

DB: 8-23-12

## Topics Ch 14

Name of the Father, the son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

God our enlightenment

Guardian angels strengthen the light of our minds

Order and illumine our images and arouse us to consider more correctly

St. Thomas Aquinas Angelic doctor

Help us to understand all that you have written.

Name of the Father, the son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Shakespeare's Definition of reason (from the *Exhortation to Use Reason*)

- Def: Capability for large discourse looking before and after
  - *sn*: from St. Thomas' *Disputed Questions on Power*
    - *Whether the son can have a son*
      - 1st argument:
        - if the son had a word,
        - then the word would have a word, then there would be discourse (running through) in God
        - But there is no discourse in God
        - Therefore the son does not have a word
    - Discourse: (the sense used in the definition): coming to know what you don't know from what you do know
      - None of this in God
- Large discourse vs. Looking before and after (comparison)
  - *Looking before and after* is what reason is trying to do in its *discourse*
  - Reason *looks before and after*
    - 1) in the thing that it is thinking about
    - 2) in its own discourse
      - Ex. Premise *before* conclusion
      - Genus is *before* species
- Large discourse (vs. Small discourse)
  - Shakespeare calls reason the ability for *large* discourse instead of *small* discourse because you define an ability by its utmost
  - And ability for *large* discourse includes the ability for *small* discourse
    - Ex. You say a man can lift 100 pounds if that is the most, but not 50 pounds, since included in the ability for lifting 100 pounds is the ability to lift 50 pounds
- 3 ways discourse can be called large [what is an example of a small vs. Large discourse?]
  - 1) about the large

- A. Covers a large area (by considering the universal)
  - A consideration about *being* will consider a vast quantity of things or all being
  - Or reason can consider a person, in which case it's discourse will be small
- B. Large in greatness
  - Reason can consider small things (we sometimes call this 'small talk')
  - Ex. The weather
  - Reason can consider great things
    - Ex. The universe, the soul, God
- The wise man's discourse is large in both of these senses
  - For he considers the most universal *being* and *one* (A)
  - He considers God himself (in the 12 bk of the metaphysics)
- 2) limits are large
  - A. From the beginning (is called large based on a consideration of many singulars)
    - 'this is based upon a large induction'
    - Large induction: an induction from many singulars
    - But because it *begins* from many singulars it's discourse is called large
  - B. From the end (many conclusions follow from one principle)
    - Ex. In geometry we start with a few principles but end with many conclusions
    - Ex2. Mathematical equation ( $f=ma$ ) from this one formula an *infinity* of numbers can arise
  - The wise man's discourse is large in both of these areas
    - M. Dionne "wisdom depends on experience" (A)
      - But not a knowledge of many singulars, but rather of a knowledge of particular sciences, and so it can be said to be most large
      - So the wise man's induction is even more large than the induction of the particular sciences
      - Sn: Aristotle moves from each of the particular sciences to rise to the same science (Metaphysics studies being as being)
        - Logic: bk 7 being as being divided into the figures of predication to being as being. Start from substance to being as being
        - Geom: bk 4 moves from numeric one to one as being to being as being
        - NatScience: bk 9 moves from act and ability and moves to pure act (being as being)
    - Principles learned in Metaphysics extend to all kinds of things (b)
      - For it judges all the other sciences
- 3) the distance traveled is large

- Perhaps a better way to think of it is as a *long* discourse
- A. Long if it goes through many steps
  - Ex. The Pythagorean theorem takes many steps, for it is prop 47.
    - So whoever wants to learn this must learn all 46 props prior to this prop (a very long way indeed)
    - “there’s no royal road to geometry” (there’s no short cut)
- B. Long if it goes between things very far apart in its nature
  - Ex. From motion (imperfect act) to God (pure act).
  - This is a long move, though the argument may not take many steps
- Discourse (which literally means to run from one to another)
  - 1st sense: running from one thing to another
  - 2nd sense: (the one which defines reason) is *running* from the things that you do know to what you don’t know (coming to what you don’t know through what you do know)
    - M#5: logic/ logistics (both are named from *logos*: the Greek for reason)
      - Logic: art of defining and reasoning
      - Logistics: art of counting and calculating
    - These are the two main ways that reason goes from what it does know to what I don’t know
    - This validates what Shakespeare is using discourse
- Looking before and after
  - (what sense of *looking* does he have in mind?)
    - 3 sense of looking
      - Look with eyes
      - Imagine (look with imagination)
        - “I can see my father now, in my mind’s eye” - Hamlet (in his imagination)
      - Understand (look with reason)
  - (what sense of before and after does he mean? (ch 12 of Categories))
    - 4/5 senses
      - 1. Time
      - 2. Being
        - What does not reciprocate as a consequence of being
        - A can be without B, but B can not be without A, then A is *before* B in being
        - M#4: water can be without lemonade but lemonade can’t be without water
      - 3. Order (of knowing)
        - Any road in our knowledge will be in this sense
      - 4. Nobility/ honor/ in goodness
        - Ex. I put Mozart before Haydn, since his music is better. Even though Haydn is before in time

- (what sense of before, does one sense of before come before another sense of before?)
  - 3rd sense, since we name things as we know them.
  - Sn: we name things as we know them, but we know continuous first, therefore we name continuous things first
    - And every word can be brought back to a 1st meaning as it is applied to something continuous.
  - Before (the progression of its senses) (each are similar and share some likeness to the prior one)
    - 1st. Before in time
    - 2nd. In motion (what is measured by time)
    - 3rd. In place (for things move in place)
    - 4th. In being (I must pass through some places before I move to the end, but I can not move to the end without passing through some places), this is similar to being, since something can be without the other, but another can not be without the first, just like the places along the road)
      - Is it difficult to be good, no
        - But it is difficult to become good.
      - In other words, for some things I must *become*, before I can *be*
        - Ex. M#5. I must *become* good before I can *be* good, but I can be *becoming* good, though not *be* good
    - 5th. In knowing (certain knowledge must be known before other kinds of knowledge)
      - Ex. Knowledge of a triangle depends on the knowledge of a line, but the knowledge of a line is not dependent on the knowledge of the line
    - 6th. In honor
      - Some knowledge is better than other knowledge, and therefore, we notice some things are better than others
  - The 5th sense
    - The cause is before the effect (it is more like the 2nd)
      - As the effect depends on the cause, what is after in being depends on the prior being
      - But they are distinct because the effect and cause always go together, while the two subsequent beings do not always have to be together

- Ex. The fact that you are sitting is the cause of the truth of the statement 'you are sitting', but they arise simultaneously, and necessarily simultaneously
- [so what sense of before does Shakespeare mean here]
  - All of the senses, however, the 5th sense, the cause before the effect, is a great concern of the philosopher, and perhaps looking before and after in this sense is what lends itself to 'large' discourse
  - While looking before and after in the 1st sense (time) might not be a large discourse (this is why history is lesser consideration than philosophy)

What follows from this definition of reason

- [if reason is able to look before and after, it must be able to look?]
  - Sn: homer. [man not being able to look 'before and behind himself']
    - Both Shakespeare and Homer (the two greatest poets) have a very similar definition of reason
- It must be able to distinguish
  - Since nothing is before nor after itself
  - Then looking before and after necessitates seeing two things being distinct
    - M #4: if you want to say which wine is better (Cab Sav or Pino) then you must first be able to distinguish between the two. If you cant distinguish between the two, then you can't tell which is better)
- In the beginning of the of the Physics and also the 5th book of the Metaphysics Aristotle begins with a exposition of the *Beginning/ principle, cause, element*
  - [what is the order of these three]
    - General to the particular: every element is a cause (material cause), but not every cause is an element
    - Every beginning is a cause, but not every beginning is a cause
      - Ex. God is a principle is a principle of the son, but not the cause
- Principle, cause, element : distinction, division, definition :: universal: less universal
  - Every definition is a division (of the genus and difference)
  - Every division is a distinction (of the whole from the part, or part from part)
    - Two kinds of division
      - 1. Integral/ composed whole into its part part
        - Ex. C part of CAT
      - 2. Universal whole into its parts
        - Ex. Species part of genus
- THEREFORE: if reason can see a distinction, then it can see a division, then it can see a definition

- Definition: a main kind of discourse, a main way of coming to know what you don't know from what you do know
- [what would you say about an animal who can see divisions, but can not define?]
  - But they do not have large discourse, namely looking to the universal
- But if reason is able to define, then it is able to syllogism
  - Since definition is the beginning of a demonstration/ syllogism
    - For the definition is the middle term of the syllogism
    - Once you are able to see the middle term of the syllogism, then you are able to syllogism
- Looking directly
  - Reason must be able to *define*, since defining is *looking before and after*.
    - Since the genus and difference is before the species (which is what is the definition)
    - Ex. Animal and rational are before understanding the species of man, which is defined as rational animal
  - [is there a before and after in the 2nd act of reason]
    - Yes, since I must know the definition of something before one can begin to predicate
      - Ex. I must know that man is a rational animal, before I can see that no man is a dog
  - So to in the 3rd act
    - For I must know some statements (premises) before I can know other statements (conclusion)
- THEREFORE, if we are not looking to the roads in our knowledge, then we are not using our reason
  - For the roads in our knowledge is a discourse looking before and after, in other words, a discourse (coming to know what you don't know through what you do know)

#### Dialectic

- definition is the beginning of syllogism, for Aristotle is looking before and after, and seeing that syllogism comes after definition
- [where does dialectic fall?]
  - Before definition, and dialectic is primarily aiming at definition
    - As clearly seen in the 3 and 4th tool of dialectic

#### Four tools of dialectic

- 1) selection of probable opinions (considering the opinions of the most suitable men in a particular field)
- 2) distinguishing the sense of the word
  - Ex. I must distinguish the different sense of discourse in Shakespeare's definition of reason
- 3) find differences among things
  - To find the difference in the definition
- 4) consider likeness of things
  - To consider the genus

Topics = places

- the places to look in order to perform dialectic
  - Even the tools have some places
    - Ex. 2nd tool of dialectic: a place to distinguish the many senses of a word is by looking to the opposite.
      - If the opposite has more than one meaning, then the word has many meanings
    - Ex. Different senses of liberal can be seen by looking to the different opposites
      - Liberal vs. Servile/ conservative/ stingy
      - Many vs. Few/ one
- Though there are places to utilize the tools of dialectic, more primarily there are places to look in order to ask the question (is y a good definition of x)

Four Problems (four kinds of question to ask)

- 1) essential vs. 2) non. Essential
- 3) reciprocal vs. 4) non. Reciprocal
  - The questions/ problems will look like this
    - Is x essential/ non. essential to y?
    - Is x reciprocal/ non. Reciprocal to y?
      - Reciprocal = convertible
      - Convertible = every a is b and every b is a = every 2 is half of 4 and every half of 4 is 2
- From this we can see four different possibilities for x being related to y
  - X can be essential but not reciprocal with y (genus)
  - X can be essential and reciprocal with y (species)
  - X can not be essential but reciprocal with y (property)
  - X can not be essential and non reciprocal with y (accident)
- Therefore one can see that a question of the definition of a thing (its species) is asking whether y is both essential and reciprocal with x and if it is, then y is the definition of x

In sum, the topics are the places to look in order to answer the questions necessary to determine if something is a good definition. (but it can also be about the places to look in order to determine the truth or falsity of a statement).