 426)

Ensoulment and Be-ing

It is important to note that the term "first" in the above characterization
is not a temporal term. In other words, by referring to the soul as the "first
activity," Aristotle and Aquinas were not meaning that the soul is the very
first action that an organism engages in. Rather, the term "first" might be
better thought of as "top," "overriding," "prime," or better still, "defining."
As Kenny (1993) put it:

> Some vital motions have their origin in the animal's heart, and the
> form of consciousness which is vision depends on the activity of the
> animal's eye. But neither the heart nor the eye is a soul. St. Thomas is
> prepared to call each of them a principle of life, but not a root or first
> principle of life. (p. 130)

For St. Thomas, the soul animates an organism and orients it toward a

particular style of living out its life. In other words, ensoulment makes possible the manifestation of a life form. An important implication of this characterization of the soul is the impossibility of understanding the nature or essence of a human being separate from his or her existence. The nature of human existence lies in the potential to act, to do or "be" in the world in a characteristic manner. Thus, Caputo (1982) observed:

> It is a serious mistake, but not an uncommon one, to think that essence somehow floats about awaiting actualization by existence. Essence is a potentiality, for St. Thomas, not because it exists in one way now while being able to take on a new form later—although this is what potentiality meant for Aristotle—but because it is a principle of receiving and limiting esse. To be potential in this case means to be able to be, not to be formed. Essence signifies the capacity to exist in such and such a way, to be able to be so much and no more. Of itself it is not; and when it is conjoined with the actual principle it "is" only so much, and no more. (pp. 127-128)

As Caputo aptly notes, St. Thomas's anthropological scheme does not allow for an essentialist interpretation, whereby the actual living out of one's potentials is accidental or secondary to the being of the organism. As Copleston (1950) put it:

> Existence determines essence in the sense that it is act and through it the essence has being…. …We must not imagine that essence existed before receiving existence (which would be a contradiction in terms) or that there is a kind of neutral existence which is not the existence of any thing in particular until it is united with essence…. Existence, then, is not something accidental to the finite being: it is that by which the finite being is a being. (pp. 333-334)

The Soul as Spiritual" Clearing," "Lighting" or World-Openness

Thus, to inquire into the nature of the human soul is to articulate the way a truly human life is animated into action. According to St. Thomas, human beings are spiritual beings. More precisely, the human soul is a spiritual soul. To assert that the human soul is spiritual was, for St. Thomas, a way of avoiding the perils of materialistic reductionism, such as psychologism.

St. Thomas's argument against the possibility of the soul being "just another material thing" is grounded the observation that human beings can perceive, reflect upon, and make organized sense out of anything in the concrete, material world from a multiplicity of perspectives. The inherent receptiveness of the human soul requires a certain distance from the material world for this process to begin. For example, in order to see an apple, the apple cannot be shoved into the eye, nor can the apple be too close to the eye for that matter. In order for a person to perceive an apple, the apple must not actually be in the eye, but separate from the eye. As Kenny (1993) noted, St. Thomas used the example of an infected tongue to illustrate his argument for productive distanciation, as it were. A tongue infected with bilious and bitter humor cannot taste sweetness, only sourness as a consequence the infection. The tongue cannot taste anything of itself in order to taste the flavors of the world (p. 132). Viktor Frankl (1978) uses a parallel analogy to illuminate the self-transcendent nature of human existence. As he put it:

> When, apart from looking in a mirror, does the eye see anything of itself? An eye with a cataract may see something like a cloud, which is its cataract; an eye with glaucoma may see its glaucoma as a rainbow halo around the lights. A healthy eye sees nothing of itself—it is self-transcendent. (pp. 38-39)

Thus, for St. Thomas, the soul's powers of apprehension and apperception require that the human soul itself not be just another material thing. The powers of the soul cannot be confined to a particular material substrate if they are to be available for the free exploration of the material world, unhampered by restrictions that would arise as a result of biological reductionism. As Copleston (1950) observed:

> If [the human soul] were material, it would be determined to a specified object, as the organ of vision is determined to the perception of colour. Again, if it depended intrinsically on a bodily organ, it would be confined to the knowledge of some particular kind of bodily object, which is not the case, while if it were itself a body, material, it could not reflect on itself. (p. 384)

All in all, St. Thomas's view is that the soul is a spiritual "clearing" or "lighting" so to speak, that endows human beings with world-openness. The use of

Heideggerian sounding terminology here is quite intentional, so as to draw a deliberate parallel between Aquinas's notion of the soul and existentialist "being-in-the-world." This parallel is seen even more clearly in the following passage from the famous Heideggerian psychologist Medard Boss (1963):

> …How would any perception, understanding, and elucidation of the meaning of a single thing or living being, any appearing and shining forth of this or that particular matter, be possible at all without an open realm of light, a realm that lends itself to letting shine forth whatever particular being may come into its elucidating openness? …Only because man—in contrast to the things he deals with—is he essentially an understanding, seeing, luminating being is he capable of going both physically and spiritually blind. (pp. 37-38)

The Soul as Primordial "Closeness" to Oneself or Relative Self-Awareness

A spiritual soul is not only able to be open to the world, but also to oneself in the world. As spiritual, the human soul is a primordial close-ness to oneself that founds the inclination to bend back upon our own comportment and reflect upon our total situation. In other words, human ensoulment endows a person with potentials for self-awareness and also self-reflection. However, it is vitally important to note that the human po-tential for self-awareness did not lead St. Thomas to posit the existence of a mind that is always fully conscious of itself. As Strasser (1957) observed, "It is very well possibly to be a 'rational animal' without possessing objec-tive self-knowledge" (p. 186). St. Thomas did not believe in the primacy of a cogito or world-determining transcendental ego. St. Thomas's notion of the soul is that it is inherently worldly. The mind has no privileged, "back door" contact with itself that completely sidesteps concrete existence and life-world experience. As Strasser (1957) put it, "It is a misuse of the tradi-tional categories when one claims that the self-subsistent being is found by detaching from it what is accidental being in it" (p. 75).

For St. Thomas, human knowledge is inherently worldly and therefore relative and imperfect. As Caputo (1982) observed, the "weakness" of the human intellect plays an important role in St. Thomas's account of the differ-ences between the human soul, angelic forms, and God (p. 261). He notes, "Now, in St. Thomas' Neo-Aristotelianism the distinctly 'human' character of knowledge is found in its dependence upon perception" (p. 263). The

primacy of perception in the soul's acquisition of knowledge reveals the inherently perspectival and finite nature of human knowledge. Embodied perspective is inherently limited in scope. Again, Caputo:

> In Aristotle, the actual principle determines matter and saves it from being unformed; in Thomas, the potential principle determines and restricts the being in its very be-ing. As Father Clarke so conclusively shows, potency does not limit act in Aristotle, act limits potency. The limitation of act by potency is a Thomistic breakthrough. (p. 127)

Therefore, the impossibility of perfect self-transparency is rooted in the very nature of the human, embodied soul itself. As Strasser (1957) has shown in his analysis of the soul in St. Thomas's philosophy, a human being can never "get behind" or "above" his or her own thinking and willing so completely that idealism is at last justified. There is no possibility of a total, absolute egological or "transcendental" reduction, to use the language of phenomenology. The act of reflecting upon ones thinking and willing is itself a kind of thinking and willing. At no time can a human being "step back" or "detach" from thinking and willing completely, so to speak, and gain an absolutely neutral, conceptual grasp of his or her existence. In Strasser's words, "Will not my actual "I consider to be true" be that with respect to which I cannot place myself at a distance? Is not my actual willing for me something of which I cannot dispose at all?" (p. 159). Concrete existence cannot be bypassed or overcome by what Paul Tillich (1952) called a "naked epistemological subject."

The Soul as a Non-Objectifiable Fact of Existence

St. Thomas, in effect, espoused a very existential view of the soul. The Thomistic soul lies in between the abstract, hypothetical realms of pure objectivity and non-worldly, non-embodied subjectivity. On the one hand, St. Thomas rejected the idea that the soul might be the epiphenomenal "residue" of physical and physiological forces. Though embodied, the soul is neither a material thing, nor reducible to materialistic dynamisms. Spiritual ensoulment implies a truly personal element to existence that is characteristic of human living above all. Thus, we sometimes label machines "soulless." As Strasser (1957) noted, to "besoul" means to endow something in the world with something of my being, to make it part of my being-in-the-world

(in the lived, phenomenological sense of the term) (p. 143). However, as Strasser further noted, "my being does not exhaust itself fully in the being of anything." (p. 143). In his words:

> I cannot leave my soul out of consideration, because my soul is that which considers. I cannot "raise" it to universality, because for me the soul represents a center of the universe which cannot be compared with anything else. In other words, my soul is not a possible object of abstractive thinking. My soul is for me the unique and incomparable reality through which my being is rooted in being itself. (p. 106)

On the other hand, besouling is not the "work" of a "free and rational consciousness set against a mechanical, physical world," as Solomon (1988) termed it (p. 175). The soul is impotent without a body and a world. St. Thomas saw the soul as emanating from a source that outstrips the personal or is more primordial than the personal without leading to the hypothesis of a transcendental ego. St. Thomas view of the soul avoids psychologism while leaving no room for a homunculus. To understand the human soul we are "condemned" to look forever in-the-world, as the soul is naturally oriented towards things, others, and so on. The similarity between this aspect of the soul in St. Thomas's work and Husserl's notion of the intentionality of consciousness are striking. This may be one reason why St. Edith Stein commented that Husserl told her that his work "converges towards" and "prolongs" Thomism (de Mirabel, 1954, p. 37). At the same time, the similarity between this aspect of the Thomistic view of the soul and Heidegger's being-in-the-world are due to the fact that Thomism diverges from Husserlian phenomenology inasmuch as Husserl made a "transcendental turn" back to the realm of immanence during his famous "idealist" period.

Herein lies the inexorable mystery of the soul: the soul is not reducible to any one or a number of worldly contingencies (i.e., its existence cannot be "explained away"), yet it can only exist in and through its worldly conditions (i.e., its situatedness "in-the-world"). Thus, Heidegger (1962) observed:

> Thomas is engaged in the task of deriving the 'transcendentia'—those characters of Being which lie beyond every possible way in which an entity may be classified as coming under some generic kind of subject-matter (every modus specialis entis), and which belong necessarily to anything, whatever it may be. Thomas has to demonstrate that the

verum is such a transcendens. He does this by invoking an entity which, in accordance with its very manner of Being, is properly suited to 'come together with' entities of any sort whatever. This distinctive entity, the ens quods natum est convenire cum omni ente, is the soul (anima). Here the priority of 'Dasein' over all other entities emerges, although it has not been ontologically clarified. This priority has obviously nothing in common with a vicious subjectivizing of the totality of entities. (p. 34)

All things considered, St. Thomas's understanding of the soul is consonant with Gabriel Marcel's (1995) notion of "being": "being is what withstands—or what would withstand—an exhaustive analysis bearing on the data of experience and aiming to reduce them step by step to elements increasingly devoid of intrinsic or significant value" (p. 14). A human a soul is neither a material thing nor a "thought-thing," as it were. As Strasser (1957) observed, "My soul is not my soul because I "have" it. My "ego-source," my originating ego, my soul is that which primarily I am." (p. 73). Accordingly, St. Thomas viewed human existence as "a non-conceptualizable act in the being itself" (Caputo, 1982, 111). As Caputo (1982) noted of St. Thomas's view of the relationship of the soul to existence:

> …Just as esse cannot be contained within the limits of metaphysics, so human ratio must give way to the simplicity of intellectus. Just as esse cannot be contained within the limits of rational conceptualization, so the mind itself is not content with conceptual, judgmental, and discursive knowledge of reality. The mind is driven on by a dynamism of its own to seek a life beyond ratio in the sphere of pure intellectus. (p. 260)

This same theme of non-conceptualizability is integral to Levinas's phenomenology of the Other as well (DeRobertis & Iuculano, 2005).

The Soul as Primordial Existential Unity Rather Than Mental Construct

In addition to being the non-objectifiable fact of existence, the soul is also the fountainhead of personal integration attributable to the human existent. In St. Thomas's philosophical-anthropology the soul represents the ultimate source of integration governing all aspects of human functioning. The idea that there is some kind of overarching principle of psychophysical

integration inherent to human existence has long been debated in both philosophy and psychology. Aquinas's work counts as one of the great defenses of the integrative approach to human existence and personality. Ensoulment bestows the existent with irreducible organismic unity:

> Fundamentally Hume speaks the strict truth when he says that "we have no impression of self or substance, as something simple and individual." The only suitable answer here is: do not look among your "impressions," your "idea," or any contents of consciousness whatsoever which you have. Pay attention to the fact that you are. What you have is always a plurality; what you are is necessarily an identical self-subsistent unity. And this is precisely what we mean when we speak of "substance." (Strasser, 1957, p. 73-74)

To be sure, many philosophers since Aquinas have defended the integrative thrust of his work, but in a somewhat different way. Descartes's systematic doubt set a precedent in philosophy that significantly increased emphasis on questions regarding the epistemological subject (Murray, 2001, pp. 37-38). This, in and of itself, was not necessarily a bad thing, as Descartes was attempting to defend the notion that the "subject" of knowledge constitutes a necessary component of experiential reality. In grammar, the subject is that about which we are speaking. In the world of interpersonal relationships, a subject is he or she to whom we are referring or addressing, as opposed to an accumulation of nerve impulses or fleeting sensations. This idea has remained central to the philosophies of Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, Levinas, Ricoeur and other contemporary existential-phenomenological thinkers (Ricoeur, 1971). The importance of the notion of a "subject" (for those who defend it) is that if there is any such thing as real knowledge or truth, then truth is not without a substantive "someone," a person who is compelled by and "subjected" to that truth, an individual who stands for that truth (Levinas). The subject constitutes a substantive "pole" of experience correlative to the world of things. If there is no substantive someone, no "I" of any kind, then reductive psychologists are quite justified in looking upon human existence as nothing more than a mass of sensory impressions and neural impulses, for example. Skepticism is given similar justification, which then undermines psychology as a science, as a matter of course. In effect, defenses of psychologism, biologism, and any number of "gisms" are strengthened, while arguments against reductionism and skepticism are

considerably weakened.

Philosophical meditations on the epistemological subject grew out of discourse pertaining to the soul. Philosophical reflections on the nature of subjectivity are historically rooted in discourse on ensoulment, such as that which is found in St. Thomas's work. Discourse on ensoulment and subjectivity in philosophy emphasize the need for some recognition of an integrative core of human existence. However, whereas the study of subjectivity can sometimes revolve rather strongly around cognition (such as in Descartes work, for example), philosophical dialogue concerning ensoulment in St. Thomas's work brings to bear larger questions regarding a dynamic psychophysical configuration (Gestalt) that is unique to human beings. For St. Thomas, to study human ensoulment in particular is to illuminate an organized bio-psycho-social-spiritual-ethical life form. Such a process, however, cannot be completed without considerations of the will and individual freedom of the will.

St. Thomas' Non-Rationalist View of Human Existence

The existential movement in philosophy "officially" began as a reaction to what Paul Tillich (1952) called "the loss of the Existential point of view since the beginning of modern times" (p. 131). As Rollo May (1958) put it:

> [Existentialism] arose…in Kierkegaard's violent protest against the reigning rationalism of his day, Hegel's "totalitarianism of reason," to use Maritain's phrase. Kierkegaard proclaimed that Hegel's identification of abstract truth with reality was an illusion and amounted to trickery. "Truth exists," wrote Kierkegaard, "only as the individual produces it in action." (p. 11-12)

St. Thomas's view of human existence is intrinsically harmonious with the non-rationalist spirit of existential philosophy, despite his emphasis on the importance of the intellect in human living. While both Aquinas and Descartes (1993, p. 66) saw the intellect and the will as highly important aspects of the human soul, Aquinas would have disagreed with Descartes's famous declaration, "I think, therefore I am." Aquinas could not agree with such a statement due to its inordinate emphasis on intellection. Aquinas adamantly held that "the intellect is a power of the soul, and not the very

essence of the soul" (p. 337). In agreement with this viewpoint, Levinas (1989) observed:

> The reduction of subjectivity to consciousness dominates philosophical thought, which since Hegel has been trying to overcome the duality of being and thought, but by identifying, under different figures, substance and subject. This also amounts to undoing the substantivity of substance, but in relationship with self-consciousness. (p. 93)

Simply put, the will and the other powers of the soul are too integral to human existence for Aquinas to grant the intellect the magnitude of importance that one finds in Descartes's work. As St. Thomas put it, "Reason has its power of moving from the will" (1948, p. 611). Moreover, as Copleston (1950) noted of Aquinas's philosophy, "…the will may be nobler than the intellect in certain respects…" (p. 382). St. Thomas considered intellectual knowledge of corporeal objects to be "superior" to our will in relation to these objects. Again, Copleston:

> In regard to corporeal objects, therefore, knowledge of them is more perfect and nobler than volition in respect to them, since by knowledge we possess the forms of these objects in ourselves. And these forms exist in a nobler way in the rational would than they do in the corporeal objects. (p. 382)

Kenny (1993) also noted that for St. Thomas, the intellect is only superior to the will with regard to relations to entities inferior to the soul, such as material forms. Otherwise, however, the will is the superior faculty of the soul (p. 72). As regards entities that are transcendent with respect to the world of corporeal objects in their sheer complexity, things which are not reducible to material causes (particularly human souls and God), Aquinas saw the will as having a role that is superior to knowledge:

> In the case of objects which are less noble than the soul, corporeal objects, we can have immediate knowledge, and such knowledge is more perfect than volition; but in the case of…an object which transcends the human soul, we have only mediate knowledge in this life, and our love…is more perfect than our knowledge…. (Copleston, 1950, p. 383)

St. Thomas's notion of willing had a very concrete, anti-intellectualist character in another respect as well. For St. Thomas, volition is not utterly dependent upon reflective awareness. A willing organism may engage the world of things without explicit self-consciousness as a matter of course. St. Thomas maintained that volition often occurs with no more than implicit or "pre-reflective" self-awareness, to employ the language of phenomenology. St. Thomas did not consider choice to be a pure act of the intellect (Aquinas, 1948, p. 514). The intellect is important for human volition inasmuch as it provides the means for a more perfect knowledge of the end or goal of volition. However, explicit, self-reflective knowledge of acts is not continuous or even necessary for willing to occur (p. 483). As St. Thomas put it, "On the contrary, The Philosopher says that both children and irrational animals participate in the voluntary" (p. 482).

Thomistic Emphasis on Individuality and Freewill

To be sure, Kierkegaard's existentialist reaction to Hegel displays other themes that can be found in St. Thomas's works. For instance, Kierkegaard's emphasis on the unique value of the individual human existent as a free agent is represented in St. Thomas's view of the human soul. Kierkegaard is famous for having once noted, "Once you label me, you negate me." Kierkegaard fought against the systematizing approach to philosophy wherein the value of individual human beings is subjugated to larger, more impersonal forces in nature or society. In particular, he found the pantheistic element of the Hegelian "Spirit" to be depersonalizing and dehumanizing. Similarly, St. Thomas noted that every human soul is distinct and individual, and therefore cannot be grasped as a mere dimension of a collective spirit. Aquinas believed that the human soul was "multiplied according to the number of bodies." In his words, "It is absolutely impossible for one intellect to belong to all men" (Aquinas, 1948, p. 299).

Moreover, Aquinas believed in the freewill of every individual human being. As he put it, "Man has free choice, or otherwise counsels, exhortations, commands, prohibitions, rewards and punishments would all be in vain" (p. 369). Teleologically, human beings are oriented toward happiness, the good life, the life of virtue, as an inherent part of the contextual backdrop of human willing. However, St. Thomas was quite emphatic that will and freewill are not separate, distinct powers (e.g., Aquinas, 1948, p. 375). Thus, despite this inherent teleological thrust, the living, breathing human being

is free to resist his or her most primordial inclination, and this opens human beings to the possibility of authentic good and evil. Stated differently, while Aquinas would likely agree with the saying, "The road to hell is paved with good intensions," he nonetheless maintained that acts of evil can be performed out of passionate or malicious choice as well as sheer ignorance (Brennen, 1941, p. 227).

Though St. Thomas believed in freewill, however, it is important to note that his view of freewill diverges from the view of freedom that has typically been identified with existentialism due to the popularity of Jean-Paul Sartre's work. Sartre (1966) is famous for having espoused a notion of "pure," intellectual freedom, which is intimately connected to his view that human beings have no essence, no nature. Paul Tillich (1961) criticized this view of freedom, calling it an attempt to espouse a "pure" existentialism. St. Thomas's philosophy radically differs from Sartre's with respect to both freewill and human nature.

With regard to human freedom, St. Thomas never viewed freedom as operating with complete and total autonomy. For Aquinas there are theological (i.e., creationist), physiological and psychological (i.e., "vegetative" and "sensitive") factors that provide universal structure to human freedom. On this basis, Kenny (1993) has opined that St. Thomas might be considered a "soft determinist" (pp. 77-78). In St. Thomas's philosophy, there are situational factors and forces that contextualize human agency and give rise to distinctly human forms of being in the world. A host of existential-phenomenological psychologists and philosophers have argued against the notion of a "pure," Sartrean existentialism on just this sort of basis. For example, Rollo May (1981) asserted:

> The Sartrean man, it is true, becomes a solitary individual creature standing on the basis of his defiance alone against God and society. The philosophical basis of this principle is given in Sartre's famous statement, "Freedom is existence, and in it existence precedes essence." That is to say, there would be no essences—no truth, no structure in reality, no logical forms, no logos, no God nor any morality—except as man in affirming his freedom makes these truths. (pp. 5-6)

Later, May noted, "…you cannot have freedom or a free individual without some structure in which (or in the case of defiance, against which) the individual acts. Freedom and structure imply each other" (p. 7). Thus, Viktor

Frankl (1969) opined:

> …as Jean-Paul Sartre has it, man invents himself. This reminds me of a fakir trick. The fakir claims to throw a rope into the air, into the empty space, without anything to fix it on, and yet, he pretends, a boy will climb up the rope." (p. 60-61)

In philosophy, some of the most highly regarded existential thinkers have also rejected the argument for pure freedom from a pure existentialism as well. Martin Heidegger (1977) specifically addressed the misidentification of his own work with Sartre's work by observing that Sartre simply inverted objectivistic, causal (i.e., traditionally "metaphysical") thought, and thusly remained within its strictures (p. 208). Whereas objectivistic philosophies tend to minimize the role of freedom in human existence due to an over-emphasis on causative forces tied to a preexisting human design, the notion of a pure existentialism purifies freedom of all form or structure. In effect, pure existentialism merely reverses the very same current of objectivistic thought, thereby failing to truly transcend the very tradition it opposes. Even Emmanuel Levinas (1969), who has more recently opposed essentialist philosophy quite vehemently, maintained:

> Life is an existence that does not precede its essence. Its essence makes up its worth [prix]; and here value [valeur] constitutes being. The reality of life is already on the level of happiness, and in this sense beyond ontology. Happiness is not an accident of being, since being is risked for happiness. (p. 112)

Human Nature as a Context for Human Freedom in St. Thomas's Philosophy

With regard to human nature, St Thomas maintained a position that resisted rationalist and idealist interpretations of human existence through his insistence that vegetative and vital (i.e., "sensitive" or animal) functions are integral to human ensoulment. Aquinas, following Aristotle, saw humans as intelligent animals. However, for St. Thomas, the intellect is not "pure," not tangentially related to a body, not a logical thought-thing set against a mechanistic world. A human being is an amalgam of both vegetative and vital characteristics and intellect. This characterization of human nature is at odds with the Cartesian worldview. Descartes explicitly rejected the

Aristotelian-Thomistic characterization of human nature (1993 p. 64). The body and all of its functions were systematically doubted by Descartes in his search for the true core of human identity. As a result, he found the essence of human existence in cogitation. St. Thomas, on the other hand, wholeheartedly opposed the identification of the soul (and still less, human existence) with the intellect, despite the fact that he considered the human soul to be an intellectual soul.

St. Thomas often spoke of the uniquely human aspects of human beings in terms of ratio, and also referred to humans as rational animals on this basis. However, it must be noted that "reason," for St. Thomas, does not refer exclusively to mere "formal operations," to borrow Jean Piaget's terminology. Ratio is not exclusively indicative of logical deliberation. As Heidegger (1962) noted, ratio has multiple translations, one of which being the "ground" or "reason" for discussing something with another person (p. 58). The concept of reason is far more limited in the post-Cartesian world than it was in St. Thomas's time. In Caputo words:

> It cannot be overlooked that St. Thomas' metaphysics is pre-Cartesian and hence that it is not an onto-theo-logic in the strong sense of the post-Cartesian systems. St. Thomas' conception of reason differs markedly from that of the post-Cartesian thinkers and should never be confused with rationalist reason. (Caputo p. 250)

The pre-Cartesian notion of ratio is not so closely identified with pure, abstract logic. Rather, ratio has wider denotations, such as the more concrete phenomenon of "being reasonable" as a human possibility above and beyond brute animal existence, which is more decisively dominated by innate behavioral tendencies and emotions. Hence, St. Thomas made a distinction between the concupiscible, irascible and intellectual appetites (e.g., Aquinas, 1948, pp.352-353). Consequently, Stein (2000) observed that St. Thomas work has practical import as a "philosophy for life" (pp. 27-28). All in all, it is perhaps best to bear in mind that St. Thomas considered the intellect to be the uniquely human aspect of humans in order to avoid confused associations with post-Cartesian reason. Again, Caputo:

> There is no Cartesian subjectivism in St. Thomas which groups the whole of Being around the thinking self, no principium reddendae rationis which refuses to grant permission to be unless the being can

> present its credentials before the jurisdiction of reason (Leibniz), no Hegelian absolutizing of rational categories. In St. Thomas, reason is subordinate to faith, to mysticism, and, in the end, to the eschatological consummation of intelligence in the beatific vision. (Caputo p. 250)

In addition to being an intelligent animal, St. Thomas Aquinas considered human beings to be inherently social and political animals. Thus, he noted, "Man has a natural inclination to…live in society…" (Aquinas, 1948, p. 638). Aquinas derived this idea from Aristotle. In Gilby's (1989) words:

> Aquinas was the first to depart from the traditional view, formed by the Stoics and Augustine, that the civil power, like private property, was propter peccatum, a remedy against our anti-social appetites. He revived Aristotle's idea of the State meeting the essential demands of human nature, which, he says, using two terms, is both social and political (p. 23).

Inevitable consequences therefore follow as a result of Aquinas' views on human nature.

Given that human beings have an intellect and a natural proclivity toward social and political relationships, the establishment of cultural milieus is unavoidable. The nature of a culture can be healthy or unhealthy, just or unjust. However, according to St. Thomas, humans live in a world that was given to them by design. Creation is not ours to desecrate, defile, and destroy. Finite humans participate in eternal Being, which added further justification for St. Thomas to appropriate Aristotle's notion that happiness, the good life, eudaimonia, is the life of virtue rather than hedonistic selfishness or mere enjoyment (Aquinas, 1948, pp. 598-599; Aristotle, 1985, p. 7).

For St. Thomas, both virtue and law belong to our nature as intellectual, reasonable creatures (Aquinas, 1948, pp. 610, 639 & 587). What is most properly human, therefore, is that humans create a culture that is value laden, virtuous, ethical, moral, and considerate of the many needs of all life forms. Thus, the many derivatives of St. Thomas's views on human nature, such as "cultural animal" (Baumeister, 2005), "valuing animal" (May, 1979, p. 72), "religious animal" (Strasser, 1977, p. 290) and "metaphysical animal" (Strasser, 1977, p. 356) all apply to St. Thomas's work as well. It is no wonder, then, why St. Thomas's work has most often been discussed in the areas of social, moral, and political philosophy.

Existential-Phenomenological Correctives to Thomistic

Philosophical-Anthropology

While the preceding discussion outlines some significant points of conversion between Thomism and existential-phenomenology, it is certainly not meant to imply that these two currents of thought are identical. There are differences between Thomism and existential-phenomenology, but these differences provide opportunities for mutual enrichment. For instance, Heidegger's work was in some respects an attempt to retrieve the primordial meanings of logos as speech, language, and dialogue as a corrective to its typical translation as ratio in Medieval philosophy and St. Thomas's philosophy. Through Heidegger's works, the importance of language in the creation of human reality and hermeneutics were given much needed recognition in philosophy. Heidegger's appreciation for the radical and transformative role of language in human existence was not present in St. Thomas's work. This is not to say that language and logos were not important in St. Thomas's work. Rather, St. Thomas's philosophy had a more causal and objective character about it wherein language was not characterized as a factor in the actual construction or constitution of worldhood, as it were. At the same time, Heidegger never endorsed any form of relativism, skepticism, or nihilism as an alternative to objectivism. As was noted above, Heidegger rejected metaphysical objectivism and subjectivism alike. These issues are addressed most formidably and most clearly by Heidegger in his Letter on Humanism (1977). Adopting the hermeneutic standpoint prevalent in existential-phenomenology makes possible discourse on the "changing nature of man," as van den Berg (1961) termed it, and can temper the more causal-objective aspects of Aquinas's work.

Another highly significant existential-phenomenological corrective to Thomism is the notion of Existenz itself. As Copelston (1950) noted:

> The philosophy of St. Thomas…does not presuppose a notion from which realism is to be deduced…his thought remains ever in contact with the concrete, the existent, both with that which has existence as something derived, something received, and with that which does not receive existence but is existence. In this sense it is true to say that Thomism is an 'existential philosophy,' though it is very misleading , in my opinion, to call St. Thomas an existentialist,' since the Existenz of the existentialists is not the same thing as St. Thomas's esse (p. 308)

Despite the existential import of St. Thomas's work, the fact remains that he did not dwell on human existence as a network of meaningful projects and relationships under conditions of finitude. He did not examine the ways in which being-with-others-alongside-things (Heidegger) is concretely affected by lived-embodiment, socio-cultural and historical situatedness, and so on. Moreover, Aquinas did not articulate the distinction between authentic and inauthentic being-in-the-world. This kind of dialogue is evident in Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, and Heidegger to name a few. Existential philosophers tend to emphasize the importance of distinguishing between someone who follows "the crowd," "the herd," "the flock," or "that man" as opposed to someone who is more circumspect and conscientious with respect to their existence. For example, in Heidegger's work, the modification in being that marks the shift from inauthenticity or "fallenness" to authenticity is the appropriation of one's "ownmost" possibilities such that the person refuses to interpret his or her life and death as anyone and everyone would. Thus, he noted that the "who of everyday Dasein" is not the "I myself" (1962, p. 150).

One such way that people can live their lives in an anonymous, inauthentic manner is to interpret their lives primarily in terms of reason, logic, and calculative thought. Hence, Solomon (1988) noted that, "falling into the Cartesian view of the world will be a paradigmatic form of inauthenticity" (pp. 161-162). Knowles (1986) made similar assertions in his existential-phenomenological reinterpretation of Erik Erikson psychosocial theory of child development. Along similar lines, Edward L. Murray (1986, 2001) admonished that it is imaginative thinking that is closest to the core of authentic subjectivity. Even though St. Thomas reserves an important place for the imagination in his work, he did not explicate the central role of the imagination in facilitating authentic being-in-the-world. Such explications can be found in Murray's works. Following Heidegger, Murray considered "imaginative projections" to be at the very core of human subjectivity and selfhood. As a hermeneut, Murray explored the ways in which imaginative projections manifest themselves in everyday language, scientific language, philosophical dialogue, and theological discourse via metaphor, symbol, and myth. In his works, the centrality of both language and imagination in historical, embodied, enculturated being-in-the-world are unmistakable. This is in no way meant to disparage the value of discursive reasoning. In his words:

> It is a proper human accomplishment to live both logically and imaginatively, and it may well be that the greatest human achievement of all lies in the experiential realization of genuine poetic living, thus optimizing the strong presence of both kinds of thinking in human existence. (pp. 36-37)

Murray's point is that one cannot truly access the meaning of authentic human living without adequately accounting for the central and primary role of the unity building power (i.e., imagination) within each of us (1986, pp. 62-69). In effect, it is the imagination that allows a person to "imagine another way" of interpreting their lives, one that diverges from anonymous, "they-existence." It is likely that St. Thomas's time and place in history was simply too "collectivist" for him to pursue such ideas.

Finally, despite his insistence that the human soul is a spiritual soul, St. Thomas did not speak of the human spirit in terms of meaningful living. Here, it is Viktor Frankl's existential-phenomenology that is implicated. For Frankl, human existence is unique in its dependence on meaning, value, or a sense of purpose. The term spiritual as indicative of the uniquely human soul entails recognizing human meaning-dependence. As he put it:

> In fact, logos means "meaning." However, it also means "spirit." And logotherapy takes the spiritual or noölogical dimension fully into account. In this way, logotherapy is also enabled to realize—and to utilize—the intrinsic difference between the noetic and psychic aspects of man. Despite this ontological difference between the noetic and psychic, between spirit and mind, the anthropological wholes and ones is not only maintained by our multidimensional concept of man, but even supported by it. (1967, p. 74)

Once again, to be fair to St. Thomas, such considerations are most pertinent in a world that has already been exposed to nihilism. St. Thomas's work predates the nihilistic trends that typify modern and post-modern philosophy. Hence, the need to emphasize meaning, value, and purpose would not likely have occurred to him or perhaps would not have seemed worthy of discussion.

Thomistic Contributions to Existential-Phenomenological Anthropology

In its turn, St. Thomas's philosophical-anthropology has much to offer existential-phenomenology. For example, some existential-phenomenological authors purposefully avoid using terms such as subjective and objective. This is due to their rejection of the subject-object dichotomy. However, as Husserl once noted, subjectivity and objectivity represent inextricable poles of concrete, lived-experience. This fact is sometimes forgotten in the existential aspiration to illuminate being-in-the-world. As Frankl (1967) observed:

> I am aware that Daseinsanalysts would abhor speaking of a "subjective mode of experiencing," for this would presuppose an objectively given world. Logotherapy, however, holds that no matter how subjective (or pathologically distorted) the segment we are "cutting out" of the world (which as a whole always remains inaccessible to a finite spirit) may be, nonetheless it is cut out of the objective world. The typical daseinanalytic terminology which claims to have closed the gap between subjectivity and objectivity seems to me to be self-deceptive. Man is neither capable of bridging such a gap, nor would such an accomplishment be commendable. Cognition is grounded, indispensably, on a field of polar tension between the objective and the subjective, for only on this basis is the essential dynamics of the cognitive act established. (pp. 134-135)

Frankl, like St. Thomas before him, recognized that neither the soul nor the material world can be totalized or eliminated without serious consequence. For St. Thomas, the consequence would have been a lapse into absurdity due to a series of logical contradictions, whereas for Frankl, the consequences were nihilism (vis-à-vis materialism) and noölogism (vis-à-vis spiritualism).

From a Thomistic perspective, rationalists and idealists (including Husserl in his transcendental period) have fought too hastily to preserve the possibility of truth while materialists have fought just as hastily to save the objectivity of the world. Thomism provides an explicit framework for preserving both subjectivity and objectivity without resorting to Husserlian transcendental idealism or a daseinsanalytic minimization of the poles of human experiential reality.

Existential-phenomenology also stands to benefit from a dialogue with St. Thomas's anthropology due to the popularity of the concept of soul in various aspects of psychology. There are serious contributions to psychology wherein the concept of soul plays a primary role, most notably, Jungian-archetypal psychology (e.g., Hillman, 1975). The popular success of archetypal psychologist Thomas Moore's Care of the Soul (1992) attests to the appeal of the notion of ensoulment among contemporary readers. To be sure, archetypalists and Thomists do not use the term soul in exactly the same manner. Nonetheless, a hermeneutic interpretation of the soul via a dialogue between Thomism and existential-phenomenology might act as a catalyst for an increased and deepened dialogue between existential-phenomenology and archetypal psychology.

An existential-phenomenological-Thomistic notion of ensoulment also has relevance in contemporary psychology due to the still rising popularity of the concept of selfhood, which began in the middle of the twentieth century (Murray, 2001, p. 47). Ensoulment is the philosophical precursor and underpinning of dialogue on the self as well as the subject. As Allport (1955) noted:

> Since the time of Wundt, the central objection of psychology to self, and also to soul, has been that the concept seems question-begging. It is temptingly easy to assign functions that are not fully understood to a mysterious central agency, and then to declare that "it" performs in such a way as to unify the personality and maintain its integrity. Wundt, aware of this peril, declared boldly for a "psychology without a soul." It was not that he necessarily denied philosophical or theological postulates, but that he felt psychology as a science would be handicapped by the petition principii implied in the concept. For half a century few psychologists other than Thomists have resisted Wundt's reasoning or his example. Indeed we may say that for two generations psychologists have tried every conceivable way of accounting for the integration, organization, and striving of the human person without having recourse to the postulate of a self. (pp. 36-37)

Elsewhere, Allport reiterated the historical relevance of Thomism in psychology as a proponent of the need for an integrative life principle in psychology as follows:

> It may seem odd to credit Freud, the supreme irrationalist of our age, with helping the Thomists preserve for psychology the emphasis upon the ego as the rational agent in personality, but such is the case. For whether the ego reasons or merely rationalizes, it has the property of synthesizing inner needs and outer reality. Freud and the Thomists have not let us forget this fact, and have thus made it easier for modern cognitive theories to deal with this central function of the proprium. (p. 46)

Allport's comments demonstrate how discourse on the soul in philosophy continues in psychology on a more factual level in theoretical and empirical research on the self. Murray (2001) has defended the same position regarding the notions of subject and self (pp. 44-45). To be sure, the soul in St. Thomas's works is not identical to any of the objectifiable egos or selves (e.g., personal, social, etc) that appear in psychological literature (Strasser, 1957, p. 65). However, as Edie (1987) noted, William James distinguished between the "empirical," experienced self and the experienceing self on purely phenomenological grounds (pp. 76-77). While James held that former is conceptualizable and objectifiable, he denied that possibility of the latter. Years later, Heinz Kohut (1977) asserted that the self is "not knowable in its essence" (Kohut, 1977, p. 310-311). In his words, "we will…not know the essence of the self as differentiated from its manifestations" (p. 311). More recently, Daniel Stern (1985), observed, "Even though the nature of the self may forever elude the behavioral sciences, the sense of self stands as an important subjective reality, a reliable, evident phenomenon that the sciences cannot dismiss" (Stern, 1985, p. 6). Thus, a convergence of existential-phenomenological thought and Thomism on the concept of ensoulment may be productive in making a unique and valuable contribution to psychological theorizing on the self. As Murray (2001) put it, "The truth of the matter is, both the metaphysical and the empirical, the ontological and the epistemological…have much to offer psychology's efforts to understand the human being (p. 44).

The emphasis on the social, moral, and ethical aspects of human nature in St. Thomas's philosophical-anthropology can also make a positive contribution to existential-phenomenology. As Sartre's philosophy demonstrates so well, there is a highly individualist current that runs through some of existentialism. Even a thinker as synoptic, rigorous and consistent as Heidegger has been accused of creating an unduly individualist philosophical-

anthropology (e.g., Friedman, 1964, p. 173). In addition, there is a highly tragic element to existential thought that is perhaps sometimes inordinately emphasized as well. Thinkers such as Marcel (e.g., 1995), Buber (e.g., 1956) and Levinas (e.g., 1969) have written about the excesses of tragic, individualist existentialism, as it were, at some length. Hence, Marcel (1995) referred to "the man of Heidegger and Sartre" as "the victim of some cosmic catastrophe, flung into an alien universe to which he is bound by nothing" (p. 102). Marcel goes on:

> But should it not be the task of a sane philosophy at this time to link up with this tradition by an effort of thought which should bring out its metaphysical evidence? Nothing short of an effort of this kind seems to me to have any chance of success against a doctrine of dean on which, whatever one may say, no wisdom can be built. (pp. 102-103)

St. Thomas's emphasis on the social, moral and ethical aspects of humanity can help to counterbalance the individualistic, nihilistic trends in existential-phenomenology. Aquinas's philosophical-anthropology might be brought into contact with the works of thinkers like Marcel, Buber and Levinas to aid in the explication of a more holistic, personalistic existential philosophical-anthropology.

Finally, an existential-phenomenological dialogue with St. Thomas's works on happiness can provide the means for a critical dialogue with positive psychology and its current trend of researching "the good life." For example, Martin Seligman has recently authored Authentic Happiness (2002), a title that discusses a topic central to the thought of Aristotle and St. Thomas (i.e., happiness) using characteristically Heideggerian sounding language (i.e., authenticity). Literature on happiness is becoming increasingly popular, and references to concepts like eudaimonia are commonplace in positive psychology. There are even debates over whether or not it is possible to be "too" happy (e.g., Oishi, Diener, & Lucas, 2007). Yet there is no compelling evidence that the leaders of the positive psychology movement are philosophically trained despite the fact that they are importing philosophical language into psychology. In fact, Seligman's concept of eudaimonia has been found to be problematic on just this basis (Woolfolk & Wasserman, 2005). Together, existential-phenomenologists and Thomists can help increase rigor and conscientiousness in the theoretical and empirical study of

human happiness.

Concluding Remarks

In the above discussion I hope to have shown that St. Thomas Aquinas's philosophical-anthropology is a viable underpinning for a holistic psychology, one that avoids dualism, reductionism, and rugged individualism. I hope to have demonstrated this by calling attention to legitimate parallels with existential-phenomenology. These parallels are evidence of a certain internal harmony between Thomism and existential-phenomenology. An ongoing philosophical-anthropological dialogue between these two traditions of thought ought to benefit both traditions. Existential-phenomenology can assist in eliminating objectivistic bias from Thomism. Thomism, in return can help to strengthen existential-phenomenologists' arguments for anthropological holism and, ironically, assist existential-phenomenology in reaching a wider audience among contemporary readers.

Notes

[1] See Neiman, op.cit., p. 212.
[2] Bernard Williams, *"The Makropulos Case: Reflections on the Tedium of Immortality"* in Bernard Williams, *Problems of the Self: Philosophical Papers 1956-1972* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1973), p. 90. It should also be noted here that Williams helped me a great deal in developing the ideas on finitude.
[3] See Williams, op.cit., p. 90.
[4] Albert Borgmann, *Technology and the Character of Contemporary Life* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1984), pp. 213-240.
[5] John Dewey, *"Human Nature and Value"* in *The Moral Writings of John Dewey*, edited by James Gouinlock (New York: Hafner Press, 1976), p. 97.
[6] Albert Borgmann, *Crossing the Postmodern Divide* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992), pp. 87-88.
[7] Martin Heidegger, *The Question Concerning Technology* in *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays,* translated by William Lovitt (New York, 1977), p.45.
[8] John Dewey, *The Quest for Certainty: A Study in the Relation of Knowledge and Action* (New York: Minton, Balch&Company, 1929), p.260.
[9] Albert Borgmann, *Technology and the Character of Contemporary Life*

(Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1984), pp. 128-129.
[10] Albert Borgmann, *Crossing the Postmodern Divide* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992), pp. 92-93.

References

Allport, G. (1955). *Becoming: Basic Considerations for a Psychology of Personality.* Connecticut: Yale.

Aquinas, T. (1948). *Introduction to St. Thomas Aquinas.* New York: Random House.

Aristotle (1985). *Nicomachean Ethics* (Terence Irwin, Trans.). Indiana: Hackett.

Baumeister, R.F. (2005). *The Cultural Animal: Human Nature, Meaning, and Social Life.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Boss, M. (1963). *Psychoanalysis and Daseinsanalysis.* New York: DaCapo.

Brennen, R.E. (1941). *Thomistic Psychology.* New York: Macmillan.

Brett, G.S. (1967). *Brett's History of Psychology.* Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Buber, M. (1956). *The Writings of Martin Buber.* New York: Meridian Books.

Caputo, J.D. (1982). *Heidegger and Aquinas.* New York: Fordham.

Copelston, F. (1950). *History of Philosophy Volume II: Augustine to Scotus.* New Jersey: Paulist Press.

de Mirabel, E. (1954). *Edith Stein.* Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

DeRobertis, E. & Iuculano (2005). "Metaphysics and Psychology: A Problem of the Personal." *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology,* 25(2), 238-256.

Descartes, R. (1993). *Discourse on Method and Meditations of First Philosophy* (Donald A. Cress, Trans.). Indianapolis: Hackett. (Original works published in 1637 and 1641 respectively).

Edie, J.M. (1987). *William James and Phenomenology*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Frankl, V.E. (1969). *The Will to Meaning: Foundations and Applications of Logotherapy.* New York: Nal.

Frankl, V.E. (1967). *Psychotherapy and Existentialism: Selected Papers on Logotherapy.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Frankl, V.E. (1978). *The Unheard Cry for Meaning: Psychotherapy and Humanism.* New York: Washington Square Press.

Friedman, M. (1964). *The Worlds of Existentialism: A Critical Reader.* New Jersey: Humanities Paperback Library.

Gilby, T. (1989). *Aquinas.* In J.O. Urmson & J. Rée (Eds.), *The Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy & Philosophers,* (pp. 20-23). New York: Routledge.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time* (John Macquarrie & Edward Robinson, Trans.). New York: Harper Collins. (Original work published 1926).

Heidegger, M. (1977). *Basic Writings.* New York: Harper Collins.

Hillman, J (1975). *Re-visioning Psychology.* New York: Harper Perennial.

Hunt, M. (1993). *The Story of Psychology.* New York: Anchor Books.

Irwin, T. (1985). Glossary. In Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* (pp. 385-432). Indiana: Hackett.

Kenny, A. (1993). *Aquinas on Mind.* New York: Routledge.

Knolwes, R.T. (1986). *Human Development and Human Possibility: Erikson in the Light of Heidegger.* Maryland: University Press of America.

Kohut, H. (1977). *The Restoration of the Self.* Connecticut: International Universities Press.

Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority* (Alphonso Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press. (Original work published 1961).

Levinas, E. (1989). *The Levinas Reader.* Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.

Magee, J.D. (1996-1999). Thomistic philosophy page. Retrieved February 28, 2008 from http://www.aquinasonline.com/Topics/identity.html

Marcel, G. (1995). *The Philosophy of Existentialism* (Manya Harari, Trans.). New York: Citadel. (Original work published 1949).

Maritain, J. (1948). *Existence and the Existent: An Essay on Christian Existentialism.* New York: Image Books.

May, R. (1979). *Psychology and the Human Dilemma.* New York: W.W. Norton.

May, R. (1958). "The Origins and Significance of the Existential Movement in Psychology." In R. May, E. Angel & H.F. Ellenberger (Eds.), *Existence: A New Dimension in Psychiatry and Psychology* (pp.3-36). New York: Basic Books.

May, R. (1981). "Introduction." In J.P. Sartre, *Existential Psychoanalysis.* New York: Gateway Editions.

Moore, T. (1992). *Care of the Soul: A Guide for Cultivating Depth and Sacredness in Everyday Life.* New York: Harper Collins.

Murray, E.L. (1986). *Imaginative Thinking and Human Existence*. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Murray, E.L. (2001). *The Quest for Personality Integration: Reimaginizing our Lives.* Pittsburgh: Simon Silverman Phenomenology Center.

Oishi, S., Diener, E., and Lucas, R.E. (2007). "The Optimum Level of Well-Being: Can People be Too Happy?" *Association for Psychological Science*, 2(4), 346-360.

Ricoeur, P. (1971). "From Existentialism to the Philosophy of Language." *Criterion*, 10, 14-18.

Sartre, J.P. (1966). *Being and Nothingness* (Hazel Barnes, Trans.). New York: Washington Square Press. (Original work published 1943)

Seligman, M.E.P. (2002). *Authentic Happiness: Using the New Positive Psychology to Realize your Potential for Lasting Fulfillment.* New York: Free Press.

Solomon, R.C. (1988). *Continental Philosophy since 1750: The Rise and Fall of the Self.* New York: Oxford

Stein, E. (2000). *Knowledge and Faith* (Walter Redmond, Trans.). Washington D.C.: ICS Publications. (Original work published 1993).

Stern, D.N. (1985). *The Interpersonal World of the Infant: A View from Psychoanalysis and Developmental Psychology.* New York: Basic Books.

Strasser, S. (1957). *The Soul in Metaphysical and Empirical Psychology.* Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Tillich, P. (1952). *The Courage to Be.* Connecticut: Yale.

Tillich, P. (1961). "Existentialism and Psychotherapy." *Review of Existential Psychology and Psychiatry,* 1(1), 9.

van den Berg, J. H. (1961). *The Changing Nature of Man: Introduction to a Historical Psychology.* New York: W.W. Norton.

Van Kaam (1966). *Existential Foundations of Psychology.* Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Woolfolk, R.L. & Wasserman, R.H. (2005). "Count No One Happy: Eudaimonia and Positive Psychology." *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology,* 25(1), 81-90.