!^W(H does A): Prayer

Gunwon Lee (SNU)

glee@plaza.snu.ac.kr

Here we would like to examine the conditions to know what will be what we want and pray to be such. In the difficult times as in Book of Change, this attempt was originated when we try to state the nature of the ideal community in Plato, which was termed as the good community by Aristotle. The assumption here we can see is that the good was the want in the context of pray in the hermeneutics of Aristotle. In the hermeneutics of Aristotle, the good in the context of the pray was a predicate which cannot be true or false. The form of Plato and the set in mathematics were what cannot be seen and only be thought in the Republic. There the form can only be thought was not "what there is". And we cannot say what there is not as what there is. In this context the Platonic form cannot be claimed to be existing, but if they assume that as what there is "in a certain sense", then we have to accept that there is certain dream which can be treated as there is at least "in a certain sense". In Aristotle, we can name them conveniently as the modal predicates such as pray(*On Interpretation* 17a5). In this sense, we feel easy to say that we assume the modality, want as there is as a formal structure.

In this recalcitrant context, the plan for the good community in the Republic was viewed as the plan prayed by human beings especially when they were in a difficult situations. The uses of the predicate pray has been turned out to be directive uses of want. And this directive use was not a description, but the expression where the world should be fitted as stated in that directive, if the pray as a speech act be successful fulfilling the felicity conditions of the pray in question. We tried to read those claims of the linguistic philosophers comprehensive way as they defended themselves again and again. And furthermore, we try to follow that there is the logic of illocutionary forces. Then we can talk about the formal system for the pray, which classified as the modal structure after Aristotle. And those speech act verbs involved here have been received as the modality in the form of sentential logic.

The readers of the Republic had been claiming that the good was not defined in the book. And in general, the absolute good cannot be defined or had not been defined as stated by recent

philosophers. We think their arguments can be illustrated as the problem of "grading". The formal structure of the modality pray was definable as far as it was a "formal system" with the proviso that there are problems of interpretations in this formal system as illustrated in the matter of grading. The interpretation in this modal structure has been received as the matter of the functional completeness thesis of the formal system. The cardinality of the continuum has been viewed as outrunning that of any linguistic expressions. And the adoption of bypassing method has been excused as the philosophical comforts.

The algebraic demand to define the set of want was that there should be possible definition of it as "*genus et differentia*" which can be posed as:

p.1: **W =: {x : Wx & (x in SA)}**
where W: want, SA: speech acts.

It was possible that there can be the formal structure of modality want, and it was to meet the demand rather than to be elegant by itself, as we can observe.

We would like to borrow the expressions of contemporary logician that the uses of sciences as "ameliorating a hostile environment"(Copi(1978)). The philosophy in the problematic context of our everyday life has been understood as "the unified sciences" during last 20th century. Hence the ameliorating a hostile environment can be received as the task of philosophy

for difficulties, aporia. Also we would like to ask your attention on the expressions, such as "is" and "ought" in order to examine the nature of pray. The dream which has been demanded widely in our everyday life often had been received as obligations which should be the mental states described objectively. The pray out of the hope was existing in our mental states, but it has been received often also as the obligations such as the ameliorating a hostile environment too, I think.

Plato quoted(*Republic* 331a) from Pindar: "sweet companion with him, to cheer his heart and nurse his old age, accompanieth Hope, who chiefly ruleth the changeful mind of mortals." The hope, elpis in his mind, kardian can be said to be "the pleasant environment", I think. The obstacles for the pleasant environments such as the natural and social aspects should be ameliorated in terms of the works in the unified sciences. From the beginning, if the man was good and he "ruleth the changeful mind of mortals", he can be good throughout. It was described(Psalms 1.3) as: "And he shall be like a tree planted by the river of water, that bringth forth his fruit in his season, his leaf also shall not whither; and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." The prosperity of the good "like a tree planted by the river of water", was the content of the hope here. However unfortunately there were obstacles too heavy for him, therefore we think they pray for the peace. We would like to receive the expressions: "Hope, peace, and prosperity" in this

context.

Last year, we had to reflect on the blind-sight such as that of honey bees. It "seems more likely that bees are a kind of zombie", they say(Allen-Hermanson(2002)). The hope of mankind had been said to be different. Here we would like to follow the well received view in our philosophical communities. The Mind of human beings has been known as that which we can find in the words of Buddha, Lao-tzu, Confucius, Socrates, and Plato. Historically man experienced quite a lot of mischiefs of their own, then they tried to remember those days when the lions of Olympus took havoc of Persian camels. Their "distant bitter memory" of it, probably, was accumulated as the Mind. It was stated that this Mind, was formulated from 10th century B. C. to 5th century B. C.. They tried to understand human life different from that of lions and also that of honey bees too. Hence the Mind of man has been understood specially as the human mind, I think.

We would like to state the common part of various philosophies, even though the differences are more heavy in our everyday life, following the spirit that it would be better to look for the normative. After the formulations of the Mind, Socrates asked to reflect oneself. This direction to reflection was well observed in Plato when he quoted(*Republic* 441b) from *Odyssey*(20.17): "He smote his breast and chided thus his heart.", I think. Book IV of the Republic has been focused as the result of this reflection on oneself, and turned out to be a study on psyche, I think. Plato divided psyche in parts, and the spirit or the purposes of this work was not stated explicitly as recently pointed out(Katayama(2002)). They all knew the subject was the piety, which has been received from their tradition, and it was the direction toward which all of his works were running. Korean reader arranged the positions of Plato on the subject of piety, aidos(Chonghyun Park(1997)). First, piety illustrated as that toward their own parents cannot be mere naming, but should be shown in terms of deeds(*Republic* 463d). Second, the children who are not obedient toward their parents cannot be just, and their injustice cannot be compensated in terms of the reverence toward other gods(*Republic* 465b). Third, the reverence toward their parents and love toward their siblings should be extended, if possible, toward every one in order to be harmonious in their community(*Republic* 466c). Fourth, one should be able to keep oneself intact from the folly to denounce the reverence as the false attitude(*Republic* 560d). Finally, the matter of piety should not be directed emotional way only in terms of poetry or imitations(*Republic* 595b). In general, the piety was the demand of the Mind to live in accordance with the idea of good in the community study of Plato. They want to have a good community, however in Plato following Socrates every citizen was asked to live in accordance with the Platonic form, with the spirit that one should work what he

was asked to do, or his own assignments, oikeiopragia(*Republic* 434c).

In general, we should not be tipsy or drunken unable to control our own body when we are driving, kuberna(*Republic* 331a). This may be named as a normative study on the mind body problem. But we also cannot deny that in our life there should be relaxing time and place in order to be able to drive again. And secondly the piety asks more, that is, our mind should be driven by reverence, which is certainly looks like the boundary cases in the study on mind.

The hermeneutics of Aristotle enumerated a couple of predicates(*On Interpretation* 22a10): "It may be. It is contingent. It is impossible. It is necessary. It is true." We take them as introducing the concept of possibility, *dunaton in addition to that of truth*, alethes. Roughly we understand the California semantics as the semantics mainly based on this hermeneutics of Aristotle, which is also by and large similar to the post structuralism working on *parole* logically, I think. The characteristic feature of them is to assert that there are logic of illocutionary forces, dunateo. Including the predicate "It is true", the enumerated predicates are predicates predicated on the sentences, which had been posed as:

p.2: "**F(p)**" (Searle(1979)), where p: proposition, F: predicate.

As we had been reading Aristotle, his syllogism was the first order predicate logic with the proviso that the sample space was not empty. And in Hermeneutics, he tried to reflect on the predicates which are somewhat beyond the scope of his original syllogism, organ. Often those philosophers of language claimed that they can handle those problems solely by the linguistic expressions. On the other hand the onto-hermeneutics, such as that in Heidegger(Heidegger 1975), presupposing the truth can be shown in terms of Moira, and they emphasized that Moira is the appearance of the truth when Moira is conflicting with logos.

We can detect the logic in the process of scientific developments. The cosmos of Ptolemy, the turn of Copernicus, also the dynamics of Newton, and the non-Euclidean *geometry* around Jan Lukasiewicz, those are places we can find logic. Now we try to find another kind of logic in the utterances including indirect speech acts, *oration oblique*. However the works on the idea of Plato *per se* had been read as "the technical". And the hermeneutics of Aristotle provided a branch of logic named modal logic, but in California semantics, the scope of discourse was confined into that of sentential logic, I think.

In the developments of modal logic, this attitude has been posed(Hughes & Cresswell(1968)) as:

p.3: "**M(p)**" where M: Possibility; p: proposition.

Here we would like to take "M(p)" as a substitution instance of the form "F(p)" quoted in the above. And the predicate variable "Fx" is interpreted as to range over the set of predicates, which is infinite in principle. And therefore we can say there can be infinite models of modal logic. Here we would like to pay attention on the uses of expression "modality" in the 20th century logic, where the provability(Goedel(1931)) was also termed as the "provability modality". The predicate called as the theorem was predicated to the set of well formed formulas. By doing so if the set of theorems is well defined, the predicate provable was a decidable predicate or a predicate can provide an algorithm in that context. Then the provability was included in the modality in general, hence this provability is included in the taxonomy of illocutionary acts too, I think.

The statement(*Republic* 427e) in Plato says; "Clearly, then, it will be wise, brave, sober, and just." was the essential part of the book. And in our study of speech acts, again the essential attitude of it was that Plato wanted that the city state will be wise, brave, sober, and just. The speech act verb, want was not repeated explicitly just like in the case of "Good morning!". They said the good was not defined in a sense that the predicates, wise, sophe was not defined. But if the predicates, wise, brave, and sober were defined, the good can be defined. And our concern here to translate the speech act verbs in an artificial language is the verbs which usually not repeated. The wise was in the propositional contents and we can write in the pattern of the above as:

p.4: !⌒ W(Is & Bs & Ss) for "s is wise, brave, and sober."

In the translated part, there is no explicit sign that it was want, but here we read as "The author wanted that s is wise, brave, and sober." In order that the city state has been "rightly founded, is good in the full sense of the word", the author said the propositional contents clearly. If the city state is already as the author stated clearly, my conjecture that this speech acts is a pray or a want cannot be well received. The reality is not that much, and as far as it had been accepted as a normative statement, my conjecture that it is a pray can be justified, I think.

If it was the case, we can write them down as in the studies in the speech acts quoted in the above. However we want to use it not "a technical" way, but as a part of philosophy, therefore we want to confine into the sentential logic. The domain first of all, should be a countable one, which can admit the elimination of quantifiers which can be posed:

p.5: $(x)Fx = : F0 \& F1 \& .. \& Fn$ where n is a natural number.

And we want to have the finite axioms which can be conjuncted as a sentence as they read in the hermeneutics of Aristotle(Cook(1938)). This finite

axiomatizability was read as the original intention of Aristotle. However the explicit statement of it was found after the development of logic with the California semantics, I think.

We would like to have a formal system which is the group representation of the uses of illocutionary acts, in the sense that we are representing the innate formal structure of the utterances termed as "the underlying rules". Plato used the metaphor(*Republic* 341c) said: "And what of the pilot—the pilot rightly so called—is he a ruler of sailor or a sailor?" "A ruler of a sailors." Here the sailing, pleo had been often used metaphorically as the governing. We pray that the pilot will govern well. Now we may call it pleo-logic, logic for the praying for the "sailing rightly, pleon orthos"(*Protagoras* 356e) in this context.

The spirit to build a formal system is that we will use an economic representation for the underlying rules. Let us think of a model, "NF + pleo", where NF for the new foundations of mathematics(Quine(1936)) and pleo can be posed as:

p.6: $W=:\{x:Wx \ \& \ (x \ in \ SA)\}$; pleo
p.7: $Wx=:$ **Wx is larger or equal to not Wx**; pleon orthos
p.8: **Lx is larger or equal to Wx, and Wx is larger or equal to Mx**; where Lx: x is necessary, Mx: x is possible, Wx: x is wanted.

We may conclude tentatively: (1) The pray is the human activity under the linguistic shelter, hence the pray by a man with enough experience is recommended. (2) The pray is aimed to communicate effectively, hence the felicity conditions in speech acts are asked for. (3) The demand of realization and the vision are often conflicting, hence the harmony of them asked for as the pragmatic logic. (4) The contents of the pray are technical Platonic form which asked the bypassing in addition to the interpretations. (5) The reminding in terms of the distant memory was often appeared as mystical, which asked strongly the Mind select correctly. The community study should meet the demand, if not it is highly vaporous. "May this rail road unite Korean family!" at Dorasan Station was a good example, because it meets the Korean Mind now. However another example that Columbia, in Southern America experienced that five out of seven presidential candidates were assassinated. And civil war continued for fifty years. Gaviotas described one of their community practise building a new community neutral from both horns of fighters(Hankyoreh April 6, 2002 p.17), which was irritating.

In short, if there is no "objective measure", it will not worked out any way as said by Hongkyu Park. The linguistic approach can deal with the expressions given already objectively, comparing to that about the future. Hence philosophy of language based on the theory of description had been worked out effectively. This method reveals the limits of analogy, analogia

here, that is, we should say based on the experiences only as an empiricist. However by doing so they can see things as it is without any bias. The works of last 20th century philosophy was not easy, but we think, directed correctly.

Errol *Proceedings and Addresses* The American Philosophical Association 2002

April 23 2002(Tue) Morning at Jeongam
李 建源

REFERENCES

·Wang & Ren *Book of Change* Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press 1993

·Heidegger, Martin *Early Greek Thinking: Translated by David Farrell Krell and Frank Capuzzi* Harper & Row Publishing Company 1975

·Plato *Republic* Ⅰ,Ⅱ; *Protagoras, Sophist: Translated into English in The Loeb Classical Library* Harvard University Press, Korean Translation by Chonghyun Park.

·Aristotle *On Interpretation, Politics: Translated into English in The Loeb Classical Library* Harvard University Press.

·Kelsen, H. *What is justice?* University of California Press 1957

·Quine, W. V. *From a logical point of view, Methods of logic etc* Harvard University Press

·Searle, J. R. *Speech acts, Intentionality, Expression and meaning etc* Cambridge University Press

·Copi, I. M. *Introduction to logic: International Edition* Macmillan Publishing Company 1978

·Hughes & Cresswell *An Introduction to Modal Logic* Harper & Row Publishing Company 1968

·Allen-Hermanson, Sean J.; Katayama,