

# Summa Theologica

Because the doctor of Catholic truth ought not only to teach the proficient, but also to instruct beginners (according to the Apostle: *As unto little ones in Christ, I gave you milk to drink, not meat* -- [1 Corinthians 3:1-2](#)), we purpose in this book to treat of whatever belongs to the Christian religion, in such a way as may tend to the instruction of beginners. We have considered that students in this doctrine have not seldom been hampered by what they have found written by other authors, partly on account of the multiplication of useless questions, articles, and arguments, partly also because those things that are needful for them to know are not taught according to the order of the subject matter, but according as the plan of the book might require, or the occasion of the argument offer, partly, too, because frequent repetition brought weariness and confusion to the minds of readers.

Endeavouring to avoid these and other like faults, we shall try, by God's help, to set forth whatever is included in this sacred doctrine as briefly and clearly as the matter itself may allow.

## **PRIMA PARS.**

Sacred Doctrine. The One God. The Blessed Trinity. Creation. The Angels. The Six Days. **Man. The Government of Creatures.**

## **PRIMA SECUNDÆ PARTIS.**

**Man's Last End. Human Acts. Passions.** Habits. Vice and Sin. **Law.** Grace. -

## **SECUNDA SECUNDÆ PARTIS.**

Faith. Hope. Charity. Prudence. Justice. Fortitude  
Temperance. Acts Which Pertain to Certain Men.

## **TERTIA PARS.**

The Incarnation. The Life of Christ. Sacraments. Baptism.  
Confirmation. The Holy Eucharist. Penance.

## **SUPPLEMENTUM TERTIA PARTIS.**

Penance (continued). Extreme Unction. Holy Orders.  
Matrimony. The Resurrection. Appendices.

# First Part (Prima Pars)

## SACRED DOCTRINE

**GENERAL:** The [nature and extent \(1\)](#) of sacred doctrine.

## THE ONE GOD

**EXISTENCE:** The [existence \(2\)](#) of God.

**ESSENCE:** We cannot know what God is, but only what He is not. So to study Him, we study what He has not -- such as composition and motion. His [simplicity \(3\)](#) or lack of composition. His perfection: and because everything in so far as it is perfect is called good, we shall speak of [His goodness \(6\)](#) -- and [goodness in general \(5\)](#) -- as well as [His perfection \(4\)](#). His [infinity \(7\)](#) and [omnipresence \(8\)](#). His [immutability \(9\)](#), and His [eternity \(10\)](#) following on His immutability. His [unity \(11\)](#). How God is [known by us \(12\)](#). The [names of God \(13\)](#).

**OPERATIONS (INTELLECT):** God's [knowledge \(14\)](#). The [ideas \(15\)](#), which exist in His knowledge. [Truth \(16\)](#) in God, for knowledge is of things that are true. [Falsity \(17\)](#) in God. The [life of God \(18\)](#), since to understand belongs to living beings.

**OPERATIONS (WILL):** God's [will \(19\)](#). In our own wills we find both the passions (such as joy and love), and the habits of the moral virtues (such as justice and fortitude). Hence we shall first consider the [love \(20\)](#) of God, and secondly His [justice and mercy \(21\)](#).

**OPERATIONS (INTELLECT AND WILL):** [Providence \(22\)](#), in respect to all created things; for in the science of morals, after the moral virtues themselves, comes the consideration of prudence, to which providence belongs.

[Predestination \(23\)](#) and the [book of life \(24\)](#).

**POWER:** The [power of God \(25\)](#), the principle of the divine operation as proceeding to the exterior effect. The [divine beatitude \(26\)](#)

## THE BLESSED TRINITY

**ORIGIN:** The question of [origin or procession \(27\)](#). The relations of origin [relations of origin \(28\)](#).

**THE PERSONS IN GENERAL:** The [signification \(29\)](#) of the word "person". The [number \(30\)](#) of the persons, and what is involved in the number of persons, or is opposed thereto; as diversity, and similitude, and the like [\(31\)](#). [Our knowledge \(32\)](#) of the persons.

**FATHER:** The person of the [Father \(33\)](#).

**SON:** The person of the Son, to whom three names are attributed: [Son \(see 33\)](#), the idea of which is gathered from the idea of Father; [Word \(34\)](#) and [Image \(35\)](#).

**HOLY GHOST:** The person of the Holy Ghost, Who is called three things: [Holy Ghost \(36\)](#), [Love \(37\)](#) and [Gift \(38\)](#).

**THE THREE COMPARED:** The person in reference to the [essence \(39\)](#), with the [relations or properties \(40\)](#), or to the [notional acts \(41\)](#). The [equality and likeness \(42\)](#) of the persons. Their [mission \(43\)](#).

## CREATION

**PRODUCTION:** The [first cause \(44\)](#) of beings. [Creation \(45\)](#), which is the mode of emanation of creatures from the first cause. The [beginning of the duration \(46\)](#) of creatures.

**DISTINCTION:** The distinction of [things in general\(47\)](#). The distinction of good and evil: [evil \(48\)](#) and its [cause \(49\)](#). The distinction of creatures -- spiritual (or angels), corporeal, and man (which is both) -- is outlined below.

## THE ANGELS (SPIRIT)

**SUBSTANCE:** Their substance considered [absolutely \(50\)](#), and in relation to corporeal things, such as [bodies \(51\)](#) and

[locations \(52\)](#). Their [local movement \(53\)](#).

**INTELLECT:** His [power \(54\)](#) and [medium \(55\)](#) of knowledge. The [immaterial \(56\)](#) and [material \(57\)](#) objects known. The [manner \(58\)](#) whereby he knows them.

**WILL:** The [will itself \(59\)](#) and its movement, which is [love \(60\)](#).

**ORIGIN:** How they were brought into [natural existence \(61\)](#) and [perfected in grace \(62\)](#). How some of them became wicked: Their [sins \(63\)](#) and [punishment \(64\)](#).

### THE SIX DAYS (MATTER)

**CREATION:** The work of [creation \(65\)](#).

**DISTINCTION:** The [ordering \(66\)](#) of creation towards distinction. The work of distinction in itself: The [first \(67\)](#), [second \(68\)](#) and [third \(69\)](#) days.

**ADORNMENT:** The [fourth \(70\)](#), [fifth \(71\)](#), [sixth \(72\)](#) and [seventh \(73\)](#) days.

**GENERAL:** [All seven days \(74\)](#) in common.

### MAN (SPIRIT AND MATTER)

**ESSENCE:** The nature of the soul [in itself \(75\)](#), and its [union with the body \(76\)](#).

**POWER:** The powers of the soul [in general \(77\)](#) Those powers which are a [preamble to the intellect \(78\)](#). The [intellectual \(79\)](#) powers. The appetitive powers [in general \(80\)](#), and specifically: [sensuality \(81\)](#), the [will \(82\)](#) and [free-will \(83\)](#).

**OPERATIONS:** We consider the will in the second part of this work, which deals with morals. Here we treat of the acts of the intellect. How the soul, when united to the body, understands corporeal things beneath it: Specifically, [through what \(84\)](#) does it know them? [How \(85\)](#) does it know them? [What \(86\)](#) does it know in them? When united to the body, how does the soul [know itself \(87\)](#)? When united to the body, how does it know [immaterial substances \(88\)](#) which are above it? And how does the soul understand when [separated from the body \(89\)](#)?

**ORIGIN (PRODUCTION):** The production of man's [soul](#)

[\(90\)](#) and [body \(91\)](#), and the production of the [woman \(92\)](#).

**ORIGIN (END):** The [end \(93\)](#) of man's production, inasmuch as he is "the image and likeness of God".

**ORIGIN (FIRST MAN):** The state of Adam's soul: His [intellect \(94\)](#); the [righteousness \(95\)](#) of his will and the use of righteousness as regards his [dominion over things \(96\)](#).

The state of Adam's body: Preservation of the [individual \(97\)](#) and of the [species \(98\)](#) through generation. The state of the offspring's [body \(99\)](#), [virtue \(100\)](#) and [knowledge \(101\)](#).

**ORIGIN (HOME):** His home, which is [paradise \(102\)](#).

## **THE GOVERNMENT OF CREATURES**

**GENERAL:** The government of things [in general \(103\)](#) and the [specific effects \(104\)](#) of this government.

**GOD:** How [God \(105\)](#) changes creatures.

**SPIRITS:** How an angel acts on another angel, through [enlightenment \(106\)](#) and [speech \(107\)](#); the hierarchies of [good \(108\)](#) and [evil \(109\)](#) spirits. How an angel acts on a [bodily creature \(110\)](#). How an angel acts on man by his [natural power \(111\)](#) and as a [minister of God \(112\)](#). The [guardianship \(113\)](#) of the good angels and the [assaults \(114\)](#) of the demons.

**BODIES:** How bodies change: the [action \(115\)](#) of the bodily creature, and [fate \(116\)](#), which is ascribed to certain bodies.

**MAN:** How man -- who is both body and spirit -- changes [in general \(117\)](#). The production of man from man as to the [soul \(118\)](#) and to the [body \(119\)](#).

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

# The nature and extent of sacred doctrine

1. [Is it necessary?](#)
2. [Is it a science?](#)
3. [Is it one or many?](#)
4. [Is it speculative or practical?](#)
5. [How it is compared with other sciences?](#)
6. [Is it the same as wisdom?](#)
7. [Is God its subject-matter?](#)
8. [Is it a matter of argument?](#)
9. [Does it rightly employ metaphors and similes?](#)
10. [May the Sacred Scripture of this doctrine be expounded in different senses?](#)

# Whether, besides philosophy, any further doctrine is required?

**Objection 1.** It seems that, besides philosophical science, we have no need of any further knowledge. For man should not seek to know what is above reason: "Seek not the things that are too high for thee" ([Sirach 3:22](#)). But whatever is not above reason is fully treated of in philosophical science. Therefore any other knowledge besides philosophical science is superfluous.

**Objection 2.** Further, knowledge can be concerned only with being, for nothing can be known, save what is true; and all that is, is true. But everything that is, is treated of in philosophical science--even God Himself; so that there is a part of philosophy called theology, or the divine science, as [Aristotle](#) has proved (Metaph. vi). Therefore, besides philosophical science, there is no need of any further knowledge.

**On the contrary,** It is written ([2 Timothy 3:16](#)): "All Scripture, inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice." Now Scripture, inspired of God, is no part of philosophical science, which has been built up by human reason. Therefore it is useful that besides philosophical science, there should be other knowledge, i.e. inspired of God.

**I answer that,** It was necessary for man's salvation that there should be a knowledge revealed by God besides philosophical science built up by human reason. Firstly,

indeed, because man is directed to God, as to an end that surpasses the grasp of his reason: "The eye hath not seen, O God, besides Thee, what things Thou hast prepared for them that wait for Thee" ([Isaiah 66:4](#)). But the end must first be known by men who are to direct their thoughts and actions to the end. Hence it was necessary for the salvation of man that certain truths which exceed human reason should be made known to him by divine revelation. Even as regards those truths about God which human reason could have discovered, it was necessary that man should be taught by a divine revelation; because the truth about God such as reason could discover, would only be known by a few, and that after a long time, and with the admixture of many errors. Whereas man's whole salvation, which is in God, depends upon the knowledge of this truth. Therefore, in order that the salvation of men might be brought about more fitly and more surely, it was necessary that they should be taught divine truths by divine revelation. It was therefore necessary that besides philosophical science built up by reason, there should be a sacred science learned through revelation.

**Reply to Objection 1.** Although those things which are beyond man's knowledge may not be sought for by man through his reason, nevertheless, once they are revealed by God, they must be accepted by faith. Hence the sacred text continues, "For many things are shown to thee above the understanding of man" ([Sirach 3:25](#)). And in this, the sacred science consists.

**Reply to Objection 2.** Sciences are differentiated according to the various means through which knowledge is obtained. For the astronomer and the physicist both may prove the same conclusion: that the earth, for instance, is round: the astronomer by means of mathematics (i.e. abstracting from matter), but the physicist by means of matter itself. Hence there is no reason why those things which may be learned from philosophical science, so far as they can be known by natural reason, may not also be taught us by another science so far as they fall within revelation. Hence theology included in sacred doctrine differs in kind from that theology which is part of philosophy.



# Whether sacred doctrine is a science?

**Objection 1.** It seems that sacred doctrine is not a science. For every science proceeds from self-evident principles. But sacred doctrine proceeds from articles of faith which are not self-evident, since their truth is not admitted by all: "For all men have not faith" (

[2 Thessalonians 3:2](#)). Therefore sacred doctrine is not a science.

**Objection 2.** Further, no science deals with individual facts. But this sacred science treats of individual facts, such as the deeds of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and such like. Therefore sacred doctrine is not a science.

**On the contrary,** [Augustine](#) says (De Trin. xiv, 1) "to this science alone belongs that whereby saving faith is begotten, nourished, protected and strengthened." But this can be said of no science except sacred doctrine. Therefore sacred doctrine is a science.

**I answer that,** Sacred doctrine is a science. We must bear in mind that there are two kinds of sciences. There are some which proceed from a principle known by the natural light of intelligence, such as arithmetic and geometry and the like. There are some which proceed from principles known by the light of a higher science: thus the science of perspective proceeds from principles established by geometry, and music from principles established by arithmetic. So it is that sacred doctrine is a science because it proceeds from principles established by the light of a higher science, namely, the science of God and the blessed. Hence, just as the musician accepts on authority the principles taught him

by the mathematician, so sacred science is established on principles revealed by God.

**Reply to Objection 1.** The principles of any science are either in themselves self-evident, or reducible to the conclusions of a higher science; and such, as we have said, are the principles of sacred doctrine.

**Reply to Objection 2.** Individual facts are treated of in sacred doctrine, not because it is concerned with them principally, but they are introduced rather both as examples to be followed in our lives (as in moral sciences) and in order to establish the authority of those men through whom the divine revelation, on which this sacred scripture or doctrine is based, has come down to us.

# Whether sacred doctrine is one science?

**Objection 1.** It seems that sacred doctrine is not one science; for according to the

[Philosopher](#) (Poster. i) "that science is one which treats only of one class of subjects." But the creator and the creature, both of whom are treated of in sacred doctrine, cannot be grouped together under one class of subjects. Therefore sacred doctrine is not one science.

**Objection 2.** Further, in sacred doctrine we treat of angels, corporeal creatures and human morality. But these belong to separate philosophical sciences. Therefore sacred doctrine cannot be one science.

**On the contrary,** Holy Scripture speaks of it as one science: "Wisdom gave him the knowledge [scientiam] of holy things" ([Wisdom 10:10](#)).

**I answer that,** Sacred doctrine is one science. The unity of a faculty or habit is to be gauged by its object, not indeed, in its material aspect, but as regards the precise formality under which it is an object. For example, man, ass, stone agree in the one precise formality of being colored; and color is the formal object of sight. Therefore, because Sacred Scripture considers things precisely under the formality of being divinely revealed, whatever has been divinely revealed possesses the one precise formality of the object of this science; and therefore is included under sacred doctrine as under one science.

**Reply to Objection 1.** Sacred doctrine does not treat of God and creatures equally, but of God primarily, and of creatures only so far as they are referable to God as their beginning or end. Hence the unity of this science is not impaired.

**Reply to Objection 2.** Nothing prevents inferior faculties or habits from being differentiated by something which falls under a higher faculty or habit as well; because the higher faculty or habit regards the object in its more universal formality, as the object of the "common sense" is whatever affects the senses, including, therefore, whatever is visible or audible. Hence the "common sense," although one faculty, extends to all the objects of the five senses. Similarly, objects which are the subject-matter of different philosophical sciences can yet be treated of by this one single sacred science under one aspect precisely so far as they can be included in revelation. So that in this way, sacred doctrine bears, as it were, the stamp of the divine science which is one and simple, yet extends to everything.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ

# Whether sacred doctrine is a practical science?

**Objection 1.** It seems that sacred doctrine is a practical science; for a practical science is that which ends in action according to the

[Philosopher](#) (Metaph. ii). But sacred doctrine is ordained to action: "Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only" ([James 1:22](#)). Therefore sacred doctrine is a practical science.

**Objection 2.** Further, sacred doctrine is divided into the Old and the New Law. But law implies a moral science which is a practical science. Therefore sacred doctrine is a practical science.

**On the contrary,** Every practical science is concerned with human operations; as moral science is concerned with human acts, and architecture with buildings. But sacred doctrine is chiefly concerned with God, whose handiwork is especially man. Therefore it is not a practical but a speculative science.

**I answer that,** Sacred doctrine, being one, extends to things which belong to different philosophical sciences because it considers in each the same formal aspect, namely, so far as they can be known through divine revelation. Hence, although among the philosophical sciences one is speculative and another practical, nevertheless sacred doctrine includes both; as God, by one and the same science, knows both Himself and His works. Still, it is speculative rather than practical because it is more concerned with



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 5

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether sacred doctrine is nobler than other sciences?

**Objection 1.** It seems that sacred doctrine is not nobler than other sciences; for the nobility of a science depends on the certitude it establishes. But other sciences, the principles of which cannot be doubted, seem to be more certain than sacred doctrine; for its principles--namely, articles of faith--can be doubted. Therefore other sciences seem to be nobler.

**Objection 2.** Further, it is the sign of a lower science to depend upon a higher; as music depends on arithmetic. But sacred doctrine does in a sense depend upon philosophical sciences; for [Jerome](#) observes, in his Epistle to Magnus, that "the ancient doctors so enriched their books with the ideas and phrases of the philosophers, that thou knowest not what more to admire in them, their profane erudition or their scriptural learning." Therefore sacred doctrine is inferior to other sciences.

**On the contrary,** Other sciences are called the handmaidens of this one: "Wisdom sent her maids to invite to the tower" ([Proverbs 9:3](#)).

**I answer that,** Since this science is partly speculative and partly practical, it transcends all others speculative and practical. Now one speculative science is said to be nobler than another, either by reason of its greater certitude, or by reason of the higher worth of its subject-matter. In both these respects this science surpasses other speculative sciences; in point of greater certitude, because other sciences

derive their certitude from the natural light of human reason, which can err; whereas this derives its certitude from the light of divine knowledge, which cannot be misled: in point of the higher worth of its subject-matter because this science treats chiefly of those things which by their sublimity transcend human reason; while other sciences consider only those things which are within reason's grasp. Of the practical sciences, that one is nobler which is ordained to a further purpose, as political science is nobler than military science; for the good of the army is directed to the good of the State. But the purpose of this science, in so far as it is practical, is eternal bliss; to which as to an ultimate end the purposes of every practical science are directed. Hence it is clear that from every standpoint, it is nobler than other sciences.

**Reply to Objection 1.** It may well happen that what is in itself the more certain may seem to us the less certain on account of the weakness of our intelligence, "which is dazzled by the clearest objects of nature; as the owl is dazzled by the light of the sun" (Metaph. ii, lect. i). Hence the fact that some happen to doubt about articles of faith is not due to the uncertain nature of the truths, but to the weakness of human intelligence; yet the slenderest knowledge that may be obtained of the highest things is more desirable than the most certain knowledge obtained of lesser things, as is said in *de Animalibus* xi.

**Reply to Objection 2.** This science can in a sense depend upon the philosophical sciences, not as though it stood in need of them, but only in order to make its teaching clearer. For it accepts its principles not from other sciences, but immediately from God, by revelation. Therefore it does not depend upon other sciences as upon the higher, but makes use of them as of the lesser, and as handmaidens: even so the master sciences make use of the sciences that supply their materials, as political of military science. That it thus uses them is not due to its own defect or insufficiency, but to the defect of our intelligence, which is more easily led by what is known through natural reason (from which proceed the other sciences) to that which is above reason, such as are the teachings of this science.



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 6

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

## Whether this doctrine is the same as wisdom?

**Objection 1.** It seems that this doctrine is not the same as wisdom. For no doctrine which borrows its principles is worthy of the name of wisdom; seeing that the wise man directs, and is not directed (Metaph. i). But this doctrine borrows its principles. Therefore this science is not wisdom.

**Objection 2.** Further, it is a part of wisdom to prove the principles of other sciences. Hence it is called the chief of sciences, as is clear in Ethic. vi. But this doctrine does not prove the principles of other sciences. Therefore it is not the same as wisdom.

**Objection 3.** Further, this doctrine is acquired by study, whereas wisdom is acquired by God's inspiration; so that it is numbered among the gifts of the Holy Spirit ([Isaiah 11:2](#)). Therefore this doctrine is not the same as wisdom.

**On the contrary,** It is written ([Deuteronomy 4:6](#)): "This is your wisdom and understanding in the sight of nations."

**I answer that,** This doctrine is wisdom above all human wisdom; not merely in any one order, but absolutely. For since it is the part of a wise man to arrange and to judge, and since lesser matters should be judged in the light of some higher principle, he is said to be wise in any one order who considers the highest principle in that order: thus in the order of building, he who plans the form of the house is called wise and architect, in opposition to the inferior laborers who trim the wood and make ready the stones: "As a wise architect, I have laid the foundation" ([1 Corinthians 3:10](#)).



Again, in the order of all human life, the prudent man is called wise, inasmuch as he directs his acts to a fitting end: "Wisdom is prudence to a man" ([Proverbs 10:23](#)). Therefore he who considers absolutely the highest cause of the whole universe, namely God, is most of all called wise. Hence wisdom is said to be the knowledge of divine things, as [Augustine](#) says (De Trin. xii, 14). But sacred doctrine essentially treats of God viewed as the highest cause--not only so far as He can be known through creatures just as philosophers knew Him--"That which is known of God is manifest in them" ([Romans 1:19](#))--but also as far as He is known to Himself alone and revealed to others. Hence sacred doctrine is especially called wisdom.

**Reply to Objection 1.** Sacred doctrine derives its principles not from any human knowledge, but from the divine knowledge, through which, as through the highest wisdom, all our knowledge is set in order.

**Reply to Objection 2.** The principles of other sciences either are evident and cannot be proved, or are proved by natural reason through some other science. But the knowledge proper to this science comes through revelation and not through natural reason. Therefore it has no concern to prove the principles of other sciences, but only to judge of them. Whatsoever is found in other sciences contrary to any truth of this science must be condemned as false: "Destroying counsels and every height that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God" ([2 Corinthians 10:4-5](#)).

**Reply to Objection 3.** Since judgment appertains to wisdom, the twofold manner of judging produces a twofold wisdom. A man may judge in one way by inclination, as whoever has the habit of a virtue judges rightly of what concerns that virtue by his very inclination towards it. Hence it is the virtuous man, as we read, who is the measure and rule of human acts. In another way, by knowledge, just as a man learned in moral science might be able to judge rightly about virtuous acts, though he had not the virtue. The first manner of judging divine things belongs to that wisdom which is set down among the gifts of the Holy Ghost: "The spiritual man judgeth all things" ([1 Corinthians 2:15](#)). And

[Dionysius](#) says (Div. Nom. ii): "Hierotheus is taught not by mere learning, but by experience of divine things." The second manner of judging belongs to this doctrine which is acquired by study, though its principles are obtained by revelation.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

> [Article 7](#)[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether God is the object of this science?

**Objection 1.** It seems that God is not the object of this science. For in every science, the nature of its object is presupposed. But this science cannot presuppose the essence of God, for [Damascene](#) says (De Fide Orth. i, iv): "It is impossible to define the essence of God." Therefore God is not the object of this science.

**Objection 2.** Further, whatever conclusions are reached in any science must be comprehended under the object of the science. But in Holy Writ we reach conclusions not only concerning God, but concerning many other things, such as creatures and human morality. Therefore God is not the object of this science.

**On the contrary,** The object of the science is that of which it principally treats. But in this science, the treatment is mainly about God; for it is called theology, as treating of God. Therefore God is the object of this science.

**I answer that,** God is the object of this science. The relation between a science and its object is the same as that between a habit or faculty and its object. Now properly speaking, the object of a faculty or habit is the thing under the aspect of which all things are referred to that faculty or habit, as man and stone are referred to the faculty of sight in that they are colored. Hence colored things are the proper objects of sight. But in sacred science, all things are treated of under the aspect of God: either because they are God Himself or because they refer to God as their beginning and end. Hence it follows that God is in very truth the object of this science.

This is clear also from the principles of this science, namely, the articles of faith, for faith is about God. The object of the principles and of the whole science must be the same, since the whole science is contained virtually in its principles. Some, however, looking to what is treated of in this science, and not to the aspect under which it is treated, have asserted the object of this science to be something other than God-- that is, either things and signs; or the works of salvation; or the whole Christ, as the head and members. Of all these things, in truth, we treat in this science, but so far as they have reference to God.

**Reply to Objection 1.** Although we cannot know in what consists the essence of God, nevertheless in this science we make use of His effects, either of nature or of grace, in place of a definition, in regard to whatever is treated of in this science concerning God; even as in some philosophical sciences we demonstrate something about a cause from its effect, by taking the effect in place of a definition of the cause.

**Reply to Objection 2.** Whatever other conclusions are reached in this sacred science are comprehended under God, not as parts or species or accidents but as in some way related to Him.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 8

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether sacred doctrine is a matter of argument?

**Objection 1.** It seems this doctrine is not a matter of argument. For [Ambrose](#) says (De Fide 1): "Put arguments aside where faith is sought." But in this doctrine, faith especially is sought: "But these things are written that you may believe" ([John 20:31](#)). Therefore sacred doctrine is not a matter of argument.

**Objection 2.** Further, if it is a matter of argument, the argument is either from authority or from reason. If it is from authority, it seems unbecoming its dignity, for the proof from authority is the weakest form of proof. But if it is from reason, this is unbecoming its end, because, according to [Gregory](#) (Hom. 26), "faith has no merit in those things of which human reason brings its own experience." Therefore sacred doctrine is not a matter of argument.

**On the contrary,** The Scripture says that a bishop should "embrace that faithful word which is according to doctrine, that he may be able to exhort in sound doctrine and to convince the gainsayers" ([Titus 1:9](#)).

**I answer that,** As other sciences do not argue in proof of their principles, but argue from their principles to demonstrate other truths in these sciences: so this doctrine does not argue in proof of its principles, which are the articles of faith, but from them it goes on to prove something else; as the [Apostle](#) from the resurrection of Christ argues in proof of the general resurrection (1 Cor. 15). However, it is

to be borne in mind, in regard to the philosophical sciences, that the inferior sciences neither prove their principles nor dispute with those who deny them, but leave this to a higher science; whereas the highest of them, viz. metaphysics, can dispute with one who denies its principles, if only the opponent will make some concession; but if he concede nothing, it can have no dispute with him, though it can answer his objections. Hence Sacred Scripture, since it has no science above itself, can dispute with one who denies its principles only if the opponent admits some at least of the truths obtained through divine revelation; thus we can argue with heretics from texts in Holy Writ, and against those who deny one article of faith, we can argue from another. If our opponent believes nothing of divine revelation, there is no longer any means of proving the articles of faith by reasoning, but only of answering his objections--if he has any--against faith. Since faith rests upon infallible truth, and since the contrary of a truth can never be demonstrated, it is clear that the arguments brought against faith cannot be demonstrations, but are difficulties that can be answered.

**Reply to Objection 1.** Although arguments from human reason cannot avail to prove what must be received on faith, nevertheless, this doctrine argues from articles of faith to other truths.

**Reply to Objection 2.** This doctrine is especially based upon arguments from authority, inasmuch as its principles are obtained by revelation: thus we ought to believe on the authority of those to whom the revelation has been made. Nor does this take away from the dignity of this doctrine, for although the argument from authority based on human reason is the weakest, yet the argument from authority based on divine revelation is the strongest. But sacred doctrine makes use even of human reason, not, indeed, to prove faith (for thereby the merit of faith would come to an end), but to make clear other things that are put forward in this doctrine. Since therefore grace does not destroy nature but perfects it, natural reason should minister to faith as the natural bent of the will ministers to charity. Hence the [Apostle](#) says: "Bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ" ([2 Corinthians 10:5](#)). Hence sacred doctrine makes use also of the authority of philosophers in

those questions in which they were able to know the truth by natural reason, as Paul quotes a saying of Aratus: "As some also of your own poets said: For we are also His offspring" ([Acts 17:28](#)). Nevertheless, sacred doctrine makes use of these authorities as extrinsic and probable arguments; but properly uses the authority of the canonical Scriptures as an incontrovertible proof, and the authority of the doctors of the Church as one that may properly be used, yet merely as probable. For our faith rests upon the revelation made to the [apostles](#) and prophets who wrote the canonical books, and not on the revelations (if any such there are) made to other doctors. Hence [Augustine](#) says (Epis. ad Hieron. xix, 1): "Only those books of Scripture which are called canonical have I learned to hold in such honor as to believe their authors have not erred in any way in writing them. But other authors I so read as not to deem everything in their works to be true, merely on account of their having so thought and written, whatever may have been their holiness and learning."

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 9

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#)

## Whether Holy Scripture should use metaphors?

**Objection 1.** It seems that Holy Scripture should not use metaphors. For that which is proper to the lowest science seems not to befit this science, which holds the highest place of all. But to proceed by the aid of various similitudes and figures is proper to poetry, the least of all the sciences. Therefore it is not fitting that this science should make use of such similitudes.

**Objection 2.** Further, this doctrine seems to be intended to make truth clear. Hence a reward is held out to those who manifest it: "They that explain me shall have life everlasting" ([Sirach 24:31](#)). But by such similitudes truth is obscured. Therefore, to put forward divine truths by likening them to corporeal things does not befit this science.

**Objection 3.** Further, the higher creatures are, the nearer they approach to the divine likeness. If therefore any creature be taken to represent God, this representation ought chiefly to be taken from the higher creatures, and not from the lower; yet this is often found in Scriptures.

**On the contrary,** It is written ([Hosea 12:10](#)): "I have multiplied visions, and I have used similitudes by the ministry of the prophets." But to put forward anything by means of similitudes is to use metaphors. Therefore this sacred science may use metaphors.

**I answer that,** It is befitting Holy Writ to put forward divine and spiritual truths by means of comparisons with material things. For God provides for everything according to the



capacity of its nature. Now it is natural to man to attain to intellectual truths through sensible objects, because all our knowledge originates from sense. Hence in Holy Writ, spiritual truths are fittingly taught under the likeness of material things. This is what [Dionysius](#) says (Coel. Hier. i): "We cannot be enlightened by the divine rays except they be hidden within the covering of many sacred veils." It is also befitting Holy Writ, which is proposed to all without distinction of persons--"To the wise and to the unwise I am a debtor" ([Romans 1:14](#))--that spiritual truths be expounded by means of figures taken from corporeal things, in order that thereby even the simple who are unable by themselves to grasp intellectual things may be able to understand it.

**Reply to Objection 1.** Poetry makes use of metaphors to produce a representation, for it is natural to man to be pleased with representations. But sacred doctrine makes use of metaphors as both necessary and useful.

**Reply to Objection 2.** The ray of divine revelation is not extinguished by the sensible imagery wherewith it is veiled, as [Dionysius](#) says (Coel. Hier. i); and its truth so far remains that it does not allow the minds of those to whom the revelation has been made, to rest in the metaphors, but raises them to the knowledge of truths; and through those to whom the revelation has been made others also may receive instruction in these matters. Hence those things that are taught metaphorically in one part of Scripture, in other parts are taught more openly. The very hiding of truth in figures is useful for the exercise of thoughtful minds and as a defense against the ridicule of the impious, according to the words "Give not that which is holy to dogs" ([Matthew 7:6](#)).

**Reply to Objection 3.** As [Dionysius](#) says, (Coel. Hier. i) it is more fitting that divine truths should be expounded under the figure of less noble than of nobler bodies, and this for three reasons. Firstly, because thereby men's minds are the better preserved from error. For then it is clear that these things are not literal descriptions of divine truths, which might have been open to doubt had they been expressed under the figure of nobler bodies, especially for those who could think of nothing nobler than bodies. Secondly,

because this is more befitting the knowledge of God that we have in this life. For what He is not is clearer to us than what He is. Therefore similitudes drawn from things farthest away from God form within us a truer estimate that God is above whatsoever we may say or think of Him. Thirdly, because thereby divine truths are the better hidden from the unworthy.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 10

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether in Holy Scripture a word may have several senses?

**Objection 1.** It seems that in Holy Writ a word cannot have several senses, historical or literal, allegorical, tropological or moral, and anagogical. For many different senses in one text produce confusion and deception and destroy all force of argument. Hence no argument, but only fallacies, can be deduced from a multiplicity of propositions. But Holy Writ ought to be able to state the truth without any fallacy. Therefore in it there cannot be several senses to a word.

**Objection 2.** Further, [Augustine](#) says (De util. cred. iii) that "the Old Testament has a fourfold division as to history, etiology, analogy and allegory." Now these four seem altogether different from the four divisions mentioned in the first objection. Therefore it does not seem fitting to explain the same word of Holy Writ according to the four different senses mentioned above.

**Objection 3.** Further, besides these senses, there is the parabolical, which is not one of these four.

**On the contrary,** [Gregory](#) says (Moral. xx, 1): "Holy Writ by the manner of its speech transcends every science, because in one and the same sentence, while it describes a fact, it reveals a mystery."

**I answer that,** The author of Holy Writ is God, in whose power it is to signify His meaning, not by words only (as man also can do), but also by things themselves. So, whereas

in every other science things are signified by words, this science has the property, that the things signified by the words have themselves also a signification. Therefore that first signification whereby words signify things belongs to the first sense, the historical or literal. That signification whereby things signified by words have themselves also a signification is called the spiritual sense, which is based on the literal, and presupposes it. Now this spiritual sense has a threefold division. For as the [Apostle](#) says ([Hebrews 10:1](#)) the Old Law is a figure of the New Law, and [Dionysius](#) says (Coel. Hier. i) "the New Law itself is a figure of future glory." Again, in the New Law, whatever our Head has done is a type of what we ought to do. Therefore, so far as the things of the Old Law signify the things of the New Law, there is the allegorical sense; so far as the things done in Christ, or so far as the things which signify Christ, are types of what we ought to do, there is the moral sense. But so far as they signify what relates to eternal glory, there is the anagogical sense. Since the literal sense is that which the author intends, and since the author of Holy Writ is God, Who by one act comprehends all things by His intellect, it is not unfitting, as [Augustine](#) says (Confess. xii), if, even according to the literal sense, one word in Holy Writ should have several senses.

**Reply to Objection 1.** The multiplicity of these senses does not produce equivocation or any other kind of multiplicity, seeing that these senses are not multiplied because one word signifies several things, but because the things signified by the words can be themselves types of other things. Thus in Holy Writ no confusion results, for all the senses are founded on one--the literal--from which alone can any argument be drawn, and not from those intended in allegory, as [Augustine](#) says (Epis. 48). Nevertheless, nothing of Holy Scripture perishes on account of this, since nothing necessary to faith is contained under the spiritual sense which is not elsewhere put forward by the Scripture in its literal sense.

**Reply to Objection 2.** These three--history, etiology, analogy--are grouped under the literal sense. For it is called history, as [Augustine](#) expounds (Epis. 48), whenever

anything is simply related; it is called etiology when its cause is assigned, as when Our Lord gave the reason why Moses allowed the putting away of wives--namely, on account of the hardness of men's hearts; it is called analogy whenever the truth of one text of Scripture is shown not to contradict the truth of another. Of these four, allegory alone stands for the three spiritual senses. Thus [Hugh of St. Victor](#) (Sacram. iv, 4 Prolog.) includes the anagogical under the allegorical sense, laying down three senses only--the historical, the allegorical, and the tropological.

**Reply to Objection 3.** The parabolical sense is contained in the literal, for by words things are signified properly and figuratively. Nor is the figure itself, but that which is figured, the literal sense. When Scripture speaks of God's arm, the literal sense is not that God has such a member, but only what is signified by this member, namely operative power. Hence it is plain that nothing false can ever underlie the literal sense of Holy Writ.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliae

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ

# The existence of God

1. [Is the proposition "God exists" self-evident?](#)
2. [Is it demonstrable?](#)
3. [Does God exist?](#)

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ

Copyright © 2005 by K. Knight. All rights reserved. Updated 24 August 2005.



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

> [Article 1](#)[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether the existence of God is self-evident?

**Objection 1.** It seems that the existence of God is self-evident. Now those things are said to be self-evident to us the knowledge of which is naturally implanted in us, as we can see in regard to first principles. But as [Damascene](#) says (De Fide Orth. i, 1,3), "the knowledge of God is naturally implanted in all." Therefore the existence of God is self-evident.

**Objection 2.** Further, those things are said to be self-evident which are known as soon as the terms are known, which the [Philosopher](#) (1 Poster. iii) says is true of the first principles of demonstration. Thus, when the nature of a whole and of a part is known, it is at once recognized that every whole is greater than its part. But as soon as the signification of the word "God" is understood, it is at once seen that God exists. For by this word is signified that thing than which nothing greater can be conceived. But that which exists actually and mentally is greater than that which exists only mentally. Therefore, since as soon as the word "God" is understood it exists mentally, it also follows that it exists actually. Therefore the proposition "God exists" is self-evident.

**Objection 3.** Further, the existence of truth is self-evident. For whoever denies the existence of truth grants that truth does not exist: and, if truth does not exist, then the proposition "Truth does not exist" is true: and if there is anything true, there must be truth. But God is truth itself: "I am the way, the truth, and the life" ([John 14:6](#)) Therefore "God exists" is self-evident.

**On the contrary,** No one can mentally admit the opposite of what is self-evident; as the [Philosopher](#) (Metaph. iv, lect. vi) states concerning the first principles of demonstration. But the opposite of the proposition "God is" can be mentally admitted: "The fool said in his heart, There is no God" ([Psalm 52:1](#)). Therefore, that God exists is not self-evident.

**I answer that,** A thing can be self-evident in either of two ways: on the one hand, self-evident in itself, though not to us; on the other, self-evident in itself, and to us. A proposition is self-evident because the predicate is included in the essence of the subject, as "Man is an animal," for animal is contained in the essence of man. If, therefore the essence of the predicate and subject be known to all, the proposition will be self-evident to all; as is clear with regard to the first principles of demonstration, the terms of which are common things that no one is ignorant of, such as being and non-being, whole and part, and such like. If, however, there are some to whom the essence of the predicate and subject is unknown, the proposition will be self-evident in itself, but not to those who do not know the meaning of the predicate and subject of the proposition. Therefore, it happens, as [Boethius](#) says (Hebdom., the title of which is: "Whether all that is, is good"), "that there are some mental concepts self-evident only to the learned, as that incorporeal substances are not in space." Therefore I say that this proposition, "God exists," of itself is self-evident, for the predicate is the same as the subject, because God is His own existence as will be hereafter shown (3, 4). Now because we do not know the essence of God, the proposition is not self-evident to us; but needs to be demonstrated by things that are more known to us, though less known in their nature--namely, by effects.

**Reply to Objection 1.** To know that God exists in a general and confused way is implanted in us by nature, inasmuch as God is man's beatitude. For man naturally desires happiness, and what is naturally desired by man must be naturally known to him. This, however, is not to know absolutely that God exists; just as to know that someone is approaching is not the same as to know that Peter is approaching, even though it is Peter who is approaching; for many there are who imagine that man's perfect good which is happiness,



consists in riches, and others in pleasures, and others in something else.

**Reply to Objection 2.** Perhaps not everyone who hears this word "God" understands it to signify something than which nothing greater can be thought, seeing that some have believed God to be a body. Yet, granted that everyone understands that by this word "God" is signified something than which nothing greater can be thought, nevertheless, it does not therefore follow that he understands that what the word signifies exists actually, but only that it exists mentally. Nor can it be argued that it actually exists, unless it be admitted that there actually exists something than which nothing greater can be thought; and this precisely is not admitted by those who hold that God does not exist.

**Reply to Objection 3.** The existence of truth in general is self-evident but the existence of a Primal Truth is not self-evident to us.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 2

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether it can be demonstrated that God exists?

**Objection 1.** It seems that the existence of God cannot be demonstrated. For it is an article of faith that God exists. But what is of faith cannot be demonstrated, because a demonstration produces scientific knowledge; whereas faith is of the unseen ([Hebrews 11:1](#)). Therefore it cannot be demonstrated that God exists.

**Objection 2.** Further, the essence is the middle term of demonstration. But we cannot know in what God's essence consists, but solely in what it does not consist; as [Damascene](#) says (De Fide Orth. i, 4). Therefore we cannot demonstrate that God exists.

**Objection 3.** Further, if the existence of God were demonstrated, this could only be from His effects. But His effects are not proportionate to Him, since He is infinite and His effects are finite; and between the finite and infinite there is no proportion. Therefore, since a cause cannot be demonstrated by an effect not proportionate to it, it seems that the existence of God cannot be demonstrated.

**On the contrary,** The [Apostle](#) says: "The invisible things of Him are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made" ([Romans 1:20](#)). But this would not be unless the existence of God could be demonstrated through the things that are made; for the first thing we must know of anything is whether it exists.

**I answer that,** Demonstration can be made in two ways: One is through the cause, and is called "a priori," and this is to argue from what is prior absolutely. The other is through the effect, and is called a demonstration "a posteriori"; this is to argue from what is prior relatively only to us. When an effect is better known to us than its cause, from the effect we proceed to the knowledge of the cause. And from every effect the existence of its proper cause can be demonstrated, so long as its effects are better known to us; because since every effect depends upon its cause, if the effect exists, the cause must pre-exist. Hence the existence of God, in so far as it is not self-evident to us, can be demonstrated from those of His effects which are known to us.

**Reply to Objection 1.** The existence of God and other like truths about God, which can be known by natural reason, are not articles of faith, but are preambles to the articles; for faith presupposes natural knowledge, even as grace presupposes nature, and perfection supposes something that can be perfected. Nevertheless, there is nothing to prevent a man, who cannot grasp a proof, accepting, as a matter of faith, something which in itself is capable of being scientifically known and demonstrated.

**Reply to Objection 2.** When the existence of a cause is demonstrated from an effect, this effect takes the place of the definition of the cause in proof of the cause's existence. This is especially the case in regard to God, because, in order to prove the existence of anything, it is necessary to accept as a middle term the meaning of the word, and not its essence, for the question of its essence follows on the question of its existence. Now the names given to God are derived from His effects; consequently, in demonstrating the existence of God from His effects, we may take for the middle term the meaning of the word "God".

**Reply to Objection 3.** From effects not proportionate to the cause no perfect knowledge of that cause can be obtained. Yet from every effect the existence of the cause can be clearly demonstrated, and so we can demonstrate the existence of God from His effects; though from them we cannot perfectly know God as He is in His essence.

# Whether God exists?

**Objection 1.** It seems that [God](#) does not exist; because if one of two contraries be infinite, the other would be altogether destroyed. But the word "God" means that He is infinite goodness. If, therefore, [God](#) existed, there would be no evil discoverable; but there is evil in the world. Therefore [God](#) does not exist.

**Objection 2.** Further, it is superfluous to suppose that what can be accounted for by a few principles has been produced by many. But it seems that everything we see in the world can be accounted for by other principles, supposing [God](#) did not exist. For all natural things can be reduced to one principle which is nature; and all voluntary things can be reduced to one principle which is human reason, or will. Therefore there is no need to suppose [God's existence](#).

**On the contrary,** It is said in the person of [God](#): "I am Who am." ([Exodus 3:14](#))

**I answer that,** The [existence of God](#) can be proved in five ways.

The first and more manifest way is the argument from motion. It is certain, and evident to our senses, that in the world some things are in motion. Now whatever is in motion is put in motion by another, for nothing can be in motion except it is in potentiality to that towards which it is in motion; whereas a thing moves inasmuch as it is in act. For motion is nothing else than the reduction of something from potentiality to actuality. But nothing can be reduced from potentiality to actuality, except by something in a state of actuality. Thus that which is actually hot, as fire, makes

wood, which is potentially hot, to be actually hot, and thereby moves and changes it. Now it is not possible that the same thing should be at once in actuality and potentiality in the same respect, but only in different respects. For what is actually hot cannot simultaneously be potentially hot; but it is simultaneously potentially cold. It is therefore impossible that in the same respect and in the same way a thing should be both mover and moved, i.e. that it should move itself. Therefore, whatever is in motion must be put in motion by another. If that by which it is put in motion be itself put in motion, then this also must needs be put in motion by another, and that by another again. But this cannot go on to infinity, because then there would be no first mover, and, consequently, no other mover; seeing that subsequent movers move only inasmuch as they are put in motion by the first mover; as the staff moves only because it is put in motion by the hand. Therefore it is necessary to arrive at a first mover, put in motion by no other; and this everyone understands to be [God](#).

The second way is from the nature of the efficient cause. In the world of sense we find there is an order of efficient causes. There is no case known (neither is it, indeed, possible) in which a thing is found to be the efficient cause of itself; for so it would be prior to itself, which is impossible. Now in efficient causes it is not possible to go on to infinity, because in all efficient causes following in order, the first is the cause of the intermediate cause, and the intermediate is the cause of the ultimate cause, whether the intermediate cause be several, or only one. Now to take away the cause is to take away the effect. Therefore, if there be no first cause among efficient causes, there will be no ultimate, nor any intermediate cause. But if in efficient causes it is possible to go on to infinity, there will be no first efficient cause, neither will there be an ultimate effect, nor any intermediate efficient causes; all of which is plainly false. Therefore it is necessary to admit a first efficient cause, to which everyone gives the name of [God](#).

The third way is taken from possibility and necessity, and runs thus. We find in nature things that are possible to be and not to be, since they are found to be generated, and to corrupt, and consequently, they are possible to be and not to

be. But it is impossible for these always to exist, for that which is possible not to be at some time is not. Therefore, if everything is possible not to be, then at one time there could have been nothing in existence. Now if this were true, even now there would be nothing in existence, because that which does not exist only begins to exist by something already existing. Therefore, if at one time nothing was in existence, it would have been impossible for anything to have begun to exist; and thus even now nothing would be in existence-- which is absurd. Therefore, not all beings are merely possible, but there must exist something the existence of which is necessary. But every necessary thing either has its necessity caused by another, or not. Now it is impossible to go on to infinity in necessary things which have their necessity caused by another, as has been already proved in regard to efficient causes. Therefore we cannot but postulate the existence of some being having of itself its own necessity, and not receiving it from another, but rather causing in others their necessity. This all men speak of as [God](#).

The fourth way is taken from the gradation to be found in things. Among beings there are some more and some less good, true, noble and the like. But "more" and "less" are predicated of different things, according as they resemble in their different ways something which is the maximum, as a thing is said to be hotter according as it more nearly resembles that which is hottest; so that there is something which is truest, something best, something noblest and, consequently, something which is uttermost being; for those things that are greatest in truth are greatest in being, as it is written in Metaph. ii. Now the maximum in any genus is the cause of all in that genus; as fire, which is the maximum heat, is the cause of all hot things. Therefore there must also be something which is to all beings the cause of their being, goodness, and every other perfection; and this we call [God](#).

The fifth way is taken from the governance of the world. We see that things which lack intelligence, such as natural bodies, act for an end, and this is evident from their acting always, or nearly always, in the same way, so as to obtain the best result. Hence it is plain that not fortuitously, but

designedly, do they achieve their end. Now whatever lacks intelligence cannot move towards an end, unless it be directed by some being endowed with knowledge and intelligence; as the arrow is shot to its mark by the archer. Therefore some intelligent being exists by whom all natural things are directed to their end; and this being we call [God](#).

**Reply to Objection 1.** As [Augustine](#) says (Enchiridion xi): "Since [God](#) is the [highest good](#), He would not allow any evil to exist in His works, unless His omnipotence and goodness were such as to bring good even out of evil." This is part of the infinite goodness of [God](#), that He should allow evil to exist, and out of it produce good.

**Reply to Objection 2.** Since nature works for a determinate end under the direction of a higher agent, whatever is done by nature must needs be traced back to [God](#), as to its first cause. So also whatever is done voluntarily must also be traced back to some higher cause other than human reason or will, since these can change or fail; for all things that are changeable and capable of defect must be traced back to an immovable and self-necessary first principle, as was shown in the body of the Article.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ

# The simplicity of God

1. [Is God a body?](#)
2. [Is He composed of matter and form?](#)
3. [Is there composition of quiddity, essence or nature, and subject in Him?](#)
4. [Is He composed of essence and existence?](#)
5. [Is He composed of genus and difference?](#)
6. [Is He composed of subject and accident?](#)
7. [Is He in any way composite, or wholly simple?](#)
8. [Does He enter into composition with other things?](#)

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*  
Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province  
Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.  
*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.  
*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ

Copyright © 2005 by K. Knight. All rights reserved. Updated 24 August 2005.



# Whether God is a body?

**Objection 1.** It seems that God is a body. For a body is that which has the three dimensions. But Holy Scripture attributes the three dimensions to God, for it is written: "He is higher than [Heaven](#), and what wilt thou do? He is deeper than Hell, and how wilt thou know? The measure of Him is longer than the earth and broader than the sea" ([Job 11:8-9](#)). Therefore God is a body.

**Objection 2.** Further, everything that has figure is a body, since figure is a quality of quantity. But God seems to have figure, for it is written: "Let us make man to our image and likeness" ([Genesis 1:26](#)). Now a figure is called an image, according to the text: "Who being the brightness of His glory and the figure," i.e. the image, "of His substance" ([Hebrews 1:3](#)). Therefore God is a body.

**Objection 3.** Further, whatever has corporeal parts is a body. Now Scripture attributes corporeal parts to God. "Hast thou an arm like God?" ([Job 40:4](#)); and "The eyes of the Lord are upon the just" ([Psalm 33:16](#)); and "The right hand of the Lord hath wrought strength" ([Psalm 117:16](#)). Therefore God is a body.

**Objection 4.** Further, posture belongs only to bodies. But something which supposes posture is said of God in the Scriptures: "I saw the Lord sitting" ([Isaiah 6:1](#)), and "He standeth up to judge" ([Isaiah 3:13](#)). Therefore God is a body.

**Objection 5.** Further, only bodies or things corporeal can be

a local term "wherefrom" or "whereto." But in the Scriptures God is spoken of as a local term "whereto," according to the words, "Come ye to Him and be enlightened" ([Psalm 33:6](#)), and as a term "wherefrom": "All they that depart from Thee shall be written in the earth" ([Jeremiah 17:13](#)). Therefore God is a body.

**On the contrary,** It is written in the Gospel of St. John ([John 4:24](#)): "God is a spirit."

**I answer that,** It is absolutely true that God is not a body; and this can be shown in three ways.

First, because no body is in motion unless it be put in motion, as is evident from induction. Now it has been already proved (2, 3), that God is the First Mover, and is Himself unmoved. Therefore it is clear that God is not a body.

Secondly, because the first being must of necessity be in act, and in no way in potentiality. For although in any single thing that passes from potentiality to actuality, the potentiality is prior in time to the actuality; nevertheless, absolutely speaking, actuality is prior to potentiality; for whatever is in potentiality can be reduced into actuality only by some being in actuality. Now it has been already proved that God is the First Being. It is therefore impossible that in God there should be any potentiality. But every body is in potentiality because the continuous, as such, is divisible to infinity; it is therefore impossible that God should be a body.

Thirdly, because God is the most noble of beings. Now it is impossible for a body to be the most noble of beings; for a body must be either animate or inanimate; and an animate body is manifestly nobler than any inanimate body. But an animate body is not animate precisely as body; otherwise all bodies would be animate. Therefore its animation depends upon some other thing, as our body depends for its animation on the soul. Hence that by which a body becomes animated must be nobler than the body. Therefore it is impossible that God should be a body.



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 2

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether God is composed of matter and form?

**Objection 1.** It seems that God is composed of matter and form. For whatever has a soul is composed of matter and form; since the soul is the form of the body. But Scripture attributes a soul to God; for it is mentioned in Hebrews ([Hebrews 10:38](#)), where God says: "But My just man liveth by faith; but if he withdraw himself, he shall not please My soul." Therefore God is composed of matter and form.

**Objection 2.** Further, anger, joy and the like are passions of the composite. But these are attributed to God in Scripture: "The Lord was exceeding angry with His people" ([Psalm 105:40](#)). Therefore God is composed of matter and form.

**Objection 3.** Further, matter is the principle of individualization. But God seems to be individual, for He cannot be predicated of many. Therefore He is composed of matter and form.

**On the contrary,** Whatever is composed of matter and form is a body; for dimensive quantity is the first property of matter. But God is not a body as proved in the preceding Article; therefore He is not composed of matter and form.

**I answer that,** It is impossible that matter should exist in God.

First, because matter is in potentiality. But we have shown (2, 3) that God is pure act, without any potentiality. Hence it

is impossible that God should be composed of matter and form.

Secondly, because everything composed of matter and form owes its perfection and goodness to its form; therefore its goodness is participated, inasmuch as matter participates the form. Now the first good and the best--viz. God--is not a participated good, because the essential good is prior to the participated good. Hence it is impossible that God should be composed of matter and form.

Thirdly, because every agent acts by its form; hence the manner in which it has its form is the manner in which it is an agent. Therefore whatever is primarily and essentially an agent must be primarily and essentially form. Now God is the first agent, since He is the first efficient cause. He is therefore of His essence a form; and not composed of matter and form.

**Reply to Objection 1.** A soul is attributed to God because His acts resemble the acts of a soul; for, that we will anything, is due to our soul. Hence what is pleasing to His will is said to be pleasing to His soul.

**Reply to Objection 2.** Anger and the like are attributed to God on account of a similitude of effect. Thus, because to punish is properly the act of an angry man, God's punishment is metaphorically spoken of as His anger.

**Reply to Objection 3.** Forms which can be received in matter are individualized by matter, which cannot be in another as in a subject since it is the first underlying subject; although form of itself, unless something else prevents it, can be received by many. But that form which cannot be received in matter, but is self-subsisting, is individualized precisely because it cannot be received in a subject; and such a form is God. Hence it does not follow that matter exists in God.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*  
Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province  
Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight  
*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 3

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether God is the same as His essence or nature?

**Objection 1.** It seems that God is not the same as His essence or nature. For nothing can be in itself. But the substance or nature of God--i.e. the Godhead--is said to be in God. Therefore it seems that God is not the same as His essence or nature.

**Objection 2.** Further, the effect is assimilated to its cause; for every agent produces its like. But in created things the "suppositum" is not identical with its nature; for a man is not the same as his humanity. Therefore God is not the same as His Godhead.

**On the contrary,** It is said of God that He is life itself, and not only that He is a living thing: "I am the way, the truth, and the life" ([John 14:6](#)). Now the relation between Godhead and God is the same as the relation between life and a living thing. Therefore God is His very Godhead.

**I answer that,** God is the same as His essence or nature. To understand this, it must be noted that in things composed of matter and form, the nature or essence must differ from the "suppositum," because the essence or nature connotes only what is included in the definition of the species; as, humanity connotes all that is included in the definition of man, for it is by this that man is man, and it is this that humanity signifies, that, namely, whereby man is man. Now individual matter, with all the individualizing accidents, is not included in the definition of the species. For this

particular flesh, these bones, this blackness or whiteness, etc., are not included in the definition of a man. Therefore this flesh, these bones, and the accidental qualities distinguishing this particular matter, are not included in humanity; and yet they are included in the thing which is man. Hence the thing which is a man has something more in it than has humanity. Consequently humanity and a man are not wholly identical; but humanity is taken to mean the formal part of a man, because the principles whereby a thing is defined are regarded as the formal constituent in regard to the individualizing matter. On the other hand, in things not composed of matter and form, in which individualization is not due to individual matter--that is to say, to "this" matter--the very forms being individualized of themselves--it is necessary the forms themselves should be subsisting "supposita." Therefore "suppositum" and nature in them are identified. Since God then is not composed of matter and form, He must be His own Godhead, His own Life, and whatever else is thus predicated of Him.

**Reply to Objection 1.** We can speak of simple things only as though they were like the composite things from which we derive our knowledge. Therefore in speaking of God, we use concrete nouns to signify His subsistence, because with us only those things subsist which are composite; and we use abstract nouns to signify His simplicity. In saying therefore that Godhead, or life, or the like are in God, we indicate the composite way in which our intellect understands, but not that there is any composition in God.

**Reply to Objection 2.** The effects of God do not imitate Him perfectly, but only as far as they are able; and the imitation is here defective, precisely because what is simple and one, can only be represented by divers things; consequently, composition is accidental to them, and therefore, in them "suppositum" is not the same as nature.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*  
Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province  
Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.



# Whether essence and existence are the same in God?

**Objection 1.** It seems that essence and existence are not the same in God. For if it be so, then the divine being has nothing added to it. Now being to which no addition is made is universal being which is predicated of all things.

Therefore it follows that God is being in general which can be predicated of everything. But this is false: "For men gave the incommunicable name to stones and wood" ([Wisdom 14:21](#)). Therefore God's existence is not His essence.

**Objection 2.** Further, we can know "whether" God exists as said above (2, 2); but we cannot know "what" He is.

Therefore God's existence is not the same as His essence--that is, as His quiddity or nature.

**On the contrary,** [Hilary](#) says (Trin. vii): "In God existence is not an accidental quality, but subsisting truth." Therefore what subsists in God is His existence.

**I answer that,** God is not only His own essence, as shown in the preceding article, but also His own existence. This may be shown in several ways.

First, whatever a thing has besides its essence must be caused either by the constituent principles of that essence (like a property that necessarily accompanies the species--as the faculty of laughing is proper to a man--and is caused by the constituent principles of the species), or by some exterior agent--as heat is caused in water by fire. Therefore, if the

existence of a thing differs from its essence, this existence must be caused either by some exterior agent or by its essential principles. Now it is impossible for a thing's existence to be caused by its essential constituent principles, for nothing can be the sufficient cause of its own existence, if its existence is caused. Therefore that thing, whose existence differs from its essence, must have its existence caused by another. But this cannot be true of God; because we call God the first efficient cause. Therefore it is impossible that in God His existence should differ from His essence.

Secondly, existence is that which makes every form or nature actual; for goodness and humanity are spoken of as actual, only because they are spoken of as existing. Therefore existence must be compared to essence, if the latter is a distinct reality, as actuality to potentiality. Therefore, since in God there is no potentiality, as shown above (1), it follows that in Him essence does not differ from existence. Therefore His essence is His existence.

Thirdly, because, just as that which has fire, but is not itself fire, is on fire by participation; so that which has existence but is not existence, is a being by participation. But God is His own essence, as shown above (3) if, therefore, He is not His own existence He will be not essential, but participated being. He will not therefore be the first being--which is absurd. Therefore God is His own existence, and not merely His own essence.

**Reply to Objection 1.** A thing that has nothing added to it can be of two kinds. Either its essence precludes any addition; thus, for example, it is of the essence of an irrational animal to be without reason. Or we may understand a thing to have nothing added to it, inasmuch as its essence does not require that anything should be added to it; thus the genus animal is without reason, because it is not of the essence of animal in general to have reason; but neither is it to lack reason. And so the divine being has nothing added to it in the first sense; whereas universal being has nothing added to it in the second sense.

**Reply to Objection 2.** "To be" can mean either of two



things. It may mean the act of essence, or it may mean the composition of a proposition effected by the mind in joining a predicate to a subject. Taking "to be" in the first sense, we cannot understand God's existence nor His essence; but only in the second sense. We know that this proposition which we form about God when we say "God is," is true; and this we know from His effects (2, 2).

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 5

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether God is contained in a genus?

**Objection 1.** It seems that God is contained in a genus. For a substance is a being that subsists of itself. But this is especially true of God. Therefore God is in a genus of substance.

**Objection 2.** Further, nothing can be measured save by something of its own genus; as length is measured by length and numbers by number. But God is the measure of all substances, as the [Commentator](#) shows (Metaph. x). Therefore God is in the genus of substance.

**On the contrary,** In the mind, genus is prior to what it contains. But nothing is prior to God either really or mentally. Therefore God is not in any genus.

**I answer that,** A thing can be in a genus in two ways; either absolutely and properly, as a species contained under a genus; or as being reducible to it, as principles and privations. For example, a point and unity are reduced to the genus of quantity, as its principles; while blindness and all other privations are reduced to the genus of habit. But in neither way is God in a genus. That He cannot be a species of any genus may be shown in three ways.

First, because a species is constituted of genus and difference. Now that from which the difference constituting the species is derived, is always related to that from which the genus is derived, as actuality is related to potentiality. For animal is derived from sensitive nature, by concretion as it were, for that is animal, which has a sensitive nature.

Rational being, on the other hand, is derived from intellectual nature, because that is rational, which has an intellectual nature, and intelligence is compared to sense, as actuality is to potentiality. The same argument holds good in other things. Hence since in God actuality is not added to potentiality, it is impossible that He should be in any genus as a species.

Secondly, since the existence of God is His essence, if God were in any genus, He would be the genus "being", because, since genus is predicated as an essential it refers to the essence of a thing. But the [Philosopher](#) has shown (Metaph. iii) that being cannot be a genus, for every genus has differences distinct from its generic essence. Now no difference can exist distinct from being; for non-being cannot be a difference. It follows then that God is not in a genus.

Thirdly, because all in one genus agree in the quiddity or essence of the genus which is predicated of them as an essential, but they differ in their existence. For the existence of man and of horse is not the same; as also of this man and that man: thus in every member of a genus, existence and quiddity--i.e. essence--must differ. But in God they do not differ, as shown in the preceding article. Therefore it is plain that God is not in a genus as if He were a species. From this it is also plain that He has no genus nor difference, nor can there be any definition of Him; nor, save through His effects, a demonstration of Him: for a definition is from genus and difference; and the mean of a demonstration is a definition. That God is not in a genus, as reducible to it as its principle, is clear from this, that a principle reducible to any genus does not extend beyond that genus; as, a point is the principle of continuous quantity alone; and unity, of discontinuous quantity. But God is the principle of all being. Therefore He is not contained in any genus as its principle.

**Reply to Objection 1.** The word substance signifies not only what exists of itself--for existence cannot of itself be a genus, as shown in the body of the article; but, it also signifies an essence that has the property of existing in this way--namely, of existing of itself; this existence, however, is not its essence. Thus it is clear that God is not in the genus

of substance.

**Reply to Objection 2.** This objection turns upon proportionate measure which must be homogeneous with what is measured. Now, God is not a measure proportionate to anything. Still, He is called the measure of all things, in the sense that everything has being only according as it resembles Him.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 6

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether in God there are any accidents?

**Objection 1.** It seems that there are accidents in God. For substance cannot be an accident, as [Aristotle](#) says (Phys. i). Therefore that which is an accident in one, cannot, in another, be a substance. Thus it is proved that heat cannot be the substantial form of fire, because it is an accident in other things. But wisdom, virtue, and the like, which are accidents in us, are attributes of God. Therefore in God there are accidents.

**Objection 2.** Further, in every genus there is a first principle. But there are many "genera" of accidents. If, therefore, the primal members of these genera are not in God, there will be many primal beings other than God--which is absurd.

**On the contrary,** Every accident is in a subject. But God cannot be a subject, for "no simple form can be a subject", as [Boethius](#) says (De Trin.). Therefore in God there cannot be any accident.

**I answer that,** From all we have said, it is clear there can be no accident in God.

First, because a subject is compared to its accidents as potentiality to actuality; for a subject is in some sense made actual by its accidents. But there can be no potentiality in God, as was shown (2, 3).

Secondly, because God is His own existence; and as [Boethius](#) says (Hebdom.), although every essence may have

something superadded to it, this cannot apply to absolute being: thus a heated substance can have something extraneous to heat added to it, as whiteness, nevertheless absolute heat can have nothing else than heat.

Thirdly, because what is essential is prior to what is accidental. Whence as God is absolute primal being, there can be in Him nothing accidental. Neither can He have any essential accidents (as the capability of laughing is an essential accident of man), because such accidents are caused by the constituent principles of the subject. Now there can be nothing caused in God, since He is the first cause. Hence it follows that there is no accident in God.

**Reply to Objection 1.** Virtue and wisdom are not predicated of God and of us univocally. Hence it does not follow that there are accidents in God as there are in us.

**Reply to Objection 2.** Since substance is prior to its accidents, the principles of accidents are reducible to the principles of the substance as to that which is prior; although God is not first as if contained in the genus of substance; yet He is first in respect to all being, outside of every genus.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

> [Article 7](#)[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether God is altogether simple?

**Objection 1.** It seems that God is not altogether simple. For whatever is from God must imitate Him. Thus from the first being are all beings; and from the first good is all good. But in the things which God has made, nothing is altogether simple. Therefore neither is God altogether simple.

**Objection 2.** Further, whatever is best must be attributed to God. But with us that which is composite is better than that which is simple; thus, chemical compounds are better than simple elements, and animals than the parts that compose them. Therefore it cannot be said that God is altogether simple.

**On the contrary,** [Augustine](#) says (De Trin. iv, 6,7): "God is truly and absolutely simple."

**I answer that,** The absolute simplicity of God may be shown in many ways.

First, from the previous articles of this question. For there is neither composition of quantitative parts in God, since He is not a body; nor composition of matter and form; nor does His nature differ from His "suppositum"; nor His essence from His existence; neither is there in Him composition of genus and difference, nor of subject and accident. Therefore, it is clear that God is nowise composite, but is altogether simple.

Secondly, because every composite is posterior to its component parts, and is dependent on them; but God is the

first being, as shown above (2, 3).

Thirdly, because every composite has a cause, for things in themselves different cannot unite unless something causes them to unite. But God is uncaused, as shown above (2, 3), since He is the first efficient cause.

Fourthly, because in every composite there must be potentiality and actuality; but this does not apply to God; for either one of the parts actuates another, or at least all the parts are potential to the whole.

Fifthly, because nothing composite can be predicated of any single one of its parts. And this is evident in a whole made up of dissimilar parts; for no part of a man is a man, nor any of the parts of the foot, a foot. But in wholes made up of similar parts, although something which is predicated of the whole may be predicated of a part (as a part of the air is air, and a part of water, water), nevertheless certain things are predicable of the whole which cannot be predicated of any of the parts; for instance, if the whole volume of water is two cubits, no part of it can be two cubits. Thus in every composite there is something which is not it itself. But, even if this could be said of whatever has a form, viz. that it has something which is not it itself, as in a white object there is something which does not belong to the essence of white; nevertheless in the form itself, there is nothing besides itself. And so, since God is absolute form, or rather absolute being, He can be in no way composite. [Hilary](#) implies this argument, when he says (De Trin. vii): "God, Who is strength, is not made up of things that are weak; nor is He Who is light, composed of things that are dim."

**Reply to Objection 1.** Whatever is from God imitates Him, as caused things imitate the first cause. But it is of the essence of a thing to be in some sort composite; because at least its existence differs from its essence, as will be shown hereafter, (4, 3).

**Reply to Objection 2.** With us composite things are better than simple things, because the perfections of created goodness cannot be found in one simple thing, but in many





&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 8

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether God enters into the composition of other things?

**Objection 1.** It seems that God enters into the composition of other things, for [Dionysius](#) says (Coel. Hier. iv): "The being of all things is that which is above being--the Godhead." But the being of all things enters into the composition of everything. Therefore God enters into the composition of other things.

**Objection 2.** Further, God is a form; for [Augustine](#) says (De Verb. Dom., [Serm. xxxviii]) that, "the word of God, which is God, is an uncreated form." But a form is part of a compound. Therefore God is part of some compound.

**Objection 3.** Further, whatever things exist, in no way differing from each other, are the same. But God and primary matter exist, and in no way differ from each other. Therefore they are absolutely the same. But primary matter enters into the composition things. Therefore also does God. Proof of the minor--whatever things differ, they differ by some differences, and therefore must be composite. But God and primary matter are altogether simple. Therefore they nowise differ from each other.

**On the contrary,** [Dionysius](#) says (Div. Nom. ii): "There can be no touching Him," i.e. God, "nor any other union with Him by mingling part with part."

Further, the first cause rules all things without commingling with them, as the [Philosopher](#) says (De Causis).

**I answer that,** On this point there have been three errors. Some have affirmed that God is the world-soul, as is clear from [Augustine](#) (De Civ. Dei vii, 6). This is practically the same as the opinion of those who assert that God is the soul of the highest [heaven](#). Again, others have said that God is the formal principle of all things; and this was the theory of the Almaricians. The third error is that of David of Dinant, who most absurdly taught that God was primary matter. Now all these contain manifest untruth; since it is not possible for God to enter into the composition of anything, either as a formal or a material principle.

First, because God is the first efficient cause. Now the efficient cause is not identical numerically with the form of the thing caused, but only specifically: for man begets man. But primary matter can be neither numerically nor specifically identical with an efficient cause; for the former is merely potential, while the latter is actual.

Secondly, because, since God is the first efficient cause, to act belongs to Him primarily and essentially. But that which enters into composition with anything does not act primarily and essentially, but rather the composite so acts; for the hand does not act, but the man by his hand; and, fire warms by its heat. Hence God cannot be part of a compound.

Thirdly, because no part of a compound can be absolutely primal among beings--not even matter, nor form, though they are the primal parts of every compound. For matter is merely potential; and potentiality is absolutely posterior to actuality, as is clear from the foregoing (3, 1): while a form which is part of a compound is a participated form; and as that which participates is posterior to that which is essential, so likewise is that which is participated; as fire in ignited objects is posterior to fire that is essentially such. Now it has been proved that God is absolutely primal being (2, 3).

**Reply to Objection 1.** The Godhead is called the being of all things, as their efficient and exemplar cause, but not as being their essence.

**Reply to Objection 2.** The Word is an exemplar form; but not a form that is part of a compound.

**Reply to Objection 3.** Simple things do not differ by added differences--for this is the property of compounds. Thus man and horse differ by their differences, rational and irrational; which differences, however, do not differ from each other by other differences. Hence, to be quite accurate, it is better to say that they are, not different, but diverse. Hence, according to the [Philosopher](#) (Metaph. x), "things which are diverse are absolutely distinct, but things which are different differ by something." Therefore, strictly speaking, primary matter and God do not differ, but are by their very being, diverse. Hence it does not follow they are the same.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliae

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ



## The goodness of God

1. [Does goodness belong to God?](#)
2. [Is God the supreme good?](#)
3. [Is He alone essentially good?](#)
4. ~~[Are all things good by the divine goodness?](#)~~

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ

Copyright © 2005 by K. Knight. All rights reserved. Updated 24 August 2005.



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 1

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

## Whether God is good?

**Objection 1.** It seems that to be good does not belong to God. For goodness consists in mode, species and order. But these do not seem to belong to God; since God is immense and is not ordered to anything else. Therefore to be good does not belong to God.

**Objection 2.** Further, the good is what all things desire. But all things do not desire God, because all things do not know Him; and nothing is desired unless it is known. Therefore to be good does not belong to God.

**On the contrary,** It is written ([Lamentations 3:25](#)): "The Lord is good to them that hope in Him, to the soul that seeketh Him."

**I answer that,** To be good belongs pre-eminently to God. For a thing is good according to its desirableness. Now everything seeks after its own perfection; and the perfection and form of an effect consist in a certain likeness to the agent, since every agent makes its like; and hence the agent itself is desirable and has the nature of good. For the very thing which is desirable in it is the participation of its likeness. Therefore, since God is the first effective cause of all things, it is manifest that the aspect of good and of desirableness belong to Him; and hence [Dionysius](#) (Div. Nom. iv) attributes good to God as to the first efficient cause, saying that, God is called good "as by Whom all things subsist."

**Reply to Objection 1.** To have mode, species and order belongs to the essence of caused good; but good is in God as in its cause, and hence it belongs to Him to impose mode,

species and order on others; wherefore these three things are in God as in their cause.

**Reply to Objection 2.** All things, by desiring their own perfection, desire God Himself, inasmuch as the perfections of all things are so many similitudes of the divine being; as appears from what is said above (4, 3). And so of those things which desire God, some know Him as He is Himself, and this is proper to the rational creature; others know some participation of His goodness, and this belongs also to sensible knowledge; others have a natural desire without knowledge, as being directed to their ends by a higher intelligence.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 2

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether God is the supreme good?

**Objection 1.** It seems that God is not the supreme good. For the supreme good adds something to good; otherwise it would belong to every good. But everything which is an addition to anything else is a compound thing: therefore the supreme good is a compound. But God is supremely simple; as was shown above (3, 7). Therefore God is not the supreme good.

**Objection 2.** Further, "Good is what all desire," as the [Philosopher](#) says (Ethic. i, 1). Now what all desire is nothing but God, Who is the end of all things: therefore there is no other good but God. This appears also from what is said ([Luke 18:19](#)): "None is good but God alone." But we use the word supreme in comparison with others, as e.g. supreme heat is used in comparison with all other heats. Therefore God cannot be called the supreme good.

**Objection 3.** Further, supreme implies comparison. But things not in the same genus are not comparable; as, sweetness is not properly greater or less than a line. Therefore, since God is not in the same genus as other good things, as appears above (3, 5; 4, 3) it seems that God cannot be called the supreme good in relation to others.

**On the contrary,** [Augustine](#) says (De Trin. ii) that, the Trinity of the divine persons is "the supreme good, discerned by purified minds."

**I answer that,** God is the supreme good simply, and not only as existing in any genus or order of things. For good is

attributed to God, as was said in the preceding article, inasmuch as all desired perfections flow from Him as from the first cause. They do not, however, flow from Him as from a univocal agent, as shown above (4, 2); but as from an agent which does not agree with its effects either in species or genus. Now the likeness of an effect in the univocal cause is found uniformly; but in the equivocal cause it is found more excellently, as, heat is in the sun more excellently than it is in fire. Therefore as good is in God as in the first, but not the univocal, cause of all things, it must be in Him in a most excellent way; and therefore He is called the supreme good.

**Reply to Objection 1.** The supreme good does not add to good any absolute thing, but only a relation. Now a relation of God to creatures, is not a reality in God, but in the creature; for it is in God in our idea only: as, what is knowable is so called with relation to knowledge, not that it depends on knowledge, but because knowledge depends on it. Thus it is not necessary that there should be composition in the supreme good, but only that other things are deficient in comparison with it.

**Reply to Objection 2.** When we say that good is what all desire, it is not to be understood that every kind of good thing is desired by all; but that whatever is desired has the nature of good. And when it is said, "None is good but God alone," this is to be understood of essential goodness, as will be explained in the next article.

**Reply to Objection 3.** Things not of the same genus are in no way comparable to each other if indeed they are in different genera. Now we say that God is not in the same genus with other good things; not that He is any other genus, but that He is outside genus, and is the principle of every genus; and thus He is compared to others by excess, and it is this kind of comparison the supreme good implies.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS





&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 3

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether to be essentially good belongs to God alone?

**Objection 1.** It seems that to be essentially good does not belong to God alone. For as "one" is convertible with "being," so is "good"; as we said above (5, 1). But every being is one essentially, as appears from the [Philosopher](#) (Metaph. iv); therefore every being is good essentially.

**Objection 2.** Further, if good is what all things desire, since being itself is desired by all, then the being of each thing is its good. But everything is a being essentially; therefore every being is good essentially.

**Objection 3.** Further, everything is good by its own goodness. Therefore if there is anything which is not good essentially, it is necessary to say that its goodness is not its own essence. Therefore its goodness, since it is a being, must be good; and if it is good by some other goodness, the same question applies to that goodness also; therefore we must either proceed to infinity, or come to some goodness which is not good by any other goodness. Therefore the first supposition holds good. Therefore everything is good essentially.

**On the contrary,** [Boethius](#) says (De Hebdom.), that "all things but God are good by participation." Therefore they are not good essentially.

**I answer that,** God alone is good essentially. For everything is called good according to its perfection. Now perfection of

a thing is threefold: first, according to the constitution of its own being; secondly, in respect of any accidents being added as necessary for its perfect operation; thirdly, perfection consists in the attaining to something else as the end. Thus, for instance, the first perfection of fire consists in its existence, which it has through its own substantial form; its secondary perfection consists in heat, lightness and dryness, and the like; its third perfection is to rest in its own place. This triple perfection belongs to no creature by its own essence; it belongs to God only, in Whom alone essence is existence; in Whom there are no accidents; since whatever belongs to others accidentally belongs to Him essentially; as, to be powerful, wise and the like, as appears from what is stated above (3, 6); and He is not directed to anything else as to an end, but is Himself the last end of all things. Hence it is manifest that God alone has every kind of perfection by His own essence; therefore He Himself alone is good essentially.

**Reply to Objection 1.** "One" does not include the idea of perfection, but only of indivision, which belongs to everything according to its own essence. Now the essences of simple things are undivided both actually and potentially, but the essences of compounds are undivided only actually; and therefore everything must be one essentially, but not good essentially, as was shown above.

**Reply to Objection 2.** Although everything is good in that it has being, yet the essence of a creature is not very being; and therefore it does not follow that a creature is good essentially.

**Reply to Objection 3.** The goodness of a creature is not its very essence, but something superadded; it is either its existence, or some added perfection, or the order to its end. Still, the goodness itself thus added is good, just as it is being. But for this reason is it called being because by it something has being, not because it itself has being through something else: hence for this reason is it called good because by it something is good, and not because it itself has some other goodness whereby it is good.



&gt;

&gt;

&gt;

&gt; Article 4

[A](#) | [B](#) | [C](#) | [D](#) | [E](#) | [F](#) | [G](#) | [H](#) | [I](#) | [J](#) | [K](#) | [L](#) | [M](#) | [N](#) | [O](#) | [P](#) | [Q](#) | [R](#) | [S](#) | [T](#) | [U](#) | [V](#) | [W](#) | [X](#) | [Y](#) | [Z](#) |

# Whether all things are good by the divine goodness?

**Objection 1.** It seems that all things are good by the divine goodness. For [Augustine](#) says (De Trin. viii), "This and that are good; take away this and that, and see good itself if thou canst; and so thou shalt see God, good not by any other good, but the good of every good." But everything is good by its own good; therefore everything is good by that very good which is God.

**Objection 2.** Further, as [Boethius](#) says (De Hebdom.), all things are called good, accordingly as they are directed to God, and this is by reason of the divine goodness; therefore all things are good by the divine goodness.

**On the contrary,** All things are good, inasmuch as they have being. But they are not called beings through the divine being, but through their own being; therefore all things are not good by the divine goodness, but by their own goodness.

**I answer that,** As regards relative things, we must admit extrinsic denomination; as, a thing is denominated "placed" from "place," and "measured" from "measure." But as regards absolute things opinions differ. Plato held the existence of separate ideas (84, 4) of all things, and that individuals were denominated by them as participating in the separate ideas; for instance, that Socrates is called man according to the separate idea of man. Now just as he laid down separate ideas of man and horse which he called absolute man and absolute horse, so likewise he laid down

separate ideas of "being" and of "one," and these he called absolute being and absolute oneness; and by participation of these, everything was called "being" or "one"; and what was thus absolute being and absolute one, he said was the supreme good. And because good is convertible with being, as one is also; he called God the absolute good, from whom all things are called good by way of participation.

Although this opinion appears to be unreasonable in affirming separate ideas of natural things as subsisting of themselves--as [Aristotle](#) argues in many ways--still, it is absolutely true that there is first something which is essentially being and essentially good, which we call God, as appears from what is shown above (2, 3), and [Aristotle](#) agrees with this. Hence from the first being, essentially such, and good, everything can be called good and a being, inasmuch as it participates in it by way of a certain assimilation which is far removed and defective; as appears from the above (4, 3).

Everything is therefore called good from the divine goodness, as from the first exemplary effective and final principle of all goodness. Nevertheless, everything is called good by reason of the similitude of the divine goodness belonging to it, which is formally its own goodness, whereby it is denominated good. And so of all things there is one goodness, and yet many goodnesses.

This is a sufficient Reply to the Objections.

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ

Copyright © 2005 by K. Knight. All rights reserved. Updated 24 August 2005.

# Goodness in general

1. [Are goodness and being the same really?](#)
2. [Granted that they differ only in idea, which is prior in thought?](#)
3. [Granted that being is prior, is every being good?](#)
4. [To what cause should goodness be reduced?](#)
5. [Does goodness consist in mode, species, and order?](#)
6. [Is goodness divided into the virtuous, the useful, and the pleasant?](#)

*The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas*

Second and Revised Edition, 1920

Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province

Online Edition Copyright © 2003 by Kevin Knight

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Innocentius Apap, O.P., S.T.M., Censor. Theol.

*Imprimatur.* Edus. Canonicus Surmont, Vicarius Generalis. Westmonasterii.

APPROBATIO ORDINIS

*Nihil Obstat.* F. Raphael Moss, O.P., S.T.L. and F. Leo Moore, O.P., S.T.L.

*Imprimatur.* F. Beda Jarrett, O.P., S.T.L., A.M., Prior Provincialis Angliæ

MARIÆ IMMACULATÆ - SEDI SAPIENTIÆ

Copyright © 2005 by K. Knight. All rights reserved. Updated 24 August 2005.

# Whether goodness differs really from being?

**Objection 1.** It seems that goodness differs really from being. For [Boethius](#) says (De Hebdom.): "I perceive that in nature the fact that things are good is one thing: that they are is another." Therefore goodness and being really differ.

**Objection 2.** Further, nothing can be its own form. "But that is called good which has the form of being", according to the commentary on De Causis. Therefore goodness differs really from being.

**Objection 3.** Further, goodness can be more or less. But being cannot be more or less. Therefore goodness differs really from being.

**On the contrary,** [Augustine](#) says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 42) that, "inasmuch as we exist we are good."

**I answer that,** Goodness and being are really the same, and differ only in idea; which is clear from the following argument. The essence of goodness consists in this, that it is in some way desirable. Hence the [Philosopher](#) says (Ethic. i): "Goodness is what all desire." Now it is clear that a thing is desirable only in so far as it is perfect; for all desire their own perfection. But everything is perfect so far as it is actual. Therefore it is clear that a thing is perfect so far as it exists; for it is existence that makes all things actual, as is clear from the foregoing (3, 4; 4, 1). Hence it is clear that goodness and being are the same really. But goodness

presents the aspect of desirableness, which being does not present.

**Reply to Objection 1.** Although goodness and being are the same really, nevertheless since they differ in thought, they are not predicated of a thing absolutely in the same way. Since being properly signifies that something actually is, and actuality properly correlates to potentiality; a thing is, in consequence, said simply to have being, accordingly as it is primarily distinguished from that which is only in potentiality; and this is precisely each thing's substantial being. Hence by its substantial being, everything is said to have being simply; but by any further actuality it is said to have being relatively. Thus to be white implies relative being, for to be white does not take a thing out of simply potential being; because only a thing that actually has being can receive this mode of being. But goodness signifies perfection which is desirable; and consequently of ultimate perfection. Hence that which has ultimate perfection is said to be simply good; but that which has not the ultimate perfection it ought to have (although, in so far as it is at all actual, it has some perfection), is not said to be perfect simply nor good simply, but only relatively. In this way, therefore, viewed in its primal (i.e. substantial) being a thing is said to be simply, and to be good relatively (i.e. in so far as it has being) but viewed in its complete actuality, a thing is said to be relatively, and to be good simply. Hence the saying of [Boethius](#) (De Hebrom.), "I perceive that in nature the fact that things are good is one thing; that they are is another," is to be referred to a thing's goodness simply, and having being simply. Because, regarded in its primal actuality, a thing simply exists; and regarded in its complete actuality, it is good simply--in such sort that even in its primal actuality, it is in some sort good, and even in its complete actuality, it in some sort has being.

**Reply to Objection 2.** Goodness is a form so far as absolute goodness signifies complete actuality.

**Reply to Objection 3.** Again, goodness is spoken of as more or less according to a thing's superadded actuality, for example, as to knowledge or virtue.