

Wisdom and Self-appropriation.

1. Question raised yesterday: Can philosophy seize an opportunity without becoming opportunist? Can it meet the problem of the times, be timely, without becoming ephemeral?

If so, then great wisdom needed: sapientia omnia ordinat et omnia iudicat; and it can judge all, because it grasps and orders all. Children; minors; youth ethics;

Wisdom first of intellectual habits, virtues: I-II 66 5 lm  
science of conclusions, depends on principles  
intellectus of principles, grasps nexus between terms  
wisdom selects and judges basic terms -- especially ens (Parm Plat Plot Avic Th Scot Hegel)

How does one acquire wisdom? Gifts of Holy Ghost; Aristotle's Metaphysics.  
But gifts not part of philosophy  
And how does one know Aristotle's metaphysics is the right one?  
More relevantly, Aquinas corrected Aristotle's M : how do we get the wisdom to grasp just what is essential to the Ar-Thom position and effect the adaptation needed if we are to seize opportunity without being opportunist.

This is the epistemological problem for scholastics  
not abstract question: does any knowledge exist  
but concrete question: how do we become wise, make others wise  
personal question: how do I become wise? how much can I help others  
radical question:

Not solved by deducing from self-evident truths: every truth in a precise meaning presupposes some determinate notion of ens; and that precisely is the point at issue

2. Really an old question with a very old answer: gwrthi seautov - philosophia

If one were wise, one would order all and be able to judge all  
But ordering and judging are intellectual activities - intelligence and reflection  
One tackles wisdom in its principle, not on the side of the All to be ordered and judged, but on the side of the subject that orders and judges  
One reaches the order of all, through the principle of that order

Principle, not abstract proposition, but concrete person, qua knower  
*no error if judgement of rational principle - principles*  $\rightarrow$  *light of intellect*  
*lower intellect*

3. Self-appropriation

- a) Terms, Relations, Identification, Appropriation = What is it?
- b) Properties of s-a = What is its significance? Is it a source of wisdom?

Neither can be performed adequately in a lecture:

- a) 'Insight' is a long series of exercises inviting subject to self-appropriation
- b) Significance to be seen only in full range of implications: more tomorrow and Saturday

*mti*

4. Terms.

Reflective level: An sit. Grasp of VU. Judgement. (Verum = medium in quo ens cogn.)  
 definitions,

Intellectual : Quid sit. Insight. Concepts, /hypotheses, objects of thought, consider.

Experiential : Sensa, percepts, free images. Consciousness (E & I & R).

RL: not the formulated question, but critical attitude, Is that really so  
 grasp of VU, chap IX & X, = marshalling and weighing evidence; sufficient qua suffic  
 judgement: not verbal proposition but interior assent, intrinsically rational,  
 proceeds not from 'cause' but from 'because'; Laroche foucault

IL: not formulated question  
 not grasp of nexus between terms (concepts) but of intelligible in sensible  
 ground whence definitions proceed intelligently  
 concept: expression of intelligibility + common matter + anticipation of ens

EL: 3-fold presence: chair in room; I to you; you to yourself  
 don't crane neck looking round into self; what counts is not Looked-at but Looker  
 and Looker no matter what he is looking at; that makes no difference  
 not merely looker but also intelligent inquirer and critically reflecting subject

5. Relations. a) of acts, b) of contents, c) in subject

Exact meaning of terms fixed by relations to one another. Grasp the  
 relations, and you grasp the terms in their full generality. (Cf Implicit definition).

a) Wonder, beginning of all science and philosophy  
 But can't wonder, unless 'given' to wonder about; experiential is pure, first 'given'  
 And if wonder, then head for insight, try to understand

In-sight, intelligere in phantasmate; presupposes 'given' into which one sees  
 If insight, then expression, communication; scientific mode, definition, hypothesis  
 Expression, not solely the intelligibility, but also common matter

New deeper wonder, on level of wisdom, Is that right? so? true?  
 alchemy and chemistry; astrology and astronomy; legend, myth and history; ignorance & science  
 Heads for grasp of unconditioned  
 If VU, then must affirm or surrender rationality; if not VU, then must not, or surrender rat

b) Just as prior acts presupposed and complemented by later, so also contents of acts.  
 Single intention throughout: intellect is teleological, has a goal  
 What is imagined is what is inquired about; what is inquired about, is what  
 is understood; what is understood, is what is conceived; what is conceived, is what is  
 reflected on,.. is grasped as unconditioned,.. is affirmed.  
 Contents are 'quibus cognoscitur', as principles of being are 'quibus est'  
 NB analogy: experience, understanding, judgement ;; potency, form, act.

c) Acts cannot presuppose and complement one another; contents cannot coalesce  
 into one complete act of knowing; unless single subject that experiences, inquires  
 about his experience, understands it to some extent, formulates his understanding

6. Identification.

- a) Not like talk about other side of moon, Central Asia, mystical experience.  
'I' am conscious ~~in a certain way~~ empirically intelligently reasonably  
'I' (not Fichtean 'ego') (not Kantian 'Ich denke') concrete subject, myself  
cannot avoid experiencing: sounds; hearing; feeling; pleasure; pain  
am not stupid, inquire, understand, can say what I mean  
don't believe all I hear; listen critically; don't agree unless WU
- b) can be enormously enriched: common sense; maths; physics; phil; human sc; theology;  
depth psychology; history; travel  
essentially the same activities, because the same structure.
- c) I cannot be myself and reject it. (Get the sceptic to talk).

It's all bosh. Therefore I make judgements  
My judgements really are judgements; reasonable; it's not in the manuals  
I am critically reflective; clear from fact that I don't accept all I am told

But do you really understand what is being said?  
I understand perfectly all the terms and all the defining relations; and  
I am quite capable of reaching the 3rd type of presence, of adverting to my understanding  
and to my grasp of sufficient evidence.

But if you advert to experiential, intellectual, rational consciousness in  
yourself, how can you deny that you are exp int and rat conscious

- d) I cannot revise this structure without employing it.

Problem of empirical science; hypothesis, verification, yet only probable.  
But this is just an item of empirical science. Therefore only probable.

Suppose there were a revision; then data overlooked; new data lead to new  
understanding; verification of new understanding leads to new judgement.

Can be enriched (should be enriched, fuller self-appropriation) but not revised.

Radical difference from scientific hypothesis: mass, temperature, electromagnetic  
vectors are hypothetical. Experience, intelligence, critical reflection are given;  
and can be negated only by non-experience, stupidity, silliness.

- e) Cannot conflict with any scientific result. Perfectly open.

Because any scientific result is a matter of experience, intelligence, verification  
Not a dam attempting to block the river of science, but the bed in which the river flows.

f) Not involved in self-referential contradiction. Hume. We use same structure  
of experience, intelligence, reflection (a) in science (b) in common sense and (c) in  
cognitive theory.

- g) Can develop in future. Same structure remains though self-appropriation increases.

7. Significance.

- a) Full story when go on to metaphysics, ethics, theology.
- b) In principle: unites universality and necessity with concreteness and development.

Universality: not because of abstract object, but because holds for every human subject in all his cognitional activities, whether abstract or concrete, all fields.

Necessity: not because of necessary link between abstract objects, but because of concrete nature (we are what we are) of not stupid but intelligent, not silly but wise subject. No one claims to be stupid & silly. If anyone does, then no one listens to him (De Unitate Intellectus: Ergo hic homo non intelligit; ergo non est audiendus)

Concreteness: concrete fact of me inquiring, of me reflecting, supplies basic relations: at once key to universal structure, and dynamic elements in my consciousness, in my being an intelligent and rational animal

What counts are not the terms, not the defining relations (relations as conceived), but the self-appropriating subject. He is source of meaning.

Kant: knowledge based on principles and knowledge based on data. But one can learn maths, philosophy, as though one were learning history, multiplication table.

Plaster-cast of a man (row of plaster-casts) can tell you all that Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas, Kant, Hegel said. But has no internal principle of evaluation, testing. Cannot think for himself; cannot take one step beyond what's down in book; cannot work out for himself a single reason, put in different terms.

Development: a basic structure in barest outline.

Self-appropriation is of a self that has to be developed; need I learn more about maths, science? Perhaps

Ready to meet changes that can, will, arise in the future.

- c) How can philosophy retain its hold upon immutable, and yet deal concretely with opportunities that arise in time and are temporally conditioned.

Through the universality and necessity of the structure of the concrete and temporally developing philosopher.

- d) Does this yield an approach, a methodical genesis, of the wisdom on which all philosophy depends

a third way that is not simply accepting Aristotle's metaphysics or appealing to religion

We must wait for our next lecture

→ omnis ordo et omnia indicat - [in principle methodically]