

Conference

p. 9, 208 : "And this brings us to the main point
of the present talk."

(1)

The Role of Woman in the Work of Redemption.

During the Centenary celebrations of Mary's apparitions in Lourdes, an author of the Reformed Church wrote: "It is not ~~a~~ feminine because we stand in need of ~~extreme~~ and maternal tenderness that we should bring into the ~~the~~ drama of salvation a feminine figure. If God had judged this to be relevant, He would have taken it upon Himself to arouse such a figure, ^{and that} in a fashion ^{which} ~~that~~ would not make of her a screen to separate us from her Son."

We must take it for granted that the author of these words does hold that Christ is truly the Son of Mary, and that her Son is a Divine Person. It is plain, too, that the author believes ~~that~~ the Sacred Scriptures ^{to be} ~~are~~ the word of God to man.

The author's statement is in fact quite amazing, seeing that what he calls "the drama of salvation" was begun by a feminine figure. For we read in Genesis ii that "the Lord God said: It is not good for a man to be alone: let us make him a help like unto himself." ~~Korzxpxzxnwzknzknzwnz"forzAdam Until then, there for Adam there was not found a helper like himself.~~ And the Lord God made what he took from Adam into a woman: and brought her to Adam." And Adam said: This now is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man."

From the very beginning the Fathers of the Church pointed out the inverse proportion between the formation of our first parents and the formation of the Son of Man from the Virgin Mary. Eve, the first virgin, was taken and formed from Adam; whereas Christ received His Humanity from the Virgin Mary who can say of her Son what Adam said of the one whom God made a help like unto himself: He is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh. And she can say in all truth that He is the Son of man.

because He was taken out of woman.

In fact, what the author calls "the drama of Salvation" in the person of the ^{the first} was begun ~~by~~ woman, whom God had ~~formed~~ from man with the distinct intent of making him "a help like unto himself." For it is to the woman that the Serpent addressed himself. It is in her that Satan aroused the desire for a premature confirmation in the good: she desired this security in her own time, of her own accord, over and against the [^]commandment which God had given to ~~the~~ man. Who was first seduced to that revolt? The infernal Serpent "he ~~it~~ was, ~~whose~~ whose guile, stirred up with envy and revenge, deceived the mother of mankind." (Paradise Lost.) "And the woman saw that the tree was good to eat (i.e. the tree of knowledge of good and evil), and fair to the eyes, ~~and desirable for the sake of acquiring knowledge; and she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave to her husband who did eat.~~" (Gen. iii, 6).

Plainly, on this account, it is through woman, seduced by the Serpent, that sin came into the world. "It is the woman, Adam replied to God, whom thou gavest me to be my companion, who gave me of the tree, and I did eat. And the Lord said to the ~~Serpent~~ woman: Why hast thou done this? And she answered: The Serpent deceived me, and I did eat." (12) Now this role of the first Eve will be ~~be~~ emphasized by the Apostle. "And it was not Adam who was seduced, but the woman, who, seduced, made herself guilty of transgression" (I tm ii 14).

Now we do not say that Eve committed the fault of Adam. We did not sin in ~~Adam~~ Eve. It was the fault of Adam ~~the~~ which was transmitted to their posterity. For, as St. Paul says: "by one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death; and so death passed upon all men, in whom all have sinned." (Rm v 12) ~~Now~~ This same Adam, as St. Paul adds, is a figure of Him who was

(3)

to come"(Rm v 14). "For by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead. And as in Adam ~~all~~ all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive."(I Co xv 21)

Why, then, did God bring woman into "the drama of Salvation"? Why did He not let Adam sin first and quite on his own accord? Why did ^{God} ~~He~~ in fact ^{plan things in such a way} that the transgression, committed by ~~him~~ the man, the first made, had already entered the world through the ~~mediation of the woman~~ mediation of the woman who had been seduced by the one who was a homicide from the beginning(Jn viii, 44)? It is God Himself who underscored this mediation:

"Because thou hast listened to the counsel of thy wife, and hast eaten the fruit I forbade thee to eat; and now, through thy act, the ground is under a curse"(Bn iii 17).

Why does Genesis emphasize ^{this role of} ~~that it is precisely the woman,~~ taken from Adam ~~xxxx~~ to be [~] help like onto himself? Because, as He had said, "it is not good for man to be alone"?(Gn ii 18) And this man is Adam, a figure of the One ~~Who~~ who is to come.

God might ~~have~~ henceforth have ~~left~~ left woman in the shadow. But in fact He most definitely did not. In announcing the work of Redemption to the Serpent and to our first parents, God takes it upon Himself to maintain the feminine ~~figure~~ and maternal figure: "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, between between thy offspring and hers; she is to crush thy head, while thou dost lie in wait at her heels"(Gn iii 15). It is God Himself ~~who~~ speaks of the hostility between the one who is a liar, and the father thereof, "(Jn viii 44) and the woman; of the feud between ~~the one~~ the one "in whom there is no truth," (ib.); the great dragon, ... that old serpent, who is called the Devil and Satan, seducer of the whole world "(Ap xii 9), and the posterity of the woman! Whoever the persons or person in question, ~~here~~

7

the figure is that of woman, playing an eminent role, well defined, in the great work of Redemption. And ~~the~~ the Lord said to the woman: "Many are the pangs, many are the throes I will give thee to endure; with pangs thou shalt give birth to children, and thou shalt be subject to thy husband; he shall be thy lord" (Gn iii 16). Of these children we understand that they are the offspring that ~~are~~ ^{are} hostile to the offspring of the serpent, given birth to in the pangs God gave woman to endure. "The name which Adam gave his wife was Eve, Living, because she was the mother of all living men." (Gn iii 20).

~~Tout d'un coup, la femme,~~ ^{From woman,} from the beginning to the bitter end, from Genesis right into the Apocalypse. "And now, in heaven, a great portent appeared; a woman that wore the sun for her ~~her~~ mantle, with the moon under her feet, and a crown of twelve stars about her head. She had a child in her womb, and was crying out as she travailed, in great pain of her delivery. Then a second portent appeared in heaven; a great dragon was there, fiery-eyed, with seven heads and ten thorns, ... And he stood fronting the woman who was in childbirth, ready to swallow up the child as soon as she bore ~~him~~ it." (Ap. xii 1). How, then, can we possibly say that the feminine and maternal figure, so far as the work of Salvation is concerned, is invented by our need for that kind of tenderness? All the words we have quoted are in principle accepted by the author who makes this allegation.

Now this woman, if she could escape our attention, is nonetheless, ~~the~~ on the part of the dragon, the ancient serpent, the object of a well-defined preoccupation. "So the dragon, finding himself cast down to earth, went in pursuit of the woman, the boy's mother... Thereupon the serpent sent a flood of water out of his mouth in pursuit of the woman, to carry her away on its tide; but earth came to the woman's rescue. The earth

gaped wide ,and swallowed up this flood which the dragon had sent out of his mouth. So,in spite against the woman,the dragon went to make war with ^{the} rest of her seed,who keep the commandments of God,and have the testimony of Jesus Christ!"(Ap xii 13)

Who then has decided that it was opportune to introduce a feminine figure into ~~the~~ both ^{the} order of original justice and the order of Redemption? That among other reasons God did do this because we stand in need of femine ⁱⁿ and maternal tenderness does not alter the fact that God did choose to do what He did--and nothing of what He does is done in vain. Nor should we be blind to the feminine and maternal tenderness of Mary toward the Son of God. God has no need for tenderness from anyone. God is love,but this love,in which we share by the theological virtue of charity,is not a passion. But if God ^{deign} does in fact ~~choose~~ to stand in need,even of sensible affection,and of sensible signs of it,who will reproach Him? He has freely willed to have a Mother,and she was no ~~no~~ doubt such as the Author of Nature wants a mother to be; and Mary was no doubt the Mother of ^{the} Son of God precisely as He wanted her to be. If the Eternal Word,the Image of the Father,chooses to ^{be} born of woman,must He therefore divest her~~x~~ of feminine and maternal tenderness toward Him who is her Son? Can we expect Him to make her unnatural? contrary to nature? Must His own feelings be contrary to nature? ^{those inspired by} ~~He~~ did not despise

He ~~was~~ most certainly/the signs of sensible tenderness.

"And turning to the woman,he said unto Simon:Dost thou see this woman? I entered into thy house,thou gavest me no water for my feet;but she with tears hath washed my feet,and with her hairs hath wiped them. Thou gavest me no kiss; but she,since she came in,hath not ceased to kiss my feet. My head with oil thou didst not anoint;but she

Thanks to his son Isaac, son of Sara, Abraham will have a posterity to bear his name. And now God gives rise to another great feminine figure, Rebecca, "an exceedingly lovely young maiden, and a most beautiful virgin." And as she left her family to become the wife of Abraham's son Isaac, she was told by them, "Thou art our sister, mayst thou increase to thousands of thousands, and may thy seed possess the gates of their enemies." Having given birth to twins, Esau and Jacob, it is Rebecca who combined a successful plan to ensure of her husband upon the blessing ~~of~~ Jacob, the son whom she preferred. Again St. Paul points out the meaning of this feminine figure introduced by God in the work of the covenant concluded with our forebears in view of our Redemption by His Son.

And it is God who chose Judith "to wound and destroy those who had formed such dark designs against thy ~~will~~ covenant." It is of her that Ozias, the prince of the people of Israel, said: "Blessed art thou, O daughter, by the Lord the most high God, above all women upon the earth. Blessed be the Lord who made heaven and earth, who hath directed thee to cut off the head of the prince of our enemies. Because he hath so magnified thy name this day, that thy praise shall not depart out of the mouth of men who shall be mindful of the power of the Lord forever, for that thou hast not spared thy life, by reason of the distress and tribulation of thy people, but hast prevented our ruin in the presence of our God." (Jdt)

8

Another feminine figure will in the course of time save God's chosen people from extermination. I mean Esther, Assuerus's queen. Now there is a passage in the Book which will be most relevant to the point we wish to make ~~here~~ here; I mean the words of king Assuerus, when he says: "Thou (Esther) shalt not die: for this law is not made for thee, but for all others" (xv 13). Here we have a biblical figure who is above the law, as it were, and not subject to the sentence passed upon the whole people. ~~Now~~ Esther is ^{one} a figure of in turn another Woman to come, and her exemption is itself a figure.

Now why should all these women be mentioned at all, and why should their roles be emphasized as they are, if they were to be deemed irrelevant to God's great design, to His covenant with man and to salvation?

And each of these feminine figures acted in a fashion that was particularly appropriate to ~~women~~ their womanhood. Human beings are masculine or feminine, and God redeemed mankind, not angels. Why then should man and woman not each have their share in the work of Redemption, a share ~~that~~ that befits their nature as man and as woman?

We are told by the Holy Spirit, through His prophets, that original sin did not come into this world without the mediation of woman--of the woman whom He had made a help like unto Adam. Besides, Adam called her "'Eve' because she was the mother of all the living." Now God, as we read, in passing sentence upon the act of disobedience committed first by Eve, then by Adam, again brings the woman to the foreground, this time in relation to the struggle and the victory to be achieved, that is, to the order of Redemption--a work to be ^{fulfilled} ~~achieved~~ by the offspring of the woman.

^

Although all the feminine figures we have mentioned are foreshadowings of the Woman to come, there is the respect in which none of them ~~can~~^{even to the} be compared ~~to~~ Eve, the mother of all the living. For Eve has the nature of first principle in more than one respect. In the order of nature, but also in the order of human action. Notice that in the commission of evil, the created person has the nature of first cause, whereas in our good actions God is the first and proper cause. Now Eve, of all human kind, was the first to sin, both against God and neighbour. And her sin was the first cause of sin in this order. For, as Adam said: "It is the woman who gave me of the tree, and I did eat." Although it was Adam's sin that was transmitted to their offspring, he sinned because of Eve. In other words Eve, through Adam and in him, is a universal cause, even as it is thanks to Adam that she is mother of all the living.

And this brings us to the main point of the present talk. For just as the first Eve exercised universal causality in the fall of mankind, so, inversely, does Mary, the New Eve, exercise a universal causality in the order of Redemption. This is not new doctrine. It is contained in the very words of Scripture, and was fully brought out by St. Irenaeus of Lyons in the second century. (Irenaeus had known St. Polycarp, a disciple of St. John the Evangelist.) The proportion which he points out to us is the following. Just as death came into this world through the disobedience of Eve, so did life come to us through the obedience of that other Virgin, Mary. You have all heard of this ~~parallel~~ 'recapitulation', the parallel between Adam and Eve on the one hand, and the New Adam and New Eve on the other. The first Eve's mediating role

in the fall is inversely parallel to the second Eve's mediating role in salvation. She shared in her Son's passion by her compassion.

God did not present the world with the first Eve to place Adam in the ~~shadow~~ shadow, or, to ~~the~~ use the expression of author we have quoted, "pour faire écran à son mari." For God himself has ~~made~~ made it known that it is by the first Adam's offence that death came into the world, "by one man's offence... Therefore, as by the offence of one, unto all men to condemnation; so also by the justice of one, unto all men to the justification of life. For as by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners; so also by the obedience of one, many shall be made just." (Rom. v 17) But ^{the} guilt of the first man did not exclude the mediation of the first woman in his guilt. Similarly, ~~the~~ merit of the second Adam did not exclude or bypass the merit and mediation of the second Eve.

Neither the unicity nor the primacy of Adam exclude the universal share of the woman ^{from his being the one} ~~in the~~ father of mankind; ~~and~~ ^{did not} the absolute priority of this father prevent Eve from being the mother of all the living. The transgression committed by ^{the} woman did not put that of Adam in the shadow; on the other hand, our common father would have had no descendants without the fecundity of this mother. Now, this paternity of Adam, is it less certain because, children of Adam, we are at the same time the children of Eve? It is said in Tobias: "Thou madest Adam of the slime of the earth, and gavest him Eve as a helper, and the human race was born of those two." (viii 8) Now this share of the mother of all the living, does it in any way make the origin of our life equivocal, ambiguous

Is this mother to be held for little or for nothing, because it is her husband who is the father of all? Is it fitting that we should overlook the ^{woman} who disobeyed first of all, because we inherited our sin from the man whom she led to disobey?

And why did God make such a case ^{of} ~~not regarding~~ the hostility between the Serpent and the Woman? Was it for no purpose at all that God ~~announced~~ announced the many pangs and throes ~~that~~ with which she was to bear ~~her~~ and give birth to her children? Can we be indifferent to this suffering and act contrary to nature?

Nor can we be led to believe that St. Paul created confusion when he wrote that Adam was not seduced; but the woman, being seduced, was in transgression." (1m 11 14)
The first Eve was not a screen to separate Adam from his sons--I mean the Adam who was the figure of the New Adam to come--; she was no such a hindrance, neither as a help like unto Adam, nor in her disobedience, nor in her fecundity of spouse and mother of all the living.

The same holds true of Mary. Neither her obedience, nor her Motherhood, nor her Compassion make for a screen that would separate us from her Son. And when did the Church ever allow ~~her to consider~~ us to consider her as an obstacle of that kind? All is said when the Church teaches that God made ^{for} the New Adam a like unto Himself, which is precisely what is meant by the Immaculate Conception. It is this particular fulness of grace of the Handmaid of the Lord, ~~and~~ of His Mother and Spouse, that establishes between them the most perfect friendship of all. It is in His friendship ~~to~~ this feminine ^{and} maternal figure that God shows ~~His abundant~~

the nobility of His friendship toward all mankind. p.396.

The only question, of all those you asked me recently, that now comes to mind concerns the repetition involved in the Rosary. I have notes on the subject, with no idea where to look for them. But I do recall that I insisted first upon the function of repetition in nature and its counterpart in art: electrons are sheer repetitions, and so are stars and their revolutions; days, years and seasons; on the biological level, cells, and the individuals of the species. In art, the stuff is repetitious, such as the alphabet, that small amount of letters used to construct such a variety of words and sentences; consider the bricks used in construction; and so is the stuff of our days - repetition, the metabolic cycle, eating and sleeping. That for the sake of which there is repetition requires this spreading out. The repetition is essentially for the sake of something else. It is like the process of memorizing, where we repeat for the sake of possession. In the spiritual life, repetition is as the material of the spiritual edifice. The greatest of the sacraments is to be repetitious - the Eucharist. More generally, and even prior to the spiritual life proper we have the repetition of the acts of virtue as the only way of acquiring and retaining virtue. Turning now to the function of repetition in the Rosary: it is for the sake of the form, namely the meditation of the mysteries. The repetition, here, is very appropriate to the feminine character of the Blessed Virgin. The Our Father is repeated, too, but only one for each mystery; the Hail Mary ten times to one. Women are more dependant upon repetition than men are. A wife, or any woman in love, is in constant need of repetition: she wants to be told again and again that she is loved, not just every day, but as much as possible all day long. To refuse her this is to neglect the very substance of her love. She is more subject to time and its waste than a man is. Tempus est magis causa corruptionis. Repetition then, is to her, a condition of survival, of love. Now the B.V. is Mediatrix. God has chosen the feminine to play an essential role in our ascending to Him. In the Rosary, considered from the viewpoint of its matter, the repetition has a twofold advantage: one based on the nature of woman, as shown above; the other is to be found in the nature of repetition in respect of facility: no new form is involved in the repetition itself, it being just more of the same. Here we join the repetition in nature and in art. No species in nature can be fulfilled in a single individual. The permanence of form depends upon repetition. Our meditation, the form of the mysteries of the Rosary, depends likewise upon the reiteration of the Hail Marys, each of these being in its turn a confession of doctrine and a prayer.

All this repetition, of the Hail Marys, the Our Fathers, and of the Rosaries themselves, can be viewed as the very stuff of a spiritual edifice. And Mary is the Civitas Dei (Apoc.). Thus the Rosary is, as it were, an active reflection of that Civitas in us, one to which we contribute constructively, providing both the bricks and the form in that humble manner which is so proportionate to our nature and surroundings. (I should have pointed out, earlier, that the mysteries in fact contain all the truths of our faith, both doctrinal and historical, so that in reciting the Rosary we lead in concrete temporal form our Catholic life.)

A great deal more remains to be said on the subject. Various items should be taken up severally, such as the repetition of "Hail," a constant salutation: why should we be called upon to remain in a state of salutation? Why should there be, as it were, an unceasing revival of the Annunciation? One might recall that one of the reasons for the Annunciation was "ut ostenderetur esse quoddam spirituale matrimonium inter Filium Dei et humanam naturam. Et ideo per annuntiationem expectabatur consensus Virginis loco totius humanae naturae." (IIIa Pars, q.30, a.1.) You see, at the same time, how our repeated salutation fits in both with the feminine character of the 'locum tenens' and the spiritual wedlock which the Annunciation signifies. Which goes to show how easily one could write a whole book on the subject of the Rosary as to the repetition it is made of — as to its matter.

De la Répétition
On Répétition

Chapelet

- ① Schéma de conf. en franc 2 pp.
- ② Répétit schéma et texte en anglais - 9 pp. ~~12 pp.~~

La Répétition

1. Très naturelle. Fréquence.
S'il n'y en avait pas...
2. La monotonie de la répétition.
C'est cet aspect de la répétition
qui pose le problème.
Exemple particulier et frappant:
les "Ave..." dans la récitation
du chapelet. Salutation répétée.
(Accusation/protestation)
3. Exemples de répétitions dans la nature.
Les atomes, les étoiles, les gouttes
d'eau, les grains de sable, les
hommes; les individus de la
espèce.
Dans le temps; les pas; les batte-
ments du cœur; les repas.
4. Pourquoi? Arist. II de Gen. 10; II de An. 4.
Les Anges et les choses matérielles.
Durée angélique et temps. Comment
nous nous maintenons côte à côte...
Notre vie dispersée, morcelée.
"Tomorrow, and tomorrow,..."
La séparation des jours et des lieux. Les
pas, la difficulté de franchir...
5. La sanctification de la répétition et de la
monotonie.
a. N.S.: un homme...
l'auteur des jours...
l'éternel vivant dans le temps
dans le lieu
Les pas, les bateaux, la bicyclette.
Fatigue, lavement des pieds.
Le P. sacrement: jours et lieux.

B. Le chapelet.
Les pas { méditation des mystères;
récitation { répétition
variété.

Qui est Elle?

Pleine de grâce.

Principe pour nous, toujours, sans
cease: la grâce par la méditation.

"Ab initio et ante saecula..."

Ideo: "Je vous salue, Marie,..."

Pour demeurer à la hauteur
de ce principe, et de ce fondement.

Nous nous tenons au dessus de
la dispersion et l'évanescence
du temps.

Nous multiplions les paroles, pour
en faire une

Et elle, un "Verbum abbreviatum".

Pour le dire, il nous faut bcp de
paroles - comme briques pour
faire une maison.

Dans l'humilité des Ave nous faisons
de grandes choses.

La récitation orale.

De la Répétition

I. Le fait de la répétition. Très familier.

des objets homogènes. des grains de sable, les gouttes d'eau.

des saisons. les hommes. les jours, les semaines, les années; les battements du cœur.

Tout cela "naturel". — C'est d'une certaine explication.

C'est néanmoins — autrement, pas de plage, pas d'océan, plus d'arbres.

Mais, quelle est la première cause de cette répétition? la fin de celui qui l'a faite?

~~Les choses se répètent parce qu'elles sont éternelles.~~

Question opportune, surtout quand on s'arrête au côté ennuyeux de certaines répétitions. Dormir, se lever, se coucher; répétition des pas pour arriver quelque part. Ennui de la routine.

Il y a des cas où la répétition paraît superflue. Exemple frappant: la répétition des "Ave" dans la récitation du chapelet.

Non s'agit répétition de la m^e prière, mais de la "Paléographie".

Du reste, les critiques: "prière pour des sots".

Raison communément donnée (et bonne): celui qui aime ne se lasse pas de le redire sans cesse.

Mais c'est là un simple fait, et qui, du reste, n'explique pas la "saturation" répétée.

Remarquons: chapelet composé de deux parties { méditation des mystères
la récitation des prières } diversité
Donc, nous arrivons à un seul aspect? ressemblance.

II. Aristote, { II de Gen. & Corrupt. II de Anima.

diffé. entre sublt. spirit. & sublt. corporelles.

spéc. au p^{er} duré. Il faut succession & répétition pour rester à la hauteur de l'existence;

pour rester de pair avec l'ange aimé nous devons marcher.

Jamais ne ne "sommes" tout compl. Nos pensées s'évanouissent

sans nous dans le gouffre du passé. Il nous devons "courir après". Tous nos anges

Pour les choses éternelles, la répétition nous d'imiter le divin: l'immortel.

Pour garder une pensée présente à la considération, nous devons nous la répéter.

Notre existence se compl. en petit moment. Pour avoir le que l'ange tient dans un billet, nous devons tenir
chaque fois des valises — très lourdes.

C'est épuisement de la répétition peut être envisagé de 2 manières { en elle-m^e: matière: gouffre noir, sans
par rapport à son terme: forme.

Compar.: briques & maison.

L'intelligence se réveille entre la pure répétition. "Tedium as a twice told tale."

[Tomorrow and tomorrow and tomorrow,
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,
To the last syllable of recorded time;
And all our yesterday, have lighted fools
The way to dusty death.]

Nous sommes des répétitions.

III. La répétition de la répétition.

Dieu lui-même, devenu vraiment homme.

Pas premier-né des hommes. Premiers des Prédestinés, néanmoins fils de David, fils de la Vierge, qui le précèdent dans le temps. Une répétition de l'apôtre.

S'est promené sur la terre - marché. Jour et nuit - repas.

Lui, la Parole qui dit ttes choses en une ^{seule} ~~fois~~ ^{parole}, multiplie ses paroles dans le temps.

Plume avec nous dans l'eucharistie où répétition selon les lieux et le temps.

Se laisse porter, en bicyclette, en autobus.

Vient parmi nous selon notre mode.

Toutes ces répétitions mènent vers l'éternité indivisible. Les triques que nous entassons seront un jour une maison ~~faite~~ ^{édifiée}.

IV La chapel.

Répétition de la Salutation Angélique.

Mari: "le nom de Marie lui convient, puisqu'il signifie "Etoile de la mer."

"C'est par l'étoile de la mer que les navigateurs se dirigent vers le port:

pareillement, c'est par Marie que les Chrétiens se dirigent vers la gloire." (Sth, Salut. a)

La Salutation se fait au principe d'une rencontre.

"Je vous salue Marie, plein de grâce, le S. est avec vous, vous êtes bénie...."

Par tout cela, Elle est un principe pour nous.

La pureté telle que tout autre purifié dérive d'elle.

Pas elle un principe au commencement d'une succession temporelle:

Elle est au principe, Premier-Présens. avec son Fils; Mère du Rédempteur, corréductrice, médiatrice de toutes les grâces, elle ne cesse pas d'être un commencement, un principe, une sagesse incessamment innovatrice. A chaque instant tout bien spirituel qui nous parvient nous parvient par elle. Elle est la Mère de tous nos jours.

Nous devons le reconnaître tous les moments de notre vie, autant que possible. Plus particulièrement dans la méditation des mystères de notre foi. Et alors, ~~notre pensée~~ notre parole chargée de cette pensée, peut, au cours de cette méditation, nous garder à la hauteur de ^{ce} principe.

La répétition est notre manière d'exprimer une dépendance entière et constante de celle qui est la source du bien dont l'aube ~~sur cette répétition nous nous maintenons à la hauteur~~ dit: le S. est avec vous.

Toujours, comme nous l'avons dit, la génération et la corruption seront continues, et jamais elles ne feront défaut, en raison de la cause que nous avons établie. Et cette continuité se trouve rationnellement justifiée. En effet, en toutes choses, disons-nous, la nature tend toujours vers le meilleur, et il est meilleur d'être que de n'être pas (nous reconnaissons à l'Être des sens multiples; nous l'avons expliqué ailleurs), mais l'Être ne peut appartenir à toutes choses, parce qu'elles sont trop éloignées de leur Principe. Aussi est-ce de l'autre façon que DIEU a réalisé la perfection de l'Univers: c'est en faisant la génération interrompue, car ainsi l'enchaînement le plus rigoureux possible serait assuré à l'existence, par ce fait que ce qui se rapproche le plus de l'Être éternel, c'est que la génération elle-même toujours se refasse. II de Gen. et corr., c.10, 336b25.

Car la plus naturelle des fonctions pour tout être vivant qui est achevé et qui n'est pas incomplet, ou dont la génération n'est pas spontanée, c'est de créer un autre être semblable à lui, l'animal un animal, et la plante une plante, de façon à participer à l'éternel et au divin, dans la mesure du possible. Car tel est l'objet du désir de tous les êtres, la fin de leur naturelle activité. Or le terme "fin" est pris en un double sens: c'est, d'une part, le but lui-même, et, d'autre part, l'être pour qui ce but est une fin. Puis donc qu'il est impossible pour l'individu de participer à l'éternel et au divin d'une façon continue, par le fait qu'aucun être corruptible ne peut demeurer le même et numériquement un, c'est seulement dans la mesure où il peut y avoir part que chaque être y participe, l'un plus, l'autre moins; et il demeure ainsi non pas lui-même, mais semblable à lui-même, non pas numériquement un, mais spécifiquement un. II de Anima, c.4, 415a25.

Repetition

SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE
CONDUCTED BY THE CHRISTIAN BROTHERS
SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE, CALIFORNIA

1. So common, not problem. Repetition of things, trees, ships, meats.
Natural because so common &
these obviously necessary.
2. But in some instances, reason less obvious. Rosary.
Most critical attacks against the repetition.
"Prayer for fools".
3. Repetition only small part. Yet. $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{duplication} \\ \text{repetition} \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{l} \text{meditation of mysteries} \\ \text{revelation} \end{array}$
Here, ex repetition of "Hail Mary!" For, salutation.
4. Philos. doct. of repetition

On Repetition

Introd.

~~I have been asked to introduce the series of talks on the Sacraments and to repeat at this time a talk I gave last week, on the side, to a smaller group. I'm not too sure whether or not the problem involved will now of interest to you. It all depends how much you take for granted the repetitions character of what we are and of what surrounds us.~~

The subject of this talk is so common that one may well wonder how it could raise a problem at all. Nothing seems more natural than repetition: like the succession of hours and days and years. A tree comes to life and grows ^{and dies}, and another comes to life, grows and dies. We are satisfied, perhaps, that this is natural. The question "Why should there be repetition at all?" may even appear foolish in view of the ~~glaringly~~ obvious fact that if there were no repetition of coming-to-be and of growth there would soon be no more trees. And what could be more natural than, in moving from one place to another, we repeat our steps; or that to remain alive we repeat our meals.

The species of a tree can be kept in existence only by repetition.

Yet there are instances where the necessity of repetition is less obvious and where, for that very reason, repetition becomes a problem. I'm thinking, more particularly, of the striking repetition involved in the recitation of the Rosary. We repeat the Ave Maria's over and over again. If we can agree on this problem, we shall see that the general reason for repetition of any kind is not quite as obvious as we believe on first sight. - Indeed, the most critical attacks upon the Rosary have been launched against its repetitious character. Learned men have called it a

prayer for fools, forgetting, perhaps, that there is a wisdom which because of its strictly divine character, is foolishness to the world.

Do not for one moment believe our exposition is meant to compass all that the Rosary is. Repetition is only one small aspect of it. ~~At the Rosary House, you must not believe this in itself as establishing a general reason for it, we presume to demand for what the very nature of the Rosary is.~~ The repetition is only a material aspect of what has been called the Psalter of the Virgin, this unfathomable prayer which embraces all the Mysteries of Redemption.

In the Encyclical letter "Incarnationem", Leo XIIIth said: "As all know, [the Rosary] is composed of two parts, distinct but inseparable — the meditation on the mysteries and the recitation of the prayers." — We are not concerned, at present, with the meditative part, nor with the recitation as such, but rather with the repetition this recitation involves, and, more particularly, with the repetition constantly repeated salutation: "Hail Mary!" Perhaps our problem will be the more striking from the peculiar nature of this repetition: for, "Ave Maria!" are words of greeting, pronounced on first approach. We say "hello!" or "Good Morning!" on first meeting the person we salute. We do not repeat to him "Good Morning!" all morning long. Yet we do something like that in the Rosary — and for good reason, as we shall see.

The reason we shall seek to establish is not one that is to be held in mind expressly and constantly while reciting this prayer. It is not ~~the~~ by itself the proper and exclusive object of meditation, although it may be considered as part of this object — as a fundamental part of the mysteries. But let us get on with our subject.

• The philosophical doctrine of repetition.
Is how divinely reasonable is the repetition of the Ave Maria's in the recitation of the Rosary.

The Cause of Repetition

There is so much of it around us, from the day we were born - indeed, our very birth was a repetition - that it has spent itself, as it were - at least to us - and we are blind to it.

To say that ^{universal} divine is the cause of repetition may appear strange on first hearing. Yet such it is.

Let us consider first of all the things that are repeated in our world.

The many stars, the many atoms, their ever repeated windings and revolutions, the succession of seasons, succession of days and nights; of drops of water, of grains of sand; life in this universe is founded on repetition. Man is, in a sense, unceasing repetition: many individuals... And so are our years, the days, the hours, the minutes. Barely to live, we must repeat our meals, our sleep. To go from one place to the next we must repeat our steps. In speech, we say this is such and that is such. - This is enough repetition!

Where is the divine in all this? It is Aristotle who tells us: *II de Generatione et Cor.*, c. 10, 336b 15; *II de Anima*, c. 4, 415a 25.

Some things are so imperfect in their nature that they must be repeated lest they cease to be at all. Consider the angels... Consider our "time". We cannot exist ~~except~~ except in succession - we never simply are ~~except~~ "now" and "then". So considered, we are not divine. Yet we do imitate the divine by means of repetition and succession. We keep a thought present to us by repetition - we must constantly come back to it. To memorize, we must repeat: process.

The very beat of our heart is a repetition. Surely, there is more to all this than repetition, but it is there - like the many bricks which make up a house.

II Sanctification in Repetition

When we abstract from what is being maintained or achieved by repetition, life and growth, repetition as such, ^{involves} as it were, a constant death. Homogeneity opposed to form. The tedium of the twice told tale; ~~Rosset always~~ it has the weight of small change, ~~But~~ this aspect is not the whole story.

Remember the school-room song: Many drops of water... And be reminded of their power. The little drops of water wearing down the so-called golden rocks.

Yet, we cannot fail to see that to be and to do by repetition is not the best way to be and to do. It would be better could we have the fulness of life and that ~~not~~ undivided and unscattered; to have it all whole instead of piecemeal.

Indeed, repetition may be a bore, tedious, a burden, and as a waste of steps and of time. This aspect we cannot ~~not~~ escape. The prospect of the next meal is ^{attractive} tolerable only until we have had it. At that point, the necessity of another is merely accepted.

Yet there has been a sanctification of this repetition, that goes far beyond anything the most profound philosophy could envisage.

God was born true man. First and only born of the Father, He was not the first born as a man. The first of the Predestinati, yet He is the Son of David - many have gone before Him. He was and is the Son of Mary. Christ, the man, is a repetition of the species. He walked upon the earth, and He took step after step, He lived through days and nights, He had to take food over and over again. He became tired on his journeys, and

All our days are doomed to become yesterday, ^{even} the tomorrow of our hope will soon be ~~the~~ yesterday. Our days are mendicant days, each begging for another still in need of for another. We are beggars of life, not possessors. As the poet says: "[Death] dwells between the places of my breath." ~~They are mendicant days, each begging for another still in need of another.~~

The pace of our days is a petty one. It is even more so when we are disheartened and deluded by ~~speed~~ speed accomplishing nothing, merely ~~the~~ bringing us back to where we started from.

Filius David

She was and is before the ~~eternity~~ ages:
 "ante saecula" et "per omnia saecula."
 This is the background we keep pace
 with in repetition.

The salutation of the angel is a
 greeting never ended; ~~while~~ it is
 God's word which ~~is sent~~ to her by
 the greeting of the ~~angel~~ angel; whereupon
 and she ~~received~~ ^{was} received the ~~timely~~ ^{word} from the Holy Spirit
~~what from the Holy Spirit~~

Viewed in this light, even the
 humble stuff of the Rosary, the
 repetition of the beads, becomes
 sublime. They are so many strokes, keeping
~~us~~ ^{us} apace with that
beginning which is without end: a beginning and source, which never ceases to

Very close to the eternal Word by
 this repetition.

indivisible
 undivided all things from all eternity,
 and in whom we shall one day see, ~~all~~
~~reappear~~ by a vision undivided, all that
 God gives us to see in them. But as it is, here
 below, we can hold this word among us only
 by repetition.

The "Hail Mary's", as spoken,
 sensible words: incarnate words, ~~with~~
 thus we keep apace body and soul.

Our word is only thus complete.

~~Repetition~~ The lowliness of the sensible
 enunciation of the words is to be

compared ~~to that we said of this~~ to the lowliness of the
 sacraments as sensible signs, ^{yet, even} in this
 our vocal speech as a fulness of which
 the Incarnate word is the original.

In becoming flesh, the Word, the Second
 Person of the Holy Trinity, humbled
 himself - humiliavit semetipsum. Hence, why should

~~for more~~ we refuse to humble ourselves
 in such oral prayer,
 which, by its very repetition, respects
 the dust we are made of: "even dust"
 in the hands of its Shaper is a glorified thing."

Repetition is our mode, and means, of
 keeping abreast with the ever innovating
 Dei Genetrix; and thus forms the
 background of our thoughts and requests.

Thus, even when we repeat that
ever renewed and receiving salutation
to the Mother of our life and of
our days, and while we form and
enunciate the seventh word, we do
imitate the Word become flesh. — The
Word ~~which~~ came amongst us in
the mode of our minute, of our days
and of our years, and that Word was
a seventh word by reason of its humanity.
By repeating "Hail Mary, full of
grace," we hold with us the Lord, her
Son — for it is from her that He is
with us — Emmanuel — with us in
our mode — so that, after these weary days and nights,
days, we may, one time, be with Him
in His undivided, ~~now~~ unrepeated
yet everlasting noon.

Also stubborn maintenance ^{over and} against and
through turmoil of life ^{circumstances}. Stubbornness
of clock ticking away, meaning unobscured.

The Relevance of Vague Knowledge can be

"Chaque homme sait une quantité prodigieuse de choses qu'il ignore qu'il soit. [Every man knows a prodigious amount of things which he is unaware of knowing.] "Savoir tout ce que nous savons?" [To know all that we know?] Cette simple recherche épuise la philosophie." [This simple investigation takes in all of philosophy.] Voltaire, Maupertuis, Rousseau, etc.

A large measure of truth, but surely not the whole truth. Let us consider the measure of truth in this statement.

- Memo Plato's reminiscence.

- Aristotle: "All doctrinal and intellectual discipline proceed from preexistent knowledge... The preexistent knowledge required is of two kinds. In some cases admission of the fact must be assumed; in others, understanding of the meaning of the term used, and sometimes both assumptions

are essential." Post. An. I, 1.

2 can be

We may safely call this pre-scientific knowledge. It is the knowledge we express in ordinary language. Now, most of this knowledge is admittedly vague.

Two questions:

(1) Is it therefore irrelevant?

(2) Irrelevant to science?

(1) Surely relevant to our practical life, to behavior and to much of our making. E.g. food. There were boats before we could account for the reason they float. - We care for people before we can give an explicit and proper reason for this. - We have very little scientific knowledge of the things that are our chief concern in practical life. We must make do with it notwithstanding its vagueness.

(2) Is the vague knowledge we have of bodies around us, from pebbles to planets and stars; of living things, is it relevant to science, or, is scientific knowledge of a kind that replaces all that?

Bertrand Russell has made a
sound observation on this point.
(cf. p. 24)

3 can be

Weisenberg deals with the same
question where he observes. (p. 22)

He goes so far as to say that "Even
for the physicist the description
in plain language will be a
criterion of the degree of understanding
that has been reached."

My point is that the non-physicist
is not to be taken too literally.

I venture the opinion that the
non-physicist he mentions is
primarily the physicist himself
qua non-physicist.

This, I believe, is borne out by
Schrödinger. (Sep. sheet)

But surely no one wants to
rest in vague knowledge. Exactness
is our aim. Still, there will always
be the problem of relating the more
exact knowledge we progressively

acquire to the confused or 4 can be
vague knowledge we already
have. How else could I start
asking questions? If I can
answer a question I must it not
be an answer to a question about
something already known?

Russell's point is that knowledge
become distinct does not destroy
the certainty of knowledge preliminary
to it, however vague such
knowledge may be. (p. 6).

If Russell and Reichenberg
and Louis de Broglie are right,
then vague knowledge remains
relevant to science - at least
to the natural sciences, if not so
much in Mathematics, where
the subjects are constructions we
ourselves lay down.

C. P. Snow's The Two Cultures.

Does the physicist stand in
need of a third ^{person} ~~man~~, so that
he could talk to himself as a
man? Reichenberg: not if he is
also a philosopher.

Two reasons why this doctrine can be
made to appear unreasonable.

First the name.

Second, it calls for distinctions.

239
Qu'est-ce I

QU'EST-CE QUE LA PHILOSOPHIE

Ce ne sera pas, je pense, rompre avec la tradition que de vous parler quelques instants de choses élémentaires mais fondamentales, simples et évidentes que l'on est cependant porté à oublier, tant est grande la confusion présente des idées.

Il s'agit de la notion même de la philosophie. Voir d'une part ce que nous entendons aujourd'hui par philosophie et se rappeler d'autre part ce que les anciens: Aristote, Saint Thomas en disaient, pour constater ensuite que nos définitions modernes ont peut-être contribué à rapetisser la philosophie en laissant entendre qu'elle est une science bien abstraite sinon abstruse, séparée et exilée de toutes les autres sciences, de toutes les autres disciplines.

Quelle conception les scolastiques se font-ils du philosophe, depuis le Moyen-Age? Pour eux, le philosophe n'est sûrement pas l'homme de lettres; ce n'est pas non plus le mathématicien, ni l'homme de science; ce n'est même pas le sociologue. Mais alors, qui donc est-il? Sans doute, le philosophe est celui qui étudie la philosophie, mais qu'est-ce que la philosophie? La philosophie? me direz-vous; ouvrez n'importe quel manuel et vous l'apprendrez dès la première page! Depuis des générations, en effet, aucun des manuels n'a manqué de nous donner ce qu'ils appellent tous une définition réelle de la philosophie, savoir, "une connaissance certaine par les causes"; ou encore, "connaissance certaine par les causes ultimes". Par ailleurs, ils divisent la philosophie en logique, philosophie de la nature, en métaphysique et morale.

Pourtant, si nous nous donnons la peine de réfléchir un peu, cette définition et cette division de la philosophie ne nous paraîtront pas aussi évidentes qu'elles veulent l'être dans la pensée de leurs auteurs. En effet, si nous disons que la philosophie est une connaissance par les causes ultimes, il faudra de toute nécessité réserver cette définition à la seule métaphysique, car seule elle considère les causes ultimes. D'autre part, si nous supprimons de la définition le mot "ultime" et ne retenons que ceux-ci, savoir "Connaissance certaine par les causes", nous ne voyons pas bien pourquoi on rejette de la philosophie la mathématique, car celle-ci est non seulement une connaissance par causes mais elle est aussi au dire de Saint Thomas, la connaissance la plus certaine pour nous. Enfin, dire de la philosophie qu'elle est une connaissance certaine, c'est dire en somme que la science morale n'est pas une partie de la philosophie, autrement comment expliquer que Saint-Thomas ne cesse de répéter que la philosophie morale procède "figuraliter, idest verisimiliter". Disons-nous donc tout simplement que la philosophie est une connaissance par causes? Mais alors, pourquoi on exclure la poétique et la rhétorique?

Force nous est donc de conclure que la définition réelle de la philosophie qu'on sort depuis des siècles aux bacheliers, est un pur trompe-l'œil. Mais au fait, une définition réelle de la philosophie est-elle possible? Nous répondons carrément qu'elle ne l'est pas.

En effet comment pourrait-on assigner un genre prochain et une différence spécifique à une notion qui embrasse des choses aussi différentes que la métaphysique, qui est sagesse, et la philosophie de la nature et la morale, qui ne sont que des sciences, pour ne parler que des seules parties de la philosophie que les scolastiques étudiaient encore?

Aussi bien, ce n'est pas sans raison qu'Aristote et Saint Thomas se sont toujours contentés d'une définition nominale de la philosophie, celle de Pythagore: "amor sapientiae". Pour eux la philosophie est un amour de la sagesse. Cette définition n'a pas le seul mérite d'être la seule qu'on puisse donner de la philosophie; elle a encore et surtout le très grand mérite de dire exactement ce qu'est la philosophie, et d'embrasser tout ce que celle-ci comprend véritablement, tout ce qu'elle comprenait pour les anciens. Pour ceux-ci, en effet, le philosophe n'est pas celui qui possède déjà la sagesse et n'a plus qu'à en jouir, car la sagesse est divine et seul Dieu la possède de façon parfaite et durable. Le philosophe, c'est celui qui est à la recherche des causes, et on dornière analyse des causes ultimes, sans exclure les autres causes. Pour eux la philosophie est l'intelligence spéculative orientée vers les causes ultimes comme vers un terme, allant des "notissima simplicior" connus des sens jusqu'aux "notissima secundum se". Comment on serait-il autrement, puisque nous dépendons des choses, que nous sommes mesurés par elles; bien plus nous connaissons par le ministère des sens, et la philosophie, tout en poursuivant la recherche des causes ultimes, ne peut jamais se passer de la certitude des sens, laquelle est pour nous la plus forte. Aussi bien, la sagesse métaphysique dépend, et dans son acquisition et dans sa nature même de sagesse, de toutes les disciplines inférieures, y compris les arts libéraux. Et c'est précisément en tant qu'ordonnées à la sagesse, vers laquelle elles doivent tendre, que ces disciplines inférieures et particulières sont parties de la philosophie. C'est tout cela qu'exprime la définition d'Aristote, "amor sapientiae", savoir la grande diversité en même temps que l'unité d'ordre de la recherche philosophique. Et le début de sa Métaphysique n'est qu'une manifestation, du reste admirable, de cette définition.

Pour Aristote et Saint Thomas toute connaissance spéculative par causes est philosophique. Le philosophe se distingue du seul artiste.

Mais afin de mieux faire voir cette diversité et cette unité d'ordre de la philosophie telle que l'entendaient les anciens, parcourons rapidement les nombreuses disciplines qui constituent comme autant d'étales successives, ascendantes, et interdépendantes, du mouvement de la raison vers la sagesse.

Il y a d'abord l'infima doctrina, savoir la poésie, qui n'est pas une connaissance proprement universelle. Le poète en effet n'argumente pas, il use de métaphore; l'image est son instrument propre.

De là le caractère quasi inné de la poésie. Elle est l'art le moins soumis à l'acquisition: Nascuntur poetae. L'art du poète dépend davantage de ses qualités naturelles d'imagination et de sensibilité, qualités assurément exceptionnelles qui font de lui un être rare et étonnant.

Mais cette "infima doctrina" est ordonnée à la sagesse; c'est dire qu'elle doit être réglée et mesurée par une connaissance supérieure, par la Poétique qui était pour les anciens une partie de la philosophia rationalis.

La connaissance du poète se distingue de la poétique. Le poète ne possède pas nécessairement les deux. La poétique est l'habitus propre à l'homme de lettres, au littérateur qui entend juger les poètes, mais c'est un habitus déterminé et qui doit être acquis; il est un des habitus de la philosophia rationalis, mais ce n'est pas un habitus autonome sans rapport avec le terme parfait de toute connaissance qu'est la sagesse.

Entre ces deux connaissances, celle du poète et celle du véritable homme de lettres qui possède la poétique, il n'y a pas de place pour une autre connaissance déterminée. Il ne peut y avoir que des connaissances plus ou moins vulgaires et par conséquent inefficaces pour juger aussi bien que pour régler les poètes.

Après la Poétique vient la Rhétorique, laquelle possède un caractère plus intellectuel. En effet, elle a pour fin propre la vérité, et son instrument principal est le discours, l'argumentation. Mais ce discours est encore très imparfait et doit s'appuyer sur les images. De plus, le rhéteur ne peut, strictement, engendrer même l'opinion, il conduit tout au plus au soupçon; d'où la nécessité pour lui de toucher les passions. Et la raison dernière de cette imperfection de la connaissance rhétorique c'est que sa matière propre est la "materia civilis", ce qu'il y a de plus contingent, de plus variable.

Comme la rhétorique, pour Aristote, consiste principalement dans la preuve, elle doit être réglée d'en haut par la logique, on raison du discours, car c'est la logique qui règle la forme de tout discours quel qu'il soit.

Puis vient la Logique. Ici le discours est parfaitement rigoureux. La Logique est même une science très abstraite, aussi abstraite que la métaphysique. Si néanmoins les anciens la placent immédiatement après la Rhétorique et avant les autres sciences proprement dites, dans l'ordre d'acquisition, cela tient uniquement à ce qu'elle est l'instrument propre de la raison. Il reste que c'est un habitus dont l'acquisition dépend matériellement des habitus inférieurs qui lui sont ordonnés. D'autre part, la logique, comme toutes les autres disciplines est ordonnée à la sagesse, et n'échappe pas, par conséquent, à sa direction.

Quant aux mathématiques, elles sont les sciences les plus adéquates à l'intelligence humaine, à cause de leur abstraction de toute matière sensible, principe de mouvement, et aussi parce qu'elles se résolvent dans l'imagination. Par suite, elles n'exigent pas l'expérience et peuvent être, au dire de Saint Thomas, facilement apprises même par les enfants. C'est pourquoi leur acquisition doit précéder celle des autres sciences, à l'exception de la Logique, pour les raisons que nous venons d'indiquer. Et leur subordination à la métaphysique sagesse, se voit manifestement en ceci qu'elles n'atteignent pas le "quid rei" de la quantité qu'elles considèrent; seul le métaphysicien peut dire ce qu'est la quantité comme nature.

La science qui fait suite aux mathématiques dans l'ordre d'acquisition c'est la philosophie de la nature. Parce que son objet ne fait pas abstraction de toute matière sensible, il ne peut échapper tout à fait aux exigences du mouvement et de la contingence. Dans sa démarche à partir des 'communia' vers la concrétion, la philosophie de la nature dépend de plus en plus de l'expérience.

Il en va de même de la philosophie morale, elle dépend de l'expérience encore plus que la philosophie de la nature. Aussi Aristote disait-il que le jeune ne saurait être un auditeur convenable de la philosophie morale, soit à cause de son inexpérience s'il est jeune d'âge, soit à cause de son imprudence, s'il est resté jeune de mœurs. Aussi bien, une philosophie morale purement abstraite ne saurait atteindre sa fin qui est de diriger la prudence.

La dernière discipline dans l'ordre d'acquisition est la métaphysique, ce qui se conçoit facilement: elle requiert au dire de Saint Thomas une intelligence virile "juvenes non credunt metaphysicalia, id non attingunt mento, licet dicant oro".

Voilà, si l'on peut dire, le tableau des principales doctrines philosophiques, selon les anciens. Toute connaissance spéculative avait sa place déterminée en philosophie puisque toute connaissance spéculative est une participation plus ou moins éloignée de la sagesse et que la philosophie est l'amour de la sagesse. Saint Thomas appelait Aristote "Le philosophe", non seulement parce qu'il a recherché les causes ultimes, qu'il a écrit un traité de métaphysique, - part très restreinte de son ouvrage, - mais aussi parce qu'il a étudié la Poétique, la Rhétorique, la Politique, l'Economique, le Ciel, les Météores, les Parties des Animaux, le Mouvement des animaux, l'Histoire des animaux, etc.

Au contraire en acceptant la définition des scolastiques modernes, on reconnaît à un grand nombre de disciplines le droit de vivre en marge de la philosophie, en marge de la sagesse et on ne voit plus bien ce qui distingue entre elles les doctrines qu'on retient comme parties de la philosophie.

En définissant la philosophie par la certitude et par les causes ultimes, on abandonne les fondements mêmes de la doctrine philosophique, à savoir les arts libéraux. On compromet l'acquisition de la logique et par conséquent de toute sagesse. Déjà de son temps Hugues de St-Victor déplorait le grand nombre de ceux qui étudient et apprennent et le petit nombre de ceux qui sont sages: Multos studentes, paucos vero sapientes.

Par cette même définition, les mathématiques, les sciences expérimentales et la sociologie sont exclues de la philosophie.

De la science de la nature ainsi que de la morale on ne retient que les "communia" très certains sans doute, mais inaptos par eux-mêmes à nous donner une connaissance suffisante des objets de ces deux sciences.

Qu'en est-il résulté, non seulement pour les scolastiques qui se sont ainsi isolés, mais pour l'esprit humain? Il n'y a qu'à jeter un regard sur la pensée moderne.

Ce fut la révolte contre la sagesse, des lettres d'abord, puis des mathématiques et de la science moderne, de la philosophie morale et politique. Ce fut la négation même de la Métaphysique, ce qui est logique, puisqu'on ne peut l'acquérir qu'à partir des disciplines inférieures. A leur tour, ces disciplines ont voulu s'ériger en sagesse, juger tout à la lumière d'une connaissance défectueuse, parce qu'elles ont perdu de son principe et de son terme. Dans le monde moderne, ce n'est plus le sage qui ordonne, c'est le non-sage qui est infini en nombre "infinitus est numerus stultorum". "Vidi servos in equis, et principes ambulantes sicut servos super terram". Eccl. X.

Sans nous attarder à ce sombre tableau qu'il serait facile de noircir encore, souhaitons un retour à Aristote et à Saint Thomas d'abord pour la définition même de la philosophie. Au lieu de nous présenter une définition réelle fièrement installée à côté de la pauvre définition nominale, qu'on s'applique plutôt à nous faire voir le plein sens de cette humble mais très adéquate définition de Pythagore: "Amor sapientiae, l'amour de la sagesse".

Et surtout laissons-nous guider dans l'acquisition et l'enseignement de la philosophie par la véritable conception qui est au principe de cette définition des anciens.
