Primus Sermo Secundus Sermo

Tertius Sermo

The role of negation in the sublimation of language has grown from small beginnings. Jespersen says about these beginnings: "hot" means kess than! or in other words when take the 'between the term qualified and bothing'. This is especially obvious when we consider the orthogy meaning of negative numerals: 'He does not read three books in a year! means ' less than three'. (Jespersen, Philosophy of Hanguage, pp. 375 ff.) The role of negation does not ead when some thing has been negated. From these modest beginnings, negation has developed in to a lever which has lifted up the whole numar speech to a higher level, twice. Pirst, the naive language of the child or the primitive, of singing, marrating, talking, calling, has been civilized, by its vaccination with negatives into a state which for the sake of clarity we shall call sermo secundus. It is the equivalent to reflective, rational, philosophical language. And wheras the philosophers oppose it to language as something absolutely different, we cannot agree to their breaking up the relation of speech and reflection. We do, however, admit the new qualities incorporated i

486

tio n. We do, however, admit the new qualities incorporated i into language by negation, aprocess that we are going to shudy in the next pagas.

Thought is speech inside ourselves. This <u>sermo</u> <u>secundus</u> is the great experience of the adolescent. When we enter puberty and begin to fall in love with the other sex, we match this external 'gdging half' by out invernal igoing double'. Man, at puberty, splits, acquires a conscience, and that is, begins to converse with himstlf, in a dialogue of reasoning and justification. Most people remain eternal adolescents, and remain enamoured with their dialectidal power. The adult, however, gets fed up with reasoning. The adult, as in every thing else, wants to see results of reasoning. A third level of speech becomes desirable, <u>sermo</u> <u>tertius</u>, belonging to manhood and parenthood. This <u>sermo</u> <u>tertius</u> or parental speech is neither naive speech within the group nor expert reflection, of individuals, but is the application of expert reflection for the re-making or refounding of groups.

The degree to which a person has incorporated negatives, determines their rank. The child, the adolescent, the adult should handle language on different levels. We shall analyze the sermo secundus (philosophy) first, and this will help the rea der to take the more difficult step of reaching the third level that has been sometimes called the second philosophy but which it is more coherent to term sermo Cortius.

The negation is preparing a better and truer affirmation. Negations are onhancing the value of our positive statements. In St. Augustine's Phalm(see text)out of five hundred sentences, not fiss than ninety contain a negation. Aliving French thinker has pointed out that in our prose language it is difficult to formulate realities and certitudes because prose reduces(as we know already; see our chapters on reduction and plenitude). But for a person's vital experience and his hucid conviction of a long range view one rendering never seems exhaustive. To him, prose offers a means of suggesting successfully that fulness or plenitude which ligatures our faculties of expression. Instead of listing one point after another in more succession, he will describe the new and unifying spirit that animates him, with thehelp on negations.

"Take, for instance, a scientific definition of "the state"; "state" is the sovereign government over one varticular ter is the sovereign government over one particular territory." This is a definition which is rather dry as long as the autho r is unable to familiarize has readers with just what "sovereign, government, and particular territory" mean. Of course, he could let us hear the patriotic songs, the history, the budget, the orders of the head of the executive power. Then we would see clearly that the state although a sowereign yet was not a deity like Athene or Moloch, in other words that soversign was a very relative term. We would see that to govern was restricted to the correction of abuses and dangers, etc., and did not preach love or fashions, also that the State was uninterested in the future of mankind as a unity, or in the internamiage and clanish relationships of all its members. It would become clear that the state was not the Church, nor the tribe, nor a femily, nor a free association. We would see kkak the state in action. But the writer on the state usually does not write polatics or po etry or histomy. He is a scientist, albeit a political scientist. Thus, instead of introducing the other styles of speech (imperatived and nervetives and songs), he infuses into his scientific treatment itself the necessary clarifications by saying what the state is not.

A definition is arbitrary when it is not elucidated by negatio ns or limitations. Mistrust any definition that is gurely ffirmative. It is more verbiage. And the simple word in the "state" mostly is preferable to such stuffed circumscriptions. This type of definition is not better that the answer given by the young communist to the question: But what do you meen by capitalism? he replied: "Capitalism is everything which I dislike." The purely affermative definitions of scientists very often deserve our suspicion that they simply are wishful thinking and that they pat into their topic everything that they deblike. For example, most politicians m'x some religion, some humanitarianism, some imperialism, and some homespun sentimintalities in their talk about taxes or states' nights, and yet, they will not mention these elements when you ask them fortheir definitions of these state. It is only when negations are added that the definition amounts to something tangible and responsible.

rupe affirmations are worthless except when all four forms of speech(imper tive, optative, narrative, besides the indicative) are used. In a drama, for instance, we do not need definitions. In the family, people don't need definitions. Here we are at grips with the full cross of reality, and are living together at all four fronts of life, we do not need to define what we say. It is only in the school that we must define and analyse our tools of peech; the fellowship is one of common thought, and here, the absent three fronts or reality are represented by the addition of negations. Thought must include nightion before it can become scientific. He who has not doubted, has no judjæment. In court, the judge must lian to the plaintiff's side for a while, and for a while to the side of the defendant. Or he is prejudided. Tp judge means to be first moved thes way, then the other, and finally reach a decision. His judgement is always a qualied affirmation, qualified by having tasted the possibility of an opposite decision. We call the dislecticel method that method

(2)

that moves from plain Yes through No to a higher affirmation. To think, then, is to include the phase of saying No in your final affirmation. And this will lead us to a definition that excludes certain elements of of which one might think when one heard the simple first one. Farmenides the Greek, has been the first man who saw this pro cess clearly. He became the first fhilosopher, in a scientific sense. The Chinese nevergot that far. They have wisdom, great teachers, traditions, but not a philosophy. The occidental philosophers have been so proud of this technique that they have exalted it into something quite apart from speech. They insist that a concept is not a word, and mad that it does not belong to therealm of human speech but to that quite separate world of thought. Now, the vitriolic contempt of philosophers for people who think that they talk when they think, is a thousand fothoms deep. Kame, We would get drowned if we risked a cruise on this Dead Sea.

For the book of human speech, it is , however, sufficient to re member that the process of meditation, defining, conceiving, is consecutive tox that of recording, naming, telling. We use our brain in both cases. I cannot perceive the beauty of a innerga landscape if I am not trainedmentally. And I cannot conceive of "the state" if I cannot speak. The first philosophy, to us, is a second "sermo". It is analytic speech, cautioned by the use o of negations.

Pure affirmations being worthless in any debateon a doubtful question(since affirmations zely on unanimity like the command and obedience of master and disciple, ceptain and soldier), negations must clear the road for a new unanimity to be created out of nothing. We can agree again, after having drifted apart when we have understood what is keeping us apart and excluded this or negated that it should enter in the argument and perp* etuate pur understanding. In a unanimous group, no arguments are needed and therefore no philosophy. The first case of philosophical argumentation is in court. Because the parties work queries and are no longer unanimous, the judge defines the concept of "theft". The parties say, one: it is theft, the other: it is not; Ionly took the car for an hour for a drive. Thus the judge must talk it over within himself; and whatever élse the dogicions may call what he does, to us it is though to conceive of concepts as a second layer of speech.

We may easily draw the line between unanimous language and defining lenguage. In the first, it matters little who does the talking. Everybody feels to give expression to the whole group. He is a mouthplace of the life of this group to which he seems to talk. But a man who defines and uses condepts, stanks alone, like a judge. He becomes a person. A man who has the courage to say that he denies before he says what he adcepts, always will make himself heard and leave an impression. This personal contribution is quite rare. But he may, indeed, be sure that he will force people to become aware of the fact that he tries to say something definitely his own. Examples of definitions:

Uibil est in intellectu quod non ante fuerit inxin in sensu nisi ipse intellictui. (Leibniz) Adjutrix et libera philosophia; sed non adjutrix nisi libera, imo non libera nisi adjutrix. (St. Bernard)

(3)

The Third Speech or the Second Philosophy

That the language of definitions w hich is spoken in courts and textbooks and classrooms(mark: it actually is written and spoken daily to millions o f people, and therefore at is by no means just "thought"),has become necessary when people who did not live together in unanimity, had come to agreements, is a phase of langu-age which the Romans (and the Greeks) found in the ancient days of their linguéstic development, from 500 B.C. to 500 A.D. We findL Latin equipped with it fully from the times of Cicero. There is, however, a third and still higher type of speech, a sermo tertius, or a second philosophy that heals the folly of mere definitions and abstract concepts. And we can see this rise, within Latin, before our own eyes. The dayly life of Latin teaching addepted this manner,"the philosophy of the paradox," not more than 900 years ago. What is a paradox? It is the fact that Az is also not 4. In logic thes cannot be true; for a higher science, it is the daily fact of o ur own life, I am what I have been, and I am not; and I am what I shall finally be, in a certain sense now already while in anothersense I am not all that I hope to be. In space, " must equal A. But through time it may not. All first # philosophy has analysed indicatives only, prepositions like: "he is coming" (and not "she"). The first philosophy is a logic of concepts in space, and in space, the part A always keeps its id-entity with itself. The second philosophy, the philosophy of paradoxxgis conscious of the fact that we also talk at the time fronts. And here, nothing keeps its identity.

The first scholastic sentences of this thand type of language, the sermo tertius, I can find are the two following: "Paulus apostolus Romanus et non Romanus est." That means the

"Paulus apostolus Romanus et non Romanus est." That means the apostle belongs to Rome, is buried in Rome's suburb, is the patron of thes city. And yet he is not. He belongs to the whole Church, and not to the Roman Church. He actually has no specific Church, any more than his master. (The point was of considerable practical political importance at that time). The sentence was written about IO85 by Po pe Victor III.

The second sentence deals with the question of bread and wine on the communion table. And the solution of a long quarrel said: **PF**idelis in communione et ipsum compus quod de virgine sumptum fuit, sumit, et tamen non ipsum corpus sumit." Thesentence as from the pen of Lanfrank, Anselm's predecessor in Canterbury, ga. 1078.

Hé is and he is not. He eats and he eats not. These are typical sentences of the third speech. The paradox(which means "praeter opinionem") frees the speaker from the slavery to hisown terms or words. Only in about 1070,1089,1090, has this kind of thinking become established in the occident, and has remained our distinction till today. It would have been impossible except for the condiseness of Latin, to put it so neatly.

Only by paradoxes, is it possible frackefor human men to study evolution, progress, conversions, and any dynamic process. In any dynamic process the same thing ceases to be and yet, it remains. Hence it is, and it is not.

The Paradox then is the new application of the word "no." In a definition, a concept is produced by negating other things, In the paradox, the same thing itself is shown in its ambivalence, as really having two meanings at the same time. "Sumus id quod sumus. Non sumus id quod sumus" is the ternal truth about all living beings, and especially about man with his neversatiated longing for change and improvment and self-fulfillment. But those sent-

(4)

ences must be kept in mind at the same time; or we shall misjudge man. Waxxthe

Now the third Speech, the second philosophy, has been achieved by a new linguistic equipment, by applying the negation once more. But for healing the lack of completeness in any merely indicative statement, not for the purpose of excluding the negated part, only.

Anglicus est; mericanus est. Yes, they are; but how wrong to call them thes way and thereby keep them apart for ever. Hic neque Anglicus neque Americanus: sumus omnes unum.

This timous word of the first writer of the <u>Bermo</u> tertius, of that the Apostle, is based on the paradoxes of his master. Here are some of them: Et de vestimento quid solliciti estis? Considerate lilia agri quomodo crescunt: non laborant neque nent. Dico autem vobis quoniam nec Salomon in omniz gloria sua coopertus est sicut unum ex istis.

Scitis quia principes gentium dominantur eorum:et qui majores suht postestatem exercent in eos. Non ita erit enter vos:sed quicumque voluerit inter vos major fieri,sit vester minister,et qui voluerit inter vos primus esses,erit vester servui.

The sharp division between the sermo secundus philosophorum that only corrects indicatives, and the sermo tertius that corrects the philosophers themselves for their shortcomings by omitting the other moods of speech from their argument, may be studied in the first sermon of the sermo tertius which was put down in writing by the author himself. This text, then, befittingly, concludes the glorious story of negation as a vehicle to higher language. This story is a paraller to the marchof zero in mathematics and calculus.

"Videte ne quis vos decipiat per philosophiam et finanem fallciam secundum traditionem hominum.

e Excellentiorem vaam vobis Demonstrol i linguid hominum loquar et angelorum, caritatem autem non habeam, Bactus sum velu# aes sonans aut cymbalum tinniens. At si habuero prophetiem et noverim mysteria omnia, et omnem scientiam, et si habuero omnem fidem ita ub montes tr^Msferam, charitatem sutem non habuero, hihil sum. Et si distribuero in cibos pauperum omnes facultates meas, et si tradidero corpus meum ita ut erdeam, bharitatem autem non habuero, nihil mihi prodest.

Charitas petiens est, benigna est; cheritas non semulatur, non agit perperam, non inflatur, non est ambitiosa, non queerit quae sua sunt, non inflatur, non cogitat malum, non genedet super iniquitate, congaudet autom veritati:omnia suffert, omnia credit, omnia sperat, omnia sustinet. Charitas numquam excidit:sive prophetiae evacuabuntur, sive linguae cessabunt, sive scientia sestruetur. Ex parte enim cognoscimus, et ex parte prophetamus. Cum autem venerit quod perfectumest, evacuabitur quod ex parte est. Videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate, tunc autem fecie ad faciem. Nunc cogm nosco ex parte tunc autem cognoscame sicut et cognitus sum. Nunc autem manent fides, spes, charitas: tria haec; major autem horum est charitas.(I or, I3).

The question of peace is a question of unanimity. As long as we speak in the name of our group, we do not endanger the unanimity and that is the peace of the group. Any Ng, however, that we have to say, breaks up the unanimity of our society, hence engangers its peace. Man found that No must be spoken, and yet, the peace must be kept. So, the courts came into being, with their decisions

(5)

based on defined concepts, on negation, and yet peaceful. The quarrels between whole groups could not be ended by judges. A new power anticipated unanimity till it dould be reached in real common language again. The whole description given by Paul of this new power, is, in the last analysis, nothing but a means to cover the hiatus between the unanimity lost and the unanimity to be restored finally. Charitas operatur quando lingua communis secundum traditionem hominum periit. Charitas spernit se ipsam inter gentes separatas, inter inimicos non habentes pacem mutuam, usque ad redadeptam linguam communem. Unanimitas petitur cum sermone utamur. Sed quia unanimitas saepe in verbis non iam est, per interlocutores supplenda est. Non possumus loqui hodië in axrivorbe tantopere diviso nisi supplendo patientia nostra am lecunam illam quam sermo deficiens non supplet. Ine enim fit, ut sermoni temporis spatium credatur quo durante nova lingua communis creari et crescere possit. Ad producendam hanc creationem nova m. omnis homo suam linguam relinguere, et lingues communiori sicque efficaciori patere debet.

Sationes et profektiones variae tentum diligunt sermones suak, ut linguak elterius egeent, ex qua vares novam ad restaurandam unanimitatem applicandas haurire possint. Sermo Latinus et fuit et hic est fons rejuvenandi nathones inimicas et separatas. Et omnis mens liberatur lingue secunda ite ut loqui possit: "Patrius sermo sermo meus est; patrius sermo meus sermo non est. Classis mea meas classis est; classis mea mea classis non est. Et sic, lingua secunda profiteamint, ut sermone tertio liberante uti possitis. Magnam Chartem Latinam conscripsimus spe commoti vos, lector noster, hac via profundiorem unanimitatém inter homines producendam petituram esse. Sunt autem viae sermones tres: infantis, adolescentis, adulti. Infanti lo uendi ars communicatur; adolescenti definiendi studium explicatur, adulti sanandi linguam privilegium impartitur. Loco privilegii, igitur, hunc libellum inscripsimus nomine Magnae Chartae libertatum Angliae.

Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy

\$

(6)