

<https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.6.15.2024.3619-3625>



African Journal of Biological Sciences

Journal homepage: <http://www.afjbs.com>



Research Paper

Open Access

Complementarities between Humanistic Psychology and Aristotelian-Thomistic Anthropological Philosophy.

^[1]Silviano de Jesús de Anda Ibarra

^[1] Decanato de Ciencias Sociales y Económico Administrativas.

Universidad Autónoma de Guadalajara. Av. Patria 1201, 45129, Zapopan, México.

^[1]silviano.deanda@edu.uag.mx

Article History

Volume 6, Issue 15, 2024

Received : 03 May 2024

Accepted : 28 Aug 2024

Published: 07 Sep 2024

[doi:10.48047/AFJBS.6.15.2024.3619-3625](https://doi.org/10.48047/AFJBS.6.15.2024.3619-3625)

Purpose: To suggest a vision where the postulates of humanistic psychology can be complemented, or even completed by the theoretical corpus of the Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophies.

Theoretical framework: consists on displaying the essential notions of both areas in order to set a scenario for comparison and posterior suggestion of integration.

Methodology/approach: applied was the four Aristotelian reasoning positions mentioned in the Organon: compatibilities, consecutions, contradictions and oppositions in order to identify the points of connection, of incompatibility and possible conciliations between both fields.

Findings: Because of its postulates about existence, essence, humanity, virtue, and happiness philosophical anthropology owns an immovable teleology, a clear destination for humankind potentialities and a solid "how" to identify, know and guide to the reach of that destination.

Research, Practical & Social Implication: When it comes to praxis the therapeutical area is not the expertise of a philosopher, this means humanistic psychology could integrate through its person-centered therapy the theoreticality of philosophical anthropology for guiding people to a healthier actualization.

Originality/Value: Because conciliation assures reaching higher levels of knowledge and, despite antithesis is essential to dialectize, a conciliation among different theoretical corpus can help to reach a healthier, cleared and solid ideal of humanity.

Index Terms—humanistic psychology, philosophic anthropology, Aristotelian-Thomistic.

I. INTRODUCTION

Humanism is a notion with many nuances dependable on the historical moment, humanistic psychology's theoretical background is the 20th century humanism while the Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophical anthropology is the root of humanism itself, consequently, this article works as a proposition of conciliation between these two humanistic fields through their postulates. The path to reach that purpose consists on setting a conceptual framework for displaying the postulates of humanistic psychology, philosophical anthropology in general, and the Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophical anthropology for developing a comparative analysis which finally allowed to draw conclusions.

II. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

A. Being, essence, existence, psyche, self.

Following mainly Thomist (but also Aristotelian tradition) [2], [9], [13] a being is any entity constituted by essence and existence, it could be purely abstract such as numbers, or combined (material-abstract) such as a building or a person. Essence can be understood as "what makes something or someone itself" for the consequence of a lack/modification of any essential constituent means to become another being. Existence is understood as being in a "present," that present can be chronological -here and now- or purely abstract -just now-. Psyche refers to the human dimension that is not bodily/corporal, therefore it will refer to any human

constitute or activity of abstract nature such as thinking, behaving, and even the notion of mind. Self is understood as a conscient being, a being capable of reflecting his own entity, psyche, essence, and existence, consequently someone aware of its individuality and uniqueness that permits to realize, configure, and consolidate an identity, an “I.”

B. Humankind, humanity, person, and personality.

Humankind is understood as the Aristotelian [3] “*zoon politikon*,” the civilized animal, when using this notion, it must be interpreted as a non-actualized being, a potential self. In contrast, humanity refers to the ideal actualization of humankind, a being consciously built by/in virtue, a being that has reached the self. The notion person refers just an individual of mankind, and personality refers to a person’s self.

C. Material Object

According to Aristotle [2], [9] seconded by Thomas Aquinas [17], the material object of any subject is the one that answers to these questions: with and on/in what the object of study manifests. When it comes to psychology and philosophical anthropology, the material object (cause) is a double one because both constituents of humankind (person) -body and psyche- are relevant, there’s no access to the psyche without a body and there’s no psychical manifestation without a body, consequently, both areas work with, on and in the body and the psyche. Nevertheless, philosophy tries to go beyond body and psyche, it looks for the ultimate reality of humankind, that’s why Choza [7] mentions that the (material) object of philosophy is the self not culture, or anything that has emerged from human behavior; therefore, the ultimate material object of philosophical anthropology is the essence/being/self of humanity.

D. Formal Object

According to Aristotle [2] and seconded by Thomas Aquinas [17], the formal object of any subject is the one that answers to these questions: “How” is “the ideal state” of the object of study, “how” does it manifest? These questions are the genesis of “the method” because that “how” reveals the way to know and reach the object of study. From an Aristotelian-Thomistic point of view the method in humanistic psychology can be understood in two ways: a theoretical one represented by epistemology, and a practical one manifested as research methodology through fulltime researchers’ praxis, or as therapy through psychologists daily professional activity, and even both, when psychologists are at the same time researchers and therapists.

On the other hand, the method of philosophical anthropology will be understood as a dialectic-ontological process which while nourishing from other sciences (specifically for this case: psychology) seeks to define a non-contradictory path (how) for knowing and achieving the final cause. Being more specific, for Aristotle [6] and Thomas Aquinas dialectic meant logic, therefore, their method is a complex system which seeks [6] well-grounded knowledge through the consecution, compatibility, contradiction and/or opposition among propositions, for this encounter of ideas allows interpretation and posteriorly the draw of conclusions.

E. Final Cause

According to Aristotle [2] and seconded by Thomas Aquinas [17], the Final Cause reveals the purpose of the object of study, therefore, reaching this cause answers why and what for phenomena (object of study) happen. By the other hand, recalling that any end is also a principle, answering why humankind is as it is (why) means answering how humankind should be (what for), in other words, what ideals any person is called to know and fulfill. For this article, the Final Cause can be understood as the “ultimate human actualization, the ultimate personality.”

F. Actualization

In humanistic psychology De Robertis and Bland [5], [10] politely polemized around the notion of “actualization” by emphasizing the importance of understanding concepts such as self-enriching and self-transcending because they are most indicative of world-openness, openness to the future, growth, and (as their names indicate) evolving selfhood. Historically, terms like self-realization, self-actualization, and self-fulfillment have been used to highlight this growth-oriented view of human development. These terms refer to the dynamically motivated process of “situated becoming oneself” in relation to time. Therefore “actualization” can be understood as the process of living resiliently despite one’s personal, environmental, and historical shortcomings and of overcoming obstacles (real and perceived) notwithstanding inherent risks, this is why Bland and De Robertis [5], [10] prefer to say “self-cultivation.”

When it comes to Aristotelian [2] and Thomistic [17] philosophy, actualization is at the same time a “moving towards a different/better state” and an “achievement,” due “potency” is any possibility for being and “act” is a certain way of being -both according to a determined essence-; when a being moves from potency to act, it can be said its essence/being has been “actualized.” When combining this reasoning to the postulates of humanistic psychology, human actualization means reaching an expected state in accordance with already existing essential potentialities, therefore, humankind is called to actualize their psychology through an already existing potential, and the epitome of human psychology actualization for Aristotle [3] and Thomas Aquinas [8] is virtue; this is why the trinomial psychology-behavior-ethics is indissoluble, and that’s why ethics are concerned in reaching a constant state of virtue.

Nevertheless, because the notion “actualization” coincides with both perspectives, when mentioned further on it will mean the ordered/virtuously development of the person (personality) while talking philosophically, and self-cultivation, enrichment, fulfillment, realization, when talking about humanistic psychology.

G. Virtue and happiness

Aristotle [3] seconded by Aquinas [8] defined ethical virtue as the middle point in between opposite extremes, in other words, virtue is the moderation between absence/deficiency and excess, this is why virtue is preferred for itself over the polarization of vices and even ascetism. This reasoning led these philosophers to the conclusion that “happiness” is the constant state of virtue, the prolongation of an equilibrated personality, consequently, -as mentioned before- the ultimate

human actualization is happiness, each person ultimately longs for a happy personality.

H. Epistemology

Mardones and Ursúa [16] posed the question: What do epistemologists do? The answer they gave is that they look for the genesis of scientific structures from a logical, historical, and sociological point of view, therefore they asked themselves: how is a scientific theory constructed? What is the roll of scientific praxis in the ideological and social context? By answering these questions, they conclude epistemology is the area that configures a general theory of knowledge, and/or the structure and genesis of science. Consequently, epistemology is a first approximation for studying the production of scientific knowledge under logic, linguistic, historic and ideologic perspectives: the epistemologist can analyze notions such as “scientific explanation,” “law,” “theory,” “experimentation,” and “verification.”

The epistemology of humanistic psychology is a dialectical result among the holism started by Dilthey, Nietzsche’s vitalism, Husserl, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, Sartre and others (onto)phenomenological perspective and the psychological vision of Maslow, Rogers, Adler and Allport [5],[10],[11],[12],[18],[19] among others; therefore, in this article, the epistemology of humanistic psychology will be understood as the interpretative background for signifying the collected data through therapy-methodology, and purely theoretical research; in other words, epistemology is the point of starting for building the attitude of humanistic psychology towards mankind/humanity. By the other hand, when it comes to Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy, the concept of epistemology is indeed irrelevant because it is much more recent than those philosophies and consequently it cannot frame them at all, this is why the concept epistemology for these philosophies is more a methodological step towards a universal order/hierarchy instead of a specific area.

I. Attitude

Dictionaries link the word attitude with opinion, behavior, position and even feelings about someone or something. For achieving the purpose of this article and based on the mentioned words, the suggested order to interpret/apply the word attitude is the feeling that develops an opinion which generates a behavior that concludes in a position towards humankind/humanity. For this article, attitude refers to the position towards the approaching and reaching of the ultimate human personality.

III. METHODOLOGY

Recurring to the essence of Aristotelian and Thomistic method, for this article the methodology consisted of the following steps: 1) the identification of the essential epistemological-methodological constituents of humanistic psychology. 2) Analyze the consecutions, compatibility, contradictions, and oppositions among humanistic psychology postulates. 3) Confront the notions of material/formal objects and final causes (postulates) of the Aristotelian-Thomist to the humanistic psychology. 4) Make an ontological evaluation through the notions of actualization to define the attitude each area has towards humankind and

consequently determining the complementarity between them. 5) Drawing of conclusions through observations, and if necessary, recommendations.

IV. ABOUT HUMANISTIC PSYCHOLOGY

Epistemology

Being epistemology the basis for drawing theoretical-interpretative conclusions that define a scientific attitude, it’s important to explore de process of how humanistic psychology has been integrated into the whole of philosophy.

Echevarría [11] mentions that psychotherapy and psychology are generally divided into three main groups: psychodynamic (psychoanalysis and its branches), cognitive-behavioral and humanistic, but even though this division doesn’t lack of foundations it’s imprecise because it omits important psychotherapeutic and psychology branches. This is why this author has decided to classify psychology-psychotherapy by distinguishing psychologies of responsibility from humanistic psychologies.

For sustaining the previous observation, Echevarría [11] mentions that on one way there’s a group of authors and currents which reacted against the pandeterminism of the unconscious psychologies (and Freud’s particularly), emphasizing the capital importance of reason, free will, finality and values. On the other side, “humanistic psychologies” emerged as an alternative to behaviorism and psychoanalysis, but, in contrast with the previous category, “the most human” in humankind is not always reason and free will, which are the foundations for liberty and responsibility.

On the other hand, De Robertis and Bland [10] affirm that humanistic psychology garners greater or lesser degrees of coverage by including Freudian psychosexual theory, Eriksonian psychosocial theory, behavioral learning theory, social learning or social–cognitive theory, Piagetian theory, and the theories of Vygotsky and Bronfenbrenner as eco-sensitive alternatives for developmental theory.

On the same page, De Robertis and Bland [10] reaffirm that the phenomenological emphasis of EHSDT (Existential-Humanistic Self-Development Theory) insists that developmental research should not remain exclusively tied to impersonal, third person, explanatory approaches to development. Rather, data collection ought to be sensitive to the dynamics of the whole developing person and include disciplined descriptive attempts to grasp development as a meaningfully structured individualized process. Consequently, phenomenology gives EHSDT research footing in the lifeworld rather than the world as construed by the scientist in the abstract, looking on as a disinterested, uninvolved observer. Tudor [18] also affirms that humanistic psychotherapy is heavily influenced by phenomenology and challenges the notion of ‘reality’; it represents subjectivist as distinct from objectivist approaches to psychological and social science such as nominalist views of ontology or the essence of things, voluntaristic views of human nature, anti-positivistic epistemologies, and ideographic methodologies.

Elkins [12] also contributes by saying that mainstream psychology is committed to the natural science paradigm as the “gold standard” in psychological research. Indeed, the commitment is so strong that it sometimes borders on “scientism,” which is the philosophical position that the methods of the natural sciences should be used in all

investigative endeavors. It is easy to forget that human beings choose their epistemological perspectives, which themselves are not scientifically verifiable. Humanistic psychologists are not opposed to the natural science model when it is appropriate to the phenomenon being studied.

Therapy:

Due to methodology emerges from epistemology, now it's important to dimension the roll of therapy because it's the daily methodology of fulltime researchers and psychologists, and which is constituted by strict research methodology: "how" to approach/know to the object of study, and/or "how" to guide towards the final cause. First, it's necessary to mention contemporary humanistic psychotherapies share several therapeutic evidence-based principles of practice, many of which are rooted in Rogers' person-centered therapy [5] -the main contribution of humanistic psychology is the change in the paradigm of psychotherapy- (in the opinion of several authors). Even though, Elkins [12] comments that although thousands of psychotherapists eschew the medical model and know that it does not accurately describe what actually occurs in therapy, the model remains the dominant descriptive schema for psychotherapy in mainstream psychology, in contrast, most humanistic psychologists view psychotherapy not so much as a "treatment for mental illness" as a liberating interpersonal process.

Bland and De Robertis [5] add that humanistic therapy assumes clients are holistic/irreducible (i.e., not determined by their past or conditioning, capable of agentic change) and that they are experts on their own experiences, their potentials within themselves, and the social, community, and cultural contexts within which they forge their identities and senses of control, responsibility, and teleological purpose. Thus, clients are granted an autonomous role in the therapy process, with therapists respecting their freedom and potential to make choices about whether and how to change.

Tudor [18] opines that this emphasis on the facilitative and even curative nature of the therapeutic relationship— or relating— derives from the humanistic view of human nature and especially the concept of the organism (which cannot be understood separate from its environment) and, arguably, a self which, as it develops, becomes ever more engaged with others and the world. This sense of interconnectedness is reflected in the importance of the social group (Adler) and human kinship (Maslow), of relationship with the other (Buber), of the trend to homonymy or belonging alongside that of autonomy (Angyal), and of *Mitwelt* or the social world (Binswanger). From this it may be understood that, despite the criticism levelled at humanism and, more broadly, Western psychology, of an over-emphasis on the individual and a self-obsessed self, humanistic psychology actually represents the person and a psychology which are concerned with self-and-other and the world.

V. ABOUT PHILOSOPHICAL ANTHROPOLOGY IN GENERAL

Why was philosophical anthropology born? Amengual [1] mentions that the two main questions which have led to the dawn of this philosophical knowledge are: what is mankind's being/self, and, how to set order in the plurality of ideas developed by the sciences occupied on studying humankind? The same Amengual [1] answers that philosophical anthropology studies the totality of humankind which specific characteristic is to display and hierarchize the

totality, the unity, integrality and globality of mankind's essence for understanding its place along the cosmos, in contrast with the partial-sectorial approach proper to each human science.

What is the attitude of philosophical anthropology towards humankind's knowledge? Ibañez [14] explains that the object of study of philosophical anthropology is the ultimate reflection about humankind/humanity and its ontological constitution (self). It seeks to answer what is humankind in the most profound and radical sense, that's why this anthropology is the area of philosophy that studies humankind through philosophical methods (what ancient Greeks and medieval named psychology).

Consequently, Ibañez [14] concludes that philosophical anthropology is not just a superior elaboration of experimental sciences results, it has its own ontological formal perspective. Positive sciences are intrinsically linked to the human phenomenon, the perceptive regularities, and particular manifestations; anthropological philosophy is interested on the internal consistency, the universality, the ultimate and intimate substantiality of humankind/humanity.

On this same perspective, Kramsky [15] hierarchizes the anthropological knowledge in three levels, which are (in chronological-configuration-accessibility order): Common Spontaneous Anthropology, Scientific Experimental Anthropology and Philosophical Anthropology. Common Spontaneous Anthropology is methodless because it's the elemental nonsystematic empirical knowledge each human individual possesses according to time, space, and knowledge capacities, or in other words: age, environment, and cognitive capabilities; this anthropological knowledge is what every person knows just because of existing surrounded by certain natural-cultural environment that stimulates their cognition/knowledge.

Scientific Experimental Anthropology is constituted primordially by Philosophical Anthropology and Experimental Psychology (following Kramsky's reasoning other sciences can be classified here). Philosophical Anthropology nourishes from Experimental Psychology due to its positivistic-experimental method characterized by approaching to its material object (the knowledge of mankind vital activities and phenomena) through immediate-phenomenological causes, which by the way is insufficient for incompletely answering to: where does mankind come, what is the sense of human existence, is humankind called to a certain destiny? These questions lead the philosophical knowledge of humankind to seek its vital root, what determines the substantial structure which allows phenomena to manifest, the existence, the nature of the principles that sustain and enable the acts of psyche justifying then the unity and order among mankind multi-vital activities.

On this same direction Choza [7] mentions that its necessary to start sketching an integration model for positive anthropologies, which is only achievable from the supreme epistemological level of philosophy. Acquired knowledge of humankind cannot be integrated if it's ignored what humanity is, and the range of action that positive sciences have in it. This is important because philosophy always tend to guide actions to desirable ends and the end of ends is only defined by philosophy. The same Choza [7] continues

affirming that what is proper to philosophy is to tell what and how mankind, society, history, culture are, because human sciences or social sciences aspire to the degree of rigor, exactitude and predictability which characterizes natural sciences, but it corresponds to philosophy the determination of how truthful social sciences are to what mankind/humanity is, and what is still to know about it beyond those sciences. Lastly, if all theories about mankind are philosophical theories, the ultimate criterion for valuating positive anthropologies is philosophy.

VI. ABOUT ARISTOTELIAN-THOMIST ANTHROPOLOGICAL PHILOSOPHY.

There's no human praxis without theorization because no matter how spontaneous a person action appears to be, there's a rational background to it, and there's no theoretical knowledge that is not constituted and enriched by praxis, therefore: people's praxis reflects humanity's way of thinking, and a way of thinking is at the same time the reflection how people have been living (actualizing/behaving).

The notion of life is key for understanding Aristotelian-Thomistic anthropology, this is why Kramsky [15] differentiates three senses or life dimensions: strict, extensive, and metaphorical. The strict sense refers exclusively to the existence of a being/self (which sometimes may be elusive in Aristotle for the absence of the notion existence), to the fact of being in a present that permits to configure the extensive sense of life, the sense characterized by the actualization of psycho-somatic potencies into vital operations, which at the same times enables to configure the philosophical (metaphorical) sense by understanding life as an opportunity for directing the actualization of the human self towards the final cause and even transcendence.

Another pilar for Aristotelian [2], and Thomistic [17] philosophies is hierarchy, because its semantics in both doctrines' corpus can be interpreted as "architectonical, causal, natural, essential, and ordered" among others, and which tries to display reality as the result of a hierarchized causality; consequently, when this vision of "order" impregnates psychology, personality can be understood as a building for, as buildings -personality- also is on the need for foundations and, according to the characteristics of those foundations upper levels will be solid or fragile. Therefore, a systematical process of causes and effects must be clearly design for building a personality. But, how to know what is the healthiest cause-effect way to build a personality? The answer is knowing human nature -the essence of humanity- because that essence is where all human potentialities are and, therefore the key for an ordered/hierarchized human actualization, it's into the essence where ideal actualization can be found.

Consequently, solidly theorizing a hierarchized actualization clears the path for a hierarchized praxis which for Aristotle and Aquinas [3] [9] turns to be virtue, because it is the middle point in between two extremes, an equilibrium that works as principle for the main virtues: temperance, fortitude, justice, and prudence; this is why, virtues are the constituents of a hierarchized actualization. As exemplification, a child's psycho-somatic actualization differs from an adult's or and elder's because, even though

ideal actualization answers essentially to the human nature, it also answers specifically to the life stage each person is living, any alteration produces a disordered actualization.

This is why (as discussed before) a psycho-philosophical, or an "onto-psychological" knowledge of humankind /humanity characterized by unity, clarity and order is needed, that's why the genius of Aristotle developed an interconnected corpus where the "Treatise of the Soul" or "Peri Psyche" is the basis that sustains the Aristotelian Cognitive theory [4] which at the same time sustains his Behavioral theory, or better said "Ethics" [3]. Thomas Aquinas [8] on his part continued that unity, that interconnection and commented, corrected, and enriched both treaties through the contributions of Boethius, Agustine of Hippo, Avicenna, Averroes, and his mentor Albert Magnus, among others.

Following this reasoning then, and putting all "religious spirituality" aside, what was the ultimate destination for a person according to Aristotle [2] and Thomas Aquinas [8] that demanded and justified an anthropological knowledge? To where do all humankind psycho-somatic potentialities are directed, and consequently, what is the ultimate state a person is called to achieve through the binomial theory-praxis? What is the final cause of humanity? The answer is Happiness. Due to humanity itself spins around the conception of life, it is the only certain "meanwhile" where all potentially for happiness can be actualized. So, what is happiness for Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophies? A constant state of virtue, a constant hierarchized actualization which essentially calls humanity to happiness (Aristotle) but accordingly to the specific stage of life each person lives in (Aquinas). This means all the anthropological knowledge developed by Aristotle and Aquinas was to elucidate a theoretical background for the notion of happiness in order to sustain a praxis (how) to achieve that ideal.

So, till this far humanistic psychology and philosophical anthropology seem to be quite alike, is there actually a difference between the actualization of humanistic psychology and the Aristotelian-Thomistic anthropology?

The key for the answer lies on the following reasoning: [18] the onto-phenomenology which is the ultimate background of humanistic psychology affirms existence precedes essence. For Aristotle [13] there's no concept of existence as such only the notion of act, and the semantics of notions such as essence, being, self and person constantly fluctuate, consequently, for the Greek philosopher there was no existence that actualizes an essence but the "motion act" (energeia) that allow to move from pure potency to a "concluded act" (entelecheia). Thomas Aquinas [13] on the other hand continued the path started by Boethius deepening and integrating the notion of existence to Aristotelian philosophy, for Aquinas both -essence and existence- are constituents of being/self, and even though when theoretically it's possible to separate/differentiate essence from existence allowing to define existence as the actualizer of essence, praxis is diametrically contrasting because both constituents are inseparable, an existence without essence is as impossible as an essence without existence.

If there's no essence, what does exist? what is to be actualized? If there's no existence, how can essence be actualized? Therefore, the reasoning of humanistic

psychology that affirms existence precedes essence is unsustainable, and the notion of existence contains both actualities -motion and completion-, consequently because humanistic psychology's philosophical postulate is contradictory, and the Aristotelian is insufficient, the comparison and conciliation will ultimately happen through Thomistic philosophy.

VII. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Strong Compatibilities and Consecutions

The nature of compatibility leads to the non-contradictions that permit a non-obstruction on reasoning and therefore a fluent dialectic. The first strong point on which both areas coincide is the material object (body-psyche) because both are interested on teleologically accessing to the psyche, and the first step is the phenomenon of corporality. The second strong point is the notion of actualization because both areas coincide on understanding actualization as development. The third strong point is understanding development as a meaningful structured individualized process, which due to its resilient nature and person-centered therapy is mainly an individual purposeful organismic liberating teleological process, which is totally compatible with the specificity of each life-stage-actualization that emphasizes the interconnection among self, the other and the world.

Non-conciliatory postulates

These non-conciliatory postulates are meant to take aside because of its contrasting nature to the purpose of philosophical anthropology and to the postulates of Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophies. The first non-conciliatory postulate is the antipositivism of certain humanistic psychologists because as mentioned before, philosophical anthropology needs the positivistic research, actually, it's thanks to positivistic sciences that philosophical anthropology has knowledge to criticize, and to hierarchize. This sense of hierarchization is the reason why the standardized application of natural sciences paradigm/method is counterproductive, for it means reducing to only one perspective a phenomenon. These two previous incompatibilities belong to an epistemological nature, but the main and most dangerous incompatibility is the postulate of philosophical nature that existence precedes essence. This postulation is contradictory to the concept of essence itself because essence is characterized by its invariability, therefore, while affirming existence "exists" without an essence leads to the conclusion that essence can be constantly reconstructed -not enriched or developed- through existence. Also, this postulate is opposite to the very reasoning of humanistic psychology, because if humanistic psychologists emphasize the importance of knowing humankind/humanity's essence due to the previous conclusion, how to know what is the true essence? how to know what essence to follow mostly when performing a therapeutical process?

Conciliatory-Complementary Differences

Epistemologically speaking, the three levels of philosophical anthropology work as a conciliation with humanistic psychology and enrichment for both because it permits to hierarchize particular, general and universal anthropological knowledge; particular is equal to the spontaneous level which is of a personal nature, general

knowledge is for scientific-experimental anthropology which is of an epistemological (methodological) nature characterized by a holistic view, and the universal level for philosophical knowledge. At the same time, spontaneous and experimental anthropology cover the immediate-perceptive regularities and particular manifestations of the phenomenological method, while the philosophical level conciliates everything through the internal consistency, universality, and ultimate intimate substantiality of humankind/humanity. When it comes to therapy, the phenomenological method is totally compatible with the first two senses of life -strict and extensive-, which also reinforces the idea that subjectivity is other type of objectivity; this means that through the method, essential components of subjectivity (personality) can be objectivize and consequently "teleologize;" here is where the metaphorical (philosophical sense) through the praxis of virtue enriches and complements the teleology of therapy in the consecution of the ultimate personality, in pursuit of happiness.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a final conclusion it can be said that because of its postulates about existence, essence, humanity, virtue, and happiness philosophical anthropology owns an immovable teleology, a clear destination for humankind potentialities and a solid "how" to identify, know and guide to the reach of that destination. Nevertheless, when it comes to praxis the therapeutical area is not the expertise of a philosopher, this means that humanistic psychology through their person-centered therapy could integrate the theoreticality of philosophical anthropology for guiding people to a healthier actualization. This also could help philosophical anthropologists to intensify the knowledge nourishing process from positivistic sciences and indirectly be closer to praxis; for humanistic psychologists it can help them to surpass the limitations of their epistemological interpretations by philosophizing them, which means a unification of humanistic psychology postures through a universal hierarchization of knowledge. This is why, it's recommended to integrate both areas because due to the teleology of Aristotelian-Thomistic, humanistic therapy could potentialize the attitude of humanistic psychologist towards therapy as not just a treatment for illness but as a self-liberation process. The attitude, -the feeling that develops an opinion which generates a behavior that concludes in a position towards humankind/humanity- of humanistic therapy could be the one of an invitation to a process of naturally-orderly-hierarchically actualize personal potentialities in order to build the ultimate personality as a constant effort for extending the state of virtue, of happiness.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Amengual, "Antropología Filosófica," BAC, pp.3-14, 2007.
- [2] Aristóteles, "Ἀριστοτέλους Τα Μετα Τα φυσικά, Aristotelis Metaphysica, Metafísica de Aristóteles," Gredos, 1998.
- [3] Aristóteles, "Ἠθica y Política," Gredos, 2014.
- [4] Aristóteles, "Física, Acerca del Alma, Poética," Gredos, pp.50-55, 2014.
- [5] A. M. Bland, E. M. DeRobertis. "Humanistic Perspective," Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual differences, pp.1-19, 2019.

- [6] M. Candel Sanmartín, "Aristóteles. Tratados de Lógica," Gredos, 294-299, 2015.
- [7] J. Choza, "Antropologías positivas y antropología filosófica," Thémata, 2 ed., pp. 165-171, 2015.
- [8] S.T. De Aquino, "Comentario a la Ética a Nicómaco de Aristóteles," EUNSA, 2010.
- [9] S. T. De Aquino, "El ente y la esencia," UANL, 2000.
- [10] E. M. DeRobertis, A. M. Bland, "Lifespan human development and 'the humanistic perspective': a contribution toward inclusion," The Humanistic Pshychologist, pp.1-25, 2019.
- [11] M. F. Echavarría, "Corrientes de Psicología Contemporánea," UCALP, pp. 485-534, 2011.
- [12] D. N. Elkins, "Why Humanistic Psychology lost its power and Influence in American Psychology," Journal of Humanistic Psychology, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 284-285, 2009.
- [13] E. Gilson, "El ser y los filósofos," EUNSA, 3 ed., 1996.
- [14] J. M. Ibañez Langlois, "Introducción a la antropología filosófica," EUNSA, 6 ed, pp. 11-15, 2007.
- [15] C. Kramsky Steimpreis, "Antropología Filosófica," CEIDSA, pp.9-39, 1997.
- [16] J.M. Mardones, N. Ursúa, "Filosofía de las ciencias humanas y sociales. Materiales para fundamentación científica" Fontamara, pp. 39-45, 1982.
- [17] M. A. Santos Sánchez. "Opúsculos y Cuestiones Selectas," BAC, pp. 31-77, 2001.
- [18] K. Tudor, "Humanistic psychology: A critical counter culture." Handbook of Critical Psychology, pp.127, 2015.
- [19] A. S. Waterman, "The humanistic psychology-positive psychology divide. Contrasts in philosophical foundations," American Psychologist, vol.68, no.3, pp. 124-133, 2013.