
Isn't what my view comes to something like the following?

(1) There is a distinction to be made between two levels of living understandingly: the primary level of **self-understanding and life-praxis** and the secondary level of **critical reflection and proper theory**.

(2) There is a further distinction to be made between **the broadly natural** and **the broadly moral**, the first having to do with reality (= *physis=natura*="process"), and the second having to do with human action in relation to, or in the context of, reality.

(3) There is yet another distinction to be made between **the categorial** and **the transcendental** as levels both of the broadly natural and the broadly moral and of the two levels of living understandingly, "life-praxis" being the categorial level of living understandingly on the primary level, "self-understanding," its transcendental level.

Given these three distinctions, one may say that, just as **morality** as a distinct form of self-understanding and life-praxis is a matter of the broadly moral at the categorial level, so **religion** as yet another distinct form of self-understanding and life-praxis is a matter of the broadly moral at the transcendental level.

Similarly, one may say that, whereas **science** as a distinct form of critical reflection and proper theory concerns itself with the broadly natural at the categorial level, **metaphysics** as yet another distinct form of critical reflection and proper theory is also concerned with the broadly natural, albeit at the transcendental level.

In summary, then, I should want to say that, just as at the primary level of self-understanding and life-praxis morality and religion are both matters of the broadly moral, morality at the categorial level, and religion at the transcendental, so at the secondary level of critical reflection science and metaphysics are both concerned with the broadly natural, science at the categorial level and metaphysics at the transcendental.

What I need to explore with some care is a concept of the "practical" broad enough to include both self-understanding and praxis; and a concept of the "theoretical" broad enough to include both deliberate, methodical, and reasoned reflection on the validity claims expressed or implied by self-understanding and the same kind or level of critical reflection on the validity claims expressed or implied by praxis.

Assuming the validity of such concepts of the "practical" and the "theoretical," I need to determine the validity of the following theses:

1. The theory cognate with any given practice (whether at the level of self-understanding or at the level of praxis) derives not only from asking and answering questions of reflection concerning the validity of the claims expressed or implied by the practice but also from asking and answering such questions of reflection as questions of study, and thus in a deliberate, methodical, and reasoned way.

2. A professional properly so-called is a person who engages in a given practice not only reflectively but also on the basis of study, and thus is guided by the theory cognate with the practice in question.

March 1987