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I. Metaphysics of the Human Being
   A. Hylomorphism ➔ Cartesian Dualism at 50,000 ft
      1. Hylomorphism: the simple version
         a. human being: one substance, two “principles” or “aspects”
         b. soul: principle of life and so (substantial) form of the living body (so human soul is the (substantial) form of the living human body)
         c. form-matter metaphysics

         ![Diagram of body and soul]

      2. Dualism: the simple version
         a. human being: two substances related in some way (causation? institution of nature? union?)
         b. soul/mind: complete substance
         c. soul/mind-body metaphysics

         ![Diagram of body, soul, and mind]

   B. Hylomorphism ➔ Cartesian Dualism at 20,000 ft (kicking up some dust)
      1. Hylomorphism: the perforated Aristotelian soul
         a. soul: (substantial) form of the living body
         b. mind: signature faculty of the human soul, viz. intellect, principle of thought
            i. immaterial
            ii. separable (can exist apart from body)
            iii. immortal
         c. unity problem: the “mind-soul” problem: what’s the relationship between the mind and the rest of the soul? How can an immaterial faculty be a power or part of a soul conceived as the substantial form of the body?
         d. mind-body interaction problem: how can a material sensory phantasm act on an immaterial intellect, as it seems it must for intellectual cognition via abstraction to occur?

      2. Cartesian Dualism: a separable Aristotelian mind
         a. real distinction: mind/soul is separable from body, i.e., can exist apart from it
b. **separable soul/mind** = (pure) intellect only, i.e., A’n mind 

c. **embodied soul/mind** (which includes sensation and passion) is *united* to the body;
   the extra features of the embodied mind *require* the body; “cannot pertain to
   the mind solely in virtue of its being a thinking thing” (*Principles* II.2)

d. **unity problem:** how might mind and body be united to form a single thing, a
   human being, given one part is immaterial and one part is material?

e. **mind-body interaction problem:** how can a material body act on the mind in
   sensation?

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hylomorphism:</th>
<th>Dualism:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. Real Change is not Hylomorphism ➔ Dualism but the Death of the Soul**

1. **Descartes’ Game Changer:** reconceive the *soul* from *principle of life ➔ principle of thought* and in so doing realign the concepts of *body, life, soul* and *mind.*
   (Bitbol-Héspériès rightly and helpfully stresses this point)

2. **Move1:** shrink the Aristotelian soul down to one of its faculties, the mind, which
   has the principle of thought (and then fuss with it a bit)

3. **Move2:** outsource the principle of life to body (and fuss with it a bit)

4. **Result:** the soul is out of a job; **death of the soul**

5. **Gassendi is onto his tricks!** AT VII 263

6. **Our Task:** look at Move1 and Move2, and the creative mess that arises

---

**II. Body and Life**

**A. Preliminaries**

1. Descartes’ commitment and importance to the life sciences

2. Note in favor of anachronistic terminology
   a. Helpfully targets the phenomena under discussion
   b. Period terms and disciplinary boundaries are in flux

---

**B. The General Argument for Outsourcing Life from Soul to Body**

1. **Soul as Giver of Life:** the body dies and vital functions cease *because* the soul
   departs. (Fernel)
   [a. Voluntary motions: the will, and so soul, moves the body]
   b. Corpses have the same body but no vital function, so soul moves the body.

2. **Body as Giver of Life:** the soul quits the body *because* the body dies and its vital
   functions cease. (Descartes)
   a. **not soul:** Many vital motions involve no thought (*so no soul*).
   b. **not soul:** Bodies are mostly moved by other bodies (*soul induced the exception*).
   c. **but body:** If the body is out of whack, the soul can’t move the body
   d. **but body:** If the body is in whack, there’s nothing left for the soul to do.
C. Re-conceiving Body: an all and only extended substance, the properties of which include only “modes” of extension, viz., size, shape, position, and [kinematic] motion. Call this the “geometrico-mechancial” conception of body. Effects:

1. “The essence of body is extension” to Aristotelian ears.
   a. Body as genus of corporeal substances, part of corporeal substance, or [necessary] accident of corporeal substance; extension might reasonably be cast as essence of the genus boy and the accident body (continuous quantity).
   b. But in none of these cases is body itself a corporeal substance.

2. Descartes raises extension from the ontological category of accident to the ontological category of substance by rendering it not a necessary accident but the very essence of corporeal substance.

3. Descartes changes the explanatory terms of physics from forms to mechanisms

D. Re-conceiving Life as a Corporeal Principle

1. Classificatory Criteria: Living vs Nonliving [Current debate 1]
   a. self-moving machines or automata
   b. micromechanisms (importantly just as occult as the soul)
   c. complexity and ingenuity [kind or degree?]
   d. self-maintaining classic life functions (nutrition, growth, responsiveness to environment)
   e. having a functioning heart?

2. Explanation: Mechanizing the life functions
   a. basic principle of life: blood heated by heart [or equiv in plants]
   b. rest of the story: micromechanisms

3. Tough Questions about the explanatory project
   a. How reductive is Descartes’ program in the life sciences? [Current debate 2]
      i. Eliminative (Alalen, Grene? Sloan?)
      ii. Non-eliminative but reductive (Brown, Detlefsen, Des Chene, Hatfield, Manning, Theurer)
      iii. Non-reductive (Hutchins)
   b. Are the Cartesian life sciences filled with pernicious teleology (outside the human case)?
      [Current debate 3]
      i. No, functions are nonteleological (Bitbol-Héspériès, Brown, Distelzweig-a, Gaukroger, Shapiro)
      ii. Yes and no, functions are teleological but that’s okay (Pichot, Des Chene, Detlefsen, Hatfield, Manning)
      iii. Yes (Distelzweig-b)

E. Re-conceiving the Sensitive Soul

1. Corporeal psychology: extends the mechanical (and hydraulic) explanation through appropriate behavioral responses to objects in the environment (sensory perception, passions, associative learning)

2. Example: so you run into a mountain lion…what happens?
III. Soul or Mind

A. Recap: Aristotelian soul = principle of life
1. Mind or Intellect is a(n immaterial, separable, immortal) faculty of the human soul
2. Mind or Intellect’s job: understanding
3. Mind or Intellect’s object: the intelligible = the immaterial = (for corporeal reality) the universal
4. Mind or Intellect’s corporeal requirement: needs to abstract intelligible forms/species from sensible phantasms (b/c no innate intelligible forms; cf. angels)

B. The Cartesian Amputation: Soul becomes Mind
1. Shrinks soul down to one of its faculties, mind or intellect
2. Thereby recasts the soul as principle of thought and discards the rest of the Aristotelian soul
3. Severs it from the body (no need for body since it has innate intellectual ideas)
4. So far it looks like the Cartesian soul/mind = the Aristotelian faculty of mind (but with a stock of innate intellectual ideas) [M2, M6, to Regius, *Principles* I.48 & 63]
5. Truth in this: this is what the separated Cartesian soul/mind that is really distinct from body amounts to

C. The Cartesian Reconstructive Surgery: Mind becomes Cartesian Mind
1. Expands (embodied) mind to include imagining and sensing: M2 & M3
2. Nip: bifurcate imagination and sensation into
   a. imagination\(_m\), sensation\(_m\): soul/mind component
   b. imagination\(_b\), sensation\(_b\): body component
3. Tuck: adds imagination\(_m\) and sensation\(_m\) to soul/mind not because they are forms of intellection, but because they undoubtedly belong to the same thinking subject as the more properly intellectual activities [but cf. M6] [and cf. Aquinas!]

Target Question: what do intellection, imagination\(_m\) and sensation\(_m\) have in common such that they all count as forms of thinking, or, indeed, as modes/modification of thinking? What’s the metaphysical basis for the grafting imagination\(_m\) and sensation\(_m\) onto the mind? What is the modern Cartesian mind?

Each substance has one principal property which constitutes its nature and essence, and to which all its other properties are referred…thought constitutes the nature of thinking substance…whatever we find in the mind is simply one of the various modes of thinking. (*Principles* I.53, AT VIII-A 25):

4. Malpractice: imagination\(_m\) and sensation\(_m\) imperfectly sewn into mind
   a. intellect essential, imagination\(_m\) and sensation\(_m\) accidental
   b. intellect belongs to the mind on its own, imagination\(_m\) and sensation\(_m\) belong only to the embodied mind
   c. indeed imagination\(_m\) and sensation\(_m\) require the mind’s union with body
   d. intellection vs imagination\(_m\) and sensation\(_m\) are different in kind

Target Question Redux: what is the nature of the Cartesian mind (i.e., of thought) such that it can meet the following three constraints:
• **Common Factor:** intellect, imagination\textsubscript{m} and sensation\textsubscript{m} are *all modes or modifications of it*; we need a common denominator.

• **Heterogeneity:** intellect is different in kind, not merely degree, from imagination and sensation

• **Priority:** intellect belongs to it *essentially and on its own* but imagination\textsubscript{m} and sensation\textsubscript{m} belong to it only *accidentally and when united to body*; the basic model is a pure intellect, the human model costs extra

D. **Descartes is no help**

E. **Interpretive Options**

1. **Consciousness** (Alquié, Balz, Gilson, Laporte, Maritain, Rorty, Williams, Maritain) (LaForge?): includes non-representational mental states (“mere sensations” “raw feels”); comes with magical epistemic properties like incorrigibility, indubitability, infallibility, transparency, privileged access, immunity to error through misidentification, etc.

   a. **pro**
   i. passages: AT VII 160, 176, 352; *Principles* I.9
   ii. LaForge definitions
   iii. fits narrative of D the man of subjectivity and first-person
   iv. good on Common Factor

   b. **con**
   i. neutral (perhaps) on Heterogeneity, but terrible on Priority
   ii. rarely uses the term *conscientia*
   iii. pulls a rabbit of the hat (totally discontinuous with tradition)
   iv. we are conscious of our thoughts, so consciousness can’t be the stuff of thought itself; it’s an important feature of thought, perhaps even an essential feature, and so a reliable mark of the mental—a way of finding the stuff, but it is not the metaphysical stuff of the mental

2. **Intellection** (Alanen, Baker and Morris, Carriero, Cottingham)

   a. **pro**
   i. passages: AT VII 27, 78; *Principles* I.48 & 63
   ii. “pure intellection” vs sensory perception and imagination
   iii. “clear and distinct” (intellectual) perception vs “obscure” and/or “confused” (sensory and imaginative) perception
   iv. gets at both Common Factor and Priority

   b. **con**
   i. sheer implausibility of construing sensations as bad intellections
   ii. bad on Heterogeneity: different in *kind* not degree, in *way* of conceiving
      a. why the restriction to bodies? if sensations are just bad intellections why don’t we have sensations of immaterial things?
      b. obscurity and confusion
         i. sensations are not intrinsically obscure or confused
         ii. some intellections are obscure and confused
   c. intellect and senses have different objects and functions, each good at its own job
   v. theodician problem: why would God give us a batch of bad intellections?
   vi. LaForge passage: intellection *presupposes* the faculty of thinking
3. **Conscious Conception of Things** (Broughton, Hatfield, Somers, me)
   a. the view
      i. object of thought
         a. intentionality (orthodox and unorthodox [aka: Malebranche])
         b. representational (orthodox only)
         c. objective being
      ii. manner of conceiving/perceiving
         a. formal being
         b. different forms: understanding, imagining, sensing

NB: relation between i and ii: two sides of a single thought-coin, not related as act-object.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manner of conceiving</th>
<th>Object of thought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>Idea-materially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>Formal being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Idea-materially</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. consciousness
    a. property of thought (not constitutive of thought)
    b. through it thought makes itself present to the mind that has it
    c. its objects: represented object, manner of conceiving, and self
    d. first-order reflexive property (not higher order)
    e. entailed by the very nature of thought

b. pro
    i. passages
    ii. some continuity with neoAristotelianism (not out of the blue)
    iii. good on Common Factor and Heterogeneity
    iv. Priority? intellection is not constitutive of thought but the default manner of conception when there is no body around to make for the imagistic manner of conceiving; it's what consciously conceiving and object looks like in a mind with no body in its life (the single life); imagination and sensation come with marriage to a body, and the offspring bear the traits of the corporeal parent in being imagistic (phenomenally extended)

c. lingering questions
    i. tough question a: is the difference between sensory and purely intellectual perception a difference in the object of thought or the manner of conceiving, the OR or FR, or both?
    ii. tough question b: does the phenomenal character of, say, a blue sensation lie in the object of thought or manner of conceiving, OR or FR?
    iii. tough question c: why bother giving sensations and imaginings to the embodied mind, given that the mechanism of the body itself can get itself around in the world in a self-preserving manner? What’s added by having sensations? Why not simply an animal body and pure intellect?