

Peer Review

Review of: "Science in Light of the Analogy of Being"

Zili Dong¹

1. Philosophy, University of Western Ontario, Canada

I am delighted to review this concise, clear, and well-organized essay. In return, I will also keep my comments short and to the point.

1. I am curious whether the concept of “the Analogy of Being” is playing an essential role in your essay. It looks like Aristotle’s potential ontology – that “parts are potential beings” – is what really matters for your argument. The analogy of being gives you a hierarchy of beings in Section 3, but people have been talking about similar hierarchies without mentioning the analogy of being. Put differently, my question is: is it possible to formulate your arguments without invoking “the Analogy of Being”? If the answer is no, what are the benefits of centering your argument around this concept?
2. I have a similar question about your use of “Aristotelian hylomorphism”. In Section 3, you said that you “use the distinction of material and formal principles (hylomorphism) to clarify the ontological structure of material beings”. Putting aside whether your interpretation of Aristotelian hylomorphism is valid (I have always found this concept obscure), I think people can talk about the ontological structure of material beings as shown in Table 1 without committing to Aristotelian hylomorphism (e.g., Rueger & McGivern 2010). Still, the question here is whether Aristotelian hylomorphism is doing the real work here.
3. I am not sure whether this is something you intended to convey in your paper, but you seem to be implying that the idea of “nonlinear ontology” discussed in Section 4 is not just compatible with quantum mechanics but validated by quantum mechanics. The latter is a much stronger claim because this makes your argument hinge on the truth of quantum mechanics. However, many people would contend that we can reject reductionism even if the world is classical; nonlinearity doesn’t require quantum mechanics. Note, again, I understand that you are NOT claiming that

nonlinearity requires quantum mechanics. I am merely suggesting that this might be something you want to clarify.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.