

Dear Charles:-

There are some things I would like to know, if ever you get time to enlighten me ("bonum est diffusivum sui ut causa finalis" which, in English, means "if you want something ask for it"):

1. Do you think the "Fundamental Constitution of Matter" a legitimate problem in Philosophy. I am thinking of a godawful lecture I heard on the subject the other day in the manner of the NeoScholastic textbooks of "Cosmology", wherein the lecturer presented ~~it~~ Matter and Form as coordinate with the electron theory, chemical atomism, etc. But I wondered whether ~~it~~ the Constitution of matter in any such sense is a philosophical problem at all, in view of the fact that the theory of Matter and Form was worked out by Aristotle as part of his explanation of change, generation and corruption, n'est ce pas?
2. What do you think of Gilson: God and Philosophy?
3. Ditto of LaLandé: Vocabulaire Technique et Critique de la Philosophie?
4. Will you be able to furnish an off-print of your "Philosophy and Order in International Relations" (ACPA program). Hart will supply you with some at little or no cost if you ask him. I hardly think I'll

be at the meeting.

If you get time to answer all these,  
euge, euge. If not, Merry Christmas any-  
how, to you, to Madame, and to the kids.

RJB SJ

*J. Bellperche*

February 9, 1942.

Reverend Father Belleperche, S.J.  
John Carroll University  
University Heights  
Cleveland, Ohio

Dear Père,

I think the answer to your first question concerning the fundamental constitution of matter will be found in the reprint I sent you recently on the distinction between Philosophy of Nature and the experimental Sciences. The proper reason why scientific <sup>the</sup> series should be left aside in our philosophical treatises is that, although they respond to the desire of knowing more and more about natural things, they are always provisional, and properly taken care of in scientific texts. Restate your question again after having read my article.

I think Gilson's book is very irritating. I cannot explain his disdain for Aristotle, and the many historical falsehoods about the Philosopher's Theology, such as that his God knew only himself. You will remember my remarks on Gilson's overlooking the "intelligere seipsum" as the formal constituent of divine nature. Why does the exaltation of Christian Philosophy have to be based on a debasement of the Greeks.

Lalande's Vocabulaire is fairly good for modern philosophy, but it is frightfully inadequate for both scholastic and Greek philosophy. I sometimes use it as a starting point for a dialectical discussion.

I asked Father Hart for some reprints. But I haven't heard from him since.

As I had expected, Miss Lincoln made out very well in her licence examination. Jean McCall did very well with Dionne in Logic. The other results are not yet known.

Shall we have you with us this Summer? Adler will be around.

With best wishes from Ed and the kids.