



Universiteit  
Leiden

The Netherlands

## **Categorial hylomorphism: an inquiry into the significance of categories for the doctrine of hylomorphism through a confrontation of the ideas of Aristotle and Kant**

Pantoja Quiroz, D.R.

### **Citation**

Pantoja Quiroz, D. R. (2026, February 19). *Categorial hylomorphism: an inquiry into the significance of categories for the doctrine of hylomorphism through a confrontation of the ideas of Aristotle and Kant*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4292367>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4292367>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# CATEGORIAL HYLOMORPHISM:

**An Inquiry into the Significance of Categories for the Doctrine of  
Hylomorphism through a Confrontation of the Ideas of Aristotle and  
Kant**

DANIEL PANTOJA



# CATEGORIAL HYLOMORPHISM:

## An Inquiry into the Significance of Categories for the Doctrine of Hylomorphism through a Confrontation of the Ideas of Aristotle and Kant

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van  
de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,  
op gezag van rector magnificus prof.dr. S. de Rijcke,  
volgens besluit van het college voor promoties  
te verdedigen op donderdag 19 februari 2026  
klokke 11.30 uur

door

DANIEL RIENZI PANTOJA QUIROZ

geboren te Valparaíso, Chili  
in 1986

Promotores: Prof. dr. James McAllister  
Prof. dr. Hernán Pringe (Diego Portales  
University-Buenos Aires University)

Copromotor: Dr. Maria van der Schaar

Promotiecommissie: Dr. Bernardo Ainbinder (University of  
Wollongong)  
Prof. dr. Frans de Haas  
Prof. dr. Tuomas Tahko (University of Bristol)  
Dr. Marijana Vujosevic

This research was supported by the Chilean Research Council (CONICYT-ANID) via a National PhD Grant (No. 21171891, 2017–2021).

Printing: Ridderprint, [www.ridderprint.nl](http://www.ridderprint.nl)  
Cover Design by Nicolás Del Canto

*To my mother*



εἰ δ' ἐστίν, ὥσπερ λέγομεν, τὸ μὲν ὕλη τὸ δὲ μορφή, καὶ  
τὸ μὲν δυνάμει τὸ δὲ ἐνεργείᾳ, οὐκέτι ἀπορία δόξειεν ἂν  
εἶναι τὸ ζητούμενον.

ARISTOTLE, *Metaph.*, 1045a23–25

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	11
ABBREVIATIONS .....	12
INTRODUCTION .....	13
PART I .....	41
CATEGORIAL FORMS AND FORMATION .....	41
CHAPTER 1 .....	43
ON THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN NON-FUNCTIONAL AND FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIAL FORMS.....	43
1. INTRODUCTION.....	43
2. METHODOLOGICAL REMARKS ON THE CONFRONTATION BETWEEN ARISTOTLE AND KANT .....	45
3. A SCIENCE FINISHED AND COMPLETE .....	48
3.1 <i>The Relevance of General Logic for Kant's Transcendental Project</i> .....	49
3.2 <i>The Aristotelian Roots of Kant's Table of Judgments</i> .....	52
3.2.1 Quantity and Quality.....	55
3.2.2 Modality .....	58
3.2.3 Relation .....	59
3.3 <i>Final Remarks</i> .....	62
4. ARISTOTLE FROM CATEGORIES TO JUDGMENT.....	63
4.1 <i>Introduction</i> .....	63
4.2 <i>On the Categorial Distinction Between Substance and Accident</i> .....	65
4.3 <i>Categories as "things said without combination"</i> .....	67
4.3.1 Categorical and Syncategorematic Terms .....	69
4.3.2 The Onomastic and the Apophantic Level.....	71
4.4 <i>Final Remarks</i> .....	76
5. KANT'S FUNCTIONALIZATION OF CATEGORIES.....	77
5.1 <i>Introduction</i> .....	77
5.2 <i>Identification versus Composition</i> .....	79
5.3 <i>Remarks on the Hylomorphic Character of Transcendental Logic</i> .....	82
5.4 <i>A Difference Concerning Substance and Accident</i> .....	87
5.5 <i>Final Remark (Transition to Chapter 2)</i> .....	88
CHAPTER 2 .....	91
ESSENTIAL AND FUNCTIONAL FORMS AND FORMATION .....	91
1. INTRODUCTION.....	91
2. METHODOLOGICAL NOTE.....	93
3. ARISTOTLE'S ESSENTIAL HYLOMORPHISM AND FORMATION.....	94
3.1 <i>First Approach to the Distinction between Substantial and Accidental Compounds</i> .....	94
3.2 <i>Substantial Hylomorphism and Formation</i> .....	98
3.2.1 Introduction to Substantial Hylomorphism.....	98
3.2.2 Aristotelian Substantial Forms and Substantial Formation.....	102
3.2.2.1 The Logico-functional Role of Substantial Forms.....	105

3.3 <i>Accidental Hylomorphism and Formation</i> .....	109
3.3.1 Introduction to Accidental Forms.....	109
3.3.2 Accidental Forms .....	110
3.3.3 Accidental Compounds .....	113
3.3.4 Accidental Formation as Mere Qualification .....	115
3.4 <i>Final Remarks</i> .....	119
4. KANT'S FUNCTIONAL HYLOMORPHISM AND FORMATION .....	120
4.1 <i>Introduction</i> .....	120
4.2 <i>Kant's Hylomorphic Doctrine of the Object</i> .....	121
4.3 <i>Kant's Functional Formation versus Aristotle's Essential Formation</i> .....	126
5. FINAL REMARKS .....	130
<b>PART II</b> .....	<b>133</b>
<b>CATEGORIAL HYLOMORPHISM AND HIERARCHICAL COMPOSITION</b> .....	<b>133</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3</b> .....	<b>135</b>
<b>THE POWER OF MATTER</b> .....	<b>135</b>
1. INTRODUCTION.....	135
2. ARISTOTLE ON MATTER AND HIERARCHICAL HYLOMORPHISM.....	138
2.1 <i>Introduction</i> .....	138
2.2 <i>Absolute and Relative Matter in Aristotle's Hylomorphism</i> .....	139
2.2.1 Prime and Ultimate Matter.....	143
2.2.2 A Hierarchical Conception of Matter or a Hierarchical Conception of Hylomorphism? .....	146
2.2.3 Matter and the Logico-functional Character of Substantial Form .....	151
2.3 <i>The Case of Accidental Compounds. Can Substance be Matter for the Accidental Form?</i> .....	153
2.4 <i>Final Remarks (Transition to Section 3)</i> .....	156
3. KANT ON MATTER AND HIERARCHICAL HYLOMORPHISM .....	158
3.1 <i>Introduction</i> .....	158
3.2 <i>On Kant's Relative and Hylomorphic Conception of Matter</i> .....	158
3.3 <i>An Analogical Approach to Kant's General Categorical Hylomorphism</i> .....	166
3.3.1 The Case of Quantity and Quality .....	168
3.3.2 The Case of Modality.....	173
3.3.3 First Part of the Confrontation between Aristotle's and Kant's Hierarchical Composition of the Object .....	177
3.4 <i>The Matter, Form and Hierarchical Composition of Relations</i> .....	181
3.4.1 Introduction .....	181
3.4.2 The Peculiarity of the Categories of Relation .....	182
3.4.2.1 On the Distinction between Mathematical and Dynamical Categories .....	183
3.4.2.2 On the Distinction between the Dynamical Categories of Relation and Modality .....	187
3.4.3 An Analogical Approach to Kant's Relational Hylomorphism.....	192
3.4.3.1 The Matter, Form and Hierarchical Structure of the Judgments of Relation ...	193
3.4.3.2 The Matter, Form and Hierarchical Composition of Experience.....	196
3.4.3.2.1 Preliminary Remarks Concerning the Analogies of Experience .....	198
3.4.3.2.2 The Material Character of the substantia phaenomenon.....	201

3.4.3.2.3 The Formal Character of the Category of ‘Cause and Effect’ in the Context of the Second Analogy of Experience .....	205
3.4.3.2.4 Matter, Form, ‘Interaction’ and ‘Community’ .....	214
3.4.3.2.4.1 Remarks on the Analogy between the Hylomorphic Structure of Judgment and the Hylomorphic Structure of the Object .....	232
4. FINAL PART OF THE CONFRONTATION BETWEEN ARISTOTLE AND KANT. KANT’S EXPANSION OF THE ONTOLOGICAL SCOPE OF HYLOMORPHISM .....	237
<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>245</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>261</b>
<b>SAMENVATTING .....</b>	<b>269</b>
<b>CURRICULUM VITAE .....</b>	<b>273</b>

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest academic gratitude goes to my supervisors. James McAllister and Hernán Pringe, I thank you for your helpful suggestions and insights throughout this process. I am particularly grateful to Maria van der Schaar, whose indefatigable work in providing detailed commentary and revision suggestions, as well as her probing questions, was instrumental in bringing this dissertation to its final form.

I would also like to thank the Chilean National Agency for Research and Development (ANID) for their generous financial support, which made the research presented in this dissertation possible by granting me a doctoral fellowship for the years 2017–2021.

Several scholars shaped my intellectual path to this project. Bernardo Ainbinder, my MA supervisor, provided crucial guidance in developing the initial research proposal and continued to offer his support in subsequent years. Alejandro Vigo's work and seminars on Aristotle, Kant and Husserl, which I attended in 2016 and 2017, have had a lasting influence on my philosophical approach. I would also like to thank Tuomas Tahko, whom I met in 2019, for his valuable insights during the early stages of this project. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to Tania Squizzato, my former Ancient Greek professor, for instilling in me a sense of rigour and discipline, which were indispensable tools for the completion of this thesis.

For support that went far beyond philosophical discussion, I would like to thank my friend, Erwin Tegtmeier, whose encouragement has been a constant source of reassurance throughout these years.

I would also like to thank my friends Ilse Zweegers and Dennis van der Weerd for making my stay in the Netherlands during 2019 and 2020 more comfortable and smooth.

My most profound personal thanks go to my family. Although my parents are no longer with us, their guidance remains foundational. To my father, who instilled in me the love of reading and showed me the value of discipline; and to my mother, who taught me what true freedom and strength of will mean. The spirit of independence and rigorous inquiry they fostered is, I hope, reflected in the pages of this dissertation.

Finally, and most importantly, my deepest thanks to Alejandra Baehr, the partner of my life: without her unwavering support in every conceivable way, this work would never have come to fruition.

## ABBREVIATIONS

### WORKS OF ARISTOTLE:

*Cat.* = *Categoriae et liber de interpretatione*

*Metaph.* = *Metaphysica*

*Phys.* = *Physica*

*Top.* = *Topica et sophisticus elenchi*

### WORKS OF KANT:

*KrV* = *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*

*Log.* = *Jäsche Logik*