

 [nagasaichandra](#) / [AutoFAQ](#)Branch: master ▾ [AutoFAQ](#) / Cusanus, Nicolaus [Nicolas of Cusa]_faq.md[Find file](#)[Copy path](#) **mfekadu** updates faq docs bc plato not use `www`

5b0dc53 3 hours ago

[3 contributors](#) 

227 lines (176 sloc) 19.7 KB

[Raw](#)[Blame](#)[History](#)

Cusanus, Nicolaus [Nicolas of Cusa]

How is the presence of god and god's identity with things not to be thought of as?

summarized_paragraph : Christian Neoplatonism is distinctive for its ability to hold together dialectically in thought the insight it provides about this asymmetrical, non-reciprocal connection between God and creatures. God penetrates and surpasses or exceeds each thing God creates and encompasses. Creatures are thus themselves real with the limited sort of independence they manifest, yet they are at once in God and indeed one with God without being themselves divine. **This means that the presence of God and God's identity with things is not to be thought as the kind of reciprocity, say, that two created physical things have.**

avg_grammar_rating : 5.0*avg_answerability_rating* : 5.0*sum_yes_meaningful* : 3*sum_no_meaning* : 0*sum_maybe_meaning* : 0

Nicholas said that assimilation in perception is a matter of reason's active selecting and managing the deliverances of what?

summarized_paragraph : Nicholas asks us to imagine wax informed by mind in the way mind informs our capacities for sensing. **He proposes that mind so imagined could "form the wax to every shape presented to it."** Nicholas is saying, in effect, that "assimilation" in perception is indeed a matter of reason's active selecting and managing the deliverances of sense and imagination that result from our encounters with perceptible things. We are not mere passive recipients of colors, sounds, textures and so on, he writes.

avg_grammar_rating : 3.8*avg_answerability_rating* : 5.0*sum_yes_meaningful* : 3*sum_no_meaning* : 1*sum_maybe_meaning* : 0

What is the wall of paradise?

summarized_paragraph : Cusanus leads us through a series of reflections on seeing and on the face of God. God is located beyond both imaginative exercise and conceptual understanding. **Nicholas symbolizes our approach to this beyond by encouraging us to enter "into a certain secret and hidden silence wherein there is no knowledge or concept of a face,"** characterizing it as an "obscuring mist, haze, darkness or ignorance." He invokes the coincidence of opposites from On Learned Ignorance and proposes his second central metaphor: the wall of paradise.

avg_grammar_rating : 5.0
avg_answerability_rating : 4.3
sum_yes_meaningful : 3
sum_no_meaning : 0
sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What symbolizes our approach to this beyond?

summarized_paragraph : Cusanus leads us through a series of reflections on seeing and on the face of God. God is located beyond both imaginative exercise and conceptual understanding. **Nicholas symbolizes our approach to this beyond by encouraging us to enter "into a certain secret and hidden silence wherein there is no knowledge or concept of a face,"** characterizing it as an "obscuring mist, haze, darkness or ignorance." He invokes the coincidence of opposites from On Learned Ignorance and proposes his second central metaphor: the wall of paradise.

avg_grammar_rating : 3.3
avg_answerability_rating : 3.7
sum_yes_meaningful : 2
sum_no_meaning : 1
sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What kind of knowledge is our knowledge derived from?

summarized_paragraph : Nicholas never questioned that the varied things we discover in the natural universe and fashion ourselves in the social and cultural milieu exist independently of our minds. **But the question here is whether our knowledge is derived from what is independent of mind or is in whole or part the result of linguistic and conceptual measures we learn, construct and employ in dealing with reality.** If knowing is creative or productive, solely a matter of our "measuring," it is easy to see how it is an image of God's creating, but not how it's a likening to extra-mental things.

avg_grammar_rating : 4.3
avg_answerability_rating : 4.3
sum_yes_meaningful : 3
sum_no_meaning : 0
sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What is our knowledge derived from?

summarized_paragraph : Nicholas never questioned that the varied things we discover in the natural universe and fashion ourselves in the social and cultural milieu exist independently of our minds. **But the question here is whether our knowledge is derived from what is independent of mind or is in whole or part the result of linguistic and conceptual measures we learn, construct and employ in dealing with reality.** If knowing is creative or productive, solely a matter of our "measuring," it is easy to see how it is an image of God's creating, but not how it's a likening to extra-mental things.

avg_grammar_rating : 4.7
 avg_answerability_rating : 4.0
 sum_yes_meaningful : 3
 sum_no_meaning : 0
 sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What type of things are the opposites of the god?

summarized_paragraph : Cusanus says we can do more justice to the unique relation between God and creatures. He identifies the infinite God with this "oppositeness of opposites." Now the 'opposites' in question are the ordinary things of our experience that are separate and distinct and that may have opposed or mutually exclusive properties. Cusanus proposes some possible indirect routes that will give us no positive insight or conceptual grasp of the divine Essence. For instance, if we look to the very oppositions and contradictions that plague our normal thinking about God.

avg_grammar_rating : 5.0
 avg_answerability_rating : 4.0
 sum_yes_meaningful : 4
 sum_no_meaning : 0
 sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What is the word for a man's word for imagination?

summarized_paragraph : It is the mind's power to discriminate and make sense of what we perceive, imagine or remember that Cusanus emphasizes. He writes, speaking of imagination, "When sensible things are not present, it [imagination] conforms itself to things in a confused way and without discriminating one condition from another" (Idiota de mente, c.7) The power of the mind to discriminate is the power of imagination. It is the key to understanding the world around us.

avg_grammar_rating : 2.3
 avg_answerability_rating : 2.0
 sum_yes_meaningful : 1
 sum_no_meaning : 2
 sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What power does he say conforms itself to things in a confused way?

summarized_paragraph : It is the mind's power to discriminate and make sense of what we perceive, imagine or remember that Cusanus emphasizes. He writes, speaking of imagination, "When sensible things are not present, it [imagination] conforms itself to things in a confused way and without discriminating one condition from another" (Idiota de mente, c.7) The power of the mind to discriminate is the power of imagination. It is the key to understanding the world around us.

avg_grammar_rating : 4.7
 avg_answerability_rating : 4.3
 sum_yes_meaningful : 3
 sum_no_meaning : 0
 sum_maybe_meaning : 0

Are we more familiar with the phrase "the not other" in negative ways of stating self

- identity?

summarized_paragraph : In De li Non Aliud/On the Not Other Nicholas returns to the ancient Platonic categories of the One and the Other in order to re-construe in novel language what Christians believe about the dependence of creatures on their Creator. Several of Cusanus' later works use verbal coinages or Latin neologisms as "names" or characterizations of God that are original with him, though they have earlier echoes in Christian Neoplatonism. **In this dialogue he uses the expression "the not other" as a substantive for God as the divine Not-Other, even though we are more familiar with the phrase in negative ways of stating self-identity.**

avg_grammar_rating : 5.0

avg_answerability_rating : 5.0

sum_yes_meaningful : 4

sum_no_meaning : 0

sum_maybe_meaning : 0

How are we familiar with the phrase " the not other "?

summarized_paragraph : In De li Non Aliud/On the Not Other Nicholas returns to the ancient Platonic categories of the One and the Other in order to re-construe in novel language what Christians believe about the dependence of creatures on their Creator. Several of Cusanus' later works use verbal coinages or Latin neologisms as "names" or characterizations of God that are original with him, though they have earlier echoes in Christian Neoplatonism. **In this dialogue he uses the expression "the not other" as a substantive for God as the divine Not-Other, even though we are more familiar with the phrase in negative ways of stating self-identity.**

avg_grammar_rating : 5.0

avg_answerability_rating : 4.3

sum_yes_meaningful : 2

sum_no_meaning : 0

sum_maybe_meaning : 1

What is God different from?

summarized_paragraph : God is not a dependent function of creatures. **God is precisely not any of the others and so is not other or different in the way creatures are.** Thinking God as Not-Other requires a characteristic Cusan dialectical thinking, not simply affirming or denying difference. We are to recognize and acknowledge that the divine not-Other is both not one of the other and at once not other than any or all of them. The "Not" in " not-other" differentiates God from creatures but does not exclude the divine Not- other.

avg_grammar_rating : 5.0

avg_answerability_rating : 4.3

sum_yes_meaningful : 3

sum_no_meaning : 0

sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What is not one of the others?

summarized_paragraph : God is not a dependent function of creatures. **God is precisely not any of the others and so is not other or different in the way creatures are.** Thinking God as Not-Other requires a characteristic Cusan dialectical thinking, not simply affirming or denying difference. We are to recognize and acknowledge that the divine not-Other is both not one of the other and at once not other than any or all of them. The "Not" in "not-other" differentiates God from creatures but does not exclude the divine Not- other.

avg_grammar_rating : 4.3

avg_answerability_rating : 3.0

sum_yes_meaningful : 3

sum_no_meaning : 1

sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What does nicholas propose?

summarized_paragraph : The natural universe, then, is the whole or contracted maximum collectively constituted by the many beings in space and time. **Nicholas proposes the quasi-Anaxagorean slogan that "each thing is in each thing: quodlibet in quolibet" to emphasize that the individual beings or parts are no less "contracted" images of the whole created universe.** Just as God is present to each creature that stands as a contracted image of the divine, so the universe as a macrocosm is present to each creatures or constitutive part as microcosm.

avg_grammar_rating : 5.0

avg_answerability_rating : 5.0

sum_yes_meaningful : 3

sum_no_meaning : 0

sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What is the universe?

summarized_paragraph : The natural universe, then, is the whole or contracted maximum collectively constituted by the many beings in space and time. **Nicholas proposes the quasi-Anaxagorean slogan that "each thing is in each thing: quodlibet in quolibet" to emphasize that the individual beings or parts are no less "contracted" images of the whole created universe.** Just as God is present to each creature that stands as a contracted image of the divine, so the universe as a macrocosm is present to each creatures or constitutive part as microcosm.

avg_grammar_rating : 5.0

avg_answerability_rating : 4.0

sum_yes_meaningful : 4

sum_no_meaning : 0

sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What kind of reality are mind - independent things?

summarized_paragraph : **Nicholas avers that our knowledge of the natural and cultural world embodied in and made systematic in the technical and mechanical and liberal arts will remain "conjectural"** The reason is that **we are not dealing with the true reality of mind-independent things whose true forms are one with God.** We only encounter the physically located temporal realities that are images of the really real. Only the concepts of mathematics are not conjectural because we fashion or construct these ideas ourselves. Consequently our conceptions of them can be precise and certain. As conceptual entities they escape the sorts of change and bodily limits characteristic of the physical world.

avg_grammar_rating : 4.7
 avg_answerability_rating : 4.0
 sum_yes_meaningful : 2
 sum_no_meaning : 1
 sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What will our knowledge of the natural and cultural world embodied in and made systematic in the technical and mechanical arts remain?

summarized_paragraph : Nicholas avers that our knowledge of the natural and cultural world embodied in and made systematic in the technical and mechanical and liberal arts will remain "conjectural" The reason is that we are not dealing with the true reality of mind-independent things whose true forms are one with God. We only encounter the physically located temporal realities that are images of the really real. Only the concepts of mathematics are not conjectural because we fashion or construct these ideas ourselves. Consequently our conceptions of them can be precise and certain. As conceptual entities they escape the sorts of change and bodily limits characteristic of the physical world.

avg_grammar_rating : 4.7
 avg_answerability_rating : 4.7
 sum_yes_meaningful : 3
 sum_no_meaning : 0
 sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What kind of not - other is not one of the creatures?

summarized_paragraph : The divine Not-Other is not one of the creatures, but in a different way than they are different from one another. Cusanus gives expression to this important difference between finite and Infinite. Negatively, the Not- other is not finite as the others are. Positively, the reflexivity characteristic of a limited thing's self-identity also characterizes the not-Other's relation with it. To put this more formally, the difference or opposition between created things is both symmetrical and transitive.

avg_grammar_rating : 4.7
 avg_answerability_rating : 5.0
 sum_yes_meaningful : 3
 sum_no_meaning : 0
 sum_maybe_meaning : 0

The divine not - other is not one of what?

summarized_paragraph : The divine Not-Other is not one of the creatures, but in a different way than they are different from one another. Cusanus gives expression to this important difference between finite and Infinite. Negatively, the Not- other is not finite as the others are. Positively, the reflexivity characteristic of a limited thing's self-identity also characterizes the not-Other's relation with it. To put this more formally, the difference or opposition between created things is both symmetrical and transitive.

avg_grammar_rating : 3.3
 avg_answerability_rating : 4.0
 sum_yes_meaningful : 2
 sum_no_meaning : 1
 sum_maybe_meaning : 1

What is one way we can speculate about the non - finite presence - in - absence?

summarized_paragraph : We are able to speculate about the case of a non-finite presence-in-absence by starting with but moving beyond the limits of the presence and absence we are familiar with in the realm of limited things. Now we turn to the presence of the unfamiliar infinite One as what is finally required, even if not obviously experienced, to keep the creaturely image present and real. In this case, we may think that absence becomes what is metaphorical. But God's presence is hardly like that of one physical thing to another. It is ineluctably and literally necessary to explain the reality of anything and everything.

avg_grammar_rating : 5.0

avg_answerability_rating : 5.0

sum_yes_meaningful : 2

sum_no_meaning : 1

sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What cardinal's of the pope has to be conjectural?

summarized_paragraph : The cardinal's sight of the pope has to be conjectural because anything extended can show, as it were, but one side of itself to another embodied viewer. Two other sources of "otherness" besides bodiliness underlie the limitations on perceptual knowledge. These differ from both our mental capacities and what we are looking at or listening to. This means the terms in which perceptual judgments are expressed reflect the broader historical background and interests of the perceiver as well as his or her linguistic community.

avg_grammar_rating : 4.0

avg_answerability_rating : 5.0

sum_yes_meaningful : 3

sum_no_meaning : 0

sum_maybe_meaning : 0

The cardinal's sight of the pope has to be conjectural because it can show only one side of itself to another embodied?

summarized_paragraph : The cardinal's sight of the pope has to be conjectural because anything extended can show, as it were, but one side of itself to another embodied viewer. Two other sources of "otherness" besides bodiliness underlie the limitations on perceptual knowledge. These differ from both our mental capacities and what we are looking at or listening to. This means the terms in which perceptual judgments are expressed reflect the broader historical background and interests of the perceiver as well as his or her linguistic community.

avg_grammar_rating : 1.7

avg_answerability_rating : 2.3

sum_yes_meaningful : 0

sum_no_meaning : 2

sum_maybe_meaning : 1

What is a kind of second - order language about the ways in which we are forced to think and talk about divinity?

summarized_paragraph : In negative and apophatic "theology," we are not only told what God is not but led to reflect explicitly on what God must be. **The result is a kind of second-order language about the ways in which we are forced to think and talk about divinity.** It is not that creatures coincide with God or God with creatures, but that in God all else coincides as nothing else than God. At the same time this "coincidence" underlines the divine Oneness that comprehends all else.

avg_grammar_rating : 5.0

avg_answerability_rating : 4.7

sum_yes_meaningful : 3

sum_no_meaning : 0

sum_maybe_meaning : 0

What is not one of the other?

summarized_paragraph : God is not a dependent function of creatures. God is precisely not any of the others and so is not other or different in the way creatures are. Thinking God as Not-Other requires a characteristic Cusan dialectical thinking, not simply affirming or denying difference. **We are to recognize and acknowledge that the divine not-Other is both not one of the other and at once not other than any or all of them.** The "Not" in "not-other" differentiates God from creatures but does not exclude the divine Not- other.

avg_grammar_rating : 4.3

avg_answerability_rating : 3.3

sum_yes_meaningful : 0

sum_no_meaning : 2

sum_maybe_meaning : 1

What is not one of the other?

summarized_paragraph : God is not a dependent function of creatures. God is precisely not any of the others and so is not other or different in the way creatures are. Thinking God as Not-Other requires a characteristic Cusan dialectical thinking, not simply affirming or denying difference. **We are to recognize and acknowledge that the divine not-Other is both not one of the other and at once not other than any or all of them.** The "Not" in "not-other" differentiates God from creatures but does not exclude the divine Not- other.

avg_grammar_rating : 3.7

avg_answerability_rating : 2.7

sum_yes_meaningful : 0

sum_no_meaning : 2

sum_maybe_meaning : 1