

37 4
Dec. 17/46.

Dear Bell:

1^o Father Hausmann's point is well put and his objection should be met. I presume we may publish his letter (substituting "To the editor" loco "Bell"), and will do so, answer or no answer from Lalor — whom I advise to look into his notes of lectures I gave on this very subject during his first years at Laval. I want the Quodlibeta to be the real thing — and to face issues. — Whatever the answer, I'll see to its civility.

2^o No question of dictating questions. They have been asked, but not for the Qdl. Since they have their point, they might as well be used. Those brought up against what I hold are made by people who do not come out in the open. Item, we must get this thing started.

3^o Circa Maritain's Logic. Though I think he could have digested John of St. Th. more thoroughly, — he errs concerning the nature of formal and material logic, and fails to take modern logicians by the seat of their pants in the notes circa finem (which I will point out when I get back from my trip to California this week until Jan. 7 — no time now — *qua ratione velociter scribo*). I do not recall having voiced any criticism; I have said, and still say, that it is by far the best, and indeed the only piece of strictly philosophical writing Maritain has ever given us. Dionne, I know, has voiced criticism in class — but merely in answer to objections raised from Maritain's Logic. What he has to my I'll find out and tell you. Indeed, Dionne does not go the whole distance with John on speculative and liberal art, but rather follows Cajetan. I'll tell you about this too.

4^o I see nothing wrong in your presentation of CG, and surely do not object to the device. — Apart from what you have then, and both for speculative and practical reasons, be sure to bring out the fact that the common good has the nature of what is common as opposed to proper, primo et per se because, in a given order, its perfection is greater than what can be possessed by an individual as a proper good — which shows that it always denotes an imperfection in *eo cuius est bonum*. Otherwise (and this is important especially in the case of beatitude) the community of the good would arise only from the existence of many to share in it. And thus you also see what "part" and "whole" mean in this connection. *Ex inde*, any contempt for, or revolt against a common good qua common, is always due to pride.

Dear Susan:

50 The 10th predicament will turn up in the QdI. The nun you refer to (Sister Verda Claire) is still here, and, from her notes, I'm supposed to have said, in explaining III Phys., 1.5, n.15, circa finem, that when "habitus" is taken properly, it must always signify what results from a man being clothed or armed. The present passage is the best in St. Thomas. Hence, what results from a horse being-saddled is not called "habitus", secundum quod equus in sua natura consideratur, sed etc... The reason is clear from what was said in the same paragraph. Now, if we considered only and absolutely the related terms "horse" and "saddle", no "habitus" proper arises, and the use of the term becomes a metaphor. Hence, in all such instances dupliciter considerari possunt; vel secundum se, et tunc dicitur habitus metaphorice; vel secundum quod in usum hominis veniunt, scil. proprie, quamvis mediate. — I referred to that text in John of St. Thomas, and said it should be understood in the same way, adding that, si in hoc fiat vis, houses and vehicles, insofar as they protect us against weather or supply us with what the antelope has by its legs or the bird by its wings, may be reduced to a common genus with clothing proper, or whatever man has in such a way. Thus, the "paries" and the "ornamenta" become related to man like "trunks" and "pants" or "socks" and "shoes", and not merely like "pantseid trunks" or "shoed socks", or "saddled horse".—Omnia suntne clara?

60 The article that was to appear in the Journal is not yet ready. Ratio: I haven't got the proper mathematician around to help me. The best mathematician here, the dean of Science, is completely immersed in administration. I'm waiting. But, what is most important is this question from the philosophical point of view, has appeared in Lav. Th. & Ph. no 1, "La dialectique des limites....", which, to become readable, should be expanded into a book.

70 Circa PS, re logic for 16 weekers. Something would have to be written for them. Personally, there being no such text, I'd give them Aristotle's Rhetoric. But I'll talk to Dionne about it.

Drop me a line after New Year to remind me!

Love.

January 27, 1947

Dear Chas:-

Very sorry indeed I had to keep you waiting so long, but this mass-product educational factory in which I function as a very minor cog has had me breathless since the first of the month. And before that I was equally breathless getting out Christmas mail, etc. One dam thing after another. I shall try to clear up various items now.

To begin with, I had a letter from Hausmann, saying to go ahead and use his letter to me about "infinite sets" as treated in Lalor's paper. I don't think there is anything more I need say about that. Be sure I get a notice when the third number of the Bulletin comes out, and I shall send check to cover my abonnement for the present year.

I enclose the last letter you wrote me, as per your request. The rest of this will be in response to that.

There's a chap at Loyola College in Montreal, Father Eric O'Connor, who has a degree in Math from Harvard, and who is highly spoken of in that field here as well as there. Very nice fellow to meet. When I passed thru Montreal last summer I told him of the project under way at Laval to develop the philosophy of math, adding a little soft-soap about the necessity of making said development acceptable to mathematicians, or, at any rate, not leaving any of their objections unanswered. I took the liberty of suggesting that, if he should be asked to do so, he could be of considerable service (being one of the few mathematicians who is also equipped with a background in philosophy) in keeping the mathematical viewpoint in proper focus in connection with this ~~project~~ project, and helping to test the results in accordance with that viewpoint. In plain English, if your stuff would satisfy him it would stand a better chance of satisfying other mathematicians. Trouble with all these guys, though, is that they are either afraid of the philosopher (having the feeling that he is trying to dictate to them), or they want him to sit at their feet while they instruct him not only in math but in philosophy. I think Eric is one of the least likely to do that, since he impresses me as a real gentleman, and very likeable chap. Since, as you once remarked, we haven't had a genuine philosopher in the tradition since the 17th century, and I suppose there have been a hell of a lot of good mathematicians during that interval, one has to recognize the naturalness of this attitude of theirs and be patient with them. Which, if you don't mind my saying so, appears to me to be precisely the place where Kocurek is likely to fail, -- I mean by wounding tender skins!

Thanks for the dope on Maritain's logic. I shall keep a copy of that, while returning the original to you. I shan't be teaching logic the coming semester, so I shall have time to work it in against the time when I do teach logic again. My reference to criticism of M's logic which I had heard at Laval was really to the criticisms which, as you say, Dionne had voiced against him. I didn't hear Dionne myself, but only what some students attending his classes had quoted him as saying. Perhaps I should not have bothered you about it at all, but the matter has come up here more than once, and I was especially puzzled by the position taken by one man, viz., that M. was merely condensing JST's logic for the use of elementary students, and that, consequently, if JST was acceptable he didn't see why Maritain shouldn't be.

In re the other point about logic, i.e. what to do in a 16 week course, 3 hours per week: I quite understand that something has to be written for them, as you say; and, in fact, have been using my own text, or notes, or outline, or whatever you want to call it, in mimeographed form, since my second year in Cleveland; and it has been used by three others here for the past two semesters. Much to my surprise, they have found it satisfactory, with a few emendations here and there, and express themselves as wishing to go on using it for the coming semester. But my problem is rather: I can't see what the hell use is the amount of formal logic which you can give them in that length of time under these conditions if you stick to anything like the traditional procedure. (Incidentally, your remark about giving them Aristotle's rhetoric has more

Anyway: either give them more time or don't bother with

than a little bit in its favor; I intend to look into the possibilities of that. I've felt for a long time that the whole thing should be combined with freshman English and let it go at that). In that amount of time you can give them a few snippets about terms, some more snippets about propositions (contradictories, conversion, opposition, etc); and you have to watch yourself ~~me~~ or else the time will slip by and you will have to rush through the syllogism, the enthymeme, etc., which are supposed to be the important part of the course. ~~As a matter of fact~~ This year we all rushed like hell, but I don't think any of the four of us who were teaching the stuff got beyond the treatment of the enthymeme and the hypothetical syllogism; and, at that, the kids (said "kids" are, many of them, married men with children, ex G.I's!) were yelling that we were going too fast. They also say: "This course just gets interesting and begins to look a bit practical when exam time swoops down on us and we have to quit it." Of course we give them a lot of drill, exercises in criticizing syllogisms, ~~and~~ ^{expanding} and criticizing ~~and~~ ^{and} enthymemes, etc., and that takes up a good deal of the time. If it were a matter of lecture only you could get much farther; but I doubt if it would be any use. The course is easy enough to teach and there's plenty of matter even in my little text to fill out the time; but damned if I can see what ~~anyone's~~ good such stuff does anyone unless and until they have reached a fairly thorough treatment of fallacies, and, above all, have had a good deal of practice in applying their knowledge of rules etc., to "live prose", i.e. prose which is written to set forth ideas and doctrines, sound or unsound, and not merely made up to provide exercises for a logic text. The same kids who can rattle off the rules of the syllogism and pick out an undistributed middle every time, cannot be trusted to analyze a paragraph of Aristotle or St Thomas, or even an ordinary newspaper editorial or "column" and say clearly what the writer is trying to put over, where he fails, where he is unsound and why, etc. And if the course doesn't do that much for them I don't see much use in giving it at all.

However, please don't take time to answer this diatribe. You don't mind my blowing off on paper, 800 miles away. It's not like having to listen to me in the Grand Salon, or on the porch at Les Eboulements. As with the radio, when ~~the letter~~ a letter gets tiresome you can turn it off, -- by skipping!

I am pleased that you are content with my attempt to present Bien Commun graphically by a diagrammatic device. I have squeezed it into my course in Ethics, and it has to be done some such way or there won't be time for it at all. I shall make a copy of your paragraph 4 in the letter which I am returning herewith, and be guided what you say therein.

which was asked

Jan 28. The question about the tenth predicament does not yet seem to me to be answered, nor, indeed, understood. The question referred to a paragraph in Hartman: Textbook of Logic (in general not a bad book, and pretty widely used by logic teachers as a handbook, if not by their students; Hartman is a Precious Blood Father, at St Joseph's College, Indiana). The paragraph is as follows: (page 90):

"Habit is the modification of one substance by another. Examples: John wears an overcoat. The floor is overlaid with linoleum (this was the example Sister Verda adduced). The book is wrapped. The apples are crated. The altar is decorated with flowers."

Now in this passage, there is no question of man at all, except in the first, or "overcoat" example. In the proposition "John is overcoated", the predicate "overcoated" obviously bears the relation of habitus to the subject. But what Sister V. and I wanted to know was: Can the same be said of "overlaid with linoleum" in relation to "floor"; of "wrapped" in relation to "book"; of "crated" in relation to "apples", of "decorated" in relation to "altar"? In other words, are "linoleum", "wrapped", etc. in the category of habitus because the linoleum is on a floor, or the wrapping on a book?

Now I have to run and hear retreatants' confessions. And how the hell can I study habitus or anything else when I have to be always running to this and that?

..... Confessions over, back to habitus. If, as you seem to insist,

and as St Thomas' commentary also seems to insist, a thing comes under the category of habitus only when it can be predicated, remotely at least, of man, then (1) the definition of habitus given by Hartman: "the modification of one substance by another" is a bad definition; and (2) such predicates as "linoleated", "wrapped", "crated", and "decorated", are not good examples of habitus, as Hartman seems to think they are, and they should not be paralleled with "overcoated", as Hartman appears to do.

With regard to the passage in JST, Curs. Phil., Vol I, p. 637 b, 41: "Reducuntur etiam ad hoc praedicamentum ornamenta parietum, quae proprie non sunt vestes", Thompson offered that as justifying Hartman's view. I don't think it does, because "ornamenta parietum" in that passage refers at least remotely to man, whereas, in the other other examples, "linoleated", "wrapped", etc., do not refer to man; but to "floor", "book", etc. Am I right?

A practical question: I have dug up a lad here who looks as tho he might have some excellent stuff in him and who is nibbling at the idea of going in for philosophy teaching. Product of Father Flanagan's "Boystown", in Iowa, so, I judge, an orphan, or comes from a broken home or something like that. Went from there to Benedictine monastery, Conception, Missouri. ~~Max~~ Is twenty-two years old, has had ~~sixty years~~ four years high school Latin and two years seminary Latin, some French also. Has quite a keen mind; and, as you remarked of Oesterle, "asks the right questions". He was in the service for some time and has been here for two years on the GI bill. Why he started here as a freshman I don't know, since he'd had two years of college already. ^{coming semester} This will be his last semester here, for I have told him that, if he's thinking of philosophy teaching, he will be wasting his time here, since we have so little to offer him, -- he is definitely, in my opinion, past the stage of "assembly line education", and quite ready to start graduate work. This coming semester I am planning to go through the De Anima and commentary (Latin and Kocourek's translation) with him, introduce him to I Physicorum, and also the Poemia Naturalia. What I would like you to tell me is this: would there be any chance that he would be accepted at Laval next fall without having an undergraduate degree from here? I think he quite definitely plans to attend courses at Laval next summer, and I shall put every pressure on him to do so. Hence you will be able to get acquainted with him and by that means be in better position to answer my question.

Understand you will be touring USA in early spring, and then going to Rome for lectures at the Angelicum. Good luck with both, and perhaps I shall see you during the first period. For God's sake be careful of yourself hopping round in planes, etc., with all these crashes being reported almost daily.

No doubt the Cardinal's death will have been a great loss to you. I was sure it would. I hope his successor, whoever he may be, will be as understanding and helpful to you as was the kindly Roderigue. I said Mass for him the day after receiving your card, tho I had already seen the news in the papers.

Regards to Zoe and the family.

Bell

P.S. You asked whether that horrible speech of Patton's was supposed to be authentic. I was told it was an actual transcript.

As a definition of Common Good intelligible to kids I have been using the following: "A Common Good, in general, is a good which can be possessed by many, each one having the whole of it, (though not "wholly", necessarily) in such a way that what each possesses is not diminished by the fact that others possess it also, nor by any increase in the number of those who possess it." Est-ce que cela marche?

7/2/47

Dear Charley:-

Bref, because I'm up to my eyes in work,-- summer school, etc. I have given a letter of introduction to you to Charles Smith, who graduated here in 1946 and has been taking a few grad courses here during the past year besides acting as office manager for the Dean of one of the colleges. He will be following your courses and Flynn's this summer and will be teaching logic and possibly pre-Socratic Greek phil here next year. By way of helping him a bit with the latter I'd like very much to have him see Reith's thesis, which I found so illuminating, if you could let him have it for a short time. He has a copy which I had made here while it was in my possession, but there was not time to proof-read it, and corrections are badly needed. My idea is that if he could get a look/~~at~~ at the original he could make the corrections himself, while in Quebec. All this supposes that you have no objection to leaving it in his possession for a week or so. He is thoroughly reliable and absolutely reponsible.

Another graduate from here (1947) who will be with Smith is Joseph McCarthy, who will also be teaching for us next fall as a graduate assistant.

Stille another is Thomas MacIntosh, who, I think, graduates next February or next June.

All these lads are good students, as far as philosophy goes. Their big difficulty will be French and Latin.

Father L.L.Nurnberger, SJ. from This province, who studied last year at Toronto, has, I understand, been in Quebec for some weeks, and has probably contacted you before this. I shall be interested in his reaction. I dont think he is as yet completely indoctrinated (or infected!) with the Toronto bug, and, judging from the report of a colleague of his, now teaching here in summer school, he and others are a bit critical of certain proceduress there. Privately, I should like to see both of them transfer to Laval.

Best regards to Zoe and the family, and conaratuaditions on the arrival of Joseph-Marie (?).

July 1, 1947

Dear Charles:-

This will introduce to you Mr Charles Smith, one of our graduate students, who is following some of the summer courses at Laval and who will be teaching Philosophy for us here next year. Also Mr Thomas MacIntosh, one of our seniors, who will like/~~wise~~ be following your courses. Any courtesy you may be able to show them will be esteemed a personal favor to me.

I should be especially grateful if you would allow Mr Smith to use the original of Father Reith's thesis: "The Marxian Dialectics of Nature", to make some necessary corrections in a copy which I had made while the manuscript was in my possession last summer, and which is considerably in need of proof-reading. Mr. Smith has the copy with him.

Sincerely yours

R. J. Belleporche SJ
R. J. Belleporche SJ

July 27, 1947

Dear Charley:-

We have a Belgian priest visiting here at present, Father De Muelder, who is contemplating a trip to Quebec shortly, and, having been told that I had been there and that I knew you, requested of me a letter of introduction to you, which I am giving him. He is originally, I believe, from Antwerp, but has been for the past twenty years connected with the Belgian Jesuit Mission of Ranchi in India. He tells me that they have built up a mission of 350,000 converts and some 800 schools, and that they have finally got round to starting a college which they hope to develop into a university. His visit to Montreal and Quebec has a twofold purpose: to try to persuade the authorities, both diocesan and Jesuit, to allow him to make an appeal ^{from the pulpit} for funds, as he has been doing in various places in the USA, and to find, if possible, some young chaps with the requisite training, especially in the sciences, who would be willing to sign up for a couple of years teaching in the aforesaid college.

You do not need to fear that he will try to make a "touch", for I have intimated to him that you are a sort of missionary yourself and are carrying on at a sacrifice. However, if "the poor Belgian immigrant", from Montreal, whose name I forget but whom I met last summer, would be inclined to help the mission by way of a sort of "fire-insurance for the next world", it might not do any harm to bring the two together. Possibly de Muelder, who is a very engaging fellow, might bring him back to the straight and narrow path. You will know about that much better than I. As for the contacts through which he might get to meet young graduates to whom the sojourn in India might appeal, you will also know what to do about that, if anything.

I have told ^u De Muelder that, if he arrives in Quebec after August first, you will probably not be in town, but he says he will take a chance on that.

I hope that our lads who have followed the summer courses, as well as Fathers Toner and Nurenberger have given a good account of themselves. Whether they have or not, they cannot fail to have gotten something

which will help them to make a start next year, and, I hope, lead to further studies in the regular course later on at Laval. I shall look forward eagerly to getting their impressions.

Take a good rest at Les Eboulements. My best regards to Zoe and the family.

Sincerely yours

Bell

Sept # 3

Dear Chas:-

I need some advice. I have to teach a course in "Special Ethics" this coming semester. As you may or may not know, the course in Special Ethics as treated in the average neo-Scholastic textbook is largely watered-down and thinly-disguised moral theology, and seminary-textbook moral theology at that. The assigned text which I will have to use is a particularly lousy example of this.

On the other hand, these textbooks give very little treatment to what I consider the most important part of ethics after the treatise on the End of Man, viz., the treatise on the virtues. The students get some knowledge of the "End", but little or none about the "Means" to that end. It was skipped or skimmed in the Ethics course which I had in the scholasticate, and it is skipped in the colleges. Particularly the subject matter of Nach Ethics book VI, the Intellectual Virtues, is never so much as mentioned. Mentioning the matter a few times recently in giving courses in General Ethics, I found that the students eagerly lapped it up, but there was no time to do anything like a thoro job with it. The text which I have to use gives a scant nine pages to the subject, unintelligibly technical, and not mentioning the intellectual virtues at all.

In a Scholastic approach to a very moralistic treatment of conscience
Now I should like to try a fuller treatment of the subject in the coming semester, giving at least half the time, or more, to the treatment of the virtues, both moral and intellectual. But, as usual, there is the question of what to follow by way of a text which is both full enough in treatment and not too difficult for beginners. Further, I should like to do the thing in such a way that the students will thereby gain a little more acquaintance with Aristotle and St Thomas.

There are several possibilities:

- (1) The text of Aristotle, in whole or in part, together with St Thomas' commentary on the same.
- (2) The treatise on the virtues in the Summa, I-II, qq. 55-67, plus some additions, possibly, from the commentary.

... the articles which contain a division of the various kinds of virtues.

September 9, 1947.

... the amount of Ethics. However the

usually make quite a mess. I do not skip the problem. In greater detail by sim- your course is to be I would use the Summa Chapters 25 to 39 in- would proceed as St. Aristotle's Ethics. o the negative aspect r the preparation of reak. Our treatises, lcity, at the same tant to know, first Heretoo, the dialec- ly when we know what pared to understand I find out that the first, happiness can- as, that it cannot an glory, that it ad so on.

of virtue using the ae, questions 57-69. he Ethics except for ason is that the pro- of the Ethics is a to use the "De

inalibus" from the

(3) The Questio Disputata "De Virtutibus in Communi" and something of the Questio "De Virtutibus Cardinalibus". These I would have to translate for the students as we go along and give it to them in mimeographed form, as would also be the case with the Commentary, if I used that. This would be a lot of work, but I would be learning a good deal myself.

Will you advise me on; first, whether you think it a good idea to attempt the thing at all; secondly, whether to use one of the above indicated treatments, or some combination of them; thirdly, whether there is anything else which may be used.

If John of St Thomas' Cursus Philosophicus contained a "Summa textus" on this subject as it does, for instance, on the physics, this would be ideal, but I do not believe it does. Possibly there is something in the Cursus Theologicus, of which we have a copy, which would serve the purpose better than any of the above. I would appreciate it if you would give me the reference, if the treatment is useable and is contained in the Curs. Theol.

I enclose a self-addressed postcard on which I have written the various possibilities, to make a prompt reply convenient for you. I shall be grateful for any expansion of this by letter which you may be able to add.

I had a nice visit with Doc Doran in Cleveland. He and his wife wish to be remembered to you. They greatly appreciate your calling on them when you are in Cleveland. Naturally, Doc is still interested in the business of the philosophical demolition of "socialized medicine". I doubt if it can be done the way he wants it, but, if I can find the time, I shall try to formulate a question for him to send you which you may find answerable.

Natalie told me earlier in the summer that Zoe had been ill, and Parent in a brief note indicated that most of the rest of the family had been laid up also, but added "tous sont maintenant retablis", which was good news. Take care of your own self as well as of them. We had several casualties in our community this year, including a couple of deaths from heart conditions, at least one of them traceable to overwork. Myself I don't think it is worth the risk. as always yours, Bell

September 9, 1947.

tell me is the amount of in Ethics. However the

usually make quite a mess I'd not skip the problem. in greater detail by since your course is to be al, I would use the Summa up Chapters 25 to 39 in- I would proceed as St. Aristotle's Ethics. to the negative aspect for the preparation of a break. Our treatises, felicity, at the same important to know, first in. Heretoo, the dialectic only when we know what prepared to understand will find out that the why, first, happiness cannot goods, that it cannot human glory, that it y, and so on.

problem of virtue using the Ia Iae, questions 57-69. of the Ethics except for The reason is that the pro- h book of the Ethics is od idea to use the "De is Cardinalibus" from the articles which contain a virtues.

September 9, 1947.

Rev. R J Belleperche, S.J.
University of Detroit.

Dear Bell:

One important thing you forgot to tell me is the amount of time you dispose of for these lectures on Ethics. However the general idea is a very good one.

First of all, though the textbooks usually make quite a mess of the treatise on the End of Man, I would not skip the problem. On the contrary, I would have take it up in greater detail by simply following the text of St. Thomas. Since your course is to be mainly philosophical, not just theological, I would use the Summa Contra Gentes, Book III. You might take up Chapters 25 to 39 inclusive, De fine et felicitate hominis. I would proceed as St. Thomas does, who follows as much as possible Aristotle's Ethics. That is, I would devote considerable time to the negative aspect of the problem, and, by using the Ethics for the preparation of your lectures, give practical happiness a break. Our treatises, insisting as they should on speculation felicity, at the same time ignore the practical. It is very important to know, first of all, what happiness does not consist in. Heretoo, the dialectical approach is quite essential. It is only when we know what felicity does not consist in that we are prepared to understand more fully what it does consist in. You will find out that the students are very interested in seeing why, first, happiness cannot consist in the enjoyment of material goods, that it cannot even consist in a good name, in fame and human glory, that it can't consist in the acquisition of money, and so on.

Next I would take up the general problem of virtue using the text you, yourself, suggest, that is the Ia Iae, questions 57-69. I would not, however, use the sixth book of the Ethics except for the preparation of your own lectures. The reason is that the problem is much too metaphysical. The sixth book of the Ethics is not really Ethics. And it would be a good idea to use the "De Virtutibus in Communi" and "De Virtutibus Cardinalibus" from the Quaestiones Disputatae, especially the articles which contain a general division of the various kinds of virtues.

And finally I would give them some examples taken from the third and fourth books of the Ethics. You might indeed advise these students to procure the text of Aristotle which is available in cheap editions. I would use these two books to give them an idea of what a moral treatment of the virtues consist in and I would stress more particularly such virtues as magnificence and magnanimity. These virtues are usually neglected.

This covers a lot of territory. In fact, I had thought at first that it might be best to confine yourself to the treatment of human happiness (Third book of Summa Contra Gentiles) and to the treatise on the Divine Law in the same third book S.C.G. chapters 107 to 146 — using, of course, the Ia IIae for your own preparation. Take a look at this. You will see immediately whether or not it will interest your students. You have greater experience than I have.

It might be a good idea to read John of St. Thomas "Isagoge" the part where it shows the order of Ia IIae. There exists a French translation of this "Isagoge". There may be an English translation. If you are allowed to go into moral theology, I would give the students a copy. But again you are the better judge.

Dec. 1947

Dear Charles:-

If you don't mind my talking shop along with a Christmas greeting, I'd like to ask a few questions which I've been wanting to ask for some time:

1. Where do I stand with regard to this de Lubac business? At our meeting in Boston last Easter one read a communication which he had received from de Lubac in answer to a point-blank question: "Do you or do you not hold the impossibility of the creation of man without a supernatural end?" De L. answered: "I do not hold and never have held any such view."

2. Has Gilson successfully shown, in "Being and Some Philosophers" that Aristotle is an essentialist in his metaphysics, whereas he ought to be an existentialist? (Keep calm, mon fils, keep calm!) I can gather what your answer might be from a line on page 143 of Laval Phil. et Theol. vol. V, No. 1: "....on peut s'étonner de lire que toute science, selon Aristote, fait abstraction de l'esse...." Is there, or will there be forthcoming, anything in the nature of a detailed review or criticism? The work has tremendous authority in some quarters and through his admirers its influence is being passed on to students who are not yet capable of judging for themselves.

-2-

To these last, if not to their Gilson-olatrous teachers, such a criticism might be helpful.

3. Is his general position sound, viz. that true philosophy must be existentialist rather than essentialist?

4. I noted with great interest the catalog description of "Introduction to Philosophy" in your current catalog. Can't lay my hand on it right now, but I do not remember that any materials were listed. At the same time I hardly think it will be a lecture course. We are thinking of re-vamping our "Introduction" here, ~~the~~ which has practically been the pre-Socratics et praeterea nihil, and a more detailed knowledge of how the course as described in your catalog is handled would be very helpful. Possibly we should drop the course as some seem to think, but every attempt to do that has been thwarted some way or other. I have sometimes thought that a very good Introductory course could be given simply by the reading of most of I Physics and I Metaphysics.

My very best Christmas and New Year wishes to yourself and Zoe and the family, not forgetting Berta, if she is still with you. Hope to see you in St Paul next Easter.

Mon fils:-

A brief note for the following purposes;

1. To wish you and Zoe and the family again all the joys of the season

2. To say that I am sending you under separate cover an oversize Christmas card which will serve to illustrate your lecture on "Le Sens de 'L'Humeur'", apropos "Monkeys are funny because they look as tho they should be rational and arent". *Good luck, what?*

3. To say that I have seen Maritain's "Person and the Common Good", a reprint of the article he had in the "Review of Politics", with one chapter added, and to ask why the hell he doesn't see, -- or, if he sees, isn't willing to admit, -- that that business about the individual and the person is ~~irrelevant~~ irrelevant in this discussion, no matter how important it may be metaphysically. Am I right in thinking that that is largely the nub of the whole issue?

4. To ask, in a routine way, about the article which was promised quite some time back, to appear in the Journal of Mathematics, involving, I think, the theory of limits (a most fertile insight), and especially pertinent in ^{illuminating} ~~solving~~ the "mystery of Hegel". I keep mentioning it just because I want to be sure not to be overlooked when it appears.

5. To say that I am told that you will be reading a paper before the American Phil Assn in New York, and to say that, since I am not a member and frequently do not see their publication, I need an off-print of it, when you are in a position to supply one. Better tell your secretary to put me down for one on your list right now.

I shall see Kocourek and Mullahy in St Louis. I hope they will both be smooth enough not to get the animals needlessly excited.

as always yours

Bell

Dear Charles:-

I recall that you told me some time ago that you would be in Detroit around the end of this month.

I hope there will be time for me to see you a bit, if it does not inconvenience you. I have started off the graduate course De Virtutibus, last Tuesday, and naturally have already made use of Pichette and other things I have from you De Speculativo et Practico. I am looking especially for the copy I am sure I have of your piece "The Revolt Against Prudence", but have not as yet been able to put my hand on it.

If time allows during your visit I wonder if you would care to dine with me and the members of the class, -- there are only four of them, all mature students, one a Passionist father and the other three teachers and graduate assistants in philosophy here, working for Masters' Degrees. Two of them have spent last summer at Quebec. They are all agreeable chaps, and we could dine somewhere out in the county, with ante- and post-prandial good cheer. If the idea appeals to you the only thing that has to be controlled is the time factor. Our class meets on Tuesdays and Thursdays at three. Consequently one of those days would be the best, as we could turn the class into a "field trip" for the above-mentioned purpose!

We would, of course, pick you up at any designated place and undertake to return you there sound of wind and limb.

My regards to Zoe and the family.

as always yours

Bell

March 3, 1946.

Rev. Jules A. Baisnée S.S.
Catholic University of America
Washington D.C.

Dear Father Baisnée:

I owe you an apology. I should have written you long ago. Yet I did not want to do so until I could offer you further evidence to prove our point against Father Eschmann who has chosen to defend personalism in its most abject form. Furthermore, in refraining from any communication with you until my reply was published, I also meant to deprive our opponents of any basis for their contention that our writings are but a conspiracy and "un épisode dans une campagne odieuse contre M. Maritain". Although my students have been hankering for an open rebuttal, I refused even to mention our Adversary in class, lest I indulge in M. Maritain's unsporting practice of attacking me in his lectures, as he did in Toronto several years ago, "coram pueris, qui nesciunt de causis arduis judicare", loosely attributing to me not just conclusions, but positions quite as ridiculous as he made them out to be. Nevertheless, had I known the publication of my paper would take so long, I would have at least sent you a brief message.

My reply should have appeared last autumn. The first two chapters were barely finished when I narrowly escaped a skull fracture in an automobile accident (no distraction—I wasn't driving), with the result that I was completely incapacitated for a month. I got back to work only gradually, and had first to attend to my regular duties. Only toward the beginning of February could I again devote full attention to this problem. My text should come off the press toward the end of the week.

Doctrinally, my reply adds nothing to what I had already shown in my essay. It is difficult to believe our Assailant really read my book. He was probably too carried off by his personal enmity and resentment toward the Cardinal, Chancellor of Laval University. Who would suspect a "personalist" of

turning on ^{you} whom he calls a "dear friend" for the sake of personal vengeance on a third person? His attack came wholly unexpected. When my essay appeared, he told one of his students in Toronto (who later came here to complete his studies, Fr. Otto Eisenzimmer, O.S.B. from St. John's University, Minn.) that I had written a good book, although he did not like the Cardinal's Preface. When his first article came out in *Medieval Studies* (V), I noted two things: (a) that his collection of texts was very incomplete, (b) that the series quoted under the heading "Special criticism of the principle" must have been brought forth for the purpose of raising a dialectical problem he would resolve in the second article by introducing the more profound texts he had omitted. The procedure seemed to me rather strange, yet I could not bring myself to believe a man who claims to have pondered all the texts could do otherwise. Any misgivings I might have had were suspended for the time when I met him in Montreal, the late autumn of 1944. He repeated his agreement with my position and expressly condemned Maritain's, adding that the latter had never seriously studied the problem. As to his M.S. article, he said I would see when the second appeared. This was not an occasional meeting. My annual lecture series at the University of Montreal happened to coincide with his own at the Institut d'études médiévales. We both stayed at the latter Dominican House. I served his mass daily, and daily we spent several hours in conversation. As usual, he avoided philosophical subjects. I never knew what his true worth was. He had been invited at Laval by the head of the Social Science School. I permitted him to lecture in our Faculty on the basis of his reputation. From reports, what he taught on the common good was true enough. Even at the time of our above-mentioned meeting, I did not know exactly why he had been discharged by the Chancellor, except that, according to rumours, he had been too outspoken on questions relating to our hostilities with Germany. We had received him and, I must say, spoiled him as a poor victim of the Nazis. Only once had there been a slight altercation between him and myself, when I insisted he use as the basis for his lectures in our Faculty the very text of Aristotle's *Politics* and the commentary of St. Thomas and Peter of Auvergne. But I thought this might be settled later when he became better acquainted with our method. — Then came a letter from The Modern Schoolman, asking me for permission to quote from my book in an article "In Defense of Maritain", by Father Eschmann. I still did not believe he would attack me, but that he might make an attempt toward conciliation, however futile, on certain points. Teaching at St. Michael's where Maritain and Gilson are near formally revealed truth, I thought he might have begun to realize on what side his bread was buttered. Finally, in late June, I read his paper. Only those he believed might be turned against me had received off-prints, even people who know nothing about philosophy. He never wrote me.

turning on ^{one} whom he calls a "dear friend" for the sake of personal vengeance on a third person? His attack came wholly unexpected. When my essay appeared, he told one of his students in Toronto (who later came here to complete his studies, Fr. Otto Eisenzimmer, O.S.B. from St. John's University, Minn.) that I had written a good book, although he did not like the Cardinal's Preface. When his first article came out in *Medieval Studies* (V), I noted two things: (a) that his collection of texts was very incomplete, (b) that the series quoted under the heading "Special criticism of the principle" must have been brought forth for the purpose of raising a dialectical problem he would resolve in the second article by introducing the more profound texts he had omitted. The procedure seemed to me rather strange, yet I could not bring myself to believe a man who claims to have pondered all the texts could do otherwise. Any misgivings I might have had were suspended for the time when I met him in Montreal, the late autumn of 1944. He repeated his agreement with my position and expressly condemned Maritain's, adding that the latter had never seriously studied the problem. As to his M.S. article, he said I would see when the second appeared. This was not an occasional meeting. My annual lecture series at the University of Montreal happened to coincide with his own at the Institut d'études médiévales. We both stayed at the latter Dominican House. I served his mass daily, and daily we spent several hours in conversation. As usual, he avoided philosophical subjects. I never knew what his true worth was. He had been invited at Laval by the head of the Social Science School. I permitted him to lecture in our Faculty on the basis of his reputation. From reports, what he taught on the common good was true enough. Even at the time of our above-mentioned meeting, I did not know exactly why he had been discharged by the Chancellor, except that, according to rumours, he had been too outspoken on questions relating to our hostilities with Germany. We had received him and, I must say, spoiled him as a poor victim of the Nazis. Only once had there been a slight altercation between him and myself, when I insisted he use as the basis for his lectures in our Faculty the very text of Aristotle's *Politics* and the commentary of St. Thomas and Peter of Auvergne. But I thought this might be settled later when he became better acquainted with our method.— Then came a letter from *The Modern Schoolman*, asking me for permission to quote from my book in an article "In Defense of Maritain", by Father Eschmann. I still did not believe he would attack me, but that he might make an attempt toward conciliation, however futile, on certain points. Teaching at St. Michael's where Maritain and Gilson are near formally revealed truth, I thought he might have begun to realize on what side his bread was buttered. Finally, in late June, I read his paper. Only those he believed might be turned against me had received off-prints, even people who know nothing about philosophy. He never wrote me.

3

The Modern Schoolman allowed me only about ten pages for my reply and were not entirely certain they would be able to publish it. Originally I should have liked at least the space they had accorded Father Eschmann. Instead of writing first a short reply in the magazine in which the attack had appeared, and then a more detailed answer on some other occasion, I chose to make the refutation complete right from the start, thus forestalling any possible half-baked retraction from the Adversary or pretence at having been misunderstood. In the meantime I heard of the unusual success of his article. (See, for instance, Theological Studies, Sept. 1945, p. 439) The result is that my reply turns out to be about three times the original essay.

Father Eschmann has already claimed that the English text of his article does not quite convey what he means. Mortimer Adler too, while publicly stating he agrees with Father Eschmann's doctrine, at the same time claims the passage of his Theory of Democracy I criticize does not say what he means. They always manage to say just the opposite of what they mean.

Your article is referred to in the last chapter of my reply. I did not want to quote his "Pacem amicis..." until the reader could appreciate who makes Catholic scholarship a laughing stock.

You will, I'm sure, agree with me that, per accidens, Father Eschmann has rendered the cause a distinct service. He has expressly defended the most fundamental position implicit in the personalism of those Catholic authors who uphold it, and proved my essay was not a "qui venture". Father Farrell and Mortimer Adler had been quite explicit (that is why I named them), but only on the question of the temporal common good. The former recently stated he never had in mind but the ethical problem. If I had named all the authors you mentioned, the ensuing discussion would have been both endless and futile. Professor Yves Simon is still convinced I am in full agreement with M. Maritain, and yet he refuses to pronounce himself on Father Eschmann's article. See what a beautiful mess these personal loyalties over and above the truth can get one into?

There is yet another service he has rendered. He has unwittingly brought to light the abysmal ignorance under which labour the Historical Point of View conjurers who devote all their time and precious paper to research on problems which arise only from their own shallow and contemptuous acquaintance with the simple elements of philosophy. I have good reason to believe even those of his peers who encouraged him will, in the end, desert him.

4

As I had done in the case of the personalist conception of marriage, and in that of the nature of theology according to Fathers Charlier and Chenu, I venture to say that Father Eschmann's personalism will in time receive the same official censure. In this too, his article will have been a useful contribution.

I hope you may consider yourself sufficiently vindicated. With kindest regards, I am

Cordially yours,

Charles De Koninck

May 31, 1944.

Rev. Father Bernard Flynn,
The Saint Paul Seminary,
Saint Paul, Minn.

Dear Bernie,

This letter will open with a quotation from yours: "For months I have been intending to write to you, but it seems that there is always something pressing to do when I am at my desk".

But that would not be giving you the whole truth. I have been doing things about this answer. Many years ago I wrote a paper for the ACFAS on the first point you ask me about. I can't find the darned thing. I don't remember the solution. I wonder whether it was any good. But it might have been a starting-point for a new discussion. I'll have to do without it and get down to St. Thomas' text *prout jacet*.

I presume you refer to the de Coelo, B.I.L.2, nn.7 & sq. You will note that he speaks of "*probare demonstrative esse solum tres dimensiones*", and not merely "*esse tres dimensiones*", for each of the three dimensions are given intuitively and defined as first principles. Now the question arises; could there be more? Does mathematics have to stop at three? Then he refers to Ptolemaeus' argument. If this argument were valid, then we would have demonstrated implicitly that neither can there be more than three in nature. However, if mathematics could conceive a fourth, say, then it would still belong to experience to teach us whether there is a fourth in nature. When I say "to experience", I am taking experience in the broad sense, i.e. as comprising also that to which we must conclude in order to save experience proper.

Now mathematics is not confined to three-dimensional continuums. But it should be noted that when we go beyond them, we have to do away with our intuitive representation of space which allows only three. If I only had that paper before me I could tell you more clearly that a more than three-dimensional continuum is a dialectical construction. It involves the notion of limit. (Take a look at n.9, ibi "*Tertium...*" of the same lesson). That this is true you can learn from the better physicists, who will insist that when they speak of a four-dimensional continuum, they do not mean four spacial dimensions, but three of space and one of time. However, the four must be taken together in the sense that no event can be described but in terms of all those coordinates

taken together as one inseparable bolderklats. But, und diss is not without importance; that may affect the very structure of your three dimensions of space. It might, for instance, coive your space, not, in the intuitive sense - we can't represent to ourselves a coived space except through a kind of metaphore, as when Eddington tells you to look at your image on a polished door knob. (Est autem valde notandum that I don't want to pronounce myself on curved space. It certainly remains a double hypthesis. (a) Can it, legitimately, be applied to the physical world? (b) If so, it still remains a hypothesis in the ordinary sense. The first hypothesis (a) may involve a contradiction methodologically, as when we posit some hypothesis which is later found out to involve a contradiction, although it seemed so save the appearances; the second does save the known appearances, although not definitely.

Does your difficulty about the ens per accidens follow from this: Risibilitas est ens per accidens quia non est ipsa hominis essentia; ergo homo risibilis est ens per accidens? Then I answer: Ens per accidens seu ens per aliud est duplex; unum proprium, aliud commune. Proprium est quod non potest abesse, ut risibilitas quae sequitur necessario ex ipsa hominis essentia, a.v. habent connexionem per se ita quod si datur unum, datur et aliud, et sic habent unam generationem. Aliud accidens est commune, ut musicus in aedificatore; aedificator enim non est musicus in quantum aedificator; generato aedificatore, non generatur musicus, nec e converso; non habent per se connexionem, nec unam generationem. Unde quamvis rationale et risibile sese habeant ut essentia, et quod est extra essentiam et in alio, scil. in rationali, tamen, quia connexio eorum est per se, homo risibilis est ens per, et unum per se. Unless of course you restricted "ens per se" and "unum per se" to that which is such "omnibus modis", that is, identical. In other words, risibile is a per se accidens.

I hope all this doesn't make you even more unhappy. Now the third point. McCoy will have finished his scholarship before the opening of our academic year. If his thesis is not ready, he can finish that in St. Paul. His plans are to go back to St. Paul. Does that mean you may be free? I hope Kocourek's coming won't prevent you. You must manage to spend a year around here.

I too have reasons to be unhappy. Our Dionne is in none too good shape. He had to drop all work several weeks ago, and may not resume his teaching until next fall, unless he improves considerably before the summer session. He has weak lungs and coughed all winter. It's in the family. Knowing what Dionne means to me, you'll understand.

Now about the last point. You and McCoy are pretty darn good; Kocourek may turn out all right; Dulac is promising, and I understand you have more good students in prospect. That means that you could start from scratch and have a really well coordinated bunch. Would it have to include myself? I don't know. I don't say no. Other things come up. Whatever it is, I'll do the thing the common good seems to require.

THE SAINT PAUL SEMINARY
SAINT PAUL, MINNESOTA.

July 4, 1945

John Charles

Boeselak sends you her best regards. She's taking quite work-out. She's lost the maid. Can't get another. And Bertha is on a two weeks vacation. Remember us to Vince. Tell Mr. Baskfield I haven't forgotten the letter I promised him on the discussion we had following my talk. But I expected to write out the talk for publication and send him a copy. Now you know how those things go. Say hello to Liam and to his wife. Not yet received a reply at the time that I talked to him. Do you wish to meet me in Quebec, put a bonfire under the tree and have him finish his work in time.

Cordially,

The boss was very kind, this day, that I saw the
the boss was so kind to take them out. He was well liked with
the way and thought it a good idea. It was not for the
the boss was. The importance of that body and he wished no points in
the boss was. However, paragraphs I managed to insert a good word for
the boss was that is good. So good good, and I think that it was.

Not much has happened since you left us, except the salary that happened in our reception office. You must know that Mr. Hodges has the job, but Mr. McFarling is still sick and is not working either even yet. One of the other men claims that he has dreamed that some day he is going to double cross himself. I have heard a good deal about it, but I do not know for certain.

Henry Eastfield and I spent a couple of weeks at the

"It was the night... along you would hear silence, no
crying, laughing, sitting, and standing.
The whole world had died. We are so grateful here.

As soon as I hear of it, I will contact and tell you. I know what
position is in you. The building told me not so much of it as
the other one. I will tell you the way you said it if the news
is not so good. I will tell you as a further to the news. I will
tell you the way you said it. I will tell you the way you said it.
I will tell you the way you said it. I will tell you the way you said it.

[illegible]

REPORT OF OFFICIALS OF THE

Amundsen

1301 Leeper Ave.
South Bend, Indiana.

18 septembre 1938

Cher maître,

Notre-Dame m'a causé une
bonne impression jusqu'ici.

Le campus est très imposant tant
par son étendue que par sa beauté
naturelle et architecturale.

Transporté sur le parc des Champs
de Bataille de Québec il en couvrirait
presque la longueur et déborderait
de beaucoup sa largeur.

Les nombreux bâtiments de briques
(une quarantaine) sont pour la plupart
d'un style gothique raffiné. Ils sont
disposés en ordre sur toute l'étendue

que

du campus, et éloignés les uns des autres au point que le seul fait d'aller de l'un à l'autre constitue pour beaucoup une "deambulatio propter evacuationem".

Tout le terrain n'est qu'une belle pelouse verte où les allées en béton dessinent des figures géométriques, et qu'ombragent un grand nombre d'arbres adultes et d'essences diverses. Deux jolis lacs naturels y ajoutent beaucoup de couleur et de fraîcheur.

C'est, en plus, une espèce de cité grecque, administrativement indépendante. On y trouve tout ce qui est nécessaire au fonctionnement d'une ville, pasqu'un bureau de poste, la gare, le cafeteria et la Candy Shop. C'est vous dire

que les raisons qui vous amènent en ville sont strictement "personnelles" et n'ont rien à voir avec la vie étudiante proprement dite.

Quant à l'esprit qui anime les quelque trois-mille-cinq-cents habitants de cette institution, il est franchement démocratique. Les Pères se mêlent très volontiers aux étudiants et n'en rencontrent pas un seul sans lui dire: Hello! ou Good morning!, avec un sourire ou une "joke".

Parmi les étudiants ex-rivales je n'ai remarqué jusqu'ici aucune partialité ou esprit de classe, ils sont apparemment tous bien disposés les uns envers les autres. A-t-on

besoin d'un renseignement quelconque, il suffit de s'adresser au premier venu et il s'empresse de vous satisfaire au meilleur de sa connaissance.

Ce qui m'a frappé davantage, c'est la patience, la considération des fonctionnaires, hommes ou femmes. Cela est surtout remarquable le jour de l'enregistrement. Du reste, cela me semble être un caractère spécifique des américains. Dans les gares, les tramways, les autobus etc. prendre des informations est presque un plaisir. Les employés ne vous lancent pas de fleurs, sans doute, ils ne font pas de courbettes; par contre, ils ne montrent aucune irritabilité, mais vous répondent en prenant bien leur

14
5
temps, et souvent avec un brin
d'humour.

Je crois bien que je vais me plaire,
ici. Dans une autre lettre, je vous
parlerai du Père Ward, le Vpres Suion
et de quelques autres. Étant secrétaire
de Suion, je compte bien améliorer
mon français, ici, loin d'oublier
le peu que je connais. Je me débrouille
bien en anglais. Cependant, il me reste
encore à élargir mon vocabulaire et
à perfectionner ma prononciation,
aussi bien que ma diction.

- Nous sommes peu nombreux,
en philosophie, une dizaine au plus,
dont cinq ou six "graduates". C'est
moi qui suis le "doyen", étant le
seul "post-graduate". Je suis comme
qui dirait le cog de la faculté. Une

7
six heures par semaine. Les qui fait
en tout, si je pars Cnapter, 17 heures.

Que pensez-vous de cet arrangement?

Je m'arrête, comme dirait
le grand Bossuet. Je vous reviendrai
prochainement.

Mes amitiés à Madame de Kounik
et à Mr de Moulin,

Rugère.

P.S. J'ai vu le Père Belperch, à Détroit.

Mes amis causer de vous, surtout.

Il s'imagire que vous êtes un grand
penseur. Ah! ces jésuites!

1301 Leeper Ave.

South Bend, Ind.

21 septembre 1938.

Cher maître et ami;

De Mr Suion je ne
vous dis qu'un mot, pour la bonne
raison que Mr de Montéon peut vous
renseigner mieux que moi à son sujet.
(Mr Suion me dit que Mr de Montéon
est son plus grand ami).

Sa principale note individualisante est
une jambe courte, ce qui l'oblige à
marcher à trois pattes, je veux dire
qu'il se sert d'une cane. Il a bien
un grain de beauté sur la joue gauche,
sur l'encoignure de l'œil, mais, mon
Dieu, comme ce grain est fade à
côté du vôtre! Par ailleurs il est très
affable. Il se débrouille assz bien

en anglais et se fait comprendre de ses élèves. Sa prononciation, toutefois, est affreusement française. Dentre dans ses fonctions de secrétaire de le corriger sous ce rapport. Sa grande simplicité et son manque de prétention me rendent la chose facile. En ce moment je traduis son article: "Note sur la prévision scientifique".

J'ai vu sa femme ce matin, pour la première fois. Toute petite, elle n'a rien de plantureuses flamandes de Rembrandt. Ce qui ne l'empêche pas d'être gentille et toute souriante.

Si je savais ne pas vous déplaire je vous dirais qu'ils ont, comme vous, quatre enfants, dont trois garçons et une fille.

"Maintenant, continuons notre discours en prenant un nouveau point de départ".

Je voudrais vous parler de ma thèse.

Plus j'y songe, plus j'ai le trac. A ma courte honte je dois vous confesser que je ne sais pas trop encore où j'en suis. En d'autres termes, je ne sais pas par quel bout commencer mon travail, ni de quelle manière le traiter. Il me semble qu'il y a là occuper dix longues années d'une intelligence supérieure à la mienne, et pourtant il me faudrait y mettre le dernier point cette année, ou à peu près.

Serez-vous assez bon de me suggérer, dans les grandes lignes, ce qui, chez les grecs, et en particulier chez Platon et Aristote, doit entrer dans une thèse qui a pour titre : La notion d'intelligence chez les grecs ? Si toutefois vous pensez pouvoir le faire sans manquer à la justice, ou encore sans "tricher"

le code de la Faculté. Je n'entends évidemment pas que vous vous chargiez de faire ma thèse, mais j'aimerais que vous me donniez une orientation précise qui m'empêche de tourner indéfiniment sur moi-même dans ce remous d'idées qui m'étourdit, et qui me permette d'avancer en ligne droite vers un but défini, et pas trop éloigné.

Quand je prends la plume pour écrire c'est toute l'œuvre d'Aristote qui se dresse devant ma mémoire, et chacune de ses thèses en particulier qui se dispute mon attention et mon choix. Je ne puis pourtant pas exposer par le menu tout le système philosophique d'Aristote et des autres. Je vois bien que c'est l'esprit analytique qui l'emporte chez moi sur l'esprit synthétique. Au fond, je

souffre d'un manque de sagesse, je ne
 suis pas "ordinaire en umum". Mais,
 qu'y puis-je? Le temps presse et je
 ne dois pas attendre, pour commencer
 mon travail, que la sagesse ait daigné
 faire son habitation en mon âme.

Vous dire ces choses m'est
 très pénible. Quand je songe à l'intérêt et
 à la confiance que vous m'avez témoignés
 jusqu'ici, quand je me représente que
 j'ai été et suis encore le sujet d'une
 amitié toute particulière de la part
 d'un homme comme vous, je peux
 difficilement m'ôter de l'idée que cet
 aveu de mon incapacité ne vous
 dégoûte. Je voudrais faire quelque chose,
 je veux réussir et dès cette année,
 ne serait-ce que pour vous payer
 un peu en retour de ce que vous
 avez été pour moi depuis quatre ans.

61

Eh! pourtant, je crois sincèrement, (avec prétention peut-être) que je ne suis pas tout à fait dépourvu d'esprit philosophique. J'ai l'impression que de tous vos élèves je ne suis pas celui qui a le moins bien compris votre enseignement. Dès le début j'ai éprouvé une sympathie toute naturelle vis-à-vis votre pensée, une espèce de parenté intellectuelle, au dixième degré sans doute, mais enfin elle existe et fait mon orgueil.

Voilà la confession que je sentais le besoin de vous faire bien avant mon départ. Je vous serais très reconnaissant de me dire ce que vous en pensez, et sans ménagements je vous prie. Vous pourriez me rendre ainsi un service inappréciable.

Je vous sers très fort les deux mains,
Eugène.

University of Notre Dame,
Notre Dame, Indiana, U.S.A.

october 2, 1938.

Cher ami,

Votre réponse m'a causé toute une surprise! Je m'attendais si bien à être grondé, tancé, repremimandé, rabroué, etc...! Du reste c'est ce que je voulais, sans trop le vouloir car il est toujours pénible d'essayer les reproches d'un ami, surtout quand ils sont mérités. Mais non, votre lettre toute entière ne respire qu'indulgence et paternelle affection. Vous avez même eu soin de bien serrer les lignes comme pour empêcher que rien de déplaisant ne se glissât entre elles contre votre volonté.

Elle m'a aussi causé toute une joie! Elle m'apprend, en effet, que vous venez à mon aide, tout de suite, et avec un plan d'attaque étudié. Comme je vous suis reconnaissant, surtout quand je songe au surcroît de travail que par là je vous impose! Je ressens bien une certaine gêne à vous distraire de vos obligations si urgentes et si nombreuses, c'est même ce qui m'a retenu jusqu'à ces derniers temps de vous lancer un s.o.s. Maintenant je commence à comprendre que des choses comme celles-là sont nécessaires, qu'il est donné à très peu de gens d'être vraiment indépendant, self-sufficient. Il vaut encore mieux, j'imagine, faire quelque chose avec autrui que de ne rien faire du tout. C'est la loi de subalternation, quoi! Et pour un subalternans combien de subalternata!

Le Père Edmond m'a peut-être mis sur la bonne voie, et je serais très reine si je vous avais donné l'impression qu'il ne m'a pas aidé consciemment et intelligemment. Il m'a ouvert toute grande la porte de son dévouement et de son savoir, et la dernière fois que je l'ai vu il a insisté pour que je corresponde avec lui, m'assurant qu'il m'aiderait autant et aussi souvent qu'il le pourrait.

Il reste, néanmoins, que je ne suis pas encore parvenu à voir (exactement) où cette voie mène exactement. Il faut croire que ce sujet est trop vaste pour le temps dont je dispose. Il m'a fait étudier, surtout, la matière, la forme et la substance dans les textes d'Aristote, avec les commentaires de Bonitz, Ross et Joachim. Je comprends que ces thèses sont fondamentales dans une étude sur l'évolution de la notion d'intelligence chez les grecs. Mais il y a aussi Platon et les pré-socratiques! De plus, il me semble que parler de l'intelligence d'un système c'est parler du système tout entier. Or, les auteurs ne manquent pas qui ont déjà fait ce travail dans le cas des pré-socratiques, de Platon et d'Aristote, et quel temps considérable ils y ont mis! De sorte que (pour) faire quelque chose d'original et de convenable dans ce sens me paraît difficile et de longue haleine. Il y faudrait une critique très poussée des textes de Platon et d'Aristote, et de leurs commentateurs.

Coincidence assez curieuse, Mr Simon, que le père Ward a mis au courant de mon sujet de thèse, me disait avant-hier: Votre sujet de thèse est vraiment trop vaste. Ou bien vous y consacrerez un an ou deux et vous ferez un travail banal, ou bien vous ferez un travail sérieux et original, mais vous y mettrez dix ans!". Je lui ai alors laissé entendre que je songeais à changer de sujet, que je traiterais peut-être la dialectique

d'Aristote. Tout de suite il fut enchanté et il ne cessa de me répéter que c'était là un sujet très intéressant, pas trop long et surtout très peu traité jusqu'ici. (Lui-même, prétend-il, connaît très mal cet aspect de la philosophie aristotélicienne). Sur le champ il me donna les quelques références bibliographiques qui lui vinrent à la pensée à ce moment, et il me recommanda d'écrire sans tarder à Marcel de Corte, m'assurant que celui-ci se ferait un plaisir de me fournir une bibliographie très complète des Topiques. De plus, il se charge de me traduire les textes allemands dont je pourrais avoir besoin.

J'ai devant moi la traduction anglaise des Topiques de la collection de Ross. Je vais tâcher de me procurer aussi le texte grec. Quant aux rares textes où St. Thomas traite de la question je me repose entièrement sur vous pour m'en dresser une liste complète. Peut-être de Monleon, de son côté pourrait-il me fournir des indications précieuses.

J'attends votre décision avec docilité et anxiété à la fois. En attendant que vous me donniez un plan de travail aussi détaillé que vous le permettra votre conscience professionnelle, et les règlements du doctorat, je vais lire la traduction anglaise des Topiques et faire des recherches bibliographiques.

Je vais m'efforcer de mettre en pratique le conseil de Polonius, fût-ce au prix d'un héroïsme constant. Vous avez été bien inspiré de me mettre en garde contre mon besoin d'amitié, et tout de suite. Les gens, ici, sont tellement familiers et inquisiteurs (pour ne pas dire curieux)! Je n'ai encore montré mes notes et vos écrits à personne, mais j'ai eu l'occasion de dire, modérément j'espère, ce que je pensais de vous; je tâcherai de me contenir davantage même sur ce sujet, mais ça sera difficile. Je n'ai pas l'intention de discuter d'indéterminisme avec Simon, mais je crains qu'il prenne les devants et me pompe. Ces français sont de terribles "pompiers"! Il sait que j'ai été votre élève, et il a sans doute lu vos articles dans la Revue Thomiste. L'autre jour il m'a dit qu'il me donnerait peut-être la parole, au cours! Bonne mère! Imaginez un peu ma situation, si cela arrivait! Encore si je savais comme Ulysse mentir honnêtement.... Enfin, je ferai de mon mieux pour détourner la conversation; au moins je m'abstiendrai de vous trainer dans la boîte aux témoins.

Je vous quitte pour aller souper. Je vous serre les deux mains et vous donne un gros "bec à pincette". Mes amitiés à madame de Koninck, à Mr de Monleon, et des baisers aux enfants.

Affectueusement,

Eugène

P.S. Il faut adresser mes lettres à University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana, à l'avenir. Je viens de me transporter sur le campus. Je loge avec deux autres étudiants; j'espère que cela ne me fera pas perdre trop de temps.



16 octobre, 1938.

Cher ami,

Hier après-midi, dans notre Stadium, le Notre Dame a défait Illinois par un compte de 14 à 6. Le baromètre marquait environ 70 ou 75 degrés et le temps était humide.

C'est la troisième victoire consécutive du Notre Dame; ses deux premières victimes ont été Kansas (52-0) et Georgia Tech (14-6).

Une partie de football est tout un événement dans la vie universitaire de Notre Dame, et, je crois bien, dans la vie de tout américain. Ce n'est pas l'affaire de quelques heures mais de deux jours pleins. La veille le New York Times, le Chicago Tribune, le Chicago Herald and Examiner, etc... en font un "headline" en première page. Le président de l'université, de son côté, reçoit officiellement de hauts personnages qui arrivent de très loin pour assister à la partie.

Le soir du même jour, il y a un "rally" irradié, dont il est question dans les journaux du matin. Cette fois-ci, il y avait même une danse officielle, formal dance, le Cotillion des Sophomores.

Voilà pour le prélude éloigné, ou l'appétitif. Le samedi matin les heures de cours sont télescopées en demi-heures. Les élèves mangent à onze heures, car à midi le cafétaria est pris d'assaut par les étrangers qui viennent à la joute.

À une heure et quart la fanfare sort en parade et joue pendant une demi-heure sur le terrain de base-ball tout à côté du Stadium. À deux heures moins un quart elle fait son entrée solennelle sur le tapis vert-irlandais, et, tout en jouant, dessine des figures, écrit des mots (Notre Dame, Irish, etc...). Hier après-midi la fanfare d'Illinois était également présente, un corps musical de 180 membres. Il y a, enfin, les cheer-leaders qui se défient l'anatomie pour arracher des applaudissements à une foule de quelque quarante-cinq milliers de personnes. Ajoutez à cela la présence, à chacune de nos parties, de Fred Snite, le "iron lungs man", un ancien de Notre Dame. Il y a là de quoi créer une atmosphère "super-sportive" et à laquelle il est difficile d'échapper. Sans toutes ces "circumstantiae" médiate et immédiate, le jeu lui-même serait sans doute encore intéressant, mais pas autant que le hockey qui est beaucoup plus rapide, plus continu et plus riche en combinaisons possibles et imprévues.

Pour clôturer une journée aussi mémorable dans l'histoire américaine on ne trouve pas mieux que d'aller danser en ville.

18 octobre.-Ce matin j'ai subi un examen général sur toute la philosophie devant le Père Ward et mr MacMahon: affaire de formalité, de routine. Le but de cet examen est de se rendre compte si l'élève possède assez de connaissances philosophiques pour se diriger vers l'obtention du doctorat. I wasn't told that I flunked.

Ce matin, également, mr Simon m'a remis ma dissertation sur le concept de science chez St. Thomas. Il a écrit en marge: "Travail très sérieux et très intéressant, qui témoigne de connaissances étendues et profondes. Plein de promesses"! Ca m'a terriblement impressionné! A l'instant même j'ai pensé à tout l'honneur qui en rejaillissait sur mes professeurs de Laval, sur l'université Laval et même sur mon pays tout entier! Et je me suis dit: "At a boy, Gene, your're doin' swell". Cependant, il y avait quelques fautes de composition et il n'a pas manqué de me les mettre sous le nez. Il corrige très sérieusement, et avec beaucoup de méthode, ce dont je lui suis très reconnaissant. Il est à même de me rendre de grands services dans ce domaine. Lui-même travaille méthodiquement, et quand je travaille avec lui comme secrétaire il ne manque pas une occasion de me communiquer son esprit méthodique. Aussi bien, j'apprécie beaucoup les heures que je passe en sa compagnie.

A la fin de mon travail j'ai fait quelques considérations, très brèves, sur la science "physique". J'affirme que la science physique n'est pas une science proprement dite, au sens où Aristote définit la science dans ses Analytiques postérieurs, parce que son objet formel n'est pas un universel proprement dit, ne couvrant pas tous les cas possibles. Et je conclus que, pour cette raison, la Physique n'entre pas dans le premier degré d'abstraction. Il a écrit en marge: "Je conteste. Vérifier la valeur de ces idées avant de les publier. Danger de scandale"!

Je voulais seulement l'amener à préciser sa conception de la science "physique". Il a remis la discussion à plus tard. Il a néanmoins affirmé à plusieurs reprises qu'il était convaincu que la Physique moderne était véritablement une science, du moins la physique non appliquée, et qu'elle prenait place dans le premier degré d'abstraction. Jusqu'ici il n'a guère fait que de donner l'opinion des "scientistes" modernes: Auguste Comte, Meyerson, Poincaré, Sorel, etc...

L'autre jour nous l'avons amené à préciser sa conception du hasard et de la connaissance des faits de hasard. Il accepte, à peu près telle quelle, la position de Maritain. Il m'a confié, à ce sujet, que Maritain souffrait un véritable tourment métaphysique à la pensée des De Koninck et de Monleon enfonçant étourdiment la pointe virulente de l'indéterminisme en plein nombril du thomisme. J'en avais les larmes aux yeux....

Mr Maritain est actuellement à Chicago. Il viendra à Notre Dame dans quelques jours pour prendre part au symposium de philosophie au début de novembre. Le Père Ward vous a-t-il invité? Je lui ai demandé de le faire, pour la bonne raison que le Père Belleperche avait l'espoir de vous attirer à Detroit à cette même époque. Si vous venez à Detroit ne manquez pas de vous rendre à Notre Dame, je voudrais tellement vous voir, I miss you badly.

*Mes respects et amitiés à Madame de Koninck,
des baisers aux enfants. Je vous serre la main, Eugène.*

P. S. Je suis très anxieux d'avoir vos
"précisions" au sujet de ma thèse.
J'ai lu le livre du P. Régis: l'Opinion
chez Aristote. Il traite longuement de la
nature et de la fonction de la Dialectique.
J'y ai trouvé des références précieuses.

Malheureusement nous n'avons, ici,
aucun commentaire des Topiques, nous
n'avons même pas le texte grec. Le Père
Ward va essayer d'emprunter ces livres
de la bibliothèque de Chicago.

Le premier numéro du Laval Théologique
et Philosophique est-il paru? Gare
au scandale!

29 octobre, 1935.



Cher Mr de Koninck,

Le Révérend Père Edmond.
me demande de vous écrire pour savoir
si que vous avez décidé au sujet de
ma thèse. Il me dit qu'il en a causé avec
vous et que tous les deux vous êtes d'accord
que la Dialectique d'Aristote est un sujet
passablement vaste.

J'ai bien hâte de connaître ce que vous
avez l'intention de me proposer, j'ai la
pénible impression que j'ai perdu beaucoup
de mon temps jusqu'ici! Et, ce qui
m'inquiète davantage, je prévois que j'en
perdrai beaucoup pendant toute l'année
scolaire. L'atmosphère, sur le campus,
est plus ou moins favorable à l'étude
d'Aristote et de Saint Thomas.

L'université américaine me paraît

dessus
le
ine

es
méta-
oisème
re
sus
ques,
de de

e
ean
s
e
,

empla-

el
jet.
e
s,
cation.

ns.

e

que j'ai
trouvé
vrai

être une espèce de collège hypertrophié;
un "overgrown college," tout au plus.

Le silence a beaucoup de peine à se frayer
un chemin à travers le barrage bruyant
des instruments de fanfare, des milliers
de "radios" répandus aux quatre coins
du campus, des hurlements des
freshmen, etc. Pour ma part, je suis
de plus handicapé par la présence
de deux compagnons de chambre qui,
pour être gentils, n'en sont pas moins
inévitavelmente des occasions de
distractions nombreuses, surtout
à cause des visites assez fréquentes
qu'ils reçoivent.

Je ne voudrais cependant pas exagérer
la situation. Il y a toujours moyen de
travailler, et les radios et la fanfare
ne jouent pas du matin au soir.
Néanmoins, avec ma nature indécisive,
mon peu de suite dans les idées et
mon manque d'esprit pratique, la
chose m'est plus difficile qu'à
d'autres. Aussi bien, il est important

que je sache le plus tôt possible ce que
j'ai à faire exactement si je veux me
trouver devant quelque chose qui m'
vaille la peine, à la fin de cette année
scolaire.

Il ne faudrait pas croire que
je regrette d'être à Notre-Dame. C'est
vrai, sans doute, que du point de
vue thomisme il m'aurait été infiniment
plus profitable de rester à Cabat, si
la chose eût été possible. Je ne partage
pas les idées philosophiques de Mr Simon
dans son cours sur l'indéterminisme
(ou plutôt sur le déterminisme). Il est
marxiste sur toute la ligne, ou à
peu près: identification du hasard et
de l'objet du hasard, impossibilité de
l'évolution des espèces philosophiques
sans l'intervention créatrice, caractère
proprement scientifique de la science
positive, etc. En ce moment il s'essaye
de nous faire voir et saisir la causalité
dans le comportement des entités
physiques. Avec une assurance que
je lui envie, il critique la position
de thomisme en s'appuyant sur la division

8

~~XXXX~~
-dessus
n le
rine

tes
méta-
troisième
re
sus
ques,
re de

le

Jean
ns
de
L.,

empla-

n
gel

ujet.
tre
nas,
ication.

ons.
t
rs



CABINET DU DOYEN

aristotélisme des sensibler propres et
des sensibler communs ^{et p. acc.} qu'il a soin
de "compléter" par la division plus à la
page de Sherrington (propriétés extéro-ceptives,
intéro-ceptives et proprio-ceptives). Le lien
de causalité entre une bille de billard qui
en déplace une autre serait un sensible
par accident qu'on saisi à la façon de
la relation de filiation, quand je vois le
fils de Diès. Il a peut-être raison, et le
jeune John Fitzgerald, que vous avez connu
à Lourvain, est épaté de ces explications
et de leur clarté. Pour ma part, je n'y
vois qu'atte, et il m'est absolument im-
possible de faire entrer ça dans le cadre
de l'enseignement que vous m'avez
donné.

Le cours du Père Moore, sur l'histoire,
ne m'a pas à grand-chose, et celui du
Père M. C. Doy sur Platon est assz "lourd".
Néanmoins, je pressens que mon passage
à Notre Dame me sera utile à d'autres
points de vue, ne serait-ce que me
de donner et me donner de l'initiative.

Mes amitiés à Madame, à Mr
de Montéon, et des baisers aux enfants.

Je vous serre la main, avec l'espoir
de vous lire bientôt,
Rugène.



CABINET DU DOYEN

UNIVERSITÉ LAVAL
FACULTÉ DE PHILOSOPHIE

2 Nov. 38

Mon cher Eugène:

Voici ma suggestion. Faire une étude sur les quatre espèces d'opposition: de contradiction, de ~~contradiction~~ privation, de contrariété, et de relation. Il y a là-dessus un opuscule autrefois attribué à saint Thomas (Jean le considérait encore comme authentique), dont la doctrine semble toutefois thomiste.

Il faudrait étudier tout d'abord ces différentes espèces d'opposition chez Aristote, surtout dans la métaphysique. La distinction entre la première et la troisième espèce, p.ex., est le fondement de la distinction entre la science et la dialectique. Vous trouverez là-dessus énormément de précisions dans les Topiques, Sophistiques, et Rhétoriques. (Lisez ces traités avec le commentaire de Sylvestre Maurus) C'est ce qui distingue le plus profondément Aristote de Platon. (Voir à ce sujet le Sophiste)

Ensuite dans saint Thomas même, et enfin dans Jean de saint Thomas. Du moins c'est l'ordre à suivre dans la présentation du travail. Mais je vous conseille de lire tout d'abord Jean lui-même, surtout Cours Phil., Tome II, p. 808 (IIIP., q. X, a. 2).

Toute la philosophie moderne est fondée sur la confusion de ces différentes espèces d'opposition. La mathématique moderne aussi dans la mesure où elle veut s'ériger en logique scientifique, où elle veut remplacer la logique démonstrative par la dialectique (voir saint Thomas, Métaph. ~~VII, lect. 4~~ IV, lect. 4) La question est d'un intérêt tout particulier dans l'étude de Hegel et de Marx.

On pourrait très facilement se perdre dans ce sujet. Contentez-vous d'abord de bien voir la différence entre les différentes espèces en lisant Aristote, saint Thomas, et Jean. Vous saurez ensuite quoi choisir dans l'application.

Je suis très heureux de votre attitude générale. Ne vous laissez pas entraîner dans de vaines discussions. Tous ces gens ne désirent pas savoir quomodo se habeat veritas rei, ils vivent et sont heureux dans le discours séparé.

Continuez à m'écrire.

*de quatre espèces
Maurus, T 5.
(Selon Reiser authentique).*

University of Notre Dame,
Notre Dame, Indiana.

17 novembre, 1938.

Cher m. De Koninck,

Je suis très heureux d'apprendre que vous êtes très heureux de mon attitude générale. Je suis d'autant plus heureux que cette nouvelle est pour moi une heureuse surprise. Je m'attendais à un peu moins d'enthousiasme de votre part. Aussi, ce "très heureux" me fait beaucoup de bien et me donne un nouveau courage. Je sens si profondément que votre désapprobation, surtout en matière de philosophie, aurait pour effet de me faire perdre toute confiance en moi-même.

Quant à mes "attitudes particulières" je ne compte pas que vous en soyez toujours satisfait, je n'en suis pas toujours satisfait moi-même. Qu'est-ce que vous voulez? Operatio sequitur esse, et, après tout, je suis rien que moi-même.

J'ai cependant le plaisir de vous annoncer que le P. Moore a été très satisfait de ma dissertation sur les relations de l'Ethique et de l'Histoire, et les élèves aussi. J'ai traité le sujet en me plaçant au point de vue de la fin de l'homme et de ses activités. J'ai débuté par quelques considérations générales sur la science historique, en m'aidant de vos notes sur la philosophie de l'histoire. Mon travail a suscité d'intéressantes discussions, en particulier sur ma conception de la science historique. On a finalement adopté mon point de vue.

Je tâche d'éviter autant que possible les vaines discussions, mais je ne réussis pas toujours. C'est ordinairement après coup qu'on s'aperçoit qu'une discussion a été vaine ou non, du moins à mon âge. C'est ainsi que l'autre jour, à un thé chez Dubos, j'ai eu le cran (ou fait la bêtise) de discuter avec Jacques Maritain lui-même. Ce n'était pas prémédité, en aucune façon. Je voulais tout simplement lui demander quelques tuyaux en rapport avec la dialectique. Il m'a d'abord répondu qu'il ne pouvait pas m'en donner, pour la bonne raison que ce problème l'embêtait beaucoup lui-même et qu'il n'avait pas encore d'opinion définie sur ce sujet. Puis il s'est référé au IV^e livre de la Métaphysique et m'indiqua où se trouvait, selon lui, le point crucial de la question. Et, je ne sais plus comment, mais la discussion glissa rapidement de la dialectique à la physique. Oh! alors, mon démon s'est emparé de moi, je devins littéralement possédé. Je ne me suis jamais aussi fortement senti koninckien (bon ou mauvais). Je pris la parole et le mis en demeure de me montrer sur quoi il pouvait bien fonder la nécessité de la science physique, étant donné que la physique ne connaît ni essences réelles, ni propriétés essentielles réelles; comment il pouvait bien placer la physique dans le troisième degré d'abstraction, étant donné que ce degré d'abstraction est un degré d'abstraction philosophique, etc... Il essaya de m'expliquer comment la physique

pouvait, au moyen de la mathématique, trouver un substitut de l'essence, etc... Je n'y ai rien compris. (Madame Maritain assistait loyalement son époux).

Heureusement, la discussion n'a pas duré. Elle me laissa, néanmoins, passablement confus. Je me sentis aussitôt après imprudent et prétentieux, tout à la fois, et je jurai, mais un peu tard, qu'on ne m'y prendrait plus. Et puis, c'est un peu sa faute. Il est d'une simplicité si charmante qu'on a tôt fait, avec lui, d'oublier les distances d'âge et de science. Je l'avais déjà rencontré plusieurs fois chez lui où il m'appelait pour revoir l'anglais de ses conférences.

En passant, le symposium philosophique a été, dans l'opinion de plusieurs, un franc succès, si on fait abstraction de la longueur des conférences et de l'accent étranger de la grande majorité des conférenciers. A mon avis son grand défaut a été de manquer de profondeur philosophique, à l'exception peut-être des discours de Maritain et de Adler. Ce dernier a donné une conférence très brillante et a épaté tous les assistants. Il a cité Aristote et St. Thomas, il était cependant difficile de juger s'il les possédait bien.

Le sujet de thèse que vous me proposez me sourit beaucoup. Je ne sais pas encore, comme vous, comment "toute la philosophie moderne est fondée sur la confusion de ces différentes espèces d'opposition", mais je m'en doute un peu déjà. Je pressens aussi qu'il faut chercher de ce côté pour trouver une explication aux futilités élucubrations des scolastiques modernes, surtout en matière de philosophie des sciences. Enfin, si je puis mener à bien cette étude, je me trouverai, du coup, en possession d'un merveilleux instrument de travail, d'une ligne directrice pour mes recherches futures.

J'ai fait une première lecture d'Aristote, de St. Thomas, de J. de St. Thomas. J'ai parcouru, aussi, le De Quatuor Oppositis qui me paraît franchement thomiste; en tout cas, il ne manque pas de profondeur. Jusqu'ici je crois qu'il importe avant tout de préciser exactement le fondement propre de chaque espèce d'opposition; contradiction: être et néant; privation: acte et puissance; contrariété: mouvement. Je ne sais pas encore quel fondement attribuer à la relation. De plus, serait-il ~~à~~ vrai de dire que tout jugement portant sur des contradictoires est nécessairement vrai ou faux parce que l'être en tant que tel implique aussi bien l'existence que l'essence? Cette idée m'est venue en lisant un texte des Catégories (10, 13 b 1 - b 2). Des deux propositions contraires "Socrate est malade" et "Socrate est bien portant" l'une n'est nécessairement vraie que si Socrate existe actuellement. Par contre, des deux propositions contradictoires "Socrate est malade", "Socrate n'est pas malade", l'une est ~~vraiment~~ vraie et l'autre nécessairement fausse, que Socrate existe ou n'existe pas. Si vous pouviez me donner quelques éclaircissements, à ce sujet, je vous serais bien reconnaissant. En attendant, je vais consulter le commentaire de Pacius. (Nous n'avons pas, ici, Sylvester Maurus).

Autre chose: en mathématiques il n'est pas question d'opposition de contrariété puisqu'elles font abstraction du mouvement. Mais on doit y trouver l'opposition de contradiction puisque les conclusions mathématiques sont nécessaires, et l'opposition de relation, relation d'identité surtout. C'est vrai, tout ça? Et la Physique, sur quelle opposition repose-t-elle? Il n'y a que vous qui puissiez m'aider en ce domaine; trouverez-vous le temps de le faire?

J'ai fait part à monsieur Simon de mon intention d'étudier les quatre espèces d'opposition, sans lui dire que la suggestion venait de vous. (Le Pere Ward l'a chargé de s'occuper de moi, et il prend son rôle très au sérieux. Du reste je ne tiens pas à me passer de ses services, c'est un homme très méthodique et il peut m'aider beaucoup surtout dans la composition de mon travail; c'est l'homme tout indiqué pour m'empêcher de "fuser"). Il s'est écrié aussitôt: "Prenez garde, il ne faut pas briser l'unité de votre thèse!" La dialectique l'intéresse beaucoup, et je ne sais pas comment je m'y prendrai pour lui faire adopter mon nouveau point de vue. Il admet, toutefois, qu'il est probable que la clef du problème de la dialectique se trouve dans l'opposition de contrariété. "C'est une bonne idée que vous avez là", m'a-t-il dit, "il faut l'approfondir, mais il ne faudrait pas trop vous y attarder". (On finira par croire, sur le Campus, que j'ai des idées personnelles! C'est votre faute, et je m'en lave les mains). J'espère, néanmoins, que nous nous entendrons bien.

Aurevoir. Continuez à me répondre...

Amities, Eugène.

P.S.-J'ai une terrible envie d'aller passer les vacances de Noël à Quebec. Le fait de vous voir pendant une semaine ou deux pour discuter de ma thèse m'avancerait considérablement dans mon travail. J'ai d'autres raisons, mais celle-là suffit pour justifier le coût du voyage, vous ne croyez pas? Toutefois, je n'ai encore aucune idée où je prendrai l'argent nécessaire. Mais à force d'y penser et de le désirer intensément je finirai bien par trouver.

14 décembre 1935

Cher Monsieur de Kruick,

Je serai à
Québec dimanche prochain,
le 18. Je voudrais furieusement
vous voir, au moins pendant
quelques jours, (soit avant Noël,
soit après Noël, comme ça vous
conviendra le mieux) pour
causer avec vous au sujet
de ma Thèse. Si vous pouvez
me donner un peu de votre
temps, je vous en serais très
(j'allais dire: infiniment!) recon-
naissant.

C'ai bien hâte de vous em-
brasser, et madame et les
enfants aussi.

A bientôt, Eugene

