pp. 375 ff.) The tole negation does not ema when someta. has been negated. Frou these modest beginnings, negation has develuped is to a dever which has lifled up the whole rumar speech a higher evel, twice. Pist, the naive language oi the chidd or the fimitive, of singing,narrating, tulking, cali.g, has been civilized, oy its vaccination with nogatives into state which for the sake of clarity we shall call sermo secundus. It is the equivalent to reflective, ratjonal, phidosophical language. And wheras the philosophers oppe it to lan gue as something abiolutely different, we
cannot agree to their breaking up the relation of speech and reflectio $n$. We do, however, admit the new qualities incorporatied i
into I nguage by neg tion, gprocess that we are going to strudy in the next pagns.

Thought id speech inside ourselves. This sermo secundus is the great experience of the edolescent. When we enter puberty and berin to foll in love with the other sex, we match this external 'gdeing half' hy out intetnal ggoing double'. Man. at puberty, splits, acquires a conscience, and that is, begins to converse ith himself, in a dialogue of reasoning and justification. Most people remain eternal adolescents, and remain enamoured $\cdots$ ith their dialectidal power. The adult, however, gets fed up ith reasoning. The adult, as in evary thing else, wants to see results of reusoning. A third level of speech becomes desirable, sermo tertius, belonging to manhood and parenthoou. This serno tertius or pareatal speech is neither naive speach within the group nor expert reflection, of individuls, but is te applicstion of expert reflection for the romaking or refounding of groups.

The degree to whilh a person hus incorpor ted negatives, debermines their runk. The child, the adolescent, the adult should hende 1 neuage on difforent levels. We shall analyze the sermo secundus(philosophy) forstgand this will help the rea der to teke tire mone difficult step of reaching the third level that hes been sometimes celled the second philospphy but which it is more coherent to term sermoceigrtius.

The negetion is preparing a better and truer aftrmation. Negstions re onhencing the value of our postive atatements. In St. Augustine's Pailm (see text) out of five hundred sentences, not isiss then ninety contain a negution. Aliving Prench thinker has pointed out that in our prose language it is difricult to formulate realities and certitudes because prose reduces (as "e know already; see our dhapters on redudtion and plenitude). But for a person's vital experience and his lucid conviction of a long renge view one rendering never seems exhaustive. To himprose offers means of suggesting success-
fully that fulnessp or plenitude whoch ligetures our faculties of exprescion. Insted of listing one point after mother in mere succescion, he "ill describe the new and unifying spirit that animates hin, ett thehelp on negations.
Take, for instrace, a scientific defintion of "the state" "state" is tine sovirelgn govermment over one particular territory." This is a definition which is rather dry as long as the autho $r$ is unable to gamilisarize his readers vith just what "sovereign, governmemt, and particulur territory" mean. of course, he could let us haar the patriotic songs, toe history, the budget, the orders of the herd of the executive power. Then we mould see cleariy thet the st although a sonereign yet wras not a deity like Athene or Moloch, in other words that soverigign was a very relative term. We would see that to govern was restricted to the correction of nbuses and duners, etc., and did not preach love or fashions,also thet the State was uninterested in the future of menkind as 2 unity, or in the intermanage and chanish $r$ letionships of sil itsammbers. It would become clear that the state was not the Church, nor the tribs, nor a femily, nor a free association. We would se kixat the state in action. But the writer on the stete ususily does not write politics or po etry or hi toxy. He is a sclentist,albelt a politicil scientiat. Thus, insteac of introducing the other sty? of speech (imperat ver end nor +ive and songs), he infuses into his selentific treatmert itsolf the necessary clerjficut ons by saying what the state is rot.

A defintion is arbitrary wen it is now elucidated by negam tio ns or limitutiond. Mistrust any defintion thet is durely in the firmative. It is more varbiage. And the shrple word "state" mostly is prof reble to such stuffed circumscriptions. this type of delinition is not better thav the answer given by the young comnunist to the quection: But what do you mean cusitalism? he replied:"Cripitalism is everything wich I dislike." The purely affermative defintions of scientists very often deserve our suspicion that they simpl; are wishful thinking and thet they put into their topic everything thrt they For example, most politicians $m$ : $x$ some roligion, some humanitarlanism, some imperialien, and some homespan sentimintalities in their tilk about taxes or states' aights, and yet, they will not mention these olements then you ask them fortheir deflntttons of thes state. It is only when negetions are added thet the definition amouns to something tangible and responsible.
rute affimatons are orthless except whon all four forms of speech(impor tivo, pptativ, narratetve, besides the indicative) are ued. In a dr ma, for instance, do not need definitions. In the f:my, people don't nopd perinitions. here we aro at grips with the full cross of relity, anc ure tiving together at 112 four fronts of life, we do not need to define what we say. It is ondy in the school that we must define and analyse our tools of peech; the fellowship is one of comion thought, and here, the absent thr fronts or reility are representel by the addition of negetions. Thought must include negition before it can becoee scientirfc. He who has not doubted, has no judjzment. In court, the judge mist lean to theplaintiff's side for a while, and for hile to the side of the defendant. Or he is prejudided. Tp juage means to he first moved thes way, then the other, and finally reach a decision. His judgement is always a qualled affirmation, qualified by having tasteder the possibility of an opposite decision. We call the dielecticel method thet method
that moves from plain ${ }^{\text {Fes }}$ through No to a higher affirmation. To think, then, is to include the phase of aaying No in your final affirmation. And this will leed us to a defintion that excluces certain elements of of which one might think when one herrd the simple firat one. Parmenides the Greek, has beem the first man who say the pro cess clearly. He bectme the first Fhilosonher, in a cietific sense. The Chinese nevergot that far. They have wisdom, great teachers, traditions, but not a philosophy. "heoccidental philosophers have been so proud of this technique thet they have exsited it into something quite ppert from speech. They insist that a concept is not so word, and mper the it does not belong to theros Im of human spech but to thet quite sepapate world of thought. Tow the vitriolic contempt of philosophers for people who think that they telk when they think, is a thousand f'sthoms deep. Hewe, We would get drowned if we risked a cruise on this Dead Sea.

For the book of human speech, it is ,hcever, sufficient to re member that the prow ofs of mitution, deftneng, concelvang, is concecutive toa that of rocoling, naming, telling. Te use our brain in botil case. 1 cannot percelve the beauty of a magmagh landscape if I am not trinedmentally. find I cannot conceive of"the state" if I cunnot speak. The frst philosophy, to us, is a second "sermo". It is analytic speech, ceutioned by the use of negations.

Puro aftimations being wortrless. In any debateon a doubtful question(since afirmations aly on unonimity like the command and obedienc of master and dimciple, coptaln and soldier), negations must clear the roed for a new unanimity to be creeted out of nothing. e can agree agn, ater having drifted apart when we have understood whet is keeping us apart and excluded this or negsted trot it shoulo onter in the argument and perp* etuate pur understanding. In a unenimous group, no arguments are needed and therefore no philosophy. The first case of philosom phical argumention is in court. Becauso the farties watt quer ol and are no longer unanimous, the fudge defines the concopt of "theft" The parties say, one:it os theft, the other:it is not; Ionly took the c.r for an hour for a drive. Thus the judge must telk it over witin himself;and hatever else the dogicm lons may cill wint he doee, to us it is enough to coneeive of concopts as a second layer of speech.

We may aacily draw the line between unanimous language and defining lenguage. In the first, it matters littie who poes then talking. Everybody feel to give expression to the whole group. He is mouthplece of the life of this group to winich he seems to tolk. But a men who depines and uses condepts, stanis alone, lise a judge. He becomes person. A mon who has the courage to eay hat he denier berore he says what he edcepts, always will make himself herrd and leave n impression. This personal contribution is quite rare. But he may, indesd, be sure that he will forde people to become avare of the foet that he triea to say som thine definitely his orn. Examples of definitions:
in기 est in intellectu cuod non ante fuerit xurxk in sensu nisi inse intellictak. (Leibniz)
Adjutrix et libera philosophia;sed non adjutrix nisi libera, imo non libers nisi adjutrix. (St. Bernard)

## The Third Speech or the Second Philosophy

That the language of definitions which is spoken in courts and textbooks and classrooms(mark:it actually is written and spoken daily to millions o f people, and therefore $\begin{gathered}\text { is by no means just }\end{gathered}$ "thought"), has become necessary when people who did not live together in unanimity, had come to agreements, is a phase of language which the Romans(and the Greeks)found in theancient duys of their lingutstic development, from $\$ 00 \mathrm{~B} . \mathrm{C}$. to $800 \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{D}$. We find Latin equipped with it fully from the times of Cicero. There is, however, a third and still higher type of speech, a *omo tertins, or a second philosophy that heals the folly of mere definitions and ebstract concepts. And we can soe this risogwithin Latin, before our omn eyes. The dadly life of Latin teaching adepted this manner, "the philosophy of the parsdox," not more than 900 years ago. What is a par dox? It is the fact that At is also not $A_{\text {. In }}$ Iogic this canno $t$ be true;for a higher sciende, it is the dail fact of 0 ur own life, I am what I have been, and I am not;and I am what I shall finaliy he, in a certain sense now azready while in enothersense I am not all that I hope to be. In space, ${ }^{\text {A }}$ must equal A. But through time it may not. All first philosophy has analised indeatives only, prepositions like: "he is coming" (end not "she"). The first philosophy is a logid of concepts in space,and in space, the part A always keeps its identity with itsel. The second philosophy, the phidosophy of para adoxxis conscious of the fact that we aino talk at the time fronts. And here, nothing keeps its identity

The first scholastic sentences of this third type of language, the sermo tertius, i can find are the two following:
"paulus apostolus Romanus eb non Romanus est." That means the apostle belongs to Rome, is buried in 'iome's suburb, is the patron of this city. Anal yet he is not. He belongs to the whole Gnurch, and not to the Roman Church. He actually has no specifte Church, any more then his master. (The point was of considersble practical political importance ot that time). The sentence was written about IO85 by Po pe Victor III.

The second sentence deabs with the cuestion of bread and wine on the communion teble. And the solution of elong quarrel soid: FFidelis in communione et ipsum compus quod de virgine sumptum fuit, sumit, et tanen non ipsum corpus sumit." Thesentence fs from the pen of Lanfrank, Anselm's predecessor in Canterbury, wa. IO78.

He is and he is not. He eats and he eats not. These are typical sentences of the third speach. The paradox(which means "praeter opdnionem") fres the sperker from the slavery to hisown terms or words. Only in ebout 1070, I080, IO90, has this kind of thinking become est.ablisked in the oceident, and has remained our distinction till todey. It would havebeen fmpossible except for the condiseness of Latin, to put it so nestly.

Only by paradoxes, is it possible fexampor human nemat to study evolution, progress, conversions, and any dynemic process. In any dynamic process the same thing ceeses to be and yet,it remains. Hence it is, and it is not.

The Paradox then is the now application of the word "no." In a definition, a concept isproduced by negatirg other things, In the paradox, he 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 theeternal truth about all living beingi, and especiaily about man with his nevarsatiated longing for chenge and improvment and self-fulfillment. But those sent-
ences must be kept in mind at the same time;or we shall misjudge man. Huxx站e

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 $l_{\text {a }}$ 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 thas way and themby keop them apart for ever. Hic neque Anglicus neque Americenus: sumus omnes unum.

This fimous word of the first writer of the germo tertius, of Paul the Apostle, is based on the paradoxes of his mester. Here are some of them: Et de vestimento quid solliciti estis? Considerate lilis agri quomodo crescunt:non leborant neque nenta. Dico autem vobis ghonimm noc salomon in omis gloria su: coopertus est sicut unum ex istis.

Scitis quia principes gentium dominantur eorumset qui majores sunt postestatem exercent in eos. Non ita erit enter vosised quicumque voluerit inter vos major fieri, sit vester minister, et qui volusrit enter vos primus esses, erit vester servua.

The sitarp division between the sermo secundus philosophorum that only corrects indicatives, and the sermo tertius that coro rects the philowophers themselves for their shortcomings by omitting the other moods of speach from their argument, may be studied in the first semon of the sermo tertius which was put down in ariting by the author himself. This text, then, befittingly, concludes the glorious story of negation as a vehicle to higher language. This story is a par lles to the marchof zero in mathematics and colculus.
"Videte ne quis vos decipiat per philosophiam ot fnanem fellciam secundum traditionem hominum.
e Exceliemtapres veam yobes demonstrpl "i linguis hominum loquar et angelorum, carltatem autem non habeam, Betus sum veluf aes sonans aut cymbulum tinniens. Lt si habueto propheti:m et noverim mystere ia omin, et omnem scientiamget si habuero omnem fidem ita ub montes trisferam, choritutem autem non habuero, hihil sum. Et si distribuero in cibos paunerum omnes facult tes meas, et gi tradid ero corpus meum ita ut erdeam, haritatem autem non habuero, nhil mini prodest.

Charitas pethens est, benigna est; charitas non semulatur, non agit perperam, non inflitur, non es ambitiose, non queerit quae sua sunt, non erritatur, non cogitet malum, non geadet super iniquitate, congaudet aut m vitatisomnia suffert,omis credit,omnia sperat, omnia sustinut. Charitas namquam 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 ar faciem. Nunc coge nosco ex parte tunc autem cognoscemf sicut et cognitus sum. Nunc eutem manemt fides, spes, charitas:tria heec;major autem horum est charitas. (I Vor.I3).

The question of peace as a ques ion of unanimity. As long as we speak in the name of our group, we do not endsnger the unanimity and that is the peece of the group. Any Ng, however, that we have to say, breaks up the unanimity of our society,hence engencers it paree. Man found that No must be spoken, and yet, the peace must be kept. So, the courts came into being; with their decisions
based on defined concepts, on negation, and tet peaceful.
The quarrels between whole groups could not be ended by judges. A new power anticipated unanimity till it dould be resched in real common longuage agsin. The hole description given by Paul of this new power, is, in the last analysis, nothong but a means to cover the hiatus between the unanimity lost and the unanimity to be resiored finally. Charitas operetur quando lingu: conmunis gecundum traditionem hominum perift. Oharitad spernit se ipsam inter gentes separatas, inter inimicos non habentes pacem mutuam, usque ad rededeptam linguam commurem. Unanimitas petitur cum sermone vtamur. Sed quia unenimitas saepe in verbis non iam est, per interlocutores supplenda est. Non possumus loqui hodie in
 lecunam illam quam cermo deficiens non supplet. Ite enim fit, ut sermonit temporis spatium credetur ano dur nte nove ingue communis creare et crescore possit. Ad producendem hane crettionem nova $m$, omnis homo suam linguam $r$ in uere, et lingyo gommuniori sicque efflcaciori patere debet.
ivationes et prefesciones veriae fentum diligunt semones suak. ut linguna elterius egeent, ex que vires novas ad restauranciam unanimitatem applicendes haurire possint. Sermo Letinus et fuit et hic est fons rejuvenandi notenes inimicas et separatas. Et omnis mens liberatur lingue secunda its ut loqui possit: "Patrius sermo sermo meus est;patrius sermo meus sermo non est. Clessis mea menf classis Get;classis mea mea classis non est. It sic, lingur socunde profitamine, ut sermone tertio liber nte uti possethe Magnam Chartom Latinam conseripsimus spe commoti vos, lector noster, hec via profundforem unenimitatam inter homines
 adolescontis, adulti. Infanti lo vendi ars comunic tur;adolescenti. definiende studium explicatur, adulti sanmi lingunm privilegium impartitur. Loco privilegii, igiturhunc libellum inseripsimua nomine magnae Chartae libertatum Angliae.
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