

Why Aquinas did not hit off "to ti nv eivai"

1. He did not investigate the Aristotelian text from the view-point of the usage of technical terms. There was no Bonitz index. Aquinas was not a philologist.

He dealt with meanings: in immediate sentences; in the inter-relation of sentences, paragraphs, etc.

2. He was interested in the metaphysical aspects of the issues: Avicenna and Averroes.

In epistemology he was interested predominantly in the relation between universal terms and reality, not in the intervening mechanism.

He did not perhaps go in for introspection, and certainly he no more thought of introspective description than did Aristotle.

3. Now to hit off "to ti nv eivai" is a matter of introspective description of the most exacting sort; the insight of understanding is "pre-conceptual" and as such to put it into words is to transform it into the resultant concepts; it can be described only on the understanding, on the part of both writer and reader, that one is describing the principle of description before it causes description.

This aspect is sufficiently plain from the account of "verbum"

4. When to ti nv eivai is one of the four causes, Aq outright that it is form.

But when it is principle of definition, the key to defining, the prior insight to the act of defining, it becomes the quod quid est or the quidditas (concrete or abstract general essence).

5. Ar. ousia, a general term, the reality (Ross)

Aq. littera read "substance";

Ar. regularly tends to call to ti nv eivai substane ousia, and this brings Aq to call it quod quid est.

To ti estiv; to ti nv eivai.

1. "Ti" means "dia ti"
2. As to ti estiv so also to ti nv eivai primarily applies to substance and secondarily to the other categories. Z 4 1030a 18-32
3. Definition is the account of the to ti nv eivai
Z 5 1031a 11 ff: hóti mev ouv estiv hó ~~horismos~~ horismos ho
tou tí nv eivai lógos... dnlov
4. Definition is the answer to "to ti estiv"
5. Form is the answer to "to ti nv eivai"; what is the link between matter and being? why is this matter something.

TO TI NV EIVAI

Z, 17

1. It is what one is looking for when one asks, What is a man?
But it is the key to the answer of that question, not the answer
itself. For the answer itself is a definition, and a definition
is the logos of the tou ti nv eivai. Z 5 1031a 11

It is the answer to Why one thing with respect to another,
and not any general question about identity. Z 17 1041a 10ff

The question is about matter huln, tode, tade ibid a26 b2 b5,
with respect to eivai. What puts this matter, these data, these
stones and bricks, in a/category? specific/

It is to ti nv eivai, form: form makes this matter a house,
that matter a man.