

QUAESTIONES
DISPUTATAE
DE VERITATE

St. Thomas Aquinas

Volume I
Questions 1-9

QUAESTIONES DISPUTATAE DE VERITATE

St. Thomas Aquinas

Volume I
Questions 1-9
translated by
Robert W. Mulligan, S.J.

Henry Regnery Company
Chicago, IL
© 1952

Contents

Question I: Truth	I
1. What is truth?	I
2. Is truth found principally in the intellect or in things?	7
3. Is truth only in the Intellect joining and separating?	10
4. Is there only one truth by which all things are true?	12
5. Is some truth besides the first truth eternal?	18
6. Is created truth immutable?	27
7. Is truth as applied to God predicated personally or essentially?	31
8. Is every other truth from the first truth?	33
9. Is truth in sense?	37
10. Is there any false thing?	38
11. Is falsity in sense?	43
12. Is falsity in the intellect?	45
 Question II: God's Knowledge	 48
1. Is there knowledge in God?	48
2. Does God know or understand himself?	54
3. Does God know things other than himself?	61
4. Does God have proper and determinate knowledge of things?	71
5. Does God know singular things?	77
6. Does the human intellect know singulars?	85
7. Does God know the singulars now existing or not existing?	88
8. Does God know non-beings and things which are not, have not been, and will not be?	91
9. Does God know infinities?	93
10. Can God make infinities?	99
11. Is knowledge predicated of God and men purely equivocally?	102
12. Does God know singular future contingents?	107
13. Does God's knowledge change?	115
14. Is God's knowledge the cause of things?	121
15. Does God have knowledge of evil things?	124
 Question III: Ideas	 127
1. Are there ideas in God?	127
2. Are there many ideas?	134

Contents

3.	Do ideas belong to speculative or only to practical knowledge?	140
4.	Is there in God an idea of evil?	146
5.	Is there in God an idea of first matter?	148
6.	Are there ideas in God of those things which do not exist, will not exist, and have not existed?	150
7.	Are there in God ideas of accidents?	152
8.	Are there in God ideas of singulars?	154

Question IV: The Divine Word **157**

1.	Can there be a word, properly speaking, in God?	157
2.	Is word predicated of God essentially or only personally?	164
3.	Is word a proper name of the Holy Spirit?	170
4.	Does the Father utter all creatures in the word by which he utters himself?	172
5.	Does the Word imply a relation to creatures?	176
6.	Do things exist more truly in the word or in themselves?	180
7.	Is the Word related to those things which do not exist, will not exist, and never have existed?	183
8.	Are all created things life in the Word?	184

Question V: Providence **187**

1.	To which attribute can God's providence be reduced?	187
2.	Is the world ruled by providence?	193
3.	Does God's providence extend to corruptible things?	199
4.	Are the motions and actions of all bodies here below subject to divine providence?	202
5.	Are human acts ruled by providence?	207
6.	Are brute animals and their acts subject to God's providence?	210
7.	Are sinners ruled by God's providence?	212
8.	Are all material creatures governed by God's providence through angels?	214
9.	Does divine providence dispose bodies here below by means of the celestial bodies?	221
10.	Are human acts governed by God's providence through the instrumentality of celestial bodies?	231

Question VI: Predestination **236**

1.	Does predestination belong to knowledge or will?	236
----	--	-----

2. Is foreknowledge of merits the cause of or reason for predestination?	243
3. Is predestination certain?	250
4. Is the number of predestined certain?	257
5. Are the predestined certain of their predestination?	262
6. Can predestination be helped by the prayers of the saints?	264

Question VII: The Book of Life **268**

1. Is the book of life a created thing?	268
2. Is the book of life predicated of God personally or essentially?	273
3. Can the book of life be appropriated to the son?	276
4. Is the book of life the same as predestination?	278
5. Is the book of life spoken of in relation to uncreated life?	279
6. Is the book of life spoken of in relation to the natural life of creatures?	282
7. Does the book of life used without qualification refer to the life of grace?	284
8. Can we speak of a book of death as we speak of the book of life?	286

Question VIII: The Knowledge of Angels **289**

1. Do the angels see God through his essence?	289
2. Do the intellects of beatified angels and men comprehend the divine essence?	296
3. Can an angel by means of his own natural powers attain the vision of God through his essence?	300
4. Does an angel, seeing God through his essence, know all things?	308
5. Is the vision of things in the word had through likenesses of them existing in the angelic intellects?	317
6. Does an angel know himself?	320
7. Does one angel know another?	325
8. Does an angel know material things through forms or by knowing his own essence?	333
9. Are the forms by which angels know material things innate or received from things?	338
10. Do higher angels know by forms more universal than those by which lower angels know?	343
11. Do angels know singulars?	346
12. Do angels know the future?	352
13. Can angels know the heart's secrets?	356

Contents

14. Can angels know many things at the same time?	359
15. Is angels' knowledge of things discursive?	367
16. Should morning knowledge be distinguished from evening knowledge in angels?	372
17. Is an angel's knowledge adequately divided into morning and evening knowledge?	378

Question IX: The Communication of Angelic Knowledge 381

1. Does one angel illumine another?	381
2. Is an inferior angel always illumined by a superior angel or is he sometimes illumined directly by God?	389
3. Does one angel cleanse another when he illumines him?	392
4. Does one angel speak to another?	395
5. Do the inferior angels speak to the superior?	401
6. Is a determinate local distance required in order that one angel can speak to another?	404
7. Can one angel speak to another in such a way that others will not know what he is saying?	406

Question I

TRUTH

1. What is truth?
2. Is truth found principally in the intellect or in things?
3. Is truth only in the intellect joining and separating?
4. Is there only one truth by which all things are true?
5. Is some truth besides the First Truth eternal?
6. Is created truth immutable?
7. Is truth as applied to God predicated personally or essentially?
8. Is every other truth from the First Truth?
9. Is truth in sense?
10. Is there any false thing?
11. Is falsity in sense?
12. Is falsity in the intellect?

ARTICLE I

*What is truth?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that the true is exactly the same as being, for

1. Augustine says: "The true is that which is." But that which is, is simply being. The true, therefore, means exactly the same as being.

2. It was said in reply that the true and being are the same materially but differ formally.—On the contrary the nature of a thing is signified by its definition; and the definition of the true, according to Augustine, is that which is." He rejects all other definitions. Now, since the true and being are materially the same, it seems that they are also formally the same.

3. Things which differ conceptually are so related to each other that one of them can be understood without the other. For this reason, Boethius says that the existence of God can be understood if for a moment we mentally separate His goodness from His existence. Being, however can in no way be understood apart from the true, for being is known only in so far as it is true. Therefore, the true and being do differ conceptually.

* Cf. *S.T.*, I, 16, aa. 1, 3; *I Sent.*, 19, 5, 1; *C.G.*, I, 60; *I Perih.*, lect. 3, nn. 3-10; *VI Metaph.*, lect. 4, nn. 1230-44.

4. If the true is not the same as being, it must be a state of being. But it cannot be a state of being. It is not a state that entirely corrupts—otherwise, this would follow: “It is true. Therefore, it is non-being”—as it follows when we say: “This man is dead. Therefore, this is not a man.”

Similarly, the true is not a state that limits. If it were, one could not say: “It is true. Therefore it is.” For one cannot say that a thing is white simply because it has white teeth. Finally, the true is not a state which contracts or specifies being, for it is convertible with being. It follows, therefore, that the true and being are entirely the same.

5. Things in the same state are the same. But the true and being are in the same state. Therefore, they are the same. For Aristotle writes: “The state of a thing in its act of existence is the same as its state in truth.” Therefore, the true and being are entirely the same.

6. Things not the same differ in some respect. But the true and being differ in no respect. They do not differ essentially, for every being is true by its very essence. And they do not differ in any other ways, for they must belong to some common genus. Therefore, they are entirely the same.

7. If they were not entirely the same, the true would add something to being. But the true adds nothing to being, even though it has greater extension than being. This is borne out by the statement of the Philosopher that we define the true as: “That which affirms the existence of what is, and denies the existence of what is not.” Consequently, the true includes both being and non-being; since it does not add anything to being, it seems to be entirely the same as being.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Useless repetition of the same thing is meaningless; so, if the true were the same as being, it would be meaningless to say: “Being is true.” This, however, is hardly correct. Therefore, they are not the same.

2. Being and the good are convertible. The true and the good, however, are not interchangeable, for some things, such as fornication, are true but not good. The true, therefore, and being are not interchangeable. And so they are not the same.

3. In all creatures, as Boethius has pointed out, “to be is other than that which is.” Now, the true signifies the existence of things. Consequently, in creatures it is different from that which is. But that which is, is the same as being. Therefore, in creatures the true is different from being.

4. Things related as before and after must differ. But the true and being are related in the aforesaid manner; for, as is said in *The Causes*: “The first of

all created things is the act of existence.” In a study of this work, a commentator writes as follows: “Everything else is predicated as a specification of being.” Consequently, everything else comes after being. Therefore, the true and being are not the same.

5. What are predicated of a cause and of the effects of the cause are more united in the cause than in its effects—and more so in God than in creatures. But in God four predicates—being, the one, the true—are appropriated as follows: being, to the essence; the one, to the Father; the true, to the Son; and the good, to the Holy Spirit. Since the divine Persons are really and not merely conceptually distinct, these notions cannot be predicated of each other; if really distinct when verified of the divine Persons, the four notions in question are much more so when verified of creatures.

REPLY

When investigating the nature of anything, one should make the same kind of analysis as he makes when he reduces a proposition to certain self-evident principles. Otherwise, both types of knowledge will become involved in an infinite regress, and science and our knowledge of things will perish.

Now, as Avicenna says, that which the intellect first conceives as, in a way, the most evident, and to which it reduces all its concepts, is being. Consequently, all the other conceptions of the intellect are had by additions to being. But nothing can be added to being as though it were something not included in being—in the way that a difference is added to a genus or an accident to a subject—for every reality is essentially a being. The Philosopher has shown this by proving that being cannot be a genus. Yet, in this sense, some predicates may be said to add to being inasmuch as they express a mode of being not expressed by the term *being*. This happens in two ways.

First, the mode expressed is a certain special manner of being; for there are different grades of being according to which we speak when we speak of different levels of existence, and according to these grades different things are classified. Consequently, *substance* does not add a difference to being by signifying some reality added to it, but *substance* simply expresses a special manner of existing, namely, as a being in itself. The same is true of the other classes of existents.

Second, some are said to add to being because the mode they express is one that is common, and consequent upon every being. This mode can be taken in two ways: first, in so far as it follows upon every being considered absolutely; second, in so far as it follows upon every being considered in relation to another. In the first, the term is used in two ways, because it expresses

something in the being either affirmatively or negatively. We can, however, find nothing that can be predicated of every being affirmatively and, at the same time, absolutely, with the exception of its essence by which the being is said to be. To express this, the term *thing* is used; for, according to Avicenna, "thing differs from being because being gets its name from to-be, but thing expresses the quiddity or essence of the being. There is, however, a negation consequent upon every being considered absolutely: its undividedness, and this is expressed by *one*. For the *one* is simply undivided being.

If the mode of being is taken in the second way—according to the relation of one being to another—we find a twofold use. The first is based on the distinction of one being from another, and this distinctness is expressed by the word *something*, which implies, as it were, *some other thing*. For, just as a being is said to be *one* in so far as it is without division in itself, so it is said to be *something* in so far as it is divided from others. The second division is based on the correspondence one being has with another. This is possible only if there is something which is such that it agrees with every being. Such a being is the soul, which, as is said in *The Soul*, "in some way is all things." The soul, however, has both knowing and appetitive powers. *Good* expresses the correspondence of being to the appetitive power, for, and so we note in the *Ethics*, the good is "that which all desire." *True* expresses the correspondence of being to the knowing power, for all knowing is produced by an assimilation of the knower to the thing known, so that assimilation is said to be the cause of knowledge. Similarly, the sense of sight knows a color by being informed with a species of the color.

The first reference of being to the intellect, therefore, consists in its agreement with the intellect. This agreement is called "the conformity of thing and intellect." In this conformity is fulfilled the formal constituent of the true, and this is what *the true* adds to being, namely, the conformity or equation of thing and intellect. As we said, the knowledge of a thing is a consequence of this conformity; therefore, it is an effect of truth, even though the fact that the thing is a being is prior to its truth.

Consequently, truth or the true has been defined in three ways. First of all, it is defined according to that which precedes truth and is the basis of truth. This is why Augustine writes: "The true is that which is"; and Avicenna: "The truth of each thing is a property of the act of being which has been established for it." Still others say: "The true is the undividedness of the act of existence from that which is." Truth is also defined in another way—according to that in which its intelligible determination is formally completed. Thus, Isaac writes: "Truth is the conformity of thing and intellect"; and Anselm: "Truth is a rec-

titude perceptible only by the mind.” This rectitude, of course, is said to be based on some conformity. The Philosopher says that in defining truth we say that truth is had when one affirms that “to be which is, and that not to be which is not.”

The third way of defining truth is according to the effect following upon it. Thus, Hilary says that the true is that which manifests and proclaims existence. And Augustine says: “Truth is that by which that which is, is shown”; and also: “Truth is that according to which we, judge about inferior things.”

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. That definition of Augustine is given for the true as it has its foundation in reality and not as its formal nature is given complete expression by conformity of thing and intellect. An alternative answer would be that in the statement, “The true is that which is,” the word *is* is not here understood as referring to the act of existing, but rather as the mark of the intellectual act of judging, signifying, that is, the affirmation of a proposition. The meaning would then be this: “The true is that which is—it is had when the existence of what is, is affirmed.” If this is its meaning, then Augustine’s definition agrees with that of the Philosopher mentioned above.

2. The answer is clear from what has been said.

3. “Something can be understood without another” can be taken in two ways. It can mean that something can be known while another remains unknown. Taken in this way, it is true that things which differ conceptually are such that one can be understood without the other. But there is another way that a thing can be understood without another: when it is known even though the other does not exist. Taken in this sense, being cannot be known without the true, for it cannot be known unless it agrees with or conforms to intellect. It is not necessary, however, that everyone who understands the formal notion of being should also understand the formal notion of the true—just as not everyone who understands being understands the agent intellect, even though nothing can be known without the agent intellect.

4. The true is a state of being even though it does not add any reality to being or express any special mode of existence. It is rather something that is generally found in every being, although it is not expressed by the word *being*. Consequently, it is not a state that corrupts, limits, or contracts.

5. In this objection, *condition* should not be understood as belonging to the genus of quality. It implies, rather, a certain order; for those which are the cause of the existence of other things are themselves beings most completely, and those which are the cause of the truth of other things are themselves true

most completely. It is for this reason that the Philosopher concludes that the rank of a thing in its existence corresponds to its rank in truth, so that when one finds that which is most fully being, he finds there also that which is most fully true. But this does not mean that being and the true are the same in concept. It means simply that in the degree in which a thing has being, in that degree it is capable of being proportioned to intellect. Consequently, the true is dependent upon the formal character of being.

6. There is a conceptual difference between the true and being since there is something in the notion of the true that is not in the concept of the existing—not in such a way, however, that there is something in the concept of being which is not in the concept of the true. They do not differ essentially nor are they distinguished from one another by opposing differences.

7. The true does not have a wider extension than being. Being is, in some way, predicated of non-being in so far as non-being is apprehended by the intellect. For, as the Philosopher says, the negation or the privation of being may, in a sense, be called being. Avicenna supports this by pointing out that one can form propositions only of beings, for that about which a proposition is formed must be apprehended by the intellect. Consequently, it is clear that everything true is being in some way.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

1. The reason why it is not tautological to call a being true is that something is expressed by the word *true* that is not expressed by the word *being*, and not that the two differ in reality.

2. Although fornication is evil, it possesses some being and can conform to intellect. Accordingly, the formal character of the true is found here. So it is clear that *true* is coextensive with *being*.

3. In the statement, “To be is other than that which is,” the act of being is distinguished from that to which that act belongs. But the name of being is taken from the act of existence, not from that whose act it is. Hence, the argument does not follow.

4. The true comes after being in this respect, that the notion of the true differs from that of being in the manner we have described. This argument has three flaws. First, although the Persons are really distinct, the things appropriated to each Person are only conceptually, and not really, distinct. Secondly, although the Persons are really distinct from each other, they are not really distinct from the essence; so, truth appropriated to the Person of the Son is not distinct from the act of existence He possesses through the divine essence. Thirdly, although being, the true, the one, and the good are more united in

God than they are in created things, it does not follow from the fact that they are conceptually distinct in God that they are really distinct in created beings. This line of argument is valid only when it is applied to things which are not by their very nature one in reality, as wisdom and power, which, although one in God, are distinct in creatures. But being, the true, the one, and the good are such that by their very nature they are one in reality. Therefore, no matter where they are found, they are really one. Their unity in God, however, is more perfect than their unity in creatures.

ARTICLE 2

*Is truth found principally in the intellect or in things?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is found principally in things, for:

1. It was pointed out that the true is convertible with being. But being is found more principally in things than in the soul. The true, therefore, is principally outside the soul.

2. Things are not in the soul through their essences but, as pointed out by the Philosopher, through species. If, therefore, truth is found principally in the soul, truth will not be the essence of a thing but merely its likeness or species; and the true will be the species of a being existing outside the soul. But the species of a thing existing in the soul is not predicated of a thing outside the soul and is not convertible with it; for, if this were so, the true could not be converted with being—which is false.

3. That which is in something is based upon that in which it is. If truth, then, is principally in the soul, judgments about truth will have as their criterion the soul's estimation. This would revive that error of the ancient philosophers who said that any opinion a person has in his intellect is true and that two contradictories can be true at the same time. This, of course, is absurd.

4. If truth is principally in the intellect, anything which pertains to the intellect should be included in the definition of truth. Augustine, however, sharply criticizes such definitions, as, for example, "The true is that which is as it is seen." For, according to this definition, something would not be true if it were not seen. This is clearly false of rocks hidden deep in the earth. Augustine similarly criticizes the following definition: "The true is that which is as it appears to the knower, provided he is willing and able to know." For, according

* PARALLEL READINGS: *C.G.*, I, 59; *III De anima*, lect. 11, nn. 746-51, 760-64; *S.T.*, I, 16, 2. See also readings given for preceding article.

to this definition, something would not be true unless the knower wished and were able to know. The same criticism can be leveled against other definitions that include any reference to intellect. Truth, therefore, is not principally in the intellect.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. The Philosopher says: "The true and the false are not in things but in the mind."

2. Truth is "the conformity of thing and intellect." But since this conformity can be only in the intellect, truth is only in the intellect.

REPLY

When a predicate is used primarily and secondarily of many things, it is not necessary that that which is the cause of the others receive the primary predication of the common term, but rather that in which the meaning of the common term is first fully verified. For example, *healthy* is primarily predicated of an animal, for it is in an animal that the nature of health is first found in its fullest sense. But inasmuch as medicine causes health, it is also said to be healthy. Therefore, since truth is predicated of many things in a primary and a secondary sense, it ought to be primarily predicated of that in which its full meaning is primarily found.

Now, the fulfillment of any motion is found in the term of the motion; and, since the term of the motion of a cognitive power is, the soul, the known must be in the knower after the manner of the knower. But the motion of an appetitive power terminates in things. For this reason the Philosopher speaks of a sort of circle formed by the acts of the soul: for a thing outside the soul moves the intellect, and the thing known moves the appetite, which tends to reach the things from which the motion originally started. Since good, as mentioned previously, expresses a relation to appetite, and true, a relation to the intellect, the Philosopher says that good and evil are in things, but true and false are in the mind. A thing is not called true, however, unless it conforms to an intellect. The true, therefore, is found secondarily in things and primarily in intellect.

Note, however, that a thing is referred differently to the practical intellect than it is to the speculative intellect. Since the practical intellect causes things, it is a measure of what it causes. But, since the speculative intellect is receptive in regard to things, it is, in a certain sense, moved by things and consequently measured by them. It is clear, therefore, that, as is said in the *Metaphysics*, natural things from which our intellect gets its scientific knowledge measure

our intellect. Yet these things are themselves measured by the divine intellect, in which are all created things—just as all works of art find their origin in the intellect of an artist. The divine intellect, therefore, measures and is not measured; a natural thing both measures and is measured; but our intellect is measured, and measures only artifacts, not natural things.

A natural thing, therefore, being placed between two intellects is called *true* in so far as it conforms to either. It is said to be true with respect to its conformity with the divine intellect in so far as it fulfills the end to which it was ordained by the divine intellect. This is clear from the writings of Anselm and Augustine, as well as from the definition of Avicenna, previously cited: “The truth of anything is a property of the act of being which has been established for it.” With respect to its conformity with a human intellect, a thing is said to be true in so far as it is such as to cause a true estimate about itself; and a thing is said to be false if, as Aristotle says, “by nature it is such that it seems to be what it is not, or seems to possess qualities which it does not possess.”

In a natural thing, truth is found especially in the first, rather than in the second, sense; for its reference to the divine intellect comes before its reference to a human intellect. Even if there were no human intellects, things could be said to be true because of their relation to the divine intellect. But if, by an impossible supposition, intellect did not exist and things did continue to exist, then the essentials of truth would in no way remain.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. As is clear from the discussion, true is predicated primarily of a true intellect and secondarily of a thing conformed with intellect. True taken in either sense, however, is interchangeable with being, but in different ways. Used of things, it can be interchanged with being through a judgment asserting merely material identity, for every being is conformed with the divine intellect and can be conformed with a human intellect. The converse of this is also true.

But if *true* is understood as used of the intellect, then it can be converted with being outside the soul—not as denominating the same subject, but as expressing conformity. For every true act of understanding is referred to a being, and every being corresponds to a true act of understanding.

2. The solution of the second argument is clear from the solution of the first.

3. What is in another does not depend on that other unless it is caused by the principles of that other. For example, even though light is in the air, it is caused by something extrinsic, the sun; and it is based on the motion of the sun rather than on air. In the same way, truth which is in the soul but caused

by things does not depend on what one thinks but on the existence of things. For from the fact that a thing is or is not, a statement or an intellect is said to be true or false.

4. Augustine is speaking of a thing's being seen by the human intellect. Truth, of course, does not depend on this, for many things exist that are not known by our intellects. There is nothing, however, that the divine intellect does not actually know, and nothing that the human intellect does not know potentially, for the agent intellect is said to be that "by which we make all things knowable," and the possible intellect, as that "by which we become all things." For this reason, one can place in the definition of a true thing its actually being seen by the divine intellect, but not its being seen by a human intellect, except potentially, as is clear from our earlier discussion.

ARTICLE 3

*Is truth only in the Intellect joining and separating?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. The true is predicated from the relation of being to intellect. But the first operation by which an intellect is related to things is that in which the intellect forms the quiddities of things by conceiving their definitions. Truth, therefore, is principally and more properly found in that operation of the intellect.

2. The true is a "conformity of thing and intellect." Now, although the intellect, in joining and separating, can be conformed with things, it can also be conformed with things in understanding their quiddities. Truth, therefore, is not merely in the intellect joining and separating.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. In the *Metaphysics* we read: "The true and the false are not in things but in the mind. In regard to simple natures and quiddities, however, it is not in the mind."

2. In *The Soul* the statement is made that the true and the false are not to be found in simple apprehension.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, I, 9; *S. T. I.*, 16, 2; *I Sent.*, 19, 5, 1; *C.G. I.*, 59; *III De anima*, lect. 11, nn. 746-51, 760-64; *I Perih.*, lect. 3, nn. 3-10; *VI Metaph.*, lect. 4, nn. 1233-44; *IX Metaph.*, lect. 11, n. 1896 seq.

REPLY

Just as the true is found primarily in the intellect rather than in things, so also is it found primarily in an act of the intellect joining and separating, rather than in an act by which it forms the quiddities of things. For the nature of the true consists in a conformity of thing and intellect. Nothing becomes conformed with itself, but conformity requires distinct terms. Consequently, the nature of truth is first found in the intellect when the intellect begins to possess something proper to itself, not possessed by the thing outside the soul, yet corresponding to it, so that between the two—intellect and thing—a conformity may be found. In forming the quiddities of things, the intellect merely has a likeness of a thing existing outside the soul, as a sense has a likeness when it receives the species of a sensible thing. But when the intellect begins to judge about the thing it has apprehended, then its judgment is something proper to itself—not something found outside in the thing. And the judgment is said to be true when it conforms to the external reality. Moreover, the intellect judges about the thing it has apprehended at the moment when it says that something is or is not. This is the role of “the intellect composing and dividing.”

For these reasons, the Philosopher says that composition and division are in the intellect, and not in things. Moreover, this is why truth is found primarily in the joining and separating by the intellect, and only secondarily in its formation of the quiddities of things or definitions, for a definition is called true or false because of a true or false combination. For it may happen that a definition will be applied to something to which it does not belong, as when the definition of a circle is assigned to a triangle. Sometimes, too, the parts of a definition cannot be reconciled, as happens when one defines a thing as “an animal entirely without the power of sensing.” The judgment implied in such a definition—“some animal is incapable of sensing”—is false. Consequently, a definition is said to be true or false only because of its relation to a judgment, as a thing is said to be true because of its relation to intellect.

From our discussion, then, it is clear that the true is predicated, first of all, of joining and separating by the intellect; second, of the definitions of things in so far as they imply a true or a false judgment. Third, the true may be predicated of things in so far as they are conformed with the divine intellect or in so far as, by their very nature, they can be conformed with human intellects. Fourth, true or false may be predicated of man in so far as he chooses to express truth, or in so far as he gives a true or false impression of himself or of others by his words and actions; for truth can be predicated of words in the same way as it can be predicated of the ideas which they convey.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Although the formation of a quiddity is the first operation of the intellect, by it the intellect does not yet possess anything that, properly speaking, is its own and can be conformed to the thing. Truth, accordingly, is not found in it.
2. From this the solution of the second difficulty is clear.

ARTICLE 4

*Is there only one truth by which all things are true?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that this is so, for

1. Anselm says that the relation of truth to all true things is like that of time to all temporal things. But there is only one time to which all temporal things are related. Therefore there will be only one truth to which all true things are related.
2. But it was said that truth is used in two ways. In one, it means the entity of a thing, as when Augustine says: "The true is that which is." If truth be understood in this sense, then there should be as many truths as there are essences of things. In the second way in which truth is used, it signifies truth as it is expressed in the intellect. Consequently, Hilary writes: "The true affirms existence." But since nothing can manifest anything to the intellect except in virtue of the first divine truth, all truths are, in some sense, one, inasmuch as they all move the intellect—just as colors are one in moving the sense of sight, since they all move it because of one thing: light. On the contrary, however, time, the measure of all temporal things, is numerically one; and if truth is related to true things as time is related to temporal things, the truth of all true things must also be numerically one. It will not be sufficient for all truths to be one in their action of moving the intellect or to be one in their exemplary cause.
3. Anselm argues as follows: If there are as many truths as there are true things, then truths should change as true things change. But truths do not change with the changes of true things, for, even when true and correct things are destroyed, the truth and correctness by which they are true or correct remain. There is, therefore, only one truth. He proves the minor from this: When a sign is destroyed, the correctness of the signification remains, for it

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 21, 4, ad 5; 27, 1, ad 7; *S.T.*, I, 16, 6; I-II, 33, 1, ad 3; *C.G.*, III, 47; *Quodl.*, X, 4, 7; *I Sent.*, 19, 5, 2.

remains correct that the sign should signify that which it did signify. For the same reason, rectitude or truth remains even when a true or correct thing has been destroyed.

4. With regard to created things, nothing is identical with that whose truth it is. The truth of a man is not the man; the truth of flesh is not the flesh. But every created thing is true. No created thing, therefore, is truth. Consequently, every truth is uncreated, and so there is only one truth.

5. As Augustine says, only God is greater than the human mind. But, as he proves elsewhere, truth is greater than the human mind, for truth certainly cannot be said to be less than the human mind. If this were so, it would be within the competence of the mind to pass judgment on truth. This, of course, is false, for the mind does not judge truth but judges according to the truth, like a magistrate who does not pass judgment upon the law but, as Augustine himself says, judges according to the law. Similarly, the mind of man cannot be said to be equal to truth, for it judges everything according to truth. It does not judge everything according to itself. Truth, therefore, must be God Alone, and so there is only one truth.

6. Augustine has proved that truth is not perceived by any bodily sense. His proof is that nothing is perceived by sense unless it is changeable. But truth is unchangeable. Truth, therefore, is not perceived by sense.

One could similarly argue that everything created is changeable. But truth is not changeable. Therefore, it is not a creature but is something uncreated. Consequently, there is only one truth.

7. Augustine offers another proof in the same place: "There is no sensible thing that does not have some similarity to what is false, and, as a result, the two cannot be distinguished. To mention only one example: all that we sense through the body. Even when these objects are not present to the senses, we experience their images as though they were present, as when we are asleep or become delirious." Truth, however, has no resemblance to what is false. Therefore, truth is not perceived by a sense.

One could similarly argue that every created thing has some similarity to what is false in so far as it has some defect. Nothing created, therefore, is truth, and so there is only one truth.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Augustine writes: "As likeness is the form of like things, so truth is the form of true things." But for many like things there are many likenesses. Therefore, for many true things there are many truths.

2. Just as every created truth is derived from the uncreated truth as its

model, and has its truth from it, so all intelligible light is derived from the first uncreated light as from its exemplary cause, and from it possesses its power of making things known. But we say that there are many intelligible lights, as is clear from the writings of Dionysius. Therefore, following this analogy, it seems we must likewise simply concede that there are many truths.

3. Although all colors are able to affect the sense of sight in virtue of light, nevertheless, in themselves colors are distinct and different, and cannot be said to be one, except from a particular point of view. Consequently, even though all created truths manifest themselves in the intellect by virtue of the first truth, we cannot for this reason say that there is one truth, unless considered under this one aspect.

4. Just as a created truth can manifest itself to the intellect only by virtue of the uncreated truth, so no power in a creature can act except by virtue of the uncreated power. Yet we do not say that somehow or other there is one power for all powers; so, in the same manner, we should not say that in some way there is one truth for all truths.

5. God as a cause is related to things in three ways: as an efficient, an exemplary, and as a final cause. Consequently, by a kind of appropriation, the entity of things is referred to God as efficient cause, their truth to Him as an exemplary cause, their goodness to Him as a final cause—even though, properly speaking, each single one could be referred to each single cause. But in no manner of speaking do we say that there is one goodness for all good things, or one entity for all beings. Therefore, we should not say that there is one truth for all true things.

6. Although there is one uncreated truth from which all created truths take their model, these truths are not modeled on it in the same way. For while it is true that the uncreated truth has the same relation to all, all do not have the same relation to it—as pointed out in *The Causes*. Necessary and contingent truths are modeled on the uncreated truth in quite different ways. But different ways of imitating the divine model cause diversity among created things. Consequently, there are many created truths.

7. Truth is “the conformity of thing and intellect.” But since things differ specifically, there cannot be a single conformity to the intellect. So, since true things are specifically different, there cannot be one truth for all true things.

8. Augustine writes as follows: “One must believe that the nature of the human mind is so connected with intelligible things that it gazes upon all it knows by means of a unique light.” Now, the light by whose means the soul knows all things is truth. Truth, therefore, belongs to the same genus as the

soul and must be a created thing. Consequently, in different creatures there are different truths.

REPLY

From our previous discussion it is clear that truth is properly found in the human or divine intellect, as health is found in an animal. In things, however, truth is found because of some relation to intellect—just as health is said to be in things other than animals in so far as they bring about or preserve animal health. Truth, therefore, is properly and primarily in the divine intellect. In the human intellect, it exists properly but secondarily, for it exists there only because of a relation to either one of the two truths just mentioned.

In his gloss on these words of Psalm 11 (v. 2), “Truths are decayed from among the children of men,” Augustine writes that the truth of the divine intellect is one, and from it are drawn the many truths that are in the human intellect—“just as from one man’s face many likenesses are reflected in a mirror.” Now, there are many truths in things, just as there are many entities of things. But truth predicated of things because of their relation to the human intellect is, as it were, accidental to those things; for, supposing that the human intellect did not or could not exist, things would still remain essentially the same. But truth predicated of things because of their relation to the divine intellect is inseparably attendant on them, for they cannot exist except by reason of the divine intellect which keeps bringing them into being. Again, truth is primarily in a thing because of its relation to the divine intellect, not to the human intellect, because it is related to the divine intellect as to its cause, but to the human intellect as to its effect in the sense that the latter receives its knowledge from things. For this reason, a thing is said to be true principally because of its order to the truth of the divine intellect rather than because of its relation to the truth of a human intellect.

So, if truth in its proper sense be taken as that by which all things are primarily true, then all things are true by means of one truth, the truth of the divine intellect. This is the truth which Anselm writes about. But if truth in its proper sense be taken as that by which things are said to be true secondarily, then there are many truths about many true things, and even many truths in different minds about one true thing. Finally, if truth in its improper sense be taken as that by which all things are said to be true, then there are many truths for many true things, but only one truth for one true thing.

Things are called true from the truth in the divine or human intellect, just as food is called healthy, not because of any inherent form, but because of the health which is in an animal. If, however, a thing is called true because of the

truth in the thing, which is simply its entity conformed with intellect, then it is so called because of something inhering in it after the manner of a form, as food is said to be healthy because of a quality of its own—which is the reason for its being said to be healthy.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Time is related to temporal things as a measure is related to the measured. It is clear, therefore, that Anselm is referring to that truth which is only the measure of all true things. There is only one such truth numerically, just as there is only one time—as the second argument concludes. However, the truth in the human intellect or in things themselves is not related to things as an extrinsic or common measure is related to those it measures. It is related as a measured thing is related to a measure, for such is the relation of truth in a human intellect to things, and it must, as a consequence, vary as things vary. Or, it is related as an intrinsic measure to the thing itself, as is the case with the truth that is in things themselves. Intrinsic measures must be multiplied as the number of things measured is multiplied—just as dimensions must be multiplied with the multiplicity of bodies.

2. We concede the second argument.

3. The truth which remains after things are destroyed is the truth of the divine intellect, and this is numerically one. However, the truth which is in things or in the soul is diversified according to the diversity of things.

4. The proposition “Nothing is its own truth” is understood of things having a complete act of existence in reality. It is likewise said that “Nothing is its own act of existence,” yet the act of existence of a thing is, in a sense, something created. In the same way, the truth of a thing is something created.

5. The truth by which the soul passes judgment on all things is the first truth; for, just as from the truth of the divine intellect there flow into the angelic intellects those intelligible species by which angels know all things, so does the truth of the first principles by which we judge everything proceed from the truth of the divine intellect as from its exemplary cause. Since we can judge by means of the truth of these first principles only in so far as this truth is a likeness of the first truth, we are said to judge everything according to the first truth.

6. That immutable truth is the first truth, which is neither perceptible by sense nor something created.

7. Although every creature has some similarity to what is false, created truth itself does not have this similarity. For a creature has some similarity to what is false in so far as it is deficient. Truth, however, does not depend on a

creature in so far as it is deficient, but in so far as it rises above its deficiency by being conformed to the first truth.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

1. Properly speaking, when two things are similar, likeness is found in both. Truth, however, being a certain agreement of intellect and thing, is not, properly speaking, found in both, but only in intellect; and since all things are true and said to be true in so far as they are in conformity with one intellect, the divine intellect, everything must be true according to one truth, even though in many like things there are many different likenesses.

2. Although intelligible light has the divine light for its exemplary cause, light is nevertheless predicated in the proper sense of created intelligible lights. Truth, however, is not predicated in the proper sense of things having the divine intellect as their exemplary cause. Consequently, we do not say that there is one light in the same way that we say that there is one truth.

3. Our reply given immediately above will answer the argument taken from colors, for visible is properly predicated of colors, also, even though they are not seen except by means of light.

4-5. Our answer to the fourth argument (from the nature of power) and to the fifth (from the nature of being) is the same.

6. Even though things are modeled in different ways upon the divine truth, this does not keep things from being true in the proper sense of the term by a single truth—not by many truths. For that which is received in different ways in the things modeled upon the exemplar is not properly called truth with the same propriety as truth is said to be in the exemplar itself.

7. Although things differing specifically are not on their own part conformed with the divine intellect by one conformity, the divine intellect to which all things are conformed is one, and on its part there is one conformity with all things—even though all things are not conformed to it in the same way. The truth of all things, therefore, is one in the manner described.

8. Augustine is speaking of truth in our mind as it is modeled upon the divine mind as the likeness of a face is reflected in a mirror; and, as we said, there are many reflections of the first truth in our souls. Or one can say that the first truth belongs to the genus of the soul if *genus* be taken in a broad sense, namely, in so far as everything intelligible or incorporeal is said to belong to one genus. *Genus* is used in this way in the Acts of the Apostles (17:28) where we read: “For we are also his offspring [*genus*].”

ARTICLE 5

*Is some truth besides the first truth eternal?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that there is some such truth, for

1. When treating the truth of propositions, Anselm says: "Whether truth be said to have, or whether it is understood not to have, a beginning or end, it cannot be circumscribed by a beginning or end." But every truth is understood either to have or not to have a beginning or end. Therefore, no truth is circumscribed by a beginning or end, and, since anything like this is eternal, every truth is eternal.

2. Anything whose existence is a consequence of the destruction of its existence is eternal; for, whether it is taken as existing or not existing, it follows that it is. Moreover, at any given time each and every thing must be held as either existing or not existing. Now, a consequence of the destruction of truth is that truth is; for, if truth is not, the fact that truth is not is true, and nothing can be true except by truth. Therefore, truth is eternal.

3. If the truth of propositions is not eternal, then a time must be assigned when their truth was not. But at that time it was true to say: "There is no truth of propositions." Therefore, truth of propositions exists—which contradicts the supposition. Therefore, one cannot say that the truth of propositions is not eternal.

4. The Philosopher's proof that matter is eternal (which is false) rests on the fact that matter remains after its corruption and exists prior to its generation, since, if it corrupts, it corrupts into something, and if it is generated, it is generated out of something. But that from which something is generated and that into which it corrupts is matter. The same would be true of truth if it were said to undergo corruption or generation: it would exist before its generation and after its corruption. If it were generated, it would be changed from non-being to being, and if it corrupted, it would change from being to non-being. However, when truth did not exist, it would have been true that it did not exist—which could not be unless there was truth. Therefore, truth is eternal.

5. Whatever cannot be conceived as not existing is eternal, for whatever is able not to exist can be conceived as not existing. The truth of propositions, however, cannot be conceived as not existing, because the intellect cannot un-

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 10, 3, ad 3; 16,7; *I Sent.*, 19, 5, 3; *C. G.*, II, cc. 36, 83-84; *De pot.*, 3,17, ad 27-29.

derstand anything unless it understands it to be true. Therefore, the truth of propositions is eternal.

6. Anselm argues as follows: "Let him who is able think of when this truth began or when it did not exist."

7. That which is future always was future, and that which is past will always be past. Consequently, a proposition about the future is true since something is future, and a proposition about the past is true since something is past. Therefore, the truth of a future proposition always was, as the truth of a proposition concerning the past always will be. Hence, not only the first truth is eternal, but also many other truths are eternal.

8. St. Augustine says that nothing is more eternal than the nature of a circle and that two and three are five. Since these are created truths, some truth besides the first truth is eternal.

9. For a proposition to be true, it is not necessary that something be actually stated. It is sufficient that something exist about which a proposition can be formed. But, even before the world existed, there was something, even apart from God, about which a proposition could be formed. Hence, before the world existed, the truth of propositions existed, and, since what existed before the world is eternal, the truth of propositions is eternal. The minor is proved thus: The world is made from nothing, that is, after nothing. Hence, before the world was, there was its non-existence. But a true proposition is formed not only about that which is, but also about that which is not; for, just as what is, is truly stated to be, so that which is not is truly stated not to be—as is clearly shown in *Interpretation*. Hence, before the world existed, there was that from which a true proposition could be formed.

10. Whatever is known is true while it is known. But from all eternity God knew all possible propositions. Therefore, from all eternity the truth of all propositions has existed, and so there are many eternal truths.

11. It was said, however, that from this it follows that those propositions are true in the divine intellect—not in themselves.—On the contrary, things must be true in the way in which they are known. But from eternity all things are known by God not only in so far as they are in His mind, but also as they exist in their proper nature; for Sirach (23:29) says: "All things were known to the Lord God before they were created: so also after they were perfected, he beholdeth all things." He accordingly knows things in no other way after they are perfected than He did from eternity. Therefore, from eternity there were many truths existing not only in the divine intellect but in themselves.

12. A thing is said to exist simply in so far as it is in that which gives it its formal perfection. But the character of truth finds its formal perfection in the

intellect. Hence, if from eternity there were many things simply true in the divine intellect, it must be granted that there are many eternal truths.

13. Wisdom (1:15) states: "For justice is perpetual and immortal." As Cicero says, however, truth is a part of justice. Hence, truth is perpetual and immortal.

14. Universals are perpetual and immortal. But the true is most universal, for it is interchangeable with being. Therefore, truth is perpetual and immortal.

15. It was said, however, that, although a universal does not cease of itself, it may cease accidentally.—On the contrary, a thing ought to be denominated by that which belongs to it essentially rather than by that which belongs to it accidentally. Therefore, if truth taken essentially is perpetual and incorruptible, and does not cease or begin to be except accidentally, truth taken universally must be eternal.

16. Since from eternity God was prior to the world, this relation of priority in God was eternal. But when one member of a relation is posited, the other must also be posited. Therefore, from eternity the posteriority of the world with respect to God existed; consequently, there was from all eternity something outside of God to which truth belonged in some way. Hence, our original position stands.

17. It must be said that that relation of before and after is not something in nature but merely a rational relation.—On the contrary, as Boethius says, God is by nature prior to the world, even if the world had always existed. Therefore, that relation of priority is a relation of nature and not of reason alone.

18. The truth of signification is correctness of signification. But from eternity it was correct that something is signified. Therefore, the truth of signification was from eternity.

19. From eternity it was true that the Father generates the Son, and that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both. Since these are a number of truths, a number of truths exist from eternity.

20. It was said, however, that these are true by one truth; hence, it does not follow that several truths existed from eternity.—On the contrary, that by which the Father is Father and generates the Son is not that by which the Son is Son and breathes the Holy Spirit. But by that by which the Father is Father it is true that the Father generates the Son, or that the Father is the Father; and by that by which the Son is the Son it is true that the Son is generated by the Father. Hence, propositions of this kind are not true by one truth.

21. Although *man* and *capable of laughter* are interchangeable, the same

truth is not found in each of the two following propositions: “Man is man” and “Man is capable of laughter”; for the property which the word *man* predicates is not the same as that predicated by *capable* of *laughter*. Similarly, the property implied in the word *Father* is not that implied in the word *Son*. Therefore, the truth is not the same in the propositions mentioned above.

22. It was said, however, that those propositions were not from eternity.—On the contrary, whenever there is an intellect able to make a proposition, there can be a proposition. But from eternity the divine intellect existed, understanding the Father to be the Father, and the Son to be the Son, and thus forming propositions or speaking—since, according to Anselm, “for the most high Spirit to speak is the same as to understand.” Therefore, the propositions previously mentioned existed from eternity.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. No creature is eternal, and every truth, except the first, is created. Therefore, only the first truth is eternal.

2. Being and the true are interchangeable. But only one being is eternal. Therefore, only one truth is eternal.

REPLY

As mentioned previously, truth means a proportion and commensuration. Hence, something is said to be true just as something is said to be commensurate. A body, however, is measured both by an intrinsic measure, such as a line, surface, or depth, and by an extrinsic measure, such as happens when a located body is measured by place, or when motion is measured by time, or a piece of cloth by an elbow length. Similarly, a thing can receive the name true in two ways: by its inherent truth or by an extrinsic truth. In this latter way, all things receive the name true from the first truth; and since truth in the intellect is measured by things themselves, it follows that not only the truth of things, but also the truth of the intellect or of a proposition signifying what is understood, gets its name from the first truth.

In this commensuration or conformity of intellect and thing it is not necessary that each of the two actually exist. Our intellect can be in conformity with things that, although not existing now, will exist in the future. Otherwise, it would not be true to say that “the Anti-Christ will be born.” Hence, a proposition is said to be true because of the truth that is in the intellect alone even when the thing stated does not exist. Similarly, the divine intellect can be in conformity with things that did not exist eternally but were created in time; thus, those in time can be said to be true from eternity because of the

eternal truth.

If we take truth, therefore, as meaning the inherent truth of true created things—the truth we find in things and in a created intellect—then truth is not eternal whether it be that of things or that of propositions; for neither the things themselves nor the intellect in which these truths inhere exists from all eternity. On the other hand, if we take it to mean the truth of true created things, by which all are said to be true—their extrinsic measure, as it were, which is the first truth then the truth of everything—of things, propositions, and intellects—is eternal. Both Augustine and Anselm search for an eternal truth of this sort; the latter writes: “You can understand how I have proved in my *Monologion* that the highest truth does not have a beginning or end from the truth that is in speech.”

This first truth must be one for all things. For in our intellect truth is multiplied in only two ways: first, by the multiplicity of the things known, for this results in a multiplicity of conceptions upon which there follows a multiplicity of truths in our soul; second, by the multiplicity of our ways of knowing, for even though Socrates’ running is one thing, the soul understands time along with it by joining and separating—as it is said in *The Soul*. Consequently, the soul knows his running as present, as past, and as future—each in a different way. Accordingly, it forms separate conceptions in which separate truths are found. In divine knowledge, however, neither of these two kinds of diversity can be found. For God does not have separate acts of knowing for separate things, but by one act He knows all, since He knows all by a single principle, that is, by His essence, as Dionysius points out, and He does not direct His act of knowing toward things one by one. Similarly, too, His own act of knowing does not involve time, since it is measured by eternity, which abstracts from all time inasmuch as it embraces all. It remains, therefore, that there are not many truths from eternity, but one alone.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

I. As Anselm explains his meaning in another place, he said that the truth of statements is not circumscribed by a beginning or end, “not because the statement itself has no beginning but because no time can be conceived at which the statement could exist and truth be absent from it.” The statement referred to here is one discussed previously, namely, one by which it is truly signified that something will take place in the future. Hence, it is quite clear that Anselm did not want to imply that either the truth inherent in a created thing or a proposition itself is without a beginning and end. Be held simply that the first truth by which a proposition is said to be true by a sort of extrin-

sic measure is without beginning or end.

2. Outside the mind we find two things: the thing itself, and its privations and negations. These two are not related to truth in the same way, for they do not have the same relation to intellect. Because of the species it possesses, the thing itself is proportioned to the divine intellect as a product of art is to art. Because of the same species, moreover, the thing is able to conform our intellect to it, in so far as its likeness, being received into the soul, causes the thing itself to be known. But non-being, considered outside the soul, has nothing by which it can be proportioned to the divine intellect or cause itself to be known in our intellects. Hence, if non-being is in conformity with any intellect, it is not because of itself but because of the intellect which forms within itself the notion of non-being.

Anything existing positively outside the soul has something in itself by which it can be called true; but this is not the case with the nonexistence of a thing: whatever truth is attributed to it comes from the intellect. When it is said, therefore, "It is true that truth does not exist," the truth here signified has no reality except in the intellect, since it is about a non-being. Hence, from the fact that the truth in a thing is destroyed nothing follows except that there is a truth which is in the intellect. And so it is clear that from this argument we can conclude only that the truth which is in the intellect is eternal. This truth must, of course, be in an eternal intellect, and it is the first truth. Consequently, from the argument given only the first truth is shown to be eternal.

3-4. The explanation just given also makes clear the solution to the third and fourth arguments.

5. Truth, taken without any qualification, cannot be understood as not existing; but all created truth can be conceived as not existing, just as it can be conceived that no creature exists. For the intellect can conceive itself as not existing and not understanding, even though it can never conceive without existing or understanding. It is not necessary, however, that, in its act of understanding, the intellect understand everything that it has in its act of understanding, because it does not always reflect upon itself. Hence, there is no contradiction if it understands created truth as not existing, even though, without it, it cannot understand.

6. [No solution is given for the sixth difficulty.]

7. Since the future as such is not, and the past as such is not, the same reasoning holds for the truth of the past and future as for the truth of non-being. From this, as has been said, the eternity of no truth other than the first can be concluded.

8. The words of Augustine must be understood in the sense that the

truths mentioned are eternal in so far as they are in the divine mind. Or Augustine takes *eternal* in the sense of *perpetual*.

9. Although a true proposition can be made about being and nonbeing, being and non-being are not similarly related to truth, as is clear from what was said above. From it, also, the solution to this difficulty is clear.

10. Although God knew many propositions from eternity, He knew them by one act of knowing. Hence, from eternity there was only one truth by which the divine cognition was true of many things that would come about in time.

11. As is clear from our previous discussion, intellect is in conformity not only with things actually existing but also with those not actually existing—especially the divine intellect to which the past and the future are the same. Hence, although things did not exist from eternity in their own proper nature, the divine intellect was conformed with things in their proper nature even though they would come into being in time. In this way, from eternity, God had true knowledge of things, even in their proper natures, although the truths of things did not exist from eternity.

12. Truth finds its formal perfection in the intellect, but a thing does not. Hence, although we must concede without qualification that the truth of all things was from eternity, since it was in the divine intellect, we cannot concede without qualification that there were true things from eternity merely because they existed in the divine intellect.

13. The definition refers to divine justice; or, if it refers to human justice, then it is said to be perpetual in the way in which natural things are said to be perpetual. For example, we say that fire always moves upwards, unless impeded, because of its natural inclination. Now, because a virtue is, as Cicero says, “a habit resembling a nature and in harmony with reason,” in so far as the nature of the virtue goes, it has an unfailing inclination to its act, even though this is sometimes impeded. Hence, in the Digest one reads that justice is: “the constant and perpetual will to give each one his due.” However, the truth which is a part of justice is found in the testimony of legal trials. But we are not now discussing that kind of truth.

14. The statement that a universal is perpetual and incorruptible is explained by Avicenna in two ways. First, a universal is said to be incorruptible and perpetual because, according to those who hold the eternity of the world, particulars had no beginning and will have no end. For, according to the philosophers, generation is for the purpose of conserving the perpetual existence of the species—since it cannot be preserved by the individual. Second, a universal is said to be perpetual in so far as it does not cease of itself but acciden-

tally—because of the corruption of the individual.

15. A thing is predicated of another essentially in two ways. First, it is done positively, as when we say of fire that it is carried upwards. A thing gets its name from this kind of essential predicate rather than from an accidental predicate; for we say rather that fire is carried upwards and belongs to the class of things carried upwards than that it belongs to the class of those that are carried downwards, even though it may happen, accidentally, that fire is carried downwards—as would evidently be the case of red-hot iron.

The second type of essential predication is by “removal”—when there is removed from a thing those things which bring on a contrary disposition. If one of those things should happen to be present, the contrary disposition will be predicated absolutely. For example, unity is predicated essentially of first matter, not by positing some unifying form, but by removing diversifying forms. Hence, when forms occur which differentiate matter, we say, without qualification, that there are several matters rather than that there is only one. Such is the case in the difficulty; for a universal is said to be incorruptible, not because it possesses some form giving it incorruptibility, but because those material qualities which cause corruption in individuals do not belong to it as a universal. Hence, a universal existing in particular things is said, without qualification, to be corrupted in this or that individual.

16. All genera as such, with the exception of relation, posit something in reality. For example, quantity by its very nature posits something. But relation, alone, because of what it is, does not posit anything in reality, for what it predicates is not *something* but *to something*. Hence, there are certain relations which posit nothing in reality, but only in reason. This occurs in four ways, as can be seen in the writings of the Philosopher and Avicenna.

F i r s t , there occurs a relation merely in reason when a thing is referred to itself; for example, when we say that a thing is identical with itself. If this relation posited something in reality in addition to the thing which is declared to be identical with itself, we should have an infinite process in relations; for the very relation by which something is said to be identical with itself would also be identical with itself through an added relation, and so on to infinity. Second, a relation existing only in reason occurs when the relation itself is referred to something. For example, one cannot say that paternity is referred to its subject by some intermediate relation; for that mediate relation would need another intermediate relation, and so on to infinity. Consequently, the relation signified when paternity is compared to its subject is not real but only rational. Third, a relation existing in reason alone occurs when one of the related things depends on the other and not conversely. For example, knowledge depends on

the thing known but not the other way about. Hence, the relation of knowledge to a thing known is something real, but the relation of the thing known to knowledge is merely rational. Fourth, a rational relation occurs when a being is compared with a non-being. For example, we say that we are prior to those who are to come after us. If this were a real relation, it would follow (if future generations were infinite) that there could be an infinite number of relations in the same thing.

From the last two types it is clear that that relation of priority posits nothing in reality but only in the intellect, because God does not depend on creatures and because such a priority is a relation of being to non-being. From this argument, therefore, it does not follow that there is an eternal truth except in the divine intellect, which alone is eternal. This is the first truth.

17. Although God is prior by nature to created beings, it does not follow that this relation is real. Since it arises merely from a consideration of what is naturally prior and what is naturally posterior—in the way in which a thing known is said to be naturally prior to knowledge—the relation of the thing known to knowledge is not a real relation.

18. The statement that, even when signification does not exist, it is nevertheless correct that something is signified, is taken with respect to the order of things existing in the divine intellect. For example, even when a trunk does not exist, it is correct to say that a trunk has a lid according to the plan conceived by the craftsman. Consequently, this argument also does not prove that there is an eternal truth other than the first.

19. The intelligible character of the true is based upon being. Although several persons and properties are posited in God, only one act of being is posited in Him, for the act of being is predicated essentially of Him; so, all those propositions, such as that the Father is or generates, and that the Son is or is generated, and so on,—in so far as they are related to the divine essence—all have one truth, the first and eternal truth.

20. Although that by which the Father is Father, and that by which the Son is Son, are different, since one is paternity, the other, filiation, that by which the Father is, and that by which the Son is, is the same. For each is because of the divine essence, which is one. Moreover, the intelligible character of truth is not based upon the character of paternity and sonship as such, but upon the character of being. Here, moreover, paternity and sonship are the one essence. Therefore, there is one truth for both.

21. The property predicated by *man* and *capable of laughter* is not the same essentially, nor does it have one act of existence, as is the case of paternity and sonship. Hence, there is no analogy.

22. The divine intellect knows things, no matter how diverse they be, by one act of knowing, even if they have different truths considered in themselves. Hence, He knows with only one act of knowing all the various propositions about the persons even to a greater degree. Consequently, there is only one truth for these, also.

ARTICLE 6

*Is created truth immutable?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is, for

1. Anselm says: “By this argument, I see that truth persists immutable.” The argument he refers to is that taken from the truth of Signification, which we discussed earlier. Hence, the truth of propositions is immutable; for the same reason, so is the truth of the thing which it signifies.

2. If the truth of a proposition changes; it changes especially when a thing changes. But when a thing has been changed, the truth of the proposition remains. Therefore, the truth of a proposition is immutable. Proof of the minor: Truth according to Anselm is “a certain correctness—inasmuch as the thing fulfills that which it receives in the divine mind. But the fact that the proposition, “Socrates is sitting,” signifies the sitting of Socrates comes from the divine mind, and this proposition will signify his sitting even when Socrates does not sit. Therefore, even when Socrates does not sit, truth remains in that proposition. Consequently, the truth of the proposition is not changed, even if the thing be changed.

3. If truth is changed, this can be only because the subjects in which truth inheres have previously been changed—just as certain forms cannot be said to be changed unless their subjects have changed. But truth is not changed with the change of true things; for, as both Augustine and Anselm prove, when true things have been destroyed, truth still remains. Therefore, truth is entirely immutable.

4. The truth of a thing is the cause of the truth of a proposition, for a statement is said to be true or false in so far as a thing exists or does not exist. But the truth of a thing is immutable. Therefore, the truth of a proposition is also immutable. Proof of the minor: Anselm proves that the truth of a proposition remains fixed to the extent that it fulfills that which it has received in the divine mind. But each thing likewise fulfills that which it has

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 16, 8; *I Sent.*, 19, 5, 3; *Quodl.*, X, 4, 7.

been ordained in the divine mind to have. Therefore, the truth of each and every thing is immutable.

5. That which always remains when every change has been made is never changed. For example, when colors are changed, we do not say that the surface is changed, for it remains no matter what change of colors is made. Now, truth remains in a thing, no matter what change a thing undergoes, for being and the true are interchangeable. Therefore, truth is immutable.

6. Where there is the same cause, there is the same effect. But the same thing is the cause of the truth of these three propositions: "Socrates sits," "Socrates will sit," and "Socrates sat"—namely, the sitting of Socrates. Therefore, the truth of each is the same. Now, if one of these three propositions is true, one of the other two must always be true; for, if at some time it is true that Socrates sits, it always was true and will be true that Socrates sat or will sit. Therefore, one truth remains constant for the three propositions, and, consequently, is immutable. For the same reason, any other truth is immutable.

TO THE CONTRARY

Effects are changed when their causes are changed. But things, which cause the truth of a proposition, undergo changes. Therefore, the truth of propositions changes.

REPLY

A thing is said to be changed in two ways. First, because it is the subject of a change, as when we say that a body is changeable. In this meaning, no form is said to be changeable. Consequently, a form is said to be something steadfast in an unchanging essence; since truth consists in a form, the present question is not whether truth is mutable in this sense. Second, a thing is said to be changed because something else changes according to it, as when we say that whiteness is changed because a body is changed in its whiteness. It is in this sense that we ask whether or not truth is changeable.

To clarify this point, we should note that the thing according to which there is a change is sometimes said to be changed and sometimes not. For, when it is inhering in a thing which is affected in its respect, then it is said to be changed itself—as whiteness or quantity is said to be changed when something is changed in their respect because they succeed each other in a subject. When, however, that according to which the change occurs is extrinsic, the thing itself is not changed but remains unaffected throughout the whole change. For example, a place is not said to be moved when a thing moves with respect to it. For this reason, it is said in the *Physics* that place is "the un-

changeable boundary of the container,” because local motion does not mean a succession of loci in regard to one located body, but a succession of many located bodies in one place.

Now, there are two ways in which inhering forms are said to be changed with respect to a change of their subject; for general forms are said to be changed in one way and special forms in another. After a change, a special form does not remain the same either according to its act of existing or according to its intelligible character. For example, when a qualitative change has been made, whiteness does not remain at all. But, after a change has been made, a general form retains the same intelligible character, though not the same act of existing. For example, after a change from white to black has taken place, color, according to the general character of color, remains unchanged; but the same species of color does not remain.

It was noted previously,” however, that a thing is said to be true by the first truth as by an extrinsic measure; but it is said to be true by an inherent truth as by an intrinsic measure. Consequently, created things change in their participation of the first truth, yet the first truth itself, according to which they are said to be true, does not change in any way. This is what Augustine says: “Our minds sometimes see more, sometimes less, of truth itself; but truth itself remains, and neither increases nor decreases.”

If we take truth as inherent in things, however, then truth is said to be changed inasmuch as some things are said to be changed with respect to truth. For, as pointed out previously, truth in creatures is found in two different subjects: in things themselves and in intellect. The truth of an action is included in the truth of a thing, and the truth of a proposition is included in the truth of the understanding which it signifies. A thing, however, is said to be true by its relation to intellect, divine and human.

Consequently, if the truth of a thing is considered according to its reference to the divine intellect, then, indeed, the truth of a changeable thing is changed into another truth, but not into falsity. For truth is a most general form because the true and being are interchangeable. Hence, just as, even after any change has been made, a thing nevertheless remains a being, although it is other as a result of the other form by which it has existence; so, also, a thing always remains true—but by another truth; for, no matter what form or what privation it acquires through the change, it is conformed in that respect to the divine intellect, which knows it as it is, whatever may be its state.

If, however, the truth of a thing is considered in its reference to a human intellect, or conversely, then sometimes there is a change from truth into falsity, sometimes from one truth to another. For truth is “an equation of thing

and intellect"; and, if equal amounts are taken from things that are equal, these things remain equal, although the equality is not the same. Hence, when intellect and thing are similarly changed, truth remains; but it is another truth. For example, when Socrates sits, what is understood is that Socrates is sitting. Afterwards, when he does not sit, what is understood is that he is not sitting. But, if something is taken from one of two equal things, and nothing from the other, or if unequal amounts are taken from each, then inequality must result; and this corresponds to falsity, just as equality corresponds to truth.

Consequently, if an intellect is true, and it is not changed when a thing is changed, or vice versa, or if each is changed but not similarly, falsity results, and there will be a change from truth to falsity. For example, if, when Socrates is white, he is understood to be white, the intellect is true. If, however, the intellect later understands him to be black, although Socrates still is white; or if, conversely, he is still understood to be white, although he has turned black; or if, when he has turned pale, he is understood to be reddish—then there will be falsity in the intellect. Accordingly, it is clear how truth changes and how it does not.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Anselm is speaking here of the first truth according to which all things are said to be true as by an extrinsic measure.

2. Since the intellect reflects upon itself and knows itself as it knows other things (as said in *The Soul*), the things belonging to the intellect as regards the intelligible character of truth can be considered in two ways. First, in so far as they are things; in this way, truth is predicated of them in the same way in which it is predicated of other things. Consequently, as a thing is said to be true because it fulfills what was assigned to it in the divine mind by retaining its own nature, so a proposition is also said to be true by retaining its own nature, which was also allotted to it in the divine mind; and this cannot be taken from it as long as the proposition itself remains. Second, these may be considered in their reference to things that are known. In this way, a proposition is said to be true when it is proportioned to a thing. This kind of truth is changed, as has been said.

3. Truth which remains after true things have been destroyed is the first truth, which does not change even when things change.

4. As long as a thing remains, no change can take place in it concerning its essentials. For example, it is essential to a proposition that it signify that which it has been made to signify. Consequently, it does not follow that the truth of a thing is in no way changeable, but only that it is unchangeable with

respect to the essentials of the thing while the thing remains. Nevertheless, in those cases in which a change occurs through corruption of a thing, but only with respect to its accidentals, this accidental change can take place even though the thing remains. In this way, a change can take place in the truth of a thing in regard to its accidentals.

5. When every change has been made, truth remains, but not the same truth—as is clear from what has been said.

6. The identity of the truth depends not only on the identity of the thing but also on the identity of the intellect—the same way that identity of an effect depends on the identity of the agent and that of the patient. Moreover, even though the same thing is signified by those three propositions, the understanding of each is not the same; for time enters into the intellect's conjunctive operation, and the understandings of things differ with the differences of time.

ARTICLE 7

*Is truth as applied to God predicated personally or essentially?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is predicated personally, for

1. In regard to God, whatever implies the relation of origin is predicated personally. But truth belongs to this class, as is clear from Augustine;⁷ for he says that the divine truth is “the greatest possible likeness of its source, without any unlikeness” from which falseness arises. Therefore, truth is predicated personally of God.

2. Just as nothing is similar to itself, so also, nothing is equal to itself. But, according to Hilary, from the fact that nothing is similar to itself, likeness in God implies a distinction of persons. The same reasoning can be applied to equality. But truth is a certain equality. Therefore, truth implies a distinction of persons in God.

3. Whatever implies procession in God is predicated personally of Him. But truth implies a certain procession since it signifies an intellectual concept just as a word does. Therefore, just as the Word is predicated personally, so also is truth.

TO THE CONTRARY

Augustine says that of the three Persons there is but one truth. Therefore,

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 16, 5, ad 2; 39, 8.

it is something essential, not personal.

REPLY

In regard to God, truth can be taken in two ways: properly and, as it were, metaphorically. If truth is taken properly, then it will imply an equality of the divine intellect and of a thing. Since the first thing the divine intellect knows is its own essence, through which it knows all other things, truth in God principally implies an equality between the divine intellect and a thing which is its essence; and, in a secondary sense, truth likewise implies an equality of the divine intellect with created things.

The divine intellect and the divine essence are not, however, made equal to each other in the way in which a measure is related to what is measured, since one is not the source of the other, but both are entirely identical. Consequently, the truth resulting from such equality does not involve its having the character of a source, whether it be considered from the standpoint of the essence or from that of the intellect, since both in this case are one and the same. For, just as in God the knower and the thing known are the same, so also in Him the truth of the thing and that of intellect are the same, without any connotation of origin.

But if the truth of the divine intellect be considered in its conformity to created things, the same truth will still remain; for God knows Himself and other things through the same means. However, there is added to the concept of truth the note of origin with respect to creatures, to which the divine intellect is compared as a measure and cause. Moreover, in theological matters every name which does not imply the notion of origin or of being from a principle is predicated essentially. And even if the name implies the notion of origin of creatures, it still is also predicated essentially. Consequently, if truth is taken properly in whatever pertains to God, it is predicated essentially; yet it is appropriated to the person of the Son, as are also art and all else pertaining to intellect.

Truth is taken metaphorically or figuratively in divine matters when we take it according to that formal character by which truth is found in created things. For in these, truth is said to exist inasmuch as a created thing imitates its source, the divine intellect. Similarly, when truth is applied to God and is said to be the highest possible imitation of its principle, this is attributed to the Son. Taken in this way, truth properly belongs to the Son and is predicated personally; and this, too, is what Augustine says.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The response is clear from the reply.
2. When equality is referred to divine things it sometimes implies a relation that indicates a distinction of Persons—as when we say that the Father and the Son are equal. In this respect a real distinction is understood in the word *equality*. Sometimes, however, a real distinction is not understood in the word *equality*, but merely a rational distinction, as when we say that the divine wisdom and the divine goodness are equal. Hence, equality does not necessarily imply a distinction of persons. Such also is the distinction implied in the word *truth*, since truth is an equality of intellect and essence.
3. Although truth is conceived by the intellect, the notion of a concept is not expressed by the word *truth* as it is by the term *word*. Hence, no analogy can be drawn.

ARTICLE 8

*Is every other truth from the first truth?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. Fornication is a true thing; yet it is not from the first truth. Therefore, not every truth is from the first truth.
2. The answer was given that fornication is said to be true by reason of the truth of the sign or concept, and this is from God. Its truth as a thing, however, is not from God.—On the contrary, besides the first truth, there is not only the truth of the sign or of the concept, but also the truth of the thing. Therefore, if its truth as a thing is not from God, then there is a truth of a thing not from God, and our proposition that not every truth other than the first is from God will have to be granted.
3. From “He fornicates,” it follows that “fornication is true.” Therefore, a transition can be made from the truth of a proposition to the truth of what is said, which in turn expresses the truth of the thing. Consequently, the truth mentioned consists in this: that that act is joined to that subject. But the truth of what is said would not arise from the conjunction of such an act with a subject unless the conjunction of the act, which has the deformity, were understood. Therefore, the truth of the thing regards not only the very essence of an act but also its deformity. But an act considered as having a deformity is

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 21, 4, ad 5; 27, 1, ad 7; *S.T.*, I, 16, aa. 5-6; *C.G.*, III, 47; *Quodl.*, X, 4, 7; *I Sent.*, 19, 5, aa. 1-2; *II Sent.*, 37, 1, 2, ad 1; *X Metaph.*, lect. 2, nn. 1956-59.

by no means from God. Not all truth of things, therefore, is from God.

4. Anselm says that a thing is called true if it is as it ought to be. Among the ways in which a thing can be said to be what it ought to be he mentions one, namely, that it happens with God's permission. Now, God's permission extends even to the deformity in an act. Therefore, the truth of the thing reaches as far as that deformity. But deformity is in no way from God. Therefore, not every truth is from God.

5. It was said, however, that just as a deformity or privation cannot be called a being without qualification, but only a being in a certain respect, so also a deformity or privation cannot be said to have truth without qualification, but only in a certain respect. Such a restricted truth is not from God.—On the contrary, to being, the true adds a reference to intellect. Now, although privation or deformity in itself is not being absolutely, it is apprehended absolutely by the intellect. Therefore, even though it does not have entity absolutely, it does have truth absolutely.

6. Everything qualified is reduced to something unqualified. For example, "An Ethiopian is white with respect to teeth" is reduced to this: "The teeth of an Ethiopian are white without qualification." Consequently, if some limited truth is not from God, then not every qualified truth will be from God—which is absurd.

7. What is not the cause of the cause is not the cause of the effect. For example, God is not the cause of the deformity of sin, for He is not the cause of the defect in a free choice from which the deformity of sin arises. Now, just as the act of existing is the cause of the truth of affirmative propositions, so non-existing is the cause of negative propositions. Now, as Augustine says, since God is not the cause of this non-existing, it follows that He is not the cause of negative propositions. Hence, not every truth is from God.

8. Augustine says: "The true is that which is as it appears."³ Now, an evil thing is as it appears. Therefore, something evil is true. But no evil is from God. Therefore, not every true thing is from God.

9. But it was said that evil is not seen through the species of evil but through the species of a good.—On the contrary, the species of a good never makes anything appear but that good. Consequently, if evil is seen only through the species of a good, evil will appear only as a good. But this is false.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Commenting on the text, "And no man can say the Lord Jesus..." (1 Corinthians 12:3), Ambrose says: "Every true thing, no matter who says it, is from the Holy Spirit."

2. All created goodness is from the first uncreated goodness, God. For the same reason, all other truth is from the first truth, God.

3. The formal character of truth finds its completion in the intellect. But every intellect is from God. Hence, every truth is from God.

4. Augustine says: "The true is that which is." But every act of existing is from God. Therefore, every truth is from Him.

5. Just as the one is interchangeable with being, so is the true, and conversely. But all unity is from the first unity, as Augustine says. Therefore, every truth also is from the first truth.

REPLY

As is clear from what has been said among created things truth is found both in things and in intellect. In the intellect it is found according to the conformity which the intellect has with the things whose notions it has. In things it is found according as they imitate the divine intellect, which is their measure—as art is the measure of all products of art—and also in another way, according as they can by their very nature bring about a true apprehension of themselves in the human intellect, which, as is said in the *Metaphysics*, is measured by things. By its form a thing existing outside the soul imitates the art of the divine intellect; and, by the same form, it is such that it can bring about a true apprehension in the human intellect. Through this form, moreover, each and every thing has its act of existing. Consequently, the truth of existing things includes their entity in its intelligible character, adding to this a relation of conformity to the human or divine intellect. But negations or privations existing outside the soul do not have any form by which they can imitate the model of divine art or introduce a knowledge of themselves into the human intellect. The fact that they are conformed to intellect is due to the intellect, which apprehends their intelligible notes.

It is clear, therefore, that when a stone and blindness are said to be true, truth is not related to both in the same way; for truth predicated of the stone includes in its notion the entity of the stone, adding a reference to intellect, which is also caused by the thing itself since it has something by which it can be referred to intellect. As predicated of blindness, however, truth does not include in itself that privation which is blindness, but only the relation of blindness to intellect. This relation, moreover, is not supported by anything in the blindness itself, since blindness is not conformed to intellect by virtue of anything which it has in itself.

Hence, it is clear that the truth found in created things can include nothing more than the entity of a thing and conformity of the thing to intellect

or conformity of intellect to things or to the privations of things. All this is entirely from God, because both the very form of a thing, through which it is conformed, is from God, and the truth itself in so far as it is the good of the intellect, as is said in the *Ethics*; for the good of any thing whatsoever consists in its perfect operation. But since the perfect operation of the intellect consists in its knowing the true, that is its good in the sense just mentioned. Hence, since every good and every form is from God, one must say, without any qualification, that every truth is from God.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The argument—"Every true thing is from God. But to fornicate is true."—falls into the fallacy of accident. For, as is evident from our discussion above,* when we say that fornicating is true, we do not imply that the defect involved in the act of fornication is included in the notion of truth. True predicates merely the conformity of that act to an intellect. Hence, one cannot conclude that fornicating is from God, but merely that its truth is from God.

2. As is clear from our reply just above, deformities and other defects do not possess truth in the same way that other things do. Consequently, even though the truth of defects is from God, it does not follow that the deformity is from God.

3. According to the Philosopher, truth does not consist in the composition found in things but in that made by the soul. Hence, truth does not consist in this, that the act with its deformity inheres in a subject (for this is proper, rather, to the character of good and evil). It consists in the conformity of the act, inherent in its subject, to the soul's apprehension.

4. The good, the due, the right, and all other things of this sort are related in one way to the divine permission, and in another, to other manifestations of the divine will. In the latter, there is a reference to the object of the will act, as well as to the will act itself. For example, when God commands that parents be honored, both the honor to be given parents and the act of commanding are goods. But in a divine permission there is a reference only to the subjective act of permitting, and not to the object of the permission. Hence, it is right that God should permit deformities, but it does not follow from this that the deformity itself has some rectitude.

5. [The solution to the fifth difficulty is not given.]

6. The qualified truth which belongs to negations and defects is reducible to that unqualified truth which is in the intellect and from God. Consequently, the truth of defects is from God, although the defects themselves are not from Him.

7. Non-existing is not the cause of the truth of negative propositions in the sense that it causes them to exist in the intellect. The soul itself does this by conforming itself to a non-being outside the soul. Hence, this non-existing outside the soul is not the efficient cause of truth in the soul, but, as it were, its exemplary cause. The difficulty is based upon the efficient cause.

8. Although evil is not from God, that evil is seen to be what it is, is from God. Hence, the truth by which it is true that there is evil is from God.

9. Although evil does not act on the soul except through the species of good, nevertheless, since evil is a deficient good, the soul grasps the intelligible character of the defect, and so conceives the character of evil. Accordingly, evil is seen as evil.

ARTICLE 9

*Is truth in sense?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is not, for

1. Anselm says: "Truth is a correctness perceivable only by the mind." But sense does not have the same nature as the mind. Hence, truth is not in sense.

2. Augustine proves that truth is not known by the bodily senses, and his reasons were set down above. Hence, truth is not in sense.

TO THE CONTRARY

Augustine says: "Truth manifests that which is." But that which is, is manifested not only to the intellect, but also to sense.

REPLY

Truth is both in intellect and in sense, but not in the same way. It is in intellect as a consequence of the act of the intellect and as known by the intellect. Truth follows the operation of the intellect inasmuch as it belongs to the intellect to judge about a thing as it is. And truth is known by the intellect in view of the fact that the intellect reflects upon its own act—not merely as knowing its own act, but as knowing the proportion of its act to the thing. Now, this proportion cannot be known without knowing the nature of the act; and the nature of the act cannot be known without knowing the nature

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 16, 2; 17, 2; 85, 6; *III De anima*, lect. 6, n. 660 seq.; *IV Metaph.*, lect. 12, nn. 67 3, 68 1 seq.

of the active principle, that is, the intellect itself, to whose nature it belongs to be conformed to things. Consequently, it is because the intellect reflects upon itself that it knows truth.

Truth is in sense also as a consequence of its act, for sense judges of things as they are. Truth is not in sense, however, as something known by sense; for, although sense judges truly about things, it does not know the truth by which it truly judges. Although sense knows that it senses, it does not know its own nature; consequently, it knows neither the nature of its act nor the proportion of this act to things. As a result, it does not know its truth.

The reason for this is that the most perfect beings, such as, for example, intellectual substances, return to their essence with a complete return: knowing something external to themselves, in a certain sense they go outside of themselves; but by knowing that they know, they are already beginning to return to themselves, because the act of cognition mediates between the knower and the thing known. That return is completed inasmuch as they know their own essences. Hence, it is said in *The Causes*: “A being which is such as to know its own essence returns to it by a complete return.”

Since sense is closer to an intellectual substance than other things are, it begins to return to its essence; it not only knows the sensible, but it also knows that it senses. Its return, however, is not complete, since it does not know its own essence. Avicenna has given the reason for this by pointing out that the sense knows nothing except through a bodily organ, and a bodily organ cannot be a medium between a sensing power and itself. But powers without any ability to sense cannot return to themselves in any way, for they do not know that they are acting. For example, fire does not know that it is heating.

From this discussion the solutions to the difficulties are clear.

ARTICLE 10

*Is there any false thing?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. According to Augustine: “The true is that which is.” Hence, the false is that which is not. Now, what is not is not a thing. Therefore, no thing is false.
2. It was said that the true is a differentia of being; consequently, the

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 16, aa. 1, 6; *I Sent.*, 19, 5, 1; *IV Metaph.*, lect. 12, n. 681 seq.; *V Metaph.*, lect. 22, nn. 1128-29; *VI Metaph.*, lect. 4, n. 1237 seq.

false, like the true, is that which is.—On the contrary, no dividing differentia is interchangeable with that whose differentia it is. Now, as was said, the true is interchangeable with being. Consequently, the true is not a dividing differentia of being, for this would make it possible to call some thing false.

3. Truth is a conformity of thing and intellect. Now, an things are conformed to the divine intellect, since in itself nothing can be other than it is known to be by the divine intellect. Hence, all things are true, and nothing is false.

4. All things possess truth from their forms. For example, one is said to be a true man if he has the true form of a man. But there is nothing which does not have some form, for every act of existing comes from form. Hence, everything is true, and there is no thing which is false.

5. Good and evil are related as true and false are related. Now, since evil is found in things, it has concrete reality only in something good, as Dionysius and Augustine say. Therefore, if falseness is found in things, it can have reality only in what is true. But this does not seem possible, for then the same thing would be both true and false; but this is impossible. This would mean, for example, that man and white are the same because whiteness is made real in a man.

6. Augustine proposes the following difficulty. If a thing is called false, it is either because it is similar or because it is dissimilar. “If because it is dissimilar, there is nothing that cannot be called false, for there is nothing that is not unlike something else. If because it is similar, all things loudly protest, for they are true because they are similar.” Therefore, falsity cannot be found in things in any way.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Augustine defines the false as follows: “The false is that which approaches the likeness of something else without being that whose likeness it bears. But every creature bears the likeness of God. Therefore, since no creature is identical with God Himself, it seems that every creature is false.

2. Augustine says that “Every body is a true body and a false unity. Now, a body is said to be false because it imitates unity, yet is not a unity. Therefore, since every creature, in so far as it is perfect, imitates the divine perfection, and, nevertheless, in any perfection which it has, remains infinitely distant from it, it seems that every creature is false.

3. The good, like the true, is interchangeable with being. But the interchangeability of the good and being does not stand in the way of a thing’s being evil. Therefore, the fact that the true is interchangeable with being does

not stand in the way of a thing's being false.

4. Anselm says that there are two kinds of truth in propositions. "The first type occurs when the proposition has the meaning which was given to it." For example, this proposition, "Socrates sits," means that Socrates is sitting, whether he is actually sitting or not. "The second type of truth occurs when the proposition signifies that for which it was formed"—and it has been formed to signify that something is when it is. In this respect, a proposition is properly said to be true. In the same way, a thing may be called true when it fulfills its purpose, and false when it does not do so. But everything which falls short of its end does not fulfill its purpose; and, since there are many things of this sort, it seems that many things are false.

REPLY

Just as truth consists in an equation of thing and intellect, so falsity consists in an inequality between them. Now, as was said, a thing is related to divine and human intellects. In regard to everything that is positively predicated of things or found in them, it is related to the divine in one way as the measured to its measure; for all such things come from the divine intellect's art. A thing is related in another way to the divine intellect: as a thing known is related to the knower. In this way even negations and defects are equated to the divine intellect, since God knows all these even though He does not cause them. It is clear, then, that a thing is conformed to the divine intellect in whatever way it exists, under any for in whatsoever or even under a privation or a defect. Consequently, it is clear that everything is true in its relation to the divine intellect. Hence, Anselm says: "There is, then, truth in the essence of all things which are, for they are what they are in the highest truth." Therefore, in its relation to the divine intellect, nothing can be false.

In its relation to a human intellect, however, an inequality of thing with intellect, caused in some way by the thing, is occasionally found; for a thing makes itself known in the soul by its exterior appearance, since our cognition takes its beginning from sense, whose direct object is sensible qualities. For this reason it is said in *The Soul*: "Accidents greatly contribute to our knowledge of the quiddity." Consequently, when there are manifested in any object sensible qualities indicating a nature which does not actually underlie them, that thing is said to be false. Hence, the Philosopher says that those things are called false "which are such as to seem to be what they are not, or of a kind which they are not." For example, that is called "false" gold which has in its external appearance the color and other accidents of genuine gold, whereas the nature of gold does not interiorly underlie them. But a thing is not to be

the cause of falsity in the soul in the sense that it necessarily causes falsity; for truth and falsity exist principally in the soul's judgment; and the soul, inasmuch as it judges about things, is not acted upon by things, but rather, in a sense, acts upon them. Hence, a thing is not said to be false because it always of itself causes a false apprehension, but rather because its natural appearance is likely to cause a false apprehension.

As was pointed out previously," however, the relation to the divine intellect is essential to a thing; and in this respect a thing is said to be true in itself. Its relation to the human intellect is accidental to it; and in this respect a thing is not true, absolutely speaking but, as it were, in some respect and in potency. Therefore, all things are true absolutely speaking, and nothing is false. But in a certain respect, that is, with reference to our intellect, some things are said to be false. Hence, it is necessary to answer the arguments of both sides.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The definition, "The true is that which is," does not perfectly express the intelligible character of truth. It expresses it, as it were, only materially, unless is here signifies the affirmation of a proposition, and means that a thing is said to be true when it is said to be or to be understood as it is in reality. Taken in this sense, the false may be said to be that which does not exist; it is not as it is said or understood to be. And this type of falsity can be found in things.

2. Properly speaking, the true cannot be a differentia of being, for being does not have any differentia, as is proved in the *Metaphysics*. But in some sense the true, as well as the good, is related to being in the manner of a differentia, since it expresses something about being which is not expressed by the noun *being*; and in this sense the meaning of being is indeterminate with respect to the meaning of the true. Consequently, the meaning of the true is compared to the notion of being somewhat as a differentia is compared to its genus.

3. That argument must be conceded, since it treats a thing in its relation to the divine intellect.

4. All things have some form, yet not everything has that form whose characteristics are externally manifested by sensible qualities; and it is in regard to these that a thing is said to be false if it is naturally apt to produce a false estimation about itself.

5. As is clear from what has been said, something outside the soul is said to be false if it is naturally such as to give a false impression of itself. But what is nothing is not capable of making any impression, since it does not move a knowing power. What is said to be false, therefore, must be a being; and since

every being, in so far as it is a being, is true, falsity must exist in things and be based upon some truth. For this reason Augustine says that a tragedian representing true persons in dramas would not be false without being a true tragedian. Similarly, a painting of a horse would not be a false horse were it not a true picture. It does not follow, however, that contradictories are true, because the affirmation and the negation in expressing the true and the false do not refer to the same reality.

6. A thing is said to be false in so far as, by its nature, it is likely to deceive. When I say *deceive*, however, I mean an action that brings on some defect; for nothing can act except to the extent that it is being, and every defect is non-being. Moreover, everything has some likeness to the true to the extent that it is a being; and in so far as it does not exist it departs from this likeness. Consequently, this *deceiving* as implying action arises from likeness; but the defect it implies (and in which the intelligible character of falsity formally consists) arises from unlikeness. Hence, Augustine says that falsity arises from unlikeness.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

1. The soul is not so constituted as to be deceived by any likeness whatsoever, but only by a considerable resemblance which makes it difficult to discover the unlikeness. Hence, the soul is deceived by similarities, more or less great, according to the varying degrees of its acuteness in discovering unlikenesses. A thing, however, should not be said to be absolutely false because it leads into error, however much it may do that, but only because it is such as to deceive many or highly intelligent men. Now, although creatures bear some resemblance to God in themselves, so great is the dissimilarity between the two that only because of great stupidity could it happen that a mind would be deceived by such similarity. Hence, from the similarity and dissimilarity between creatures and God, it does not follow that all creatures should be called false.

2. Some have thought that God is a body; and, since He is the unity by which all things are one, they consequently thought that body was unity itself, because of its likeness to unity. Therefore, a body is called a false unity for this reason, that it has led or could lead some into the error of believing it to be unity.

3. There are two kinds of perfection, first and second. First perfection is the form of each thing, and that by which it has its act of existing. Nothing is without it while it continues in existence. Second perfection is operation, which is the end of a thing or the means by which a thing reaches its end; and

a thing is sometimes deprived of this perfection. The note of truth in things results from first perfection; for it is because a thing has a form that it imitates the art of the divine intellect and produces knowledge of itself in the soul. But the note of goodness in things results from its second perfection, for this goodness arises from the end. Consequently, evil, but not falsity, is found in things absolutely.

4. According to the Philosopher, the true itself is the good of the intellect, for an operation of intellect is perfect because its concept is true. And since a proposition is a sign of what is understood, truth is its end. But this is not the case with other things, and so there is no similarity.

ARTICLE II

*Is falsity in sense?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is not, for

1. As is said in *The Soul*: “The intellect is always correct.” Now, since the intellect is the superior part of man, his other parts must also pursue correctness—just as the disposition of lower bodies in the universe depends on the motion of the higher bodies. Therefore, sense, which is the inferior part of the soul, will also always be correct there is, then, no falsity in it.

2. Augustine says: “Our eyes do not deceive us: they can report to the mind only their own modification, And if all the bodily senses report as they are affected, I do not know what more we can require of them.” Hence, there is no falsity in the senses.

3. Anselm says: “It seems to me that truth or falsity is not in the sense but in opinion.” This confirms our thesis.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Anselm says: “Truth is, indeed, in our senses, but not always; for they sometimes deceive us.

2. According to Augustine: “A thing is called false because it is far from being a likeness of the true, even though it does in some way imitate the true.” Now, a sense has at times a likeness of certain things other than they are in reality. For example, when the eye is pressed, one thing is sometimes seen as two. Consequently, there is falsity in sense.

3. The answer was given that sense is not deceived with regard to prop-

* PARALLEL READINGS: See readings given for q. 1, a. 9.

er sensibles, but only with regard to common sensibles.—On the contrary, whenever something is apprehended about a thing other than it is, the apprehension is false. Now, when a white body is seen through a green glass, the sense apprehends it other than it is, for it sees it as green and judges accordingly—unless a higher judgment is present, detecting the falsity. Therefore, sense is deceived even with regard to proper sensibles.

REPLY

Our knowledge, taking its start from things, proceeds in this order. First, it begins in sense; second, it is completed in the intellect. As a consequence, sense is found to be in some way an intermediary between the intellect and things; for with reference to things, it is, as it were, an intellect, and with reference to intellect, it is, as it were, a thing. Hence, truth or falsity is said to be in sense in two respects. The first is in the relation of sense to intellect. In this respect, the sense is said to be true or false as a thing is, namely, in so far as it causes a true or false judgment in the intellect. The second respect is in the relation of sense to things. In this, truth and falsity are said to be in sense as they are said to be in the intellect, namely, in so far as the sense judges that what is, is or is not.

Hence, if we speak of a sense in the first meaning, in a way there is falsity in sense, and in a way there is not. For sense, in itself, is a thing; and it also passes judgment on other things. If, in its relation to the intellect, it is considered as a thing, then there is no falsity in sense; for a sense reveals its state to the intellect exactly as it is affected. Hence, Augustine says, in the passage referred to: “The senses can report to the mind only how they are affected.” On the other hand, if sense is considered in its relation to the intellect as representing some other thing, it may be called false in view of the fact that it sometimes represents a thing to the intellect other than it actually is. For, in that case, as we said about things, it is such as to cause a false judgment in the intellect—but not necessarily, since the intellect judges on what is presented by sense just as it judges about things. Thus, in its relation to the intellect, sense always produces a true judgment in the intellect with respect to its own condition, but not always with respect to the condition of things.

If sense is considered in its relation to things, however, then there are truth and falsity in sense in the manner in which these are in the intellect. For truth and falsity are found primarily and principally in the judgment of the intellect as it associates and dissociates, and in the formation of quiddities, only in their relation to the judgment following upon this formation. Hence, truth and falsity are properly said to be in sense inasmuch as it judges about sensible

objects, but inasmuch as it apprehends a sensible object, there is not properly truth or falsity, except in the relation of this apprehension to the judgment, in so far as a judgment of this or that sort naturally follows upon a particular apprehension.

The judgment of sense about certain things—for example, proper sensibles—takes place spontaneously. About other things, however, it takes place by means of a certain comparison, made in man by the cogitative power, a sense power, whose place in animals is taken by a spontaneous estimation. This sensitive power judges about common sensibles and accidental sensibles. However, the spontaneous action of a thing always takes place in one way, unless by accident it is impeded intrinsically by some defect or extrinsically by some impediment. Consequently, the judgment of sense about proper sensibles is always true unless there is an impediment in the organ or in the medium; but its judgment about common or accidental sensibles is sometimes wrong. Thus, it is clear how there can be falsity in the judgment of sense.

As regards the apprehension of the senses, it must be noted that there is one type of apprehensive power, for example, a proper sense, which apprehends a sensible species in the presence of a sensible thing; but there is also a second type, the imagination, for example, which apprehends a sensible species when the thing is absent. So, even though the sense always apprehends a thing as it is, unless there is an impediment in the organ or in the medium, the imagination usually apprehends a thing as it is not, since it apprehends it as present though it is absent. Consequently, the Philosopher says: “Imagination, not sense, is the master of falsity.”

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. In the macrocosm the higher bodies do not receive anything from the lower. Just the opposite occurs. In man, the microcosm, the intellect, which is superior, does receive something from sense. Hence, no parallel can be made.

2-3. Our previous discussion will easily answer the other difficulties.

ARTICLE 12

*Is falsity in the intellect?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 17, 3; 58, 5; 85, 6; *I Sent.*, 19, 5, 1, ad 7; *C.G.*, I, 59; III, 108; *III De anima*, lect. 11, nn. 746-51, 760-64; *I Perih.*, lect. 3, nn. 3-10; *VI Metaph.*, lect. 4, nn. 1223 seq., esp. n. 1241; *IX Metaph.*, lect. 11, n. 1896 seq.

1. The intellect has two operations. By one it forms quiddities, and, as the Philosopher says, the false is not in this. By the other it joins and separates, and the false is not in this either, as is clear from Augustine's saying: "No one has intellectual knowledge of false things. Consequently, falsity is not in the intellect.

2. According to Augustine: "Whoever is deceived does not understand that in which he is deceived. The intellect is always true, therefore, and there can be no falsity in it.

3. Algazel says: "Either we understand something as it is or we do not understand. But whoever understands a thing as it is truly understands it. Therefore, the intellect is always true, and there is no falsity in it.

TO THE CONTRARY

The Philosopher says: "Where there is a joining of concepts, there the true and the false begin to be." Hence, falsity is found in the intellect.

REPLY

The name intellect arises from the intellect's ability to know the most profound elements of a thing; for to understand (*intelligere*) means to read what is inside a thing (*intus legere*). Sense and imagination know only external accidents, but the intellect alone penetrates to the interior and to the essence of a thing. But even beyond this, the intellect, having perceived essences, operates in different ways by reasoning and inquiring. Hence, intellect can be taken in two senses.

First, it can be taken merely according to its relation to that from which it first received its name. We are said to understand, properly speaking, when we apprehend the quiddity of things or when we understand those truths that are immediately known by the intellect, once it knows the quiddities of things. For example, first principles are immediately known when we know their terms, and for this reason intellect or understanding is called "a habit of principles." The proper object of the intellect, however, is the quiddity of a thing. Hence, just as the sensing of proper sensibles is always true, so the intellect is always true in knowing what a thing is, as is said in *The Soul*. By accident, however, falsity can occur in this knowing of quiddities, if the intellect falsely joins and separates. This happens in two ways: when it attributes the definition of one thing to another, as would happen were it to conceive that "mortal rational animal" were the definition of an ass; or when it joins together parts of definitions that cannot be joined, as would happen were it to conceive that "irrational, immortal animal" were the definition of an ass. For it is false to say

that some irrational animal is immortal. So it is clear that a definition cannot be false except to the extent that it implies a false affirmation. (This twofold mode of falsity is touched upon in the *Metaphysics*. Similarly, the intellect is not deceived in any way with respect to first principles. It is plain, then, that if intellect is taken in the first sense—according to that action from which it receives the name intellect—falsity is not in the intellect.

Intellect can also be taken in a second sense—in general, that is, as extending to all its operations, including opinion and reasoning. In that case, there is falsity in the intellect. But it never occurs if a reduction to first principles is made correctly.

From this discussion, the answers to the difficulties are clear.

Question II

GOD'S KNOWLEDGE

1. Is there knowledge in God?
2. Does God know or understand Himself?
3. Does God know things other than Himself?
4. Does God have proper and determinate knowledge of things?
5. Does God know singular things?
6. Does the human intellect know singulars?
7. Does God know the singular as now existing or not existing?
8. Does God know non-beings, and things which are not, have not been, and will not be?
9. Does God know infinities?
10. Can God make infinities?
11. Is knowledge predicated of God and man purely equivocally?
12. Does God know singular future contingents?
13. Does God's knowledge change?
14. Is God's knowledge the cause of things?
15. Does God have knowledge of evil things?

ARTICLE I

*Is there knowledge in God?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. That which is had by an addition to another cannot be found in a most simple being, and God is most simple. Therefore, since knowledge is had by an addition to the essence—for life adds something to the act of existence and knowledge adds something to life—it seems that knowledge is not in God.

2. The answer was given that knowledge does not add anything to God's essence, since *knowledge* merely indicates a perfection God has that is not indicated by *essence*.—On the contrary, *perfection* is the name of a thing. But in God, essence and knowledge are absolutely one thing. The same perfection,

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 14, 1; *I Sent.*, 35, 1; *C.G.* I, 44; *XII Metaph.*, lect. 8, n. 2542 seq.; lect. 11, n. 2600 seq.; *Comp. Theol.*, I, cc. 28-32.

therefore, is indicated by both words, *essence* and *knowledge*.

3. No noun can be used of God which does not signify the entire divine perfection; for if it does not signify His entire perfection, it signifies nothing about Him, since parts are not found in God and cannot be attributed to Him. Now, *knowledge* does not represent His entire perfection, for God "is above all names which name Him," as is stated in *The Causes*. Therefore, knowledge cannot be attributed to Him.

4. Moreover, science is the habit of conclusions, and understanding, the habit of principles—as is clear from what the Philosopher says. But God does not know anything as a conclusion: for this would mean that His intellect would proceed from premises to conclusions, though, as Dionysius has shown, this is not true even for the angels. Hence, science is not in God.

5. Whatever is known scientifically is known through something more known. For God, however, there is not anything more known or less known. Therefore, scientific knowledge cannot be in God.

6. Algazel says that knowledge is an impression of the known in the intellect of the knower. But an impression is entirely alien to God, for it implies receptivity and composition. Therefore, knowledge cannot be attributed to God.

7. Nothing implying imperfection can be attributed to God. But knowledge implies imperfection, for it is regarded as a habit or first act—the operation of considering being regarded as second act, as is stated in *The Soul*. But a first act is imperfect with respect to the second since it is in potency to the second. Therefore, knowledge cannot be in God.

8. The answer was that there is only actual knowledge in God.—On the contrary, God's knowledge is the cause of things. Therefore, if knowledge is attributed to God, it existed eternally in Him; and if only actual knowledge is in God, He produced things from all eternity. This is false.

9. Whenever there is anything which corresponds to the concept we have of the word *knowledge*, of it we know not only that it is but also what it is, for knowledge is a distinct reality. But, as Damascene says, we cannot know what God is, but only that He is. Therefore, in God there is nothing corresponding to our concept expressed by *knowledge*. Knowledge, therefore, does not exist in God.

10. Augustine states that God is not accessible to the intellect since He eludes every form. But knowledge is a form which the intellect conceives. Hence, God also eludes this form, and so there cannot be knowledge in God.

11. To understand is more simple and of greater dignity than to know. But as stated in *The Causes*, when we say that God understands or is an intelli-

gence, we are not naming Him with a proper noun but "with the name of His first effect." Much less, then, can we use *knowledge* of God.

12. Quality implies a greater composition than quantity does, for quality inheres in a substance by means of quantity. We do not attribute anything of the genus of quantity to God because of His simplicity, for everything quantified has parts. Hence, since knowledge is in the genus of quality, it cannot be attributed to God.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. The Epistle to the Romans (11:33) says: "O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God!"

2. According to Anselm, we must attribute to God everything which in each thing it is better absolutely to have than not to have. Since knowledge is a perfection of this kind, it must be attributed to God.

3. Only three things are required for knowledge: an active power in the knower by which he judges about things, a thing known, and the union of both. But in God there is the most active power possible and an essence that is most knowable; consequently, there is a union of both. God, therefore, knows in the highest degree. Our proof of the minor premise is drawn from the fact mentioned in *The Intelligences*, namely: "The first substance is light." But light has active power most of all, as is shown from its diffusion and multiplication. It is, besides, highly knowable and, because of this, also makes other things known. Therefore, the first substance, God, has an active power to know and is Himself also knowable.

REPLY

All attribute knowledge to God, but in different ways. Some, not being able by their own intellectual power to go beyond the manner of created knowledge, have believed that knowledge is in God like some sort of disposition added to His essence, as is the case with us. This is quite absurd and erroneous. For, if it were true, God would not be absolutely simple. There would be in Him a composition of substance and accident, and, further, God would not be His own act of existence; for, as Boethius says: "What exists can share in something else, but existence itself in no way shares in anything else." If God shared in knowledge as if it were a state added to His essence, He would not be His own act of existence, and, thus, He would have His origin from another who would be the cause of His existence. In short, He would not be God.

For this reason others have asserted that, when we attribute knowledge or something of the same sort to God, we postulate nothing positive in Him but

merely designate Him as the cause of knowledge in created things. In other words, God is said to be a knower merely because He communicates knowledge to creatures. Although a partial reason for the truth of the proposition "God is a knower" may be that He causes truth (and Origen and Augustine seem to say this), it is not the whole truth for two reasons. First, by the same reasoning we should have to predicate of God whatever He causes in creatures, and so we should have to say that He moves since He causes motion in things. This, of course, cannot be said. Second, those attributes which are predicated of both causes and effects are not said to be in the causes because of the effects. Rather, they are said to be in the effects because they are found in the causes. For example, because fire is hot, it induces heat into the air. The converse is not true. Similarly, because the nature of God is to have knowledge, He communicates knowledge to us, and not the other way about.

Still others have said that knowledge and the like are attributed to God in a certain proportionate likeness, as anger, mercy, and similar passions are attributed to Him. For God is said to be angry in so far as He does something similar to what an angry man does, for He punishes. In us, this is the effect of anger. Properly speaking, of course, the passion of anger cannot be in God. In the same way, they say, God is said to be a knower because His effects resemble those of a knowing agent. For example, the works of one who has scientific knowledge proceed from determined principles to determined ends, and so do the divinely originated works of nature—as is clear from the *Physics*. But, according to this view, knowledge is attributed merely metaphorically to God, as are anger and other like things—an opinion contrary to the words of Dionysius and other saints.

Consequently, one must give another answer and say that, when knowledge is attributed to God, it signifies something which is in Him. The same is true of life, essence, and the like. These attributes do not differ as regards the reality which is signified, but only in our manner of understanding them. For God's essence, life, knowledge, and whatever else of this sort that may be predicated of Him are all the same; but in understanding essence, life, and so forth in His regard, our intellect has different concepts for each. This does not mean that these concepts are false; for our intellectual conceptions are true inasmuch as they actually represent the thing known by a certain process of assimilation. Otherwise they would be false, that is, if they corresponded to nothing.

Our intellect, however, cannot represent God in the same way that it represents creatures; for, when it knows a creature, it conceives a certain form which is the likeness of the thing according to its entire perfection; and in

this manner defines the things understood. But since God infinitely exceeds the power of our intellect, any form we conceive cannot completely represent the divine essence, but merely has, in some small measure, an imitation of it. Similarly, extra-mental realities imitate it somewhat, but imperfectly. Hence, all different things imitate God in different ways; and, according to different forms, they represent the one simple form of God, since in His form are found perfectly united all the perfections that are found, distinct and multiple, among creatures. This is like the properties of numbers, which all, in a certain sense, pre-exist in unity, and like all the individual authorities of royal officials, which are all united in the authority of the king. If there were anything that could perfectly represent God, that thing would be unique, for it would represent Him in one way and according to one form. For this reason, there is in God only one Son, who is the perfect image of the Father.

Accordingly, our intellect represents the divine perfection by means of different conceptions, for each one of them is imperfect. If one were perfect, it would be the only one, just as there is only one Word in the divine intellect. There are, therefore, many conceptions in our intellect that represent the divine essence, and the divine intellect corresponds to each one of these as a thing corresponds to an imperfect image of itself. Thus, even though we have several intellectual conceptions about one thing, they are all true. Moreover, since names do not signify things without the mediation of the intellect, as is pointed out in *Interpretation*,² the intellect applies several names to one thing according to the different ways in which it understands it, or (what comes to the same thing) according to different formal aspects. To all of these, however, there corresponds something in reality.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Knowledge is not had by an addition to being, except in so far as our intellect grasps someone's knowledge and essence as distinct; for addition presupposes distinction. In God, knowledge and essence are not really distinct, as is clear from our discussion. They are merely conceived in this way. Therefore, knowledge is not in God by an addition to His essence, except according to our way of understanding.

2. One cannot correctly say that knowledge in God signifies a perfection other than His essence. It is merely signified as though it were another perfection, since our intellect applies to Him the names referred to from the different concepts we have of Him.

3. Since names represent concepts, a name signifies the totality of a thing in direct proportion to the intellect's understanding of it. Our intellect

can understand the whole of God, but not wholly. With God, one must know the whole or nothing at all, since in Him there is no question of part and whole. I say “not wholly,” however, since the intellect does not know Him perfectly in so far as He is knowable by His very nature. Thus, our knowledge is like that of a man who knows with probability the conclusion, “The diameter is asymmetric to the side,” merely because all men assert it. He does not know this conclusion wholly, since he does not arrive at the perfect manner of knowing with which it is capable of being grasped. Yet he knows the entire conclusion and is ignorant of no part of it. So, too, the names which are applied to God signify the whole God, but not wholly.

4. What is in God without imperfection is found with some defect in creatures. Hence, if we attribute to God something found in creatures, we must entirely remove everything that smacks of imperfection so that only what is perfect will remain; for it is only according to its perfection that a creature imitates God. I point out, therefore, that our scientific knowledge contains both some perfection and some imperfection. Its certitude pertains to its perfection, for what is known scientifically is known with certainty. To its imperfection belongs its progression from principles to the conclusions contained in that science; for this progression happens only because the intellect, in knowing the premises, knows the conclusions only potentially. If it actually knew the conclusions, there would be no need of it to go further, since motion is simply the passage from potency to act. Knowledge is said to be in God, therefore, because of its certitude about things known, but not because of the progression mentioned above, for, as Dionysius says, this is not found even in angels.

5. If we take into consideration the manner proper to God as a knower, there is nothing more known or less known in God, because He sees all with the same intuition. If we consider the condition of the things known, however, He knows some to be more knowable in themselves and some less knowable; for example, of all the things He knows, the most knowable is His own essence, through which He knows everything—not by a progression, however, since by seeing His essence He simultaneously sees all things. If this order of things known in the divine cognition is considered, the notion of science can also be verified in God, for He knows all things principally in their Cause.

6. That statement of Algazel is to be understood of our knowledge, which is acquired by the impression upon our souls of the likenesses of things. The opposite is true of God’s cognition, for it is from His intellect that forms flow into creatures. Our knowledge is the impressing of things in our souls; but the forms of things are the impressing of the divine knowledge in things.

7. The knowledge posited of God is not like a habit but rather like an act, since He always actually knows all things.

8. Effects proceed from acting causes according to the condition of the causes. Hence, every effect which proceeds by reason of knowledge follows the determination of that knowledge, which limits its conditions. Therefore, the things which have God's knowledge as their cause proceed only when it has been determined by God that they shall proceed. Consequently, it is not necessary that things actually exist from eternity, even though God's knowledge is actual from all eternity.

9. The intellect is said to know what a thing is when it defines that thing, that is, when it conceives some form of the thing which corresponds to it in all respects. From our previous discussion, it is clear that whatever our intellect conceives of God falls short of being a representation of Him. Consequently, the quiddity of God Himself remains forever hidden from us. The most we can know of God during our present life is that He transcends everything that we can conceive of Him—as is clear from Dionysius.

10. God is said to elude every form of our intellect, not because there is no form of our intellect that can represent Him at all, but because there is no form that can represent Him perfectly.

11. As is said in the *Metaphysics*: "An intelligible character signified by a noun is a definition. Hence, the name of a thing is proper if its meaning is its definition. Now, since no intelligible character signified by a name defines God Himself, no name we apply to God is proper to Him. It is proper rather to the creature defined by the character signified by the name. These names, though the names of creatures, are attributed to God, however, in so far as a likeness of Him is found in some way in creatures.

12. The knowledge attributed to God is not a quality. Furthermore, a quality that follows upon quantity is a bodily quality—not a spiritual quality, as knowledge is.

ARTICLE 2

*Does God know or understand himself?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that He does not, for

1. A knower is related to the thing known because of his knowledge.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 14, 2; *C.G.*, I, 47; *XII Metaph.*, lect. 8, n. 2544; lect. 11, n. 2600 seq.; *De causis*, lect. 13 (P. 21:736b seq.); *Comp. Theol.*, I, c. 30; *III Sent.*, 27, 1, 4, sol.

Now, as Boethius says: "The essence accounts for the divine unity, and the relations account for the multiplicity of the Trinity of Persons." In God, therefore, the thing known must be personally distinct from the knower. Furthermore, the distinction of Persons in God will not permit a reciprocal predication—the Father is not said to have generated Himself because He generated the Son. Consequently, we cannot grant that God knows Himself.

2. In *The Causes* we read: "Everyone knowing his own essence returns to it by a complete return. But God does not return to His essence, since He never leaves it; and there cannot be a return if there has been no departure. God, therefore, does not know His own essence and does not know Himself.

3. Knowledge is an assimilation of a knower to a thing known. But nothing is similar to itself, for, as Hilary says: "likeness is not referred to oneself. Hence, God does not know Himself.

4. Scientific knowledge is only about universals. But God is not a universal, for every universal is bad by abstraction. There can be no abstraction from God, however, since He is perfectly simple. Hence, God does not know Himself.

5. If God knew Himself scientifically, He would understand Himself, since understanding is more simple than scientific knowledge and, for this reason, is the more to be attributed to God. But God does not understand Himself; hence, He does not know Himself scientifically. Proof of the minor premise: Augustine says: "Whatever understands itself comprehends itself. However, only finite being can be comprehended, as Augustine clearly shows in the same passage. Therefore, God does not understand Himself.

6. Augustine argues as follows: "Our intellect does not wish to be infinite (although it is able so to wish), since it desires to know itself." Hence, what wishes to know itself does not wish to be infinite. But God wishes to be infinite, since He is infinite; for, if He were something He did not wish to be, He would not be supremely happy. Consequently, He does not wish to be known to Himself and, hence, does not know Himself.

7. The answer was given that, although God is simply infinite and wills to be such, He is not, however, infinite but finite to Himself, and so does not will that He be infinite.—On the contrary, as is pointed out in the *Physics*, something is said to be infinite if it is untraversable, finite if it is traversable. But, as is proved in the *Physics*, the infinite cannot be traversed by means of either a finite or another infinite being. Therefore, although God is infinite, He cannot be finite to Himself.

8. What is a good to God is simply good. Therefore, what is finite to God is simply finite. But God is not simply finite. Hence, He is not finite to

Himself.

9. God knows Himself only in so far as He enters into a relation with Himself. Therefore, if He were finite to Himself, He would know Himself in a finite manner; but, since He is infinite, He would be knowing Himself other than He is and, consequently, have false knowledge of Himself.

10. Of those who know God, one knows Him more than another, according as his manner of cognition surpasses that of the other. But God knows Himself infinitely more than any one else knows Him. Hence, His manner of knowing is infinite, He knows Himself infinitely, and is not finite to Himself.

11. St. Augustine proves that one Person cannot understand a thing more than another can. He argues as follows: "Whoever knows a thing otherwise than as it is, is deceived, and anyone who is deceived about a thing does not understand it. Hence, whoever understands anything otherwise than as it is does not understand it; for nothing can be understood in any other way than as it is." Since a thing exists in one manner, it is known in one manner by all. Hence, no one understands a thing more than another does. Therefore, if God were to understand Himself, He would not understand Himself more than others understand Him. Thus, in some respect a creature would be equal to his Creator; this, however, would be absurd.

TO THE CONTRARY

Dionysius declares: "By knowing itself, the divine wisdom knows all else." Hence, God knows Himself especially.

REPLY

When it is said that a being knows itself, it is implicitly said to be both the knower and the known. Hence, in order to consider what kind of knowledge God has of Himself, we have to see what kind of a nature it is that can be both knower and known.

Note, therefore, that a thing is perfect in two ways. First, it is perfect with respect to the perfection of its act of existence, which belongs to it according to its own species. But, since the specific act of existence of one thing is distinct from the specific act of existence of another, in every created thing of this kind, the perfection falls short of absolute perfection to the extent that that perfection is found in other species. Consequently, the perfection of each individual thing considered in itself is imperfect, being a part of the perfection of the entire universe, which arises from the sum total of the perfections of all individual things.

In order that there might be some remedy for this imperfection, another

kind of perfection is to be found in created things. It consists in this, that the perfection belonging to one thing is found in another. This is the perfection of a knower in so far as he knows; for something is known by a knower by reason of the fact that the thing known is, in some fashion, in the possession of the knower. Hence, it is said in *The Soul* that the soul is, "in some manner, all things," since its nature is such that it can know all things. In this way it is possible for the perfection of the entire universe to exist in one thing. The ultimate perfection which the soul can attain, therefore, is, according to the philosophers, to have delineated in it the entire order and causes of the universe. This they held to be the ultimate end of man. We, however, hold that it consists in the vision of God; for, as Gregory says: "What is there that they do not see who see Him who sees all things?" Moreover, the perfection of one thing cannot be in another according to the determined act of existence which it has in the thing itself. Hence, if we wish to consider it in so far as it can be in another, we must consider it apart from those things which determine it by their very nature. Now, since forms and perfections of things are made determinate by matter, a thing is knowable in so far as it is separated from matter. For this reason, the subject in which these perfections are received must be immaterial; for, if it were material, the perfection would be received in it according to a determinate act of existence. It would, accordingly, not be in the intellect in a state in which it is knowable, that is, in the way in which the perfection of one thing can be in another.

Hence, those ancient philosophers erred who asserted that like is known by like, meaning by this that the soul, which knows all things, is materially constituted of all things: its earth knows the earth, its water knows water, and so forth. They thought that the perfection of the thing known had the same determined act of existence in the knower as it had in its own nature. But the form of the thing known is not received in this way in the knower. As the Commentator remarks, forms are not received in the possible intellect in the same way in which they are received in first matter, for a thing must be received by a knowing intellect in an immaterial way.

For this reason, we observe, a nature capable of knowing is found in things in proportion to their degree of immateriality. Plants and things inferior to plants can receive nothing in an immaterial way. Accordingly, they are entirely lacking in the power of knowing, as is clear from *The Soul*. A sense, however, can receive species without matter although still under the conditions of matter; but the intellect receives its species entirely purified of such conditions.

There is likewise a hierarchy among knowable things; for, as the Commentator says, material things are intelligible only because we make them in-

telligible; they are merely potentially intelligible and are made actually intelligible by the light of the agent intellect, just as colors are made actually visible by the light of the sun. But immaterial things are intelligible in themselves. Hence, although less known to us, they are better known in the order of nature.

Since God, being entirely free of all potentiality, is at the extreme of separation from matter, it follows that He is most knowing and most knowable. It follows, too, that the knowability of His nature is directly proportioned to the act of existence which it exercises. Finally, because God is by reason of the fact that He possesses His own nature, it follows that God knows to the extent that He possesses His nature as one most knowing. For this reason Avicenna says: "He Himself knows and apprehends Himself because His own quiddity, being completely stripped (that is, of matter), is that of a thing perfectly identified with Himself."

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. In God, the Trinity of Persons gets its plurality from the real relations in Him, namely, the relations of origin. When one says "God knows Himself," the relation connoted is not a real relation but a rational relation, for, whenever a thing is referred to itself, the relation is not real but merely rational. A real relation demands two terms.

2. The dictum stating that one who knows himself returns to his essence is metaphorical. For, as shown in the *Physics*, there is no motion in intellection, and hence, properly speaking, no departure or return. Intellection is said to be a progression or movement to the extent that in it one passes from one thing known to another. In us, this takes place by a sort of discourse; and so, when the soul knows itself, there is a departure from the soul and a return to it. For the act, going out from the soul, first terminates in the object. Then one reflects upon the act, and finally upon the power and the essence, in so far as acts are known from their object, and powers by their acts. In divine cognition, however, there is, as was pointed out above, no progression from the known to the unknown. Nevertheless, from the point of view of the thing known, one can find a certain cycle in God's knowledge; for in knowing His own essence He beholds all other things, and in these things He sees a likeness of His own essence. Hence, in some way He may be said to return to His own essence—not, however, in the sense that He knows His essence only from other things, as is the case with our soul.

Note, however, that in *The Causes* the return to one's own essence is called the very subsistence of a thing in itself; for non-subsistent forms are, as it were,

poured out upon something other than themselves, and are not in possession of themselves. But subsistent forms reach out to other things, perfecting them and influencing them—in such a way, however, that they still retain their immanence and self-possession. In this way, God returns to His essence in the highest degree, for He provides for all, and, because of this providence, in a sense He goes forth and out into all things, although in Himself He remains unmoved and uncontaminated by anything else.

3. A likeness which is a real relation demands a distinction of things. If it is merely a conceptual relation, a distinction of reason between the things which are similar is sufficient.

4. A universal is intelligible in direct proportion to its separation from matter. Hence, those things which have not been separated from matter by an act of our intellect but are, in themselves, free from all matter, are most knowable. Consequently, God is most knowable, even though He is not a universal.

5. God knows, understands, and comprehends Himself, although, absolutely speaking, He is infinite. He is not infinite privatively—as a quantity is infinite, having part after part *ad infinitum*. If such an infinite had to be known according to the formal character of its infinity, one could never comprehend it; one could never come to its end, for it does not have an end. But God is said to be negatively infinite since His essence is not limited by anything. Now, every form received in a subject is limited according to the capacity of the subject; but since the divine act of existence is not received in a subject, for He is His own act of existence, His act of existence is infinite and, for that very reason, His essence is said to be infinite.

The knowing power of every created intellect is finite, since it is received in some subject. Consequently, our intellect cannot come to know God as clearly as He is capable of being known. Accordingly, our intellect cannot comprehend Him, for it cannot attain that fullness of knowledge which is the meaning of *comprehend*, as was mentioned above. But the divine essence and its knowing power possess the same infinity, and God's knowledge is just as powerful as His essence is great. Consequently, He attains a perfect knowledge of Himself and is thus said to have comprehensive knowledge—not because such comprehension imposes some limits on the thing known, but rather because the knowledge is perfect and there is nothing lacking to it.

6. Since our intellect is finite in its nature, it cannot comprehend or perfectly understand anything infinite. Augustine's reasoning proceeded on the assumption of this limited nature. The nature of the divine intellect, however, is different; so the argument does not follow.

7. If the word God, properly speaking, is given its full meaning, He is

finite neither to Himself nor to others. He is said to be finite to Himself merely because He knows Himself as a finite intellect knows a finite thing; for, just as a finite intellect can attain a complete knowledge of a finite thing, so the divine intellect can have a complete knowledge of God Himself. But that characteristic of the infinite by which its end can never be reached is proper to a privative infinite. But this is entirely beside the point.

8. In regard to those perfections which involve quantity, if anything in reference to God has a certain attribute, the consequence is that it has that attribute absolutely. Thus, whatever is great in reference to God is, as a consequence, simply great. But in regard to those terms which involve imperfection, the same thing does not follow. If, for instance, something is small in comparison with God, it is not necessarily, as a consequence, small absolutely. All things are, indeed, nothing in comparison with God, yet they are not absolutely nothing. What is good in the sight of God, therefore, is good absolutely; but it does not follow that what is finite for God is finite absolutely, because *finite* involves imperfection, but *good* expresses a perfection. In either case, however, anything which is found in the divine judgment to have a certain Attribute has that attribute absolutely.

9. The statement, "God knows Himself limitedly," can be understood in two ways. In the first way, *limitedly* is applied to the thing known, so that God would know Himself to be limited. In this sense the statement is incorrect, for then God's knowledge would be false. In the second way, *limitedly* is applied to the knower. Then, two interpretations are possible. Either *limitedly* means perfectly, so that the knower is said to know limitedly whose knowledge attains its end and, in this sense, God actually does know Himself "limitedly"; or *limitedly* pertains to the efficacy of cognition—and in this sense God knows Himself, not limitedly, but infinitely, for the extent of the power of His cognition is the infinite itself. However, from the fact that He is finite to himself in the manner described, one cannot conclude that His knowledge of Himself is limited, except in the sense in which this was said to be true.

10. That argument is based on the word *infinite* being taken as referring to the efficacy of knowledge. Consequently, it is clear that God does not know Himself finitely.

11. The statement that one person can understand more than another may be taken in two ways. In the first, the word *more* refers primarily to the thing known. In this sense, no one of those who understand understands more than another of the thing understood, provided that it is understood; for whoever attributes more or less to the thing known than is in the nature of the thing is in error and does not, properly speaking, understand. But the word

more can also be taken as referring to the manner in which one knows. In this sense, one understands more than another because he understands more clearly—as an angel understands more clearly than a man, and God more than an angel, because of a greater power of understanding. We must similarly distinguish another phrase assumed in this proof, that is, “to know a thing other than as it is.” For, if the word *other* refers primarily to the thing known, then no one who understands knows a thing other than it is; for this would be to understand it to be in some other way than it is. If the word *other*, however, refers to the manner by which one knows, then everyone who understands a material thing knows it other than it is, because a thing having a material act of existence is understood only in an immaterial way.

ARTICLE 3

*Does God know things other than himself?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that He does not, for

1. The known is a perfection of the knower. But nothing distinct from God Himself can be His perfection; otherwise, something would be more noble than He is. Therefore, He can know nothing distinct from Himself.

2. But it was said that in so far as a thing or creature is known by God, it is one with Him.—On the contrary, a creature is one with God only inasmuch as it is in Him. Hence, if God knows a creature only as it is one with Him, He will know it only as it is in Him, and not as it is in its own nature.

3. If the divine intellect knows a creature, it knows it either through its essence or through something extrinsic. If it knows it through some extrinsic medium, then, since every medium of knowing is a perfection of the knower, because it is his form as knower (as is evident of the species of a stone in the pupil of the eye), it would follow that something extrinsic to God would be one of His perfections. But this is absurd. On the other hand, if He knows a creature through His own essence, since His essence is something distinct from the creature, it will follow that from knowing one thing He will know another. Now, every intellect that knows one thing from another is one which discourses and reasons. Consequently, there is discursive thought in the divine intellect, and, therefore, imperfection. But this is absurd.

4. The medium through which a thing is known ought to be propor-

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 14, 5; *I Sent.*, 35, 2; *C.G.*, I, 48-49; *XII Metaph.*, lect. 11, nn. 2614-16; *De causis*, lects. 10, 13 (P. 21:736b seq.; 741a); *Comp. Theol.*, I, cc. 132-35.

tionate to that which is known through it. But the divine essence is not proportionate to a creature since it infinitely surpasses it, and there is no proportion between the infinite and the finite. Therefore, by knowing His own essence, God cannot know a creature.

5. The Philosopher proves that God knows only Himself. Now, only means “not with something else.” Therefore, He does not know things other than Himself.

6. If God knows things other than Himself, since He knows Himself, He knows either Himself and other things also under the same formal aspect or Himself under one formal aspect and other things under another. If He knows both under the same formal aspect, then, since He knows Himself through His own essence, it follows that He knows other things through their essence. But this is impossible. However, if He knows one under one formal aspect and the other under another, then, since the knowledge of the knower is specified by the formal aspect under which the thing is known, there would be multiplicity and diversity in the divine cognition; but this is repugnant to the divine simplicity. Therefore, God does not know a creature in any way whatsoever.

7. A creature is farther removed from God than the person of the Father is from the nature of the Godhead. But God does not know that He is God in the same act that He knows that He is the Father, for, when it is said that He knows He is the Father, the notion of Father is included, which is not included in the statement, “He knows that He is God.” Much more is it true, then, that, if God knows a creature, He will know Himself under a different formality than that under which He will know the creature. This, however, would be absurd, as is proved above in the sixth difficulty.

8. The principles of being and of knowing are the same. But, as Augustine says, the Father is not the Father by the same principle that He is God. Therefore, the Father does not know that He is the Father by the same principle that He knows He is God, and much more so the Father does not know Himself and a creature by the same principle—if He does know any creatures.

9. Knowledge is an assimilation of the knower to the thing known. But the least possible likeness exists between God and a creature. Therefore, God has the least possible knowledge, or none at all, of creatures.

10. Whatever God knows He beholds. But, as Augustine says: “God does not behold anything outside Himself.” Therefore, He does not know anything outside Himself.

11. A creature is compared to God as a point to a line. Hence, Trismegistus says— “God is an intelligible sphere, whose center is every, where, and

whose circumference is nowhere,” and by its center, as Alanus explains, he means a creature. Now, a line loses none of its quantity if a point is taken from it. Hence, the divine perfection loses none of its perfection if knowledge of a creature is taken from it. But whatever is in God pertains to His perfection, since nothing is in Him as an accident. Consequently, He does not have any knowledge of creatures.

12. Whatever God knows He knows from eternity, since His knowledge does not vary. Now, whatever He knows is a being, for knowledge is only of being. Hence, whatever He knows existed from eternity. But no creature existed from eternity. Consequently, He knows no creature.

13. Whatever is perfected by something else has a passive potency in regard to that thing, because perfection is, as it were, a form of that which is perfected. But God does not have any passive potency in Himself, for this is a principle of change, which is far removed from God. Therefore, God is not perfected by anything other than Himself. Now, the perfection of a knower depends on the object of his knowledge, for his perfection consists in his actual knowing; and this is only something that can be known. Therefore, God does not know anything other than Himself.

14. As is said in the *Metaphysics*, “The mover is prior by nature to what is moved. But, as is said in the same place, just as the object of sense moves the sense, so the object of the intellect moves the intellect. Therefore, if God were to know something other than Himself, it would follow that something were prior to Him. But this is absurd.

15. Whatever is known causes some delight in the knower. Hence, it is said in the *Metaphysics*: “All men naturally desire knowledge. An indication of this is the delight of the senses...”—as some books have this passage. If, therefore, God knew something other than Himself, that something would be a cause of delight in Him. But this is absurd.

16. Nothing is known except through the nature of being. But a creature possesses more non-existence than existence, as is evident from Ambrose and from the sayings of many saints. Hence, a creature is more known than known to God.

17. Nothing is apprehended unless it has the character of truth, just as nothing is desired unless it has the character of goodness. But in Scripture visible creatures are compared to lies, as is evident in Sirach (34:2): “The man that giveth heed to lying visions is like to him that catcheth at a shadow and followeth after the wind.” Therefore, creatures are more unknown than known.

18. However, it was noted that a creature is said to be a non-being only in comparison with God.—On the contrary, a creature is known by God only in

so far as it is compared with Him. Therefore, if a creature, as compared with God, is a lie and a non-being, then it is unknowable and cannot be known by God in any way whatsoever.

19. Nothing is in the intellect that was not previously in sense. But in God there is no sensitive cognition, because this is material. Therefore, He does not know created things, since they were not previously in His sense.

20. Things are known most thoroughly by a knowledge of their causes, especially of those that are the cause of the thing's act of existence. But of the four causes, the efficient and final are the causes of a thing's becoming. Form and matter, however, are causes of a thing's existence because they enter into the thing's constitution. God, however, is only the efficient and final cause of things; hence, what He knows about creatures is very little.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. The Epistle to the Hebrews (4:13) says: "All things are naked and open to his eyes..."

2. When one of two related things is known, the other is known. For a principle and that which arises from the principle are said to be related. Therefore, since God is the principle of things through His essence, by knowing His essence He knows creatures.

3. God is omnipotent. For the same reasons, He should be said to be omniscient. Hence, He knows not only delightful but also useful things.

4. Anaxagoras affirmed the existence of an intellect that was unmixed so that it could know all things; and for this he is praised by the Philosopher. But the divine intellect is unmixed and pure in the highest possible degree. Therefore, God knows all things in the highest possible degree, not only Himself but things other than Himself.

5. The more simple a substance is, the more it can comprehend a number of forms. Now, God is the most simple substance there is. Hence, He can comprehend the forms of all things, and consequently He knows all things, not merely Himself.

6. A cause always contains the perfection of its effect in a higher degree. But God is the cause of knowing for all who know; for He is the "light, which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world" (John 1:9). Therefore, He knows creatures in the highest possible degree.

7. Augustine proves that nothing is loved unless it is known. But God "loveth all things that are" (Wisdom 11:25). Hence, He knows all things.

8. The Psalmist asks rhetorically: "He that formed the eye, doth he not consider?" (Psalms 93:9), implying the answer "Yes." Consequently, God

Himself, who has made all things, considers and knows all things.

9. The following is also found in the Psalms (32:15): “He who hath made the hearts of every one of them: who understandeth all their works.” Now, the person referred to is God, the maker of hearts. Therefore, He knows the works of men, and thus things other than Himself.

10. The same conclusion must be drawn from what is said elsewhere in the Psalms (135:5): “Who made the heavens in understanding”; for, as the Psalmist says, He knew the heavens which He created.

11. When a cause, especially a formal cause, is known, the effect is known. Now, God is the formal exemplary cause of creatures. Therefore, since He knows Himself, He also knows creatures.

REPLY

Undoubtedly, it must be granted that God knows not only Himself but also all other things. This can be proved in the following manner. Whatever naturally tends toward another must have this tendency from someone directing it toward its end; otherwise, it would tend toward it merely by chance. Now, in the things of nature we find a natural appetite by which each and every thing tends toward its end. Hence, we must affirm the existence of some intellect above natural things, which has ordained natural things to their end and implanted in them a natural appetite or inclination. But a thing cannot be ordained to any end unless the thing itself is known, together with the end to which it is ordained. Hence, there must be a knowledge of natural things in the divine intellect from which the origin and the order of nature come. The Psalmist suggests this proof when he says: “He that formed the eye, doth he not consider?” (Psalms 93:9); for, as Rabbi Moses points out, it is as if the Psalmist had said: “Does He not consider the nature of the eye—who has made it to be proportioned to its end, which is its act of seeing?” But now we must further consider the manner by which He knows creatures.

It should be understood, therefore, that, since every agent acts to the extent that it is in act, that which is effected by the agent must in some way exist in the agent. This is the reason why every agent causes something similar to itself. Now, whatever is in another is in it according to the manner of the recipient. Hence, if the active principle is material, the effect is in it somehow materially, because it is, as it were, in a material power. If the active principle is immaterial, however, its effect will also be in it immaterially.

Now, as we have said earlier, a thing is known by another in so far as it is received immaterially by that other. Consequently, active material principles do not know their effects, because these latter do not exist in them in a manner

in which they could be known; but in immaterial active principles the effects are present in a manner in which they are knowable, since they are there immaterially. Therefore, every immaterial active principle knows its own effect. This is why it is said in *The Causes*: "An intelligence knows what is below it in so far as it is its cause." Therefore, since God is the immaterial active principle of things, it follows that in Him there is knowledge of things.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The known is a perfection of the knower, not by its substance (for the thing is outside the knower), but rather by the likeness by which it is known; for a perfection exists in the perfected—and the likeness of the stone, not the stone, exists in the soul. Now, the likeness of the thing known exists in the intellect in two ways: sometimes as something other than the knower himself, at other times as the very essence of the knower. For example, our intellect, by knowing itself, knows other intellects in so far as it is itself a likeness of other intellects; but the likeness of a stone in the intellect is not the very essence of intellect; in fact, this likeness is received somewhat as a form is received in matter. Now, this form, which is other than the intellect, is sometimes the cause of the thing whose likeness it is. We have an evident example of this in the practical intellect, whose form is the cause of the thing done. But sometimes this form is the effect of the thing, as is clearly the case with our speculative intellect when it receives its knowledge from things.

Therefore, whenever an intellect knows a thing through a likeness which is not the essence of the knower, then the intellect is perfected by something other than itself; but if that likeness should happen to be the cause of the thing, in that case the intellect will be perfected only by the likeness, and not at all by the thing whose likeness it is. For example, a house is not the perfection of the artistic conception, but rather the contrary. On the other hand, if the likeness is caused by the thing, then the perfection of the intellect will be, as it were, the thing in an active sense, but its likeness in a formal sense. However, when the likeness of the thing known is the very essence of the knower, the intellect is not perfected by something other than itself except, perhaps, actively, as would be the case if its essence were produced by another. But because the knowledge of the divine intellect is not caused by things and neither the likeness by which it knows the thing nor its own essence is caused by another, it by no means follows from the fact that God knows things other than Himself that His intellect is perfected by something else.

2. God does not know other things only inasmuch as they exist in Him, if *inasmuch as* refers to His knowledge from the point of view of the thing

known, because, in regard to things, He knows not only the act of being which they have inasmuch as they are one with Him, but also the act of being which they have outside of Him, and by which they are distinguished from Him. However, if *inasmuch as* specifies His knowledge from the point of view of the knower, then it is true that God knows things only inasmuch as they are in Him; for He knows them from their likeness, which is identical in reality with Himself.

3. The manner in which God knows creatures is by their existence within Himself. An effect existing in any efficient cause whatsoever is not other than that cause if there is question of a thing which is a cause in itself. For example, a house existing in the conception of the artist is not other than that conception itself; for an effect is in an active principle simply inasmuch as the active principle produces an effect similar to itself, and this active principle is the very thing by which the artist acts. Consequently, if some active principle acts only through its form, its effect is in it in so far as it has that form, and its effect will not exist in the principle as something distinct from its form. Similarly, since God acts through His essence, His effect is not in Him as something distinct from His essence; but it is entirely one with it. Therefore, His knowledge of an effect is not distinct from His own essence.

Nevertheless, from the fact that He knows His effect by knowing His own essence, it does not follow that there is any discursive reasoning in His intellect; for an intellect is said to reason from one thing to another only if it apprehends each by distinct apprehensions. Thus, the human intellect apprehends a cause and an effect by distinct acts; and since it knows an effect through its cause, it is said to reason from the cause to the effect. When, however, the knowing power is directed by the same act to the medium by which it knows and to the thing known, then there is no discursive process in knowing. For example, when sight knows a stone by means of the species of stone in this sense, or when it knows by means of a mirror a thing reflected in the mirror, it is not said to reason discursively; for to be directed to the likeness of a thing is the same as to be directed to the thing which is known through this likeness. It is in this manner that God knows His effects through His essence—just as a thing is known through its likeness. Therefore, with one cognition He knows Himself and other things. Dionysius agrees when he speaks as follows: “God does not have a proper knowledge of Himself and another general knowledge that comprehends all existing things.” Consequently, there is no discourse in God’s intellect.

4. A thing is said to be proportionate to another in two ways. In one way, a proportion is noted between the two things. For example, we say that

four is proportioned to two since its proportion to two is double. In the second way, they are proportioned as by a proportionality. For example, we say that six and eight are proportionate because, just as six is the double of three, so eight is the double of four; for proportionality is a similarity of proportions. Now, since in every proportion a relation is noted between those things that are said to be proportioned because of some definite excess of one over the other, it is impossible for any infinite to be proportionate to a finite by way of proportion. When, however, things are said to be proportionate by way of proportionality, their relation to each other is not considered. All that is considered is the similarity of the relation of two things to two other things. Thus, nothing prevents an infinite from being proportionate to an infinite; for, just as a particular finite is equal to a certain finite, so an infinite is equal to another infinite. In this way, there should be a medium that is proportionate to that which is known by the medium. Consequently, just as the medium is related to the act of demonstrating, so that which is known through the medium is related to the act of being demonstrated. Thus, nothing prevents the divine essence from being the medium by which a creature is known.

5. A thing is understood intellectually in two ways. First, it is understood in itself, as happens when the regard of the beholder is shaped directly by the thing itself, which is understood or known. Second, a thing is seen in something else; and, when this latter is known, it itself is known. God, therefore, knows only Himself in Himself; but He does not know other things in themselves except by knowing His own essence. This is what the Philosopher meant when he said that God knows only Himself; and the following statement of Dionysius is quite in agreement: "God knows things that come to be, not by a knowledge of such things, but by His knowledge of Himself."

6. If the formal aspect under which knowledge occurs is considered here from the point of view of the knower, then God knows Himself and other things under the same formal aspect; for the knower, the act of knowing, and the medium of knowing are all the same. But, if we consider the formal aspect from the point of view of the thing known, then He does not know Himself and other things under the same formal aspect; for the relation of Himself and of other things to the medium by which He knows is not the same; for He is the same as that medium by His essence, while other things are "the same" as the medium merely because of their resemblance to it. Therefore, He knows Himself through His essence, but other things through a likeness. However, that which is His essence and that which is the likeness of other things is the same reality.

7. If we consider the knower, it is entirely true that God knows that He

is God and that He is the Father by the same act of knowing. But He does not know both by the same act of knowing if we consider that which is known; for He knows that He is God by the Godhead, and that He is the Father by His paternity. This latter, according to our manner of understanding, is not the same as the Godhead, although they are one in reality.

8. If we consider only the thing known, that which is the principle of its existence is also the principle of its being known, because a thing is knowable by means of its principles. But if we consider the knower, then that by which a thing is known is a likeness of the thing or of its principles. This likeness is not a principle of the existence of the thing, except in practical knowledge.

9. There are two ways of considering the mutual likeness between two things. First, we can consider them inasmuch as they agree in a common nature. Such a likeness between the knower and the known is not required; indeed, we sometimes see that the smaller the likeness, the sharper the cognition. For example, there is less resemblance between the intellectual likeness of a stone and the stone than there is between the sense likeness and the stone, for the intellectual likeness is farther removed from matter; yet the intellect knows more profoundly than sense.

Secondly, the likeness between two things can be considered from the point of view of representation. Such a likeness of the knower to the thing known is necessary. Therefore, although there is the least possible likeness between a creature and God in regard to agreement in nature, there is, on the other hand, the greatest possible likeness between them inasmuch as the divine essence most clearly represents the creature. Consequently, the divine intellect knows a thing most perfectly.

10. The statement that God beholds nothing outside Himself should be taken as referring to that *in which* God beholds, not to that which He beholds; for that in which He beholds all things is Himself.

11. Although a line loses none of its quantity if an actual point is taken from it, if we take from a line its essential property of terminating in a point, the very substance of the line perishes. The same principle is also true of God; for, while nothing will be detracted from God if a creature of His is supposed as not existing, His perfection will be destroyed if His power of producing a creature is taken from Him. For He knows things, not only inasmuch as they actually exist, but also inasmuch as they are within His power.

12. Although knowledge has only being for its object, it is not necessary that what is known should be a real being at the time in which it is known; for, just as we know things that are distant in place, we also know things distant in time, as is evident from our knowledge of things past. Hence, it is not incon-

sistent to affirm a knowledge of God that is about things that are not eternal.

13. The word *perfection*, if taken strictly, cannot be used of God, for nothing is perfected unless it is made. *Perfection*, however, is used more negatively of God than positively. Hence, He is said to be perfect because nothing at all is lacking to Him, not because there is something in Him which was in potency to perfection and is perfected by something else which is its act. Consequently, there is no passive potency in God.

14. What is understood or sensed moves the sense or intellect only if the sense knowledge or intellectual knowledge is received from things. Divine cognition is not of this kind; hence, the argument does not follow.

15. According to the Philosopher, the delight of the intellect arises from its agreeable operation. Hence, he says: "God delights in one simple operation." Therefore, the object of the intellect is the cause of intellectual delight in so far as it is the cause of an intellectual operation; and it is this in so far as it produces its likeness in the intellect, so that by it the activity of the intellect may be informed. Hence, it is clear that the thing which is understood causes delight in the intellect only when the intellect's knowledge is received from things. This is not true of the divine intellect.

16. The term to *be*, taken simply and absolutely, is understood only of the divine existence. This is also true of the good; and for this reason it is said in Luke (18:19): "None is good but God alone." Hence, the more closely a creature approaches God, the more it possesses of the act of existence; the further it is from Him, the more it possesses of non-existence. But, since a creature approaches God only in so far as it participates in a finite act of existence, yet its distance from God is always infinite, it is said to have more non-existence than existence. However, since the act of existing which it has is from God, it is known by God.

17. In line with the preceding answer, a visible creature possesses truth only in so far as it approaches the first truth. As Avicenna says, it possesses falsity in so far as it falls short of it.

18. A thing is compared to God in two ways: first, according to a common measurement, and then a creature, when compared with God, is found to be almost nothing at all; second, according to its dependence upon God, from whom it receives its act of existing. In this latter way, it is compared with God only with respect to its act of existing, and in this way, also, it can be known by God.

19. That axiom is to be understood as applying only to our intellect, which receives its knowledge from things. For a thing is led by gradual steps from its own material conditions to the immateriality of the intellect through

the mediation of the immateriality of sense. Consequently, whatever is in our intellect must have previously been in the senses. This, however, does not take place in the divine intellect.

20. It is true, as Avicenna says, that a natural agent is a cause only of becoming. This is evident from the fact that, when such a cause ceases to exist, a thing does not cease to be, but merely ceases to become. But since the divine agent imparts the act of existence to things, He is the cause of their existence, although He does not enter into their constitution. Yet He has a certain resemblance to the essential principles which enter into the constitution of a thing, and for this reason He knows not only the becoming of a thing, but also its act of existing and its essential principles.

ARTICLE 4

*Does God have proper and determinate knowledge of things?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that He does not, for

1. As Boethius says, the object of cognition is “universal as long as it is understood, singular as long as it is sensed.” Now, since there is no sensitive knowledge in God, but only intellectual knowledge, God has only universal knowledge of things.

2. If God knows creatures, He knows them either by many or by one species. If He knows them by many, His knowledge as it is in the knower will be multiplied, because that by which one knows is in the knower. If He knows creatures by one species, and it is impossible to have proper and distinct knowledge of many things by means of one species, it would seem that God does not have proper knowledge of things.

3. God is the cause of things in so far as He imparts the act of existing to them—just as fire is the cause of warm things from the fact that it pours heat into them. Now, if fire could know itself, by knowing its own heat, it would know other things only in so far as they are warm. Consequently, by knowing His own essence, God knows other things only inasmuch as they are beings. That, however, is not proper knowledge of things, but a most universal knowledge of things. Therefore, God does not have proper knowledge of things.

4. Proper knowledge of a thing can be had only through a species which comprises nothing more or nothing less than is in the thing itself. For, just

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 14, 6; *I Sent.*, 3 5, 3; *C.G.*, I, 50; *De pot.*, 6, 1, c.; *De causis*, lectio 10 (P. 21:737a); *Comp. Theol.*, I, cc. 132–35.

as the color green would be imperfectly known by means of a species that fell short of it,—for example, the species of black—so also would green be imperfectly known by a species that went beyond it—for example, the species of white. For in white, the nature of color is found to exist most perfectly; therefore, whiteness, as is said in the *Metaphysics*, is the measure of all colors. Now, in the measure in which God surpasses a creature, in that measure the creature falls short of God. Therefore, since the divine essence can in no way be known properly and completely by means of a creature, neither can a creature be known properly by means of the divine essence. God, however, knows creatures only through His essence. Therefore, He does not have proper knowledge of them.

5. Any medium that causes proper knowledge of a thing can be used as the middle term of a demonstration whose conclusion will be that thing. The divine essence, however, does not stand in such a relation to a creature; otherwise, creatures would exist whenever the divine essence existed. Consequently, by knowing creatures through His essence, God does not have proper knowledge of things.

6. If God knows a creature, He knows it either in its own nature or in an idea. If He knows it in its own nature, then the proper nature of a creature is the means by which God knows a creature. But the medium of knowing is a perfection of the knower; hence, the-nature of a creature would be a perfection of the divine intellect. This, of course, is absurd. On the other hand, if God knows a creature in an idea, since the idea is more removed from a thing than are the essentials or accidentals of the thing, God's knowledge of a thing will be less than that knowledge which is had through its essentials or accidentals. But all proper knowledge of a thing is had through its essential constituents or accidents, because, as is said in *The Soul*: "Even accidents contribute in a great part to our knowledge of what a things. Consequently, God does not have proper knowledge of things.

7. Proper knowledge of any particular thing cannot be had through a universal medium. For example, we cannot have proper knowledge of man by means of "animal." But the divine essence is the most universal medium possible, since it is the universal medium for knowing all things. Therefore, God cannot have proper knowledge of creatures by means of His essence.

8. The type of knowledge is determined by its medium of knowing. Therefore, proper knowledge can be had only through a proper medium. The divine essence, however, cannot be the proper medium of knowing a particular creature, because, if it were proper to that one, it would not be the medium of knowing anything else; for what belongs to this creature and to that is com-

mon to both and not proper to either. Therefore, God does not have proper knowledge of creatures by knowing through His own essence.

9. Dionysius says that God knows “material things immaterially and many things as united,” or, in other words, distinct things indistinctly. Now, since this is the kind of knowledge by which God knows things, He has merely indistinct knowledge of things, and therefore He does not properly know this or that.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. No one can distinguish between things if he does not have proper knowledge of them. But God has that kind of knowledge of creatures which distinguishes between them; for He knows that this creature is not that creature. Otherwise, He could not give each creature according to its own capacity or reward each person according to his merits by passing a just judgment upon men’s actions. Therefore, God has proper knowledge of things.

2. Nothing imperfect should be attributed to God. But that kind of knowledge by which something is known in merely a general way and not in particular is imperfect knowledge, for it lacks something. Therefore, divine knowledge of things is not merely general but also particular.

3. God, who is most happy, would be most stupid if it were true that He does not know what we know about things. The Philosopher regards such a position as inconsistent.

REPLY

From the fact that God ordains a thing to its end one can prove that God has proper knowledge of things; for a thing can be ordained to its proper end only through knowledge of its proper nature, according to which it has a determinate relation to that end. How this is possible we must consider as follows.

By knowing a cause, we know the effect only inasmuch as the effect follows from the cause. Therefore, if there is some universal cause whose action is not determined to any effect except through the intermediate action of some particular cause, from the knowledge of such a common cause we will not have proper knowledge of the effect but merely a general knowledge of it. For example, the action of the sun is determined to the production of this plant through the intermediate action of a germinating force which is either in the ground or in the seed. Consequently, if the sun could know itself, it would not have a proper knowledge of this plant but only a general knowledge, unless it also knew the proper causes of the plant. Therefore, in order to have proper

and perfect knowledge of any effect, the knower must have assembled in himself complete knowledge of the proper and common causes. This is also what the Philosopher says: "We are said to know a thing when we know its first causes and its first principles down to its elements," that is, down to its proximate causes, as the Commentator explains.

Now, we say that something is known to God inasmuch as He is its cause through His essence. In this way a thing is in Him and can be known by Him. Therefore, since He is the cause of all proper and common causes, through His essence He knows all proper and common causes; for there is in a thing, determining its common nature, nothing of which God is not the cause. Consequently, the reason for His knowledge of the common nature of things is the very same as the reason for His knowledge of the proper nature and proper causes of each individual thing. Dionysius gives the same explanation when he writes: "If according to one cause God gives being to all existing things, then He knows all things according to that same cause"—and further on: "For the cause of all, knowing itself, would be idle somewhere if it did not know those things that are from it and whose cause it is." *Idle* here means to fall short of causing something that is found in a thing; and it would follow that God would be idle in this sense were He ignorant of any of the realities that exist in a thing.

Thus, it is clear from what has been said that all the examples induced to show that God knows all things in Himself are faulty—like that of the point, which, if it could know itself, would (according to the example) know lines, and that of light, which, by knowing itself, would know colors. For not everything in a line can be reduced to a point as to its cause, nor can everything in color be reduced to light. Consequently, if a point knew itself, it would know the line only in a general way; and light would know color similarly. This is not the case with divine knowledge, as is clear from what has been said in the preceding article.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. That statement of Boethius should be understood as referring to our intellect, not to the divine intellect, which can know singulars, as will be explained later." However, even though our intellect does not know singulars, it has proper knowledge of things by knowing them according to their distinctive specific characters. Consequently, even if the divine intellect did not know singulars, it could nevertheless have proper knowledge of things.

2. God knows all things by one principle, for that principle has the intelligible character of many. This principle is His essence, which is the likeness

of all things; and since His essence is the proper intelligible character of each and every thing, He has proper knowledge of all things. How one thing can be both the proper and the common intelligible character of many things may be explained as follows.

The divine essence is the intelligible character of a thing inasmuch as that thing imitates the divine essence. No created thing, however, fully imitates the divine essence. For, if so, there would be only one such imitation, and the divine essence considered in that way would be the proper intelligible character of only one being, just as there is only one image of the Father which perfectly imitates Him, and that is the Son. However, since a created thing imperfectly imitates the divine essence, it happens that different things imitate it in different ways; yet every one of them has been produced according to a likeness of the divine essence. Thus, whatever is proper to each finds in the divine essence that which it imitates. In this respect, the divine essence is the likeness of a thing, even in regard to what is proper to it. Similarly, it is the proper intelligible character of that thing, and, for the same reason, the proper character of another thing, and also of all other things. Therefore, it is the common character of all things in so far as it is the one thing which all things imitate; but it is the proper character of this or that thing inasmuch as things imitate it in different ways. In this way the divine essence causes proper knowledge of each and every thing, for it is the proper intelligible character of all.

3. Fire is not the cause of warm things with respect to everything found in them, as is the case with the divine essence, as we have pointed out.* Hence, there is no parallel.

4. Whiteness surpasses green with respect to one of the two things that belong to the nature of color, namely, light, which is, as it were, the formal element in the composition of color. In this respect, whiteness is the measure of all colors. But there is something else in colors which is, as it were, their material element, namely, the determination of the transparent medium. In this respect, whiteness is not the measure of colors; and thus it is clear that everything contained in the other colors does not exist in the species of whiteness. Consequently, proper knowledge of any of the other colors cannot be had through the species of whiteness. This is not the case with the divine essence. Moreover, in the divine essence, other things exist as in their cause; but other colors do not exist in whiteness as in their cause. Hence, there is no parallel.

5. Demonstration is a type of argumentation accomplished by a discursive process of the intellect. The divine intellect, which is not discursive, does not know its effects through its essence as if by demonstration, even though it has more certain knowledge of things by means of its essence than one who

demonstrates has by means of his demonstration. Besides, if anyone could comprehend God's essence, through it he would know the nature of each individual thing with greater certainty than a conclusion is known by means of demonstration. Nevertheless, it does not follow from the fact that God's essence is eternal that His effects are eternal; for His effects are not in His essence in such a way that they should always exist in themselves but merely that they should exist at *some time*, whenever the divine wisdom has determined.

6. God knows things in their proper nature if that restriction refers to His knowledge from the point of view of the thing known. However, if we are speaking of His knowledge on the part of the knower, then God knows things in an idea, that is, through an idea which is the likeness of all things existing in reality, both accidental and essential, although the idea itself is neither an accident nor the-essence of the thing. In the same manner, our intellectual likeness of a thing is neither essential nor accidental to the thing itself, but it nevertheless is a likeness of the thing's essence or accident.

7. The divine essence is a universal medium as though it were a universal cause. The relation of a universal cause to the production of knowledge is quite different from that of a universal form. For in a universal form the effect is, as it were, in material potency, somewhat as differences are in a genus after the analogy of forms in matter, as Porphyry says. However, effects are in a cause in an active potency, just as a house exists in the mind of the architect in active potency. Now, since everything is known in so far as it is in act, and not in so far as it is in potency, the fact that the differences specifying a genus are in it potentially does not suffice for proper knowledge of a species through the generic form. But since what is proper to a thing exists in some active cause, it is sufficient to know that thing through that cause. Consequently, a house is not known by means of its wood and stones as it is known by means of the form of it which is in the architect. Since the proper conditions of each and every thing, are in God as in its active cause, even though His essence is a universal medium, it can give proper knowledge of all things.

8. The divine essence is both a common and a proper medium, but not in the same respect, as has been said.

9. When it is said that "God knows distinct things indistinctly," the statement is true if *indistinctly* qualifies the knowing from the point of view of the knower; for with one cognition God knows all things. This is how Dionysius understands the statement. On the other hand, if it qualifies the knowing in regard to what is known, the statement is false; for God knows the distinction of one thing from another, and also that by which one thing is distinguished from another. Therefore, He has proper knowledge of each and

every thing.

ARTICLE 5

*Does God know singular things?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that He does not, for

1. Our intellect does not know singulars because it is separated from matter. But the divine intellect is much more separated from matter than ours. Hence, it does not know singulars.

2. It was noted, however, that our intellect does not know singulars, not only because it is separated from matter, but also because it abstracts its knowledge from things.—On the contrary, our intellect cannot receive anything from things without the mediation of sense or imagination. Consequently, sense and imagination receive from singular things before our intellect does, yet singulars are known through sense and imagination. Hence, the fact that the intellect receives from things is no reason why it should not know singulars.

3. It was said, however, that from things the intellect receives a form that is entirely purified; but this is not the case with sense and imagination.—On the contrary, it is not by reason of the purifying of the form considered as a starting point that our intellect does not know singulars. Indeed, from this point of view the intellect ought to know singulars all the more, for the assimilative character of intellection comes from the fact that it has received something from reality. It remains, therefore, that what prevents knowledge of singulars is the purifying of the form considered as an end-result, which is the purity that the form has in the intellect. Now, that purity of the form is had only because of the freedom of the intellect from matter; and that is the only reason why our intellect does not know singulars, namely, because it is separated from matter. Thus, our point that God does not know singulars is proved.

4. If God knows some singulars, He should know all; for the argument for one is the same as the argument for all. But He does not know all singulars. Therefore, He knows none. The proof of the minor premise is as follows: “Many things,” as Augustine says, meaning despicable things, “it is better not to know than to know.” But many singulars are worthless. Since everything

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 19, 2; *S.T.*, I, 14, 11; 89, 4; *I Sent.*, 36, 1, 1; *II Sent.*, 3, 3, 3; *C.G.*, I, cc. 50, 63, 65; *Q.D. de anima*, aa. 5, 20; *Comp. Theol.*, I, cc. 132-35; *Perih.*, lect. 14, n. 16 seq.; *De subst. sep.*, cc. 11-12 (*Perr.* 1:nn. 68-76).

which is better should always be attributed to God, it seems that He does not know all singulars.

5. All knowledge takes place through an assimilation of the knower with what is known. But there is no assimilation between singulars and God, for singulars are changeable and material, and have many other qualities of this sort, whose complete contraries are in God. Therefore, God does not know singulars.

6. Whatever God knows, He knows perfectly. But perfect knowledge is not had of a thing unless it is known in the same way as it exists. Now, since God does not know a singular in the same way as it exists, for a singular is material, and God knows immaterially, it seems that God cannot know the singular perfectly, and consequently does not know it at all.

7. But it was said that while perfect knowledge demands that the knower know the thing just as it is, this refers only to what is known, not to the operation of the knower.—On the contrary, knowledge arises from the application of the thing known to the knower. Therefore, the mode of what is known and the mode of the knower should be the same. Thus, the distinction given seems to be invalid.

8. According to the Philosopher, if one wishes to find something, he must previously have some knowledge of it. What he has through some common form is not sufficient, unless that form is contracted by something. For example, one could not well look for a slave he has lost unless he had previously had some knowledge of the slave, otherwise he would not recognize him even when he found him; nor would it be enough to know that the slave was a man, because this would not mark him off from others. He must, instead, have some knowledge particularized by the points that are proper to the slave. Consequently, if God is to know any singular, the common form by which He knows, His essence, must be contracted by something. But since there is nothing in Him by which it can be contracted, it seems that He does not know singulars.

9. It was said, however, that that species through which God knows is common in such a way that it nevertheless is proper to each and every thing.—On the contrary, *proper* and common are opposed to each other. Therefore, it is impossible that the same reality be both a proper and a common form.

10. The operation of sight is not determined to any one colored thing because of light, which is the medium of sight; it is determined rather by the object, the colored thing itself. But in God's knowledge, His essence is the medium by which He knows things; for His essence is, as it were, a medium of knowledge, and, as Dionysius says, like a light by which all things are known.

Consequently, His knowledge is in no way determined to any singular; thus, He does not know singulars.

11. Since knowledge is a quality, it is a form whose variations change the subject. But knowledge is changed as its objects are changed; for example, if I know that you are sitting, I lose that knowledge when you get up. Hence, the knower is changed when what he knows changes. But God cannot be changed in any way whatsoever. Therefore, He cannot know singulars, which are subject to change.

12. No one can know a singular unless he knows that by which a singular is constituted. But that which makes a singular to be such is matter. God, however, does not know matter. Hence, He does not know singulars. The proof of the minor is as follows: There are, as Boethius and the Commentator say, certain things which are difficult for us to know because of a defect in us—for example, the very things which are most knowable in themselves, immaterial substances. On the other hand, there are other things which are not known because of some defect in them—for example, those that have very little existence, such as motion, time, vacuums, and the like. Now, first matter has a very limited act of existence. Hence, God does not know matter since it is of itself unknowable.

13. But it was said that although matter cannot be known by our intellect, it can be known by the divine intellect.—On the contrary, our intellect knows a thing by means of a likeness received from the thing, but the divine intellect knows it by means of a likeness that is the cause of the thing. Now, a greater conformity is needed between a thing and a likeness which causes that thing than is needed between [that thing and] some other likeness. Therefore, since the deficiency of matter is the reason why our intellects cannot get a likeness sufficient for the knowledge of matter, much more will it be the reason why the divine intellect cannot get a likeness sufficient for the knowledge of matter.

14. According to Algazel, God knows Himself because the three things required for knowledge are found in Him: an intelligent substance separated from matter, an intelligible thing separated from matter, and the union of both. From this it follows that nothing is known unless it is separated from matter. Now, a singular as such cannot be separated from matter. Hence, it cannot be understood.

15. Knowledge is an intermediary between the knower and the object; and the more knowledge moves away from the knower, the more imperfect it is. Now, whenever knowledge is directed to something outside the knower, it rushes out, as it were, to something external. But, since divine knowledge

is most perfect, it does not seem that it should be about singulars, which are outside of God.

16. The act of knowledge essentially depends upon the knowing power, but just as essentially upon the thing known. But it is out of place to say that an act of divine knowledge, which is God's essence, essentially depends on something outside of itself. Hence, it is inadmissible to say that He knows singulars, which are outside of Him.

17. Whatever is known is known according to the manner in which it is in the knower, as Boethius says. But things exist in God immaterially and, hence, without the concretion of matter and material conditions. Therefore, He does not know those things which depend upon matter, such as singulars.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. We read in the first Epistle to the Corinthians (13:12): "But then I shall know even as I am known." Now, the Apostle who was speaking was a singular. Therefore, singulars are known by God.

2. As is clear from what was said earlier," things are known by God in so far as He is their cause. But since He is the cause of singulars, He must know them.

3. It is impossible to know the nature of an instrument without knowing the purpose for which the instrument is ordained. Now, senses are certain powers ordained as instruments to knowledge of singular things. If God did not know singulars, He would also be ignorant of the nature of the senses, and, as a consequence, of the nature of the human intellect, whose object is the forms in the imagination. This, however, is absurd.

4. God's wisdom is equal to His power. Therefore, whatever falls under His power falls under His knowledge. Now, His power extends itself to the production of singulars. Consequently, His knowledge extends itself to a knowledge of the same.

5. As was said above, God's knowledge of things is proper and distinct. But this could not be true if He did not know the factors which distinguish one thing from another. He knows, therefore, the singular conditions of each and every thing, by which one thing is distinguished from another; consequently, He knows singulars in their singularity.

REPLY

There have been many errors in connection with this problem. Some, as the Commentator mentions, have simply denied that God knows singulars, except, perhaps, in general. These persons wish to confine the nature of the di-

vine intellect within the limits of our own. But this error can be destroyed by the reasoning used by the Philosopher against Empedocles; for if—as would follow from what Empedocles had said—God were ignorant of that which others knew, God would be most stupid, although He Himself is most happy and, for this reason, most wise. The same thing would be true if it were asserted that God did not know the singulars which all of us know.

Therefore, others, such as Avicenna and his followers, have said that God knows every singular, but universally, as it were, in knowing all the universal causes from which a singular is produced. An astronomer, for example, knowing all the motions of the heavens and the distances between the celestial bodies, would know every eclipse that will occur even for the next hundred years, yet he would not know any one eclipse as a distinct singular so as to have evidential knowledge that it actually exists or not—which a country bumpkin has when he sees an eclipse. It is in this manner, they say, that God knows singulars: He does not, as it were, see them in their singular nature but through knowledge of universal causes. But neither can this opinion stand; for from universal causes there follow only universal forms, unless something intervenes through which these forms are individuated. But from a number of universal forms gathered together—no matter how great this number may be—no singular can be constituted, because the collection of these forms can still be understood to be in many. Therefore, if one were to know an eclipse by means of universal causes in the manner described above, he would know, not a singular, but only a universal. For a universal cause has as proportionate to it a universal effect, and a particular cause, a particular effect. Hence, there would still remain the inadmissible consequence mentioned earlier, that God should be ignorant of singulars.

Therefore, we must simply admit that God knows all singulars, not only in their universal causes, but also each in its proper and singular nature. As proof of this, note that the divine knowledge which God has of things can be compared to the knowledge of an artist, since He is the cause of all things as art is the cause of all works of art. Now, an artist knows a product of his art by means of the form which he has in himself and upon which he models his product. However, he produces his work only with respect to its form—nature has prepared the matter for the works of art. Accordingly, by means of his art, an artist knows his works only under the aspect of the form. Now, every form is of itself universal; and, consequently, by means of his art, a builder knows, indeed, house in general, but not this house or that house, unless he acquires other knowledge of it through his senses. But if the artistic form produced matter as it produces form, then by its means the artist would know his work

both under the aspect of its form and under that of its matter. Consequently, since matter is the principle of individuation, he would know it not only in its universal nature but also inasmuch as it is a definite singular. Therefore, since divine art produces not only the form but also the matter, it contains not only the likeness of form but also that of matter. Consequently, God knows things in regard to both their matter and their form; and, therefore, He knows not only universals but also singulars.

But a difficulty still remains. Since everything that is in something is in it according to the manner of that in which it is, and thus the likeness of a thing can be in God only immaterially, how is it that our intellect, because it receives the forms of things in an immaterial way, does not know singulars, yet God knows them?

The reason for this will be clear if we consider the difference between the relation to the thing had by its likeness in our intellect and that had by its likeness in the divine intellect. For the likeness in our intellect is received from a thing in so far as the thing acts upon our intellect by previously acting upon our senses. Now, matter, because of the feebleness of its existence (for it is being only potentially), cannot be a principle of action; hence, a thing which acts upon our soul acts only through its form; consequently, the likeness of a thing which is impressed upon our sense and purified by several stages until it reaches the intellect is a likeness only of the form.

On the other hand, the likeness of things in the divine intellect is one which causes things; for, whether a thing has a vigorous or a feeble share in the act of being, it has this from God alone; and because each thing participates in an act of existence given by God, the likeness of each is found in Him. Consequently, the immaterial likeness in God is a likeness, not only of the form, but also of the matter. Now, in order that a thing be known, its likeness must be in the knower, though it need not be in him in the same manner as it is in reality. Hence, our intellect does not know singulars, because the knowledge of these depends upon matter, and the likeness of matter is not in our intellect. It is not because a likeness of the singular is in our intellect in an immaterial way. The divine intellect, however, can know singulars, since it possesses a likeness of matter, although in an immaterial way.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

I. Besides being separated from matter, our intellect receives its knowledge from things. Consequently, because it does not receive forms materially and, because matter can have no likeness, our intellect does not know singulars. The case is otherwise with the divine intellect, as has been said.

2. Sense and imagination are powers attached to bodily organs. Consequently, likenesses of things are received in them in a material manner, that is, with material conditions, although without matter. For this reason, they know singulars. The case is otherwise with the intellect. Hence, the argument does not follow.

3. Because of the terminus of the purifying process, it happens that the form is received immaterially; but this alone does not explain why the singular is not known. It is rather because of the very beginning of this process that the likeness of matter is not received into the intellect, but only that of the form. Hence, the argument does not follow.

4. All knowledge, taken in itself, belongs to the class of good things; but it may happen accidentally that the knowledge of certain despicable things is bad, either because it is the occasion of some base action (and for this reason certain knowledge is forbidden) or because some individual might be kept from better things because of certain knowledge; consequently, what is good in itself may harm certain people. This, however, cannot happen to God.

5. For knowledge a likeness of conformity in nature is not required, but only a representative likeness. For example, we are reminded of a certain man merely by a golden statue of him. This argument, however, proceeds on the assumption that knowledge requires a likeness consisting in conformity in nature.

6. The perfection of knowledge consists in knowing the thing to be as it is, not in having the same mode of existence as the thing known in the knower—as we have said repeatedly above.

7. That application of the known to the knower, which causes knowledge, should not be understood by way of identity but rather by way of representation. Therefore, it is not necessary that the mode of the knower and of what is known be the same.

8. That argument would hold if the likeness by which God knows were common in such a way that it could not be proper to each individual thing. That the contrary is true we have shown earlier.

9. The same thing in the same aspect cannot be both common and proper. But how the divine essence, through which God knows all things, is a common likeness of all, yet a proper likeness of each, has been explained above.

10. There are two mediums for physical sight. First, there is the medium *under which* it knows. This is light, which does not determine sight to any particular object. Second, there is the medium *by which* it knows, namely, the likeness of the thing known. By this medium, sight is determined to a special

object. In divine knowledge, however, the divine essence takes the place of both. Hence, it can cause proper knowledge of individual things.

11. Divine knowledge is in no way changed by a change in the objects of its knowledge. Our knowledge varies when the objects change because it knows with separate conceptions things present, past, and future. Consequently, when Socrates is not sitting, the cognition had of him when he was sitting becomes false. God, however, sees things as present, past, or future in a single intuition. Therefore, no matter how a thing may change, the truth in His intellect remains the same.

12. Those things which possess a defective act of existence fall short of knowability for our intellect for the very reason that they fall short, of the ability to act. But this does not affect the divine intellect, which, as we have said, does not receive its knowledge from things.

13. In the divine intellect, which is the cause of matter, there can exist a likeness of matter which, as it were, leaves its impression upon, the matter. In our intellect, however, a likeness cannot exist that is capable of making us know matter. This is clear from what has been said.

14. Although a singular as such cannot be separated from matter, it can be known by means of a likeness separated from matter, namely, the likeness of matter itself. Consequently, even if it be separated from matter physically, it is not separated from matter representatively.

15. An act of divine knowledge is not something other than God's essence, for in God intellect and intellectual operation are one and the same, because His action is His essence. His knowledge, therefore, cannot be said to pass outside of Him simply because He knows something other than Himself. Moreover, no action of a cognitive power can be said to pass outside in the way in which acts of physical powers do, which go from the agent into the patient. For knowledge does not mean something flowing from the knower to a thing known, as happens in physical actions. It means, rather, the existence of the thing known in the knower.

16. An act of divine knowledge has no dependence upon the thing known; for the relation implied in divine knowledge does not involve dependence of the knowledge upon the things known, but, rather, the dependence of the thing known upon the knowledge. The opposite is true of us, for the relation implied by the word *knowledge* when used of us is one that indicates a dependence of our knowledge upon its object. Moreover, the relation of an act of knowledge to its object is not the same as its relation to the power of knowing; for it is supported in its act of existence by the knowing power, not by its object, because the act is in the power but not in the object.

17. A thing is known because it is represented in the knower, not because it exists in him; for the likeness existing in a knowing power is a principle by which a thing is known, not under the aspect of the act of being it has in the knowing power, but under the aspect of the relation it has to the thing known. Consequently, a thing is not known according to the mode of existence which the likeness of the thing has in the knower, but rather according to the manner in which the likeness existing in the intellect represents the thing. Therefore, although the likeness in the divine intellect has an immaterial act of existence, nevertheless, since it is a likeness of matter, it is also a principle of knowing material things and, therefore, singulars.

ARTICLE 6

*Does the human intellect know singulars?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it does, for

1. The human intellect knows by abstracting the form from matter. Now, the abstraction of a form from matter does not destroy its particularity, for mathematics, which abstracts from matter, considers particular lines. Consequently, the fact that our intellect is immaterial does not prevent it from knowing singulars.

2. Singulars are not distinct according to their participation in a common nature, for the fact that many men participate in the species of man makes them one man. Therefore, if our intellect knows only universals, it does not know one singular as distinct from another. Consequently, our intellect would not direct us to those objects of operations in regard to which we are guided by choice; for choice presupposes the distinction of one thing from another.

3. But it was said that our intellect knows singulars inasmuch as it applies the universal form to some particulars.—On the contrary, our intellect cannot apply one thing to another unless it already knows each. Consequently, knowledge of the singular precedes the application of the universal to the singular. Therefore, the above-mentioned application cannot be the reason why our intellect knows the singular.

4. According to Boethius, whatever a lower power can do a higher power can do. Now, as he says in the same place, the intellect is superior to imagi-

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 86, 1; *II Sent.*, 3, 3, 3, ad 1; *IV Sent.*, 50, 1, 3; *C.G.*, I, 65; *III De anima*, lect. 8, n. 710 seq.; *Q.D. De anima*, aa. 5, 20; *Quodl.*, VII, 1, 3; *Quodl.*, XII, 8, 11; *De prin. individ.* (Perr. I:nn. 1-4).

nation and the imagination is superior to sense. Therefore, since sense knows the singular, our intellect should also know it.

TO THE CONTRARY

Boethius says: "What is sensed is singular, what is understood is universal."

REPLY

All action is determined by the condition of the form of the agent, the principle of action, just as the process of heating is measured by the amount of heat. Now, the likeness of the thing known, by which the knowing power is informed, is the principle of actual knowledge, just as heat is of heating. Hence, all cognition is necessarily determined by the limitations of the form in the knower. Consequently, since the likeness of a thing existing in our intellect is received as separated from matter and all the conditions of matter, which are the principles of individuation, it follows that our intellect, of itself, does not know singulars but only universals. For every form as such is universal, unless it happens to be a subsistent form, which, from the very fact of its being subsistent, is incommunicable.

It happens, however, that our intellect knows the singular indirectly. For, as the Philosopher says, phantasms are related to our intellect as sensible objects are related to sense and as colors outside the soul are related to sight. Therefore, just as the species in the sense is abstracted from things themselves and by its means the cognition of the sense is extended to the sensible things themselves, so also our intellect abstracts the species from the phantasms, and, by means of this species, its cognition is extended, in a certain sense, to the phantasms.

There is, however, this difference: The likeness in sense is abstracted from the thing as from an object of knowledge, and, consequently, the thing itself is directly known by means of this likeness. The likeness in the intellect, however, is not abstracted from the phantasm as from an object of knowledge but as from a medium of knowledge after the manner in which our sense receives the likeness of a thing which is in a mirror; it is directed to it not as to a thing but rather as to a likeness of a thing. Consequently, from the species which it receives, our intellect is not applied directly to knowing the phantasm but rather the thing whose phantasm is presented. Nevertheless, by a certain reflection our intellect also returns to a knowledge of the phantasm itself when it considers the nature of its act, the nature of the species by which it knows, and, finally, the nature of that from which it has abstracted the species, name-

ly, the phantasm. It is like the case of sight, which is brought through a likeness received from a mirror directly to a knowledge of the thing reflected, but by a sort of reflection to the image itself in the mirror. Therefore, inasmuch as our intellect, through the likeness which it receives from the phantasm, turns back upon the phantasm from which it abstracts the species, the phantasm being a particular likeness, our intellect gets some kind of knowledge of the singular because of its dynamic union with the imagination.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. There are two kinds of matter from which abstraction is made: intelligible matter and sensible matter—as is clear from the *Metaphysics*. I call that matter *intelligible* which is considered in the nature of a continuum, and *sensible*, that which is physical matter. Each, however, can be taken in two ways: as designated and as not designated. I call matter *designated* if it is considered together with the determination of its dimensions, that is, with these or those dimensions. I call it *not designated*, however, if it is considered without the determination of its dimensions. In this connection, it must be noted that designated matter is the principle of individuation, from which every intellect abstracts inasmuch as it is said to abstract from the here and now. The intellect of the natural Philosopher, however, does not abstract from non-designated sensible matter; for it considers man, flesh, and bone, in whose definitions non-designated sensible matter is included. The intellect of the mathematician, however, abstracts entirely from sensible matter, though not from non-designated intelligible matter. Hence, it is clear that abstraction, which is common to all intellects, makes a form universal.

2. According to the Philosopher, in us the intellect is not the only motive principle. The imagination is also such, and, by its means, the universal knowledge of the intellect is applied to some particular thing to be done. For this reason, the intellect is, as it were, a remote mover, but particular reason and the imagination are proximate movers.

3. Man has prior knowledge of singulars through imagination and sense. Consequently, he can apply his universal intellectual knowledge to a particular; for, properly speaking, it is neither the intellect nor the sense that knows, but man that knows through both—as is clear from *The Soul*.

4. What a lower power can do a higher power can do; not in the same, but in a more noble, way. Consequently, the intellect knows the same thing that sense knows, but in a more noble, because a more immaterial, way. Hence, it does not follow that the intellect knows the singular if the senses know it.

ARTICLE 7

*Does God know the singulars now existing or not existing?**

This inquiry is occasioned by the position of Avicenna mentioned above. We wish to inquire whether God knows propositions, especially about singulars.

DIFFICULTIES:

It seems that He does not, for

1. The divine intellect always remains in the same state; but a singular, inasmuch as now it exists and now it does not exist, has different states. Consequently, the divine intellect does not know whether or not a singular now exists.

2. Those powers of the soul which are indifferent to a thing's presence or absence—as, for example, the imagination—do not know whether or not a thing exists; this is known only by those powers, such as sense, which do not know absent things as though they were present. Now, the divine intellect is disposed in the same way to things present or absent. Consequently, it does not know whether things exist now or not; it knows merely their natures.

3. According to the Philosopher, the composition signified when a thing is said to be or not to be is not in things but only in the intellect. Now, there can be no composition in the divine intellect. Therefore, God does not know whether or not a thing exists.

4. In the Gospel according to St. John (1:3-4) we read: "What was made, in Him was life. Now, in his explanation of this passage, Augustine says that created things are in God in the way in which a trunk is in the mind of the one who makes it. By means of the mental likeness of the trunk, however, a carpenter does not know whether the trunk exists or not. Consequently, neither does God know whether or not a singular now exists.

5. The more noble knowledge is, the more it resembles God's knowledge. But the knowledge of an intellect comprehending the definitions of things is more noble than sense knowledge; for, when the intellect defines, it penetrates to the interior of a thing, but sense deals with externals. When the intellect defines, however, it does not know whether a thing exists or not, but simply the nature of the thing. Sense, however, does have such knowledge. It seems, therefore, that that type of knowledge by which only the nature of a thing is known, but not whether a thing exists or not, should be attributed to God.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 14, 14; *I Sent.*, 38, 3; 41, 5; *C.G.*, I, cc. 58-59.

6. God knows each and every thing by means of the idea He has of it. Now, that idea is indifferent to the existence or the non—existence of the thing. Otherwise, God could not know the future by means of it. God, therefore, does not know whether or not a thing exists.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. The more perfect knowledge is, the more conditions it grasps in its object. Now, divine knowledge is most perfect; consequently, it knows a thing according to all its conditions. Therefore, God knows whether or not a thing exists.

2. As we have said above,⁵ God has a proper and distinct knowledge of things. Now, He would not know things distinctly unless He could distinguish an existing thing from one which does not exist. Therefore, He knows if a thing does or does not exist.

REPLY

The relation of the universal essence of any species to the essential properties of that species is the same as that of a singular essence to all the proper accidents of that singular, that is, all the accidents found in the singular; for, in so far as they are individuated by the singular, they are made proper to it. Now, by knowing the essence of a species, the intellect comprehends all the essential properties of that species; for, as the Philosopher says, the definition is the principle of any demonstration that concludes to the proper accidents of a subject. Therefore, once the proper essence of any singular were known, all the accidents of that singular would also be known. Our intellect, however, cannot know the essence of a singular, because it abstracts from designated matter, which pertains to the essence of a singular and would be placed in its definition if the singular had one. The divine intellect, however, can comprehend not only the universal essence of a species, but, since it can apprehend matter, it can also comprehend the singular essence of each and every thing. Therefore, it knows all accidents, those common to the entire species or genus, as well as those proper to each individual. Among these latter is time, in which every concrete reality is found and according to which a thing is said to exist now or not. Consequently, God knows whether or not each and every thing exists; and He knows all other propositions that can be formed about universals or individuals.

In this respect, however, the divine intellect differs from ours. In order to know a subject and an accident and to know different accidents, our intellect forms separate concepts, and, consequently, passes from knowledge of a

substance to knowledge of one of its accident. Again,— in order to know the inherence of one of its accidents, it joins one species with the other, and, in a certain manner, unites them. In this way, the intellect forms propositions in itself. But by one reality, namely, its own essence, the divine intellect knows all substances and all accidents. Consequently, it neither passes from substance to accident nor joins one with the other; but instead of the joining of species which takes place in our intellect, there is, in the divine intellect, complete unity; because of this, God, without complexity, knows what is complex, just as He knows many things simply and with unity, and material things immaterially.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. By means of one and the same reality, the divine intellect knows all the conditions in a thing that are subject to change; so, while remaining in one and the same state, it knows all the states of things, no matter how they change.

2. The likeness in the imagination is a likeness merely of the thing; it is not a likeness by which one can know the time in which a thing exists. This limitation is not found in the divine intellect, so the cases are not parallel.

3. In place of the composition found in our intellect, there is, instead, a unity in the divine intellect. This composition, however, is a kind of imitation of unity, and for this reason it is said to be a union. Thus, it is clear that God knows enunciable truths by not composing more truly than an intellect that does compose and divide.

4. The trunk in the mind of its maker is not a likeness of everything which can belong to it. Consequently, a craftsman's knowledge and God's are not similar.

5. He who knows a definition knows potentially the truths demonstrable by the definition. But in the divine intellect, *actually to be* does not differ from *to be able to be*. Consequently, from the fact that it knows the essences of things, it immediately comprehends all the accidents that follow upon them.

6. That idea in the divine mind is related to a thing in the same way, no matter what its condition is, for it is a likeness of the thing according to all its states. Consequently, through it the divine mind knows that thing in any condition whatever.

ARTICLE 8

*Does God know non-beings and things which are not, have not been, and will not be?**

DIFFICULTIES:

It seems that He does not have such knowledge, for

1. Dionysius says that cognition is had only of existing things. But that which neither is nor will be nor has been does not exist in any way. Hence, God cannot have knowledge of such a thing.

2. All cognition takes place through an assimilation of the knower to the thing known. But the divine intellect cannot be assimilated to a non-being. Hence, it cannot know a non-being.

3. God's knowledge of things is through ideas. But there is no idea of a non-being. Hence, God does not know a non-being.

4. Whatever God knows is in His Word. But, as Anselm says: "There is no word for that which neither is, was, nor will be." Hence, God does not know non-beings.

5. God knows only the true. But the true and being are interchangeable. Hence, God does not know things that do not exist.

TO THE CONTRARY

According to the Epistle to the Romans (4:17): "He calls things that are not as though they were." But God would not call non-beings beings unless He knew them. Therefore, He knows non-beings.

REPLY

God's knowledge of created things may be compared to that which an artist has of his artistic products and which is their cause. Hence, the relation of God's knowledge to things known is the opposite of the relation of our knowledge to them. Our knowledge is received from things, and, by its nature, comes after them. But the Creator's knowledge of creatures, and the artist's of his products, by its very nature, precedes the things known. Now, when what is antecedent is removed, what is subsequent is likewise removed; but the opposite is not true. Hence, our knowledge of natural things cannot be had unless these things previously exist; but the actual existence or non-existence of a thing is a matter of indifference to the intellect of God or that of an artist.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 14, 9; *I Sent.*, 38, 4; *III Sent.*, 14, 2, sol. 2.; *C.G.*, I, 66.

We must remark, however, that an artist has two kinds of knowledge about something that can be made: speculative and practical. He has speculative or theoretical knowledge when he knows the intimate nature of a work but does not have the intention of applying the principles to the production of the work. His knowledge is practical, properly speaking, when by his intention he ordains the principles of the work to operation as an end. In this way, as Avicenna says, medicine is divided into theoretical and practical.

It is clear that the practical knowledge of an artist follows his speculative knowledge, since it is made practical by applying the speculative to a work. But when the practical is absent, the speculative remains. Evidently, then, an artist can have knowledge of some work which he sometimes sets about making and sometimes does not, as when he thinks up the form of some piece of handicraft which he does not intend to make. Moreover, the artist does not always regard this work which he does not take steps to make as something within his power; for sometimes he visualizes a type of device entirely beyond his power of making. He regards it rather in the light of his own purposes, that is, he sees that he could attain such and such an end by means of such and such a device. For, as the Philosopher says, in the order of things to be done, ends are as principles are in the order of things to be studied; hence, as conclusions are known in their principles, products of art are known in the light of their purposes.

It is clear, therefore, that God can know some non-beings. Of some He has, as it were, practical knowledge—that is, of those which are, have been, or will be; and these come forth from His knowledge as He decides. Of those which neither have been, are, nor will be—which He has decreed never to make—He has a kind of speculative knowledge. And although one can say that He sees these things as within His power, since there is nothing He cannot do, it is more appropriate to say that He sees them in His goodness, the end of all that is made by Him; for He sees that there are many other ways of communicating His goodness, besides those He has already communicated to existing things, having existence, past, present, or future, because all created things cannot equal His goodness, no matter how much they seem to participate in it.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Things which neither have been, are, nor will be, exist in some way in God's power as in an active principle, or in His goodness as in a final cause.
2. Knowledge received from things known consists in a passive assimilation by which the knower is assimilated to objects of knowledge previously existing. But knowledge which is the cause of things known consists in an ac-

tive assimilation by which the knower assimilates the thing known to himself. Since God can assimilate to Himself that which has not yet been assimilated to Him, He can also have knowledge of non-being.

3. If, according to common usage, *idea* is taken as meaning the form of practical knowledge, then there is an idea only of those things which have been, are, or will be. If it be taken as also meaning the form of speculative knowledge, then there can also be an idea of other things—those things which neither are, have been, nor will be.

4. The Word designates the operative power of the Father by which all His operations take place. Hence, the Word is extended only to those things to which the divine operation is extended. Consequently, we read in the Psalms (32:9): “He spoke and they were made.” For, although the Word knows other beings, it is not the word of other beings.

5. Things which neither have been, are, nor will be possess truth in so far as they possess existence, namely, in so far as they are in their active principle or final cause. As such, they are also known by God.

ARTICLE 9

*Does God know infinities?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that He does not, for

1. Augustine says: “Whatever is known is made finite by the comprehension of the knower.” But the infinite cannot be made finite. Therefore, the infinite is unknown to God.

2. But it was said that God knows infinite things by His knowledge of simple intelligence, not by His knowledge of vision.—On the contrary, all perfect knowledge comprehends and consequently limits that which it knows. But God’s knowledge of simple intelligence is as perfect as His knowledge of vision; so, just as He does not know infinities by His knowledge of vision, neither does He know them by His knowledge of simple intelligence.

3. Whatever God knows He knows through His intellect. But intellectual cognition is called vision. Therefore, whatever He knows He knows by His knowledge of vision. But through His knowledge of vision He does not know infinities. Hence, He does not know infinities in any manner.

4. The natures of all the things known by God are in God, and are in

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 20, 4, ad 1; *S.T.*, I, 14, 12; III, 10, 3; *I Sent.*, 39, 1, 1; *C.G.*, I, 69; *Quodl.*, III, 2, 3; *Comp. Theol.*, I, c. 133.

Him actually. If, therefore, infinities were known by God, infinite natures would be in Him actually; but this is impossible.

5. Whatever God knows He knows perfectly. But nothing is known perfectly unless the knowledge of the knower penetrates to the heart of the thing. Therefore, whatever God knows, in some sense He pass through. But an infinite cannot in any way be passed through either by a finite or by an infinite being. Therefore, God does not know infinities in any way whatsoever.

6. Whoever sees something limits that thing by the very fact that he can see it. But whatever God knows He sees. Therefore, what is infinite cannot be known by Him.

7. If God knows infinite things, then His knowledge is infinite. But this cannot be, for whatever is infinite is imperfect, as is proved in the *Physics*. Consequently, God does not know infinite things.

8. Whatever is repugnant to the definition of an infinite can by no means be attributed to an infinite. But to be known is repugnant to the definition of an infinite; for "it is characteristic of an infinite," as is said in the *Physics*, "that whatever quantity one takes from it, there always remains more to be taken." However, that which is known must be taken or received by the knower; and a thing is not known fully if something of it remains beyond the knower. Consequently, it is clearly repugnant to the definition of an infinite that it be fully known by someone. Therefore, since whatever God knows He knows fully, He does not know infinite things.

9. God's knowledge is the measure of the thing He knows. But there cannot be any measure for an infinite. Hence, an infinite does not come within His knowledge.

10. Measuring is simply ascertaining the quantity of what is measured. Therefore, if God knew an infinite, and thus knew its quantity, He would measure it. But this is impossible, because an infinite, by its very nature, is immeasurable. Hence, God does not know an infinite.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. As Augustine says: "Although there is no number for an infinite number, yet an infinite is not incomprehensible to Him whose knowledge has no number."

2. Since God makes nothing that is unknown to Him, He can know whatever He can make. But, since He can make infinite things, He can know them.

3. In order to understand something, immateriality is required in the one who understands, in the thing understood, and in the conjunction of the

two. But, since the divine intellect is infinitely more immaterial than any created intellect, it is infinitely more capable of understanding. Now, a created intellect can know what is potentially infinite. Therefore, the divine intellect can know what is actually infinite.

4. God knows whatever is, will be, or has been. But, if the duration world were infinite, then generation would never end, and there would be an infinite number of singular things. This, moreover, would be possible for God. Therefore, it is not impossible for Him to know infinities.

5. As the Commentator says, "All proportions and forms which are potentially in first matter exist actually in the first mover." Augustine agrees when he says that there are seminal principles of things in first matter, but that the causal principles are in God. Now, in first matter there are, potentially, an infinite number of forms, because its passive potency is infinite. Therefore, in God, the first mover, there are actual infinities. But God knows whatever is in Him actually. Hence, God knows infinities.

6. In arguing against the Academics, who denied that anything was true, Augustine shows that there is not merely a multitude of true things but even an infinite multitude of them, resulting from a kind intellectual reduplication or from the reduplication of a sentence. For example, if I tell the truth, it is true that I tell the truth, and it is true that I say that I tell the truth, and so on to infinity. But God knows all true things. Hence, He knows infinities.

7. Whatever is in God is God. Therefore, God's knowledge is God Himself. But God is infinite, because He cannot be comprehended. Therefore, His knowledge is infinite, and He has knowledge of infinities.

REPLY

As Augustine says, some, wishing to conceive of the divine intellect in terms of our own intellects, have said that God cannot know infinities, just as we cannot know them; and since they asserted both that God knows singulars and that the world is eternal, it followed that there would be a cycle of numerically the same things in different ages—an opinion which is utterly absurd.

It must accordingly be said that God knows infinities, as can be shown from the reasons given above. For, since He knows not only things which have been, are, or will be, but also all those which could participate in His goodness—and the number of these is infinite since His goodness is infinite—it follows that He knows infinities. How this takes place must now be considered.

Note, therefore, that cognition extends itself to many or to few things according to the force of the means of knowing. For example, a likeness received in the sense of sight has the same determinations as the particular conditions

of the thing. Hence, it leads us to the knowledge of only one thing. But a likeness received in the intellect is freed from particular conditions; and since it is more elevated, it leads us to the knowledge of a number of things. Indeed, because one universal form, by its very nature, is such that it can be participated in by an infinite number of singulars, the intellect can in some way be said to know infinities. However, since that intellectual likeness does not lead to knowledge of a singular according to its distinctive features but only under the aspect of a common nature, our intellect, through the species which it has within it, knows infinities only potentially. But the medium by which God knows, namely, His own essence, is a likeness of the infinities capable of imitating that essence. It is a likeness not only of that which is common to them, but also of those features by which they are distinguished from one another, as is clear from what was said earlier. Hence, the divine cognition has the power to know infinities.

The manner in which God knows actual infinities must now be considered. There is no reason why something cannot be infinite in one respect and finite in another. For example, a body can be infinite in length but finite in width. The same can be true of forms. For example, let us suppose some infinite body that is white. The extensive quantity of the whiteness (in so far as whiteness can be said to have quantity accidentally) will be infinite; but its intensive or essential quantity will nevertheless be finite. The same is true of any other form of an infinite body; for every form received in matter is limited according to the nature of the recipient and so does not have infinite intensity. It is possible neither to know nor to traverse an infinite. Both are repugnant to the idea of infinite. Nevertheless, if something were to be moved across an infinite, not in the direction of its infinity, it could be traversed. For example, what is infinite in length but finite in width could be traversed across its width but not along its length. Similarly, if an infinite were known in the respect in which it is infinite, it could by no means be known perfectly; but, if it were known in a respect which is not that of the infinite, it could be perfectly known. For, since "the character of infinity fits quantity," as the Philosopher says, and quantity of its very nature has an order of parts, an infinite would be known by way of its infinity if it were known part by part.

If our intellect had to know a white body in this manner, it would never be able to know either it or its whiteness perfectly. If, however, it knew the nature of whiteness or of corporeity which is found in an infinite body, then it would know the infinite perfectly with respect to all its parts— not, however, according to its infinity. Thus it is possible for our intellect in some manner to know an infinite continuum perfectly; but it cannot know an infinite number

of things taken one by one, since it cannot know many things by means of one species. Hence, if our intellect has to consider a number of things, it has to know them one after another. Consequently, it knows discontinuous quantity only through continuous quantity. Therefore, if it were to know a multitude that is actually infinite, our intellect would be knowing an infinite according to its infinity, but that is impossible.

The divine intellect, however, knows all things through one species. Hence, simultaneously and with one intuition, God has knowledge of all things. Consequently, He does not know a multitude according to the order of its parts, and He can know an infinite multitude, but not according to its infinity; for, if He were to know it according to its infinity so that He would be grasping part after part of the multitude, He would never come to its end and never know it perfectly. I simply concede, therefore, that God actually knows infinities absolutely. These infinities, however, are not equal to His intellect in the way in which He Himself as known equals His intellect; for the essences of created infinities are, as it were, intensively finite as whiteness is in an infinite body. God's essence, however, is infinite in all respects; and because of this all infinities are finite to Him and can be comprehended by Him.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. A thing is said to be made finite by a knower in the sense that it is known to such an extent that it does not exceed the intellect of the knower; in other words, some part of it does not remain outside the knower's intellect. In this way, the thing known stands as something finite to the intellect. There is no reason why this cannot happen to an infinite which is known in a way other than according to its infinity.

2. Knowledge of simple intelligence and that of vision imply no difference on the part of the knower but only on the part of the things known. Knowledge of vision is said to be in God because of its resemblance to bodily sight which looks upon things outside of itself. Hence, God is said to know by His knowledge of vision only those things that are outside of Him, whether they are present, past, or future. But, as was proved above, God knows by His knowledge of simple intelligence things that neither are, will be, nor ever have been. There is no other way by which God knows these and those things.

Hence, the fact that God does not see infinities is not due to His knowledge of vision but rather to the non-existence of the things that would be the objects of His knowledge of vision. For if it were held that these were infinite, either actually or successively, no doubt God would know them by His knowledge of vision.

3. Properly speaking, sight is a bodily sense. Hence, if the word *vision* is transferred to immaterial cognition, its use will be merely metaphorical. In metaphors, however, there is a different basis of truth according to the different points of likeness found in things. Hence, nothing prevents our sometimes calling all divine knowledge vision and at other times reserving the name to that which is about things present, past, and future.

4. By His essence God Himself is a likeness of all things and a proper likeness of each one of them. Hence, there cannot be said to be many intelligible characters of things in God except in regard to His various relations to various creatures. These relations, however, are merely rational relations. Moreover, as Avicenna says, there is no reason why rational relations cannot be multiplied to infinity.

5. *Passing through* implies a motion from one thing to another. Since God knows all the parts of an infinite, continuous or discontinuous, not by a progression of His thought, but in one simple intuition, He therefore knows an infinite perfectly. He does not, however, pass through an infinite in understanding it.

6. See the reply to the first difficulty.

7. This argument is based on what is infinite in a privative sense—a type of infinity peculiar to quantity. Whatever is spoken of privatively is imperfect. The argument does not touch what is infinite in the negative sense in which God is said to be infinite. It is more perfect for a thing not to be limited at all.

8. The argument proves that an infinite cannot be known according to its infinity; for whatever part of its infinity you take, no matter how big it is, something further will always remain to be taken. God, however, does not know an infinite by passing from part to part.

9. That which is infinite in quantity has a finite act of existence, as has been said. Accordingly, God's knowledge can be the measure of an infinite.

10. The nature of measuring consists in this, that from it certainty results about the determinate quantity of a thing. God, however, does not know an infinite in such a way that He knows its determinate quantity, for an infinite does not have determinate quantity. Hence, it is not repugnant to the nature of an infinite that God should know it.

ARTICLE 10
*Can God make infinities?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that He can, for

1. Natures existing in the divine mind are productive of things, and one does not impede another by its action. Since there are infinite natures in the divine mind, infinite effects could follow from them—were the divine power to carry them into execution.

2. The power of the Creator infinitely surpasses that of a creature. But a creature can produce infinities successively. Therefore, God can produce infinities simultaneously.

3. A power is useless if it is not put into act; it is especially useless if it cannot be put into act. But God's power extends to infinities. Hence, such a power would be useless if He could not actually make infinities.

DIFFICULTIES TO THE CONTRARY

1. Seneca's opinion is to the contrary: "An idea is an exemplar of things coming into being naturally." But, since there cannot be infinite things naturally, it would seem that they cannot come to be; for what cannot be cannot come to be. Therefore, there will be no idea of infinities in God. But God cannot make anything except through an idea. Therefore, He cannot make infinities.

2. When God is said to create a thing, nothing new on the part of the Creator is affirmed but only on the part of the creature. Hence, it seems the same to say that God creates things as to say that things come forth into being from God. For the same reason, therefore, to say that God can create things is to say that things are able to come forth from God into being. But infinite things cannot come to be, for no creature has the capacity for infinite act. Hence, even God cannot make actual infinities.

REPLY

The infinite can be distinguished in two ways. In one way, it is distinguished by means of potency and act. A potential infinite is that which consists in an endless succession. For example, we find potential infinity in generation, in time, and in the division of a continuum; for, when one member

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 25, 2, ad 2; *I Sent.*, 43, 1, 3; *C.G.*, I, 43; *De pot.*, I, 2; *VIII Phys.*, lect. 23, n. 9; *III Phys.*, lect. 8, n. 9; *XII Metaph.*, lect. 8, nn. 2549-5; *Comp. Theol.*, I, c. 19.

is given, another always follows. An example of an actual infinite, however, would be a line which we would assume to have no termini.

In the second way, an essential infinite is distinguished from an accidental infinite. This distinction is explained as follows: "The character of the infinite," as mentioned above, "belongs to quantity." Now, quantity is predicated first of all of discrete quantity rather than of continuous quantity. Hence, in order to see what is infinite essentially and what is infinite accidentally, we must consider that a multitude is sometimes required essentially and sometimes merely accidentally. Essentially a multitude is required in ordered causes and effects where one has an essential dependence upon another. For example, the soul sets in motion the natural heat by which nerves and muscles are moved, which, in turn, move the hands, which move a stick by which a stone is moved. In this series, each of the later members essentially depends upon every one that precedes. But an accidental multitude is found when all the members of the multitude are posited, as it were, in place of one; and their mutual relation is such that it is a matter of indifference whether they be one or many, or more or fewer. For example, if a builder makes a house in whose construction he wears out many saws successively, a multitude of saws is required for the erection of the house only accidentally, that is, because one saw cannot last forever. It does not matter to the house how many saws are used; hence, one saw does not have that dependence upon another which we find when a multitude is required essentially.

There are many different opinions about the infinite. Some ancient philosophers posited actual infinities, both essential and accidental, thinking that an infinite would necessarily be a result of what they posited as a beginning. For this reason, they also posited an infinite process of causes. The Philosopher refutes this position, however.

Others, following Aristotle, conceded that an essential infinite cannot be found either in act or in potency, because it is impossible for a thing to depend essentially upon an infinite number of things; for, if this were true, then its own act of existence would never be formally constituted. But they posited an accidental infinite, both in potency and in act. Algazel holds: "There are an infinite number of human souls separated from bodies"—something which he thought followed from his view that the world is eternal. He saw no difficulty since they have no mutual dependence, and so in their multiplicity they constituted merely an accidental infinity.

Others asserted that there cannot be an actual infinite, either essential or accidental. They admitted a potential infinite, which, as is taught in the *Physics*, consists in succession; and this is the position of the Commentator. But for

either of two reasons it can happen that an actual infinite cannot exist: either because to be in act is contradictory to the infinite by the very fact that it is infinite; or because of some extrinsic reason—as being lifted up is repugnant to a lead triangle, not because it is a triangle, but because it is lead.

But if an actual infinite is not contradictory to the infinite as such and can exist, as I hold, or if it cannot exist merely because of some impediment extrinsic to the notion of an infinite, then I say that God can make an actual infinite. If, however, actual existence is repugnant to the very notion of an infinite, then God cannot make one, just as, for example, He cannot make a man be an irrational animal. This would mean that two contradictories would coincide in one act of existence. However, whether or not it is intrinsically repugnant for an actual infinite to exist must be discussed elsewhere, since this question arose only incidentally. Answers, however, must be given to the difficulties on both sides.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Natures in the divine mind are not reproduced in a creature the way in which they are in God, but in the way which the nature of a creature allows. Hence, although they themselves are immaterial, from them are brought forth things with a material act of existence. If, therefore, as the Philosopher says, it is of the essence of an infinite to exist, not actually and simultaneously, but merely successively, then the infinite natures in the divine mind cannot all be produced in creatures simultaneously but only successively. So, it does not follow that there are actual infinities.

2. The power of a creature is said to be wanting in two ways. First, it can be wanting because of a lack of strength. In this respect, it is correct to argue that what a creature cannot do God can do. Second, it can be wanting because that which is said to be impossible for a creature to do contains in itself some intrinsic repugnance. In this respect, it is possible neither for a creature nor for God-as, for instance, that contradictories should exist simultaneously, and that an *infinite actually exist* falls into this class, if to exist actually is repugnant to the nature of an infinite.

3. As is said in the *Physics*, a being is useless if it does not attain the end for which it exists. Hence, a power is not said to be had in vain simply because it is not put into act, but only because its effect or the very act, being distinct from the power itself, is the end for which the power exists. However, no effect of the divine power is its end, nor is its act distinct from it. Hence, the argument does not follow.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

1. Although the members of infinities may not naturally be able to exist simultaneously, they may, however, come into being. For the essence of an infinite does not consist in simultaneous existence; but it is like things which are in a state of becoming, such as a day or a contest, as is said in the *Physics*. Nor does it follow that God is able to make only things which come into being naturally. It is true that according to the meaning given previously an idea was taken as applying to practical knowledge, which is an idea for this reason that it is determined by the divine will to an act. However, by His will God is able to make many things other than those which He has determined to exist now, in the past, or in the future.

2. Although in creation there is nothing new except in reference to the creature, the word *creation* implies not only this newness but also something on the part of God; for it signifies a divine action, which is His essence, and connotes an effect in a creature, which is the reception of being from God. So, it does not follow that it is the same to say that God can create something as to say that something can be created by Him. Otherwise, before there was a creature, nothing could be created unless the potency of a creature first existed. This would be positing eternal matter. Therefore, although the potency of a creature does not extend to the existence of actual infinities, this does not exclude ability on the part of God to make actual infinities.

ARTICLE 11

*Is knowledge predicated of God and men purely equivocally?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is, for

1. Wherever there exists a common ground for univocal or analogical statement, there exists a certain likeness. But there can be no likeness between a creature and God. Therefore, there cannot be anything common to both either univocally or analogically. Consequently, if knowledge is predicated of God and of us, it will be merely an equivocal predication. Proof of the minor: In Isaiah (40:18) we read: "To whom then have you likened God?"—as if to say: "He can resemble no one."

2. Wherever a likeness exists, some comparison is possible. But no comparison between God and creature is possible, since a creature is finite and

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 13, 5; 14, 1; *I Sent.*, prol., a. 2, ad 2; I, 2, 3; 19, 59 2, ad i; 35t i, aa. 1, 4; *C.G.*, I, cc- 32-34, 44; *XII Metaph.*, lect. 8, n. 2541 seq.; *De div. nom.*, I, lect. 3 (P. 15:271a); *De pot.*, 7, 7; *Comp. Theol.*, I, cc. 27-28.

God is infinite. Therefore, no likeness can exist between them, and the original difficulty stands.

3. Whenever a comparison is possible, there must be some form possessed to a greater and a lesser degree or equally by several things. But this cannot be said of God and a creature, for then something would be more simple than God. Therefore, no comparison between God and a creature is possible, nor is any likeness or community possible apart from that of equivocation.

4. There is a greater distance between things which bear no resemblance than between those which do resemble each other. But there is an infinite distance between God and a creature; indeed, no greater distance is possible. Therefore, there is no likeness between them; thus, the original difficulty returns.

5. A greater distance lies between a creature and God than lies between a created being and non-being; for a created being surpasses non-being only by reason of the amount of its entity, which is not infinite. But, as is said in the *Metaphysics*: "There is nothing common to being and non-being except by equivocation, which happens, for example, when that which we call man is called non-man by others." Hence, there cannot be anything common to God and a creature except by a pure equivocation.

6. All analogates are such that either one is placed in the definition of another—as substance is placed in the definition of accident, and act, in the definition of potency—or the same thing is placed in the definition of both—as the health of an animal is placed in the definition of healthy, which is predicated of urine and food since one is the sign of this health and the other conserves it. But God and creatures are not related in this manner: one is not placed in the definition of the other, nor is something identical placed in the definition of each, even on the supposition that God could be defined. Therefore, it seems that nothing can be predicated analogously of God and creatures. As a consequence, any term predicated of both of them is used only equivocally.

7. Substance and accident differ more than do two species of substances. But when the same word is used to signify two species of substances according to formal character proper to each, the predication is merely equivocal. This happens, for example, when the word *dog* is applied to the dog-star, a barking dog, and the dog-fish. It would be a far more equivocal predication if one word were applied to a substance and an accident. Now, our knowledge is an accident and that of God, a substance. Therefore, the word *knowledge* is predicated equivocally of God's and of ours.

8. Our knowledge is merely an image of the divine knowledge. But the

name of a thing cannot be applied to its image except by equivocation. Hence, *animal*, according to the Philosopher, is predicated equivocally of a real animal and of one in a picture. Therefore, the word *knowledge* is likewise predicated only equivocally of God's knowledge and ours.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. The Philosopher says that that is perfect, absolutely speaking, in which the perfections of all genera are found. As the Commentator remarks on this passage, such a being is God. But the perfections of other genera could not be said to be found in Him unless there were some resemblance between His perfection and the perfections of other genera. Hence, a creature resembles God in some way. Knowledge, therefore, and whatever else is predicated of God and creatures is not a pure equivocation.

2. Genesis (1:26) says: "Let us make man to our image and likeness." Therefore, some likeness exists between God and creature. We conclude as before.

REPLY

It is impossible to say that something is predicated univocally of a creature and God because in all univocal predication the nature signified by the name is common to those of whom the univocal predication is made. Hence, from the point of view of the nature signified by the predicate, the subjects of the univocal predication are equal, even though from the point of view of its real existence one may take precedence over another. For example, all numbers are equal from the point of view of the nature of number, even though, by the nature of things, one number is naturally prior to another. No matter how much a creature imitates God, however, a point cannot be reached where something would belong to it for the same reason it belongs to God. For things which have the same formal characters but are in separate subjects are common to the same subjects in regard to substance or quiddity but distinct in regard to the act of being. But whatever is in God is His own act of being; and just as His essence is the same as His act of being, so is His knowledge the same as His act of being a knower. Hence, since the act of existence proper to one thing cannot be communicated to another, it is impossible that a creature ever attain to the possession of something in the same manner in which God has it, just as it is impossible for it to attain the same act of being as that which God has. The same is true of us. If *man* and *to exist as man* did not differ in Socrates, man could not be predicated univocally of him and Plato, whose acts of existing are distinct.

Nevertheless, it cannot be said that whatever is predicated of God and creatures is an equivocal predication; for, unless there were at least some real agreement between creatures and God, His essence would not be the likeness of creatures, and so He could not know them by knowing His essence. Similarly, we would not be able to attain any knowledge of God from creatures, nor from among the names devised for creatures could we apply one to Him more than another; for in equivocal predication it makes no difference what name is used, since the word does not signify any real agreement.

Consequently, it must be said that knowledge is predicated neither entirely univocally nor yet purely equivocally of God's knowledge and ours. Instead, it is predicated analogously, or, in other words, according to a proportion. Since an agreement according to proportion can happen in two ways, two kinds of community can be noted in analogy. There is a certain agreement between things having a proportion to each other from the fact that they have a determinate distance between each other or some other relation to each other, like the proportion which the number two has to unity in as far as it is the double of unity. Again, the agreement is occasionally noted not between two things which have a proportion between them, but rather between two related proportions—for example, six has something in common with four because six is two times three, just as four is two times two. The first type of agreement is one of proportion; the second, of proportionality.

We find something predicated analogously of two realities according to the first type of agreement when one of them has a relation to the other, as when being is predicated of substance and accident because of the relation which accident has to substance, or as when healthy is predicated of urine and animal because urine has some relation to the health of an animal. Sometimes, however, a thing is predicated analogously according to the second type of agreement, as when sight is predicated of bodily sight and of the intellect because understanding is in the mind as sight is in the eye.

In those terms predicated according to the first type of analogy, there must be some definite relation between the things having something in common analogously. Consequently, nothing can be predicated analogously of God and creature according to this type of analogy; for no creature has such a relation to God that it could determine the divine perfection. But in the other type of analogy, no definite relation is involved between the things which have something in common analogously, so there is no reason why some name cannot be predicated analogously of God and creature in this manner.

But this can happen in two ways. Sometimes the name implies something belonging to the thing primarily designated which cannot be common to God

and creature even in the manner described above. This would be true, for example, of anything predicated of God metaphorically, as when God is called lion, sun, and the like, because their definition includes matter which cannot be attributed to God. At other times, however, a term predicated of God and creature implies nothing in its principal meaning which would prevent our finding between a creature and God an agreement of the type described above. To this kind belong all attributes which include no defect nor depend on matter for their act of existence, for example, being, the good, and similar things.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. As Dionysius says, God can in no way be said to be similar to creatures, but creatures can be said to be similar to Him in some sense. For what is made in imitation of something, if it imitates it perfectly, can be said to be like it absolutely. The opposite, however, is not true; for a man is not said to be similar to his image but vice versa. However, if the imitation is imperfect, then it is said to be both like and unlike that which it imitates: like, in so far as it resembles it; unlike, in so far as it falls short of a perfect representation. It is for this reason that Holy Scripture denies that creatures are similar to God in every respect. It does, however, sometimes grant that creatures are similar to God, and sometimes deny this. It grants the similarity when it says that man is made in the likeness of God, but denies it when it says: "O God, who is like to thee?" (Psalms 70:19).

2. The Philosopher distinguishes two kinds of likenesses. One is found between things in different genera, and is taken according to proportion or proportionality; that is, one thing is related to another as a third thing is related to a fourth, as Aristotle himself says in the same place. The second kind of likeness is found existing between things in the same genus, as when the same thing is found in distinct subjects. Now, likeness of the first kind does not demand a comparison based on a definite relationship as does that of the second kind. Consequently, the possibility of the first type of likeness existing between God and creature should not be excluded.

3. That difficulty arises from the second type of likeness; and we grant that this type does not exist between creature and God.

4. A likeness that is found because two things share something in common or because one has such a determinate relation to the other that from one the other can be grasped by the intellect—such a likeness diminishes distance. A likeness according to an agreement of proportion does not; for such a likeness is also found between things far or little distant. Indeed, there is

no greater likeness of proportionality between two to one and six to three than there is between two to one and one hundred to fifty. Consequently, the infinite distance between a creature and God does not take away the likeness mentioned above.”

5. There is some agreement between being and non-being according to analogy, for non-being itself is called being analogously, as is made clear in the *Metaphysics*. Consequently, the distance lying between a creature and God cannot prevent a common ground for analogical statement.

6. That argument is valid in regard to community of analogy taken according to a definite relation of one thing to another. In that case, one thing must be put in the definition of the other as substance is put in the definition of accident or as one thing is put into the definition of two other things because both are predicated with reference to it, as substance is put into the definition of quantity and quality.

7. Although two species of substance have more in common than accident and substance have, it is possible that the same word is not applied to the two different species by reason of any consideration of something common between them. In that case, the word will be merely equivocal. But it is possible for a word common to substance and accident to be used because of a consideration of what they have in common. In such a case the word will not be equivocal but analogous.

8. The word *animal* is used not to signify the external form which a picture imitates when it depicts a real animal, but to signify its internal nature, in which it is not imitated. Hence, *animal* is used equivocally of the real animal and of the one painted. But the word *knowledge* is suitable to both creature and Creator in the respect in which the creature imitates the Creator. Consequently, knowledge is not predicated of the two altogether equivocally.

ARTICLE 12

*Does God know singular future contingents?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that He does not, for

1. Nothing but the true can be known, as is said in the *Posterior Analytics*. But, as said in *Interpretation*, there is no definite truth in singular future contingents. Hence, God does not have knowledge of individual and contin-

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 14, 13; 86,4; *I Sent.*, 3 8, 1, 5; *C.G.*, I, 67; *De rationibus fidei*, c. 10 (P. 16:96a); *Quodl.*, XI, 3, 3; *De malo*, 16, 7; *I Perih.*, lect. 14, n. 16 seq.; *Comp. Theol.*, I, cc. 132-33.

gent futures.

2. That from which the impossible would follow is impossible. But if God knew a singular future contingent, the impossible would follow, namely, that God's knowledge would be wrong. Hence, it is impossible for Him to know a singular future contingent. Proof of the minor follows. Let us suppose that God knows some singular future contingent event, such as that Socrates is sitting. Now, either it is possible that Socrates is not sitting or it is not possible. If it is not possible, then it is impossible for Socrates not to sit. Hence, for Socrates to sit is necessary, although what was granted was contingent. On the other hand, if it be possible not to sit, and granted he does not, nothing inconsistent follows from this. It would follow, however, that the knowledge of God is erroneous, and hence it would not be impossible for His knowledge to be false.

3. It was said, however, that the contingent, as it is in God, is necessary.—On the contrary, what is in itself contingent is not necessary with respect to God, except in the way in which it is in God. But inasmuch as it is in Him, it is not distinct from Him. If, therefore, it is known by God only as necessary, He will not know it in the way it exists distinct from Himself.

4. According to the Philosopher, when the major of a syllogism expresses necessity and the minor expresses inherence, a contingent expressing necessity follows. But the following is true: Whatever is known by God must necessarily be. For, if what God knew as existing did not exist, His knowledge would be false. Therefore, if something is known by God to exist, it necessarily exists. But no contingent must necessarily be. Therefore, no contingent is known by God.

5. It was said, however, that when it is said that whatever is known by God must necessarily be, the necessity implied is not with reference to the creature but to God alone.—On the contrary, when it is said that whatever is known by God must necessarily be, the necessity is attributed to the thing for which the subject of the statement stands. Now, the subject of the statement is that which is known by God, not God Himself as knowing. Therefore, the necessity implied in this statement refers only to the thing known.

6. The more certain our knowledge is, the less it has to do with contingents; for science is only about necessary truths, since it is more certain than opinion, which may be about contingent things. Now, God's knowledge is most certain; hence, it can be about necessary matters only.

7. If the antecedent of any true conditional proposition is absolutely necessary, the consequent will be absolutely necessary. But the following conditional is true. If something is known by God, it will exist. Since this antec-

ent, "This is known by God," is absolutely necessary, the consequent will be absolutely necessary. Hence, whatever is known by God must necessarily exist. That this, namely, "This is known by God," is absolutely necessary was proved as follows. This is something said about the past. But whatever is said about the past, if true, is necessary; for, since it has been, it cannot not have been. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary.

8. Whatever is eternal is necessary. Now, all that God has known He has known from eternity. Therefore, that He has known is absolutely necessary.

9. Everything is related to the true as it is related to the act of existence. But future contingents do not have any act of existence; therefore, neither do they have truth. Hence, there can be no certain knowledge of them.

10. According to the Philosopher, whoever does not understand one determined thing understands nothing. But if a future contingent is open to its being or not being, it is by no means determined either in itself or in its cause. Therefore, there can, by no means, be any knowledge of it at all.

11. Hugh of St. Victor says: "God, who has all things in Himself, knows nothing outside Himself." Now, whatever is contingent is outside of Him, for in Him there is no potentiality. Hence, He does not know future contingents at all.

12. Something contingent cannot be known through a medium that is necessary; for, if the medium is necessary, the conclusion will be necessary. Now, God knows all things through a medium, His own essence. Hence, since this medium is necessary, it seems that He cannot know anything contingent.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. The Psalms (32:15) speak as follows: "He who hath made the hearts of every one of them; who understandeth all their works." But the works of men are contingent since they depend on free choice. Therefore, God knows future contingents.

2. Whatever is necessary is known by God. Now, every contingent is necessary inasmuch as it is related to divine cognition, as Boethius says.—Therefore, every contingent is known by God.

3. Augustine says: "God knows changeable things in an unchangeable manner. But if a thing is contingent, it is changeable; for a contingent is said to be that which can either be or not be. Hence, God knows contingents in an unchangeable manner.

4. God knows things in so far as He is their cause. But God is the cause not only of necessary but also of contingent things. Therefore, He knows both necessary and contingent things.

5. God knows all things to the extent that the model of all things is in Him. But the divine model for the contingent and the necessary can be immutable, just as it is an immaterial model for the material and a simple model for the composite. Hence, it seems that just as God knows what is composite and material, although He Himself is immaterial and simple, so also He can know contingents, although contingency has no place in Him.

6. To know is to understand the cause of a thing. Now, God knows the causes of all contingents; for He knows Himself, the cause of all things. Hence, He knows contingents.

REPLY

On this question there have been several erroneous opinions. Some, wishing to pronounce upon divine knowledge from the viewpoint of our own way of knowing, have said that God does not know future contingents. This opinion cannot stand, for it would eliminate providence over human affairs, which are contingent. Consequently, others have said that God has knowledge of all futures, but that all take place necessarily, otherwise His knowledge of them would be subject to error. But neither can this opinion stand, for it would destroy free choice and there would be no need to ask advice. Moreover, it would be unjust to punish or to give rewards in proportion to merit when everything takes place necessarily.

Hence, it must be said that God knows all futures; nevertheless, this does not prevent things from taking place contingently. As evidence of this, it should be noted that we have certain powers and cognitive habits in which there can never be falsity; for example, sense, science, and the understanding of principles. On the other hand, we have others in which there can be falsity; for example, imagination, opinion, and judgment. Now, falsity occurs in a cognitive act because something is not in reality as it is apprehended. Hence, if there is any knowing power such that there is never any falsity in it, then the thing to be known by it never falls short of what the knower apprehends about it.

Now, what is necessary cannot be prevented from happening even before it happens, in view of the fact that its causes are unchangeably ordained to its production. Hence, by means of habits that are always true, what is necessary can be known even when it will happen in the future, just as we know a coming eclipse or the rising of the sun by means of true science. But a contingent can be impeded before it is brought into being; for at that stage it exists only in its causes, which may be prevented from producing their effect. After a contingent has been brought into existence, however, it can no longer be

prevented. Hence, such a power or habit can make about a present contingent a judgment in which falsity is never found, as sense does when it judges that Socrates is sitting when he sits.

From this it is clear that a contingent can be known as future by no cognition that excludes all falsity and the possibility of falsity; and since there is no falsity or possibility of falsity in the divine knowledge, it would be impossible for God to have knowledge of future contingents if He knew them as future. Now, something is known as future when an order of past and future stands between the event and the knowledge. This order, however, cannot be found between the divine knowledge and any contingent thing whatsoever; but the relation of the divine knowledge to anything whatsoever is like that of present to present. This may be understood by the following example.

If someone were to see many people walking successively down a road during a given period of time, in each part of that time he would see as present some of those who walk past, so that in the whole period of his watching he would see as present all of those who walked past him. Yet he would not simultaneously see them all as present, because the time of his seeing is not completely simultaneous. However, if all his seeing could exist at once, he would simultaneously see all the passers-by as present, even though they themselves would not all pass as simultaneously present. Therefore, since the vision of divine knowledge is measured by eternity, which is all simultaneous and yet includes the whole of time without being absent from any part of it, it follows that God sees whatever happens in time, not as future, but as present. For what is seen by God is, indeed, future to some other thing which it follows in time; to the divine vision, however, which is not in time but outside time, it is not future but present. Therefore, we see what is future as future because it is future with respect to our seeing, since our seeing is itself measured by time; but to the divine vision, which is outside of time, there is no future. For example, what one would see who is within the ranks of passers-by and sees only those who are in line ahead of him is quite different from what he would see were he outside their ranks and saw all of them simultaneously. Therefore, the fact that our sense of sight is never deceived when it sees contingents when they are present does not prevent the contingents themselves from happening contingently. In like manner, God infallibly knows all the contingents, whether they are present, past, or future to us; for they are not future to Him, but He knows that they are when they are; and the fact of His knowing them does not prevent them from happening contingently.

The difficulty in this matter arises from the fact that we can describe the divine knowledge only after the manner of our own, at the same time pointing

out the temporal differences. For example, if we were to describe God's knowledge as it is, we should have to say that God knows that this is, rather than that it will be; for to Him every thing is present and nothing is future. For this reason, Boethius says that His knowledge of future things "is more properly called providence than foresight," since He sees them all, as it were, from a great distance, in the mirror of eternity. However, it might also be called foresight because of its relation to other things in whose regard what He knows is future.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Although a contingent is not determined as long as it is, future, yet, as soon as it is produced in the realm of nature, it has a determinate truth. It is in this way that the gaze of divine knowledge is brought upon it.

2. As was said, a contingent is referred to divine knowledge according to its act of existence in the realm of nature. Moreover, from the moment that it is, it cannot not be when it is; for, "what is must be when it is," as is said in *Interpretation*. It does not follow, however, that it is necessary without any qualification or that God's knowledge is defective—just as my sense of sight is not deceived when I see that Socrates is sitting, although this fact is contingent.

3. A contingent is said to be necessary in so far as God knows it, because He knows it, not as something already present. Nevertheless, no necessity arises from the fact that it is going to be, so that one could say that it comes about necessarily; for *event* applies to something which is to be, because what already is cannot eventuate. But that it has happened is true, and this is necessary.

4. The necessity referred to in the statement, "Whatever is known by God is necessary," can concern either the manner of speaking or the thing spoken about. If the necessity is applied to the manner of speaking, then the proposition is composite and true, its meaning will be as follows: It is necessary that whatever is known by God exists, since it is not possible that God would know something to be and it would not be. If the necessity is applied to the thing spoken about, then the proposition is divided and false. Its meaning will be as follows: What is known by God must necessarily exist. But, as is clear from what has been said, things do not happen necessarily simply because God knows them.

One might object that this distinction is valid only in regard to forms, such as whiteness and blackness, which can succeed one another in a subject, but that since it is impossible for something once known by God later not to be known by Him, this distinction does not apply here. However, we re-

ply that, although God's knowledge does not change but always remains the same, the condition according to which a thing is referred to His knowledge does not always remain the same with respect to that knowledge. For a thing is related to God's knowledge as it is in its own present existence, yet present existence does not always belong to it. Hence, we can consider the thing either together with its condition of being present or without it, and, consequently, we can consider it either in the manner in which it is referred to God's knowledge or in some other manner. In this way, the afore-mentioned distinction is valid.

5. If this proposition concerns the thing, then it is true that necessity is applied to the thing itself which is known by God; but if it concerns the manner of speaking, then the necessity is not applied to the thing but to the relation of His knowledge to the thing known.

6. Neither our science nor God's knowledge can be about future contingents. This would be even more true if He knew them as future. He knows them, however, as present to Himself and future to others. Therefore, the objection does not stand.

7. There have been many opinions about this. Some say that the antecedent, "This is known by God," is contingent because, although it refers to something in the past, it nevertheless implies a relation to the future, and therefore is not necessary. For example, when it is said, "This was going to happen," the *was* does not mark the event as necessary, since what was going to happen could have failed to do so; for, as is said in *Generation and Corruption*: "He who is about to walk, will not walk." This argument, however, is invalid; for when one says, "This is future" or "This was future," one designates the ordination of the causes of that thing to its production. Now, although it is possible that the causes ordained to a certain effect can be impeded in such a way that the effect will not follow from them, it is not possible to prevent their having been at some time ordained to produce this effect. Hence, even if that which is future should be able not to happen in the future, it will never be able at any time not to have been a future.

For this reason, others say that this antecedent is contingent since it is composed of a necessary and a contingent; for God's knowledge is necessary, but what is known by Him is contingent, and each of these is included in the antecedent mentioned in the difficulty. For example, the following are contingent: "Socrates is a white man," or "Socrates is an animal and he runs." However, this argument, too, is invalid, for the truth of a proposition is not affected by the necessity and contingency of that which is affirmed materially in a proposition. The truth of a proposition is determined only by the prin-

cial composition. Hence, the same character of necessity and contingency is found in each of the following: "I think that man is an animal" and "I think that Socrates is running." Consequently, since the principal act signified in the antecedent, "God knows Socrates is running," is necessary, no matter how contingent the thing may be which is affirmed materially, this still does not prevent the afore-mentioned antecedent from being necessary.

Hence, others simply concede that the antecedent is necessary. Yet, they add, from the fact that an antecedent is absolutely necessary, it need not follow that the consequent is absolutely necessary, unless the antecedent is the proximate cause of the consequent. If it is the remote cause, the necessity of the effect can be impeded by the contingency of the proximate cause. For example, even though the sun is a necessary cause, the flowering of a tree, its effect, is contingent; for its proximate cause, the tree's germinating power, is not constant. This argument, however, does not seem to be sufficient; for it is not due to the nature of the cause and effect that a necessary consequence follows from a necessary antecedent, but rather to the relation that the consequent has to its antecedent. For the contrary of the consequent can by no means stand with the antecedent. And this would happen if a contingent consequent followed from a necessary antecedent. This relationship must be found in any true conditional, whether the antecedent is the effect, the proximate cause, or the remote cause. Moreover, if this relationship is not found in the conditional, the proposition is not true at all. Therefore, this conditional is also false: "If the sun moves, the tree will flower."

Hence, the difficulty must be solved differently: the antecedent is necessary without any qualification, and the consequent is absolute necessary in the way in which it follows from the antecedent. For what is attributed to a thing in itself is quite different from what is attributed to a thing in so far as it is known. What is attributed to it in itself belongs to it according to its own manner; but what is attributed to a thing or follows upon it in so far as it is known is according to the manner of the knower. Hence, if, in the antecedent, something is signified which pertains to knowledge, the consequent must be taken according to the manner of the knower, not according to the manner of the thing known. For example, were I to say, "If I understand something, that thing is without matter," what is understood need be immaterial only in so far as it is understood. Similarly, when I say, "If God knows something, it will be," the consequent should not be taken according to the mode of being of the thing in itself but according to the mode of the knower. For, although a thing in itself is future, it is present according to the mode of the knower. Consequently, we should rather say, "If God knows something, it is," than say, "it

will be." We must, therefore, judge in the same way the proposition, "If God knows something, it will be," and this one, "If I see Socrates running, Socrates is running"; for both are necessary as long as the action is going on.

8. [There is no solution given for the eighth difficulty.]

9. Although a contingent does not exercise an act of existence as long as it is a future, as soon as it is present it has both existence and truth, and in this condition stands under the divine vision. God, however, also knows the relation of one thing to another, and in this way He knows that a thing is future in regard to another thing. Consequently, there is no difficulty in affirming that God knows something as future which will not take place, inasmuch as He knows that certain causes are inclined toward a certain effect which will not be produced. But when we talk in this way we are not speaking of that knowledge of the future by which God sees things in their causes, but of that by which He sees a thing in itself. In this latter type of knowledge a thing is known as present.

10. The future, in so far as it is known by God, is present; hence, it is determined to one or the other member of a contradiction. But as long as it is future it remains open to either.

11. It is true that God knows nothing outside Himself, if the word *outside* refers to that by *which* He knows. However, God does something outside Himself if this refers to *what* He knows. This point was discussed above.

12. There are two types of mediums for knowledge. One, the medium of demonstration, must be proportionate to the conclusion, so that, when it has been posited, its conclusion is posited. God is not such a medium for the knowledge of contingents. The other medium of knowledge is that which is a likeness of the thing known; and the divine essence is a medium of this sort. However, it is not equated with anything, even though it is a proper medium for singulars, as was said above.

ARTICLE 13

*Does God's knowledge change?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it does, for

1. Knowledge is an assimilation of the knower to the thing known. Now, God's knowledge is perfect. Hence, He will be perfectly assimilated to

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, I, 5, ad 11; I, 7; *S.T.*, I, 14, 15; *I Sent.*, 38, 1, aa.2-3; 39, 1, aa.1-2; 41, a. 5; *C.G.*, I, cc. 58-59.

the things He knows. However, the things God knows change. Therefore, His knowledge changes.

2. Any knowledge which is open to error can change. Now, God's knowledge is open to error since it is about contingent things, which are able not to be. Should they not be, then His knowledge is erroneous and, consequently, can change.

3. Our knowledge, which is had by receiving from things, follows the mode of the knower. Therefore, God's knowledge, which takes place by reason of the fact that He confers something upon things, follows the mode of the things known. But things which God knows can change. Therefore, His knowledge can change.

4. When one of two terms in a relation is taken away, the remaining one is also taken away. Hence, when one term changes, the other also changes. Now, what God knows changes. Hence, His knowledge of things changes.

5. Any knowledge that can be increased or diminished is subject to change. But God's knowledge can be increased or diminished.—Proof of the minor is as follows: If a knower at times knows more things, at other times fewer, his knowledge changes. Therefore, a knower who can know more or fewer things than he now knows possesses knowledge subject to change. Now, God can know more than He knows: He knows that there are, or were, or will be things made by Him; however, He could make more which He is never going to make. Consequently, He could know more things than He does. Similarly, He can know fewer than He does, since He could do away with a part of what He is going to make. Therefore, His knowledge can be increased and diminished.

6. The answer was given that even though more or fewer things could fall under God's knowledge, His knowledge itself could not change.—On the contrary, just as the possibles are subject to divine power, so are knowable things subject to divine knowledge. Now, if God could make more than He could previously, His power would be increased; and it would be diminished if He could make fewer. For the same reason, if He could know more than He knew previously, His knowledge would be increased.

7. At one time God knew that Christ would be born. Now, however, He does not know that Christ will be born but that He has been born. Therefore, God knows something which He previously did not know, and He has known something which now He does not know. Hence, His knowledge is changed.

8. A manner of knowing, as well as an object of knowledge, is required for knowledge. Now, if the manner in which God knows were changed, His knowledge would be changed. For the same reason, therefore, when the ob-

jects of God's knowledge change, His knowledge will be changed.

9. There is said to be a knowledge of approval in God by which He knows only good people. However, God could approve those whom He has not approved. Hence, He could know what He previously did not know; so, it seems that His knowledge is changeable.

10. Just as God's knowledge is God Himself, so God's power is God Himself. But we say that by the power of God things are brought into being through a change. For the same reason, therefore, things are known by God's knowledge through a change, without any detriment to the divine perfection.

11. Any knowledge changes if it goes from one thing to another. But God's knowledge is of this kind because He knows things through His essence. Hence, His knowledge changes.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. The Epistle of St. James (1:17) says of God: "With Whom there is no change..."

2. Whatever is moved is reduced to the first unmovable being. But the first cause of all things that change is God's knowledge, just as art is the cause of products. Hence, God's knowledge cannot change.

3. As is said in *The Soul*, motion is the act of an imperfect thing. But in divine knowledge there is no imperfection. Hence, it cannot change.

REPLY

Since knowledge is intermediate between the knower and the known, it can vary in two ways: first, on the part of the knower; second, on the part of the thing known. On the part of the knower, we can consider three things: his knowledge, his act, and the manner of his act. According to these three, changes can take place in knowledge on the part of the knower.

On the part of knowledge itself, a change takes place when knowledge which was not had previously is newly acquired or when knowledge of what was known previously is lost. Accordingly, we can speak of a generation or corruption, or of an increase or decrease, in knowledge. Such a change, however, cannot take place in God's knowledge, since, as we have shown, its object is not only beings but also non-beings, and there cannot be anything beyond being and non-being because between affirmation and negation there is no middle ground.

It is true that in a certain respect the objects of God's knowledge are only things existing in the present, Past, or future, namely, in so far as His knowledge is ordained to the work which His will carries out. However, even if He

would know something by this kind of knowledge that He did not know previously, there would be no change in His knowledge, because on its part it pertains equally to beings and non-beings. If there were any change in God, it would be in His will, which would be determining His knowledge to something to which it had not previously determined it.

This, however, could not cause any change in His will, either; for to produce its act freely belongs to the nature of the will, because, of its very nature, the will is equally able to go out to either of two opposites. For example, it can will or not will to make or not to make a thing. However, the will cannot make itself simultaneously will and not will; nor can the divine will, which is immutable, first wish something and later not wish the same thing at the same time, because then God's will would be circumscribed by time and would not be entirely simultaneous. If we are speaking of absolute necessity, therefore, it is not necessary for Him to wish what He wishes. Therefore, absolutely speaking, it is possible for Him not to wish it. On the other hand, if we are speaking of the necessity following a supposition, then it is necessary that He wish it if He wishes or has wished it. On this supposition, then, namely, if He wishes or has wished, it is not possible for Him not to wish.

Now, since a change requires two terms, it always views the final term in its relation to the first. Consequently, only this would follow, that it would be possible for His will to change if it were possible for Him not to wish what He wishes, if He had previously wished. It is clear, therefore, that no change is affirmed of His knowledge or will by the fact that more or fewer things could be known by God through this kind of knowledge; for to say that He is able to know more means simply that He can by His will determine His knowledge to make more things.

On the part of the act, there are three ways a change takes place in knowledge. The first occurs when knowledge actually considers what it previously did not consider. For example, we say that a person changes who passes from habit to act. Now, this kind of change cannot be found in God's knowledge, because He does not know habitually but only actually, since in Him there is no potentiality such as there is in a habit. Change is found in a second way in the act of knowing when it considers now one thing, now another. But neither can this be found in God's knowledge, since He sees all through the one species of His essence, and consequently looks upon all things in the same intuition. A third kind of change occurs when, in his contemplation, a person passes from one thing to another. But this, too, cannot be found in God, for discursive reasoning is a passage between two members, and there is no discursive reasoning in knowledge that sees two things if it sees both in one

intuition. This is what actually takes place in the divine knowledge, since God sees all things by one intuition.

From the point of view of the manner of knowing, there can also be changes in knowledge by reason of the fact that one can now know something more clearly and perfectly than he did before. This can arise from two sources. First, it can arise from a difference in the medium by which the cognition takes place. For example, one may first know something through a probable middle term, and later through a middle term that is necessary. This, however, cannot take place in God because His essence, which for Him is the medium of knowing, never changes. Secondly, it can come from the intellectual power which causes a man of greater acumen to know something more penetratingly, even through the same medium, than another man does. This, too, however, cannot take place in God, since the power by which He knows is His own essence, and this does not change. Hence, it remains that God's knowledge does not change in any way whatsoever from the point of view of the knower.

But from the point of view of the thing known, knowledge can also change in its truth and falsity, because, if a thing is changed while the judgment of it remains the same, the judgment which was previously true is now false. This, however, cannot take place in God either, since the intuition of God's cognition is directed to a thing as it is in its *presentness*, that is, in so far as it has already received this rather than that determination; and in this respect it can change no more. Even if that thing should receive another state, that state will again fall under the divine vision in the same way; hence, God's knowledge changes in no way whatsoever.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The assimilation of the knower to the thing known does not take place through a conformity of nature but through a representation. So, it is not necessary for the knowledge of changing things to change.

2. Although the thing known by God may be other than it is if considered in itself, it falls under God's cognition inasmuch—as it cannot be other than it is, as we have already shown.

3. All knowledge, whether had by receiving from things or by an impression upon the things themselves, takes place according to the manner of the knower, since both take place in so far as a likeness of the thing known is in the knower. Moreover, what exists in someone is in him according to the manner of him in whom it exists.

4. That to which God's knowledge is related is changeless in so far as it falls under His knowledge. Therefore, His knowledge does not change, ei-

ther, with respect to its truth, which could be changed by a change of the afore-mentioned relation.

5. When it is said, "God can know what He does not know," one can understand this in two ways—even if we are speaking of His knowledge of vision. First, we can understand it in its composite sense, that is, on the supposition that God has not known what He is said to be able to know. In this sense it is false; for the following two things cannot be true simultaneously, namely, that God should have been ignorant of something, and later know that thing. The proposition can also be taken in a divided sense. In this sense, no supposition or condition of His power is included, and in this sense it is true, as is clear from our discussion.

Although it may, in some sense, be conceded that God can know what He did not know previously, we cannot concede in any sense that He can know more than He knows; for, since the word *more* implies a comparison to what has previously existed, it is always understood in a composite sense. For the same reason, we can in no way concede that God's knowledge can be increased or diminished.

6. We concede the sixth argument.

7. As we said previously, God knows propositions without joining and separating. Just as God knows many different things in the same manner, both when they exist and when they do not, so does He know in the same manner different propositions, both when they are true and when they are false, because He knows each to be true at the time when it is true. For example, He knows this proposition, "Socrates is running," to be true when it is true; similarly, this proposition, "Socrates will run," and so forth. Hence, although it is not true now that Socrates is running but that he has run, nevertheless, God knows each because He simultaneously intuits each time when each proposition is true. If He knew a proposition by forming it in Himself, however, then He would know a proposition only when it is true, as happens in us. Then His knowledge would change.

8. The manner of knowing is in the knower himself. The thing known, however, is not in the knower according to its own nature. Therefore, a variation in the manner of knowing would make knowledge vary, but changes in the things known would not.

9. The answer to this is already clear.

10. This act of power terminates outside the agent in the thing as it is in its own nature—in which the thing has a changeable act of being. So, if we consider the thing produced, we must concede that it is given its act of existence by means of a change. But knowledge concerns things in so far as they are, in some way, in the knower. So, since the knower is unchanging, He

knows things in an unchanging manner.

11. Although God knows other things through His essence, He does not pass from one thing to another; for in the same intuition He knows both His essence and other things.

ARTICLE 14

*Is God's knowledge the cause of things?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. Origen says: "A thing will be, not because God knows that it will be, but, because it will be, it is known by God before it exists." Consequently, it seems that things are the cause of His knowledge rather than conversely.

2. Given the cause, the effect follows. But God's knowledge has been from eternity. Therefore, if His knowledge is the cause of things, it seems that things have existed from eternity. But this is heretical.

3. A necessary effect follows a necessary cause. Hence, even demonstrations, which are made through a necessary cause, have necessary conclusions. But God's knowledge is necessary since it is eternal. Therefore, all things which are known by God would be necessary. But this is absurd.

4. If God's knowledge is the cause of things, then it will be related to things in the way in which things are related to our knowledge. But things determine the type of knowledge we have; for instance, of necessary things we have necessary knowledge. Therefore, if God's knowledge were the cause of things, it would impose the mode of necessity on all things. But this is false.

5. A first cause has a more powerful influence upon an effect than a second. But, if God's knowledge is the cause of things, it will be a first cause; and, since necessity follows in the effects of necessary secondary causes, much more will necessity in things follow from God's knowledge. Thus, the original difficulty stands.

6. Knowledge has a more essential relation to things to which it stands as their cause than to things to which it stands as their effect; for a cause leaves its impression upon an effect, but an effect does not leave its impression upon the cause. Now, our knowledge, which is related to things as their effect, requires necessity in the things known if it is to be necessary itself. Therefore, if God's knowledge were the cause of things, much more would it demand necessity in the things it knows. Consequently, God would not know contin-

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 14, 8; *I Sent.*, 38, 1, 1.

gent beings, and, this is contrary to what was said previously.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Augustine says: "Not because they are does God know all creatures, spiritual and corporeal, but they are because He knows them." Therefore, God's knowledge is the cause of created things.

2. God's knowledge is, in a sense, the art of the things that are to be created; hence Augustine says: "The Word is an artistic conception filled with the intelligible characters of living things." But art is the cause of artistic products. Therefore, God's knowledge is the cause of created things.

3. The opinion of Anaxagoras," approved by the Philosopher, seems to support this view; for he asserted that the first principle of things was an intellect, which moved and distinguished all things.

REPLY

An effect cannot be more simple than its cause. Consequently, whatever things in which one nature is found must be reduced to some one thing which is the first subject of that nature, as all hot things are reduced to one and the first hot thing, namely, fire, which, as is said in the *Metaphysics*, is the cause of heat in others. Now, since every resemblance involves an agreement of forms, whatever things are alike are so related that either one is the cause of the other or both are caused by one cause. Moreover, in all knowledge there is an assimilation of the knower to the known. Hence, either the knowledge is the cause of the thing known, or the thing known is the cause of the knowledge, or both are caused by one cause. It cannot be said, however, that what is known by God is the cause of His knowledge; for things are temporal and His knowledge is eternal, and what is temporal cannot be the cause of anything eternal. Similarly, it cannot be said that both are caused by one cause, because there can be nothing caused in God, seeing that He is whatever He has. Hence, there is left only one possibility: His knowledge is the cause of things. Conversely, our knowledge is caused by things inasmuch as we receive it from things. Angels' knowledge, however, is not caused by things and is not the cause of things, but both the things which the angels know and their knowledge are from one cause; for in the same way that God communicates universal forms to things, making them subsist, He communicates likenesses of things to the minds of angels so that the angels can know them.

It should be observed, however, that knowledge as knowledge does not denote an active cause, no more than does a form as a form. Action consists, as it were, in the procession of something from the agent; but a form as a form

has its act of existence by perfecting that in which it is, and by resting in that thing. Consequently, a form is not a principle of acting, except through the mediation of a power. In some cases, it is true, the form itself is the power, but not by reason of being a form. In other cases, the power is other than the substantial form of the thing. For example, the actions of bodies do not take place without the mediation of certain of their qualities. Similarly, knowledge denotes that there is something in the knower, not that something has been caused by the knower. Hence, an effect never arises from knowledge except through the mediation of the will, which, of its very nature, implies a certain influence upon what is willed. For action never proceeds from a substance without the mediation of a power, although in the case of some substances, such as God, will is identical with knowledge. In other substances, namely, all creatures, this is not the case. Similarly, effects proceed from God, the first cause of all things, through the mediation of secondary causes.

Hence, between His knowledge (the cause of the thing) and the thing caused there is found a twofold medium: one on the part of God, namely, the divine will; another on the part of things themselves in regard to certain effects, namely, the medium of secondary causes through whose mediation things proceed from God's knowledge. Moreover, every effect follows not only the condition of the first cause but also that of the intermediate cause. Hence, the things known by God proceed from His knowledge as conditioned by His will and as conditioned by secondary causes. Consequently, it is not necessary that these things follow the manner of His knowledge in all respects.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Origen's meaning is that God's knowledge is not a cause so necessitating the thing known that from the very fact that something is known by God it must necessarily take place. Moreover, his phrase "Because it is to be, it is known by God..." gives the reason for concluding that God knows it, not the cause of the divine knowledge.

2. Since things proceed from knowledge through the mediation of the will, it is not necessary for them to come into being whenever there is knowledge of them, but only when the will determines that they should.

3. An effect follows the necessity of its proximate cause, which can also be a means of demonstrating the effect. An effect need not follow the necessity of the first cause, since an effect can be impeded, if it is contingent, by reason of a secondary cause. This is seen in the effects produced by the motion of the celestial bodies through the mediation of inferior forces on objects subject to generation and corruption. Even though the motion of the heavens remains

always the same, these effects are contingent because the natural forces are defective.

4. A thing is the proximate cause of our knowledge. Hence, it imposes its own mode upon our knowledge. But, since God is a first cause, there is no parallel. Or we may say that our knowledge of necessary things is necessary, not by reason of the fact that things known cause our knowledge, but because of the conformity of the power to the things known, which is required for knowledge.

5. Although the first cause influences an effect more powerfully than a secondary cause does, the effect does not take place without the operation of the secondary cause. Hence, if it is possible for the secondary cause to fail in its operation, it is possible for the effect not to take place, even though the first cause itself cannot fail. The possibility of the effect's not taking place would be much greater if the first cause itself could fail. Therefore, since both causes are required for the existence of an effect, a failure of either cause will result in a failure of the effect. Hence, if contingency is affirmed of either cause, the effect will be contingent. But, if only one of the causes is necessary, the effect will not be necessary, since both causes are required for the existence of the effect. But, because a secondary cause cannot be necessary if the first cause is contingent, one can say that the necessity of an effect follows the necessity of the second cause.

6. Our reply here is the same as our reply to the fourth difficulty.

ARTICLE 15

*Does God have knowledge of evil things?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that He does not, for

1. All knowledge either causes the thing known, is itself caused by it, or at least proceeds from one and the same cause. But God's knowledge is not the cause of evil things, evil things do not cause it, nor does some other thing cause both His knowledge and evil things. Therefore, God does not know evil things.

2. As is said in the *Metaphysics*, every being is related to truth in the same way as it is related to existence. But evil, as Dionysius and Augustine say, is not a being; therefore, it is not something true. Now, nothing is known

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 3, 4; *S.T.*, I, 14, 10; 18, 4, ad 4; *I Sent.*, 36, 1, 2; *C.G.*, I, 71; *Quodl.*, XI, 2, 2.

unless it is true. Hence, evil cannot be known by God.

3. The Commentator says that an intellect that is always in act does not know a privation at all. But God's intellect is in act in the highest possible degree. Hence, it knows no privations. But, as Augustine says: "Evil is the privation of good." Therefore, God does not know evil.

4. Whatever is known is known either through its likeness or through its contrary. Now, evil is not like the divine essence through which God knows all things; nor is evil its contrary, for evil cannot harm it—and a thing is said to be evil because it is harmful. Therefore, God does not know evil things.

5. That which cannot be learned cannot be known. But, as Augustine says: "Evil cannot be learned through instruction, for only good things can be learned." Therefore, evil cannot be known, and so is not known by God.

6. Whoever knows grammar is grammatical. Therefore, whoever knows evil things is evil. But God is not evil. Hence, He does not know evil.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. No one avenges what he does not know. But God is the avenger of evil; therefore, He has knowledge of evil things.

2. There is no good which God lacks. But the knowledge of evil things is good, for by it evils are avoided. Therefore, God knows evil things.

REPLY

According to the Philosopher, whoever does not understand a thing which is one does not understand anything at all. A thing is one, however, by being undivided in itself and distinct from others. Hence, whoever knows a thing must know its distinction from other things. But the first basis of distinction lies in affirmation and negation. Therefore, whoever knows an affirmation must know its negation. Now, since privation is nothing but a negation having a subject (as is said in the *Metaphysics*), and since "one of two contraries is always a privation" (as is said both in the *Metaphysics* and *Physics*)—from the very fact that a thing is known, its privation and its contrary are known. Accordingly, since God has a proper knowledge of all His effects, knowing each one of them as it is, distinct in its own nature, He must know all the opposed negations and opposed privations, as well as all the contrarieties found in things. Consequently, since evil is the privation of good, by knowing any good at all and the measure of any thing whatsoever, He knows every evil thing.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. That proposition is true about knowledge had from a thing through its likeness. But evil is not known to God by its likeness, but through the likeness of its opposite. Consequently, it does not follow that God is the cause of evil things because He knows them. It follows, rather, that He is the cause of the good to which the evil is opposed.

2. From the fact that non-being is opposed to being, it is said in some way to be being, as is clear from the *Metaphysics*. As a consequence, from the fact that evil is opposed to good, it has the character of something knowable and of the true.

3. It was the opinion of the Commentator that by knowing His essence God does not know individual effects in a determined way, that is, as they are distinct in their own proper nature, but that He knows only the nature of being which is found in all of them. Since evil is not opposed to universal but to particular being, it follows from this that God would not know evil. But this position is false, as is evident from what has been said. Hence, what follows from this position is also false, namely, that God does not know privations and evil things. For, according to the Commentator, a privation is known by an intellect only by the absence of a form from the intellect—a condition that cannot exist in an intellect which is always in act. But this is not necessary; for, from the very fact that a thing is known, its privation is known. Hence, both thing and privation are known through the presence of a form in the intellect.

4. The opposition of one thing to another can be taken in two ways: first, in general, as when we say that evil is opposed to good, and in this sense, evil is opposed to God; second, in particular, as when we say that this white thing is opposed to this black thing, and in this sense an evil is opposed only to that good which can be taken away by this evil and to which it would be harmful. In this second way evil is not opposed to God. Augustine accordingly says: "Vice is opposed to God in the way in which evil is opposed to good." But, to the nature which it vitiates, vice is opposed not merely as evil to good but also as something harmful to that nature.

5. In so far as evil is known, it is a good; for to know evil is a good. Thus, it is true that whatever can be learned is a good—not that it is good in itself, but that it is good only in so far as it is known.

6. Grammar is known by possessing the art of grammar. But evil is not known by possessing it. Hence, no analogy can be drawn.

Question III

IDEAS

1. Are there ideas in God?
2. Are there many ideas?
3. Do ideas belong to speculative or only to practical knowledge?
4. Is there in God an idea of evil?
5. Is there in God an idea of first matter?
6. Are there ideas in God of those things which do not exist, will not exist, and have not existed?
7. Are there in God ideas of accidents?
8. Are there in God ideas of singulars?

ARTICLE I

*Are there ideas in God?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that there are no ideas in Him, for

1. God's knowledge is most perfect. Now, knowledge had from the essence of a thing is more perfect than knowledge had from its likeness. Consequently, God knows things, not by means of their likenesses, but by means of their essences. Hence, those likenesses of things which are called ideas do not exist in God.

2. But it was said that God knows things more perfectly by knowing them through His essence, which is a likeness of things, than He would if He knew them through their own essences.—On the contrary, knowledge is an assimilation to the thing known. Hence, the more the medium of knowing resembles and is united with the thing known, the more perfectly is the thing known by means of that medium. But the essence of created things is more united with things than the divine essence is. Consequently, God would know things more perfectly if He knew them by means of their essences than He does by knowing them through His own essence.

3. But it was said that the perfection of knowledge consists in the union of the medium of knowledge with the knower, not with the thing known.—On the contrary, the species of a thing, which is in the intellect, is rendered

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 151 1; 44, 3; *I Sent.*, 36, 2, 1; *I Metaph.*, lect. 15, nn. 232-33.

individual by the act of existence it has in the intellect; but in relation to the thing known it has the character of a universal, since it is a likeness of the thing according to its common nature and not according to its particular conditions. Yet the knowledge which is made possible by means of that species is not singular but universal. Hence, knowledge follows the relation of the species to the thing known rather than its relation to the knower.

4. The Philosopher criticizes Plato's theory of ideas because the latter asserted that the forms of material things existed without matter. Now, these forms would exist without matter to a much greater extent were they in the divine intellect instead of being outside of it, because the divine intellect is the acme of immateriality. Therefore, it is much more inconsistent to say that ideas exist in the divine intellect.

5. The Philosopher criticizes Plato's theory of ideas because the ideas he posited can neither generate nor be generated, and hence are useless. But, if the ideas are said to be in the divine mind, they also will not be generated—because whatever is generated is composite—nor will they generate, for, since whatever is generated is composite and whatever generates resembles what is generated, that which generates must also be composite. Hence, it would be inconsistent to say that there are ideas in the divine mind.

6. Dionysius says that God knows existing things by means of the non-existing, and that He does not know them by means of ideas. But the only reason for affirming the existence of ideas in God is so He can know things by their means. Hence, ideas do not exist in God's mind.

7. Whatever has been modeled upon an archetype is proportionate to it. But there is no proportion of a creature with God, just as there is no proportion between what is finite and what is infinite. Therefore, in God there cannot be any archetypes of creatures; consequently, since ideas are exemplary forms, it seems that ideas of things do not exist in God.

8. Ideas are the rule of knowledge and action. But that which cannot err in its knowledge or action does not need a rule for either; and, since God is this kind of being, it seems out of place to say that there are ideas in him.

9. We read in the *Metaphysics* that just as being one in quantity causes equality, so being one in quality causes resemblance. Now, because of the difference between God and a creature, a creature can in no way be said to be equal to God, nor can God be said to be equal to a creature. Therefore, there is nothing in God that resembles a creature. Consequently, since *idea* means a likeness of a thing, it seems that there are no ideas of things in God.

10. If ideas are in God, they are there only for the production of creatures. But Anselm says: "It is sufficiently clear that in the Word, through which all

things have been made, likenesses of things do not exist. Only the one simple essence is present.” Therefore, it seems that ideas, which are called the likenesses of things, do not exist in God.

11. God knows Himself in the same way in which He knows other things; otherwise, His knowledge would be multiple and divisible. Now, God does not know Himself by means of an idea. Therefore, He does not know other things by means of ideas.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Augustine says: “Whoever denies that there are ideas is an infidel, since he denies the existence of the Son.”

2. Every intellectual agent possesses within himself a plan of his work; otherwise, he would not know what he was doing. But God acts through His intellect, and He is not ignorant of what He is doing. Therefore, there exist within Him intelligible characters of things, and these are called ideas.

3. As is said in the *Physics*: “The three causes, namely, the efficient, final, and formal causes, are ultimately identical.” Now, God is the efficient and final cause of things. Hence, He is also their formal cause—but as an exemplary cause, since He cannot be a form that is part of a creature. We conclude as before.

4. A particular effect is not produced by a universal cause unless the universal cause is proper or appropriated. Now, all particular effects are from God, who is the universal cause of all things. Hence, they should come from Him in so far as He is the proper or appropriated cause of each and every one of them. But this would not be possible unless the intelligible characters of things existed in Him. Hence, the intelligible characters of things, that is, ideas, must exist in Him.

5. Augustine says: “I regret that I said that there are two worlds, one the object of sense, the other the object of intellect—not because this is not true, but because I said it as though it were an original idea, when in fact it had been previously pointed out by philosophers, and because this manner of speaking is not usual in Holy Scripture. Now, the intelligible world is nothing other than the idea of the world. Hence, it is true that there are ideas.

6. Speaking to God, Boethius says: “You have drawn all things from the highest pattern, having in your mind the glorious world—you, the most glorious of all.” Therefore, the pattern of the world, and of all that is in the world, is in God; and our conclusion is the same as before.

7. In the Gospel according to John (1:3-4), we read: “What was made in him was life...” This means, as Augustine says, that all creatures are in the

divine mind as a piece of furniture is in the mind of a cabinetmaker. Now, a piece of furniture is in the mind of a cabinetmaker by means of its idea and likeness. Therefore, ideas of all things are in God.

8. A mirror does not lead us to the knowledge of things unless their likenesses are reflected in it. Now, the uncreated Word is a mirror that leads to the knowledge of all creatures, because by the Word the Father utters Himself and all other things. Therefore, likenesses of all things are in the Word.

9. Augustine says: "The Son is the Father's art, containing the living forms of all things." Now, those forms are nothing other than ideas. Therefore, ideas exist in God.

10. Augustine says that there are two ways of knowing things: through an essence and through a likeness. Now, God does not know things by means of their essence, because only those things which are present in the knower are known in this manner. Therefore, since He does know things, as is clear from what has been said previously, He must know them by means of their likenesses. Hence, our conclusion is the same as before.

REPLY

As Augustine says: "We can literally translate *ιδεαι* as *species* or *forms*. Now, the *form* of a thing has three meanings. First, it can mean that *from which* a thing gets its form, as when we say that the informing of an effect proceeds from the form of the agent. Now, an action does not necessarily result in effects that attain the complete character of the form of the agent, for effects often fall short of this, especially in the case of equivocal causes. Consequently, the form *from which* something gets its form is not said to be its idea or form. Second, the form of a thing can mean that *by which* a thing is informed, as when we say that the soul is the form of man, and the shape of a statue is the form of the bronze. Now, although form, which is part of the composite, is truly said to be the form of a thing, we do not usually call it its idea, because it seems that the word *idea* signifies a form separate from that whose form it is. Third, the form of a thing can mean that *according to which* a thing is informed. This is the exemplary form in imitation of which a thing is made. It is in this meaning that *idea* is ordinarily used. Hence, the idea of a thing is the form which a thing imitates.

Note, however, that a thing can imitate a form in two ways. It can imitate it because of the agent's intention, as an artist makes his painting imitate someone whose portrait he is making. It happens at times, however, that such an imitation is not intentional, but happens by chance or by accident. For example, painters frequently paint something resembling someone when they

have not intended to do so. Now, what imitates a form by chance is not said to be formed according to that form, because *according to* seems to imply direction to an end. Hence, since the exemplary form or idea is that according to which a thing is formed, the exemplary form or idea should imitate something intentionally, not accidentally.

We see also that a thing acts because of an end in two ways. The agent himself may determine his end—and this is true of all intellectual agents—or the end of the agent may be determined by another principal agent. For example, the flight of an arrow is toward a definite end, but this end is determined by the archer. Similarly, an operation of a nature which is for a definite end presupposes an intellect that has pre-established the end of the nature and ordered it to that end. For this reason, every work of nature is said to be a work of intelligence. Consequently, if a thing imitating something else comes into existence through an agent which has not itself determined the end, the form imitated will not have the character of an exemplar or idea merely because of what has happened. For example, we do not say that the form of the man who generates is the idea or exemplar of the man who is generated; but we use these terms only when an agent acting for an end has determined the end himself—whether the form imitated be within him or outside of him. For we say that the form of art in the artist is the plan or idea of the artistic product, and we also say that a form outside the artist is a plan if he imitates it when he makes a thing. This, therefore, seems to constitute the character of an idea: It must be a form which something imitates because of the intention of an agent who antecedently determines the end himself.

Consequently, it is clear that those who say that all things happen by chance cannot admit the existence of ideas. This opinion, however, is criticized by philosophers, because things which happen by chance do not happen uniformly, but happen only in a few instances. We see, however, that the course of nature always, or at least in most cases, proceeds in an uniform manner.

Similarly, those who say that all things proceed from God by a necessity of nature and not by a decision of will cannot admit ideas, because those who act impelled by the necessity of nature do not determine the end for themselves. This cannot be the case here, however, because, if a thing acts for an end but does not determine that end itself, it has its end determined for it by something else superior to it; and thus there would be a cause superior to God. This, of course, is impossible, since all those who speak of God understand Him to be the first cause of beings.

For these reasons, Plato affirmed the existence of ideas, avoiding the opinion of the Epicureans, who asserted that everything happens by chance, and

that of Empedocles and others who asserted that everything happens because of a natural necessity. This reason for affirming ideas, namely, on account of the previous planning of the works that are to be done, is suggested by Dionysius, who says: "We say that exemplars in God are the intelligible characters of things that come to be, the individually pre-existing causes of subsistent beings. These, theology calls 'predefinitions.' They predetermine and cause godly and good inclinations in creatures. It is according to these that the super-substance predefines and produces all things. However, because an exemplary form or idea has, in some sense, the nature of an end, and because an artist receives the form by which he acts—if it is outside of him—we cannot say that the divine ideas are outside of God. They can be only within the divine mind, for it is unreasonable to say that God acts on account of an end other than Himself or that He receives that which enables Him to act from a source other than Himself.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The perfection of knowledge can be considered either with reference to the knower or with reference to the thing known. When it is said, therefore, that knowledge by means of an essence is more perfect than that had by means of a likeness, this is to be understood as referring to what is known. For that which is knowable in itself is, in itself, known more than that which, not knowable in itself, is known only in so far as it is in a knower by means of its likeness. In this sense, it is not inconsistent to say that created things are less knowable than the divine essence, which is knowable by its very nature.

2. Two things are required for a species which is a medium of knowledge. First, it must represent the thing known. This belongs to a species in so far as it approaches the nature of what is known. Second, it must have a spiritual or immaterial act of existing. This belongs to a species in so far as it has its act of existing in the knower. For this reason, a thing is known better by means of an intellectual species than by means of the species in sense, since the former is more immaterial. Similarly, a thing is known better by means of the species in the divine mind than it could be known by means of its own essence—even granting that the essence of a thing could be the medium of knowledge despite its materiality.

3. Two elements of knowledge must be considered. First, we must consider its nature; and this is determined by the relation of the species to the intellect in which it exists. Second, we must consider the determinate character which the knowledge has with respect to its object; and this follows the relation that the species has to the thing itself. Hence, the more similar the

species is as a representation to the thing known, the more determinate is the knowledge; and the more it approaches immateriality, which belongs to the nature of the knower in so far as he knows, the more efficacious it is in the production of knowledge.

4. It is contrary to the nature of natural forms that they should be immaterial in themselves; but it is not inconsistent for them to acquire immateriality from the one in whom they exist. Consequently, in our intellects, the forms of natural things are immaterial. Hence, while it would be incorrect to assert that ideas of natural things have a separate subsistence, it would be correct to say that they are in the divine mind.

5. Strictly speaking, the ideas existing in the divine mind neither generate nor are generated, but rather create or produce things. Hence, Augustine says: "Although they themselves neither begin nor cease to be, nevertheless, whatever can begin or cease to be is said to be informed according to them." Nor is it necessary, when composite things are made, for the first efficient cause to resemble what is generated: this is true only of the proximate efficient cause. Since Plato asserted that the ideas are the proximate principle of generation, the argument mentioned in the difficulty is directed against him.

6. Dionysius wished to say merely that God does not know by means of an idea received from things or in such a manner that He would know a thing differently by means of an idea. For this reason, another translation of this passage reads: "Nor does He by His vision come into contact with individual things." Hence, from this argument, it is not impossible for ideas to exist.

7. Although there can be no proportion between God and a creature, there can be a proportionality, as we have previously shown.

8. Just as God does not need an essence other than His act of existence, because He cannot not be, neither does He need a norm other than Himself, because He cannot know or act in a way that would be faulty. The reason for this perfection is that He is His own norm, just as the reason for the necessity of His existence is that His essence is His act of existence.

9. In God there is no dimensional quantity on whose basis an equality could be established. There is in Him, however, quantity after the manner of intensive quantity. For example, whiteness is said to be *great* when it attains the perfect fullness of its nature. The intensity of a form, moreover, refers to the manner in which that form is possessed. Now, although that which is divine may in some way be passed on to creatures, we can never grant that a creature possesses it in the same way in which God possesses it. Hence, although we grant that there exists a likeness between a creature and God in some way, we do not grant that they are equal in any way whatsoever.

10. As will be evident to one who carefully considers Anselm's words, Anselm means to say merely that in the Word there exists no likeness drawn from things themselves, but, instead, all the forms of things are taken from the Word. Accordingly, he means that the Word is not a likeness of things, but things are imitations of the Word. Consequently, this argument does not dispense with the ideas, since an idea is a form which something imitates.

11. The statement that God knows Himself in the same way in which He knows other things is true if we are speaking about the way of knowing with reference to the knower. It is not true, however, if we are speaking about the way of knowing with reference to the thing known, because the creature which is known by God is not the same in the real order as the medium by which God knows. But He Himself is really the same as it. Consequently, it does not follow that there is multiplicity in His essence.

ARTICLE 2

*Are there many ideas?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. The things which are predicated essentially of God are not less true of Him than those which are predicated personally of Him. Now, a plurality of personal properties involves a plurality of persons, and for this reason God is said to be triune. Consequently, since ideas are essential perfections because common to all three Persons, if the number of ideas is determined by the number of things that there are, it follows that there are not only three Persons but an infinite number of them.

2. It was said, however, that ideas are not essential properties, since they are the essence itself.—On the contrary, God's goodness, wisdom, and power are His essence, yet they are said to be essential attributes. Therefore, even though they are His essence, ideas can be called His essential properties.

3. Whatever is attributed to God should be attributed to Him as existing in the most noble manner possible. Now, God is the principle of all things; hence, whatever pertains to the nobility of a principle should be said to exist in Him in the highest possible degree. However, unity is a perfection of this sort, because, as is said in *The Causes*: "Every power is more infinite when it has unity than when it is multiplied." Hence, the highest unity is in God.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 15, 7; 44, 3; 47, 1, ad 2; *I Sent.*, 36, 2, 2; *III Sent.*, 14, 2, sol. 2; *C.G.*, I, 54; *De pot.*, 3, 16, ad 12-14; *Quodl.*, IV, 1, 1.

He is, therefore, not only one in reality, but also one in concept, because that which is one in both respects is more *one* than that which is one merely in one respect. Consequently, many intelligible characters or ideas do not exist in God.

4. The Philosopher says: "What is entirely one cannot be separated either by intellect, time, place, or concept—especially with regard to its substance." Consequently, if God is one in the highest degree because He is being in the highest degree, conceptual distinctions are not applicable to Him; so, our original position stands.

5. If there are many ideas, they must be unequal, because one idea will contain only the act of existence, another, both existence and life, a third, both of these and intellection besides—according as the thing, whose idea it is, resembles God in one or many respects. But, since it is inconsistent to say that there is any inequality in God, it seems that there cannot be many ideas in Him.

6. Material causes can be reduced to one first matter, and efficient and final causes can be reduced in a similar manner. Consequently, formal causes can also be reduced to one first form. The end-term of this reduction, however, will be ideas, because, as Augustine says: "these are the principal forms or intelligible characters of things." Hence, there is only one idea in God.

7. But it was said that, although there is only one first form, ideas are nevertheless said to be many because of the different relations this form has.—On the contrary, it cannot be said that ideas are multiplied because of their relation to God in whom they exist, for He is one; nor can they be multiplied because of their relation to what is made according to them and as these creatures exist in the first cause, since, as Dionysius says, in the first cause creatures exist as one. Finally, ideas cannot be multiplied because of their relation to what is made according to them and as these things exist in their own natures, because creatures are temporal and ideas are eternal. Hence, there is no possible way of saying that the ideas are many because of their relation to the first form.

8. The relation between God and creature does not exist in God; it exists only in the creature. But an idea or exemplar implies a relation of God to a creature. Therefore, that relation is not in God but only in the creature. Now, since the idea is in God, ideas cannot be multiplied by relations of this sort.

9. An intellect that knows by means of many species is composite and moves from one to another. But this way of knowing is far from God's way. Therefore, since ideas are the intelligible characters of things by which God understands, it seems that there are not many ideas in Him.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. The same thing under the same aspect can, of its very nature, produce only one and the same reality. But God produces many and different things. Hence, God causes things, not according to one concept, but according to many concepts. But the concepts by which God produces things are ideas. Therefore, there are many ideas in God.

2. Augustine says: "It remains, therefore, that all things are created by plan, but a man not by the same plan as a horse. So to think would be absurd." Each thing is therefore created according to its own plan; hence, there are many ideas.

3. Augustine says that it is just as wrong to say that the plan which God has of man in general is the same as that of this man in particular as it is to say that the idea of an angle is the same as that of a square. It seems, therefore, that there are many plans in God's ideas.

4. The Epistle to the Hebrews (11:3) states: "By faith we understand that the world was framed by the word of God; that from invisible things visible things might be made." Note that he refers to the ideal species as invisible *things* (plural). Hence, there are many ideas.

5. The saints call ideas art and the world, as is clear from the authorities cited. But *art* implies plurality, for art is a collection of precepts converging toward one end. *World* has a similar connotation, since it implies the collection of all creatures. Hence, we should affirm the existence of many ideas in God.

REPLY

While admitting that God acts through His intellect and not under the compulsion of His nature, some have said that He intends only one thing, namely, creature in general, and the distinction between creatures is brought about by secondary causes. They declare that God first established one intelligence that produced three things: a soul, the world, and another intelligence; and by means of this procession a plurality of things issued forth from the one first principle. According to this position, there would, indeed, be an idea in God, but only one common to all creation. The proper idea of each individual thing would exist only in secondary causes. This opinion, Dionysius says, was held by a certain philosopher named Clement, who maintained that higher beings were the archetypes of lower.

This opinion, however, cannot stand, because if the intention of an agent is directed toward one thing only, whatever else that follows is apart from his intention and, as it were, a chance happening, which happens accidentally in conjunction with that which he principally intended. This would make the

agent like someone who wants to produce something that is triangular, and whether it is small or large is a matter of indifference to him. Now, to whatever is general something special is indirectly connected. Hence, if an agent intends merely something general, in whatever way it is determined by something special it is entirely apart from his intention. For example, if nature intends to generate only an animal, it is apart from nature's intention that what is generated be a man or a horse. Consequently, if God's intention when He acts regards only creatures in general, then all distinction between creatures happens by chance. But it is hardly correct to say that this difference between creatures is related only accidentally to the first cause and essentially to second causes, since what is essential is previous to what is accidental, and the relation of a thing to the first cause is previous to its relation to a second cause, as is clear from *The Causes*. Consequently, it is impossible for the distinction between creatures to be related only accidentally to the first cause and essentially to a second cause. The opposite, however, can happen; for we see that those things that happen by chance as far as we are concerned are foreknown by God and ordained by Him. Hence, we must say that all the distinction between things is predefined by God. Consequently, we must affirm that intelligible characters proper to individual things exist in God and that for this reason there are in Him many ideas.

From this the plurality of ideas can be understood. A form can exist in the intellect in two ways. First, it can exist there so as to be a principle of the act of understanding, as is the form had by a knower in so far as he understands. This is the likeness of what is understood, existing in him. Second, the form can exist in the intellect so as to be the end-term of the act of understanding. For example, by understanding an architect thinks out the form of a house; and since that form has been thought out by means of an act of understanding and is, as it were, effected by that act, it cannot be a principle of the act of understanding and thus the first means by which the understanding takes place. It is, instead, *the understood*, by which the knower makes something. Nevertheless, it is the second means by which understanding takes place, because it is by means of the excogitated form that the architect understands what he is to make. Similarly, with respect to the speculative intellect, we see that the species by which the intellect is informed so that it can actually understand is the first means by which understanding takes place; and because the intellect is brought into act by means of this form, it can now operate and form quiddities of things, as well as compose and divide. Consequently, the quiddities formed in the intellect, or even the affirmative and negative propositions, are, in a sense, products of the intellect, but products of such a kind that through

them the intellect arrives at the knowledge of an exterior thing. Hence, this product is, in a fashion, a second means by which understanding takes place. If, however, the intellect of an artist were to produce a work that resembled itself, then, indeed, the very intellect of the artist would be an idea, not in so far as it is an intellect, but in so far as it is understood.

Now, with respect to those things made in imitation of something else, we sometimes find that they imitate their archetype perfectly. In such a case, the operative intellect when preconceiving the form of what was made, possesses as an idea the very form of the thing imitated precisely as the form of the thing imitated. At other times, however, we find that that which is made in imitation of another is not a perfect imitation. In this case, the operative intellect would not take as its idea or archetype the form of the archetype itself, absolutely and exactly as it is, but it takes it with a definite proportion varying according to the degree of closeness with which the copy imitates the original.

I say, therefore, that God, who makes all things by means of His intellect, produces them all in the likeness of His own essence. Hence, His essence is the idea of things—not, indeed, His essence considered as an essence, but considered as it is known. Created things, however, do not perfectly imitate the divine essence. Consequently, His essence as the idea of things is not understood by the divine intellect unqualifiedly, but with the proportion to the divine essence had by the creature to be produced, that is, according as the creature falls short of, or imitates, the divine essence. Now, different things imitate the divine essence in different ways, each one according to its own proper manner, since each has its own act of existence, distinct from that of another. We can say, therefore, that the divine essence is the idea of each and every thing, understanding, of course, the different proportions that things have to it. Hence, since there are in things different proportions to the divine essence, there must necessarily be many ideas. If we consider the essence alone, however, there is but one idea for all things; but if we consider the different proportions of creatures to the divine essence, then there can be said to be a plurality of ideas.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Personal properties introduce a distinction of persons in God because they are opposed to each other by relative opposition. But properties that are not opposed, such as common spiration and paternity, do not distinguish one person from another. Moreover, neither the ideas nor other essential attributes are opposed by relative opposition. Hence, there is no similarity.

2. The same thing is not true of ideas and essential attributes. In their

principal meaning, the essential attributes do not signify anything more than the essence of the Creator. Hence, strictly speaking, they are not plural, although God is compared to creatures with reference to them. For example, with reference to His goodness, we say that creatures are good; with reference to His wisdom, we say that they are wise. An idea, however, in its principal meaning signifies something other than God's essence, namely, the proportion a creature has to His essence; and this completes the formal notion of an idea. Because of this there are said to be many ideas. Nevertheless, the ideas may be called essential attributes inasmuch as they are related to the essence.

3. A plurality of concepts is sometimes reduced to a diversity in the thing. For example, there is a rational distinction between Socrates and Socrates sitting, and this is reduced to the difference that there is between substance and accident. Similarly, man and animal differ rationally; and this difference is reduced to the difference between form and matter, because genus is taken from matter but the specific difference from form. Consequently, such a conceptual difference is repugnant to the highest unity or simplicity. On the other hand, a conceptual difference sometimes is reduced not to any diversity in the thing, but to its truth, which can be understood in different ways. It is in this sense that we say that there is a plurality of intelligible characters in God. Hence, this plurality is not repugnant to His highest unity or simplicity.

4. In this passage, the Philosopher speaks of intelligible characters as definitions. But we cannot talk of there being many intelligible characters in God as though these were definitions, for none of these comprehends the divine essence. Hence, this passage is not to the point.

5. The form in the intellect has a double relationship. It is related not only to the thing whose form it is, but also to the intellect in which it exists. On the basis of its first relation, the form is not said to be *of a certain kind* but rather *of a certain thing*, for the intellectual form of material things is not a material form, nor is the intellectual form of sensible things sensible. It is on the basis of its second relationship that the intellectual form is said to be "of a certain kind," because its kind is determined by that in which it exists. Hence, from the fact that some of the things of which ideas are had imitate the divine essence more perfectly than others, it does not follow that the ideas are unequal, but that they are ideas of unequal things.

6. The one first form to which all things are reduced is the divine essence, considered in itself. Reflecting upon this essence, the divine intellect devises—if I may use such an expression—different ways in which it can be imitated. The plurality of ideas comes from these different ways.

7. The ideas are multiplied according to the different relations they

have to things existing in their own natures. It is not necessary that these relations be temporal even if the things are temporal, because the action of the intellect—even of the human intellect—can extend to something even when it does not exist, as, for example, when we know the past. Moreover, as is said in the *Metaphysics*, a relation follows upon action; hence, even relations to temporal things are eternal in the divine intellect.

8. The relation existing between God and creature is not a real relation in God. However, it is in God according to our manner of understanding Him; similarly, it can be in Him according to His own manner of understanding Himself, that is, in so far as He understands the relation things have to His essence. Thus, these relations exist in God as known by Him.

9. An idea does not have the character of *that by which* a thing is first understood, but, rather, of *that which is* understood and is existing in the intellect. Moreover, whether or not there is to be but one form in the understanding is determined by the unity of *that by which* a thing is first understood, just as the unity of an action is determined by the unity of the form of the agent which is its principle. Hence, although the relations understood by God are many (and it is in these relations that the plurality of ideas consists), nevertheless, because e understands all things by means of His essence, His understanding is not multiple but one.

ARTICLE 3

*Do ideas belong to speculative or only to practical knowledge?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they belong only to practical knowledge, for

1. According to Augustine: "Ideas are the principal forms of things, according to which everything is formed that has a beginning or an end." But, since nothing is formed by reason of speculative knowledge, ideas do not belong to this type of knowledge.

2. It was said, however, that ideas are related not only to those things which have a beginning or an end, but also to those which *can* have a beginning or end, as Augustine says in the same passage. Consequently, ideas are related to those things which do not exist, will not exist, and never have existed, but nevertheless can exist. Of these, God has speculative knowledge.—On the contrary, practical knowledge is said to be that knowledge according to

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 14, 16; 15, 3; *I Sent.*, 36, 2, 3; *De div. nom.*, c. 5, lect. 3 (P. 15:352a seq.); *De pot.*, 1, 5, ad 10-11; 3, 1, ad 13.

which one knows how a thing is done, even if he never intends to do it. This is why part of medical study is called practical. Now, God knows how the things which He can make are to be made, even though He does not intend to make them. Therefore, God has practical knowledge of them. Hence, in both ways, ideas pertain to practical knowledge.

3. An idea is nothing but the exemplary form. Now, one can speak of the exemplary form only in connection with practical knowledge, because an exemplar is that upon which a thing else is modeled. Therefore, ideas pertain only to practical knowledge.

4. According to the Philosopher, the practical intellect pertains to those things whose principles are within us. But the ideas existing in the divine intellect are principles of the things that are modeled on the ideas. Therefore, they belong to the practical intellect.

5. All the forms in the intellect either are from things or have a relation to things. The latter type of forms belongs to the practical intellect; the former, to the speculative. But no forms in the divine intellect are from things, since it receives nothing from things. Therefore, the forms in the divine intellect have a relation to things, and thus belong to the practical intellect.

6. If in God an idea of the practical intellect were other than an idea of the speculative intellect, this diversity could not be based on something absolute in Him; for everything of this kind in God is one and one only; nor could it be based on a relation of identity such as exists when a thing is said to be identical with itself, because such a relation involves no plurality. Finally, it could not be based on a relation of diversity, since a cause is not multiplied even when its effects are multiple. Therefore, there is no possible way of distinguishing an idea of speculative knowledge from an idea of practical knowledge.

7. But it was said that these ideas are distinguished because a practical idea is a principle of being, while a speculative idea is a principle of knowing.— On the contrary, principles of being and of knowing are the same. Therefore, a speculative idea cannot be distinguished from a practical idea on the basis suggested.

8. God's speculative knowledge seems to be the same as His simple knowledge. God's simple knowledge, however, is nothing other than bare knowledge. Now, since an idea adds a relation to things, it seems that an idea does not belong to His speculative knowledge but only to His practical knowledge.

9. The end of the practical intellect is the good. Now, the reference of an idea can be determined only to a good; for, if evil occurs, that is outside of

God's intention. Consequently, an idea pertains only to the practical intellect.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Practical knowledge extends only to those things which are to be made. But by His ideas God knows not only what things are to be made, but also those things that are made and have been made. Therefore, ideas are not restricted merely to practical knowledge.

2. God knows creatures more perfectly than an artist knows the products of his craftsmanship. But by means of the forms through which he acts, an artist, who is merely a creature, has speculative knowledge of his handicraft. How much more must this be true of God!

3. Speculative knowledge is that which considers the principles and causes of things, as well as their properties. But by ideas God knows all that can be known of things. Therefore, the divine ideas pertain not only to practical, but also to speculative knowledge.

REPLY

As is said in *The Soul*: "Practical knowledge differs from speculative knowledge in its end." For the end of speculative knowledge is simply truth, but the end of practical knowledge, as we read in the *Metaphysics*, is action. Now, some knowledge is called practical because it is directed to a work. This happens in two ways. In the first way, it is directed in act—that is, when it is actually directed to a certain work, as the form is which an artist preconceives and intends to introduce into matter. This is called actual practical knowledge and is the form by which knowledge takes place. At other times, however, there is a type of knowledge that is capable of being ordered to an act, but this ordering is not actual. For example, an artist thinks out a form for his work, knows how it can be made, yet does not intend to make it. This is practical knowledge, not actual, but habitual or virtual. At still other times, knowledge is utterly incapable of being ordered to execution. Such knowledge is purely speculative. This also happens in two ways. First, the knowledge is about those things whose natures are such that they cannot be produced by the knowledge of the knower, as is true for example, when we think about natural things. Second, it may happen that the thing known is something that is producible through knowledge but is not considered as producible; for a thing is given existence through a productive operation, and there are certain realities that can be separated in understanding although they cannot exist separately. Therefore, when we consider a thing which is capable of production through the intellect and distinguish from each other realities that cannot exist sep-

arately, this knowledge is not practical knowledge, either actual or habitual, but only speculative. This is the kind of knowledge a craftsman has when he thinks about a house by reflecting only on its genus, differences, properties, and other things of this sort which have no separate existence in the thing itself. But a thing is considered as something capable of execution when there are considered in its regard all the things that are simultaneously required for its existence.

God's knowledge is related to things in these four ways. Since His knowledge causes things, He knows some things by ordaining by a decree of His will that they come into existence at a certain time. Of these things He has actual practical knowledge. Moreover, He knows other things which He never intends to make, for He knows those things which do not exist, have not existed, and never will exist, as we said in the preceding question. Of these things He has actual knowledge, not actually practical knowledge, however, but merely virtually practical. Again, since He knows the things which He makes or is able to make, not only as they exist in their own act of existence, but also according to all the notes which the human intellect can find in them by analysis, He knows things that He can make even under an aspect in which they are incapable of execution. Finally, He knows certain things of which His knowledge cannot be the cause—evils, for example. Therefore, it is very true to say that there is both practical and speculative knowledge in God.

Now we must see which of the preceding ways is proper to the ideas which must be attributed to God's knowledge. As Augustine says if we consider the proper meaning of the word itself, an idea is *a form*; but if we consider what the thing itself is, then an idea is *an intelligible character* or likeness of a thing. We find, moreover, in certain forms, a double relation: one relation to that which is informed by these forms, and this is the kind of relation that knowledge has to the knower; another to that which is outside, and this is the kind of a relation that knowledge has to what is known. This latter relationship, however, is not common to all forms, as the first is. Therefore, the word form implies only the first relation. This is why a form always has the nature of a cause, for a form is, in a sense, the cause of that which it informs—whether this informing takes place by inherence, as it does in the case of intrinsic forms, or by imitation, as it does in the case of exemplary forms. But an intelligible character and a likeness also have the second relationship, which does not give them the nature of a cause. If we speak, therefore, of an idea, considering only the notion that is properly conveyed by that word, then an idea includes only that kind of knowledge according to which a thing can be made. This is knowledge that is actually practical, or merely virtually practical, which, in

some way, is speculative. On the other hand, if we call an idea an intelligible character or likeness in a wide sense, then an idea can also pertain to purely speculative knowledge. Or, if we wish to speak more formally, we should say that an idea belongs to knowledge that is practical, either actually or virtually; but an intelligible character or likeness belongs to both practical and speculative knowledge.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Augustine is referring the formative action of ideas not only to those things which are made but also to those which can be made. For, even if these latter never exist, they are, in a certain sense, known, speculatively, as is clear from what has been said.

2. This argument refers only to knowledge which is practical virtually, not actually. Nothing prevents us from calling this speculative in some sense in so far as it falls short of actual execution.

3. Although an exemplar implies a relation to something outside, it is related as a cause to that extrinsic thing. Therefore, properly speaking, it belongs to knowledge that is practical, either habitually or virtually. But an exemplar is not necessarily restricted to that which is actually practical, because a thing can be called an exemplar merely if something else can be made in imitation of it—even though this other thing is never made. The same is true of ideas.

4. The practical intellect pertains to those things whose principles are within us not in any manner whatsoever, but as being capable of being executed by us. Hence, as is evident from what we have said, we can also have speculative knowledge of those things whose causes are within us.

5. The speculative intellect is not differentiated from the practical because one has its forms from things, and the other, forms related to things, because our practical intellect, at times, also receives its forms from things, as happens, for example, when an artist, having seen some work of art, conceives a form according to which he intends to make something. Therefore, it is not necessary, either, that all the forms which pertain to the speculative intellect be received from things.

6. God's practical and speculative ideas should not be distinguished as though they were two kinds of ideas. They are distinguished because, according to our way of understanding, to the speculative idea the practical adds a relation to an operation. It is just as we say that *man* adds rational to *animal*, even though man and animal are not two things.

7. Principles of being and principles of knowing are said to be the same,

because whatever is a principle of being is also a principle of knowing. The opposite, however, is not true, since effects are not infrequently principles of knowing causes. Consequently, there is no reason why the forms of the speculative intellect should not be merely principles of knowing, while the forms of the practical intellect are principles both of knowing and of being.

8. We speak of God's simple knowledge, not to exclude the relation which His knowledge has to what He knows, for such a relation is inseparably joined to all knowledge, but to exclude from it things that are outside the genus of knowledge. Such things are the existence of things (which is added by His knowledge of vision) and the relation of His will to the things that He knows and will produce (which is added by His knowledge of approval). It is just as we call fire a simple body, not to deny that it has essential parts, but rather to exclude foreign elements from its definition.

9. The true and the good include each other, since the true is a good and every good is true. Therefore, the good can be considered speculatively when only its truth is considered. For example, we can define the good and show what its nature is. But the good can also be considered practically if it is considered as a good, that is, as an end of a motion or operation. Consequently, it clearly does not follow that the ideas or likenesses or intelligible characters in the divine intellect belong only to practical knowledge simply because they have a relation terminating in a good.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

1. Time has no ebb or flow in God, because His eternity, which is entirely simultaneous, includes all time. Hence, He knows the past, present, and future in the same way. This is precisely what Sirach (23:29) says: "For all things were known to the Lord God, before they were created: so also after they were perfected he beholdeth all things." Hence, it is not necessary that an idea properly so called should exceed the limits of practical knowledge merely because the past is known by means of it.

2. If the knowledge of his handicraft which an artist, who is a creature, has by means of forms referred to action is a knowledge of his work as it can be produced, although he does not intend to produce it, then that knowledge is not speculative in all respects but is habitually practical. But that knowledge by which the artist knows, works, not, however, as he can produce them, is purely speculative. It does not contain ideas corresponding to the work, although it might possibly contain likenesses or intelligible characters of it.

3. Both speculative and practical knowledge are had by means of principles and causes. Consequently, this argument cannot prove that a science is

speculative or that it is practical.

ARTICLE 4

*Is there in God an idea of evil?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that there is, for

1. God knows evil things in His science of simple knowledge. But the ideas belong to His science of simple knowledge in some way if *idea* is taken in its broader meaning of a likeness or intelligible character. Therefore, there is an idea of evil in God.

2. There is no reason why evil cannot be in a good not opposed to it. Now, the likeness of evil is not opposed to the good, just as the likeness of black is not opposed to white, because the species of contraries in the soul are not contrary. Therefore, there is no reason why there cannot be an idea or likeness of evil in God, even though He is the highest good.

3. Wherever there is any community, there is likeness. Now, from the fact that a thing is a privation of being, being can be predicated of it; hence it is said in the *Metaphysics* that negations and privations are called beings. Therefore, from the fact that evil is the privation of good, some likeness of it exists in God, who is the highest good.

4. Whatever is known in itself has its idea in God. But the false, like the true, is known in itself; for, just as first principles are known in themselves in their truth, so also are the opposites of these principles known in themselves in their falsity. Hence, the false has its idea in God. Now, the false is a kind of evil, just as the true is the good of the intellect, as we read in the *Ethics*. Therefore, evil has an idea in God.

5. Whatever has a nature has an idea in God. Now, since vice is the contrary of virtue, it has a nature which belongs to the genus of quality. Therefore, it has an idea in God. But because it is vice, it is evil. Therefore, evil has an idea in God.

6. If evil has no idea, the only reason for this is that evil is non-being. But the forms by which one knows can have non-beings as their objects. There is nothing to prevent us, for example, from imagining golden mountains or chimeras. Therefore, there is no reason why evil cannot have an idea in God.

7. If a thing has no mark upon it and exists among other things that are

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 2, 15; *S.T.*, I, 14, 10; 15, 3, ad 1; *I Sent.*, 36, 1, 2; *C.G.*, I, 7 1; *Quodl.*, XI, 2, 2.

marked, the very lack of a mark becomes its mark, as is clear in sheep which are marked. Now, an idea is, in a way, a sign of that of which it is an idea. Therefore, since all good things have an idea in God, and evil does not, evil itself should be said to be modeled upon or formed in the likeness of an idea.

8. Whatever comes from God has its idea in Him. But evil, that is, the evil of punishment, comes from God. Therefore, it has an idea in God.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. All effects of an idea have an act of existence determined by that idea. But evil does not have a determined act of existence, since it does not have any existence, and is, instead, a privation of being. Therefore, evil does not have an idea in God.

2. According to Dionysius,³ the divine exemplar or idea is a pre-definition of the divine will. But the divine will is related only to what is good. Therefore, evil has no exemplar in God.

3. "Evil," according to Augustine, "is the privation of form, measure, and order." Now, Plato says that ideas themselves are beautiful. Consequently, evil can have no idea.

REPLY

As pointed out previously, an idea, according to its proper nature, implies a form that is the principle of informing a thing. Consequently, since there is nothing in God that can be a principle of evil, evil cannot have an idea in God if *idea* is taken in its proper sense. This is likewise true if it is taken in its broad sense as meaning a likeness or intelligible character, because, as Augustine says, evil gets its name from the fact that it lacks form. Hence, since a likeness is considered as a form that is in some way shared by others, evil can have no likeness in God, because a thing is called evil for the very reason that it falls short of any participation in divinity.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. God's science of simple knowledge has as its object, not only evil, but also certain good things that do not exist, will not exist, and never did exist. It is with respect to these non-existing things that there is an idea in God's simple knowledge, but there is no idea in it of evil things.

2. We deny that evil has an exemplar in God, not just because of its opposition, but because evil has no nature through which it could in some way participate in something that is in God and which could, therefore, be called a likeness of it.

3. That community by which something is predicated both of being and of non-being is a community merely of reason, because negations and privations are merely beings of reason. Such a community is not enough for the likeness of which we are now speaking.

4. That this principle, "No whole is greater than its part," is false is a truth. Therefore, to know that it is false is to know something true. However, the falsity of this principle is known only by its privation of truth, just as blindness is known by its being a privation of sight.

5. Just as evil actions are good in so far as they have existence and come from God, so also in this sense are the habits good which are the principles or effects of these actions. Therefore, the fact that they are bad does not posit any nature but only a privation.

6. A thing is called a non-being for two reasons. First, because nonexistence is included in its definition; and this is why blindness is called a non-being. It is impossible to conceive, either in our imagination or in our intellect, any form for such non-beings; and evil is a non-being of this type. Second, because the non-being is not found in the realm of nature, even though the privation of existence is not included in its definition. Here, however, there is no reason why we cannot imagine such non-beings and conceive their forms.

7. Because evil has no idea in God, God knows it by means of the idea of the good opposed to it. In this way, evil is related to His knowledge as though it had an idea-not that the privation of an idea stands in the place of an idea, however, because there can be no privation in God.

8. The evil of punishment proceeds from God as part of His order of justice. Hence, it is good and has an idea in Him.

ARTICLE 5

*Is there in God an idea of first matter?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. According to Augustine: "An idea is a form." But matter has no form. Therefore, in God there is no idea corresponding to matter.

2. Matter is merely a being in potency. Now, if an idea has to correspond to its effect, if matter has an idea, the idea of matter will be merely in potency. There is, however, no potentiality in God. Therefore, first matter has no idea in Him.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 15, 3, ad 3; *I Sent.*, 36, 1, 1.

3. As they exist in God, the ideas are of those things which are or can be. But first matter does not exist separately, that is, by itself, nor can it so exist. Therefore, it has no idea in God.

4. An idea is that according to which a thing is informed. But first matter can never be informed so that a form would belong to its essence. Therefore, if it did have an idea, that idea would be useless in God. This, however, is absurd.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Whatever derives its act of existence from God has an idea in God. Matter belongs to this class of beings. Therefore, it has an idea in God.

2. Every essence is derived from the divine essence. Therefore whatever has an essence has an exemplar in God. Matter belongs to this class of beings.

REPLY

Plato, who was the first to speak about ideas, did not posit any idea for first matter, because he asserted that the ideas were the causes of the things modeled upon them, and first matter is not caused by an idea but, instead, is its co-cause. For he said that there are two principles to be found in matter, “the great” and “the small,” but only one principle to be found in form, namely, the idea. We, however, assert that matter is caused by God. Hence, it is necessary to affirm that it exemplar in some way exists in God, since He possesses a likeness of whatever He causes.

On the other hand, if we take *idea* in its strict sense, we cannot say that first matter of itself has an idea in God that is distinct from the idea of the form or of the composite. For an idea, properly speaking is related to a thing in so far as it can be brought into existence; an matter cannot come into existence without a form, nor can a form come into existence without matter. Hence, properly speaking, there is no idea corresponding merely to matter or merely to form; but one idea corresponds to the entire composite—an idea that causes the whole, both its form and its matter. On the other hand, if we take *idea* in its broader sense as meaning an intelligible character or likeness, then both matter and form of themselves can be said to have an idea by which they can be known distinctly, even though they cannot exist separately. In this sense, there is no reason why there cannot be an idea of first matter, even taken in itself.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Although first matter has no form, there is in it an imitation of the

first form; for, even though its act of existence may be very feeble, it is an imitation of the first being. For this reason, its likeness can be in God.

2. The idea and its copy need not be similar according to a conformity in nature. It is enough that one represent the other. For this reason, the idea of even composite things is simple, and, similarly, the idea of a potential being is actual.

3. Even though matter cannot exist by itself, it can be considered in itself. Thus, it can, in itself, have a likeness.

4. That argument refers to the idea inasmuch as it is actually or virtually practical, and is related to a thing in so far as it can be brought into being. First matter does not have an idea of this kind.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

1. Matter derives its act of existence from God only in so far as it is part of a composite. In this sense, it does not, properly speaking, have an idea in God.

2. Similarly, matter does not properly have an essence. It is, rather, part of the essence of the whole.

ARTICLE 6

*Are there ideas in God of those things which do not exist, will not exist, and have not existed?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. Nothing has an idea in God unless it has a determinate act of existence. But that which does not exist, never has existed, and never will exist has no determinate act of existence at all. Therefore, neither does it have an idea in God.

2. But it was said that, even though it does not have a determinate act of existence in itself, it has, nevertheless, such a determinate act in God.—On the contrary, a thing is determinate in so far as it is distinguished from another. But all things as they exist in God are one and are not distinct from each other. Therefore, even in God it does not have a determinate act of existence.

3. According to Dionysius, exemplars are those good acts of the divine will which cause and predetermine things. But the things which are not, have not been, nor will be were never predetermined by the divine will. Therefore,

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 15, 3, ad 2. See also readings given for q. 2, a. 8.

they do not have an idea or exemplar in God.

4. An idea is ordained to the production of a thing. If there is, therefore, an idea of something which will never be given existence, it seems that such an idea is useless. But this would be absurd.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. God knows things by means of ideas. But as we said above. He knows those things which are not, have not been, nor will be. Therefore, there is an idea in God of all that does not exist, has not existed and never will exist.

2. A cause does not depend on its effect. Now, an idea is a cause of the existence of things. Therefore, it does not depend in any way on their existence. Consequently, there can be ideas of those things which do not exist, have not existed, and never will exist.

REPLY

Properly speaking, an idea belongs to practical knowledge that is not only actually but also habitually practical. Therefore, since God has virtually practical knowledge of those things which He could make, even though He never makes them or never will make them, there must be ideas of those things which are not, have not been, nor will be. But these ideas will not be the same as those of the things which are, have been, or will be, because the divine will determines to produce the things that are, have been, and will be, but not to produce those which neither are, have been, nor will be. The latter, therefore have, in a certain sense, indeterminate ideas.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Even though that which never existed, does not exist, and will no exist lacks a determined act of existence in itself, it exists determinately in God's knowledge.

2. It is One thing to be in God, another to be in His knowledge. Evil is not in God; it is, however, contained in His knowledge. Now, a., thing is said to be in God's knowledge if God knows it; and because God knows all things distinctly, as we said in the previous question, things are distinct in His knowledge even though in Him they are one,

3. Even though God may never will to bring into existence things of this class, whose ideas He possesses, He wills that He be able to produce them and that He possess the knowledge necessary for producing them. Consequently, Dionysius is saying that the nature of an exemplar demands, not a will that is predefining and effecting, but merely a will that can define and effect.

4. Those ideas are not directed by God's knowledge to the production of something in their likeness, but rather to this, that something *can be* produced in their likeness.

ARTICLE 7

*Are there in God ideas of accidents?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. An idea is for knowing and causing things. But an accident is known by means of its substance, and is caused by the principles of the substance. Hence, it need not have an idea in God.

2. But it was stated that the existence, not the essence, of an accident is known by means of its subject.—On the contrary, the definition of a thing signifies what it is, especially by giving its genus. But, in the definitions of accidents, as is said in the *Metaphysics*, are placed substance and the subject, in the sense in which subject is used instead of the genus, as the Commentator notes. For example, we say: "Snub means a curved nose." Consequently, we know the essence of an accident by knowing the substance.

3. Whatever has an idea participates in it. But accidents do not participate in anything, because participation is proper only to substances since they alone can receive something. Accidents, therefore, do not have ideas.

4. In regard to those things that are predicated as prior and subsequent, in Plato's opinion an idea should not be taken as common, e.g., as applied to numbers and geometrical figures. This is clear from the *Metaphysics* and *Ethics*. The reason for this is that the first is, as it were, the exemplar of the second. Now, being is predicated of substance and accident as prior and subsequent. Therefore, an accident does not have an idea, but has substance in the place of an idea.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Whatever is caused by God has its idea in God. Now, God causes not only substances but accidents as well. Therefore, accidents have ;in idea in God.

2. Every inferior of a genus should be reduced to the first of that *gentis*, just as everything that is hot is reduced to the heat of fire. Now, as Augustine says: "Ideas are principal forms." Consequently, since accidents are forms, it

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 15, 3, ad 4; *I Sent.*, 36, 1, 1.

seems that they have ideas in God.

REPLY

As the Philosopher says, Plato, who first introduced the notion of ideas, posited ideas, not for accidents, but only for substances. The reason for this was that Plato thought that the ideas were the proximate causes of things. Hence, when he found a proximate cause other than an idea for a thing, he held that the thing did not have an idea. This also is the reason why he said that there is no common idea for those things that are predicated as being prior and subsequent, but that the first is the idea of the second. Dionysius also mentions this opinion, attributing it to a certain Clement the Philosopher, who said that superior beings were the exemplars for inferior. Using this argument, namely, that accidents are caused directly by substances, Plato did not posit ideas of accidents.

On the other hand, since we affirm that God is the direct cause of each and every thing because He works in all secondary causes and since all secondary effects are results of His pre-definition, we posit ideas in Him not only of first beings but also of second beings, and, consequently, both of substances and of accidents, but of different accidents in different ways.

First, there are proper accidents, which are caused by the principles of their subjects and never have existence apart from their subjects. These accidents are brought into existence together with their subject by one operation. Consequently, since an idea, properly speaking, is a form of something that can be made, considered precisely under this aspect, there will not be distinct ideas of such accidents. There will be only one idea, that of the subject with all its accidents—just as an architect has one form of a house and of all the accidents that pertain to a house as such, and by means of this one form brings into being the house and all its accidents, such as its square shape and the like.

There are other accidents, however, that are not inseparable from their subject and do not depend on its principles. These are brought into existence by an operation other than that by which the subject is produced. For example, it does not follow from the fact that a man is made a man that he is a grammarian; this is the result of another operation. Now, the ideas in God of such accidents are distinct from the idea of the subject, just as the form of a picture of a house, which an artist conceives, is distinct from the form he conceives of the house itself.

If we take *idea* in its broader sense, however, as meaning a likeness, then we can say that both types of accidents have distinct ideas in God, because He can know each one in itself distinctly. This is why the Philosopher says

that, with respect to their manner of being known, accidents should, like substances, have ideas; but with respect to the other reasons why Plato posited exemplars, namely, to be the causes of generation and of being, it seems that only substances have ideas.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. As we said above, there is in God an idea not only of first effects but also of second effects. Hence, even though accidents have their act of existence by means of substances, this does not prevent their having ideas.

2. An accident can be taken in two ways. First, it can be taken in the abstract. In this way, it is considered according to its proper nature, a genus and species are given it, and its subject is not placed in its definition as a genus but rather as a specific difference. In this sense we say: "Snubness is a curvature of the nose." On the other hand, an accident can be taken in the concrete. In this way, it is considered according as it has an accidental unity with its subject. Hence, neither a genus nor a species is assigned to it. Here it is true that the subject is put in the place of the genus in the definition of an accident.

3. Although an accident is not that which participates, it is, however, a participation. Hence, it is clear that in God there is an idea or likeness corresponding to it.

4. The response to this difficulty is clear from what has been said.

ARTICLE 8

*Are there in God ideas of singulars?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. Singulars are potentially infinite in number. Now, in God there is an idea, not merely of what exists, but also of what can exist. If, therefore, there were ideas of singulars in God, there would be an infinite number of ideas in Him. This seems absurd, since they could not be actually infinite.

2. If singulars have ideas in God, either there is one idea for the individual and the species, or there are distinct ideas for them. If there were distinct ideas, then there would be many ideas in God for one thing, because the idea of the species is also that of the individual. On the other hand, if there is but one and the same idea for the individual and the species, then, since all the individuals of the same species have the same idea, there would be only one

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 15, 3, ad 4; *De ver.*, 2, aa. 4-5.

idea for all, and, consequently, singulars would not have distinct ideas in God.

3. Many singulars happen by chance. Now, such beings are not pre-defined. Since, as is evident from what has been said previously, namely, that an idea postulates pre-definition, it seems that not all singulars have an idea in God.

4. Certain singulars are combinations of two species. For example, a mule is a combination of a horse and an ass. Now, if such things had ideas in God, it would seem that there would be two ideas for each one. This seems absurd, since it is unreasonable to affirm multiplicity in the cause and unity in the effect.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Ideas are in God for the purpose of knowing and making. But God is one who knows and makes singulars. Therefore, there are in God ideas of singulars.

2. Ideas are directed to the existence of things. But singulars have acts of existence more truly than universals do, because the latter subsist only in singulars. Therefore, it is more necessary for singulars to have exemplars than it is for universals.

REPLY

Plato did not posit ideas of singulars but only of species. There were two reasons for this. First, according to him, ideas did not cause the matter but only the forms of things here below. Now, the principle of individuation is matter, and it is because of the form that each singular is placed under a species. Consequently, his ideas did not correspond to a singular in so far as it is singular but only by reason of its species. His second reason may have been this: An idea is related only to those things that are intended directly, as is clear from what was said. But the intention of nature is principally to preserve the species. Consequently, even though generation terminates in this or in that man, the intention of nature is simply to generate man. For this reason, the Philosopher also says that final causes should be assigned for the accidents common to a species, but not for the accidents found in singulars. For the latter, only efficient and material causes can be assigned; consequently, an idea does not correspond to a singular but to a species. Using the same argument, moreover, Plato did not posit ideas for genera, alleging that nature does not intend to produce the form of a genus but only that of a species. We, however, assert that God is the cause of singulars, both of their form and of their matter. We also assert that all individual things are determined by His divine provi-

dence. Hence, we must also posit ideas for all singulars.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Ideas are multiplied only in so far as they have different relations to things. As Avicenna says, however, it is not contradictory to multiply conceptual relations infinitely.

2. If we speak of idea in the proper sense, namely, inasmuch as it is the idea of a thing in so far as that thing is capable of being produced, then there is but one idea for the singular, the species, the genus, and for whatever is individuated in that singular, because Socrates the man and Socrates the animal do not have separate acts of existence. If, however, we are speaking of idea in its broader sense of a likeness or intelligible character, then, since the considerations of Socrates as Socrates, as a man, and as an animal all differ, a number of ideas or likenesses will correspond to him in this respect.

3. Although some things may happen by chance with respect to their proximate agent, nothing happens by chance with respect to the agent who knows all things beforehand.

4. The mule has a separate species, halfway between that of a horse and that of an ass. Therefore, the mule is not in two species but in one. This fact is due to the mixture of seeds, because the generative powers of the male cannot bring the material provided by the female to the perfection of his own species, since the material is outside his own species; so, instead, the male brings it to a term that is close to his species. For this reason, a separate idea is assigned to the mule and to the horse.

Question IV

THE DIVINE WORD

1. Can there be a word, properly speaking, in God?
2. Is “Word” predicated of God essentially or only personally?
3. Is “Word” a proper name of the Holy Spirit?
4. Does the Father utter all creatures in the Word by which He utters Himself?
5. Does the Word imply a relation to creatures?
6. Do things exist more truly in the Word or in themselves?
7. Is the Word related to those things which do not exist, will not exist, and never have existed?
8. Are all created things life in the Word?

ARTICLE I

*Can there be a word, properly speaking, in God?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that there cannot be, for

1. There are two kinds of words: exterior and interior. An exterior word cannot be predicated properly of God since it is material and passing. Nor can an interior word be predicated of God, for Damascene defines it as follows: “Speech that is internally expressed is a motion of the soul, produced in the process of thinking, and not orally enunciated.” Now, motion or a process of thinking cannot be said to exist in God. Hence, it seems that there cannot be a word, properly speaking, in Him.

2. Augustine proves that some word belongs to the mind, because something is also said to be the mouth of the mind, as is evident in the Gospel according to St. Matthew (15:18): “But the things which proceed out of the mouth...these defile a man.” That this means the mouth of the heart is clear from what follows: “But the things which proceed out of the mouth, come forth from the heart” (15:18). Now, a mouth cannot be predicated of spiritual things except metaphorically. Hence, neither can a word.

3. That the Word is a medium between the creator and creatures is

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 34, 1; I-II, 93, 1, ad 2; *I Sent.*, 77, 2, 1; *De pot.*, 9, 91 ad 7-8; *Quodl.*, IV, 4, 6, ad 1; *Comp. Theol.*, I, cc. 37-44.

shown from St. John (1:3) where we read: "All things were made by him." From this passage, Augustine proves that the Word is not a creature. Using the same proof, we can show that the Word is not the creator. Consequently, the Word affirms nothing which is in God.

4. A medium is equidistant from extremes. Now, if the Word is the medium between the Father who utters and the creature which is uttered, the Word should be essentially distinct from the Father, since He is essentially distinct from creatures. But there is nothing in the divine Persons which is distinguished by the divine essence. Hence, a word, properly speaking, cannot be in God.

5. Whatever belongs to the Son in so far as He is incarnate is not properly predicated of God, as, for example, to be man, to walk, or anything of this sort. But being the Word belongs to the Son only in so far as He is incarnate, because it is the nature of a word to manifest the one who is speaking. The Son, however, manifests the Father only in so far as the Son is incarnate, just as our words manifest our understanding only in so far as they are expressed vocally. Hence, a word, properly speaking, does not exist in God.

6. If the Word, properly speaking, existed in God, the Word existing eternally in the Father and that which was made Incarnate in time would be the same—just as we say that it is the same Son. But it seems that we cannot say this, because the Incarnate Word is compared to a word vocally expressed; the Word existing in the Father, however, is compared to a mental word. This is clear from what Augustine has written. Now, the word that is vocally expressed is not the same as that existing in the heart. Therefore, it does not seem that the Word which is said to have existed eternally in the Father properly pertains to the divine nature.

7. The later in a series an effect occurs, the more does it have the nature of a sign. For example, wine is the final cause of a wine jar, and, more remotely, of the circular tag which is attached to the jar as a marker; for this reason, the tag is more truly a sign than the jar is. Now, a word that is vocally expressed is the last effect of the procession from the intellect. Consequently, the nature of a sign belongs to the vocal word more than to the mental concept, and, similarly, the nature of a word belongs more to the external expression from the fact that it manifests something. Now, whatever exists in its primary sense in material things and not in spiritual things is not properly predicated of God. Therefore, a word cannot be properly predicated of God.

8. Every noun especially signifies that from which it has been derived. But *verbum* (word) is derived either from *verberatio aeris* (a disturbing of the air) or from *boatus* (shout), so that *verbum* means simply *verum boans* (shout-

ing what is true). Hence, this is what is especially signified by the noun *verbum*. Now, this cannot be said to be in God except metaphorically. Therefore, a word, properly speaking, is not in God.

9. The word that one says seems to be a likeness of the thing spoken, existing in the speaker. But when the Father knows Himself, He knows Himself not by means of a likeness, but by means of His essence. Consequently, it seems that by intuiting Himself the Father does not generate any word of Himself. "Now, with reference to the Highest Spirit, *to speak* means simply to intuit in thought," as Anselm says. Hence, a word, properly speaking, does not exist in God.

10. Whenever anything resembling a creature is predicated of God, it is not predicated of Him properly, but only metaphorically. Now, as Augustine says,⁶ the Word in God resembles the word which is in us. Hence, it seems that a word can be predicated of God metaphorically, but not properly.

11. Basil says that God is called the Word because all things are uttered by Him, and that He is called the wisdom by which all things are known, and the light by which all things are made manifest. However, to utter is not properly predicated of God, because uttering pertains to the voice. Consequently, word is not predicated of God in its proper sense.

12. The vocal word is related to the Incarnate Word as the mental word is related to the eternal Word. This is clear from Augustine." The vocal word, however, is predicated only metaphorically of the Word Incarnate. Hence, the interior word is also predicated only metaphorically of the eternal Word.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Augustine says: "The Word which we are trying to make you understand is knowledge with love." Now, knowledge and love are predicated of God in their proper sense. Hence, so is the Word.

2. Augustine says: "The word which is heard exteriorly is a sign of the word shining within; and to this latter the name *word* more properly belongs. For the vocalization of the word by a physical mouth is merely the voice of the word; and it also is called a word because of that from which it has been taken in order that the interior word might itself appear externally. It is clear from this that the term *word* belongs more properly to the spiritual than to the material word. Now, whatever is found more properly in spiritual things than in material things most properly belongs to God. Therefore, word is predicated of God in its most proper sense.

3. Richard of St. Victor says that a word manifests the meaning of one who is wise. But the Son manifests the meaning of the Father in the truest way

possible. Hence, word is predicated of God in the most proper sense.

4. According to Augustine, the word is “thought, fully formed.” Now, God’s contemplation is never capable of formation, but is always fully formed, since it is always in act. Consequently, a word, in the most proper sense, is predicated of God.

5. Among the types of oneness, that which is most simple is called one primarily and most properly. The same is true of a word—that which is most simple is called a word in the most proper sense. Now, the Word that is in God is most simple; hence, it is most properly called a word.

6. According to grammarians, the part of speech called the verb receives this general name *verbum* as its own because it is a perfection of the entire sentence, and is, as it were, the most important part of it. Moreover, other parts of the sentence are expressed by the verb, since the noun is understood in it. Now, the divine Word (*Verbum*) is the most perfect of all things and expresses all things. Therefore, it is called a word in the most proper sense.

REPLY

We give names to things according to the manner in which we receive our knowledge from things. Hence, since those things which come after others in the order of nature are usually the ones that we know first, it frequently happens that, in applying names to things, we first use a name of one of two things when the reality it signifies primarily exists in the second. We have a clear example of this in the names that are used of both God and creatures. *Being, good*, and words of this sort are first applied to creatures, and then transferred from creatures to God, even though the act of existence and the good are found primarily in God.

Consequently, since the exterior word is sensible, it is more known to us than the interior word; hence, according to the application of the term, the vocal word is meant before the interior word, even though the interior word is naturally prior, being the efficient and final cause of the exterior.

It is the final cause, indeed, because we use the exterior word to manifest the interior. Hence, the interior word is that which is expressed by the exterior. Moreover, the exterior word signifies that which is understood, not the act of understanding, nor the habit or faculty, as the objects of understanding, unless the habit and the faculty are themselves the things that are understood. Consequently, the interior word is what is understood interiorly. Again, the interior word is the efficient cause of the word spoken exteriorly, for, since the meaning of a word is arbitrary, its principle is the will—just as the will is the principle of other products. Moreover, just as there preexists in the mind of a

craftsman a certain image of his external work, so also does there pre-exist in the mind of one who pronounces an exterior word a certain archetype of it.

Consequently, just as we consider three things in the case of a craftsman, namely, the purpose of his work, its model, and the work now produced, so also do we find a threefold word in one who is speaking. There is the word conceived by the intellect, which, in turn, is signified by an exterior vocal word. The former is called *the word of the heart*, uttered but not vocalized. Then there is that upon which the exterior word is modeled; and this is called *the interior word* which has an image of the vocal word. Finally, there is the word expressed exteriorly, and this is called *the vocal word*. Now, just as a craftsman first intends his end, then thinks out the form of his product, and finally brings it into existence, so also, in one who is speaking, the word of the heart comes first, then the word which has an image of the oral word, and, finally, he utters the vocal word.

Now, because the vocal word is expressed by means of a body, such a word cannot be predicated of God except metaphorically, that is, only in the sense in which creatures or their motions, being produced by God, are said to be His word inasmuch as they are signs of the divine intellect as effects are signs of their cause. For the same reason, the word which has an image of the vocal word cannot be properly predicated of God, but only metaphorically. Consequently, His ideas of things to be made are called the Word of God only metaphorically. But the word of the heart—that which is actually considered by the intellect—is predicated properly of God, because it is entirely free of matter, corporeity, and all defects; and such things are properly predicated of God, for example, knowledge and the known, understanding and the understood.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

I. Since the interior word is that which is understood and is within us only in so far as we actually understand, it always demands that the intellect be in its act, which is to understand. Now, the act of understanding is called a motion, not a motion of what is imperfect, such as is described in the *Physics*, but a motion of what is perfect—an operation, as is described in *The Soul*. It is in this sense that Damascene spoke of the interior word as a motion of the mind, because motion is taken for that in which the motion terminates; that is, operation is taken for the term of the operation, just as the act of understanding is taken for the understood.

Moreover, the notion of the mental word does not require that the act of the intellect which terminates in a mental word take place by means of some

reasoning process which thinking seems to involve. It is enough that something is actually understood—no matter how this takes place. But because *we* usually speak interiorly by means of a reasoning process, Damascene and Anselm in defining a word use *thinking* instead of *consideration*.

2. Augustine's argument is not from a parallel but from the lesser to the greater. For, if one can speak of the heart as having a mouth, he can with greater verisimilitude speak of it as containing a word. Hence, the argument proves nothing.

3. A medium can be understood in two ways. First, it can be understood as being a medium between the two terms of a motion, as pale is a medium between white and black in a process of blackening or whitening. Second, it can be understood as existing between what is active and what is passive, as the instrument of the artist is a medium between the artist and his work. In fact, anything by which the artist acts is a medium in this sense. It is in this second sense, too, that the Son is a medium between the creating Father and the creature created through the Word. The Son, however, is not a medium between God creating and the creature created, for the Word is also God creating. Hence, just as the Son is not a creature, so also He is not the Father.

There is still another reason why the conclusion does not follow. We say that God creates by means of His wisdom predicated essentially; hence, His wisdom can be called a medium between God and creature. Yet, this very wisdom is God.

In the argument cited, moreover, Augustine is proving that the Word is not a creature, not because He is a medium, but because He is the universal cause of creatures. Now, every motion is reduced to some first mover which is itself unmoved at least relatively to the motion in question, just as all things which undergo qualitative change must be reduced to some first thing which causes this change but is itself not changed in this way. Similarly, that to which all created beings are reduced must itself be uncreated.

4. A medium understood as existing between the two terms of a motion is sometimes taken as existing equidistant from each term, but at other times it is not taken in this sense. For a medium that exists between what is active and what is passive—if, indeed, it is a medium, as an instrument—is sometimes closer to the first active thing, sometimes closer to the last passive thing, although it may at other times stand equidistant from each. This becomes clear if we consider the action of an agent which finally terminates in what is passive by means of several instruments: the medium which is the form by which the agent acts is always closer to the agent because it is really in the agent, whereas only its likeness is in the patient. Now, it is in this manner that the Word is said

to be a medium between the Father and the creature. Consequently, the Word does not necessarily stand equidistant between the Father and the creature.

5. It is true that we manifest something to another only by means of a word that is vocally expressed. Yet one can manifest something to oneself by means of the word of the heart; and, since this manifestation takes place before the other manifestation, the interior word is said to be the Principal word. Similarly, the Father is revealed to all by means of the Word Incarnate, but the eternally generated Word has manifested Him to Himself. Consequently, the name word does not belong to the Son merely in so far as He is incarnate.

6. The Incarnate Word in some respects resembles, and, in other respects, does not resemble the vocal word. They have this in common as a basis for comparison: a vocal word manifests the interior word as flesh manifested the eternal Word. They differ, however, in the following respect: the flesh assumed by the eternal Word is not said to be a word, whereas the vocal word used to manifest an interior word is said to be a word. Consequently, the vocal word is something other than the interior word, but the Incarnate Word is the same as the eternal Word, just as the word signified by the vocal word is the same as the word within the heart.

7. The nature of a sign belongs more properly to in effect than to a cause when the-cause brings about the existence of the effect but not its meaning, as is the case in the example given. But when the effect has derived from its cause, not only its existence, but also its meaning, then this cause is prior to the effect both in existence and in meaning. Hence, signification and manifestation belong more properly to the interior than to the exterior word, for whatever meaning the exterior word has been adopted to convey is due to the interior word.

8. A name is derived from two sources: from the one who uses the word or from the thing to which it has been applied. A word is said to be derived from a thing in so far as it signifies that by which the notion of the thing is completed, that is, the thing's specific difference; and this is what a word principally signifies. But, since we do not know essential differences, sometimes, as is said in the *Metaphysics*, we use accidents or effects in their place, and name a thing accordingly. Hence, in so far as something other than the essential difference of a thing is used as the source of a word, the word is said to be derived from the one who uses it. An example of this is the word *lapis* (stone) which is derived from its effect, *laedere pedem* (to bruise the foot). Now, this effect should not be taken as that which the word principally signifies, but merely as that which takes the place of what is signified. Similarly, *verbum* (word) is derived from *verberatio* (a disturbing) or from *boatus* (shout) because of those

who use it—not because of the thing it signifies.

9. As far as the nature of a word is concerned, it makes no difference whether a thing is understood by means of a likeness or by means of its essence; for it is evident that the exterior word signifies whatever can be understood—whether it be understood by means of its essence or by means of a likeness. Hence, whatever is understood, whether it has been caused by a likeness or by its essence, can be called an interior word.

10. Some of the things predicated both of God and creatures exist in God before they exist in creatures, even though their names were applied to creatures first. These predicates, such as *goodness*, *wisdom*, and the like, are used of God in their proper sense. Other names signifying other things cannot be used of God in their proper sense, but things similar to these things can be found in God. These things, therefore, are predicated metaphorically of Him, as when we say that God is a lion or that God walks. Hence, when the term *word* is applied to the divine Word from our word, this indicates merely the order in the use of the name, not the order between the two realities. Consequently, Word is not used metaphorically of God.

11. Vocal expression pertains to the nature of a word only with respect to that from which the word was taken by the one who employed this noun, not with respect to the thing itself. Consequently, even though vocal expression is predicated metaphorically of God, it does not follow that a word is in Him only metaphorically. For example, Damascene says that the word Θεός (God) comes from αθίεν, which means to burn; but, although *burning* is predicated metaphorically of God, *God* is not.

12. The Incarnate Word is compared with the vocal word merely because of a certain resemblance, as is clear from what has been said. Hence, the Incarnate Word can be said to be a vocal word only metaphorically. But the eternal Word is compared with the word of the heart, according to the true nature of the interior word. Hence, each is called a word in the proper sense.

ARTICLE 2

*Is word predicated of God essentially or only personally?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that word can also be predicated essentially, for

1. *Word* signifies making manifest, as we said in the preceding article.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 34, 2; *I Sent.*, 27, 2, 2; *In Evang. Johannis*, c. 1, lect. 1 (P. 10:284b). See also readings given for preceding article.

Now, of itself the divine essence can manifest itself. Consequently, a word of itself belongs to the divine essence, and can be predicated of it essentially.

2. As we read in the *Metaphysics*, a word signifies a definition. But, according to Augustine, the word is “knowledge with love;” and according to Anselm: “When the highest spirit is said to speak, this means that He is intuiting by thinking. Now, nothing but essential attributes are placed in these definitions. Hence, word is predicated essentially.

3. Whatever is said is a word. But, as Anselm writes, the Father utters not only Himself but also the Son and the Holy Spirit. Hence, word is common to all three Persons, and, therefore, is predicated essentially.

4. As Augustine says, whoever speaks possesses the word he speaks. But, as Anselm points out: “Just as the Father knows, and the Son knows, and the Holy Spirit knows, and yet there are not three knowers but one, so also the Father speaks, and the Son speaks, and the Holy Spirit speaks, and yet there are not three speakers but one.” Hence, *word* can be used of any one of them. Now, nothing is common to the three persons but the essence. Hence, word is predicated essentially of God.

5. With respect to our intellect, there is no difference between speaking and understanding. Now, the divine Word is understood as resembling the word in the intellect. Hence, when we say that God speaks, we mean simply that He understands. Consequently, His Word is simply that which He understands. Now, what God understands is predicated of Him essentially. Hence, His Word should be similarly predicated.

6. As Augustine says, the divine Word is the operative power of the Father. Now, operative power is predicated essentially of God. Therefore, word is also predicated essentially.

7. Just as love implies an outpouring of affection, so does the word imply an outpouring of understanding. But love is predicated essentially of God. Hence, so also is the word.

8. That which can be understood of God without understanding the distinction of Persons is not predicated personally. Now, the word belongs to this type, for even those who deny the distinction of persons admit that God utters Himself. Hence, the word is not predicated of God personally.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Augustine says: “Only the Son is called the Word, not the Father and the Son taken together.” Now, whatever is predicated essentially belongs equally to both. Therefore, the Word is not predicated essentially.

2. In the Gospel according to St. John (1:11) we read: “The Word was

with God.” Since *with* is a transitive preposition, it implies a distinction. Consequently, the Word is distinct from God. But nothing that is predicated essentially is distinct in God. Therefore, the Word is not predicated essentially.

3. In God whatever implies a relation of person to person is predicated personally, not essentially. But the Word is of this type.

4. In support of this position, the authority of Richard of St. Victor can be cited, since he shows that only the Son is called the Word.

REPLY

The word that is predicated metaphorically of God, namely, a creature, which is called His word because it manifests Him, undoubtedly pertains to the entire Trinity. The object of our present inquiry, however, is the word in so far as it is predicated properly of God. Viewed superficially, the question seems to be very simple to solve, because the Word implies a certain origin according to which the divine Persons can be distinguished. Considered more profoundly, however, the question is more difficult, since we find in God certain things that imply origin, not in reality, but only according to our manner of thinking. For example, *operation* undoubtedly implies something proceeding from the one who operates, yet that procession is only according to our manner of thinking. Consequently, operation is predicated essentially of God, not personally, because God’s power and operations do not differ from His essence. Hence, it is not immediately evident whether *the Word* implies a real procession—as *son* does—or whether it implies merely a procession according to our way of thinking—as *operation* does, and so whether the Word is an essential or a personal predicate.

For the clarification of this matter, it should be noted that our intellectual word, which enables us to speak about the divine Word by a kind of resemblance, is that at which our intellectual operation terminates. This is the object of understanding, which is called the conception of the intellect—whether the conception can be signified by a simple expression, as is true when the intellect forms the quiddities of things, or whether it can be signified only by a complex expression, as is true when the intellect composes and divides. Now, for us every object of understanding really proceeds from something else. For example, conceptions of conclusions proceed from principles, conceptions of the quiddities of later things proceed from quiddities of things prior, or at least an actual conception proceeds from habitual knowledge. Now, this is universally true of whatever we understand, whether it be understood by its essence or by its likeness; for conception itself is an effect of the act of understanding. Consequently, when the mind understands itself, its conception is

not the mind but something expressed by the mind's act of knowledge. Hence, two things pertain to the nature of our intellectual word: it is understood, and it is expressed by an agent distinct from itself.

Therefore, if word is predicated of God because of its resemblance to both of these characteristics, then the name of word implies a real procession—and not merely because of our manner of thinking. On the other hand, if it is predicated of God merely because of its resemblance to one of these characteristics, namely, that it is understood, then word as applied to God does not imply a real procession but one only according to our manner of thinking, such as *the understood* implies. This, however, would not be taking word in its proper meaning, because it is not taken in its proper meaning if something belonging to its nature is entirely left out. Consequently, if *word* is taken in its proper meaning when used of God, it can be predicated of Him only personally. However, if it is taken in a broad sense, it can also be predicated essentially. Since, however, we should use words as most people use them, as the Philosopher says, usage should be followed very carefully when it comes to the meanings of words. Moreover, since all the saints commonly use word as a personal predication, this is even a stronger reason for saying that it is predicated personally.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The nature of a word includes not only the property of making something manifest but also a real procession of one thing from another. Now, although the divine essence manifests itself, the essence does not come from itself in a real procession. Hence, it cannot be called a word unless it is called this because it is identical with that Person, as, for the same reason, the essence is called the Father or the Son.

2. The knowledge that is included in the definition of a word should be understood as knowledge uttered by another. In us, this is actual knowledge. Now, although knowledge or wisdom is predicated essentially of God, generated wisdom is predicated only personally. Similarly, Anselm's statement, "*Speak* signifies intuiting by thinking," can be understood if *speak* be taken, in its proper sense, in its relation to intellectual intuition. In this sense, we can say that something proceeds through speech, namely, *the understood*.

3. The intellectual conception is a medium between the intellect and the thing known, because through its mediation the intellectual operation attains the thing. Hence, the intellectual conception is not only *that which* is understood but also *that by which* the thing is understood. Consequently, that which is understood can be said to be both the thing itself as well as an

intellectual conception. Similarly, that which is spoken interiorly can be said to be both the thing expressed by the word and the word itself, as is also true of the exterior word, because both the word and the thing the word signifies are expressed when the word is spoken. I assert, therefore, that the Father is spoken, not as a word, but as a thing spoken by the Word. The same is true of the Holy Spirit, because the Son manifests the entire Trinity. Consequently, by uttering His own one Word, the Father utters all three Persons.

4. Here Anselm seems to contradict himself, for he says that *Word* is predicated only personally and belongs only to the Son, while to *speak* belongs to all three Persons. To speak, however, means nothing else but to send forth a word from oneself. Augustine's statement also seems to contradict Anselm's, for he says that not each of the Persons in the Trinity speaks, but only the Father speaks by means of His Word. Consequently, just as the Word, properly speaking, is predicated only personally of God and belongs only to the Son, so also speech belongs only to the Father. Anselm, however, is taking to *speak* in its general meaning of to understand, and *word* in its proper sense. If he wished, he could have taken these words the other way around.

5. As used of us, *speaking* signifies not merely understanding but understanding plus the expression from within oneself of some conception; and we cannot understand in any way other than by forming a conception of this sort. Therefore, properly speaking, every act of understanding is, in our case, an act of uttering. God, however, can understand without something really proceeding from Him, because in Him the one understanding, the understood, and intellection itself are all identical. This is not true of us, however. Consequently, properly speaking, not all understanding in God is said to be uttering.

6. Just as the Word is said to be the Father's knowledge only in the sense that it is knowledge generated by the Father, so also it is called the operative power of the Father because it is a power proceeding from Him. Now, a power that proceeds is predicated personally, and an operative power proceeding from the Father is predicated in this manner.

7. One thing may proceed from another thing in two ways; First, it may proceed from it as action proceeds from an agent or as an operation proceeds from one operating. Second, it may proceed as a term of an operation from one operating. Now, the procession of an operation from the one operating does not distinguish a thing that is substantially existing from another substantially existing thing; it merely distinguishes a perfection from what is perfected, because an operation is a perfection of the one operating. On the other hand, the procession of the term of an operation distinguishes one thing from another. Now, in God the distinction between a perfection and what is per-

fected cannot be a real distinction. There are, however, distinct things in God, namely, the three Persons. Hence, a procession signified as existing in God as an operation from the one operating is a procession merely according to our manner of thinking. But a procession signified as that of a thing proceeding from a principle can really be found in God.

Moreover, there is this difference between the intellect and the will: an operation of the will terminates in things, in which good and evil are found; but an operation of the intellect terminates in the mind, in which the true and the false are found, as is said in the *Metaphysics*. Consequently, the will does not have anything proceeding from it except in the manner of an operation. The intellect, however, has something in itself that proceeds from it, not only in the manner of an operation, but also in the manner of a thing that is the term of an operation. Consequently, the word is signified as a thing that proceeds, but love, as an operation that proceeds. Hence, love is not such as to be predicated personally in the same way in which word is.

8. If one does not consider the distinction of Persons, he will not say that God utters Himself, properly speaking; and those who do not admit that there are distinct Persons in God do not understand this uttering in its proper sense.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

One could easily answer the objections proposed here if he wished to support the opposite opinion.

1. To the difficulty drawn from the words of Augustine one could say that Augustine understands *word* in so far as it implies a real origin.

2. One could reply to this by pointing out that, even if the preposition *with* implies a distinction, this distinction is not implied in *word*. Hence, from the fact that the Word is said to be with the Father, one cannot conclude that it is predicated personally, because the Word is also said to be “God of God” and “God with God.”

3. One could answer by saying that this relation is merely conceptual.

4. This may be answered as the first difficulty is answered.

ARTICLE 3

*Is word a proper name of the Holy Spirit?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is, for

1. Basil says: "The Holy Spirit is related to the Son in the same way in which the Son is related to the Father; and, for this reason, the Son is the word of God, and the Spirit is the word of the Son." Therefore, the Holy Spirit can be called a word.

2. In the Epistle to the Hebrews (1:3) the following is said of the Son: "Who being the brightness of his glory, and the figure of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power..." Hence, the Son has a word proceeding from Himself by which He upholds all things. But in God no one proceeds from the Son except the Holy Spirit. Therefore, the Holy Spirit can be called the Word.

3. As Augustine says: "The Word is loving knowledge." But, just as knowledge is appropriated to the Son, so love is appropriated to the Holy Spirit. Consequently, the Word is a proper name for the Holy Spirit as well as for the Son.

4. The Gloss on "upholding all things by the word of his power" (Hebrews 1:3) says that *word* should be taken as meaning a *command*. But a command is classified as a sign of the will. Therefore, since the Holy Spirit proceeds from the will, it seems that He can be called Word.

5. The notion of word implies a making manifest. Now, the Holy Spirit manifests the Father and the Son, just as the Son manifests the Father; for, as we read in the Gospel of St. John (16:13): "the Holy Spirit teaches all truth." Therefore, the Holy Spirit should be called Word.

TO THE CONTRARY

Augustine says: "The Son is called Word for the same reason that He is called Son." Now, the Son is called Son because He is generated. Therefore, He is called Word, also, because He is generated. The Holy Spirit, however, is not generated; hence, He is not a word.

REPLY

Word and *image* are used differently by us and our holy men than they

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I 34, 2; *I Sent.*, 27, 2, 2, sol. 2; *Contra errores graec.*, c. 12; *In Hebr.*, c. 1, lect. 2 (P. 13:672b).

were used by the ancient Greek doctors, who used these names to signify everything that proceeds from the Godhead, and indifferently called the Son and the Holy Spirit Word and Image. Our saints and ourselves, however, have followed the custom of canonical Scripture in the use of these words; and Scripture seldom if ever uses Word or Image for any one except the Son. We are not now concerned with image, but that our use of *word* is reasonable enough will appear from the following.

Word implies a making manifest, and manifestation is found essentially only in the intellect. If something outside the intellect is said to “manifest” this is true only to the extent that something of it remains in the intellect. Hence, what proximately manifests is within the intellect, even though what remotely manifests can be outside of it. Consequently, *word* is used properly of that which proceeds from the intellect. Of that which does not proceed from the intellect it can be used only metaphorically; that is, it can be used of such a thing only in so far as it manifests in some way or other. I say, therefore, that in God only the Son proceeds from the intellect, because He proceeds from one Person; the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from two Persons, proceeds from the will. Consequently, the Holy Spirit can be called Word only metaphorically, that is, only in so far as whatever manifests can be called a word. The quotation from Basil should be understood in this sense.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The reply is clear from our discussion.
2. According to Basil’s the “word” referred to in this passage is the Holy Spirit. If this is true, our reply is the same as we gave to the first difficulty. Or, if we follow the Gloss, the “word” referred to is the command of the Son. This is called the word metaphorically, since we ordinarily command by means of a word.
3. Knowledge belongs to the notion of word since it implies, as it were, the very essence of word; but love belongs to the notion of word, not as something pertaining to its essence, but as something that accompanies a word. The passage cited shows this. Hence, one cannot conclude that the Holy Spirit is a word, but, rather, that He proceeds from the Word.
4. A word manifests not only what is in the intellect but also what is in the will, in so far as the will itself is also understood. Hence, even though a command is a sign of the will, it can be called a word and it pertains to the intellect.
5. The reply is clear from our discussion.

ARTICLE 4

*Does the Father utter all creatures in the word by which he utters himself?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. When we say that the Father utters Himself, all that is signified is one uttering and something uttered, and the Father alone is signified by both. Now, since the Father does not produce the Word from Himself except as He utters Himself, it seems that creatures are not uttered by the Word which proceeds from the Father.

2. The word by which each thing is expressed is its likeness. "The Word cannot be called a likeness of creatures," as Anselm proves, because either it would resemble creatures perfectly—and then it would be changeable and without its sublime immutability—or it would not resemble them perfectly—and then it would lose its sublime truth, because the truth of a likeness is in direct proportion to its conformity with that whose likeness it is. Hence, the Son is not the Word by which creatures are uttered.

3. The word of creatures is said to be in God as the word of his products is in a craftsman. Now, the word of his products in a craftsman is merely the plan he has with respect to them. Therefore, the word of creatures in God is merely the plan He has made with respect to creatures. But God's plans for His creatures are predicated of the essence, not of a person. Hence, the word by which creatures are uttered is not the Word that is a personal predicate.

4. Every word is related as an archetype or image to that which is uttered by it. When a word causes a thing, as happens in the practical intellect, then that word is an archetype. When, however, a thing causes a word, as happens in our speculative intellect, then that word is an image. Now, in God there cannot be the word of a creature that is the image of a creature. Hence, the word of creatures that is in God must be an archetype of creatures. But the divine archetype of creatures is an idea. Therefore, the divine word of creatures is simply an idea. An idea, however, is predicated of God, not personally, but essentially. Consequently, the Word which is predicated personally of God, and by which the Father utters Himself, is not the word by which creatures are uttered.

5. The distance separating creatures from God is greater than that which separates them from other creatures. Now, in God there are many ideas of different creatures; hence, the Father does not utter Himself and creatures

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 34, 3; 37, 2, ad 3; III, 3, 8; *I Sent.*, 27, 2, 3; *Quodl.*, IV, 4, 6.

in the same word.

6. According to Augustine: “The Son is called the Word for the same reason that He is called an image. Now, the Son is not an image of creatures but only of the Father. Hence, He is not the word of creatures.

7. Every word proceeds from that whose word it is. But the Son does not proceed from creatures. Hence, He is not the word by which creatures are uttered.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Anselm says that by uttering Himself the Father uttered all creatures. But the Word by which He uttered Himself is the Son. Therefore, by the Word, which is the Son, the Father utters all creatures.

2. Augustine explains the expression, “He spoke and it was made,” as meaning: “He begot the Word in which all things were in order to come into existence.” Therefore, by the Word which is the Son the Father uttered all creatures.

3. By the same act, the artist is turned toward his art and his work. But God Himself is the eternal art from which creatures are produced like works of art. Therefore, in the same act, the Father is turned toward Himself and to all creatures. Hence, by uttering Himself, He utters all creatures.

4. Whatever is subsequent is reduced to what is first in that class as to its cause. Now, creatures are uttered by God. Therefore, they are reduced to the first which God utters. But God first utters Himself. Hence, by the fact that He utters Himself, He utters all creatures.

REPLY

The Son proceeds from the Father in the manner of nature inasmuch as He proceeds as a Son, and in the manner of intellect inasmuch as He proceeds as the Word. We find both types of processions in ourselves, although not in the same respect. For in our case nothing proceeds from something else both in the manner of nature and in the manner of intellect, because with us the act of understanding and the act of existing are not the same—which they are in God.

Moreover, in both types of procession the difference between procession from God and procession from us is similar. For a human son, proceeding in the manner of nature from a human father, receives only a part of his father’s substance, not all of it; but the Son of God, proceeding in the manner of nature from the Father, receives all of His Father’s nature in such a way that both the Father and the Son have absolutely one and the same numerical nature.

This difference is also found with respect to the intellectual processions. The word expressed in us by actual consideration and arising, as it were, from a consideration of a thing known previously, or at least from habitual knowledge, does not receive into itself the whole of that from which it had its origin. For, in the conception of one word, the intellect expresses not all but only part of what it possesses in its habitual knowledge. Similarly, what is contained in one conclusion does not express all that was contained virtually in its principle. However, for the divine Word to be perfect, it must express whatever is contained in that from which it had its origin, especially since God sees all things, not in many intuitions, but in one. Consequently, whatever is contained in the Father's knowledge is necessarily and entirely expressed by His only Word and in the very same manner in which all things are contained in His knowledge. In this way it is a true word, whose intellectual content corresponds to that of its principle. Through His knowledge, moreover, the Father knows Himself, and, by knowing Himself, He knows all other things. Hence, His Word chiefly expresses the Father and, as a result, all other things which the Father knows by knowing Himself. Therefore, because the Son is a word that perfectly expresses the Father, the Son expresses all creatures. This sequence is outlined by the words of Anselm, who said that by uttering Himself the Father uttered all creatures.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. When we say that the Father utters Himself we signify that in this utterance every creature is included, since the Father's knowledge contains all creatures, being, as it were, their archetype.

2. Anselm is taking *likeness* in its strict sense, as Dionysius does when he says that, when things are ordered equally to each other, we receive a mutual likeness; that is, one thing can be said to be similar to the other and the other similar to it. But, properly speaking, no such mutual likeness is found between a cause and its effect. We say that a picture of Hercules resembles Hercules, but not that Hercules resembles the picture. Hence, since the divine Word is not, like our word, made in the likeness of a creature, but rather the opposite is true, Anselm means to say simply that the Word is not a likeness of creatures but creatures are a likeness of the Word.

However, if *likeness* is taken in its broader meaning, then we can say that the Word is a likeness of creatures, not, however, in the sense that it is an image of creatures, but in the sense that it is their archetype. Taking the term in this meaning, Augustine calls ideas likenesses of things.

Finally, it does not follow that the highest truth is not in the Word mere-

ly from the fact that the Word remains unchanged while existing creatures change; for the truth of a word does not demand that it be a likeness with the same nature as that of the thing declared by the word; it is enough if it is a true representation of the thing, as we have pointed out previously.

3. The divine plan for creatures is called a word, properly speaking, only if this plan proceeds from another—and is therefore a begotten plan. This, however, like begotten wisdom, is a personal predication. Taken simply, the divine plan is an essential predication.

4. A word differs from an idea, for the latter means an exemplary cause and nothing else, but the word in God of a creature means an exemplary form that is drawn from something else. Hence, a divine idea pertains to the essence, but a word, to a person.

5. Even though the greatest possible distance separates God from a creature because of what is proper to each, God is the model in whose likeness creatures are created. There is no creature that is a model for another creature. Hence, in that Word by which God is expressed every creature is expressed; but the idea by which one creature is expressed does not express another. Thus, this is another difference between the Word and an idea. The reason for this is that an idea is directly related to a creature; hence, for many creatures there are many ideas. On the other hand, the Word is directly related to God, whom the Word expresses first, and then, as a consequence, expresses creatures. Because all creatures are one as they exist in God there is only one Word for all of them.

6. When Augustine says that the Son “is called a Word for the same reason that He is called an Image,” he is referring to the distinguishing personal characteristic of the Son, which remains the same whether He is called, because of it, the Son, the Word, or the Image of the Father. But in the manner of signifying, these three predicates are not of the same type, for *word* implies not only the notion of origin and imitation but also that of manifestation. Consequently, the Word is, in a fashion, the word of creatures, because creatures are manifested by means of the Word.

7. A word can belong to something in different ways. First, it can belong to one who is speaking. Taken in this sense, it proceeds from him whose word it is. Second, it can belong to that which is made manifest by the word. In this sense, the word does not necessarily proceed from that whose word it is, unless the knowledge from which the word proceeds has been caused by things. However, this is not true of God’s knowledge. Hence, the conclusion does not follow.

ARTICLE 5

*Does the Word imply a relation to creatures?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. Every name that implies a relation to creatures is predicated of God only from the beginning of time, for example, *Creator* and *Lord*. But *Word* is predicated of God from all eternity. Therefore, it does not imply a relation to creatures.

2. All relatives are relative in being or in predication. Now, the *Word* is not related to creatures in being, because then it would depend on creatures. Nor is it related to them merely in predication, because then it would have to be related to creatures in one of the grammatical cases. And since in this type of relation one thing is usually referred to another by means of the genitive case, we would have to say: "The *Word* is of creatures." This statement, however, Anselm denies. Therefore, the *Word* does not imply any relation to creatures.

3. Any name implying a relation to creatures cannot be understood unless the actual or potential existence of creatures is also understood, because, if one understands one of two relatives, he also understands the other. But, even if some creature is not understood as existing now or in the future, the divine *Word*, by which the Father utters Himself, is understood. Therefore, the *Word* does not imply any relation to creatures.

4. The relation of God to creatures can be only that of a cause to an effect. But, as Dionysius says, any name that implies an effect in creatures is common to the entire Trinity. However, *Word* is not this kind of a name. Hence, it does not imply any relation to creatures.

5. God is not understood as having a relation to creatures unless it be by His wisdom, goodness, and power. But these attributes are predicated of the *Word* merely by appropriation; and since *Word* is not merely an appropriated but a proper name, it seems that *Word* does not imply a relation to creatures.

6. Even though man arranges things, the word man does not imply a relation to the things he has arranged. Therefore, even though all things are arranged by the *Word*, *Word* does not imply a relation to them.

7. Like son, word is a relative predication. Now, the entire relation of the son terminates in the father, for he is not the son of any one but the father. Therefore, the entire relation of the *Word* terminates similarly. Hence, *Word*

* PARALLEL READINGS: See readings given for preceding article.

does not imply a relation to creatures.

8. According to the Philosopher, every relative is said to be such only with relation to one other thing. Otherwise, the relative would have two essences, since the essence of a relative lies simply in its being related to another. Now, the Word is predicated as relative to the Father; therefore, it is not predicated as relative to creatures.

9. If the same word is applied to specifically different things, it is used of them equivocally, as *dog* is used of hounds and fish. Now, superiority and inferiority are specifically different types of relations. If, therefore, one word implies both relations, then that word is used equivocally. But the relation of the Word to creatures is simply one of superiority, and the relation of the Word to the Father is, in a way, one of inferiority—not because of any unequal dignity, but because of the authority which a principle has. Hence, the Word which implies a relation to the Father does not imply a relation to creatures, unless it is taken equivocally.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Augustine says: “In the beginning was the Word.” (John 1:1) The Word is called *Logos* in Greek, and in Latin it means an intelligible character and word. In this passage, however, *word* is better interpreted as meaning a relation, not only to the Father, but also to those things which are made by His power, acting through the Word. This statement clearly supports our position.

2. Explaining the words of the Psalmist, “God hath spoken once” (Psalms 61:12), the Gloss says: “Once, that is, God has eternally begotten the Word in which He disposes all things.” Now, disposition implies a relation to the things disposed. Therefore, Word is predicated relatively.

3. Every word implies a relation to what is signified by it. But, as Anselm says, by uttering Himself God utters all creatures. Therefore, the Word implies a relation, not only to the Father, but also to creatures.

4. From the very fact of His being the Son, the Son perfectly represents the Father in that which is intrinsic to the Father. Now, the Word, by its very name, adds the notion of making manifest. But there can be no manifestation other than that in which the Father is manifested through creatures—a manifestation, as it were, to the exterior. Therefore, the Word implies a relation to creatures.

5. Dionysius says that God is praised as being a word or principle of intelligibility because “He is the giver of wisdom and reason.” From this it is clear that the Word as predicated of God implies the notion of cause. Now, a

cause is predicated relatively to its effect. Therefore, the Word implies a relation to creatures.

6. The practical intellect is related to the things carried out through its instrumentality. Now, the divine Word is the word of an intellect that is practical, because, as Damascene says, the Word is an operative word. Therefore, it implies a relation to creatures.

REPLY

Whenever two things are related to each other in such a way that one depends upon the other but the other does not depend upon it, there is a real relation in the dependent member, but in the independent member the relation is merely one of reason—simply because one thing cannot be understood as being related to another without that other being understood as being related to it. The notion of such a relation becomes clear if we consider knowledge, which depends on what is known, although the latter does not depend on it.

Consequently, since all creatures depend on God but He does not depend on them, there are real relations in creatures, referring them to God. The opposite relations in God to creatures, however, are merely conceptual relations; but, because names are signs of concepts, certain names we use for God imply a relation to creatures, even though, as we have said, this relation is merely conceptual. The only real relations in God are those by which the divine persons are distinguished from each other.

Among relative terms, we find that some are used to signify the relations themselves, for example, the word *likeness*. Others are used to signify something upon which a relation follows. For example, *knowledge* is used to signify a certain quality upon which a particular relation follows. We find this difference also in the relative names used of God, both in the names used of Him as from all eternity, as well as in those used of Him as from the beginning of time. For *Father* is used of Him as from all eternity, and *Lord* as from the beginning of time; and each of these words is used to signify the relations themselves. But *Creator*, used of God as from the beginning of time, is employed to signify a divine action upon which a certain relation follows. The same is true of *Word*; it is used to signify something absolute to which something relative is joined; for, as Augustine says, the Word is simply “begotten Wisdom.”

This, however, does not prevent Word from being a personal predication, because God begetting or God begotten is, like Father, predicated personally. It may happen, however, that an absolute thing is able to have a relation to many other things. This is why a name that is used to signify something absolute upon which a relation follows can be spoken of as being relative to many

things, and it is in this manner that *knowledge* is used. Inasmuch as it is knowledge, it is relative to what is known, but inasmuch as it is a particular accident or form, it is related to the knower. In the same way, word is related to the one who utters it and to that which is uttered by the word. In the latter relation, it can be taken in two ways: first, according as the two are interchangeable, and in this sense we speak of a word as being related to what is spoken; second, according as the word is related to a thing to which the character of being uttered belongs. And since the Father principally utters Himself by begetting His Word, and, as a consequence of this, utters creatures, the Word is principally, and, as it were, essentially referred to the Father, but consequently, and, as it were, accidentally, to creatures; for it is only accidental to the Word that creatures are uttered through it.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. That argument is true of those names which imply an actual relation to creatures, but not of those which imply a habitual relation. A habitual relation is one that does not require the actual existence of a creature. All the relations that follow upon an act of the soul are of this kind, because the will and the intellect can be related to a thing that does not actually exist. Now, the Word implies an intellectual procession. Hence, the argument proves nothing.

2. The Word is spoken of as being related to creatures, but this is not a real relation in the sense that this relation to creatures really exists in God. It is rather a relation merely according to predication. Moreover, there is no reason why this relation should not be expressed by some grammatical case; for I can say that He is the Word of creatures in the sense that the Word is about creatures, although not from them. It is this last sense that Anselm denies. Besides, even if the Word were not referred to creatures by means of some grammatical case, it would be enough if it is referred to them in any manner whatsoever; for example, if it were referred to them by a preposition joined with some case. Then one would say that the Word "is for creatures," that is, for constituting them.

3. That argument holds for those names whose notions imply a relation to creatures. But this name is not that type, as is evident from our discussion in the body of the article. Hence, the conclusion does not follow.

4. Inasmuch as *Word* implies something absolute, it expresses a relation of causality over creatures; but inasmuch as it implies a relation of real origin, it is a personal name; and under this aspect it expresses no relation to creatures.

5. From our last answer, the answer to the fifth difficulty is evident.
6. The Word is not merely that by which the arrangement of all creatures takes place; it is the arrangement itself which the Father makes of things to be created. Hence, in some way, the Word is related to creatures.
7. The name *son* implies a relation only to that principle from which He comes, but *word* implies a relation both to the principle by which the Word was uttered and to that which is, as it were, its term, namely, that which is manifested through the word. What is manifested, of course, is principally the Father; but also, and, as a consequence, creatures are manifested, which, however, can in no way be a principle of a divine Person. Hence, Son implies no relation at all to creatures, such as *Word* does.
8. That argument is based on those names used to signify relations themselves, for it is impossible for one relation to terminate in many things, unless these are in some way one.
9. The same reply may be given to the ninth difficulty.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

The arguments supporting the opposite opinion conclude that the Word is in some way related to creatures, but not that it implies this relation essentially or, as it were, principally. In this limited sense, they must be granted.

ARTICLE 6

*Do things exist more truly in the word or in themselves?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that things do not exist more truly in the Word, for

1. A thing exists more truly where it exists through its essence than where it exists only through its likeness. But things exist in the Word only through their likeness, and in themselves through their essence. Therefore, they exist more truly in themselves than in the Word.
2. But it was said that they exist more nobly in the Word because in the Word they have a more noble act of existence.—On the contrary, as Augustine says, a material thing has a more noble act of existence in our soul than it has in itself, yet it exists more truly in itself than it does in our soul. For the same reason, a thing exists more truly in itself than it does in the Word.
3. What exists actually exists more truly than what exists potentially.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 18, 4, ad 3; *C.G.*, IV, 13; *In Evang. Johannis*, c. 1, lect. 2 (P. 10:293a); *De diff. verbi div. et hum.* (Petr. 1:n. 5).

But a thing existing in itself is in act; in the Word, however, it exists only potentially, like a product existing in a craftsman. Therefore, a thing exists more truly in itself than it does in the Word.

4. The ultimate perfection of a thing is its operation. Now, things existing in themselves have their own operations—which they do not have as they exist in the Word. Therefore, they exist more truly in themselves than in the Word.

5. Only things of one character can be compared. Now, the act of existence which a thing in itself has is not of the same character as that which it has in the Word. Therefore, at least one cannot say that a thing exists more truly in the Word than in itself.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. As Anselm says, a creature as it exists in the Creator is a creative essence. But an uncreated act of existence exists more truly than the created act. Therefore, a thing has existence in the Word more truly than it has in itself.

2. We assert that there are ideas in the divine mind, just as Plato asserted that the ideas of things exist outside of it. Now, according to Plato, the “separated man” was more truly man than the material man; hence, he called the separated man “man in himself.” For this reason, and, indeed, because of the position of the Faith, things exist more truly in the Word than in themselves.

3. That which is truest in any class is the measure for the entire class. But the likenesses of things existing in the Word are the measures of the truth of all things, because a thing is said to be true in so far as it imitates that upon which it was modeled, and this archetype exists in the Word. Therefore, things exist more truly in the Word than in themselves.

REPLY

As Dionysius says effects fall short of perfectly imitating their causes which are above them, and, because of this distance between the cause and the effect, something is truly predicated of the effect that is not predicated of the cause. For example, amusements are not properly said to be amused, although they are causes of our being amused. Now, this certainly could not happen unless the manner of the causes’ existence were more sublime than the things predicated of their effects. And we find this to be true of all equivocal efficient causes. For example, the sun cannot be said to be hot, even though other things are heated by it; and this is because of the superiority of the sun over those things that are called hot.

When, therefore, we ask if things exist more truly in themselves than in

the Word we must make a distinction, because more truly can refer to the truth of the thing or to the truth of the predication. If it refers to the truth of the thing, then undoubtedly the truth of things as they exist in the Word is greater than that which they possess in themselves. But, if it refers to the truth of predication, then the opposite is true. For man is more truly predicated of a thing which is in its own nature than it is of a thing as it is in the Word. But this is not due to any defect in the Word, but, rather, to its great superiority, as was pointed out.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. If one is thinking of truth of predication, then, simply speaking, it is true that a thing exists more truly where it exists through its essence than where it exists through a likeness. But if one considers the truth of the thing, then a thing exists more truly where it exists through a likeness which is its cause than where it exists through a likeness which it has caused.

2. The likeness of a thing in our soul is not the cause of that thing, as is the likeness existing in the Word. Hence, there is no parallel.

3. An active potency is more perfect than an act which is its effect. It is According to this kind of potency that creatures are said to exist potentially in the Word.

4. Although creatures as they are in the Word do not have their own operations, nevertheless, they have more noble operations inasmuch as they cause things as well as the operations of things.

5. Although the act of existence of creatures in the Word and their act of existing in themselves are not of the same character univocally, they are of the same character analogously.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

1. This argument proceeds from the truth of the thing, not from the truth of predication.

2. Plato was criticized for asserting that natural forms exist in their own natures, without matter—as though matter were merely accidentally related to natural species. If this were true, “natural things” could be truly predicated of things without matter. Our position, however, is not the same as Plato’s. Hence, there is no parallel.

3. The reply to the third argument is the same as our reply to the first.

ARTICLE 7

*Is the Word related to those things which do not exist,
will not exist, and never have existed?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is, for

1. A word implies something proceeding from an intellect. Now, the divine intellect knows also those things which are not, will not be, and never have been. This we showed when we treated God's knowledge. Hence, the Word can be related to these things.

2. According to Augustine: "The Son is the Father's art, filled with the ideas of living things." But, as Augustine says elsewhere: "Even if nothing comes into being because of an idea, it is rightly called an idea." Hence, the Word is also related to those things which will not be or have not been made.

3. The Word would not be perfect unless it contained in itself all that is contained in the knowledge of Him who utters it. But the knowledge of the Father, who utters the Word, includes those things which never will be and never were. Therefore, these things also are contained in the Word.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Anselm says: "There can be no word of that which does not exist, will not exist, and never has existed."

2. That whatever a person says takes place is a sign of his power. Now, God is most powerful. Hence, His Word does not pertain to anything which will not, at some time, take place.

REPLY

A thing can be in the Word in two ways. First, it can be in the Word as what the Word knows, or what can be known in the Word. It is in this latter way that those things exist in the Word that do not exist, have not existed, and will not exist; for the Word knows these things just as the Father does, and they can be known in the Word just as they can be known in the Father. Second, a thing is said to be in the Word as something spoken through the Word. Now, whatever is spoken by a word is in some way directed to be carried out, because it is by means of words that we incite others to action and arrange for them to carry out our ideas. This is why God's utterance is called His arrangement, as the Gloss says, commenting on the words of the Psalmist (Psalms

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 34, 3, ad 5; III, 3,8; *I Sent.*, 27, 2, 3; *Quodl.*, IV, 4, a. 6.

61:12): “God hath spoken once...” Hence, just as God does not dispose things unless they are, will be, or have been, so also He does not utter such things. Consequently, the Word is related to these things only, namely, the things that are actually uttered. But knowledge, art, and idea (in other words, intelligible representation) do not imply a relation to execution. Hence, no parallel exists between them and the Word.

From this, our replies to the Difficulties are clear.

ARTICLE 8

*Are all created things life in the Word?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. The Word causes things in so far as they exist in it. Therefore, if the things within the Word are life, the Word causes them through its life. Now, from the fact that the Word causes things through its goodness, all things are good. Hence, if it causes things through its life, all things would be living. This is false, and, consequently, the initial proposition is false.

2. Things exist in the Word as works exist in an artist. But as they are in an artist works are not life. They are not the life of the artist, who lived even before they existed in him, nor do they have any life themselves, for they are lifeless. Therefore, creatures in the Word are not life, either.

3. In Scripture, the causing of life is appropriated to the Holy Spirit rather than to the Word. This is clear from John (6:64): “It is the spirit that quickeneth,” as well as from other passages. Now, as is clear from what we said previously, only the Son, and not the Holy Spirit, is called the Word. Consequently, it is not consistent to say that things existing in the Word are life.

4. Intellectual light is not the principle of life. But things in the Word are light. Hence, it seems that in the Word they are not life.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. We read the following in John (1:3): “What is made in Him was life.”

2. According to the Philosopher, the motion of the heavens is said to be “a kind of life for all naturally existing things.” But the Word has a greater influence on creatures than the motion of the heavens has on nature. Therefore, as they exist in the Word, things should be called life.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 18, 4. See also readings given for q. 4, a. 6.

REPLY

As they exist in the Word, things can be considered in two ways: in their relation to the Word and in their relation to things exist in their own natures. In both ways, the likeness of a creature in the Word is life.

Now, we say that something lives in the proper sense if it has a principle of motion or of any activity whatsoever within it, for the primary reason why things are said to be alive is that they seem to have something within them moving them in some kind of motion. For this reason the word *life* is used of all things which have in them the principle of their own activity. Consequently, because certain things understand, feel, or will, they are said to be living—not merely because they move from place to place or because they increase in quantity. Hence, that act of existence which a thing has in so far as it moves itself to perform a certain action is properly called the life of the thing, because “the life of a living being is its act of existence,” as is said in *The Soul*. In our case, however, no action that we move ourselves to perform is our act of existence. Hence, properly speaking, to understand is not our life, unless to *live* is taken to mean the end-term of an operation; but this is merely a sign of life. Similarly, a likeness as conceived within us is not our life. On the other hand, the intellection of the Word is His act of existence, and so is the likeness of things He possesses. Therefore, a likeness of a creature existing in the Word is also His life.

Similarly, this likeness of the creature is, in a way, the creature itself—that is, in the same way that the soul is said to be, in some fashion, all things. Consequently, because the likeness of a creature existing within the Word in some way produces the creature and moves it as it exists in its own nature, the creature, in a sense, moves itself, and brings itself into being; that is, in view of the fact that it is brought into being, and is moved by its likeness existing in the Word. Thus the likeness of a creature in the Word is, in a certain sense, the very life of the creature itself.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. That a creature existing in the Word is called life does not pertain to the creature’s own nature, but to its manner of existence in the Word. Since it does not exist in this manner in itself, it does not follow that it lives in itself, even though it is life in the Word—any more than it follows that the thing is immaterial in itself because it is immaterial in the Word. On the other hand, goodness, being, and other things of this sort belong to the creature’s own nature. Hence, just as creatures good when existing in the Word, so also are they good when existing in their own nature.

2. The likeness of things in an artist cannot be called life in the strict sense, because they are neither the very act of existence of the living artist nor the artist's operation, as is true of God. It is true, however, as Augustine says, that "a cabinet existing in the mind of a cabinetmaker is living;" but this is because as it exists in his mind it possesses an intelligible act of existence, which belongs to the category of life.

3. Life is attributed to the Holy Spirit according as God is said to be the life of things, namely, as He is in all things and moves all things, with the result that all things seem to be moved, in some way, by an intrinsic principle. But life is appropriated to the Word according as things are in God. This is clear from what has been said.

4. Just as the likenesses of things in the Word cause existence in things, so also they cause knowledge in things—that is, in so far as they are received into intelligences, thus causing them to be able to know things. Hence, just as these likenesses are called life because they are principles of existing, so are they also called light because they are principles of knowing.

Question V

PROVIDENCE

1. To which attribute can God's providence be reduced?
2. Is the world ruled by providence?
3. Does God's providence extend to corruptible things?
4. Are the motions and actions of all bodies here below subject to divine providence?
5. Are human acts ruled by providence?
6. Are brute animals and their acts subject to God's providence?
7. Are sinners ruled by God's providence?
8. Are all material creatures governed by God's providence through angels?
9. Does divine providence dispose bodies here below by means of the celestial bodies?
10. Are human acts governed by God's providence through the instrumentality of celestial bodies?

ARTICLE I

*To which attribute can God's providence be reduced?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it belongs only to His knowledge, for

1. Boethius says, "It is certainly clear that Providence is the immovable and simple form of things to be done." Now, in God the form of things that should be done is an idea, and an idea pertains to His knowledge. Providence, therefore, pertains to His knowledge.

2. But it was said that providence also pertains to God's will in so far as it is the cause of things.—To the contrary, in us practical knowledge causes the things that we know. Practical knowledge, however, consists merely in knowledge. The same is true, therefore, of providence.

3. In the same section as cited above, Boethius writes: "The plan of carrying things out, when considered in the purity of God's understanding, is called Providence." Now, purity of understanding seems to pertain to specula-

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 3, aa. 2-3; *S.T.*, I, 22, 1; *I Sent.*, 39, 2, 1; *VI Metaph.*, lect. 3, n. 1218 *seq.*

tive knowledge. Providence, therefore, pertains to speculative knowledge.

4. Boethius writes: "Providence is so called because, standing at a distance from the lowest things, it looks upon all things from their highest summit." Now, to look upon is to know, especially to know speculatively. Providence, therefore, seems to belong to speculative knowledge.

5. As Boethius says: "Fate is related to Providence as reasoning is to understanding." Now, understanding and reasoning are common to both speculative and practical knowledge. Providence, therefore, also belongs to both types of knowledge.

6. Augustine writes: "An unchangeable law controls all changeable things, governing them gloriously." Now, control and government belong to providence. Consequently, that unchangeable law is providence itself. But law pertains to knowledge. Therefore, providence also belongs to knowledge.

7. The natural law as it exists within us is caused by divine providence. Now, a cause acts to bring about an effect in its own likeness. For this reason we also say that God's goodness is the cause of goodness in things, His essence, the cause of their being, and His life, the cause of their living. Divine providence, therefore, is a law; hence, our former position stands.

8. Boethius says: "Providence is the divine plan set up within the ruler of all things." Now, as Augustine says, the divine plan of a thing is an idea. Providence, therefore, is an idea; and since an idea pertains to knowledge, providence also pertains to knowledge.

9. Practical knowledge is ordained either to bring things into existence or to order things already in existence. Now, it does not belong to providence to bring things into existence. It rather presupposes the things over which it is exercised. Nor does it order things that are in existence. This belongs to God's disposal of things. Providence, therefore, pertains not to practical, but only to speculative knowledge.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Providence seems to belong to the will, because, as Damascene says: "Providence is the will of God, which brings all existing things to a suitable end."

2. We do not call those people provident who know what to do but are unwilling to do it. Providence, therefore, is related more to the will than to knowledge.

3. As Boethius says, God governs the world by His goodness. Now, goodness pertains to the will. Therefore, providence also pertains to the will, since the role of providence is to govern.

4. To dispose things is a function, not of knowledge, but of will. Now, according to Boethius, providence is the plan according to which God disposes all things. Providence, therefore, pertains to the will, not to knowledge.

5. What is provided for, taken simply as such, is neither a wise thing nor a known thing. It is merely a good. Consequently, one who provides, taken as such, is not wise, but good. Hence, providence does not pertain to wisdom, but to goodness or to the will.

TO THE CONTRARY (SECOND SERIES)

1. Furthermore, it seems that providence pertains to power. For Boethius says: "Providence has given to the things it has created the greatest reason for enduring, so that as far as they are able, all things naturally desire to endure." Providence, therefore, is a principle of creation. But, since creation is appropriated to God's power, providence pertains to power.

2. Government is the effect of providence, for the Book of Wisdom (14:3) says: "But thy providence, O Father, governeth all." But, as Hugh of St. Victor says, the will commands, wisdom directs, and power executes. Power, therefore, is more closely related to government than is knowledge or will. Consequently, providence pertains more to power than to knowledge or will.

REPLY

Because our intellects are weak, what we know of God we have to learn from creatures, around us. Consequently, to know how God is said to be provident, we have to see how creatures are provident.

We should first note that Cicero makes providence a part of prudence. Providence, as it were, completes prudence, since the other two parts of prudence, memory and understanding, are merely preparations for the prudent act. Moreover, according to the Philosopher," prudence is the reasoned plan of doing things. Now, things to be done differ from things to be made, because the latter start from an agent and terminate in some extrinsic matter, as, for example, a bench and a house; and the reasoned plan of making them is called art. On the other hand, things to be done are actions which do not go outside the agent, but, instead, are acts that perfect him, as, for example, chaste living, bearing oneself patiently, and the like. The reasoned plan of performing these is called prudence. With respect to action, two things should be considered: the end and the means.

However, it is especially the role of prudence to direct the means to the end; and, as we read in the *Ethics*, one is called prudent if he deliberates well. But, as we also read in the *Ethics*, deliberation "is not concerned with ends,

but only with means." Now, the end of things to be done pre-exists in us in two ways: first, through the natural knowledge we have of man's end. This knowledge, of course, as the Philosopher says, belongs to the intellect, which is a principle of things to be done as well as of things to be studied; and, as the Philosopher also points out, ends are principles of things to be done. The second way that these ends pre-exist in us is through our desires. Here, the ends of things to be done exist in us in our moral virtues, which influence a man to live a just, brave, or temperate life. This is, in a sense, the proximate end of things to be done. We are similarly perfected with respect to the means towards this end: our knowledge is perfected by counsel, our appetite, by choice; and in these matters we are directed by prudence.

It is clear, therefore, that it belongs to prudence to dispose, in an orderly way, the means towards an end. And because this disposing of means to an end is done by prudence, it can be said to take place by a kind of reasoning process, whose first principles are ends. The very reason for the sequence described above—and found in all things to be done—is taken from ends, as is clear in the case of art products. Consequently, if one would be prudent, he must stand in the proper relation to the ends themselves, for a reasoned plan cannot exist unless the principles of reason are maintained. Hence, prudence requires not only the understanding of ends but also moral virtues by which the will is settled in a correct end. For this reason, the Philosopher says that the prudent man must be virtuous. Finally, this is common to all rightly ordered powers and acts of the soul: the virtue of what is first is maintained in all the rest. Consequently, in prudence, in some way, are included both the will as directed towards an end and the knowledge of the end itself.

From what has been said it is now clear how providence is related to God's other attributes. His knowledge is related both to ends and to means toward ends, because through knowledge God knows Himself and creatures. But providence pertains only to that knowledge which is concerned with means to ends and in so far as these means are ordained to ends. Consequently, in God providence includes both knowledge and will, although, taken essentially, it belongs only to knowledge, that is, to practical, not to speculative, knowledge. Providence, moreover, also includes the power of execution; hence, an act of power presupposes an act of providence, as it were, directing it, and for this reason power is not included in providence as the will is.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Two aspects of a creature can be considered: first, its species taken absolutely; second, its relation to an end. The form of each exists previously in

God. The exemplary form of a thing considered absolutely in its species is an idea; but the form of a thing considered as directed to an end is called providence. Moreover, according to Boethius, the order divine providence implants in things is called fate. Consequently, providence is related to fate as an idea is related to the species of a thing. An idea, however, can in some way pertain to speculative knowledge; but providence is related only to practical knowledge, since it implies an ordering to an end, and, consequently, to something to be done, by means of which the end will be reached.

2. Providence pertains more to the will than does practical knowledge taken absolutely, because the latter is concerned in general only with the knowledge of an end and of the means to achieve it. Consequently, practical knowledge does not presuppose that an end has been willed. If this were true, then the will would be included in knowledge, as has been said with regard to providence.

3. Purity of understanding is mentioned, not to exclude the will from the concept of providence, but to exclude change and mutability.

4. In this passage Boethius is not giving a complete description of the nature of providence. He is merely giving the reason for its name. Consequently, even though looking upon things may be considered as speculative knowledge, it does not follow that providence may be considered to be such. Besides, Boethius explains providence, or foresight, as though it were far-sight, because "God Himself surveys all things from their highest summit." But God is on the highest summit of things for the very reason that He causes and directs all things. So, even in the words of Boethius something pertaining to practical knowledge can be noted.

5. The comparison Boethius makes is taken from the resemblance had by the proportion between the simple and the composite to the proportion between a body at rest and a body in motion. For, just as understanding is simple and non-discursive but reason is discursive, passing from one thing to another, similarly, providence is simple and unchangeable but fate is multiple and changeable. The conclusion, therefore, does not follow.

6. Properly speaking, God's providence is not the eternal law; it is something that follows upon the eternal law. The eternal law should be thought of as existing in God as those principles of action exist in us which we know naturally and upon which we base our deliberation and choice. These belong to prudence or providence. Consequently, the law of our intellect is related to prudence as an indemonstrable principle is related to a demonstration. Similarly, the eternal law in God is not His providence, but, as it were, a principle of His providence; for this reason one can, without any inconsistency, attri-

bute an act of providence to the eternal law in the same way that he attributes every conclusion of a demonstration to self-evident principles.

7. There are two types of causality to be found in the divine attributes. The first type is exemplary causality. Because of this type, we say that all living beings come from the first living being. This type of causality is common to all the divine attributes. The second type of causality is according to the relation the attributes have to their objects. We say, for example, that divine power is the cause of the possibles, divine knowledge is the cause of what is known. An effect of this type of causality need not resemble its cause; for the things that are made by knowledge need not be knowledge, but merely known. It is according to this type of causality that the providence of God is said to be the cause of all things. Consequently, even though the natural law within our understanding is derived from providence, it does not follow that divine providence is the eternal law.

8. "That divine plan within the highest ruler" is not called providence unless one includes in it the notion of direction to an end, which, in turn, presupposes that an end has been willed. Consequently, even though providence may essentially belong to knowledge, it also, in some way, includes the divine will.

9. A twofold ordering may be found in things. First, there is that order according to which things come from their principles. Second, there is the order according to which they are directed to an end. Now, the divine disposing pertains to that order according to which things proceed from their principles; for things are said to be disposed inasmuch as they are put on different levels by God, who is like an artist arranging the different parts of his work in different ways. Consequently, disposition seems to pertain to art. Providence, however, implies the ordering which directs to an end; for this reason it differs from the divine art and disposition. For divine art is so called because of its relation to the production of things, but divine disposition is so called because of its relation to the order of what has already been produced. Providence, however, implies the ordination to an end. Now, we can gather from the end of an art product whatever exists in the thing itself. Moreover, the ordering of a thing to an end is more closely related to the end than is the ordering of its parts to each other. In fact, their ordering to an end is, in a sense, the cause of the ordering of the parts to each other. Consequently, divine providence is, in a sense, the cause of God's disposition of things, and for this reason an act of His disposition is sometimes attributed to His providence. Therefore, even if providence is not an art related to the production of things or a disposition related to the ordering of things one to another, it does not follow that provi-

dence does not belong to practical knowledge.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

1. With reference to the difficulty about the will, we reply that Damascene calls providence will inasmuch as providence includes and presupposes the will, as we have pointed out previously.

2. As the Philosopher says, no man can be prudent unless he has moral virtues which rightly dispose him toward his ends, just as no one can demonstrate properly unless he knows well the principles of demonstration. It is for this reason that no one is said to be provident unless he has a correct will—not because providence is in the will.

3. God is said to govern through His goodness, not because His goodness is providence, but because, having the nature of an end, His goodness is a principle of providence. He is also said to govern through His goodness because the divine goodness is related to God as moral virtues are to us.

4. Even though the disposition of things presupposes the will, it is not an act of the will, because, as the Philosopher says, ordering, which is what is meant by disposition, is the act of one who is wise. Consequently, both disposition and providence really belong to knowledge.

5. Providence is compared to what is provided for as knowledge is compared to what is known—not as knowledge is compared to the knower. Consequently, it is not necessary that what is foreseen, taken as such, be wise, but rather that it be known.

The other two arguments we concede.

ARTICLE 2

*Is the world ruled by providence?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is not, for

1. No agent that acts from natural necessity acts through providence. But God acts upon created things through the necessity of nature, because, as Dionysius says: “The divine goodness communicates itself to us like the sun, which, without previous choice or knowledge, pours out its rays upon all bodies.” The world, therefore, is not ruled by the providence of God.

2. A principle having many forms is posterior to a principle having but

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 22, 2; 103, 5; *I Sent.*, 39, 2, 2; *C.G.*, III, cc. 1, 64, 75, 79, 94; *De div. nom.*, c. 3, lect. 1 (P. 15:292a); *De subst. sep.*, cc. 11-15 (Perr.:nn. 68-91); *Comp. Theol.*, I, cc. 123, 130, 132-33.

one form. Now, the will is a multiform principle because it is related to opposites. Consequently, providence is also multiform, since it presupposes will. On the other hand, nature is a principle having but one form, because it is determined to one. Therefore, nature precedes providence. Consequently, the realm of nature is not ruled by providence.

3. But it was said that a principle having one form precedes a multiform principle in the same genus, not in other genera.—On the contrary, the greater the power that a principle has of exercising causality, the greater is its priority. But the more a principle has but one form, the greater is its power of causality, since, as said in *The Causes*: “A united power is more infinite than one that is multiplied.” Consequently, a principle having but one form precedes a multiform principle whether they are in the same genus or in different genera.

4. According to Boethius, any inequality is reduced to an equality and any multitude to a unity. Therefore, any multiple act of the will ought to be reduced to an act of nature that is simple and equal. Hence, the first cause must work through its own essence and nature, and not through providence. Thus, our original argument stands.

5. What is, of itself, determined to one course of action does not need the direction of anything else, because direction *is* applied to a thing to prevent it from taking a contrary course. Natural things, however, are determined to one course of action by their own natures. Consequently, they do not need the direction of providence.

6. But it was said that natural things need the direction of providence to be kept in being.—On the contrary, if no possibility of corruption exists in a thing, it has no need of something extrinsic to conserve it. Now, there are some things in which there is no potency to corruption, since there is none to generation, as, for example, the celestial bodies and the spiritual substances, which are the most important things in the universe. Therefore, substances of this sort do not need providence to keep them in being.

7. There are certain things in the realm of nature that even God cannot change, such as the principle that “one cannot assert and deny the same thing under the same aspect,” and “what has existed cannot not have existed,” as Augustine says. Therefore, at least principles of this sort do not need divine rule and conservation.

8. Damascene points out that it would be illogical to say that the one who makes things is other than the one who exercises providence over them. Material bodies, however, are not made by God, since He is a spirit, and it seems no more possible for a spirit to produce a material body than for a ma-

terial body to produce a spirit. Material bodies of this sort, therefore, are not ruled through divine providence.

9. The government of things involves distinguishing between things. But making things distinct does not seem to be the work of God, because, as said in *The Causes*, God is related to all things in one way. Therefore, things are not ruled through divine providence.

10. Things ordered of themselves need not be ordered by others. But natural things are ordered of themselves, because, as is said in *The Soul*: "For all things naturally constituted there is a term and proportion set to their size and growth." Natural things, therefore, are not ordered by divine providence.

11. If things were ruled by divine providence, we could know divine providence by studying the order of nature. But, as Damascene says: "We should wonder at all things, praise all things, and accept without question all the works of providence." The world, therefore, is not ruled by providence.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Boethius writes: "O Thou that dost the world in everlasting order guide!"

2. Whatever has a fixed order must be ruled by a providence. But natural things have a fixed order in their motions. Hence, they are ruled by providence.

3. Things which have different natures remain joined only if they are ruled by a providence. For this reason, certain philosophers were forced to say that the soul is a harmony, because contraries remain joined together in the bodies of animals. Now, we see that in the world contraries and things of different natures are kept together. Consequently, the world is ruled by providence.

4. As Boethius says: "Fate directs the motion of all things and determines their places, forms, and time. This unfolding of the temporal order, united in the foresight of God's mind, is providence." Therefore, since we see that things have distinct forms, times, or places, we must admit the existence of fate and, consequently, that of providence.

5. Whatever cannot keep itself in existence needs something else to rule it and keep it in existence. But created things cannot keep themselves in existence, for, as Damascene says, what is made from nothing tends, of itself, to return to nothing. There must, therefore, be a providence ruling over things.

REPLY

Providence is concerned with the direction of things to an end.

Therefore, as the Commentator says, whoever denies final causality should also deny providence. Now, those who deny final causality take two positions.

Some of the very ancient philosophers admitted only a material cause. Since they would not admit an efficient cause, they could not affirm the existence of an end, for an end is a cause only in so far as it moves the efficient cause. Other and later philosophers admitted an efficient cause, but said nothing about a final cause. According to both schools, everything was necessarily caused by previously existing causes, material or efficient.

This position, however, was criticized by other philosophers on the following grounds. Material and efficient causes, as such, cause only the existence of their effects. They are not sufficient to produce goodness in them so that they be aptly disposed in themselves, so that they could continue to exist, and toward others so that they could help them. Heat, for example, of its very nature and of itself can break down other things, but this breaking down is good and helpful only if it happens up to a certain point and in a certain way. Consequently, if we do not admit that there exist in nature causes other than heat and similar agents, we cannot give any reason why things happen in a good and orderly way.

Moreover, whatever does not have a determinate cause happens by accident. Consequently, if the position mentioned above were true, all the harmony and usefulness found in things would be the result of chance. This was actually what Empedocles held. He asserted that it was by accident that the parts of animals came together in this way through friendship—and this was his explanation of an animal and of a frequent occurrence! This explanation, of course, is absurd, for those things that happen by chance, happen only rarely; we know from experience, however, that harmony and usefulness are found in nature either at all times or at least for the most part. This cannot be the result of mere chance; it must be because an end is intended. What lacks intellect or knowledge, however, cannot tend directly toward an end. It can do this only if someone else's knowledge has established an end for it, and directs it to that end. Consequently, since natural things have no knowledge, there must be some previously existing intelligence directing them to an end, like an archer who gives a definite motion to an arrow so that it will wing its way to a determined end. Now, the hit made by the arrow is said to be the work not of the arrow alone but also of the person who shot it. Similarly, philosophers call every work of nature the work of intelligence.

Consequently, the world is ruled by the providence of that intellect which gave this order to nature; and we may compare the providence by which God

rules the world to the domestic foresight by which a man rules his family, or to the political foresight by which a ruler governs a city or a kingdom, and directs the acts of others to a definite end. There is no providence, however, in God with respect to Himself, since whatever is in Him is an end, not a means to it.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The metaphor used by Dionysius notes merely that, like the sun which, on its own part, keeps no body from sharing its light, the divine goodness keeps no creature from participating in itself. The metaphor does not mean that providence acts without choice or knowledge.

2. A principle can be said to be multiform in two senses. First, the multiformity can refer to the very essence of the principle—that is, the principle is composite. A principle that is multiform in this sense must be posterior to a principle having but one form. Second, the multiformity may refer to the principle's relation to its effects, so that a principle is said to be multiform because it extends its influence to many things. A principle that is multiform in this sense precedes one that has but a single form, because the more simple a principle is, the more extensive is its influence. It is in this sense, moreover, that the will is said to be a multiform, and nature, a uniform principle.

3. The argument given is based on the uniformity of a principle according to its essence.

4. God is the cause of things by His essence. Consequently, any plurality in things can be reduced to one simple principle. His essence, however, is the cause of things only in so far as it is known, and consequently, only in so far as it wills to be communicated to a creature by the creature's being made in its likeness. Hence, things proceed from the divine essence through the ordering of knowledge and will, and so through providence.

5. That determination by which a natural thing is restricted to one course of action belongs to it, not because of itself, but because of something else. Consequently, the very determination for bringing about the suitable effect is, as has been said, a proof of divine providence.

6. Generation and corruption can be understood in two senses. First, generation and corruption can arise from a contrary being and terminate in a contrary. In this sense, the potency to generation and corruption exists in a thing because its matter is in potency to contrary forms; and in this respect celestial bodies and spiritual substances have no potency to generation or corruption. Second, these terms are commonly used to indicate any coming into or passing out of existence that is found in things. Consequently, even creation, by which a thing is drawn from nothingness into existence, is called

generation; and the annihilation of a thing is called corruption.

Moreover, a thing is said to be in potency to generation in this sense if an agent has the power to produce it; and it is said to be in potency to corruption if an agent has the power to reduce it to nothingness. In this way of speaking, every creature is in potency to corruption; for all that God has brought into existence He can also reduce to nothingness. For, as Augustine says, for creatures to subsist God must constantly work in them. This action of God, however, must not be compared to the action of a craftsman building a house, for, when his action ceases, the house still remains; it should rather be compared to the sun's lighting up the air. Consequently, when God no longer gives existence to a creature, whose very existence depends on His will, then this creature is reduced to nothingness.

7. The necessity of the principles mentioned depends upon God's providence and disposition, because the fact that created things have a particular nature and, in this nature, a determined act of existence, makes these things distinct from their negations; and upon this distinction is based the principle that affirmation and negation cannot be true simultaneously. Moreover, on this principle, as we read in the *Metaphysics*, the necessity of all the other principles is founded.

8. An effect cannot be stronger than its cause. It can, however, be weaker than its cause. Now, since body is naturally inferior to spirit, it cannot produce a spirit; but a spirit can produce a body.

9. God is similarly said to be related to all things, because there is no diversity in Him. He is, however, the cause of diversity in things inasmuch as by His knowledge He contains within Himself the intelligible characters of all things.

10. That order which is found in nature is not caused by nature but by something else. Consequently, nature needs providence to implant such an order in it.

11. Creatures fail to represent their creator adequately. Consequently, through them we cannot arrive at a perfect knowledge of God. Another reason for our imperfect knowledge is the weakness of our intellect, which cannot assimilate all the evidence of God that is to be found in creatures. It is for this reason that we are forbidden to scrutinize God's attributes over-zealously in the sense of aiming at the completion of such an inquiry, an aim which is implied in the very notion of overzealous scrutiny. If we were to act thus, we would not believe anything about God unless our intellect could grasp it. We are not, however, kept from humbly investigating God's attributes, remembering that we are too weak to arrive at a perfect comprehension of Him. Con-

sequently, Hilary writes as follows: "Even if a man who reverently seeks the infinite ways of God never reaches the end of his search, his search will always profit him."

ARTICLE 3

*Does God's providence extend to corruptible things?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it does not, for

1. A cause and its effects are in the same order. Now, corruptible creatures are the cause of sin. This is evident. For example, women's beauty is an incitement to and cause of lust. Moreover, Wisdom (14:11) says: "The creatures of God have been turned into...a snare for the feet of the unwise." Now, since sin is outside the order of divine providence, it seems that corruptible beings are not subject to this order.

2. Nothing that a wise man arranges can destroy his work, because he, would be contradicting himself were he to build and destroy the same thing. Now, we find among corruptible things some that are contrary to and destructive of others. Consequently, corruptible things were not arranged by God.

3. Damascene speaks as follows: "It must be true that all things happening according to God's providence take place according to right reason in a way that is best and most fitting in God's eyes—indeed, in a way that is better for them to take place." But corruptible things could become better, for they could become incorruptible. The providence of God he ore, does not extend to corruptible things.

4. Whatever is corruptible has corruption in it by its very nature; otherwise it would not be necessary for all corruptible things to corrupt. But, since corruption is a defect, it is not provided for by God, who cannot be a cause of any defect. Corruptible natures, therefore, do not come under God's providence.

5. As Dionysius says, providence does not destroy nature but saves it. The role of God's providence, therefore, is to save things continually. But corruptible things are not continually saved. They are not, therefore, subject to God's providence.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Wisdom (14:3) says: "But thy Providence, O Father, governeth all

* PARALLEL READINGS: See readings given for preceding article.

things.”

2. Wisdom (12:13) also says that it is God who “hast care of all things.” Therefore, corruptible as well as incorruptible things fall under His providence.

3. As Damascene says, it is illogical to hold that one being creates things and another exercises providence over them. Now, God is the efficient cause of all corruptible things. Consequently, He also provides for them.

REPLY

As we said above, the providence by which God rules things is similar to the providence by which the father of a family rules his household or a king rules a city or kingdom. The common element in these rules is the primacy of the common good over the good of the individual; for, as we read in the *Ethics*, the good of the nation is more divine than that of the city, family, or person. Consequently, whoever is supervising must—if he is to rule wisely—pay more attention to what is good for the community than to what is good merely for an individual.

Some have not kept this point in mind, but considering only that there are corruptible things which, if taken in themselves, could be better, and not considering the order of the universe in which each and every thing is excellently arranged—some, I say, have said that those corruptible things are therefore not ruled by God but that only incorruptible things are. These persons are represented in Job (22:14) by the man who says: “The clouds are God’s covert, and he doth not consider our things, and he walketh about the poles of heaven.” Moreover, they assert that corruptible things act necessarily and without any ruler at all or are ruled by an opposing principle. The Philosopher, however, has refuted this position by taking an army as an example. In an army we find two orders, one by which the parts of the army are related to each other, and a second by which the army is directed to an external good, namely, the good of its leader. That order by which the parts of the army are related to each other exists for the sake of the order by which the entire army is subordinated to its leader. Consequently, if the subordination to the leader did not exist, the ordering of the parts of the army to each other would not exist. Consequently, whenever we find a group whose members are ordered to each other, that group must necessarily be ordered to some external principle.

Now, the corruptible and incorruptible parts of the universe are related to each other essentially, not accidentally. For we see that corruptible bodies benefit from celestial bodies, and always, or at least ordinarily, in the same manner. Consequently, all things, corruptible and incorruptible, must be in

one order under the providence of an external principle outside the universe. For this reason, the Philosopher concluded that it was necessary to affirm the existence of a single rule over the universe, and of not more than one.

It must be noted, however, that a thing is provided for in two ways: for itself, or for other things. For example, in a home, care is taken of some things on their own account, namely, those things that constitute the essential goods of a household, such as sons, possessions, and the like; and other things, such as utensils, animals, and the like are cared for so that the essential things can use them. Similarly, in the universe, the things in which the essential perfection of the universe consists are provided for on their own account, and like the universe itself, these things stay in existence. But the things that do not endure are provided for, not for their own sake, but for the sake of other things. Consequently, spiritual substances and heavenly bodies, which are perpetual both as species and as individuals, are provided for on their own account both as species and as individuals. Corruptible things, however, are perpetual only as a species; hence, these species are looked after for their own sake, but the individual members of these species are not provided for except for this reason: to keep the species in perpetual existence.

If we thus understand the opinion of those who say that divine providence does not extend to corruptible things of this kind, except as they participate in the nature of a species, it need not be rejected; for this opinion is true if it is understood as referring to the providence of things by which they are provided for on their own account.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Of themselves, corruptible creatures do not cause sin. They are only its occasion and accidental cause. Now, an accidental cause and its effect do not have to belong to the same order.

2. A wise provider does not consider what is good for merely one of the things that fall under his providence. He is concerned rather with what is better for all. Consequently, even though the corruption of a thing in the universe is not good for that thing, it is good for the perfection of the entire universe, because the continual generation and corruption of individuals makes it possible for the species to be perpetual; and it is in this that the perfection of the universe essentially consists.

3. Although a corruptible thing would be better if it possessed incorruptibility, it is better for the universe to be made of both corruptible and incorruptible things than to be made merely of the latter, because the nature of the corruptible thing, as well as that of the incorruptible, is good, and it is

better to have two goods than merely one. Moreover, multiplication of individuals in one nature is of less value than a variety of natures, since the good found in a nature, being communicable, is superior to the good found in an individual, which is incommunicable.

4. Darkness is brought about by the sun, not because of any action of the sun, but because the sun does not send out light. Similarly, corruption comes from God, not because of any positive action by Him, but because He does not give the thing permanency.

5. The things that are provided for by God on their own account last forever. But this permanency is not necessary for those things that are not provided for on their own account. These need remain only so long as they are needed by the things for which they are provided. Consequently, as is clear from the previous discussion, certain things corrupt because they are not looked after for their own sakes.

ARTICLE 4

*Are the motions and actions of all bodies here
below subject to divine providence?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they are not, for

1. God does not provide for a thing if He is not its author, because, as Damascene says, it is illogical to say that one person makes a thing and another provides for it. Now, God is not the author of evil, for to the extent that things come from Him they are good. Therefore, since many evil things happen in the actions and motions of creatures here below, it does not seem that all of their motions fall under His divine providence.

2. Motions that are contrary do not seem to belong to the same order. Now, in creatures here below there are contrary motions and actions. Consequently, it is impossible that they all fall under the order of divine providence.

3. A thing falls under divine providence only inasmuch as it is directed to an end. But evil is not ordered to an end. On the contrary, it is a privation of order. Consequently, evil does not fall under providence. In creatures here below, however, many evils occur.

4. A man is not prudent if he allows something evil to occur in those things whose actions fall under his providence when he can prevent that evil from taking place. Now, God is most prudent and powerful. Hence, since

* PARALLEL READINGS: See readings given for q. 5, a. 2.

many evils occur in creatures here below, it seems that certain of their acts do not fall under divine providence.

5. It was said, however, that God permits these evils to happen because He can draw good from them.—On the contrary, good is more powerful than evil, so it is easier to draw good from good than good from evil. Consequently, it is not necessary for God to permit evil to happen in order to draw good from it.

6. As Boethius says, just as God creates all things through His goodness, so does He also govern all things by His goodness. But His divine goodness does not permit Him to make anything evil. Consequently, His goodness does not permit anything evil from coming under His providence

7. If a thing is arranged, it does not happen by chance. Therefore, if all the motions of creatures here below were arranged, nothing would happen by chance, but everything would happen by necessity. This, however, is impossible.

8. As the Commentator says, if everything happened in creatures here below because of the necessity of matter, they would not be ruled by providence. But many things in creatures here below happen because of the necessity of matter. At least these events, then, are not ruled by providence.

9. No prudent man permits a good so that evil will result. For the same reason, therefore, no prudent man permits an evil that good will result. Since God is prudent, He will therefore not permit evils in order that good will result. Consequently, it seems that the evils occurring in creatures here below are not allowed by providence.

10. What is blameworthy in a man should by no means be attributed to God. But a man is blamed if he does wrong in order to get something good. This is clear from the Epistle to the Romans (3:8): “As we are slandered, and as some affirm that we say: Let us do evil, that there may come good.” Consequently, it is contrary to God’s nature for evil to come under His providence in order that good may be drawn from it.

11. If the acts of bodies here below were subject to God’s providence, they would act in harmony with God’s justice. But the lower elements do not act in this way: fire burns the homes of the just as well as those of the unjust. Consequently, acts of lower bodies do not fall under God’s providence.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. In the Gospel according to Matthew (10:29), we read: “Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father.” On this, the Gloss reads: “Great is the providence of

God. Not even the smallest things escape it.” Consequently, even the smallest movement of things here below comes under God’s providence.

2. Augustine writes as follows: “It is because of God’s providence that we see celestial bodies ordered from on high, stars and planets of the earth shining down on us below, the regular alternation of night and day, the rugged earth being cleansed by surrounding waves of water, air gushing out in the heavens, shrubs and animals being conceived and born, growing, wasting away, and killing, and all things else that happen by interior, natural motion.” Consequently, all motions of lower bodies fall under God’s providence.

REPLY

Since the first principle of things is the same as their final end, things come from their first principle and are ordered to their ultimate end in the same manner. Studying things as they come from their principle, however, we find that those which are close to their principle have an unfailing act of existence, but, as is said in *Generation and Corruption*, those that are remote from their principle have a corruptible act of existence. Consequently, with respect to their relation to an end, those things that are closest to their ultimate end unfailingly keep their direction to their end, but those that are remote from their ultimate end sometimes diverge from their direction to it.

Moreover, the same things that are close to their principle are close to their end, and those that are remote from their principle are remote from their end. Consequently, not only have incorruptible substances an unfailing act of existence, but also their actions never fail to keep their direction to an end. For example, there are heavenly bodies whose motions never leave their natural orbit. However because corruptible bodies have defective natures, many of their movements diverge from their proper order. It is for this reason that, in regard to the order of the universe, the Philosopher compares incorruptible bodies to children in a household who always do what is good for the home, and corruptible bodies to domestic animals and slaves whose actions frequently violate the order laid down by the one in charge of the household. This is the reason, too, why Avicenna says that nothing evil lies beyond the moon and that there is evil only in creatures here below.

It should not be thought, however, that those acts of things here below which are outside their proper course are entirely outside the order of providence. For a thing comes under God’s providence in two ways: it can be something to which something else is ordered or it can be something that is ordered to something else. Now, as said in the *Physics* and in the *Metaphysics*, in an order of means to an end, all the intermediate members are ends as well as means

to an end. Consequently, whatever is rightly ordered by providence comes under providence not only as something that is referred to something else, but also as something to which another thing is referred. However, a thing which leaves the right order comes under providence only as something referred, to something else, not as something to which another thing has been referred. For example, the act of the generative powers by which a man generates another complete in his nature is directed by God to a particular thing, namely, a human form; and to the act itself something else is directed, namely, the generative power. A defective act which results occasionally in the generation of natural monstrosities is, of course, directed by God to some useful purpose; but to this defective act itself nothing else was directed. It happened merely on account of the failure of some cause. With regard to the first-named act of generation, the providence is one of approval; with regard to the second, it is one of permission. These two kinds of providence are discussed by Damascene.

It should be noted, however, that some have restricted God's providence to only the species of natural things, and have excluded it from individuals except as they participate in a common nature. They did this because they did not admit that God knows singulars, but said that God directs the nature of a species in such a way that the resultant power of a species can bring about a certain action, and, if this should fail at times, the failure itself is directed to something useful—just as the corruption of one thing is directed to the generation of another. They denied, however, that a particular force is directed to a particular act and that this particular failure is directed to this particular use. But since we say that God knows all particular things perfectly, we assert that all individual things, even as individuals, fall under God's providence.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. That argument touches only the providence of approval. It is true, however, that God does not provide for a thing unless He is in some way its author. Consequently, since evil does not come from God, it does not fall under His providence of approval, but falls only under His providence of permission.

2. Although contrary motions do not belong to the same specific order, they do belong to one general order, as do even the different orders of different crafts which are subordinated to the order of a city.

3. Even though evil inasmuch as it issues from its own cause is without order and, for this reason, is defined as a privation of order, there is nothing that keeps a higher cause from ordering it. In this way evil comes under provi-

dence.

4. Any prudent man will endure a small evil in order that a great good will not be prevented. Any particular good, moreover, is trifling in comparison with the good of a universal nature. Again, evil cannot be kept from certain things without taking away their nature, which is such that it may or may not fail; and, while this nature may harm something in particular, it nevertheless gives some added beauty to the universe. Consequently, since God is most prudent, His providence does not prevent evil, but allows each thing to act as its nature requires it to act. For, as Dionysius says, the role of providence is to save, not to destroy, nature.

5. There are certain goods which can be drawn only from certain evils; for example, the good of patience can be drawn only from the evil of persecution, and the good of penitence only from the evil of sin. This, however, is not to deny that evil is weak in comparison with good, because things of this sort are drawn out of evil, not as from an essential cause, but, as it were, accidentally and materially.

6. Inasmuch as it has an act of existence, whatever is made must have the form of the one who makes it, because the making of a thing terminates in its act of existence. Consequently, an evil cannot be produced by a cause that is good. Now, providence directs a thing to an end, and this direction to an end follows upon the act of existence of the thing. It is not impossible, therefore, for something evil to be directed to a good by one who is good, but it is impossible for one who is good to direct something to an evil. For, just as the goodness of a maker puts the form of goodness in the things he makes, so also does the goodness of one who is provident put a direction to good in the things that are subject to his providence.

7. Effects happening accidentally in creatures here below can be considered in two ways: in their relation to proximate causes—and, in this sense, many things happen by chance—or in their relation to the first cause—and, in this sense, nothing in the world happens by chance. It does not follow, therefore, that all things happen necessarily, because in necessity and contingency effects do not follow first causes but proximate causes.

8. Those things resulting from the necessity of matter are themselves determined by natures ordered to an end, and for this reason can also fall under divine providence. This would not be possible if everything resulted from the necessity of matter.

9. Evil is the contrary of good. Now, of itself no contrary brings about its contrary, but every contrary brings its contrary to that which is similar to itself. For example, heat does not bring a thing to coldness, except accidentally.

Instead, it reduces cold to warmth. Similarly, no good person directs a thing to evil; instead, he directs it to good.

10. As is clear from the above discussion, to do evil is in no way proper to those who are good. To do evil for the sake of a good is blameworthy in a man and cannot be attributed to God. On the other hand, to direct evil to a good is not opposed to one's goodness. Hence, permitting evil in order to draw some good from it can be attributed to God.

11. [No answer is given to the eleventh difficulty. See the answer to the sixth difficulty of the following article.]

ARTICLE 5

*Are human acts ruled by providence?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they are not, for

1. As Damascene says: "What is in us is the work not of providence but of our own free choice." *What is in us* means our human actions. Consequently, these do not fall under God's providence.

2. Of the things coming under God's providence, the more noble a thing is, the more elaborately is it provided for. Now, man is more noble than those creatures that lack sensation and, never departing from their course, rarely, if ever, deviate from the right order. Men's actions, however, frequently deviate from the right order. Hence, they are not ruled by providence.

3. The evil of sin is very hateful to God. But no one who is provident permits what is most displeasing to him to happen for the sake of something else, because this would mean that the absence of the latter would be even more displeasing to him. Consequently, since God permits the evil of sin to occur in human acts, it seems that they are not ruled by His providence.

4. What is abandoned does not fall under the rule of providence. But, as we read in Sirach (15:14): "God left man in the hand of his own counsel." Human acts, therefore, are not ruled by providence.

5. In Ecclesiastes (9:11) we read: "I saw that...the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong...but time and chance in all." Since the author is speaking about human acts, it seems that men's actions are subject to the whims of chance and are not ruled by providence.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 24, aa. 1-2; *II Sent.*, 39, 1, 1; *IV Sent.*, 49, 1, 3, ad 1; *S.T.*, I, 22, 2, ad 4; 22, 4; 59, 3; 83, 1; I-II, 9, 6, ad 3; 10, 4; 13, aa. 1, 6; *C.G.*, I, 68; III, 73; *De malo*, 3, 2, ad 4; 3, 3, ad 5; 6, 1 (P. 8:311a); *De Pot.*, 3, 7, ad 12-14; *In Rom.*, c. 9, lect. 3 (P. 13:97a); *De rationibus fidei*, c. 10 (P. 16:96a).

6. By the rule of providence, different allotments are made to different things. But in human affairs the same things happen to the good and to the evil; for, as we read in Ecclesiastes (9:2): “All things equally happen to the just and to the wicked, to the good and to the evil.” Consequently, human affairs are not ruled by providence.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. In the Gospel according to Matthew (10:30) is written: “The very hairs of your head are all numbered.” Even the least of human acts, therefore, is directed by God’s providence.

2. To punish, reward, and issue commands are acts of providence because it is through acts of this kind that every provider governs his subjects. Now, God does all these things in connection with human acts. Consequently, all human acts are ruled by His providence.

REPLY

As pointed out previously, the closer a being is to the first principle, the higher is its place in the order of providence. Now, among all things, spiritual substances stand closest to the first principle; this is why they are said to be stamped with God’s image. Consequently, by God’s providence they are not only provided for, but they are provident themselves. This is why these substances can exercise a choice in their actions while other creatures cannot. The latter are provided for, but they themselves are not provident.

Now, since providence is concerned with directing to an end, it must take place with the end as its norm; and since the first provider is Himself the end of His providence, He has the norm of providence within Himself. Consequently, it is impossible that any of the failures in those things for which He provides should be due to Him; the failures in these things can be due only to the objects of His providence. Now, creatures to whom His providence has been communicated are not the ends of their own providence. They are directed to another end, namely, God. Hence, it is necessary that they draw the rectitude of their own providence from God’s norm. Consequently, in the providence exercised by creatures failures may take place that are due, not only to the objects of their providence, but also to the providers themselves.

However, the more faithful a creature is to the norm of the first provider, the firmer will be the rectitude of his own providence. Consequently, it is because creatures of this sort can fail in their actions and are the cause of their actions, that their failures are culpable something which is not true of the failures of other creatures. Moreover, because these spiritual creatures are

incorruptible even as individuals, they are provided for on their own account as individuals. Hence, defects that take place in them are destined to a reward or punishment which will belong to these individuals themselves—and not to them only as they are ordered to other things.

Now, man is numbered among these creatures, because his form—that is, his soul—is a spiritual being, the root of all his human acts, and that by which even his body has a relation to immortality. Consequently, human acts come under divine providence according as men themselves have providence over their own acts; and the defects in these acts are ordained according to what belongs to these men themselves, not only according to what belongs to others. For example, when a man sins, God orders the sin to the sinner's good, so that after his fall, upon rising again, he may be a more humble person; or it is ordered at least to a good which is brought about in him by divine justice when he is punished for his sin. The defects happening in sensible creatures, however, are directed only to what belongs to others; for example, the corruption of some particular fire is directed to the generation of some particular air. Consequently, to designate this special manner of providence which God exercises over human acts, Wisdom (12:18) says: "Thou with great favour disposest of us."

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The statement of Damascene does not mean that the things in us (that is, in our power to choose) are entirely outside of God's providence, but it means rather that our choice is not determined to one course of action by divine providence, as are the actions of those beings which do not possess freedom.

2. Natural things lacking sensation are provided for by God alone. Consequently, no failure here is possible on the part of the one who provides, but only on the part of the objects of His providence. But human acts can be defective because of human providence. For this reason, we find more failures and de-ordinations in human acts than we do in the acts of natural things. Yet, the fact that man has providence over his own acts is part of his nobility. Consequently, the number of his failures does not keep man from holding a higher place under God's providence.

3. God loves a thing more if it is a greater good. Consequently, He wills the presence of a greater good more than He wills the absence of a lesser evil (for even the absence of an evil is a certain good). So, in order that certain greater goods may be had, He permits certain persons to fall even into the evils of sin, which, taken as a class, are most hateful, even though one of them may

be more hateful to Him than another. Consequently, to cure a man of one sin, God sometimes permits him to fall into another.

4. “God leaves man in the hand of his own counsel” in the sense that He gives him providence over his own acts. Man’s providence over his acts, however, does not exclude God’s providence over them, just as the active power of creatures does not exclude the active power of God.

5. Even though many of our human acts are the result of chance if we consider only lower causes, still, if we consider the providence which God has over all things, there is nothing that results from chance. Indeed, the very fact that so many things happen in human affairs when, if we consider merely lower causes, just the opposite should happen, proves that human actions are governed by God’s providence. Hence, the powerful frequently fall, for this shows that one is victorious because of God’s providence and not because of any human power. The same can be said of other cases.

6. Even though it may seem to us that all things happen equally to the good and to the evil since we are ignorant of the reasons for God’s providence in allotting these things, there is no doubt that in all these good and evil things happening to the good or to the evil there is operative a well worked out plan by which God’s providence directs all things. It is because we do not know His reasons that we think many things happen without order or plan. We are like a man who enters a carpenter shop and thinks that there is a useless multiplication of tools because he does not know how each one is used; but one who knows the trade will see that this number of tools exists for a very good reason.

ARTICLE 6

*Are brute animals and their acts subject to God’s providence?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they are not, for

1. In the first Epistle to the Corinthians (9:9) we read: “Doth God take care for oxen?” Consequently, God does not take care of other animals for the same reason.

2. In the Book of Habakkuk (1:14) we read: “Thou wilt make men as the fishes of the sea...” In this passage, the prophet is lamenting the troubling of the order which seems to happen in men’s actions. It seems, therefore, that the acts of irrational creatures are not governed by divine providence.

3. If a man is punished for no fault of his own, and this punishment

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 22, 2. See also readings given for q. 5, a. 2.

does not help him in any way, it would not seem that human affairs were ruled by providence. Now, brute animals cannot commit a fault, and, when they are killed, their death is not directed to their good, because there is no reward for them after death. Their lives, therefore, are not ruled by providence.

4. A thing is not ruled by God's providence if it is ordained to the end which He intends; and this end is nothing other than God Himself. Brutes, however, cannot attain to a participation in God, since they are not capable of beatitude. Consequently, it seems that divine providence does not rule them.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. In the Gospel according to Matthew (10:29) we read: "not one sparrow shall fall on the ground without our heavenly Father's permission."

2. Brutes are more noble than creatures that lack sensation. But these other creatures and all their actions come under God's providence. Even more, then, will brutes come under His providence.

REPLY

In this matter two errors have been made. Some have said that brutes are not ruled by providence except as they participate in the nature of their species, which alone is provided for and directed by God. It is to this kind of providence, they say, that all the passage in Scripture refer when they seem to imply God's providence over brutes, for example: "Who giveth to beasts their food: and to the young..." (Psalms 146:9); "The young lions roaring..." (Psalm 103:21); and many similar passages. This error, however, attributes very great imperfection to God. Moreover, it is not possible that God should know the individual acts of brutes and not direct them, since He is most good and, because He is good, pours out His goodness upon all things. Consequently, the error we have mentioned belittles either God's knowledge by denying that He knows individual things or His goodness by denying that He directs individual things as individuals. For this reason, others have said that the acts of brutes, also, fall under providence in the same way in which the acts of rational being do. Consequently, no evil would be found in the acts of brutes that would not be directed to their good. This position, however, is also far from reasonable, for punishment and reward is due only to those who have free choice.

It must be said, therefore, that brutes and their acts, taken even individually, fall under God's providence, but not in the same way in which men and their actions do. For providence is exercised over men, even as individuals, for their own sake; but individual brutes are provided for merely for the sake of something else—just as other corruptible creatures are, as mentioned previ-

ously. Hence, the evil that happens to a brute is not ordered to the good of the brute but to the good of something else, just as the death of an ass is ordered to the good of a lion or that of a wolf. But the death of a man killed by a lion is directed not merely to the good of the lion, but principally to the man's punishment or to the increase of his merit; for his merit can grow if he accepts his sufferings.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The Apostle does not intend to remove brutes entirely from God's care. He simply means to say that God does not care so much for brutes that He would impose a law upon men for the sake of brutes, commanding men to be good to them or not to kill them; for brutes have been made for man's use. Consequently, providence is not exercised over them for their own sake but for the sake of men.

2. God has so ordered fishes and brutes that the weak are subject to the strong. This was done without any consideration of merits or demerits, but only for the conservation of the good of nature. The prophet wondered, therefore, if human affairs were governed in the same way. For this to be true, of course, would be unreasonable.

3. A different order of providence is required for human affairs than is required for brutes. Consequently, if the ordering of human affairs were only that proper to brutes, human affairs would seem to be entirely without providence. Yet, that order is sufficient for the providence of brutes.

4. God Himself is the end of all creatures, but in different ways. He is said to be the end of some creatures inasmuch as they participate somewhat in God's image. This participation is common to all creatures. However, He is said to be the end of certain creatures inasmuch as they can attain God Himself through their own actions. This is the end only of rational creatures, who can know and love God in whom their beatitude lies.

ARTICLE 7

*Are sinners ruled by God's providence?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they are not, for

1. What is left to its own devices is not ruled. But the evil are left to themselves: "So I let them go according to the desires of their heart: they shall

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 22, 2, ad 4; *C.G.*, III, cc. 71, 73, 113.

walk..." (Psalm 80:13). The evil, therefore, are not governed by providence.

2. It is part of the providence by which God rules over men that they are guarded by angels. But guardian angels sometimes abandon men. From their own lips we have these words: "We would have cured Babylon, but she is not healed: let us forsake her (Jeremiah 51:9). The evil, therefore, are not governed by God's providence.

3. What is given as a reward to the good should not be given to the evil. But government by God is promised as a reward to the good—"The eyes of the Lord are upon the just" (Psalms 33:16).

TO THE CONTRARY

No one justly punishes those who are not under his rule. But God punishes the evil for the sins they commit. Therefore, they are under His rule.

REPLY

Divine providence extends to men in two ways: first, in so far as men are provided for; second, in so far as they themselves become providers. If they fail in their own providence they are called evil; but if they observe the demands of justice they are called good. Moreover in so far as they come under providence they are given both good and evil. Now, men are provided for in different ways according to the different ways they have of providing for themselves. For, if they keep the right order in their own providence, God's providence in their regard will keep an ordering that is congruent with their human dignity; that is, nothing will happen to them that is not for their own good, and everything that happens to them will be to their own advantage, according to what is said in the Epistle to the Romans (8:28): "To them that love God, all things work together unto good." However, if in their own providence men do not keep that order which is congruent with their dignity as rational creatures, but provide after the manner of brute animals, then God's providence will dispose of them according to the order that belongs to brutes, so that their good and evil acts will not be directed to their own profit but to the profit of others, according to the words of the Psalmist: "And man when he was in honour did not understand; he is compared..." (Psalms 48:13) —From this it is evident that God's providence governs the good in a higher way than it governs the evil. For, when the evil leave the order of providence, that is, by not doing the will of God, they fall into another order, an order in which the will of God is done to them. The good, however, are in the true order of His providence in both respects.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. God is said to abandon the wicked, not because they are entirely alien to His providence, but because their acts are not directed to their own profit. This is especially true of the depraved.

2. The angels in charge of guarding men never leave a man entirely. They are merely said to leave a man when, according to God's just judgment, they permit a man to fall into sin or into some punishment.

3. A special kind of providence is promised to the good as a reward. As we mentioned above, this does not belong to the wicked.

ARTICLE 8

*Are all material creatures governed by God's providence through angels?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they are not, for

1. In Job (34:13) we read: "What other hath he appointed over the earth? or whom hath he set over the world which he hath made?" In his commentary on this passage, Gregory says: "By Himself, indeed, He rules that world who has created it by Himself." Consequently, God does not rule material creatures through the mediation of spirits.

2. Damascene says that it is inconsistent to say that one person makes a thing and another rules over it. But, without any medium, God alone creates material creatures. Therefore, He governs them without any intermediaries.

3. Hugh of St. Victor says that God's providence is His predestination, which is the highest wisdom and the highest goodness. Now, the highest good or wisdom is not communicated to any creature. Therefore, neither is providence. Hence, God does not provide for material creatures through the mediation of spiritual creatures.

4. Material creatures are ruled by providence in so far as they are directed to an end. But bodies are ordained to their end through their natural operations in accordance with their determinate natures. Therefore, since the natures of natural bodies are made determinate, not by spiritual creatures, but directly by God, it seems that they are not governed through the mediation of spiritual substances.

5. Augustine distinguishes between two types of providential operations: "natural and voluntary." The former he calls natural because it makes

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 22, 3; 103, 6; *C.G.*, III, cc. 76-78, 83, 94, 124-25; *De subst. sep.*, c. 13 (Perr. 1:n. 80); *Comp. Theol.*, I, cc. 130-31.

trees and plants grow; the latter he calls voluntary because it takes place through the deeds of angels and men. It is clear, therefore, that all material things are ruled by the natural operation of providence, not through the mediation of angels, as would be true were they ruled by voluntary operation.

6. What is attributed to one person because of his dignity does not belong to another who does not have a similar dignity. Now, Jerome writes: "Great is the dignity of souls, each of whom has an angel appointed to guard it." This dignity, however, is not found in material creatures; consequently, they are not committed to the providence and direction of angels.

7. The effects and due courses of these material bodies are frequently hindered. This would not happen if they were governed by the mediation of angels, because these obstacles would then occur either with the consent of the angels—and this is impossible, since it would be contrary to that for which angels were appointed, namely, the government of natures according to its due order—or they would occur against the angels' will—and this, too, is impossible, since the angels would not be in the state of beatitude if something could happen to them which they did not want to happen. Therefore, material creatures are not ruled through the mediation of spiritual creatures.

8. The more noble and powerful a cause is, the more perfect is its effect. Now, lower causes can produce such effects as can be kept in existence even after the operation of their efficient cause ceases; for example, a knife continues in existence even after the work of the cutler has ceased. Much more so, then, will the effects of God's power be able to exist by themselves without being provided for by any efficient cause. Consequently, they do not need to be ruled through angels.

9. The divine goodness has created the whole world in order to manifest itself; for, as we read in Proverbs (16:4): "The Lord hath made all things for himself..." Now, God's goodness, as Augustine also says, is manifested more by a diversity of natures than by a number of things all possessing the same nature. For this reason, God did not make all creatures rational or all of them to exist in themselves. He made some creatures irrational, and some, like accidents, that exist in others. Consequently, it seems that for the greater manifestation of Himself God created not only creatures that needed the rule of another, but also some creatures that needed no rule at all. Hence, our position stands.

10. There are two types of acts in creatures, first act and second act. First act is the form and the act of existence that a form gives. Form is called the primarily first act, existence, the secondarily first act. Second act, however, is operation. Now, the first act of corporeal things comes directly from God.

Therefore, their second acts are also caused directly by God. But the only way in which one thing governs another is by being in some manner the cause of its operations. Therefore, material creatures of this sort are not governed through the instrumentality of spirits.

11. According to Augustine, God simultaneously created a world that was perfect in all its parts in order that His power might be better shown. The praiseworthiness of His providence would similarly be even better shown if He were to govern all things directly. Therefore, He does not govern material things through the mediation of spirits.

12. There are two ways of governing. One way is to impart light or knowledge; this is the way in which a teacher rules his class, and a ruler, his city. The other way is to impart motion to a thing; this is the way in which a pilot guides his ship. Now, spiritual creatures do not govern material creatures by imparting light or knowledge, because these material things cannot receive knowledge, nor do they govern them by imparting motion, because, as is proved in the *Physics*, a mover must be joined to what he moves, and spiritual substances are not joined to these lesser material bodies. Consequently, the latter are not governed in any way through their mediation.

13. Boethius says: "Through Himself alone God disposes all things." His disposition of material things, therefore, does not take place through spirits.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Gregory says: "In this visible world, nothing can be disposed except through invisible creatures."

2. Augustine writes: "All material things are ruled in a definite order through the spirit of life."

3. Augustine also says: "God does certain things Himself, as illuminating and beatifying souls. Other things He does through creatures who serve Him. These, in proportion to their merit and according to inviolable laws, are ordained to care even for sparrows, even for the beauty of the grass of the fields, indeed, even for the number of hairs on our heads—and to all this divine providence extends." Now, the creatures ordained to serve God's inviolable decrees are the angels; consequently, it is through them that He governs material things.

4. Origen writes: "The world needs the angels, who rule over beasts, preside over the birth of animals, and over the growth of bushes, plants, and other things."

5. Hugh of St. Victor says: "The ministry of angels rules not only over the life of men but also over the things that are related to their life." Now, all

material things are ordained for men's use. Consequently, all things are governed through the mediation of angels.

6. In a coordinated series, the earlier members act on the later members. The later do not act on the earlier. But spiritual substances are prior to material, since they are closer to the first principle. Therefore, the action of spiritual substances governs material actions, and the opposite is not true.

7. Man is said to be a "microcosm" because the soul rules the human body as God rules the whole universe. In this respect, the soul is called "an image of God" more than angels are. Now, our soul governs the body through the mediation of certain spirits which are spiritual in comparison with the body, although material in comparison with the soul. Consequently, God also rules material creatures through the mediation of spiritual creatures.

8. Our soul exercises certain operations directly, for example, understanding and willing; but it exercises other operations mediately by using bodily organs as instruments, as, for example, in the operations of the sensitive and vegetative soul. God also exercises certain operations directly, such as the beatifying of souls and the other actions He performs in relation to the highest substances. Consequently, some of God's operations will also take place in the lowest substances through the mediation of the highest ones.

9. The first cause does not take away the operation of a second cause, but, as is clear from what is said in *The Causes*, it strengthens it. Now, if God were to govern all things immediately, second causes would have no operations of their own. God, therefore, rules lower beings through higher beings.

10. In the universe there is something, such as the ultimate constituents of bodies, which is ruled but does not rule. There is something, such as God, which is not ruled but rules. Therefore, there will exist something that both rules and is ruled—a medium between both types. Consequently, God rules lower creatures through the mediation of higher.

REPLY

As Dionysius and Augustine say, the divine goodness is the cause of things' being brought into existence, for God wished to communicate His goodness to others as far as this was possible to creatures. God's goodness, however, has a twofold perfection. We can consider it in itself as it contains all perfections in itself in a super-eminent way, or we can consider it as it flows into things, that is, as it is the cause of things. It was fitting, therefore, that God's divine goodness should be communicated to creatures in both ways so that because of this goodness created things not only would exist and possess goodness but also would give existence and goodness to other things, just like the sun's

outpoured rays, which not only illumine other bodies but also make them to be sources of light, too. However, the following order is kept: Those that most resemble the sun receive the most of its light and, consequently, have sufficient light not only for themselves but also to pour out on other things.

Similarly, in the ordering of the universe, as a result of the outpouring of God's goodness, superior creatures have not only that by which they are good in themselves, but also that by which they are the cause of goodness for other things which participate the least in God's goodness. These last-named things participate in the divine goodness merely in order to exist—not to be the cause of other things. And this is the reason, as Augustine and the Philosopher say, why that which is active is always more noble than that which is passive.

Now, among the superior creatures, the closest to God are those rational ones that exist, live and understand in the likeness of God. Consequently, God in His goodness gives them the power not only of pouring out upon other things but also of having the same manner of outpouring that He Himself has—that is, according to their will, and not according to any necessity of their nature. Hence, God governs inferior creatures both through spiritual creatures and through the more noble material creatures. He provides through material creatures, not by making them provident themselves, but by making them active. He governs through spiritual creatures, however, by making them provident themselves.

But even in rational creatures an order can be found. Rational souls hold the lowest place among these, and their light is shadowy in comparison with that of the angels. Consequently, as Dionysius says, their knowledge is more restricted, and their providence is likewise restricted to a few things, namely, to human affairs and practical matters of human life. But the providence of angels is universal and extends to all material creation. Consequently, both saints and philosophers say that all corporeal things are governed by divine providence through the mediation of angels. We must differ with the philosophers, however, in this, that some of them say that corporeal things are not only cared for by angels but are also created by them. This opinion is contrary to faith. We should follow, instead, the opinion of the saints who hold that corporeal things of this sort are administered by the providence of angels through motion only; that is, the angels move the higher bodies, and these motions cause the motions of the lower.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. An exclusive statement regarding an agent does not exclude the operation of an instrument; it merely excludes another principal agent. Hence,

if one were to say, "Socrates alone makes a knife," not the operation of his hammer but only the operation of another carpenter is excluded. Similarly, when it is said that God governs the world by Himself, this does not exclude the operation of inferior causes, which God uses as instrumental means. All that is excluded is government by another principal ruler.

2. The governing of a thing pertains to its direction to an end. The ordination of a thing to an end, however, presupposes its act of existing; but its act of existing presupposes nothing else. Consequently, creation, by which all things are brought into existence, is the operation of the only cause that presupposes no other cause by which it is kept in existence. Government, however, can be one of those causes that do presuppose other causes, so it is not necessary for God to create through the mediation of certain causes through whose instrumentality He governs.

3. What creatures receive from God cannot exist in them in the same manner in which it exists in Him. Consequently, this difference becomes apparent when names are applied to Him. Those names that express some perfection absolutely are common also to creatures; but those that express both a perfection and its manner of existing in God are not common to creatures, for example, *omnipotence*, *supreme wisdom*, and *supreme goodness*. It is clear, therefore, that even though supreme goodness is not communicated to a creature, providence can be communicated to it.

4. Even though that establishment of nature by which material things receive a tendency to an end comes directly from God, their motion and action can take place through the instrumentality of angels, just as natures in seeds possess their undeveloped nature from God alone but, by the providence of a farmer, are helped to develop into act. Consequently, just as a farmer supervises the growth of the crops in his fields, so do angels direct the entire activity of material creation.

5. Augustine divides the operation of natural providence from that of voluntary providence by considering the proximate principles of their operations; and nature is the proximate principle of some operations of divine providence, while the will is that of others. But the remote principle of all providential action is the will, at least the divine will. The argument, therefore, proves nothing.

6. Just as all material bodies lie under God's providence but God's care is nevertheless said to be only for men because of the special kind of providence He has for them, so also, even though all material bodies are subject to the rule of angels, nevertheless, because of the dignity of men's souls, angels are appointed to guard men in a very special way.

7. Just as the will of God as ruler is not opposed to defects in things but, instead, allows or permits them, so is the same entirely true of the wills of angels, which are perfectly conformed to the divine will.

8. As Avicenna says, no effect can remain if its proper cause is removed. Now, certain inferior causes are causes of becoming; others are causes of existing. A cause of becoming is that which educes a form from the potentiality of matter by means of motion, such as a cutler who is the efficient cause of a knife. A cause of a thing's existing, however, is that upon which the act of existence of a thing essentially depends, as the existence of light in the air depends upon the sun. Now, if the cutler is removed, the becoming of the knife ceases, but not its existence. However, if the sun is taken away, there ceases the very existence of the light in the air. Similarly, if God's action ceases, the existence of a creature utterly ceases, since God is the cause not only of a thing's becoming but also of its existence.

9. That condition cannot possibly be in a creature; that is, a creature cannot have an act of existence without someone keeping it in that act. It is repugnant to the very notion of a creature; for a creature, because it is a creature, has an act of existence that is caused, and, consequently, it depends on something else.

10. More things are required for second act than for first act. Hence, it is not unreasonable that something should be the cause of another's motion and operation, even though it is not the cause of its act of existence.

11. The breadth of God's providence and goodness is manifested more clearly in His governance of inferior beings through superior beings than if He were to govern all things directly. For in this kind of government, as is clear from what has been said, the perfection of God's goodness is communicated in more than one regard.

12. A spiritual creature governs a material one by giving it motion. This does not necessitate that spiritual creatures be joined to all bodies, but only to those which they move directly, namely, the first bodies. Spiritual creatures, moreover, are not joined to these bodies by being their forms, as some have held, but by being their movers.

13. When something is said to take place through another, the preposition *through* implies that it is a cause of the operation. Now, since an operation stands halfway between the one doing the work and the work that is done, *through* can imply a cause of the operation in so far as this cause issues in a result. In this sense it is said that something takes place *through* an instrument. *Through* can also, however, signify a cause of the operation in so far as the operation comes from the one operating. In this sense we say that something

takes place *through* the form of the agent. Now, here it is not the instrument which is the cause of the agent's action, but his form or some superior agent is the cause. However, an instrument can be the cause of the result which receives the agent's action.

Consequently, when we read that God disposes all things through Himself alone, *through* denotes the cause of His divine disposition in so far as it comes from God who is disposing. In this sense, God is said to dispose through Himself alone, because He is not moved by any superior disposing Him; and He disposes, not through any extrinsic form, but only through His own goodness.

ARTICLE 9

*Does divine providence dispose bodies here below
by means of the celestial bodies?**

DIFFICULTIES:

It seems not, for

1. Speaking of celestial bodies, Damascene writes as follows: "We say, however, that they do not cause generation or corruption." Since bodies here below are subject to generation and corruption, they are consequently not disposed through celestial bodies.

2. It was said, however, that the celestial bodies are not called the causes of bodies here below merely because they do not introduce any necessity into them.—On the contrary, if an effect of a heavenly body on bodies here below is impeded, this must have been caused by some condition in the lower bodies. Now, if the lower bodies are ruled by the heavenly bodies, then that obstructing condition must be traced to some influence of a heavenly body. Consequently, no impediment could arise from bodies here below unless it were due to an exigency of the celestial bodies. Therefore, if the celestial bodies rule the lower, and if the motions of the celestial bodies are necessary, they will introduce necessity into the lower bodies.

3. For an action to be completed, all that is needed is something active and something passive. Now, both active and passive natural powers are found in bodies here below. Therefore, no power of a celestial body is needed for their actions. Consequently, bodies here below are not ruled through the instrumentality of celestial bodies.

4. According to Augustine, there are three types of things: first, things that are acted upon but do not act (e.g., bodies); second, things that act but

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 22, 3; 115, 3; *II Sent.*, 15, 1, 2; *C.G.*, III, 82; *Comp. Theol.*, I, c. 127.

are not acted upon (e.g., God); third, things that both act and are acted upon (e.g., spiritual substances). Now, celestial bodies are simply corporeal. Consequently, they do not have the power of acting upon bodies here below. Hence, the latter are not disposed through their instrumentality.

5. If a celestial body acts upon bodies here below, either it acts upon them in so far as it is a body, that is, through its material form, or it acts upon them through something else. Now, a celestial body does not act in so far as it is a body, because this kind of action can be found in all bodies; and this explanation seems unlikely from what Augustine says. Consequently, if it does act upon lower bodies, its action is due to something else; and, in this case, it should be attributed to an immaterial power and not to the heavenly bodies. Hence, the conclusion is the same as before.

6. What does not belong to what is prior does not belong to what is subsequent. Now, as the Commentator says, material forms presuppose indeterminate dimensions in matter. However, dimensions are not active, because quantity is not an active principle. Therefore, material forms are not active principles, and so no body can do anything except through an immaterial power existing within it. Consequently, the conclusion is the same as before.

7. Explaining this statement made in *The Causes*, "Every noble soul has three operations," a Commentator declares that the soul acts on nature by means of a divine power existing within it. A soul, however, is much more noble than a body. Hence, neither can a body do anything to the soul except by means of a divine power within it. Consequently, our original position stands.

8. That which is more simple is not moved by what is less simple. But seminal principles in the matter of bodies here below are more simple than the material power of the heavens, because the power of the latter is diffused in matter while that of the seminal principles is not. Therefore, the seminal principles in bodies here below cannot be moved by the power of a celestial body. Hence, bodies here below are not governed in their motions by celestial bodies.

9. Augustine writes as follows: "Nothing pertains to the body more than the body's sex. Yet, twins of different sexes can be conceived when the stars are in the same position." Therefore, celestial bodies have no influence even on material things, and our original position stands.

10. As we read in *The Causes*: "The first cause has more effect on what is caused by a second cause than the second cause itself has." Now, if bodies here below are disposed by celestial bodies, then with respect to the powers in bodies here below the powers of the celestial bodies are in a relation similar to that of the first cause; and the powers in bodies here below are then like sec-

ond causes. Hence, effects taking place in bodies here below are determined more by the disposition of the celestial spheres than they are by the powers of the bodies themselves. However, there is necessity in the celestial bodies, since they always remain the same. Therefore, their effects below will also be necessary. But this is not true. Consequently, the first statement—that bodies here below are disposed by heavenly bodies—is also not true.

11. As we read in *The Heavens*, the motion of the heavens is natural. Consequently, it can hardly be voluntary or the result of a choice. The things that are caused by it, therefore, are not caused as the result of a choice, and so do not come under providence. It would be unreasonable, however, to suppose that bodies here below are not governed by providence. Therefore, it is unreasonable for the motion of celestial bodies to be the cause of bodies here below.

12. When a cause is placed, an effect is placed. Therefore, the act of existence of a cause is, as it were, antecedent to that of an effect. Now, if an antecedent is necessary, the consequent is also necessary. Therefore, if a cause is necessary, the effect is likewise necessary. However, the effects taking place in bodies here below are not necessary but contingent. Consequently, they are not caused by the motion of the heavens, which is necessary because natural. Therefore, our original position stands.

13. The final cause of a thing's becoming is more noble than the thing. But all things were made for the sake of man—even heavenly bodies. For we read the following in Deuteronomy (4:19): "Lest perhaps lifting up thy eyes to heaven, thou see the sun and the moon, and all the stars of heaven, and being deceived by error thou adore them, which the Lord thy God created for the service of all the nations that are under heaven." Therefore, man is more noble than the celestial bodies. Now, what is less noble does not influence what is more noble. Consequently, celestial bodies have no influence on a human body, and, for the same reason, none on other bodies such as elements that are prior to the human body.

14. It was said, however, that man is more noble than the heavenly bodies because of his soul, not because of his body.—On the contrary, a nobler perfection is proper to a nobler subject. Now, the body of a man has a more noble form than a heavenly body has; for the form of the heavens is purely material, and a rational soul is much more noble than matter. Therefore, even the body of a man is nobler than a heavenly body.

15. A contrary is not the cause of its contrary. Now, occasionally, the power of a celestial body is opposed to the introduction of certain effects into lower bodies. For example, sometimes a celestial body starts to cause damp-

ness, while a doctor is trying to dispose of some matter by drying it up in order to restore health; and he often succeeds in doing this even though a heavenly body is exerting a contrary influence. Therefore, heavenly bodies do not cause physical effects in bodies here below.

16. Since all action takes place through contact, what makes no contact does not act. Heavenly bodies, however, do not touch bodies here below. Consequently, they do not act upon them; and the original position stands.

17. But it was said that heavenly bodies contact lower bodies through a medium.—On the contrary, whenever there is contact and action through a medium, the medium must receive the effect of the agent before the end-term does. For example, fire heats the air before it heats us. Now, the effects of the sun and of the stars cannot be received in the lower spheres because these have the nature of the fifth essence and consequently cannot be affected by heat, cold, or any of the other states found in bodies here below. Therefore, no action can come from the heavenly bodies through the lower spheres to bodies here below.

18. Providence is communicated to what is an instrument of providence. But providence cannot be communicated to heavenly bodies, since they lack intelligence. Therefore, they cannot be an instrument for providing for things.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Augustine says: “Bodies with weaker and grosser natures are ruled in a definite order by those that are more subtle and powerful.” Now, the heavenly bodies are more subtle and powerful than bodies here below. Therefore, they rule the bodies here below.

2. Dionysius says that the rays of the sun “enable visible bodies to generate and give them life, nourishment, and growth.” Now, these are the more noble effects to be found in bodies here below. Consequently, all the other physical effects also are produced by the providence of God through the mediation of celestial bodies.

3. According to the Philosopher, that which is first in any genus is the cause of the others that come afterwards in that genus. But the heavenly bodies are first in the genus of bodies, and their motions are first of all material motions. They are, therefore, the cause of material bodies that are moved here below. Hence, the conclusion is the same as before.

4. According to the Philosopher, the movement of the sun along an inclined circle causes generation and corruption in bodies here below. Consequently, generations and corruptions are measured by this movement. Aristotle also says that all the variety found in concepts is due to the heavenly bodies.

Therefore, bodies here below are disposed through their mediation.

5. Rabbi Moses says that the heavens are in the universe as a heart is in an animal. But all the other members are ruled by the soul through the instrumentality of the heart. Therefore, all material things are ruled by God through the instrumentality of the heavens.

REPLY

The common intention of all philosophers was to reduce multitude to unity and variety to uniformity as much as possible. Consequently, after considering the diversity of actions to be found in bodies here below, the ancient philosophers attempted to reduce these bodies to some fewer and more simple principles, that is, to elements, one or many, and to elementary qualities. But their position is not logical; for, in the actions of natural things, elementary qualities are like instrumental principles. An indication of this is the fact that they do not have the same way of acting in all things, nor do their actions always arrive at the same term. They have different effects in gold, in wood, and in the flesh of an animal. Now, this would not happen unless their actions were controlled by something else. Moreover, the action of the principal agent is not reduced to the action of an instrument as to its principle. Rather, the opposite is true, as, for example, a product of handicraft ought not be attributed to the saw but to the craftsman. Therefore, neither can natural effects be reduced to elementary qualities as to their first principles.

Consequently, others (the Platonists) made simple and separated forms the first principles of natural effects. These were the origin, they said, of the existence, genera on, and every natural property of bodies here below. This opinion also, however, is false; for, if a cause remains always the same, then the effect is always the same. Now, the forms they posited were immovable. Consequently, any generation resulting from them would always have to happen in bodies here below in a constant manner. But we see with our own eyes that what happens is quite the contrary.

It is therefore necessary to say that in bodies here below the principles of generation, of corruption, and of the other motions that depend upon these do not always remain the same; but they nevertheless always remain as the first principles of generation, and thereby make continual generation possible. Moreover, they must be unchangeable in their substance, and subject only to local motion. Consequently, as a result of their approach or withdrawal, they bring about diverse and contrary motions in bodies here below. Now, the heavenly bodies are of just such a nature. Consequently, all material effects should be reduced to them as to their cause.

In this reduction, however, two errors have been made. Some have reduced the bodies here below to heavenly bodies, as though the latter were their absolute first cause, for these philosophers denied that immaterial substances exist. Consequently, they said that what is prior among bodies is first among beings. This, however, is clearly false. Whatever is moved must be reduced to a first immovable principle, since nothing is moved by itself, and one cannot keep going back into infinity. Now, even though a heavenly body does not undergo change by generation or corruption or by a motion which would alter what belongs to its substance, it is nevertheless moved locally. Consequently, the reduction must be made to some prior principle so that things undergoing qualitative change are traced back by a definite order to that which causes this change in other things but is not so changed itself, although it is moved locally; and then further back to that which does not change in any way at all.

Others have asserted that the heavenly bodies cause not only the motion of bodies here below but also their very beginning. For example, Avicenna says that, as a result of what is common to all heavenly bodies, that is, their circular motion, there is caused the common element of bodies here below, namely, first matter; and, as a result of those things which differentiate one heavenly body from another, there is caused the difference in their forms. Thus, the heavenly bodies are media, to some extent, between God and things here below even in the line of creation. This position, however, is contrary to faith, which teaches that the whole of nature in its first beginning was created directly by God. But that one creature should be moved by another, presupposing that natural powers of each creature are given it as a result of God's work, is not contrary to faith. Consequently, we say that the heavenly bodies are the causes of bodies here below merely in the line of motion. Thus, these heavenly bodies are instruments in the work of governing, but not in the work of creating.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

I. Damascene intends to exclude from heavenly bodies only first causality or any causality which would introduce necessity into bodies here below. For, even if heavenly bodies always act in the same way, their effects are received in lower bodies according to the manner of these lower bodies, which are frequently seen to be in a contrary state. Consequently, the forces exercised by the heavenly bodies are not always able to bring about their effects in the bodies here below, because a contrary disposition prevents them from doing so. This is why the Philosopher says that signs of storms and winds frequently appear, but the storms and winds do not take place because the contrary dis-

positions are stronger.

2. Those dispositions that resist the force of the celestial bodies are caused in their original creation, not by a heavenly body, but by God's operation, which has made fire to be hot, water to be cold, and so forth. Consequently, we should not reduce all impediments of this kind to the celestial bodies.

3. The active powers in these lower bodies are merely instrumental. Consequently, like an instrument which does not move unless it is moved by a first agent, the active powers of inferior bodies cannot operate unless moved by celestial bodies.

4. That objection touches a certain opinion found in *The Fount of Life* to the effect that no body acts because of any power that it has as a body, because the quantity found in matter prevents the form from acting. Hence, every action we attribute to a body is really the action of some spiritual power operating in it. According to Rabbi Moses, this opinion was held by certain teachers among the Moors who said that fire does not heat, but God heats in the fire. This position, however, is foolish, since it denies all things their natural operations. Moreover, it is contrary to what philosophers and saints have said. Consequently, we say that bodies act by means of their material power; nevertheless, God operates in all things as a first cause operating in a second cause.

Therefore, the statement made to the effect that bodies are only acted upon but do not act should be understood in this sense: only that is said to act which has dominion over its action. It was in this sense that Damascene asserted: "Brute animals do not act but are only acted upon." But this does not mean that animals do not act if act is taken to mean simply the performance of an action.

5. As we read in *Generation and Corruption*, that which is active is always other than or contrary to that which is passive. Consequently, it does not belong to a body to act upon another body with respect to that which it has in common with that body, but only with respect to that in which it is different from it. A body, therefore, does not act in so far as it is a body, but in so far as it is a certain kind of body. For example, no animal reasons inasmuch as it is simply animal, but some animals reason inasmuch as they are also men. Similarly, fire does not heat in so far as it is a body, but in so far as it is hot. The same is true of a celestial body.

6. Before the advent of natural forms, dimensions are presupposed as existing in matter in a state of incomplete act, not of complete act. Consequently, they are first in the line of matter and of generation. Form, however,

is first in the line of completion. Now, a thing acts in so far as it is completed and is an actual being, not in so far as it is in potency. As a being in potency it is merely passive. Hence, it does not follow from the fact that matter or dimensions pre-existing in matter are not active that form is likewise inactive. Instead, the opposite follows. It would follow, however, if these dimensions were not passive, that the form would not be passive. But, as the Commentator says, the form of a heavenly body is not in it through the mediation of dimensions of the sort described.

7. The order of effects should correspond to the order of causes. According to the author of that book, however, the following order of causes exists: first, the first cause, God; second, the intelligence; third, the soul. Consequently, the first effect, the act of existence, is properly attributed to the first cause; the second effect, knowing, is attributed to intelligence; the third effect, moving, is attributed to the soul.

A second cause, however, always acts in virtue of the first cause, and, consequently, possesses something of its operation (like the lower spheres which possess something of the motion of the highest). According to the author, however, the intelligence not only knows but also gives existence; and the soul, which he holds to be caused by the intelligence, has not only the motion of the soul, which is to move, but also that of an intellect, which is to understand, and that of God, which is to give existence. I admit these to be the actions of a noble soul, but he understands such a soul to be the soul of a heavenly body or any other rational soul whatsoever. Therefore, it is not necessary that the divine power be the only one to move all things without any intermediary. The lower causes can also move through their own powers in so far as they participate in the power of superior causes.

8. According to Augustine, seminal principles are all the active and passive powers given to creatures by God; and through their instrumentality natural effects are brought into existence. He writes in *The Trinity*: "Like a mother pregnant with her unborn infant, the world is pregnant with the causes of unborn things." While explaining what he said above about seminal principles, he also called them "the powers and faculties" that are allotted to things.

Consequently, included in these seminal principles are the active powers of celestial bodies, which are more noble than the active powers of bodies here below and, consequently, able to move them. They are called seminal principles inasmuch as all effects are originally in their active causes in the manner of seeds. But if, as some hold, seminal principles are understood as being the beginnings of forms in first matter, inasmuch as first matter is in potency to all

forms, then, even though this does not agree very much with the words of Augustine, it can be said that the simplicity of these principles, like the simplicity of first matter, is caused by their imperfection, and, because of it, they cannot be moved, just as first matter cannot be.

9. Differentiation of the sexes must be attributed to celestial causes. Our reason for saying this is as follows: Every agent tends to form to its own likeness, as far as possible, that which is passive in its respect. Accordingly, the active principle in the male seed always tends toward the generation of a male offspring, which is more perfect than the female. From this it follows that conception of female offspring is something of an accident in the order of nature—in so far, at least, as it is not the result of the natural causality of the particular agent. Therefore, if there were no other natural influence at work tending toward the conception of female offspring, such conception would be wholly outside the design of nature, as is the case with what we call “monstrous” births. And so it is said that, although the conception of female offspring is not the natural result of the efficient causality of the particular nature at work—for which reason the female is sometimes spoken of as an “accidental male”—nevertheless, the conception of female offspring is the natural result of universal nature; that is, it is due to the influence of a heavenly body, as Avicenna suggests.

Matter, however, can cause an impediment which will prevent both the celestial force and the particular nature from attaining their effect, namely, the production of a male. And so, sometimes, as a result of an improper disposition in matter, a female is conceived even when the celestial influence tends to the contrary; or the opposite may happen, and, despite the influence of the celestial body, a male will sometimes be conceived because the formative influence of the particular agent is strong enough to overcome the defect in the material. In the conception of twins, the matter is separated by the operation of nature; and one part of the matter yields to the active principle more than the other part does because of the latter’s deficiency. Consequently, in one part a female is generated, in the other, a male—independently of the dispositions of the celestial spheres one way or the other. The generation of a female twin, however, happens more often when a celestial body disposes to the female sex.

10. A first cause is said to have more influence than a second cause in so far as its effect is deeper and more permanent in what is caused than the effect of the second cause is. Nevertheless, the effect has more resemblance to the second cause, since the action of the first cause is in some way determined to this particular effect by means of the second cause.

11. Although a movement in the heavens, as it is the act of a movable

body, is not a voluntary motion, nevertheless, as it is the act of a mover, it is voluntary; that is to say, it is caused by a will. And in this respect the things which are caused by this movement may come under providence.

12. An effect does not follow from a first cause unless the second cause has already been placed. Consequently, the necessity of a first cause does not introduce necessity into its effect unless the second cause is also necessary.

13. The celestial bodies are not made for man in the sense that man is their principal end. Their principal end is the divine goodness. Moreover, that man is nobler than a heavenly body is not due to the nature of his body but to the nature of his rational soul. Besides, even granting that man's body were, speaking absolutely, nobler than a celestial body, this would not prevent a celestial body from being nobler than a human body under a certain aspect, namely, as it has active power while the latter has merely passive power; and in this respect, a celestial body can act upon the human body. Similarly, fire as it is actually hot can act upon a human body in so far as the latter is potentially hot.

14. The rational soul is a substance as well as the act of a body. As a substance, therefore, it is nobler than the form of a celestial body; but it is not nobler as the act of a body. Or it could be said that the soul is a perfection of the human body both as a form and as a mover. But, since a celestial body is more perfect, it does not need a spiritual substance to perfect it as a form, but only to perfect it as a mover. This self-sufficiency makes it naturally more noble than [man who needs] a human soul.

Even though some have asserted that the movers of the heavenly spheres are joined to them as forms, Augustine left the matter in doubt. In his commentary on the words of Ecclesiastes (1:6), "The spirit goeth forward surveying all places round about," Jerome seems to follow the affirmative position; for he says: "He calls the sun a spirit because it breathes and lives like an animal." Damascene, however, holds the contrary: "Let no one think that the heavens or the stars are living. They lack both life and feeling."

15. Even the action of a contrary which resists the active influence of a celestial body has some cause in the heavens; for, as the philosophers say, things here below are sustained in their actions by the first motion. Consequently, a contrary whose action impedes the effect of a celestial body, like the hot remedy which impedes moistening by the moon, nevertheless has a cause in the heavens. Similarly, the health that follows is not entirely contrary to the action of the celestial body but has some roots there.

16. As is said in *Generation and Corruption*, heavenly bodies contact bodies here below, but are not contacted by them. Moreover, as was mentioned,

no heavenly body immediately contacts a body here below. The contact is through a medium.

17. The action of the agent is received in the medium according to the manner of the medium. Consequently, it is sometimes received in a different way in the medium than in the ultimate term. For example, the force of a magnet attracting iron passes to the iron through the medium of air, which is not attracted; and, as the Commentator says, the force of a fish that shocks the hand is transmitted to the hand through a net which is not shocked. Moreover, heavenly bodies do have all the qualities found in bodies below, but in their own way (which is that of a source) and not as in these lower bodies. Consequently, their actions are not received in the intermediate spheres in such a way that these are changed as the lower bodies are.

18. Bodies of this kind here below are ruled by divine providence through the higher bodies, but not in such a way that divine providence is communicated to them. They are made merely the instruments by which God's providence is carried out—just as art is not communicated to a hammer, which is merely an instrument of the art.

ARTICLE 10

*Are human acts governed by God's providence through
the instrumentality of celestial bodies?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they are, for

1. According to Damascene, heavenly bodies “are responsible for our habits, temperament, and disposition.” Now, habits and dispositions belong to the intellect and the will, which are the principles of human acts. Consequently, human acts are disposed by God through the mediation of celestial bodies.

2. We read in *The Six Principles*: That the soul when joined to a body, imitates the temperament of that body. But, since the celestial bodies leave their impression on a man's temperament, they thereby influence his soul. Hence, they can cause human acts.

3. Whatever acts upon a prior member of a series also acts upon a subsequent member. Now, the essence of the soul exists before its powers of intellect and will exist, because these have their origin in the essence of the soul.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 22, 3; 115, 4; I-II, 9, 5; II-II, 95, 5; *1st Sent.*, I5, 1, 3; *In Matth.*, c. 2 (P. 10:21a); *C.G.*, III, cc. 84-85, 87; *III De anima*, lect. 4, n. 621; *I Perih.*, lect. 14, n. 14 seq.; *VI Metaph.*, lect. 3, nn. 1203-05, 1213-17; *Comp. Theol.*, I, cc. 127-28.

Therefore, since the celestial bodies leave their impression on the essence of the rational soul, which they do inasmuch as the soul is the act of a body—a function belonging to it by its very essence, it seems that they leave their impression on the intellect and will, and, consequently, are principles of human acts.

4. An instrument acts, not only because of its own power, but also because of the power of the principal agent. Now, since a heavenly body is a moved mover, it is the instrument of the spiritual substance moving it. Consequently, its motion is not that of a body alone but it is also the act of the spirit moving it. Therefore, its motion takes place, not only by reason of the body moved, but also by reason of the spirit moving it. Now, just as that celestial body is superior to a human body, so is that spiritual substance superior to a human spirit. Consequently, that motion leaves its impression on a man's soul as well as on his body. It seems, therefore, that they are the principles of his acts of intellect and will.

5. By experience we know that from their birth some men have talents for learning or exercising certain crafts. Hence, some become carpenters, others become doctors, and so forth. Now, this proclivity cannot be reduced to the proximate principles of generation as its cause, for children are often found to have a bent to certain things which their parents did not have. This difference in talent, therefore, should be reduced to the celestial bodies as its cause. Moreover, it cannot be said that this sort of talent is in men's souls through the mediation of their bodies, because the physical qualities of the body do not contribute to these inclinations as they actually do to anger, joy, and similar passions of the soul. Celestial bodies, therefore, leave their impression on men's souls immediately and directly. Consequently, human acts are disposed through the instrumentality of the celestial bodies.

6. Of all human acts, the following seem to be superior to all others: ruling, waging wars, and similar actions. But, as Isaac says: "God made a sphere to rule over kingdoms and wars." Much more, then, are other human acts disposed through the mediation of heavenly bodies.

7. It is easier to transfer a part than a whole. But, according to philosophers, the influence of the celestial bodies sometimes moves the entire population of a province to launch a war. Much more, then, can the power of these celestial bodies affect some particular man.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Damascene writes of the heavenly bodies that they never cause our acts: "We have been given free choice by our Maker, and we are the masters of

our conduct.”

2. Both Augustine and Gregory support this contrary view.

REPLY

To get a clear understanding of this question, we must first understand what is meant by *human acts*. Human acts, properly speaking, are those over which a man is master. A man, however, is the master of his acts through his will or free choice. Consequently, this question is concerned with the acts of the will and of free choice. There are, of course, other acts in man that do not lie under the command of his will, for example, the acts of his nutritive and generative powers. These acts lie under the influence of celestial forces, just as other physical acts do.

There have been many errors regarding human acts. Some have said that human acts do not come under God's providence and cannot be reduced to any cause other than our own providence. As Augustine says, this seems to have been the position of Cicero. The position, however, is untenable; for, as proved in *The Soul*, our will is a moved mover. Consequently, its act must be reduced to some first principle that is an unmoved mover.

For this reason, some have reduced all the acts of the will to the celestial bodies; for, since they asserted that our senses and intellect are the same, it followed that all the powers of the soul are material and, therefore, subject to the action of the heavenly bodies. The Philosopher, however, destroys this position by showing that the intellect is an immaterial power and that its action is not material. As he says in *The Generation of Animals*, if the actions of principles are immaterial, the principles themselves must be immaterial. Consequently, it is impossible for the actions of the will and intellect of themselves to be reduced to any material principles.

Avicenna, therefore, declared that heavenly bodies were made, like man, of a soul and body, and that, just as the actions and motion of a human body are reduced to celestial bodies, so all the actions of the soul are reduced to celestial souls as to their principles. Consequently, whatever will we have is caused by the will of a celestial soul. This position is consistent with his opinion on the end of man, which he holds to be the union of the human soul with a celestial soul or intelligence. For, since the perfection of the will is its end and its good—and this is its object, just as the visible is the object of sight—then that which acts upon the will should have the nature of an end, because an efficient cause acts only in so far as it impresses its form on a recipient.

Faith, however, teaches that God is the direct end of man's life, and that we will be beatified and enjoy the vision of God. Consequently, He alone can

leave an impression on our will. Now, the order of what is moved should correspond to the order of the movers. But in our ordination to our end, with which providence is concerned, the first thing that is in us is our will; and the characters of the good and of an end primarily pertain to the will, which uses everything we have as instruments toward achieving our end. However, in a certain respect the intellect precedes the will, and is, moreover, more closely related to it than our bodily powers are. Consequently, God alone, who is the first provider in all respects, leaves His imprint on our will; the angels, who follow Him in the order of causes, leave their imprint on our intellect in so far as we are enlightened, cleansed, and perfected by them, as Dionysius says. But the celestial bodies, which are inferior agents, can leave their imprint only upon our sensible powers and the other powers in our organs. Of course, inasmuch as the movement of one power of the soul flows over into another, it happens that the impression made by a celestial body will, as it were, accidentally flow over into the intellect and finally into the will. Similarly, the impression made by an angel upon our intellect also accidentally flows over into our will.

But the relation of the intellect and of the will to the sensitive powers is different in the following respect: the intellect is naturally moved by the sensitive apprehension in the way in which a potency is moved by an object, because, as is said in *The Soul*, the phantasm is related to the possible intellect as color is to sight. Consequently, whenever an interior sensitive power is disturbed, the intellect is necessarily also disturbed. We see, for example, that when the organ of the imagination is injured the action of the intellect is necessarily impeded. By this means, therefore, the action or influence of a celestial body can flow over into the intellect with a kind of necessity; but this influence is accidental, because what it directly influences is the body. I say it necessarily flows over—unless there is a contrary disposition in what is affected. But the sensitive appetite is not the natural mover of the will. Instead, the opposite is true, because, as is said in *The Soul*, a higher appetite moves a lower “as one sphere” moves another. And no matter how much a lower appetite is troubled by the passion, as of anger or of concupiscence, the will need not be disturbed. Indeed, the will has the power to repel a disturbance of this kind; for, as we read in Genesis (4:7): “The lust thereof shall be under thee.” Consequently, no necessity is introduced into human acts by the influence of celestial bodies, either by the celestial bodies themselves or by those things which receive their influence. The celestial bodies introduce only an inclination, which the will can resist by means of an acquired or infused power.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Damascene is thinking of bodily habits and dispositions.
2. From what was said above, it is clear that an act of the will in the soul does not necessarily follow the disposition of the body. From the temperament of the body, only an inclination arises to those things which are the object of the will.
3. That argument would proceed correctly if a heavenly body could leave its impression on the essence of the soul directly. But the influence of a heavenly body reaches to the essence of the soul only indirectly, that is, only in so far as the soul is united to a body, whose act the soul is. The will, however, does not have its origin in the essence of the soul in so far as the soul is joined to a body. Consequently, the argument proves nothing.
4. An instrument of a spiritual agent acts through a spiritual power only as it acts through its own material power. Because of its material power, however, a heavenly body can act upon our bodies only. Consequently, the action that arises from its spiritual power can arrive at the soul only indirectly, that is, through the mediation of man's body. However, the material and spiritual power of a heavenly body can influence man's body directly. Because of its material power it moves elementary qualities, such as hot, cold, and so forth; and because of its spiritual power it moves to species and to those effects following the entire species which cannot be reduced to elementary qualities.
5. There are in those bodies some effects of the heavenly bodies which are not caused by heat or cold, such as the attraction of iron by a magnet. In this way some disposition is left in a human body by a celestial body; and by reason of this disposition the soul that is joined to such a body is inclined to this or that craft.
6. If we must "save" the words of Isaac, we have to understand them to mean merely an inclination in the manner described above.
7. For the most part, a large group follows its natural inclinations, for, as members of a group, men give in to the passions of the group. But by using their intelligence wise men overcome these passions and inclinations. Consequently, it is more probable that a large group will do what a celestial body inclines it to do than that one individual will; for he may use his reason to overcome this inclination. Similarly, if there is a large group of hot-tempered men, it is unlikely that they will not be angered, although it is more likely that an individual will not.

Question VI

PREDESTINATION

1. Does predestination belong to knowledge of will?
2. Is foreknowledge of merits the cause of or reason for predestination?
3. Is predestination certain?
4. Is the number of predestined certain?
5. Are the predestined certain of their predestination?
6. Can predestination be helped by the prayers of the saints?

ARTICLE I

*Does predestination belong to knowledge or will?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it has will as its genus, for

1. As Augustine says, predestination is the intention of being merciful. But intention belongs to the will. Consequently, predestination also belongs to the will.

2. Predestination seems to be the same as the eternal election referred to in the Epistle to the Ephesians (1:4): “He chose us in him before the foundation of the world”—because the chosen are the same as the predestined. Now, according to the Philosopher, choice belongs rather to appetite than to intellect. Hence, predestination belongs more to the will than to knowledge.

3. But it was said that election comes before predestination and is not the same as it.—On the contrary, will comes after knowledge, not before it. But choice pertains to the will. If, therefore, choice comes before predestination, then predestination cannot belong to knowledge.

4. If predestination belonged to knowledge, then it would seem to be the same as foreknowledge; and thus whoever foreknew the salvation of a person would predestine him. Now, this is false; for the prophets foreknew the salvation of the Gentiles; yet they did not predestine it.

5. Predestination implies causality. Now, causality does not have the nature of knowledge, but rather the nature of will. Consequently, predestination

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 23, aa. 1, 3-4; *I Sent.*, 40, 1, 2; *C.G.*, III, 163; *In Rom.*, c. 1, lect. 3 (P. 13:7a, 82).

belongs more to the will than to knowledge.

6. The will differs from a passive potency in this respect, that the latter refers only to effects taking place in the future, for we, cannot speak of passive potency in relation to things that are or have been, whereas the will extends equally to both present and future effects. Now, predestination has both present and future effects; for, as Augustine says: "Predestination is the preparation of grace in the present and of glory in the future." Therefore, it belongs to the will.

7. Knowledge is not related to things in so far as they are made or to be made but in so far as they are known or to be known. Now, predestination is related to a thing as something that must be effected. Consequently, it does not belong to knowledge.

8. An effect receives its name from its proximate cause rather than from its remote cause. For example, we say that a man is begotten by a man, instead of saying by the sun, which also begets him. Now, preparation is the effect of both knowledge and will, but knowledge is prior to the will and more remote than it. Consequently, preparation belongs more to the will than to knowledge. But, as Augustine says: "Predestination is the preparation of someone for glory." Therefore, predestination pertains rather to the will than to knowledge.

9. When many motions are ordered to only one term, then the entire coordinated complex of motions takes the name of the last motion. For example, in the drawing out of a substantial form from the potency of matter, the following order is had: first, alteration, then generation. But the whole is called generation. Now, when something is prepared, this order is had: first, movements of knowledge, then movements of the will. Consequently, the whole should be attributed to the will; therefore, predestination seems to be especially in the will.

10. If he of two contraries is appropriated to something, then the other contrary is removed from it in the highest possible degree. Now, evil is appropriated especially to God's foreknowledge, for we say that the damned are known beforehand. Consequently, His foreknowledge does not have good things as its object. Predestination, however, is concerned only with those good things that lead to salvation. Therefore, predestination is not related to foreknowledge.

11. When a word is used in its proper sense, it does not need a gloss. But; whenever the sacred Scripture speaks of knowledge of good, a gloss is added saying that this means approval. This is evident from the Gloss on the first Epistle to the Corinthians (8:3): "If any man love God, the same is known

by him'—that is, he is approved by God"; and from the Gloss on the second Epistle to Timothy (2:19): "The Lord knoweth who are his'—that is, God approves him." In its proper sense, therefore, knowledge is not related to good things. But predestination is related to good things.

12. To prepare belongs to a power that moves, for preparation is related to some work. But, as has been said, predestination is a preparation. Therefore, it belongs to a moving power and so to the will, not to knowledge.

13. A reasoning power modeled upon another reasoning power imitates it. Now, in the case of the human reason, which is modeled upon the divine, we see that preparation belongs to the will, not to knowledge. Consequently, divine preparation is similar; and the conclusion is the same as before.

14. Although the divine attributes are one reality, the difference between them is manifested in the difference in their effects. Consequently, something said of God should be reduced to that attribute to which this effect is appropriated. Now, grace and glory are the effects of predestination, and they are appropriated either to His will or His goodness. Therefore, predestination also belongs to His will, not to His knowledge.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. The Gloss on the Epistle to the Romans (8:29), "For whom he foreknew, he also predestinates," says: "Predestination is God's foreknowledge and preparation of benefits..."

2. Whatever is predestined is known, but the opposite is not true. Consequently, what is predestined belongs to the class of things that are known; hence, it is included in the genus of knowledge.

3. A thing should be placed in the genus to which it always belongs, rather than in a genus which is not always proper to it. Now, the element of knowledge always belongs to predestination, because foreknowledge always accompanies it. The granting of grace, however, which takes place through the will, does not always accompany predestination, since predestination is eternal while the bestowal of grace takes place in time. Predestination, therefore, should be placed in the genus of knowledge rather than in that of will acts.

4. The Philosopher places habits of knowing and doing among the intellectual virtues, for they belong more to reason than to appetite. This is clearly what he does in the case of art and prudence, as can be seen in his *Ethics*. Now, predestination implies a principle of doing and of knowing, since, as is evident from the definition given, predestination is both foreknowledge and preparation. Predestination, therefore, belongs more to knowledge than it does to the will.

5. Contraries belong to the same genus. But predestination is the contrary of reprobation. Now, since reprobation belongs to the genus of knowledge, because God foreknows the malice of the damned but does not cause it, it seems that predestination also belongs to the genus of knowledge.

REPLY

Destination (from which *predestination* is derived) implies the direction of something to an end. For this reason, one is said to *destine* a messenger if he directs him to do something. And because we direct our decisions to execution as to an end, we are said to *destine* what we decide. For example, Eleazar (2 Maccabees 6:19) is said to have “destined” in his heart not to do “any unlawful things for the love of life.”

Now, the particle *pre-*, when joined to a word, adds a relation to the future. Consequently, *to destine* refers to what is present, while *to predestine* can also refer to what is future. For two reasons, therefore, predestination is placed under providence as one of its parts, namely, because direction to an end, as pointed out in the preceding question,” pertains to providence, and because providence—even according to Cicero—includes a relation to the future. In fact, some define providence by saying that it is present knowledge bearing upon future event.

On the other hand, predestination differs from providence in two respects. Providence means a general ordering to an end. Consequently, it extends to all things, rational or irrational, good or bad, that have been ordained by God to an end. Predestination, however, is concerned only with that end which is possible for a rational creature, namely, his eternal glory. Consequently, it concerns only men, and only with reference to those things that are related to salvation. Moreover, predestination differs from providence in a second respect. In any ordering to an end, two things must be considered: the ordering itself, and the outcome or result of the ordering, for not everything that is ordered to an end reaches that end. Providence, therefore, is concerned only with the ordering to the end. Consequently, by God’s providence, all men are ordained to beatitude. But predestination is also concerned with the outcome or result of this ordering, and, therefore, it is related only to those who will attain heavenly glory. Hence, providence, is related to the initial establishment of an order, and predestination is related to its outcome or result; for the fact that some attain the end that is eternal glory is not due primarily to their own power but to the help of grace given by God.

Therefore, just as we said above that providence consists in an act of reason, like prudence, of which it is a part, because it belongs to reason alone to

direct and to ordain, so now we say that predestination also consists in an act of reason, directing or ordering to an end. However, the willing of an end is required before there can be direction to an end, because no one directs anything to an end which he does not will. This is why the Philosopher says that a perfect prudential choice can be made only by a man of good moral character, because moral habits strengthen one's affections for the end which prudence dictates. Now, the one who predestines does not consider in a general way the end to which his predestination directs him; he considers it, rather, according to the relation it has to one who attains it, and such a person must be distinct in the mind of the one predestining from those persons who will not achieve this end. Consequently, predestination presupposes a love by which God wills the salvation of a person. Hence, just as a prudent man directs to an end only in so far as he is temperate or just, so God predestines only in so far as He loves.

Another prerequisite of predestination is the choice by which he who is directed to the end infallibly is separated from others who are not ordained to it in the same manner. This separation, however, is not on account of any difference, found in the predestined, which could arouse God's love; for, as we read in the Epistle to the Romans (9:11-13): "When the children were not yet born nor had done any good or evil...it was said...[Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated.]" Consequently, predestination presupposes election and love, and election presupposes love. Again, two things follow upon predestination: the attainment of the end, which is glory, and the granting of help to attain this end, namely, the bestowal of the grace that pertains to the call to be among the predestined. Predestination, therefore, has two effects: grace and glory.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The acts of the soul are such that a preceding act in some way is virtually contained in the act that follows. Since predestination presupposes love, an act of the will, the notion of predestination includes something that belongs to the will. For this reason, intention and other elements belonging to the will are sometimes put into its definition.

2. Predestination is not the same as election, but, as we said above, it presupposes election. This is why the predestined are the same as the elect.

3. Since choice belongs to the will, and direction to the intellect, direction always precedes election if both have the same object. But if they have different objects, then there is no inconsistency in election's coming before predestination, which implies the existence of direction. As election is taken here, however, it pertains to one who is directed to an end; and the acceptance of one who is to be directed toward an end comes before the direction itself.

In the case stated, therefore, election precedes predestination.

4. Even though predestination is placed under the genus of knowledge, it adds something to knowledge and foreknowledge, namely, direction or an order to an end. In this respect, it resembles prudence, which also adds something to the notion of knowledge. Consequently, just as every person who knows what to do is not thereby prudent, so also not every one who has foreknowledge thereby predestines.

5. Even though causality does not belong to the notion of knowledge as such, it belongs to that knowledge which directs and orders to an end; and direction of this kind is not proper to the will but to the intellect alone. Similarly, understanding does not belong to the nature of a rational animal in so far as it is animal but only in so far as it is rational.

6. Knowledge is related to both present and future effects, just as the will is. On this basis, therefore, it cannot be proved that predestination belongs more to one than to the other. Yet predestination, properly speaking, is related only to the future—as the prefix *pre-* indicates, because it implies an ordering to the future. Nor is it the same to speak of having an effect *in the present* and of having a present effect, because whatever pertains to the state of this life—whether it be present, past, or future—is said to be *in the present*.

7. Even though knowledge as knowledge is not related to things in so far as they are to be made, practical knowledge is related to things under this aspect, and predestination is reduced to this type of knowledge.

8. In its proper sense, preparation implies a disposing of a potency for act. There are, however, two kinds of potencies: active and passive; consequently, there are two kinds of preparations. There is a preparation of the recipient, which we speak of when we say that matter is prepared for a form. Then there is a preparation of the agent, which we speak of when we say that someone is preparing himself in order to do something. It is this latter kind of preparation that predestination implies; for it asserts simply this, that in God there exists the ordering of some person to an end. Now, the proximate principle of ordering is reason, and, as is clear from above, its remote principle is will. Consequently, for the reason given in the difficulty, predestination is attributed more to reason than to will.

9. A similar answer should be given to the ninth difficulty.

10. Evil things are ascribed as proper to foreknowledge, not because they are more proper objects of foreknowledge than good things, but because good things in God imply something more than mere foreknowledge, while evil things have no such added implication. Similarly, a convertible term which does not signify an essence appropriates to itself the name of property, which

belongs just as properly to the definition, because the definition adds a certain priority.

11. A gloss does not always mean that a word has not been used in its proper sense. Sometimes a gloss is necessary merely to make specific what has been stated in a general way. This is why the gloss explains *knowledge* as meaning knowledge of approval.

12. To prepare or direct belongs only to powers that move. But to move is not peculiar to the will. As is clear from *The Soul*, this is also a property of the practical intellect.

13. In so far as preparation made even in a human reason implies an ordering or directing to an end, it is an act proper to the intellect, not to the will.

14. When treating a divine attribute, we should not consider only its effect but also its relation to the effect; for, while the effects of knowledge, power, and will are the same, still, as the names of these attributes imply, their relations to them are not. Now, in so far as predestination is directive, the relation implied by predestination to its effect is more logically said to be a relation of knowledge than a relation of power or will. Consequently, predestination is reduced to a type of knowledge.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

1., 2., 4. We concede the other arguments presented here. One might reply to the second, however, by pointing out that not everything that is found in more things is thereby a genus, for it might be predicated of them as an accident.

3. Even though the granting of grace does not always accompany predestination, the will to grant grace always does.

5. Reprobation is directly opposed, not to predestination, but to election, for He who chooses accepts one and rejects another and this is called reprobation. Consequently, as the word itself shows, *reprobation* pertains more to the will. For to reprobate is, as it were, to reject—except that it might be said that to reprobate means the same as to judge unworthy of admittance. However, reprobation is said to belong to God's foreknowledge for this reason, that there is nothing positive on the part of His will that has any relation to sin. He does not will sin as He wills grace. Yet reprobation is said to be a preparation of the punishment which God wills consequent to sin—not antecedent to it.

ARTICLE 2

*Is foreknowledge of merits the cause of or reason for predestination?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is, for

1. In his gloss on the verse in Romans (9:15), “I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy,” Ambrose writes as follows: “I will give mercy to him who I know will return with his whole heart to Me after his error. This is to give mercy to him to whom it should be given, and not to give it to one to whom it should not. Consequently, He calls him who He knows will obey, not him who He knows will disobey.” Now, to obey and to return to God with all one’s heart are meritorious; the opposite actions are de-meritorious. Foreknowledge of merit or of demerit is therefore the cause of God’s intention of being merciful to some and of excluding others from His mercy. This is equivalent to predestination and reprobation.

2. Predestination includes God’s will to save men. It cannot be said that it includes only His antecedent will, because, according to this will—as is said in the first Epistle to Timothy (2:4): “God wills all men to be saved”; hence, it would follow that all are predestined. It remains, therefore, that predestination includes only His consequent will. Now, “We are the cause,” as Damascene says, “of God’s consequent will,” according as we merit salvation or deserve damnation. Our merits foreknown by God are therefore the cause of predestination.

3. Predestination means primarily God’s will with respect to man’s salvation. But men’s merits are the cause of their salvation. Moreover, knowledge causes and specifies the act of the will, since that which moves the will is a desirable thing which is known. Consequently, foreknowledge of merits is a cause of predestination, since two of the things which foreknowledge contains cause the two things contained in predestination.

4. Reprobation and predestination signify the divine essence while connoting an effect. There is no diversity, however, in the divine essence. Consequently, the difference between predestination and reprobation comes entirely from their effects. Now, effects are considered as caused by us. It is due to us, as cause, therefore, that the predestined are segregated from the reprobate, as takes place through predestination. Hence, the same must be said as before.

5. Taken in itself, the sun is in the same relation to all bodies that can

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 19, 5; 2 3, aa. 2, 4-5; *I Sent.*, 40, 1, 1; 41, 3; *C.G.*, III, 163; *In Ephes.*, c. 1, lects. 1, 4 (P. 13:445b, 45 1 b); *In Evang. Johannis*, c. 15, lect. 3 (P. 10:568b); *In Rom.*, c. 1, lect. 3; c. 8, lect. 6; c. 9, lect. 3 (P. 13:8a, 86b, 96a, 972).

be illuminated, even though all bodies cannot share its light equally. Similarly, God is equally related to all, even though all do not participate in His divine goodness in an equal measure, as the saints and philosophers say so often. Now, since the sun is in the same relation to all bodies, it is not the cause of the differences that we find in these bodies, namely, that some of them are dark and others bright. This is due, rather, to differences in the physical constitution of the bodies which affect their reception of sunlight. Similarly, the reason for this difference, namely, that some reach salvation and others are damned, or that some are predestined while others are rejected, is to be found not in God but in us. Consequently, our original thesis stands.

6. Good communicates itself. It belongs to the highest good, therefore, to communicate itself in the highest possible degree, that is, as much as each and every thing is capable of receiving it. Consequently, if it does not communicate itself to something, this is because that thing is not capable of receiving it. Now, according to the quality of his merits, a person is capable or not capable of receiving that salvation which predestination ordains. Foreknowledge of merits, therefore, is the reason why some are predestined and others are not.

7. Concerning the passage in Numbers (3:12), "I took Levites..." Origen writes: "Jacob, younger by birth, was judged to be the firstborn. Because what they intended to do was in their hearts, and this was clear to God before they were born or did any good or evil, It was said of them: 'Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated.'" Now, this love, the saints commonly explain, pertains to Jacob's predestination. Consequently, God's foreknowledge of the intention Jacob was going to have in his heart was the reason for his predestination. Thus, the same must be said as was said previously.

8. Predestination cannot be unjust, since the ways of the Lord are always the ways of mercy and truth. Nor can there be any form of justice between God and men other than distributive justice. There is no place for commutative justice, since God, who needs none of our good things, receives nothing from us. Now, distributive justice rewards unequally only those that are unequal. But the only cause of inequality among men is difference in merit. Therefore, the reason why God predestines one man and not another is that He foreknows their different merits.

9. As mentioned previously, predestination presupposes election. But a choice cannot be reasonable unless there is some reason why one person is to be preferred to another. Now, in the election we are speaking about, there can be no reason for the preference other than merits. Therefore, since God's choice cannot be irrational, His election and, consequently, His predestination also must be caused by His foreknowledge of merits.

10. Commenting on that verse in the Prophecy of Malachi (1:2-3), “I have loved Jacob, but have hated Esau,” Augustine says that “the will of God,” by which He chose one and rejected the other “cannot be unjust, for it came from their hidden merits.” But the hidden merits can enter into an intention only in so far as they are foreknown. Consequently, predestination comes from foreknowledge of merits.

11. As the use of grace is related to the final effect of predestination so the abuse of it is related to the effect of reprobation. Now, in the case of Judas, the abuse of grace was the reason for his reprobation, since he was made reprobate because he died without grace. Moreover, the fact that he did not have grace when he died was not due to God’s unwillingness to give it but to his unwillingness to accept it—as both Anselm and Dionysius point out. Consequently, the good use of grace by Peter or anyone else is the reason why he is elected or predestined.

12. One person can merit the first grace for another. For the same reason, it seems that he could merit for that other person a continuation of grace up to the end. Now, if one gets final grace, he is predestined. Consequently, predestination can be caused by merits.

13. According to the Philosopher: “One thing is said to be prior to another when the sequence of their being cannot be reversed.” But God’s foreknowledge is related to predestination in this way, because God knows beforehand what He predestines, while He foreknows the evil which He does not predestine. Foreknowledge, therefore, is antecedent to predestination. But what is prior in any order is the cause of what is posterior. Consequently, foreknowledge is the cause of predestination.

14. The word *predestination* is derived from *sending* or *destining*. But knowledge precedes sending or destining, because no one can send a person without knowing him first. Knowledge, therefore, is prior also to predestination; hence, it seems that it is the cause of predestination. Consequently, our thesis stands.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. The Gloss on the following verse in the Epistle to the Romans (9:12), “Not of works, but of him that calleth was it said,” reads: “He shows that the words ‘I have loved Jacob, etc.,’ were due neither to any previous nor to any future merits.” And the Gloss on the verse, “Is there injustice with God?” (9:4), says: “Let no one say that God chooses one man and rejects another because He foresaw future works.” Consequently, it does not seem that foreknowledge of merits is the cause of predestination.

2. Grace is the effect of predestination but the principle of merit. Hence, foreknowledge of merits cannot possibly be the cause of predestination.

3. In the Epistle to Titus (3:5), the Apostle says: "Not by the works of justice which we have done but according to his mercy..." Predestination of one's salvation, therefore, does not arise from foreknowledge of merits.

4. If foreknowledge of merits were the cause of predestination, then no one would be predestined who did not merit. But some predestined never merit, as is evidently the case of children. Consequently, foreknowledge of merits is not the cause of predestination.

REPLY

There is this difference between a cause and an effect—that whatever is the cause of the cause must be the cause of the effect, but the cause of the effect is not necessarily the cause of the cause. It is evident, for example, that the first cause produces its effect through a second cause, and so the second cause, in some way, causes the effect of the first cause, although it is not the cause of the first cause.

Now, we must distinguish two aspects of predestination, the eternal predestination itself and its twofold temporal effect, grace and glory. Glory has human acts as its meritorious cause, but grace cannot have human acts as its meritorious cause; human acts can act only as a certain material disposition to grace, inasmuch as through these acts men are prepared for the acceptance of it. It does not follow from this, however, that our acts, whether they precede or follow grace, are the cause of predestination.

Now, to discover the cause of predestination we must recall what we have said previously, namely, that predestination is a certain direction to an end, and this direction is brought about by reason, moved by the will. Consequently, a thing can be the cause of predestination if it can move the will. However, a thing can move the will in two ways, first, as something due, secondly, as something not due. Now, as something due, a thing can move the will in two ways, namely, either absolutely or on the supposition of something else. The ultimate end, which is the object of the will, moves absolutely; and it moves the will in such a fashion that the will cannot turn away from it. For example, as Augustine says, no man is capable of not willing to be happy. But that without which an end cannot be had is said to move as something due "on the supposition of something else." If an end can be had, however, without a certain thing which contributes merely to the well-being of the end, then that thing does not move the will as something due. In this case, the will inclines to it freely; but when the will is already inclined to it freely, the will is thereby

inclined to all the things without which it cannot be had, as to things that are due on the supposition of that which was first willed. For example, out of liberality a king makes a person a soldier; but, because one cannot be a soldier without a horse, on the supposition of the aforementioned liberality, giving the soldier a horse becomes due and necessary.

Now, the end-object of the divine will is God's own goodness, which does not depend on anything else. God needs nothing to help Him possess it. Consequently, His will is inclined first to make something freely, not something due, inasmuch as it is His goodness that is manifested in His works. But, supposing that God wishes to make something, it follows as something due from the supposition of His liberality that He make those things also without which those that He has first willed cannot be had. For example, if He wills to make a man, He must give him an intellect. But if there is anything which is not necessary for that which God wills, then that thing comes from God, not as something due, but simply as a result of His generosity. Now, the perfection of grace and glory are goods of this kind, because nature can exist without them inasmuch as they surpass the limits of natural powers. Consequently, the fact that God wishes to give grace and glory is due simply to His generosity. The reason for His willing these things that arise simply from His generosity is the overflowing love of His will for His end-object, in which the perfection of His goodness is found. The cause of predestination, therefore, is nothing other than God's goodness.

According to these principles, a solution can be found to the controversy that has been taking place between certain groups. Some have asserted that everything comes from God's simple pleasure, while others say that everything which comes from God is due. Both opinions are false. The former ignores the necessary order that exists between the things God causes, and the latter asserts that everything arises from God because of a natural necessity. A middle course must therefore be chosen so that it may be laid down that those things which are first willed by God come from His simple pleasure, but those that are required for this first class of things come as something due, although on the basis of a supposition. This "debt" does not, however, make God obliged to things but only to His own will; for what is said to come from God as something due is due simply in order that His will be fulfilled.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

I. Divine providence ordains that grace bestowed be used as it should. Consequently, it is impossible for foreknowledge of this right use of grace to be the cause that moves God to give grace. The words of Ambrose, "I will give

grace to him who I know will return to me with his whole heart,” cannot be understood as meaning that a perfect change of heart inclines God’s will to give grace but that His will ordains that the grace given be accepted by the person and that he be turned completely toward God.

2. Predestination includes God’s consequent will, which is related in some way to that which we cause on our part, not by inclining the divine will to act, but by bringing about that effect for which His will has ordained grace or by bringing about that which, in a certain sense, disposes us for grace and merits glory.

3. While it is true that knowledge moves the will, not every kind of knowledge does this but only knowledge of an end; and an end is an object moving the will. Consequently, it is because of His knowledge of His own goodness that God loves it; and, from this love, He wishes to pour out His goodness upon others. But it does not therefore follow that knowledge of merits is the cause of His will in so far as it is included in predestination.

4. Although the different formal characters of God’s attributes are drawn from the differences in their effects, it does not follow from this that these effects are the cause of His attributes. For the different formal characteristics of His attributes are not derived from our qualities as though our qualities caused them; rather, our qualities are signs that the attributes themselves are causes. Consequently, it does not follow that that which comes from us is the reason why one man is reprobated and another predestined.

5. We can consider God’s relation to things in two ways. We can consider it only with respect to the first disposition of things that took place according to His divine wisdom, which established different grades of things. If only this is considered, then God is not related to all things in the same way. We can, however, consider His relation to things also according to the way in which He provides for them as already disposed. If His relation to them is considered in this manner, then He is related to all things in the same way, because He gives equally to all, according to the proportion He has made. Now, all that has been said to proceed from God, according to His will taken simply, belongs to the first disposition of things, of which preparation for grace is a part.

6. It belongs to the divine goodness as infinite to give from its perfections whatever the nature of each thing requires and is capable of receiving. But this is not required for superabundant perfections such as grace and glory. Hence, the argument proves nothing.

7. God’s foreknowledge of what lay in the heart of Jacob was not the reason for His willing to give grace to him. Instead, the intention in Jacob’s

heart was a good for which God ordained the grace to be given to him. It is for this reason that God is said to have loved him “because his heart’s intention was known by Him.” For God loved him in order that he might have such an intention in his heart or because He foresaw that his heart’s intention was a disposition for the acceptance of grace.

8. It would be contrary to the nature of distributive justice if things that were due to persons and were to be distributed to them were given out unequally to those that had equal rights. But things given out of liberality do not come under any form of justice. I may freely choose to give them to one person and not to another. Now, grace belongs to this class of things. Consequently, it is not contrary to the nature of distributive justice if God intends to give grace to one person and not to another, and does not consider their unequal merits.

9. The election by which God chooses one man and reprobates another is reasonable. There is no reason why merit must be the reason for His choice, however, since the reason for this is the divine goodness. As Augustine says, moreover, a justifying reason for reprobation [in the present] is the fact of original sin in man—for reprobation in the future, the fact that mere existence gives man no claim to grace. For I can reasonably deny something to a person if it is not due to him.

10. Peter Lombard says that Augustine retracted that statement in a similar passage. But, if it must be sustained, then it should be taken as referring to the effect of reprobation and of predestination, which has a meritorious or disposing cause.

11. God’s foreknowledge of this abuse of grace was not the reason why Judas was reprobated, unless we are considering only the consequences of this abuse—though it is true that God denies grace to no one who is willing to accept it. Now, the very fact that we are willing to accept grace comes to us through God’s predestination. Hence, our willingness cannot be a cause of predestination.

12. Although merit can be the cause of the effect of predestination, it cannot be the cause of predestination itself.

13. Although that with which the consequent cannot be interchanged is prior in some way, it does not always follow that it is prior as a cause is said to be prior; for, if this were true, then to be colored would be the cause of being a man. Consequently, it does not follow that foreknowledge is the cause of predestination.

14. The answer to this difficulty is clear from our last response.

ARTICLE 3

*Is predestination certain?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it has no certitude, for

1. No cause whose effects can vary can be certain of its effects. But the effects of predestination can vary, for one who is predestined may not attain the effect of his predestination. This is clear from the commentary of Augustine on the words of the Apocalypse (3:11), "Hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take..." in which he says: "If one person will not receive glory unless another loses it, then the number of the elect is certain." Now, from this it seems that one could lose and another receive the crown of glory, which is the effect of predestination.

2. Human affairs fall under God's providence as things in nature do. But, according to the ordering of God's providence, only those natural effects that are produced necessarily by their causes proceed from them with certainty. Now, since the effect of predestination, man's salvation, arises not necessarily but contingently from its proximate causes, it seems that the ordering of predestination is not certain.

3. If a cause has certitude with respect to some effect, that effect will necessarily follow unless there is something that can resist the power of the agent. For example, dispositions in bodies here below are sometimes found to resist the action of celestial bodies; and, as a consequence, these celestial bodies do not produce their characteristic effects, which they would produce were there not something resisting them. But nothing can resist divine predestination, because, as we read in the Epistle to the Romans (9:19): "Who resisteth his will?" Therefore, if divine predestination is ordered with certitude to its effect, its effect will necessarily be produced.

4. The answer was given that the certitude which predestination has of its effect presupposes the second cause.—On the contrary, any certitude based on the supposition of something is not absolute but conditional certitude. For example, it is not certain that the sun will cause a plant to bear fruit unless the generative power of the plant is in a favorable condition; and, because of this, the certitude of the sun's producing this effect presupposes the power of the plant as though the latter were a second cause. Consequently, if the certitude of divine predestination includes the presupposition of a second cause, that

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 23, aa. 6-7; *I Sent.*, 40, 3; *Quodl.*, XI, 3, 3; XII, 3, 3; *De rationibus fidei*, c.10 (P. 16:96a); *C.G.*, III, cc. 94, 162-63. See also readings given for q. 5, a. 5.

certitude will not be absolute but merely conditional—like the certitude I have that Socrates is moving if he runs, and that he will be saved if he prepares himself. Therefore, God will have no more certitude about those who are to be saved than I have. But this is absurd.

5. We read in Job (34:24): “He shall break in pieces many and innumerable, and shall make others to stand in their stead.” In explanation of this passage, Gregory writes: “Some fall from the place of life, while others are given it.” Now, the place of life is that place to which men are ordained by predestination. Hence, one who is predestined can fall short of the effect of predestination; therefore, predestination is not certain.

6. According to Anselm, predestination has the same kind of truth that a proposition about the future has. But a proposition about the future does not have certain and determinate truth. Such a proposition is open to correction—as is clear from that passage in Aristotle where he says: “One about to walk may not walk.” Similarly, therefore, the truth that predestination has does not possess certitude.

7. Sometimes one who is predestined is in mortal sin. This was clearly true of Paul when he was persecuting the Church. Now, he can stay in mortal sin until death or be killed immediately. If either happens, predestination will not obtain its effect. Therefore, it is possible for predestination not to obtain its effect.

8. But it was said that, when it is stated that one predestined may possibly die in the state of sin, the proposition is taken compositely and so is false; for its subject is taken as simultaneously having the determination *predestined*. But if its subject is taken without this determination, then the proposition is taken in a divided sense and is true. —On the contrary, with those forms which cannot be removed from the subject, it does not matter whether a thing is attributed to the subject with those qualifying determinations or without them. For example, taken either way, the following proposition is false: “A black crow can be white.” Now, predestination is the kind of form that cannot be removed from the one predestined. In the matter at hand, therefore, there is no room for the afore-mentioned distinction.

9. If what is eternal be joined to what is temporal and contingent, then the whole is temporal and contingent. Thus, it is clear that creation is temporal, even though its notion includes God’s eternal essence as well as a temporal effect. The same is true of a divine mission, which implies an eternal procession and a temporal effect. Now, even though predestination implies something eternal, it also implies a temporal effect. Therefore, predestination as a whole is temporal and contingent and, consequently, does not seem to have

certitude.

10. What can be or not be cannot have any certitude. But the fact that God predestines to salvation can be or not be. For just as He can, from all eternity, predestine and not predestine, so even now He can predestine and not predestine, since present, past, and future do not differ in eternity. Consequently, predestination cannot have any certitude.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. In explanation of that verse in the Epistle to the Romans (8:29), "Whom he foreknew, he also predestined," the Gloss says: "Predestination is the foreknowledge and preparation of the benefits of God by which whoever are freed are most certainly freed."

2. If the truth of a thing is unshakable, it must be certain. But, as Augustine says: "The truth of predestination is unshakable." Therefore, predestination is certain.

3. Whoever is predestined has this predestination from all eternity. But what exists from all eternity cannot be changed. Predestination, therefore, is unchangeable and, consequently, certain.

4. As is clear from the Gloss mentioned above J predestination includes foreknowledge. But, as Boethius has proved, foreknowledge is certain. Therefore, predestination is also certain.

REPLY

There are two kinds of certitude: certitude of knowledge and certitude of ordination. Now, certitude of knowledge is had when one's knowledge does not deviate in any way from reality, and, consequently, when it judges about a thing as it is. But because a judgment which will be certain about a thing is had especially from its causes, the word *certitude* has been transferred to the relation that a cause has to its effect; therefore, the relation of a cause to an effect is said to be certain when the cause infallibly produces its effect. Consequently, since God's foreknowledge does not imply, in all cases, a relation of a cause to all the things which are its objects, it is considered to have only the certitude of knowledge. But His predestination adds another element, because it includes not only His foreknowledge but also the relation of a cause to its objects, since predestination is a kind of direction or preparation. Thus, not only the certitude of knowledge, but also the certitude of ordination is contained in predestination. Now we are concerned only with the certitude of predestination; the certitude of knowledge, found also in predestination, has been explained in our investigation of God's knowledge.

It should be known that, since predestination is a particular type of providence, not only its notion adds something to providence, but also its certitude adds something to the certitude of providence. Now, the ordering of providence is found to be certain in two respects. First, it is certain with relation to a particular thing, when God's providence ordains things to some particular end, and they attain that end without failure. This is evident in the motions of celestial spheres and in all things in nature that act necessarily. Second, providence is certain in relation to things in general, but not in particular. For example, we see that the power of beings capable of generation and corruption sometimes falls short of the proper effects to which it has been ordered as its proper ends. Thus, the power that shapes bodies sometimes falls short of forming members completely. Yet, as we saw above when treating providence, these very defects are directed by God to some end. Consequently, nothing can fail to attain the general end of providence, even though it may at times fall short of a particular end.

The ordering of predestination, however, is certain, not only with respect to its general end, but also with respect to a particular and determinate end. For one who is ordained to salvation by predestination never fails to obtain it. Moreover, the ordering of predestination is not certain with reference to a particular end in the way in which the ordering of providence is; for, in providence, the ordering is not certain with respect to a particular end unless the proximate cause necessarily produces its effect. In predestination, however, there is certitude with respect to an individual end even though the proximate cause, free choice, does not produce that effect except in a contingent manner.

Hence, it seems difficult to reconcile the infallibility of predestination with freedom of choice; for we cannot say that predestination adds nothing to the certitude of providence except the certitude of foreknowledge, because this would be to say that God orders one who is predestined to his salvation as He orders any other person, with this difference, that, in the case of the predestined, God knows he will not fail to be saved. According to this position, one predestined would not differ in ordination from one not predestined; he would differ only with respect to [God's] foreknowledge of the outcome. Consequently, foreknowledge would be the cause of predestination, and predestination would not take place by the choice of Him who predestines. This, however, is contrary to the authority of the Scriptures⁷ and the sayings of the saints. Thus, the ordering of predestination has an infallible certitude of its own—over and above the certitude of foreknowledge. Nevertheless, the proximate cause of salvation, free choice, is related to predestination contingently, not necessarily.

This can be considered in the following manner. We find that an ordering is infallible in regard to something in two ways. First, an individual cause necessarily brings about its own effect because of the ordering of divine providence. Secondly, a single effect may be attained only as the result of the convergence of many contingent causes individually capable of failure; but each one of these causes has been ordained by God either to bring about that effect itself if another cause should fail or to prevent that other cause from failing. We see, for example, that all the individual members of a species are corruptible. Yet, from the fact that one succeeds another, the nature of the species can be kept in existence; and this is how God keeps the species from extinction, despite the fact that the individual perishes.

A similar case is had in predestination; for, even though free choice can fail with respect to salvation, God prepares so many other helps for one who is predestined that he either does not fall at all or, if he does fall, he rises again. The helps that God gives a man to enable him to gain salvation are exhortations, the support of prayer, the gift of grace, and all similar things. Consequently, if we were to consider salvation only in relation to its proximate cause, free choice, salvation would not be certain but contingent; however, in relation to the first cause, namely, predestination, salvation is certain.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The word crown as used in the Apocalypse (3:11) may mean either the crown of present justice or the crown of future glory. No matter which meaning is taken, however, one person is said to receive the crown of another when that other person falls in the sense that the goods of one person help another, either by aiding him to merit or even by increasing his glory. The reason for this is that all the members of the Church are connected by charity in such a way that their goods are common. Consequently, one receives the crown of another when that other falls through sin and does not achieve the reward of his merits; and another person receives the fruits of the sinner's merits, just as he would have benefited from the sinner's merits had the latter persevered. From this, however, it does not follow that predestination is ever in vain.

Or it can be answered that one is said to receive the crown of another, not because the other lost a crown that was predestined for him, but because whenever a person loses the crown that was due to him because of the justice he possessed, another person is substituted in his place to make up the number of the elect—just as men have been substituted to take the place of the fallen angels.

2. A natural effect issuing infallibly from God's providence takes place

because of one proximate cause necessarily ordered to the effect. The ordering of predestination, however, is not made certain in this manner but in the manner described above.

3. A celestial body, taken in itself, imposes a kind of determinism in its action on bodies here below. Consequently, its effect necessarily takes place, unless something resists it. But God does not act on the will in the manner of one necessitating; for He does not force the will but merely moves it, without taking away its own proper mode, which consists in being free with respect to opposites. Consequently, even though nothing can resist the divine will, our will, like everything else, carries out the divine will according to its own proper mode. Indeed, the divine will has given things their mode of being in order that His will be fulfilled. Therefore, some things fulfill the divine will necessarily, other things, contingently; but that which God wills always takes place.

4. The second cause, which we must suppose as prerequisite for obtaining the effect of predestination, lies also under the ordering of predestination. The relationship between lower powers and the power of a superior agent is not one of predestination. Consequently, even though the ordering of God's predestination includes the supposition of a human will, it nevertheless has absolute certitude, despite the fact that the example given points to the contrary.

5. Those words of Job and Gregory should be referred to the state of present justice. If some fall from it, others are chosen in their place. From this, therefore, we cannot conclude to any uncertainty with reference to predestination; for those who fall from grace at the end were never predestined at all.

6. The comparison Anselm makes holds good in this respect, that just as the truth of a proposition about the future does not remove contingency from a future event, so also the truth of predestination [does not take away the contingency of predestination]. But, in another respect, the comparison is weak. For a proposition about the future is related to the future in so far as it is future, and, under this aspect, it cannot be certain. As we pointed out previously, however, the truth of predestination and foreknowledge is related to the future as present, and, consequently, is certain.

7. A thing can be said to be possible in two ways. First, we may consider the potency that exists in the thing itself, as when we say that a stone can be moved downwards. Or we may consider the potency that exists in another thing, as when we say that a stone can be moved upwards, not by a potency existing in the stone, but by a potency existing in the one who hurls it.

Consequently, when we say: "That predestined person can possibly die in

sin,” the statement is true if we consider only the potency that exists in him. But, if we are speaking of this predestined person according to the ordering which he has to another, namely, to God, who is predestining him, that event is incompatible with this ordering, even though it is compatible with the person’s own power. Hence, we can use the distinction given above; that is, we can consider the subject with this form or without it.

8. Blackness and whiteness are, in a sense, examples of forms that exist in a subject said to be white or black. Consequently, nothing can be attributed to the subject, either according to potency or according to act, as long as blackness remains, if it is repugnant to this form of blackness. Predestination, however, is a form that exists, not in the person predestined, but in the one predestining, just as the *known* gets its name from knowledge in the knower. Consequently, no matter how fixed predestination may remain in the order of knowledge, yet, if we consider only the nature [of the predestined], we can attribute something to it which is repugnant to the ordering of predestination. For, considered this way, predestination is something other than the man who is said to be predestined, just as blackness is something other than the essence of a crow, even though it is not something outside the crow, but, by considering only the essence of a crow, one can attribute to it something that is repugnant to its blackness. For this reason, as Porphyry says, one can think of a white crow. Similarly, in the problem being discussed, one can attribute something to a predestined person taken in himself which cannot be attributed to him in so far as he is predestined.

9. Creation and mission imply the production of a temporal effect. Consequently, they affirm the existence of a temporal effect, and so must be temporal themselves, even though they include something eternal. Predestination, however, does not imply the production of a temporal effect—as the word itself shows—but only an ordering to something temporal, such as will, power, and all such attributes also imply. Since it does not affirm the actual existence of a temporal effect, which is also contingent, predestination is not necessarily temporal and contingent itself, because from eternity something can be unchangeably ordained to a temporal and contingent effect.

10. Absolutely speaking, it is possible for God to predestine or not to predestine each and every person, and it is possible for Him to have predestined or not to have predestined. For, since the act of predestination is measured by eternity, it never is past and never is future. Consequently, it is always considered as issuing from His will as something free. Because of the supposition, however, certain things are impossible: He cannot predestine if He has predestined, and He cannot predestine if He has already not predestined—

for God does not change. Hence, it does not follow that predestination can change.

ARTICLE 4

*Is the number of predestined certain?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. No number is certain if something can be added to it. But something can be added to the number of the predestined, because Moses' petition for such an increase is described in Deuteronomy (1:11) where he says: "The Lord God of your fathers add to this number many thousands." And the Gloss comments: "This number is fixed by God, who knows who belong to Him." Now, unless such an addition were possible, Moses would have asked in vain. Consequently, the number of the predestined is not certain.

2. As we are prepared for grace through the disposition of natural perfections, so are we prepared through grace for the attainment of glory. Now, grace is found in whomsoever there is sufficient preparation of natural gifts. Similarly, then, glory will be found wherever grace is found. But one not predestined may, at one time, possess grace. Therefore, he will possess glory and so be predestined. Consequently, one not predestined may become predestined. In this way, the number of the predestined can be increased; hence, it is not certain.

3. If one who has grace is not to have glory, his loss of glory will be due to a failure either on the part of grace or on the part of the one giving glory. However, this loss cannot be due to a failure on the part of grace, for, in itself, it sufficiently disposes for glory; nor can it be due to a failure on the part of the one giving glory, for, on His part, He is ready to give it to all. Consequently, whoever has grace will necessarily have glory. Thus, one who is foreknown [as lost] will have glory and be predestined. Accordingly, our original argument stands.

4. Whoever prepares himself sufficiently for grace, gets grace. But one foreknown [as lost] can prepare himself for grace. Therefore, it is possible for him to have grace. Whoever has grace, however, can persevere in it. So it seems that one who is foreknown [as lost] can persevere in grace up to the time of his death and thus become predestined. Consequently, the same must be said as before.

* PARALLEL READINGS: See readings given for preceding article.

5. It was said, however, that God's foreknowledge that a man will die without grace is necessary by conditional necessity, not by absolute necessity.—On the contrary, any necessity, which lacks a beginning and an end, and which is without succession, is not conditional but simple and absolute. Now, this is the kind of necessity that the necessity of foreknowledge is, because it is eternal. Therefore, it is simple and not conditioned.

6. A number larger than any finite number is possible. But the number of the predestined is finite. Therefore, a larger number is possible, and the number of the predestined is not certain.

7. Since good communicates itself, infinite goodness should not impose a limit on its communication. Now, the divine goodness communicates itself to the predestined in the highest possible degree. Therefore, it does not belong to the divine goodness to establish a certain number of predestined.

8. Like the creation of things, the predestination of men depends on the divine will. Now, God can make more things than He has made, because, as we read in Wisdom (12:18): "His power is at hand when He wills." Similarly, He has not predestined so many men that He cannot predestine more; and so our original argument returns.

9. Whatever God was at one time able to do He still is able to do. But from eternity God was able to predestine one whom He did not predestine. Consequently, He is still able to predestine him, and so an addition can be made to the number of the predestined.

10. In the case of all powers not determined to one course of action, what can be can also not be. Now, the power of the one predestining with respect to the one to be predestined, and the power of the one predestined with respect to his obtaining the effect of predestination, belong to this class of powers, because the one predestining predestines by His will, and the one predestined obtains the effect of predestination by his will. Consequently, the predestined can be non-predestined, and the non-predestined can be predestined. Hence, the conclusion is the same as before.

11. In commentary on that verse in Luke (5:6), "And their net broke," the Gloss reads: "In the Church, the net of circumcision is broken, for not as many Jews enter as were preordained by God to life." Consequently, since the number of the predestined can be diminished, it is not certain.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Augustine says: "The number of the predestined is certain and can neither be increased nor diminished."

2. Augustine says: "The heavenly Jerusalem, our mother, the City of

God, will not be robbed of any of the number of its citizens nor will it reign with more than the predestined number.” Now, the citizens mentioned are the predestined. Consequently, the number of the predestined cannot be increased or decreased. Hence, it is certain.

3. Whoever is predestined is predestined from eternity. But what exists from eternity is unchangeable, and what did not exist from eternity can never be eternal. Consequently, he who is not predestined cannot be predestined and, conversely, he who is predestined cannot be non-predestined.

4. After the resurrection, all the predestined will be in the highest heaven with their own bodies. Now, that place is finite, since all bodies are finite, and, as is commonly held, not even two glorified bodies can exist, simultaneously [in one place]. Consequently, the number of the predestined should be determinate.

REPLY

Treating this question, some have distinguished, saying that the number of the predestined is certain if we mean number understood actively or formally, but not certain if we mean number understood passively or materially. For example, one could say that it is certain that one hundred have been predestined, but it is not certain who these one hundred are. The occasion for such a position seems to be the words of Augustine mentioned previously. Augustine seems to imply that one can lose and another receive the predestined crown without the number of the predestined at all varying. But, if those holding this opinion are speaking about certitude of predestination in its relation to the first cause, that is, to God who predestines, then the opinion is entirely absurd, because God Himself has definite knowledge of the number of the predestined, whether the number be taken formally or materially. He knows exactly how many and who are to be saved, and, with respect to both, His ordination is infallible. Consequently, with respect to both numbers, God has certitude, not only of knowledge, but also of ordination.

On the other hand, if we are speaking about the certitude that can be had about the number of the predestined from its relation to the proximate cause of man's salvation (to which predestination is ordained), then our judgment about the formal number and the material number will not be the same. For, since the salvation of each individual has been produced through free choice as through its proximate cause, in some way the material number is subject to man's will, which is changeable. Consequently, the material number in some way lacks certainty. But the formal number is not determined in any manner by man's will, because by no kind of causality does the human will affect the

number of the predestined taken as a whole. Consequently, the formal number remains completely certain. In this way the aforementioned distinction can be sustained, as long as we concede, without any qualifications, that both numbers are certain as far as God is concerned.

It should be noted, moreover, that the number of the predestined is certain in this respect, that it cannot be increased or diminished. The number could be increased if one who was foreknown [as lost] could be predestined; but this would be contrary to the certainty of foreknowledge or of reprobation. Again, the number could be diminished if it were possible for one who is predestined to become non-predestined; but this would be contrary to the certainty of predestination. Thus, it is clear that the certitude about the number of the predestined is made up of two certitudes, the certitude of predestination and the certitude of foreknowledge or reprobation. These two certitudes differ, however; for, as has been said, the certitude of predestination is the certitude of knowledge and of direction to an end, while the certitude of foreknowledge is merely the certitude of knowledge. For God does not preordain the reprobate to sin as He ordains the predestined to merit.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. That quotation from Deuteronomy should be understood as referring, not to the number of the predestined, but to the number of those who are in the state of present justice. This is clear from the *Interlinear Gloss*, which adds: “In number and in merit.” Now, this number of those in present justice is both increased and diminished; but God’s appointment, which predefines this number, too, is never wrong, because it is He who decrees that there be more of these at one time and fewer at another. Or we could even answer that God defines a certain number in the manner of a judgment in harmony with inferior reasons, and this limitation can be changed; but He predestines another number in the manner of an election in harmony with superior reasons, and this limitation cannot be changed. For Gregory says: “He changes His judgment but never His election.”

2. No preparation disposes anything to have a perfection at a time other than its proper time. For example, his natural temperament may dispose a boy to be brave or wise—not, however, in the days of his childhood, but in the days of his manhood. Now, the time when one obtains grace is simultaneous with the time when nature is prepared. Consequently, no barrier can come between them. Thus, when the preparation of nature is found in a person, grace is also found in him. But the time when one obtains glory is not simultaneous with the time when he has grace. Consequently, a barrier can come between

these two. For this reason, one who is foreknown to possess grace will not necessarily possess glory also.

3. That one who had grace is nevertheless deprived of glory is not due to failure either on the part of grace or on the part of Him who gives glory. It is due rather to a failure on the part of the recipient, in whom an impediment has arisen.

4. When we affirm that a person is foreknown [as lost], we thereby affirm that he will not have final grace; for, as we pointed out previously, God's knowledge is directed to future things as though they were present. Consequently, just as the condition of not having final grace cannot be reconciled with the condition of having final grace, even though the former condition is possible if taken by itself, so the condition of having final grace cannot be reconciled with the condition of being foreknown [as lost], even though the former condition is also possible if taken by itself.

5. The fact that such a thing known by God is not absolutely necessary comes, not from a defect in God's knowledge, but from a defect in the proximate cause. On the other hand, the reason why this necessity is eternal—without beginning and end, and, as it were, without succession—comes from God's knowledge, which is eternal, not from the proximate cause, which is temporal and changeable.

6. Even though finite number as finite number does not prevent a larger number from existing, the impossibility may come from another source, namely, from the fixed character of God's foreknowledge, which is apparent in the problem at hand. Similarly, when we consider the size of some natural thing, we see that a larger size cannot exist, not because of the nature of quantity, but because of the nature of the thing itself.

7. The divine goodness communicates itself only under the guidance of wisdom, for this is the best manner for its communication. Now, as we read in Wisdom (11:21), the ordering of God's wisdom requires that all things be made according to "number, weight, and measure." Consequently, that there be a definite number of predestined is in harmony with God's goodness.

8. As is clear from what was said previously, while it may be granted with reference to a determined person that God, absolutely speaking, can predestine or not predestine him, nevertheless, supposing that God has predestined him, He cannot not predestine him. Nor is the opposite possible, because God cannot change. Consequently, it is commonly said that the following proposition, "God can predestine one who is not predestined or not predestine one who is predestined," is false if taken in a composite sense, but true if taken in a divided sense. All statements, therefore, which imply that

composite sense are absolutely false. Thus, we must not concede that the number of the predestined can be increased or diminished, because addition presupposes something which is increased, and subtraction, something which is diminished. For the same reason, we cannot concede that God can predestine more or fewer than He has already predestined.

Furthermore, the example drawn from the making of things is not to the point; for making is a particular action terminating exteriorly in an effect, and the fact that God makes something first and does not make it later indicates no change in God but only in the effect. On the other hand, predestination, foreknowledge, and similar things are acts intrinsic to God; and no change can take place in them without a change taking place in God. Nothing, therefore, that implies a change in these acts should be granted.

9-10. The answer to these arguments is clear, for they are based on an understanding of God's power as absolute, not as modified by a supposition of predestination or non-predestination.

11. That Gloss should be understood as meaning this: the number of Jews entering is not as large as the total number of all those who have been preordained to life, for it is not only Jews who have been predestined. Or one could reply that the Gloss is not speaking about the preordination of predestination but about the preordination of preparation by which the Jews were disposed for life by means of the Law. Or, finally, one could reply that not as many Jews entered the early Church as are predestined, because, as we read in the Epistle to the Romans (11:25-26): "When the fullness of the Gentiles should come in...all Israel will be saved" in the Church at the end of time.

ARTICLE 5

*Are the predestined certain of their predestination?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they are, for

1. The words of St. John, "His unction teacheth you of all things" (1 John 2:27), are understood as referring to all things pertaining to salvation. But predestination pertains very much to salvation, since it is the cause of salvation. Consequently, through an unction they receive, all men are made certain of their predestination.

2. It is consonant with God's goodness, which does all things in the best

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 23, 1, ad 4; I-II, 112, 5; *In Evang. Johannis*, c. 10, lect. 5 (P. 10:484b); *In Psalm.* 50 (P. 14:348b).

possible way, to lead men to their reward in the best possible way. Now, the best possible way seems to be that each and every man be certain of his reward. Therefore, each and every person who is predestined is given assurance that he will come to his reward. Consequently, the same must be said as before.

3. All whom the leader of an army enrolls for merit in battle are likewise enrolled for a reward. Consequently, they are as certain about their reward as they are about their merit. But men are certain that they are in the state of meriting. Consequently, they are also certain that they will obtain their reward. We conclude as before.

TO THE CONTRARY

In Ecclesiastes (9:1) we read: "Man knoweth not whether he be worthy of love or hatred."

REPLY

There is nothing inconsistent in the revelation to some person of the fact of his predestination; but, in view of His general law, it would be inconsistent if He revealed this to all the predestined for the following two reasons. The first reason may be found by considering those who are not predestined. Now, if all the predestined knew that they were predestined, then all those not predestined would know that they were not predestined from the very fact that they did not know if they were predestined. This would, in some way, lead them to despair. The second reason may be found by considering those who are predestined. Now, security is the mother of negligence; and if the predestined were certain, about their predestination, they would be secure about their salvation. Consequently, they would not exercise so great care in avoiding evil. Hence, it has been wisely ordained by God's providence that men should be ignorant of their predestination or reprobation.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. When Scripture says that His unction teaches everything connected with salvation, this should be understood as referring to those things knowledge of which pertains to salvation, not to all those things which, in themselves, do pertain to salvation. And, although predestination itself is necessary for salvation, knowledge of predestination is not.

2. It is not proper, when giving a reward, to give the person who is to receive it unconditional assurance. The proper way is to give conditional assurance to the one for whom the reward is being prepared, namely, that the reward will be given him unless he fails on his part. This kind of assurance is

given to all the predestined through the infusion of the virtue of hope.

3. One cannot know with any certainty that he is in the state of meriting, although he can know, by conjecture, that this is probably the case. For a habit never can be known except through its acts, and the acts of the infused supernatural virtues greatly resemble the acts of the acquired natural virtues. Consequently, it is not easy to be certain that acts of this kind have their source in grace, unless, by a special privilege, a person is made certain of it through a revelation. Moreover, he who is enrolled by the leader of an army for a secular struggle is given only conditional assurance of his reward, because one “is not crowned,—except he strive lawfully” (2 Tim. 2:5).

ARTICLE 6

*Can predestination be helped by the prayers of the saints?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. What can be aided can be prevented, but predestination cannot be prevented. Therefore, it cannot be aided in any way.

2. When one thing has its effect whether another thing is present or not, the latter is no help to it. But predestination must have its effect, because it cannot fail whether prayers take place or not. Consequently, predestination is not helped by prayers.

3. Nothing eternal is preceded by something temporal. But prayer is temporal, and predestination is eternal. Therefore, prayer cannot precede predestination, and, consequently, cannot help it.

4. As is clear from the first Epistle to the Corinthians (12:12), the members of the mystical body resemble the members of a natural body. Now, in a natural body, a member does not acquire its perfection by means of another member. Consequently, the same is true [of members] in the mystical body. But the members of the mystical body receive their greatest perfection through the effects of predestination. Therefore, one man is not aided in obtaining the effects of predestination by the prayers of another.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. We read in Genesis (25:21): “Isaac besought the Lord for his wife because she was barren; and he heard him, and made Rebecca to conceive.” As a result of this conception Jacob was born, who had been predestined from all

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 23, 8; *I Sent.*, 41, 1, 4; *IV Sent.*, 45, 3, 3; *C.G.*, III, cc. 95-96, 113.

eternity; and this predestination would never have been fulfilled had he not been born. But it was effected by the prayer of Isaac. Consequently, predestination is helped by prayers.

2. In a certain sermon on the conversion of St. Paul, in which the Lord is represented as speaking to Paul, we read: "Unless Stephen, my servant, had prayed for you, I would have destroyed you." The prayers of Stephen, therefore, freed Paul from reprobation; and so through these prayers he was predestined. Hence, we conclude as before.

3. One can merit the first grace for someone. For the same reason, therefore, he can also merit final grace for him. But whoever possesses final grace is predestined. Therefore, the predestination of one person can be furthered by the prayers of another.

4. As Damascene tells us in a certain sermon on the dead, Gregory prayed for Trajan and freed him from hell. It seems, therefore, that he was freed from the company of the damned by Gregory's prayers. Hence, the same must be said as before.

5. The members of the mystical body resemble the members of a natural body. But in a natural body one member is helped by another. Consequently, the same is true in the mystical body, and the above proposition stands.

REPLY

That predestination can be helped by the prayers of the saints can be understood in two ways. First, it can mean that the prayers of the saints help one to be predestined. This, however, cannot be true of prayers, either as they exist in their own proper condition, which is temporal while predestination is eternal, or as they exist in God's foreknowledge, because, as explained above, foreknowledge of merits is not the cause of predestination, whether the merits be one's own or those of another. On the other hand, that predestination is furthered by the prayers of the saints can mean that their prayers help us obtain the effect of predestination as an instrument helps one in finishing his work. The problem has been considered in this way by all those who have studied God's providence over human affairs. Their answers, however, have been different.

Attending only to the immutability of God's decrees, some have declared that prayer, sacrifice, and similar actions help in no way at all. This is said to have been the opinion of the Epicureans, who taught that all things happened necessarily because of the influence of celestial bodies, which they called gods.

Others said that sacrifices and prayers help to this extent, that they change the preordination made by those who have the power to determine human

acts. This is said to have been the opinion of the Stoics, who taught that all things are ruled by certain spirits whom they called gods; and, even though something had been pre-established by them, according to the Stoics, such a prearrangement could be changed by placating their souls through prayers and sacrifices. Avicenna seems to have fallen into this error, too; for he asserts that all human actions whose principle is the human will can be reduced to the wills of celestial souls. He thought that the heavenly bodies had souls, and, just as a heavenly body influences a human body, so, according to him, the celestial souls influence human souls. In fact, what takes place in things here below is according to the notions of these celestial souls. Consequently, he thought that sacrifices and prayers helped these souls to conceive what we wished to take place.

These theories, however, are opposed to the Faith. For the first destroys freedom of choice; the second, the certainty of predestination. Consequently, we must answer the problem differently, and must say that, while God's predestination never changes, prayers and other good works are nevertheless effective in obtaining the effect of predestination. Now, when considering any order of causes, we must consider not only the order of the first cause to the effect but also the order of the second cause to the effect and the order of the first cause to the second cause, since the second cause is ordered to an effect only through the direction of the first cause. For, as is clear from *The Causes*, the first cause gives to the second cause the power of influencing the effect.

I say, therefore, that the effect of predestination is man's salvation, and this comes from it as from its first cause. It can have, however, many other proximate and, as it were, instrumental causes, which are ordered by divine predestination for man's salvation, as tools are used by a craftsman for completing a product of his craft. Consequently, the effect of God's predestination is not only that an individual person be saved but also that he be saved by certain prayers or certain merits. Gregory also said this: "What holy men effect by their prayers is predestined to be obtained by prayer." Consequently, Boethius says: "If we pray well, our prayers cannot be without effect."

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. There is nothing that can check the ordering of predestination. Consequently, predestination cannot be impeded. Many things, however, are related to the ordering of predestination as intermediate causes; and these are said to further predestination in the manner described.

2. From the fact that it is predestined that a certain man will be saved because of certain prayers, these prayers cannot be omitted without detriment

to his predestination. The same is true of man's salvation, which is the effect of predestination.

3. That argument proves that prayer does not help predestination by being, as it were, its cause. This we concede.

4. The effects of predestination, which are grace and glory, are not, as it were, basic perfections but secondary perfections. Now, even though the members of a natural body do not help each other in acquiring their basic perfections, they nevertheless do help each other to acquire their secondary perfections. There is, moreover, a member in the body which, having been formed first, helps in the formation of other members—namely, the heart. Consequently, the argument proceeds on a false assumption.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

1. We concede this argument.

2. Paul was never reprobated according to the disposition made by divine election, because this is unchangeable. He was reprobated, however, according to a [provisional] judgment of God in harmony with lower causes, a judgment which sometimes changes. It follows, therefore, not that prayer was the cause of predestination, but that it furthered only the effect of predestination.

3. Although predestination and final grace are interchangeable, it does not necessarily follow that whatever is the cause of final grace in any manner whatsoever is also the cause of predestination. This is clear from what has been said previously.

4. Although Trajan was in the place of the damned, he was not damned absolutely; for he was predestined to be saved by the prayers of Gregory.

5. We concede the fifth argument.

Question VII

THE BOOK OF LIFE

1. Is the Book of Life a created thing?
2. Is the Book of Life predicated of God personally or essentially?
3. Can the Book of Life be appropriated to the Son?
4. Is the Book of Life the same as predestination?
5. Is the Book of Life spoken of in relation to uncreated life?
6. Is the Book of Life spoken of in relation to the natural life of creatures?
7. Does the Book of Life used without qualification refer to the life of grace?
8. Can we speak of a Book of Death as we speak of a Book of Life?

ARTICLE I

*Is the book of life a created thing?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is, for

1. Explaining that line in the Apocalypse (20:12), “and another book was opened, which was the book of life,” the Gloss says: “The book of life is Christ, who will then appear in His power and give life to His own.” Now, at the final judgment, Christ will appear in human form, which is not something uncreated. Consequently, the book of life does not mean anything uncreated.

2. Gregory says: “Our future judge Himself is called the book of life, because whoever sees Him will at once remember all he has done. Now, judgment has been given to Christ as man. This is clear from the words of John (5:27): “And he hath given him power to do judgment, because he is the son of man.” Therefore, Christ as man is the book of life, and the same must be said as before.

3. A thing is called a book because it has received writing. But a thing is said to be receptive in so far as it contains material potency, which cannot exist in God. Therefore, nothing uncreated is called the book of life.

4. Since *book* means a kind of collection, it signifies distinction and dif-

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 24, aa. 1-2; *I Sent.*, 40, I, 2, ad 5; *III Sent.*, 3 I, I, 2, sols. 1-2; *In Philip.*, c. 4, lect. 1 (P. 13:525b); *In Heb.*, c. 12, lect. 4 (P. 13:780a).

ference. But, being most simple, an uncreated nature contains no diversity. Therefore, nothing in such a nature can be called a book.

5. In every book, the writing is something other than the book. Now, the writing in a book is made up of figures, and by means of these we know the things which are read in the book. However, the ideas by which God knows things do not differ from the divine essence. Consequently, His uncreated nature cannot be called a book.

6. But it was said that even though there is no real difference in the divine nature, there is nevertheless a conceptual difference.—On the contrary, a merely conceptual difference exists only in our mind. Consequently, if the difference which this book involves is only a conceptual difference, the book of life must exist only in our intellects, and hence will not be something uncreated.

7. The book of life seems to be God's knowledge of those who are to be saved. Moreover, the knowledge of the elect is contained in God's knowledge of vision. Now, since the soul of Christ sees in the Word all the things that God knows with His knowledge of vision, it seems that it also knows the number of the elect and all those who have been chosen. Therefore, the soul of Christ can be called the book of life; hence, the book of life means something created.

8. We read in Sirach (24:32): "All these are the book of life..."; and the Gloss on this passage adds: "That is, the new and old testament." Now, the Old and New Testament are created. Therefore, the book of life means something created.

9. A book seems to get its name from the fact that something is written in it. Writing, however, involves some imperfection; hence, in its initial purity, our intellect is compared to "a page on which nothing has been written." But God's nature is far more pure and simple than our intellect. Hence, it cannot be called a book.

10. A book exists for someone to read. But God's nature cannot be said to be a book in the sense that He reads it. This is evident from Augustine's statement that its title, "Book of Life," does not mean that God has to read it in order to know something which He did not know previously. Similarly, it cannot be called a book in the sense that someone other than God reads it, because no one can read anything unless he finds some diversity of markings—for example, no one can read a blank piece of paper, because it is undifferentiated. Therefore, God's uncreated nature cannot be called a book.

11. From a book one does not receive knowledge of things as from their cause but as from a sign of them. Now, God does not receive His knowledge

of things, as it were, from a sign, but, as it were, from a cause. Therefore, God's knowledge cannot be called the book of life.

12. Nothing can be merely a sign of itself. Now, a book is a sign of truth. Consequently, since God is truth itself, He Himself cannot be called a book.

13. A book and a teacher are principles of knowledge in different ways. Now, all wisdom is said to come from God as from a teacher. Therefore, it does not come from Him as from a book.

14. A thing is represented differently in a mirror and in a book. Now, Wisdom (7:26) calls God a mirror because all things are represented in Him. Consequently, He cannot and should not be called a book.

15. Even those books that are copied from the original are called books. But the minds of men and angels, in some sense, copy God's mind when they receive knowledge of things from it. Consequently, if the divine mind is called the book of life, created minds should be similarly called; and thus it is not always something uncreated that is called the book of life.

16. The book of life seems to imply a representation of life and an exercise of causality over it. Now, all this belongs to Christ as man, because in Him, as in a pattern, is represented all life, both that of grace and that of glory. For this reason it was said to Moses (Exodus 25:40): "Look and make it according to the pattern that was shewn thee in the mount." Moreover, Christ merited life for us. Therefore, Christ Himself, as man, can be called the book of life.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Augustine says: "We should know that there is a divine force which causes each one to remember his deeds, good or bad. Indeed, this divine power is called a book." Now, a divine force is something uncreated. Therefore, something uncreated is also called the book of life.

2. In the same work, Augustine says: "The book of life is God's foreknowledge, which cannot be mistaken." But His foreknowledge is something uncreated. Therefore, the book of life is also something uncreated.

REPLY

Applied to God, *book* can be used only metaphorically; thus, it is in this sense that the representation of life is called the book of life. In this connection, it should be noted that life can be represented in two ways: first, as it is in itself, or, secondly, as it can be participated in by certain individuals. Furthermore, life taken in itself can be represented in two ways. This can be done, first, by means of instruction; and this kind of representation pertains to the sense of hearing, which, as said in *The Senses and the Sensed*, is the chief sense

for learning. Taken in this meaning, therefore, *the book of life* signifies that which contains instructions on how one should live. Consequently, the Old and New Testaments are called the book of life. The second way of representing life in itself is by giving a model; and this kind of representation pertains to the sense of sight. Consequently, Christ Himself is called the book of life, because, by looking at Him as at a model, we can see how we must live in order to attain eternal life.

We are not speaking of the book of life in these senses, however, but only in the sense that the book of life is said to be the representation of those who are to attain eternal life, and whose names, according to a comparison drawn from human affairs, are said to be written down in this book.

For, in a state that is wisely ruled, anyone who becomes a citizen must do so according to the ordinances of its ruler. Hence, those who are to be admitted to citizenship are enrolled as being, as it were, participants in the state. By using this enrollment, the ruler of the state is guided in rejecting persons from and in admitting them to the fellowship of the citizens subject to him. Now, the citizens who are ruled most perfectly by divine providence form the society of the Church triumphant, which is also called the City of God in Scripture.⁸ Hence, the enrollment or representation of those who are to be admitted to that society is called the book of life. This is clear from Scripture's manner of speaking. For example, Luke (10:20) says: "Rejoice in this, that your names are written in heaven," that is, in the book of life; Isaiah (4:3): "Everyone...shall be called holy...that is written in life in Jerusalem"; and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (12:22-23) we read: "But you are come...to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the company of many thousands of angels, and to the church of the first-born who are written in the heavens." It is necessary, therefore, to carry out the metaphor—and say that from this enrollment the ruler of the society shall know those who are to be given life. The bestowal of life, of course, belongs to God alone. However, God is not guided by anything created, for He is a rule that is directed by nothing extrinsic to Himself. Consequently, the book of life, in the sense in which we are now using it, means something uncreated.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1-2. Our answer is clear from what we have said above. For the Gloss and Gregory's statement concern the book of life in another sense, namely, as it means a model for living: anyone who looks at it can tell whether or not he conforms to it.

3. When terms are applied to God, the general rule should be observed

that in no respect can imperfection be contained in predicates applied to the divinity. Consequently, whatever implies matter, privation, or time must be removed. Now, that it receives markings from something extrinsic belongs to a book in so far as it is temporal and newly written. These notes are not included in the predicate when it is applied to God.

4. The very notion of *book* implies a difference existing between the things known by its means, because a book hands down the knowledge of many things. But that a book must have diversity to hand down knowledge of many things is a defect in the book. It would be much more perfect if it could teach by means of one thing all that it now explains by means of many things. Consequently, since God is most perfect, the book of life is such that it shows many things by means of that which is one in the highest degree.

5. That the letters written in a book differ from the pages on which they are written is due to a defect of material books. For, because books are composite things, that which has is not the same as that which is had. Consequently, in God these ideas differ from His essence, not really, but only conceptually.

6. Although the distinction between the writing and that in which it is written is merely conceptual, the representation, which completes the notion of a book, is not only in our mind but also in God. Hence, the book of life is really in God.

7. As indicated above, the book of life directs God, who gives life, in His giving of life. Now, even though the soul of Christ knows all the elect, God is directed, not by Christ's human knowledge, but by His own uncreated knowledge, which is Himself. Hence, the knowledge possessed by the soul of Christ cannot be called the book of life in the sense in which we are speaking of it.

8. The reply is clear from what has been said.

9. Although there is no diversity but only the greatest purity in God, He is nonetheless compared to a book that has been written in, and not to the blank page to which our intellect has been compared. For our intelligence is compared to a blank page because it is in potency to all intelligible forms, and as yet has none of them actually. In God's intellect, however, all the forms of things exist in act, and in Him they are one. Consequently, in God the formal character of writing is compatible with His oneness.

10. God Himself reads the book of life, and others can read it in so far as they are allowed to do so. Augustine does not mean to deny that God reads the book of life; he denies only that He reads it in order to know what He previously did not know. Moreover, others can read the book of life, even though it is entirely simple, since it is possible for one and the same reality to be the intelligible character of many things.

11. One thing is a likeness of another in two ways. In the first way, it is the model for the other thing and thus its cause; second, it itself can be modeled upon the other, and thus be its effect and sign. Now, in the case of men, a book conforms to their knowledge, which, in turn, is caused by things. Consequently, they receive knowledge of things from a book, not as from a cause, but as from a sign. However, God's knowledge is the cause of things, since it contains the archetypes of all things. Hence, knowledge is received from the book of life as from a cause, and not as from a sign.

12. The book of life is uncreated truth itself as well as a likeness of created truth, just as a created book is a sign of truth.

13. In God, exemplary and efficient causality come to the same thing. Consequently, from the fact that He is an exemplary cause He can be called a book, and from the fact that He is the efficient cause of wisdom He can be called a teacher.

14. The representation a mirror gives differs from that which a book gives, because it refers directly to things while that of a book refers to things through the medium of knowledge. For the letters contained in a book are only signs of words, and these, in turn, are signs of concepts, which are likenesses of things. A mirror, however, reflects the forms of things. Yet in God the species of things are reflected in both ways, because He knows things and He knows that He knows them. Consequently, in God both the notion of mirror and the notion of book can be verified.

15. The minds of the saints can also be called books. This is clear from the Apocalypse (20:12): "And the books were opened"—which Augustine explains as meaning the hearts of the just. However, the saints' minds cannot be called books of life in the sense in which we are taking this term. This is clear from what has been said.

16. Although Christ as man is an archetype and, in some sense, the cause of life, as man He is not the cause of the life of glory through His authority nor an archetype directing God in His bestowal of life. Consequently, Christ as man cannot be called the book of life.

ARTICLE 2

*Is the book of life predicated of God personally or essentially?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is predicated personally, for

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 39, 8. See also readings given for preceding article.

1. In the Psalms (39:8) we read: “In the head of the book it is written of me...” and the Gloss explains: “That is, in the Father, who is my head.” Now, in God nothing has a head except that which has a principle. But *that which has a Principle* is a personal predicate in matters pertaining to God. Therefore, the book of life is a personal predication.

2. Just as word signifies knowledge proceeding from another, *book* also signifies this, because the writing in a book proceeds from a writer. Now, for the reason already given, word is predicated personally of God. Consequently, the book of life is also a personal predication.

3. It was said, however, that word implies a real procession, whereas *book* implies a procession only according to our way of understanding.—On the contrary, we can name God only from the things that exist here below. But, in our experience, a word coming from a speaker is really distinct from him, and so is a book really distinct from its author. For this reason, therefore, both terms imply a real distinction in God.

4. There is greater distance between one who speaks and his oral word than there is between him and the word within his heart; and an even greater distance is between him and a written word signifying the word within his heart. Consequently, if the divine Word, which, as Augustine says, resembles the word within the heart, is really distinct from the one who utters it, much more distinct will be a book, since this implies writing.

5. That which is attributed to a thing should belong to it according to all that belongs to its nature. Now, the notion of a book demands not only that it represent something but also that it be written by someone. Consequently, in matters concerning God, the word *book* is taken according as a book is something by another. Hence, it is predicated personally.

6. Just as the notion of a book includes its being read, so does it also include its being written. But, in so far as it is written, it is by another, and in so far as it is read, it is directed to another. Therefore, it belongs to the notion of a book to be to another and by another. Hence, the book of life is predicated personally.

7. *Book of life* signifies knowledge expressed by another. But what is expressed by another has its origin in another. Consequently, *the book of life* implies a relation of origin, and thus is a personal predication.

TO THE CONTRARY

The book of life is predestination itself. This is clear from Augustine and the Gloss. But predestination is predicated of the divine essence, never of the divine Persons. Consequently, the book of life is similarly predicated.

REPLY

Some say that the book of life is sometimes a personal, sometimes, an essential predication: in so far as it is used of God according to the notion of writing, it is predicated personally, and in this usage it implies origin from another, for a book has to be written by another; but, in so far as it implies a representation of the things written in the book it is predicated essentially.

This distinction, however, does not seem reasonable, because a term used of God is not predicated personally unless its meaning in connection with God implies a relation of origin. Moreover, with regard to words used in a transferred sense, a metaphor is not to be understood as indicating complete resemblance, but only some agreement in a characteristic belonging to the nature of the thing whose name is being applied. For example, the word lion is applied to God, not because of a resemblance between two natures possessing sensation, but because of a resemblance based on one property of the lion. Consequently, the book of life is not predicated of God according to what is common to all products of art, but only according to that which is proper to a book as a book. Now, to come from an author does not belong to a book as a book but only as it is a product of art; and, in a similar manner, a house is from a builder, and a knife is from a cutler. On the other hand, to represent the things written about in the book belongs to the notion of a book as such. Consequently, as long as this representation remains, the book remains a book, even though it is not written by another and is not a product of art. From this it is clear that *book* is applied to God, not in so far as a book is written by another, but in so far as a book represents the things which are written in it. Therefore, since representation is common to the entire Trinity, *book* is predicated, not personally of God, but only essentially.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Words that are predicated essentially of God sometimes stand for the persons. Hence, *God* sometimes stands for the person of the Father, sometimes for the person of the Son, as when we say “God begets” or “God begotten.” Similarly, even though *book* is predicated essentially, it can sometimes stand for the person of the Son. In this sense, in matters pertaining to divinity, the book of life can be said to have a head or principle.

2. According to its intelligible character, the term *word* when used of God implies origin from another. This has already been discussed. But *book* does not imply the notion of origin when the term is applied to God. Hence, no parallel can be drawn.

3. Although in the case of creatures a book really proceeds from a writer,

just as a word does from a speaker, nevertheless, that procession is not implied by *book* as it is implied by word. For procession from a writer is not implied any more by *book* than a procession from a builder is implied by *house*.

4. That argument would hold if the notion of the written word belonged to the very notion of book. This, however, is not true. Hence, the argument proves nothing.

5. That argument holds for words that are used literally. But when words are used metaphorically, as *book* is used here, it is not necessary that the term predicated express of its subject everything implied by that term taken literally. Otherwise, God, who is called a lion in the metaphorical sense, would have to have claws and a mane.

6. The reply to this difficulty is clear from what has been said.

7. The same holds for the seventh difficulty.

ARTICLE 3

*Can the book of life be appropriated to the son?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. The book of life pertains to life. But life is attributed in Scripture to the Holy Spirit, as, for example, in John (6:64): "It is the spirit that quickeneth." Hence, the book of life should be appropriated to the Holy Spirit, not to the Son.

2. In everything, the beginning is the most important. But the Father is called the head or the beginning of the book, as is clear in the Psalms (39:8), where we read: "In the head of the book it is written of me..." Therefore, the term *book* should be appropriated to the Father.

3. That in which something is written has the proper nature of a book. Now, a thing is said to be written in the memory; hence, the memory has the nature of a book. But memory is appropriated to the Father, just as intelligence is to the Son, and will is to the Holy Spirit. Consequently, the book of life should be appropriated to the Father.

4. The Father is the head of the book. But, as we read in the Psalms (39:8), in the head of the book there is writing about the Son. Consequently, the Father is the book of the Son. Therefore, the book [of life] should be appropriated to the Father.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 39, 8; *III Sent.*, 31, 1, 2, sol. 1.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Augustine says that the book of life is God's foreknowledge. But knowledge is appropriated to the Son: "...Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God" (1 Corinthians 1:24). Therefore, the book of life is also appropriated to the Son.

2. *Book* implies a representation, just as *mirror*, *image*, *stamp*, and, *figure*. But all these terms are attributed to the Son. Consequently, the book of life should also be appropriated to Him.

REPLY

To appropriate means nothing else than to contract something common, making it something proper. Now, what is common to the entire Trinity cannot be appropriated to a single Person on the grounds that this belongs more to this Person than it does to another. Such an action would deny the equality of the Persons. However, appropriation may be made on the grounds that what is common nevertheless has a greater resemblance to what is proper to one person than it has to what is proper to another. For example, goodness resembles what is proper to the Holy Spirit, who proceeds as love, because goodness is the object of love, and so is appropriated to the Holy Spirit. Again, power is appropriated to the Father because power as such is a principle, and being the principle of all divinity is proper to the Father. Similarly, wisdom is appropriated to the Son, because it resembles what is proper to the Son, since the Son proceeds from the Father as His Word, and word describes an intellectual procession. Consequently, because the book of life pertains to knowledge, it should be appropriated to the Son.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Although life is appropriated to the Holy Spirit, knowledge of life is appropriated to the Son; and it is this that the book of life implies.

2. The Father is called the head of the book, not because the notion of book has more in common with Him than with the Son, but because the Son, to whom the name of *book of life* is appropriated, has His origin from the Father.

3. There is no inconsistency in something being appropriated to different persons if this is done under different formalities. For example, the gift of wisdom is appropriated to the Holy Spirit in so far as it is a gift, because love is the reason for all gifts, but it is also appropriated to the Son in so far as it is wisdom. Similarly, memory is appropriated to the Father in so far as it is a principle of understanding; but, in so far as it is a power of knowing, it is

appropriated to the Son. Now, it is in the memory as a knowing power that a thing is said to be written in it. Hence, in this sense, memory can have the nature of a book. Consequently, being the book of life is appropriated more to the Son than to the Father.

4. Although being the book of life is appropriated to the Son, this also belongs to the Father, since it is a property of all the Persons, not of only one of them. Hence, there is no inconsistency in saying that something is written in the Father.

ARTICLE 4

*Is the book of life the same as predestination?**

DIFFICULTIES:

It seems that it is, for

1. Augustine says that the book of life is the predestination of those to whom eternal life is due.

2. We know God's attributes through their effects. But the effect of predestination is the same as that of the book of life, namely, final grace and glory. Therefore, predestination and the book of life are the same.

3. Whatever is predicated metaphorically of God should be reduced to what is predicated literally. Now, the book of life is predicated metaphorically of God, as is clear from what has been said. Therefore, it should be reduced to something predicated literally of Him. However, it cannot be reduced to anything else except predestination. Therefore, the book of life is the same as predestination.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. A thing is called a book because something is written in it. But the notion of writing does not pertain to predestination. Consequently, predestination and the book of life are not the same.

2. A book, of its very nature, implies no causality regarding the things to which it is referred. Predestination, however, implies causality. Therefore, it is not the same as the book of life.

REPLY

As is clear from what has been said previously, *the book of life* is used of God because of its resemblance to the document which directs a chief of state

* PARALLEL READINGS: See readings given for q. 7, a. 1.

in admitting persons to and excluding them from citizenship. Now, this document lies between two operations, for it is subsequent to the decision of the head of the state, who selects those whom he wishes to admit in preference to those whom he excludes, and it is anterior to the admission or exclusion. Moreover, this document is merely a kind of representation of his antecedent decision. Similarly, the book of life is also nothing more than an inscription in the divine mind of God's predestination, for by this act of predestining God predetermines who are to be admitted to the life of glory. Moreover, His knowledge of this predestination is always with Him; and His knowledge that He has predestined some is, as it were, His predestination written in Him as in a book of life.

Considered formally, therefore, the book of life and predestination are not the same, even though, considered materially, the book of life is predestination—just as we say that a certain book, considered materially, is the teaching of the Apostle because it contains the Apostle's teaching. It is in this sense that Augustine speaks when he says that the book of life is predestination.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The answer is clear from what was said above in the reply.
2. The book of life and predestination are related to the same effect but not in the same manner. Predestination regards that effect without any intervening medium; the book of life regards it through the medium of predestination. Similarly, the likenesses of things in our soul are direct likenesses; but the words written in a book indicate merely what the soul has received. Hence, a book is only mediately a sign of things.
3. The book of life can be reduced to something predicated literally of God; this something, however, is not predestination but that knowledge of predestination by which God knows that He has predestined certain persons.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

- 1.-2. It is not difficult to answer these arguments.

ARTICLE 5

*Is the book of life spoken of in relation to uncreated life?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is, for

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 24, 1; *III Sent.*, 31, 1, 2, sol. 2.

1. As Augustine says, the book of life is God's knowledge. But God knows His own life, just as He knows that of others. Consequently, the book of life concerns uncreated life also.

2. The book of life represents life, but not created life; for what is first does not represent what is second, but what is second represents what is first. Consequently, the book of life represents uncreated life.

3. What is predicated of several, but predicated primarily of one and secondarily of the others, is understood simply in its primary predication. Now, life is predicated primarily of God rather than of creatures, because His life, as Dionysius has shown, is the origin of all life. Therefore, since *life* is used simply in the phrase *the book of life*, it should be understood as referring to uncreated life.

4. Just as a book implies a representation, so also does a figure, especially when a book represents something by means of figures. But the Son is said to be the *figure* of the Father (Hebrews 1:3). Therefore He can be said to be a book with respect to the life of the Father.

5. Book is predicated as being in a relation to that about which the book is written. But the Son is written about in the book of life, for we read in the Psalms (39:8): "In the head of the book it is written of me..." Now, the life of the Son is not created. Hence, the book of life is concerned with uncreated life.

6. A book and the subject treated there cannot be identical in regard to the same thing. Now, a creature is a book revealing God. Therefore, God cannot be a book revealing created life. Hence, the book of life can be spoken of only in relation to uncreated life.

7. Words, like books, pertain to knowledge. Now, Word is predicated primarily of the divine essence rather than of a creature, because, by uttering Himself, the Father utters all creatures. Consequently, the book of life is primarily concerned with uncreated life rather than with created life.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. According to Augustine, the book of life is predestination. However, predestination regards only creatures. Therefore, the book of life regards only creatures.

2. A book represents a thing only by means of figures and likenesses. Now, God knows Himself, not by means of likenesses, but by means of His own essence. Therefore, He is not a book with respect to Himself.

REPLY

As is clear from what has been said previously, the book of life is an enrollment which directs the one who confers life in his bestowal of it, in accordance with what has been preordained concerning a certain person. Therefore, the life from which the book of life is named has two aspects. The first is that this life is acquired through someone's grant; the second is that it follows upon the afore-mentioned enrollment which directs its being granted.

Neither of these features is found in uncreated life. God does not acquire His life of glory but has it by His very nature. Moreover, no knowledge precedes His life, but, according to our manner of understanding, His life precedes even His knowledge. Consequently, the book of life cannot be spoken of in relation to uncreated life.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Not all of God's knowledge is called the book of life, but only that concerning the life which the elect are to possess. This can be gathered from the words that follow the section quoted.

2. To represent a thing means to bear its likeness. There are two kinds of likenesses, however. The first kind, like the likeness in the practical intellect, produces a thing. Through a likeness of this kind, what is first can represent what is second. The second kind of likeness comes from the thing whose likeness it is. Through a likeness of this kind, what comes later represents what comes first, and not conversely. However, the book of life represents life, not by means of the second type of likeness, but by means of the first.

3. What is predicated simply is sometimes understood as applying to that about which it is predicated only secondarily, because some qualification has been added. For example, *being* [with the added qualification] in *another* is understood as signifying an accident. Similarly, *life*, because of the added qualification *book*, is understood as signifying created life, which is life only secondarily.

4. A figure represents its original as its principle, because a figure and an image are drawn from the archetype as from a principle. The book of life, however, represents life as something that it itself has caused. Now, it belongs to God the Father to be the principle of the Son, who is the figure of the Father, but the life of the Father cannot have anything as its principle. Therefore, there is no parallel between life and a figure.

5. That text of the Psalms is understood of the Son according to His human nature.

6. A cause represents its effect, and the effect its cause. This is clear from

what has been said. Accordingly, God can be called a book with respect to creatures, and creatures a book with respect to God.

7. By the force of its own proper signification, Word does not denote the principle of that which is expressed by the word; *but the book of life* as taken here does. Hence, the two are not similar.

ARTICLE 6

*Is the book of life spoken of in relation to the natural life of creatures?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is, for

1. Natural life, as well as the life of glory, is represented in God's knowledge. Now, God's knowledge of the life of glory is called the book of life. Therefore, His knowledge of natural life should be similarly called.

2. God's knowledge contains all things according to the manner of life, because we read in John (1:3-4): "What was made, in Him was life..." Therefore, His knowledge should be called the book of life with respect to all things, especially living things.

3. Just as a person is preordained by God's providence to the life of glory, so is he also preordained to natural life. Now, as mentioned previously, the knowledge of those preordained to the life of glory is called the book of life. Therefore, the knowledge of those preordained to natural life also is called the book of life.

4. In its explanation of that verse in the Apocalypse (3:5), "I will not blot out his name out of the book of life," the Gloss reads: "The book of life is God's knowledge, in which all things are clear."¹³ Consequently, the book of life is said to concern all things, hence, even natural life.

5. The book of life is, as it were, knowledge of the life of glory. But the life of glory cannot be known unless natural life is also known. Therefore, the book of life likewise concerns natural life.

6. The word *life* has been taken from natural life and applied to the life of glory. Now, a thing is said more truly of that of which it is said properly than of that to which it is merely applied. Therefore, the book of life concerns natural life more than it concerns the life of glory.

7. What is more permanent and common is more noble. Now, natural life is more permanent than the life of glory or of grace. Similarly, it is more common, because natural life continues with the life of grace or of glory; but

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 2.4, 2; *III Sent.*, 31, 1, 2, sols. 1-2.

the opposite is not true. Therefore, natural life is more noble than the life of grace and glory. Hence, the book of life concerns the life of nature more than it concerns the life of grace or of glory.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. As Augustine says, the book of life is, in a sense, predestination. But predestination does not concern natural life. Hence, neither does the book of life.

2. The book of life concerns the life which is given by God directly. Natural life, however, is given by God through the medium of natural causes. Therefore, the book of life is not about natural life.

REPLY

The book of life, as mentioned previously, is that knowledge which directs the giver of life in His bestowal of it. Now, when we give anything, we need no direction unless it is necessary to separate those to whom bestowal is to be made from those to whom it is not to be made. Hence, the book of life concerns only that life which is to be granted by choice. Natural life, however, like all other natural goods, is supplied to all in general, according to each one's capacity. The book of life, therefore, does not concern natural life but only that life which, according to a choice made by God's will, is given to some and not to others.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Although natural life and the life of glory are represented in God's knowledge, His knowledge of natural life does not fulfill the notion of the book of life as does His knowledge of the life of glory for the reason given.

2. The book of life gets its name, not from the fact that it has life, but because it is a book about the life to which some are preordained by God's election, and because the names of these persons are written down in it.

3. In His providence, God gives life to some as a thing due to their nature, but He grants the life of glory only according to the good pleasure of His will. Consequently, He gives natural life to everything which can receive it, but not the life of glory. Hence, there is no book of natural life as there is a book of the life of glory.

4. The Gloss is not to be understood as meaning that all things are clear—that is, all things are contained—in the book of life. It means, rather, that all which is written in it is clear, that is, all is determined.

5. The book of life implies, as has been said, not only knowledge of the

life of glory but also God's choice—not, however, with respect to merely natural life.

6. The life of glory is less known to us than natural life is. Consequently, we come to know the life of glory after knowing natural life. Similarly, we name the life of glory from natural life, even though more of the nature of life belongs to the life of glory than belongs to natural life. This is true of all the names that we give God which are taken from creatures. Consequently, when the word *life* is used by itself, it need not be understood as necessarily referring to natural life.

7. The life of glory, taken by itself, is more permanent than natural life, because it makes natural life stable. Accidentally, however, natural life is more permanent than the life of grace; that is, it is more closely related to the living thing, to which natural life, but not the life of glory, is due by reason of its essence.

Moreover, while natural life is more common in one sense than the life of glory, in another sense it is less common. For a thing is said to be common in two senses. First, it is said to be common through effect or predication; that is, it is found in many things according to one intelligible character. In this sense, that which is more common is not more noble but more imperfect, as animal is, which is more common than man. Now, it is in this sense that natural life is more common than the life of glory. Second, a thing is said to be common after the manner of a cause; that is, it resembles a cause which, while remaining numerically one, extends to many effects. In this sense, what is more common is more noble. For example, the preservation of a city is more noble than the preservation of a family. In this sense, natural life is not more common than the life of glory.

ARTICLE 7

*Does the book of life used without qualification refer to the life of grace?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it does, for

1. As is evident from what Dionysius has written, what is in the effect is found in a nobler manner in the cause. Now, glory is the effect of grace. Consequently, the life of grace is more noble than the life of glory. Hence, the book of life concerns the life of grace more than it does the life of glory.

2. As mentioned earlier, the book of life is the enrollment of those who

* PARALLEL READINGS: See readings given for preceding article.

are predestined. But predestination, in general, is the preparation of grace and glory. Therefore, the book of life concerns, in general, the life of grace as well as the life of glory.

3. The book of life designates certain persons as citizens of that city in which there is life. But, just as some are made citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem through the life of glory, so some are made citizens of the Church militant through the life of grace. Therefore, the book of life concerns the life of grace as well as the life of glory.

4. What is predicated of many is understood as predicated without qualification of that of which it is predicated first. Now, the life of grace is prior to the life of glory. Therefore, when the book of life is mentioned, it is understood as referring to the life of grace.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. One who is in the state of grace possesses the life of grace without qualification. His name, however, is not said to be written in the book of life without qualification; it is written there only in a certain respect, namely, in so far as he is in the state of grace. Therefore, the book of life is not concerned simply with the life of grace.

2. The end is more noble than the means to the end. But the life of glory is the end of grace. Therefore, it is more noble. Consequently, when used without qualification, *life* should be understood as referring to the life of glory. Hence, the book of life used without qualification is concerned only with the life of glory.

REPLY

The book of life means the enrollment of someone who will obtain life as a kind of reward and possession, for men of this sort are customarily enrolled in something. Now, a thing is said to be a possession, properly speaking, when it can be had at one's command; and such a thing has no defects. Consequently, the Philosopher says that knowledge had about God "is not a human possession" but divine, because only God knows Himself perfectly, while man's knowledge of God is necessarily defective. Thus, life will be had as a possession when through life all the defects opposed to life are excluded. Now, this is what the life of glory does; it excludes all death, spiritual as well as physical, so that there remains not even the possibility of dying. The life of grace does not do this. Consequently, the book of life does not concern the life of grace without qualification, but only the life of glory.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Certain causes are more noble than their effects, namely, the efficient, formal, and final causes. Hence, what exists in these causes exists in a more noble manner than what exists in their effects. On the other hand, matter is less perfect than its effects. Consequently, a thing exists in a material cause in a less noble manner than it does in the effect of this cause; for in matter it is incomplete and potential, but in the effect of the material cause its existence is actual.

Now, every disposition that prepares a subject to receive a perfection can be reduced to the material cause; and it is in this way that grace is the cause of glory. Consequently, life exists in glory in a more noble way than it does in grace.

2. Predestination does not concern grace except as grace is ordained to glory. Hence, to be predestined belongs only to those who have final grace, upon which glory follows.

3. Although those who possess the life of grace are citizens of the Church militant, the condition of the Church militant is not one in which life is possessed fully, because the possibility of dying still remains. Hence, the book of life is not spoken of in relation to these individuals.

4. Although in the line of generation, the life of grace is prior to the life of glory, nevertheless, in the line of perfection the life of glory is prior—just as the end is prior to the means to the end.

ARTICLE 8

*Can we speak of a book of death as we speak of the book of life?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that we can, for

1. In its comment on Luke (10:20), “Rejoice in this, that your names are written...,” the Gloss reads: “By means of his heavenly or earthly deeds, a person is, as it were, engraved on God’s memory forever.” Now, just as a person is ordained to life through heavenly deeds, that is, through works of justice, so is he also ordained to death through earthly deeds, that is, through works of sin. Hence, as there is in God an enrollment of those ordained to life, so is there also in Him an enrollment of those ordained to death. Consequently, just as there is said to be a book of life in God, so should there also be said to be in Him a book of death.

2. The book of life is said to be in God only inasmuch as He has a list

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 2.4, 1; *III Sent.*, 31.1, 2, sols. 1-2.

of those for whom He has prepared an eternal reward—a list resembling that which a ruler on earth has, containing the names of those whom he has decided to honor. But a ruler on earth has a list of punishments and tortures as well as a list of honors and rewards. Therefore, God also has a book of death.

3. Just as God knows the predestination by which He prepares some for life, so does He also know His reprobation by which He prepares others for death. Now, the knowledge which God has of His predestination is called the book of life, as mentioned earlier. Therefore, His knowledge of reprobation should be called the book of death.

TO THE CONTRARY

According to Dionysius, “We should not venture to say anything about God unless we can support what we are saying from Scripture.” Now, we do not find anything in Scripture that refers to a book of death as it refers to the book of life. Therefore, we should not affirm the existence of a book of death.

REPLY

A person’s knowledge about matters written in a book is superior to his knowledge of other matters. Hence, in connection with God’s knowledge of things, the term *book* is used of knowledge that is superior in kind to His knowledge of other truths.

Now, there are two kinds of knowledge in God, namely, knowledge of simple understanding and knowledge of approval. His knowledge of simple understanding concerns all things, both the good and the evil; but His knowledge of approval concerns only the good. Hence, the good are known to God in a more special way than the others; and for this reason they are said to be written in a book, while the evil are not. Consequently, a book of death is not spoken of as the book of life is.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Some explain “heavenly deeds” as meaning the labors of the contemplative life, and “earthly deeds” as meaning the labors of the active life. If a person performs one or the other, however, he is enrolled for life and not for death. Therefore, both enrollments pertain to the book of life and neither to a book of death. Others understand “earthly deeds” as meaning works of sin, which, taken by themselves, simply ordain a person to death, although he may, for another reason, be ordained to life inasmuch as he may rise again after his fall, more cautious and humble.

One might also answer—and this is the better explanation—that when a

thing is said to be known by means of some other thing, this statement can be understood in two ways. First, *by means of* may signify the cause of the knowledge on the part of the knower. This cannot be its meaning in the Gloss, however, because the works one does, whether they be good or bad, are not a cause of God's foreknowledge ' of His predestination, or of His eternal reprobation. Second, *by means of* may signify the cause on the part of what is known. This is its meaning in the Gloss. For a person is engraved on God's memory by means of the works he has done, not because his works of the kind described are the cause of God's knowing him, but because God knows that on account of these works he will possess life or death.

It is clear from this that the Gloss is not speaking of that enrollment for life which pertains to the book of life and is on the part of God.

2. Things are written in a book so that they may be known forever. Men who are punished, however, are kept by their very punishments from being known by other men. Hence, their names are written down only, temporarily until the time when their punishment is inflicted upon them. But those who are thought worthy of honors and rewards have their names written down unconditionally in order that they may be kept, as it were, in everlasting memory.

3. God does not have a special knowledge of the reprobate as He has of the predestined. Hence, no comparison can be made.

Question VIII

THE KNOWLEDGE OF ANGELS

1. Do the angels see God through His essence?
2. Do the intellects of beatified angels and men comprehend the divine essence?
3. Can an angel by means of his own natural powers attain the vision of God through His essence?
4. Does an angel, seeing God through His essence, know all things?
5. Is the vision of things in the Word had through likenesses of them existing in the angelic intellects?
6. Does an angel know himself?
7. Does one angel know another?
8. Does an angel know material things through forms or by knowing his own essence?
9. Are the forms by which angels know material things innate or received from things?
10. Do higher angels know by forms more universal than those by which lower angels know?
11. Do angels know singulars?
12. Do angels know the future?
13. Can angels know the heart's secrets?
14. Can angels know many things at the same time?
15. Is angels' knowledge of things discursive?
16. Should morning knowledge be distinguished from evening knowledge in angels?
17. Is an angel's knowledge adequately divided into morning and evening knowledge?

ARTICLE I

*Do the angels see God through his essence?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 12, 1; 12, 4, ad 3; 56, 3; 62, 1; I-II, 3, 8; 5, 1; *II Sent.*, 4, 1, 1; 23, 2, 1; *IV Sent.*, 49, 2, 1; *C.G.*, III, cc. 41, 49, 51, 54, 57; *Quodl.*, X, 8, 17; *In Math.*, c. 5 (P. 10:53a); *Comp. Theol.*, I, c. 104; II, cc. 9-10; *In Evang. Johannis*, c. 1, lect. 11 (P. 10:312a); *Q.D. De anima*, 17, ad 10; *In I Tim.*,

1. We read in the Gospel according to St. John (1:18): "No man hath seen God at any time." Commenting on this, Chrysostom writes: "Not even the heavenly essences themselves, I mean the cherubim and seraphim, were able to see God as He is." But whoever sees God through His essence sees Him as He is. Angels, therefore, do not see God through His essence.

2. Commenting on that verse in Exodus (33:11), "And the Lord spoke to Moses face to face," the Gloss reads: "No man, no angel has ever seen the essence of God as it is." Consequently, our conclusion is the same as before.

3. According to Augustine, one desires a thing only if one does not have it. But in the first Epistle of St. Peter (1:12), we read that "the angels desire to look upon God." Therefore, they do not see God through His essence.

4. Commenting on the first chapter of John, Chrysostom says: "Neither prophets, angels, nor archangels were able to see that which is God." Since that which is God is God's essence, our conclusion is the same as before.

5. Whatever is seen by the intellect is seen through a form. Consequently, if the intellect of an angel were to see the divine essence, it would have to see it through some form. Now, it could not see it through the divine essence itself, because the form by which the intellect understands makes the intellect to be in act and, consequently, is the act of the intellect. Hence, the divine essence and the intellect would be made one. But this cannot be said of the divine essence, which cannot become the constitutive part of anything. Therefore, when an angel knows God, he sees Him through the medium of some other form, and, consequently, does not see Him through His essence.

6. The intellect must be proportionate to the intelligible since the intelligible is a perfection of the one who understands. But there can be no proportion between the divine essence and an angelic intellect, for they are separated by an infinite distance, and there is no proportion between such widely separated things. Consequently, an angel cannot see God through His essence.

7. One thing can be made like another only in so far as it has received likeness of that other into itself. But by knowing God, an angelic intellect is made like God, for all knowledge takes place through assimilation. Consequently, an angel must know God through a likeness, and not through His essence.

8. Whoever knows a thing through its essence knows what that thing is. Now, as is clear from the writings of Dionysius and Damascene, one cannot know what God is, but only what He is not. No created intellect, therefore, can see God through His essence.

9. As Dionysius says, darkness is said to be in God because of the superabundance of His brightness and because He is hidden from all lights and concealed from all knowledge. Now, God's brightness exceeds not only our intellect but also the angelic intellect. Consequently, the brightness of the divine essence is hidden from the knowledge of angels.

10. Dionysius argues as follows: All cognition is about existing things. God, however, does not exist but is above existence. Therefore, He cannot be known except by transcendent knowledge, which is divine knowledge.

11. Dionysius says: "If a person seeing God understood what he saw, he did not see God but only one of the things belonging to Him." Therefore, no created intellect can see God through His essence.

12. The stronger sight is, the more it can see something at a distance. Consequently, what is infinitely distant cannot be seen except by a sight that has infinite power. Now, the divine essence stands at an infinite distance from any created intellect. Therefore, since no created intellect has unlimited power, no created intellect can see God through His essence.

13. For any kind of knowledge, a judgment is necessary. A judgment, however, is made only by a superior about something inferior. Therefore, since no intellect is superior to the divine essence, no created intellect will be able to see God through His essence.

14. Boethius says: "A judgment is the act of one who judges." Consequently, what is judged is related to the judgment as something passive. But the divine essence cannot be in the relation of passivity with respect to any created intellect. Therefore, a created intellect cannot see God through His essence.

15. Whatever is seen through its essence is reached by the intellect. But no intellect can reach that which stands at an infinite distance from it. Consequently, an angelic intellect cannot see God's essence, which stands at an infinite distance from it.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. In the Gospel according to St. Matthew (18:10) we read: "Their angels always see the face of my Father." Now, to see the face of the Father is to see His essence. Angels, therefore, see God through His essence.

2. Beatified angels see God in the way in which we have been promised to see Him when we are beatified. But we will see God through His essence, as is clear from the first Epistle of St. John (3:2): "When he shall appear, we shall be like to him; because we shall see him as he is." Therefore, angels see God through His essence.

3. Angels know the one who has made them. But the divine essence itself is the cause of angels. Therefore, angels see the divine essence.

4. Whatever is seen is seen either through its essence or through a likeness. But God's likeness is not something other than His essence, because whatever is in God is God. Consequently, angels see God through His essence.

5. The intellect is stronger when it knows than the will when it loves. Consequently, Augustine says: "The intellect goes first; the will act follows later or not at all." Now, angels love the divine essence. Therefore, they see it in a much higher degree.

REPLY

Treating this question, some philosophers have erred by saying that no created intellect can see God through His essence; for they concentrated only on the distance lying between a created intellect and the divine essence. Since this position is heretical, it cannot be held.

It is clear that the beatitude of any intellectual creature consists in its most perfect operation. Now, the supreme element of any rational creature is his intellect. Consequently, the beatitude of any rational creature consists in the most noble act of his intellectual vision. The nobility of intellectual vision, however, comes from the nobility of what is understood, just as the Philosopher says that the most perfect operation of sight takes place when it is in good condition and is directed to the most beautiful of all those things that fall under its view. If in its most perfect vision a rational creature would not see the divine essence, then its beatitude would not be God Himself but something inferior to Him. This, however, is not possible, for the ultimate perfection of all things consists in their reaching their principle; and our faith tells us that God Himself immediately created all rational creatures. Hence, according to faith, all rational creatures who attain beatitude should see God through His essence.

Now, however, we must consider or understand how we can see God through His essence. In all vision there must be posited something by which the one who sees beholds what is seen. This medium is either the very essence of the thing seen, as is true in the case of God's knowledge of Himself, or some likeness of the thing seen, as is true in the case of a man seeing a stone. This is necessary, because the person who knows and the known should in some manner become one in the act of knowing. God's essence, however, cannot be seen by a created intellect by means of a likeness. For, in all cognition taking place through a likeness, the perfection of cognition is determined by the

conformity which the likeness has with that thing whose likeness it is; and I mean a conformity in representation, such as a species in the soul has with the thing outside the soul even though it does not have a conformity with it in real existence. Consequently, if a likeness represents a genus, but not a species, the thing is known according to the intelligible character of the genus but not according to that of the species. If the likeness were to fail to represent even the genus, however, it would represent the thing only according to a likeness which is merely analogous. In such a case, the thing would not be known even according to the intelligible character of the genus. This would happen, for example, if I were to know a substance through the likeness of an accident.

Now, any likeness of the divine essence that is received into a created intellect can have no proportion with the divine essence other than that of analogy. Consequently, knowledge which is had through such a likeness is not knowledge of God Himself through His essence. In fact, it is more imperfect than that which would be had if a substance were known through the likeness of an accident. Consequently, those persons who said that God is not seen through His essence taught that only a certain brightness of the divine essence will be seen, meaning by *brightness* a likeness of the uncreated light through which, they affirmed, God could be seen but which was unable to represent the divine essence—just as the light received by our eyes fails to represent the brightness of the sun, with the result that we cannot fix our vision upon the sun's brightness but can see only some of its brilliant rays. It remains, therefore, that that by which a created intellect sees God through His essence is the divine essence itself.

It is not necessary, however, for the divine essence to become the form of the intellect but only to become related to the intellect after the manner of a form. Consequently, just as one actual being results from matter and a form which is a part of the thing; so, with the necessary differences, the created intellect and the divine essence become one in the act of understanding when the intellect understands and the divine essence is understood through itself.

How it is possible for a separated essence to be joined to the intellect as a form has been shown by the Commentator. Whenever two things are received in something that can receive, and one of them is more perfect than the other, the proportion of what is more perfect to that which is less perfect is like the proportion of a form to what it perfects—just as light is the perfection of color when both are received in a transparent medium. Consequently, since a created intellect, because present in a created substance, is less perfect than the divine essence, the divine essence bears to it in some way the relation of a form as long as it exists in it. We can find some sort of example of this among

natural things. A self-subsistent thing cannot be the form of any matter if it contains matter itself. For example, a stone cannot be the form of any matter. A self-subsistent thing lacking matter, however, can be the form of matter, as is clear in the case of the soul. Similarly and in some way or other, and even though it is pure act and has an act of being entirely distinct from the intellect, the divine essence becomes related to the intellect as its form in the act of understanding. For this reason, Peter Lombard says that the union of the body with a rational soul is, in a way, an example of the beatifying union of a rational spirit with God.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The statement, "This is seen as it is," can be understood in two ways. First, it can mean that the very mode of the thing's existence comes within one's vision, that is to say, the very mode of the thing's existence is seen along with the thing. It is in this way that God, as He is, is seen by angels and will be seen by the blessed; for they will see that His essence has that manner of being which it has. That verse in the first Epistle of John, "We shall see him as he is" (3:2), is to be understood in this sense. Second, however, it can mean that the manner mentioned determines the vision of the one who sees. In other words, the manner of the vision itself is the same as the manner of the essence of the thing seen. In this sense, no created intellect can see God as He is; for it is impossible for the mode of a created intellect's vision to be as sublime as the mode of God's existence. The statement of Chrysostom should be understood in this sense.

2., 3., 4. A similar reply should be given to the second, third, and fourth Difficulties.

5. The form by which an intellect sees God when it sees Him through His essence is the divine essence itself. From this, however, it follows, not that the essence is that form which is a part of a thing in its existence, but only that in the act of knowing it has a relation similar to that of a form which is a part of a thing in its existence.

6. Properly speaking, a proportion is nothing else but a relation of a quantity to a quantity, such as arises when one quantity is equal to or three times another. The term proportion was then transferred to signify the relation of one reality to another. For example, even though no relation of quantity is involved, matter is said to be proportioned to form inasmuch as it is related to form as its matter. Similarly, a created intellect is proportionate to the sight of the divine essence inasmuch as, in some way, it is related to the latter as to an intelligible form, even though the perfections of the two are

incommensurable because an infinite distance lies between them.

7. Assimilation is required for knowledge for this reason only, that the knower be in some way united to what is known. However, when the thing itself is united through its own essence to the intellect, the union is more perfect than if it had taken place through a likeness. Consequently, since the divine essence is united to the angelic intellect as its form, there is no need that the angelic intellect be informed by some likeness which would serve as a medium for knowing the divine essence.

8. The statements of Dionysius and of Damascene should be understood as referring to the vision had in this life, in which a person sees God through some form or other. Since this form falls short of representing the divine essence, the latter cannot be seen through it. All that is known is that God transcends this intellectual representation of Him. Consequently, that which God is remains hidden; and this is the most exalted mode of knowledge that we can attain while we are in this life. Hence, we do not know what God is, but only what He is not. Nevertheless, the divine essence represents itself sufficiently. But when it becomes, as it were, the form of the intellect, the intellect knows not only what God is not but also what He is.

9. God's splendor proves too much for the intellects of persons in this life for two reasons. First, it lies beyond the grasp of their intellectual power. From this it follows that the perfection of our vision is not equal to the perfection of His essence, because what an action can accomplish is determined by the agent's perfection. Second, it transcends the form by which our intellects now understand. Consequently, God is not seen now through His essence, as is clear from what has been said. In the beatific vision, however, while God still transcends the power of a created intellect, and the perfection of our vision still does not equal the perfection of His being, He does not lie beyond the form by which He is seen. Consequently, that which is God will be seen.

10. Dionysius's argument proceeds from the knowledge had while in this life. This is had from forms in existing creatures, and, consequently, it cannot attain to what is transcendent. Such is not the case, however, of the vision had in heaven. His argument, therefore, is not pertinent to the problem at hand.

11. That statement of Dionysius should be understood as referring to the vision had in this life, wherein God is known through some created form. Our reason for saying this has been explained above.

12. A sense of sight must be very strong if it sees what is at some distance from it; for sight is a passive power, and the more perfect a passive potency is, the less is required to move it. Conversely, the more perfect an active power is, the more it can move. Again, a thing is more susceptible to being heated, the

less heat it requires to become hot. But the more distant a thing seen is, the smaller is the visual angle; consequently, less of the thing seen comes to the sense of sight. However, if an equal form were to come from what is near and from what is far, the near object would not be seen less than the distant object would be. Now, even though an infinite distance lies between God and an angelic intellect, He is nevertheless joined to that intellect by His entire essence. Consequently, the cases are not similar.

13. There are two kinds of judgments. In the first, we judge how a thing should be; and this kind of judgment can be made only by one who is superior about what is inferior. In the second, we judge how things are; and this kind of judgment can be both about what is superior and about what is equal, for I am equally able to judge if one is standing or sitting, whether he be a king or a peasant. This second kind of judgment is found in cognition.

14. A judgment is not an action which passes out from the agent into an exterior thing which is then changed by it. Instead, it is an operation that remains as a perfection in the one who judges. Consequently, that about which the intellect or the sense judges need not be passive, even though it may be signified as passive. As a matter of fact, what is sensed and what is understood (the object of a judgment) are related to intellect and sense more like agents, inasmuch as the operations of sensation and understanding are in a certain sense passive.

15. A created intellect never attains the divine essence so as to be of the same nature. It does attain it, however, as an intelligible form.

ARTICLE 2

*Do the intellects of beatified angels and men comprehend the divine essence?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they do, for

1. If what is simple is seen, the whole of it is seen. Now, the divine essence is simple. Therefore, when a beatified angel sees it, he sees the entire essence and consequently comprehends it.

2. It was said, however, that even though the entire essence is seen, it is not seen entirely.—On the contrary, *entirely* signifies a certain mode, but every mode of the divine essence is the essence itself. Therefore, if the entire

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 2, 2, ad 5-7; 20, 5; *S.T.*, I, 12, 7; I-II, 4, 3, ad 1; III, 10, 1; *III Sent.*, 14, 2, 1; 27, 3, 2; *IV Sent.*, 49, 2, 3; *In Ephes.*, c. 5, lect. 3 (P. 13:490b); *In I Tim.*, c. 6, lect. 3 (P. 13:618b); *De div. nom.*, c. i, lects. 1-2 (P. 15:261b seq.; 269a seq.); *De caritate*, a. 10, ad 5; *In Evang. Johannis*, c. 1, lect. 11 (P. 10:312b); *Comp. Theol.*, I, c. 106; *C.G.*, III, 55.

essence is seen, it will be seen entirely.

3. The effectiveness of an action is measured by the form, which is, the principle of action on the part of the agent. This is clear from the case of heat and the process of heating. Now, the form by which the intellect understands is the principle of intellectual vision. Consequently, the effectiveness of the intellect in seeing God will be as great as the perfection of the divine essence. Therefore, the intellect will comprehend the divine essence.

4. Just as the most perfect way of knowing composite intelligible objects is to know them by demonstration, so also the most perfect way of knowing the incomposite is to know what they are.

Now, every composite intelligible object known by demonstration is comprehended. Consequently, if one knows what a thing is, he comprehends it. But those who know God through His essence know what He Is, since to know what a thing is, is to know its essence. Angels, therefore, comprehend the divine essence.

5. In the Epistle to the Philippians (3:12), we read: "But I follow after, hoping I may comprehend as I am also comprehended." But God perfectly comprehended the Apostle. The Apostle, therefore, was moving to a stage wherein he would perfectly comprehend God.

6. The gloss on the passage cited immediately above says: "If I may comprehend"—that is, that I may know the immensity of God that surpasses any intellect." Now, God is incomprehensible only by reason of His immensity. Therefore, the blessed perfectly comprehend the divine essence.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. In his commentary on Luke, Ambrose says: "No one has looked upon the abundance of goodness which lives in God. Neither mind nor eye has comprehended it."

2. In his treatment of the vision of God, Augustine says: "No one has ever comprehended the fullness of God, either with his bodily eyes or with his mind."

3. According to Augustine in the same work: "A thing is comprehended if its limits can be seen." Now, this is impossible in the case of God, for He is infinite. Consequently, He cannot be comprehended.

REPLY

Properly speaking, one thing is said to be comprehended by another if it is included within it, for to comprehend means to apprehend something in all its parts simultaneously. This is, as it were, to include it in all its aspects. Now,

what is included by another thing does not exceed it; instead, it is less than or at most equal to it. These principles pertain to quantity. Consequently, there are two modes of comprehension according to the two kinds of quantity, namely, dimensional (or extensive) quantity and virtual (or intensive) quantity. According to dimensional quantity, a cask *comprehends* wine; according to virtual quantity, matter is said to *comprehend* form when, nothing remains in the matter which has not been perfected by the form. It is in this latter manner that a knowing power is said to comprehend its object, namely, in so far as what is known lies perfectly under its cognition. When the thing known exceeds its grasp, then the knowing power falls short of comprehension.

This *excess* must be considered differently in the different powers. To the sensitive powers, the object is related not merely according to virtual quantity but also according to dimensional quantity; for, inasmuch as a sense is in space, the sensibles move it, not only in virtue of the quality of the proper sensibles, but also according to dimensional quantity. This is clear in the case of the common sensibles. As a result, comprehension by sense can be impeded in two ways. First, it can be impeded by an excess in the object considered from the standpoint of virtual quantity. For example, the eye is kept from comprehending the sun because the intensity of the sun's brightness, by which it is visible, exceeds the proportion of the eye's ability to see it. Second, it can be impeded by an excess according to dimensional quantity. For example, the eye is kept from comprehending the entire mass of the earth. Part of it the eye sees, part of it it does not. This, however, is not true of the first example given, for we see all the parts of the sun alike, but none of them as perfectly as they might be seen.

Now, the intelligible is related to intellect only indirectly according to dimensional or natural quantity, that is, only inasmuch as the intellect receives something from sense. Consequently, our intellect is similarly kept from comprehending what is infinite according to dimensional quantity, so that some of the infinite comes into the intellect, but some of it remains outside. The intelligible is not, however, directly related to the intellect according to dimensional quantity, since the intellect is a power that does not use a physical organ. Instead, the intelligible is related to intellect according to virtual quantity. Consequently, the intellectual comprehension of those things which are understood in themselves without dependence on sense is impeded only because of an excess according to virtual quantity. This occurs, for example, when what is known can be understood in a more perfect way than the intellect understands it. For example, a person can understand the following conclusion: "A triangle has three angles equal to two right angles," merely be-

cause of a probable reason, namely, the authority of another or because the proposition is commonly accepted. Such a person does not comprehend the proposition, not because he is ignorant of one part of it and knows another, but because that conclusion can be known by a demonstration which he does not yet know. Consequently, he does not comprehend the proposition simply because he has not grasped it perfectly.

Now, it is clear that there is no place for dimensional quantity in an angelic intellect, especially in its relation to the vision of God. Consequently, any equality or excess occurring here must be taken as involving virtual quantity only. Moreover, the perfection of the intelligibility of the divine essence lies beyond the grasp of angelic and all created intellects in so far as they have the power of knowing, because the truth by which the divine essence is knowable surpasses the light by which any created intellect knows. Consequently, it is impossible for any created intellect to comprehend the divine essence, not because it does not know some part of the essence, but because it cannot attain the perfect manner of knowing it.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The entire divine essence is seen by an angel, for there is nothing in it which he does not see. Consequently, the term *entire* is to be explained in a privative sense, not in a sense that would suppose parts. He does not, however, see the essence perfectly. Therefore, it does not follow that he comprehends it.

2. We can consider three modes in any vision. The first mode is that of the person who sees, taken absolutely; and it means the extent of his capacity. According to this, the intellect of an angel sees God entirely; for this statement means simply that an angel uses all the force of his intellect in seeing God. The second mode is that of the thing seen; and this mode is nothing other than the thing's quality. But, since quality in God is nothing other than His substance, His mode is His very essence. Consequently, angels see God entirely in this sense, too, for they see God's entire mode in the same way in which they see the entire essence. The third mode is that of the vision itself, which is a medium between the one seeing and the thing seen; and therefore it signifies the mode of the one seeing in his relation to the thing seen. In this sense, one person is said to see another entirely when his vision is total, as occurs when the mode of the vision is as perfect as the mode of the thing's visibility. As is clear from what was said above, one cannot see the divine essence entirely in this sense. In this respect, we are like one who knows that a proposition can be demonstrated but does not know the demonstration. Such a person knows the entire mode of its cognition, but he does not know it according to the

complete mode in which it is knowable.

3. That reasoning follows when the form which is the principle of an action is united to the agent according to its complete mode. Such a union is necessarily true of all non-subsistent forms, whose very existence is to be in another. But, even though the divine essence is, in some way, like a form of the intellect, still, because it is seized by the intellect only according to the manner of the intellect seizing it, and because the action here is not only that of the form but also that of the agent, the action cannot be as perfect as the form which is the principle of the action, because of the defect on the part of the agent.

4. A thing whose definition is known is comprehended only if the definition itself is comprehended. It is possible, however, to know a thing or its definition without comprehending either; consequently, the thing itself is not comprehended. Moreover, even though an angel knows in some way what God is, still he does not comprehend this.

5. Vision of God had through His essence can be called comprehension in comparison with the vision had in this life, which does not attain God's essence. It is not, however, comprehension simply speaking, for the reason already given.* Consequently, in the statements, "Hoping I may comprehend as I am also comprehended" and "I shall know even as I have been known," the word as signifies a comparison of likeness, not of equality.

6. God's immeasurableness will be seen, but not in an immeasurable manner; for, as was said previously, His entire mode will be seen, but not entirely.

ARTICLE 3

*Can an angel by means of his own natural powers
attain the vision of God through his essence?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that he can, for

1. According to Augustine, in their initial state in which, as many say, the angels had only natural powers, they saw in the Word all the creatures that were to be made. Now, this would not have been possible unless they saw the Word. Therefore, by means of its purely natural powers, an angelic intellect saw God in His essence.

2. Whatever can understand what is less intelligible can understand

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 12, 4. See also readings given for q. 8, a. 1.

what is more intelligible. Now, the divine essence is most intelligible, because it is most free of matter; and it is because of this condition that a thing becomes actually intelligible. Therefore, since an angelic intellect can by means of its purely natural powers understand other intelligible objects, it can with even greater reason also know the divine essence by means of its purely natural powers.

3. But it was said that, even though the divine essence if taken in itself is most intelligible, it is not most intelligible to an angelic intellect.—On the contrary, the fact that what is more visible in itself is not more visible to us is due to a defect in our sight. There is no defect, however, in an angelic intellect; for, as Dionysius says, an angel is “a pure, clean and spotless mirror.” Consequently, that which is more intelligible in itself is more intelligible to an angel.

4. According to the Commentator, the principle laid down by Themistius, “This is more intelligible; therefore it is more understood,” is applicable to intellects completely separated from matter. Now, an angelic intellect is of this nature. Therefore, the principle can be applied to it.

5. Surpassing visible brilliancy is less visible to our sense of sight because its very brilliancy harms sight. But surpassing intelligible brilliancy does not harm our intellect; indeed, it strengthens it. Consequently, that which is more intelligible in itself is more understood by the intellect.

6. To see God in His essence is an act of the intellect. But grace lies in the affective power. Grace, therefore, is not needed in order to see God through His essence. Consequently, angels were able to reach the vision of God merely through natural powers.

7. According to Augustine, since faith by its essence is present in the soul, it is also seen through its essence by the soul. Now, God by His essence is present to the soul and is present similarly to an angel and to all creatures whatsoever. Consequently, in his purely natural state an angel could see God in His essence.

8. According to Augustine, a thing is present in the soul in three ways: through union, through a notion, and through the presence of its essence. Now, if this division is consistent, it must have been made through opposites. Consequently, since God is present to an angelic intellect through His essence, He is not present to it through a likeness. Hence, God cannot be seen by an angel by means of a likeness. If an angel, therefore, can know God in some way merely by means of his natural powers, it seems that he knows Him through His essence naturally.

9. If a thing is seen in a material mirror, the mirror itself must be seen. Now, in the state in which they were created angels saw things in the Word as

in a mirror. Consequently, they saw the Word.

10. But it was said that the angels were created not in a purely natural condition but with grace—either with sanctifying grace or with charisms.—On the contrary, just as the light of nature falls short of the light of glory, so also does the light of grace given in sanctifying grace and in charisms. Consequently, if persons possessing either of these graces could see God through His essence, they could, for a like reason, do the same in the state of pure nature.

11. Things are seen only where they are. Now, before things were created, they existed only in the Word. Consequently, when the angels came to know the things that were to be made, they knew them in the Word and thus saw the Word.

12. Nature does not fail in necessary matters. But to attain its end is one of the most necessary concerns of nature. Consequently, each and every nature has been provided for in such a way that it can attain its end. Now, to see God through His essence is the end for which a rational creature exists. Therefore, by its own purely natural powers a rational creature can attain this vision.

13. Superior powers are more perfect than inferior. Now, by means of their own natures, inferior powers can attain their objects. For example, senses can attain sensibles; the imagination, objects of imagination. Consequently, since God is the object of the intelligence, as is said in *Spirit and Soul*, it seems that an angelic intelligence can see God through its own natural powers.

14. But it was said that such a comparison cannot be made, because the objects of other powers do not exceed the powers themselves, but God exceeds all created intelligences.—On the contrary, no matter how much a created intelligence is perfected by the light of glory, God always infinitely surpasses it. Consequently, if “excess” prevented one from seeing God through His essence, no created intellect would ever be able to attain a state of glory in which it would see God through His essence. This, however, is absurd.

15. In *Spirit and Soul*, we read: “The soul is a likeness of all wisdom,” but so is an angel, for the same reason. Now, things are known naturally by means of their likenesses. Consequently, an angel naturally knows those things which belong to wisdom. But, as Augustine says, wisdom is about divine matters. An angel, therefore, can come to see God through His essence by means of his natural powers.

16. In order that a created intellect see God through His essence, all that is required is that it be made like God. Now, by its very nature, the intellect of an angel is godlike. Consequently, it can see God through His essence by means of its own natural powers.

17. All knowledge of God is either as through a mirror or through His essence. This is clear from the first Epistle to the Corinthians (13:12): "We see now through a glass in a dark manner, but then face to face." Now, in their natural condition angels do not know God as through a mirror, because, as Augustine says: "From the time they were created they enjoyed the eternal vision of the Word. They did not know the invisible things of God through things that are made." (This latter type of knowledge is "seeing through a glass.") Consequently, angels naturally see God through His essence.

18. We see a thing without a medium if we can think of it without thinking about something else. An angel, however, can by his natural knowledge think of God without thinking about any creature. Consequently, he can see God without any medium; and this is to see Him through His essence.

19. Augustine says that those realities which are in the soul in their essence are known by the soul through their essence. But the divine essence is in the soul in this manner.

20. That which is not seen through its essence is seen through a species if it is seen at all. Now, the divine essence cannot be seen through a species, for a species is more simple than that of which it is the species. Consequently, since the divine essence is known naturally by an angel, it is known by him through its essence.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. To see God through His essence is life eternal. This is clear from the Gospel of St. John (17:3): "This is eternal life, etc." Now, one cannot attain eternal life through merely natural powers; for, as it is said in the Epistle to the Romans (6:23): "The grace of God is life everlasting." Consequently, by merely natural powers, one cannot attain the vision of God through His essence.

2. Augustine says that, even though the soul is made to know God, it can be led to this act of knowledge only by the infusion of divine light. Consequently, no one can by his natural power see God through His essence.

3. Nature does not transcend its limits. Now, the divine essence surpasses any created nature. Consequently, the divine essence cannot be seen by any natural cognition.

REPLY

In order that God be seen through His essence, the divine essence must be united with the intellect in some way as an intelligible form. However, what is to be perfected can be united with a form only after a disposition is present which makes the subject to be perfected capable of receiving such a form, be-

cause a definite act takes place only in a potency suitable for it. For example, a body is united with a soul as with its form only after it has been organized and disposed. Similarly, there must be some disposition produced in the intellect by which it is made perfectible by this form, the divine essence. This disposition is brought about by an intellectual light; and, were this light natural, an intellect could see God in His essence by its purely natural powers. It is impossible, however, for it to be natural, because the ultimate disposition for a form and the form itself must belong to one order. Consequently, if one is natural, so is the other. The divine essence, however, is not the natural intelligible form of a created intellect.

This is clear from the principle that act and potency always belong to one genus. Hence, potency in the genus of quantity has no relation to an act in the genus of quality; and, similarly, the natural form of a created intellect can belong only to that genus in which the potency of a created intellect exists. As a result, the form of the intellect cannot be a sensible form, since it belongs to another genus, but can be only an immaterial form belonging to the same genus as the intellect. Now, just as a sensible form lies below the genus of created intellectual powers, so does the divine essence lie above it. Consequently, the divine essence is not a form within the ambit of the natural power of the intellect. Therefore, that intellectual light by which a created intellect receives the ultimate disposition for union with the divine essence as with an intelligible form is not a natural light, but a supernatural light. And this is the light of glory of which the Psalmist speaks when he says (35:10): "In thy light we shall see light."

Therefore, the natural capacity of any intellect has a determinate relation to some created intelligible form. This relationship, however, differs in man and in angels, since in man it is to an intelligible form abstracted from sense (all man's knowledge has its origin in sense); however, in angels it is to an intelligible form not received from sense, and especially to that form which is their own essence. Consequently, the knowledge of God that an angel can naturally attain is simply that which he gets when he sees Him through his own substance. Hence, we read in *The Causes*: "An intelligence understands what lies above it through the mode of its own substance," because, inasmuch as it is caused by God, its substance is a certain likeness of the divine essence. The knowledge of God that man can naturally attain, however, is had through knowing Him by means of sensible form which, by the light of the active intellect, is abstracted from sensible conditions. Hence, in its commentary on the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (1:20), "For the invisible things of him, etc.," the Gloss states that men were given help toward knowing God by

sensible creatures and by the natural light of reason. However, knowledge of God had by means of a created form is not vision of Him through His essence. Consequently, neither man nor angel can attain the vision of God through His essence by their own purely natural powers.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. This statement of Augustine, that angels saw things in the Word, can be understood as referring to angels, not as they were immediately after their creation, but as they were when they were beatified. Or the reply might be given that, even though they did not see the Word through His essence when they were in a natural state, they saw Him in some way by means of a likeness existing within them, and it was from this knowledge that they were able to know creatures. Later, however, they knew them much more fully in the Word when they saw the Word through His essence, since, in so far as a cause is known, its effects are known by means of the cause.

2. Even though the divine essence, taken in itself, is most knowable, it is not most knowable to a created intellect, because it lies outside the order of the latter.

3. The angelic intellect is said to be a pure and spotless mirror without defect because in view of its genus it does not suffer from a defect of intelligible light as the human intellect does. The intelligible light of the human intellect is obscured to such an extent that it must be passive in regard to phantasms under the limitations of space and time and progress discursively from one thing to another. This is why Isaac says: "Reason is born in the shadow of intelligence"¹⁶ and why its intellectual power can grasp the quiddities only of intelligible created forms belonging to its own genus. But the angelic intellect is also found to be "dark" and defective in its relation to the divine essence, which lies outside its genus. Therefore, it falls short of seeing the divine essence, even though the latter in itself is most knowable.

4. This statement of the Commentator is understood as referring to knowledge of created intelligibles, not to knowledge of the uncreated essence. A created intelligible substance is in itself most intelligible, but is less intelligible to us for this reason, that it exceeds forms abstracted by sense, our natural means of knowledge. Similarly—in fact, even to a much greater extent—the divine essence exceeds the created intelligible form by which angelic intellects know. Consequently, an angelic intellect understands the divine essence less [than created things] even though it is more intelligible in itself, just as our intellect knows less about an angelic essence than it does about sensible things, even though an angelic essence is more intelligible in itself.

5. Even though surpassing intelligible brilliancy does not harm the intellect but strengthens it, it sometimes lies beyond the representation of the form by which the intellect understands; and, for this reason, it hinders the intellect. Consequently, the following statement in the *Metaphysics* that the intellect is related to what is most manifest in nature “as the eye of the bat is to the light of the sun” is true.

6. For the vision of God through His essence, grace is not required as some kind of immediate disposition; but by grace man merits that the light of glory be given him, and through this he sees God in His essence.

7. Faith is known through its essence in so far as its essence is joined to the intellect as an intelligible form, and not for any other reason. But, the divine essence is not joined to a created intellect in this manner during life. It merely sustains the intellect in its act of existence.

8. That division is made, not through opposing things, but through opposing formal concepts. Consequently, there is no reason why something cannot be in the soul in one manner, say, through its essence, and in another manner also, as through its likeness or image. For an image and likeness of God exist in the soul, even though God is also present there through His essence.

9. The answer here is the same as that given to the first difficulty.

10. Neither sanctifying grace nor charisms suffice for vision of God through His essence. Only perfected grace is sufficient, and this is the light of glory.

11. Even before things existed in their own natures they existed not only in the Word but also in the minds of angels. Consequently, they could be seen even though the Word was not seen through His essence.

12. As the Philosopher says, many degrees of perfection are found in things. The first and most perfect degree is that wherein a thing has its own goodness without the motion or the help of another, just as the most perfect health exists in one who is healthy by himself without the help of medicine. This is the degree proper to divine perfection. The second degree is that wherein one can attain perfect goodness with slight help or with a little motion, like a man who can keep his health with only a little exercise. The third degree is that wherein one acquires perfect goodness only through many motions, like a man who acquires perfect health only after much exercise. The fourth degree belongs to him who can never acquire perfect goodness, but can acquire only some goodness by means of many motions. The fifth degree belongs to him who cannot acquire any goodness at all and has no movement towards goodness. He is like a man who has an incurable disease and, conse-

quently, does not take any medicine.

Now, irrational natures can in no way attain perfect goodness, which is beatitude. They can attain only some imperfect goodness, their natural end, which they achieve through the force of their own natures. Rational creatures, however, can attain perfect goodness, that is, beatitude. Yet, in order to attain this, they need more things than lower natures need in order to obtain their ends. Consequently, even though rational creatures are more noble, it does not follow that they can attain their end by means of their own natural powers as lower natures do. For, to attain beatitude through one's own power belongs exclusively to God.

13. A similar reply should be given to this difficulty about the ordering of powers.

14. Even though a created intellect is never elevated by the light of glory to such an extent that the distance between it and the divine essence is no longer infinite, yet, as a result of this light, the intellect is united with the divine essence as with an intelligible form; and this union can happen in no other way.

15. By his natural powers an angel can know God through a likeness; but this knowledge is not the same as seeing God through His essence.

16. The natural conformity which an angelic intellect has with God is not such that it is proportioned to the divine essence as to an intelligible form. It consists rather in this, that an angelic intellect does not receive its knowledge of sensible things from sense as we do; and in other respects, too, the angelic intellect resembles God more than it resembles the human intellect.

17. A thing is seen in three different ways. First, it is seen through its essence, in the way in which a visible essence itself is joined to sight when the eye sees light. Second, it is seen through a species, as takes place when the likeness of a thing is impressed on my sense of sight when I see a stone. Third, it is seen "through a mirror"; and this takes place when the thing's likeness, through which it is known, is not caused in the sight by the thing itself directly but by that in which the likeness of the thing is represented, just as sensible species are caused in a mirror.

Now, to see God in the first manner is natural only to God. It lie above the nature of man and angel. To see God in the second manner is natural to an angel. To see God in the third manner, however, is natural to man himself, for he can come to know God from creature inasmuch as they represent Him somehow or other. Consequently, the statement that all knowledge is either through an essence or through a mirror should be taken as referring to human knowledge. The knowledge which an angel naturally has of God lies between these two types.

18. An image of a thing can be considered in two ways. First, it can be considered in so far as it is a certain thing; and since as a thing it is distinct from that of which it is an image, under this aspect the motion of the cognitive power to the image will be other than its motion toward that of which it is an image. Second, it can be considered in so far as it is an image. Under this aspect, the motion toward the image will be the same as the motion toward that of which it is an image. Consequently, when a thing is known by means of a resemblance existing in its effect, the cognitive motion can pass over immediately to the cause without thinking about any other thing. This is the way in which the intellect of a person still in this life can think of God without thinking of any creature.

19. Those things which are in the soul in their essence, and are united with it as intelligible forms are understood by the soul through their essences. The divine essence, however, is not present this way in the soul of one still in this life. Consequently, the argument proves nothing.

20. That argument is talking about species abstracted from things, and these must be more simple than the things themselves. A created [angelic] intellect, however, does not know God naturally through such a likeness, but only through a likeness imprinted by Him. Consequently, the argument proves nothing.

ARTICLE 4

*Does an angel, seeing God through his essence, know all things?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that he does, for

1. As Isidore says: "Angels see all things in the Word of God before they come into being."

2. Every faculty of sight sees those things whose likenesses it has within it. But the divine essence, a likeness of all things, is joined to the angelic intellect as an intelligible form. Consequently, when an angel sees God through His essence he sees all things.

3. If an angel does not know all things, this is because of a defect in his faculty of knowing or in its objects or in the medium of his cognition. But his lack of knowledge is not due to any defect in the angel's intellect, for, as Dionysius says, an angel "is a pure and spotless mirror." Nor is it due to any defect

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 20, aa. 4-6; *S.T. I*, 12, 8; 57, 5; 106, 1, ad 1; *III*, 10, 2; *II Sent.*, 11, 2, 2, aa. 1-2; *III Sent.*, 14, 2, sols. 2-4; *IV Sent.*, 45, 3, 1; 49, 2, 5; *C.G.*, *III*, cc. 56, 59.

in the objects of this faculty, for all things are knowable in the divine essence. Finally, it is not due to any defect in the medium by which angels know, for the divine essence represents all things perfectly. Consequently, seeing God, an angel sees all things.

4. An angel's intellect is more perfect than the intellect possessed by a human soul. But the human soul has the power to know all things; for as is said in *The Soul*, it is "all things in some manner" since it is natural for it to know all things. Consequently, an angelic intellect can also know all things. Now, nothing is more effective in bringing an angelic intellect to the act of cognition than the divine essence. Therefore, when an angel sees the divine essence he knows all things.

5. As Gregory says, love in heaven is equated with knowledge, for there one's love is proportioned to his knowledge. But one who loves God will love in Him all things lovable. Consequently, one who sees God will see all things knowable.

6. If an angel, seeing God, does not see all things, then this is only because all the intelligibles are infinite. But an angel is not kept from understanding by the fact that the object of his intellect is infinite, for the divine essence itself is distant from him as something infinite from what is finite. Consequently, it seems that when an angel sees God he can see all things.

7. The knowledge one has in heaven is greater than that had by one on earth, no matter how much the knowledge of the latter is elevated. Now, all things can be revealed to one still on earth. That all things present can be revealed is clear from the case of Benedict, who, as Gregory says, was shown the whole world at once. That all future things can be revealed is also clear, since God reveals some future events to prophets; and, in the same way, He could reveal all of them to a prophet—and all past things, too. For an even better reason, therefore, an angel seeing God in the heavenly vision knows all things.

8. Gregory writes as follows: "What is there that they do not see when they see the one that sees all things?" Now, angels see God, who knows all things, through His essence. Consequently, angels know all things.

9. As regards knowledge, the power of an angel is not less than that of a soul. But Gregory says: "Every creature is small for a soul who sees the Creator." Therefore, every creature is small to an angel; thus our conclusion is the same as before.

10. Spiritual light pours itself into the mind with greater force than physical light does into the eye. But, if physical light were the adequate cause of all colors, then in pouring itself into the eye it would manifest all colors. Consequently, since God Himself, who is spiritual light and the perfect principle of

all things, pours Himself into the mind of an angel who sees Him, by knowing God the angel will know all things.

11. Cognition is, as it were, a kind of contact between the knower and the knowable. Now, if a simple thing is touched, whatever there is in it is touched. But God is simple. Therefore, if He is known, all things are known, because all their intelligible characters exist within Him.

12. Knowledge of creatures does not belong to the substance of beatitude. Therefore, creatures seem to be related equally to the knowledge had in that state: one who is beatified knows either all creatures or none at all. But, since he knows some creatures, he must know them all.

13. Any potency that is not reduced to act is imperfect. But the intellect of an angel is in potency to the knowledge of all things; otherwise, it would be inferior to the human intellect, which has the power to become all things. Consequently, if an angel did not know all things in his state of beatitude, his knowledge would remain imperfect; but this seems repugnant to the perfection of beatitude, which takes away all imperfections.

14. If a beatified angel did not know all things, he would, since he is in potency to knowing all things, at one time know something which he did not know previously. Now, this is impossible; for, as Augustine says, “beatified angels’ thoughts do not change”; and they would change if angels came to know something of which they were previously ignorant. Consequently, beatified angels see all things when they see God.

15. The beatific vision is measured by eternity, and for this reason is called eternal life. Now, since there is no “before” or “after” in eternity, these sequences are not in the beatific vision either. Hence, [in the vision] something cannot be known which was not known previously. Therefore, our conclusion is the same as before.

16. In the Gospel according to John (15:9), we read the following: “He shall go in, and go out, and shall find pastures.” This is explained as follows in *Spirit and Soul*: “He shall go in to contemplate the divinity of the Saviour, and go out to gaze upon His humanity. In both he will find glorious refreshment.” Now, our external sight will nourish itself perfectly upon the humanity of our Saviour, because nothing in His body will be hidden from it. Consequently, the eye of the mind will nourish itself similarly on His divinity, because it will be ignorant of nothing in His divinity, and so will know all things.

17. As is said in *The Soul*, an intellect that understands what is most intelligible does not understand what is less intelligible to a lesser degree but to a greater degree. Now, God is most intelligible. Hence, when an intellect sees God it sees all things.

18. One knows an effect especially by knowing its cause. Now, God is the cause of all things. Consequently, when an intellect sees God it knows all things.

19. Colors painted on a tablet, to become known by sight, would need only a light to shine upon them and make them actually visible. Now, through the illumination of the divine light, the representations of all things are actually intelligible in the divine essence. Consequently, when an intellect sees the divine essence, it sees all things by means of these representations of all things.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. We read the following in the Epistle to the Ephesians (3:10): “That the manifold wisdom of God may be made known to the principalities and powers in heavenly places through the church.” Commenting on this passage, Jerome says that the angels learned the mystery of the Incarnation through the preaching of the Church. Consequently, they were ignorant of it before the preaching of the Church, even though they saw God through His essence. Therefore, when they saw God in His essence they did not know all things.

2. Dionysius writes: “Many aspects of the mysteries are hidden from the celestial essences.”

3. Nothing is equal to another’s extension according to dimensional quantity unless it has the same amount of dimensional quantity. Therefore, nothing is equal to another’s extension in virtual quantity unless it has the same amount of efficacy. Now, an angelic intellect is not equal to the divine intellect in perfection. Consequently, it is impossible for an angelic intellect to embrace all things which the divine intellect embraces.

4. Since angels have been made to praise God, they praise Him in so far as they know Him. But, as is clear from what Chrysostom has written, all angels do not praise Him equally. Therefore, some know more things in God than others. Nevertheless, even those who know less see God through His essence. Consequently, when they see God through His essence they do not see all things.

5. Knowledge and joy belong to the substance of angelic beatitude. Now, the beatified angels can rejoice over something which they did not rejoice over previously, as, for example, the conversion of a sinner: “There shall be joy before the angels of God upon one (Luke 15:10). Consequently, they can also know something which they did not know previously. Thus, even though they see God through His essence, there are some things which they do not know.

6. No created thing can be all-good or all-powerful. Therefore, no creat-

ed thing can be all-knowing.

7. God's knowledge infinitely surpasses that of a creature. Consequently, it is impossible for a creature to know all that God knows.

8. In Jeremiah (17:9-10) we read the following: "The heart is perverse... and unsearchable. Who can know it? I...the Lord." From this it seems that even though the angels see God through His essence, they nevertheless do not know the heart's secrets and, therefore, do not know all things.

REPLY

In seeing His own essence, God knows some things, namely, the present, past, and future, with the knowledge of vision. Other things, namely, all those which He could make but which nevertheless do not exist, have not existed, and will not exist—these He knows with the knowledge of simple understanding. Now, it seems impossible that any creature seeing the divine essence should know all the things which God knows with His knowledge of simple understanding.

It is clear that the number of effects a person knows of a cause is in proportion to the perfection of his knowledge of that cause. For example, the more perfectly one knows a principle of demonstration, the more conclusions can he draw from it. Consequently, if an intellect is to know from its knowledge of a cause all the effects of that cause, it must attain a perfect knowledge of it and, consequently, must comprehend it. Now, as is evident from what has been said previously, it is impossible for a created intellect to comprehend the divine essence. Therefore, it is impossible for any created intellect in seeing the divine essence to know all the things that can be caused by it.

However, it is possible for a created intellect which sees God to know all that God knows with His knowledge of vision. All hold this is true of the soul of Christ. Opinion is split, however, about the others who see God through His essence. Some say that all angels and all the souls of the blessed necessarily know all things by seeing God's essence because they are like men who look into a mirror and see all that is reflected there. This opinion, however, seems to contradict the sayings of the saints, especially those of Dionysius, who expressly states that the lower angels rid themselves of their ignorance by the help of higher angels. Hence, we must assert that the higher angels know things of which the lower are ignorant, even though all angels without exception contemplate God.

Consequently, we answer that things do not exist in the divine essence as actually distinct; but, as Dionysius says, in God all things are one in the way in which many effects are united in one cause. Images reflected in a mirror,

however, are actually distinct; consequently, the way in which all things are in the divine essence is more like the way in which effects are in a cause than that in which images are in a mirror. Moreover, one who knows a cause will know all the effects which that cause can produce only if he comprehends that cause, but such comprehension is impossible for a created intellect with regard to the divine essence. Hence, in seeing His essence God alone necessarily knows all the things that He can make. The same is true of the effects that can be produced by the divine essence: one knows more of these the more fully he sees God's essence. Consequently, the soul of Christ, which sees God more perfectly than all other creatures do is said to know all things, present, past, and future. Other creatures however, do not have this knowledge. Each one of them sees more or fewer effects of God in proportion to the knowledge he has of Him.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. As Peter Lombard points out, when one says that angels see all things in the Word before they come into being, his statement should not be understood as referring to all angels, but possibly only to the higher angels. Nor do these see all things perfectly, but, perhaps, only in general. Some things they know, as it were, only implicitly. Or one could also reply that many concepts can be drawn from one object, just as many demonstrations can be made about a triangle; and it is possible for one to know the definition of a triangle and still not know all the things that can be known about a triangle. Therefore, it is one thing to know all things, and another to know all that can be known about things.

However, it is sufficiently probable that all who see God through His essence know all creatures at least according to their species. This is what Isidore means when he says angels "know all things in the Word before they come into existence," for coming into existence pertains to things, not to intelligible characters. It is not necessary, however, that an angel know all the intelligible characters of a thing when he knows it; and, even if he were to know all the natural properties which can be known by comprehending its essence, he would not know it according to all the formalities by which it falls under the ordering of divine providence, which ordains one thing to many events. It is about such things that the highest angels enlighten the lower. And this is what Dionysius means when he says that higher angels teach the lower about the intelligible characters of things.

2. That argument holds when sight is joined to a likeness according to the entire potentialities of that likeness. Then sight necessarily knows every-

thing to which the likeness extends. However, a created intellect is not joined to the divine essence in this manner. Consequently, the argument does not hold.

3. The fact that an angel, seeing God, nevertheless does not see all things is due to a defect in his intellect, which is not united to the divine essence according to the total cognoscibility of the essence. But, as mentioned above, this defect is not contrary to the purity of the angelic intellect.

4. The ambit of a soul's natural power includes only those objects which can be understood by the light of the active intellect, and these are forms abstracted from sensible objects. Similarly, the natural power of an angelic intellect includes only those objects that are manifested to it by its own natural light, which is not, however, sufficient to manifest all the things hidden in the wisdom of God. Moreover, the soul receives knowledge of those things which it can know naturally only through a medium that is proportioned to itself. Consequently, even though two persons may apprehend a conclusion by one and the same medium, one will come to know it when the other, with a slower intellect, will not. Similarly, when angels see God's essence, a higher angel will know many things which a lower angel will not. However, the lower angel gets knowledge of these things through a medium that is more proportioned to him, namely, the light of the higher angel. Hence, it is necessary for one angel to enlighten another.

5. Affection tends toward things themselves, but intellect not only tends toward things but also divides them up into many concepts. Consequently, these concepts are understood but not loved. They can, however, be the principle of love or the reason for it. But, properly speaking, what is loved is the thing itself. Therefore, since the angels who see God through His essence know all creatures, they can love all creatures. But, because they do not apprehend all the intelligible aspects of creatures, they do not love creatures under all the aspects under which they can be loved.

6. Even though God is at an infinite distance from the angelic intellect, angels do not know God according to the mode of His infinity, because they do not know Him infinitely. Consequently, it is not necessary that they know all the infinite things that He knows.

7. God could reveal to a person in this life so many things that he would know more about creatures than the intellect of one in heaven knows. Similarly, God could reveal to a person in a lower place in heaven as many things as one in a higher place knows—or even more things. But this is not the point of our present inquiry. The point is: Does it follow that a created intellect knows all things from the fact that it sees God's essence?

8. Gregory's statement can be understood as referring to things that pertain to the substance of beatitude. Or one can reply that Gregory is speaking about the sufficiency of the medium, because the divine essence is a medium that is sufficient to make all things known. Gregory accordingly holds that it is not strange if one who sees the divine essence knows future things; but that he does not know all things comes from a defect in the intellect which does not comprehend it.

9. This statement declares that every creature is small for a soul seeing the divine essence; that is, from such a soul no creature is hidden because of its nobility. There can be another reason, however, why it might remain hidden, namely, the fact that it is not joined to the soul by a proportionate medium through which the soul could know it.

10. That argument would hold if a physical eye could take upon itself all the potentialities of physical light. In the problem proposed this is clearly not the case.

11. When an intellect touches God by its cognition; it knows the whole of God, even though it does not know God wholly. Consequently, it does know all that is in God actually. It is not necessary however, that the intellect know the relation God has to all His effects, for this would mean that it knew God in so far as He is the ultimate meaning of all of them.

12. Although the knowledge of creatures does not belong to the substance of beatitude as something that beatifies, nevertheless, some knowledge of creatures pertains to beatitude as being in a way necessary for some act which the beatified person has to perform. For example, to know all who have been placed under his care belongs to the beatitude of an angel. Similarly, it belongs to the beatitude of the saints to know those persons who implore their help and even to know those other creatures from which they ought to rise to the praise of God.

Or it might be said that, even if the knowledge of creatures pertain in no way at all to beatitude, it does not follow that all knowledge of creatures is equally related to the beatific vision. For, when a cause is known, some effects are known immediately in it while others still remain rather hidden. For example, some conclusions can be drawn immediately from principles of demonstration while others cannot be except by means of numerous media; and one cannot come to know the latter by himself but must be led to them by someone else. The same is true of knowing the intelligible reasons of effects in their relation to the divine essence: some are hidden but others are manifest. Consequently, when one sees the divine essence he sees some effects but not others.

13. A thing can be in potency to something else in two ways. First, it can be in natural potency; and it is in this way that a created intellect is in potency to knowing all those things that can be manifested to it by its own natural light. A beatified angel is ignorant of none of these things, for were he ignorant of these his intellect would be imperfect. Secondly, a thing can be in merely obediential potency; and it is in this way that a thing is said to be in potency to those things above its nature which God can nevertheless cause in it. If such things are not reduced from potency to act, the potency is not imperfect. Consequently, the intellect of a beatified angel is not imperfect if it does not know all the things which God could reveal to it.

Or one could reply that if a potency is ordered to two perfections, and if the second is the final cause of the first, then that potency would not be imperfect if it should have the second without the first—for example, if one were to have health without the help of medicine which causes health. Now, all knowledge of created things is ordered to the knowledge of God. Consequently, granted the impossible position that a created intellect did not know creatures but still knew God, it would not be imperfect. Moreover, an intellect that sees God and knows more creatures is not more perfect because of this knowledge of creatures but rather by the fact that it knows God more perfectly. For this reason, Augustine says: “Unhappy the man who knows all things,” that is, created things, “but does not know You. Happy is he who knows You, even if he does not know creatures. Moreover, if he knows You and creatures, he is not happier on account of them, but his happiness comes from You alone.”

14. Change in thought, which is not had in beatified angels, can be understood in two different senses. First, thought is said to change as a result of reasoning from effects to causes or from causes to effects. Now, this discursive thinking is proper to reason and is beneath the clarity of angelic intellects. Second, change in thought can mean succession in the things that are thought about; and here we should note that there cannot be any succession in the knowledge by which angels know things in the Word, because they know many different things in one medium. But there is succession with respect to those things which they know through innate species or through the illuminations of higher angels. Hence, Augustine says: “God moves spiritual creatures through time;” that is, they are changed in their affections.

15. The beatific vision is that by which God is seen through His essence and things are seen in God. There is no succession in this vision, nor do angels make any progress in it or in beatitude. But they can progress in their vision of things through innate species or through the illumination of superior angels;

and this vision is measured, not by eternity, but by time—not by that time which is the measure of the first mobile thing's motion, about which the Philosopher speaks, but by non-continuous time, such as that by which creation is measured. This is nothing other than the difference between “before” and “after” in the creation of things or in the succession of acts of understanding had by angels.

16. Christ's body is finite and can be comprehended by physical sight. The divine essence, however, cannot be comprehended by spiritual sight, because it is infinite. Hence, no comparison can be made.

17. That argument would conclude if the intellect could know perfectly what is most knowable, namely, God Himself. Since this is not so, the argument does not hold.

18. As is clear from what we have said, this difficulty from causes and effects can be answered in a similar way.

19. The intelligible representations of things are not in God the way in which colors are on a tablet or wall. This is clear from what we have said above. Hence, the argument proves nothing.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

We concede these arguments, since their conclusions are true even though they are not reached as they should be.

ARTICLE 5

*Is the vision of things in the word had through likenesses
of them existing in the angelic intellects?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is, for

1. All cognition takes place through an assimilation of the knower to the known. Therefore, if an angelic intellect knows things in the Word, it should know them by means of likenesses existing within itself.

2. A spiritual thing is related to spiritual sight as a physical thing is related to physical sight. But a physical thing is known by physical sight only by means of an impression of the thing existing within it. The same is true, therefore, of spiritual sight.

3. The glory had in heaven does not destroy nature; instead, it perfects it. Now, the natural cognition of angels takes place through species. There-

* Parallel readings; *S.T.*, I, 12, 9; *III Sent.*, 14, 1, sols. 4-5.

fore, their knowledge in glory, which consists in their vision in the Word, takes place through likenesses of things.

4. All knowledge takes place through some form. But the Word cannot be the form of the intellect, except perhaps the exemplary form, since He cannot be the intrinsic form of anything. Consequently, an angelic intellect must know the things that it knows in the Word through other forms.

5. It is clear from the second Epistle to the Corinthians (12:4) that Paul in rapture saw the essence of God and there saw “secret words which it is not granted to man to utter.” Now, he did not forget those words when he no longer saw the Word through His essence. Hence, he must have known them by means of some likenesses, which remained in his intellect. For the same reason, therefore, it seems that angels know through likenesses the things they know in the Word.

6. But it was said that when the Word departed from Paul, some traces of his vision remained in Paul’s soul, that is, some impressions or likenesses by which he could remember the things that he saw in the Word—just as impressions are left on the senses even after the objects that have been sensed are no longer present.—On the contrary, a thing leaves a greater impression on another when it is present than when it is absent. Therefore, if the Word when absent left an impression on Paul’s intellect, He also left an impression when He was present.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Whatever is in God is God Himself. Consequently, when an angel sees God’s essence he does not see it by means of a likeness, nor does he see through a likeness the ideas of things as they exist in God.

2. The natures of things are reflected in the Word like images in a mirror. Now, all the things reflected in a mirror are seen by means of their one likeness there. Hence, all the things known in the Word are seen through the form of the Word.

3. An angelic intellect is like a painted tablet, for, as said in *The Causes*, “every intellect is filled with forms.” Now, other pictures are not added to a tablet that is already painted; hence, it is proved in *The Soul* that the possible intellect can receive all things because it is “like a tablet on which nothing has been written.” Consequently, an angel cannot have any likenesses of those things which he knows in the Word.

REPLY

All cognition takes place through an assimilation of the knower to the

known. Now, whenever one thing is made like a second thing in so far as the second thing is like a third, then the first thing is also like the third. For example, if a son is like his father in so far as the father is like the grandfather, then the son is like the grandfather. Now, one thing can be made like another in two ways: it can get this likeness immediately from the other, or it can get it by being assimilated to a third thing which is like the second. Cognition is had in two ways, also: we can know Socrates by seeing him either because our sense of sight is made like Socrates himself or because it is made like a picture of Socrates. In either case, the assimilation is sufficient for us to know Socrates.

I say, therefore, that, when a thing is known by means of the likeness of a second thing, that knowledge does not take place by means of some other likeness derived immediately from the thing known; and if the knower knows one and the same thing by means of its own likeness and also by means of its likeness to another thing, then these cognitions are different. This can be explained as follows.

Some knowing powers know only by receiving, not by forming something from what they have received. For example, the senses know merely those things whose species they receive and nothing more. Other powers, however, not only know what they receive, but can also form some other species from it. This is clearly the case of the imagination, which, having received the forms of gold and of mountain, forms a phantasm of a golden mountain. The same is true of the intellect, which, having comprehended the forms of genus and difference, forms the definition of a species. Consequently, when these powers know a thing through its likeness existing in another thing, it sometimes happens that a species other than that likeness is formed a species which belongs immediately to the thing. For example, when I have seen a statue of Hercules, I can form another likeness which will belong immediately to Hercules; but this second act of knowing will be other than that by which I knew Hercules by his statue. If it were the same, then the same thing would happen in all other powers—which is manifestly absurd, because, when my external sense of sight sees Hercules in a statue, that knowledge, does not take place through any other likeness than that of the statue.

Consequently, I say that the divine essence is itself a likeness of all things. Therefore, an angelic intellect can know things both through their likenesses and through the divine essence. But the act of knowledge by which it knows things through their likenesses is other than the act by which it knows things through the Word, even though those likenesses are caused by a conjunction of the angelic intellect to the Word either through operations of the angelic intellect (similar to those of the imagination) or, as seems more probable,

through an outpouring from the Word.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Since the divine essence is a likeness of the things known through the Word, the angelic intellect's union with the divine essence makes it sufficiently assimilated to these things to know them.

2. The Word can imprint something on an angelic intellect, but, as was said, the knowledge that would result from this impression would be other than that which is had through the Word.

3. Even though the glory had in heaven does not destroy nature, it elevates it to a level which it could not reach by itself, namely, that level where it can see things through God's very essence without any likeness acting as a medium in this vision.

4. The Word is not the intrinsic form of a thing in the sense that it is part of a thing's essence. It is, however, a form within the intellect, since it is intelligible of its very nature.

5. When Paul no longer saw God's essence, he remembered the things he had known in the Word by means of likenesses of things that still remained with him.

6. Those likenesses which remained even when the Word had departed were imprinted when Paul saw the Word through His essence. But, as is clear from what has been said above, when Paul saw through the Word, the vision itself did not take place through these impressions.

ARTICLE 6

*Does an angel know himself?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. As Dionysius says, angels do not know their own power. Now, if they knew themselves by means of their essence, they would know their power. Consequently, angels do not know their own essence.

2. If an angel knows himself, he knows himself, not through a likeness, but through his own essence; for, as is said in *The Soul*, "in those beings which exist without matter, the knower and the known are one and the same." But an angel cannot know himself by means of his own essence, since a thing is un-

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 56, 1; *C.G.*, II, 98; *III De anima*, lect. 9, n. 721 seq.; *De causis*, lect. 13 (P. 21:741 a).

derstood by means of a form within the intellect. Now, the essence of an angel cannot be the form of his own intellect, because the intellect itself inheres in his essence as its property or form. Consequently, an angel cannot know himself at all.

3. The same thing cannot be both active and passive, mover and moved, unless one of its parts is a mover or active and its other part is moved or passive. This is clear in the case of animals, as is shown in the *Physics*. But the knower and the known are related as active and passive. Consequently, it is impossible for an angel to know all of himself.

4. If an angel understands himself through his own essence, his essence must be the act of his intellect. But, unless it is pure act, no subsisting essence can be the act of anything else, for a material thing cannot be the form of another thing. Now, pure act of being belongs only to the divine essence. Consequently, an angel cannot know himself through his own essence.

5. A thing is understood only if it is stripped of matter and of the conditions of matter. But to be in potency is, in a way, a material condition which cannot be stripped from an angel. Consequently, an angel cannot understand himself.

6. If an angel understands himself through his own essence, his essence must be in his intellect. This, however, is impossible; for, as a matter of fact, his intellect is in his essence, and if one thing is in another, this other cannot be in it. Consequently, an angel does not know himself by means of his own essence.

7. The intellect of an angel is mixed with potentiality. Now, nothing is reduced from potency to act by itself. Consequently, since an intellect is reduced to the act of knowing by the known, it will be impossible for an angel to understand himself.

8. Every potency has the perfection of its activity determined by the essence in which it is rooted. Consequently, an angelic intellect can understand because of the power of its essence. Now, the same thing cannot be a principle of acting and of being acted upon; and, since that which is understood is, in a way, acted upon, it seems that an angel cannot know his own essence.

9. Demonstration is an intellectual act. But a thing cannot be demonstrated by means of itself. Therefore, an angel cannot understand himself by means of his essence.

10. There is the same reason for holding that the will reflects upon itself as that the intellect does. But the will of an angel reflects upon itself only by means of its natural love, which is a kind of natural habit. Consequently, an angel can know himself only by means of some habit, and, therefore, he can-

not know himself by means of his essence.

II. Operation lies as a medium between what is active and what is passive. But the knower and the known are related as active and passive. Now, since there is nothing intermediate between a thing and itself, it seems impossible that an angel could know himself.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. As Boethius says, what a lower power can do a higher power can. But our soul can know itself. Therefore, it is even more true that an angel can know himself.

2. As Avicenna says, the reason why our intellect, but not our senses, knows itself is that the senses use a physical organ but the intellect does not. Now, an angelic intellect is even further removed from a physical organ than our intellect is. Therefore, an angel also knows himself.

3. Since the intellect of an angel is godlike, it greatly resembles God's intellect. But God knows Himself through His essence. Therefore, an angel knows himself also through his essence.

4. The more proportionate an intelligible is to an intellect, the more the intellect can know it. Now, there is no intelligible more proportionate to an angelic intellect than its own essence. Therefore, it knows its essence in a very high degree.

5. In *The Causes* it is said: "Whoever knows intellectually knows his own essence, and returns to it in a complete reflection." Therefore, angels can do this, for they know intellectually.

REPLY

There are two types of action. One proceeds from the agent and goes out to an exterior thing, which it changes. An example of this type is illumination, which can properly be called an action. The second type of action does not go out to an exterior thing but remains in the agent as its perfection. Properly speaking, this is called operation. Shining is an example of this type.

Now, these two actions are at one in this, that both issue only from a thing which is actually existing and only in so far as it is in act. Consequently, a body does not shine unless it actually has light; and the same is true of illuminating action.

The action of appetite, sense, and intellect is not, however, like the action that goes out to exterior matter; it is like the action that remains in the agent as its perfection. Consequently, in so far as he knows, a knower must be in act. It is not necessary, however, for the knower in knowing to become an efficient

cause and for the known to become something passive; but inasmuch as one thing results from the knower and known, namely, an intellect in act, these two are but one principle of this act, which is understanding.

I say that one thing results from them inasmuch as what is understood is joined to the understanding either through its essence or through a likeness. Hence, a knower is not related as active or as passive except for another consideration; that is, activity or passivity is required to some extent in order that the intelligible be united to the intellect. Efficient causality is required, because the active intellect makes species actually intelligible; change is required because the possible intellect receives intelligible species, and the senses, sensible species. But understanding follows upon this change or efficient causality as an effect follows upon a cause. Consequently, just as a bright body shines when light actually exists in it, so also does the intellect understand everything that is actually intelligible in it.

We must note, however, that there is no reason why a thing cannot be one thing actually and another potentially. For example, a transparent body is actually a body, but it is colored only potentially. Similarly, it is possible for a thing to be in act in the order of existence but only in potency in the order of intelligibility. Now, in beings there are grades of act and potency. One being, prime matter, is in potency only. Another, God, exists only actually. All other intermediate beings exist both actually and potentially. Similarly, in the genus of intelligibles, one being, the divine essence, is in act only; another, the possible intellect, is only in potency, and for this reason the Commentator says that the possible intellect in the order of intelligibles is like prime matter in the order of sensibles. All the angelic substances lie in between; for they have something of potency and of act, not only in the genus of being, but also in the genus of intelligibility.

Now, prime matter cannot perform any action unless it is perfected by some form (and even then that action is a kind of emanation from the form rather than from the matter); because things that actually exist can perform actions only in so far as they are in act. Similarly, our possible intellect can understand nothing before it is brought into act by an intelligible form. Only then can it understand that thing to which this form belongs. Moreover, it can understand itself only by means of an intelligible form that actually exists in itself. But, since the essence of an angel, which is in act in the genus of intelligibility, is present to it, an angelic intellect can understand this intelligible reality within itself, namely, its own essence—and not through any likeness of it but through the essence itself.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Angels know their power by comprehending it as it is in itself. They do not comprehend it, however, in so far as it has been modeled upon the eternal archetype, for this would involve comprehension of the archetype itself.

2. Even though in the order of existence an angel's essence cannot stand in the relation of act to potency with respect to his intellect, in the order of understanding it is related to it as act is to potency.

3. The knower and the known are not related as active and passive but as one principle of activity, as is clear from what has been said above, even though they may seem to be so related from our manner of speaking.

4. Although an angel's essence is not pure act, it nevertheless is without matter. It is in potency merely in this respect, that it does not have its act of existence from itself. Consequently, there is no reason why it cannot be related to an angelic intellect as act in the order of understanding.

5. A thing that is understood need not be stripped entirely of matter; for it is evident that natural forms are never understood without matter, since matter is included in their definition. They must, however, be stripped of individual matter, that is, matter that lies under determinate dimensions. There is no reason, therefore, why angels need be separated from the kind of potency which they possess.

6. There is no reason why one thing cannot be in a second and the second in the first if this is in different ways, such as the ways in which a whole is in its parts and the parts are in the whole. The same is true here: the essence of the angel is in his intellect as an intelligible is in a knower, and his intellect is in his essence as a power is in a substance.

7. The intellect of an angel is not in potency with respect to his essence. In this respect, it is always in act. But with respect to other intelligible objects his intellect can be in potency. It does not follow, however, that when his intellect is in potency it is always reduced to act by some other agent. This is true only when it is in essential potency, as a person is before he learns something. When it is in accidental potency, the potency a person is in who has habitual knowledge but is not using it—then it can go into act by itself, except, that it might be said that his intellect is reduced to act by his will, which moves it to actual consideration.

8. As is evident from what we have said above, that which is understood is not like something passive but like a principle of action. Consequently, the argument does not hold.

9. A thing can be the cause of knowing in two ways. First, it can be what is known. Thus, what is more known is the cause of cognizing what is less

known; and in this way the medium of demonstration is a cause of understanding. Second, it can be the one who knows. Then the cause of knowledge is that which makes the intelligible to be present actually in the knower. Taken in this way, there is no reason why a thing cannot be known by means of itself.

10. Natural love is not a habit but an act.

11. The act of understanding is not a medium that stands as a reality between the knower and the known; it proceeds from the union of both.

ARTICLE 7

*Does one angel know another?**

DIFFICULTIES (FIRST SERIES)

It seems not, for

1. As Dionysius says, even the angels themselves do not know their mutual relationships. Now, if one angel knew another, angels would know these. Consequently, one angel does not know another.

2. As is said in *The Causes*: “An intelligence knows what is above it in so far as that is its cause, and it knows what is below it in so far as that is its effect.” But our faith does not teach that one angel is the cause of another. Consequently, one angel does not know another.

3. As Boethius says: “The universal is had in intellection, the singular in sensation.” Now, since an angel is a person, he is, in a way, a singular. Consequently, it seems that one angel does not know another angel, because he knows merely through intellection.

DIFFICULTIES (SECOND SERIES)

1. It seems that an angel does not know another angel by means of the latter’s essence, because that by which the intellect understands must be within the intellect. But the essence of one angel cannot come into the intellect of another; only God can be substantially present in the mind of an angel. Consequently, an angel cannot know another angel by means of the latter’s essence.

2. It is possible for one angel to be known by all angels. Now, that by which a thing is known is joined to the one who knows. So if one angel were to know another angel by means of the latter’s essence, then the angel known could be in many places, because the angels who could know him might be in

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 56, 2; 107, 1; *C.G.*, II, 98; *II Sent.*, II, 2, 3; In *I Cor.*, c. 13, lect. 1 (P. 13:259b).

many places.

3. The essence of an angel is a substance; his intellect, being a power, is an accident. Now, a substance is not the form of an accident. Consequently, the essence of one angel cannot be for the intellect of another angel the form by which he knows.

4. A thing cannot be known to the intellect by its presence if it is separated from it. But the essence of one angel is separated from the intellect of another. Consequently, one angel is not known by another through the presence of his essence.

DIFFICULTIES (THIRD SERIES)

1. It seems that one angel cannot know another by knowing through his own essence, because the lower angels lie below the higher, as sentient creatures also do. Consequently, if a higher angel could know other angels by knowing his own essence, he could also know all sentient things in the same way, and not, as is said in *The Causes*, by means of forms.

2. One thing leads to the knowledge of another only in so far as it resembles that other. But the essence of one angel is only in generic agreement with that of another angel. Consequently, if one angel were to know another merely by knowing his own essence, then he would know that other only generically, and this would be imperfect knowledge.

3. That through which a thing is known is an intelligible representation of it. Now, if one angel knew all others by means of his own essence, then his own essence would be an intelligible representation of what is proper to all angels. But this property seems to belong to the divine essence alone.

DIFFICULTIES (FOURTH SERIES)

1. It seems that one angel does not know another by means of a likeness or species existing within himself, because, as Dionysius says, angels are lofty intelligible lights. Now, a light is not known by means of a species, but only by means of itself. Therefore, an angel cannot be known by means of a species.

2. Every creature is a shadow. This is evident from Origen's commentary on that verse in the Gospel of St. John (1:5): "And the darkness [shadows] did not comprehend it." Now, a likeness of a shadow must itself be a shadow; a shadow, however, is not a principle that manifests but one that conceals. Hence, since an angel is a creature and is therefore a shadow, he cannot be known by means of a likeness. If he is known, he must be known by means of a God-given light existing within him.

3. An angel is closer to God than the rational soul is. Now, according to

Augustine, the soul knows all things and judges about all things, not by means of any arts which the soul may have brought with it to the body, but by means of the connection it has with the eternal intelligible representations. Much more so, then, will one angel know another, not indeed by means of a likeness, but by means of an eternal intelligible representation.

DIFFICULTIES (FIFTH SERIES)

1. It seems that one angel cannot know another even through an innate likeness. For an innate likeness is similarly related to what is present and to what is absent. Consequently, were one angel to know another by means of an innate likeness, he would not know when that angel was present and when he was absent.

2. God could make another angel. But an angel would not have within him the form of an angel that does not yet exist. Consequently, if, by his natural cognition, an angel knows other angels only by means of innate forms, the angels that exist now would not know by natural cognition an angel that would come into existence later.

DIFFICULTIES (SIXTH SERIES)

1. It seems that one angel cannot know another through forms impressed by immaterial beings, as the sense knows through forms received from sensible things, because, if this were true, then the lower angels would not be known by the higher, since higher angels do not receive any influence from the lower.

DIFFICULTIES (SEVENTH SERIES)

1. It seems that one angel cannot know another even through abstracted forms, such as the agent intellect abstracts from phantasms, because then the lower angels would not know the higher.

From all this it seems that one angel does not know another.

TO THE CONTRARY (FIRST SERIES)

1. In *The Causes* we read: "Every intelligence knows the things that do not undergo corruption and are not measured by time." Now, angels are incorruptible and outside of time. Consequently, one angel is known by another.

2. Likeness is a cause of knowledge. But one angel has more in common with the intellect of another than material things have. Consequently, since angels know material things, it is even truer to say they know other angels.

3. The essence of one angel is more proportionate to the intellect of

another than the divine essence is. But, since angels see God through His essence, it is even truer to say that they can know the essences of other angels.

4. As is said in *The Intelligences*: “Any substance that is immaterial and free from composition can know all things”; and this is proved in *The Soul*, where it is shown that the intellect is free from composition “and so can know all things.” Now, to be free from matter and composition belongs especially to angels. Consequently, they know all things, and one knows another.

TO THE CONTRARY (SECOND SERIES)

1. It seems that one angel can know another by means of the latter’s essence. For Augustine says that angels show what they have seen “by one spirit mingling with another.” But such a mingling is possible only if one spirit can be joined to another by means of his essence. Consequently, one angel can be joined to another by means of his essence, and thus, through his essence, be known by that other.

2. Knowledge is an act. Now, contact is sufficient for action. Since there can be spiritual contact between one angel and another, one angel can know another by means of the latter’s essence.

3. The intellect of one angel has more in common with the essence of another angel than with the likeness of a material thing. But the intellect of an angel can be *informed* by the likeness of a material thing so that it knows it. Consequently, the essence of one angel can be the form whereby the intellect of another can know him.

4. According to Augustine, intellectual vision is had of those things whose likenesses are the same as their essences. Now, one angel knows another only by means of intellectual vision. Consequently, he does not know that angel by means of a likeness other than that angel’s essence. Hence, the same must be said as was said previously.

REPLY

There can be no doubt that one angel knows another, because every angel is an actually intelligible substance, since he is entirely free from matter. Now, an angelic intellect does not receive from sensible things. Consequently, it understands these immaterial intelligible forms by directing itself immediately to them. If we consider what various writers have said, however, there seem to have been different opinions about the mode of angelic knowledge.

According to the Commentator, in substances separated from matter the form in the intellect does not differ from the form outside of it. Now, in the case of men the form of a house existing in the mind of an architect is oth-

er than the form of the house existing outside his mind; however, this is because the exterior form is in matter, while the form of the artistic conception is without matter. But, since angels are substances and immaterial forms, as Dionysius says, it seems to follow that the form by which one angel is known by another is the same as the essence by which the former substantially exists. This mode of knowledge, however, does not seem to be possible in all cases. For the form by which an intellect understands is more noble than that intellect, since it is its perfection. With this in mind, the Philosopher proves that God does not know anything outside Himself, since its form would perfect His intellect and consequently be more noble than God Himself. Therefore, if higher angels were to know lower angels by means of the essences of the latter, it would follow that these essences were more perfect and more noble than the intellects of the higher angels. This, however, is impossible.

One might say, perhaps, that such a way would present no Difficulties as far as the knowledge of higher angels by the lower is concerned, that is, a lower angel could know a higher by means of the latter's essence; and this seems to be in agreement with Dionysius, who taught that angels seem to be divided into "intelligible and intellectual substances," the higher called intelligible, the lower, intellectual. For he also taught that the higher angels are "like food" to the lower, and this statement can be understood as meaning that the essences of the higher angels are forms by which the lower angels understand.

This opinion, too, might be supported by those philosophers who say that the higher intelligences create the lower; for thus they could assert that a higher angel is in some way intimately linked with the lower, being, as it were, the cause that keeps the lower in existence. We, however, can ascribe such action only to God, who is substantially present in the minds of men and of angels. Moreover, the form by which an intellect understands should be within an intellect that is in act. Consequently, we cannot say that any spiritual substance, except God, is seen by another by means of his essence.

That other philosophers did not think one angel could be seen by another by means of his essence is clear to anyone reading their works. For example, the Commentator says that that which the mover of Saturn understands about the mover of the first sphere is different from that which the mover of Jupiter understands about him. Now, this could be true only if that by which each of them understands [is different]. And this would not be possible if each of them knew the mover of the higher sphere by means of the latter's essence. Moreover, we read in *The Causes* that "a lower intelligence knows what is above it according to the manner of its own substance," not according to the manner of the higher substance; and Avicenna says that "the presence of the

intelligences within us” means merely the effects they have caused within us, not that they are in the intellect through their own essence.

Now, the words of the Commentator, cited above, are to be taken in the following way. When a substance separated from matter know itself, it is not necessary that the form in its intellect be other than the form by which it substantially subsists, since the form by which such a thing substantially subsists is actually intelligible because of its complete freedom from matter.

The words of Dionysius are likewise not to be taken in the sense assigned to them above. Rather, he calls the same angels intelligible and intellectual, or he calls the higher angels intelligible and the food of the lower because the lower angels understand by means of the light given by the higher.

From what others have written, however, it seems that one angel sees another by means of his essence, that is, by means of his own essence. This is what Augustine seems to have intended when he wrote: “As the mind collects notions of physical things through the physical senses, so also does it collect notions of spiritual things through itself.” This seems to be true of an angelic mind, for, by knowing itself, it knows other angels. In support of this, one could cite *The Causes* where it is said, “An intelligence understands what is above and below itself by means of the mode of its own substance.”

This explanation does not seem to be sufficient, however; for, since all knowledge takes place through assimilation, by knowing his own essence one angel would know only as much about another angel as his essence resembled the latter's. Now, one angel resembles another only according to their common nature. Hence, it would follow that the knowledge one angel would have about another would not be complete; and it would be very incomplete according to the opinion of those who hold that there are many angels in one species. This view, however, might be supported to some extent by those who hold that each angel is specifically different; for, by knowing his own essence, each angel would know perfectly what an intellectual nature is, and, having known this perfectly, he would know all the grades an intellectual nature could have. Now, the different species of angels are distinguished only according to grades of perfection found in intellectual natures; consequently, by seeing his own essence, one angel could conceive of the individual grades of perfection found in intellectual natures, and, by means of these conceptions, have complete knowledge of all other angels.

In this way, we could save the opinion of those who say that one angel knows another by means of a form he has acquired—if, indeed, the aforementioned conceptions could be called acquired forms. It would be as though whiteness understood itself, and, by knowing perfectly the nature of color,

knew all species of color distinctly, according to their grades—even all individual colors, too, supposing that there were only one member to a species.

But this explanation does not seem sufficient either, because, even though there is only one angel in every species, nevertheless, in any particular angel there will be a difference between what belongs to him according to the intelligible constitution of his specific nature and what belongs to him as an individual, for example, his own particular operations. According to this theory, these special operations could in no way be known by another angel. Moreover, the words of Augustine do not mean that a mind can know other things through itself as through a medium, but merely as through a knowing power, as material things are known through the senses.

We must consequently take another explanation and say that one angel knows other angels by means of their likenesses existing within his intellect. These, however, are not abstracted or imprinted by the other angels, or acquired in any way, but are imprinted by God who creates them. Angels know material things also by means of these likenesses. This will become clearer in the following answers.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES (FIRST SERIES)

1. Angels know their order one to another considered in itself, but they do not comprehend it as it stands under God's providence; for this would mean that they could comprehend providence itself.

2. The relation of cause and effect is a source of intelligibility only inasmuch as the effect bears some resemblance to its cause and vice versa. Consequently, if we admit the existence of an angel's likeness within another angel without admitting that one angel is the cause or effect of another, we will still have a sufficient basis for knowledge, since knowledge takes place through assimilation.

3. That statement of Boethius should be understood as referring to particular material things that fall under the senses. An angel, however, is not a particular of this type. Consequently, the argument proves nothing.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES (SECOND AND THIRD SERIES)

We concede those arguments that prove one angel does not know another by means of either his own essence or that of the other angel. Still, one could make some kind of a reply to them.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES (FOURTH SERIES)

We must reply, however, to those arguments that prove one angel does

not know another by means of a likeness.

1. It is possible to have a likeness even of light. This can be weaker than light, like color, which in a certain sense is a similitude of light, or one more perfect than light, like the light in a substance that illumines. Moreover, since angels are called lights inasmuch as they are forms which are actually intelligible, it is not inconsistent to say that the likenesses they have of other angels exist in a more sublime manner in the higher angels and in a less sublime manner in the lower.

2. When one says that every creature, taken in itself, is a shadow or false or nothing, this is not because its essence is dark or false, but because whatever act of existence, light, or truth it has it has from another being. Consequently, only considered apart from what it has from another is it nothing, darkness, and falsity.

3. The soul is united with the eternal representations inasmuch as there are certain imprints of these on our mind, such as the principles we know naturally and by which we judge all things. In angels these imprints are the likenesses by which they know things.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES (FIFTH SERIES)

1. An angel knows another angel, not by means of a likeness that has been abstracted or imprinted upon his mind, but by means of one that is innate and leads him to the knowledge of the other angel—indeed, to a knowledge not only of the other's essence but also of all his accidental qualities. By means of this likeness, therefore, he knows when the other angel is present or absent.

[No answers are given for the next three Difficulties.]

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES (FIRST SERIES)

We concede the arguments proving that one angel knows another.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES (SECOND SERIES)

We must reply, however, to the arguments proving that one angel is known by another by means of the essence of the angel known.

1. That knowledge Augustine speaks about should be understood as referring not to essences but to operations by which a higher spirit enlightens a lower.

2. From what we have said previously, it is clear that the knower and the known are related not as active and passive but as two things from which arises one principle of knowing. Consequently, for knowledge it is not enough that

contact take place between the knower and the known. It is necessary, rather, that the intelligible be united to the knower like a form, either by means of its own essence or by means of a likeness.

3. Even though the essence of one angel has more in common with the intellect of another angel than with the likeness of a material thing, because they both participate in one nature, nevertheless, they do not have more in common in regard to that relationship which must exist between a perfection and what is to be perfected. Similarly, a soul has more in common with another soul than it has with a body; yet one soul is not the form of another soul, though it is the form of a body.

4. This statement of Augustine can be explained in two ways. It can mean that Augustine is talking about that intellectual vision by which a created spirit sees himself or God or other things which are within him through their essences. For it is evident that, even though a stone is known by the soul, it is not present in the soul by its essence.

Or this statement can be taken as referring to the thing known, not to the form by which it is known. Now, exterior accidents, which are the object of sense and of imagination, are merely likenesses of a thing, not the thing itself. The object of the intellect, however, is “the quiddity of a thing,” that is, its essence, as is said in *The Soul*. Consequently, the likeness of the thing in the intellect is a direct likeness of the thing’s essence, but the likeness which is in a sense or in the imagination is merely that of its accidents.

ARTICLE 8

*Does an angel know material things through forms or by knowing his own essence?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that he knows them by knowing his own essence, for

1. A thing can be known sufficiently by knowing what it is modeled upon. Now, in the opinion of Clement, a philosopher mentioned in *The Divine Names*, lower beings are modeled upon higher. Consequently, the essences of material things are modeled upon angels. Angels, therefore, know material things by means of their own essences.

2. Material things are known better in the divine essence than they are in their own natures, because there they shine forth more brightly. Now, the

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 10, 4; *S.T.*, I, 55, 1; 84, 2; 87, 1; I-II, 50, 6; 51, 1, ad 2; *1st Sent.*, 3, 39 1; *C.G.*, II, 98.

essence of an angel is closer to the divine essence than material things are. Consequently, material things can be known better in the essences of angels than in their own nature; and since we human beings know material things in their own nature, still truer is it that angels know them all simply by looking at their own essences.

3. The light of the angelic intellect is more perfect than the light of the active intellect of our soul. Now, we know all material things in the light of this intellect because it is the act of all intelligibles. Consequently, it is even truer to say that, by knowing their own light, angels know all material things.

4. Since an angel knows material things, he must know them either by their species or by knowing his own essence. However, he does not know them through species—not through particular species, because an angel is completely free from matter; and not through universal species, because then he would not have perfect knowledge of things in their individuality. Consequently, he knows material things by means of his own essence.

5. If physical light could know itself, it would know all colors, because it is the act of all colors. Therefore, since an angel is a spiritual light, by knowing himself he can know all material things.

6. An angel's intellect lies halfway between the divine and the human intellect. Now, the divine intellect knows all things by means of the divine essence, and a human intellect knows all by means of species. Consequently, the intellect of an angel will know at least some things by knowing his essence.

7. Dionysius says: "Scripture asserts that angels have knowledge of things that are on earth, by seeing them, not through sense, but through the power and nature of their godlike minds." Hence, it seems that they know material things by knowing their own power and nature.

8. If a physical mirror could know and if the species of material things were not reflected in it, it would know them by means of its own essence. But species of material things are not reflected in the intellect of angels, as is evident from the writings of Dionysius. And since an angel, as Dionysius also says, is a kind of mirror, if he knows material things, he must know them by means of his own essence.

9. The knowing power of angels is more perfect than the natural power of material things. Now, many of the powers of material things can attain their objects by their own means, without anything being added to them. It is much more true, therefore, to say that the intellect of an angel knows material things by means of his essence and without any species.

10. An angel's ability to know is much greater than fire's ability to bum. But fire can bum combustible material without that material entering into the

fire. So, likewise, an angel knows through itself without the presence of a cognoscible species within it.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. It is stated in *The Causes* that “every intelligence is filled with forms.” Moreover, it is said in the same work that “forms exist in an intelligence in an intelligible manner.” Consequently, an intelligence knows things by means of these forms and not by means of its essence.

2. The essence of an angel has more in common with another angel than with a material thing. But an angel cannot know other angels by knowing his own essence. Therefore, he cannot know material things by knowing his own essence.

3. That which is the principle of unity cannot be the principle of distinction. Now, the essence of an angel is the principle of his unity, for it is by means of his essence that an angel is one. Therefore, his essence cannot be the principle of knowledge about things distinct from him.

4. Nothing except God is that which it has. But an angel has intellectual power. Therefore, he is not intellectual power. Much less is he that by which he understands. Consequently, he does not understand things by means of his essence.

REPLY

All knowing takes place by means of assimilation, and likeness existing between two things is caused by their agreement in a form. Now, since unity in an effect shows unity in a cause, and, since, in consequence, no matter what genus any form may belong to, one must get back to the one first principle of that form, two things can resemble each other for two reasons only: either one is the cause of the other or both have been caused by one cause that has imprinted the same form upon both. Using this principle, we say that angels know material things in a manner different from that in which philosophers say that angels know them.

For we do not say that angels cause material things. God is the creator of all things, visible and invisible. Consequently, a likeness of the things of nature cannot be within an angel unless it comes from Him who is the cause of material things. Now, whatever one does not have from himself but from another is over and above his own essence. For this reason, Avicenna proves that the act of being of anything except the First Being is something other than its essence, because all things have their act of existence from another. Consequently, the likenesses of material things existing within an angel must be other than his

essence and must be imprinted there by God. Now, the intelligible representations of material things existing in the divine mind are life and light: they are life inasmuch as they come forth to constitute things in their act of existence, as the form of an artistic conception comes forth to constitute a product of art; they are light inasmuch as they cause impressions, resembling themselves, on the minds of angels.

Philosophers, however, have asserted that angels are the creators of material things. But logically, according to this position, angels should know material things, not by means of their own essences, but by means of forms added to them. For the likeness of an effect is in its cause only in the manner in which the power to produce that effect is there. Now, as is said in *The Causes*, "An intelligence gives existence to inferior things only by means of God's power existing within it"; and for that reason the author calls this operation divine. Consequently, this power does not belong to the intelligence as flowing from the principles of its essence, but is something over and above its essence. Therefore, even if material things were caused by an angel, their likenesses would be over and above his essence.

It is clear, therefore, no matter what position is taken, that an angel does not know material things by means of his own essence but only by means of their forms existing within him.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. According to its formal nature, an archetype implies a relation of causality to the things modeled upon it; for an archetype is a thing that something else is made to imitate. Consequently, in the passage cited, Dionysius finds fault with Clement's opinion, and holds that the archetypes of things should be called intelligible representations of things, existing in God. However, if an archetype is taken in a broader sense as meaning a thing that is represented in some way by another thing, then angels' essences can also be called the archetypes of material things. But the divine essence is the archetype of each and every thing in its individuality, because it contains the exemplary ideas of all things. Similarly, an angelic essence is a likeness of a material thing in its individuality because of the form which the angel possesses of it; though this form is not the same as his essence, as is true of the idea in God.

2. The divine essence is infinite. Hence, far from being included in any genus, it contains, as Dionysius, Aristotle, and Averroes say, the perfections of all genera. Consequently, it can be a likeness of all things in their individuality, and through it all things can be known perfectly. The essence of an angel, however, is confined within a particular genus. Consequently, it cannot be,

in itself, a likeness of all material things. Hence, to know a thing with all its individual characteristics, an angel must be given a likeness of it, which is over and above his essence.

3. All things are not known by means of the agent intellect as though by a likeness sufficient for us to know all things. For the agent intellect is not the act of all intelligible forms in the sense that it is this or that form, but only in so far as these forms are intelligible. For all things are said to be known by means of the agent intellect as through an active principle of knowing.

4. An angel knows things neither through particular species nor through universal species that are universal forms abstracted from the senses. Instead, he knows them through universal species which represent both universals and particulars. This will become clearer from our discussion later on.

5. Were physical light to know itself, it would not for that reason know all colors determinately. It would know them only in so far as they are visible. Otherwise, even the eye would see all colors by seeing light; and this is clearly false.

6. Since the angelic intellect lies halfway between the divine and the human intellect, it knows things other than itself by means of forms added to its essence; and, in this respect, it falls short of the divine intellect. However, it knows itself by means of its own essence, and, in this respect, it surpasses the human intellect.

7. This statement of Dionysius should not be understood as meaning that an angel's power and nature are the medium by which he knows other things, but that his manner of knowing follows the characteristics of his nature and power and not the characteristics of the natures of the things he knows. This is clear from the fact that he knows material things in an immaterial manner, and sense-objects without the aid of any senses.

8. Even if a physical mirror knew itself, it would by no means know other things simply by knowing its own essence. It would know things only by knowing forms reflected in itself. Moreover, it would make no difference whether these forms were received from things or were innate in the mirror.

9. The knowing power of an angel is ordered to a more sublime act than is the natural power of a material thing. Consequently, even though it may need more help, it remains a more perfect and more noble power.

10. A knower is not related to the known as what burns is related to the combustible. In this second case, one is active and the other passive; but a knower and the known are related as one principle of knowing inasmuch as the act of knowing in some way comes into being from the known and the knower. This is clear from what was said previously. Hence, the argument proves nothing.

ARTICLE 9

*Are the forms by which angels know material things innate or received from things?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they are not innate, for

1. Speculative knowledge differs from practical inasmuch as practical knowledge is directed to things, while speculative is derived from things. Now, as Damascene says, angels do not make material things; consequently, they do not have practical but only speculative knowledge. Their knowledge, therefore, is taken from things, and not from innate species.

2. In the Epistle to the Ephesians (3:10) we read: "That the manifold wisdom of God may be known to the principalities and power in heavenly places through the church." Jerome understood this to mean that the angels learned the mystery of the Incarnation from the Apostles. Now, knowledge had through innate species is not received from others. Consequently, angels' knowledge is not had through innate species.

3. Angels' innate species are equally related to the present and future. Their knowledge, however, is not equally related to the present and future, because they know the present but are ignorant of the future. Consequently, their knowledge is not had through innate species.

4. Angels have distinct knowledge of material things. Now, distinct knowledge of things can be had only through that which is a principle of distinction, because the principle of being and that of knowing are the same. But the principle of distinction in material things is their form. Consequently, the knowledge angels have of material things must be through forms received from things.

5. Things that are innate or naturally inborn remain always the same. Angels' knowledge, however, does not remain always the same, for they know things now which they did not know previously; and, for this reason, Dionysius says that some angels have to be freed of their ignorance. Hence, their knowledge is not had by means of innate forms.

6. The forms that exist within angels are universal. But, as is said in *The Soul*: "A universal is either nothing or posterior [to something]." Consequently, those forms are either nothing or posterior to things, since they are received from them.

7. A thing is known only in so far as it is in the knower. Consequently,

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 55, 2; *11 Sent.*, 3, 3, 4; *C.G.*, II, 96.

if an angel knows material things, these very things must be in his intellect by means of forms which they have imprinted there.

8. The intelligible light in angels is more powerful than that in a human soul. But we can abstract species from phantasms by means of the light of the active intellect. Therefore, an angel can to an even greater degree abstract forms from sense-objects.

9. A superior power can do what an inferior can. Now, our soul, which is inferior to angels, can conform itself to things by producing forms within itself that are neither innate nor received from things. For example, our imagination can form a phantasm of a golden mountain, which it has never seen. For a much better reason, therefore, an angel can conform himself to things present to him and know them in this manner. Thus, there will be no need for him to know material things by means of innate species; he can know them by means of species which he will make within himself.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. According to Dionysius, angels do not gather their knowledge by means of sense, or from things subject to division. Therefore, they do not know by means of forms received from things.

2. The superiority of angels over all physical things is greater than that of higher bodies over lower. But, because of their nobility, higher bodies do not receive any influence from the lower. Consequently, much less will angelic intellects receive forms from physical things in order to understand them.

REPLY

Taking as already proved that angels know material things not by means of their own essence but by means of forms, we can now consider three opinions about these forms.

Some say that the forms by which angels know material things are received from them. This, however, is impossible; for an intellect that receives forms from things is related to them in two ways, as something active and as something passive—taking *active* and *passive* in their broad meaning. Now, forms of material things are only potentially, not actually, intelligible when they are in the senses or in the imagination, because they are not entirely stripped of matter. Consequently, an intellectual action is required in order that they become actually intelligible. For this reason, we must necessarily affirm the existence of an active intellect within ourselves.

Moreover, even when these forms have been made intelligible, we cannot understand things through them unless they are truly united to our intellect

in such a way that the knower and the known become one. Consequently, our intellect must receive the forms of these things; and so, in a way, it is passive in their regard in so far as all reception is a kind of passivity.

Now, just as a form is related to matter as act is to potency, so also is something active similarly related to something passive, because a thing acts in so far as it is in act, and is passive in so far as it is in potency. Moreover, since a definite act has a definite relation to a definite potency, a definite passivity corresponds to a definite agent and vice versa—just as matter and form are mutually related. Consequently, what is active and what is passive must belong to the same class, for potency and act divide every class of being that there is. For example, “the white” is not passive with respect to “the sweet” (except indirectly) but only with respect to “the black.”

Now, material things and intelligibles belong to entirely different genera; for, as the Philosopher says, those things that do not have matter do not belong to the same genus as those that do. Consequently, it is not possible for a material thing to be passive immediately in relation to the intellect or to act upon the intellect. The Creator of our nature has therefore provided us with powers of sensation, in which forms exist in a mode between intelligibility and materiality. They have this in common with intelligible forms, that they are forms without matter, and this in common with material forms, that they are not yet stripped of material conditions. Hence, there can be activity and passivity between material things and the sense faculties in their own proper way, and, similarly, between the sense faculties and the intellect.

Therefore, if the intellect of an angel were to receive forms from material things, it would have to have sense powers and, consequently, a body naturally united to it. This opinion seems to make angels animals (an actual opinion of certain Platonists) and to have them receive forms from material things. Moreover, it contradicts the authority of the saints and right reason itself.

Consequently, others say that angels do not know by means of forms received from things or by means of innate forms, but angels are able to conform their essence to anything present to them. These persons hold that knowledge of a thing follows from a conformity of this kind. Their opinion, however, seems to be of little value, because one thing can be conformed to another only if the form of the latter becomes present within it. Now, it cannot be said that the essence of an angel by its own activity becomes the form of a material thing, because its essence retains a single formal character. Hence, the form by which an angel conforms himself to a thing is something added to his essence and was previously in him potentially, because an angel could not have conformed himself to a thing unless he was previously in potency to such

a conformity. Indeed, nothing is reduced from potency to act except by that which is in act. Consequently, in an angel, we should assume that forms must pre-exist by which he can reduce himself from being potentially conformable to being actually conformed, as our imagination forms a new species, say, of a mountain of gold, from species it had previously, namely, of mountain and of gold, and as our intellect forms the definition of a species from the forms it has of genus and of differentia. Hence, we must return to the position holding that forms pre-exist in angels; and these are either innate or received from things.

As a result, it seems that we must say what the third opinion says an opinion more widespread and closer to the truth—namely, that angels know material things by means of innate forms. Therefore, just as from the eternal archetypes existing in the mind of God come the material forms by which things subsist, so also do the forms of all things come from God to the minds of angels in order that they may know things. Hence, an angelic intellect excels our intellect as a thing possessing a form excels matter that is formless. Our intellect may be compared to a tablet on which nothing has been written, but that of an angel, to a painted tablet or to a mirror in which the intelligible characters of things shine forth.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. That difference between speculative and practical knowledge is not essential but accidental; that is, it arises only in so far as these knowledges are human. Man knows things which he has not made only by means of forms received from things. The case is otherwise with angels, however, because they have the forms of things given them from the moment of their creation.

2. The mystery of the Incarnation was known by angels before it was known by men. Indeed, as Dionysius says, men learned of it from angels, who knew this mystery of the Incarnation, hidden from the world for ages; and, as Augustine explains, God revealed this mystery to the princes and powerful ones of this world through the church of the angels, which is in heavenly places. What is said there about the Church should therefore be taken as referring to the church of angels, as Augustine explains—even though Jerome seems to say the contrary.

However, Jerome's words are not to be understood in the sense that angels acquire knowledge from men. He meant that while the Apostles were announcing the things that had taken place and had been previously predicted by the prophets, the angels understood them more fully, just as they know the present more fully than the future—a point that will be clarified later.

3. Even though the angels do not know any future events, they know

events when they take place. From this it does not follow, however, that they receive species from the things which they know. For knowing takes place through an assimilation of the knower to the known. Hence, a person will receive new knowledge of a thing in so far as he is assimilated to it in a new manner. This happens in two ways: either through his own motion or through the motion of another with respect to a form which he already possesses.

Similarly, he begins to know something new in one way by newly receiving a form for the first time from an object which he now knows. This happens with us. Or the object known arrives for the first time at a form already in the knower; and this is how angels have new knowledge of present things that previously were future. For example, if a man did not yet exist, an angelic intellect would not yet be assimilated to him by means of the form of man which it has within itself; but, when he comes into existence, the angelic intellect begins to assimilate itself to him by means of this form, without any change being made within itself with respect to that object.

4. Just as it is not the form by which a thing exists but only a likeness of it that is in the intellect, so also distinct knowledge of things does not demand that the very principles of distinction themselves be in the knower but that their likenesses be there. Moreover, as far as distinct knowledge is concerned, it makes no difference where these likenesses come from.

5. Without acquiring new intelligible forms, an angelic intellect can have new understanding in two ways. First, as was mentioned before, it can have new understanding by something being newly assimilated to those forms [which it already has]. Second, it can be strengthened by some stronger light, enabling it to draw more knowledge from the same forms. Similarly, when the light of prophecy operates from forms already existing in the imagination, knowledge is received which could not be received by means of the natural light of the active intellect.

6. The Philosopher's statement should be taken as referring to the universal as it exists in the understanding, by which we understand things in nature. This universal is received from things. But even the universal existing in our understanding is prior, not posterior, to artificial things, because we produce artificial things by means of universal forms of art already existing within us. In a similar way, God produces creatures by means of eternal archetypes; and, from these, forms flow down into the angels' intellects. Hence, it follows that the forms in angels' intellects are posterior, not to things, but only to the eternal archetypes.

7. The known is in the knower in the same way, whether its form, existing in the knower, has been received from the thing known or not. Conse-

quently, the argument does not touch the problem.

8. No proportion exists between the light of an angelic intellect and sensible things that is such as to allow the latter to be rendered intelligible by means of this light. This is clear from what has been said. Hence, the conclusion does not follow.

9. The soul does not produce forms within itself unless some forms already exist there. Consequently, as is clear from what has been said, the argument does not hold.

ARTICLE 10

*Do higher angels know by forms more universal
than those by which lower angels know?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. The higher angels' knowledge is more perfect than the lower angels. Now, what is known by universal knowledge is less perfectly known than what is known by particular knowledge. Consequently, the higher angels do not know by means of forms that are more universal.

2. If the knowledge of the higher angels is more universal than that of the lower angels, this universality pertains either to their causal operations or to the object of their knowledge. It does not, however, pertain to their operations, for, as Damascene says, the higher angels do not make things; nor does it pertain to the object of their knowledge, for both higher and lower angels know the things of nature. Consequently, the higher angels' knowledge is not more universal.

3. If the higher angels know all that the lower do but through more universal forms, these forms in the higher angels' intellects must extend to more things. However, one and the same thing cannot represent the individual characteristics of many things. Therefore, the higher angels would not know things in their individual natures, and so their knowledge would be less perfect than that had by lower angels. This, however, is absurd.

4. As Dionysius says, the knowledge of angels is determined by the power and nature of the knower. Now, the nature of a higher angel is more in act than a lower angel's nature is. Consequently, his knowledge is also more in act. But universal knowledge is in potency, and particular knowledge is in act.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 55, 3; 89, 1; *1st Sent.*, 3, 3, 2; *C.G.*, II, 98; *Q.D. De anima*, 7, ad 5; 18; *De causis*, lect. 10 (P. 21:737a).

Therefore, higher angels know through forms that are less universal.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. According to Dionysius,³ higher angels, such as the Cherubim, have higher and more universal knowledge. Lower angels have only particular and inferior knowledge.

2. In *The Causes* it is said that “the higher intelligences contain forms that are more universal.”

3. Higher angels possess greater simplicity than the lower do. Consequently, their forms are also more simple and, therefore, more universal, for what is more universal possesses greater simplicity.

Reply

That which is in potency to many is made determinate to one by act. Consequently, form and act are found to be principles of union, but potency is found to be the principle of multiplicity and division. Now, since the ability of a thing to operate comes from its being in act, the more united a power is, the more it is able to act. Consequently, the higher a power is, the fewer the things it needs for its operation, even though it extends to many things. We see that this is generally true of productive and knowing powers. For, even though a master art, such as architecture, by one form directs all the operations coming within its scope, in these operations the subordinate workmen are directed by diverse arts. The same is true of the cognoscitive powers. A person with a higher intelligence is ready, from a few principles he has within himself, to proceed to various conclusions which those with a less acute intelligence cannot reach without considerable illustrated explanation and without knowing the proximate principles of these conclusions.

Now, since in God there is pure act and a most perfect power, He can do all things, and know all things most perfectly by means of one thing, His own essence. Moreover, as was previously explained, the representations of intelligible things flow from God into the angels, not in order that the angels may cause things, but in order that they may know them. Consequently, the more act and less potency there is in an angel, the fewer are the emanations he receives, and the stronger is his power to know. According to this principle, therefore, the higher angels know through forms more universal than those by which the lower know.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. To know something “by universal knowledge” can be understood in two ways. First, it can refer to what is known. If taken this way, then to know

something by universal knowledge means to know the universal nature of an object. In this sense, the argument is true, because, if only the universal nature of a thing is known, the thing is known less perfectly than it would be were it known in its individuality. Secondly, the phrase can refer to the medium of cognition. Then to know a thing by universal knowledge, that is, by a medium which is universal, is more perfect, as long as this knowledge extends to the individuality of the thing.

2. These forms are said to be more universal with respect to knowledge, not because they cause the knowledge of more things, but because a higher intellect, perfected by a few of them, can nevertheless know the same number of things—even more perfectly. For example, a higher angel might know all species of animals by means of one form of animal, but a lower angel would not know them except through many forms. Besides this, a higher angel can draw out many more intelligible characters from the same things.

3. What is one cannot be the intelligible representation of many in their individuality if it is merely equal to them. However, if it excels them, then it can represent their individual characteristics, because, within its own one form, it contains the individual characteristics of each of the elements which these objects have separately. In a similar manner, God's essence is the intelligible representation of all things in their individuality, for, as Dionysius says, in this one form there preexists all that is found separately in creatures.

Similarly, since the forms in the intellects of angels, being closer to God, excel things, it is not inconsistent to say that one form within an angelic intellect is an intelligible representation of many things in their individuality, according as this form has different relationships to different things, just as the divine essence is the proper representation of many things in their individuality according to its different relationships to things; and from these relationships an angel can have many ideas. The forms in our intellects, however, are received from things. Hence, they do not excel things, and are, as it were, equal to them as far as representation goes, even though they may excel them in mode of being because their act of existence is immaterial. Consequently, one form in our intellect cannot be the intelligible representation of many things in their individuality.

4. The answer is the same as for the first difficulty.

ARTICLE II

*Do angels know singulars?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. According to Boethius: "The universal is known in intellection, the singular, in sensation." But angels do not know except through intellection. Therefore, they do not know singulars.

2. But it was said that this statement referred to our intellect, not to that of an angel.—On the contrary, because it is immaterial, our intellect cannot understand singular things. Consequently, it is our material powers of knowing, such as sense and imagination, that know singulars. But an angel's intellect is more immaterial than man's. Hence, it does not know singulars.

3. All knowledge takes place through an assimilation of the knower to the known. Now, an angel's intellect cannot be assimilated to a singular in its singularity because a singular gets its singularity from matter, and an angel's intellect is entirely removed from matter and from the conditions of matter. Consequently, the intellect of an angel does not know singulars in their singularity.

4. According to the Philosopher, the principle of being and the principle of knowing are one and the same. But the principle of being for a singular is an individuated form. Hence, this is the principle of knowing the singular. An angelic intellect, however, receives [forms] without matter and the conditions of matter which individuate forms. Therefore, it receives only universals, and not singulars.

5. Whatever is received into another is there after the manner of the recipient. Now, an angelic intellect has a simple and immaterial mode of being. Consequently, the likenesses of particular things existing in an angel's intellect are there immaterially and simply, and therefore universally. Hence, by their means, he does not know singulars.

6. Different kinds of things cannot be distinctly known in their differences by the same medium. They must be known by separate media, because things known by a common medium are known only in so far as they are one. Now, any form abstracted from matter is common to many particular things. Through such a form, therefore, distinct particulars cannot be known distinctly in their individuality. In an angelic intellect, however, there is no form

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 10, 5; 19, 2; *S.T.*, I, 57, 2; 89, 4; *1st Sent.*, 3, 3, 3; *IV Sent.*, 50, 1, 3; *C.G.*, II, 100; *Quodl.*, VII, 1, 3; *Q.D. De anima*, 20; *De subst. sep.*, c. 14 (Perr. 1:nn.81-84).

that is not immaterial. Hence, an angel can in no way know singulars.

7. A universal is opposed to a singular for the reason that it is in the intellect while the singular is outside it. Now, a universal is never outside the intellect. Hence, a singular is never inside it, and, consequently, cannot be known by it.

8. No power ever goes beyond its object. Now, as is said in *The Soul*, the object of the intellect is a quiddity stripped of matter. Therefore, since a singular essence is realized in sensible matter, it cannot be known by the intellect.

9. What is known with certainty cannot change, because intellectual knowledge is the same whether the object be absent or present. But, as is said in the *Metaphysics*, certitude cannot be had about things that can change, because such things can become absent. Now, singulars can change, for they are subject to motion and variation. Consequently, they cannot be known by the intellect; and the same must be said as previously.

10. The form within the intellect is more simple than the intellect itself, just as a perfection is more simple than what is perfected. Now, an angelic intellect is immaterial. Therefore, its forms are immaterial. But its forms are not individual unless they are material. Consequently, those forms are universal, and not principles for knowing singulars.

11. As is said in the *Metaphysics*, because it is the principle by which the measured is known, a measure must be homogeneous with the measured. Therefore, a species, which is a principle of knowledge, must be homogeneous with the thing that it makes known. But, being immaterial, the form within an angelic intellect is not homogeneous with a singular. Through such a form, therefore, an angel cannot know a singular.

12. The power had in glory surpasses power had by nature. Therefore, the power of knowing possessed by a glorified human intellect surpasses the natural power had by an angel. But the intellect of a beatified man does not know individual things on earth, for, as Augustine says, the dead—even the saints—do not know what the living, even their sons, are doing. Consequently, angels cannot know singulars by means of their natural knowledge.

13. Were an angel to know singulars, he would know them through either singular or universal species. But he cannot know them through singular species, because then he would have to have within himself as many species as there are singulars. Singulars, however, are potentially infinite. This is evident if one grants that the world will continue in the future as it has in the past—a possibility clearly within God's power. But then there would be an infinite number of forms in an angel's intellect; and this is impossible. Likewise, an angel cannot know singulars by means of universals, because in that case he

would not have distinct knowledge of individuals, and this would mean that he knew them imperfectly. But imperfect knowledge is not to be attributed to angels. Consequently, angels do not know singulars.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. No one can guard what he does not know. But angels guard individual men. This is clear from the Psalms (90:11): "For he hath given his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways." Therefore, they know singulars.

2. As is clear from Augustine, one can love only what he knows. Now, since angels have charity, they love individual men—even their sensible bodies, for these, too, are to be loved out of charity. Therefore, angels also know men.

3. According to the Philosopher, one who knows the universal knows the particular; but the opposite is not true. Now, angels know the universal causes of things. Hence, they also know singulars.

4. As Boethius says, whatever a lower power can do a higher power can. But man's sensitive and imaginative powers know singulars. Therefore, it is even truer to say that the intellectual power of an angel knows them.

REPLY

Some have erred in this matter by saying that angels do not know singulars. Such a position is contrary to faith," denying as it does the custody of angels over men, as well as opposed to right reason, because, if angels did not know things which we know, their knowledge would, at least in this respect, be less perfect. This would occasion a remark similar to that made by Aristotle, to the effect that God would be most stupid if He were ignorant of disharmony that others knew about.

Once we have excluded this error, we find there are four ways proposed by different philosophers to explain how angels know singulars. Some say that angels know singulars by abstracting species of singulars from things, just as we know singulars by means of our senses. But this position is utterly irrational. First of all, as is clear from Dionysius and Augustine, as well as from what has been said above, angels do not receive their knowledge from things. Second, even granting that they do receive it from things, the forms received would be in an angelic intellect immaterially according to the manner of the intellect receiving them. Consequently, the same difficulty would remain: How could they, by these forms, know singular things, which are individuated by matter?

Avicenna proposed another theory and said that God and angels know singulars universally, not individually—meaning that a thing is known *indi-*

vidually when it is known as it is here and now, and under all its individuating conditions, and *universally*, when it is known merely according to its universal principles and universal causes. For example, one knows this eclipse *individually* when he perceives it with his senses, *universally* when he foretells it from the motions of the heavens. According to this theory, angels would know singulars universally in a similar fashion; and, because they knew all the universal causes, they would be ignorant of nothing in individual effects. This manner of knowing, however, does not seem to be sufficient; for we assert that angels know singulars even with respect to those things which belong to their singularity, just as they also know men's individual actions and other things of this sort that pertain to the care of a guardian.

Hence, a third theory has been proposed by others, namely, those who say that angels have within themselves universal forms of the entire order of the universe. These forms were given angels at the moment of creation, and they apply them to this or to that singular. In this way, they know singulars by means of universal forms. But this theory also seems to be inconsistent, because one thing cannot be applied to another unless that other has been already known previously in some way. For example, we can apply our universal knowledge to singulars which pre-exist in our sensitive knowledge. In angels, however, there is no knowledge other than intellectual in which the knowledge of singulars could pre-exist and so make it possible for the universal forms of their intellect to be applied to singulars. From this it is clear that the application of the universal to the particular demands intellectual knowledge of singulars in angels as a prerequisite; it cannot cause such knowledge.

Hence, it is more probable to say with the fourth theory that the forms within the intellects of angels can cause knowledge, not only of universals, but also of particulars, without there being any need of such application. This, however, is not true of our intellectual forms, which are related to things in two ways: first, as the cause of things, like the forms of the practical intellect; second, as caused by things, like the forms of the speculative intellect, by which we speculate about natural things. By means of the forms of the practical intellect, however, an artisan makes only a form. Hence, the forms of the practical intellect are likenesses merely of forms; and because every form as a form is universal, an artisan can have only universal knowledge of his product by means of the form of his artistic conception. Knowledge of it as a singular he acquires by means of his senses, just as anyone else does. But were he to make both the matter and the form by means of the forms of his artistic conception, then the latter would be an archetype of both form and matter, and, by its means, he could know the products of his art, not only universally, but

also individually, because matter is the principle of individuation.

Forms in the speculative intellect, however, arise in us to some extent as the result of the action of things. Now, all action comes from the form. Hence, as far as the power of the agent is concerned, the form that comes to us from things is a likeness only of the form. True, it is also a likeness of material conditions, but this is because it is received in a material organ, which receives in a material way; consequently, it retains some conditions of matter. This is why sense and imagination know singulars. But, since the intellect receives in a manner that is entirely immaterial, the forms within the speculative intellect are likenesses of things only with respect to their forms.

However, the intelligible archetypes existing in God have a causal relation not only to things' forms but also to their matter. Hence, they are likenesses of things in both respects. For this reason, God knows a thing through them not only in its universal nature by knowing the form, but also in its singularity by knowing its matter. Moreover, just as natural things come from the divine intellect according to both their form and matter, which constitute them in being, so do the forms within the angelic intellects come from God in order that angels might know both. Consequently, angels know things both in their singularity and universality by means of innate forms since these are similar to the creative forms, namely, the archetypes existing in the divine mind; yet these innate ideas do not create things.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The statement of Boethius refers to our intellect, which receives forms from things, not to the angelic intellect, which receives forms immediately from God. The reason for this has already been given.

2. Because the forms received in an angelic intellect are more immaterial than those in our intellect, they are by that very fact more powerful. Consequently, they represent a thing not only according to its formal, but also according to its material, principles.

3. Between the knower and the known there is needed a community, not of nature, but of representation. It is evident that that form of a stone existing within the soul has a far different nature from the form of a stone existing in matter, but, inasmuch as it represents the stone, it is a principle which can lead to knowledge of it. Hence, even though the forms within an angelic intellect are immaterial by their own nature, nothing prevents that intellect from being assimilated by means of them to things in regard to their matter as well as in regard to their forms.

4. A form is a principle of a thing's being. But it need not be substan-

tially present in an intellect in order to be a principle for knowing the thing; its similitude in the intellect would suffice. For in the soul there is not the form by which a stone exists but only a likeness of that form. Hence, what is necessary is not that the form by which an angelic intellect knows a singular be individuated, but that it be a likeness of the form that is individuated.

5. Forms in an angelic intellect are immaterial; yet they are likenesses of material things, just as are the ideas existing in God, which are much more immaterial. Thus, by their means, singulars can be known.

6. One species can be an intelligible representation of different things in their individuality if it excels them. This is clear from what has been said. Through a medium that is merely equal, however, distinct things cannot be known distinctly.

7. Although it is true that the universal has its act of existence in the intellect, the universal is not the only thing that exists in the intellect. Hence, in this reasoning, the fallacy of the consequent occurs.

8. By means of that species stripped of matter, which the angelic intellect has within itself, it can also understand the material conditions of a thing. This is clear from what has been said.

9. By means of the species which it has within itself, an angelic intellect knows a singular, not only according to its substance, but also according to all its accidents. Therefore, it can know a singular no matter how many its accidental variations may be. Consequently, the fact that a singular may vary does not take certitude away from angelic cognition.

10. Our answer to this can be taken from our replies above.

11. In so far as a measure is a principle for knowing the thing measured, it must belong to the same genus as the latter does, but not in all respects. It is evident, for example, that an elbow length is a measure for cloth, but all it has in common with the cloth is quantity; however, this is enough for it to be a measure for cloth. Similarly, the form in an angelic intellect need not have the same mode of existence that a singular existing outside the soul has, since the singular has a material existence, and the afore-mentioned form is immaterial.

12. Saints in glory know in the Word the things that are happening here. This is very clear from what Gregory has written. Moreover, this statement of Augustine should be taken as referring to the natural state. Nor is there any parallel between an angel and a soul, because an angel naturally has forms given to him at creation, and, by means of these, he knows singulars.

13. Forms in an angelic intellect are neither singular, like the forms in imagination or sense, because they are entirely separated from matter, nor universal, as our intellectual forms are, which can represent only a universal

nature. Although they exist immaterially in themselves, they nevertheless indicate and express a universal nature and particular conditions.

ARTICLE 12

*Do angels know the future?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they do, for

1. Angels know things by means of innate forms. Now, these forms are related equally to the present and future. Consequently, since angels know present things by their means, they also will know the future.

2. Boethius says that God is able to foreknow future contingent events infallibly, because His vision, being measured by eternity, is entirely simultaneous. But the beatific vision is likewise entirely simultaneous, since it is measured by participated eternity. Consequently, beatified angels know future contingent events.

3. According to Gregory, when the soul severs its connection with the body, it knows the future by means of its own subtle nature. Now, an angel is completely free of any connection with a body, and its nature is most subtle. Therefore, they can know the future.

4. The possible intellect in our soul is in potency to the knowledge of all things, and hence to the knowledge of the future. Now, as was said above, the potentialities of an angelic intellect are completely actuated by means of innate forms. Angels, therefore, have knowledge about future events.

5. Those who have providence over a person should also have foreknowledge of the things affecting that person. But, as our guardians, the angels have been entrusted with our providence and care. Consequently, they must know things in the future that affect us.

6. The angelic intellect excels the human. Now, a human intellect can know future events which have determined causes in nature. Therefore, an angelic intellect can know even those future contingent events which, not having any determined causes, can happen in either of two ways.

7. We are differently related to knowing the future than we are to knowing the present, because we receive our knowledge from things, and, consequently, things must exist before we can know them. Angels, however, do not receive their knowledge from things. Therefore, they are equally related to

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 57, 3; 86, 4; II-II, 95, 1; *I Sent.*, 38, 1, 5; *II Sent.*, 7, 21 2; *In Isaiam*, c. 3 (P. 14:445a); *C.G.*, III, 154; *Quodl.*, VII, 1, 3, ad 1; *De spir. creat.*, a. 5, ad 7; *Q.D. De anima*, 20, ad 4; *De malo*, 16, 7; *Comp. Theol.*, I, c. 134.

knowing the future and the present. Consequently, our original thesis stands.

8. Intellectual knowledge does not include time, because it abstracts from the “here and now,” and so is equally related to all time. Now the only knowledge an angel has is intellectual. Consequently, an angel is equally related to knowing the present, past, and future. Hence, we conclude as before.

9. An angel knows more than a man does. But in the state of innocence man knew future events. This is clear from Genesis (2:24) “Adam said...‘Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother.’” Therefore, angels also know the future.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. In Isaiah (41:23) we read: “Shew the things that are to come hereafter: and we shall know that ye are gods.” Thus, knowledge of the future is a sign of divinity. However, angels are not gods. Therefore, they do not know the future.

2. Knowledge with certitude can be had only of those things which have determinate truth. But, as is clear from *Interpretation*, future contingent events do not belong to this class of things. Consequently, they are not known by angels.

3. Future events can be known only through a species of an artistic conception like that by which an artist knows the things he is going to make, or in their causes, as a future cold spell is known in the signs and positions of the stars. But angels do not know the future by means of artistic conceptions, because they do not make anything, nor do they know future things in their causes, since future contingent events are not determined in their causes. If they were, they would be necessary. There are no means, therefore, by which angels know future contingent events.

4. Hugh of St. Victor says that angels were shown what they should do, not what would happen to them in the future. It is even less true, therefore, to say that they know other future events.

REPLY

Anything that is known in another thing is known according to the manner in which it exists in that other. Now, some future events are determined in their proximate causes in such a way as to happen necessarily from them, for example, tomorrow’s rising of the sun. Future effects of this sort can be known in their causes. Other future effects, however, do not exist so determinately in their causes that something else might not happen; their causes are merely disposed more to one effect than to another; and these effects are contingent

events, which happen more or less often as the case may be. As a consequence, effects of this type cannot be known in their causes with infallibility, but only with conjectural certitude. Moreover, other future effects come from causes that are indifferently related to opposite effects; and these effects, especially those that depend upon free choice, are called “contingent to opposites.”

Now, as the Commentator proves, an effect cannot come from a cause indifferent to opposites and in a certain respect in potency, unless this cause is determined to one effect more than to another by means of another cause. Consequently, an effect of this sort cannot be known in any way through causes indifferent to opposites if these causes be taken merely by themselves. Yet, if we consider these causes, which are indifferent to opposites, together with those things that incline them more to one effect than to another, we can get some conjectural certitude about their effects. For example, we can conjecture about future effects depending upon free choice by considering men’s habits and temperaments, which incline them to one course of action.

But all these future effects, no matter what their proximate causes may be, exist determinately in the first cause, which by its presence sees them all, and by its providence gives a determinate character to each. Now, the angels see the divine essence and, by means of innate forms, know all things and all natural causes. By their natural knowledge, therefore, they can foreknow by their innate forms only those future events which have determinate existence in a natural cause, whether this cause be merely one thing or a collection of many things—for an effect may be contingent with respect to one cause but necessary with respect to a concurrence of many. And since angels know all natural causes, some effects that seem contingent to us, who consider only a few causes, are known as necessary by the angels, who consider all their causes. Indeed, if angels could comprehend God’s providence, they would know all future events with certainty. None of them, however, comprehends His providence perfectly; but because some of them see it more perfectly than others do, they know more future events in the Word, even those coming from causes indifferent to opposites, than others know.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Species within an angelic intellect are not related equally to the present and future, because things that are present are actually similar to the forms existing within the angels and, consequently, can be known by their means. Things that are future, however, are not yet similar to these forms and thus, as explained earlier, cannot be known through them.

2. Angels are related indifferently to the knowledge of the present and

future as far as the vision by which they see things in the Word is concerned. Yet it does not follow that they know all future events in the Word, because they do not comprehend the Word.

3. As Augustine tells us, some asserted that “the soul has powers of divination in itself.” He refuted this opinion on the grounds that, if the soul could foretell the future by its own means, it would always know future events; but we know that, even if the soul does have foreknowledge at some times, it is unable to know the future whenever it wishes. Consequently, it must need some help in order to know the future. It can be helped by a higher spirit, created or uncreated, good or evil. Moreover, while it is burdened with the weight of a body and fixes its attention on sense-objects, it is less capable of receiving such thoughts. Hence, when it withdraws from the senses, either in sleep or in sickness or by any other way, it thereby becomes more susceptible to the influence of the higher spirit. So, being severed in this manner from its physical connections, the soul foreknows the future with the help of a revelation by a higher spirit, who can reveal these future things, because, as has been said, he knows them either by his natural knowledge or in the Word.

4. There are two kinds of potency. One is natural and can be reduced to act by a natural agent. This potency in angels is completely actuated by innate forms. It is not according to this kind of potency, however, that our possible intellect is in potency to knowing all future things. But there is another potency, obediential potency, according to which the Creator can cause whatever He wants to cause in a creature. The possible intellect is in this kind of potency to the knowledge of all future things, that is, all things can be divinely revealed to it. However, the obediential potency of the angelic intellect is not totally actuated by means of innate forms.

5. It is not necessary for one who has providence over some persons to foreknow future events. It is enough for him to foresee what might happen so he can take proper steps against it.

6. An angelic intellect surpasses a human intellect inasmuch as it knows more contingent effects that exist determined in their causes and these with greater certitude. It does not necessarily surpass it in the respect touched upon in the objection.

7. The reply here should be the same as that given to the first difficulty.

8. By means of his intellectual knowledge, an angel knows things which are here and now, even though he himself is free from space and time. This is clear from what has been said. Hence, it should not occasion surprise if he should know the present in a manner different from that by which he knows the future. For he knows them differently, not because he has a different rela-

tion to them, but because, as explained previously, they are differently related to him.

9. In his state of innocence, man did not know future contingent events except in their causes or in the Word, just as angels know them. This is clear from what has been said.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

To the extent that these Difficulties are contrary to the truth, an answer will be found in what has been said in this article.

ARTICLE 13

*Can angels know the heart's secrets?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they can, for

1. To cleanse is the duty of angels. But the impurity from which we are cleansed is in our conscience. Therefore, angels know our consciences.

2. As the body receives its shape from its figure, so does the intellect receive its shape from the species of that which it actually thinks about. Now, when the eye sees a body, it simultaneously sees the body's shape. Therefore, when an angel sees another angel's intellect, he sees its thought.

3. Since the species in an intellect are actually intelligible, they are more intelligible than the forms existing in material things, which are merely potentially intelligible. Now, angels understand the forms of material things by means of forms which they have within themselves. Consequently, it is even truer that they understand the forms within our intellect; hence, they know our thoughts.

4. Man never knows without a phantasm. But angels know the phantasms in our imagination. Consequently, Augustine says: "The spiritual likenesses of material things existing within our soul are known to spirits, even to unclean spirits." Therefore, angels know our thoughts.

5. By means of the forms he has within himself an angel can know whatever he can do by these forms. Now, an angel can make an impression on our intellect by enlightening and cleansing us. Therefore, it is even truer that he can know our thoughts.

6. Augustine says: "Demons sometimes learn men's dispositions with

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 57, a. 4; *Resp. de art.* 42 (Declar. XLII quaest.), a. 38 (P. 16:163); *Resp. de art.* 36 (Declar. XXXVI quaest.), a. 36 (P. 16:175); *De malo*, 16, 8; *In I Cor.*, c. 2, lect. 2 (P. 13:171a).

the greatest ease, not only when they are expressed by speech, but even when conceived in thought and expressed by the soul through certain signs in the body." Now, there is no thought that does not leave a trace on the body. Consequently, the demons know all our thoughts, and much more so do the angels.

7. Commenting on that verse in the Epistle to the Romans (2:15), "...their thoughts between themselves accusing or also defending one another," Origen says that this passage should be understood as referring to thoughts which, during their existence, left marks on those who had them. Consequently, every thought leaves some mark on the soul. Now, this mark cannot be unknown to an angel, because he sees the whole soul. Hence, angels know our thoughts.

8. Angels know effects in their causes. Now, as Augustine says, knowledge proceeds from the mind, and actual understanding proceeds from habitual knowledge. Consequently, since angels know our mind, they know what we know and what we are actually thinking.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. We read the following in Jeremiah (17:9-10): "The heart is perverse... and unsearchable. Who can know it? I...the Lord. Therefore, it belongs to God alone to know the heart's secrets.

2. The following is found in the Psalms (7:10): "The searcher of hearts and reins is God." It seems, therefore, that God alone can search our hearts.

REPLY

Of themselves angels cannot see the thoughts of the heart directly; for, in order that the mind actually think something, the will must make an intention moving the mind to act with respect to its mental species. This is clear from what Augustine has said. Now, an angel cannot naturally know the motion in the will of another person, because he naturally knows by means of forms that have been given him, and these are likenesses of things existing in nature. The motion of the will, however, has no dependence on or connection with any natural cause. It is the divine cause alone that can influence the will. Consequently, the will's motion and the heart's thoughts can be known, not by any likenesses of natural things, but only in the divine essence, which leaves its imprint on the will. Thus, angels cannot know the thoughts of the heart directly, but only if they are revealed to them in the Word.

Sometimes, however, an angel can indirectly come to know the heart's thoughts, and this can happen in two ways. First, it happens inasmuch as a

motion in the body results from an actual thought, as when one is affected by joy or sadness from what he thinks, and his heart is moved in some way or other. By this means, even doctors can sometimes know what a heart is experiencing. Second, an angel can know thoughts in so far as a person gains or loses merit from what he is actually thinking; for thus the doer's or thinker's condition is somehow changed for good or for evil, and angels can know this change in his condition. But this gives only a general knowledge of what was thought, because, as a result of many different thoughts, a person can merit or demerit, be joyful or sorrowful, in the same way.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. That cleansing of which Dionysius speaks should be understood as being from ignorance, not from the impurity of sin.

2. From one species which the intellect has within itself, many distinct thoughts arise—just as we can think many different things about man from the one species we have of man. Consequently, even if an angel sees our intellect shaped to the species of man, it does not follow that he knows determinately what the heart is thinking about.

3. We do not actually think of all the things whose species we have within us, because sometimes species are in us only in the state of habit. Consequently, from the fact that the species in our intellects are seen by angels it does not follow that they know our thoughts.

4. By means of the same phantasms, our reason can direct its thought to different objects. Consequently, even should one know the phantasms by which the soul thinks, it would not follow that he knew the thoughts themselves. Thus, Augustine says: "If demons could see clearly a man's internal thought, arising from his virtues, they would not tempt him."

5. As a consequence of an angel's action, we may be made capable of thinking certain things; but in order to think something actually, we must make an act of the will, and this by no means depends upon an angel. Consequently, even though angels can know our intellect's power, that is, the power by which we can speculate about intelligible things, it does not follow that they know our actual thoughts.

6. Bodily motion, found in the passions of the soul, does not follow all knowledge but only practical knowledge. For, as is said in *The Soul*, when we consider something speculatively, we are related to the things we are considering "as though we were looking at them in pictures." Moreover, even when bodily motion does take place, it indicates thought only in a general way, as we have said.

7. Those marks are nothing other than merits or demerits; and from these, thoughts can be known only in a general way.

8. Even though angels know our mind and our habitual knowledge, it does not follow that they know what we are actually thinking, because many actual thoughts can arise from one thing known habitually.

ARTICLE 14

*Can angels know many things at the same time?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that they can, for

1. Augustine says: "In heaven we shall behold all our knowledge at the same time by one glance." But angels see now in the manner in which we will see in heaven. Therefore, angels now actually understand many things at the same time.

2. An angel understands that a man is not a stone. Now, whoever understands this understands man and stone at the same time. Angels, therefore, understand many things at the same time.

3. An angel's intellect is stronger than the common sense. But the common sense apprehends many things at the same time, because its object is number, whose parts are many unities. Consequently, it is even truer to say that an angel can know many things simultaneously.

4. That which belongs to an angel by reason of his natural power belongs to him no matter by what medium he understands. Now, in virtue of his nature it belongs to an angel to understand many things. For this reason, Augustine says: "The spiritual power of an angelic mind can with ease intellectually comprehend at the same time all that it wills. Therefore, no matter whether an angel knows things in the Word or through individual species, he still can know many things at one time.

5. The intellect and the intelligible are mutually related. Now, one intelligible can be grasped simultaneously by distinct intellects. Therefore, one intellect can focus on distinct intelligibles simultaneously.

6. Augustine says: "Our mind always remembers, understands, and wills itself." The same is true of an angelic mind. Now, an angel sometimes understands things other than himself. Therefore, when this happens, he understands many things at the same time.

7. The relation of the intellect to the intelligible is the same as that of

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 12, 10; 58, 2; 85, 4; *II Sent.*, 3,3,4; *C.G.*, II, 101.

knowledge to the knowable. But one who knows can know many things at the same time. Consequently, the intellect can understand many things at the same time.

8. An angel's mind is much more spiritual than air. But because of air's spirituality, many distinct forms, such as black and white, can exist in it simultaneously. For example, a black thing and a white thing can be so situated that lines drawn from the eyes of different people to these things will intersect at one point, through which the species of black and of white will pass simultaneously. Therefore, it is even truer to say that an angelic intellect can be simultaneously actuated by distinct forms. Hence, it can know many things at once.

9. The intellect is reduced to the act of understanding by means of species which it has within itself. Now, many species exist simultaneously in an angelic intellect, for, as is said in *The Causes*: "an intelligence is filled with forms." Consequently, an angel understands many things at the same time.

10. Many things can be understood at the same time in so far as they are one. But all intelligibles are one in so far as they are intelligible. Therefore, all intelligibles can be understood at the same time by an angel.

11. More distance lies between the divine essence and created forms than between one created form and another. Now, angels understand simultaneously through the divine essence and through a created form, because they always see things in the Word, and, unless they knew things at the same time through innate species, they would never understand them by means of these species. Much more possible is it, then, for an angel to understand by means of different created innate forms at the same time and in this way understand many things simultaneously.

12. If an angel did not understand many things at the same time, *before* and *after* would be found in the action by which he understands this and that thing. But every action in which *before* and *after* are found involves time; and, therefore, the characteristic action of an angel would be circumscribed by time. This is contrary, however, to *The Causes*, where we read: "An intelligence is a thing whose substance and operation are above time."

13. The reason for our intellect's not being able to know many things simultaneously seems to be this, that it understands things dependently on time and space. Neither of these, however, belongs to an angelic intellect, because it does not receive from the senses. Consequently, it can understand many things at the same time.

14. Since forms in the intellect are second perfections, they are accidental forms. Now, many accidental forms can exist in the same subject if they are

not contraries, as whiteness and blackness are. Therefore, an angel's intellect can also be informed by many different forms at the same time, as long as they are not contraries. Thus, it can know many things at the same time.

15. Music and grammar are forms belonging to one genus; and they can simultaneously inform the soul of a person who has both habits. It is possible, therefore, for an intellect to be informed simultaneously by different forms. Hence, the conclusion is the same as before.

16. By understanding that it understands, an angelic intellect is aware that it understands something other than itself. Therefore, it simultaneously understands itself and something else. Thus, it can understand many things at the same time.

17. An angelic intellect is of itself indifferently related to all the forms existing within it. Therefore, it understands either through all of them at the same time or through none of them at all. The latter alternative is impossible; hence, it understands through all of them at one time. Thus, it understands many things simultaneously.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. The Philosopher says: "It may happen that we have habitual knowledge of many things, but we have actual understanding of only one."

2. As Augustine says, an intention is required before a thing can be considered actually. But, since intention is a motion, it cannot be directed to different objects, because one motion can have only one end-term. Consequently, an angel cannot know many things at the same time.

3. As a body receives its shape from figure, so does the intellect receive its shape from the species of that which it actually understands, as Algazel says." Now, one body cannot be shaped by different figures simultaneously. Consequently, an intellect, too, cannot be shaped simultaneously by different species. Therefore, it cannot know many things at the same time.

4. Just as [an angel], when understanding things in their own nature, understands them through distinct forms, so also, when understanding them in the Word, he understands them through distinct intelligible representations. Therefore, he cannot understand many things simultaneously either in their own nature or in the Word.

5. A thing's power cannot be greater than its substance. Now, an angel's substance cannot be in many places at the same time. Hence, his intellectual power cannot understand many things at the same time.

6. A thing which extends to many things contains some composition. But an angel's intellect is simple. Therefore, it cannot extend to the simultane-

ous understanding of many things.

REPLY

All that an intellect understands it understands by means of some form. Consequently, keeping in mind the kinds of forms by which an angel understands, we must now consider whether or not he can understand many things at one time.

It should be observed, therefore, that some forms belong to one genus, others belong to different genera, and the forms belonging to different genera are related to different potencies. Now, as the Philosopher says, the unity of a genus is determined by the unity of matter or of potency. Consequently, it is possible for the same subject to be perfected simultaneously by forms belonging to different genera, because then the one potency would not be terminating in different acts but differently. For example, if a body is both white and sweet at the same time, it has whiteness in it in so far as it shares the nature of the transparent medium, and sweetness in so far as it shares the nature of the moist. But forms belonging to one genus are related to one potency, whether they be contraries (as blackness and whiteness) or not contraries (as triangle and square).

Now, these forms are said to be in a subject in three ways. In the first, they exist only potentially and, consequently, simultaneously, because one potency has for its object different forms of one genus and their contraries. In the second, they exist in imperfect act, so that they are coming into being. In this manner, they can also exist simultaneously. This is evident in the case of one who becomes white; for, during the whole period of alteration, whiteness inheres in him as something coming into being, and blackness as something going out of being. In the third, they exist in perfect act, as whiteness does when the whitening process is finished. In this manner, it is impossible for two forms belonging to the same genus to be present simultaneously in the same subject, because the same potency would have to terminate in different acts; and this is just as impossible as it is for one line, beginning from one point, to be terminated at different points.

We should understand, therefore, that all intelligible forms belong to one genus, even if the things, whose forms they are, belong to different genera, because all intelligible forms are related to an intellectual potency. Consequently, in the intellect they can all simultaneously exist in potency, as well as in incomplete act—a mean between potency and perfect act. This latter condition is that had by a species which is present habitually, for habit is a mean between potency and act.

But many species cannot exist simultaneously in perfect act in an intellect, because, in order to understand actually, an intellect must be in perfect act with respect to that species by which it understands. Hence, it is impossible for the intellect to understand actually according to different forms taken together at one time. Therefore, all the different things which it understands by different forms cannot be understood at one time, but all that is understood by the same form will be understood at one time. Consequently, an angelic intellect can understand simultaneously all that it understands through the one essence of the Word, but the things it understands through innate forms (which are numerous) it cannot understand simultaneously if its understanding is through different forms. Any angel, however, through the same form, can understand many things, at least all the singulars of a species by means of one form of that species. Indeed, the higher angels can understand more through one species than the lower angels can. Hence, they are more able to understand many things at one time.

We should remember, however, that a thing can be one in one respect and many in another. For example, a continuum is actually one but potentially many. Now, if the intellect or sense is directed to a thing of this sort in so far as it is one, it is seen at one time, but if the same powers are directed to it in so far as it is many (and this would be to consider each part by itself), then the whole could not be seen simultaneously. Similarly, when our intellect considers a proposition, it considers many things as one. Hence, in so far as the things are one, many things are understood at one time when the one proposition made up of them is understood; but, in so far as they are many, they cannot be understood at one time, because this would mean that the intellect can simultaneously turn itself to understanding the intelligible characters of each one of them taken in itself. Consequently, the Philosopher says: "I mean, however, by understanding things 'together' or 'apart' in an affirmation or negation that they are not understood in succession but as one thing." For they cannot be understood simultaneously in so far as a relation of distinctness exists between them, but they can be understood simultaneously in so far as they are united in one proposition.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Augustine is speaking of knowledge had by the blessed. In this they know all things in the Word.
2. As is clear from what has been said, when an angel, knowing a man, knows that he is not a stone, he knows many things as one.
3. The same answer should be given here as was given to the second

difficulty.

4. The nature of an angelic mind is such that it can know many things through one form. Thus, by turning to that species, it can, when it wishes, understand at one time all that it knows through that species.

5. No part of the intellect itself is in the intelligible, but something of what is understood is in the intellect. Consequently, the argument for many things being understood simultaneously by one intellect is not the same as that for one thing being understood by many intellects.

6. Augustine himself later explains that his statement, "Our mind always remembers, understands, and wills itself," refers to internal memory. Consequently, our soul does not always actually understand itself. An angelic mind, however, always understands itself actually. This is due to the fact that an angelic mind understands itself through its essence, which always informs it. Our act of understanding, however, might be said to depend in a certain sense on the intention of our will. Nevertheless, even though an angel's mind in some way understands itself and some other thing, it does not simultaneously understand many things except as they are one. This will be clear from the following.

If any two things are so related that one of them is the reason why the other can be understood, one of them will be, as it were, formal, the other, as it were, material. Thus, those two constitute one intelligible, because matter and form constitute one thing. Consequently, when the intellect understands one thing through another, it understands only one intelligible. This is evidently the case with sight. For light is that by which color is seen, and so is related to color, in a manner of speaking, as its formal element. Thus, color and light constitute only one visible thing and are seen simultaneously by sight. Now, an angel's essence is his means for knowing all that he knows, even though it is not a perfect means and, for this reason, needs forms to be given it. For he knows all things according to the mode of his substance, as *The Causes* states, and according to his power and nature, as Dionysius says. Consequently, when he understands himself and other things, he cannot understand many things except as they are one.

7. Knowledge is a habit, knowing is an act. Now, many forms can exist in the intellect at the same time habitually, but not in perfect act, as is clear from what has been said. Hence, one can know many things together, but he cannot understand many things at one time.

8. Those forms are not in the air except in the stage of coming-to-be, for they are in it as in a medium of transmission.

9. Many species exist simultaneously in an angel's intellect, but they are

not in perfect act.

10. All things are one in so far as they are intelligible, and so they can be understood at the same time in so far as they are intelligibles. This takes place when their intelligibility is understood.

11. The divine essence is the cause of the intelligibility of all the angel's innate forms, because they are, as it were, modeled upon it. One innate form, however, is not the cause of the intelligibility of another. Hence, there is no parallel.

12. Any operation essentially involves time if it needs some future thing to complete its species. This is evidently the case with motion, which does not have a complete species until it is carried through to a term, because the motion which would end at mid-point would be specifically different from that which would terminate at the extreme. On the other hand, operations which have their complete species immediately are not measured by time except for another reason. Examples of such are understanding, sensing, and the like. For this reason, the Philosopher says that delight is not in time. By exception, however, these operations can be in time, in so far as they are joined to motion by existing in natures subject to time, namely, physical natures which come into and go out of existence. Our sensitive powers use organs, which are of this nature, and our intellect receives from them. But it is clear that an angel's act of understanding involves time neither intrinsically nor extrinsically. Therefore, there is no *before* and *after* in an act by which he understands one intelligible. Nevertheless, this does not prevent a number of operations from being ordered according to *before* and *after*.

13. The reason given in the objection is not the entire reason for a possible intellect's not being able to understand many things at one time. The entire reason has been given above.

14. Accidental forms, if not contrary, can exist simultaneously link the same subject if they are related to different powers, but not if they belong to one genus and are related to the same power. This is clear if we consider triangles and squares.

15. Since music and grammar are habits, they are not complete acts, but, as it were, forms standing halfway between potency and act.

16. The knower and the actually known are in some way one. Hence, when anyone understands that he understands something, he understands many things as one.

17. The angelic intellect is not similarly related to all the forms it has within itself, because sometimes it is in perfect act with regard to one form but not with regard to the others. This takes place by means of the will, which

reduces the intellect from this potency to act. Consequently, Augustine says in the statement quoted earlier that an angel understands when he wills.

ANSWERS TO CONTRARY DIFFICULTIES

1. It may happen that only one thing can be understood as one at one time and through one form, but this does not prevent many things from being understood as one at one time or through one form.

2. Virtual quantity is ascertained by comparing the power with its objects. Consequently, just as a body can, by its different parts, touch different things by means of its dimensional quantity, so can a power be applied to different things according to its different relation to them, as long as it has been perfected in act, just as fire can warm different things on all sides at the same time. Similarly, an intellect perfected by a form can be simultaneously directed to the different things to which that form's representative power extends. There may be many intelligible characters in the thing to which the intellect is directed, but there will be only one species in the intellect because of the intellect's unity with the form.

3. The intellect does not understand many things at one time if, to understand them, it must be shaped by many different forms.

4. The intelligible characters in the divine ideas differ only in so far as things have different relations to them. Hence, they are one through the divine essence. This is not true of the innate forms possessed by the angels.

5. When one says that a thing's power cannot be greater than its substance, this statement should not be understood as meaning that nothing belongs to its power that does not belong to its substance, but rather that the strength of a power is determined by the mode of the substance. For example, if a substance is material, its power will act in a material way.

6. The more simple a thing's virtual quantity, the greater is the number of objects to which it extends; but the more simple its dimensional quantity, the smaller the number of objects to which it extends. Consequently, extension to many things by reason of dimensional quantity is a sign of composition, but extension by reason of virtual quantity is a sign of simplicity.

ARTICLE 15

*Is angels' knowledge of things discursive?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is, for

1. Whoever knows one thing through another knows it discursively. Now, angels know one thing through another when they see creatures in the Word. Hence, their knowledge of things is discursive.

2. Just as we know some things and not others, so do angels also know some things and not others. This is clear from what has been said.⁷ But we are able to learn what we do not know by means of what we do know. Therefore, since angels possess more profound intellects than we, it seems that they, too, can come to a knowledge of what they do not know by means of what they know already. This, however, is discursive knowledge. Therefore, angels reason from one thing to another.

3. No motion can be detected in intellection other than that by which the mind passes from one thing to another. Now, angels are moved when they understand, and that is why Dionysius says that the motion of angels with respect to the good and the beautiful is circular, oblique, and horizontal, just as that of our own souls is. Therefore, angels, as well as our own souls, understand discursively.

4. As Augustine says, demons know the heart's thoughts by means of the movements that appear on the body. But this is to know the cause through the effect; it is also to reason from one thing to another.

Therefore, demons know things by reasoning from one thing to another; and, by the same argument, angels also know in this manner, because the same kind of natural cognition is found in both angels and demons.

5. Maximus says that our souls roll many things together, just as angels do. Now, to roll many things together means to compare them. Therefore, angels know things by way of comparison.

6. Angels know natural causes and effects as perfectly as we do. Now, we see effects in causes and causes in effects. Therefore, angels do the same. Consequently, they make comparisons, just as we do.

7. All knowledge had through experience is knowledge had by a process of comparison, because, as said in the *Metaphysics*, it is based on experience, and the general apprehension results from the memory of many individual events. Now, as Augustine says, through their long experience demons come

* PARALLEL READINGS: *De ver.*, 15, 1; *S.T.*, I, 58, aa. 3-4; 79, 8; 85, 5; *De malo*, 16, 6, ad 1 s. c.

to know many things about natural effects. Therefore, demons possess knowledge that is the result of comparison.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. All discursive knowledge is had by reasoning either from the universal to particulars or from particulars to the universal, for all reasoning is reduced to syllogizing and induction. But, as Dionysius says, angels do not acquire divine knowledge from what is divisible or from senses, nor are they led to these particular things from something common. Therefore, there is no discursive knowledge in angels.

2. Man is said to be rational inasmuch as he reasons by inquiring. As is clear from Dionysius, however, angels are not called rational but intellectual. Therefore, angels do not know discursively.

3. As said in *Spirit and Soul*: "Reasoning is a search made by the reason." But in angels there is no reason, because, as is clear from the same work, reason is put into the definition of the human soul a being one of its properties. Therefore, angels neither reason nor have discursive knowledge.

4. We read the following in *Spirit and Soul*: "It belongs to the same person to know the natures of visible things and to investigate invisible things." Now, the first type of knowledge belongs to man because of his senses, and the second type, too, for the same reason. Therefore, it seems that the second type of knowledge does not belong to angels, because they do not have senses.

5. Maximus the Commentator writes that angels do not circle about a number of existing things as our souls do. Now, souls are said to circle about a number of existing things in so far as they reason from one thing to another. Therefore, angels do not know discursively.

REPLY

Properly speaking, to discourse is to come to the knowledge of one thing through another. There is a difference, however, between knowing something in another and knowing it *from* another. For when one thing is known in another, the knower is, by one motion, directed to both. This is clearly the case when a thing is known in another as in an intelligible form. This kind of knowledge is not discursive. Moreover, in this regard, it makes no difference whether the thing be seen in its own species or in a different one; for sight is not said to know discursively when it sees a stone either by means of a species received from the stone itself or by seeing the stone's species reflected in a mirror.

A thing is said to be known *from* another, however, when the motion to

both is not the same, but the intellect is first moved to one and from this is moved to the other. Consequently, discourse takes place here, as it evidently takes place in demonstrations. For the intellect is first directed only to principles, then it is directed through the principles to conclusions. From the moment of their creation, however, the intellects of angels are perfected by innate forms giving them all the natural knowledge to which their intellectual powers extend, just as the matter of celestial bodies is completely terminated by its form, with the result that it no longer remains in potency to another form. For this reason, *The Causes* states: "An intelligence is filled with forms." Now, it would not be filled with forms unless its entire potentialities were actuated by forms. Therefore, an intelligence is ignorant of none of the things that it can know naturally.

But because our intellect shares in a defective intellectual light, it is not actuated with regard to all the intelligibles which it can know naturally. It remains perfectible, nor could it reduce itself from potency to act had not its knowledge with respect to some things been actuated by nature. Consequently, there necessarily are some things in our intellect which it knows naturally, namely, first principles—even though in us this knowledge is not caused unless we receive something through our senses. Therefore, the relation of our intellect to those principles is similar to that which an angel has to all that he knows naturally. And since the knowledge we have of principles is the highest form of our knowledge, it is evident that on this summit of our nature we reach to some extent the lowest point of an angel's. For, as Dionysius says: "The divine wisdom has linked the boundaries of the first creatures to the place where the second begin." Consequently, just as we know principles by simple intuition without discourse, so do the angels know all they know in the same fashion. This is why they are called "intellectual," and why our habit of principles has the same name.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Angels know creatures in the Word without any discourse, as things are known in their likenesses.
2. Angels are not ignorant of any of the things whose knowledge they can arrive at naturally; but they are ignorant of some things that surpass their natural knowledge. By themselves, they cannot arrive at a knowledge of these through discourse, but they need divine revelation. Our intellect, however, does not know all that it can know naturally. Hence, from the things it knows it can arrive at what it does not know. But, it cannot arrive at unknown things, such as matters of faith, that surpass our natural powers of knowing.

3. The motion of which Dionysius speaks is not taken to mean the passage from one thing to another. It is motion merely in that sense in which all operations are called motions, just as understanding and sensing are called motions. Consequently, Dionysius distinguishes three kinds of motions in souls and in angels as regards their knowledge of God: circular, oblique, and straight—using these as metaphors. Now, circular motion is perfectly uniform, because all the parts of a circle are equidistant from its center, and because it cannot be said that one part of a circular motion is its beginning or end more than any other. Straight motion, however, is not uniform, because as a line its parts are not equidistant from a designated point, and as motion it has a designated beginning and end. Oblique motion possesses uniformity in so far as it agrees with circular motion, but lacks uniformity in so far as it agrees with straight motion.

Now, there is not the same manner of uniformity and non-uniformity in an angel and in a soul. Consequently, Dionysius distinguishes between these motions as found in each. In the act of knowing God, an angel does not direct his cognition to many different things but fixes it on God alone. In this regard, he is said to be moved about God, as it were, in a circular motion, because he does not arrive at God as at the end of cognition that had its beginning from some principle of cognition, but [his knowledge is] like a circle, without a beginning or end. Hence Dionysius says that angels are moved “in a circular motion which is simple, without beginnings, and rich with everlasting illuminations of the good and the beautiful.”

These divine illuminations coming into the minds of the angels are to be understood as though they were lines coming from the center of a circle to its circumference and in some way constituting the substance of the circumference. Then, the knowledge which God has of Himself is compared to the center of the circle, and the knowledge which the angel has of God is compared to the circle itself, which imitates the unity of its center but falls short of achieving it.

Non-uniformity in an angel's knowledge of God is not to be found in the knowledge itself but only in its communication, that is, in so far as he passes on his knowledge of God to others. This action Dionysius assigns to the angels' straight movement, saying: “Their motion is straight when, passing directly over all things, they go forth to provide for all who are entrusted to them.” Moreover, he calls that motion of theirs oblique which is, as it were, made up of both of the afore-mentioned motions—the motion which occurs when, remaining united to God in knowledge, they go forth in action to lead others back to Him. Hence, he says: “They are moved obliquely when, while

caring for those who have less, they nevertheless remain unmoved in uninteruptible union with the cause of union."

However, uniformity and non-uniformity are also found in the soul's knowledge of God, because a soul is moved towards God in three ways. In the first, by looking upon the visible things that have been made, the soul sees the invisible things of God. This motion is straight. Consequently, Dionysius says: "The motion of the soul is straight when the soul goes forth to the things which lie around it, and from external things, as from varied and multiple signs, is lifted up to simple and unified contemplation." The soul is moved toward God in a second way by the illuminations it receives from Him. These, however, it receives in accordance with its own manner of existence, that is, they are veiled in sensible figures. For example, Isaiah saw "the Lord sitting upon a throne high and elevated" (Isaiah 6:1). This motion is oblique, having something of uniformity from God's illumination and something of non-uniformity from the sensible figures. Hence, Dionysius says: "The soul is moved obliquely in so far as it is illumined by divine thoughts according to its nature—not, indeed, intellectually and intuitively, but rationally and discursively." Moreover, the soul is moved in a third way when it turns away from all sense objects by thinking of God as being above all things, even above itself. In this way, it is separated from any non-uniformity, and therefore it is circular motion. Hence, Dionysius says: "The circular motion of the soul takes place when, withdrawing from external things, the soul enters into itself and reflects by its intellectual powers. Finally, it is made uniform and enters into union with its united powers. In this way, it is led to that which is above all things."

4. Angels see thoughts hidden in hearts by means of bodily movements, just as causes are seen without discourse by means of their likeness in their effects. However, this does not mean that angels need to reason discursively when they know these motions for the first time, because, as soon as sensible things come into being, they become similar to forms in the angels and so are known by the angels. Hence, without discourse, angels know new sensible things.

5. That rolling together does not mean comparison, but rather a kind of circular union of the soul with itself, and of the angel with itself.

6. [Angels] see causes in their effects and effects in their causes, not by reasoning discursively, as it were, from one thing to another, but in the manner in which a thing is seen in its image, without any discourse being needed.

7. Demons' experiential knowledge is not had by making comparisons but by seeing effects in their causes or causes in their effects in the manner described. The longer they have existed, the greater the number of effects they

know of a given cause. Thus, they come to know, in some way, more about a cause, not intensively but extensively, the more they see its power manifested in effects.

ARTICLE 16

*Should morning knowledge be distinguished
from evening knowledge in angels?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. There are shadows in the morning and evening. In an angelic intellect, however, there are no shadows; for, as Dionysius says,, angels are very bright mirrors. Therefore, in angels morning knowledge should not be distinguished from evening knowledge.

2. According to Augustine, that knowledge is called morning knowledge by which an angel knows in the Word the things that are to be created; and that is called evening knowledge by which he knows things in their own natures. Now, angels do not know things differently before they exist than after they exist, since their intellects are like God's intellect and do not receive their knowledge from things. Therefore, their morning knowledge should not be distinguished from their evening knowledge.

3. Evening knowledge is that by which things are known in their own nature. But things are known in their own nature in the Word, because the Word represents things in their individuality even more expressly than the forms within the angels do. Therefore, since morning knowledge is knowledge in the Word, it seems that angel's evening knowledge should not be distinguished from their morning knowledge.

4. We read in Genesis (1:5): "And there was evening and morning one day." Now, as Augustine says, day is taken there as meaning angels' knowledge. Consequently, angels' morning and evening knowledge are one and the same.

5. The light of morning grows until noon. However, knowledge of things had in the Word cannot grow into another, fuller knowledge. Therefore, knowledge of things in the Word cannot properly be called morning knowledge. Hence, angels' morning and evening knowledge cannot be distinguished by the fact that one is knowledge of things in the Word, the other, knowledge of them in their own nature.

* [PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I 58, aa. 6-7; 62, 1, ad 3; 64, 1, ad 3; *II Sent.*, 12, 1, 3; *In Ephes.*, c. 3, lect. 3 (P. 13:470b); *De Pot.*, 4, 2, ad 2, 8, 10, 12-21, 24-25.

6. Knowledge of things that are to be created comes before that of things that are already created. Now, evening knowledge comes before morning knowledge, as is clear from the words of Genesis (1:5): "There was evening and morning one day." Consequently, it is not proper to distinguish evening knowledge from morning knowledge so that the former means knowledge of things already made, and the latter, of things to be made.

7. Augustine compares the knowledge of things in the Word to the knowledge had from an artistic concept, and that of them in their own nature to the knowledge had from the work of art itself. He also compares these two types of knowledge to the knowledge had of a line which is mentally conceived and to that which is had of a line written in dust. But these distinctions do not involve different genera of knowledge. Consequently, knowledge of things in the Word and in their proper nature are not two types of knowledge. Hence, morning and evening knowledge are not distinct.

8. As soon as he was created, an angel knew with morning knowledge. However, he did not know the Word, because he was not created in the state of beatitude, and the sight of the Word is the act of beatitude. Consequently, knowledge of things in the Word is not morning knowledge. Hence, we conclude as before.

9. But it has been said that, even though an angel did not know the Word through its essence, he knew it through some created likeness and, therefore, did, know things in the Word.—On the contrary, all knowledge through created forms is obscure, because all creatures, taken in themselves, 'are shadowy. But evening knowledge is obscure knowledge. Therefore, to know things in the Word, or to know the Word in the manner just described, would not be morning but evening knowledge.

10. Augustine says: "When a mind, strong and vigorous, sees that first truth, it forgets all other things." Therefore, when it sees the Word, it sees nothing else in it. Consequently, the morning knowledge of angels cannot be called the knowledge of things in the Word.

11. Morning knowledge is clearer than evening knowledge. But knowledge of things had in the Word is less clear than that of things in their own nature, because things are in the Word only in a certain respect, but in their own nature without any qualification. It is better, however, to know a thing where it exists simply than to know it where it exists only in a certain respect. Consequently, a distinction cannot be made whereby knowledge of things had in the Word will be called morning knowledge, and that of things in their own nature, evening knowledge.

12. Knowledge had from a thing's individual immediate causes is more

perfect than that had from a general cause. But God is the general cause of all things. Consequently, that knowledge by which things are known in the Word is more imperfect than that by which they are known in their own nature.

13. Things are known in the Word as in a mirror. But things are known more perfectly in themselves than in a mirror. Consequently, they are known more perfectly in their own nature than in the Word. Hence, the same must be said as before.

TO THE CONTRARY

Augustine distinguishes these types of knowledge in the manner described.

REPLY

The expression “morning and evening knowledge” was introduced by Augustine so that he could hold that the things we read about as having been made in the first six days were really completed without any succession of time. Consequently, he wanted those days to be understood as referring, not to distinct times, but to distinct angelic cognitions. For, just as the presence of physical light on things here below makes a day in the temporal sense, so does the presence or operation of light from an angelic intellect on created things make a day in the spiritual sense. Consequently, as many days can be distinguished as there are relations from angelic intellects to the different classes of things to be known. Taken in this way, the order of a day would not be an order of time but an order of nature, and this would be found in angelic knowledge according to the order that the known things have to each other, that is, according as one thing is prior by nature to another. Moreover, just as morning is the beginning of a temporal day and evening its end, so the beginning and end of an angel’s knowledge of some one thing would be determined by the order in that thing. Now, the beginning of anything is to be found in the cause from which it issues; its end, in the thing itself, because it is in this that the action of the productive cause terminates. Hence, the first knowledge to be had of a thing is that in which it is considered in its cause, the eternal Word. For this reason, the knowledge of things in the Word is called morning knowledge. The last knowledge to be had of a thing is that in which it is known in itself. This is called evening knowledge.

It should be understood, however, that that distinction can have two meanings. First, it can refer to a distinction in the thing known; second, it can refer to a distinction in the medium of knowledge. Taking the distinction

in the first way, we can say that a thing is said to be known in the Word when the being it has in the Word is known; and it is said to be known in its own nature in so far as the being which it has in itself is known. But this way of understanding causes Difficulties, because the being which it has in the Word is not other than that of the Word itself, since, as Anselm says, the creature in the Creator is simply the creative essence. Hence, to know a creature in the Word in this manner is to know, not the creature, but rather the Creator. Consequently, this distinction between morning and evening knowledge must be referred to the medium of knowledge. Accordingly, a thing will be said to be known in the Word when it is known in its own nature through the Word; and it will be said to be known in its own nature when it is known by means of some created forms proportioned to created things, as things are known [to angels] by innate forms or by acquired forms—if, indeed, angels did know by acquired forms, but it would make no difference as far as the present problem is concerned.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The figure of evening and morning in angelic knowledge is not based on the fact that there are shadows in the morning and evening of a temporal day, but, as has been said, on the fact that these two have the nature of a beginning and end. Or it can be said that all intellects, being created from nothing, are shadowy in comparison with the brightness of God's intellect. They do, however, have some brightness in so far as they imitate His intellect.

2. In the Word the angels know in the same way the things that are to be created and the things already created. But the way in which they know in the Word the things to be created differs from the way in which they know the individual natures of things already created when they know these latter by means of a similitude within them selves. It is according to this difference that their morning and evening knowledge are distinguished.

3. Even though things are more expressly represented in the Word than they are by the forms within an angel's intellect, nevertheless, these forms are more proportioned to things and, in a way, conformed to them. Hence, this kind of knowledge, and not knowledge in the Word, is said to be of things in their own nature.

4. Just as one general science contains within itself different particular sciences by which different conclusions can be known, so also all the knowledge an angel has, being in some sense a whole, contains within itself morning and evening knowledge as, in a way, its parts—as a temporal day has morning and evening for its parts.

5. It is not necessary that spiritual things be like material things in all respects. Hence, knowledge of things in the Word is not called morning knowledge because it grows into greater knowledge, but, as has been said, because of its relation to an inferior knowledge.

6. Morning knowledge comes before evening knowledge if we consider the natural ordering found in one and the same thing. But, if we consider different things, evening knowledge of what is prior precedes morning knowledge of what is posterior, that is, as long as knowledge is considered from the viewpoint of what is prior and posterior in the things known. Consequently, in Genesis, evening is put before morning, because the work of the first day was light, which Augustine understands as a spiritual light enkindled by knowledge of the Word. By their natural knowledge, however, angels first knew themselves in themselves, and, having known themselves, they did not remain there to enjoy their own selves and, as it were, make themselves their own ends (for then they would have become “night”—as angels who sinned); instead, they turned their knowledge back to the praise of God. Hence, from contemplation of themselves angels turned to a contemplation of the Word, in whom existed the morning of the following day, inasmuch as the angels received knowledge in the Word of the creature that was to follow, namely, the firmament. Therefore, just as we see that in continuous time the same now belongs to two times, that is, it is the end of the past and the beginning of the future, so morning knowledge of the second day is the end of the first day and the beginning of the second, and so on until the seventh day is reached.

7. The knowledge had of a work of art from its artistic concept is not the same as that had from the thing already made. The first knowledge is universal only; the second can also be particular, as, for example, when I look at a particular house that has been made.

Besides, there is no parallel at all, because created art is more proportioned and conformed to artificial things than uncreated art is to created things.

8. At the moment of his creation, an angel was not beatified and did not see the Word through His essence. Hence, he did not have morning knowledge, but first he had evening knowledge and from this progressed to morning. For this reason, the first day is expressly said not to have had a morning, but began as evening, and from evening passed into morning. The reason for this was that that spiritual light, namely, the angelic substance, made on the first day, knew himself as soon as he was made. This was his evening knowledge. Then he turned this knowledge to the praise of the Word, and in the Word his knowledge became morning knowledge. This is why Genesis (1:5) says: “And there was evening and morning one day.”

9. Evening and morning knowledge must be distinguished with respect to the medium of knowledge, not with respect to the thing that is known. Knowledge of the Creator through creatures, therefore, is evening knowledge, just as, conversely, knowledge of creatures through the Creator is morning knowledge. To this extent, the argument is correct.

10. A strong mind intent on divine things is said to forget other things, not in the sense that it does not know them, but in the sense that it no longer esteems them. For, when we see God's majesty, we consider as of little value creatures that previously seemed to be of very great worth.

11. Knowledge of things in the Word is more perfect than that of them in their own nature, because the Word expresses each one of them more clearly than a created species does. Moreover, the statement that things exist more truly in themselves than they do in the Word can be understood in two ways. First, it can mean that the existence they have in themselves is more perfect than that which they have in the Word. But this is false, because in themselves they have a created act of existence, and in the Word, uncreated being. Consequently, the existence they have in themselves is existence only in a certain sense as compared with that which they have in the Word. Second, it can mean that the thing can be its individual self more perfectly in its own being than in the Word. This, to a certain extent, is true. For in itself a thing is material (at least materiality belongs to the nature of some things); in the Word, however, it is not material. There is merely a likeness of the thing's matter and form in the Word. Although it is true that a thing in so far as it is such and such exists only in a certain fashion in the Word, nevertheless, it is known more perfectly through the Word than through itself, even in so far as it is such and such a thing. The reason for this is that a thing's own nature is more perfectly represented in the Word than it is in itself, and this despite the fact that it exists more truly in itself when it exists according to its own mode of existence. For knowledge follows the representation of the form. Hence, even though a thing is not in the soul except in a qualified sense, that is, by its likeness, it is known simply as a thing.

12. God Himself is the proper and immediate cause of each and every thing, and, as Augustine says, in some way He is more closely united to each thing than the thing is to itself.

13. Forms do not flow into things from a mirror; rather, they flow into a mirror from things. From the Word, however, forms flow into things. Consequently, no parallel can be drawn between knowledge of things had from a mirror and that of them had in the Word.

ARTICLE 17

*Is an angel's knowledge adequately divided into morning and evening knowledge?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. Augustine says, that evening knowledge is that by which things are known in themselves, morning knowledge, that whereby things are referred to the praise of the Creator. Thus, morning knowledge seems to be distinguished from evening by means of distinguishing between related and non-related. But, besides this division of knowledge of creatures in themselves into knowledge related and not related to the Word, there is another knowledge of creatures—a knowledge that differs more from creatures than one of them differs from another—namely, the knowledge of creatures in the Word. Therefore, the division of angels' knowledge into morning and evening is not adequate.

2. Augustine says that a creature has three existences: one in the Word, a second in its own nature, a third in the mind of an angel. Now, the first two existences are included by morning and evening knowledge. Hence, the third should be included by a third type of knowledge.

3. Morning and evening knowledge are distinguished by this, that the first is knowledge of things in the Word, the second, knowledge of them in their own nature. They are also distinguished in so far as one is the knowledge of things to be created, the other, of things already created. This latter division, however, can be further divided in four ways. First, we can speak of knowing in the Word the things that will be created; second, of knowing in the Word things already created; third, of knowing in their own nature the things that are already created; fourth, of knowing in their own nature things that will be created. The last division, however, seems to be a useless addition, because a thing cannot be known in its own nature before it exists. At any rate, there should be at least three kinds of angelic knowledge. Hence, the twofold division is inadequate.

4. Angels' morning and evening knowledge get their names from their resemblance to a temporal day. Now, in a temporal day, noon lies between morning and evening. Therefore, a noonday knowledge should be placed between morning and evening knowledge.

5. Angels know not only creatures but the Creator Himself. But angels' knowledge is divided into morning and evening only with reference to their

* PARALLEL READINGS: See readings given for preceding article.

knowledge of creatures. Consequently, we must assign a third knowledge to angels that is other than their morning and evening knowledge.

6. Morning and evening knowledge pertain only to knowledge had by grace; otherwise, bad angels would also have morning or evening knowledge. This does not seem true, however, because there is no day for demons, and evening and morning are parts of a day. Consequently, since angels' natural knowledge is other than that which they have as a result of grace, it seems that we must assign a third type of knowledge to them.

TO THE CONTRARY

Morning and evening knowledge are divided according to created and uncreated. Now, there is no mean between these two. Therefore, there is none between morning and evening knowledge.

REPLY

We may speak of morning and evening knowledge in two ways. First, we may speak of them simply in so far as they are knowledge. No mean can fall between the two types of knowledge, considered in this manner. For, as said previously, morning is distinguished from evening knowledge by means of the medium of knowing. If the medium is created, it causes evening knowledge, no matter how it is had. If the medium is uncreated, it causes morning knowledge. And there can be no mean between created and uncreated.

On the other hand, if we consider the nature of morning and evening alone, then a mean can fall between the two for two reasons. First, morning and evening are parts of a day; and, according to Augustine, "day" exists in angels by means of the illuminating effects of grace. Consequently, morning and evening do not extend beyond the knowledge good angels have because of grace. Hence, their natural knowledge will be a third type. Second, evening as evening ends with morning, and morning ends with evening. Hence, not any knowledge of things in their own nature can be called evening knowledge, but only that which is referred to the praise of the Creator, because, in this sense, evening returns to morning. Consequently, the knowledge demons have of things is neither morning nor evening. Therefore, these terms can be applied only to the knowledge angels have as a result of grace, and this knowledge is found only in the beatified angels.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Knowledge of things in their own nature is always evening knowledge. Its relation to knowledge in the Word does not make it morning, but

makes it merely terminate in morning knowledge. Consequently, it should not be said that an angel has morning knowledge because he refers the knowledge he has of things in their own natures to the Word, as though this knowledge, being thus related, is morning knowledge. Rather, it is because he refers this knowledge that he merits to receive morning knowledge.

2. That argument proceeds as though morning were distinguished from evening knowledge on the part of the thing known. Then there would be three kinds of knowledge based on the three kinds of intelligible existence things have. However, morning is distinguished from evening knowledge entirely on the basis of the medium of knowledge, which is either created or uncreated, and the existence of things can be known through either of these mediums. Hence, there is no need for postulating a third kind of knowledge.

3. All knowledge had in the Word is called morning knowledge, whether the thing known is already created or not. The reason for this is that such knowledge is similar to God's knowledge who without difference of manner knows all things before they are created just as He knows them after they are created. However, all knowledge of things in the Word is of them as they are to be created, whether they are already created or not. Consequently, *are to be created* does not signify time but merely the fact that a creature has to leave the hands of its Creator. It is like the knowledge had of a work of art by means of an artistic conception: it concerns the thing in its coming to be, even after the thing has been made.

4. Augustine calls that knowledge *morning* which is in full light and, for this reason, includes noon. Consequently, he sometimes calls it *day knowledge*, sometimes *morning knowledge*. Or, one could reply that all the intellectual knowledge had by angels is mixed with shadows as far as the knower is concerned. Consequently, no knowledge had by an angelic intellect should be called *noonday knowledge*, but only that by which God knows all things in Himself.

5. The Word and things in the Word are known by the same knowledge. Hence, knowledge of the Word is also called *morning knowledge*. This is evident, because the seventh day, which signifies the day when God rested in Himself, has a morning. Hence, morning knowledge is had in so far as an angel knows God.

6. The answer is clear from what has been said.

Question IX

THE COMMUNICATION OF ANGELIC KNOWLEDGE

1. Does one angel illumine another?
2. Is an inferior angel always illumined by a superior angel or is he sometimes illumined directly by God?
3. Does one angel cleanse another when he illumines him?
4. Does one angel speak to another?
5. Do the inferior angels speak to the superior?
6. Is a determinate local distance required in order that one angel can speak to another?
7. Can one angel speak to another in such a way that others will not know what he is saying?

ARTICLE I

*Does one angel illumine another?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. As Augustine says, only God can perfect a mind. But the illumination of an angel is, in a way, a perfecting of the mind of the person illumined. Hence, only God can illumine an angel.

2. There are no lights in angels other than those of nature and of grace. Now, one angel does not illumine another by the light of nature, because every angel has his natural powers directly from God, nor does one angel illumine another by the light of grace, because grace also comes directly from God alone. Consequently, one angel cannot illumine another.

3. As a body is related to material light, so is a spirit related to spiritual light. Now, a body illuminated by a very bright light is not illuminated simultaneously by a weaker light. For example, air illuminated by the light of the sun is not illuminated at the same time by the moon. Consequently, since God's spiritual light surpasses any created light more than the light of the sun surpasses that of a star or of a candle, it seems one angel is not illumined by another, simply because all angels are illumined by God.

4. If one angel illumines another, he does this either through a medium

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 106, 1; 111, 1; *1st Sent.*, 9, 1, 2; 11, 1, 2; *Comp. Theol.*, I, c. 126.

or directly. But he cannot do it directly, because then he would have to be joined directly to the angel he is to illumine; and only God can be joined to minds in this manner. On the other hand, he cannot illumine another angel through a medium. He cannot illumine by means of a material medium, because such a medium cannot receive a spiritual light. Nor can he illumine by means of a spiritual medium because this medium would have to be an angel, and then an infinite series would arise, and illumination would be utterly impossible, for it is impossible to pass through an infinite. And, if we finally arrive at a point where one angel directly illumines another, this has already been shown to be impossible. Consequently, it is impossible for one angel to illumine another.

5. If one angel illumines another, he does this by giving him either his own light or some other light. But he does not do it in the first manner, because, in that case, one and the same light would be in two different illuminated beings; nor does he do it in the second manner, because that light then would have to be made by the higher angel and from this it would follow that he created that light, since such a light is not made out of matter. Therefore, it seems that one angel does not illumine another.

6. If one angel is to be illumined by another, then the illumined angel must be reduced from potency to act, because to be illumined is a kind of becoming. But whenever a thing is reduced from potency to act something in it must undergo corruption. Now, since nothing in angels can corrupt, it seems that one angel is not illumined by another.

7. If one angel is illumined by another, the light which one gives to the other is either a substance or an accident. Now, it cannot be a substance, because, as Aristotle says, when a substantial form is added to a thing, it changes the species of the thing, just as an added unit changes the species of a number; hence, it would follow that an angel, by the fact of being illumined, would undergo a specific change. Similarly this light cannot be an accident, because an accident does not extend beyond its subject. Hence, one angel does not illumine another.

8. Our sensible and intellectual vision needs light, because its object is only potentially visible and potentially intelligible, but, by means of light, becomes actually visible and actually intelligible. Now, the object of angelic knowledge is actually intelligible, because it is the divine essence itself or co-created species. Consequently, angels do not need intellectual light in order to know.

9. If one angel illumines another, he illumines him with respect to either natural or gratuitous knowledge. However, he does not illumine him with re-

spect to natural knowledge, because the natural knowledge had by both higher and lower angels is made perfect through innate forms; nor does he illumine him with respect to the gratuitous knowledge by which angels know things in the Word, because all angels see the Word directly. Consequently, one angel does not illumine another.

10. For intellectual knowledge, all that is required is an intelligible form and an intelligible light. Now, one angel does not give another angel intelligible forms, which are co-created, nor does he give him an intelligible light, because every angel is illumined by God, as we read in Job (25:3): “Is there any numbering of his soldiers? and upon whom shall not his light arise?” Therefore, one angel does not illumine another.

11. The purpose of illumination is to dispel darkness. But there is no darkness or obscurity in angelic knowledge. Consequently, the Gloss reads: “In the region of intelligible substances,”—clearly a reference to the regions where angels dwell—“the mind sees truth clearly, without any corporeal images, and not obscured by the mists of false opinions.” Hence, one angel is not illumined by another.

12. An angelic intellect is more noble than the active intellect of our soul. But the active intellect of our soul only illumines; it is never illumined. Therefore, angels are not illumined.

13. We read the following in the Apocalypse (21:23): “And the city hath no need of the sun, nor of the moon, to shine in it. For the glory of God hath enlightened it...” The Gloss expounds this text as referring to the principal and minor Doctors of the Church. Therefore, since an angel is already a citizen of that city, he is illumined only by God.

14. If one angel illumines another, he does this either through the abundance of the light given to him by his nature or through the abundance of light given him gratuitously. Now, one angel cannot illumine another through the abundance of his natural light, because the angel who fell belonged to the highest angels, and possessed the highest natural gifts, which, as Dionysius says, remained with him in their full strength. Consequently, a demon would be able to illumine an angel, and this is clearly absurd. Nor does one angel illumine another through the abundance of light given him gratuitously, because some men still living possess more grace than the lower angels do; indeed, because of their grace, they will be elevated to the ranks of the higher angels. Hence, a man still living could illumine an angel, and this is equally absurd. Therefore, one angel does not illumine another.

15. Dionysius says: “To be illumined is to receive divine knowledge.” Now, divine knowledge can be only that knowledge which is about God or

divine things; and, in either case, angels can receive such knowledge only from God. Consequently, one angel does not illumine another.

16. Since the potency of an angelic intellect is entirely terminated by means of innate forms, these forms suffice for an angel to know all that he can know. Consequently, an angel should not need to be illumined by a higher angel in order to know something.

17. All angels, or at least those belonging to different orders, differ specifically from one another. Now, nothing is illumined by a light belonging to another species; for example, a material thing is not illumined by a light that is spiritual. Therefore, one angel is not illumined by another.

18. The light of an angel's intellect is more perfect than the light of our active intellect. But the light of our active intellect suffices for us to know all the species we receive from our senses. Therefore, the light of an angel's intellect is also sufficient for an angel to know all his innate species; consequently, no other light need be added to him.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Dionysius says that the angelic hierarchy is divided into "those who are illumined and those who illumine."

2. Just as there is a hierarchy among men, so is there a hierarchy among angels. This is clear from what Dionysius has written. Now, among men, superiors enlighten inferiors. For example, St. Paul says in the Epistle to the Ephesians (3:8-9): "To me, the least of all the saints, is given this grace, to preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to enlighten all men..." Therefore, superior angels likewise illumine inferior angels.

3. Spiritual light is more efficacious than material light. But higher bodies illumine lower bodies. Therefore, higher angels illumine lower angels.

REPLY

We should discuss intellectual light in terms of its resemblance to material light. Now, material light is a medium by which we can see things, serving our sense of sight in two ways: first, it makes things actually visible that were previously only potentially visible; second, its nature helps the sense of sight to see. Consequently, light must be in the very composition of the organ.

Similarly, intellectual light can be said to be the power of knowing which the intellect possesses, or even that thing by which another thing becomes known to us. There are two ways, therefore, in which a person can be illumined by another: first, his intellect can be strengthened for the acts of knowledge; second, it can be guided by something to the knowledge of some other

thing. Both of these actions are found together in the intellect; and we have a clear case of both of them happening together when the medium which a person mentally conceives strengthens his intellect to see some things which it previously could not see.

Accordingly, one intellect is said to be illumined by another in so far as the latter gives it some medium of knowledge, which strengthens it, and enables it to know some things which it previously could not know. Now, among men this takes place in two ways. First, it takes place through speech, as happens when a teacher, by what he says, gives some medium to his student that strengthens the latter's intellect, enabling him to know things which he previously could not. In this sense, a teacher is said to enlighten his pupil. Second, a person can be given a sensible sign, and this can lead him to the knowledge of some truth. In this sense, according to Dionysius, priests are said to enlighten the people, inasmuch as they display and administer to them the mysteries which lead them to divine truths.

Angels, however, do not arrive at the knowledge of divine truths by means of sensible signs; nor do they receive intellectual media in a successive and discursive way, as we do, but immaterially. This is also what Dionysius held; for, when showing how the higher angels are illumined, he writes: "The highest essences, the angels, contemplate, [not] by gazing on symbols that can be known by the senses or intellect, nor by being led to God by the elaborations found in the Scriptures, but by being filled with the higher light of spiritual knowledge." Consequently, for one angel to be illumined by another means simply this, that, through something seen in a higher angel, a lower angel's intellect is strengthened to know other things.

This can take place in the following manner. Just as among bodies, higher bodies are, as it were, act with respect to lower bodies (as fire is, with respect to air), so a higher spirit is act, as it were, with respect to lower spirits. Now, every potency is strengthened and made perfect by being joined to its act. For this reason, lower bodies are preserved in higher bodies, which are the place of the former. Similarly, therefore, the lower angels can be strengthened by their being connected with the higher, and this connection takes place through intellectual intuition. For this reason, the lower angels are said to be illumined by the higher.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Augustine is speaking of that ultimate perfecting by which the mind is perfected with grace; and grace comes directly from God.
2. The illumining angel does not make a new light of grace or of na-

ture; he merely shares his light. For, since whatever is known is understood by means of an intellectual light, the known as known includes in its notion a shared intellectual light that has the power to strengthen the intellect. This is evident if we consider the teacher who gives his pupil a medium *of demonstration* in which the light of the active intellect is contained as in an instrument; for, as the Commentator says, first principles are quasi-instruments of the active intellect; and the same is true of all second principles which contain their own means of demonstration. Consequently, when a higher angel shows his knowledge to another angel, the intellect of the latter is strengthened so that it knows what it previously did not. Hence, no new light of nature or of grace comes into existence in the enlightened angel, but the light that was there previously is strengthened by the light contained in the higher angel's knowledge.

3. Material and spiritual light are not entirely similar. For all bodies can be illumined by any material light whatsoever, since all material light is equally related to all visible forms; but not all spirits can be illumined by any light whatsoever, because not all lights contain intelligible forms in the same manner. The supreme light contains intelligible forms that are more universal. Consequently, it is not sufficient for an inferior intellect to be illumined by a higher light, since such an intellect is proportioned to receive its knowledge through forms that are more particular. To be led to the knowledge of things, this intellect must be illumined by an inferior light, as, of course, takes place in the case of men. For example, a metaphysician knows all things in their universal principles. A doctor, however, considers things especially in their particulars; hence, he does not take his principles directly from a metaphysician but directly from a philosopher of nature, whose principles are less general than those of a metaphysician. However, the natural philosopher, who considers things more universally than the doctor does, can take the principles for his science directly from the metaphysician.

Consequently, since the intelligible characters of all things are united in the highest degree in the light of the divine intellect, as in a single most universal principle, the lower angels are not proportioned to receive knowledge through such a light, unless there is joined to them the light of the higher angels, in whom the intelligible forms are made less universal.

4. An angel illumines another angel, sometimes through a medium, sometimes without a medium. Illumination through a medium (which is, of course, spiritual) takes place, for example, when a very high angel illumines an angel that stands halfway in the angelic hierarchy, and when the latter, by means of the light given him by the first, illumines an angel in the lowest part of the hierarchy. On the other hand, illumination without a medium takes

place when, for example, a superior angel illumines an angel existing immediately below him in the hierarchy. It is not necessary that the angel who illumines be directly joined to the mind of the angel who is enlightened; the two are joined together simply by the fact that one intuites the other directly.

5. The medium that is known by the lower angel is numerically the same as that which is known by the higher; but the knowledge which the higher angel has of that medium is other than that which the lower angel has. Consequently, in some sense, it is the same light, and, in another sense, it is another light. But even in the sense that it is another light it does not follow that it is created by the higher angel, because things which do not exist substantially do not, properly speaking, come into existence, just as they do not exist substantially. For example, as we read in the *Metaphysics*, it is not color but a colored thing that comes into existence. Consequently, the angel's light does not come into existence, but the illumined angel, from being potentially enlightened, becomes actually enlightened.

6. Just as no form is removed but only the privation of light, namely, darkness, is removed when material illumination takes place, so does a similar removal take place in spiritual illumination. Consequently, it is not necessary for any corruption to take place when spiritual illumination occurs. There is merely a removal of a negation.

7. That light by which an angel is said to be illumined is not one of his essential perfections but a second perfection, which is reduced to the genus of accidents. Moreover, it does not follow that the accident extends beyond its subject, because the knowledge by which the higher angel is enlightened is not numerically the same as that which is in the lower angel. Their knowledge is the same merely in so far as it has the same nature and belongs to the same species, just as the light which is in illuminated air and that which is in the illumining sun is specifically, but not numerically, the same.

8. It is true that through light a thing which was potentially intelligible becomes actually so, but this can happen in two ways. First, it may be that that which is in itself only potentially intelligible becomes actually intelligible. This happens in our knowledge. But in this respect an angelic intellect does not need light, for it does not abstract species from phantasms. Secondly, it may be that that which is potentially intelligible to some particular knower becomes actually intelligible to him. This takes place, for example, when the higher substances become actually intelligible to us, that is, when we arrive at knowledge of them by reasoning. It is for such knowledge that an angel's intellect needs light, that is, so it can be led to the actual knowledge of those things which it knows only potentially.

9. The illumination by which one angel illumines another does not concern those things that belong to angels' natural knowledge, because, in that case, all the angels would have perfect natural knowledge from the moment when they first existed—unless we held that the higher angels caused the lower, and this position is contrary to faith. It concerns, rather, the knowledge that is revealed to angels and the things that surpass their natural knowledge, for example, mysteries pertaining to the Church in heaven or on earth. Hence, Dionysius also speaks of a hierarchical action among angels. Moreover, it does not follow from the fact that all angels see the Word that, whatever the higher angels see there, the lower also see.

10. When one angel is enlightened by another, new species are not infused into him, but, by the very same species which he had previously, his intellect is strengthened through a higher light, and, in the manner described, it is enabled to know more things. Similarly, when our intellect is strengthened by divine or angelic light, from the same phantasms it can come to know more things than it could know if left unaided.

11. Although there is no obscurity or error in angels' intellects, angels do not know things which surpass their natural powers of knowing. For this reason, they need light.

12. No matter how material a thing is, it does not receive something else according to what is formal in itself, but only according to what is material in it. For example, our soul does not receive an illumination according to its active intellect but only according to its possible intellect. Similarly, material things do not receive impressions according to their own forms but merely according to their own matter. Yet our possible intellect is more simple than any material form. Similarly, an angel's intellect is illumined only with respect to that which it possesses potentially, even though it is more noble than our active intellect, which is not illumined.

13. That text should be understood as referring to the things that belong to the knowledge the blessed have. Without any intermediary God illumines all angels about these things.

14. The illumination of which we are speaking takes place through the light of grace, which perfects natural light. Moreover, it would not follow that a man, still in this life, could illumine an angel, because he possesses greater grace only virtually, not actually. He has merely grace, by which he can merit a more perfect state, just as, in the same sense, a colt, immediately after birth, is said to have greater strength than an ass, even though its strength is actually less.

15. When we say that to be illumined is to receive divine knowledge, this

knowledge is called divine merely because it has its origin in a divine enlightenment.

16. Innate forms are sufficient for an angel to know all that he can know naturally; but, to know those things that are above his natural powers, he needs a higher light.

17. It is not necessary for the intelligible lights existing in angels, who are specifically different, to be specifically different themselves. For example, color existing in bodies that are specifically different is nevertheless specifically the same. The same principle is especially true of the light of grace, which is specifically the same both in men and in angels.

18. The light of the active intellect is sufficient for us to know those things that can be known naturally; but, to know other things, we need a higher light, such as that of faith or of prophecy.

ARTICLE 2

*Is an inferior angel always illumined by a superior angel
or is he sometimes illumined directly by God?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that he is illumined directly by God, for

1. An inferior angel is in potency to receiving grace in his will and illuminations in his intellect. Now, he receives only as much grace from God as he is capable of receiving. Therefore, he receives only as much illumination from God as he is capable of receiving. Consequently, he is directly illumined by God, and not through an intermediate angel.

2. Just as superior angels stand midway between God and the inferior angels, so do the inferior angels stand midway between superior angels and men. Now, the superior angels sometimes illumine us directly. For example, a Seraph illumined Isaiah (Isaiah 6:6). Consequently, the inferior angels also are sometimes illumined directly by God.

3. Just as there is a definite order of spiritual substances, so is there also a definite order of material substances. But God's power sometimes acts directly on material things, passing over intermediate causes. For example, He sometimes raises a person from the dead without the co-operation of a celestial body. Consequently, He sometimes illumines inferior angels without the services of superior angels.

4. Whatever a lower power can do a high power can. Therefore, if a

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 107, 3; *II Sent.*, 3, 1, 3, ad 4; 9, 1, 29 ad 3-4.

higher angel can illumine a lower angel, God can certainly illumine the lower angel directly. Hence, it is not necessary that God's illuminations should always be given to lower angels by means of higher.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. Dionysius says that God has established an unchangeable law that lower beings be led back to God through the mediation of higher beings. Consequently, God never directly illumines lower angels.

2. Just as angels are, by their very nature, superior to bodies, so are the higher angels, by their very nature, superior to the lower. Now, in matters related to God's rule over material things, He never causes anything to happen without the ministry of His angels. This is clear from what Augustine has written. Consequently, God likewise never causes anything to happen in lower angels without the ministry of the higher.

3. Lower bodies are not moved by higher except through media. For example, the earth is moved by the heavens through the mediation of air. Now, the order of spirits resembles that of bodies. Consequently, the highest spirits do not illumine the lower except by means of intermediate spirits.

REPLY

Because of His goodness, God communicates His perfections to creatures according to their capacity. Consequently, He shares His goodness with them, not only so that they will be good and perfect themselves, but also so that they can, with God's help, give perfection to others. Now, to give perfection to other creatures is the most noble way of imitating God. Hence, Dionysius says: "The most God-like of all actions is to cooperate with God." On this principle rests the ordering of angels, according to which some illumine others.

There have, however, been several opinions on this ordering. Some think that this order is so firmly fixed that nothing can happen outside of it, and it is always and in all cases preserved. Others, however, concede that this ordering is stable, but say that, while events usually happen according to it, it is sometimes passed over by the action of necessary causes—as when, by God's dispensation, even the natural course of things is changed, and a new cause springs into being, as clearly it takes place in miracles.

But the first opinion seems to be more logical for three reasons. First, it belongs to the dignity of higher angels that the lower should be illumined through them. It would detract from their dignity if the lower angels were sometimes illumined without their ministry. Second, the closer beings are to God, who is most unchangeable, the more unchangeable should they them-

selves be. For this reason, bodies here below, standing at a great distance from God, are sometimes defective in their natural action, while celestial bodies always preserve the motion prescribed by their natures. Consequently, it does not seem reasonable that the ordering of celestial spirits, who are closest to God, should sometimes be changed. Third, God does not make any change in the things of nature except for something better, namely, for something pertaining to grace or glory. But there is no state higher than the states of glory by which the orders of angels are distinguished from each other. Therefore, it does not seem reasonable that matters concerning the order of angels should sometimes be changed.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. God gives grace and illuminations to angels according to their capacity—with this difference, however, that, because grace pertains to the will, He gives grace to all of them directly; for there is no ordering in angels' wills whereby one could act upon another. But God's illuminations descend from Him to the lowest angels by means of the angels standing at the top and middle of the hierarchy.

2. Dionysius gives two answers to this difficulty. First, the angel that was sent to cleanse the lips of the prophet belonged to the inferior angels, but, by equivocation, was called a Seraph since he cleansed the prophet's lips by burning them with a glowing coal brought from the altar by tongs; hence, he was said to be a Seraph only because he burned or set on fire. Dionysius' second answer is that this angel, belonging to a lower order, cleansed the lips of the prophet because he did not intend to summon him to himself but to God and a higher angel, since he acted by the power of both. This is why he showed the prophet the higher angel and God. Similarly, a bishop is also said to absolve a person when a priest absolves by the bishop's authority. Following this interpretation, we need not say that this angel was called a Seraph by equivocation or that a Seraph illumined the prophet directly.

3. The course of nature can have a more noble state; hence, it is proper for it to be changed at times. But there is nothing more noble than the state of glory. Therefore, no parallel can be drawn.

4. It is not because of any defect in God's power or in that of the higher angels that God and the higher angels illumine the lower through the mediation of angels between them and the lower angels. This order is kept merely to preserve the dignity and perfection of all; and this demands that many co-operate with God in the same action.

ARTICLE 3

*Does one angel cleanse another when he illumines him?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that he does not, for

1. To be cleansed is to be freed from impurity. But there is no impurity in angels; consequently, one angel cannot cleanse another.

2. But it was said that this cleansing is not from sin but from ignorance or lack of knowledge.—On the contrary, since such ignorance cannot be the result of any sin in the beatified angels, for they have no sin, it must be the result of nature. Now, those things that are natural cannot be removed while the nature remains. Consequently, an angel cannot be freed of his ignorance.

3. Illumination dispels darkness. Now, the only darkness which makes sense in regard to angels is the darkness of ignorance or of lack of understanding. Consequently, if their ignorance is removed when they are cleansed, their being cleansed and their being illumined come to the same thing, and the two should not be distinguished.

4. But it was said that illumination is referred to the end-term, while cleansing is referred to the initial term.—On the contrary, in no way of taking them is there found a term that is other than the end-term or the initial term. Consequently, if those two hierarchical actions, purgation and illumination, are distinguished according as one is referred to the initial term and the other to the end-term, a third hierarchical action cannot be posited; but to deny such a third action is to oppose Dionysius, who places the action of perfecting third.

5. As long as a thing is in the state of progression, it is not yet perfect. But, as the Master of the *Sentences* says, angels' knowledge grows in some way until judgment day. Hence, at the present time, one angel cannot perfect another.

6. Illumination is the cause of perfecting, just as it is the cause of cleansing. Now, a cause must be prior to its effect. Therefore, just as illumination precedes perfection, so does it also precede purgation if the purgation be from ignorance.

TO THE CONTRARY

Dionysius distinguishes and orders these actions in this manner, saying:

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 106, 2, ad I; I-II, 112, 1, ad 3; *II Sent.*, 3, 3, 2. See also readings given for q. 9, a. 1.

“The hierarchical order is such that some angels are cleansed, others do the cleansing, some are illumined, others illumine, some are perfected, others do the perfecting.”

REPLY

In angels those three actions pertain merely to their reception of knowledge; for this reason Dionysius says: “Purgation, perfection, and illumination are the reception of divine knowledge.” However, the distinction between them should be understood in the following manner. Two terms can be found in any generation or change, namely, the initial term and the end-term. Both, however, are found in different ways in different changes.

In some changes the initial term is something contrary to the perfection to be acquired. For example, blackness is the contrary of the whiteness acquired when a thing becomes white. On the other hand, sometimes the perfection to be acquired does not have a contrary directly, but the dispositions existing in the subject before the change are contrary to the dispositions ordered to the perfection to be introduced. This condition is found, for example, when a soul is infused into a body. Again, it sometimes happens that nothing is presupposed for the introduction of the form except a privation or negation. For example, in air that is to be illumined only darkness precedes; and this is removed by the presence of light.

Similarly, there is at times only one end-term. For example, the end term of the process of whitening is whiteness only. At other times, there are two end-terms, one of which is directed to the other. This is clearly the case when elements undergo change: one end-term is a disposition which demands a form, the other is the substantial form itself.

Now, in the reception of knowledge, we find the diversity mentioned above with respect to its initial term, because sometimes, before a person receives knowledge, there exists in him an error contrary to it. Again, at times there are in him beforehand only contrary dispositions, such as impurity of soul, an immoderate occupation with sense objects, or something of this nature. Again, at other times, there may be in him beforehand only a privation or negation of the knowledge, such as exists in us whose knowledge increases from day to day. It is in this last-named sense that we should understand the initial term of illumination in angels.

Moreover, we find that there are two end-terms in the reception of knowledge. The first is that by which the intellect is perfected in order to know something. This end-term may be either an intelligible form, an intelligible light, or any medium of cognition whatsoever. The second end-term is the

knowledge itself, which follows; and this is the final term in the reception of knowledge.

In angels' cleansing takes place through the simple removal of ignorance in the manner described; for this reason Dionysius says: "To receive divine knowledge is to be cleansed of ignorance." The illumination, however, takes place in the first end-term. Hence, Dionysius also says that angels are illumined in so far as something is manifested to them "through a higher illumination." Finally, "perfection" takes place in the ultimate end-term; and, for this reason, Dionysius says: "They are perfected by the light of resplendent knowledge." In other words, illumination and perfection are understood to differ as the informing of the sense of sight by a species of what is seen differs from the knowledge of the thing seen.

Drawing an analogy from the principles laid down above, Dionysius writes that the order of the deacons is to purify neophytes in the faith, that of priests is to illumine them, and that of bishops, to perfect them. He said this because deacons exercise their office over catechumens and those possessed by the devils; and, in these persons, there are dispositions contrary to illumination which are removed by the deacons' ministry. The duty of priests, however, is to teach and communicate the mysteries of the faith to the people; for these are, as it were, means for leading us to God. Finally, the duty of bishops is to uncover the spiritual riches that were concealed in the mystical symbols.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. As Dionysius says, the cleansing of angels is to be understood as a cleansing, not from any impurity, but from lack of knowledge.

2. A negation or defect is said to be natural in two senses. In the first, it is said to be natural because the presence of such a negation is, as it were, due to nature. For example, not having an intellect is natural to an ass. Now, this kind of natural defect is never removed as long as the nature itself remains. In the second sense, however, a negation is said to be natural because to have some certain perfection is not due to nature. This kind of a negation is found especially when a faculty of the nature is not able to acquire a perfection of the sort mentioned. Such natural defects can be removed. For example, the ignorance boys have is removed, and our lack of glory is removed by the bestowal of glory. Similarly, the ignorance angels have can be removed.

3. Illumination and cleansing are related to each other in the acquisition of knowledge by angels as generation and corruption are related in the acquisition of a natural form. Needless to say, generation and corruption are one in so far as they are in one subject, but they differ in their formal character.

4. The reply is clear from what has been said.

5. In our proposition, *perfection* is not taken as referring to all the knowledge an angel has, but only to a single act of knowledge; and he is perfected by this when he is led to the knowledge of some particular thing.

6. Just as form is, in some way, the cause of matter inasmuch as it gives matter actual existence, so, in some way, matter is the cause of form inasmuch as it sustains the form. Similarly, the things coming from form are, in a certain sense, prior to those coming from matter, but in the case of some the opposite is true. Now, because privation is related to matter, the removal of the privation is naturally prior to the introduction of the form according to the order in which matter is prior to form, namely, the order of generation. But the introduction of the form is prior according to that order in which the form is prior to matter, namely, the order of perfection. The same argument can be applied to the orders of illumination and perfection.

ARTICLE 4

*Does one angel speak to another?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. Commenting on the words of Job (28:17), “Gold or crystal cannot equal it,” Gregory says: “In heaven everyone will be seen by others as now he does not even see himself.” But while on earth person does not have to speak to himself in order to know his own idea. Consequently, in heaven it will not be necessary for him to speak to another so that he can know it. Hence, speech is unnecessary for beatified angels.

2. In the same passage, Gregory writes: “When one’s face is seen, in the same instant, his conscience will be penetrated.” Therefore, in heaven speech is not required for one person to know another’s concept.

3. Referring to angels, Maximus writes as follows: “When spiritual creatures meet and leave each other, one knows far more clearly what the other wishes to convey than were they to speak to each other. For, in some way, they silently discuss things and communicate their thoughts to each other.” Now, since silence is opposed to speech, angels know what other angels want to signify, without having to speak.

4. All speech takes place through signs. Now, a sign must be some thing

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 107, 1; 108, 5, ad 5; 108, 6; 109, 3; *II Sent.*, 11, 2, 3; *In I Cor.*, c. 13, lect. 1 (P. 13:259b).

that can be sensed, because, as is said in the *Sentences*: "A sign is that which, besides impressing a species upon the senses, make something else known." Consequently, since angels do not receive their knowledge from sensible things, they do not receive it by mean of signs, and, hence, not through speech.

5. A sign seems to be something that is more known to us but less known according to nature. Accordingly, the Commentator distinguishes between a demonstration through a sign and a perfect demonstration, the latter being a demonstration which is causal. Now, angels do not receive their knowledge from things posterior in nature, consequently, not from signs. Hence, they do not receive knowledge by means of speech.

6. In all speech the speaker must arouse his listener to attention to his words, which, in our case, are produced by the voice of the speaker. But to listen to words of this kind is impossible for an angel. Therefore, speech is likewise impossible for him.

7. As Plato says, speech was given to us so we could know signs of others' wills. But one angel knows the signs of another angel's will by knowing himself, because these signs are spiritual, and, by the same knowledge, an angel knows all spiritual things. Hence, since one angel knows the spiritual nature of another angel by knowing himself in the same way he knows his will. Therefore, he has no need of speech.

8. The forms within an angelic intellect are ordered to the knowledge of things, as in God the intelligible characters of things are ordered to their production, for angels' intellectual forms resemble these characters. Now, all things and whatever exists in a thing, whether it be interior or exterior, are produced by means of these intelligible characters. Therefore, when an angel knows another angel by means of the forms within his own intellect, he also knows all that is within that angel; and, as a consequence, he knows that angel's thought. Hence, the same must be said as before.

9. We have two kinds of speech, namely, internal and external. Now, we do not say that there is external speech in angels, because, if this were true, angels would have to form vocal speech to speak to each other. However, as Anselm and Augustine say, "Internal speech is nothing other than thought." Therefore, it is not necessary to assert that there exists in angels any kind of speech other than thought.

10. Avicenna says that we speak because we have a multitude of desires. This evidently arises from our many needs, because, as Augustine remarks, we desire a thing only if we do not have it. Now, since we cannot say that angels need many things, we cannot say that they speak to one another.

11. One angel cannot know another's thought through its essence, be-

cause it is not present through its essence, to the other's intellect. Hence, he must know the other's thought by means of a species. Now, of himself, an angel is able to know, by means of innate species, all that naturally exists in another angel. For the same reason, therefore, through these same species he knows all that takes place by the will of the other angel. Hence, it does not seem necessary to affirm the existence of speech in angels in order that one can make his thought known to another.

12. Signs and nods are directed to the sense of sight, not to that of hearing, but speech is directed to the sense of hearing. Now, angels indicate their thought "by signs and nods," for this is how the Gloss explains that verse in the first Epistle to the Corinthians (13:1): "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels..." Therefore, angels do not use speech to communicate.

13. Speech is a motion of a cognitive power. Now, the motion of a cognitive power terminates in the soul, not in something outside. Therefore, through speech, an angel is not directed to the manifestation of his thought to another angel.

14. In all speech something unknown should be manifested by means of what is known. For example, we manifest our concepts by means of sensible sounds. Now, we cannot say that this is possible for angels, because, as Dionysius says, the nature of an angel, naturally known by other angels, has no shape. Hence, there is nothing in an angel's nature that can be used to indicate what is not known about it. Consequently, for angels speech is impossible.

15. Angels are spiritual lights. But when light is seen it totally manifests itself. Therefore, when an angel is seen, whatever is in him is totally known. Consequently, there is no need for speech among angels.

TO THE CONTRARY

1. We read in the first Epistle to the Corinthians (13:1): "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels..." Now, tongues would be useless were there not speech. Consequently, angels speak.

2. As Boethius says, what a lower power can do a higher power also can. Now, men can reveal their thoughts to other men. Therefore, angels can do the same. However, to reveal one's thought means to speak it. Hence, angels possess speech.

3. Damascene says: "In their discourses, which are not oral, angels tell each other what their wills are, and also what are their plans and their thoughts." Now, discourse can be had only through speech. Therefore, angels possess the power of speech.

REPLY

There must be some kind of speech among angels, for, as we proved earlier, one angel does not have direct and particular knowledge of what lies hidden in the heart of another; consequently, an angel must have some way of manifesting his thought to another. This way can be called angelic speech, for what we call speech in our own case is simply the manifestation of an interior word, which we mentally conceive.

We can understand how angels manifest their concepts to one another if we study the resemblance their speech has to things in nature, because, as Boethius says, forms in nature are quasi-images of immaterial things. Now, we find that a form exists in matter in three ways. First, it can exist imperfectly, that is, in a mode halfway between potency and act. This, for example, is how forms exist that are coming into existence. Second, it can exist in perfect act; and I mean a perfection such that the being having it is perfected in itself. Third, it can exist in perfect act in such a way that the being having the form also can communicate this perfection to another. Some things are bright themselves, but cannot illumine other things.

Intelligible forms exist in the intellect in a similar way. First, they can exist, as it were, halfway between potency and act, as a form possessed habitually. Second, they may exist in perfect act with respect to the knower. This is true when a knower actually thinks according to a form which he has within himself. Third, they may exist with a relation to some other being; and their transition from one being to the other (a transition, as it were, from potency to act) is made through the will. For the will of an angel causes him to turn actually to the forms he possesses, as it were, habitually; and, similarly, it makes his intellect actually more perfect with respect to the form within him, so that the angel is perfected, not only by this intellectual form itself, but also by the relation it has to another angel. When this takes place, his thought is perceived by the other angels; and, in this sense, one angel is said to speak to another.

We would have the same way of speaking if our intellect could be directed to intelligibles without having to have recourse to media; but, because it is the nature of our intelligence to receive from the senses, sensible signs are used to express our interior concepts, and by these signs we manifest our heart's thoughts.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. Gregory's statement can be understood of both physical and spiritual vision; for in heaven, after the bodies of the saints have been glorified, a saint

will be able to see with his physical eyes the interior of another's body—something which is now impossible. It will be possible then, because glorified bodies will in some way be transparent. For this reason, Gregory compares them to glass. Similarly, one will be able to see with his spiritual eyes whether or not another person has charity, and, if so, how much he possesses—something which is likewise impossible now. From this it does not follow, however, that one, will be able to know the actual thoughts of another, because these depend on the will.

2. The conscience is said to be penetrated, but this is with respect to its habits, not to its actual thoughts.

3. In this statement, silence is opposed to oral speech such as we have, not to spiritual speech such as angels have.

4. A thing cannot be called a sign in the proper sense unless one can come to know something else as if by reasoning from it. In this sense, signs do not exist among angels, because, as we proved in the previous question, angels' knowledge is not discursive. The signs we use are sensible, because our knowledge, which is discursive, has its origin in sense-objects. But we commonly call anything a sign which, being known, leads to the knowledge of something else; and for this reason an intelligible form can be called a sign of the thing which is known by its means. It is in this sense that angels know things through signs; and thus one angel speaks to another by means of signs, that is, through a species which actuates his intellect and puts it perfectly in relation to the other.

5. Although it is true that in natural things, whose effects are more known to us than their causes are, a sign is that which is posterior in nature, the notion of a sign, even properly speaking, is not such that a sign need be prior or posterior in nature, but only that it must be known previously by us. For this reason, at times we take effects as signs of causes, as when we judge health from the pulse, and at other times we take causes as signs of effects, as we take the dispositions of heavenly bodies as signs of stormy weather and rain.

6. When angels turn to others, as long as they put some of their intelligible forms into an actual relation to these others, the angels may be said to be arousing others' attention to them.

7. It is true that an angel knows all spiritual things with the same kind of knowledge, that is, intellectually. But whether the knowledge of a thing comes through knowing oneself or through knowing something else concerns, not the type of knowledge, but only the manner in which this knowledge has been received. Hence, even if one angel knows the nature of another angel by

knowing himself, it does not follow that he also knows the speech of the other in the same manner, because the thought of one angel is not as intelligible to another as his nature is.

8. That reasoning would follow if the intellectual forms in an angel were as efficacious for the knowledge of things as the intelligible characters of things in God are for their production. But this is not true, since a creature is not in any respect equal to God.

9. Although angels do not speak exteriorly as we do, namely, through sensible signs, they do speak exteriorly in another manner. The direction of their thoughts to other angels can be called exterior angelic speech.

10. A multitude of desires is said to be the cause of speech merely because desires give rise to a multitude of concepts and these concepts would be expressed only by signs that differ greatly. Now, animals have just a few concepts, which they can express by a few natural signs. But, since angels have many concepts, they need speech. However, their having many concepts is a sign of no desire other than that of one angel's wanting to communicate his mental conception to another angel; and this desire is not a sign that he is imperfect.

11. One angel knows the thought of another through the innate species by which he knows that other angel, because through this same species he knows all that he knows about the other angel. Consequently, as soon as one angel relates himself to another angel according to an act of some form, the other angel knows his thought; and this depends on the will of the first angel. But the knowability of the angelic nature does not depend on the will of the angel. Therefore, angels do not need speech to know the nature of other angels but only to know their thoughts.

12. According to Augustine, "sight and hearing differ only exteriorly. Interiorly, in the mind, they are one and the same, because, in the mind, seeing and hearing do not differ. They differ only as they are in the external senses. Consequently, in angels, who have only minds, there is no difference between seeing and hearing. However, angelic speech gets its name from its resemblance to what takes place in us, for we receive our knowledge from others through our sense of hearing. Moreover, we can distinguish between angelic nods and signs in the following way: the species may be called signs, and the reference of the species to others, nods. But the very ability to do this is called their speech.

13. Speech is a motion of a cognitive power; however, the motion is not in the cognition but in the manifestation of the cognition. Hence, this motion must have an order to another being. For this reason, the Philosopher also says: "Speech exists in order that one can signify something to another."

14. The essence of an angel does not have a material shape, but his intellect is, as it were, shaped by its intelligible forms.

15. Physical light manifests itself because of a natural necessity. Consequently, it manifests itself in the same way in regard to everything it contains. An angel, however, possesses a will; and his concepts cannot be manifested unless his will commands that they be manifested. This is why an angel needs speech.

ARTICLE 5

*Do the inferior angels speak to the superior?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. In its explanation of that verse in the first Epistle to the Corinthians (13:1), “If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels,” the Gloss reads as follows: “These tongues are the means by which the superior angels tell the inferior angels what they are first to learn about the will of God.” Consequently, speech, an act of the tongue, belongs only to the higher angels.

2. Whenever anyone speaks, something takes place in his listener. Now, in the higher angels, nothing can take place that is caused by the lower, because the higher are not in potency with respect to the lower; rather, the opposite is true, since the superior angels have more act and less potency. Consequently, the lower angels cannot speak to the higher.

3. To the notion of thought speech adds that of infusing knowledge. But the lower angels cannot infuse anything into the higher angels, because in that case they would be acting upon them, and this is impossible. Therefore, the lower do not speak to the higher angels.

4. To illumine is simply to manifest something unknown. Now, angelic speech is for the manifestation of something unknown. Therefore, angelic speech is an illumination. Hence, since inferior angels do not illumine superior angels, it would seem that they also do not speak to them.

5. The angel to whom another angel speaks is in potency to knowing what is expressed in the speech, and, by means of this speech, he comes to know it actually. Consequently, the angel speaking reduces the one spoken to from potency to act. Now, this is not possible for inferior angels with respect to superior angels, because in that case the inferior angels would be more noble. Hence, inferior angels do not speak to superior angels.

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 107, aa. 2-3; *In I Cor.*, c. 13, lect. 1 (P. 13:259b).

6. One person teaches another if he tells him something that he did not know. Consequently, if inferior angels speak to superior angels about their concepts, which the superior are ignorant of, it would seem that they teach the superior angels, and thus perfect them, since, as Dionysius says, to teach is to perfect. But this would be contrary to the hierarchical order, according to which inferior angels are perfected by superior.

TO THE CONTRARY

Gregory says: "God speaks to angels, and angels speak to God." On the same principle, therefore, superior angels can talk to the inferior, and inferior to the superior.

REPLY

To resolve this question satisfactorily, we must consider how, in angels, illumination differs from speech; and this can be done in the following way. An intellect falls short of knowing something for two reasons. First, the knowable object may be absent. For example, we do not know what has happened in past times or in remote places, if these happenings have not come to our attention. Second, there may be a defect in the intellect. That is, the intellect may not be strong enough to arrive at those truths which it already has in its possession, as, for instance, the intellect has all conclusions within itself in possessing first principles naturally known, but it does not know those conclusions unless it is strengthened by exercise or instruction. Properly speaking, therefore, speech is that by which a person is led to the knowledge of the unknown, because, through speech, something becomes present to him that would otherwise be absent. We have an evident example of this in our own case when one person shows another what the other did not see, and thus, in some sense, makes this thing present to him by means of speech. On the other hand, illumination takes place when the intellect is merely strengthened to know something above that which it already knew. We have explained this previously.

It should be noted, however, that both angels and men can have speech without illumination, because sometimes a thing is shown to us through speech only, and this does not strengthen our intellect in any way for knowing more. For example, one can recite to me merely a historical narrative, or one angel can reveal merely his thought to another angel; such matters can be equally known or not known by one having a strong intellect as well as by one having a weak intellect. But illumination in angels and men always has speech joined to it. For we illumine another person inasmuch as we give him some means by which his intellect is strengthened to know something, and

this strengthening takes place through speech. In angels, this must also take place through speech, because the superior angel has his knowledge about things through forms that are more universal. Consequently, the inferior angel is not proportioned to receive knowledge from the superior unless the latter in some way distinguishes and divides his knowledge by conceiving within himself that about which he wishes to illumine in such a way that it will be comprehensible to the lower angel, and by manifesting this concept to him when he illumines him.

Consequently, Dionysius says: "In its providence, every intellectual essence divides and multiplies what it understands by one form, given to it by a godlike being, so that these divisions may act as guiding analogies for those below." The same is true of the teacher who, seeing that his pupil cannot grasp things which he himself knows in the same way in which he knows them, makes a special effort to distinguish and multiply his knowledge by means of examples, so that his pupil will grasp his knowledge in this manner.

Hence, we must admit that angelic speech joined with illumination is found only when superior angels speak to inferior; but the other type of angelic speech is used both when inferior angels speak to superior and when superior speak to inferior.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. The Gloss is referring here to angelic speech joined with an illumination.
2. The angel who speaks causes nothing in the angel to whom he is speaking. A change does take place, however, in himself; and, by reason of this change, he is known in the manner described above. Hence, there is no necessity for the angel speaking to infuse something into the one he is addressing.
3. The answer just given also solves the third difficulty.
4. The reply is evident from what has been said.
5. It is true that the angel to whom another angel speaks becomes an actual knower from being a potential knower; however, this takes place, not because he is reduced from potency to act, but because the angel who is speaking reduces himself from potency to act by making himself, with respect to some form, in perfect act according to an ordering to the other angel.
6. Properly speaking, *teaching* is applied only to those things which perfect an intellect. However, the fact that one angel knows the thoughts of another does not pertain to his intellectual perfection, just as it does not pertain to the perfection of my intellect if I learn about things that are not present to me and in no way concern me.

ARTICLE 6

*Is a determinate local distance required in order
that one angel can speak to another?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems that it is, for

1. Whenever arrival and departure are involved, there is necessarily a determinate distance. But, as Maximus says, angels see each other's thoughts as they approach and depart from one another.

2. According to Damascene, an angel is where he operates. Consequently, if he speaks to another angel, he must be where his listener is; hence, some determinate distance is involved.

3. We read in Isaiah (6:3): "They cried one to another." Now, the only reason for making cries is that a distance separates us from the one to whom we are speaking. Therefore, it seems that distance impedes the speech of angels.

4. Speech must be carried from the one speaking to the one listening. Now, this is not possible unless local distance separates the angel speaking from the one listening, because spiritual speech cannot be carried by a material medium. Therefore, local distance impedes the speech of angels.

5. If Peter's soul were on earth, it would know the events taking place here; but, since it is in heaven, it does not. Hence, the gloss of Augustine on Isaiah (63:16), "Abraham hath not known us," says: "The dead"—even the saints—"do not know what the living are doing"—even their own sons. Consequently, local distance impedes the cognition of a separated soul, and, by the same reasoning, that of angels, and also their speech.

TO THE CONTRARY

The greatest possible distance separates paradise from hell; but the blessed and the damned can see each other, especially before the day of final judgment. This is clear from Luke's account of Lazarus and the rich man (Luke 16:19-31). Consequently, no local distance impedes the cognition of a separated soul or that of an angel. By the same reasoning, it does not impede angels' speech.

REPLY

An agent acts according to its manner of existing. Hence, things that are

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 107, 4; *II Sent.*, II, 2, 3, ad 3.

material and circumscribed by place have actions that are material and circumscribed by place; and things that are spiritual act in a spiritual manner only. Consequently, because an angel as a knower is in no way circumscribed by place, the action of his intellect has no relation to place. Hence, since his speech is an operation of his intellect, local distance or proximity does not affect it. Therefore, one angel can understand the speech of another, whether that other be in a near or distant place—in the sense in which we say that angels are in place.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. That arrival and departure should be understood, not according to place, but according to the angels' turning to one another.

2. The statement that an angel is where he operates is to be understood as referring to an operation which he carries out on some body; and this operation gets its place from that in which it terminates. Angelic speech, however, is not an operation of this kind. Hence, the argument does not follow.

3. The cries which the Seraphim are said to have made signify rather the magnitude of the things they spoke about, namely, the unity of God's essence and the trinity of the persons; for they said: "Holy, Holy, Holy, the Lord God of hosts..." (Isaiah 6:3).

4. As already stated, the angel addressed does not receive anything from the one speaking; but, through species within himself, he knows the other angel as well as what he is saying. Consequently, there is no need of positing a medium by which something could be carried from one angel to another.

5. Augustine is speaking about the natural knowledge souls have. Through this, not even the saints can know what takes place here on earth. They can know these events, however, by means of the glory they have received. Gregory states, this explicitly when commenting on that verse in Job (14:21): "Whether his children come to honor or dishonor, he shall not understand." But angels have a natural knowledge that is more perfect than that of the separated soul. Hence, no parallel can be drawn between a soul and an angel.

ARTICLE 7

*Can one angel speak to another in such a way that others will not know what he is saying?**

DIFFICULTIES

It seems not, for

1. For angelic speech, all that is required is an intelligible species and a turning to another angel. But, if that species and turning are known by one angel, so they are also known by another. Therefore, what an angel says is equally perceived by all.

2. Using the same “nods,” one angel can speak to all the angels. Consequently, if an angel knows the speech by which another angel addresses him, he will also know the speech by which he addresses others.

3. Whoever sees an angel perceives the species by which that angel understands and speaks. But angels always see one another. Therefore, one angel always knows what another is speaking, whether that angel is speaking to him or to some other angel.

4. If a man speaks, he is heard equally by all those standing at the same distance from him, unless there is some defect in one of the hearers, that is, if he is hard of hearing. Now, sometimes another angel is by nature or locally closer to the angel speaking than is the angel who is being addressed. Therefore, the angel speaking is heard by others than those whom he addresses.

TO THE CONTRARY

It seems inconsistent to assert that the angels cannot do something which we can do. But a man can confide to another what he has conceived in his heart in such a way that it remains hidden from others. Consequently, an angel is also able to speak to another without letting others know what he is saying.

REPLY

As is clear from what was said previously, the thought of one angel comes to the knowledge of another after the manner of spiritual speech from the fact that the latter angel is actuated by a species not only subjectively but also with reference to the former; and this occurs by the will of the speaker.

Now, it is not necessary that things subject to the will should be related to all in the same way, but only as the will determines. Hence, spiritual speech is

* PARALLEL READINGS: *S.T.*, I, 107, 5.

not related to all angels equally, but only as the will of the angel who is speaking shall determine. Consequently, if, by his own will, an angel is actualized with respect to some intellectual species which he has directed to only one other angel, his speech will be known by that angel only; and, if his species has an order to several, several angels will know it.

ANSWERS TO DIFFICULTIES

1. In angelic speech the turning or direction required is not one that is known but one that makes known. Hence, when one angel turns to another, his turning makes the other know his thought.

2. In general, there is one “nod” by which an angel speaks to all angels; but, in particular, there are as many “nods” as there are turnings to the different angels. Consequently, every angel knows according to the “nod” made to him.

3. Even though one angel sees another, he does not necessarily see the species by which the other angel is actually thinking, unless that other angel turns to him.

4. Human speech makes another person hear by an action physically necessary, namely, by driving air to the ear of the listener. But, as explained previously, this does not take place in angelic speech. Here, everything depends on the will of the angel speaking.