

1909 March 28 3PM

MEANING

Introd.

1

## INTRODUCTION.

Ms. 618

I wish in this Introduction to explain to the reader what I mean by Meaning and why I hold it to be not merely worth ~~while~~ making a volume about, but a great and ~~most~~ all-important subject about in which Lady Welby, perhaps, first broke ground in her book "What is Meaning?" (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1903. pp. 321.), which is here a little further cultivated, and ~~upon~~ <sup>in</sup> which future writers will find a large field for ~~the~~ <sup>as beneficial</sup> ~~profitable~~ exercise of <sup>any amount of</sup> ~~unlimited~~ industry and genius. She calls the ~~sci~~ subject "significs", and I must, with a little regret, admit that that name, though not beautiful, will answer as a designation; but it is a branch <sup>now proceed to,</sup> of the great science of Logic, the theory of thought and thinking. I will <sup>now proceed to,</sup> indicate what place I would assign to it among the sciences.

1909 Mar 29 10 $\frac{1}{2}$

MEANING  
Introd.

2

For this purpose, I must first explain what <sup>signification</sup> ~~meaning~~ I attach to the word "science, and why; and then what I understand by "a science" and by "a branch of science," and why.

The word science, with the corresponding Latin and Greek words, scientia and ἐπιστήμη, has been used at different times in three principal senses. As long as Aristotle reigned, science was defined as "knowledge through principles," which was as much as to say, syllogistically demonstrated knowledge. But this manifestly conflicts with modern notions, since, in the first place, it excludes all the <sup>physical</sup> natural, psychological, philo-  
logical, historical, and other sciences, which for ever constitute science par excellence, and in the second place makes the conclusion of a syllogism science, while its at least as well-known premisses may not be science. Therefore, this use of the word is to be utterly rejected. Bolingbroke in his

1909-Mar-29 11 $\frac{1}{2}$  AM

MEANING  
Introd  
3

introduction to the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana defined science as "systematized knowledge". But this places the emphasis upon a character of secondary importance and ~~ignores~~ ignores the heart and vitalizing spirit of science. It makes science consist in the text-book, which every man of science <sup>more nearly</sup> regards as ~~more~~ as the mortuary urn that preserves the ashes of what formerly lived as science. What are the leading characters which animates the true scientific man in whose head and heart genuine science lives? The first is ● the effective passion to find out the very truth of some subject. The second is that this truth <sup>does not animate the scientist because of its</sup> ~~is not of~~ mere personal interest or for any other ulterior reason, but simply for its pure interest in itself as truth. ~~This~~ In saying this I do not in the least exclude practical science, such as a science of the steam-engine, and the