

A 434

Dated **March 3 1961**. Again treats ideal of reason. 4 handwritten schematic pp. These notes are written on reverse of discarded English pp, one definitely responding to a critic (Fay), the others treating the category of myth (all possibly part of one and the same larger essay).

(Page 1)

March 3 1961

The problem is that the ideal of reason bestowed by nature is objectified in different ways.

From the Greeks we have Platonic dialectic, Aristotelian logic, and such enterprises as geometry, mathematics, mechanics, medicine, history. Then there is Christian theology. And finally, there are modern methods. The Greeks and the moderns show a series of oppositions.

There is an ideal of objectification as a deductivism.

1 Once the principles are posited, the conclusions follow. A formalization is demanded. There are posited definitions, axioms, and rules of deduction. The conclusion follows mechanically, as it were, lest acts of understanding intervene surreptitiously. I.M. Bochenski said it would take a permanent commission three or four centuries to formalize the *Summa theologiae*.

There are new exigencies.

(page 2)

2 There are principles. In mathematics, there are postulates. They are postulates because from them there follow other things. They are not proposed as necessary, absolutely universal, and evident. For what was done regarding Euclid's geometry could happen again. In physics, the intellectual ordering is ultimately grounded in an artistic (aesthetic?) criterion. Lindsay and Margenau. Future physics will have to satisfy all measurements but still could be different; even now it may be different, even if more complicated. In philosophy, can philosophical principles be found (1) on the side of objectification (R. Verneaux) and (2) on the side of the one who objectifies (S. Breton, J. Trouillard). Such an ideal (the latter) is an irreformable constant, the mind itself as it demands, grounds norms, and has a nature.

(1) ? historical. Scotus is deductivist and is concerned with possible worlds. Thomas is concerned with this world. He distinguishes science (conclusions from principles), understanding (principles and terms), and wisdom (determination of which terms will be employed). Proper principles presuppose known essences, whereas common principles are grounded in the notion of being and are naturally known.

(2) Christian philosophy: the problem consists in greater concreteness. The ultimate synthesis would have theology and existential philosophy, the natural and human sciences, all connected together. The issue is not what is necessary in every possible world.

(page 3)

We have divided theology, which is a science in an analogous sense.

(1) There remains the one God, but there are many theologies, most of them more or less disorganized. There are fundamental, dogmatic, speculative, moral, pastoral, ascetical and mystical theology.

(2) These are all penetrated by a new historical ideal. There are the history of religions, biblical, patristic, medieval, oriental, modern, Protestant, contemporary, liberal, modernist theologies. [Connections are drawn from medieval to oriental, from modern to Protestant, and from contemporary to liberal and modernist.] This gives rise to serious complications. Biblical theology does not treat separately God as God, God as Creator, God as End, God as permitting sin, Christ as Messiah and as divine legate, Christ as divine person and the Triune God, Christ as Man and the Incarnate Word, Christ as head of the Church and grace and sacraments, Christ as founding the Church and ecclesiology.

There is more of a distinction in the Fathers. There is then a separation of speculative theology concerning the Trinity and positive theology concerning the Trinity, a question that is not treated separately in the sources. [The connection of ideas here (bottom of p. 3) is not clear to me.—RD]

(page 4)

(3) All of this is disturbed by practical exigencies. These are: the medieval resistance against dialectic and against Aristotle; the *devotio moderna*, according to which it is better to feel compunction and to please the Trinity [than to define compunction or engage in speculation regarding the Trinity]; Pietism, where biblical theology is precisely non-dogmatic [?]; there were the questions of what is more useful for priests and missionaries (biblical and liturgical theology); there are the *priora quoad nos, quoad the apostles, quoad the ancient Hebrews*; there are historical-cultural issues, the sociology of the parish, economic concerns.

(4) The solution is impossible as long as the Thomist questions concerning method remain unsolved. [There follows a division α with three columns. The first is set off from the other two by a vertical line. The first column is: iam pridem

insolubilia [for a long time insoluble]

The second column is: de fide divina & catholica [of divine and Catholic faith]

theologicæ certa [theologically certain]

certa & communia [certain and common]

The third column is: qq. disputatae [disputed questions]

& in aeternum disputandae [and eternally to be disputed]

Next there is a division β : with the transformed foundation, theology as science is analogically conceived, [but?] the fundamental problem remains unsolved: there is no solution in conceiving science analogically.
