

SUMMA THEOLOGICA
VOL. 3 - THE FIRST PART
OF THE SECOND PART
(PART I)

by Thomas Aquinas

Reformedontheweb
www.reformedontheweb.com/home/.html

AQUINAS FOR TODAY

It would be very difficult for someone born in the 13th century to grasp the style of life, the speed of travel and the unparalleled access to information experienced by mankind at the close of the 20th. Thomas Aquinas, were he to appear today, would, however, be dismayed at the lack of contemplation and the inadequate grasp of the long view of anything save perhaps material wealth. He would no doubt be perplexed over the pleas from laypersons and scholars alike for relevance and immediacy from every piece of information provided – especially theology. How could anything be more relevant than theology, more immediate than the contemplation of the ways and works of God?

By any standard, *Summa* is a masterpiece on the theme of theology and a magnum opus on spiritual immediacy. From the curious child's question "How many angels are there?" [P(1)-Q(50)-A(1)] to the more esoteric and scholarly issue: "Are there any seminal virtues in corporeal matter?" [P(1)-Q(115)-A(2)], *Summa* explains the faith and defends it with amazing practicality and depth. It has a permanent place in the history of theology and merits serious study even after 700 years:

"The time is overdue for all secret believers to join in a positive word of gratitude for the masterful expression and defense of the historic Christian faith bequeathed to us by this humble giant of the faith. As for myself, I gladly confess that the highest compliment that could be paid to me as a Christian philosopher, apologist, and theologian is to call me "Thomistic." This, of course, does not mean I accept everything Aquinas wrote naively and uncritically. It does mean that I believe he was one of the greatest systematic minds the Christian church has ever had, and that I can see a lot farther standing on his shoulders than by attacking him in the back. No, I do not agree with everything he ever wrote. On the other hand, neither do I agree with everything I ever wrote. But seven hundred years from now no one will even recognize my name, while Aquinas's works will still be used with great profit." [Norman Geisler, *Thomas Aquinas; An Evangelical Appraisal*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House Company, 1991, p. 14.]

SECOND PART OF THE SECOND PART

**TREATISE ON THE
THEOLOGICAL VIRTUES**

QUESTIONS 1-46

ON FAITH

QUESTIONS 1-16

QUESTION 1

OF FAITH

(TEN ARTICLES)

Having to treat now of the theological virtues, we shall begin with Faith, secondly we shall speak of Hope, and thirdly, of Charity.

The treatise on Faith will be fourfold:

- (1) Of faith itself;
- (2) Of the corresponding gifts, knowledge and understanding;
- (3) Of the opposite vices;
- (4) Of the precepts pertaining to this virtue.

About faith itself we shall consider:

- (1) its object;
- (2) its act;
- (3) the habit of faith.

Under the first head there are ten points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether the object of faith is the First Truth?
- (2) Whether the object of faith is something complex or incomplex, i.e. whether it is a thing or a proposition?
- (3) Whether anything false can come under faith?
- (4) Whether the object of faith can be anything seen?
- (5) Whether it can be anything known?
- (6) Whether the things to be believed should be divided into a certain number of articles?
- (7) Whether the same articles are of faith for all times?
- (8) Of the number of articles;
- (9) Of the manner of embodying the articles in a symbol;
- (10) Who has the right to propose a symbol of faith?

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(1)

Whether the object of faith is the First Truth?

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that the object of faith is not the First Truth. For it seems that the object of faith is that which is proposed to us to be believed. Now not only things pertaining to the Godhead, i.e. the First Truth, are proposed to us to be believed, but also things concerning Christ's human nature, and the sacraments of the Church, and the condition of creatures. Therefore the object of faith is not only the First Truth.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, faith and unbelief have the same object since they are opposed to one another. Now unbelief can be about all things contained in Holy Writ, for whichever one of them a man denies, he is considered an unbeliever. Therefore faith also is about all things contained in Holy Writ. But there are many things therein, concerning man

and other creatures. Therefore the object of faith is not only the First Truth, but also created truth.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, faith is condivided with charity, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(62)**, **A(3)**). Now by charity we love not only God, who is the sovereign Good, but also our neighbor. Therefore the object of Faith is not only the First Truth.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. vii) that “faith is about the simple and everlasting truth.” Now this is the First Truth. Therefore the object of faith is the First Truth.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(1) — *I answer that*, The object of every cognitive habit includes two things: first, that which is known materially, and is the material object, so to speak, and, secondly, that whereby it is known, which is the formal aspect of the object. Thus in the science of geometry, the conclusions are what is known materially, while the formal aspect of the science is the mean of demonstration, through which the conclusions are known.

Accordingly if we consider, in faith, the formal aspect of the object, it is nothing else than the First Truth. For the faith of which we are speaking, does not assent to anything, except because it is revealed by God. Hence the mean on which faith is based is the Divine Truth. If, however, we consider materially the things to which faith assents, they include not only God, but also many other things, which, nevertheless, do not come under the assent of faith, except as bearing some relation to God, in as much as, to wit, through certain effects of the Divine operation, man is helped on his journey towards the enjoyment of God. Consequently from this point of view also the object of faith is, in a way, the First Truth, in as much as nothing comes under faith except in relation to God, even as the object of the medical art is health, for it considers nothing save in relation to health.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(1)-RO(1) — Things concerning Christ’s human nature, and the sacraments of the Church, or any creatures whatever, come under faith, in so far as by them we are directed to God, and in as much as we assent to them on account of the Divine Truth.

The same answer applies to the Second Objection, as regards all things contained in Holy Writ.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(1)-RO(3) — Charity also loves our neighbor on account of God, so that its object, properly speaking, is God, as we shall show further on (**Q(25), A(1)**).

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(2)

*Whether the object of faith is something complex,
by way of a proposition?*

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the object of faith is not something complex by way of a proposition. For the object of faith is the First Truth, as stated above (**A(1)**). Now the First Truth is something simple. Therefore the object of faith is not something complex.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the exposition of faith is contained in the symbol. Now the symbol does not contain propositions, but things: for it is not stated therein that God is almighty, but: “I believe in God... almighty.” Therefore the object of faith is not a proposition but a thing.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, faith is succeeded by vision, according to ^{433D}1 Corinthians 13:12:

“We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face.
Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known.”

But the object of the heavenly vision is something simple, for it is the Divine Essence. Therefore the faith of the wayfarer is also.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(2) — On the contrary, Faith is a mean between science and opinion. Now the mean is in the same genus as the extremes. Since, then, science and opinion are about propositions, it seems that faith is likewise about propositions; so that its object is something complex.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(2) — I answer that, The thing known is in the knower according to the mode of the knower. Now the mode proper to the human intellect is to know the truth by synthesis and analysis, as stated in the **P(1) Q(85), A(5)**. Hence things that are simple in themselves, are known by the intellect with a certain amount of complexity, just as on the other hand, the Divine intellect knows, without any complexity, things that are complex in themselves.

Accordingly the object of faith may be considered in two ways. First, as regards the thing itself which is believed, and thus the object of faith is something simple, namely the thing itself about which we have faith. Secondly, on the part of the believer, and in this respect the object of faith is something complex by way of a proposition.

Hence in the past both opinions have been held with a certain amount of truth.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(2)-RO(1) — This argument considers the object of faith on the part of the thing believed.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(2)-RO(2) — The symbol mentions the things about which faith is, in so far as the act of the believer is terminated in them, as is evident from the manner of speaking about them. Now the act of the believer does not terminate in a proposition, but in a thing. For as in science we do not form propositions, except in order to have knowledge about things through their means, so is it in faith.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(2)-RO(3) — The object of the heavenly vision will be the First Truth seen in itself, according to ^{GR1} John 3:2:

“We know that when He shall appear, we shall be like to Him:
because we shall see Him as He is”:

hence that vision will not be by way of a proposition but by way of a simple understanding. On the other hand, by faith, we do not apprehend the First Truth as it is in itself. Hence the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(3)

Whether anything false can come under faith?

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that something false can come under faith. For faith is condivided with hope and charity. Now something false can come under hope, since many hope to have eternal life, who will not obtain it. The same may be said of charity, for many are loved as being good, who, nevertheless, are not good. Therefore something false can be the object of faith.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, Abraham believed that Christ would be born, according to ~~John~~ John 8:56:

“Abraham your father rejoiced that he might see My day:
he saw it, and was glad.”

But after the time of Abraham, God might not have taken flesh, for it was merely because He willed that He did, so that what Abraham believed about Christ would have been false. Therefore the object of faith can be something false.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the ancients believed in the future birth of Christ, and many continued so to believe, until they heard the preaching of the Gospel. Now, when once Christ was born, even before He began to preach, it was false that Christ was yet to be born. Therefore something false can come under faith.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(3)-O(4) — Further, it is a matter of faith, that one should believe that the true Body of Christ is contained in the Sacrament of the altar. But it might happen that the bread was not rightly consecrated, and that there was not Christ's true Body there, but only bread. Therefore something false can come under faith.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, No virtue that perfects the intellect is related to the false, considered as the evil of the intellect, as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. vi, 2). Now faith is a virtue that perfects the intellect, as we shall show further on (**Q(4), AA(2),5**). Therefore nothing false can come under it.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Nothing comes under any power, habit or act, except by means of the formal aspect of the object: thus color cannot be seen except by means of light, and a conclusion cannot be known save through the mean of demonstration. Now it has been stated (**A(1)**) that the formal aspect of the object of faith is the First Truth; so that nothing can come under faith, save in so far as it stands under the First Truth, under which nothing false can stand, as neither can non-being stand under being, nor evil under goodness. It follows therefore that nothing false can come under faith.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(3)-RO(1) — Since the true is the good of the intellect, but not of the appetitive power, it follows that all virtues which perfect the intellect, exclude the false altogether, because it belongs to the nature of a virtue to bear relation to the good alone. On the other hand those virtues which perfect the appetitive faculty, do not entirely exclude the false, for it is possible to act in accordance with justice or temperance, while having a false opinion about what one is doing. Therefore, as faith perfects the intellect, whereas hope and charity perfect the appetitive part, the comparison between them fails.

Nevertheless neither can anything false come under hope, for a man hopes to obtain eternal life, not by his own power (since this would be an act of presumption), but with the help of grace; and if he perseveres therein he will obtain eternal life surely and infallibly.

In like manner it belongs to charity to love God, wherever He may be; so that it matters not to charity, whether God be in the individual whom we love for God's sake.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(3)-RO(2) — That “God would not take flesh,” considered in itself was possible even after Abraham's time, but in so far as it stands in God's foreknowledge, it has a certain necessity of infallibility, as explained in the **P(1) Q(14), AA(13),15**: and it is thus that it comes under faith. Hence in so far as it comes under faith, it cannot be false.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(3)-RO(3) — After Christ's birth, to believe in Him, was to believe in Christ's birth at some time or other. The fixing of the time, wherein some were deceived was not due to their faith, but to a human conjecture. For it is possible for a believer to have a false opinion through a human conjecture, but it is quite impossible for a false opinion to be the outcome of faith.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(3)-RO(4) — The faith of the believer is not directed to such and such accidents of bread, but to the fact that the true body of Christ is under the appearances of sensible bread, when it is rightly consecrated. Hence if it be not rightly consecrated, it does not follow that anything false comes under faith.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(4)

Whether the object of faith can be something seen?

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the object of faith is something seen. For Our Lord said to Thomas (^{<431B>}John 20:29): “Because thou hast seen Me, Thomas, thou hast believed.” Therefore vision and faith regard the same object.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the Apostle, while speaking of the knowledge of faith, says (^{<432>}1 Corinthians 13:12): “We see now through a glass in a dark manner.” Therefore what is believed is seen.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, faith is a spiritual light. Now something is seen under every light. Therefore faith is of things seen.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(4)-O(4) — Further, “Every sense is a kind of sight,” as Augustine states (De Verb. Domini, Sermon. xxxiii). But faith is of things heard, according to ^{<517>}Romans 10:17: “Faith... cometh by hearing.” Therefore faith is of things seen.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (^{<518>}Hebrews 11:1) that “faith is the evidence of things that appear not.”

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Faith implies assent of the intellect to that which is believed. Now the intellect assents to a thing in two ways. First, through being moved to assent by its very object, which is known either by itself (as in the case of first principles, which are held by the habit of understanding), or through something else already known (as in the case of conclusions which are held by the habit of science). Secondly the intellect assents to something, not through being sufficiently moved to this assent by its proper object, but through an act of choice, whereby it turns voluntarily to one side rather than to the other: and if this be accompanied by doubt or fear of the opposite side, there will be opinion, while, if there be certainty and no fear of the other side, there will be faith.

Now those things are said to be seen which, of themselves, move the intellect or the senses to knowledge of them. Wherefore it is evident that neither faith nor opinion can be of things seen either by the senses or by the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(4)-RO(1) — Thomas “saw one thing, and believed another” [*St. Gregory: Hom. xxvi in Evang.]: he saw the Man, and believing Him to be God, he made profession of his faith, saying: “My Lord and my God.”

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(4)-RO(2) — Those things which come under faith can be considered in two ways. First, in particular; and thus they cannot be seen and believed at the same time, as shown above. Secondly, in general, that is, under the common aspect of credibility; and in this way they are seen by the believer. For he would not believe unless, on the evidence of signs, or of something similar, he saw that they ought to be believed.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(4)-RO(3) — The light of faith makes us see what we believe. For just as, by the habits of the other virtues, man sees what is becoming to him in respect of that habit, so, by the habit of faith, the human mind is directed to assent to such things as are becoming to a right faith, and not to assent to others.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(4)-RO(4) — Hearing is of words signifying what is of faith, but not of the things themselves that are believed; hence it does not follow that these things are seen.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(5)

*Whether those things that are of faith can be an object of science (*Science is certain knowledge of a demonstrated conclusion through its demonstration)?*

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that those things that are of faith can be an object of science. For where science is lacking there is ignorance, since ignorance is the opposite of science. Now we are not in ignorance of those things we have to believe, since ignorance of such things savors of unbelief, according to ⁵⁰¹³1 Timothy 1:13: “I did it ignorantly in unbelief.” Therefore things that are of faith can be an object of science.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, science is acquired by reasons. Now sacred writers employ reasons to inculcate things that are of faith. Therefore such things can be an object of science.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, things which are demonstrated are an object of science, since a “demonstration is a syllogism that produces science.” Now certain matters of faith have been demonstrated by the philosophers, such as the Existence and Unity of God, and so forth. Therefore things that are of faith can be an object of science.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(5)-O(4) — Further, opinion is further from science than faith is, since faith is said to stand between opinion and science. Now opinion and science can, in a way, be about the same object, as stated in Poster. 1: Therefore faith and science can be about the same object also.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Hom. xxvi in Evang.) that “when a thing is manifest, it is the object, not of faith, but of perception.” Therefore things that are of faith are not the object of perception, whereas what is an object of science is the object of perception. Therefore there can be no faith about things which are an object of science.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(5) — *I answer that*, All science is derived from self-evident and therefore “seen” principles; wherefore all objects of science must needs be, in a fashion, seen.

Now as stated above (**A(4)**), it is impossible that one and the same thing should be believed and seen by the same person. Hence it is equally impossible for one and the same thing to be an object of science and of belief for the same person. It may happen, however, that a thing which is an object of vision or science for one, is believed by another: since we hope to see some day what we now believe about the Trinity, according to ⁴¹³²1 Corinthians 13:12: “We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face”: which vision the angels possess already; so that what we believe, they see. In like manner it may happen that what is an object of vision or scientific knowledge for one man, even in the state of a wayfarer, is, for another man, an object of faith, because he does not know it by demonstration.

Nevertheless that which is proposed to be believed equally by all, is equally unknown by all as an object of science: such are the things which are of faith simply. Consequently faith and science are not about the same things.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(5)-RO(1) — Unbelievers are in ignorance of things that are of faith, for neither do they see or know them in themselves, nor do they know them to be credible. The faithful, on the other hand, know them, not as by demonstration, but by the light of faith which makes them see that they ought to believe them, as stated above (**A(4)**, ad 2,3).

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(5)-RO(2) — The reasons employed by holy men to prove things that are of faith, are not demonstrations; they are either persuasive arguments showing that what is proposed to our faith is not impossible, or else they are proofs drawn from the principles of faith, i.e. from the authority of Holy Writ, as Dionysius declares (Div. Nom. ii). Whatever is based on these principles is as well proved in the eyes of the faithful, as a conclusion drawn from self-evident principles is in the eyes of all. Hence again, theology is a science, as we stated at the outset of this work (**P(1) Q(1), A(2)**).

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(5)-RO(3) — Things which can be proved by demonstration are reckoned among the articles of faith, not because they are believed simply by all, but because they are a necessary presupposition to matters of faith, so that those who do not know them by demonstration must know them first of all by faith.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(5)-RO(4) — As the Philosopher says (Poster. i), “science and opinion about the same object can certainly be in different men,” as we have stated above about science and faith; yet it is possible for one and the same man to have science and faith about the same thing relatively, i.e. in relation to the object, but not in the same respect. For it is possible for the same person, about one and the same object, to know one thing and to think another: and, in like manner, one may know by demonstration the unity of the Godhead, and, by faith, the Trinity. On the other hand, in one and the same man, about the same object, and in the same respect, science is incompatible with either opinion or faith, yet for different reasons. Because science is incompatible with opinion about the same object simply, for the reason that science demands that its object should be deemed impossible to be otherwise, whereas it is essential to opinion, that its object should be deemed possible to be otherwise. Yet that which is the object of faith, on account of the certainty of faith, is also deemed impossible to be otherwise; and the reason why science and faith cannot be

about the same object and in the same respect is because the object of science is something seen whereas the object of faith is the unseen, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(6)

Whether those things that are of faith should be divided into certain articles?

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that those things that are of faith should not be divided into certain articles. For all things contained in Holy Writ are matters of faith. But these, by reason of their multitude, cannot be reduced to a certain number. Therefore it seems superfluous to distinguish certain articles of faith.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, material differences can be multiplied indefinitely, and therefore art should take no notice of them. Now the formal aspect of the object of faith is one and indivisible, as stated above (**A(1)**), viz. the First Truth, so that matters of faith cannot be distinguished in respect of their formal object. Therefore no notice should be taken of a material division of matters of faith into articles.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, it has been said by some [*Cf. William of Auxerre, Summa Aurea] that “an article is an indivisible truth concerning God, exacting [arctans] our belief.” Now belief is a voluntary act, since, as Augustine says (Tract. xxvi in Joan.), “no man believes against his will.” Therefore it seems that matters of faith should not be divided into articles.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Isidore says: “An article is a glimpse of Divine truth, tending thereto.” Now we can only get a glimpse of Divine truth by way of analysis, since things which in God are one, are manifold in our intellect. Therefore matters of faith should be divided into articles.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(6) — *I answer that*, the word “article” is apparently derived from the Greek; for the Greek {arthron} [*Cf. William of Auxerre, Summa Aurea] which the Latin renders “articulus,” signifies a fitting together of distinct parts: wherefore the small parts of the body which fit together are called the articulations of the limbs. Likewise, in the Greek grammar, articles are parts of speech which are affixed to words to show their

gender, number or case. Again in rhetoric, articles are parts that fit together in a sentence, for Tully says (Rhet. iv) that an article is composed of words each pronounced singly and separately, thus: “Your passion, your voice, your look, have struck terror into your foes.”

Hence matters of Christian faith are said to contain distinct articles, in so far as they are divided into parts, and fit together. Now the object of faith is something unseen in connection with God, as stated above (**A(4)**).

Consequently any matter that, for a special reason, is unseen, is a special article; whereas when several matters are known or not known, under the same aspect, we are not to distinguish various articles. Thus one encounters one difficulty in seeing that God suffered, and another in seeing that He rose again from the dead, wherefore the article of the Resurrection is distinct from the article of the Passion. But that He suffered, died and was buried, present the same difficulty, so that if one be accepted, it is not difficult to accept the others; wherefore all these belong to one article.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(6)-RO(1) — Some things are proposed to our belief are in themselves of faith, while others are of faith, not in themselves but only in relation to others: even as in sciences certain propositions are put forward on their own account, while others are put forward in order to manifest others. Now, since the chief object of faith consists in those things which we hope to see, according to ^{scrip}Hebrews 11:2: “Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for,” it follows that those things are in themselves of faith, which order us directly to eternal life. Such are the Trinity of Persons in Almighty God [*The Leonine Edition reads: The Three Persons, the omnipotence of God, etc.], the mystery of Christ’s Incarnation, and the like: and these are distinct articles of faith. On the other hand certain things in Holy Writ are proposed to our belief, not chiefly on their own account, but for the manifestation of those mentioned above: for instance, that Abraham had two sons, that a dead man rose again at the touch of Eliseus’ bones, and the like, which are related in Holy Writ for the purpose of manifesting the Divine mystery or the Incarnation of Christ: and such things should not form distinct articles.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(6)-RO(2) — The formal aspect of the object of faith can be taken in two ways: first, on the part of the thing believed, and thus there is one formal aspect of all matters of faith, viz. the First Truth: and from this

point of view there is no distinction of articles. Secondly, the formal aspect of matters of faith, can be considered from our point of view; and thus the formal aspect of a matter of faith is that it is something unseen; and from this point of view there are various distinct articles of faith, as we saw above.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(6)-RO(3) — This definition of an article is taken from an etymology of the word as derived from the Latin, rather than in accordance with its real meaning, as derived from the Greek: hence it does not carry much weight. Yet even then it could be said that although faith is exacted of no man by a necessity of coercion, since belief is a voluntary act, yet it is exacted of him by a necessity of end, since “he that cometh to God must believe that He is,” and “without faith it is impossible to please God,” as the Apostle declares (⁸⁰⁰Hebrews 11:6).

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(7)

Whether the articles of faith have increased in course of time?

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that the articles of faith have not increased in course of time. Because, as the Apostle says (⁸⁰⁰Hebrews 11:1), “faith is the substance of things to be hoped for.” Now the same things are to be hoped for at all times. Therefore, at all times, the same things are to be believed.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, development has taken place, in sciences devised by man, on account of the lack of knowledge in those who discovered them, as the Philosopher observes (Metaph. ii). Now the doctrine of faith was not devised by man, but was delivered to us by God, as stated in ⁸⁰⁸Ephesians 2:8: “It is the gift of God.” Since then there can be no lack of knowledge in God, it seems that knowledge of matters of faith was perfect from the beginning and did not increase as time went on.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, the operation of grace proceeds in orderly fashion no less than the operation of nature. Now nature always makes a beginning with perfect things, as Boethius states (De Consol. iii). Therefore it seems that the operation of grace also began with perfect

things, so that those who were the first to deliver the faith, knew it most perfectly.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(7)-O(4) — Further, just as the faith of Christ was delivered to us through the apostles, so too, in the Old Testament, the knowledge of faith was delivered by the early fathers to those who came later, according to ^{<501>}Deuteronomy 32:7: “Ask thy father, and he will declare to thee.” Now the apostles were most fully instructed about the mysteries, for “they received them more fully than others, even as they received them earlier,” as a gloss says on ^{<512>}Romans 8:23: “Ourselves also who have the first fruits of the Spirit.” Therefore it seems that knowledge of matters of faith has not increased as time went on.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Hom. xvi in Ezech.) that “the knowledge of the holy fathers increased as time went on... and the nearer they were to Our Savior’s coming, the more fully did they received the mysteries of salvation.”

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(7) — *I answer that*, The articles of faith stand in the same relation to the doctrine of faith, as self-evident principles to a teaching based on natural reason. Among these principles there is a certain order, so that some are contained implicitly in others; thus all principles are reduced, as to their first principle, to this one: “The same thing cannot be affirmed and denied at the same time,” as the Philosopher states (Metaph. iv, text. 9). In like manner all the articles are contained implicitly in certain primary matters of faith, such as God’s existence, and His providence over the salvation of man, according to ^{<511>}Hebrews 11:

“He that cometh to God, must believe that He is,
and is a rewarder to them that seek Him.”

For the existence of God includes all that we believe to exist in God eternally, and in these our happiness consists; while belief in His providence includes all those things which God dispenses in time, for man’s salvation, and which are the way to that happiness: and in this way, again, some of those articles which follow from these are contained in others: thus faith in the Redemption of mankind includes belief in the Incarnation of Christ, His Passion and so forth.

Accordingly we must conclude that, as regards the substance of the articles of faith, they have not received any increase as time went on: since whatever those who lived later have believed, was contained, albeit implicitly, in the faith of those Fathers who preceded them. But there was an increase in the number of articles believed explicitly, since to those who lived in later times some were known explicitly which were not known explicitly by those who lived before them. Hence the Lord said to Moses (~~RO~~ Exodus 6:2,3):

“I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob
[*Vulg.: ‘I am the Lord that appeared to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob’]... and My name Adonai I did not show them”:

David also said (~~RO~~ Psalm 118:100): “I have had understanding above ancients”: and the Apostle says (~~RO~~ Ephesians 3:5) that the mystery of Christ,

“in other generations was not known, as it is now revealed to His
holy apostles and prophets.”

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(7)-RO(1) — Among men the same things were always to be hoped for from Christ. But as they did not acquire this hope save through Christ, the further they were removed from Christ in point of time, the further they were from obtaining what they hoped for. Hence the Apostle says (~~RO~~ Hebrews 11:13):

“All these died according to faith, not having received the promises,
but beholding them afar off.”

Now the further off a thing is the less distinctly is it seen; wherefore those who were nigh to Christ’s advent had a more distinct knowledge of the good things to be hoped for.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(7)-RO(2) — Progress in knowledge occurs in two ways. First, on the part of the teacher, be he one or many, who makes progress in knowledge as time goes on: and this is the kind of progress that takes place in sciences devised by man. Secondly, on the part of the learner; thus the master, who has perfect knowledge of the art, does not deliver it all at once to his disciple from the very outset, for he would not be able to take it all in, but he condescends to the disciple’s capacity and instructs him little by

little. It is in this way that men made progress in the knowledge of faith as time went on. Hence the Apostle (^{<R2>}Galatians 3:24) compares the state of the Old Testament to childhood.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(7)-RO(3) — Two causes are requisite before actual generation can take place, an agent, namely, and matter. In the order of the active cause, the more perfect is naturally first; and in this way nature makes a beginning with perfect things, since the imperfect is not brought to perfection, except by something perfect already in existence. On the other hand, in the order of the material cause, the imperfect comes first, and in this way nature proceeds from the imperfect to the perfect. Now in the manifestation of faith, God is the active cause, having perfect knowledge from all eternity; while man is likened to matter in receiving the influx of God's action. Hence, among men, the knowledge of faith had to proceed from imperfection to perfection; and, although some men have been after the manner of active causes, through being doctors of faith, nevertheless the manifestation of the Spirit is given to such men for the common good, according to ^{<R1>}1 Corinthians 12:7; so that the knowledge of faith was imparted to the Fathers who were instructors in the faith, so far as was necessary at the time for the instruction of the people, either openly or in figures.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(7)-RO(4) — The ultimate consummation of grace was effected by Christ, wherefore the time of His coming is called the "time of fulness [*Vulg.: 'fulness of time']" (^{<R4>}Galatians 4:4). Hence those who were nearest to Christ, wherefore before, like John the Baptist, or after, like the apostles, had a fuller knowledge of the mysteries of faith; for even with regard to man's state we find that the perfection of manhood comes in youth, and that a man's state is all the more perfect, whether before or after, the nearer it is to the time of his youth.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)

Whether the articles of faith are suitably formulated?

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that the articles of faith are unsuitably formulated. For those things, which can be known by demonstration, do not belong to faith as to an object of belief for all, as

stated above (**A(5)**). Now it can be known by demonstration that there is one God; hence the Philosopher proves this (Metaph. xii, text. 52) and many other philosophers demonstrated the same truth. Therefore that “there is one God” should not be set down as an article of faith.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, just as it is necessary to faith that we should believe God to be almighty, so is it too that we should believe Him to be “all-knowing” and “provident for all,” about both of which points some have erred. Therefore, among the articles of faith, mention should have been made of God’s wisdom and providence, even as of His omnipotence.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, to know the Father is the same things as to know the Son, according to ~~John~~^{John} 14:9: “He that seeth Me, seeth the Father also.” Therefore there ought to be but one article about the Father and Son, and, for the same reason, about the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-O(4) — Further, the Person of the Father is no less than the Person of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Now there are several articles about the Person of the Holy Ghost, and likewise about the Person of the Son. Therefore there should be several articles about the Person of the Father.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-O(5) — Further, just as certain things are said by appropriation, of the Person of the Father and of the Person of the Holy Ghost, so too is something appropriated to the Person of the Son, in respect of His Godhead. Now, among the articles of faith, a place is given to a work appropriated to the Father, viz. the creation, and likewise, a work appropriated to the Holy Ghost, viz. that “He spoke by the prophets.” Therefore the articles of faith should contain some work appropriated to the Son in respect of His Godhead.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-O(6) — Further, the sacrament of the Eucharist presents a special difficulty over and above the other articles. Therefore it should have been mentioned in a special article: and consequently it seems that there is not a sufficient number of articles.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8) — On the contrary stands the authority of the Church who formulates the articles thus.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**AA(4),6**), to faith those things in themselves belong, the sight of which we shall enjoy in eternal life, and by which we are brought to eternal life. Now two things are proposed to us to be seen in eternal life: viz. the secret of the Godhead, to see which is to possess happiness; and the mystery of Christ's Incarnation, "by Whom we have access" to the glory of the sons of God, according to ~~ROM~~Romans 5:2. Hence it is written (~~ROM~~John 17:3):

“This is eternal life: that they may know Thee, the... true God, and
Jesus Christ Whom Thou hast sent.”

Wherefore the first distinction in matters of faith is that some concern the majesty of the Godhead, while others pertain to the mystery of Christ's human nature, which is the “mystery of godliness” (~~SUB~~1 Timothy 3:16).

Now with regard to the majesty of the Godhead, three things are proposed to our belief: first, the unity of the Godhead, to which the first article refers; secondly, the trinity of the Persons, to which three articles refer, corresponding to the three Persons; and thirdly, the works proper to the Godhead, the first of which refers to the order of nature, in relation to which the article about the creation is proposed to us; the second refers to the order of grace, in relation to which all matters concerning the sanctification of man are included in one article; while the third refers to the order of glory, and in relation to this another article is proposed to us concerning the resurrection of the dead and life everlasting. Thus there are seven articles referring to the Godhead.

In like manner, with regard to Christ's human nature, there are seven articles, the first of which refers to Christ's incarnation or conception; the second, to His virginal birth; the third, to His Passion, death and burial; the fourth, to His descent into hell; the fifth, to His resurrection; the sixth, to His ascension; the seventh, to His coming for the judgment, so that in all there are fourteen articles.

Some, however, distinguish twelve articles, six pertaining to the Godhead, and six to the humanity. For they include in one article the three about the three Persons; because we have one knowledge of the three Persons: while they divide the article referring to the work of glorification into two, viz.

the resurrection of the body, and the glory of the soul. Likewise they unite the conception and nativity into one article.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-RO(1) — By faith we hold many truths about God, which the philosophers were unable to discover by natural reason, for instance His providence and omnipotence, and that He alone is to be worshiped, all of which are contained in the one article of the unity of God.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-RO(2) — The very name of the Godhead implies a kind of watching over things, as stated in the **P(1) Q(13), A(8)**. Now in beings having an intellect, power does not work save by the will and knowledge. Hence God's omnipotence includes, in a way, universal knowledge and providence. For He would not be able to do all He wills in things here below, unless He knew them, and exercised His providence over them.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-RO(3) — We have but one knowledge of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as to the unity of the Essence, to which the first article refers: but, as to the distinction of the Persons, which is by the relations of origin, knowledge of the Father does indeed, in a way, include knowledge of the Son, for He would not be Father, had He not a Son; the bond whereof being the Holy Ghost. From this point of view, there was a sufficient motive for those who referred one article to the three Persons. Since, however, with regard to each Person, certain points have to be observed, about which some happen to fall into error, looking at it in this way, we may distinguish three articles about the three Persons. For Arius believed in the omnipotence and eternity of the Father, but did not believe the Son to be co-equal and consubstantial with the Father; hence the need for an article about the Person of the Son in order to settle this point. In like manner it was necessary to appoint a third article about the Person of the Holy Ghost, against Macedonius. In the same way Christ's conception and birth, just as the resurrection and life everlasting, can from one point of view be united together in one article, in so far as they are ordained to one end; while, from another point of view, they can be distinct articles, in as much as each one separately presents a special difficulty.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-RO(4) — It belongs to the Son and Holy Ghost to be sent to sanctify the creature; and about this several things have to be believed. Hence it is that there are more articles about the Persons of the

Son and Holy Ghost than about the Person of the Father, Who is never sent, as we stated in the **P(1) Q(43), A(4)**.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-RO(5) — The sanctification of a creature by grace, and its consummation by glory, is also effected by the gift of charity, which is appropriated to the Holy Ghost, and by the gift of wisdom, which is appropriated to the Son: so that each work belongs by appropriation, but under different aspects, both to the Son and to the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(8)-RO(6) — Two things may be considered in the sacrament of the Eucharist. One is the fact that it is a sacrament, and in this respect it is like the other effects of sanctifying grace. The other is that Christ's body is miraculously contained therein and thus it is included under God's omnipotence, like all other miracles which are ascribed to God's almighty power.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)

***Whether it is suitable for the articles of faith
to be embodied in a symbol?***

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that it is unsuitable for the articles of faith to be embodied in a symbol. Because Holy Writ is the rule of faith, to which no addition or subtraction can lawfully be made, since it is written (~~ROM~~ Deuteronomy 4:2):

“You shall not add to the word that I speak to you, neither shall
you take away from it.”

Therefore it was unlawful to make a symbol as a rule of faith, after the Holy Writ had once been published.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, according to the Apostle (~~ROM~~ Ephesians 4:5) there is but “one faith.” Now the symbol is a profession of faith. Therefore it is not fitting that there should be more than one symbol.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, the confession of faith, which is contained in the symbol, concerns all the faithful. Now the faithful are not all competent to believe in God, but only those who have living faith.

Therefore it is unfitting for the symbol of faith to be expressed in the words: “I believe in one God.”

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-O(4) — Further, the descent into hell is one of the articles of faith, as stated above (**A(8)**). But the descent into hell is not mentioned in the symbol of the Fathers. Therefore the latter is expressed inadequately.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-O(5) — Further, Augustine (Tract. xxix in Joan.) expounding the passage, “You believe in God, believe also in Me” (~~840~~ John 14:1) says: “We believe Peter or Paul, but we speak only of believing ‘in’ God.” Since then the Catholic Church is merely a created being, it seems unfitting to say: “In the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.”

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-O(6) — Further, a symbol is drawn up that it may be a rule of faith. Now a rule of faith ought to be proposed to all, and that publicly. Therefore every symbol, besides the symbol of the Fathers, should be sung at Mass. Therefore it seems unfitting to publish the articles of faith in a symbol.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, The universal Church cannot err, since she is governed by the Holy Ghost, Who is the Spirit of truth: for such was Our Lord’s promise to His disciples (~~843~~ John 16:13): “When He, the Spirit of truth, is come, He will teach you all truth.” Now the symbol is published by the authority of the universal Church. Therefore it contains nothing defective.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9) — *I answer that*, As the Apostle says (~~846~~ Hebrews 11:6), “he that cometh to God, must believe that He is.” Now a man cannot believe, unless the truth be proposed to him that he may believe it. Hence the need for the truth of faith to be collected together, so that it might the more easily be proposed to all, lest anyone might stray from the truth through ignorance of the faith. It is from its being a collection of maxims of faith that the symbol [*The Greek {syballein}] takes its name.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-RO(1) — The truth of faith is contained in Holy Writ, diffusely, under various modes of expression, and sometimes obscurely, so that, in order to gather the truth of faith from Holy Writ, one needs long study and practice, which are unattainable by all those who require to

know the truth of faith, many of whom have no time for study, being busy with other affairs. And so it was necessary to gather together a clear summary from the sayings of Holy Writ, to be proposed to the belief of all. This indeed was no addition to Holy Writ, but something taken from it.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-RO(2) — The same doctrine of faith is taught in all the symbols. Nevertheless, the people need more careful instruction about the truth of faith, when errors arise, lest the faith of simple-minded persons be corrupted by heretics. It was this that gave rise to the necessity of formulating several symbols, which nowise differ from one another, save that on account of the obstinacy of heretics, one contains more explicitly what another contains implicitly.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-RO(3) — The confession of faith is drawn up in a symbol in the person, as it were, of the whole Church, which is united together by faith. Now the faith of the Church is living faith; since such is the faith to be found in all those who are of the Church not only outwardly but also by merit. Hence the confession of faith is expressed in a symbol, in a manner that is in keeping with living faith, so that even if some of the faithful lack living faith, they should endeavor to acquire it.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-RO(4) — No error about the descent into hell had arisen among heretics, so that there was no need to be more explicit on that point. For this reason it is not repeated in the symbol of the Fathers, but is supposed as already settled in the symbol of the Apostles. For a subsequent symbol does not cancel a preceding one; rather does it expound it, as stated above (ad 2).

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-RO(5) — If we say: “‘In’ the holy Catholic Church,” this must be taken as verified in so far as our faith is directed to the Holy Ghost, Who sanctifies the Church; so that the sense is: “I believe in the Holy Ghost sanctifying the Church.” But it is better and more in keeping with the common use, to omit the ‘in,’ and say simply, “the holy Catholic Church,” as Pope Leo [*Rufinus, Comm. in Sym. Apost.] observes.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(9)-RO(6) — Since the symbol of the Fathers is an explanation of the symbol of the Apostles, and was drawn up after the faith was already spread abroad, and when the Church was already at peace, it is sung publicly in the Mass. On the other hand the symbol of the

Apostles, which was drawn up at the time of persecution, before the faith was made public, is said secretly at Prime and Compline, as though it were against the darkness of past and future errors.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(10)

Whether it belongs to the Sovereign Pontiff to draw up a symbol of faith?

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that it does not belong to the Sovereign Pontiff to draw up a symbol of faith. For a new edition of the symbol becomes necessary in order to explain the articles of faith, as stated above (**A(9)**). Now, in the Old Testament, the articles of faith were more and more explained as time went on, by reason of the truth of faith becoming clearer through greater nearness to Christ, as stated above (**A(7)**). Since then this reason ceased with the advent of the New Law, there is no need for the articles of faith to be more and more explicit. Therefore it does not seem to belong to the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff to draw up a new edition of the symbol.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, no man has the power to do what is forbidden under pain of anathema by the universal Church. Now it was forbidden under pain of anathema by the universal Church, to make a new edition of the symbol. For it is stated in the acts of the first* council of Ephesus (P. ii, Act. 6) that “after the symbol of the Nicene council had been read through, the holy synod decreed that it was unlawful to utter, write or draw up any other creed, than that which was defined by the Fathers assembled at Nicaea together with the Holy Ghost,” and this under pain of anathema. [*St. Thomas wrote ‘first’ (expunged by Nicolai) to distinguish it from the other council, A.D. 451, known as the “Latrocinium” and condemned by the Pope.] The same was repeated in the acts of the council of Chalcedon (P. ii, Act. 5). Therefore it seems that the Sovereign Pontiff has no authority to publish a new edition of the symbol.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, Athanasius was not the Sovereign Pontiff, but patriarch of Alexandria, and yet he published a symbol which is sung in the Church. Therefore it does not seem to belong to the

Sovereign Pontiff any more than to other bishops, to publish a new edition of the symbol.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, The symbol was drawn up by a general council. Now such a council cannot be convoked otherwise than by the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, as stated in the Decretals [*Dist. xvii, Can. 4,5]. Therefore it belongs to the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff to draw up a symbol.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(10) — *I answer that*, As stated above (OBJ 1), a new edition of the symbol becomes necessary in order to set aside the errors that may arise. Consequently to publish a new edition of the symbol belongs to that authority which is empowered to decide matters of faith finally, so that they may be held by all with unshaken faith. Now this belongs to the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, “to whom the more important and more difficult questions that arise in the Church are referred,” as stated in the Decretals [*Dist. xvii, Can. 5]. Hence our Lord said to Peter whom he made Sovereign Pontiff (~~Gen~~ Luke 22:32): “I have prayed for thee,” Peter, “that thy faith fail not, and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.” The reason of this is that there should be but one faith of the whole Church, according to ~~Gen~~ 1 Corinthians 1:10:

“That you all speak the same thing,
and that there be no schisms among you”:

and this could not be secured unless any question of faith that may arise be decided by him who presides over the whole Church, so that the whole Church may hold firmly to his decision. Consequently it belongs to the sole authority of the Sovereign Pontiff to publish a new edition of the symbol, as do all other matters which concern the whole Church, such as to convoke a general council and so forth.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(10)-RO(1) — The truth of faith is sufficiently explicit in the teaching of Christ and the apostles. But since, according to ~~Gen~~ 2 Peter 3:16, some men are so evil-minded as to pervert the apostolic teaching and other doctrines and Scriptures to their own destruction, it was necessary as time went on to express the faith more explicitly against the errors which arose.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(10)-RO(2) — This prohibition and sentence of the council was intended for private individuals, who have no business to decide matters of faith: for this decision of the general council did not take away from a subsequent council the power of drawing up a new edition of the symbol, containing not indeed a new faith, but the same faith with greater explicitness. For every council has taken into account that a subsequent council would expound matters more fully than the preceding council, if this became necessary through some heresy arising. Consequently this belongs to the Sovereign Pontiff, by whose authority the council is convoked, and its decision confirmed.

P(2b)-Q(1)-A(10)-RO(3) — Athanasius drew up a declaration of faith, not under the form of a symbol, but rather by way of an exposition of doctrine, as appears from his way of speaking. But since it contained briefly the whole truth of faith, it was accepted by the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, so as to be considered as a rule of faith.

QUESTION 2**OF THE ACT OF FAITH****(TEN ARTICLES)**

We must now consider the act of faith, and

- (1) the internal act;
- (2) the external act.

Under the first head there are ten points of inquiry:

- (1) What is “to believe,” which is the internal act of faith?
- (2) In how many ways is it expressed?
- (3) Whether it is necessary for salvation to believe in anything above natural reason?
- (4) Whether it is necessary to believe those things that are attainable by natural reason?
- (5) Whether it is necessary for salvation to believe certain things explicitly?
- (6) Whether all are equally bound to explicit faith?
- (7) Whether explicit faith in Christ is always necessary for salvation?
- (8) Whether it is necessary for salvation to believe in the Trinity explicitly?
- (9) Whether the act of faith is meritorious?
- (10) Whether human reason diminishes the merit of faith?

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(1)

Whether to believe is to think with assent?

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that to believe is not to think with assent. Because the Latin word “cogitatio” [thought] implies a research, for “cogitare” [to think] seems to be equivalent to “coagitare,” i.e. “to discuss together.” Now Damascene says (De Fide Orth. iv) that faith is “an assent without research.” Therefore thinking has no place in the act of faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, faith resides in the reason, as we shall show further on (**Q(4), A(2)**). Now to think is an act of the cogitative power, which belongs to the sensitive faculty, as stated in the **P(1) Q(78), A(4)**. Therefore thought has nothing to do with faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, to believe is an act of the intellect, since its object is truth. But assent seems to be an act not of the intellect, but of the will, even as consent is, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(15), A(1)**, ad 3). Therefore to believe is not to think with assent.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, This is how “to believe” is defined by Augustine (De Praedest. Sanct. ii).

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(1) — *I answer that*, “To think” can be taken in three ways. First, in a general way for any kind of actual consideration of the intellect, as Augustine observes (De Trin. xiv, 7): “By understanding I mean now the faculty whereby we understand when thinking.” Secondly, “to think” is more strictly taken for that consideration of the intellect, which is accompanied by some kind of inquiry, and which precedes the intellect’s arrival at the stage of perfection that comes with the certitude of sight. In this sense Augustine says (De Trin. xv, 16) that “the Son of God is not called the Thought, but the Word of God. When our thought realizes what we know and takes form therefrom, it becomes our word. Hence the Word of God must be understood without any thinking on the part of God, for there is nothing there that can take form, or be unformed.” In this way thought is, properly speaking, the movement of the mind while yet deliberating, and not yet perfected by the clear sight of truth. Since, however, such a movement of the mind may be one of deliberation either

about universal notions, which belongs to the intellectual faculty, or about particular matters, which belongs to the sensitive part, hence it is that “to think” is taken secondly for an act of the deliberating intellect, and thirdly for an act of the cogitative power.

Accordingly, if “to think” be understood broadly according to the first sense, then “to think with assent,” does not express completely what is meant by “to believe”: since, in this way, a man thinks with assent even when he considers what he knows by science [*Science is certain knowledge of a demonstrated conclusion through its demonstration.], or understands. If, on the other hand, “to think” be understood in the second way, then this expresses completely the nature of the act of believing. For among the acts belonging to the intellect, some have a firm assent without any such kind of thinking, as when a man considers the things that he knows by science, or understands, for this consideration is already formed. But some acts of the intellect have unformed thought devoid of a firm assent, whether they incline to neither side, as in one who “doubts”; or incline to one side rather than the other, but on account of some slight motive, as in one who “suspects”; or incline to one side yet with fear of the other, as in one who “opines.” But this act “to believe,” cleaves firmly to one side, in which respect belief has something in common with science and understanding; yet its knowledge does not attain the perfection of clear sight, wherein it agrees with doubt, suspicion and opinion. Hence it is proper to the believer to think with assent: so that the act of believing is distinguished from all the other acts of the intellect, which are about the true or the false.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(1)-RO(1) — Faith has not that research of natural reason which demonstrates what is believed, but a research into those things whereby a man is induced to believe, for instance that such things have been uttered by God and confirmed by miracles.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(1)-RO(2) — “To think” is not taken here for the act of the cogitative power, but for an act of the intellect, as explained above.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(1)-RO(3) — The intellect of the believer is determined to one object, not by the reason, but by the will, wherefore assent is taken here for an act of the intellect as determined to one object by the will.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(2)

Whether the act of faith is suitably distinguished as believing God, believing in a God and believing in God?

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the act of faith is unsuitably distinguished as believing God, believing in a God, and believing in God. For one habit has but one act. Now faith is one habit since it is one virtue. Therefore it is unreasonable to say that there are three acts of faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, that which is common to all acts of faith should not be reckoned as a particular kind of act of faith. Now “to believe God” is common to all acts of faith, since faith is founded on the First Truth. Therefore it seems unreasonable to distinguish it from certain other acts of faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, that which can be said of unbelievers, cannot be called an act of faith. Now unbelievers can be said to believe in a God. Therefore it should not be reckoned an act of faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, movement towards the end belongs to the will, whose object is the good and the end. Now to believe is an act, not of the will, but of the intellect. Therefore “to believe in God,” which implies movement towards an end, should not be reckoned as a species of that act.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(2) — On the contrary is the authority of Augustine who makes this distinction (De Verb. Dom., Sermon. lxi — Tract. xxix in Joan.).

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(2) — *I answer that,* The act of any power or habit depends on the relation of that power or habit to its object. Now the object of faith can be considered in three ways. For, since “to believe” is an act of the intellect, in so far as the will moves it to assent, as stated above (A(1), ad 3), the object of faith can be considered either on the part of the intellect, or on the part of the will that moves the intellect.

If it be considered on the part of the intellect, then two things can be observed in the object of faith, as stated above (Q(1), A(1)). One of these is the material object of faith, and in this way an act of faith is “to believe in a God”; because, as stated above (Q(1), A(1)) nothing is proposed to

our belief, except in as much as it is referred to God. The other is the formal aspect of the object, for it is the medium on account of which we assent to such and such a point of faith; and thus an act of faith is “to believe God,” since, as stated above (**Q(1), A(1)**) the formal object of faith is the First Truth, to Which man gives his adhesion, so as to assent to Its sake to whatever he believes.

Thirdly, if the object of faith be considered in so far as the intellect is moved by the will, an act of faith is “to believe in God.” For the First Truth is referred to the will, through having the aspect of an end.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(2)-RO(1) — These three do not denote different acts of faith, but one and the same act having different relations to the object of faith.

This suffices for the Reply to the Second Objection.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(2)-RO(3) — Unbelievers cannot be said “to believe in a God” as we understand it in relation to the act of faith. For they do not believe that God exists under the conditions that faith determines; hence they do not truly imply believe in a God, since, as the Philosopher observes (Metaph. ix, text. 22) “to know simple things defectively is not to know them at all.”

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(2)-RO(4) — As stated above (**P(2a), Q(9), A(1)**) the will moves the intellect and the other powers of the soul to the end: and in this respect an act of faith is “to believe in God.”

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(3)

***Whether it is necessary for salvation
to believe anything above the natural reason?***

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem unnecessary for salvation to believe anything above the natural reason. For the salvation and perfection of a thing seem to be sufficiently insured by its natural endowments. Now matters of faith, surpass man’s natural reason, since they are things unseen as stated above (**Q(1), A(4)**). Therefore to believe seems unnecessary for salvation.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it is dangerous for man to assent to matters, wherein he cannot judge whether that which is proposed to him be true or false, according to ^{<8211}Job 12:11: “Doth not the ear discern words?” Now a man cannot form a judgment of this kind in matters of faith, since he cannot trace them back to first principles, by which all our judgments are guided. Therefore it is dangerous to believe in such matters. Therefore to believe is not necessary for salvation.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, man’s salvation rests on God, according to ^{<8211}Psalms 36:39: “But the salvation of the just is from the Lord.” Now “the invisible things” of God “are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; His eternal power also and Divinity,” according to ^{<8211}Romans 1:20: and those things which are clearly seen by the understanding are not an object of belief. Therefore it is not necessary for man’s salvation, that he should believe certain things.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<8211}Hebrews 11:6):
 “Without faith it is impossible to please God.”

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Wherever one nature is subordinate to another, we find that two things concur towards the perfection of the lower nature, one of which is in respect of that nature’s proper movement, while the other is in respect of the movement of the higher nature. Thus water by its proper movement moves towards the centre (of the earth), while according to the movement of the moon, it moves round the centre by ebb and flow. In like manner the planets have their proper movements from west to east, while in accordance with the movement of the first heaven, they have a movement from east to west. Now the created rational nature alone is immediately subordinate to God, since other creatures do not attain to the universal, but only to something particular, while they partake of the Divine goodness either in “being” only, as inanimate things, or also in “living,” and in “knowing singulars,” as plants and animals; whereas the rational nature, in as much as it apprehends the universal notion of good and being, is immediately related to the universal principle of being.

Consequently the perfection of the rational creature consists not only in what belongs to it in respect of its nature, but also in that which it acquires

through a supernatural participation of Divine goodness. Hence it was said above (**P(2a), Q(3), A(8)**) that man's ultimate happiness consists in a supernatural vision of God: to which vision man cannot attain unless he be taught by God, according to ~~466~~ John 6:45: "Every one that hath heard of the Father and hath learned cometh to Me." Now man acquires a share of this learning, not indeed all at once, but by little and little, according to the mode of his nature: and every one who learns thus must needs believe, in order that he may acquire science in a perfect degree; thus also the Philosopher remarks (De Soph. Elench. i, 2) that "it behooves a learner to believe."

Hence in order that a man arrive at the perfect vision of heavenly happiness, he must first of all believe God, as a disciple believes the master who is teaching him.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(3)-RO(1) — Since man's nature is dependent on a higher nature, natural knowledge does not suffice for its perfection, and some supernatural knowledge is necessary, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(3)-RO(2) — Just as man assents to first principles, by the natural light of his intellect, so does a virtuous man, by the habit of virtue, judge aright of things concerning that virtue; and in this way, by the light of faith which God bestows on him, a man assents to matters of faith and not to those which are against faith. Consequently "there is no" danger or "condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus," and whom He has enlightened by faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(3)-RO(3) — In many respects faith perceives the invisible things of God in a higher way than natural reason does in proceeding to God from His creatures. Hence it is written (Ecclus. 3:25): "Many things are shown to thee above the understandings of man."

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(4)

Whether it is necessary to believe those things which can be proved by natural reason?

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem unnecessary to believe those things which can be proved by natural reason. For nothing is superfluous

in God's works, much less even than in the works of nature. Now it is superfluous to employ other means, where one already suffices. Therefore it would be superfluous to receive by faith, things that can be known by natural reason.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, those things must be believed, which are the object of faith. Now science and faith are not about the same object, as stated above (**Q(1)**, **AA(4),5**). Since therefore all things that can be known by natural reason are an object of science, it seems that there is no need to believe what can be proved by natural reason.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, all things knowable scientifically [*Science is certain knowledge of a demonstrated conclusion through its demonstration] would seem to come under one head: so that if some of them are proposed to man as objects of faith, in like manner the others should also be believed. But this is not true. Therefore it is not necessary to believe those things which can be proved by natural reason.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is necessary to believe that God is one and incorporeal: which things philosophers prove by natural reason.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(4) — *I answer that*, It is necessary for man to accept by faith not only things which are above reason, but also those which can be known by reason: and this for three motives. First, in order that man may arrive more quickly at the knowledge of Divine truth. Because the science to whose province it belongs to prove the existence of God, is the last of all to offer itself to human research, since it presupposes many other sciences: so that it would not be until late in life that man would arrive at the knowledge of God. The second reason is, in order that the knowledge of God may be more general. For many are unable to make progress in the study of science, either through dullness of mind, or through having a number of occupations, and temporal needs, or even through laziness in learning, all of whom would be altogether deprived of the knowledge of God, unless Divine things were brought to their knowledge under the guise of faith. The third reason is for the sake of certitude. For human reason is very deficient in things concerning God. A sign of this is that philosophers in their researches, by natural investigation, into human affairs, have fallen into many errors, and have disagreed among themselves. And consequently, in order that men might have knowledge of God, free of

doubt and uncertainty, it was necessary for Divine matters to be delivered to them by way of faith, being told to them, as it were, by God Himself Who cannot lie.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(4)-RO(1) — The researches of natural reason do not suffice mankind for the knowledge of Divine matters, even of those that can be proved by reason: and so it is not superfluous if these others be believed.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(4)-RO(2) — Science and faith cannot be in the same subject and about the same object: but what is an object of science for one, can be an object of faith for another, as stated above (**Q(1), A(5)**).

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(4)-RO(3) — Although all things that can be known by science are of one common scientific aspect, they do not all alike lead man to beatitude: hence they are not all equally proposed to our belief.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(5)

Whether man is bound to believe anything explicitly?

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that man is not bound to believe anything explicitly. For no man is bound to do what is not in his power. Now it is not in man's power to believe a thing explicitly, for it is written (⁶⁰⁴Romans 10:14,15):

“How shall they believe Him, of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach unless they be sent?”

Therefore man is not bound to believe anything explicitly.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, just as we are directed to God by faith, so are we by charity. Now man is not bound to keep the precepts of charity, and it is enough if he be ready to fulfil them: as is evidenced by the precept of Our Lord (⁴⁰⁵Matthew 5:39):

“If one strike thee on one [Vulg.: ‘thy right’] cheek, turn to him also the other”;

and by others of the same kind, according to Augustine's exposition (De Serm. Dom. in Monte xix). Therefore neither is man bound to believe

anything explicitly, and it is enough if he be ready to believe whatever God proposes to be believed.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, the good of faith consists in obedience, according to ^{<600>}Romans 1:5: “For obedience to the faith in all nations.” Now the virtue of obedience does not require man to keep certain fixed precepts, but it is enough that his mind be ready to obey, according to ^{<H80>}Psalms 118:60:

“I am ready and am not troubled;
that I may keep Thy commandments.”

Therefore it seems enough for faith, too, that man should be ready to believe whatever God may propose, without his believing anything explicitly.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<S100>}Hebrews 11:6):

“He that cometh to God, must believe that He is, and is a rewarder
to them that seek Him.”

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(5) — *I answer that*, The precepts of the Law, which man is bound to fulfil, concern acts of virtue which are the means of attaining salvation. Now an act of virtue, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(60), A(5)**) depends on the relation of the habit to its object. Again two things may be considered in the object of any virtue; namely, that which is the proper and direct object of that virtue, and that which is accidental and consequent to the object properly so called. Thus it belongs properly and directly to the object of fortitude, to face the dangers of death, and to charge at the foe with danger to oneself, for the sake of the common good: yet that, in a just war, a man be armed, or strike another with his sword, and so forth, is reduced to the object of fortitude, but indirectly.

Accordingly, just as a virtuous act is required for the fulfilment of a precept, so is it necessary that the virtuous act should terminate in its proper and direct object: but, on the other hand, the fulfilment of the precept does not require that a virtuous act should terminate in those things which have an accidental or secondary relation to the proper and direct object of that virtue, except in certain places and at certain times. We must, therefore, say that the direct object of faith is that whereby man is

made one of the Blessed, as stated above (**Q(1), A(8)**): while the indirect and secondary object comprises all things delivered by God to us in Holy Writ, for instance that Abraham had two sons, that David was the son of Jesse, and so forth.

Therefore, as regards the primary points or articles of faith, man is bound to believe them, just as he is bound to have faith; but as to other points of faith, man is not bound to believe them explicitly, but only implicitly, or to be ready to believe them, in so far as he is prepared to believe whatever is contained in the Divine Scriptures. Then alone is he bound to believe such things explicitly, when it is clear to him that they are contained in the doctrine of faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(5)-RO(1) — If we understand those things alone to be in a man's power, which we can do without the help of grace, then we are bound to do many things which we cannot do without the aid of healing grace, such as to love God and our neighbor, and likewise to believe the articles of faith. But with the help of grace we can do this, for this help “to whomsoever it is given from above it is mercifully given; and from whom it is withheld it is justly withheld, as a punishment of a previous, or at least of original, sin,” as Augustine states (De Corr. et Grat. v, vi [*Cf. Ep. cxc; De Praed. Sanct. viii.]).

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(5)-RO(2) — Man is bound to love definitely those lovable things which are properly and directly the objects of charity, namely, God and our neighbor. The objection refers to those precepts of charity which belong, as a consequence, to the objects of charity.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(5)-RO(3) — The virtue of obedience is seated, properly speaking, in the will; hence promptness of the will subject to authority, suffices for the act of obedience, because it is the proper and direct object of obedience. But this or that precept is accidental or consequent to that proper and direct object.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(6)

Whether all are equally bound to have explicit faith?

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that all are equally bound to have explicit faith. For all are bound to those things which are necessary for

salvation, as is evidenced by the precepts of charity. Now it is necessary for salvation that certain things should be believed explicitly. Therefore all are equally bound to have explicit faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, no one should be put to test in matters that he is not bound to believe. But simple reasons are sometimes tested in reference to the slightest articles of faith. Therefore all are bound to believe everything explicitly.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, if the simple are bound to have, not explicit but only implicit faith, their faith must needs be implied in the faith of the learned. But this seems unsafe, since it is possible for the learned to err. Therefore it seems that the simple should also have explicit faith; so that all are, therefore, equally bound to have explicit faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~ROM~~ Job 1:14): “The oxen were ploughing, and the asses feeding beside them,” because, as Gregory expounds this passage (Moral. ii, 17), the simple, who are signified by the asses, ought, in matters of faith, to stay by the learned, who are denoted by the oxen.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(6) — *I answer that*, The unfolding of matters of faith is the result of Divine revelation: for matters of faith surpass natural reason. Now Divine revelation reaches those of lower degree through those who are over them, in a certain order; to men, for instance, through the angels, and to the lower angels through the higher, as Dionysius explains (Coel. Hier. iv, vii). In like manner therefore the unfolding of faith must needs reach men of lower degree through those of higher degree. Consequently, just as the higher angels, who enlighten those who are below them, have a fuller knowledge of Divine things than the lower angels, as Dionysius states (Coel. Hier. xii), so too, men of higher degree, whose business it is to teach others, are under obligation to have fuller knowledge of matters of faith, and to believe them more explicitly.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(6)-RO(1) — The unfolding of the articles of faith is not equally necessary for the salvation of all, since those of higher degree, whose duty it is to teach others, are bound to believe explicitly more things than others are.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(6)-RO(2) — Simple persons should not be put to the test about subtle questions of faith, unless they be suspected of having been corrupted by heretics, who are wont to corrupt the faith of simple people in such questions. If, however, it is found that they are free from obstinacy in their heterodox sentiments, and that it is due to their simplicity, it is no fault of theirs.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(6)-RO(3) — The simple have no faith implied in that of the learned, except in so far as the latter adhere to the Divine teaching. Hence the Apostle says (^{<4016>}1 Corinthians 4:16): “Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ.” Hence it is not human knowledge, but the Divine truth that is the rule of faith: and if any of the learned stray from this rule, he does not harm the faith of the simple ones, who think that the learned believe aright; unless the simple hold obstinately to their individual errors, against the faith of the universal Church, which cannot err, since Our Lord said (^{<4022>}Luke 22:32): “I have prayed for thee,” Peter, “that thy faith fail not.”

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(7)

Whether it is necessary for the salvation of all, that they should believe explicitly in the mystery of Christ?

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not necessary for the salvation of all that they should believe explicitly in the mystery of Christ. For man is not bound to believe explicitly what the angels are ignorant about: since the unfolding of faith is the result of Divine revelation, which reaches man by means of the angels, as stated above (**A(6); P(1) Q(111), A(1)**). Now even the angels were in ignorance of the mystery of the Incarnation: hence, according to the commentary of Dionysius (Coel. Hier. vii), it is they who ask (^{<4016>}Psalms 23:8): “Who is this king of glory?” and (^{<2016>}Isaiah 63:1): “Who is this that cometh from Edom?” Therefore men were not bound to believe explicitly in the mystery of Christ’s Incarnation.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, it is evident that John the Baptist was one of the teachers, and most nigh to Christ, Who said of him (^{<4011>}Matthew 11:11) that “there hath not risen among them that are born of women, a greater than” he. Now John the Baptist does not appear to have known the mystery of Christ explicitly, since he asked Christ (^{<4013>}Matthew 11:3):

“Art Thou He that art to come, or look we for another?” Therefore even the teachers were not bound to explicit faith in Christ.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, many gentiles obtained salvation through the ministry of the angels, as Dionysius states (Coel. Hier. ix). Now it would seem that the gentiles had neither explicit nor implicit faith in Christ, since they received no revelation. Therefore it seems that it was not necessary for the salvation of all to believe explicitly in the mystery of Christ.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Corr. et Gratia vii; Ep. cxc): “Our faith is sound if we believe that no man, old or young is delivered from the contagion of death and the bonds of sin, except by the one Mediator of God and men, Jesus Christ.”

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(7) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(5); Q(1), A(8)**), the object of faith includes, properly and directly, that thing through which man obtains beatitude. Now the mystery of Christ’s Incarnation and Passion is the way by which men obtain beatitude; for it is written (^{<4012>}Acts 4:12):

“There is no other name under heaven given to men,
whereby we must be saved.”

Therefore belief of some kind in the mystery of Christ’s Incarnation was necessary at all times and for all persons, but this belief differed according to differences of times and persons. The reason of this is that before the state of sin, man believed, explicitly in Christ’s Incarnation, in so far as it was intended for the consummation of glory, but not as it was intended to deliver man from sin by the Passion and Resurrection, since man had no foreknowledge of his future sin. He does, however, seem to have had foreknowledge of the Incarnation of Christ, from the fact that he said (^{<0123>}Genesis 2:24):

“Wherefore a man shall leave father and mother,
and shall cleave to his wife,”

of which the Apostle says (^{<4013>}Ephesians 5:32) that “this is a great sacrament... in Christ and the Church,” and it is incredible that the first man was ignorant about this sacrament.

But after sin, man believed explicitly in Christ, not only as to the Incarnation, but also as to the Passion and Resurrection, whereby the human race is delivered from sin and death: for they would not, else, have foreshadowed Christ's Passion by certain sacrifices both before and after the Law, the meaning of which sacrifices was known by the learned explicitly, while the simple folk, under the veil of those sacrifices, believed them to be ordained by God in reference to Christ's coming, and thus their knowledge was covered with a veil, so to speak. And, as stated above (**Q(1), A(7)**), the nearer they were to Christ, the more distinct was their knowledge of Christ's mysteries.

After grace had been revealed, both learned and simple folk are bound to explicit faith in the mysteries of Christ, chiefly as regards those which are observed throughout the Church, and publicly proclaimed, such as the articles which refer to the Incarnation, of which we have spoken above (**Q(1), A(8)**). As to other minute points in reference to the articles of the Incarnation, men have been bound to believe them more or less explicitly according to each one's state and office.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(7)-RO(1) — The mystery of the Kingdom of God was not entirely hidden from the angels, as Augustine observes (Genesis ad lit. v, 19), yet certain aspects thereof were better known to them when Christ revealed them to them.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(7)-RO(2) — It was not through ignorance that John the Baptist inquired of Christ's advent in the flesh, since he had clearly professed his belief therein, saying: "I saw, and I gave testimony, that this is the Son of God" (^{281B} John 1:34). Hence he did not say: "Art Thou He that hast come?" but "Art Thou He that art to come?" thus saying about the future, not about the past. Likewise it is not to be believed that he was ignorant of Christ's future Passion, for he had already said (^{281B} John 1:39):

"Behold the Lamb of God, behold Him who taketh away the sins
[Vulg.: 'sin'] of the world,"

thus foretelling His future immolation; and since other prophets had foretold it, as may be seen especially in ^{281B} Isaiah 53. We may therefore say with Gregory (Hom. xxvi in Evang.) that he asked this question, being in ignorance as to whether Christ would descend into hell in His own Person. But he did not ignore the fact that the power of Christ's Passion would be

extended to those who were detained in Limbo, according to ^{<RV1>}Zechariah 9:11:

“Thou also, by the blood of Thy testament hast sent forth Thy prisoners out of the pit, wherein there is no water”;

nor was he bound to believe explicitly, before its fulfilment, that Christ was to descend thither Himself.

It may also be replied that, as Ambrose observes in his commentary on ^{<LV7>}Luke 7:19, he made this inquiry, not from doubt or ignorance but from devotion: or again, with Chrysostom (Hom. xxxvi in Matth.), that he inquired, not as though ignorant himself, but because he wished his disciples to be satisfied on that point, through Christ: hence the latter framed His answer so as to instruct the disciples, by pointing to the signs of His works.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(7)-RO(3) — Many of the gentiles received revelations of Christ, as is clear from their predictions. Thus we read (^{<RV2>}Job 19:25): “I know that my Redeemer liveth.” The Sibyl too foretold certain things about Christ, as Augustine states (Contra Faust. xiii, 15). Moreover, we read in the history of the Romans, that at the time of Constantine Augustus and his mother Irene a tomb was discovered, wherein lay a man on whose breast was a golden plate with the inscription: “Christ shall be born of a virgin, and in Him, I believe. O sun, during the lifetime of Irene and Constantine, thou shalt see me again” [*Cf. Baron, Annal., A.D. 780]. If, however, some were saved without receiving any revelation, they were not saved without faith in a Mediator, for, though they did not believe in Him explicitly, they did, nevertheless, have implicit faith through believing in Divine providence, since they believed that God would deliver mankind in whatever way was pleasing to Him, and according to the revelation of the Spirit to those who knew the truth, as stated in ^{<RV11>}Job 35:11:

“Who teacheth us more than the beasts of the earth.”

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(8)

Whether it is necessary for salvation to believe explicitly in the Trinity?

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that it was not necessary for salvation to believe explicitly in the Trinity. For the Apostle says (^{<8100>}Hebrews 11:6):

“He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and is a rewarder to them that seek Him.”

Now one can believe this without believing in the Trinity. Therefore it was not necessary to believe explicitly in the Trinity.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(8)-O(2) — Further our Lord said (^{<8105>}John 17:5,6): “Father, I have manifested Thy name to men,” which words Augustine expounds (Tract. cvi) as follows: “Not the name by which Thou art called God, but the name whereby Thou art called My Father,” and further on he adds: “In that He made this world, God is known to all nations; in that He is not to be worshipped together with false gods, ‘God is known in Judea’; but, in that He is the Father of this Christ, through Whom He takes away the sin of the world, He now makes known to men this name of His, which hitherto they knew not.” Therefore before the coming of Christ it was not known that Paternity and Filiation were in the Godhead: and so the Trinity was not believed explicitly.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, that which we are bound to believe explicitly of God is the object of heavenly happiness. Now the object of heavenly happiness is the sovereign good, which can be understood to be in God, without any distinction of Persons. Therefore it was not necessary to believe explicitly in the Trinity.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(8) — *On the contrary,* In the Old Testament the Trinity of Persons is expressed in many ways; thus at the very outset of Genesis it is written in manifestation of the Trinity: “Let us make man to Our image and likeness” (^{<0000>}Genesis 1:26). Therefore from the very beginning it was necessary for salvation to believe in the Trinity.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(8) — *I answer that,* It is impossible to believe explicitly in the mystery of Christ, without faith in the Trinity, since the mystery of

Christ includes that the Son of God took flesh; that He renewed the world through the grace of the Holy Ghost; and again, that He was conceived by the Holy Ghost. Wherefore just as, before Christ, the mystery of Christ was believed explicitly by the learned, but implicitly and under a veil, so to speak, by the simple, so too was it with the mystery of the Trinity. And consequently, when once grace had been revealed, all were bound to explicit faith in the mystery of the Trinity: and all who are born again in Christ, have this bestowed on them by the invocation of the Trinity, according to ~~419~~ Matthew 28:19:

“Going therefore teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.”

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(8)-RO(1) — Explicit faith in those two things was necessary at all times and for all people: but it was not sufficient at all times and for all people.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(8)-RO(2) — Before Christ’s coming, faith in the Trinity lay hidden in the faith of the learned, but through Christ and the apostles it was shown to the world.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(8)-RO(3) — God’s sovereign goodness as we understand it now through its effects, can be understood without the Trinity of Persons: but as understood in itself, and as seen by the Blessed, it cannot be understood without the Trinity of Persons. Moreover the mission of the Divine Persons brings us to heavenly happiness.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(9)

Whether to believe is meritorious?

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that to believe is not meritorious. For the principle of all merit is charity, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(114), A(4)**). Now faith, like nature, is a preamble to charity. Therefore, just as an act of nature is not meritorious, since we do not merit by our natural gifts, so neither is an act of faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, belief is a mean between opinion and scientific knowledge or the consideration of things scientifically known [*Science is a certain knowledge of a demonstrated conclusion through its demonstration.]. Now the considerations of science are not meritorious, nor on the other hand is opinion. Therefore belief is not meritorious.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, he who assents to a point of faith, either has a sufficient motive for believing, or he has not. If he has a sufficient motive for his belief, this does not seem to imply any merit on his part, since he is no longer free to believe or not to believe: whereas if he has not a sufficient motive for believing, this is a mark of levity, according to Ecclus. 19:4: “He that is hasty to give credit, is light of heart,” so that, seemingly, he gains no merit thereby. Therefore to believe is by no means meritorious.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{scrip} Hebrews 11:33) that the saints “by faith... obtained promises,” which would not be the case if they did not merit by believing. Therefore to believe is meritorious.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(9) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(114), AA(3),4**), our actions are meritorious in so far as they proceed from the free-will moved with grace by God. Therefore every human act proceeding from the free-will, if it be referred to God, can be meritorious. Now the act of believing is an act of the intellect assenting to the Divine truth at the command of the will moved by the grace of God, so that it is subject to the free-will in relation to God; and consequently the act of faith can be meritorious.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(9)-RO(1) — Nature is compared to charity which is the principle of merit, as matter to form: whereas faith is compared to charity as the disposition which precedes the ultimate form. Now it is evident that the subject or the matter cannot act save by virtue of the form, nor can a preceding disposition, before the advent of the form: but after the advent of the form, both the subject and the preceding disposition act by virtue of the form, which is the chief principle of action, even as the heat of fire acts by virtue of the substantial form of fire. Accordingly neither nature nor faith can, without charity, produce a meritorious act; but, when accompanied by charity, the act of faith is made meritorious thereby, even as an act of nature, and a natural act of the free-will.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(9)-RO(2) — Two things may be considered in science: namely the scientist’s assent to a scientific fact and his consideration of that fact. Now the assent of science is not subject to free-will, because the scientist is obliged to assent by force of the demonstration, wherefore scientific assent is not meritorious. But the actual consideration of what a

man knows scientifically is subject to his free-will, for it is in his power to consider or not to consider. Hence scientific consideration may be meritorious if it be referred to the end of charity, i.e. to the honor of God or the good of our neighbor. On the other hand, in the case of faith, both these things are subject to the free-will so that in both respects the act of faith can be meritorious: whereas in the case of opinion, there is no firm assent, since it is weak and infirm, as the Philosopher observes (Poster. i, 33), so that it does not seem to proceed from a perfect act of the will: and for this reason, as regards the assent, it does not appear to be very meritorious, though it can be as regards the actual consideration.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(9)-RO(3) — The believer has sufficient motive for believing, for he is moved by the authority of Divine teaching confirmed by miracles, and, what is more, by the inward instinct of the Divine invitation: hence he does not believe lightly. He has not, however, sufficient reason for scientific knowledge, hence he does not lose the merit.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(10)

*Whether reasons in support
of what we believe lessen the merit of faith?*

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that reasons in support of what we believe lessen the merit of faith. For Gregory says (Hom. xxvi in Evang.) that “there is no merit in believing what is shown by reason.” If, therefore, human reason provides sufficient proof, the merit of faith is altogether taken away. Therefore it seems that any kind of human reasoning in support of matters of faith, diminishes the merit of believing.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, whatever lessens the measure of virtue, lessens the amount of merit, since “happiness is the reward of virtue,” as the Philosopher states (Ethic. i, 9). Now human reasoning seems to diminish the measure of the virtue of faith, since it is essential to faith to be about the unseen, as stated above (**Q(1)**, **AA(4),5**). Now the more a thing is supported by reasons the less is it unseen. Therefore human reasons in support of matters of faith diminish the merit of faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, contrary things have contrary causes. Now an inducement in opposition to faith increases the merit of faith whether it consist in persecution inflicted by one who endeavors to force a

man to renounce his faith, or in an argument persuading him to do so. Therefore reasons in support of faith diminish the merit of faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~ad~~¹ Peter 3:15):

“Being ready always to satisfy every one that asketh you a reason of that faith [*Vulg.: ‘Of that hope which is in you.’ St. Thomas’ reading is apparently taken from Bede.] and hope which is in you.”

Now the Apostle would not give this advice, if it would imply a diminution in the merit of faith. Therefore reason does not diminish the merit of faith.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(10) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(9)**), the act of faith can be meritorious, in so far as it is subject to the will, not only as to the use, but also as to the assent. Now human reason in support of what we believe, may stand in a twofold relation to the will of the believer. First, as preceding the act of the will; as, for instance, when a man either has not the will, or not a prompt will, to believe, unless he be moved by human reasons: and in this way human reason diminishes the merit of faith. In this sense it has been said above (**P(2a)**, **Q(24)**, **A(3)**, ad 1; **Q(77)**, **A(6)**, ad 2) that, in moral virtues, a passion which precedes choice makes the virtuous act less praiseworthy. For just as a man ought to perform acts of moral virtue, on account of the judgment of his reason, and not on account of a passion, so ought he to believe matters of faith, not on account of human reason, but on account of the Divine authority. Secondly, human reasons may be consequent to the will of the believer. For when a man’s will is ready to believe, he loves the truth he believes, he thinks out and takes to heart whatever reasons he can find in support thereof; and in this way human reason does not exclude the merit of faith but is a sign of greater merit. Thus again, in moral virtues a consequent passion is the sign of a more prompt will, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(24)**, **A(3)**, ad 1). We have an indication of this in the words of the Samaritans to the woman, who is a type of human reason: “We now believe, not for thy saying” (~~ad~~¹ John 4:42).

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(10)-RO(1) — Gregory is referring to the case of a man who has no will to believe what is of faith, unless he be induced by reasons. But when a man has the will to believe what is of faith on the authority of God alone, although he may have reasons in demonstration of some of them,

e.g. of the existence of God, the merit of his faith is not, for that reason, lost or diminished.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(10)-RO(2) — The reasons which are brought forward in support of the authority of faith, are not demonstrations which can bring intellectual vision to the human intellect, wherefore they do not cease to be unseen. But they remove obstacles to faith, by showing that what faith proposes is not impossible; wherefore such reasons do not diminish the merit or the measure of faith. On the other hand, though demonstrative reasons in support of the preambles of faith [*The Leonine Edition reads: ‘in support of matters of faith which are however, preambles to the articles of faith, diminish,’ etc.], but not of the articles of faith, diminish the measure of faith, since they make the thing believed to be seen, yet they do not diminish the measure of charity, which makes the will ready to believe them, even if they were unseen; and so the measure of merit is not diminished.

P(2b)-Q(2)-A(10)-RO(3) — Whatever is in opposition to faith, whether it consist in a man’s thoughts, or in outward persecution, increases the merit of faith, in so far as the will is shown to be more prompt and firm in believing. Hence the martyrs had more merit of faith, through not renouncing faith on account of persecution; and even the wise have greater merit of faith, through not renouncing their faith on account of the reasons brought forward by philosophers or heretics in opposition to faith. On the other hand things that are favorable to faith, do not always diminish the promptness of the will to believe, and therefore they do not always diminish the merit of faith.

QUESTION 3

OF THE OUTWARD ACT OF FAITH

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the outward act, viz. the confession of faith: under which head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether confession is an act of faith?
- (2) Whether confession of faith is necessary for salvation?

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(1)

Whether confession is an act of faith?

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that confession is not an act of faith. For the same act does not belong to different virtues. Now confession belongs to penance of which it is a part. Therefore it is not an act of faith.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, man is sometimes deterred by fear or some kind of confusion, from confessing his faith: wherefore the Apostle (⁴⁰⁹ Ephesians 6:19) asks for prayers that it may be granted him “with confidence, to make known the mystery of the gospel.” Now it belongs to fortitude, which moderates daring and fear, not to be deterred from doing good on account of confusion or fear. Therefore it seems that confession is not an act of faith, but rather of fortitude or constancy.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, just as the ardor of faith makes one confess one’s faith outwardly, so does it make one do other external good works, for it is written (⁴¹⁰ Galatians 5:6) that “faith... worketh by charity.” But other external works are not reckoned acts of faith. Therefore neither is confession an act of faith.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, A gloss explains the words of ^{scm}2 Thessalonians 1:11, “and the work of faith in power” as referring to “confession which is a work proper to faith.”

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Outward actions belong properly to the virtue to whose end they are specifically referred: thus fasting is referred specifically to the end of abstinence, which is to tame the flesh, and consequently it is an act of abstinence.

Now confession of those things that are of faith is referred specifically as to its end, to that which concerns faith, according to ^{scm}2 Corinthians 4:13:

“Having the same spirit of faith...
we believe, and therefore we speak also.”

For the outward utterance is intended to signify the inward thought. Wherefore, just as the inward thought of matters of faith is properly an act of faith, so too is the outward confession of them.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(1)-RO(1) — A threefold confession is commended by the Scriptures. One is the confession of matters of faith, and this is a proper act of faith, since it is referred to the end of faith as stated above. Another is the confession of thanksgiving or praise, and this is an act of “latria,” for its purpose is to give outward honor to God, which is the end of “latria.” The third is the confession of sins, which is ordained to the blotting out of sins, which is the end of penance, to which virtue it therefore belongs.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(1)-RO(2) — That which removes an obstacle is not a direct, but an indirect, cause, as the Philosopher proves (Phys. viii, 4). Hence fortitude which removes an obstacle to the confession of faith, viz. fear or shame, is not the proper and direct cause of confession, but an indirect cause so to speak.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(1)-RO(3) — Inward faith, with the aid of charity, causes all outward acts of virtue, by means of the other virtues, commanding, but not eliciting them; whereas it produces the act of confession as its proper act, without the help of any other virtue.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(2)

Whether confession of faith is necessary for salvation?

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that confession of faith is not necessary for salvation. For, seemingly, a thing is sufficient for salvation, if it is a means of attaining the end of virtue. Now the proper end of faith is the union of the human mind with Divine truth, and this can be realized without any outward confession. Therefore confession of faith is not necessary for salvation.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, by outward confession of faith, a man reveals his faith to another man. But this is unnecessary save for those who have to instruct others in the faith. Therefore it seems that the simple folk are not bound to confess the faith.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, whatever may tend to scandalize and disturb others, is not necessary for salvation, for the Apostle says (~~1~~¹ Corinthians 10:32): “Be without offense to the Jews and to the gentiles and to the Church of God.” Now confession of faith sometimes causes a disturbance among unbelievers. Therefore it is not necessary for salvation.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (~~10~~¹⁰ Romans 10:10):

“With the heart we believe unto justice; but with the mouth, confession is made unto salvation.”

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Things that are necessary for salvation come under the precepts of the Divine law. Now since confession of faith is something affirmative, it can only fall under an affirmative precept. Hence its necessity for salvation depends on how it falls under an affirmative precept of the Divine law. Now affirmative precepts as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(71)**, **A(5)**, ad 3; **P(2a)**, **Q(88)**, **A(1)**, ad 2) do not bind for always, although they are always binding; but they bind as to place and time according to other due circumstances, in respect of which human acts have to be regulated in order to be acts of virtue.

Thus then it is not necessary for salvation to confess one’s faith at all times and in all places, but in certain places and at certain times, when,

namely, by omitting to do so, we would deprive God of due honor, or our neighbor of a service that we ought to render him: for instance, if a man, on being asked about his faith, were to remain silent, so as to make people believe either that he is without faith, or that the faith is false, or so as to turn others away from the faith; for in such cases as these, confession of faith is necessary for salvation.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(2)-RO(1) — The end of faith, even as of the other virtues, must be referred to the end of charity, which is the love of God and our neighbor. Consequently when God's honor and our neighbor's good demand, man should not be contented with being united by faith to God's truth, but ought to confess his faith outwardly.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(2)-RO(2) — In cases of necessity where faith is in danger, every one is bound to proclaim his faith to others, either to give good example and encouragement to the rest of the faithful, or to check the attacks of unbelievers: but at other times it is not the duty of all the faithful to instruct others in the faith.

P(2b)-Q(3)-A(2)-RO(3) — There is nothing commendable in making a public confession of one's faith, if it causes a disturbance among unbelievers, without any profit either to the faith or to the faithful. Hence Our Lord said (⁴⁰⁰⁶Matthew 7:6):

“Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine... lest turning upon you, they tear you.”

Yet, if there is hope of profit to the faith, or if there be urgency, a man should disregard the disturbance of unbelievers, and confess his faith in public. Hence it is written (⁴¹⁵²Matthew 15:12) that when the disciples had said to Our Lord that “the Pharisee, when they heard this word, were scandalized,” He answered: “Let them alone, they are blind, and leaders of the blind.”

QUESTION 4

OF THE VIRTUE ITSELF OF FAITH

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

We must now consider the virtue itself of faith, and, in the first place, faith itself; secondly, those who have faith; thirdly, the cause of faith; fourthly, its effects.

Under the first head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) What is faith?
- (2) In what power of the soul does it reside?
- (3) Whether its form is charity?
- (4) Whether living [formata] faith and lifeless [informis] faith are one identically?
- (5) Whether faith is a virtue?
- (6) Whether it is one virtue?
- (7) Of its relation to the other virtues;
- (8) Of its certitude as compared with the certitude of the intellectual virtues.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1)

***Whether this is a fitting definition of faith:
“Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for,
the evidence of things that appear not?”***

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that the Apostle gives an unfitting definition of faith (⁵⁰⁰Hebrews 11:1) when he says:

“Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for, the evidence of things that appear not.”

For no quality is a substance: whereas faith is a quality, since it is a theological virtue, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(62), A(3)**). Therefore it is not a substance.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, different virtues have different objects. Now things to be hoped for are the object of hope. Therefore they should not be included in a definition of faith, as though they were its object.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, faith is perfected by charity rather than by hope, since charity is the form of faith, as we shall state further on (**A(3)**). Therefore the definition of faith should have included the thing to be loved rather than the thing to be hoped for.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, the same thing should not be placed in different genera. Now “substance” and “evidence” are different genera, and neither is subalternate to the other. Therefore it is unfitting to state that faith is both “substance” and “evidence.”

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, evidence manifests the truth of the matter for which it is adduced. Now a thing is said to be apparent when its truth is already manifest. Therefore it seems to imply a contradiction to speak of “evidence of things that appear not”: and so faith is unfittingly defined.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The authority of the Apostle suffices.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Though some say that the above words of the Apostle are not a definition of faith, yet if we consider the matter aright, this definition overlooks none of the points in reference to which faith can be defined, albeit the words themselves are not arranged in the form of a definition, just as the philosophers touch on the principles of the syllogism, without employing the syllogistic form.

In order to make this clear, we must observe that since habits are known by their acts, and acts by their objects, faith, being a habit, should be defined by its proper act in relation to its proper object. Now the act of faith is to believe, as stated above (**Q(2), AA(2),3**), which is an act of the intellect determinate to one object of the will’s command. Hence an act of faith is related both to the object of the will, i.e. to the good and the end,

and to the object of the intellect, i.e. to the true. And since faith, through being a theological virtue, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(62), A(2)**), has one same thing for object and end, its object and end must, of necessity, be in proportion to one another. Now it has been already stated (**Q(1), AA(1),4**) that the object of faith is the First Truth, as unseen, and whatever we hold on account thereof: so that it must needs be under the aspect of something unseen that the First Truth is the end of the act of faith, which aspect is that of a thing hoped for, according to the Apostle (~~cf~~ Romans 8:25): “We hope for that which we see not”: because to see the truth is to possess it. Now one hopes not for what one has already, but for what one has not, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(67), A(4)**). Accordingly the relation of the act of faith to its end which is the object of the will, is indicated by the words: “Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for.” For we are wont to call by the name of substance, the first beginning of a thing, especially when the whole subsequent thing is virtually contained in the first beginning; for instance, we might say that the first self-evident principles are the substance of science, because, to wit, these principles are in us the first beginnings of science, the whole of which is itself contained in them virtually. In this way then faith is said to be the “substance of things to be hoped for,” for the reason that in us the first beginning of things to be hoped for is brought about by the assent of faith, which contains virtually all things to be hoped for. Because we hope to be made happy through seeing the unveiled truth to which our faith cleaves, as was made evident when we were speaking of happiness (**P(2a), Q(3), A(8); P(2a), Q(4), A(3)**).

The relationship of the act of faith to the object of the intellect, considered as the object of faith, is indicated by the words, “evidence of things that appear not,” where “evidence” is taken for the result of evidence. For evidence induces the intellect to adhere to a truth, wherefore the firm adhesion of the intellect to the non-apparent truth of faith is called “evidence” here. Hence another reading has “conviction,” because to wit, the intellect of the believer is convinced by Divine authority, so as to assent to what it sees not. Accordingly if anyone would reduce the foregoing words to the form of a definition, he may say that “faith is a habit of the mind, whereby eternal life is begun in us, making the intellect assent to what is non-apparent.”

In this way faith is distinguished from all other things pertaining to the intellect. For when we describe it as “evidence,” we distinguish it from opinion, suspicion, and doubt, which do not make the intellect adhere to anything firmly; when we go on to say, “of things that appear not,” we distinguish it from science and understanding, the object of which is something apparent; and when we say that it is “the substance of things to be hoped for,” we distinguish the virtue of faith from faith commonly so called, which has no reference to the beatitude we hope for.

Whatever other definitions are given of faith, are explanations of this one given by the Apostle. For when Augustine says (Tract. xl in Joan.: QQ. Evang. ii, qu. 39) that “faith is a virtue whereby we believe what we do not see,” and when Damascene says (De Fide Orth. iv, 11) that “faith is an assent without research,” and when others say that “faith is that certainty of the mind about absent things which surpasses opinion but falls short of science,” these all amount to the same as the Apostle’s words: “Evidence of things that appear not”; and when Dionysius says (Div. Nom. vii) that “faith is the solid foundation of the believer, establishing him in the truth, and showing forth the truth in him,” comes to the same as “substance of things to be hoped for.”

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1)-RO(1) — “Substance” here does not stand for the supreme genus condivided with the other genera, but for that likeness to substance which is found in each genus, inasmuch as the first thing in a genus contains the others virtually and is said to be the substance thereof.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1)-RO(2) — Since faith pertains to the intellect as commanded by the will, it must needs be directed, as to its end, to the objects of those virtues which perfect the will, among which is hope, as we shall prove further on (**Q(18), A(1)**). For this reason the definition of faith includes the object of hope.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1)-RO(3) — Love may be of the seen and of the unseen, of the present and of the absent. Consequently a thing to be loved is not so adapted to faith, as a thing to be hoped for, since hope is always of the absent and the unseen.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1)-RO(4) — “Substance” and “evidence” as included in the definition of faith, do not denote various genera of faith, nor different acts,

but different relationships of one act to different objects, as is clear from what has been said.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(1)-RO(5) — Evidence taken from the proper principles of a thing, make it apparent, whereas evidence taken from Divine authority does not make a thing apparent in itself, and such is the evidence referred to in the definition of faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(2)

Whether faith resides in the intellect?

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that faith does not reside in the intellect. For Augustine says (De Praedest. Sanct. v) that “faith resides in the believer’s will.” Now the will is a power distinct from the intellect. Therefore faith does not reside in the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the assent of faith to believe anything, proceeds from the will obeying God. Therefore it seems that faith owes all its praise to obedience. Now obedience is in the will. Therefore faith is in the will, and not in the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the intellect is either speculative or practical. Now faith is not in the speculative intellect, since this is not concerned with things to be sought or avoided, as stated in De Anima iii, 9, so that it is not a principle of operation, whereas “faith... worketh by charity” (~~1~~ Galatians 5:6). Likewise, neither is it in the practical intellect, the object of which is some true, contingent thing, that can be made or done. For the object of faith is the Eternal Truth, as was shown above (**Q(1), A(1)**). Therefore faith does not reside in the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(2) — On the contrary, Faith is succeeded by the heavenly vision, according to ~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 13:12: “We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face.” Now vision is in the intellect. Therefore faith is likewise.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(2) — I answer that, Since faith is a virtue, its act must needs be perfect. Now, for the perfection of an act proceeding from two active principles, each of these principles must be perfect: for it is not

possible for a thing to be sawn well, unless the sawyer possess the art, and the saw be well fitted for sawing. Now, in a power of the soul, which is related to opposite objects, a disposition to act well is a habit, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(49)**, **A(4)**, ad 1,2,3). Wherefore an act that proceeds from two such powers must be perfected by a habit residing in each of them. Again, it has been stated above (**Q(2)**, **AA(1),2**) that to believe is an act of the intellect inasmuch as the will moves it to assent. And this act proceeds from the will and the intellect, both of which have a natural aptitude to be perfected in this way. Consequently, if the act of faith is to be perfect, there needs to be a habit in the will as well as in the intellect: even as there needs to be the habit of prudence in the reason, besides the habit of temperance in the concupiscible faculty, in order that the act of that faculty be perfect. Now, to believe is immediately an act of the intellect, because the object of that act is “the true,” which pertains properly to the intellect. Consequently faith, which is the proper principle of that act, must needs reside in the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(2)-RO(1) — Augustine takes faith for the act of faith, which is described as depending on the believer’s will, in so far as his intellect assents to matters of faith at the command of the will.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(2)-RO(2) — Not only does the will need to be ready to obey but also the intellect needs to be well disposed to follow the command of the will, even as the concupiscible faculty needs to be well disposed in order to follow the command of reason; hence there needs to be a habit of virtue not only in the commanding will but also in the assenting intellect.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(2)-RO(3) — Faith resides in the speculative intellect, as evidenced by its object. But since this object, which is the First Truth, is the end of all our desires and actions, as Augustine proves (*De Trin.* i, 8), it follows that faith worketh by charity just as “the speculative intellect becomes practical by extension” (*De Anima* iii, 10).

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(3)

Whether charity is the form of faith?

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that charity is not the form of faith. For each thing derives its species from its form. When therefore two things are opposite members of a division, one cannot be the form of the other. Now faith and charity are stated to be opposite members of a division, as different species of virtue (¹1 Corinthians 13:13). Therefore charity is not the form of faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, a form and the thing of which it is the form are in one subject, since together they form one simply. Now faith is in the intellect, while charity is in the will. Therefore charity is not the form of faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the form of a thing is a principle thereof. Now obedience, rather than charity, seems to be the principle of believing, on the part of the will, according to ¹Romans 1:5: “For obedience to the faith in all nations.” Therefore obedience rather than charity, is the form of faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Each thing works through its form. Now faith works through charity. Therefore the love of charity is the form of faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As appears from what has been said above (**P(2a)**, **Q(1)**, **A(3)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(18)**, **A(6)**), voluntary acts take their species from their end which is the will’s object. Now that which gives a thing its species, is after the manner of a form in natural things. Wherefore the form of any voluntary act is, in a manner, the end to which that act is directed, both because it takes its species therefrom, and because the mode of an action should correspond proportionately to the end. Now it is evident from what has been said (**A(1)**), that the act of faith is directed to the object of the will, i.e. the good, as to its end: and this good which is the end of faith, viz. the Divine Good, is the proper object of charity. Therefore charity is called the form of faith in so far as the act of faith is perfected and formed by charity.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(3)-RO(1) — Charity is called the form of faith because it quickens the act of faith. Now nothing hinders one act from being quickened by different habits, so as to be reduced to various species in a certain order, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(18)**, **AA(6),7**; **P(2a)**, **Q(61)**, **A(2)**) when we were treating of human acts in general.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(3)-RO(2) — This objection is true of an intrinsic form. But it is not thus that charity is the form of faith, but in the sense that it quickens the act of faith, as explained above.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(3)-RO(3) — Even obedience, and hope likewise, and whatever other virtue might precede the act of faith, is quickened by charity, as we shall show further on (**Q(23)**, **A(8)**), and consequently charity is spoken of as the form of faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(4)

Whether lifeless faith can become living, or living faith, lifeless?

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that lifeless faith does not become living, or living faith lifeless. For, according to ^{<4130>}1 Corinthians 13:10, “when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away.” Now lifeless faith is imperfect in comparison with living faith. Therefore when living faith comes, lifeless faith is done away, so that they are not one identical habit.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, a dead thing does not become a living thing. Now lifeless faith is dead, according to ^{<5020>}James 2:20: “Faith without works is dead.” Therefore lifeless faith cannot become living.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, God’s grace, by its advent, has no less effect in a believer than in an unbeliever. Now by coming to an unbeliever it causes the habit of faith. Therefore when it comes to a believer, who hitherto had the habit of lifeless faith, it causes another habit of faith in him.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(4)-O(4) — Further, as Boethius says (In Categ. Arist. i), “accidents cannot be altered.” Now faith is an accident. Therefore the same faith cannot be at one time living, and at another, lifeless.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on the words, “Faith without works is dead” (~~sum~~ James 2:20) adds, “by which it lives once more.” Therefore faith which was lifeless and without form hitherto, becomes formed and living.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(4) — *I answer that*, There have been various opinions on this question. For some [*William of Auxerre, Sum. Aur. III, iii, 15] have said that living and lifeless faith are distinct habits, but that when living faith comes, lifeless faith is done away, and that, in like manner, when a man sins mortally after having living faith, a new habit of lifeless faith is infused into him by God. But it seems unfitting that grace should deprive man of a gift of God by coming to him, and that a gift of God should be infused into man, on account of a mortal sin.

Consequently others [*Alexander of Hales, Sum. Theol. iii, 64] have said that living and lifeless faith are indeed distinct habits, but that, all the same, when living faith comes the habit of lifeless faith is not taken away, and that it remains together with the habit of living faith in the same subject. Yet again it seems unreasonable that the habit of lifeless faith should remain inactive in a person having living faith.

We must therefore hold differently that living and lifeless faith are one and the same habit. The reason is that a habit is differentiated by that which directly pertains to that habit. Now since faith is a perfection of the intellect, that pertains directly to faith, which pertains to the intellect. Again, what pertains to the will, does not pertain directly to faith, so as to be able to differentiate the habit of faith. But the distinction of living from lifeless faith is in respect of something pertaining to the will, i.e. charity, and not in respect of something pertaining to the intellect. Therefore living and lifeless faith are not distinct habits.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(4)-RO(1) — The saying of the Apostle refers to those imperfect things from which imperfection is inseparable, for then, when the perfect comes the imperfect must needs be done away. Thus with the advent of clear vision, faith is done away, because it is essentially “of the

things that appear not.” When, however, imperfection is not inseparable from the imperfect thing, the same identical thing which was imperfect becomes perfect. Thus childhood is not essential to man and consequently the same identical subject who was a child, becomes a man. Now lifelessness is not essential to faith, but is accidental thereto as stated above. Therefore lifeless faith itself becomes living.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(4)-RO(2) — That which makes an animal live is inseparable from an animal, because it is its substantial form, viz. the soul: consequently a dead thing cannot become a living thing, and a living and a dead thing differ specifically. On the other hand that which gives faith its form, or makes it live, is not essential to faith. Hence there is no comparison.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(4)-RO(3) — Grace causes faith not only when faith begins anew to be in a man, but also as long as faith lasts. For it has been said above (**P(1) Q(104), A(1); P(2a), Q(109), A(9)**) that God is always working man’s justification, even as the sun is always lighting up the air. Hence grace is not less effective when it comes to a believer than when it comes to an unbeliever: since it causes faith in both, in the former by confirming and perfecting it, in the latter by creating it anew.

We might also reply that it is accidental, namely on account of the disposition of the subject, that grace does not cause faith in one who has it already: just as, on the other hand, a second mortal sin does not take away grace from one who has already lost it through a previous mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(4)-RO(4) — When living faith becomes lifeless, faith is not changed, but its subject, the soul, which at one time has faith without charity, and at another time, with charity.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(5)

Whether faith is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that faith is not a virtue. For virtue is directed to the good, since “it is virtue that makes its subject good,” as the Philosopher states (Ethic. ii, 6). But faith is directed to the true. Therefore faith is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, infused virtue is more perfect than acquired virtue. Now faith, on account of its imperfection, is not placed among the acquired intellectual virtues, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. vi, 3). Much less, therefore, can it be considered an infused virtue.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, living and lifeless faith are the same species, as stated above (**A(4)**). Now lifeless faith is not a virtue, since it is not connected with the other virtues. Therefore neither is living faith a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(5)-O(4) — Further, the gratuitous graces and the fruits are distinct from the virtues. But faith is numbered among the gratuitous graces (^{<4329>}1 Corinthians 12:9) and likewise among the fruits (^{<4822>}Galatians 5:23). Therefore faith is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Man is justified by the virtues, since “justice is all virtue,” as the Philosopher states (Ethic. v, 1). Now man is justified by faith according to ^{<4819>}Romans 5:1: “Being justified therefore by faith let us have peace,” etc. Therefore faith is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As shown above, it is by human virtue that human acts are rendered good; hence, any habit that is always the principle of a good act, may be called a human virtue. Such a habit is living faith. For since to believe is an act of the intellect assenting to the truth at the command of the will, two things are required that this act may be perfect: one of which is that the intellect should infallibly tend to its object, which is the true; while the other is that the will should be infallibly directed to the last end, on account of which it assents to the true: and both of these are to be found in the act of living faith. For it belongs to the very essence of faith that the intellect should ever tend to the true, since nothing false can be the object of faith, as proved above (**Q(1), A(3)**): while the effect of charity, which is the form of faith, is that the soul ever has its will directed to a good end. Therefore living faith is a virtue.

On the other hand, lifeless faith is not a virtue, because, though the act of lifeless faith is duly perfect on the part of the intellect, it has not its due perfection as regards the will: just as if temperance be in the concupiscible, without prudence being in the rational part, temperance is not a virtue, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(65), A(1)**), because the act of temperance requires

both an act of reason, and an act of the concupiscible faculty, even as the act of faith requires an act of the will, and an act of the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(5)-RO(1) — The truth is itself the good of the intellect, since it is its perfection: and consequently faith has a relation to some good in so far as it directs the intellect to the true. Furthermore, it has a relation to the good considered as the object of the will, inasmuch as it is formed by charity.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(5)-RO(2) — The faith of which the Philosopher speaks is based on human reasoning in a conclusion which does not follow, of necessity, from its premisses; and which is subject to be false: hence such like faith is not a virtue. On the other hand, the faith of which we are speaking is based on the Divine Truth, which is infallible, and consequently its object cannot be anything false; so that faith of this kind can be a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(5)-RO(3) — Living and lifeless faith do not differ specifically, as though they belonged to different species. But they differ as perfect and imperfect within the same species. Hence lifeless faith, being imperfect, does not satisfy the conditions of a perfect virtue, for “virtue is a kind of perfection” (Phys. vii, text. 18).

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(5)-RO(4) — Some say that faith which is numbered among the gratuitous graces is lifeless faith. But this is said without reason, since the gratuitous graces, which are mentioned in that passage, are not common to all the members of the Church: wherefore the Apostle says: “There are diversities of graces,” and again, “To one is given” this grace and “to another” that. Now lifeless faith is common to all members of the Church, because its lifelessness is not part of its substance, if we consider it as a gratuitous gift. We must, therefore, say that in that passage, faith denotes a certain excellency of faith, for instance, “constancy in faith,” according to a gloss, or the “word of faith.”

Faith is numbered among the fruits, in so far as it gives a certain pleasure in its act by reason of its certainty, wherefore the gloss on the fifth chapter to the Galatians, where the fruits are enumerated, explains faith as being “certainty about the unseen.”

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(6)

Whether faith is one virtue?

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that faith is not one. For just as faith is a gift of God according to ^{<408>}Ephesians 2:8, so also wisdom and knowledge are numbered among God's gifts according to ^{<2310>}Isaiah 11:2. Now wisdom and knowledge differ in this, that wisdom is about eternal things, and knowledge about temporal things, as Augustine states (De Trin. xii, 14,15). Since, then, faith is about eternal things, and also about some temporal things, it seems that faith is not one virtue, but divided into several parts.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, confession is an act of faith, as stated above (Q(3), A(1)). Now confession of faith is not one and the same for all: since what we confess as past, the fathers of old confessed as yet to come, as appears from ^{<2374>}Isaiah 7:14: "Behold a virgin shall conceive." Therefore faith is not one.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, faith is common to all believers in Christ. But one accident cannot be in many subjects. Therefore all cannot have one faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (^{<408>}Ephesians 4:5):

"One Lord, one faith."

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(6) — *I answer that*, If we take faith as a habit, we can consider it in two ways. First on the part of the object, and thus there is one faith. Because the formal object of faith is the First Truth, by adhering to which we believe whatever is contained in the faith. Secondly, on the part of the subject, and thus faith is differentiated according as it is in various subjects. Now it is evident that faith, just as any other habit, takes its species from the formal aspect of its object, but is individualized by its subject. Hence if we take faith for the habit whereby we believe, it is one specifically, but differs numerically according to its various subjects.

If, on the other hand, we take faith for that which is believed, then, again, there is one faith, since what is believed by all is one same thing: for

though the things believed, which all agree in believing, be diverse from one another, yet they are all reduced to one.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(6)-RO(1) — Temporal matters which are proposed to be believed, do not belong to the object of faith, except in relation to something eternal, viz. the First Truth, as stated above (**Q(1)**, **A(1)**).

Hence there is one faith of things both temporal and eternal. It is different with wisdom and knowledge, which consider temporal and eternal matters under their respective aspects.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(6)-RO(2) — This difference of past and future arises, not from any difference in the thing believed, but from the different relationships of believers to the one thing believed, as also we have mentioned above (**P(2a)**, **Q(103)**, **A(4)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(107)**, **A(1)**, ad 1).

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(6)-RO(3) — This objection considers numerical diversity of faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7)

Whether faith is the first of the virtues?

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that faith is not the first of the virtues. For a gloss on ^{<COT>}Luke 12:4, “I say to you My friends,” says that fortitude is the foundation of faith. Now the foundation precedes that which is founded thereon. Therefore faith is not the first of the virtues.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, a gloss on ^{<FR>}Psalm 36, “Be not emulous,” says that hope “leads on to faith.” Now hope is a virtue, as we shall state further on (**Q(17)**, **A(1)**). Therefore faith is not the first of the virtues.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, it was stated above (**A(2)**) that the intellect of the believer is moved, out of obedience to God, to assent to matters of faith. Now obedience also is a virtue. Therefore faith is not the first virtue.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7)-O(4) — Further, not lifeless but living faith is the foundation, as a gloss remarks on ^{<RIL>}1 Corinthians 3:11 [*Augustine, De Fide et Oper. xvi.]. Now faith is formed by charity, as stated above (**A(3)**).

Therefore it is owing to charity that faith is the foundation: so that charity is the foundation yet more than faith is (for the foundation is the first part of a building) and consequently it seems to precede faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7)-O(5) — Further, the order of habits is taken from the order of acts. Now, in the act of faith, the act of the will which is perfected by charity, precedes the act of the intellect, which is perfected by faith, as the cause which precedes its effect. Therefore charity precedes faith. Therefore faith is not the first of the virtues.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (^{scilicet} Hebrews 11:1) that “faith is the substance of things to be hoped for.” Now the substance of a thing is that which comes first. Therefore faith is first among the virtues.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7) — *I answer that*, One thing can precede another in two ways: first, by its very nature; secondly, by accident. Faith, by its very nature, precedes all other virtues. For since the end is the principle in matters of action, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(13), A(3); P(2a), Q(34), A(4), ad 1**), the theological virtues, the object of which is the last end, must needs precede all the others. Again, the last end must of necessity be present to the intellect before it is present to the will, since the will has no inclination for anything except in so far as it is apprehended by the intellect. Hence, as the last end is present in the will by hope and charity, and in the intellect, by faith, the first of all the virtues must, of necessity, be faith, because natural knowledge cannot reach God as the object of heavenly bliss, which is the aspect under which hope and charity tend towards Him.

On the other hand, some virtues can precede faith accidentally. For an accidental cause precedes its effect accidentally. Now that which removes an obstacle is a kind of accidental cause, according to the Philosopher (Phys. viii, 4): and in this sense certain virtues may be said to precede faith accidentally, in so far as they remove obstacles to belief. Thus fortitude removes the inordinate fear that hinders faith; humility removes pride, whereby a man refuses to submit himself to the truth of faith. The same may be said of some other virtues, although there are no real virtues, unless faith be presupposed, as Augustine states (Contra Julian. iv, 3).

This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7)-RO(2) — Hope cannot lead to faith absolutely. For one cannot hope to obtain eternal happiness, unless one believes this possible, since hope does not tend to the impossible, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(40), A(1)**). It is, however, possible for one to be led by hope to persevere in faith, or to hold firmly to faith; and it is in this sense that hope is said to lead to faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7)-RO(3) — Obedience is twofold: for sometimes it denotes the inclination of the will to fulfil God's commandments. In this way it is not a special virtue, but is a general condition of every virtue; since all acts of virtue come under the precepts of the Divine law, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(100), A(2)**); and thus it is requisite for faith. In another way, obedience denotes an inclination to fulfil the commandments considered as a duty. In this way it is a special virtue, and a part of justice: for a man does his duty by his superior when he obeys him: and thus obedience follows faith, whereby man knows that God is his superior, Whom he must obey.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7)-RO(4) — To be a foundation a thing requires not only to come first, but also to be connected with the other parts of the building: since the building would not be founded on it unless the other parts adhered to it. Now the connecting bond of the spiritual edifice is charity, according to ^{SCOT}Colossians 3:14: "Above all... things have charity which is the bond of perfection." Consequently faith without charity cannot be the foundation: and yet it does not follow that charity precedes faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(7)-RO(5) — Some act of the will is required before faith, but not an act of the will quickened by charity. This latter act presupposes faith, because the will cannot tend to God with perfect love, unless the intellect possesses right faith about Him.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(8)***Whether faith is more certain than science
and the other intellectual virtues?***

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that faith is not more certain than science and the other intellectual virtues. For doubt is opposed to certitude, wherefore a thing would seem to be the more certain, through being less doubtful, just as a thing is the whiter, the less it has of an admixture of black. Now understanding, science and also wisdom are free of any doubt about their objects; whereas the believer may sometimes suffer a movement of doubt, and doubt about matters of faith. Therefore faith is no more certain than the intellectual virtues.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, sight is more certain than hearing. But “faith is through hearing” according to ^{<6007}Romans 10:17; whereas understanding, science and wisdom imply some kind of intellectual sight. Therefore science and understanding are more certain than faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(8)-O(2)

Further, in matters concerning the intellect, the more perfect is the more certain. Now understanding is more perfect than faith, since faith is the way to understanding, according to another version [*The Septuagint] of ^{<2300}Isaiah 7:9: “If you will not believe, you shall not understand [Vulg.: ‘continue’]”: and Augustine says (De Trin. xiv, 1) that “faith is strengthened by science.” Therefore it seems that science or understanding is more certain than faith.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (^{<5015}1 Thessalonians 2:15): “When you had received of us the word of the hearing,” i.e. by faith... “you received it not as the word of men, but, as it is indeed, the word of God.” Now nothing is more certain than the word of God. Therefore science is not more certain than faith; nor is anything else.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(8) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(57)**, **A(4)**, ad 2) two of the intellectual virtues are about contingent matter, viz. prudence and art; to which faith is preferable in point of certitude, by reason of its matter, since it is about eternal things, which never change,

whereas the other three intellectual virtues, viz. wisdom, science [*In English the corresponding ‘gift’ is called knowledge] and understanding, are about necessary things, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(57)**, **A(5)**, ad 3). But it must be observed that wisdom, science and understanding may be taken in two ways: first, as intellectual virtues, according to the Philosopher (*Ethic.* vi, 2,3); secondly, for the gifts of the Holy Ghost. If we consider them in the first way, we must note that certitude can be looked at in two ways. First, on the part of its cause, and thus a thing which has a more certain cause, is itself more certain. In this way faith is more certain than those three virtues, because it is founded on the Divine truth, whereas the aforesaid three virtues are based on human reason. Secondly, certitude may be considered on the part of the subject, and thus the more a man’s intellect lays hold of a thing, the more certain it is. In this way, faith is less certain, because matters of faith are above the human intellect, whereas the objects of the aforesaid three virtues are not. Since, however, a thing is judged simply with regard to its cause, but relatively, with respect to a disposition on the part of the subject, it follows that faith is more certain simply, while the others are more certain relatively, i.e. for us. Likewise if these three be taken as gifts received in this present life, they are related to faith as to their principle which they presuppose: so that again, in this way, faith is more certain.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(8)-RO(1) — This doubt is not on the side of the cause of faith, but on our side, in so far as we do not fully grasp matters of faith with our intellect.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(8)-RO(2) — Other things being equal sight is more certain than hearing; but if (the authority of) the person from whom we hear greatly surpasses that of the seer’s sight, hearing is more certain than sight: thus a man of little science is more certain about what he hears on the authority of an expert in science, than about what is apparent to him according to his own reason: and much more is a man certain about what he hears from God, Who cannot be deceived, than about what he sees with his own reason, which can be mistaken.

P(2b)-Q(4)-A(8)-RO(3) — The gifts of understanding and knowledge are more perfect than the knowledge of faith in the point of their greater clearness, but not in regard to more certain adhesion: because the whole

certitude of the gifts of understanding and knowledge, arises from the certitude of faith, even as the certitude of the knowledge of conclusions arises from the certitude of premisses. But in so far as science, wisdom and understanding are intellectual virtues, they are based upon the natural light of reason, which falls short of the certitude of God's word, on which faith is founded.

QUESTION 5

OF THOSE WHO HAVE FAITH

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider those who have faith: under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether there was faith in the angels, or in man, in their original state?
- (2) Whether the demons have faith?
- (3) Whether those heretics who err in one article, have faith in others?
- (4) Whether among those who have faith, one has it more than another?

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(1)

Whether there was faith in the angels, or in man, in their original state?

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that there was no faith, either in the angels, or in man, in their original state. For Hugh St. Victor says in his Sentences (De Sacram. i, 10) that “man cannot see God or things that are in God, because he closes his eyes to contemplation.” Now the angels, in their original state, before they were either confirmed in grace, or had fallen from it, had their eyes opened to contemplation, since “they saw things in the Word,” according to Augustine (Genesis ad lit. ii, 8). Likewise the first man, while in the state of innocence, seemingly had his eyes open to contemplation; for Hugh St. Victor says (De Sacram. i, 6) that “in his original state man knew his Creator, not by the mere outward perception of hearing, but by inward inspiration, not as now believers seek an absent God by faith, but by seeing Him clearly present to their contemplation.” Therefore there was no faith in the angels and man in their original state.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the knowledge of faith is dark and obscure, according to ^{<433>}1 Corinthians 13:13: “We see now through a glass in a dark manner.” Now in their original state there was not obscurity either in the angels or in man, because it is a punishment of sin. Therefore there could be no faith in the angels or in man, in their original state.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the Apostle says (^{<507>}Romans 10:17) that “faith... cometh by hearing.” Now this could not apply to angels and man in their original state; for then they could not hear anything from another. Therefore, in that state, there was no faith either in man or in the angels.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<511>}Hebrews 11:6): “He that cometh to God, must believe.” Now the original state of angels and man was one of approach to God. Therefore they had need of faith.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Some say that there was no faith in the angels before they were confirmed in grace or fell from it, and in man before he sinned, by reason of the manifest contemplation that they had of Divine things. Since, however, “faith is the evidence of things that appear not,” according to the Apostle (^{<511>}Hebrews 11:2), and since “by faith we believe what we see not,” according to Augustine (Tract. xl in Joan.; QQ. Evang. ii, qu. 39), that manifestation alone excludes faith, which renders apparent or seen the principal object of faith. Now the principal object of faith is the First Truth, the sight of which gives the happiness of heaven and takes the place of faith. Consequently, as the angels before their confirmation in grace, and man before sin, did not possess the happiness whereby God is seen in His Essence, it is evident that the knowledge they possessed was not such as to exclude faith.

It follows then, that the absence of faith in them could only be explained by their being altogether ignorant of the object of faith. And if man and the angels were created in a purely natural state, as some [*St. Bonaventure, Sent. ii, D, 29] hold, perhaps one might hold that there was no faith in the angels before their confirmation in grace, or in man before sin, because the knowledge of faith surpasses not only a man’s but even an angel’s natural knowledge about God.

Since, however, we stated in the **P(1) Q(62), A(3); P(1) Q(95), A(1)**-that man and the angels were created with the gift of grace, we must needs say that there was in them a certain beginning of hoped-for happiness, by reason of grace received but not yet consummated, which happiness was begun in their will by hope and charity, and in the intellect by faith, as stated above (**Q(4), A(7)**). Consequently we must hold that the angels had faith before they were confirmed, and man, before he sinned. Nevertheless we must observe that in the object of faith, there is something formal, as it were, namely the First Truth surpassing all the natural knowledge of a creature, and something material, namely, the thing to which we assent while adhering to the First Truth. With regard to the former, before obtaining the happiness to come, faith is common to all who have knowledge of God, by adhering to the First Truth: whereas with regard to the things which are proposed as the material object of faith, some are believed by one, and known manifestly by another, even in the present state, as we have shown above (**Q(1), A(5); Q(2), A(4)**, ad 2). In this respect, too, it may be said that the angels before being confirmed, and man, before sin, possessed manifest knowledge about certain points in the Divine mysteries, which now we cannot know except by believing them.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(1)-RO(1) — Although the words of Hugh of St. Victor are those of a master, and have the force of an authority, yet it may be said that the contemplation which removes the need of faith is heavenly contemplation, whereby the supernatural truth is seen in its essence. Now the angels did not possess this contemplation before they were confirmed, nor did man before he sinned: yet their contemplation was of a higher order than ours, for by its means they approached nearer to God, and had manifest knowledge of more of the Divine effects and mysteries than we can have knowledge of. Hence faith was not in them so that they sought an absent God as we seek Him: since by the light of wisdom He was more present to them than He is to us, although He was not so present to them as He is to the Blessed by the light of glory.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(1)-RO(2) — There was no darkness of sin or punishment in the original state of man and the angels, but there was a certain natural obscurity in the human and angelic intellect, in so far as every creature is darkness in comparison with the immensity of the Divine light: and this obscurity suffices for faith.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(1)-RO(3) — In the original state there was no hearing anything from man speaking outwardly, but there was from God inspiring inwardly: thus the prophets heard, as expressed by the ^{<880>}Psalm 84:9:

“I will hear what the Lord God will speak in me.”

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(2)

Whether in the demons there is faith?

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the demons have no faith. For Augustine says (De Praedest. Sanct. v) that “faith depends on the believer’s will”: and this is a good will, since by it man wishes to believe in God. Since then no deliberate will of the demons is good, as stated above (**P(1) Q(64), A(2)**, ad 5), it seems that in the demons there is no faith.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, faith is a gift of Divine grace, according to ^{<418>}Ephesians 2:8: “By grace you are saved through faith... for it is the gift of God.” Now, according to a gloss on ^{<880>}Hosea 3:1, “They look to strange gods, and love the husks of the grapes,” the demons lost their gifts of grace by sinning. Therefore faith did not remain in the demons after they sinned.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, unbelief would seem to be graver than other sins, as Augustine observes (Tract. lxxxix in Joan.) on ^{<862>}John 15:22,

“If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have sin:
but now they have no excuse for their sin.”

Now the sin of unbelief is in some men. Consequently, if the demons have faith, some men would be guilty of a sin graver than that of the demons, which seems unreasonable. Therefore in the demons there is no faith.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<509>}James 2:19):

“The devils... believe and tremble.”

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(1), A(4); Q(2), A(1)**), the believer’s intellect assents to that which he believes, not because he sees it either in itself, or by resolving it to first self-evident principles, but because his will commands his intellect to assent. Now, that the will

moves the intellect to assent, may be due to two causes. First, through the will being directed to the good, and in this way, to believe is a praiseworthy action. Secondly, because the intellect is convinced that it ought to believe what is said, though that conviction is not based on objective evidence. Thus if a prophet, while preaching the word of God, were to foretell something, and were to give a sign, by raising a dead person to life, the intellect of a witness would be convinced so as to recognize clearly that God, Who lieth not, was speaking, although the thing itself foretold would not be evident in itself, and consequently the essence of faith would not be removed.

Accordingly we must say that faith is commended in the first sense in the faithful of Christ: and in this way faith is not in the demons, but only in the second way, for they see many evident signs, whereby they recognize that the teaching of the Church is from God, although they do not see the things themselves that the Church teaches, for instance that there are three Persons in God, and so forth.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(2)-RO(1) — The demons are, in a way, compelled to believe, by the evidence of signs, and so their will deserves no praise for their belief.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(2)-RO(2) — Faith, which is a gift of grace, inclines man to believe, by giving him a certain affection for the good, even when that faith is lifeless. Consequently the faith which the demons have, is not a gift of grace. Rather are they compelled to believe through their natural intellectual acumen.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(2)-RO(3) — The very fact that the signs of faith are so evident, that the demons are compelled to believe, is displeasing to them, so that their malice is by no means diminished by their believe.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(3)

*Whether a man who disbelieves one article of faith,
can have lifeless faith in the other articles?*

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that a heretic who disbelieves one article of faith, can have lifeless faith in the other articles. For the natural

intellect of a heretic is not more able than that of a catholic. Now a catholic's intellect needs the aid of the gift of faith in order to believe any article whatever of faith. Therefore it seems that heretics cannot believe any articles of faith without the gift of lifeless faith.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, just as faith contains many articles, so does one science, viz. geometry, contain many conclusions. Now a man may possess the science of geometry as to some geometrical conclusions, and yet be ignorant of other conclusions. Therefore a man can believe some articles of faith without believing the others.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, just as man obeys God in believing the articles of faith, so does he also in keeping the commandments of the Law. Now a man can obey some commandments, and disobey others. Therefore he can believe some articles, and disbelieve others.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Just as mortal sin is contrary to charity, so is disbelief in one article of faith contrary to faith. Now charity does not remain in a man after one mortal sin. Therefore neither does faith, after a man disbelieves one article.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Neither living nor lifeless faith remains in a heretic who disbelieves one article of faith.

The reason of this is that the species of every habit depends on the formal aspect of the object, without which the species of the habit cannot remain. Now the formal object of faith is the First Truth, as manifested in Holy Writ and the teaching of the Church, which proceeds from the First Truth. Consequently whoever does not adhere, as to an infallible and Divine rule, to the teaching of the Church, which proceeds from the First Truth manifested in Holy Writ, has not the habit of faith, but holds that which is of faith otherwise than by faith. Even so, it is evident that a man whose mind holds a conclusion without knowing how it is proved, has not scientific knowledge, but merely an opinion about it. Now it is manifest that he who adheres to the teaching of the Church, as to an infallible rule, assents to whatever the Church teaches; otherwise, if, of the things taught by the Church, he holds what he chooses to hold, and rejects what he chooses to reject, he no longer adheres to the teaching of the Church as to an infallible rule, but to his own will. Hence it is evident that a heretic who

obstinately disbelieves one article of faith, is not prepared to follow the teaching of the Church in all things; but if he is not obstinate, he is no longer in heresy but only in error. Therefore it is clear that such a heretic with regard to one article has no faith in the other articles, but only a kind of opinion in accordance with his own will.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(3)-RO(1) — A heretic does not hold the other articles of faith, about which he does not err, in the same way as one of the faithful does, namely by adhering simply to the Divine Truth, because in order to do so, a man needs the help of the habit of faith; but he holds the things that are of faith, by his own will and judgment.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(3)-RO(2) — The various conclusions of a science have their respective means of demonstration, one of which may be known without another, so that we may know some conclusions of a science without knowing the others. On the other hand faith adheres to all the articles of faith by reason of one mean, viz. on account of the First Truth proposed to us in Scriptures, according to the teaching of the Church who has the right understanding of them. Hence whoever abandons this mean is altogether lacking in faith.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(3)-RO(3) — The various precepts of the Law may be referred either to their respective proximate motives, and thus one can be kept without another; or to their primary motive, which is perfect obedience to God, in which a man fails whenever he breaks one commandment, according to <sup>James 2:10:

“Whosoever shall... offend in one point is become guilty of all.”

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(4)

Whether faith can be greater in one man than in another?

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that faith cannot be greater in one man than in another. For the quantity of a habit is taken from its object. Now whoever has faith believes everything that is of faith, since by failing in one point, a man loses his faith altogether, as stated above (**A(3)**). Therefore it seems that faith cannot be greater in one than in another.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, those things which consist in something supreme cannot be “more” or “less.” Now faith consists in something supreme, because it requires that man should adhere to the First Truth above all things. Therefore faith cannot be “more” or “less.”

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, faith is to knowledge by grace, as the understanding of principles is to natural knowledge, since the articles of faith are the first principles of knowledge by grace, as was shown above (**Q(1), A(7)**). Now the understanding of principles is possessed in equal degree by all men. Therefore faith is possessed in equal degree by all the faithful.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Wherever we find great and little, there we find more or less. Now in the matter of faith we find great and little, for Our Lord said to Peter (⁴¹⁶Matthew 14:31): “O thou of little faith, why didst thou doubt?” And to the woman he said (⁴¹⁸Matthew 15:28): “O woman, great is thy faith!” Therefore faith can be greater in one than in another.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(52), AA(1),2; P(2a), Q(112), A(4)**), the quantity of a habit may be considered from two points of view: first, on the part of the object; secondly, on the part of its participation by the subject.

Now the object of faith may be considered in two ways: first, in respect of its formal aspect; secondly, in respect of the material object which is proposed to be believed. Now the formal object of faith is one and simple, namely the First Truth, as stated above (**Q(1), A(1)**). Hence in this respect there is no diversity of faith among believers, but it is specifically one in all, as stated above (**Q(4), A(6)**). But the things which are proposed as the matter of our belief are many and can be received more or less explicitly; and in this respect one man can believe explicitly more things than another, so that faith can be greater in one man on account of its being more explicit.

If, on the other hand, we consider faith from the point of view of its participation by the subject, this happens in two ways, since the act of faith proceeds both from the intellect and from the will, as stated above (**Q(2), AA(1),2; Q(4), A(2)**). Consequently a man’s faith may be described as being greater, in one way, on the part of his intellect, on account of its

greater certitude and firmness, and, in another way, on the part of his will, on account of his greater promptitude, devotion, or confidence.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(4)-RO(1) — A man who obstinately disbelieves a thing that is of faith, has not the habit of faith, and yet he who does not explicitly believe all, while he is prepared to believe all, has that habit. In this respect, one man has greater faith than another, on the part of the object, in so far as he believes more things, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(4)-RO(2) — It is essential to faith that one should give the first place to the First Truth. But among those who do this, some submit to it with greater certitude and devotion than others; and in this way faith is greater in one than in another.

P(2b)-Q(5)-A(4)-RO(3) — The understanding of principles results from man's very nature, which is equally shared by all: whereas faith results from the gift of grace, which is not equally in all, as explained above (**P(2a), Q(112), A(4)**). Hence the comparison fails.

Nevertheless the truth of principles is more known to one than to another, according to the greater capacity of intellect.

QUESTION 6

OF THE CAUSE OF FAITH

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the cause of faith, under which head there are two points of inquiry:

(1) Whether faith is infused into man by God?

(2) Whether lifeless faith is a gift of God?

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(1)

Whether faith is infused into man by God?

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that faith is not infused into man by God. For Augustine says (De Trin. xiv) that “science begets faith in us, and nourishes, defends and strengthens it.” Now those things which science begets in us seem to be acquired rather than infused. Therefore faith does not seem to be in us by Divine infusion.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, that to which man attains by hearing and seeing, seems to be acquired by him. Now man attains to belief, both by seeing miracles, and by hearing the teachings of faith: for it is written (~~406~~ John 4:53): “The father... knew that it was at the same hour, that Jesus said to him, Thy son liveth; and himself believed, and his whole house”; and (~~407~~ Romans 10:17) it is said that “faith is through hearing.” Therefore man attains to faith by acquiring it.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, that which depends on a man’s will can be acquired by him. But “faith depends on the believer’s will,” according to Augustine (De Praedest. Sanct. v). Therefore faith can be acquired by man.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(1) — On the contrary, It is written (~~408~~ Ephesians 2:8,9):

“By grace you are saved through faith, and that not of yourselves... that no man may glory... for it is the gift of God.”

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Two things are requisite for faith. First, that the things which are of faith should be proposed to man: this is necessary in order that man believe anything explicitly. The second thing requisite for faith is the assent of the believer to the things which are proposed to him. Accordingly, as regards the first of these, faith must needs be from God. Because those things which are of faith surpass human reason, hence they do not come to man’s knowledge, unless God reveal them. To some, indeed, they are revealed by God immediately, as those things which were revealed to the apostles and prophets, while to some they are proposed by God in sending preachers of the faith, according to ~~515~~ Romans 10:15: “How shall they preach, unless they be sent?”

As regards the second, viz. man’s assent to the things which are of faith, we may observe a twofold cause, one of external inducement, such as seeing a miracle, or being persuaded by someone to embrace the faith: neither of which is a sufficient cause, since of those who see the same miracle, or who hear the same sermon, some believe, and some do not. Hence we must assert another internal cause, which moves man inwardly to assent to matters of faith.

The Pelagians held that this cause was nothing else than man’s free-will: and consequently they said that the beginning of faith is from ourselves, inasmuch as, to wit, it is in our power to be ready to assent to things which are of faith, but that the consummation of faith is from God, Who proposes to us the things we have to believe. But this is false, for, since man, by assenting to matters of faith, is raised above his nature, this must needs accrue to him from some supernatural principle moving him inwardly; and this is God. Therefore faith, as regards the assent which is the chief act of faith, is from God moving man inwardly by grace.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(1)-RO(1) — Science begets and nourishes faith, by way of external persuasion afforded by science; but the chief and proper cause of faith is that which moves man inwardly to assent.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(1)-RO(2) — This argument again refers to the cause that proposes outwardly the things that are of faith, or persuades man to believe by words or deeds.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(1)-RO(3) — To believe does indeed depend on the will of the believer: but man's will needs to be prepared by God with grace, in order that he may be raised to things which are above his nature, as stated above (**Q(2), A(3)**).

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(2)

Whether lifeless faith is a gift of God?

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that lifeless faith is not a gift of God. For it is written (^{650A}Deuteronomy 32:4) that “the works of God are perfect.” Now lifeless faith is something imperfect. Therefore it is not the work of God.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, just as an act is said to be deformed through lacking its due form, so too is faith called lifeless [informis] when it lacks the form due to it. Now the deformed act of sin is not from God, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(79), A(2)**, ad 2). Therefore neither is lifeless faith from God.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, whomsoever God heals, He heals wholly: for it is written (^{652A}John 7:23):

“If a man receive circumcision on the sabbath-day, that the law of Moses may not be broken; are you angry at Me because I have healed the whole man on the sabbath-day?”

Now faith heals man from unbelief. Therefore whoever receives from God the gift of faith, is at the same time healed from all his sins. But this is not done except by living faith. Therefore living faith alone is a gift of God: and consequently lifeless faith is not from God.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(2) — On the contrary, A gloss on ^{631D}1 Corinthians 13:2 says that “the faith which lacks charity is a gift of God.” Now this is lifeless faith. Therefore lifeless faith is a gift of God.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Lifelessness is a privation. Now it must be noted that privation is sometimes essential to the species, whereas sometimes it is not, but supervenes in a thing already possessed of its proper species: thus privation of the due equilibrium of the humors is essential to the species of sickness, while darkness is not essential to a diaphanous body, but supervenes in it. Since, therefore, when we assign the cause of a thing, we intend to assign the cause of that thing as existing in its proper species, it follows that what is not the cause of privation, cannot be assigned as the cause of the thing to which that privation belongs as being essential to its species. For we cannot assign as the cause of a sickness, something which is not the cause of a disturbance in the humors: though we can assign as cause of a diaphanous body, something which is not the cause of the darkness, which is not essential to the diaphanous body.

Now the lifelessness of faith is not essential to the species of faith, since faith is said to be lifeless through lack of an extrinsic form, as stated above (**Q(4), A(4)**). Consequently the cause of lifeless faith is that which is the cause of faith strictly so called: and this is God, as stated above (**A(1)**). It follows, therefore, that lifeless faith is a gift of God.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(2)-RO(1) — Lifeless faith, though it is not simply perfect with the perfection of a virtue, is, nevertheless, perfect with a perfection that suffices for the essential notion of faith.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(2)-RO(2) — The deformity of an act is essential to the act's species, considered as a moral act, as stated above (**P(1) Q(48), A(1)**, ad 2; **P(2a), Q(18), A(5)**): for an act is said to be deformed through being deprived of an intrinsic form, viz. the due commensuration of the act's circumstances. Hence we cannot say that God is the cause of a deformed act, for He is not the cause of its deformity, though He is the cause of the act as such.

We may also reply that deformity denotes not only privation of a due form, but also a contrary disposition, wherefore deformity is compared to the act, as falsehood is to faith. Hence, just as the deformed act is not from God, so neither is a false faith; and as lifeless faith is from God, so too, acts that are good generically, though not quickened by charity, as is frequently the case in sinners, are from God.

P(2b)-Q(6)-A(2)-RO(3) — He who receives faith from God without charity, is healed from unbelief, not entirely (because the sin of his previous unbelief is not removed) but in part, namely, in the point of ceasing from committing such and such a sin. Thus it happens frequently that a man desists from one act of sin, through God causing him thus to desist, without desisting from another act of sin, through the instigation of his own malice. And in this way sometimes it is granted by God to a man to believe, and yet he is not granted the gift of charity: even so the gift of prophecy, or the like, is given to some without charity.

QUESTION 7

OF THE EFFECTS OF FAITH

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the effects of faith: under which head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether fear is an effect of faith?
- (2) Whether the heart is purified by faith?

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(1)*Whether fear is an effect of faith?*

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that fear is not an effect of faith. For an effect does not precede its cause. Now fear precedes faith: for it is written (Ecclus. 2:8): “Ye that fear the Lord, believe in Him.” Therefore fear is not an effect of faith.

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the same thing is not the cause of contraries. Now fear and hope are contraries, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(23), A(2)**): and faith begets hope, as a gloss observes on ~~400~~ Matthew 1:2. Therefore fear is not an effect of faith.

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, one contrary does not cause another. Now the object of faith is a good, which is the First Truth, while the object of fear is an evil, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(42), A(1)**). Again, acts take their species from the object, according to what was stated above (**P(2a), Q(18), A(2)**). Therefore faith is not a cause of fear.

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~400~~ James 2:19):

“The devils... believe and tremble.”

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Fear is a movement of the appetitive power, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(41), A(1)**). Now the principle of all

appetitive movements is the good or evil apprehended: and consequently the principle of fear and of every appetitive movement must be an apprehension. Again, through faith there arises in us an apprehension of certain penal evils, which are inflicted in accordance with the Divine judgment. In this way, then, faith is a cause of the fear whereby one dreads to be punished by God; and this is servile fear.

It is also the cause of filial fear, whereby one dreads to be separated from God, or whereby one shrinks from equalling oneself to Him, and holds Him in reverence, inasmuch as faith makes us appreciate God as an unfathomable and supreme good, separation from which is the greatest evil, and to which it is wicked to wish to be equalled. Of the first fear, viz. servile fear, lifeless faith is the cause, while living faith is the cause of the second, viz. filial fear, because it makes man adhere to God and to be subject to Him by charity.

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(1)-RO(1) — Fear of God cannot altogether precede faith, because if we knew nothing at all about Him, with regard to rewards and punishments, concerning which faith teaches us, we should nowise fear Him. If, however, faith be presupposed in reference to certain articles of faith, for example the Divine excellence, then reverential fear follows, the result of which is that man submits his intellect to God, so as to believe in all the Divine promises. Hence the text quoted continues: “And your reward shall not be made void.”

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(1)-RO(2) — The same thing in respect of contraries can be the cause of contraries, but not under the same aspect. Now faith begets hope, in so far as it enables us to appreciate the prize which God awards to the just, while it is the cause of fear, in so far as it makes us appreciate the punishments which He intends to inflict on sinners.

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(1)-RO(3) — The primary and formal object of faith is the good which is the First Truth; but the material object of faith includes also certain evils; for instance, that it is an evil either not to submit to God, or to be separated from Him, and that sinners will suffer penal evils from God: in this way faith can be the cause of fear.

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(2)

Whether faith has the effect of purifying the heart?

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that faith does not purify the heart. For purity of the heart pertains chiefly to the affections, whereas faith is in the intellect. Therefore faith has not the effect of purifying the heart.

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, that which purifies the heart is incompatible with impurity. But faith is compatible with the impurity of sin, as may be seen in those who have lifeless faith. Therefore faith does not purify the heart.

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, if faith were to purify the human heart in any way, it would chiefly purify the intellect of man. Now it does not purify the intellect from obscurity, since it is a veiled knowledge. Therefore faith nowise purifies the heart.

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Peter said (^{<415D>}Acts 15:9):

“Purifying their hearts by faith.”

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(2) — *I answer that*, A thing is impure through being mixed with baser things: for silver is not called impure, when mixed with gold, which betters it, but when mixed with lead or tin. Now it is evident that the rational creature is more excellent than all transient and corporeal creatures; so that it becomes impure through subjecting itself to transient things by loving them. From this impurity the rational creature is purified by means of a contrary movement, namely, by tending to that which is above it, viz. God. The first beginning of this movement is faith: since “he that cometh to God must believe that He is,” according to ^{<810D>}Hebrews 11:6. Hence the first beginning of the heart’s purifying is faith; and if this be perfected through being quickened by charity, the heart will be perfectly purified thereby.

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(2)-RO(1) — Things that are in the intellect are the principles of those which are in the appetite, in so far as the apprehended good moves the appetite.

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(2)-RO(2) — Even lifeless faith excludes a certain impurity which is contrary to it, viz. that of error, and which consists in the human intellect, adhering inordinately to things below itself, through wishing to measure Divine things by the rule of sensible objects. But when it is quickened by charity, then it is incompatible with any kind of impurity, because “charity covereth all sins” (~~3002~~ Proverbs 10:12).

P(2b)-Q(7)-A(2)-RO(3) — The obscurity of faith does not pertain to the impurity of sin, but rather to the natural defect of the human intellect, according to the present state of life.

QUESTION 8

OF THE GIFT OF UNDERSTANDING

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

We must now consider the gifts of understand and knowledge, which respond to the virtue of faith. With regard to the gift of understanding there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether understanding is a gift of the Holy Ghost?
- (2) Whether it can be together with faith in the same person?
- (3) Whether the understanding which is a gift of the Holy Ghost, is only speculative, or practical also?
- (4) Whether all who are in a state of grace have the gift of understanding?
- (5) Whether this gift is to be found in those who are without grace?
- (6) Of the relationship of the gift of understanding to the other gifts;
- (7) Which of the beatitudes corresponds to this gift?
- (8) Which of the fruits?

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(1)

Whether understanding is a gift of the Holy Ghost?

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that understanding is not a gift of the Holy Ghost. For the gifts of grace are distinct from the gifts of nature, since they are given in addition to the latter. Now understanding is a natural habit of the soul, whereby self-evident principles are known, as stated in Ethic. vi, 6. Therefore it should not be reckoned among the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the Divine gifts are shared by creatures according to their capacity and mode, as Dionysius states (Div. Nom. iv). Now the mode of human nature is to know the truth, not simply (which is a sign of understanding), but discursively (which is a sign of reason), as Dionysius explains (Div. Nom. vii). Therefore the Divine knowledge which is bestowed on man, should be called a gift of reason rather than a gift of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, in the powers of the soul the understanding is condivided with the will (De Anima iii, 9,10). Now no gift of the Holy Ghost is called after the will. Therefore no gift of the Holy Ghost should receive the name of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (²⁰¹¹Isaiah 11:2):

“The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the Spirit of wisdom
of understanding.”

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Understanding implies an intimate knowledge, for “intelligere” [to understand] is the same as “intus legere” [to read inwardly]. This is clear to anyone who considers the difference between intellect and sense, because sensitive knowledge is concerned with external sensible qualities, whereas intellective knowledge penetrates into the very essence of a thing, because the object of the intellect is “what a thing is,” as stated in De Anima iii, 6.

Now there are many kinds of things that are hidden within, to find which human knowledge has to penetrate within so to speak. Thus, under the accidents lies hidden the nature of the substantial reality, under words lies hidden their meaning; under likenesses and figures the truth they denote lies hidden (because the intelligible world is enclosed within as compared with the sensible world, which is perceived externally), and effects lie hidden in their causes, and vice versa. Hence we may speak of understanding with regard to all these things.

Since, however, human knowledge begins with the outside of things as it were, it is evident that the stronger the light of the understanding, the further can it penetrate into the heart of things. Now the natural light of our understanding is of finite power; wherefore it can reach to a certain fixed point. Consequently man needs a supernatural light in order to

penetrate further still so as to know what it cannot know by its natural light: and this supernatural light which is bestowed on man is called the gift of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(1)-RO(1) — The natural light instilled within us, manifests only certain general principles, which are known naturally. But since man is ordained to supernatural happiness, as stated above (**Q(2), A(3); P(2a), Q(3), A(8)**), man needs to reach to certain higher truths, for which he requires the gift of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(1)-RO(2) — The discourse of reason always begins from an understanding and ends at an understanding; because we reason by proceeding from certain understood principles, and the discourse of reason is perfected when we come to understand what hitherto we ignored. Hence the act of reasoning proceeds from something previously understood. Now a gift of grace does not proceed from the light of nature, but is added thereto as perfecting it. Wherefore this addition is not called “reason” but “understanding,” since the additional light is in comparison with what we know supernaturally, what the natural light is in regard to those things which we known from the first.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(1)-RO(3) — “Will” denotes simply a movement of the appetite without indicating any excellence; whereas “understanding” denotes a certain excellence of a knowledge that penetrates into the heart of things. Hence the supernatural gift is called after the understanding rather than after the will.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(2)

Whether the gift of understanding is compatible with faith?

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the gift of understanding is incompatible with faith. For Augustine says (QQ. lxxxiii, qu. 15) that “the thing which is understood is bounded by the comprehension of him who understands it.” But the thing which is believed is not comprehended, according to the word of the Apostle to the ~~1082~~Philippians 3:12:

“Not as though I had already comprehended [Douay: ‘attained’], or were already perfect.”

Therefore it seems that faith and understanding are incompatible in the same subject.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, whatever is understood is seen by the understanding. But faith is of things that appear not, as stated above (**Q(1), A(4); Q(4), A(1)**). Therefore faith is incompatible with understanding in the same subject.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, understanding is more certain than science. But science and faith are incompatible in the same subject, as stated above (**Q(1), AA(4),5**). Much less, therefore, can understanding and faith be in the same subject.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. i, 15) that “understanding enlightens the mind concerning the things it has heard.” Now one who has faith can be enlightened in his mind concerning what he has heard; thus it is written (¹²⁰⁷ Luke 24:27,32) that Our Lord opened the scriptures to His disciples, that they might understand them. Therefore understanding is compatible with faith.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(2) — *I answer that*, We need to make a twofold distinction here: one on the side of faith, the other on the part of understanding.

On the side of faith the distinction to be made is that certain things, of themselves, come directly under faith, such as the mystery to three Persons in one God, and the incarnation of God the Son; whereas other things come under faith, through being subordinate, in one way or another, to those just mentioned, for instance, all that is contained in the Divine Scriptures.

On the part of understanding the distinction to be observed is that there are two ways in which we may be said to understand. In one way, we understand a thing perfectly, when we arrive at knowing the essence of the thing we understand, and the very truth considered in itself of the proposition understood. In this way, so long as the state of faith lasts, we cannot understand those things which are the direct object of faith: although certain other things that are subordinate to faith can be understood even in this way.

In another way we understand a thing imperfectly, when the essence of a thing or the truth of a proposition is not known as to its quiddity or mode of being, and yet we know that whatever be the outward appearances, they do not contradict the truth, in so far as we understand that we ought not to depart from matters of faith, for the sake of things that appear externally. In this way, even during the state of faith, nothing hinders us from understanding even those things which are the direct object of faith.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections: for the first three argue in reference to perfect understanding, while the last refers to the understanding of matters subordinate to faith.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(3)

Whether the gift of understanding is merely speculative or also practical?

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that understanding, considered as a gift of the Holy Ghost, is not practical, but only speculative. For, according to Gregory (Moral. i, 32), “understanding penetrates certain more exalted things.” But the practical intellect is occupied, not with exalted, but with inferior things, viz. singulars, about which actions are concerned. Therefore understanding, considered as a gift, is not practical.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, the gift of understanding is something more excellent than the intellectual virtue of understanding. But the intellectual virtue of understanding is concerned with none but necessary things, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. vi, 6). Much more, therefore, is the gift of understanding concerned with none but necessary matters. Now the practical intellect is not about necessary things, but about things which may be otherwise than they are, and which may result from man’s activity. Therefore the gift of understanding is not practical.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the gift of understanding enlightens the mind in matters which surpass natural reason. Now human activities, with which the practical intellect is concerned, do not surpass natural reason, which is the directing principle in matters of action, as was made clear

above (**P(2a)**, **Q(58)**, **A(2)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(71)**, **A(6)**). Therefore the gift of understanding is not practical.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<BBB>}Psalm 110:10):

\“A good understanding to all that do it.”

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(2)**), the gift of understanding is not only about those things which come under faith first and principally, but also about all things subordinate to faith. Now good actions have a certain relationship to faith: since “faith worketh through charity,” according to the Apostle (^{<RRR>}Galatians 5:6). Hence the gift of understanding extends also to certain actions, not as though these were its principal object, but in so far as the rule of our actions is the eternal law, to which the higher reason, which is perfected by the gift of understanding, adheres by contemplating and consulting it, as Augustine states (De Trin. xii, 7).

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(3)-RO(1) — The things with which human actions are concerned are not surpassingly exalted considered in themselves, but, as referred to the rule of the eternal law, and to the end of Divine happiness, they are exalted so that they can be the matter of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(3)-RO(2) — The excellence of the gift of understanding consists precisely in its considering eternal or necessary matters, not only as they are rules of human actions, because a cognitive virtue is the more excellent, according to the greater extent of its object.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(3)-RO(3) — The rule of human actions is the human reason and the eternal law, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(71)**, **A(6)**). Now the eternal law surpasses human reason: so that the knowledge of human actions, as ruled by the eternal law, surpasses the natural reason, and requires the supernatural light of a gift of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(4)

Whether the gift of understanding is in all who are in a state of grace?

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the gift of understanding is not in all who are in a state of grace. For Gregory says (Moral. ii, 49) that “the gift of understanding is given as a remedy against dulness of mind.” Now many who are in a state of grace suffer from dulness of mind. Therefore the gift of understanding is not in all who are in a state of grace.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, of all the things that are connected with knowledge, faith alone seems to be necessary for salvation, since by faith Christ dwells in our hearts, according to ~~480~~ Ephesians 3:17. Now the gift of understanding is not in everyone that has faith; indeed, those who have faith ought to pray that they may understand, as Augustine says (De Trin. xv, 27). Therefore the gift of understanding is not necessary for salvation: and, consequently, is not in all who are in a state of grace.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, those things which are common to all who are in a state of grace, are never withdrawn from them. Now the grace of understanding and of the other gifts sometimes withdraws itself profitably, for, at times, “when the mind is puffed up with understanding sublime things, it becomes sluggish and dull in base and vile things,” as Gregory observes (Moral. ii, 49). Therefore the gift of understanding is not in all who are in a state of grace.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~480~~ Psalm 81:5): “They have not known or understood, they walk on in darkness.” But no one who is in a state of grace walks in darkness, according to ~~480~~ John 8:12: “He that followeth Me, walketh not in darkness.” Therefore no one who is in a state of grace is without the gift of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(4) — *I answer that*, In all who are in a state of grace, there must needs be rectitude of the will, since grace prepares man’s will for good, according to Augustine (Contra Julian. Pelag. iv, 3). Now the will cannot be rightly directed to good, unless there be already some knowledge of the truth, since the object of the will is good understood, as stated in De Anima iii, 7. Again, just as the Holy Ghost directs man’s will by the gift of

charity, so as to move it directly to some supernatural good; so also, by the gift of understanding, He enlightens the human mind, so that it knows some supernatural truth, to which the right will needs to tend.

Therefore, just as the gift of charity is in all of those who have sanctifying grace, so also is the gift of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(4)-RO(1) — Some who have sanctifying grace may suffer dulness of mind with regard to things that are not necessary for salvation; but with regard to those that are necessary for salvation, they are sufficiently instructed by the Holy Ghost, according to ^{1st} 1 John 2:27:

“His unction teacheth you of all things.”

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(4)-RO(2) — Although not all who have faith understand fully the things that are proposed to be believed, yet they understand that they ought to believe them, and that they ought nowise to deviate from them.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(4)-RO(3) — With regard to things necessary for salvation, the gift of understanding never withdraws from holy persons: but, in order that they may have no incentive to pride, it does withdraw sometimes with regard to other things, so that their mind is unable to penetrate all things clearly.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(5)

Whether the gift of understanding is found also in those who have not sanctifying grace?

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that the gift of understanding is found also in those who have not sanctifying grace. For Augustine, in expounding the words of ^{1st} Psalm 118:20: “My soul hath coveted to long for Thy justifications,” says: “Understanding flies ahead, and man’s will is weak and slow to follow.” But in all who have sanctifying grace, the will is prompt on account of charity. Therefore the gift of understanding can be in those who have not sanctifying grace.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, it is written (^{2nd} Daniel 10:1) that “there is need of understanding in a” prophetic “vision,” so that, seemingly, there

is no prophecy without the gift of understanding. But there can be prophecy without sanctifying grace, as evidenced by ^{<407>}Matthew 7:22, where those who say: “We have prophesied in Thy name [*Vulg.: ‘Have we not prophesied in Thy name?’],” are answered with the words: “I never knew you.” Therefore the gift of understanding can be without sanctifying grace.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, the gift of understanding responds to the virtue of faith, according to ^{<200>}Isaiah 7:9, following another reading [*The Septuagint]: “If you will not believe you shall not understand.” Now faith can be without sanctifying grace. Therefore the gift of understanding can be without it.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Our Lord said (^{<465>}John 6:45):

“Every one that hath heard of the Father,
and hath learned, cometh to Me.”

Now it is by the intellect, as Gregory observes (Moral. i, 32), that we learn or understand what we hear. Therefore whoever has the gift of understanding, cometh to Christ, which is impossible without sanctifying grace. Therefore the gift of understanding cannot be without sanctifying grace.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(68), AA(1),2**) the gifts of the Holy Ghost perfect the soul, according as it is amenable to the motion of the Holy Ghost. Accordingly then, the intellectual light of grace is called the gift of understanding, in so far as man’s understanding is easily moved by the Holy Ghost, the consideration of which movement depends on a true apprehension of the end. Wherefore unless the human intellect be moved by the Holy Ghost so far as to have a right estimate of the end, it has not yet obtained the gift of understanding, however much the Holy Ghost may have enlightened it in regard to other truths that are preambles to the faith.

Now to have a right estimate about the last end one must not be in error about the end, and must adhere to it firmly as to the greatest good: and no one can do this without sanctifying grace; even as in moral matters a man has a right estimate about the end through a habit of virtue. Therefore no one has the gift of understanding without sanctifying grace.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(5)-RO(1) — By understanding Augustine means any kind of intellectual light, that, however, does not fulfil all the conditions of a gift, unless the mind of man be so far perfected as to have a right estimate about the end.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(5)-RO(2) — The understanding that is requisite for prophecy, is a kind of enlightenment of the mind with regard to the things revealed to the prophet: but it is not an enlightenment of the mind with regard to a right estimate about the last end, which belongs to the gift of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(5)-RO(3) — Faith implies merely assent to what is proposed but understanding implies a certain perception of the truth, which perception, except in one who has sanctifying grace, cannot regard the end, as stated above. Hence the comparison fails between understanding and faith.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(6)

***Whether the gift of understanding
is distinct from the other gifts?***

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that the gift of understanding is not distinct from the other gifts. For there is no distinction between things whose opposites are not distinct. Now “wisdom is contrary to folly, understanding is contrary to dulness, counsel is contrary to rashness, knowledge is contrary to ignorance,” as Gregory states (Moral. ii, 49). But there would seem to be no difference between folly, dulness, ignorance and rashness. Therefore neither does understanding differ from the other gifts.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, the intellectual virtue of understanding differs from the other intellectual virtues in that it is proper to it to be about self-evident principles. But the gift of understanding is not about any self-evident principles, since the natural habit of first principles suffices in respect of those matters which are naturally self-evident: while faith is sufficient in respect of such things as are supernatural, since the articles of faith are like first principles in supernatural knowledge, as stated

above (**Q(1)**, **A(7)**). Therefore the gift of understanding does not differ from the other intellectual gifts.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, all intellectual knowledge is either speculative or practical. Now the gift of understanding is related to both, as stated above (**A(3)**). Therefore it is not distinct from the other intellectual gifts, but comprises them all.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, When several things are enumerated together they must be, in some way, distinct from one another, because distinction is the origin of number. Now the gift of understanding is enumerated together with the other gifts, as appears from ~~2nd~~ Isaiah 11:2. Therefore the gift of understanding is distinct from the other gifts.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(6) — *I answer that*, The difference between the gift of understanding and three of the others, viz. piety, fortitude, and fear, is evident, since the gift of understanding belongs to the cognitive power, while the three belong to the appetitive power.

But the difference between this gift of understanding and the remaining three, viz. wisdom, knowledge, and counsel, which also belong to the cognitive power, is not so evident. To some [*William of Auxerre, Sum. Aur. III, iii, 8], it seems that the gift of understanding differs from the gifts of knowledge and counsel, in that these two belong to practical knowledge, while the gift of understanding belongs to speculative knowledge; and that it differs from the gift of wisdom, which also belongs to speculative knowledge, in that wisdom is concerned with judgment, while understanding renders the mind apt to grasp the things that are proposed, and to penetrate into their very heart. And in this sense we have assigned the number of the gifts, above (**P(2a)**, **Q(68)**, **A(4)**).

But if we consider the matter carefully, the gift of understanding is concerned not only with speculative, but also with practical matters, as stated above (**A(3)**), and likewise, the gift of knowledge regards both matters, as we shall show further on (**Q(9)**, **A(3)**), and consequently, we must take their distinction in some other way. For all these four gifts are ordained to supernatural knowledge, which, in us, takes its foundation from faith. Now “faith is through hearing” (~~2nd~~ Romans 10:17). Hence some things must be proposed to be believed by man, not as seen, but as heard,

to which he assents by faith. But faith, first and principally, is about the First Truth, secondarily, about certain considerations concerning creatures, and furthermore extends to the direction of human actions, in so far as it works through charity, as appears from what has been said above (**Q(4), A(2)**, ad 3).

Accordingly on the part of the things proposed to faith for belief, two things are requisite on our part: first that they be penetrated or grasped by the intellect, and this belongs to the gift of understanding. Secondly, it is necessary that man should judge these things aright, that he should esteem that he ought to adhere to these things, and to withdraw from their opposites: and this judgment, with regard to Divine things belong to the gift of wisdom, but with regard to created things, belongs to the gift of knowledge, and as to its application to individual actions, belongs to the gift of counsel.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(6)-RO(1) — The foregoing difference between those four gifts is clearly in agreement with the distinction of those things which Gregory assigns as their opposites. For dulness is contrary to sharpness, since an intellect is said, by comparison, to be sharp, when it is able to penetrate into the heart of the things that are proposed to it. Hence it is dulness of mind that renders the mind unable to pierce into the heart of a thing. A man is said to be a fool if he judges wrongly about the common end of life, wherefore folly is properly opposed to wisdom, which makes us judge aright about the universal cause. Ignorance implies a defect in the mind, even about any particular things whatever, so that it is contrary to knowledge, which gives man a right judgment about particular causes, viz. about creatures. Rashness is clearly opposed to counsel, whereby man does not proceed to action before deliberating with his reason.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(6)-RO(2) — The gift of understanding is about the first principles of that knowledge which is conferred by grace; but otherwise than faith, because it belongs to faith to assent to them, while it belongs to the gift of understanding to pierce with the mind the things that are said.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(6)-RO(3) — The gift of understanding is related to both kinds of knowledge, viz. speculative and practical, not as to the judgment, but as to apprehension, by grasping what is said.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(7)

Whether the sixth beatitude, “Blessed are the clean of heart,” etc., responds to the gift of understanding?

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that the sixth beatitude, “Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God,” does not respond to the gift of understanding. Because cleanness of heart seems to belong chiefly to the appetite. But the gift of understanding belongs, not to the appetite, but rather to the intellectual power. Therefore the aforesaid beatitude does not respond to the gift of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, it is written (~~415B~~ Acts 15:9): “Purifying their hearts by faith.” Now cleanness of heart is acquired by the heart being purified. Therefore the aforesaid beatitude is related to the virtue of faith rather than to the gift of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, the gifts of the Holy Ghost perfect man in the present state of life. But the sight of God does not belong to the present life, since it is that which gives happiness to the Blessed, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(3)**, **A(8)**). Therefore the sixth beatitude which comprises the sight of God, does not respond to the gift of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte i, 4): “The sixth work of the Holy Ghost which is understanding, is applicable to the clean of heart, whose eye being purified, they can see what eye hath not seen.”

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(7) — *I answer that*, Two things are contained in the sixth beatitude, as also in the others, one by way of merit, viz. cleanness of heart; the other by way of reward, viz. the sight of God, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(69)**, **AA(2),4**), and each of these, in some way, responds to the gift of understanding.

For cleanness is twofold. One is a preamble and a disposition to seeing God, and consists in the heart being cleansed of inordinate affections: and this cleanness of heart is effected by the virtues and gifts belonging to the appetitive power. The other cleanness of heart is a kind of complement to the sight of God; such is the cleanness of the mind that is purified of

phantasms and errors, so as to receive the truths which are proposed to it about God, no longer by way of corporeal phantasms, nor infected with heretical misrepresentations: and this cleanness is the result of the gift of understanding.

Again, the sight of God is twofold. One is perfect, whereby God's Essence is seen: the other is imperfect, whereby, though we see not what God is, yet we see what He is not; and whereby, the more perfectly do we know God in this life, the more we understand that He surpasses all that the mind comprehends. Each of these visions of God belongs to the gift of understanding; the first, to the gift of understanding in its state of perfection, as possessed in heaven; the second, to the gift of understanding in its state of inchoation, as possessed by wayfarers.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections: for the first two arguments refer to the first kind of cleanness; while the third refers to the perfect vision of God. Moreover the gifts both perfect us in this life by way of inchoation, and will be fulfilled, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(69)**, **A(2)**).

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(8)

Whether faith, among the fruits, responds to the gift of understanding?

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that, among the fruits, faith does not respond to the gift of understanding. For understanding is the fruit of faith, since it is written (~~2009~~ Isaiah 7:9) according to another reading [*The Septuagint]: “If you will not believe you shall not understand,” where our version has: “If you will not believe, you shall not continue.” Therefore fruit is not the fruit of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, that which precedes is not the fruit of what follows. But faith seems to precede understanding, since it is the foundation of the entire spiritual edifice, as stated above (**Q(4)**, **AA(1),7**). Therefore faith is not the fruit of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, more gifts pertain to the intellect than to the appetite. Now, among the fruits, only one pertains to the intellect; namely, faith, while all the others pertain to the appetite. Therefore faith,

seemingly, does not pertain to understanding more than to wisdom, knowledge or counsel.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, The end of a thing is its fruit. Now the gift of understanding seems to be ordained chiefly to the certitude of faith, which certitude is reckoned a fruit. For a gloss on ^{<REF>}Galatians 5:22 says that the “faith which is a fruit, is certitude about the unseen.” Therefore faith, among the fruits, responds to the gift of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(8) — *I answer that*, The fruits of the Spirit, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(70), A(1)**), when we were discussing them, are so called because they are something ultimate and delightful, produced in us by the power of the Holy Ghost. Now the ultimate and delightful has the nature of an end, which is the proper object of the will: and consequently that which is ultimate and delightful with regard to the will, must be, after a fashion, the fruit of all the other things that pertain to the other powers.

Accordingly, therefore, to this kind of gift of virtue that perfects a power, we may distinguish a double fruit: one, belonging to the same power; the other, the last of all as it were, belonging to the will. In this way we must conclude that the fruit which properly responds to the gift of understanding is faith, i.e. the certitude of faith; while the fruit that responds to it last of all is joy, which belongs to the will.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(8)-RO(1) — Understanding is the fruit of faith, taken as a virtue. But we are not taking faith in this sense here, but for a kind of certitude of faith, to which man attains by the gift of understanding.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(8)-RO(2) — Faith cannot altogether precede understanding, for it would be impossible to assent by believing what is proposed to be believed, without understanding it in some way. However, the perfection of understanding follows the virtue of faith: which perfection of understanding is itself followed by a kind of certainty of faith.

P(2b)-Q(8)-A(8)-RO(3) — The fruit of practical knowledge cannot consist in that very knowledge, since knowledge of that kind is known not for its own sake, but for the sake of something else. On the other hand, speculative knowledge has its fruit in its very self, which fruit is the certitude about the thing known. Hence the gift of counsel, which belongs only to practical knowledge, has no corresponding fruit of its own: while

the gifts of wisdom, understanding and knowledge, which can belongs also to speculative knowledge, have but one corresponding fruit, which is certainly denoted by the name of faith. The reason why there are several fruits pertaining to the appetitive faculty, is because, as already stated, the character of end, which the word fruit implies, pertains to the appetitive rather than to the intellective part.

QUESTION 9

OF THE GIFT OF KNOWLEDGE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the gift of knowledge, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether knowledge is a gift?
- (2) Whether it is about Divine things?
- (3) Whether it is speculative or practical?
- (4) Which beatitude responds to it?

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(1)

Whether knowledge is a gift?

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that knowledge is not a gift. For the gifts of the Holy Ghost surpass the natural faculty. But knowledge implies an effect of natural reason: for the Philosopher says (Poster. i, 2) that a “demonstration is a syllogism which produces knowledge.” Therefore knowledge is not a gift of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the gifts of the Holy Ghost are common to all holy persons, as stated above (**Q(8), A(4); P(2a), Q(68), A(5)**). Now Augustine says (De Trin. xiv, 1) that “many of the faithful lack knowledge though they have faith.” Therefore knowledge is not a gift.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the gifts are more perfect than the virtues, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(68), A(8)**). Therefore one gift suffices for the perfection of one virtue. Now the gift of understanding responds to the virtue of faith, as stated above (**Q(8), A(2)**). Therefore the gift of knowledge does not respond to that virtue, nor does it appear to which other virtue it can respond. Since, then, the gifts are perfections of virtues,

as stated above (**P(2a), Q(68), AA(1),2**), it seems that knowledge is not a gift.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Knowledge is reckoned among the seven gifts (²³¹⁰Isaiah 11:2).

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Grace is more perfect than nature, and, therefore, does not fail in those things wherein man can be perfected by nature. Now, when a man, by his natural reason, assents by his intellect to some truth, he is perfected in two ways in respect of that truth: first, because he grasps it; secondly, because he forms a sure judgment on it.

Accordingly, two things are requisite in order that the human intellect may perfectly assent to the truth of the faith: one of these is that he should have a sound grasp of the things that are proposed to be believed, and this pertains to the gift of understanding, as stated above (**Q(8), A(6)**): while the other is that he should have a sure and right judgment on them, so as to discern what is to be believed, from what is not to be believed, and for this the gift of knowledge is required.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(1)-RO(1) — Certitude of knowledge varies in various natures, according to the various conditions of each nature. Because man forms a sure judgment about a truth by the discursive process of his reason: and so human knowledge is acquired by means of demonstrative reasoning. On the other hand, in God, there is a sure judgment of truth, without any discursive process, by simple intuition, as was stated in the **P(1) Q(14), A(7)**; wherefore God's knowledge is not discursive, or argumentative, but absolute and simple, to which that knowledge is likened which is a gift of the Holy Ghost, since it is a participated likeness thereof.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(1)-RO(2) — A twofold knowledge may be had about matters of belief. One is the knowledge of what one ought to believe by discerning things to be believed from things not to be believe: in this way knowledge is a gift and is common to all holy persons. The other is a knowledge about matters of belief, whereby one knows not only what one ought to believe, but also how to make the faith known, how to induce others to believe, and confute those who deny the faith. This knowledge is numbered among the gratuitous graces, which are not given to all, but to some. Hence Augustine, after the words quoted, adds: "It is one thing for a

man merely to know what he ought to believe, and another to know how to dispense what he believes to the godly, and to defend it against the ungodly.”

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(1)-RO(3) — The gifts are more perfect than the moral and intellectual virtues; but they are not more perfect than the theological virtues; rather are all the gifts ordained to the perfection of the theological virtues, as to their end. Hence it is not unreasonable if several gifts are ordained to one theological virtue.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(2)

Whether the gift of knowledge is about Divine things?

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the gift of knowledge is about Divine things. For Augustine says (De Trin. xiv, 1) that “knowledge begets, nourishes and strengthens faith.” Now faith is about Divine things, because its object is the First Truth, as stated above (**Q(1), A(1)**). Therefore the gift of knowledge also is about Divine things.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the gift of knowledge is more excellent than acquired knowledge. But there is an acquired knowledge about Divine things, for instance, the science of metaphysics. Much more therefore is the gift of knowledge about Divine things.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, according to ⁸¹¹Romans 1:20,

“the invisible things of God... are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made.”

If therefore there is knowledge about created things, it seems that there is also knowledge of Divine things.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Trin. xiv, 1): “The knowledge of Divine things may be properly called wisdom, and the knowledge of human affairs may properly receive the name of knowledge.”

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(2) — *I answer that*, A sure judgment about a thing formed chiefly from its cause, and so the order of judgments should be according to the order of causes. For just as the first cause is the cause of the second,

so ought the judgment about the second cause to be formed through the first cause: nor is it possible to judge of the first cause through any other cause; wherefore the judgment which is formed through the first cause, is the first and most perfect judgment.

Now in those things where we find something most perfect, the common name of the genus is appropriated for those things which fall short of the most perfect, and some special name is adapted to the most perfect thing, as is the case in Logic. For in the genus of convertible terms, that which signifies “what a thing is,” is given the special name of “definition,” but the convertible terms which fall short of this, retain the common name, and are called “proper” terms.

Accordingly, since the word knowledge implies certitude of judgment as stated above (**A(1)**), if this certitude of the judgment is derived from the highest cause, the knowledge has a special name, which is wisdom: for a wise man in any branch of knowledge is one who knows the highest cause of that kind of knowledge, and is able to judge of all matters by that cause: and a wise man “absolutely,” is one who knows the cause which is absolutely highest, namely God. Hence the knowledge of Divine things is called “wisdom,” while the knowledge of human things is called “knowledge,” this being the common name denoting certitude of judgment, and appropriated to the judgment which is formed through second causes. Accordingly, if we take knowledge in this way, it is a distinct gift from the gift of wisdom, so that the gift of knowledge is only about human or created things.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(2)-RO(1) — Although matters of faith are Divine and eternal, yet faith itself is something temporal in the mind of the believer. Hence to know what one ought to believe, belongs to the gift of knowledge, but to know in themselves the very things we believe, by a kind of union with them, belongs to the gift of wisdom. Therefore the gift of wisdom corresponds more to charity which unites man’s mind to God.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(2)-RO(2) — This argument takes knowledge in the generic acceptance of the term: it is not thus that knowledge is a special gift, but according as it is restricted to judgments formed through created things.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(2)-RO(3) — As stated above (**Q(1), A(1)**), every cognitive habit regards formally the mean through which things are known, and materially, the things that are known through the mean. And since that which is formal, is of most account, it follows that those sciences which draw conclusions about physical matter from mathematical principles, are reckoned rather among the mathematical sciences, though, as to their matter they have more in common with physical sciences: and for this reason it is stated in Phys. ii, 2 that they are more akin to physics. Accordingly, since man knows God through His creatures, this seems to pertain to “knowledge,” to which it belongs formally, rather than to “wisdom,” to which it belongs materially: and, conversely, when we judge of creatures according to Divine things, this pertains to “wisdom” rather than to “knowledge.”

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(3)

Whether the gift of knowledge is practical knowledge?

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that the knowledge, which is numbered among the gifts, is practical knowledge. For Augustine says (De Trin. xii, 14) that “knowledge is concerned with the actions in which we make use of external things.” But the knowledge which is concerned about actions is practical. Therefore the gift of knowledge is practical.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. i, 32): “Knowledge is nought if it hath not its use for piety... and piety is very useless if it lacks the discernment of knowledge.” Now it follows from this authority that knowledge directs piety. But this cannot apply to a speculative science. Therefore the gift of knowledge is not speculative but practical.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the gifts of the Holy Ghost are only in the righteous, as stated above (**Q(9), A(5)**). But speculative knowledge can be also in the unrighteous, according to ³⁰¹⁷James 4:17:

“To him... who knoweth to do good, and doth it not,
to him it is a sin.”

Therefore the gift of knowledge is not speculative but practical.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. i, 32):

“Knowledge on her own day prepares a feast, because she overcomes the fast of ignorance in the mind.” Now ignorance is not entirely removed, save by both kinds of knowledge, viz. speculative and practical. Therefore the gift of knowledge is both speculative and practical.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(9), A(8)**), the gift of knowledge, like the gift of understanding, is ordained to the certitude of faith. Now faith consists primarily and principally in speculation, in as much as it is founded on the First Truth. But since the First Truth is also the last end for the sake of which our works are done, hence it is that faith extends to works, according to ~~ROM~~ Galatians 5:6: “Faith... worketh by charity.”

The consequence is that the gift of knowledge also, primarily and principally indeed, regards speculation, in so far as man knows what he ought to hold by faith; yet, secondarily, it extends to works, since we are directed in our actions by the knowledge of matters of faith, and of conclusions drawn therefrom.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(3)-RO(1) — Augustine is speaking of the gift of knowledge, in so far as it extends to works; for action is ascribed to knowledge, yet not action solely, nor primarily: and in this way it directs piety.

Hence the Reply to the Second Objection is clear.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(3)-RO(3) — As we have already stated (**Q(8), A(5)**) about the gift of understanding, not everyone who understands, has the gift of understanding, but only he that understands through a habit of grace: and so we must take note, with regard to the gift of knowledge, that they alone have the gift of knowledge, who judge aright about matters of faith and action, through the grace bestowed on them, so as never to wander from the straight path of justice. This is the knowledge of holy things, according to Wis. 10:10: “She conducted the just... through the right ways... and gave him the knowledge of holy things.”

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(4)

Whether the third beatitude, “Blessed are they that mourn,” etc. corresponds to the gift of knowledge?

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the third beatitude, “Blessed are they that mourn,” does not correspond to the gift of knowledge. For, even as evil is the cause of sorrow and grief, so is good the cause of joy. Now knowledge brings good to light rather than evil, since the latter is known through evil: for “the straight line rules both itself and the crooked line” (De Anima i, 5). Therefore the aforesaid beatitude does not suitably correspond to the gift of knowledge.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, consideration of truth is an act of knowledge. Now there is no sorrow in the consideration of truth; rather is there joy, since it is written (Wis. 8:16): “Her conversation hath no bitterness, nor her company any tediousness, but joy and gladness.” Therefore the aforesaid beatitude does not suitably correspond with the gift of knowledge.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the gift of knowledge consists in speculation, before operation. Now, in so far as it consists in speculation, sorrow does not correspond to it, since “the speculative intellect is not concerned about things to be sought or avoided” (De Anima iii, 9). Therefore the aforesaid beatitude is not suitably reckoned to correspond with the gift of knowledge.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte iv): “Knowledge befits the mourner, who has discovered that he has been mastered by the evil which he coveted as though it were good.”

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Right judgment about creatures belongs properly to knowledge. Now it is through creatures that man’s aversion from God is occasioned, according to Wis. 14:11: “Creatures... are turned to an abomination... and a snare to the feet of the unwise,” of those, namely, who do not judge aright about creatures, since they deem the perfect good to consist in them. Hence they sin by placing their last end in them, and lose the true good. It is by forming a right judgment of creatures

that man becomes aware of the loss (of which they may be the occasion), which judgment he exercises through the gift of knowledge.

Hence the beatitude of sorrow is said to correspond to the gift of knowledge.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(4)-RO(1) — Created goods do not cause spiritual joy, except in so far as they are referred to the Divine good, which is the proper cause of spiritual joy. Hence spiritual peace and the resulting joy correspond directly to the gift of wisdom: but to the gift of knowledge there corresponds, in the first place, sorrow for past errors, and, in consequence, consolation, since, by his right judgment, man directs creatures to the Divine good. For this reason sorrow is set forth in this beatitude, as the merit, and the resulting consolation, as the reward; which is begun in this life, and is perfected in the life to come.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(4)-RO(2) — Man rejoices in the very consideration of truth; yet he may sometimes grieve for the thing, the truth of which he considers: it is thus that sorrow is ascribed to knowledge.

P(2b)-Q(9)-A(4)-RO(3) — No beatitude corresponds to knowledge, in so far as it consists in speculation, because man's beatitude consists, not in considering creatures, but in contemplating God. But man's beatitude does consist somewhat in the right use of creatures, and in well-ordered love of them: and this I say with regard to the beatitude of a wayfarer. Hence beatitude relating to contemplation is not ascribed to knowledge, but to understanding and wisdom, which are about Divine things.

QUESTION 10

OF UNBELIEF IN GENERAL

(TWELVE ARTICLES)

In due sequence we must consider the contrary vices: first, unbelief, which is contrary to faith; secondly, blasphemy, which is opposed to confession of faith; thirdly, ignorance and dulness of mind, which are contrary to knowledge and understanding.

As to the first, we must consider

- (1) unbelief in general;
- (2) heresy;
- (3) apostasy from the faith.

Under the first head there are twelve points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether unbelief is a sin?
- (2) What is its subject?
- (3) Whether it is the greatest of sins?
- (4) Whether every action of unbelievers is a sin?
- (5) Of the species of unbelief;
- (6) Of their comparison, one with another;
- (7) Whether we ought to dispute about faith with unbelievers?
- (8) Whether they ought to be compelled to the faith?
- (9) Whether we ought to have communications with them?
- (10) Whether unbelievers can have authority over Christians?
- (11) Whether the rites of unbelievers should be tolerated?

(12) Whether the children of unbelievers are to be baptized against their parents' will?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(1)

Whether unbelief is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that unbelief is not a sin. For every sin is contrary to nature, as Damascene proves (De Fide Orth. ii, 4). Now unbelief seems not to be contrary to nature; for Augustine says (De Praedest. Sanct. v) that “to be capable to having faith, just as to be capable of having charity, is natural to all men; whereas to have faith, even as to have charity, belongs to the grace of the faithful.” Therefore not to have faith, which is to be an unbeliever, is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, no one sins that which he cannot avoid, since every sin is voluntary. Now it is not in a man's power to avoid unbelief, for he cannot avoid it unless he have faith, because the Apostle says (~~804~~ Romans 10:14):

“How shall they believe in Him, of Whom they have not heard?
And how shall they hear without a preacher?”

Therefore unbelief does not seem to be a sin.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(84)**, **A(4)**), there are seven capital sins, to which all sins are reduced. But unbelief does not seem to be comprised under any of them. Therefore unbelief is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(1) — On the contrary, Vice is opposed to virtue. Now faith is a virtue, and unbelief is opposed to it. Therefore unbelief is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(1) — I answer that, Unbelief may be taken in two ways: first, by way of pure negation, so that a man be called an unbeliever, merely because he has not the faith. Secondly, unbelief may be taken by way of opposition to the faith; in which sense a man refuses to hear the faith, or despises it, according to ~~804~~ Isaiah 53:1: “Who hath believed our report?” It is this that completes the notion of unbelief, and it is in this sense that unbelief is a sin.

If, however, we take it by way of pure negation, as we find it in those who have heard nothing about the faith, it bears the character, not of sin, but of punishment, because such like ignorance of Divine things is a result of the sin of our first parent. If such like unbelievers are damned, it is on account of other sins, which cannot be taken away without faith, but not on account of their sin of unbelief. Hence Our Lord said (~~John~~ John 15:22) “If I had not come, and spoken to them, they would not have sin”; which Augustine expounds (Tract. lxxxix in Joan.) as “referring to the sin whereby they believed not in Christ.”

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(1)-RO(1) — To have the faith is not part of human nature, but it is part of human nature that man’s mind should not thwart his inner instinct, and the outward preaching of the truth. Hence, in this way, unbelief is contrary to nature.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(1)-RO(2) — This argument takes unbelief as denoting a pure negation.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(1)-RO(3) — Unbelief, in so far as it is a sin, arises from pride, through which man is unwilling to subject his intellect to the rules of faith, and to the sound interpretation of the Fathers. Hence Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 45) that “presumptuous innovations arise from vainglory.”

It might also be replied that just as the theological virtues are not reduced to the cardinal virtues, but precede them, so too, the vices opposed to the theological virtues are not reduced to the capital vices.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(2)

Whether unbelief is in the intellect as its subject?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that unbelief is not in the intellect as its subject. For every sin is in the will, according to Augustine (De Duabus Anim. x, xi). Now unbelief is a sin, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore unbelief resides in the will and not in the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, unbelief is sinful through contempt of the preaching of the faith. But contempt pertains to the will. Therefore unbelief is in the will.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, a gloss [*Augustine, Enchiridion lx.] on ²2 Corinthians 11:14 “Satan... transformeth himself into an angel of light,” says that if “a wicked angel pretend to be a good angel, and be taken for a good angel, it is not a dangerous or an unhealthy error, if he does or says what is becoming to a good angel.” This seems to be because of the rectitude of the will of the man who adheres to the angel, since his intention is to adhere to a good angel. Therefore the sin of unbelief seems to consist entirely in a perverse will: and, consequently, it does not reside in the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Things which are contrary to one another are in the same subject. Now faith, to which unbelief is opposed, resides in the intellect. Therefore unbelief also is in the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(74), AA(1),2**), sin is said to be in the power which is the principle of the sinful act. Now a sinful act may have two principles: one is its first and universal principle, which commands all acts of sin; and this is the will, because every sin is voluntary. The other principle of the sinful act is the proper and proximate principle which elicits the sinful act: thus the concupiscible is the principle of gluttony and lust, wherefore these sins are said to be in the concupiscible. Now dissent, which is the act proper to unbelief, is an act of the intellect, moved, however, by the will, just as assent is.

Therefore unbelief, like faith, is in the intellect as its proximate subject. But it is in the will as its first moving principle, in which way every sin is said to be in the will.

Hence the Reply to the First Objection is clear.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(2)-RO(2) — The will’s contempt causes the intellect’s dissent, which completes the notion of unbelief. Hence the cause of unbelief is in the will, while unbelief itself is in the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(2)-RO(3) — He that believes a wicked angel to be a good one, does not dissent from a matter of faith, because “his bodily senses are deceived, while his mind does not depart from a true and right judgment” as the gloss observes [*Augustine, Enchiridion lx]. But, according to the same authority, to adhere to Satan when he begins to invite one to his abode, i.e. wickedness and error, is not without sin.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(3)

Whether unbelief is the greatest of sin?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that unbelief is not the greatest of sins. For Augustine says (De Bapt. contra Donat. iv, 20): “I should hesitate to decide whether a very wicked Catholic ought to be preferred to a heretic, in whose life one finds nothing reprehensible beyond the fact that he is a heretic.” But a heretic is an unbeliever. Therefore we ought not to say absolutely that unbelief is the greatest of sins.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, that which diminishes or excuses a sin is not, seemingly, the greatest of sins. Now unbelief excuses or diminishes sin: for the Apostle says (⁵⁰¹²1 Timothy 1:12,13):

“I... before was a blasphemer, and a persecutor and contumelious;
but I obtained... mercy... because I did it ignorantly in unbelief.”

Therefore unbelief is not the greatest of sins.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the greater sin deserves the greater punishment, according to (⁶⁵¹⁰Deuteronomy 25:2:

“According to the measure of the sin shall the
measure also of the stripes be.”

Now a greater punishment is due to believers than to unbelievers, according to (⁵⁰¹²Hebrews 10:29:

“How much more, do you think, he deserveth worse punishments,
who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath esteemed
the blood of the testament unclean, by which he was sanctified?”

Therefore unbelief is not the greatest of sins.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Augustine, commenting on (⁶¹⁵²John 15:22, “If I had not come, and spoken to them, they would not have sin,” says (Tract. lxxxix in Joan.): “Under the general name, He refers to a singularly great sin. For this,” viz. infidelity, “is the sin to which all others may be traced.” Therefore unbelief is the greatest of sins.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Every sin consists formally in aversion from God, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(71)**, **A(6)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(73)**, **A(3)**). Hence the more a sin severs man from God, the graver it is. Now man is more than ever separated from God by unbelief, because he has not even true knowledge of God: and by false knowledge of God, man does not approach Him, but is severed from Him.

Nor is it possible for one who has a false opinion of God, to know Him in any way at all, because the object of his opinion is not God. Therefore it is clear that the sin of unbelief is greater than any sin that occurs in the perversion of morals. This does not apply to the sins that are opposed to the theological virtues, as we shall stated further on (**Q(20)**, **A(3)**; **Q(34)**, **A(2)**, ad 2; **Q(39)**, **A(2)**, ad 3).

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(3)-RO(1) — Nothing hinders a sin that is more grave in its genus from being less grave in respect of some circumstances. Hence Augustine hesitated to decide between a bad Catholic, and a heretic not sinning otherwise, because although the heretic's sin is more grave generically, it can be lessened by a circumstance, and conversely the sin of the Catholic can, by some circumstance, be aggravated.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(3)-RO(2) — Unbelief includes both ignorance, as an accessory thereto, and resistance to matters of faith, and in the latter respect it is a most grave sin. In respect, however, of this ignorance, it has a certain reason for excuse, especially when a man sins not from malice, as was the case with the Apostle.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(3)-RO(3) — An unbeliever is more severely punished for his sin of unbelief than another sinner is for any sin whatever, if we consider the kind of sin. But in the case of another sin, e.g. adultery, committed by a believer, and by an unbeliever, the believer, other things being equal, sins more gravely than the unbeliever, both on account of his knowledge of the truth through faith, and on account of the sacraments of faith with which he has been satiated, and which he insults by committing sin.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(4)

Whether every act of an unbeliever is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that each act of an unbeliever is a sin. Because a gloss on ~~410~~Romans 14:23,

“All that is not of faith is sin,” says:
“The whole life of unbelievers is a sin.”

Now the life of unbelievers consists of their actions. Therefore every action of an unbeliever is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, faith directs the intention. Now there can be no good save what comes from a right intention. Therefore, among unbelievers, no action can be good.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, when that which precedes is corrupted, that which follows is corrupted also. Now an act of faith precedes the acts of all the virtues. Therefore, since there is no act of faith in unbelievers, they can do no good work, but sin in every action of theirs.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is said of Cornelius, while yet an unbeliever (~~410~~Acts 10:4,31), that his alms were acceptable to God. Therefore not every action of an unbeliever is a sin, but some of his actions are good.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(85), AA(2),4**) mortal sin takes away sanctifying grace, but does not wholly corrupt the good of nature. Since therefore, unbelief is a mortal sin, unbelievers are without grace indeed, yet some good of nature remains in them. Consequently it is evident that unbelievers cannot do those good works which proceed from grace, viz. meritorious works; yet they can, to a certain extent, do those good works for which the good of nature suffices.

Hence it does not follow that they sin in everything they do; but whenever they do anything out of their unbelief, then they sin. For even as one who has the faith, can commit an actual sin, venial or even mortal, which he does not refer to the end of faith, so too, an unbeliever can do a good deed in a matter which he does not refer to the end of his unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(4)-RO(1) — The words quoted must be taken to mean either that the life of unbelievers cannot be sinless, since without faith no sin is taken away, or that whatever they do out of unbelief, is a sin. Hence the same authority adds: “Because every one that lives or acts according to his unbelief, sins grievously.”

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(4)-RO(2) — Faith directs the intention with regard to the supernatural last end: but even the light of natural reason can direct the intention in respect of a connatural good.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(4)-RO(3) — Unbelief does not so wholly destroy natural reason in unbelievers, but that some knowledge of the truth remains in them, whereby they are able to do deeds that are generically good. With regard, however, to Cornelius, it is to be observed that he was not an unbeliever, else his works would not have been acceptable to God, whom none can please without faith. Now he had implicit faith, as the truth of the Gospel was not yet made manifest: hence Peter was sent to him to give him fuller instruction in the faith.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(5)

Whether there are several species of unbelief?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that there are not several species of unbelief. For, since faith and unbelief are contrary to one another, they must be about the same thing. Now the formal object of faith is the First Truth, whence it derives its unity, although its matter contains many points of belief. Therefore the object of unbelief also is the First Truth; while the things which an unbeliever disbelieves are the matter of his unbelief. Now the specific difference depends not on material but on formal principles. Therefore there are not several species of unbelief, according to the various points which the unbeliever disbelieves.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, it is possible to stray from the truth of faith in an infinite number of ways. If therefore the various species of unbelief correspond to the number of various errors, it would seem to follow that there is an infinite number of species of unbelief, and

consequently, that we ought not to make these species the object of our consideration.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, the same thing does not belong to different species. Now a man may be an unbeliever through erring about different points of truth. Therefore diversity of errors does not make a diversity of species of unbelief: and so there are not several species of unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Several species of vice are opposed to each virtue, because “good happens in one way, but evil in many ways,” according to Dionysius (Div. Nom. iv) and the Philosopher (Ethic. ii, 6). Now faith is a virtue. Therefore several species of vice are opposed to it.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(55), A(4); P(2a), Q(64), A(1)**), every virtue consists in following some rule of human knowledge or operation. Now conformity to a rule happens one way in one matter, whereas a breach of the rule happens in many ways, so that many vices are opposed to one virtue. The diversity of the vices that are opposed to each virtue may be considered in two ways, first, with regard to their different relations to the virtue: and in this way there are determinate species of vices contrary to a virtue: thus to a moral virtue one vice is opposed by exceeding the virtue, and another, by falling short of the virtue. Secondly, the diversity of vices opposed to one virtue may be considered in respect of the corruption of the various conditions required for that virtue. In this way an infinite number of vices are opposed to one virtue, e.g. temperance or fortitude, according to the infinite number of ways in which the various circumstances of a virtue may be corrupted, so that the rectitude of virtue is forsaken. For this reason the Pythagoreans held evil to be infinite.

Accordingly we must say that if unbelief be considered in comparison to faith, there are several species of unbelief, determinate in number. For, since the sin of unbelief consists in resisting the faith, this may happen in two ways: either the faith is resisted before it has been accepted, and such is the unbelief of pagans or heathens; or the Christian faith is resisted after it has been accepted, and this either in the figure, and such is the unbelief of the Jews, or in the very manifestation of truth, and such is the unbelief

of heretics. Hence we may, in a general way, reckon these three as species of unbelief.

If, however, the species of unbelief be distinguished according to the various errors that occur in matters of faith, there are not determinate species of unbelief: for errors can be multiplied indefinitely, as Augustine observes (*De Haeresibus*).

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(5)-RO(1) — The formal aspect of a sin can be considered in two ways. First, according to the intention of the sinner, in which case the thing to which the sinner turns is the formal object of his sin, and determines the various species of that sin. Secondly, it may be considered as an evil, and in this case the good which is forsaken is the formal object of the sin; which however does not derive its species from this point of view, in fact it is a privation. We must therefore reply that the object of unbelief is the First Truth considered as that which unbelief forsakes, but its formal aspect, considered as that to which unbelief turns, is the false opinion that it follows: and it is from this point of view that unbelief derives its various species. Hence, even as charity is one, because it adheres to the Sovereign Good, while there are various species of vice opposed to charity, which turn away from the Sovereign Good by turning to various temporal goods, and also in respect of various inordinate relations to God, so too, faith is one virtue through adhering to the one First Truth, yet there are many species of unbelief, because unbelievers follow many false opinions.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(5)-RO(2) — This argument considers the various species of unbelief according to various points in which errors occur.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(5)-RO(3) — Since faith is one because it believes in many things in relation to one, so may unbelief, although it errs in many things, be one in so far as all those things are related to one. Yet nothing hinders one man from erring in various species of unbelief, even as one man may be subject to various vices, and to various bodily diseases.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(6)

Whether the unbelief of pagans or heathens is graver than other kinds?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that the unbelief of heathens or pagans is graver than other kinds. For just as bodily disease is graver according as it endangers the health of a more important member of the body, so does sin appear to be graver, according as it is opposed to that which holds a more important place in virtue. Now that which is most important in faith, is belief in the unity of God, from which the heathens deviate by believing in many gods. Therefore their unbelief is the gravest of all.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, among heresies, the more detestable are those which contradict the truth of faith in more numerous and more important points: thus, the heresy of Arius, who severed the Godhead, was more detestable than that of Nestorius who severed the humanity of Christ from the Person of God the Son. Now the heathens deny the faith in more numerous and more important points than Jews and heretics; since they do not accept the faith at all. Therefore their unbelief is the gravest.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, every good diminishes evil. Now there is some good in the Jews, since they believe in the Old Testament as being from God, and there is some good in heretics, since they venerate the New Testament. Therefore they sin less grievously than heathens, who receive neither Testament.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, It is written (✠122 2 Peter 2:21):

“It had been better for them not to have known the way of justice,
than after they have known it, to turn back.”

Now the heathens have not known the way of justice, whereas heretics and Jews have abandoned it after knowing it in some way. Therefore theirs is the graver sin.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(6) — *I answer that*, As stated above (A(5)), two things may be considered in unbelief. One of these is its relation to faith: and from this point of view, he who resists the faith after accepting it, sins

more grievously against faith, than he who resists it without having accepted it, even as he who fails to fulfil what he has promised, sins more grievously than if he had never promised it. In this way the unbelief of heretics, who confess their belief in the Gospel, and resist that faith by corrupting it, is a more grievous sin than that of the Jews, who have never accepted the Gospel faith. Since, however, they accepted the figure of that faith in the Old Law, which they corrupt by their false interpretations, their unbelief is a more grievous sin than that of the heathens, because the latter have not accepted the Gospel faith in any way at all.

The second thing to be considered in unbelief is the corruption of matters of faith. In this respect, since heathens err on more points than Jews, and these in more points than heretics, the unbelief of heathens is more grievous than the unbelief of the Jews, and that of the Jews than that of the heretics, except in such cases as that of the Manichees, who, in matters of faith, err even more than heathens do.

Of these two gravities the first surpasses the second from the point of view of guilt; since, as stated above (**A(1)**) unbelief has the character of guilt, from its resisting faith rather than from the mere absence of faith, for the latter as was stated (**A(1)**) seems rather to bear the character of punishment. Hence, speaking absolutely, the unbelief of heretics is the worst.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(7)

Whether one ought to dispute with unbelievers in public?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that one ought not to dispute with unbelievers in public. For the Apostle says (² Timothy 2:14):

“Contend not in words, for it is to no profit,
but to the subverting of the hearers.”

But it is impossible to dispute with unbelievers publicly without contending in words. Therefore one ought not to dispute publicly with unbelievers.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, the law of Martianus Augustus confirmed by the canons [*De Sum. Trin. Cod. lib. i, leg. Nemo] expresses itself thus: “It is an insult to the judgment of the most religious synod, if anyone ventures to debate or dispute in public about matters which have once been judged and disposed of.” Now all matters of faith have been decided by the holy councils. Therefore it is an insult to the councils, and consequently a grave sin to presume to dispute in public about matters of faith.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, disputations are conducted by means of arguments. But an argument is a reason in settlement of a dubious matter: whereas things that are of faith, being most certain, ought not to be a matter of doubt. Therefore one ought not to dispute in public about matters of faith.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~402~~ Acts 9:22,29) that

“Saul increased much more in strength, and confounded the Jews,”
and that “he spoke... to the gentiles and disputed with the Greeks.”

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(7) — *I answer that*, In disputing about the faith, two things must be observed: one on the part of the disputant; the other on the part of his hearers. On the part of the disputant, we must consider his intention. For if he were to dispute as though he had doubts about the faith, and did not hold the truth of faith for certain, and as though he intended to probe it with arguments, without doubt he would sin, as being doubtful of the faith and an unbeliever. On the other hand, it is praiseworthy to dispute about the faith in order to confute errors, or for practice.

On the part of the hearers we must consider whether those who hear the disputation are instructed and firm in the faith, or simple and wavering. As to those who are well instructed and firm in the faith, there can be no danger in disputing about the faith in their presence. But as to simple-minded people, we must make a distinction; because either they are provoked and molested by unbelievers, for instance, Jews or heretics, or pagans who strive to corrupt the faith in them, or else they are not subject to provocation in this matter, as in those countries where there are not unbelievers. In the first case it is necessary to dispute in public about the

faith, provided there be those who are equal and adapted to the task of confuting errors; since in this way simple people are strengthened in the faith, and unbelievers are deprived of the opportunity to deceive, while if those who ought to withstand the perverters of the truth of faith were silent, this would tend to strengthen error. Hence Gregory says (Pastor. ii, 4): “Even as a thoughtless speech gives rise to error, so does an indiscreet silence leave those in error who might have been instructed.” On the other hand, in the second case it is dangerous to dispute in public about the faith, in the presence of simple people, whose faith for this very reason is more firm, that they have never heard anything differing from what they believe. Hence it is not expedient for them to hear what unbelievers have to say against the faith.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(7)-RO(1) — The Apostle does not entirely forbid disputations, but such as are inordinate, and consist of contentious words rather than of sound speeches.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(7)-RO(2) — That law forbade those public disputations about the faith, which arise from doubting the faith, but not those which are for the safeguarding thereof.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(7)-RO(3) — One ought to dispute about matters of faith, not as though one doubted about them, but in order to make the truth known, and to confute errors. For, in order to confirm the faith, it is necessary sometimes to dispute with unbelievers, sometimes by defending the faith, according to ~~1~~¹ Peter 3:15:

“Being ready always to satisfy everyone that asketh you a reason of that hope and faith which is in you [*Vulg.: ‘Of that hope which is in you’ St. Thomas’ reading is apparently taken from Bede].”

Sometimes again, it is necessary, in order to convince those who are in error, according to ~~1~~¹ Titus 1:9:

“That he may be able to exhort in sound doctrine and to convince the gainsayers.”

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(8)

Whether unbelievers ought to be compelled to the faith?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that unbelievers ought by no means to be compelled to the faith. For it is written (^{<13>}Matthew 13:28) that the servants of the householder, in whose field cockle had been sown, asked him: “Wilt thou that we go and gather it up?” and that he answered: “No, lest perhaps gathering up the cockle, you root up the wheat also together with it”: on which passage Chrysostom says (Hom. xlv in Matth.): “Our Lord says this so as to forbid the slaying of men. For it is not right to slay heretics, because if you do you will necessarily slay many innocent persons.” Therefore it seems that for the same reason unbelievers ought not to be compelled to the faith.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, we read in the Decretals (Dist. xlv can., De Judaeis): “The holy synod prescribes, with regard to the Jews, that for the future, none are to be compelled to believe.” Therefore, in like manner, neither should unbelievers be compelled to the faith.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, Augustine says (Tract. xxvi in Joan.) that “it is possible for a man to do other things against his will, but he cannot believe unless he is willing.” Therefore it seems that unbelievers ought not to be compelled to the faith.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(8)-O(4) — It is said in God’s person (Ezech. 18:32 [*Ezech. 33:11]): “I desire not the death of the sinner [Vulg.: ‘of him that dieth’].” Now we ought to conform our will to the Divine will, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(19), AA(9),10**). Therefore we should not even wish unbelievers to be put to death.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<14>}Luke 14:23): “Go out into the highways and hedges; and compel them to come in.” Now men enter into the house of God, i.e. into Holy Church, by faith. Therefore some ought to be compelled to the faith.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(8) — *I answer that*, Among unbelievers there are some who have never received the faith, such as the heathens and the Jews: and these are by no means to be compelled to the faith, in order that they may

believe, because to believe depends on the will: nevertheless they should be compelled by the faithful, if it be possible to do so, so that they do not hinder the faith, by their blasphemies, or by their evil persuasions, or even by their open persecutions. It is for this reason that Christ's faithful often wage war with unbelievers, not indeed for the purpose of forcing them to believe, because even if they were to conquer them, and take them prisoners, they should still leave them free to believe, if they will, but in order to prevent them from hindering the faith of Christ.

On the other hand, there are unbelievers who at some time have accepted the faith, and professed it, such as heretics and all apostates: such should be submitted even to bodily compulsion, that they may fulfil what they have promised, and hold what they, at one time, received.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(8)-RO(1) — Some have understood the authority quoted to forbid, not the excommunication but the slaying of heretics, as appears from the words of Chrysostom. Augustine too, says (Ep. ad Vincent. xciii) of himself: "It was once my opinion that none should be compelled to union with Christ, that we should deal in words, and fight with arguments. However this opinion of mine is undone, not by words of contradiction, but by convincing examples. Because fear of the law was so profitable, that many say: Thanks be to the Lord Who has broken our chains asunder." Accordingly the meaning of Our Lord's words, "Suffer both to grow until the harvest," must be gathered from those which precede, "lest perhaps gathering up the cockle, you root the wheat also together with it." For, Augustine says (Contra Ep. Parmen. iii, 2) "these words show that when this is not to be feared, that is to say, when a man's crime is so publicly known, and so hateful to all, that he has no defenders, or none such as might cause a schism, the severity of discipline should not slacken."

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(8)-RO(2) — Those Jews who have in no way received the faith, ought not by no means to be compelled to the faith: if, however, they have received it, they ought to be compelled to keep it, as is stated in the same chapter.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(8)-RO(3) — Just as taking a vow is a matter of will, and keeping a vow, a matter of obligation, so acceptance of the faith is a matter of the will, whereas keeping the faith, when once one has received it, is a

matter of obligation. Wherefore heretics should be compelled to keep the faith. Thus Augustine says to the Count Boniface (Ep. clxxxv): “What do these people mean by crying out continually: ‘We may believe or not believe just as we choose. Whom did Christ compel?’ They should remember that Christ at first compelled Paul and afterwards taught Him.”

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(8)-RO(4) — As Augustine says in the same letter, “none of us wishes any heretic to perish. But the house of David did not deserve to have peace, unless his son Absalom had been killed in the war which he had raised against his father. Thus if the Catholic Church gathers together some of the perdition of others, she heals the sorrow of her maternal heart by the delivery of so many nations.”

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(9)

Whether it is lawful to communicate with unbelievers?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that it is lawful to communicate with unbelievers. For the Apostle says (^{43107}1 Corinthians 10:27):

“If any of them that believe not, invite you, and you be willing to go, eat of anything that is set before you.”

And Chrysostom says (Hom. xxv super Epist. ad Heb.): “If you wish to go to dine with pagans, we permit it without any reservation.” Now to sit at table with anyone is to communicate with him. Therefore it is lawful to communicate with unbelievers.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, the Apostle says (^{43102}1 Corinthians 5:12): “What have I to do to judge them that are without?” Now unbelievers are without. When, therefore, the Church forbids the faithful to communicate with certain people, it seems that they ought not to be forbidden to communicate with unbelievers.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, a master cannot employ his servant, unless he communicate with him, at least by word, since the master moves his servant by command. Now Christians can have unbelievers, either Jews, or pagans, or Saracens, for servants. Therefore they can lawfully communicate with them.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~CRUX~~ Deuteronomy 7:2,3):

“Thou shalt make no league with them, nor show mercy to them;
neither shalt thou make marriages with them”:

and a gloss on ~~CRUX~~ Leviticus 15:19, “The woman who at the return of the month,” etc. says: “It is so necessary to shun idolatry, that we should not come in touch with idolaters or their disciples, nor have any dealings with them.”

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(9) — *I answer that*, Communication with a particular person is forbidden to the faithful, in two ways: first, as a punishment of the person with whom they are forbidden to communicate; secondly, for the safety of those who are forbidden to communicate with others. Both motives can be gathered from the Apostle’s words (~~CRUX~~ 1 Corinthians 5:6). For after he had pronounced sentence of excommunication, he adds as his reason: “Know you not that a little leaven corrupts the whole lump?” and afterwards he adds the reason on the part of the punishment inflicted by the sentence of the Church when he says (~~CRUX~~ 1 Corinthians 5:12): “Do not you judge them that are within?”

Accordingly, in the first way the Church does not forbid the faithful to communicate with unbelievers, who have not in any way received the Christian faith, viz. with pagans and Jews, because she has not the right to exercise spiritual judgment over them, but only temporal judgment, in the case when, while dwelling among Christians they are guilty of some misdemeanor, and are condemned by the faithful to some temporal punishment. On the other hand, in this way, i.e. as a punishment, the Church forbids the faithful to communicate with those unbelievers who have forsaken the faith they once received, either by corrupting the faith, as heretics, or by entirely renouncing the faith, as apostates, because the Church pronounces sentence of excommunication on both.

With regard to the second way, it seems that one ought to distinguish according to the various conditions of persons, circumstances and time. For some are firm in the faith; and so it is to be hoped that their communicating with unbelievers will lead to the conversion of the latter rather than to the aversion of the faithful from the faith. These are not to

be forbidden to communicate with unbelievers who have not received the faith, such as pagans or Jews, especially if there be some urgent necessity for so doing. But in the case of simple people and those who are weak in the faith, whose perversion is to be feared as a probable result, they should be forbidden to communicate with unbelievers, and especially to be on very familiar terms with them, or to communicate with them without necessity.

This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(9)-RO(2) — The Church does not exercise judgment against unbelievers in the point of inflicting spiritual punishment on them: but she does exercise judgment over some of them in the matter of temporal punishment. It is under this head that sometimes the Church, for certain special sins, withdraws the faithful from communication with certain unbelievers.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(9)-RO(3) — There is more probability that a servant who is ruled by his master's commands, will be converted to the faith of his master who is a believer, than if the case were the reverse: and so the faithful are not forbidden to have unbelieving servants. If, however, the master were in danger, through communicating with such a servant, he should send him away, according to Our Lord's command (~~CRB~~ Matthew 18:8):

“If... thy foot scandalize thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee.”

With regard to the argument in the contrary [*The Leonine Edition gives this solution before the **RO(2)**] sense the reply is that the Lord gave this command in reference to those nations into whose territory the Jews were about to enter. For the latter were inclined to idolatry, so that it was to be feared lest, through frequent dealings with those nations, they should be estranged from the faith: hence the text goes on (~~CRB~~ Deuteronomy 7:4):

“For she will turn away thy son from following Me.”

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(10)

Whether unbelievers may have authority or dominion over the faithful?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that unbelievers may have authority or dominion over the faithful. For the Apostle says (⁵⁰⁰¹ Timothy 6:1): “Whosoever are servants under the yoke, let them count their masters worthy of all honor”: and it is clear that he is speaking of unbelievers, since he adds (⁵⁰⁰² Timothy 6:2): “But they that have believing masters, let them not despise them.” Moreover it is written (⁴⁰²⁸ Peter 2:18):

“Servants be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward.”

Now this command would not be contained in the apostolic teaching unless unbelievers could have authority over the faithful. Therefore it seems that unbelievers can have authority over the faithful.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, all the members of a prince’s household are his subjects. Now some of the faithful were members of unbelieving princes’ households, for we read in the Epistle to the Philippians (³⁰⁰² 4:22): “All the saints salute you, especially they that are of Caesar’s household,” referring to Nero, who was an unbeliever. Therefore unbelievers can have authority over the faithful.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, according to the Philosopher (Polit. i, 2) a slave is his master’s instrument in matters concerning everyday life, even as a craftsman’s laborer is his instrument in matters concerning the working of his art. Now, in such matters, a believer can be subject to an unbeliever, for he may work on an unbeliever’s farm. Therefore unbelievers may have authority over the faithful even as to dominion.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, Those who are in authority can pronounce judgment on those over whom they are placed. But unbelievers cannot pronounce judgment on the faithful, for the Apostle says (⁴⁰⁰¹ Corinthians 6:1):

“Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to be judged
before the unjust,”

i.e. unbelievers, “and not before the saints?” Therefore it seems that unbelievers cannot have authority over the faithful.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(10) — *I answer that*, That this question may be considered in two ways. First, we may speak of dominion or authority of unbelievers over the faithful as of a thing to be established for the first time. This ought by no means to be allowed, since it would provoke scandal and endanger the faith, for subjects are easily influenced by their superiors to comply with their commands, unless the subjects are of great virtue: moreover unbelievers hold the faith in contempt, if they see the faithful fall away. Hence the Apostle forbade the faithful to go to law before an unbelieving judge. And so the Church altogether forbids unbelievers to acquire dominion over believers, or to have authority over them in any capacity whatever.

Secondly, we may speak of dominion or authority, as already in force: and here we must observe that dominion and authority are institutions of human law, while the distinction between faithful and unbelievers arises from the Divine law. Now the Divine law which is the law of grace, does not do away with human law which is the law of natural reason. Wherefore the distinction between faithful and unbelievers, considered in itself, does not do away with dominion and authority of unbelievers over the faithful.

Nevertheless this right of dominion or authority can be justly done away with by the sentence or ordination of the Church who has the authority of God: since unbelievers in virtue of their unbelief deserve to forfeit their power over the faithful who are converted into children of God.

This the Church does sometimes, and sometimes not. For among those unbelievers who are subject, even in temporal matters, to the Church and her members, the Church made the law that if the slave of a Jew became a Christian, he should forthwith receive his freedom, without paying any price, if he should be a “vernaculus,” i.e. born in slavery; and likewise if, when yet an unbeliever, he had been bought for his service: if, however, he had been bought for sale, then he should be offered for sale within three months. Nor does the Church harm them in this, because since those Jews

themselves are subject to the Church, she can dispose of their possessions, even as secular princes have enacted many laws to be observed by their subjects, in favor of liberty. On the other hand, the Church has not applied the above law to those unbelievers who are not subject to her or her members, in temporal matters, although she has the right to do so: and this, in order to avoid scandal, for as Our Lord showed (⁴¹⁷⁵ Matthew 17:25,26) that He could be excused from paying the tribute, because “the children are free,” yet He ordered the tribute to be paid in order to avoid giving scandal. Thus Paul too, after saying that servants should honor their masters, adds, “lest the name of the Lord and His doctrine be blasphemed.”

This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(10)-RO(2) — The authority of Caesar preceded the distinction of faithful from unbelievers. Hence it was not cancelled by the conversion of some to the faith. Moreover it was a good thing that there should be a few of the faithful in the emperor’s household, that they might defend the rest of the faithful. Thus the Blessed Sebastian encouraged those whom he saw faltering under torture, and, the while, remained hidden under the military cloak in the palace of Diocletian.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(10)-RO(3) — Slaves are subject to their masters for their whole lifetime, and are subject to their overseers in everything: whereas the craftsman’s laborer is subject to him for certain special works. Hence it would be more dangerous for unbelievers to have dominion or authority over the faithful, than that they should be allowed to employ them in some craft. Wherefore the Church permits Christians to work on the land of Jews, because this does not entail their living together with them. Thus Solomon besought the King of Tyre to send master workmen to hew the trees, as related in ⁴¹⁸⁶ 1 Kings 5:6. Yet, if there be reason to fear that the faithful will be perverted by such communications and dealings, they should be absolutely forbidden.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(11)

Whether the rites of unbelievers ought to be tolerated?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(11)-O(1) — It would seem that rites of unbelievers ought not to be tolerated. For it is evident that unbelievers sin in observing their rites: and not to prevent a sin, when one can, seems to imply consent therein, as a gloss observes on ^{<R13>}Romans 1:32:

“Not only they that do them, but they also
that consent to them that do them.”

Therefore it is a sin to tolerate their rites.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(11)-O(2) — Further, the rites of the Jews are compared to idolatry, because a gloss on ^{<R11>}Galatians 5:1, “Be not held again under the yoke of bondage,” says: “The bondage of that law was not lighter than that of idolatry.” But it would not be allowable for anyone to observe the rites of idolatry, in fact Christian princes at first caused the temples of idols to be closed, and afterwards, to be destroyed, as Augustine relates (*De Civ. Dei* xviii, 54). Therefore it follows that even the rites of Jews ought not to be tolerated.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(11)-O(3) — Further, unbelief is the greatest of sins, as stated above (**A(3)**). Now other sins such as adultery, theft and the like, are not tolerated, but are punishable by law. Therefore neither ought the rites of unbelievers to be tolerated.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(11) — *On the contrary*, Gregory [**Registr.* xi, Ep. 15: cf. *Decret.*, dist. xlv, can., *Qui sincera*] says, speaking of the Jews: “They should be allowed to observe all their feasts, just as hitherto they and their fathers have for ages observed them.”

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(11) — *I answer that*, Human government is derived from the Divine government, and should imitate it. Now although God is all-powerful and supremely good, nevertheless He allows certain evils to take place in the universe, which He might prevent, lest, without them, greater goods might be forfeited, or greater evils ensue. Accordingly in human government also, those who are in authority, rightly tolerate certain evils, lest certain goods be lost, or certain greater evils be incurred: thus

Augustine says (De Ordine ii, 4): “If you do away with harlots, the world will be convulsed with lust.” Hence, though unbelievers sin in their rites, they may be tolerated, either on account of some good that ensues therefrom, or because of some evil avoided. Thus from the fact that the Jews observe their rites, which, of old, foreshadowed the truth of the faith which we hold, there follows this good — that our very enemies bear witness to our faith, and that our faith is represented in a figure, so to speak. For this reason they are tolerated in the observance of their rites.

On the other hand, the rites of other unbelievers, which are neither truthful nor profitable are by no means to be tolerated, except perchance in order to avoid an evil, e.g. the scandal or disturbance that might ensue, or some hindrance to the salvation of those who if they were unmolested might gradually be converted to the faith. For this reason the Church, at times, has tolerated the rites even of heretics and pagans, when unbelievers were very numerous.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12)

Whether the children of Jews and other unbelievers ought to be baptized against their parents’ will?

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12)-O(1) — It would seem that the children of Jews and of other unbelievers ought to be baptized against their parents’ will. For the bond of marriage is stronger than the right of parental authority over children, since the right of parental authority can be made to cease, when a son is set at liberty; whereas the marriage bond cannot be severed by man, according to ^{<1916}Matthew 19:6: “What... God hath joined together let no man put asunder.” And yet the marriage bond is broken on account of unbelief: for the Apostle says (^{<1975}1 Corinthians 7:15):

“If the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases”:

and a canon [*Can. Uxor legitima, and Idololatria, qu. i] says that “if the unbelieving partner is unwilling to abide with the other, without insult to their Creator, then the other partner is not bound to cohabitation.” Much

more, therefore, does unbelief abrogate the right of unbelieving parents' authority over their children: and consequently their children may be baptized against their parents' will.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12)-O(2) — Further, one is more bound to succor a man who is in danger of everlasting death, than one who is in danger of temporal death. Now it would be a sin, if one saw a man in danger of temporal death and failed to go to his aid. Since, then, the children of Jews and other unbelievers are in danger of everlasting death, should they be left to their parents who would imbue them with their unbelief, it seems that they ought to be taken away from them and baptized, and instructed in the faith.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12)-O(3) — Further, the children of a bondsman are themselves bondsmen, and under the power of his master. Now the Jews are bondsmen of kings and princes: therefore their children are also. Consequently kings and princes have the power to do what they will with Jewish children. Therefore no injustice is committed if they baptize them against their parents' wishes.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12)-O(4) — Further, every man belongs more to God, from Whom he has his soul, than to his carnal father, from whom he has his body. Therefore it is not unjust if Jewish children be taken away from their parents, and consecrated to God in Baptism.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12)-O(5) — Further, Baptism avails for salvation more than preaching does, since Baptism removes forthwith the stain of sin and the debt of punishment, and opens the gate of heaven. Now if danger ensue through not preaching, it is imputed to him who omitted to preach, according to the words of ~~281a~~ Ezekiel 33:6 about the man who “sees the sword coming and sounds not the trumpet.” Much more therefore, if Jewish children are lost through not being baptized are they accounted guilty of sin, who could have baptized them and did not.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12) — *On the contrary*, Injustice should be done to no man. Now it would be an injustice to Jews if their children were to be baptized against their will, since they would lose the rights of parental authority over their children as soon as these were Christians. Therefore these should not be baptized against their parents' will.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12) — *I answer that,* The custom of the Church has very great authority and ought to be jealously observed in all things, since the very doctrine of catholic doctors derives its authority from the Church. Hence we ought to abide by the authority of the Church rather than by that of an Augustine or a Jerome or of any doctor whatever. Now it was never the custom of the Church to baptize the children of the Jews against the will of their parents, although at times past there have been many very powerful catholic princes like Constantine and Theodosius, with whom most holy bishops have been on most friendly terms, as Sylvester with Constantine, and Ambrose with Theodosius, who would certainly not have failed to obtain this favor from them if it had been at all reasonable. It seems therefore hazardous to repeat this assertion, that the children of Jews should be baptized against their parents' wishes, in contradiction to the Church's custom observed hitherto.

There are two reasons for this custom. One is on account of the danger to the faith. For children baptized before coming to the use of reason, afterwards when they come to perfect age, might easily be persuaded by their parents to renounce what they had unknowingly embraced; and this would be detrimental to the faith.

The other reason is that it is against natural justice. For a child is by nature part of its father: thus, at first, it is not distinct from its parents as to its body, so long as it is enfolded within its mother's womb; and later on after birth, and before it has the use of its free-will, it is enfolded in the care of its parents, which is like a spiritual womb, for so long as man has not the use of reason, he differs not from an irrational animal; so that even as an ox or a horse belongs to someone who, according to the civil law, can use them when he likes, as his own instrument, so, according to the natural law, a son, before coming to the use of reason, is under his father's care. Hence it would be contrary to natural justice, if a child, before coming to the use of reason, were to be taken away from its parents' custody, or anything done to it against its parents' wish. As soon, however, as it begins to have the use of its free-will, it begins to belong to itself, and is able to look after itself, in matters concerning the Divine or the natural law, and then it should be induced, not by compulsion but by persuasion, to embrace the faith: it can then consent to the faith, and be baptized, even against its parents' wish; but not before it comes to the use of reason.

Hence it is said of the children of the fathers of old that they were saved in the faith of their parents; whereby we are given to understand that it is the parents' duty to look after the salvation of their children, especially before they come to the use of reason.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12)-RO(1) — In the marriage bond, both husband and wife have the use of the free-will, and each can assent to the faith without the other's consent. But this does not apply to a child before it comes to the use of reason: yet the comparison holds good after the child has come to the use of reason, if it is willing to be converted.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12)-RO(2) — No one should be snatched from natural death against the order of civil law: for instance, if a man were condemned by the judge to temporal death, nobody ought to rescue him by violence: hence no one ought to break the order of the natural law, whereby a child is in the custody of its father, in order to rescue it from the danger of everlasting death.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12)-RO(3) — Jews are bondsmen of princes by civil bondage, which does not exclude the order of natural or Divine law.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12)-RO(4) — Man is directed to God by his reason, whereby he can know Him. Hence a child before coming to the use of reason, in the natural order of things, is directed to God by its parents' reason, under whose care it lies by nature: and it is for them to dispose of the child in all matters relating to God.

P(2b)-Q(10)-A(12)-RO(5) — The peril that ensues from the omission of preaching, threatens only those who are entrusted with the duty of preaching. Hence it had already been said (²⁸⁸⁷ Ezekiel 3:17): "I have made thee a watchman to the children [Vulg.: 'house'] of Israel." On the other hand, to provide the sacraments of salvation for the children of unbelievers is the duty of their parents. Hence it is they whom the danger threatens, if through being deprived of the sacraments their children fail to obtain salvation.

QUESTION 11

OF HERESY

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider heresy: under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether heresy is a kind of unbelief?
- (2) Of the matter about which it is;
- (3) Whether heretics should be tolerated?
- (4) Whether converts should be received?

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(1)

Whether heresy is a species of unbelief?

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that heresy is not a species of unbelief. For unbelief is in the understanding, as stated above (**Q(10), A(2)**). Now heresy would seem not to pertain to the understanding, but rather to the appetitive power; for Jerome says on ~~REB~~ Galatians 5:19: [*Cf. Decretals xxiv, qu. iii, cap. 27] “The works of the flesh are manifest: Heresy is derived from a Greek word meaning choice, whereby a man makes choice of that school which he deems best.” But choice is an act of the appetitive power, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(13), A(1)**). Therefore heresy is not a species of unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, vice takes its species chiefly from its end; hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 2) that “he who commits adultery that he may steal, is a thief rather than an adulterer.” Now the end of heresy is temporal profit, especially lordship and glory, which belong to the vice of pride or covetousness: for Augustine says (De Util. Credendi i) that “a heretic is one who either devises or follows false and new opinions, for the sake of some temporal profit, especially that he may lord and be

honored above others.” Therefore heresy is a species of pride rather than of unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, since unbelief is in the understanding, it would seem not to pertain to the flesh. Now heresy belongs to the works of the flesh, for the Apostle says (~~REF~~ Galatians 5:19): “The works of the flesh are manifest, which are fornication, uncleanness,” and among the others, he adds, “dissensions, sects,” which are the same as heresies. Therefore heresy is not a species of unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Falsehood is contrary to truth. Now a heretic is one who devises or follows false or new opinions. Therefore heresy is opposed to the truth, on which faith is founded; and consequently it is a species of unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(1) — *I answer that*, The word heresy as stated in the first objection denotes a choosing. Now choice as stated above (**P(2a), Q(13), A(3)**) is about things directed to the end, the end being presupposed. Now, in matters of faith, the will assents to some truth, as to its proper good, as was shown above (**Q(4), A(3)**): wherefore that which is the chief truth, has the character of last end, while those which are secondary truths, have the character of being directed to the end.

Now, whoever believes, assents to someone’s words; so that, in every form of unbelief, the person to whose words assent is given seems to hold the chief place and to be the end as it were; while the things by holding which one assents to that person hold a secondary place. Consequently he that holds the Christian faith aright, assents, by his will, to Christ, in those things which truly belong to His doctrine.

Accordingly there are two ways in which a man may deviate from the rectitude of the Christian faith. First, because he is unwilling to assent to Christ: and such a man has an evil will, so to say, in respect of the very end. This belongs to the species of unbelief in pagans and Jews. Secondly, because, though he intends to assent to Christ, yet he fails in his choice of those things wherein he assents to Christ, because he chooses not what Christ really taught, but the suggestions of his own mind.

Therefore heresy is a species of unbelief, belonging to those who profess the Christian faith, but corrupt its dogmas.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(1)-RO(1) — Choice regards unbelief in the same way as the will regards faith, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(1)-RO(2) — Vices take their species from their proximate end, while, from their remote end, they take their genus and cause. Thus in the case of adultery committed for the sake of theft, there is the species of adultery taken from its proper end and object; but the ultimate end shows that the act of adultery is both the result of the theft, and is included under it, as an effect under its cause, or a species under its genus, as appears from what we have said about acts in general (**P(2a)**, **Q(18)**, **A(7)**).

Wherefore, as to the case in point also, the proximate end of heresy is adherence to one's own false opinion, and from this it derives its species, while its remote end reveals its cause, viz. that it arises from pride or covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(1)-RO(3) — Just as heresy is so called from its being a choosing [*From the Greek {airein} [hairein], to cut off], so does sect derive its name from its being a cutting off [secando], as Isidore states (Etym. viii, 3). Wherefore heresy and sect are the same thing, and each belongs to the works of the flesh, not indeed by reason of the act itself of unbelief in respect of its proximate object, but by reason of its cause, which is either the desire of an undue end in which way it arises from pride or covetousness, as stated in the second objection, or some illusion of the imagination (which gives rise to error, as the Philosopher states in Metaph. iv; Ed. Did. iii, 5), for this faculty has a certain connection with the flesh, in as much as its act is independent on a bodily organ.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(2)

Whether heresy is properly about matters of faith?

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that heresy is not properly about matters of faith. For just as there are heresies and sects among Christians, so were there among the Jews, and Pharisees, as Isidore observes (Etym. viii, 3,4,5). Now their dissensions were not about matters of faith. Therefore heresy is not about matters of faith, as though they were its proper matter.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the matter of faith is the thing believed. Now heresy is not only about things, but also about works, and about interpretations of Holy Writ. For Jerome says on ~~Galatians~~ Galatians 5:20 that “whoever expounds the Scriptures in any sense but that of the Holy Ghost by Whom they were written, may be called a heretic, though he may not have left the Church”: and elsewhere he says that “heresies spring up from words spoken amiss.” [*St. Thomas quotes this saying elsewhere, in Sent. iv, D, 13, and TP, **Q(16), A(8)**, but it is not to be found in St. Jerome’s works.] Therefore heresy is not properly about the matter of faith.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, we find the holy doctors differing even about matters pertaining to the faith, for example Augustine and Jerome, on the question about the cessation of the legal observances: and yet this was without any heresy on their part. Therefore heresy is not properly about the matter of faith.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says against the Manichees [*Cf. De Civ. Dei xviii, 51]: “In Christ’s Church, those are heretics, who hold mischievous and erroneous opinions, and when rebuked that they may think soundly and rightly, offer a stubborn resistance, and, refusing to mend their pernicious and deadly doctrines, persist in defending them.” Now pernicious and deadly doctrines are none but those which are contrary to the dogmas of faith, whereby “the just man liveth” (~~Romans~~ Romans 1:17). Therefore heresy is about matters of faith, as about its proper matter.

I answer that, We are speaking of heresy now as denoting a corruption of the Christian faith. Now it does not imply a corruption of the Christian faith, if a man has a false opinion in matters that are not of faith, for instance, in questions of geometry and so forth, which cannot belong to the faith by any means; but only when a person has a false opinion about things belonging to the faith.

Now a thing may be of the faith in two ways, as stated above (**P(1) Q(32), A(4); P(2a), Q(1), A(6)**, ad 1; **P(2a), Q(2), A(5)**), in one way, directly and principally, e.g. the articles of faith; in another way, indirectly and secondarily, e.g. those matters, the denial of which leads to the corruption

of some article of faith; and there may be heresy in either way, even as there can be faith.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(2)-RO(1) — Just as the heresies of the Jews and Pharisees were about opinions relating to Judaism or Pharisaism, so also heresies among Christians are about matter touching the Christian faith.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(2)-RO(2) — A man is said to expound Holy Writ in another sense than that required by the Holy Ghost, when he so distorts the meaning of Holy Writ, that it is contrary to what the Holy Ghost has revealed. Hence it is written (³³⁰Ezekiel 13:6) about the false prophets: “They have persisted to confirm what they have said,” viz. by false interpretations of Scripture. Moreover a man professes his faith by the words that he utters, since confession is an act of faith, as stated above (**Q(3), A(1)**). Wherefore inordinate words about matters of faith may lead to corruption of the faith; and hence it is that Pope Leo says in a letter to Proterius, Bishop of Alexandria: “The enemies of Christ’s cross lie in wait for our every deed and word, so that, if we but give them the slightest pretext, they may accuse us mendaciously of agreeing with Nestorius.”

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(2)-RO(3) — As Augustine says (Ep. xliii) and we find it stated in the Decretals (xxiv, qu. 3, can. Dixit Apostolus): “By no means should we accuse of heresy those who, however false and perverse their opinion may be, defend it without obstinate fervor, and seek the truth with careful anxiety, ready to mend their opinion, when they have found the truth,” because, to wit, they do not make a choice in contradiction to the doctrine of the Church. Accordingly, certain doctors seem to have differed either in matters the holding of which in this or that way is of no consequence, so far as faith is concerned, or even in matters of faith, which were not as yet defined by the Church; although if anyone were obstinately to deny them after they had been defined by the authority of the universal Church, he would be deemed a heretic. This authority resides chiefly in the Sovereign Pontiff. For we read [*Decret. xxiv, qu. 1, can. Quoties]: “Whenever a question of faith is in dispute, I think, that all our brethren and fellow bishops ought to refer the matter to none other than Peter, as being the source of their name and honor, against whose authority neither Jerome nor Augustine nor any of the holy doctors defended their opinion.” Hence Jerome says (Exposit. Symbol [*Among the

supposititious works of St. Jerome]): “This, most blessed Pope, is the faith that we have been taught in the Catholic Church. If anything therein has been incorrectly or carelessly expressed, we beg that it may be set aright by you who hold the faith and see of Peter. If however this, our profession, be approved by the judgment of your apostleship, whoever may blame me, will prove that he himself is ignorant, or malicious, or even not a catholic but a heretic.”

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(3)

Whether heretics ought to be tolerated?

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that heretics ought to be tolerated. For the Apostle says (^{<412>}2 Timothy 2:24,25):

“The servant of the Lord must not wrangle... with modesty admonishing them that resist the truth, if peradventure God may give them repentance to know the truth, and they may recover themselves from the snares of the devil.”

Now if heretics are not tolerated but put to death, they lose the opportunity of repentance. Therefore it seems contrary to the Apostle’s command.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, whatever is necessary in the Church should be tolerated. Now heresies are necessary in the Church, since the Apostle says (^{<419>}1 Corinthians 11:19):

“There must be... heresies, that they... who are reproved, may be manifest among you.”

Therefore it seems that heretics should be tolerated.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the Master commanded his servants (^{<413>}Matthew 13:30) to suffer the cockle “to grow until the harvest,” i.e. the end of the world, as a gloss explains it. Now holy men explain that the cockle denotes heretics. Therefore heretics should be tolerated.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (^{<418>}Titus 3:10,11):

“A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid: knowing that he, that is such an one, is subverted.”

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(3) — *I answer that,* With regard to heretics two points must be observed: one, on their own side; the other, on the side of the Church. On their own side there is the sin, whereby they deserve not only to be separated from the Church by excommunication, but also to be severed from the world by death. For it is a much graver matter to corrupt the faith which quickens the soul, than to forge money, which supports temporal life. Wherefore if forgers of money and other evil-doers are forthwith condemned to death by the secular authority, much more reason is there for heretics, as soon as they are convicted of heresy, to be not only excommunicated but even put to death.

On the part of the Church, however, there is mercy which looks to the conversion of the wanderer, wherefore she condemns not at once, but “after the first and second admonition,” as the Apostle directs: after that, if he is yet stubborn, the Church no longer hoping for his conversion, looks to the salvation of others, by excommunicating him and separating him from the Church, and furthermore delivers him to the secular tribunal to be exterminated thereby from the world by death. For Jerome commenting on ~~RRB~~ Galatians 5:9, “A little leaven,” says: “Cut off the decayed flesh, expel the mangy sheep from the fold, lest the whole house, the whole paste, the whole body, the whole flock, burn, perish, rot, die. Arius was but one spark in Alexandria, but as that spark was not at once put out, the whole earth was laid waste by its flame.”

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(3)-RO(1) — This very modesty demands that the heretic should be admonished a first and second time: and if he be unwilling to retract, he must be reckoned as already “subverted,” as we may gather from the words of the Apostle quoted above.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(3)-RO(2) — The profit that ensues from heresy is beside the intention of heretics, for it consists in the constancy of the faithful being put to the test, and “makes us shake off our sluggishness, and search the Scriptures more carefully,” as Augustine states (De Genesis cont. Manich. i, 1). What they really intend is the corruption of the faith, which is to inflict very great harm indeed. Consequently we should consider what

they directly intend, and expel them, rather than what is beside their intention, and so, tolerate them.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(3)-RO(3) — According to Decret. (xxiv, qu. iii, can. Notandum), “to be excommunicated is not to be uprooted.” A man is excommunicated, as the Apostle says (^{<KRB>}1 Corinthians 5:5) that his “spirit may be saved in the day of Our Lord.” Yet if heretics be altogether uprooted by death, this is not contrary to Our Lord’s command, which is to be understood as referring to the case when the cockle cannot be plucked up without plucking up the wheat, as we explained above (**Q(10), A(8)**, ad 1), when treating of unbelievers in general.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(4)

Whether the Church should receive those who return from heresy?

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the Church ought in all cases to receive those who return from heresy. For it is written (^{<JRT>}Jeremiah 3:1) in the person of the Lord: “Thou hast prostituted thyself to many lovers; nevertheless return to Me saith the Lord.” Now the sentence of the Church is God’s sentence, according to ^{<RIT>}Deuteronomy 1:17:

“You shall hear the little as well as the great: neither shall you respect any man’s person, because it is the judgment of God.”

Therefore even those who are guilty of the prostitution of unbelief which is spiritual prostitution, should be received all the same.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, Our Lord commanded Peter (^{<MR>}Matthew 18:22) to forgive his offending brother “not” only “till seven times, but till seventy times seven times,” which Jerome expounds as meaning that “a man should be forgiven, as often as he has sinned.” Therefore he ought to be received by the Church as often as he has sinned by falling back into heresy.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, heresy is a kind of unbelief. Now other unbelievers who wish to be converted are received by the Church. Therefore heretics also should be received.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The Decretal Ad abolendam (De Haereticis, cap. ix) says that “those who are found to have relapsed into the error which they had already abjured, must be left to the secular tribunal.” Therefore they should not be received by the Church.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(4) — *I answer that*, In obedience to Our Lord’s institution, the Church extends her charity to all, not only to friends, but also to foes who persecute her, according to ^{408a}Matthew 5:44: “Love your enemies; do good to them that hate you.” Now it is part of charity that we should both wish and work our neighbor’s good. Again, good is twofold: one is spiritual, namely the health of the soul, which good is chiefly the object of charity, since it is this chiefly that we should wish for one another. Consequently, from this point of view, heretics who return after falling no matter how often, are admitted by the Church to Penance whereby the way of salvation is opened to them.

The other good is that which charity considers secondarily, viz. temporal good, such as life of the body, worldly possessions, good repute, ecclesiastical or secular dignity, for we are not bound by charity to wish others this good, except in relation to the eternal salvation of them and of others. Hence if the presence of one of these goods in one individual might be an obstacle to eternal salvation in many, we are not bound out of charity to wish such a good to that person, rather should we desire him to be without it, both because eternal salvation takes precedence of temporal good, and because the good of the many is to be preferred to the good of one. Now if heretics were always received on their return, in order to save their lives and other temporal goods, this might be prejudicial to the salvation of others, both because they would infect others if they relapsed again, and because, if they escaped without punishment, others would feel more assured in lapsing into heresy. For it is written (²⁰⁸¹Ecclesiastes 8:11):

“For because sentence is not speedily pronounced against the evil, the children of men commit evils without any fear.”

For this reason the Church not only admits to Penance those who return from heresy for the first time, but also safeguards their lives, and sometimes by dispensation, restores them to the ecclesiastical dignities which they may have had before, should their conversion appear to be sincere: we read of this as having frequently been done for the good of peace. But when they fall again, after having been received, this seems to prove them to be inconstant in faith, wherefore when they return again, they are admitted to Penance, but are not delivered from the pain of death.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(4)-RO(1) — In God's tribunal, those who return are always received, because God is a searcher of hearts, and knows those who return in sincerity. But the Church cannot imitate God in this, for she presumes that those who relapse after being once received, are not sincere in their return; hence she does not debar them from the way of salvation, but neither does she protect them from the sentence of death.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(4)-RO(2) — Our Lord was speaking to Peter of sins committed against oneself, for one should always forgive such offenses and spare our brother when he repents. These words are not to be applied to sins committed against one's neighbor or against God, for it is not left to our discretion to forgive such offenses, as Jerome says on ⁴¹⁸⁵Matthew 18:15, "If thy brother shall offend against thee." Yet even in this matter the law prescribes limits according as God's honor or our neighbor's good demands.

P(2b)-Q(11)-A(4)-RO(3) — When other unbelievers, who have never received the faith are converted, they do not as yet show signs of inconstancy in faith, as relapsed heretics do; hence the comparison fails.

QUESTION 12

OF APOSTASY

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider apostasy: about which there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether apostasy pertains to unbelief?
- (2) Whether, on account of apostasy from the faith, subjects are absolved from allegiance to an apostate prince?

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(1)

Whether apostasy pertains to unbelief?

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that apostasy does not pertain to unbelief. For that which is the origin of all sins, does not, seemingly, pertain to unbelief, since many sins there are without unbelief. Now apostasy seems to be the origin of every sin, for it is written (Ecclus. 10:14): “The beginning of the pride of man is apostasy [Douay: ‘to fall off’] from God,” and further on, (Ecclus. 10:15): “Pride is the beginning of all sin.” Therefore apostasy does not pertain to unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, unbelief is an act of the understanding: whereas apostasy seems rather to consist in some outward deed or utterance, or even in some inward act of the will, for it is written (³¹¹²Proverbs 6:12-14):

“A man that is an apostate, an unprofitable man walketh with a perverse mouth. He winketh with the eyes, presseth with the foot, speaketh with the finger. With a wicked heart he deviseth evil, and at all times he soweth discord.”

Moreover if anyone were to have himself circumcised, or to worship at the tomb of Mahomet, he would be deemed an apostate. Therefore apostasy does not pertain to unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, heresy, since it pertains to unbelief, is a determinate species of unbelief. If then, apostasy pertained to unbelief, it would follow that it is a determinate species of unbelief, which does not seem to agree with what has been said (**Q(10)**, **A(5)**). Therefore apostasy does not pertain to unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~¶~~ John 6:67): “Many of his disciples went back,” i.e. apostatized, of whom Our Lord had said previously (~~¶~~ John 6:65): “There are some of you that believe not.” Therefore apostasy pertains to unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Apostasy denotes a backsliding from God. This may happen in various ways according to the different kinds of union between man and God. For, in the first place, man is united to God by faith; secondly, by having his will duly submissive in obeying His commandments; thirdly, by certain special things pertaining to supererogation such as the religious life, the clerical state, or Holy Orders. Now if that which follows be removed, that which precedes, remains, but the converse does not hold. Accordingly a man may apostatize from God, by withdrawing from the religious life to which he was bound by profession, or from the Holy Order which he had received: and this is called “apostasy from religious life” or “Orders.” A man may also apostatize from God, by rebelling in his mind against the Divine commandments: and though man may apostatize in both the above ways, he may still remain united to God by faith.

But if he give up the faith, then he seems to turn away from God altogether: and consequently, apostasy simply and absolutely is that whereby a man withdraws from the faith, and is called “apostasy of perfidy.” In this way apostasy, simply so called, pertains to unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(1)-RO(1) — This objection refers to the second kind of apostasy, which denotes an act of the will in rebellion against God’s commandments, an act that is to be found in every mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(1)-RO(2) — It belongs to faith not only that the heart should believe, but also that external words and deeds should bear witness to the inward faith, for confession is an act of faith. In this way too, certain external words or deeds pertain to unbelief, in so far as they are signs of unbelief, even as a sign of health is said itself to be healthy. Now although the authority quoted may be understood as referring to every kind of apostate, yet it applies most truly to an apostate from the faith. For since faith is the first foundation of things to be hoped for, and since, without faith it is “impossible to please God”; when once faith is removed, man retains nothing that may be useful for the obtaining of eternal salvation, for which reason it is written (²⁰¹²Proverbs 6:12): “A man that is an apostate, an unprofitable man”: because faith is the life of the soul, according to ²⁰¹⁷Romans 1:17: “The just man liveth by faith.” Therefore, just as when the life of the body is taken away, man’s every member and part loses its due disposition, so when the life of justice, which is by faith, is done away, disorder appears in all his members. First, in his mouth, whereby chiefly his mind stands revealed; secondly, in his eyes; thirdly, in the instrument of movement; fourthly, in his will, which tends to evil. The result is that “he sows discord,” endeavoring to sever others from the faith even as he severed himself.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(1)-RO(3) — The species of a quality or form are not diversified by the fact of its being the term “wherefrom” or “whereto” of movement: *on the contrary*, it is the movement that takes its species from the terms. Now apostasy regards unbelief as the term “whereto” of the movement of withdrawal from the faith; wherefore apostasy does not imply a special kind of unbelief, but an aggravating circumstance thereof, according to ²⁰²⁰2 Peter 2:21:

“It had been better for them not to know the truth [Vulg.: ‘the way of justice’], than after they had known it, to turn back.”

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(2)

Whether a prince forfeits his dominion over his subjects, on account of apostasy from the faith, so that they no longer owe him allegiance?

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that a prince does not so forfeit his dominion over his subjects, on account of apostasy from the faith, that they no longer owe him allegiance. For Ambrose [*St. Augustine, Super ~~<EC>~~ Psalm 124:3] says that the Emperor Julian, though an apostate, nevertheless had under him Christian soldiers, who when he said to them, “Fall into line for the defense of the republic,” were bound to obey. Therefore subjects are not absolved from their allegiance to their prince on account of his apostasy.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, an apostate from the faith is an unbeliever. Now we find that certain holy men served unbelieving masters; thus Joseph served Pharaoh, Daniel served Nabuchodonosor, and Mardochai served Assuerus. Therefore apostasy from the faith does not release subjects from allegiance to their sovereign.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, just as by apostasy from the faith, a man turns away from God, so does every sin. Consequently if, on account of apostasy from the faith, princes were to lose their right to command those of their subjects who are believers, they would equally lose it on account of other sins: which is evidently not the case. Therefore we ought not to refuse allegiance to a sovereign on account of his apostatizing from the faith.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Gregory VII says (Council, Roman V): “Holding to the institutions of our holy predecessors, we, by our apostolic authority, absolve from their oath those who through loyalty or through the sacred bond of an oath owe allegiance to excommunicated persons: and we absolutely forbid them to continue their allegiance to such persons, until these shall have made amends.” Now apostates from the faith, like heretics, are excommunicated, according to the Decretal [*Extra, De Haereticis, cap. Ad abolendam]. Therefore princes should not be obeyed when they have apostatized from the faith.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(10)**, **A(10)**), unbelief, in itself, is not inconsistent with dominion, since dominion is a device of the law of nations which is a human law: whereas the distinction between believers and unbelievers is of Divine right, which does not annul human right. Nevertheless a man who sins by unbelief may be sentenced to the loss of his right of dominion, as also, sometimes, on account of other sins.

Now it is not within the competency of the Church to punish unbelief in those who have never received the faith, according to the saying of the Apostle (~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 5:12): “What have I to do to judge them that are without?” She can, however, pass sentence of punishment on the unbelief of those who have received the faith: and it is fitting that they should be punished by being deprived of the allegiance of their subjects: for this same allegiance might conduce to great corruption of the faith, since, as was stated above (**A(1)**, **O(2)**), “a man that is an apostate... with a wicked heart deviseth evil, and... soweth discord,” in order to sever others from the faith. Consequently, as soon as sentence of excommunication is passed on a man on account of apostasy from the faith, his subjects are “ipso facto” absolved from his authority and from the oath of allegiance whereby they were bound to him.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(2)-RO(1) — At that time the Church was but recently instituted, and had not, as yet, the power of curbing earthly princes; and so she allowed the faithful to obey Julian the apostate, in matters that were not contrary to the faith, in order to avoid incurring a yet greater danger.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(2)-RO(2) — As stated in the article, it is not a question of those unbelievers who have never received the faith.

P(2b)-Q(12)-A(2)-RO(3) — Apostasy from the faith severs man from God altogether, as stated above (**A(1)**), which is not the case in any other sin.

QUESTION 13

OF THE SIN OF BLASPHEMY, IN GENERAL

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the sin of blasphemy, which is opposed to the confession of faith; and

- (1) blasphemy in general,
- (2) that blasphemy which is called the sin against the Holy Ghost.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether blasphemy is opposed to the confession of faith?
- (2) Whether blasphemy is always a mortal sin?
- (3) Whether blasphemy is the most grievous sin?
- (4) Whether blasphemy is in the damned?

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(1)

Whether blasphemy is opposed to the confession of faith?

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that blasphemy is not opposed to the confession of faith. Because to blaspheme is to utter an affront or insult against the Creator. Now this pertains to ill-will against God rather than to unbelief. Therefore blasphemy is not opposed to the confession of faith.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, on ~~and~~ Ephesians 4:31, “Let blasphemy... be put away from you,” a gloss says, “that which is committed against God or the saints.” But confession of faith, seemingly, is not about other things than those pertaining to God, Who is the object of faith. Therefore blasphemy is not always opposed to the confession of faith.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, according to some, there are three kinds of blasphemy. The first of these is when something unfitting is affirmed of God; the second is when something fitting is denied of Him; and the third, when something proper to God is ascribed to a creature, so that, seemingly, blasphemy is not only about God, but also about His creatures. Now the object of faith is God. Therefore blasphemy is not opposed to confession of faith.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (⁵⁰¹¹²1 Timothy 1:12,13): “I... before was a blasphemer and a persecutor,” and afterwards, “I did it ignorantly in” my “unbelief.” Hence it seems that blasphemy pertains to unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(1) — *I answer that*, The word blasphemy seems to denote the disparagement of some surpassing goodness, especially that of God. Now God, as Dionysius says (Div. Nom. i), is the very essence of true goodness. Hence whatever befits God, pertains to His goodness, and whatever does not befit Him, is far removed from the perfection of goodness which is His Essence. Consequently whoever either denies anything befitting God, or affirms anything unbefitting Him, disparages the Divine goodness.

Now this may happen in two ways. In the first way it may happen merely in respect of the opinion in the intellect; in the second way this opinion is united to a certain detestation in the affections, even as, on the other hand, faith in God is perfected by love of Him. Accordingly this disparagement of the Divine goodness is either in the intellect alone, or in the affections also. If it is in thought only, it is blasphemy of the heart, whereas if it betrays itself outwardly in speech it is blasphemy is opposed to confession of faith.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(1)-RO(1) — He that speaks against God, with the intention of reviling Him, disparages the Divine goodness, not only in respect of the falsehood in his intellect, but also by reason of the wickedness of his will, whereby he detests and strives to hinder the honor due to God, and this is perfect blasphemy.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(1)-RO(2) — Even as God is praised in His saints, in so far as praise is given to the works which God does in His saints, so does blasphemy against the saints, redound, as a consequence, against God.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(1)-RO(3) — Properly speaking, the sin of blasphemy is not in this way divided into three species: since to affirm unfitting things, or to deny fitting things of God, differ merely as affirmation and negation. For this diversity does not cause distinct species of habits, since the falsehood of affirmations and negations is made known by the same knowledge, and it is the same ignorance which errs in either way, since negatives are proved by affirmatives, according to Poster. i, 25. Again to ascribe to creatures things that are proper to God, seems to amount to the same as affirming something unfitting of Him, since whatever is proper to God is God Himself: and to ascribe to a creature, that which is proper to God, is to assert that God is the same as a creature.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(2)

Whether blasphemy is always a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that blasphemy is not always a mortal sin. Because a gloss on the words, “Now lay you also all away,” etc. (~~scrip~~ Colossians 3:8) says: “After prohibiting greater crimes he forbids lesser sins”: and yet among the latter he includes blasphemy. Therefore blasphemy is comprised among the lesser, i.e. venial, sins.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, every mortal sin is opposed to one of the precepts of the decalogue. But, seemingly, blasphemy is not contrary to any of them. Therefore blasphemy is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, sins committed without deliberation, are not mortal: hence first movements are not mortal sins, because they precede the deliberation of the reason, as was shown above (**P(2a)**, **Q(74)**, **AA(3),10**). Now blasphemy sometimes occurs without deliberation of the reason. Therefore it is not always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(2) — On the contrary, It is written (~~scrip~~ Leviticus 24:16): “He that blasphemeth the name of the Lord, dying let him die.” Now the

death punishment is not inflicted except for a mortal sin. Therefore blasphemy is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(2) — *I answer that,* As stated above (**P(2a), Q(72), A(5)**), a mortal sin is one whereby a man is severed from the first principle of spiritual life, which principle is the charity of God. Therefore whatever things are contrary to charity, are mortal sins in respect of their genus. Now blasphemy, as to its genus, is opposed to Divine charity, because, as stated above (**A(1)**), it disparages the Divine goodness, which is the object of charity. Consequently blasphemy is a mortal sin, by reason of its genus.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(2)-RO(1) — This gloss is not to be understood as meaning that all the sins which follow, are mortal, but that whereas all those mentioned previously are more grievous sins, some of those mentioned afterwards are less grievous; and yet among the latter some more grievous sins are included.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(2)-RO(2) — Since, as stated above (**A(1)**), blasphemy is contrary to the confession of faith, its prohibition is comprised under the prohibition of unbelief, expressed by the words: “I am the Lord thy God,” etc. (⁽¹²¹⁾Exodus 20:1). Or else, it is forbidden by the words: “Thou shalt not take the name of... God in vain” (⁽¹²²⁾Exodus 20:7). Because he who asserts something false about God, takes His name in vain even more than he who uses the name of God in confirmation of a falsehood.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(2)-RO(3) — There are two ways in which blasphemy may occur unawares and without deliberation. In the first way, by a man failing to advert to the blasphemous nature of his words, and this may happen through his being moved suddenly by passion so as to break out into words suggested by his imagination, without heeding to the meaning of those words: this is a venial sin, and is not a blasphemy properly so called. In the second way, by adverting to the meaning of his words, and to their blasphemous nature: in which case he is not excused from mortal sin, even as neither is he who, in a sudden movement of anger, kills one who is sitting beside him.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(3)

Whether the sin of blasphemy is the greatest sin?

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that the sin of blasphemy is not the greatest sin. For, according to Augustine (Enchiridion xii), a thing is said to be evil because it does harm. Now the sin of murder, since it destroys a man's life, does more harm than the sin of blasphemy, which can do no harm to God. Therefore the sin of murder is more grievous than that of blasphemy.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, a perjurer calls upon God to witness to a falsehood, and thus seems to assert that God is false. But not every blasphemer goes so far as to say that God is false. Therefore perjury is a more grievous sin than blasphemy.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, on ^{<1940}Psalm 74:6, "Lift not up your horn on high," a gloss says: "To excuse oneself for sin is the greatest sin of all." Therefore blasphemy is not the greatest sin.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(3) — On the contrary, On ^{<288D}Isaiah 18:2, "To a terrible people," etc. a gloss says: "In comparison with blasphemy, every sin is slight."

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(3) — I answer that, As stated above (**A(1)**), blasphemy is opposed to the confession of faith, so that it contains the gravity of unbelief: while the sin is aggravated if the will's detestation is added thereto, and yet more, if it breaks out into words, even as love and confession add to the praise of faith.

Therefore, since, as stated above (**Q(10)**, **A(3)**), unbelief is the greatest of sins in respect of its genus, it follows that blasphemy also is a very great sin, through belonging to the same genus as unbelief and being an aggravated form of that sin.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(3)-RO(1) — If we compare murder and blasphemy as regards the objects of those sins, it is clear that blasphemy, which is a sin committed directly against God, is more grave than murder, which is a sin against one's neighbor. On the other hand, if we compare them in respect of the harm wrought by them, murder is the graver sin, for murder does

more harm to one's neighbor, than blasphemy does to God. Since, however, the gravity of a sin depends on the intention of the evil will, rather than on the effect of the deed, as was shown above (**P(2a), Q(73), A(8)**), it follows that, as the blasphemer intends to do harm to God's honor, absolutely speaking, he sins more grievously than the murderer. Nevertheless murder takes precedence, as to punishment, among sins committed against our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(3)-RO(2) — A gloss on the words, "Let... blasphemy be put away from you" (⁴⁰⁶Ephesians 4:31) says: "Blasphemy is worse than perjury." The reason is that the perjurer does not say or think something false about God, as the blasphemer does: but he calls God to witness to a falsehood, not that he deems God a false witness, but in the hope, as it were, that God will not testify to the matter by some evident sign.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(3)-RO(3) — To excuse oneself for sin is a circumstance that aggravates every sin, even blasphemy itself: and it is called the most grievous sin, for as much as it makes every sin more grievous.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(4)

Whether the damned blaspheme?

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the damned do not blaspheme. Because some wicked men are deterred from blaspheming now, on account of the fear of future punishment. But the damned are undergoing these punishments, so that they abhor them yet more. Therefore, much more are they restrained from blaspheming.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, since blasphemy is a most grievous sin, it is most demeritorious. Now in the life to come there is no state of meriting or demeriting. Therefore there will be no place for blasphemy.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, it is written (²¹¹⁸Ecclesiastes 11:3) that "the tree... in what place soever it shall fall, there shall it be": whence it clearly follows that, after this life, man acquires neither merit nor sin, which he did not already possess in this life. Now many will be damned who were not blasphemous in this life. Neither, therefore, will they blaspheme in the life to come.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~in~~ Revelation 16:9):

“The men were scorched with great heat, and they blasphemed the name of God, Who hath power over these plagues,”

and a gloss on these words says that “those who are in hell, though aware that they are deservedly punished, will nevertheless complain that God is so powerful as to torture them thus.” Now this would be blasphemy in their present state: and consequently it will also be in their future state.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**AA(1),3**), detestation of the Divine goodness is a necessary condition of blasphemy. Now those who are in hell retain their wicked will which is turned away from God’s justice, since they love the things for which they are punished, would wish to use them if they could, and hate the punishments inflicted on them for those same sins. They regret indeed the sins which they have committed, not because they hate them, but because they are punished for them. Accordingly this detestation of the Divine justice is, in them, the interior blasphemy of the heart: and it is credible that after the resurrection they will blaspheme God with the tongue, even as the saints will praise Him with their voices.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(4)-RO(1) — In the present life men are deterred from blasphemy through fear of punishment which they think they can escape: whereas, in hell, the damned have no hope of escape, so that, in despair, they are borne towards whatever their wicked will suggests to them.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(4)-RO(2) — Merit and demerit belong to the state of a wayfarer, wherefore good is meritorious in them, while evil is demeritorious. In the blessed, on the other hand, good is not meritorious, but is part of their blissful reward, and, in like manner, in the damned, evil is not demeritorious, but is part of the punishment of damnation.

P(2b)-Q(13)-A(4)-RO(3) — Whoever dies in mortal sin, bears with him a will that detests the Divine justice with regard to a certain thing, and in this respect there can be blasphemy in him.

QUESTION 14

OF BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider in particular blasphemy against the Holy Ghost: under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether blasphemy or the sin against the Holy Ghost is the same as the sin committed through certain malice?
- (2) Of the species of this sin;
- (3) Whether it can be forgiven?
- (4) Whether it is possible to begin by sinning against the Holy Ghost before committing other sins?

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(1)

*Whether the sin against the Holy Ghost
is the same as the sin committed through certain malice?*

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that the sin against the Holy Ghost is not the same as the sin committed through certain malice. Because the sin against the Holy Ghost is the sin of blasphemy, according to ⁴¹²⁹Matthew 12:32. But not every sin committed through certain malice is a sin of blasphemy: since many other kinds of sin may be committed through certain malice. Therefore the sin against the Holy Ghost is not the same as the sin committed through certain malice.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the sin committed through certain malice is condivided with sin committed through ignorance, and sin committed through weakness: whereas the sin against the Holy Ghost is condivided with the sin against the Son of Man (⁴¹²⁹Matthew 12:32). Therefore the sin against the Holy Ghost is not the same as the sin

committed through certain malice, since things whose opposites differ, are themselves different.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the sin against the Holy Ghost is itself a generic sin, having its own determinate species: whereas sin committed through certain malice is not a special kind of sin, but a condition or general circumstance of sin, which can affect any kind of sin at all. Therefore the sin against the Holy Ghost is not the same as the sin committed through certain malice.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The Master says (Sent. ii, D, 43) that “to sin against the Holy Ghost is to take pleasure in the malice of sin for its own sake.” Now this is to sin through certain malice. Therefore it seems that the sin committed through certain malice is the same as the sin against the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Three meanings have been given to the sin against the Holy Ghost. For the earlier doctors, viz. Athanasius (Super Matth. xii, 32), Hilary (Can. xii in Matth.), Ambrose (Super Luc. xii, 10), Jerome (Super Matth. xii), and Chrysostom (Hom. xli in Matth.), say that the sin against the Holy Ghost is literally to utter a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit, whether by Holy Spirit we understand the essential name applicable to the whole Trinity, each Person of which is a Spirit and is holy, or the personal name of one of the Persons of the Trinity, in which sense blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is distinct from the blasphemy against the Son of Man (⁴⁰²⁹Matthew 12:32), for Christ did certain things in respect of His human nature, by eating, drinking, and such like actions, while He did others in respect of His Godhead, by casting out devils, raising the dead, and the like: which things He did both by the power of His own Godhead and by the operation of the Holy Ghost, of Whom He was full, according to his human nature. Now the Jews began by speaking blasphemy against the Son of Man, when they said (⁴⁰¹⁸Matthew 11:19) that He was “a glutton... a wine drinker,” and a “friend of publicans”: but afterwards they blasphemed against the Holy Ghost, when they ascribed to the prince of devils those works which Christ did by the power of His own Divine Nature and by the operation of the Holy Ghost.

Augustine, however (De Verb. Dom., Serm. lxxi), says that blasphemy or the sin against the Holy Ghost, is final impenitence when, namely, a man

perseveres in mortal sin until death, and that it is not confined to utterance by word of mouth, but extends to words in thought and deed, not to one word only, but to many. Now this word, in this sense, is said to be uttered against the Holy Ghost, because it is contrary to the remission of sins, which is the work of the Holy Ghost, Who is the charity both of the Father and of the Son. Nor did Our Lord say this to the Jews, as though they had sinned against the Holy Ghost, since they were not yet guilty of final impenitence, but He warned them, lest by similar utterances they should come to sin against the Holy Ghost: and it is in this sense that we are to understand ⁴¹⁹Mark 3:29,30, where after Our Lord had said: “But he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost,” etc. the Evangelist adds, “because they said: He hath an unclean spirit.”

But others understand it differently, and say that the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, is a sin committed against that good which is appropriated to the Holy Ghost: because goodness is appropriated to the Holy Ghost, just a power is appropriated to the Father, and wisdom to the Son. Hence they say that when a man sins through weakness, it is a sin “against the Father”; that when he sins through ignorance, it is a sin “against the Son”; and that when he sins through certain malice, i.e. through the very choosing of evil, as explained above (**P(2a), Q(78), AA(1),3**), it is a sin “against the Holy Ghost.”

Now this may happen in two ways. First by reason of the very inclination of a vicious habit which we call malice, and, in this way, to sin through malice is not the same as to sin against the Holy Ghost. In another way it happens that by reason of contempt, that which might have prevented the choosing of evil, is rejected or removed; thus hope is removed by despair, and fear by presumption, and so on, as we shall explain further on (**QQ(20),21**). Now all these things which prevent the choosing of sin are effects of the Holy Ghost in us; so that, in this sense, to sin through malice is to sin against the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(1)-RO(1) — Just as the confession of faith consists in a protestation not only of words but also of deeds, so blasphemy against the Holy Ghost can be uttered in word, thought and deed.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(1)-RO(2) — According to the third interpretation, blasphemy against the Holy Ghost is condivided with blasphemy against

the Son of Man, forasmuch as He is also the Son of God, i.e. the “power of God and the wisdom of God” (^{<40124>}1 Corinthians 1:24). Wherefore, in this sense, the sin against the Son of Man will be that which is committed through ignorance, or through weakness.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(1)-RO(3) — Sin committed through certain malice, in so far as it results from the inclination of a habit, is not a special sin, but a general condition of sin: whereas, in so far as it results from a special contempt of an effect of the Holy Ghost in us, it has the character of a special sin. According to this interpretation the sin against the Holy Ghost is a special kind of sin, as also according to the first interpretation: whereas according to the second, it is not a species of sin, because final impenitence may be a circumstance of any kind of sin.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(2)

Whether it is fitting to distinguish six kinds of sin against the Holy Ghost?

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem unfitting to distinguish six kinds of sin against the Holy Ghost, viz. despair, presumption, impenitence, obstinacy, resisting the known truth, envy of our brother’s spiritual good, which are assigned by the Master (Sent. ii, D, 43). For to deny God’s justice or mercy belongs to unbelief. Now, by despair, a man rejects God’s mercy, and by presumption, His justice. Therefore each of these is a kind of unbelief rather than of the sin against the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, impenitence, seemingly, regards past sins, while obstinacy regards future sins. Now past and future time do not diversify the species of virtues or vices, since it is the same faith whereby we believe that Christ was born, and those of old believed that He would be born. Therefore obstinacy and impenitence should not be reckoned as two species of sin against the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, “grace and truth came by Jesus Christ” (^{<40117>}John 1:17). Therefore it seem that resistance of the known truth, and envy of a brother’s spiritual good, belong to blasphemy against the Son rather than against the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, Bernard says (De Dispens. et Praecept. xi) that “to refuse to obey is to resist the Holy Ghost.” Moreover a gloss on ^{
}Leviticus 10:16, says that “a feigned repentance is a blasphemy against the Holy Ghost.” Again, schism is, seemingly, directly opposed to the Holy Ghost by Whom the Church is united together. Therefore it seems that the species of sins against the Holy Ghost are insufficiently enumerated.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine [*Fulgentius] (De Fide ad Petrum iii) says that “those who despair of pardon for their sins, or who without merits presume on God’s mercy, sin against the Holy Ghost,” and (Enchiridion lxxxiii) that “he who dies in a state of obstinacy is guilty of the sin against the Holy Ghost,” and (De Verb. Dom., Sermon. lxxi) that “impenitence is a sin against the Holy Ghost,” and (De Sermon. Dom. in Monte xxii), that “to resist fraternal goodness with the brands of envy is to sin against the Holy Ghost,” and in his book De unico Baptismo (De Bap. contra Donat. vi, 35) he says that “a man who spurns the truth, is either envious of his brethren to whom the truth is revealed, or ungrateful to God, by Whose inspiration the Church is taught,” and therefore, seemingly, sins against the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(2) — *I answer that*, The above species are fittingly assigned to the sin against the Holy Ghost taken in the third sense, because they are distinguished in respect of the removal of contempt of those things whereby a man can be prevented from sinning through choice. These things are either on the part of God’s judgment, or on the part of His gifts, or on the part of sin. For, by consideration of the Divine judgment, wherein justice is accompanied with mercy, man is hindered from sinning through choice, both by hope, arising from the consideration of the mercy that pardons sins and rewards good deeds, which hope is removed by “despair”; and by fear, arising from the consideration of the Divine justice that punishes sins, which fear is removed by “presumption,” when, namely, a man presumes that he can obtain glory without merits, or pardon without repentance.

God’s gifts whereby we are withdrawn from sin, are two: one is the acknowledgment of the truth, against which there is the “resistance of the known truth,” when, namely, a man resists the truth which he has

acknowledged, in order to sin more freely: while the other is the assistance of inward grace, against which there is “envy of a brother’s spiritual good,” when, namely, a man is envious not only of his brother’s person, but also of the increase of Divine grace in the world.

On the part of sin, there are two things which may withdraw man therefrom: one is the inordinateness and shamefulness of the act, the consideration of which is wont to arouse man to repentance for the sin he has committed, and against this there is “impenitence,” not as denoting permanence in sin until death, in which sense it was taken above (for thus it would not be a special sin, but a circumstance of sin), but as denoting the purpose of not repenting. The other thing is the smallness or brevity of the good which is sought in sin, according to ~~ROM~~ Romans 6:21:

“What fruit had you therefore then in those things, of which you are now ashamed?”

The consideration of this is wont to prevent man’s will from being hardened in sin, and this is removed by “obstinacy,” whereby man hardens his purpose by clinging to sin. Of these two it is written (~~ROM~~ Jeremiah 8:6): “There is none that doth penance for his sin, saying: What have I done?” as regards the first; and, “They are all turned to their own course, as a horse rushing to the battle,” as regards the second.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(2)-RO(1) — The sins of despair and presumption consist, not in disbelieving in God’s justice and mercy, but in contemning them.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(2)-RO(2) — Obstinacy and impenitence differ not only in respect of past and future time, but also in respect of certain formal aspects by reason of the diverse consideration of those things which may be considered in sin, as explained above.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(2)-RO(3) — Grace and truth were the work of Christ through the gifts of the Holy Ghost which He gave to men.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(2)-RO(4) — To refuse to obey belongs to obstinacy, while a feigned repentance belongs to impenitence, and schism to the envy of a brother’s spiritual good, whereby the members of the Church are united together.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(3)

Whether the sin against the Holy Ghost can be forgiven?

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that the sin against the Holy Ghost can be forgiven. For Augustine says (De Verb. Dom., Sermon lxxi): “We should despair of no man, so long as Our Lord’s patience brings him back to repentance.” But if any sin cannot be forgiven, it would be possible to despair of some sinners. Therefore the sin against the Holy Ghost can be forgiven.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, no sin is forgiven, except through the soul being healed by God. But “no disease is incurable to an all-powerful physician,” as a gloss says on ^{<BAPT}Psalm 102:3, “Who healeth all thy diseases.” Therefore the sin against the Holy Ghost can be forgiven.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the free-will is indifferent to either good or evil. Now, so long as man is a wayfarer, he can fall away from any virtue, since even an angel fell from heaven, wherefore it is written (^{<RHIS} Job 4:18,19):

“In His angels He found wickedness: how much more shall they
that dwell in houses of clay?”

Therefore, in like manner, a man can return from any sin to the state of justice. Therefore the sin against the Holy Ghost can be forgiven.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<ADZ} Matthew 12:32):

“He that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be
forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in the world to come”

and Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte i, 22) that “so great is the downfall of this sin that it cannot submit to the humiliation of asking for pardon.”

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(3) — *I answer that*, According to the various interpretations of the sin against the Holy Ghost, there are various ways in which it may be said that it cannot be forgiven. For if by the sin against the Holy Ghost we understand final impenitence, it is said to be unpardonable, since in no way is it pardoned: because the mortal sin wherein a man

perseveres until death will not be forgiven in the life to come, since it was not remitted by repentance in this life.

According to the other two interpretations, it is said to be unpardonable, not as though it is nowise forgiven, but because, considered in itself, it deserves not to be pardoned: and this in two ways. First, as regards the punishment, since he that sins through ignorance or weakness, deserves less punishment, whereas he that sins through certain malice, can offer no excuse in alleviation of his punishment. Likewise those who blasphemed against the Son of Man before His Godhead was revealed, could have some excuse, on account of the weakness of the flesh which they perceived in Him, and hence, they deserved less punishment; whereas those who blasphemed against His very Godhead, by ascribing to the devil the works of the Holy Ghost, had no excuse in diminution of their punishment. Wherefore, according to Chrysostom's commentary (Hom. xlii in Matth.), the Jews are said not to be forgiven this sin, neither in this world nor in the world to come, because they were punished for it, both in the present life, through the Romans, and in the life to come, in the pains of hell. Thus also Athanasius adduces the example of their forefathers who, first of all, wrangled with Moses on account of the shortage of water and bread; and this the Lord bore with patience, because they were to be excused on account of the weakness of the flesh: but afterwards they sinned more grievously when, by ascribing to an idol the favors bestowed by God Who had brought them out of Egypt, they blasphemed, so to speak, against the Holy Ghost, saying (^{ⲉⲃⲣⲁ}Exodus 32:4): "These are thy gods, O Israel, that have brought thee out of the land of Egypt." Therefore the Lord both inflicted temporal punishment on them, since "there were slain on that day about three and twenty thousand men" (^{ⲉⲃⲣⲁ}Exodus 32:28), and threatened them with punishment in the life to come, saying, (^{ⲉⲃⲣⲁ}Exodus 32:34): "I, in the day of revenge, will visit this sin... of theirs."

Secondly, this may be understood to refer to the guilt: thus a disease is said to be incurable in respect of the nature of the disease, which removes whatever might be a means of cure, as when it takes away the power of nature, or causes loathing for food and medicine, although God is able to cure such a disease. So too, the sin against the Holy Ghost is said to be unpardonable, by reason of its nature, in so far as it removes those things which are a means towards the pardon of sins. This does not, however,

close the way of forgiveness and healing to an all-powerful and merciful God, Who, sometimes, by a miracle, so to speak, restores spiritual health to such men.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(3)-RO(1) — We should despair of no man in this life, considering God's omnipotence and mercy. But if we consider the circumstances of sin, some are called (⁴⁰⁰Ephesians 2:2) "children of despair" [*'Filios diffidentiae,' which the Douay version renders 'children of unbelief.'].].

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(3)-RO(2) — This argument considers the question on the part of God's omnipotence, not on that of the circumstances of sin.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(3)-RO(3) — In this life the free-will does indeed ever remain subject to change: yet sometimes it rejects that whereby, so far as it is concerned, it can be turned to good. Hence considered in itself this sin is unpardonable, although God can pardon it.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(4)

Whether a man can sin first of all against the Holy Ghost?

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that a man cannot sin first of all against the Holy Ghost, without having previously committed other sins. For the natural order requires that one should be moved to perfection from imperfection. This is evident as regards good things, according to ⁴⁰⁰Proverbs 4:18:

“The path of the just, as a shining light, goeth forwards and
increases even to perfect day.”

Now, in evil things, the perfect is the greatest evil, as the Philosopher states (Metaph. v, text. 21). Since then the sin against the Holy Ghost is the most grievous sin, it seems that man comes to commit this sin through committing lesser sins.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, to sin against the Holy Ghost is to sin through certain malice, or through choice. Now man cannot do this until he has sinned many times; for the Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 6,9) that “although a man is able to do unjust deeds, yet he cannot all at once do

them as an unjust man does,” viz. from choice. Therefore it seems that the sin against the Holy Ghost cannot be committed except after other sins.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, repentance and impenitence are about the same object. But there is no repentance, except about past sins. Therefore the same applies to impenitence which is a species of the sin against the Holy Ghost. Therefore the sin against the Holy Ghost presupposes other sins.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, “It is easy in the eyes of God on a sudden to make a poor man rich” (Ecclus. 11:23). Therefore, conversely, it is possible for a man, according to the malice of the devil who tempts him, to be led to commit the most grievous of sins which is that against the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), in one way, to sin against the Holy Ghost is to sin through certain malice. Now one may sin through certain malice in two ways, as stated in the same place: first, through the inclination of a habit; but this is not, properly speaking, to sin against the Holy Ghost, nor does a man come to commit this sin all at once, in as much as sinful acts must precede so as to cause the habit that induces to sin. Secondly, one may sin through certain malice, by contemptuously rejecting the things whereby a man is withdrawn from sin. This is, properly speaking, to sin against the Holy Ghost, as stated above (**A(1)**); and this also, for the most part, presupposes other sins, for it is written (¹⁸⁷⁸ Proverbs 18:3) that “the wicked man, when he is come into the depth of sins, contemneth.”

Nevertheless it is possible for a man, in his first sinful act, to sin against the Holy Ghost by contempt, both on account of his free-will, and on account of the many previous dispositions, or again, through being vehemently moved to evil, while but feebly attached to good. Hence never or scarcely ever does it happen that the perfect sin all at once against the Holy Ghost: wherefore Origen says (Peri Archon. i, 3): “I do not think that anyone who stands on the highest step of perfection, can fail or fall suddenly; this can only happen by degrees and bit by bit.”

The same applies, if the sin against the Holy Ghost be taken literally for blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. For such blasphemy as Our Lord speaks of, always proceeds from contemptuous malice.

If, however, with Augustine (De Verb. Dom., Sermon. lxxi) we understand the sin against the Holy Ghost to denote final impenitence, it does not regard the question in point, because this sin against the Holy Ghost requires persistence in sin until the end of life.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(4)-RO(1) — Movement both in good and in evil is made, for the most part, from imperfect to perfect, according as man progresses in good or evil: and yet in both cases, one man can begin from a greater (good or evil) than another man does. Consequently, that from which a man begins can be perfect in good or evil according to its genus, although it may be imperfect as regards the series of good or evil actions whereby a man progresses in good or evil.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(4)-RO(2) — This argument considers the sin which is committed through certain malice, when it proceeds from the inclination of a habit.

P(2b)-Q(14)-A(4)-RO(3) — If by impenitence we understand with Augustine (De Verb. Dom., Sermon. lxxi) persistence in sin until the end, it is clear that it presupposes sin, just as repentance does. If, however, we take it for habitual impenitence, in which sense it is a sin against the Holy Ghost, it is evident that it can precede sin: for it is possible for a man who has never sinned to have the purpose either of repenting or of not repenting, if he should happen to sin.

QUESTION 15

OF THE VICES OPPOSED TO KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING

(THREE ARTICLES)

We must now consider the vices opposed to knowledge and understanding. Since, however, we have treated of ignorance which is opposed to knowledge, when we were discussing the causes of sins (**P(2a), Q[76]**), we must now inquire about blindness of mind and dulness of sense, which are opposed to the gift of understanding; and under this head there are three points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether blindness of mind is a sin?
- (2) Whether dulness of sense is a sin distinct from blindness of mind?
- (3) Whether these vices arise from sins of the flesh?

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(1)

Whether blindness of mind is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that blindness of mind is not a sin. Because, seemingly, that which excuses from sin is not itself a sin. Now blindness of mind excuses from sin; for it is written (~~289~~ John 9:41): “If you were blind, you should not have sin.” Therefore blindness of mind is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, punishment differs from guilt. But blindness of mind is a punishment as appears from ~~290~~ Isaiah 6:10, “Blind the heart of this people,” for, since it is an evil, it could not be from God, were it not a punishment. Therefore blindness of mind is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, every sin is voluntary, according to Augustine (De Vera Relig. xiv). Now blindness of mind is not voluntary, since, as Augustine says (Confess. x), “all love to know the resplendent

truth,” and as we read in ^{<2110>}Ecclesiastes 11:7, “the light is sweet and it is delightful for the eyes to see the sun.” Therefore blindness of mind is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45) reckons blindness of mind among the vices arising from lust.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Just as bodily blindness is the privation of the principle of bodily sight, so blindness of mind is the privation of the principle of mental or intellectual sight. Now this has a threefold principle. One is the light of natural reason, which light, since it pertains to the species of the rational soul, is never forfeit from the soul, and yet, at times, it is prevented from exercising its proper act, through being hindered by the lower powers which the human intellect needs in order to understand, for instance in the case of imbeciles and madmen, as stated in the **P(1) Q(84), AA(7),8.**

Another principle of intellectual sight is a certain habitual light superadded to the natural light of reason, which light is sometimes forfeit from the soul. This privation is blindness, and is a punishment, in so far as the privation of the light of grace is a punishment. Hence it is written concerning some (Wis. 2:21): “Their own malice blinded them.”

A third principle of intellectual sight is an intelligible principle, through which a man understands other things; to which principle a man may attend or not attend. That he does not attend thereto happens in two ways. Sometimes it is due to the fact that a man’s will is deliberately turned away from the consideration of that principle, according to ^{<4810>}Psalms 35:4, “He would not understand, that he might do well”: whereas sometimes it is due to the mind being more busy about things which it loves more, so as to be hindered thereby from considering this principle, according to ^{<4500>}Psalms 57:9, “Fire,” i.e. of concupiscence, “hath fallen on them and they shall not see the sun.” In either of these ways blindness of mind is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(1)-RO(1) — The blindness that excuses from sin is that which arises from the natural defect of one who cannot see.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(1)-RO(2) — This argument considers the second kind of blindness which is a punishment.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(1)-RO(3) — To understand the truth is, in itself, beloved by all; and yet, accidentally it may be hateful to someone, in so far as a man is hindered thereby from having what he loves yet more.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(2)

*Whether dulness of sense is a sin distinct
from blindness of mind?*

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that dulness of sense is not a distinct sin from blindness of mind. Because one thing has one contrary. Now dulness is opposed to the gift of understanding, according to Gregory (Moral. ii, 49); and so is blindness of mind, since understanding denotes a principle of sight. Therefore dulness of sense is the same as blindness of mind.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45) in speaking of dulness describes it as “dulness of sense in respect of understanding.” Now dulness of sense in respect of understanding seems to be the same as a defect in understanding, which pertains to blindness of mind. Therefore dulness of sense is the same as blindness of mind.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, if they differ at all, it seems to be chiefly in the fact that blindness of mind is voluntary, as stated above (**A(1)**), while dulness of sense is a natural defect. But a natural defect is not a sin: so that, accordingly, dulness of sense would not be a sin, which is contrary to what Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 45), where he reckons it among the sins arising from gluttony.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Different causes produce different effects. Now Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 45) that dulness of sense arises from gluttony, and that blindness of mind arises from lust. Now these others are different vices. Therefore those are different vices also.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Dull is opposed to sharp: and a thing is said to be sharp because it can pierce; so that a thing is called dull through being obtuse and unable to pierce. Now a bodily sense, by a kind of metaphor, is said to pierce the medium, in so far as it perceives its object from a distance or is able by penetration as it were to perceive the

smallest details or the inmost parts of a thing. Hence in corporeal things the senses are said to be acute when they can perceive a sensible object from afar, by sight, hearing, or scent, while on the other hand they are said to be dull, through being unable to perceive, except sensible objects that are near at hand, or of great power.

Now, by way of similitude to bodily sense, we speak of sense in connection with the intellect; and this latter sense is in respect of certain primals and extremes, as stated in *Ethic. vi*, even as the senses are cognizant of sensible objects as of certain principles of knowledge. Now this sense which is connected with understanding, does not perceive its object through a medium of corporeal distance, but through certain other media, as, for instance, when it perceives a thing's essence through a property thereof, and the cause through its effect. Consequently a man is said to have an acute sense in connection with his understanding, if, as soon as he apprehends a property or effect of a thing, he understands the nature or the thing itself, and if he can succeed in perceiving its slightest details: whereas a man is said to have a dull sense in connection with his understanding, if he cannot arrive at knowing the truth about a thing, without many explanations; in which case, moreover, he is unable to obtain a perfect perception of everything pertaining to the nature of that thing.

Accordingly dulness of sense in connection with understanding denotes a certain weakness of the mind as to the consideration of spiritual goods; while blindness of mind implies the complete privation of the knowledge of such things. Both are opposed to the gift of understanding, whereby a man knows spiritual goods by apprehending them, and has a subtle penetration of their inmost nature. This dulness has the character of sin, just as blindness of mind has, that is, in so far as it is voluntary, as evidenced in one who, owing to his affection for carnal things, dislikes or neglects the careful consideration of spiritual things.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(3)

Whether blindness of mind and dulness of sense arise from sins of the flesh?

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that blindness of mind and dulness of sense do not arise from sins of the flesh. For Augustine (Retract. i, 4) retracts what he had said in his Soliloquies i, 1, “God Who didst wish none but the clean to know the truth,” and says that one might reply that “many, even those who are unclean, know many truths.” Now men become unclean chiefly by sins of the flesh. Therefore blindness of mind and dulness of sense are not caused by sins of the flesh.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, blindness of mind and dulness of sense are defects in connection with the intellective part of the soul: whereas carnal sins pertain to the corruption of the flesh. But the flesh does not act on the soul, but rather the reverse. Therefore the sins of the flesh do not cause blindness of mind and dulness of sense.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, all things are more passive to what is near them than to what is remote. Now spiritual vices are nearer the mind than carnal vices are. Therefore blindness of mind and dulness of sense are caused by spiritual rather than by carnal vices.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 45) that dulness of sense arises from gluttony and blindness of mind from lust.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(3) — *I answer that*, The perfect intellectual operation in man consists in an abstraction from sensible phantasms, wherefore the more a man’s intellect is freed from those phantasms, the more thoroughly will it be able to consider things intelligible, and to set in order all things sensible. Thus Anaxagoras stated that the intellect requires to be “detached” in order to command, and that the agent must have power over matter, in order to be able to move it. Now it is evident that pleasure fixes a man’s attention on that which he takes pleasure in: wherefore the Philosopher says (Ethic. x, 4,5) that we all do best that which we take pleasure in doing, while as to other things, we do them either not at all, or in a faint-hearted fashion.

Now carnal vices, namely gluttony and lust, are concerned with pleasures of touch in matters of food and sex; and these are the most impetuous of all pleasures of the body. For this reason these vices cause man's attention to be very firmly fixed on corporeal things, so that in consequence man's operation in regard to intelligible things is weakened, more, however, by lust than by gluttony, forasmuch as sexual pleasures are more vehement than those of the table. Wherefore lust gives rise to blindness of mind, which excludes almost entirely the knowledge of spiritual things, while dulness of sense arises from gluttony, which makes a man weak in regard to the same intelligible things. On the other hand, the contrary virtues, viz. abstinence and chastity, dispose man very much to the perfection of intellectual operation. Hence it is written (²⁰¹⁷ Daniel 1:17) that "to these children" on account of their abstinence and continency, "God gave knowledge and understanding in every book, and wisdom."

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(3)-RO(1) — Although some who are the slaves of carnal vices are at times capable of subtle considerations about intelligible things, on account of the perfection of their natural genius, or of some habit superadded thereto, nevertheless, on account of the pleasures of the body, it must needs happen that their attention is frequently withdrawn from this subtle contemplation: wherefore the unclean can know some truths, but their uncleanness is a clog on their knowledge.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(3)-RO(2) — The flesh acts on the intellective faculties, not by altering them, but by impeding their operation in the aforesaid manner.

P(2b)-Q(15)-A(3)-RO(3) — It is owing to the fact that the carnal vices are further removed from the mind, that they distract the mind's attention to more remote things, so that they hinder the mind's contemplation all the more.

QUESTION 16

OF THE PRECEPTS OF FAITH, KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the precepts pertaining to the aforesaid, and under this head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) The precepts concerning faith;
- (2) The precepts concerning the gifts of knowledge and understanding.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1)

Whether in the Old Law there should have been given precepts of faith?

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that, in the Old Law, there should have been given precepts of faith. Because a precept is about something due and necessary. Now it is most necessary for man that he should believe, according to ^{<5910>}Hebrews 11:6, “Without faith it is impossible to please God.” Therefore there was very great need for precepts of faith to be given.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the New Testament is contained in the Old, as the reality in the figure, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(107)**, **A(3)**). Now the New Testament contains explicit precepts of faith, for instance ^{<5941>}John 14:1: “You believe in God; believe also in Me.” Therefore it seems that some precepts of faith ought to have been given in the Old Law also.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, to prescribe the act of a virtue comes to the same as to forbid the opposite vices. Now the Old Law contained many precepts forbidding unbelief: thus (^{<0208>}Exodus 20:3): “Thou shalt not have strange gods before Me,” and (^{<0531>}Deuteronomy 13:1-3) they were forbidden to hear the words of the prophet or dreamer who might wish to

turn them away from their faith in God. Therefore precepts of faith should have been given in the Old Law also.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, confession is an act of faith, as stated above (**Q(3), A(1)**). Now the Old Law contained precepts about the confession and the promulgation of faith: for they were commanded (^{<1227>}Exodus 12:27) that, when their children should ask them, they should tell them the meaning of the paschal observance, and (^{<1319>}Deuteronomy 13:9) they were commanded to slay anyone who disseminated doctrine contrary to faith. Therefore the Old Law should have contained precepts of faith.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, all the books of the Old Testament are contained in the Old Law; wherefore Our Lord said (^{<1525>}John 15:25) that it was written in the Law: “They have hated Me without cause,” although this is found written in ^{<1801>}Psalms 34 and ^{<1861>}68. Now it is written (Ecclus. 2:8): “Ye that fear the Lord, believe Him.” Therefore the Old Law should have contained precepts of faith.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle (^{<1857>}Romans 3:27) calls the Old Law the “law of works” which he contrasts with the “law of faith.” Therefore the Old Law ought not to have contained precepts of faith.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1) — *I answer that*, A master does not impose laws on others than his subjects; wherefore the precepts of a law presuppose that everyone who receives the law is subject to the giver of the law. Now the primary subjection of man to God is by faith, according to ^{<1811>}Hebrews 11:6: “He that cometh to God, must believe that He is.” Hence faith is presupposed to the precepts of the Law: for which reason (^{<1210>}Exodus 20:2) that which is of faith, is set down before the legal precepts, in the words, “I am the Lord thy God, Who brought thee out of the land of Egypt,” and, likewise (^{<1811>}Deuteronomy 6:4), the words, “Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy [Vulg.: ‘our’] God is one,” precede the recording of the precepts.

Since, however, faith contains many things subordinate to the faith whereby we believe that God is, which is the first and chief of all articles of faith, as stated above (**Q(1), AA(1),7**), it follows that, if we presuppose

faith in God, whereby man's mind is subjected to Him, it is possible for precepts to be given about other articles of faith. Thus Augustine expounding the words: "This is My commandment" (~~John~~ John 15:12) says (Tract. lxxxiii in Joan.) that we have received many precepts of faith. In the Old Law, however, the secret things of faith were not to be set before the people, wherefore, presupposing their faith in one God, no other precepts of faith were given in the Old Law.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1)-RO(1) — Faith is necessary as being the principle of spiritual life, wherefore it is presupposed before the receiving of the Law.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1)-RO(2) — Even then Our Lord both presupposed something of faith, namely belief in one God, when He said: "You believe in God," and commanded something, namely, belief in the Incarnation whereby one Person is God and man. This explanation of faith belongs to the faith of the New Testament, wherefore He added: "Believe also in Me."

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1)-RO(3) — The prohibitive precepts regard sins, which corrupt virtue. Now virtue is corrupted by any particular defect, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(18)**, **A(4)**, ad 3; **P(2a)**, **Q(19)**, **A(6)**, ad 1, **A(7)**, ad 3). Therefore faith in one God being presupposed, prohibitive precepts had to be given in the Old Law, so that men might be warned off those particular defects whereby their faith might be corrupted.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1)-RO(4) — Confession of faith and the teaching thereof also presuppose man's submission to God by faith: so that the Old Law could contain precepts relating to the confession and teaching of faith, rather than to faith itself.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(1)-RO(5) — In this passage again that faith is presupposed whereby we believe that God is; hence it begins, "Ye that fear the Lord," which is not possible without faith. The words which follow — "believe Him" — must be referred to certain special articles of faith, chiefly to those things which God promises to them that obey Him, wherefore the passage concludes — "and your reward shall not be made void."

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(2)

Whether the precepts referring to knowledge and understanding were fittingly set down in the Old Law?

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the precepts referring to knowledge and understanding were unfittingly set down in the Old Law. For knowledge and understanding pertain to cognition. Now cognition precedes and directs action. Therefore the precepts referring to knowledge and understanding should precede the precepts of the Law referring to action. Since, then, the first precepts of the Law are those of the decalogue, it seems that precepts of knowledge and understanding should have been given a place among the precepts of the decalogue.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, learning precedes teaching, for a man must learn from another before he teaches another. Now the Old Law contains precepts about teaching — both affirmative precepts as, for example, (^{<600>}Deuteronomy 4:9), “Thou shalt teach them to thy sons” — and prohibitive precepts, as, for instance, (^{<600>}Deuteronomy 4:2),

“You shall not add to the word that I speak to you, neither shall you take away from it.”

Therefore it seems that man ought to have been given also some precepts directing him to learn.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, knowledge and understanding seem more necessary to a priest than to a king, wherefore it is written (^{<3000>}Malachi 2:7): “The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the law at his mouth,” and (^{<3000>}Hosea 4:6):

“Because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will reject thee, that thou shalt not do the office of priesthood to Me.”

Now the king is commanded to learn knowledge of the Law (^{<678>}Deuteronomy 17:18,19). Much more therefore should the Law have commanded the priests to learn the Law.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, it is not possible while asleep to meditate on things pertaining to knowledge and understanding: moreover it

is hindered by extraneous occupations. Therefore it is unfittingly commanded (~~CRUX~~ Deuteronomy 6:7):

“Thou shalt meditate upon them sitting in thy house, and walking on thy journey, sleeping and rising.”

Therefore the precepts relating to knowledge and understanding are unfittingly set down in the Law.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~CRUX~~ Deuteronomy 4:6):

“That, hearing all these precepts, they may say, Behold a wise and understanding people.”

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Three things may be considered in relation to knowledge and understanding: first, the reception thereof; secondly, the use; and thirdly, their preservation. Now the reception of knowledge or understanding, is by means of teaching and learning, and both are prescribed in the Law. For it is written (~~CRUX~~ Deuteronomy 6:6): “These words which I command thee... shall be in thy heart.” This refers to learning, since it is the duty of a disciple to apply his mind to what is said, while the words that follow — “and thou shalt tell them to thy children” — refer to teaching.

The use of knowledge and understanding is the meditation on those things which one knows or understands. In reference to this, the text goes on: “thou shalt meditate upon them sitting in thy house,” etc.

Their preservation is effected by the memory, and, as regards this, the text continues — “and thou shalt bind them as a sign on thy hand, and they shall be and shall move between thy eyes. And thou shalt write them in the entry, and on the doors of thy house.” Thus the continual remembrance of God’s commandments is signified, since it is impossible for us to forget those things which are continually attracting the notice of our senses, whether by touch, as those things we hold in our hands, or by sight, as those things which are ever before our eyes, or to which we are continually returning, for instance, to the house door. Moreover it is clearly stated (~~CRUX~~ Deuteronomy 4:9):

“Forget not the words that thy eyes have seen and let them not go out of thy heart all the days of thy life.”

We read of these things also being commanded more notably in the New Testament, both in the teaching of the Gospel and in that of the apostles.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(2)-RO(1) — According to ~~Deut~~ Deuteronomy 4:6, “this is your wisdom and understanding in the sight of the nations.” By this we are given to understand that the wisdom and understanding of those who believe in God consist in the precepts of the Law. Wherefore the precepts of the Law had to be given first, and afterwards men had to be led to know and understand them, and so it was not fitting that the aforesaid precepts should be placed among the precepts of the decalogue which take the first place.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(2)-RO(2) — There are also in the Law precepts relating to learning, as stated above. Nevertheless teaching was commanded more expressly than learning, because it concerned the learned, who were not under any other authority, but were immediately under the law, and to them the precepts of the Law were given. On the other hand learning concerned the people of lower degree, and these the precepts of the Law have to reach through the learned.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(2)-RO(3) — Knowledge of the Law is so closely bound up with the priestly office that being charged with the office implies being charged to know the Law: hence there was no need for special precepts to be given about the training of the priests. On the other hand, the doctrine of God’s law is not so bound up with the kingly office, because a king is placed over his people in temporal matters: hence it is especially commanded that the king should be instructed by the priests about things pertaining to the law of God.

P(2b)-Q(16)-A(2)-RO(4) — That precept of the Law does not mean that man should meditate on God’s law of sleeping, but during sleep, i.e. that he should meditate on the law of God when he is preparing to sleep, because this leads to his having better phantasms while asleep, in so far as our movements pass from the state of vigil to the state of sleep, as the Philosopher explains (Ethic. i, 13). In like manner we are commanded to meditate on the Law in every action of ours, not that we are bound to be always actually thinking about the Law, but that we should regulate all our actions according to it.

ON HOPE

QUESTIONS 17-22

QUESTION 17

OF HOPE, CONSIDERED IN ITSELF

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

After treating of faith, we must consider hope and

- (1) hope itself;
- (2) the gift of fear;
- (3) the contrary vices;
- (4) the corresponding precepts.

The first of these points gives rise to a twofold consideration:

- (1) hope, considered in itself;
- (2) its subject.

Under the first head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether hope is a virtue?
- (2) Whether its object is eternal happiness?
- (3) Whether, by the virtue of hope, one man may hope for another's happiness?
- (4) Whether a man may lawfully hope in man?
- (5) Whether hope is a theological virtue?
- (6) Of its distinction from the other theological virtues?

(7) Of its relation to faith;

(8) Of its relation to charity.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(1)

Whether hope is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that hope is not a virtue. For “no man makes ill use of a virtue,” as Augustine states (De Lib. Arb. ii, 18). But one may make ill use of hope, since the passion of hope, like the other passions, is subject to a mean and extremes. Therefore hope is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, no virtue results from merits, since “God works virtue in us without us,” as Augustine states (De Grat. et Lib. Arb. xvii). But hope is caused by grace and merits, according to the Master (Sent. iii, D, 26). Therefore hope is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, “virtue is the disposition of a perfect thing” (Phys. vii, text. 17,18). But hope is the disposition of an imperfect thing, of one, namely, that lacks what it hopes to have. Therefore hope is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. i, 33) that the three daughters of Job signify these three virtues, faith, hope and charity. Therefore hope is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(1) — *I answer that*, According to the Philosopher (Ethic. ii, 6) “the virtue of a thing is that which makes its subject good, and its work good likewise.” Consequently wherever we find a good human act, it must correspond to some human virtue. Now in all things measured and ruled, the good is that which attains its proper rule: thus we say that a coat is good if it neither exceeds nor falls short of its proper measurement. But, as we stated above (**Q(8), A(3)**, ad 3) human acts have a twofold measure; one is proximate and homogeneous, viz. the reason, while the other is remote and excelling, viz. God: wherefore every human act is good, which attains reason or God Himself. Now the act of hope, whereof we speak now, attains God. For, as we have already stated (**P(2a), Q(40), A(1)**),

when we were treating of the passion of hope, the object of hope is a future good, difficult but possible to obtain. Now a thing is possible to us in two ways: first, by ourselves; secondly, by means of others, as stated in Ethic. 3: Wherefore, in so far as we hope for anything as being possible to us by means of the Divine assistance, our hope attains God Himself, on Whose help it leans. It is therefore evident that hope is a virtue, since it causes a human act to be good and to attain its due rule.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(1)-RO(1) — In the passions, the mean of virtue depends on right reason being attained, wherein also consists the essence of virtue. Wherefore in hope too, the good of virtue depends on a man's attaining, by hoping, the due rule, viz. God. Consequently man cannot make ill use of hope which attains God, as neither can he make ill use of moral virtue which attains the reason, because to attain thus is to make good use of virtue. Nevertheless, the hope of which we speak now, is not a passion but a habit of the mind, as we shall show further on (**A(5); Q(18), A(1)**).

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(1)-RO(2) — Hope is said to arise from merits, as regards the thing hoped for, in so far as we hope to obtain happiness by means of grace and merits; or as regards the act of living hope. The habit itself of hope, whereby we hope to obtain happiness, does not flow from our merits, but from grace alone.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(1)-RO(3) — He who hopes is indeed imperfect in relation to that which he hopes to obtain, but has not as yet; yet he is perfect, in so far as he already attains his proper rule, viz. God, on Whose help he leans.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(2)

Whether eternal happiness is the proper object of hope?

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that eternal happiness is not the proper object of hope. For a man does not hope for that which surpasses every movement of the soul, since hope itself is a movement of the soul. Now eternal happiness surpasses every movement of the human soul, for the Apostle says (~~429~~ 1 Corinthians 2:9) that it hath not "entered into the heart of man." Therefore happiness is not the proper object of hope.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, prayer is an expression of hope, for it is written (^{<REF>}Psalm 36:5): “Commit thy way to the Lord, and trust in Him, and He will do it.” Now it is lawful for man to pray God not only for eternal happiness, but also for the goods, both temporal and spiritual, of the present life, and, as evidenced by the Lord’s Prayer, to be delivered from evils which will no longer be in eternal happiness. Therefore eternal happiness is not the proper object of hope.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the object of hope is something difficult. Now many things besides eternal happiness are difficult to man. Therefore eternal happiness is not the proper object of hope.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (^{<REF>}Hebrews 6:19) that we have hope “which entereth in,” i.e. maketh us to enter... “within the veil,” i.e. into the happiness of heaven, according to the interpretation of a gloss on these words. Therefore the object of hope is eternal happiness.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), the hope of which we speak now, attains God by leaning on His help in order to obtain the hoped for good. Now an effect must be proportionate to its cause. Wherefore the good which we ought to hope for from God properly and chiefly is the infinite good, which is proportionate to the power of our divine helper, since it belongs to an infinite power to lead anyone to an infinite good. Such a good is eternal life, which consists in the enjoyment of God Himself. For we should hope from Him for nothing less than Himself, since His goodness, whereby He imparts good things to His creature, is no less than His Essence. Therefore the proper and principal object of hope is eternal happiness.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(2)-RO(1) — Eternal happiness does not enter into the heart of man perfectly, i.e. so that it be possible for a wayfarer to know its nature and quality; yet, under the general notion of the perfect good, it is possible for it to be apprehended by a man, and it is in this way that the movement of hope towards it arises. Hence the Apostle says pointedly (^{<REF>}Hebrews 6:19) that hope “enters in, even within the veil,” because that which we hope for is as yet veiled, so to speak.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(2)-RO(2) — We ought not to pray God for any other goods, except in reference to eternal happiness. Hence hope regards eternal happiness chiefly, and other things, for which we pray God, it regards secondarily and as referred to eternal happiness: just as faith regards God principally, and, secondarily, those things which are referred to God, as stated above (**Q(1), A(1)**).

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(2)-RO(3) — To him that longs for something great, all lesser things seem small; wherefore to him that hopes for eternal happiness, nothing else appears arduous, as compared with that hope; although, as compared with the capability of the man who hopes, other things besides may be arduous to him, so that he may have hope for such things in reference to its principal object.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(3)

Whether one man may hope for another's eternal happiness?

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that one may hope for another's eternal happiness. For the Apostle says (^{<BOOK>}Philippians 1:6):

“Being confident of this very thing, that He Who hath begun a good work in you, will perfect it unto the day of Jesus Christ.”

Now the perfection of that day will be eternal happiness. Therefore one man may hope for another's eternal happiness.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, whatever we ask of God, we hope to obtain from Him. But we ask God to bring others to eternal happiness, according to ^{<BIB>}James 5:16: “Pray for one another that you may be saved.” Therefore we can hope for another's eternal happiness.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, hope and despair are about the same object. Now it is possible to despair of another's eternal happiness, else Augustine would have no reason for saying (De Verb. Dom., Sermon lxxi) that we should not despair of anyone so long as he lives. Therefore one can also hope for another's eternal salvation.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (Enchiridion viii) that “hope is only of such things as belong to him who is supposed to hope for them.”

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(3) — *I answer that*, We can hope for something in two ways: first, absolutely, and thus the object of hope is always something arduous and pertaining to the person who hopes. Secondly, we can hope for something, through something else being presupposed, and in this way its object can be something pertaining to someone else. In order to explain this we must observe that love and hope differ in this, that love denotes union between lover and beloved, while hope denotes a movement or a stretching forth of the appetite towards an arduous good. Now union is of things that are distinct, wherefore love can directly regard the other whom a man unites to himself by love, looking upon him as his other self: whereas movement is always towards its own term which is proportionate to the subject moved. Therefore hope regards directly one’s own good, and not that which pertains to another. Yet if we presuppose the union of love with another, a man can hope for and desire something for another man, as for himself; and, accordingly, he can hope for another eternal’s life, inasmuch as he is united to him by love, and just as it is the same virtue of charity whereby a man loves God, himself, and his neighbor, so too it is the same virtue of hope, whereby a man hopes for himself and for another.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(4)

Whether a man can lawfully hope in man?

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that one may lawfully hope in man. For the object of hope is eternal happiness. Now we are helped to obtain eternal happiness by the patronage of the saints, for Gregory says (Dial. i, 8) that “predestination is furthered by the saints’ prayers.” Therefore one may hope in man.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, if a man may not hope in another man, it ought not to be reckoned a sin in a man, that one should not be able to hope in him. Yet this is reckoned a vice in some, as appears from

~~2094~~ Jeremiah 9:4: “Let every man take heed of his neighbor, and let him not trust in any brother of his.” Therefore it is lawful to trust in a man.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, prayer is the expression of hope, as stated above (**A(2), O(2)**). But it is lawful to pray to a man for something. Therefore it is lawful to trust in him.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~2175~~ Jeremiah 17:5):

“Cursed be the man that trusteth in man.”

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Hope, as stated above (**A(1); P(2a), Q(40), A(7)**), regards two things, viz. the good which it intends to obtain, and the help by which that good is obtained. Now the good which a man hopes to obtain, has the aspect of a final cause, while the help by which one hopes to obtain that good, has the character of an efficient cause. Now in each of these kinds of cause we find a principal and a secondary cause. For the principal end is the last end, while the secondary end is that which is referred to an end. In like manner the principal efficient cause is the first agent, while the secondary efficient cause is the secondary and instrumental agent. Now hope regards eternal happiness as its last end, and the Divine assistance as the first cause leading to happiness.

Accordingly, just as it is not lawful to hope for any good save happiness, as one’s last end, but only as something referred to final happiness, so too, it is unlawful to hope in any man, or any creature, as though it were the first cause of movement towards happiness. It is, however, lawful to hope in a man or a creature as being the secondary and instrumental agent through whom one is helped to obtain any goods that are ordained to happiness. It is in this way that we turn to the saints, and that we ask men also for certain things; and for this reason some are blamed in that they cannot be trusted to give help.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(5)

Whether hope is a theological virtue?

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that hope is not a theological virtue. For a theological virtue is one that has God for its object. Now hope has for its object not only God but also other goods which we hope to obtain from God. Therefore hope is not a theological virtue.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, a theological virtue is not a mean between two vices, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(64)**, **A(4)**). But hope is a mean between presumption and despair. Therefore hope is not a theological virtue.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, expectation belongs to longanimity which is a species of fortitude. Since, then, hope is a kind of expectation, it seems that hope is not a theological, but a moral virtue.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(5)-O(4) — Further, the object of hope is something arduous. But it belongs to magnanimity, which is a moral virtue, to tend to the arduous. Therefore hope is a moral, and not a theological virtue.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Hope is enumerated (~~4th~~ 1 Corinthians 13) together with faith and charity, which are theological virtues.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Since specific differences, by their very nature, divide a genus, in order to decide under what division we must place hope, we must observe whence it derives its character of virtue.

Now it has been stated above (**A(1)**) that hope has the character of virtue from the fact that it attains the supreme rule of human actions: and this it attains both as its first efficient cause, in as much as it leans on its assistance, and as its last final cause, in as much as it expects happiness in the enjoyment thereof. Hence it is evident that God is the principal object of hope, considered as a virtue. Since, then, the very idea of a theological virtue is one that has God for its object, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(62)**, **A(1)**), it is evident that hope is a theological virtue.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(5)-RO(1) — Whatever else hope expects to obtain, it hopes for it in reference to God as the last end, or as the first efficient cause, as stated above (**A(4)**).

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(5)-RO(2) — In things measured and ruled the mean consists in the measure or rule being attained; if we go beyond the rule, there is excess, if we fall short of the rule, there is deficiency. But in the rule or measure itself there is no such thing as a mean or extremes. Now a moral virtue is concerned with things ruled by reason, and these things are its proper object; wherefore it is proper to it to follow the mean as regards its proper object. On the other hand, a theological virtue is concerned with the First Rule not ruled by another rule, and that Rule is its proper object. Wherefore it is not proper for a theological virtue, with regard to its proper object, to follow the mean, although this may happen to it accidentally with regard to something that is referred to its principal object. Thus faith can have no mean or extremes in the point of trusting to the First Truth, in which it is impossible to trust too much; whereas on the part of the things believed, it may have a mean and extremes; for instance one truth is a mean between two falsehoods. So too, hope has no mean or extremes, as regards its principal object, since it is impossible to trust too much in the Divine assistance; yet it may have a mean and extremes, as regards those things a man trusts to obtain, in so far as he either presumes above his capability, or despairs of things of which he is capable.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(5)-RO(3) — The expectation which is mentioned in the definition of hope does not imply delay, as does the expectation which belongs to longanimity. It implies a reference to the Divine assistance, whether that which we hope for be delayed or not.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(5)-RO(4) — Magnanimity tends to something arduous in the hope of obtaining something that is within one's power, wherefore its proper object is the doing of great things. On the other hand hope, as a theological virtue, regards something arduous, to be obtained by another's help, as stated above (**A(1)**).

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(6)

Whether hope is distinct from the other theological virtues?

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that hope is not distinct from the other theological virtues. For habits are distinguished by their objects, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(54)**, **A(2)**). Now the object of hope is the same as of the other theological virtues. Therefore hope is not distinct from the other theological virtues.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, in the symbol of faith, whereby we make profession of faith, we say: “I expect the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come.” Now expectation of future happiness belongs to hope, as stated above (**A(5)**). Therefore hope is not distinct from faith.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, by hope man tends to God. But this belongs properly to charity. Therefore hope is not distinct from charity.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, There cannot be number without distinction. Now hope is numbered with the other theological virtues: for Gregory says (Moral. i, 16) that the three virtues are faith, hope, and charity. Therefore hope is distinct from the theological virtues.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(6) — *I answer that*, A virtue is said to be theological from having God for the object to which it adheres. Now one may adhere to a thing in two ways: first, for its own sake; secondly, because something else is attained thereby. Accordingly charity makes us adhere to God for His own sake, uniting our minds to God by the emotion of love.

On the other hand, hope and faith make man adhere to God as to a principle wherefrom certain things accrue to us. Now we derive from God both knowledge of truth and the attainment of perfect goodness. Accordingly faith makes us adhere to God, as the source whence we derive the knowledge of truth, since we believe that what God tells us is true: while hope makes us adhere to God, as the source whence we derive perfect goodness, i.e. in so far as, by hope, we trust to the Divine assistance for obtaining happiness.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(6)-RO(1) — God is the object of these virtues under different aspects, as stated above: and a different aspect of the object suffices for the distinction of habits, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(54)**, **A(2)**).

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(6)-RO(2) — Expectation is mentioned in the symbol of faith, not as though it were the proper act of faith, but because the act of hope presupposes the act of faith, as we shall state further on (**A(7)**). Hence an act of faith is expressed in the act of hope.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(6)-RO(3) — Hope makes us tend to God, as to a good to be obtained finally, and as to a helper strong to assist: whereas charity, properly speaking, makes us tend to God, by uniting our affections to Him, so that we live, not for ourselves, but for God.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(7)

Whether hope precedes faith?

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that hope precedes faith. Because a gloss on ^{<RAB>}Psalm 36:3, “Trust in the Lord, and do good,” says: “Hope is the entrance to faith and the beginning of salvation.” But salvation is by faith whereby we are justified. Therefore hope precedes faith.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, that which is included in a definition should precede the thing defined and be more known. But hope is included in the definition of faith (^{<RAB>}Hebrews 11:1): “Faith is the substance of things to be hoped for.” Therefore hope precedes faith.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, hope precedes a meritorious act, for the Apostle says (^{<RAB>}1 Corinthians 9:10): “He that plougheth should plough in hope... to receive fruit.” But the act of faith is meritorious. Therefore hope precedes faith.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<RAB>}Matthew 1:2): “Abraham begot Isaac,” i.e. “Faith begot hope,” according to a gloss.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(7) — *I answer that*, Absolutely speaking, faith precedes hope. For the object of hope is a future good, arduous but possible to obtain. In order, therefore, that we may hope, it is necessary for the object

of hope to be proposed to us as possible. Now the object of hope is, in one way, eternal happiness, and in another way, the Divine assistance, as explained above (**A(2); A(6)**, ad 3): and both of these are proposed to us by faith, whereby we come to know that we are able to obtain eternal life, and that for this purpose the Divine assistance is ready for us, according to ~~811~~ Hebrews 11:6

“He that cometh to God, must believe that He is, and is a rewarder
to them that seek Him.”

Therefore it is evident that faith precedes hope.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(7)-RO(1) — As the same gloss observes further on, “hope” is called “the entrance” to faith, i.e. of the thing believed, because by hope we enter in to see what we believe. Or we may reply that it is called the “entrance to faith,” because thereby man begins to be established and perfected in faith.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(7)-RO(2) — The thing to be hoped for is included in the definition of faith, because the proper object of faith, is something not apparent in itself. Hence it was necessary to express it in a circumlocution by something resulting from faith.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(7)-RO(3) — Hope does not precede every meritorious act; but it suffices for it to accompany or follow it.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(8)

Whether charity precedes hope?

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that charity precedes hope. For Ambrose says on Luke 27:6, “If you had faith like to a grain of mustard seed,” etc.: “Charity flows from faith, and hope from charity.” But faith precedes charity. Therefore charity precedes hope.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xiv, 9) that “good emotions and affections proceed from love and holy charity.” Now to hope, considered as an act of hope, is a good emotion of the soul. Therefore it flows from charity.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, the Master says (Sent. iii, D, 26) that hope proceeds from merits, which precede not only the thing hoped for, but also hope itself, which, in the order of nature, is preceded by charity. Therefore charity precedes hope.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (⁵⁰¹⁵1 Timothy 1:5):

“The end of the commandment is charity from a pure heart, and a good conscience,” i.e. “from hope,”

according to a gloss. Therefore hope precedes charity.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(8) — *I answer that*, Order is twofold. One is the order of generation and of matter, in respect of which the imperfect precedes the perfect: the other is the order of perfection and form, in respect of which the perfect naturally precedes the imperfect. In respect of the first order hope precedes charity: and this is clear from the fact that hope and all movements of the appetite flow from love, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(27), A(4); P(2a), Q(28), A(6)**, ad 2; **P(2a), Q(40), A(7)**) in the treatise on the passions.

Now there is a perfect, and an imperfect love. Perfect love is that whereby a man is loved in himself, as when someone wishes a person some good for his own sake; thus a man loves his friend. Imperfect love is that whereby a man love something, not for its own sake, but that he may obtain that good for himself; thus a man loves what he desires. The first love of God pertains to charity, which adheres to God for His own sake; while hope pertains to the second love, since he that hopes, intends to obtain possession of something for himself.

Hence in the order of generation, hope precedes charity. For just as a man is led to love God, through fear of being punished by Him for his sins, as Augustine states (In primam canon. Joan. Tract. ix), so too, hope leads to charity, in as much as a man through hoping to be rewarded by God, is encouraged to love God and obey His commandments. On the other hand, in the order of perfection charity naturally precedes hope, wherefore, with the advent of charity, hope is made more perfect, because we hope chiefly in our friends. It is in this sense that Ambrose states (**O(1)**) that charity flows from hope: so that this suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(8)-RO(2) — Hope and every movement of the appetite proceed from some kind of love, whereby the expected good is loved. But not every kind of hope proceeds from charity, but only the movement of living hope, viz. that whereby man hopes to obtain good from God, as from a friend.

P(2b)-Q(17)-A(8)-RO(3) — The Master is speaking of living hope, which is naturally preceded by charity and the merits caused by charity.

QUESTION 18

OF THE SUBJECT OF HOPE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the subject of hope, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether the virtue of hope is in the will as its subject?
- (2) Whether it is in the blessed?
- (3) Whether it is in the damned?
- (4) Whether there is certainty in the hope of the wayfarer?

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(1)

Whether hope is in the will as its subject?

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that hope is not in the will as its subject. For the object of hope is an arduous good, as stated above (**Q(17), A(1); P(2a), Q(40), A(1)**). Now the arduous is the object, not of the will, but of the irascible. Therefore hope is not in the will but in the irascible.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, where one suffices it is superfluous to add another. Now charity suffices for the perfecting of the will, which is the most perfect of the virtues. Therefore hope is not in the will.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the one same power cannot exercise two acts at the same time; thus the intellect cannot understand many things simultaneously. Now the act of hope can be at the same time as an act of charity. Since, then, the act of charity evidently belongs to the will, it follows that the act of hope does not belong to that power: so that, therefore, hope is not in the will.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The soul is not apprehensive of God save as regards the mind in which is memory, intellect and will, as Augustine declares (De Trin. xiv, 3,6). Now hope is a theological virtue having God for its object. Since therefore it is neither in the memory, nor in the intellect, which belong to the cognitive faculty, it follows that it is in the will as its subject.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As shown above (**P(1) Q(87), A(2)**), habits are known by their acts. Now the act of hope is a movement of the appetitive faculty, since its object is a good. And, since there is a twofold appetite in man, namely, the sensitive which is divided into irascible and concupiscible, and the intellective appetite, called the will, as stated in the **P(1) Q(82), A(5)**, those movements which occur in the lower appetite, are with passion, while those in the higher appetite are without passion, as shown above (**P(1) Q(87), A(2)**, ad 1; **P(2a), Q(22), A(3)**, ad 3). Now the act of the virtue of hope cannot belong to the sensitive appetite, since the good which is the principal object of this virtue, is not a sensible but a Divine good. Therefore hope resides in the higher appetite called the will, and not in the lower appetite, of which the irascible is a part.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(1)-RO(1) — The object of the irascible is an arduous sensible: whereas the object of the virtue of hope is an arduous intelligible, or rather superintelligible.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(1)-RO(2) — Charity perfects the will sufficiently with regard to one act, which is the act of loving: but another virtue is required in order to perfect it with regard to its other act, which is that of hoping.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(1)-RO(3) — The movement of hope and the movement of charity are mutually related, as was shown above (**Q(17), A(8)**). Hence there is no reason why both movements should not belong at the same time to the same power: even as the intellect can understand many things at the same time if they be related to one another, as stated in the **P(1) Q(85), A(4)**.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(2)

Whether in the blessed there is hope?

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that in the blessed there is hope. For Christ was a perfect comprehensor from the first moment of His conception. Now He had hope, since, according to a gloss, the words of ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 30:2, “In Thee, O Lord, have I hoped,” are said in His person. Therefore in the blessed there can be hope.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, even as the obtaining of happiness is an arduous good, so is its continuation. Now, before they obtain happiness, men hope to obtain it. Therefore, after they have obtained it, they can hope to continue in its possession.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, by the virtue of hope, a man can hope for happiness, not only for himself, but also for others, as stated above (Q(17), A(3)). But the blessed who are in heaven hope for the happiness of others, else they would not pray for them. Therefore there can be hope in them.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, the happiness of the saints implies not only glory of the soul but also glory of the body. Now the souls of the saints in heaven, look yet for the glory of their bodies (Apoc. 6:10; Augustine, Genesis ad lit. xii, 35). Therefore in the blessed there can be hope.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (~~1st~~ Romans 8:24): “What a man seeth, why doth he hope for?” Now the blessed enjoy the sight of God. Therefore hope has no place in them.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(2) — *I answer that*, If what gives a thing its species be removed, the species is destroyed, and that thing cannot remain the same; just as when a natural body loses its form, it does not remain the same specifically. Now hope takes its species from its principal object, even as the other virtues do, as was shown above (Q(17), AA(5),6; P(2a), Q(54), A(2)): and its principal object is eternal happiness as being possible to obtain by the assistance of God, as stated above (Q(17), A(2)).

Since then the arduous possible good cannot be an object of hope except in so far as it is something future, it follows that when happiness is no longer future, but present, it is incompatible with the virtue of hope.

Consequently hope, like faith, is voided in heaven, and neither of them can be in the blessed.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(2)-RO(1) — Although Christ was a comprehensor and therefore blessed as to the enjoyment of God, nevertheless He was, at the same time, a wayfarer, as regards the passibility of nature, to which He was still subject. Hence it was possible for Him to hope for the glory of impassibility and immortality, yet not so as to the virtue of hope, the principal object of which is not the glory of the body but the enjoyment of God.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(2)-RO(2) — The happiness of the saints is called eternal life, because through enjoying God they become partakers, as it were, of God's eternity which surpasses all time: so that the continuation of happiness does not differ in respect of present, past and future. Hence the blessed do not hope for the continuation of their happiness (for as regards this there is no future), but are in actual possession thereof.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(2)-RO(3) — So long as the virtue of hope lasts, it is by the same hope that one hopes for one's own happiness, and for that of others. But when hope is voided in the blessed, whereby they hoped for their own happiness, they hope for the happiness of others indeed, yet not by the virtue of hope, but rather by the love of charity. Even so, he that has Divine charity, by that same charity loves his neighbor, without having the virtue of charity, but by some other love.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(2)-RO(4) — Since hope is a theological virtue having God for its object, its principal object is the glory of the soul, which consists in the enjoyment of God, and not the glory of the body. Moreover, although the glory of the body is something arduous in comparison with human nature, yet it is not so for one who has the glory of the soul; both because the glory of the body is a very small thing as compared with the glory of the soul, and because one who has the glory of the soul has already the sufficient cause of the glory of the body.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(3)

Whether hope is in the damned?

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that there is hope in the damned. For the devil is damned and prince of the damned, according to ^{<125b>}Matthew 25:41:

“Depart... you cursed, into everlasting fire, which was prepared for the devil and his angels.”

But the devil has hope, according to ^{<84b>}Job 40:28, “Behold his hope shall fail him.” Therefore it seems that the damned have hope.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, just as faith is either living or dead, so is hope. But lifeless faith can be in the devils and the damned, according to ^{<302b>}James 2:19: “The devils... believe and tremble.” Therefore it seems that lifeless hope also can be in the damned.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, after death there accrues to man no merit or demerit that he had not before, according to ^{<211b>}Ecclesiastes 11:3,

“If the tree fall to the south, or to the north, in what place soever it shall fall, there shall it be.”

Now many who are damned, in this life hoped and never despaired. Therefore they will hope in the future life also.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Hope causes joy, according to ^{<622b>}Romans 12:12, “Rejoicing in hope.” Now the damned have no joy, but sorrow and grief, according to ^{<254b>}Isaiah 65:14,

“My servants shall praise for joyfulness of heart, and you shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for grief of spirit.”

Therefore no hope is in the damned.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Just as it is a condition of happiness that the will should find rest therein, so is it a condition of punishment, that what is inflicted in punishment, should go against the will. Now that which is not known can neither be restful nor repugnant to the will: wherefore Augustine says (Genesis ad lit. xi, 17) that the angels could not

be perfectly happy in their first state before their confirmation, or unhappy before their fall, since they had no foreknowledge of what would happen to them. For perfect and true happiness requires that one should be certain of being happy for ever, else the will would not rest.

In like manner, since the everlastingness of damnation is a necessary condition of the punishment of the damned, it would not be truly penal unless it went against the will; and this would be impossible if they were ignorant of the everlastingness of their damnation. Hence it belongs to the unhappy state of the damned, that they should know that they cannot by any means escape from damnation and obtain happiness. Wherefore it is written (³⁸⁵² Job 15:22): “He believeth not that he may return from darkness to light.” It is, therefore, evident that they cannot apprehend happiness as a possible good, as neither can the blessed apprehend it as a future good. Consequently there is no hope either in the blessed or in the damned. On the other hand, hope can be in wayfarers, whether of this life or in purgatory, because in either case they apprehend happiness as a future possible thing.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(3)-RO(1) — As Gregory says (Moral. xxxiii, 20) this is said of the devil as regards his members, whose hope will fail utterly: or, if it be understood of the devil himself, it may refer to the hope whereby he expects to vanquish the saints, in which sense we read just before (³⁸¹⁸ Job 40:18): “He trusteth that the Jordan may run into his mouth”: this is not, however, the hope of which we are speaking.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(3)-RO(2) — As Augustine says (Enchiridion viii), “faith is about things, bad or good, past, present, or future, one’s own or another’s; whereas hope is only about good things, future and concerning oneself.” Hence it is possible for lifeless faith to be in the damned, but not hope, since the Divine goods are not for them future possible things, but far removed from them.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(3)-RO(3) — Lack of hope in the damned does not change their demerit, as neither does the voiding of hope in the blessed increase their merit: but both these things are due to the change in their respective states.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(4)

Whether there is certainty in the hope of a wayfarer?

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that there is no certainty in the hope of a wayfarer. For hope resides in the will. But certainty pertains not to the will but to the intellect. Therefore there is no certainty in hope.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, hope is based on grace and merits, as stated above (**Q(17)**, **A(1)**). Now it is impossible in this life to know for certain that we are in a state of grace, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(112)**, **A(5)**). Therefore there is no certainty in the hope of a wayfarer.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, there can be no certainty about that which may fail. Now many a hopeful wayfarer fails to obtain happiness. Therefore wayfarer's hope has no certainty.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, “Hope is the certain expectation of future happiness,” as the Master states (Sent. iii, D, 26): and this may be gathered from ^{scilicet}2 Timothy 1:12,

“I know Whom I have believed, and I am certain that He is able to keep that which I have committed to Him.”

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Certainty is found in a thing in two ways, essentially and by participation. It is found essentially in the cognitive power; by participation in whatever is moved infallibly to its end by the cognitive power. In this way we say that nature works with certainty, since it is moved by the Divine intellect which moves everything with certainty to its end. In this way too, the moral virtues are said to work with greater certainty than art, in as much as, like a second nature, they are moved to their acts by the reason: and thus too, hope tends to its end with certainty, as though sharing in the certainty of faith which is in the cognitive faculty.

This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(4)-RO(2) — Hope does not trust chiefly in grace already received, but on God's omnipotence and mercy, whereby even he that has

not grace, can obtain it, so as to come to eternal life. Now whoever has faith is certain of God's omnipotence and mercy.

P(2b)-Q(18)-A(4)-RO(3) — That some who have hope fail to obtain happiness, is due to a fault of the free will in placing the obstacle of sin, but not to any deficiency in God's power or mercy, in which hope places its trust. Hence this does not prejudice the certainty of hope.

QUESTION 19

OF THE GIFT OF FEAR

(TWELVE ARTICLES)

We must now consider the gift of fear, about which there are twelve points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether God is to be feared?
- (2) Of the division of fear into filial, initial, servile and worldly;
- (3) Whether worldly fear is always evil?
- (4) Whether servile fear is good?
- (5) Whether it is substantially the same as filial fear?
- (6) Whether servile fear departs when charity comes?
- (7) Whether fear is the beginning of wisdom?
- (8) Whether initial fear is substantially the same as filial fear?
- (9) Whether fear is a gift of the Holy Ghost?
- (10) Whether it grows when charity grows?
- (11) Whether it remains in heaven?
- (12) Which of the beatitudes and fruits correspond to it?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(1)

Whether God can be feared?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that God cannot be feared. For the object of fear is a future evil, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(41)**, **AA(2),3**). But God is free of all evil, since He is goodness itself. Therefore God cannot be feared.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, fear is opposed to hope. Now we hope in God. Therefore we cannot fear Him at the same time.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, as the Philosopher states (Rhet. ii, 5), “we fear those things whence evil comes to us.” But evil comes to us, not from God, but from ourselves, according to ^(283b)Hosea 13:9: “Destruction is thy own, O Israel: thy help is... in Me.” Therefore God is not to be feared.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^(284b)Jeremiah 10:7): “Who shall not fear Thee, O King of nations?” and (^(300b)Malachi 1:6): “If I be a master, where is My fear?”

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Just as hope has two objects, one of which is the future good itself, that one expects to obtain, while the other is someone’s help, through whom one expects to obtain what one hopes for, so, too, fear may have two objects, one of which is the very evil which a man shrinks from, while the other is that from which the evil may come. Accordingly, in the first way God, Who is goodness itself, cannot be an object of fear; but He can be an object of fear in the second way, in so far as there may come to us some evil either from Him or in relation to Him.

From Him there comes the evil of punishment, but this is evil not absolutely but relatively, and, absolutely speaking, is a good. Because, since a thing is said to be good through being ordered to an end, while evil implies lack of this order, that which excludes the order to the last end is altogether evil, and such is the evil of fault. On the other hand the evil of punishment is indeed an evil, in so far as it is the privation of some particular good, yet absolutely speaking, it is a good, in so far as it is ordained to the last end.

In relation to God the evil of fault can come to us, if we be separated from Him: and in this way God can and ought to be feared.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(1)-RO(1) — This objection considers the object of fear as being the evil which a man shuns.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(1)-RO(2) — In God, we may consider both His justice, in respect of which He punishes those who sin, and His mercy, in respect of which He sets us free: in us the consideration of His justice gives rise to fear, but the consideration of His mercy gives rise to hope, so that,

accordingly, God is the object of both hope and fear, but under different aspects.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(1)-RO(3) — The evil of fault is not from God as its author but from us, in for far as we forsake God: while the evil of punishment is from God as its author, in so far as it has character of a good, since it is something just, through being inflicted on us justly; although originally this is due to the demerit of sin: thus it is written (Wis. 1:13,16):

“God made not death... but the wicked with works and words have called it to them.”

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2)

Whether fear is fittingly divided into filial, initial, servile and worldly fear?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that fear is unfittingly divided into filial, initial, servile and worldly fear. For Damascene says (De Fide Orth. ii, 15) that there are six kinds of fear, viz. “laziness, shamefacedness,” etc. of which we have treated above (**P(2a), Q(41), A(4)**), and which are not mentioned in the division in question. Therefore this division of fear seems unfitting.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, each of these fears is either good or evil. But there is a fear, viz. natural fear, which is neither morally good, since it is in the demons, according to ^{<502b>}James 2:19, “The devils... believe and tremble,” nor evil, since it is in Christ, according to ^{<414b>}Mark 14:33, Jesus “began to fear and be heavy.” Therefore the aforesaid division of fear is insufficient.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the relation of son to father differs from that of wife to husband, and this again from that of servant to master. Now filial fear, which is that of the son in comparison with his father, is distinct from servile fear, which is that of the servant in comparison with his master. Therefore chaste fear, which seems to be that of the wife in comparison with her husband, ought to be distinguished from all these other fears.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, even as servile fear fears punishment, so do initial and worldly fear. Therefore no distinction should be made between them.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2)-O(5) — Further, even as concupiscence is about some good, so is fear about some evil. Now “concupiscence of the eyes,” which is the desire for things of this world, is distinct from “concupiscence of the flesh,” which is the desire for one’s own pleasure. Therefore “worldly fear,” whereby one fears to lose external goods, is distinct from “human fear,” whereby one fears harm to one’s own person.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2) — On the contrary stands the authority of the Master (Sent. iii, D, 34).

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2) — *I answer that*, We are speaking of fear now, in so far as it makes us turn, so to speak, to God or away from Him. For, since the object of fear is an evil, sometimes, on account of the evils he fears, man withdraws from God, and this is called human fear; while sometimes, on account of the evils he fears, he turns to God and adheres to Him. This latter evil is twofold, viz. evil of punishment, and evil of fault.

Accordingly if a man turn to God and adhere to Him, through fear of punishment, it will be servile fear; but if it be on account of fear of committing a fault, it will be filial fear, for it becomes a child to fear offending its father. If, however, it be on account of both, it will be initial fear, which is between both these fears. As to whether it is possible to fear the evil of fault, the question has been treated above (**P(2a), Q(42), A(3)**) when we were considering the passion of fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2)-RO(1) — Damascene divides fear as a passion of the soul: whereas this division of fear is taken from its relation to God, as explained above.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2)-RO(2) — Moral good consists chiefly in turning to God, while moral evil consists chiefly in turning away from Him: wherefore all the fears mentioned above imply either moral evil or moral good. Now natural fear is presupposed to moral good and evil, and so it is not numbered among these kinds of fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2)-RO(3) — The relation of servant to master is based on the power which the master exercises over the servant; whereas, *on the contrary*, the relation of a son to his father or of a wife to her husband is based on the son's affection towards his father to whom he submits himself, or on the wife's affection towards her husband to whom she binds herself in the union of love. Hence filial and chaste fear amount to the same, because by the love of charity God becomes our Father, according to ~~ROM~~ Romans 8:15,

“You have received the spirit of adoption of sons,
whereby we cry: Abba [Father]”;

and by this same charity He is called our spouse, according to ~~1COR~~ 2 Corinthians 11:2,

“I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a
chaste virgin to Christ”:

whereas servile fear has no connection with these, since it does not include charity in its definition.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2)-RO(4) — These three fears regard punishment but in different ways. For worldly or human fear regards a punishment which turns man away from God, and which God's enemies sometimes inflict or threaten: whereas servile and initial fear regard a punishment whereby men are drawn to God, and which is inflicted or threatened by God. Servile fear regards this punishment chiefly, while initial fear regards it secondarily.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(2)-RO(5) — It amounts to the same whether man turns away from God through fear of losing his worldly goods, or through fear of forfeiting the well-being of his body, since external goods belong to the body. Hence both these fears are reckoned as one here, although they fear different evils, even as they correspond to the desire of different goods. This diversity causes a specific diversity of sins, all of which alike however lead man away from God.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(3)

Whether worldly fear is always evil?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that worldly fear is not always evil. Because regard for men seems to be a kind of human fear. Now some are blamed for having no regard for man, for instance, the unjust judge of whom we read (~~Q(18)~~ Luke 18:2) that he “feared not God, nor regarded man.” Therefore it seems that worldly fear is not always evil.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, worldly fear seems to have reference to the punishments inflicted by the secular power. Now such like punishments incite us to good actions, according to ~~Q(18)~~ Romans 13:3,

“Wilt thou not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same.”

Therefore worldly fear is not always evil.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, it seems that what is in us naturally, is not evil, since our natural gifts are from God. Now it is natural to man to fear detriment to his body, and loss of his worldly goods, whereby the present life is supported. Therefore it seems that worldly fear is not always evil.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Our Lord said (~~Q(18)~~ Matthew 10:28): “Fear ye not them that kill the body,” thus forbidding worldly fear. Now nothing but what is evil is forbidden by God. Therefore worldly fear is evil.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As shown above (**P(2a)**, **Q(1)**, **A(3)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(18)**, **A(1)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(54)**, **A(2)**) moral acts and habits take their name and species from their objects. Now the proper object of the appetite’s movement is the final good: so that, in consequence, every appetitive movement is both specified and named from its proper end. For if anyone were to describe covetousness as love of work because men work on account of covetousness, this description would be incorrect, since the covetous man seeks work not as end but as a means: the end that he seeks is wealth, wherefore covetousness is rightly described as the desire or the love of wealth, and this is evil. Accordingly worldly love is,

properly speaking, the love whereby a man trusts in the world as his end, so that worldly love is always evil. Now fear is born of love, since man fears the loss of what he loves, as Augustine states (Qq. lxxxiii, qu. 33). Now worldly fear is that which arises from worldly love as from an evil root, for which reason worldly fear is always evil.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(3)-RO(1) — One may have regard for men in two ways. First in so far as there is in them something divine, for instance, the good of grace or of virtue, or at least of the natural image of God: and in this way those are blamed who have no regard for man. Secondly, one may have regard for men as being in opposition to God, and thus it is praiseworthy to have no regard for men, according as we read of Elias or Eliseus (Ecclus. 48:13): “In his days he feared not the prince.”

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(3)-RO(2) — When the secular power inflicts punishment in order to withdraw men from sin, it is acting as God’s minister, according to ^{<13>}Romans 13:4,

“For he is God’s minister, an avenger to execute wrath upon him
that doth evil.”

To fear the secular power in this way is part, not of worldly fear, but of servile or initial fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(3)-RO(3) — It is natural for man to shrink from detriment to his own body and loss of worldly goods, but to forsake justice on that account is contrary to natural reason. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. iii, 1) that there are certain things, viz. sinful deeds, which no fear should drive us to do, since to do such things is worse than to suffer any punishment whatever.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(4)

Whether servile fear is good?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that servile fear is not good. For if the use of a thing is evil, the thing itself is evil. Now the use of servile fear is evil, for according to a gloss on ^{<15>}Romans 8:15,

“if a man do anything through fear, although the deed be good, it is not well done.”

Therefore servile fear is not good.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, no good grows from a sinful root. Now servile fear grows from a sinful root, because when commenting on ~~881~~ Job 3:11, “Why did I not die in the womb?” Gregory says (Moral. iv, 25): “When a man dreads the punishment which confronts him for his sin and no longer loves the friendship of God which he has lost, his fear is born of pride, not of humility.” Therefore servile fear is evil.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, just as mercenary love is opposed to the love of charity, so is servile fear, apparently, opposed to chaste fear. But mercenary love is always evil. Therefore servile fear is also.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Nothing evil is from the Holy Ghost. But servile fear is from the Holy Ghost, since a gloss on ~~885~~ Romans 8:15, “You have not received the spirit of bondage,” etc. says: “It is the one same spirit that bestows two fears, viz. servile and chaste fear.” Therefore servile fear is not evil.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(4) — *I answer that*, It is owing to its servility that servile fear may be evil. For servitude is opposed to freedom. Since, then, “what is free is cause of itself” (Metaph. i, 2), a slave is one who does not act as cause of his own action, but as though moved from without. Now whoever does a thing through love, does it of himself so to speak, because it is by his own inclination that he is moved to act: so that it is contrary to the very notion of servility that one should act from love. Consequently servile fear as such is contrary to charity: so that if servility were essential to fear, servile fear would be evil simply, even as adultery is evil simply, because that which makes it contrary to charity belongs to its very species.

This servility, however, does not belong to the species of servile fear, even as neither does lifelessness to the species of lifeless faith. For the species of a moral habit or act is taken from the object. Now the object of servile fear is punishment, and it is by accident that, either the good to which the punishment is contrary, is loved as the last end, and that consequently the punishment is feared as the greatest evil, which is the case with one who is

devoid of charity, or that the punishment is directed to God as its end, and that, consequently, it is not feared as the greatest evil, which is the case with one who has charity. For the species of a habit is not destroyed through its object or end being directed to a further end. Consequently servile fear is substantially good, but its servility is evil.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(4)-RO(1) — This saying of Augustine is to be applied to a man who does something through servile fear as such, so that he loves not justice, and fears nothing but the punishment.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(4)-RO(2) — Servile fear as to its substance is not born of pride, but its servility is, inasmuch as man is unwilling, by love, to subject his affections to the yoke of justice.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(4)-RO(3) — Mercenary love is that whereby God is loved for the sake of worldly goods, and this is, of itself, contrary to charity, so that mercenary love is always evil. But servile fear, as to its substance, implies merely fear of punishment, whether or not this be feared as the principal evil.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(5)

Whether servile fear is substantially the same as filial fear?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that servile fear is substantially the same as filial fear. For filial fear is to servile fear the same apparently as living faith is to lifeless faith, since the one is accompanied by mortal sin and the other not. Now living faith and lifeless faith are substantially the same. Therefore servile and filial fear are substantially the same.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, habits are diversified by their objects. Now the same thing is the object of servile and of filial fear, since they both fear God. Therefore servile and filial fear are substantially the same.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, just as man hopes to enjoy God and to obtain favors from Him, so does he fear to be separated from God and to be punished by Him. Now it is the same hope whereby we hope to enjoy God, and to receive other favors from Him, as stated above (**Q(17)**,

A(2), ad 2). Therefore filial fear, whereby we fear separation from God, is the same as servile fear whereby we fear His punishments.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Augustine (In prim. canon. Joan. Tract. ix) says that there are two fears, one servile, another filial or chaste fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(5) — *I answer that*, The proper object of fear is evil. And since acts and habits are diversified by their objects, as shown above (**P(2a)**, **Q(54)**, **A(2)**), it follows of necessity that different kinds of fear correspond to different kinds of evil.

Now the evil of punishment, from which servile fear shrinks, differs specifically from evil of fault, which filial fear shuns, as shown above (**A(2)**). Hence it is evident that servile and filial fear are not the same substantially but differ specifically.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(5)-RO(1) — Living and lifeless faith differ, not as regards the object, since each of them believes God and believes in a God, but in respect of something extrinsic, viz. the presence or absence of charity, and so they do not differ substantially. On the other hand, servile and filial fear differ as to their objects: and hence the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(5)-RO(2) — Servile fear and filial fear do not regard God in the same light. For servile fear looks upon God as the cause of the infliction of punishment, whereas filial fear looks upon Him, not as the active cause of guilt, but rather as the term wherefrom it shrinks to be separated by guilt. Consequently the identity of object, viz. God, does not prove a specific identity of fear, since also natural movements differ specifically according to their different relationships to some one term, for movement from whiteness is not specifically the same as movement towards whiteness.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(5)-RO(3) — Hope looks upon God as the principle not only of the enjoyment of God, but also of any other favor whatever. This cannot be said of fear; and so there is no comparison.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(6)

Whether servile fear remains with charity?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that servile fear does not remain with charity. For Augustine says (In prim. canon. Joan. Tract. ix) that “when charity takes up its abode, it drives away fear which had prepared a place for it.”

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(6)-O(2) — Further,

“The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost, Who is given to us” (~~and~~ Romans 5:5).

Now “where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty” (~~and~~ 2 Corinthians 3:17). Since then freedom excludes servitude, it seems that servile fear is driven away when charity comes.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, servile fear is caused by self-love, in so far as punishment diminishes one’s own good. Now love of God drives away self-love, for it makes us despise ourselves: thus Augustine testifies (De Civ. Dei xiv, 28) that “the love of God unto the contempt of self builds up the city of God.” Therefore it seems that servile fear is driven out when charity comes.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Servile fear is a gift of the Holy Ghost, as stated above (A(4)). Now the gifts of the Holy Ghost are not forfeited through the advent of charity, whereby the Holy Ghost dwells in us. Therefore servile fear is not driven out when charity comes.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(6) — *I answer that*, Servile fear proceeds from self-love, because it is fear of punishment which is detrimental to one’s own good. Hence the fear of punishment is consistent with charity, in the same way as self-love is: because it comes to the same that a man love his own good and that he fear to be deprived of it.

Now self-love may stand in a threefold relationship to charity. In one way it is contrary to charity, when a man places his end in the love of his own good. In another way it is included in charity, when a man loves himself for the sake of God and in God. In a third way, it is indeed distinct from

charity, but is not contrary thereto, as when a man loves himself from the point of view of his own good, yet not so as to place his end in this his own good: even as one may have another special love for one's neighbor, besides the love of charity which is founded on God, when we love him by reason of usefulness, consanguinity, or some other human consideration, which, however, is referable to charity.

Accordingly fear of punishment is, in one way, included in charity, because separation from God is a punishment, which charity shuns exceedingly; so that this belongs to chaste fear. In another way, it is contrary to charity, when a man shrinks from the punishment that is opposed to his natural good, as being the principal evil in opposition to the good which he loves as an end; and in this way fear of punishment is not consistent with charity. In another way fear of punishment is indeed substantially distinct from chaste fear, when, to wit, a man fears a penal evil, not because it separates him from God, but because it is hurtful to his own good, and yet he does not place his end in this good, so that neither does he dread this evil as being the principal evil. Such fear of punishment is consistent with charity; but it is not called servile, except when punishment is dreaded as a principal evil, as explained above (**AA(2),4**). Hence fear considered as servile, does not remain with charity, but the substance of servile fear can remain with charity, even as self-love can remain with charity.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(6)-RO(1) — Augustine is speaking of fear considered as servile: and such is the sense of the two other objections.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(7)

Whether fear is the beginning of wisdom?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that fear is not the beginning of wisdom. For the beginning of a thing is a part thereof. But fear is not a part of wisdom, since fear is seated in the appetitive faculty, while wisdom is in the intellect. Therefore it seems that fear is not the beginning of wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, nothing is the beginning of itself. “Now fear of the Lord, that is wisdom,” according to ~~xxx~~ Job 28:28. Therefore it seems that fear of God is not the beginning of wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, nothing is prior to the beginning. But something is prior to fear, since faith precedes fear. Therefore it seems that fear is not the beginning of wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written in the ~~xxx~~ Psalm 110:10:

“The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom.”

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(7) — *I answer that*, A thing may be called the beginning of wisdom in two ways: in one way because it is the beginning of wisdom itself as to its essence; in another way, as to its effect. Thus the beginning of an art as to its essence consists in the principles from which that art proceeds, while the beginning of an art as to its effect is that wherefrom it begins to operate: for instance we might say that the beginning of the art of building is the foundation because that is where the builder begins his work.

Now, since wisdom is the knowledge of Divine things, as we shall state further on (**Q(45), A(1)**), it is considered by us in one way, and in another way by philosophers. For, seeing that our life is ordained to the enjoyment of God, and is directed thereto according to a participation of the Divine Nature, conferred on us through grace, wisdom, as we look at it, is considered not only as being cognizant of God, as it is with the philosophers, but also as directing human conduct; since this is directed not only by the human law, but also by the Divine law, as Augustine shows (De Trin. xii, 14). Accordingly the beginning of wisdom as to its essence consists in the first principles of wisdom, i.e. the articles of faith, and in this sense faith is said to be the beginning of wisdom. But as regards the effect, the beginning of wisdom is the point where wisdom begins to work, and in this way fear is the beginning of wisdom, yet servile fear in one way, and filial fear, in another. For servile fear is like a principle disposing a man to wisdom from without, in so far as he refrains from sin through fear of punishment, and is thus fashioned for the effect of wisdom, according to Ecclus. 1:27, “The fear of the Lord driveth out sin.” On the other hand, chaste or filial fear is the beginning of wisdom, as being the

first effect of wisdom. For since the regulation of human conduct by the Divine law belongs to wisdom, in order to make a beginning, man must first of all fear God and submit himself to Him: for the result will be that in all things he will be ruled by God.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(7)-RO(1) — This argument proves that fear is not the beginning of wisdom as to the essence of wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(7)-RO(2) — The fear of God is compared to a man's whole life that is ruled by God's wisdom, as the root to the tree: hence it is written (Ecclus. 1:25): "The root of wisdom is to fear the Lord, for [Vulg.: 'and'] the branches thereof are longlived." Consequently, as the root is said to be virtually the tree, so the fear of God is said to be wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(7)-RO(3) — As stated above, faith is the beginning of wisdom in one way, and fear, in another. Hence it is written (Ecclus. 25:16): "The fear of God is the beginning of love: and the beginning of faith is to be fast joined to it."

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(8)

Whether initial fear differs substantially from filial fear?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that initial fear differs substantially from filial fear. For filial fear is caused by love. Now initial fear is the beginning of love, according to Ecclus. 25:16, "The fear of God is the beginning of love." Therefore initial fear is distinct from filial fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, initial fear dreads punishment, which is the object of servile fear, so that initial and servile fear would seem to be the same. But servile fear is distinct from filial fear. Therefore initial fear also is substantially distinct from initial fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, a mean differs in the same ratio from both the extremes. Now initial fear is the mean between servile and filial fear. Therefore it differs from both filial and servile fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, Perfect and imperfect do not diversify the substance of a thing. Now initial and filial fear differ in respect of perfection and imperfection of charity, as Augustine states (In

prim. canon. Joan. Tract. ix). Therefore initial fear does not differ substantially from filial fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(8) — *I answer that*, Initial fear is so called because it is a beginning [initium]. Since, however, both servile and filial fear are, in some way, the beginning of wisdom, each may be called in some way, initial.

It is not in this sense, however, that we are to understand initial fear in so far as it is distinct from servile and filial fear, but in the sense according to which it belongs to the state of beginners, in whom there is a beginning of filial fear resulting from a beginning of charity, although they do not possess the perfection of filial fear, because they have not yet attained to the perfection of charity. Consequently initial fear stands in the same relation to filial fear as imperfect to perfect charity. Now perfect and imperfect charity differ, not as to essence but as to state. Therefore we must conclude that initial fear, as we understand it here, does not differ essentially from filial fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(8)-RO(1) — The fear which is a beginning of love is servile fear, which is the herald of charity, just as the bristle introduces the thread, as Augustine states (Tract. ix in Ep. i Joan.). Or else, if it be referred to initial fear, this is said to be the beginning of love, not absolutely, but relatively to the state of perfect charity.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(8)-RO(2) — Initial fear does not dread punishment as its proper object, but as having something of servile fear connected with it: for this servile fear, as to its substance, remains indeed, with charity, its servility being cast aside; whereas its act remains with imperfect charity in the man who is moved to perform good actions not only through love of justice, but also through fear of punishment, though this same act ceases in the man who has perfect charity, which “casteth out fear,” according to ~~Gen 1~~ John 4:18.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(8)-RO(3) — Initial fear is a mean between servile and filial fear, not as between two things of the same genus, but as the imperfect is a mean between a perfect being and a non-being, as stated in Metaph. ii, for it is the same substantially as the perfect being, while it differs altogether from non-being.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9)

Whether fear is a gift of the Holy Ghost?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that fear is not a gift of the Holy Ghost. For no gift of the Holy Ghost is opposed to a virtue, which is also from the Holy Ghost; else the Holy Ghost would be in opposition to Himself. Now fear is opposed to hope, which is a virtue. Therefore fear is not a gift of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, it is proper to a theological virtue to have God for its object. But fear has God for its object, in so far as God is feared. Therefore fear is not a gift, but a theological virtue.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, fear arises from love. But love is reckoned a theological virtue. Therefore fear also is a theological virtue, being connected with the same matter, as it were.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9)-O(4) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. ii, 49) that “fear is bestowed as a remedy against pride.” But the virtue of humility is opposed to pride. Therefore again, fear is a kind of virtue.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9)-O(5) — Further, the gifts are more perfect than the virtues, since they are bestowed in support of the virtues as Gregory says (Moral. ii, 49). Now hope is more perfect than fear, since hope regards good, while fear regards evil. Since, then, hope is a virtue, it should not be said that fear is a gift.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, The fear of the Lord is numbered among the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost (^{210B} Isaiah 11:3).

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9) — *I answer that*, Fear is of several kinds, as stated above (A(2)). Now it is not “human fear,” according to Augustine (De Gratia et Lib. Arb. xviii), “that is a gift of God” — for it was by this fear that Peter denied Christ — but that fear of which it was said (^{40B} Matthew 10:28): “Fear Him that can destroy both soul and body into hell.”

Again servile fear is not to be reckoned among the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, though it is from Him, because according to Augustine (De Nat. et Grat. lvii) it is compatible with the will to sin: whereas the gifts of the

Holy Ghost are incompatible with the will to sin, as they are inseparable from charity, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(68), A(5)**).

It follows, therefore, that the fear of God, which is numbered among the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost, is filial or chaste fear. For it was stated above (**P(2a), Q(68), AA(1),3**) that the gifts of the Holy Ghost are certain habitual perfections of the soul's powers, whereby these are rendered amenable to the motion of the Holy Ghost, just as, by the moral virtues, the appetitive powers are rendered amenable to the motion of reason. Now for a thing to be amenable to the motion of a certain mover, the first condition required is that it be a non-resistant subject of that mover, because resistance of the movable subject to the mover hinders the movement. This is what filial or chaste fear does, since thereby we revere God and avoid separating ourselves from Him. Hence, according to Augustine (De Serm. Dom. in Monte i, 4) filial fear holds the first place, as it were, among the gifts of the Holy Ghost, in the ascending order, and the last place, in the descending order.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9)-RO(1) — Filial fear is not opposed to the virtue of hope: since thereby we fear, not that we may fail of what we hope to obtain by God's help, but lest we withdraw ourselves from this help. Wherefore filial fear and hope cling together, and perfect one another.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9)-RO(2) — The proper and principal object of fear is the evil shunned, and in this way, as stated above (**A(1)**), God cannot be an object of fear. Yet He is, in this way, the object of hope and the other theological virtues, since, by the virtue of hope, we trust in God's help, not only to obtain any other goods, but, chiefly, to obtain God Himself, as the principal good. The same evidently applies to the other theological virtues.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9)-RO(3) — From the fact that love is the origin of fear, it does not follow that the fear of God is not a distinct habit from charity which is the love of God, since love is the origin of all the emotions, and yet we are perfected by different habits in respect of different emotions. Yet love is more of a virtue than fear is, because love regards good, to which virtue is principally directed by reason of its own nature, as was shown above (**P(2a), Q(55), AA(3),4**); for which reason hope is also

reckoned as a virtue; whereas fear principally regards evil, the avoidance of which it denotes, wherefore it is something less than a theological virtue.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(9)-RO(4) — According to Ecclus. 10:14, “the beginning of the pride of man is to fall off from God,” that is to refuse submission to God, and this is opposed to filial fear, which reveres God. Thus fear cuts off the source of pride for which reason it is bestowed as a remedy against pride. Yet it does not follow that it is the same as the virtue of humility, but that it is its origin. For the gifts of the Holy Ghost are the origin of the intellectual and moral virtues, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(68), A(4)**), while the theological virtues are the origin of the gifts, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(69), A(4)**, ad 3).

This suffices for the Reply to the Fifth Objection.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(10)

Whether fear decreases when charity increases?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(10)-O(1) — It seems that fear decreases when charity increases. For Augustine says (In prim. canon. Joan. Tract. ix): “The more charity increases, the more fear decreases.”

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, fear decreases when hope increases. But charity increases when hope increases, as stated above (**Q(17), A(8)**). Therefore fear decreases when charity increases.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, love implies union, whereas fear implies separation. Now separation decreases when union increases. Therefore fear decreases when the love of charity increases.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (Qq. lxxxiii, qu. 36) that “the fear of God not only begins but also perfects wisdom, whereby we love God above all things, and our neighbor as ourselves.”

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(10) — *I answer that*, Fear is twofold, as stated above (**AA(2),4**); one is filial fear, whereby a son fears to offend his father or to be separated from him; the other is servile fear, whereby one fears punishment.

Now filial fear must needs increase when charity increases, even as an effect increases with the increase of its cause. For the more one loves a man, the more one fears to offend him and to be separated from him.

On the other hand servile fear, as regards its servility, is entirely cast out when charity comes, although the fear of punishment remains as to its substance, as stated above (**A(6)**). This fear decreases as charity increases, chiefly as regards its act, since the more a man loves God, the less he fears punishment; first, because he thinks less of his own good, to which punishment is opposed; secondly, because, the faster he clings, the more confident he is of the reward, and, consequently the less fearful of punishment.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(10)-RO(1) — Augustine speaks there of the fear of punishment.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(10)-RO(2) — It is fear of punishment that decreases when hope increases; but with the increase of the latter filial fear increases, because the more certainly a man expects to obtain a good by another's help, the more he fears to offend him or to be separated from him.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(10)-RO(3) — Filial fear does not imply separation from God, but submission to Him, and shuns separation from that submission. Yet, in a way, it implies separation, in the point of not presuming to equal oneself to Him, and of submitting to Him, which separation is to be observed even in charity, in so far as a man loves God more than himself and more than aught else. Hence the increase of the love of charity implies not a decrease but an increase in the reverence of fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(11)

Whether fear remains in heaven?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(11)-O(1) — It would seem that fear does not remain in heaven. For it is written (²⁰¹³Proverbs 1:33): “He... shall enjoy abundance, without fear of evils,” which is to be understood as referring to those who already enjoy wisdom in everlasting happiness. Now every fear is about some evil, since evil is the object of fear, as stated above (**AA(2),5; P(2a), Q(42), A(1)**). Therefore there will be no fear in heaven.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(11)-O(2) — Further, in heaven men will be conformed to God, according to ^{GRK}1 John 3:2, “When He shall appear, we shall be like to Him.” But God fears nothing. Therefore, in heaven, men will have no fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(11)-O(3) — Further, hope is more perfect than fear, since hope regards good, and fear, evil. Now hope will not be in heaven. Therefore neither will there be fear in heaven.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(11) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{GRK}Psalm 18:10):

“The fear of the Lord is holy, enduring for ever and ever.”

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(11) — *I answer that*, Servile fear, or fear of punishment, will by no means be in heaven, since such a fear is excluded by the security which is essential to everlasting happiness, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(5)**, **A(4)**).

But regard to filial fear, as it increases with the increase of charity, so is it perfected when charity is made perfect; hence, in heaven, it will not have quite the same act as it has now.

In order to make this clear, we must observe that the proper object of fear is a possible evil, just as the proper object of hope is a possible good: and since the movement of fear is like one of avoidance, fear implies avoidance of a possible arduous evil, for little evils inspire no fear. Now as a thing's good consists in its staying in its own order, so a thing's evil consists in forsaking its order. Again, the order of a rational creature is that it should be under God and above other creatures. Hence, just as it is an evil for a rational creature to submit, by love, to a lower creature, so too is it an evil for it, if it submit not to God, by presumptuously revolt against Him or condemn Him. Now this evil is possible to a rational creature considered as to its nature on account of the natural flexibility of the free-will; whereas in the blessed, it becomes impossible, by reason of the perfection of glory. Therefore the avoidance of this evil that consists in non-subjection to God, and is possible to nature, but impossible in the state of bliss, will be in heaven; while in this life there is avoidance of this evil as of something altogether possible. Hence Gregory, expounding the words of Job (26:11), “The pillars of heaven tremble, and dread at His beck,” says (Moral. xvii, 29): “The heavenly powers that gaze on Him without ceasing, tremble while contemplating: but their awe, lest it should be of a penal nature, is

one not of fear but of wonder,” because, to wit, they wonder at God’s supereminence and incomprehensibility. Augustine also (*De Civ. Dei* xiv, 9) in this sense, admits fear in heaven, although he leaves the question doubtful. “If,” he says, “this chaste fear that endureth for ever and ever is to be in the future life, it will not be a fear that is afraid of an evil which might possibly occur, but a fear that holds fast to a good which we cannot lose. For when we love the good which we have acquired, with an unchangeable love, without doubt, if it is allowable to say so, our fear is sure of avoiding evil. Because chaste fear denotes a will that cannot consent to sin, and whereby we avoid sin without trembling lest, in our weakness, we fall, and possess ourselves in the tranquillity born of charity. Else, if no kind of fear is possible there, perhaps fear is said to endure for ever and ever, because that which fear will lead us to, will be everlasting.”

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(11)-RO(1) — The passage quoted excludes from the blessed, the fear that denotes solicitude, and anxiety about evil, but not the fear which is accompanied by security.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(11)-RO(2) — As Dionysius says (*Div. Nom.* ix) “the same things are both like and unlike God. They are like by reason of a variable imitation of the Inimitable” — that is, because, so far as they can, they imitate God Who cannot be imitated perfectly — “they are unlike because they are the effects of a Cause of Whom they fall short infinitely and immeasurably.” Hence, if there be no fear in God (since there is none above Him to whom He may be subject) it does not follow that there is none in the blessed, whose happiness consists in perfect subjection to God.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(11)-RO(3) — Hope implies a certain defect, namely the futurity of happiness, which ceases when happiness is present: whereas fear implies a natural defect in a creature, in so far as it is infinitely distant from God, and this defect will remain even in heaven. Hence fear will not be cast out altogether.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(12)

Whether poverty of spirit is the beatitude corresponding to the gift of fear?

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(12)-O(1) — It would seem that poverty of spirit is not the beatitude corresponding to the gift of fear. For fear is the beginning of the spiritual life, as explained above (**A(7)**): whereas poverty belongs to the perfection of the spiritual life, according to ~~4121~~ Matthew 19:21, “If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor.” Therefore poverty of spirit does not correspond to the gift of fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(12)-O(2) — Further, it is written (~~4180~~ Psalm 118:120): “Pierce Thou my flesh with Thy fear,” whence it seems to follow that it belongs to fear to restrain the flesh. But the curbing of the flesh seems to belong rather to the beatitude of mourning. Therefore the beatitude of mourning corresponds to the gift of fear, rather than the beatitude of poverty.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(12)-O(3) — Further, the gift of fear corresponds to the virtue of hope, as stated above (**A(9)**, ad 1). Now the last beatitude which is, “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God,” seems above all to correspond to hope, because according to ~~4180~~ Romans 5:2, “we... glory in the hope of the glory of the sons of God.” Therefore that beatitude corresponds to the gift of fear, rather than poverty of spirit.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(12)-O(4) — Further, it was stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(70)**, **A(2)**) that the fruits correspond to the beatitudes. Now none of the fruits correspond to the gift of fear. Neither, therefore, does any of the beatitudes.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(12) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte i, 4): “The fear of the Lord is befitting the humble of whom it is said: Blessed are the poor in spirit.”

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(12) — *I answer that*, Poverty of spirit properly corresponds to fear. Because, since it belongs to filial fear to show reverence and submission to God, whatever results from this submission

belongs to the gift of fear. Now from the very fact that a man submits to God, it follows that he ceases to seek greatness either in himself or in another but seeks it only in God. For that would be inconsistent with perfect subjection to God, wherefore it is written (^{<1918>}Psalm 19:8): “Some trust in chariots and some in horses; but we will call upon the name of... our God.” It follows that if a man fear God perfectly, he does not, by pride, seek greatness either in himself or in external goods, viz. honors and riches. In either case, this proceeds from poverty of spirit, in so far as the latter denotes either the voiding of a puffed up and proud spirit, according to Augustine’s interpretation (De Serm. Dom. in Monte i, 4), or the renunciation of worldly goods which is done in spirit, i.e. by one’s own will, through the instigation of the Holy Spirit, according to the expounding of Ambrose on ^{<1918>}Luke 6:20 and Jerome on ^{<1918>}Matthew 5:3.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(12)-RO(1) — Since a beatitude is an act of perfect virtue, all the beatitudes belong to the perfection of spiritual life. And this perfection seems to require that whoever would strive to obtain a perfect share of spiritual goods, needs to begin by despising earthly goods, wherefore fear holds the first place among the gifts. Perfection, however, does not consist in the renunciation itself of temporal goods; since this is the way to perfection: whereas filial fear, to which the beatitude of poverty corresponds, is consistent with the perfection of wisdom, as stated above (**AA(7),10**).

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(12)-RO(2) — The undue exaltation of man either in himself or in another is more directly opposed to that submission to God which is the result of filial fear, than is external pleasure. Yet this is, in consequence, opposed to fear, since whoever fears God and is subject to Him, takes no delight in things other than God. Nevertheless, pleasure is not concerned, as exaltation is, with the arduous character of a thing which fear regards: and so the beatitude of poverty corresponds to fear directly, and the beatitude of mourning, consequently.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(12)-RO(3) — Hope denotes a movement by way of a relation of tendency to a term, whereas fear implies movement by way of a relation of withdrawal from a term: wherefore the last beatitude which is the term of spiritual perfection, fittingly corresponds to hope, by way of ultimate object; while the first beatitude, which implies withdrawal from

external things which hinder submission to God, fittingly corresponds to fear.

P(2b)-Q(19)-A(12)-RO(4) — As regards the fruits, it seems that those things correspond to the gift of fear, which pertain to the moderate use of temporal things or to abstinence therefrom; such are modesty, continency and chastity.

QUESTION 20

OF DESPAIR

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the contrary vices;

- (1) despair;
- (2) presumption.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether despair is a sin?
- (2) Whether it can be without unbelief?
- (3) Whether it is the greatest of sins?
- (4) Whether it arises from sloth?

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(1)

Whether despair is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that despair is not a sin. For every sin includes conversion to a mutable good, together with aversion from the immutable good, as Augustine states (De Lib. Arb. ii, 19). But despair includes no conversion to a mutable good. Therefore it is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, that which grows from a good root, seems to be no sin, because “a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit” (~~4078~~ Matthew 7:18). Now despair seems to grow from a good root, viz. fear of God, or from horror at the greatness of one’s own sins. Therefore despair is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, if despair were a sin, it would be a sin also for the damned to despair. But this is not imputed to them as their

fault but as part of their damnation. Therefore neither is it imputed to wayfarers as their fault, so that it is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, That which leads men to sin, seems not only to be a sin itself, but a source of sins. Now such is despair, for the Apostle says of certain men (~~some~~ Ephesians 4:19):

“Who, despairing, have given themselves up to lasciviousness, unto the working of all uncleanness and [Vulg.: ‘unto’] covetousness.”

Therefore despair is not only a sin but also the origin of other sins.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(1) — *I answer that*, According to the Philosopher (Ethic. vi, 2) affirmation and negation in the intellect correspond to search and avoidance in the appetite; while truth and falsehood in the intellect correspond to good and evil in the appetite. Consequently every appetitive movement which is conformed to a true intellect, is good in itself, while every appetitive movement which is conformed to a false intellect is evil in itself and sinful. Now the true opinion of the intellect about God is that from Him comes salvation to mankind, and pardon to sinners, according to ~~some~~ Ezekiel 18:23, “I desire not the death of the sinner, but that he should be converted, and live” [*Vulg.: ‘Is it My will that a sinner should die... and not that he should be converted and live?’ Cf. ~~some~~ Ezekiel 33:11]: while it is a false opinion that He refuses pardon to the repentant sinner, or that He does not turn sinners to Himself by sanctifying grace. Therefore, just as the movement of hope, which is in conformity with the true opinion, is praiseworthy and virtuous, so the contrary movement of despair, which is in conformity with the false opinion about God, is vicious and sinful.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(1)-RO(1) — In every mortal sin there is, in some way, aversion from the immutable good, and conversion to a mutable good, but not always in the same way. Because, since the theological virtues have God for their object, the sins which are contrary to them, such as hatred of God, despair and unbelief, consist principally in aversion from the immutable good; but, consequently, they imply conversion to a mutable good, in so far as the soul that is a deserter from God, must necessarily turn to other things. Other sins, however, consist principally in conversion to a mutable good, and, consequently, in aversion from the immutable

good: because the fornicator intends, not to depart from God, but to enjoy carnal pleasure, the result of which is that he departs from God.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(1)-RO(2) — A thing may grow from a virtuous root in two ways: first, directly and on the part of the virtue itself; even as an act proceeds from a habit: and in this way no sin can grow from a virtuous root, for in this sense Augustine declared (De Lib. Arb. ii, 18,19) that “no man makes evil use of virtue.” Secondly, a thing proceeds from a virtue indirectly, or is occasioned by a virtue, and in this way nothing hinders a sin proceeding from a virtue: thus sometimes men pride themselves of their virtues, according to Augustine (Ep. ccxi): “Pride lies in wait for good works that they may die.” In this way fear of God or horror of one’s own sins may lead to despair, in so far as man makes evil use of those good things, by allowing them to be an occasion of despair.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(1)-RO(3) — The damned are outside the pale of hope on account of the impossibility of returning to happiness: hence it is not imputed to them that they hope not, but it is a part of their damnation. Even so, it would be no sin for a wayfarer to despair of obtaining that which he had no natural capacity for obtaining, or which was not due to be obtained by him; for instance, if a physician were to despair of healing some sick man, or if anyone were to despair of ever becoming rich.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(2)

Whether there can be despair without unbelief?

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that there can be no despair without unbelief. For the certainty of hope is derived from faith; and so long as the cause remains the effect is not done away. Therefore a man cannot lose the certainty of hope, by despairing, unless his faith be removed.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, to prefer one’s own guilt to God’s mercy and goodness, is to deny the infinity of God’s goodness and mercy, and so savors of unbelief. But whoever despairs, prefers his own guilt to the Divine mercy and goodness, according to ~~Gen~~ Genesis 4:13: “My

iniquity is greater than that I may deserve pardon.” Therefore whoever despairs, is an unbeliever.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, whoever falls into a condemned heresy, is an unbeliever. But he that despairs seems to fall into a condemned heresy, viz. that of the Novatians, who say that there is no pardon for sins after Baptism. Therefore it seems that whoever despairs, is an unbeliever.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, If we remove that which follows, that which precedes remains. But hope follows faith, as stated above (**Q(17), A(7)**). Therefore when hope is removed, faith can remain; so that, not everyone who despairs, is an unbeliever.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Unbelief pertains to the intellect, but despair, to the appetite: and the intellect is about universals, while the appetite is moved in connection with particulars, since the appetitive movement is from the soul towards things, which, in themselves, are particular. Now it may happen that a man, while having a right opinion in the universal, is not rightly disposed as to his appetitive movement, his estimate being corrupted in a particular matter, because, in order to pass from the universal opinion to the appetite for a particular thing, it is necessary to have a particular estimate (De Anima iii, 2), just as it is impossible to infer a particular conclusion from an universal proposition, except through the holding of a particular proposition. Hence it is that a man, while having right faith, in the universal, fails in an appetitive movement, in regard to some particular, his particular estimate being corrupted by a habit or a passion, just as the fornicator, by choosing fornication as a good for himself at this particular moment, has a corrupt estimate in a particular matter, although he retains the true universal estimate according to faith, viz. that fornication is a mortal sin. In the same way, a man while retaining in the universal, the true estimate of faith, viz. that there is in the Church the power of forgiving sins, may suffer a movement of despair, to wit, that for him, being in such a state, there is no hope of pardon, his estimate being corrupted in a particular matter. In this way there can be despair, just as there can be other mortal sins, without belief.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(2)-RO(1) — The effect is done away, not only when the first cause is removed, but also when the secondary cause is removed. Hence the movement of hope can be done away, not only by the removal of the universal estimate of faith, which is, so to say, the first cause of the certainty of hope, but also by the removal of the particular estimate, which is the secondary cause, as it were.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(2)-RO(2) — If anyone were to judge, in universal, that God's mercy is not infinite, he would be an unbeliever. But he who despairs judges not thus, but that, for him in that state, on account of some particular disposition, there is no hope of the Divine mercy.

The same answer applies to the Third Objection, since the Novatians denied, in universal, that there is remission of sins in the Church.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(3)

Whether despair is the greatest of sins?

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that despair is not the greatest of sins. For there can be despair without unbelief, as stated above (**A(2)**). But unbelief is the greatest of sins because it overthrows the foundation of the spiritual edifice. Therefore despair is not the greatest of sins.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, a greater evil is opposed to a greater good, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. viii, 10). But charity is greater than hope, according to ²⁴¹³1 Corinthians 13:13. Therefore hatred of God is a greater sin than despair.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, in the sin of despair there is nothing but inordinate aversion from God: whereas in other sins there is not only inordinate aversion from God, but also an inordinate conversion. Therefore the sin of despair is not more but less grave than other sins.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(3) — On the contrary, An incurable sin seems to be most grievous, according to ²⁴¹²Jeremiah 30:12: "Thy bruise is incurable, thy wound is very grievous." Now the sin of despair is incurable, according to ²⁴¹⁵Jeremiah 15:18: "My wound is desperate so as to refuse to be healed."

[*Vulg.: ‘Why is my wound,’ etc.] Therefore despair is a most grievous sin.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(3) — *I answer that,* Those sins which are contrary to the theological virtues are in themselves more grievous than others: because, since the theological virtues have God for their object, the sins which are opposed to them imply aversion from God directly and principally. Now every mortal sin takes its principal malice and gravity from the fact of its turning away from God, for if it were possible to turn to a mutable good, even inordinately, without turning away from God, it would not be a mortal sin. Consequently a sin which, first and of its very nature, includes aversion from God, is most grievous among mortal sins.

Now unbelief, despair and hatred of God are opposed to the theological virtues: and among them, if we compare hatred of God and unbelief to despair, we shall find that, in themselves, that is, in respect of their proper species, they are more grievous. For unbelief is due to a man not believing God’s own truth; while the hatred of God arises from man’s will being opposed to God’s goodness itself; whereas despair consists in a man ceasing to hope for a share of God’s goodness. Hence it is clear that unbelief and hatred of God are against God as He is in Himself, while despair is against Him, according as His good is partaken of by us. Wherefore strictly speaking it is more grievous sin to disbelieve God’s truth, or to hate God, than not to hope to receive glory from Him.

If, however, despair be compared to the other two sins from our point of view, then despair is more dangerous, since hope withdraws us from evils and induces us to seek for good things, so that when hope is given up, men rush headlong into sin, and are drawn away from good works. Wherefore a gloss on ¹²¹¹Proverbs 24:10,

“If thou lose hope being weary in the day of distress, thy strength
shall be diminished,”

says: “Nothing is more hateful than despair, for the man that has it loses his constancy both in the every day toils of this life, and, what is worse, in the battle of faith.” And Isidore says (De Sum. Bono ii, 14): “To commit a crime is to kill the soul, but to despair is to fall into hell.”

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(4)***Whether despair arises from sloth?***

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that despair does not arise from sloth. Because different causes do not give rise to one same effect. Now despair of the future life arises from lust, according to Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45). Therefore it does not arise from sloth.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, just as despair is contrary to hope, so is sloth contrary to spiritual joy. But spiritual joy arises from hope, according to ~~6122~~ Romans 12:12, “rejoicing in hope.” Therefore sloth arises from despair, and not vice versa.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, contrary effects have contrary causes. Now hope, the contrary of which is despair, seems to proceed from the consideration of Divine favors, especially the Incarnation, for Augustine says (De Trin. xiii, 10): “Nothing was so necessary to raise our hope, than that we should be shown how much God loves us. Now what greater proof could we have of this than that God’s Son should deign to unite Himself to our nature?” Therefore despair arises rather from the neglect of the above consideration than from sloth.


P(2b)-Q(20)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45) reckons despair among the effects of sloth.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(17)**, **A(1)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(40)**, **A(1)**), the object of hope is a good, difficult but possible to obtain by oneself or by another. Consequently the hope of obtaining happiness may be lacking in a person in two ways: first, through his not deeming it an arduous good; secondly, through his deeming it impossible to obtain either by himself, or by another. Now, the fact that spiritual goods taste good to us no more, or seem to be goods of no great account, is chiefly due to our affections being infected with the love of bodily pleasures, among which, sexual pleasures hold the first place: for the love of those pleasures leads man to have a distaste for spiritual things, and not to hope for them as arduous goods. In this way despair is caused by lust.

On the other hand, the fact that a man deems an arduous good impossible to obtain, either by himself or by another, is due to his being over downcast, because when this state of mind dominates his affections, it seems to him that he will never be able to rise to any good. And since sloth is a sadness that casts down the spirit, in this way despair is born of sloth.

Now this is the proper object of hope — that the thing is possible, because the good and the arduous regard other passions also. Hence despair is born of sloth in a more special way: though it may arise from lust, for the reason given above.

This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(4)-RO(2) — According to the Philosopher (Rhet. i, 11), just as hope gives rise to joy, so, when a man is joyful he has greater hope: and, accordingly, those who are sorrowful fall the more easily into despair, according to  2 Corinthians 2:7: “Lest... such an one be swallowed up by overmuch sorrow.” Yet, since the object of hope is good, to which the appetite tends naturally, and which it shuns, not naturally but only on account of some supervening obstacle, it follows that, more directly, hope gives birth to joy, while on the contrary despair is born of sorrow.

P(2b)-Q(20)-A(4)-RO(3) — This very neglect to consider the Divine favors arises from sloth. For when a man is influenced by a certain passion he considers chiefly the things which pertain to that passion: so that a man who is full of sorrow does not easily think of great and joyful things, but only of sad things, unless by a great effort he turn his thoughts away from sadness.

QUESTION 21

OF PRESUMPTION

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider presumption, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) What is the object in which presumption trusts?
- (2) Whether presumption is a sin?
- (3) To what is it opposed?
- (4) From what vice does it arise?

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(1)

Whether presumption trusts in God or in our own power?

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that presumption, which is a sin against the Holy Ghost, trusts, not in God, but in our own power. For the lesser the power, the more grievously does he sin who trusts in it too much. But man's power is less than God's. Therefore it is a more grievous sin to presume on human power than to presume on the power of God. Now the sin against the Holy Ghost is most grievous. Therefore presumption, which is reckoned a species of sin against the Holy Ghost, trusts to human rather than to Divine power.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, other sins arise from the sin against the Holy Ghost, for this sin is called malice which is a source from which sins arise. Now other sins seem to arise from the presumption whereby man presumes on himself rather than from the presumption whereby he presumes on God, since self-love is the origin of sin, according to Augustine (De Civ. Dei xiv, 28). Therefore it seems that presumption which is a sin against the Holy Ghost, relies chiefly on human power.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, sin arises from the inordinate conversion to a mutable good. Now presumption is a sin. Therefore it arises from turning to human power, which is a mutable good, rather than from turning to the power of God, which is an immutable good.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Just as, through despair, a man despises the Divine mercy, on which hope relies, so, through presumption, he despises the Divine justice, which punishes the sinner. Now justice is in God even as mercy is. Therefore, just as despair consists in aversion from God, so presumption consists in inordinate conversion to Him.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Presumption seems to imply immoderate hope. Now the object of hope is an arduous possible good: and a thing is possible to a man in two ways: first by his own power; secondly, by the power of God alone. With regard to either hope there may be presumption owing to lack of moderation. As to the hope whereby a man relies on his own power, there is presumption if he tends to a good as though it were possible to him, whereas it surpasses his powers, according to Judith 6:15: “Thou humblest them that presume of themselves.” This presumption is contrary to the virtue of magnanimity which holds to the mean in this kind of hope.

But as to the hope whereby a man relies on the power of God, there may be presumption through immoderation, in the fact that a man tends to some good as though it were possible by the power and mercy of God, whereas it is not possible, for instance, if a man hope to obtain pardon without repenting, or glory without merits. This presumption is, properly, the sin against the Holy Ghost, because, to wit, by presuming thus a man removes or despises the assistance of the Holy Spirit, whereby he is withdrawn from sin.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(1)-RO(1) — As stated above (**Q(20)**, **A(3)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(73)**, **A(3)**) a sin which is against God is, in its genus, graver than other sins. Hence presumption whereby a man relies on God inordinately, is a more grievous sin than the presumption of trusting in one’s own power, since to rely on the Divine power for obtaining what is unbecoming to God, is to depreciate the Divine power, and it is evident that it is a graver sin to detract from the Divine power than to exaggerate one’s own.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(1)-RO(2) — The presumption whereby a man presumes inordinately on God, includes self-love, whereby he loves his own good inordinately. For when we desire a thing very much, we think we can easily procure it through others, even though we cannot.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(1)-RO(3) — Presumption on God's mercy implies both conversion to a mutable good, in so far as it arises from an inordinate desire of one's own good, and aversion from the immutable good, in as much as it ascribes to the Divine power that which is unbecoming to it, for thus man turns away from God's power.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(2)

Whether presumption is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that presumption is not a sin. For no sin is a reason why man should be heard by God. Yet, through presumption some are heard by God, for it is written (Judith 9:17): "Hear me a poor wretch making supplication to Thee, and presuming of Thy mercy." Therefore presumption on God's mercy is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, presumption denotes excessive hope. But there cannot be excess of that hope which is in God, since His power and mercy are infinite. Therefore it seems that presumption is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, that which is a sin does not excuse from sin: for the Master says (Sent. ii, D, 22) that "Adam sinned less, because he sinned in the hope of pardon," which seems to indicate presumption. Therefore presumption is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is reckoned a species of sin against the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(20)**, **A(1)**) with regard to despair, every appetitive movement that is conformed to a false intellect, is evil in itself and sinful. Now presumption is an appetitive movement, since it denotes an inordinate hope. Moreover it is conformed to a false intellect, just as despair is: for just as it is false that God does not pardon the repentant, or that He does not turn sinners to repentance, so is

it false that He grants forgiveness to those who persevere in their sins, and that He gives glory to those who cease from good works: and it is to this estimate that the movement of presumption is conformed.

Consequently presumption is a sin, but less grave than despair, since, on account of His infinite goodness, it is more proper to God to have mercy and to spare, than to punish: for the former becomes God in Himself, the latter becomes Him by reason of our sins.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(2)-RO(1) — Presumption sometimes stands for hope, because even the right hope which we have in God seems to be presumption, if it be measured according to man's estate: yet it is not, if we look at the immensity of the goodness of God.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(2)-RO(2) — Presumption does not denote excessive hope, as though man hoped too much in God; but through man hoping to obtain from God something unbecoming to Him; which is the same as to hope too little in Him, since it implies a depreciation of His power; as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 1).

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(2)-RO(3) — To sin with the intention of persevering in sin and through the hope of being pardoned, is presumptuous, and this does not diminish, but increases sin. To sin, however, with the hope of obtaining pardon some time, and with the intention of refraining from sin and of repenting of it, is not presumptuous, but diminishes sin, because this seems to indicate a will less hardened in sin.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(3)

Whether presumption is more opposed to fear than to hope?

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that presumption is more opposed to fear than to hope. Because inordinate fear is opposed to right fear. Now presumption seems to pertain to inordinate fear, for it is written (Wis. 17:10): "A troubled conscience always presumes [Douay: 'forecasteth'] grievous things," and (Wis. 17:11) that "fear is a help to presumption [*Vulg.: 'Fear is nothing else but a yielding up of the succours from thought.']. Therefore presumption is opposed to fear rather than to hope.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, contraries are most distant from one another. Now presumption is more distant from fear than from hope, because presumption implies movement to something, just as hope does, whereas fear denotes movement from a thing. Therefore presumption is contrary to fear rather than to hope.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, presumption excludes fear altogether, whereas it does not exclude hope altogether, but only the rectitude of hope. Since therefore contraries destroy one another, it seems that presumption is contrary to fear rather than to hope.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, When two vices are opposed to one another they are contrary to the same virtue, as timidity and audacity are opposed to fortitude. Now the sin of presumption is contrary to the sin of despair, which is directly opposed to hope. Therefore it seems that presumption also is more directly opposed to hope.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As Augustine states (Contra Julian. iv, 3), “every virtue not only has a contrary vice manifestly distinct from it, as temerity is opposed to prudence, but also a sort of kindred vice, alike, not in truth but only in its deceitful appearance, as cunning is opposed to prudence.” This agrees with the Philosopher who says (Ethic. ii, 8) that a virtue seems to have more in common with one of the contrary vices than with the other, as temperance with insensibility, and fortitude with audacity.

Accordingly presumption appears to be manifestly opposed to fear, especially servile fear, which looks at the punishment arising from God’s justice, the remission of which presumption hopes for; yet by a kind of false likeness it is more opposed to hope, since it denotes an inordinate hope in God. And since things are more directly opposed when they belong to the same genus, than when they belong to different genera, it follows that presumption is more directly opposed to hope than to fear. For they both regard and rely on the same object, hope inordinately, presumption inordinately.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(3)-RO(1) — Just as hope is misused in speaking of evils, and properly applied in speaking of good, so is presumption: it is in this way that inordinate fear is called presumption.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(3)-RO(2) — Contraries are things that are most distant from one another within the same genus. Now presumption and hope denote a movement of the same genus, which can be either ordinate or inordinate. Hence presumption is more directly opposed to hope than to fear, since it is opposed to hope in respect of its specific difference, as an inordinate thing to an ordinate one, whereas it is opposed to fear, in respect of its generic difference, which is the movement of hope.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(3)-RO(3) — Presumption is opposed to fear by a generic contrariety, and to the virtue of hope by a specific contrariety. Hence presumption excludes fear altogether even generically, whereas it does not exclude hope except by reason of its difference, by excluding its ordinateness.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(4)

Whether presumption arises from vainglory?

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that presumption does not arise from vainglory. For presumption seems to rely most of all on the Divine mercy. Now mercy [misericordia] regards unhappiness [miseria] which is contrary to glory. Therefore presumption does not arise from vainglory.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, presumption is opposed to despair. Now despair arises from sorrow, as stated above (**Q(20)**, **A(4)**, ad 2). Since therefore opposites have opposite causes, presumption would seem to arise from pleasure, and consequently from sins of the flesh, which give the most absorbing pleasure.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the vice of presumption consists in tending to some impossible good, as though it were possible. Now it is owing to ignorance that one deems an impossible thing to be possible. Therefore presumption arises from ignorance rather than from vainglory.

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 45) that “presumption of novelties is a daughter of vainglory.”

P(2b)-Q(21)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), presumption is twofold; one whereby a man relies on his own power, when he attempts

something beyond his power, as though it were possible to him. Such like presumption clearly arises from vainglory; for it is owing to a great desire for glory, that a man attempts things beyond his power, and especially novelties which call for greater admiration. Hence Gregory states explicitly that presumption of novelties is a daughter of vainglory.

The other presumption is an inordinate trust in the Divine mercy or power, consisting in the hope of obtaining glory without merits, or pardon without repentance. Such like presumption seems to arise directly from pride, as though man thought so much of himself as to esteem that God would not punish him or exclude him from glory, however much he might be a sinner.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

QUESTION 22

OF THE PRECEPTS RELATING
TO HOPE AND FEAR

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the precepts relating to hope and fear: under which head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) The precepts relating to hope;
- (2) The precepts relating to fear.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(1)*Whether there should be a precept of hope?*

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that no precept should be given relating to the virtue of hope. For when an effect is sufficiently procured by one cause, there is no need to induce it by another. Now man is sufficiently induced by his natural inclination to hope for good. Therefore there is no need of a precept of the Law to induce him to do this.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, since precepts are given about acts of virtue, the chief precepts are about the acts of the chief virtues. Now the chief of all the virtues are the three theological virtues, viz. hope, faith and charity. Consequently, as the chief precepts of the Law are those of the decalogue, to which all others may be reduced, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(100), A(3)**), it seems that if any precept of hope were given, it should be found among the precepts of the decalogue. But it is not to be found there. Therefore it seems that the Law should contain no precept of hope.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, to prescribe an act of virtue is equivalent to a prohibition of the act of the opposite vice. Now no precept is to be found forbidding despair which is contrary to hope. Therefore it seems that the Law should contain no precept of hope.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says on ^{<RS>}John 15:12, “This is My commandment, that you love one another” (Tract. lxxxiii in Joan.): “How many things are commanded us about faith! How many relating to hope!” Therefore it is fitting that some precepts should be given about hope.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Among the precepts contained in Holy Writ, some belong to the substance of the Law, others are preambles to the Law. The preambles to the Law are those without which no law is possible: such are the precepts relating to the act of faith and the act of hope, because the act of faith inclines man’s mind so that he believes the Author of the Law to be One to Whom he owes submission, while, by the hope of a reward, he is induced to observe the precepts. The precepts that belong to the substance of the Law are those which relate to right conduct and are imposed on man already subject and ready to obey: wherefore when the Law was given these precepts were set forth from the very outset under form of a command.

Yet the precepts of hope and faith were not to be given under the form of a command, since, unless man already believed and hoped, it would be useless to give him the Law: but, just as the precept of faith had to be given under the form of an announcement or reminder, as stated above (**Q(16), A(1)**), so too, the precept of hope, in the first promulgation of the Law, had to be given under the form of a promise. For he who promises rewards to them that obey him, by that very fact, urges them to hope: hence all the promises contained in the Law are incitements to hope.

Since, however, when once the Law has been given, it is for a wise man to induce men not only to observe the precepts, but also, and much more, to safeguard the foundation of the Law, therefore, after the first promulgation of the Law, Holy Writ holds out to man many inducements to hope, even by way of warning or command, and not merely by way of promise, as in the Law; for instance, in the ^{<RS>}Psalms 61:9: “Hope [Douay: ‘Trust’] in Him all ye congregation of the people,” and in many other passages of the Scriptures.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(1)-RO(1) — Nature inclines us to hope for the good which is proportionate to human nature; but for man to hope for a supernatural good he had to be induced by the authority of the Divine law, partly by

promises, partly by admonitions and commands. Nevertheless there was need for precepts of the Divine law to be given even for those things to which natural reason inclines us, such as the acts of the moral virtues, for sake of insuring a greater stability, especially since the natural reason of man was clouded by the lusts of sin.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(1)-RO(2) — The precepts of the law of the decalogue belong to the first promulgation of the Law: hence there was no need for a precept of hope among the precepts of the decalogue, and it was enough to induce men to hope by the inclusion of certain promises, as in the case of the first and fourth commandments.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(1)-RO(3) — In those observances to which man is bound as under a duty, it is enough that he receive an affirmative precept as to what he has to do, wherein is implied the prohibition of what he must avoid doing: thus he is given a precept concerning the honor due to parents, but not a prohibition against dishonoring them, except by the law inflicting punishment on those who dishonor their parents. And since in order to be saved it is man's duty to hope in God, he had to be induced to do so by one of the above ways, affirmatively, so to speak, wherein is implied the prohibition of the opposite.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(2)

Whether there should have been given a precept of fear?

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that, in the Law, there should not have been given a precept of fear. For the fear of God is about things which are a preamble to the Law, since it is the "beginning of wisdom." Now things which are a preamble to the Law do not come under a precept of the Law. Therefore no precept of fear should be given in the Law.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, given the cause, the effect is also given. Now love is the cause of fear, since "every fear proceeds from some kind of love," as Augustine states (Qq. lxxxiii, qu. 33). Therefore given the precept of love, it would have been superfluous to command fear.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, presumption, in a way, is opposed to fear. But the Law contains no prohibition against presumption. Therefore it seems that neither should any precept of fear have been given.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (⁴⁵⁰⁰Deuteronomy 10:12):

“And now, Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but
that thou fear the Lord thy God?”

But He requires of us that which He commands us to do. Therefore it is a matter of precept that man should fear God.

I answer that, Fear is twofold, servile and filial. Now just as man is induced, by the hope of rewards, to observe precepts of law, so too is he induced thereto by the fear of punishment, which fear is servile.

And just as according to what has been said (**A(1)**), in the promulgation of the Law there was no need for a precept of the act of hope, and men were to be induced thereto by promises, so neither was there need for a precept, under form of command, of fear which regards punishment, and men were to be induced thereto by the threat of punishment: and this was realized both in the precepts of the decalogue, and afterwards, in due sequence, in the secondary precepts of the Law.

Yet, just as wise men and the prophets who, consequently, strove to strengthen man in the observance of the Law, delivered their teaching about hope under the form of admonition or command, so too did they in the matter of fear.

On the other hand filial fear which shows reverence to God, is a sort of genus in respect of the love of God, and a kind of principle of all observances connected with reverence for God. Hence precepts of filial fear are given in the Law, even as precepts of love, because each is a preamble to the external acts prescribed by the Law and to which the precepts of the decalogue refer. Hence in the passage quoted in the argument, “*On the contrary*,” man is required “to have fear, to walk in God’s ways,” by worshipping Him, and “to love Him.”

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(2)-RO(1) — Filial fear is a preamble to the Law, not as though it were extrinsic thereto, but as being the beginning of the Law, just

as love is. Hence precepts are given of both, since they are like general principles of the whole Law.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(2)-RO(2) — From love proceeds filial fear as also other good works that are done from charity. Hence, just as after the precept of charity, precepts are given of the other acts of virtue, so at the same time precepts are given of fear and of the love of charity, just as, in demonstrative sciences, it is not enough to lay down the first principles, unless the conclusions also are given which follow from them proximately or remotely.

P(2b)-Q(22)-A(2)-RO(3) — Inducement to fear suffices to exclude presumption, even as inducement to hope suffices to exclude despair, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 3).

ON CHARITY

QUESTIONS 23-46

QUESTION 23

OF CHARITY, CONSIDERED IN ITSELF

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

In proper sequence, we must consider charity; and

- (1) charity itself;
- (2) the corresponding gift of wisdom.

The first consideration will be fivefold:

- (1) Charity itself;
- (2) The object of charity;
- (3) Its acts;
- (4) The opposite vices;
- (5) The precepts relating thereto.

The first of these considerations will be twofold:

- (1) Charity, considered as regards itself;
- (2) Charity, considered in its relation to its subject.

Under the first head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether charity is friendship?
- (2) Whether it is something created in the soul?
- (3) Whether it is a virtue?

- (4) Whether it is a special virtue?
- (5) Whether it is one virtue?
- (6) Whether it is the greatest of the virtues?
- (7) Whether any true virtue is possible without it?
- (8) Whether it is the form of the virtues?

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(1)

Whether charity is friendship?

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that charity is not friendship. For nothing is so appropriate to friendship as to dwell with one's friend, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. viii, 5). Now charity is of man towards God and the angels, "whose dwelling [Douay: 'conversation'] is not with men" (^{<2001>}Daniel 2:11). Therefore charity is not friendship.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, there is no friendship without return of love (Ethic. viii, 2). But charity extends even to one's enemies, according to ^{<1154>}Matthew 5:44: "Love your enemies." Therefore charity is not friendship.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. viii, 3) there are three kinds of friendship, directed respectively towards the delightful, the useful, or the virtuous. Now charity is not the friendship for the useful or delightful; for Jerome says in his letter to Paulinus which is to be found at the beginning of the Bible: "True friendship cemented by Christ, is where men are drawn together, not by household interests, not by mere bodily presence, not by crafty and cajoling flattery, but by the fear of God, and the study of the Divine Scriptures." No more is it friendship for the virtuous, since by charity we love even sinners, whereas friendship based on the virtuous is only for virtuous men (Ethic. viii). Therefore charity is not friendship.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<655>}John 15:15): "I will not now call you servants... but My friends." Now this was said to them by reason of nothing else than charity. Therefore charity is friendship.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(1) — *I answer that*, According to the Philosopher (Ethic. viii, 2,3) not every love has the character of friendship, but that love which is together with benevolence, when, to wit, we love someone so as to wish good to him. If, however, we do not wish good to what we love, but wish its good for ourselves, (thus we are said to love wine, or a horse, or the like), it is love not of friendship, but of a kind of concupiscence. For it would be absurd to speak of having friendship for wine or for a horse.

Yet neither does well-wishing suffice for friendship, for a certain mutual love is requisite, since friendship is between friend and friend: and this well-wishing is founded on some kind of communication.

Accordingly, since there is a communication between man and God, inasmuch as He communicates His happiness to us, some kind of friendship must needs be based on this same communication, of which it is written (~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 1:9): “God is faithful: by Whom you are called unto the fellowship of His Son.” The love which is based on this communication, is charity: wherefore it is evident that charity is the friendship of man for God.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(1)-RO(1) — Man’s life is twofold. There is his outward life in respect of his sensitive and corporeal nature: and with regard to this life there is no communication or fellowship between us and God or the angels. The other is man’s spiritual life in respect of his mind, and with regard to this life there is fellowship between us and both God and the angels, imperfectly indeed in this present state of life, wherefore it is written (~~1~~ Philippians 3:20): “Our conversation is in heaven.” But this “conversation” will be perfected in heaven, when “His servants shall serve Him, and they shall see His face” (~~1~~ Revelation 22:3,4). Therefore charity is imperfect here, but will be perfected in heaven.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(1)-RO(2) — Friendship extends to a person in two ways: first in respect of himself, and in this way friendship never extends but to one’s friends: secondly, it extends to someone in respect of another, as, when a man has friendship for a certain person, for his sake he loves all belonging to him, be they children, servants, or connected with him in any way. Indeed so much do we love our friends, that for their sake we love all who belong to them, even if they hurt or hate us; so that, in this way, the friendship of charity extends even to our enemies, whom we love out of

charity in relation to God, to Whom the friendship of charity is chiefly directed.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(1)-RO(3) — The friendship that is based on the virtuous is directed to none but a virtuous man as the principal person, but for his sake we love those who belong to him, even though they be not virtuous: in this way charity, which above all is friendship based on the virtuous, extends to sinners, whom, out of charity, we love for God's sake.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(2)

Whether charity is something created in the soul?

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that charity is not something created in the soul. For Augustine says (De Trin. viii, 7): "He that loveth his neighbor, consequently, loveth love itself." Now God is love. Therefore it follows that he loves God in the first place. Again he says (De Trin. xv, 17): "It was said: God is Charity, even as it was said: God is a Spirit." Therefore charity is not something created in the soul, but is God Himself.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, God is the life of the soul spiritually just as the soul is the life of the body, according to ^{RSB}Deuteronomy 30:20: "He is thy life." Now the soul by itself quickens the body. Therefore God quickens the soul by Himself. But He quickens it by charity, according to ^{RSB}1 John 3:14:

"We know that we have passed from death to life,
because we love the brethren."

Therefore God is charity itself.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, no created thing is of infinite power; on the contrary every creature is vanity. But charity is not vanity, indeed it is opposed to vanity; and it is of infinite power, since it brings the human soul to the infinite good. Therefore charity is not something created in the soul.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(2) — On the charity, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. iii, 10): "By charity I mean the movement of the soul towards the enjoyment of God for His own sake." But a movement of the soul is

something created in the soul. Therefore charity is something created in the soul.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(2) — *I answer that*, The Master looks thoroughly into this question in **Q[17]** of the First Book, and concludes that charity is not something created in the soul, but is the Holy Ghost Himself dwelling in the mind. Nor does he mean to say that this movement of love whereby we love God is the Holy Ghost Himself, but that this movement is from the Holy Ghost without any intermediary habit, whereas other virtuous acts are from the Holy Ghost by means of the habits of other virtues, for instance the habit of faith or hope or of some other virtue: and this he said on account of the excellence of charity.

But if we consider the matter aright, this would be, *on the contrary*, detrimental to charity. For when the Holy Ghost moves the human mind the movement of charity does not proceed from this motion in such a way that the human mind be merely moved, without being the principle of this movement, as when a body is moved by some extrinsic motive power. For this is contrary to the nature of a voluntary act, whose principle needs to be in itself, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(6), A(1)**): so that it would follow that to love is not a voluntary act, which involves a contradiction, since love, of its very nature, implies an act of the will.

Likewise, neither can it be said that the Holy Ghost moves the will in such a way to the act of loving, as though the will were an instrument, for an instrument, though it be a principle of action, nevertheless has not the power to act or not to act, for then again the act would cease to be voluntary and meritorious, whereas it has been stated above (**P(2a), Q(114), A(4)**) that the love of charity is the root of merit: and, given that the will is moved by the Holy Ghost to the act of love, it is necessary that the will also should be the efficient cause of that act.

Now no act is perfectly produced by an active power, unless it be connatural to that power of reason of some form which is the principle of that action. Wherefore God, Who moves all things to their due ends, bestowed on each thing the form whereby it is inclined to the end appointed to it by Him; and in this way He “ordereth all things sweetly” (Wis. 8:1). But it is evident that the act of charity surpasses the nature of the power of the will, so that, therefore, unless some form be superadded

to the natural power, inclining it to the act of love, this same act would be less perfect than the natural acts and the acts of the other powers; nor would it be easy and pleasurable to perform. And this is evidently untrue, since no virtue has such a strong inclination to its act as charity has, nor does any virtue perform its act with so great pleasure. Therefore it is most necessary that, for us to perform the act of charity, there should be in us some habitual form superadded to the natural power, inclining that power to the act of charity, and causing it to act with ease and pleasure.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(2)-RO(1) — The Divine Essence Itself is charity, even as It is wisdom and goodness. Wherefore just as we are said to be good with the goodness which is God, and wise with the wisdom which is God (since the goodness whereby we are formally good is a participation of Divine goodness, and the wisdom whereby we are formally wise, is a share of Divine wisdom), so too, the charity whereby formally we love our neighbor is a participation of Divine charity. For this manner of speaking is common among the Platonists, with whose doctrines Augustine was imbued; and the lack of advertent to this has been to some an occasion of error.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(2)-RO(2) — God is effectively the life both of the soul by charity, and of the body by the soul: but formally charity is the life of the soul, even as the soul is the life of the body. Consequently we may conclude from this that just as the soul is immediately united to the body, so is charity to the soul.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(2)-RO(3) — Charity works formally. Now the efficacy of a form depends on the power of the agent, who instills the form, wherefore it is evident that charity is not vanity. But because it produces an infinite effect, since, by justifying the soul, it unites it to God, this proves the infinity of the Divine power, which is the author of charity.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(3)

Whether charity is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that charity is not a virtue. For charity is a kind of friendship. Now philosophers do not reckon friendship

a virtue, as may be gathered from Ethic. viii, 1; nor is it numbered among the virtues whether moral or intellectual. Neither, therefore, is charity a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, “virtue is the ultimate limit of power” (De Coelo et Mundo i, 11). But charity is not something ultimate, this applies rather to joy and peace. Therefore it seems that charity is not a virtue, and that this should be said rather of joy and peace.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, every virtue is an accidental habit. But charity is not an accidental habit, since it is a more excellent thing than the soul itself: whereas no accident is more excellent than its subject. Therefore charity is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Moribus Eccl. xi): “Charity is a virtue which, when our affections are perfectly ordered, unites us to God, for by it we love Him.”

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Human acts are good according as they are regulated by their due rule and measure. Wherefore human virtue which is the principle of all man’s good acts consists in following the rule of human acts, which is twofold, as stated above (**Q(17), A(1)**), viz. human reason and God.

Consequently just as moral virtue is defined as being “in accord with right reason,” as stated in Ethic. ii, 6, so too, the nature of virtue consists in attaining God, as also stated above with regard to faith, (**Q(4), A(5)**) and hope (**Q(17), A(1)**). Wherefore, it follows that charity is a virtue, for, since charity attains God, it unites us to God, as evidenced by the authority of Augustine quoted above.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(3)-RO(1) — The Philosopher (Ethic. viii) does not deny that friendship is a virtue, but affirms that it is “either a virtue or with a virtue.” For we might say that it is a moral virtue about works done in respect of another person, but under a different aspect from justice. For justice is about works done in respect of another person, under the aspect of the legal due, whereas friendship considers the aspect of a friendly and moral duty, or rather that of a gratuitous favor, as the Philosopher explains (Ethic. viii, 13). Nevertheless it may be admitted that it is not a virtue distinct of itself from the other virtues. For its praiseworthiness and

virtuousness are derived merely from its object, in so far, to wit, as it is based on the moral goodness of the virtues. This is evident from the fact that not every friendship is praiseworthy and virtuous, as in the case of friendship based on pleasure or utility. Wherefore friendship for the virtuous is something consequent to virtue rather than a virtue. Moreover there is no comparison with charity since it is not founded principally on the virtue of a man, but on the goodness of God.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(3)-RO(2) — It belongs to the same virtue to love a man and to rejoice about him, since joy results from love, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(25)**, **A(2)**) in the treatise on the passions: wherefore love is reckoned a virtue, rather than joy, which is an effect of love. And when virtue is described as being something ultimate, we mean that it is last, not in the order of effect, but in the order of excess, just as one hundred pounds exceed sixty.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(3)-RO(3) — Every accident is inferior to substance if we consider its being, since substance has being in itself, while an accident has its being in another: but considered as to its species, an accident which results from the principles of its subject is inferior to its subject, even as an effect is inferior to its cause; whereas an accident that results from a participation of some higher nature is superior to its subject, in so far as it is a likeness of that higher nature, even as light is superior to the diaphanous body. In this way charity is superior to the soul, in as much as it is a participation of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(4)

Whether charity is a special virtue?

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that charity is not a special virtue. For Jerome says: “Let me briefly define all virtue as the charity whereby we love God” [*The reference should be to Augustine, Ep. clxvii]: and Augustine says (De Moribus Eccl. xv) [*De Civ. Dei xv, 22] that “virtue is the order of love.” Now no special virtue is included in the definition of virtue in general. Therefore charity is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, that which extends to all works of virtue, cannot be a special virtue. But charity extends to all works of virtue, according to ^{463b}1 Corinthians 13:4: “Charity is patient, is kind,” etc.; indeed it extends to all human actions, according to ^{463b}1 Corinthians 16:14: “Let all your things be done in charity.” Therefore charity is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the precepts of the Law refer to acts of virtue. Now Augustine says (De Perfect. Human. Justit. v) that, “Thou shalt love” is “a general commandment,” and “Thou shalt not covet,” “a general prohibition.” Therefore charity is a general virtue.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Nothing general is enumerated together with what is special. But charity is enumerated together with special virtues, viz. hope and faith, according to ^{463b}1 Corinthians 13:13: “And now there remain faith, hope, charity, these three.” Therefore charity is a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Acts and habits are specified by their objects, as shown above (**P(2a), Q(18), A(2); P(2a), Q(54), A(2)**). Now the proper object of love is the good, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(27), A(1)**), so that wherever there is a special aspect of good, there is a special kind of love. But the Divine good, inasmuch as it is the object of happiness, has a special aspect of good, wherefore the love of charity, which is the love of that good, is a special kind of love. Therefore charity is a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(4)-RO(1) — Charity is included in the definition of every virtue, not as being essentially every virtue, but because every virtue depends on it in a way, as we shall state further on (**AA(7),8**). In this way prudence is included in the definition of the moral virtues, as explained in Ethic. ii, vi, from the fact that they depend on prudence.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(4)-RO(2) — The virtue or art which is concerned about the last end, commands the virtues or arts which are concerned about other ends which are secondary, thus the military art commands the art of horse-riding (Ethic. i). Accordingly since charity has for its object the last end of human life, viz. everlasting happiness, it follows that it extends to the acts of a man’s whole life, by commanding them, not by eliciting immediately all acts of virtue.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(4)-RO(3) — The precept of love is said to be a general command, because all other precepts are reduced thereto as to their end, according to ~~5005~~1 Timothy 1:5:

“The end of the commandment is charity.”

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(5)

Whether charity is one virtue?

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that charity is not one virtue. For habits are distinct according to their objects. Now there are two objects of charity — God and our neighbor — which are infinitely distant from one another. Therefore charity is not one virtue.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, different aspects of the object diversify a habit, even though that object be one in reality, as shown above (**Q(17)**, **A(6)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(54)**, **A(2)**, ad 1). Now there are many aspects under which God is an object of love, because we are debtors to His love by reason of each one of His favors. Therefore charity is not one virtue.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, charity comprises friendship for our neighbor. But the Philosopher reckons several species of friendship (*Ethic.* viii, 3,11,12). Therefore charity is not one virtue, but is divided into a number of various species.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Just as God is the object of faith, so is He the object of charity. Now faith is one virtue by reason of the unity of the Divine truth, according to ~~5005~~Ephesians 4:5: “One faith.” Therefore charity also is one virtue by reason of the unity of the Divine goodness.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Charity, as stated above (**A(1)**) is a kind of friendship of man for God. Now the different species of friendship are differentiated, first of all, in respect of a diversity of end, and in this way there are three species of friendship, namely friendship for the useful, for the delightful, and for the virtuous; secondly, in respect of the different kinds of communion on which friendships are based; thus there is one species of friendship between kinsmen, and another between fellow

citizens or fellow travellers, the former being based on natural communion, the latter on civil communion or on the comradeship of the road, as the Philosopher explains (Ethic. viii, 12).

Now charity cannot be differentiated in either of these ways: for its end is one, namely, the goodness of God; and the fellowship of everlasting happiness, on which this friendship is based, is also one. Hence it follows that charity is simply one virtue, and not divided into several species.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(5)-RO(1) — This argument would hold, if God and our neighbor were equally objects of charity. But this is not true: for God is the principal object of charity, while our neighbor is loved out of charity for God's sake.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(5)-RO(2) — God is loved by charity for His own sake: wherefore charity regards principally but one aspect of lovableness, namely God's goodness, which is His substance, according to ¹⁹⁸¹Psalm 105:1: "Give glory to the Lord for He is good." Other reasons that inspire us with love for Him, or which make it our duty to love Him, are secondary and result from the first.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(5)-RO(3) — Human friendship of which the Philosopher treats has various ends and various forms of fellowship. This does not apply to charity, as stated above: wherefore the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(6)

Whether charity is the most excellent of the virtues?

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that charity is not the most excellent of the virtues. Because the higher power has the higher virtue even as it has a higher operation. Now the intellect is higher than the will, since it directs the will. Therefore, faith, which is in the intellect, is more excellent than charity which is in the will.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, the thing by which another works seems the less excellent of the two, even as a servant, by whom his master works, is beneath his master. Now "faith... worketh by charity," according to ¹⁹⁸⁶Galatians 5:6. Therefore faith is more excellent than charity.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, that which is by way of addition to another seems to be the more perfect of the two. Now hope seems to be something additional to charity: for the object of charity is good, whereas the object of hope is an arduous good. Therefore hope is more excellent than charity.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~433~~ 1 Corinthians 13:13):

“The greater of these is charity.”

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(6) — *I answer that*, Since good, in human acts, depends on their being regulated by the due rule, it must needs be that human virtue, which is a principle of good acts, consists in attaining the rule of human acts. Now the rule of human acts is twofold, as stated above (**A(3)**), namely, human reason and God: yet God is the first rule, whereby, even human reason must be regulated. Consequently the theological virtues, which consist in attaining this first rule, since their object is God, are more excellent than the moral, or the intellectual virtues, which consist in attaining human reason: and it follows that among the theological virtues themselves, the first place belongs to that which attains God most.

Now that which is of itself always ranks before that which is by another. But faith and hope attain God indeed in so far as we derive from Him the knowledge of truth or the acquisition of good, whereas charity attains God Himself that it may rest in Him, but not that something may accrue to us from Him. Hence charity is more excellent than faith or hope, and, consequently, than all the other virtues, just as prudence, which by itself attains reason, is more excellent than the other moral virtues, which attain reason in so far as it appoints the mean in human operations or passions.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(6)-RO(1) — The operation of the intellect is completed by the thing understood being in the intellectual subject, so that the excellence of the intellectual operation is assessed according to the measure of the intellect. On the other hand, the operation of the will and of every appetitive power is completed in the tendency of the appetite towards a thing as its term, wherefore the excellence of the appetitive operation is gauged according to the thing which is the object of the operation. Now those things which are beneath the soul are more excellent in the soul than

they are in themselves, because a thing is contained according to the mode of the container (De Causis xii). On the other hand, things that are above the soul, are more excellent in themselves than they are in the soul. Consequently it is better to know than to love the things that are beneath us; for which reason the Philosopher gave the preference to the intellectual virtues over the moral virtues (Ethic. x, 7,8): whereas the love of the things that are above us, especially of God, ranks before the knowledge of such things. Therefore charity is more excellent than faith.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(6)-RO(2) — Faith works by love, not instrumentally, as a master by his servant, but as by its proper form: hence the argument does not prove.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(6)-RO(3) — The same good is the object of charity and of hope: but charity implies union with that good, whereas hope implies distance therefrom. Hence charity does not regard that good as being arduous, as hope does, since what is already united has not the character of arduous: and this shows that charity is more perfect than hope.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(7)

Whether any true virtue is possible without charity?

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that there can be true virtue without charity. For it is proper to virtue to produce a good act. Now those who have not charity, do some good actions, as when they clothe the naked, or feed the hungry and so forth. Therefore true virtue is possible without charity.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, charity is not possible without faith, since it comes of “an unfeigned faith,” as the Apostle says (⁵⁰⁶1 Timothy 1:5). Now, in unbelievers, there can be true chastity, if they curb their concupiscences, and true justice, if they judge rightly. Therefore true virtue is possible without charity.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, science and art are virtues, according to Ethic. 6: But they are to be found in sinners who lack charity. Therefore true virtue can be without charity.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (^{433B}1 Corinthians 13:3): “If I should distribute all my goods to the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.” And yet true virtue is very profitable, according to Wis. 8:7: “She teacheth temperance, and prudence, and justice, and fortitude, which are such things as men can have nothing more profitable in life.” Therefore no true virtue is possible without charity.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(7) — *I answer that*, Virtue is ordered to the good, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(55), A(4)**). Now the good is chiefly an end, for things directed to the end are not said to be good except in relation to the end. Accordingly, just as the end is twofold, the last end, and the proximate end, so also, is good twofold, one, the ultimate and universal good, the other proximate and particular. The ultimate and principal good of man is the enjoyment of God, according to ^{437B}Psalm 72:28: “It is good for me to adhere to God,” and to this good man is ordered by charity. Man’s secondary and, as it were, particular good may be twofold: one is truly good, because, considered in itself, it can be directed to the principal good, which is the last end; while the other is good apparently and not truly, because it leads us away from the final good. Accordingly it is evident that simply true virtue is that which is directed to man’s principal good; thus also the Philosopher says (Phys. vii, text. 17) that “virtue is the disposition of a perfect thing to that which is best”: and in this way no true virtue is possible without charity.

If, however, we take virtue as being ordered to some particular end, then we speak of virtue being where there is no charity, in so far as it is directed to some particular good. But if this particular good is not a true, but an apparent good, it is not a true virtue that is ordered to such a good, but a counterfeit virtue. Even so, as Augustine says (Contra Julian. iv, 3), “the prudence of the miser, whereby he devises various roads to gain, is no true virtue; nor the miser’s justice, whereby he scorns the property of another through fear of severe punishment; nor the miser’s temperance, whereby he curbs his desire for expensive pleasures; nor the miser’s fortitude, whereby as Horace, says, ‘he braves the sea, he crosses mountains, he goes through fire, in order to avoid poverty’” (Epis. lib, 1; Ep. i, 45). If, on the other hand, this particular good be a true good, for instance the welfare of the state, or the like, it will indeed be a true virtue, imperfect, however,

unless it be referred to the final and perfect good. Accordingly no strictly true virtue is possible without charity.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(7)-RO(1) — The act of one lacking charity may be of two kinds; one is in accordance with his lack of charity, as when he does something that is referred to that whereby he lacks charity. Such an act is always evil: thus Augustine says (*Contra Julian*. iv, 3) that the actions which an unbeliever performs as an unbeliever, are always sinful, even when he clothes the naked, or does any like thing, and directs it to his unbelief as end.

There is, however, another act of one lacking charity, not in accordance with his lack of charity, but in accordance with his possession of some other gift of God, whether faith, or hope, or even his natural good, which is not completely taken away by sin, as stated above (**Q(10), A(4); P(2a), Q(85), A(2)**). In this way it is possible for an act, without charity, to be generically good, but not perfectly good, because it lacks its due order to the last end.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(7)-RO(2) — Since the end is in practical matters, what the principle is in speculative matters, just as there can be no strictly true science, if a right estimate of the first indemonstrable principle be lacking, so, there can be no strictly true justice, or chastity, without that due ordering to the end, which is effected by charity, however rightly a man may be affected about other matters.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(7)-RO(3) — Science and art of their very nature imply a relation to some particular good, and not to the ultimate good of human life, as do the moral virtues, which make man good simply, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(56), A(3)**). Hence the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(8)

Whether charity is the form of the virtues?

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that charity is not the true form of the virtues. Because the form of a thing is either exemplar or essential. Now charity is not the exemplar form of the other virtues, since it would follow that the other virtues are of the same species as charity: nor is it the

essential form of the other virtues, since then it would not be distinct from them. Therefore it is in no way the form of the virtues.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, charity is compared to the other virtues as their root and foundation, according to ⁴⁸⁷Ephesians 3:17: “Rooted and founded in charity.” Now a root or foundation is not the form, but rather the matter of a thing, since it is the first part in the making. Therefore charity is not the form of the virtues.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, formal, final, and efficient causes do not coincide with one another (Phys. ii, 7). Now charity is called the end and the mother of the virtues. Therefore it should not be called their form.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, Ambrose [*Lombard, Sent. iii, D, 23] says that charity is the form of the virtues.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(8) — *I answer that*, In morals the form of an act is taken chiefly from the end. The reason of this is that the principal of moral acts is the will, whose object and form, so to speak, are the end. Now the form of an act always follows from a form of the agent. Consequently, in morals, that which gives an act its order to the end, must needs give the act its form. Now it is evident, in accordance with what has been said (**A(7)**), that it is charity which directs the acts of all other virtues to the last end, and which, consequently, also gives the form to all other acts of virtue: and it is precisely in this sense that charity is called the form of the virtues, for these are called virtues in relation to “informed” acts.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(8)-RO(1) — Charity is called the form of the other virtues not as being their exemplar or their essential form, but rather by way of efficient cause, in so far as it sets the form on all, in the aforesaid manner.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(8)-RO(2) — Charity is compared to the foundation or root in so far as all other virtues draw their sustenance and nourishment therefrom, and not in the sense that the foundation and root have the character of a material cause.

P(2b)-Q(23)-A(8)-RO(3) — Charity is said to be the end of other virtues, because it directs all other virtues to its own end. And since a mother is one who conceives within herself and by another, charity is called the

mother of the other virtues, because, by commanding them, it conceives the acts of the other virtues, by the desire of the last end.

QUESTION 24

OF THE SUBJECT OF CHARITY

(TWELVE ARTICLES)

We must now consider charity in relation to its subject, under which head there are twelve points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether charity is in the will as its subject?
- (2) Whether charity is caused in man by preceding acts or by a Divine infusion?
- (3) Whether it is infused according to the capacity of our natural gifts?
- (4) Whether it increases in the person who has it?
- (5) Whether it increases by addition?
- (6) Whether it increases by every act?
- (7) Whether it increases indefinitely?
- (8) Whether the charity of a wayfarer can be perfect?
- (9) Of the various degrees of charity;
- (10) Whether charity can diminish?
- (11) Whether charity can be lost after it has been possessed?
- (12) Whether it is lost through one mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(1)

Whether the will is the subject of charity?

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that the will is not the subject of charity. For charity is a kind of love. Now, according to the Philosopher (Topic. ii, 3) love is in the concupiscible part. Therefore charity is also in the concupiscible and not in the will.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, charity is the foremost of the virtues, as stated above (**Q(23)**, **A(6)**). But the reason is the subject of virtue. Therefore it seems that charity is in the reason and not in the will.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, charity extends to all human acts, according to ~~1~~¹ Corinthians 16:14: “Let all your things be done in charity.” Now the principle of human acts is the free-will. Therefore it seems that charity is chiefly in the free-will as its subject and not in the will.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The object of charity is the good, which is also the object of the will. Therefore charity is in the will as its subject.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Since, as stated in the **P(1) Q(80)**, **A(2)**, the appetite is twofold, namely the sensitive, and the intellective which is called the will, the object of each is the good, but in different ways: for the object of the sensitive appetite is a good apprehended by sense, whereas the object of the intellective appetite or will is good under the universal aspect of good, according as it can be apprehended by the intellect. Now the object of charity is not a sensible good, but the Divine good which is known by the intellect alone. Therefore the subject of charity is not the sensitive, but the intellective appetite, i.e. the will.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(1)-RO(1) — The concupiscible is a part of the sensitive, not of the intellective appetite, as proved in the **P(1) Q(81)**, **A(2)**: wherefore the love which is in the concupiscible, is the love of sensible good: nor can the concupiscible reach to the Divine good which is an intelligible good; the will alone can. Consequently the concupiscible cannot be the subject of charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(1)-RO(2) — According to the Philosopher (De Anima iii, 9), the will also is in the reason: wherefore charity is not excluded from the reason through being in the will. Yet charity is regulated, not by the reason, as human virtues are, but by God’s wisdom, and transcends the rule of human reason, according to ~~1~~¹ Ephesians 3:19: “The charity of Christ, which surpasseth all knowledge.” Hence it is not in the reason, either as its subject, like prudence is, or as its rule, like justice and temperance are, but only by a certain kinship of the will to the reason.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(1)-RO(3) — As stated in the **P(1) Q(83), A(4)**, the free-will is not a distinct power from the will. Yet charity is not in the will considered as free-will, the act of which is to choose. For choice is of things directed to the end, whereas the will is of the end itself (Ethic. iii, 2). Hence charity, whose object is the last end, should be described as residing in the will rather than in the free-will.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(2)

Whether charity is caused in us by infusion?

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that charity is not caused in us by infusion. For that which is common to all creatures, is in man naturally. Now, according to Dionysius (Div. Nom. iv), the “Divine good”, which is the object of charity, “is for all an object of dilection and love.” Therefore charity is in us naturally, and not by infusion.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the more lovable a thing is the easier it is to love it. Now God is supremely lovable, since He is supremely good. Therefore it is easier to love Him than other things. But we need no infused habit in order to love other things. Neither, therefore, do we need one in order to love God.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the Apostle says (⁵⁰⁵1 Timothy 1:5):

“The end of the commandment is charity from a pure heart, and a good conscience, and an unfeigned faith.”

Now these three have reference to human acts. Therefore charity is caused in us from preceding acts, and not from infusion.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (⁵⁰⁶Romans 5:5): “The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, Who is given to us.”

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(23), A(1)**), charity is a friendship of man for God, founded upon the fellowship of everlasting happiness. Now this fellowship is in respect, not of natural, but of gratuitous gifts, for, according to ⁵⁰⁷Romans 6:23, “the grace of God is life everlasting”: wherefore charity itself surpasses our natural facilities.

Now that which surpasses the faculty of nature, cannot be natural or acquired by the natural powers, since a natural effect does not transcend its cause.

Therefore charity can be in us neither naturally, nor through acquisition by the natural powers, but by the infusion of the Holy Ghost, Who is the love of the Father and the Son, and the participation of Whom in us is created charity, as stated above (**Q(23), A(2)**).

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(2)-RO(1) — Dionysius is speaking of the love of God, which is founded on the fellowship of natural goods, wherefore it is in all naturally. On the other hand, charity is founded on a supernatural fellowship, so the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(2)-RO(2) — Just as God is supremely knowable in Himself yet not to us, on account of a defect in our knowledge which depends on sensible things, so too, God is supremely lovable in Himself, in as much as He is the object of happiness. But He is not supremely lovable to us in this way, on account of the inclination of our appetite towards visible goods. Hence it is evident that for us to love God above all things in this way, it is necessary that charity be infused into our hearts.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(2)-RO(3) — When it is said that in us charity proceeds from “a pure heart, and a good conscience, and an unfeigned faith,” this must be referred to the act of charity which is aroused by these things. Or again, this is said because the aforesaid acts dispose man to receive the infusion of charity. The same remark applies to the saying of Augustine (Tract. ix in prim. canon. Joan.): “Fear leads to charity,” and of a gloss on ~~400~~ Matthew 1:2: “Faith begets hope, and hope charity.”

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(3)

*Whether charity is infused according to
the capacity of our natural gifts?*

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that charity is infused according to the capacity of our natural gifts. For it is written (~~405~~ Matthew 25:15) that “He gave to every one according to his own virtue [Douay: ‘proper ability’].” Now, in man, none but natural virtue precedes charity, since

there is no virtue without charity, as stated above (**Q(23)**, **A(7)**). Therefore God infuses charity into man according to the measure of his natural virtue.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, among things ordained towards one another, the second is proportionate to the first: thus we find in natural things that the form is proportionate to the matter, and in gratuitous gifts, that glory is proportionate to grace. Now, since charity is a perfection of nature, it is compared to the capacity of nature as second to first. Therefore it seems that charity is infused according to the capacity of nature.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, men and angels partake of happiness according to the same measure, since happiness is alike in both, according to ^{<420>}Matthew 22:30 and ^{<428>}Luke 20:36. Now charity and other gratuitous gifts are bestowed on the angels, according to their natural capacity, as the Master teaches (Sent. ii, D, 3). Therefore the same apparently applies to man.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<438>}John 3:8): “The Spirit breatheth where He will,” and (^{<421>}1 Corinthians 12:11):

“All these things one and the same Spirit worketh, dividing to every one according as He will.”

Therefore charity is given, not according to our natural capacity, but according as the Spirit wills to distribute His gifts.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(3) — *I answer that*, The quantity of a thing depends on the proper cause of that thing, since the more universal cause produces a greater effect. Now, since charity surpasses the proportion of human nature, as stated above (**A(2)**) it depends, not on any natural virtue, but on the sole grace of the Holy Ghost Who infuses charity. Wherefore the quantity of charity depends neither on the condition of nature nor on the capacity of natural virtue, but only on the will of the Holy Ghost Who “divides” His gifts “according as He will.” Hence the Apostle says (^{<404>}Ephesians 4:7):

“To every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the giving of Christ.”

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(3)-RO(1) — The virtue in accordance with which God gives His gifts to each one, is a disposition or previous preparation or effort of the one who receives grace. But the Holy Ghost forestalls even this disposition or effort, by moving man's mind either more or less, according as He will. Wherefore the Apostle says (⁵⁰¹²Colossians 1:12):

“Who hath made us worthy to be partakers
of the lot of the saints in light.”

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(3)-RO(2) — The form does not surpass the proportion of the matter. In like manner grace and glory are referred to the same genus, for grace is nothing else than a beginning of glory in us. But charity and nature do not belong to the same genus, so that the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(3)-RO(3) — The angel's is an intellectual nature, and it is consistent with his condition that he should be borne wholly whithersoever he is borne, as stated in the **P(1) Q(61), A(6)**. Hence there was a greater effort in the higher angels, both for good in those who persevered, and for evil in those who fell, and consequently those of the higher angels who remained steadfast became better than the others, and those who fell became worse. But man's is a rational nature, with which it is consistent to be sometimes in potentiality and sometimes in act: so that it is not necessarily borne wholly whithersoever it is borne, and where there are greater natural gifts there may be less effort, and vice versa. Thus the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(4)

Whether charity can increase?

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that charity cannot increase. For nothing increases save what has quantity. Now quantity is twofold, namely dimensive and virtual. The former does not befit charity which is a spiritual perfection, while virtual quantity regards the objects in respect of which charity does not increase, since the slightest charity loves all that is to be loved out of charity. Therefore charity does not increase.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, that which consists in something extreme receives no increase. But charity consists in something extreme,

being the greatest of the virtues, and the supreme love of the greatest good. Therefore charity cannot increase.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, increase is a kind of movement. Therefore wherever there is increase there is movement, and if there be increase of essence there is movement of essence. Now there is no movement of essence save either by corruption or generation. Therefore charity cannot increase essentially, unless it happen to be generated anew or corrupted, which is unreasonable.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (Tract. lxxiv in Joan.) [*Cf. Ep. clxxxv.] that “charity merits increase that by increase it may merit perfection.”

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(4) — *I answer that*, The charity of a wayfarer can increase. For we are called wayfarers by reason of our being on the way to God, Who is the last end of our happiness. In this way we advance as we get nigh to God, Who is approached, “not by steps of the body but by the affections of the soul” [*St. Augustine, Tract. in Joan. xxxii]: and this approach is the result of charity, since it unites man’s mind to God. Consequently it is essential to the charity of a wayfarer that it can increase, for if it could not, all further advance along the way would cease. Hence the Apostle calls charity the way, when he says (⁴²³1 Corinthians 12:31):

“I show unto you yet a more excellent way.”

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(4)-RO(1) — Charity is not subject to dimensive, but only to virtual quantity: and the latter depends not only on the number of objects, namely whether they be in greater number or of greater excellence, but also on the intensity of the act, namely whether a thing is loved more, or less; it is in this way that the virtual quantity of charity increases.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(4)-RO(2) — Charity consists in an extreme with regard to its object, in so far as its object is the Supreme Good, and from this it follows that charity is the most excellent of the virtues. Yet not every charity consists in an extreme, as regards the intensity of the act.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(4)-RO(3) — Some have said that charity does not increase in its essence, but only as to its radication in its subject, or according to its fervor.

But these people did not know what they were talking about. For since charity is an accident, its being is to be in something. So that an essential increase of charity means nothing else but that it is yet more in its subject, which implies a greater radication in its subject. Furthermore, charity is essentially a virtue ordained to act, so that an essential increase of charity implies ability to produce an act of more fervent love. Hence charity increases essentially, not by beginning anew, or ceasing to be in its subject, as the objection imagines, but by beginning to be more and more in its subject.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(5)

Whether charity increases by addition?

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that charity increases by addition. For just as increase may be in respect of bodily quantity, so may it be according to virtual quantity. Now increase in bodily quantity results from addition; for the Philosopher says (De Gener. i, 5) that “increase is addition to pre-existing magnitude.” Therefore the increase of charity which is according to virtual quantity is by addition.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, charity is a kind of spiritual light in the soul, according to ¹1 John 2:10: “He that loveth his brother abideth in the light.” Now light increases in the air by addition; thus the light in a house increases when another candle is lit. Therefore charity also increases in the soul by addition.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, the increase of charity is God’s work, even as the causing of it, according to ²2 Corinthians 9:10: “He will increase the growth of the fruits of your justice.” Now when God first infuses charity, He puts something in the soul that was not there before. Therefore also, when He increases charity, He puts something there which was not there before. Therefore charity increases by addition.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Charity is a simple form. Now nothing greater results from the addition of one simple thing to another, as proved in Phys. iii, text. 59, and Metaph. ii, 4. Therefore charity does not increase by addition.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Every addition is of something to something else: so that in every addition we must at least presuppose that the things added together are distinct before the addition. Consequently if charity be added to charity, the added charity must be presupposed as distinct from charity to which it is added, not necessarily by a distinction of reality, but at least by a distinction of thought. For God is able to increase a bodily quantity by adding a magnitude which did not exist before, but was created at that very moment; which magnitude, though not pre-existent in reality, is nevertheless capable of being distinguished from the quantity to which it is added. Wherefore if charity be added to charity we must presuppose the distinction, at least logical, of the one charity from the other.

Now distinction among forms is twofold: specific and numeric. Specific distinction of habits follows diversity of objects, while numeric distinction follows distinction of subjects. Consequently a habit may receive increase through extending to objects to which it did not extend before: thus the science of geometry increases in one who acquires knowledge of geometrical matters which he ignored hitherto. But this cannot be said of charity, for even the slightest charity extends to all that we have to love by charity. Hence the addition which causes an increase of charity cannot be understood, as though the added charity were presupposed to be distinct specifically from that to which it is added.

It follows therefore that if charity be added to charity, we must presuppose a numerical distinction between them, which follows a distinction of subjects: thus whiteness receives an increase when one white thing is added to another, although such an increase does not make a thing whiter. This, however, does not apply to the case in point, since the subject of charity is none other than the rational mind, so that such like an increase of charity could only take place by one rational mind being added to another; which is impossible. Moreover, even if it were possible, the result would be a greater lover, but not a more loving one. It follows,

therefore, that charity can by no means increase by addition of charity to charity, as some have held to be the case.

Accordingly charity increases only by its subject partaking of charity more and more subject thereto. For this is the proper mode of increase in a form that is intensified, since the being of such a form consists wholly in its adhering to its subject. Consequently, since the magnitude of a thing follows on its being, to say that a form is greater is the same as to say that it is more in its subject, and not that another form is added to it: for this would be the case if the form, of itself, had any quantity, and not in comparison with its subject. Therefore charity increases by being intensified in its subject, and this is for charity to increase in its essence; and not by charity being added to charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(5)-RO(1) — Bodily quantity has something as quantity, and something else, in so far as it is an accidental form. As quantity, it is distinguishable in respect of position or number, and in this way we have the increase of magnitude by addition, as may be seen in animals. But in so far as it is an accidental form, it is distinguishable only in respect of its subject, and in this way it has its proper increase, like other accidental forms, by way of intensity in its subject, for instance in things subject to rarefaction, as is proved in Phys. iv, 9. In like manner science, as a habit, has its quantity from its objects, and accordingly it increases by addition, when a man knows more things; and again, as an accidental form, it has a certain quantity through being in its subject, and in this way it increase in a man who knows the same scientific truths with greater certainty now than before. In the same way charity has a twofold quantity; but with regard to that which it has from its object, it does not increase, as stated above: hence it follows that it increases solely by being intensified.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(5)-RO(2) — The addition of light to light can be understood through the light being intensified in the air on account of there being several luminaries giving light: but this distinction does not apply to the case in point, since there is but one luminary shedding forth the light of charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(5)-RO(3) — The infusion of charity denotes a change to the state of “having” charity from the state of “not having it,” so that something must needs come which was not there before. On the other

hand, the increase of charity denotes a change to “more having” from “less having,” so that there is need, not for anything to be there that was not there before, but for something to be more there that previously was less there. This is what God does when He increases charity, that is He makes it to have a greater hold on the soul, and the likeness of the Holy Ghost to be more perfectly participated by the soul.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(6)

Whether charity increases through every act of charity?

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that charity increases through every act of charity. For that which can do what is more, can do what is less. But every act of charity can merit everlasting life; and this is more than a simple addition of charity, since it includes the perfection of charity. Much more, therefore, does every act of charity increase charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, just as the habits of acquired virtue are engendered by acts, so too an increase of charity is caused by an act of charity. Now each virtuous act conduces to the engendering of virtue. Therefore also each virtuous act of charity conduces to the increase of charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, Gregory [*St. Bernard, Serm. ii in Festo Purif.] says that “to stand still in the way to God is to go back.” Now no man goes back when he is moved by an act of charity. Therefore whoever is moved by an act of charity goes forward in the way to God. Therefore charity increases through every act of charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, The effect does not surpass the power of its cause. But an act of charity is sometimes done with tepidity or slackness. Therefore it does not conduce to a more excellent charity, rather does it dispose one to a lower degree.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(6) — *I answer that*, The spiritual increase of charity is somewhat like the increase of a body. Now bodily increase in animals and plants is not a continuous movement, so that, to wit, if a thing increase so much in so much time, it need to increase proportionally in each part of that time, as happens in local movement; but for a certain space of time

nature works by disposing for the increase, without causing any actual increase, and afterwards brings into effect that to which it had disposed, by giving the animal or plant an actual increase. In like manner charity does not actually increase through every act of charity, but each act of charity disposes to an increase of charity, in so far as one act of charity makes man more ready to act again according to charity, and this readiness increasing, man breaks out into an act of more fervent love, and strives to advance in charity, and then his charity increases actually.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(6)-RO(1) — Every act of charity merits everlasting life, which, however, is not to be bestowed then and there, but at its proper time. In like manner every act of charity merits an increase of charity; yet this increase does not take place at once, but when we strive for that increase.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(6)-RO(2) — Even when an acquired virtue is being engendered, each act does not complete the formation of the virtue, but conduces towards that effect by disposing to it, while the last act, which is the most perfect, and acts in virtue of all those that preceded it, reduces the virtue into act, just as when many drops hollow out a stone.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(6)-RO(3) — Man advances in the way to God, not merely by actual increase of charity, but also by being disposed to that increase.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(7)

Whether charity increases indefinitely?

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that charity does not increase indefinitely. For every movement is towards some end and term, as stated in Metaph. ii, text. 8,9. But the increase of charity is a movement. Therefore it tends to an end and term. Therefore charity does not increase indefinitely.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, no form surpasses the capacity of its subject. But the capacity of the rational creature who is the subject of charity is finite. Therefore charity cannot increase indefinitely.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, every finite thing can, by continual increase, attain to the quantity of another finite thing however much greater, unless the amount of its increase be ever less and less. Thus the Philosopher states (Phys. iii, 6) that if we divide a line into an indefinite number of parts, and take these parts away and add them indefinitely to another line, we shall never arrive at any definite quantity resulting from those two lines, viz. the one from which we subtracted and the one to which we added what was subtracted. But this does not occur in the case in point: because there is no need for the second increase of charity to be less than the first, since rather is it probable that it would be equal or greater. As, therefore, the charity of the blessed is something finite, if the charity of the wayfarer can increase indefinitely, it would follow that the charity of the way can equal the charity of heaven; which is absurd. Therefore the wayfarer's charity cannot increase indefinitely.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (~~sure~~ Philippians 3:12):

“Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect; but
I follow after, if I may, by any means apprehend,”

on which words a gloss says: “Even if he has made great progress, let none of the faithful say: ‘Enough.’ For whosoever says this, leaves the road before coming to his destination.” Therefore the wayfarer's charity can ever increase more and more.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(7) — *I answer that*, A term to the increase of a form may be fixed in three ways: first by reason of the form itself having a fixed measure, and when this has been reached it is no longer possible to go any further in that form, but if any further advance is made, another form is attained. And example of this is paleness, the bounds of which may, by continual alteration, be passed, either so that whiteness ensues, or so that blackness results. Secondly, on the part of the agent, whose power does not extend to a further increase of the form in its subject. Thirdly, on the part of the subject, which is not capable of ulterior perfection.

Now, in none of these ways, is a limit imposed to the increase of man's charity, while he is in the state of the wayfarer. For charity itself considered as such has no limit to its increase, since it is a participation of

the infinite charity which is the Holy Ghost. In like manner the cause of the increase of charity, viz. God, is possessed of infinite power. Furthermore, on the part of its subject, no limit to this increase can be determined, because whenever charity increases, there is a corresponding increased ability to receive a further increase. It is therefore evident that it is not possible to fix any limits to the increase of charity in this life.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(7)-RO(1) — The increase of charity is directed to an end, which is not in this, but in a future life.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(7)-RO(2) — The capacity of the rational creature is increased by charity, because the heart is enlarged thereby, according to ~~2~~2 Corinthians 6:11: “Our heart is enlarged”; so that it still remains capable of receiving a further increase.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(7)-RO(3) — This argument holds good in those things which have the same kind of quantity, but not in those which have different kinds: thus however much a line may increase it does not reach the quantity of a superficies. Now the quantity of a wayfarer’s charity which follows the knowledge of faith is not of the same kind as the quantity of the charity of the blessed, which follows open vision. Hence the argument does not prove.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(8)

Whether charity can be perfect in this life?

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that charity cannot be perfect in this life. For this would have been the case with the apostles before all others. Yet it was not so, since the Apostle says (~~PHIL~~Philippians 3:12): “Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect.” Therefore charity cannot be perfect in this life.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, Augustine says (Qq. lxxxiii, qu. 36) that “whatever kindles charity quenches cupidity, but where charity is perfect, cupidity is done away altogether.” But this cannot be in this world, wherein it is impossible to live without sin, according to ~~1~~1 John 1:8: “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves.” Now all sin

arises from some inordinate cupidity. Therefore charity cannot be perfect in this life.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, what is already perfect cannot be perfected any more. But in this life charity can always increase, as stated above (**A(7)**). Therefore charity cannot be perfect in this life.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (In prim. canon. Joan. Tract. v) “Charity is perfected by being strengthened; and when it has been brought to perfection, it exclaims, ‘I desire to be dissolved and to be with Christ.’” Now this is possible in this life, as in the case of Paul. Therefore charity can be perfect in this life.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(8) — *I answer that*, The perfection of charity may be understood in two ways: first with regard to the object loved, secondly with regard to the person who loves. With regard to the object loved, charity is perfect, if the object be loved as much as it is lovable. Now God is as lovable as He is good, and His goodness is infinite, wherefore He is infinitely lovable. But no creature can love Him infinitely since all created power is finite. Consequently no creature’s charity can be perfect in this way; the charity of God alone can, whereby He loves Himself.

On the part of the person who loves, charity is perfect, when he loves as much as he can. This happens in three ways. First, so that a man’s whole heart is always actually borne towards God: this is the perfection of the charity of heaven, and is not possible in this life, wherein, by reason of the weakness of human life, it is impossible to think always actually of God, and to be moved by love towards Him. Secondly, so that man makes an earnest endeavor to give his time to God and Divine things, while scorning other things except in so far as the needs of the present life demand. This is the perfection of charity that is possible to a wayfarer; but is not common to all who have charity. Thirdly, so that a man gives his whole heart to God habitually, viz. by neither thinking nor desiring anything contrary to the love of God; and this perfection is common to all who have charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(8)-RO(1) — The Apostle denies that he has the perfection of heaven, wherefore a gloss on the same passage says that “he was a

perfect wayfarer, but had not yet achieved the perfection to which the way leads.”

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(8)-RO(2) — This is said on account of venial sins, which are contrary, not to the habit, but to the act of charity: hence they are incompatible, not with the perfection of the way, but with that of heaven.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(8)-RO(3) — The perfection of the way is not perfection simply, wherefore it can always increase.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(9)

Whether charity is rightly distinguished into three degrees, beginning, progress, and perfection?

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem unfitting to distinguish three degrees of charity, beginning, progress, and perfection. For there are many degrees between the beginning of charity and its ultimate perfection. Therefore it is not right to put only one.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, charity begins to progress as soon as it begins to be. Therefore we ought not to distinguish between charity as progressing and as beginning.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, in this world, however perfect a man’s charity may be, it can increase, as stated above (**A(7)**). Now for charity to increase is to progress. Therefore perfect charity ought not to be distinguished from progressing charity: and so the aforesaid degrees are unsuitably assigned to charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (In prim. canon. Joan. Tract. v) “As soon as charity is born it takes food,” which refers to beginners, “after taking food, it waxes strong,” which refers to those who are progressing, “and when it has become strong it is perfected,” which refers to the perfect. Therefore there are three degrees of charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(9) — *I answer that*, The spiritual increase of charity may be considered in respect of a certain likeness to the growth of the human body. For although this latter growth may be divided into many parts, yet it has certain fixed divisions according to those particular actions or

pursuits to which man is brought by this same growth. Thus we speak of a man being an infant until he has the use of reason, after which we distinguish another state of man wherein he begins to speak and to use his reason, while there is again a third state, that of puberty when he begins to acquire the power of generation, and so on until he arrives at perfection.

In like manner the divers degrees of charity are distinguished according to the different pursuits to which man is brought by the increase of charity. For at first it is incumbent on man to occupy himself chiefly with avoiding sin and resisting his concupiscences, which move him in opposition to charity: this concerns beginners, in whom charity has to be fed or fostered lest it be destroyed: in the second place man's chief pursuit is to aim at progress in good, and this is the pursuit of the proficient, whose chief aim is to strengthen their charity by adding to it: while man's third pursuit is to aim chiefly at union with and enjoyment of God: this belongs to the perfect who "desire to be dissolved and to be with Christ."

In like manner we observe in local motion that at first there is withdrawal from one term, then approach to the other term, and thirdly, rest in this term.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(9)-RO(1) — All these distinct degrees which can be discerned in the increase of charity, are comprised in the aforesaid three, even as every division of continuous things is included in these three — the beginning, the middle, and the end, as the Philosopher states (*De Coelo* i, 1).

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(9)-RO(2) — Although those who are beginners in charity may progress, yet the chief care that besets them is to resist the sins which disturb them by their onslaught. Afterwards, however, when they come to feel this onslaught less, they begin to tend to perfection with greater security; yet with one hand doing the work, and with the other holding the sword as related in 2 Esdr 4:17 about those who built up Jerusalem.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(9)-RO(3) — Even the perfect make progress in charity: yet this is not their chief care, but their aim is principally directed towards union with God. And though both the beginner and the proficient seek this, yet their solicitude is chiefly about other things, with the beginner, about avoiding sin, with the proficient, about progressing in virtue.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(10)***Whether charity can decrease?***

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that charity can decrease. For contraries by their nature affect the same subject. Now increase and decrease are contraries. Since then charity increases, as stated above (**A(4)**), it seems that it can also decrease.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, Augustine, speaking to God, says (Confess. x) “He loves Thee less, who loves aught besides Thee”: and (Qq. lxxxiii, qu. 36) he says that “what kindles charity quenches cupidity.” For this it seems to follow that, *on the contrary*, what arouses cupidity quenches charity. But cupidity, whereby a man loves something besides God, can increase in man. Therefore charity can decrease.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, as Augustine says (Genesis ad lit. viii, 12) “God makes the just man, by justifying him, but in such a way, that if the man turns away from God, he no longer retains the effect of the Divine operation.” From this we may gather that when God preserves charity in man, He works in the same way as when He first infuses charity into him. Now at the first infusion of charity God infuses less charity into him that prepares himself less. Therefore also in preserving charity, He preserves less charity in him that prepares himself less. Therefore charity can decrease.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, In Scripture, charity is compared to fire, according to Cant 8:6: “The lamps thereof,” i.e. of charity, “are fire and flames.” Now fire ever mounts upward so long as it lasts. Therefore as long as charity endures, it can ascend, but cannot descend, i.e. decrease.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(10) — *I answer that*, The quantity which charity has in comparison with its proper object, cannot decrease, even as neither can it increase, as stated above (**A(4)**, ad 2).

Since, however, it increases in that quantity which it has in comparison with its subject, here is the place to consider whether it can decrease in this way. Now, if it decrease, this must needs be either through an act, or by the mere cessation from act. It is true that virtues acquired through acts

decrease and sometimes cease altogether through cessation from act, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(53)**, **A(3)**). Wherefore the Philosopher says, in reference to friendship (Ethic. viii, 5) “that want of intercourse,” i.e. the neglect to call upon or speak with one’s friends, “has destroyed many a friendship.” Now this is because the safe-keeping of a thing depends on its cause, and the cause of human virtue is a human act, so that when human acts cease, the virtue acquired thereby decreases and at last ceases altogether. Yet this does not occur to charity, because it is not the result of human acts, but is caused by God alone, as stated above (**A(2)**). Hence it follows that even when its act ceases, it does not for this reason decrease, or cease altogether, unless the cessation involves a sin.

The consequence is that a decrease of charity cannot be caused except either by God or by some sinful act. Now no defect is caused in us by God, except by way of punishment, in so far as He withdraws His grace in punishment of sin. Hence He does not diminish charity except by way of punishment: and this punishment is due on account of sin.

It follows, therefore, that if charity decrease, the cause of this decrease must be sin either effectively or by way of merit. But mortal sin does not diminish charity, in either of these ways, but destroys it entirely, both effectively, because every mortal sin is contrary to charity, as we shall state further on (**A(12)**), and by way of merit, since when, by sinning mortally, a man acts against charity, he deserves that God should withdraw charity from him.

In like manner, neither can venial sin diminish charity either effectively or by way of merit. Not effectively, because it does not touch charity, since charity is about the last end, whereas venial sin is a disorder about things directed to the end: and a man’s love for the end is none the less through his committing an inordinate act as regards the things directed to the end. Thus sick people sometimes, though they love health much, are irregular in keeping to their diet: and thus again, in speculative sciences, the false opinions that are derived from the principles, do not diminish the certitude of the principles. So too, venial sin does not merit diminution of charity; for when a man offends in a small matter he does not deserve to be mulcted in a great matter. For God does not turn away from man, more than man turns away from Him: wherefore he that is out of order in respect of things

directed to the end, does not deserve to be mulcted in charity whereby he is ordered to the last end.

The consequence is that charity can by no means be diminished, if we speak of direct causality, yet whatever disposes to its corruption may be said to conduce indirectly to its diminution, and such are venial sins, or even the cessation from the practice of works of charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(10)-RO(1) — Contraries affect the same subject when that subject stands in equal relation to both. But charity does not stand in equal relation to increase and decrease. For it can have a cause of increase, but not of decrease, as stated above. Hence the argument does not prove.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(10)-RO(2) — Cupidity is twofold, one whereby man places his end in creatures, and this kills charity altogether, since it is its poison, as Augustine states (Confess. x). This makes us love God less (i.e. less than we ought to love Him by charity), not indeed by diminishing charity but by destroying it altogether. It is thus that we must understand the saying: “He loves Thee less, who loves aught beside Thee,” for he adds these words, “which he loveth not for Thee.” This does not apply to venial sin, but only to mortal sin: since that which we love in venial sin, is loved for God’s sake habitually though not actually. There is another cupidity, that of venial sin, which is always diminished by charity: and yet this cupidity cannot diminish charity, for the reason given above.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(10)-RO(3) — A movement of the free-will is requisite in the infusion of charity, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(113)**, **A(3)**). Wherefore that which diminishes the intensity of the free-will conduces dispositively to a diminution in the charity to be infused. On the other hand, no movement of the free-will is required for the safe-keeping of charity, else it would not remain in us while we sleep. Hence charity does not decrease on account of an obstacle on the part of the intensity of the free-will’s movement.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(11)

Whether we can lose charity when once we have it?

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(11)-O(1) — It would seem that we cannot lose charity when once we have it. For if we lose it, this can only be through sin. Now he who has charity cannot sin, for it is written (~~1~~¹ John 3:9):

“Whosoever is born of God, committeth not sin; for His seed abideth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.”

But none save the children of God have charity, for it is this which distinguishes “the children of God from the children of perdition,” as Augustine says (De Trin. xv, 17). Therefore he that has charity cannot lose it.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(11)-O(2) — Further, Augustine says (De Trin. viii, 7) that “if love be not true, it should not be called love.” Now, as he says again in a letter to Count Julian, “charity which can fail was never true.” [*The quotation is from De Salutaribus Documentis ad quemdam comitem, vii., among the works of Paul of Friuli, more commonly known as Paul the Deacon, a monk of Monte Cassino.] Therefore it was no charity at all. Therefore, when once we have charity, we cannot lose it.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(11)-O(3) — Further, Gregory says in a homily for Pentecost (In Evang. xxx) that “God’s love works great things where it is; if it ceases to work it is not charity.” Now no man loses charity by doing great things. Therefore if charity be there, it cannot be lost.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(11)-O(4) — Further, the free-will is not inclined to sin unless by some motive for sinning. Now charity excludes all motives for sinning, both self-love and cupidity, and all such things. Therefore charity cannot be lost.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(11) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~1~~¹ Revelation 2:4):

“I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first charity.”

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(11) — *I answer that*, The Holy Ghost dwells in us by charity, as shown above (**A(2)**; **QQ(23),24**). We can, accordingly, consider

charity in three ways: first on the part of the Holy Ghost, Who moves the soul to love God, and in this respect charity is incompatible with sin through the power of the Holy Ghost, Who does unfailingly whatever He wills to do. Hence it is impossible for these two things to be true at the same time — that the Holy Ghost should will to move a certain man to an act of charity, and that this man, by sinning, should lose charity. For the gift of perseverance is reckoned among the blessings of God whereby “whoever is delivered, is most certainly delivered,” as Augustine says in his book on the Predestination of the saints (*De Dono Persever.* xiv).

Secondly, charity may be considered as such, and thus it is incapable of anything that is against its nature. Wherefore charity cannot sin at all, even as neither can heat cool, nor unrighteousness do good, as Augustine says (*De Serm. Dom. in Monte* ii, 24).

Thirdly, charity can be considered on the part of its subject, which is changeable on account of the free-will. Moreover charity may be compared with this subject, both from the general point of view of form in comparison with matter, and from the specific point of view of habit as compared with power. Now it is natural for a form to be in its subject in such a way that it can be lost, when it does not entirely fill the potentiality of matter: this is evident in the forms of things generated and corrupted, because the matter of such things receives one form in such a way, that it retains the potentiality to another form, as though its potentiality were not completely satisfied with the one form. Hence the one form may be lost by the other being received. On the other hand the form of a celestial body which entirely fills the potentiality of its matter, so that the latter does not retain the potentiality to another form, is in its subject inseparably. Accordingly the charity of the blessed, because it entirely fills the potentiality of the rational mind, since every actual movement of that mind is directed to God, is possessed by its subject inseparably: whereas the charity of the wayfarer does not so fill the potentiality of its subject, because the latter is not always actually directed to God: so that when it is not actually directed to God, something may occur whereby charity is lost.

It is proper to a habit to incline a power to act, and this belongs to a habit, in so far as it makes whatever is suitable to it, to seem good, and whatever is unsuitable, to seem evil. For as the taste judges of savors according to its

disposition, even so does the human mind judge of things to be done, according to its habitual disposition. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. iii, 5) that “such as a man is, so does the end appear to him.” Accordingly charity is inseparable from its possessor, where that which pertains to charity cannot appear otherwise than good, and that is in heaven, where God is seen in His Essence, which is the very essence of goodness. Therefore the charity of heaven cannot be lost, whereas the charity of the way can, because in this state God is not seen in His Essence, which is the essence of goodness.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(11)-RO(1) — The passage quoted speaks from the point of view of the power of the Holy Ghost, by Whose safeguarding, those whom He wills to move are rendered immune from sin, as much as He wills.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(11)-RO(2) — The charity which can fail by reason of itself is no true charity; for this would be the case, were its love given only for a time, and afterwards were to cease, which would be inconsistent with true love. If, however, charity be lost through the changeableness of the subject, and against the purpose of charity included in its act, this is not contrary to true charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(11)-RO(3) — The love of God ever works great things in its purpose, which is essential to charity; but it does not always work great things in its act, on account of the condition of its subject.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(11)-RO(4) — Charity by reason of its act excludes every motive for sinning. But it happens sometimes that charity is not acting actually, and then it is possible for a motive to intervene for sinning, and if we consent to this motive, we lose charity.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12)

Whether charity is lost through one mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12)-O(1) — It would seem that charity is not lost through one mortal sin. For Origen says (Peri Archon i): “When a man who has mounted to the stage of perfection, is satiated, I do not think that he will become empty or fall away suddenly; but he must needs do so gradually

and by little and little.” But man falls away by losing charity. Therefore charity is not lost through only one mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12)-O(2) — Further, Pope Leo in a sermon on the Passion (60) addresses Peter thus: “Our Lord saw in thee not a conquered faith, not an averted love, but constancy shaken. Tears abounded where love never failed, and the words uttered in trepidation were washed away by the fount of charity.” From this Bernard [*William of St. Thierry, *De Nat. et Dig. Amoris.* vi.] drew his assertion that “charity in Peter was not quenched, but cooled.” But Peter sinned mortally in denying Christ. Therefore charity is not lost through one mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12)-O(3) — Further, charity is stronger than an acquired virtue. Now a habit of acquired virtue is not destroyed by one contrary sinful act. Much less, therefore, is charity destroyed by one contrary mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12)-O(4) — Further, charity denotes love of God and our neighbor. Now, seemingly, one may commit a mortal sin, and yet retain the love of God and one’s neighbor; because an inordinate affection for things directed to the end, does not remove the love for the end, as stated above (**A(10)**). Therefore charity towards God can endure, though there be a mortal sin through an inordinate affection for some temporal good.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12)-O(5) — Further, the object of a theological virtue is the last end. Now the other theological virtues, namely faith and hope, are not done away by one mortal sin, in fact they remain though lifeless. Therefore charity can remain without a form, even when a mortal sin has been committed.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12) — *On the contrary*, By mortal sin man becomes deserving of eternal death, according to ^{<RTB>}Romans 6:23: “The wages of sin is death.” On the other hand whoever has charity is deserving of eternal life, for it is written (^{<RTB>}John 14:21):

“He that loveth Me, shall be loved by My Father: and I will love
Him, and will manifest Myself to him,”

in which manifestation everlasting life consists, according to ^{<RTB>}John 17:3:

“This is eternal life; that they may know Thee the... true God, and
Jesus Christ Whom Thou hast sent.”

Now no man can be worthy, at the same time, of eternal life and of eternal death. Therefore it is impossible for a man to have charity with a mortal sin. Therefore charity is destroyed by one mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12) — *I answer that*, That one contrary is removed by the other contrary supervening. Now every mortal sin is contrary to charity by its very nature, which consists in man’s loving God above all things, and subjecting himself to Him entirely, by referring all that is his to God. It is therefore essential to charity that man should so love God as to wish to submit to Him in all things, and always to follow the rule of His commandments; since whatever is contrary to His commandments is manifestly contrary to charity, and therefore by its very nature is capable of destroying charity.

If indeed charity were an acquired habit dependent on the power of its subject, it would not necessarily be removed by one mortal sin, for act is directly contrary, not to habit but to act. Now the endurance of a habit in its subject does not require the endurance of its act, so that when a contrary act supervenes the acquired habit is not at once done away. But charity, being an infused habit, depends on the action of God Who infuses it, Who stands in relation to the infusion and safekeeping of charity, as the sun does to the diffusion of light in the air, as stated above (**A(10), O(3)**). Consequently, just as the light would cease at once in the air, were an obstacle placed to its being lit up by the sun, even so charity ceases at once to be in the soul through the placing of an obstacle to the outpouring of charity by God into the soul.

Now it is evident that through every mortal sin which is contrary to God’s commandments, an obstacle is placed to the outpouring of charity, since from the very fact that a man chooses to prefer sin to God’s friendship, which requires that we should obey His will, it follows that the habit of charity is lost at once through one mortal sin. Hence Augustine says (Genesis ad lit. viii, 12) that “man is enlightened by God’s presence, but he is darkened at once by God’s absence, because distance from Him is effected not by change of place but by aversion of the will.”

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12)-RO(1) — This saying of Origen may be understood, in one way, that a man who is in the state of perfection, does not suddenly go so far as to commit a mortal sin, but is disposed thereto by some previous negligence, for which reason venial sins are said to be dispositions to mortal sin, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(88), A(3)**). Nevertheless he falls, and loses charity through the one mortal sin if he commits it.

Since, however, he adds: “If some slight slip should occur, and he recover himself quickly he does not appear to fall altogether,” we may reply in another way, that when he speaks of a man being emptied and falling away altogether, he means one who falls so as to sin through malice; and this does not occur in a perfect man all at once.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12)-RO(2) — Charity may be lost in two ways; first, directly, by actual contempt, and, in this way, Peter did not lose charity. Secondly, indirectly, when a sin is committed against charity, through some passion of desire or fear; it was by sinning against charity in this way, that Peter lost charity; yet he soon recovered it.

The Reply to the Third Objection is evident from what has been said.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12)-RO(4) — Not every inordinate affection for things directed to the end, i.e., for created goods, constitutes a mortal sin, but only such as is directly contrary to the Divine will; and then the inordinate affection is contrary to charity, as stated.

P(2b)-Q(24)-A(12)-RO(5) — Charity denotes union with God, whereas faith and hope do not. Now every mortal sin consists in aversion from God, as stated above (Genesis ad lit. viii, 12). Consequently every moral sin is contrary to charity, but not to faith and hope, but only certain determinate sins, which destroy the habit of faith or of hope, even as charity is destroyed by every moral sin. Hence it is evident that charity cannot remain lifeless, since it is itself the ultimate form regarding God under the aspect of last end as stated above (**Q(23), A(8)**).

QUESTION 25

OF THE OBJECT OF CHARITY

(TWELVE ARTICLES)

We must now consider the object of charity; which consideration will be twofold:

- (1) The things we ought to love out of charity:
- (2) The order in which they ought to be loved.

Under the first head there are twelve points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether we should love God alone, out of charity, or should we love our neighbor also?
- (2) Whether charity should be loved out of charity?
- (3) Whether irrational creatures ought to be loved out of charity?
- (4) Whether one may love oneself out of charity?
- (5) Whether one's own body?
- (6) Whether sinners should be loved out of charity?
- (7) Whether sinners love themselves?
- (8) Whether we should love our enemies out of charity?
- (9) Whether we are bound to show them tokens of friendship?
- (10) Whether we ought to love the angels out of charity?
- (11) Whether we ought to love the demons?
- (12) How to enumerate the things we are bound to love out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(1)

Whether the love of charity stops at God, or extends to our neighbor?

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that the love of charity stops at God and does not extend to our neighbor. For as we owe God love, so do we owe Him fear, according ^{<600>}Deuteronomy 10:12:

“And now Israel, what doth the Lord thy God require of thee, but that thou fear... and love Him?”

Now the fear with which we fear man, and which is called human fear, is distinct from the fear with which we fear God, and which is either servile or filial, as is evident from what has been stated above (**Q(10), A(2)**). Therefore also the love with which we love God, is distinct from the love with which we love our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the Philosopher says (Ethic. viii, 8) that “to be loved is to be honored.” Now the honor due to God, which is known as “latria,” is distinct from the honor due to a creature, and known as “dulia.” Therefore again the love wherewith we love God, is distinct from that with which we love our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, hope begets charity, as a gloss states on ^{<400>}Matthew 1:2. Now hope is so due to God that it is reprehensible to hope in man, according to ^{<2075>}Jeremiah 17:5: “Cursed be the man that trusteth in man.” Therefore charity is so due to God, as not to extend to our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(1) — On the contrary, It is written (^{<601>}1 John 4:21):

“This commandment we have from God, that he, who loveth God, love also his brother.”

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(1) — I answer that, As stated above (**Q(17), A(6); Q(19), A(3); P(2a), Q(54), A(3)**) habits are not differentiated except their acts be of different species. For every act of the one species belongs to the same habit. Now since the species of an act is derived from its object, considered under its formal aspect, it follows of necessity that it is specifically the

same act that tends to an aspect of the object, and that tends to the object under that aspect: thus it is specifically the same visual act whereby we see the light, and whereby we see the color under the aspect of light.

Now the aspect under which our neighbor is to be loved, is God, since what we ought to love in our neighbor is that he may be in God. Hence it is clear that it is specifically the same act whereby we love God, and whereby we love our neighbor. Consequently the habit of charity extends not only to the love of God, but also to the love of our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(1)-RO(1) — We may fear our neighbor, even as we may love him, in two ways: first, on account of something that is proper to him, as when a man fears a tyrant on account of his cruelty, or loves him by reason of his own desire to get something from him. Such like human fear is distinct from the fear of God, and the same applies to love. Secondly, we fear a man, or love him on account of what he has of God; as when we fear the secular power by reason of its exercising the ministry of God for the punishment of evildoers, and love it for its justice: such like fear of man is not distinct from fear of God, as neither is such like love.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(1)-RO(2) — Love regards good in general, whereas honor regards the honored person's own good, for it is given to a person in recognition of his own virtue. Hence love is not differentiated specifically on account of the various degrees of goodness in various persons, so long as it is referred to one good common to all, whereas honor is distinguished according to the good belonging to individuals. Consequently we love all our neighbors with the same love of charity, in so far as they are referred to one good common to them all, which is God; whereas we give various honors to various people, according to each one's own virtue, and likewise to God we give the singular honor of latria on account of His singular virtue.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(1)-RO(3) — It is wrong to hope in man as though he were the principal author of salvation, but not, to hope in man as helping us ministerially under God. In like manner it would be wrong if a man loved his neighbor as though he were his last end, but not, if he loved him for God's sake; and this is what charity does.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(2)

Whether we should love charity out of charity?

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that charity need not be loved out of charity. For the things to be loved out of charity are contained in the two precepts of charity (⁴¹²⁵Matthew 22:37-39): and neither of them includes charity, since charity is neither God nor our neighbor. Therefore charity need not be loved out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, charity is founded on the fellowship of happiness, as stated above (**Q(23), A(1)**). But charity cannot participate in happiness. Therefore charity need not be loved out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, charity is a kind of friendship, as stated above (**Q(23), A(1)**). But no man can have friendship for charity or for an accident, since such things cannot return love for love, which is essential to friendship, as stated in Ethic. 8:Therefore charity need not be loved out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Trin. viii, 8): “He that loves his neighbor, must, in consequence, love love itself.” But we love our neighbor out of charity. Therefore it follows that charity also is loved out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Charity is love. Now love, by reason of the nature of the power whose act it is, is capable of reflecting on itself; for since the object of the will is the universal good, whatever has the aspect of good, can be the object of an act of the will: and since to will is itself a good, man can will himself to will. Even so the intellect, whose object is the true, understands that it understands, because this again is something true. Love, however, even by reason of its own species, is capable of reflecting on itself, because it is a spontaneous movement of the lover towards the beloved, wherefore from the moment a man loves, he loves himself to love.

Yet charity is not love simply, but has the nature of friendship, as stated above (**Q(23), A(1)**). Now by friendship a thing is loved in two ways:

first, as the friend for whom we have friendship, and to whom we wish good things: secondly, as the good which we wish to a friend. It is in the latter and not in the former way that charity is loved out of charity, because charity is the good which we desire for all those whom we love out of charity. The same applies to happiness, and to the other virtues.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(2)-RO(1) — God and our neighbor are those with whom we are friends, but love of them includes the loving of charity, since we love both God and our neighbor, in so far as we love ourselves and our neighbor to love God, and this is to love charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(2)-RO(2) — Charity is itself the fellowship of the spiritual life, whereby we arrive at happiness: hence it is loved as the good which we desire for all whom we love out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(2)-RO(3) — This argument considers friendship as referred to those with whom we are friends.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(3)

***Whether irrational creatures
also ought to be loved out of charity?***

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that irrational creatures also ought to be loved out of charity. For it is chiefly by charity that we are conformed to God. Now God loves irrational creatures out of charity, for He loves “all things that are” (Wis. 11:25), and whatever He loves, He loves by Himself Who is charity. Therefore we also should love irrational creatures out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, charity is referred to God principally, and extends to other things as referable to God. Now just as the rational creature is referable to God, in as much as it bears the resemblance of image, so too, are the irrational creatures, in as much as they bear the resemblance of a trace [*Cf. **P(1) Q(45), A(7)**]. Therefore charity extends also to irrational creatures.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, just as the object of charity is God. so is the object of faith. Now faith extends to irrational creatures, since we

believe that heaven and earth were created by God, that the fishes and birds were brought forth out of the waters, and animals that walk, and plants, out of the earth. Therefore charity extends also to irrational creatures.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, The love of charity extends to none but God and our neighbor. But the word neighbor cannot be extended to irrational creatures, since they have no fellowship with man in the rational life. Therefore charity does not extend to irrational creatures.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(3) — *I answer that*, According to what has been stated above (**Q(13), A(1)**) charity is a kind of friendship. Now the love of friendship is twofold: first, there is the love for the friend to whom our friendship is given, secondly, the love for those good things which we desire for our friend. With regard to the first, no irrational creature can be loved out of charity; and for three reasons. Two of these reasons refer in a general way to friendship, which cannot have an irrational creature for its object: first because friendship is towards one to whom we wish good things, while, properly speaking, we cannot wish good things to an irrational creature, because it is not competent, properly speaking, to possess good, this being proper to the rational creature which, through its free-will, is the master of its disposal of the good it possesses. Hence the Philosopher says (Phys. ii, 6) that we do not speak of good or evil befalling such like things, except metaphorically. Secondly, because all friendship is based on some fellowship in life; since “nothing is so proper to friendship as to live together,” as the Philosopher proves (Ethic. viii, 5). Now irrational creatures can have no fellowship in human life which is regulated by reason. Hence friendship with irrational creatures is impossible, except metaphorically speaking. The third reason is proper to charity, for charity is based on the fellowship of everlasting happiness, to which the irrational creature cannot attain. Therefore we cannot have the friendship of charity towards an irrational creature.

Nevertheless we can love irrational creatures out of charity, if we regard them as the good things that we desire for others, in so far, to wit, as we wish for their preservation, to God’s honor and man’s use; thus too does God love them out of charity.

Wherefore the Reply to the First Objection is evident.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(3)-RO(2) — The likeness by way of trace does not confer the capacity for everlasting life, whereas the likeness of image does: and so the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(3)-RO(3) — Faith can extend to all that is in any way true, whereas the friendship of charity extends only to such things as have a natural capacity for everlasting life; wherefore the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(4)

Whether a man ought to love himself out of charity?

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that a man is bound to love himself out of charity. For Gregory says in a homily (In Evang. xvii) that there “can be no charity between less than two.” Therefore no man has charity towards himself.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, friendship, by its very nature, implies mutual love and equality (Ethic. viii, 2,7), which cannot be of one man towards himself. But charity is a kind of friendship, as stated above (**Q(23), A(1)**). Therefore a man cannot have charity towards himself.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, anything relating to charity cannot be blameworthy, since charity “dealeth not perversely” (1 Corinthians 23:4). Now a man deserves to be blamed for loving himself, since it is written (~~SIME~~ 2 Timothy 3:1,2):

“In the last days shall come dangerous times,
men shall be lovers of themselves.”

Therefore a man cannot love himself out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(4) — On the contrary, It is written (~~GEN~~ Leviticus 19:18): “Thou shalt love thy friend as thyself.” Now we love our friends out of charity. Therefore we should love ourselves too out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(4) — I answer that, Since charity is a kind of friendship, as stated above (**Q(23), A(1)**), we may consider charity from two standpoints: first, under the general notion of friendship, and in this way we must hold that, properly speaking, a man is not a friend to himself, but

something more than a friend, since friendship implies union, for Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that “love is a unitive force,” whereas a man is one with himself which is more than being united to another. Hence, just as unity is the principle of union, so the love with which a man loves himself is the form and root of friendship. For if we have friendship with others it is because we do unto them as we do unto ourselves, hence we read in Ethic. ix, 4,8, that “the origin of friendly relations with others lies in our relations to ourselves.” Thus too with regard to principles we have something greater than science, namely understanding.

Secondly, we may speak of charity in respect of its specific nature, namely as denoting man’s friendship with God in the first place, and, consequently, with the things of God, among which things is man himself who has charity. Hence, among these other things which he loves out of charity because they pertain to God, he loves also himself out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(4)-RO(1) — Gregory speaks there of charity under the general notion of friendship: and the Second Objection is to be taken in the same sense.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(4)-RO(3) — Those who love themselves are to be blamed, in so far as they love themselves as regards their sensitive nature, which they humor. This is not to love oneself truly according to one’s rational nature, so as to desire for oneself the good things which pertain to the perfection of reason: and in this way chiefly it is through charity that a man loves himself.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(5)

Whether charity is one virtue?

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that a man ought not to love his body out of charity. For we do not love one with whom we are unwilling to associate. But those who have charity shun the society of the body, according to ^{<812>}Romans 7:24: “Who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” and ^{<812>}Philippians 1:23: “Having a desire to be dissolved and to be with Christ.” Therefore our bodies are not to be loved out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, the friendship of charity is based on fellowship in the enjoyment of God. But the body can have no share in that enjoyment. Therefore the body is not to be loved out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, since charity is a kind of friendship it is towards those who are capable of loving in return. But our body cannot love us out of charity. Therefore it should not be loved out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 23,26) that there are four things that we should love out of charity, and among them he reckons our own body.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Our bodies can be considered in two ways: first, in respect of their nature, secondly, in respect of the corruption of sin and its punishment.

Now the nature of our body was created, not by an evil principle, as the Manicheans pretend, but by God. Hence we can use it for God's service, according to ^{◀R13}Romans 6:13: "Present... your members as instruments of justice unto God." Consequently, out of the love of charity with which we love God, we ought to love our bodies also, but we ought not to love the evil effects of sin and the corruption of punishment; we ought rather, by the desire of charity, to long for the removal of such things.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(5)-RO(1) — The Apostle did not shrink from the society of his body, as regards the nature of the body, in fact in this respect he was loth to be deprived thereof, according to ^{◀R14}2 Corinthians 5:4: "We would not be unclothed, but clothed over." He did, however, wish to escape from the taint of concupiscence, which remains in the body, and from the corruption of the body which weighs down the soul, so as to hinder it from seeing God. Hence he says expressly: "From the body of this death."

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(5)-RO(2) — Although our bodies are unable to enjoy God by knowing and loving Him, yet by the works which we do through the body, we are able to attain to the perfect knowledge of God. Hence from the enjoyment in the soul there overflows a certain happiness into the body, viz., "the flush of health and incorruption," as Augustine states (Ep. ad Dioscor. cxviii). Hence, since the body has, in a fashion, a share of happiness, it can be loved with the love of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(5)-RO(3) — Mutual love is found in the friendship which is for another, but not in that which a man has for himself, either in respect of his soul, or in respect of his body.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6)

Whether we ought to love sinners out of charity?

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that we ought not to love sinners out of charity. For it is written (¹⁴⁸¹Psalm 118:113): “I have hated the unjust.” But David had perfect charity. Therefore sinners should be hated rather than loved, out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, “love is proved by deeds” as Gregory says in a homily for Pentecost (In Evang. xxx). But good men do no works of the unjust: *on the contrary*, they do such as would appear to be works of hate, according to (¹⁴⁸¹Psalm 100:8): “In the morning I put to death all the wicked of the land”: and God commanded (¹⁴²⁸Exodus 22:18): “Wizards thou shalt not suffer to live.” Therefore sinners should not be loved out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, it is part of friendship that one should desire and wish good things for one’s friends. Now the saints, out of charity, desire evil things for the wicked, according to (¹⁴⁸¹Psalm 9:18): “May the wicked be turned into hell [*Douay and A. V.: ‘The wicked shall be,’ etc. See Reply to this Objection.]” Therefore sinners should not be loved out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6)-O(4) — Further, it is proper to friends to rejoice in, and will the same things. Now charity does not make us will what sinners will, nor to rejoice in what gives them joy, but rather the contrary. Therefore sinners should not be loved out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6)-O(5) — Further, it is proper to friends to associate together, according to Ethic. 8: But we ought not to associate with sinners, according to (¹⁴⁸¹2 Corinthians 6:17): “Go ye out from among them.” Therefore we should not love sinners out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 30) that “when it is said: ‘Thou shalt love thy neighbor,’ it is evident that we ought to look upon every man as our neighbor.” Now sinners do not cease to be men, for sin does not destroy nature. Therefore we ought to love sinners out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6) — *I answer that*, Two things may be considered in the sinner: his nature and his guilt. According to his nature, which he has from God, he has a capacity for happiness, on the fellowship of which charity is based, as stated above (**A(3); Q(23), AA(1),5**), wherefore we ought to love sinners, out of charity, in respect of their nature.

On the other hand their guilt is opposed to God, and is an obstacle to happiness. Wherefore, in respect of their guilt whereby they are opposed to God, all sinners are to be hated, even one’s father or mother or kindred, according to ¹²²Luke 12:26. For it is our duty to hate, in the sinner, his being a sinner, and to love in him, his being a man capable of bliss; and this is to love him truly, out of charity, for God’s sake.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6)-RO(1) — The prophet hated the unjust, as such, and the object of his hate was their injustice, which was their evil. Such hatred is perfect, of which he himself says (¹²³Psalm 138:22): “I have hated them with a perfect hatred.” Now hatred of a person’s evil is equivalent to love of his good. Hence also this perfect hatred belongs to charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6)-RO(2) — As the Philosopher observes (Ethic. ix, 3), when our friends fall into sin, we ought not to deny them the amenities of friendship, so long as there is hope of their mending their ways, and we ought to help them more readily to regain virtue than to recover money, had they lost it, for as much as virtue is more akin than money to friendship. When, however, they fall into very great wickedness, and become incurable, we ought no longer to show them friendliness. It is for this reason that both Divine and human laws command such like sinners to be put to death, because there is greater likelihood of their harming others than of their mending their ways. Nevertheless the judge puts this into effect, not out of hatred for the sinners, but out of the love of charity, by reason of which he prefers the public good to the life of the individual. Moreover the death inflicted by the judge profits the sinner, if he be converted, unto the expiation of his crime; and, if he be not converted, it

profits so as to put an end to the sin, because the sinner is thus deprived of the power to sin any more.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6)-RO(3) — Such like imprecations which we come across in Holy Writ, may be understood in three ways: first, by way of prediction, not by way of wish, so that the sense is: “May the wicked be,” that is, “The wicked shall be, turned into hell.” Secondly, by way of wish, yet so that the desire of the wisher is not referred to the man’s punishment, but to the justice of the punisher, according to ⁴⁵⁷¹Psalm 57:11: “The just shall rejoice when he shall see the revenge,” since, according to Wis. 1:13, not even God “hath pleasure in the destruction of the wicked [Vulg.: ‘living’]” when He punishes them, but He rejoices in His justice, according to ⁴⁹⁰⁸Psalm 10:8: “The Lord is just and hath loved justice.” Thirdly, so that this desire is referred to the removal of the sin, and not to the punishment itself, to the effect, namely, that the sin be destroyed, but that the man may live.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6)-RO(4) — We love sinners out of charity, not so as to will what they will, or to rejoice in what gives them joy, but so as to make them will what we will, and rejoice in what rejoices us. Hence it is written (²⁴⁵⁹Jeremiah 15:19):

“They shall be turned to thee, and thou shalt
not to be turned to them.”

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(6)-RO(5) — The weak should avoid associating with sinners, on account of the danger in which they stand of being perverted by them. But it is commendable for the perfect, of whose perversion there is no fear, to associate with sinners that they may convert them. For thus did Our Lord eat and drink with sinners as related by ⁴¹⁹¹Matthew 9:11-13. Yet all should avoid the society of sinners, as regards fellowship in sin; in this sense it is written (⁴⁴⁶⁷2 Corinthians 6:17): “Go out from among them... and touch not the unclean thing,” i.e. by consenting to sin.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(7)

Whether sinners love themselves?

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that sinners love themselves. For that which is the principle of sin, is most of all in the sinner. Now love of self is the principle of sin, since Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xiv, 28) that it “builds up the city of Babylon.” Therefore sinners most of all love themselves.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, sin does not destroy nature. Now it is in keeping with nature that every man should love himself: wherefore even irrational creatures naturally desire their own good, for instance, the preservation of their being, and so forth. Therefore sinners love themselves.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, good is beloved by all, as Dionysius states (Div. Nom. iv). Now many sinners reckon themselves to be good. Therefore many sinners love themselves.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 10:6):

“He that loveth iniquity, hateth his own soul.”

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(7) — *I answer that*, Love of self is common to all, in one way; in another way it is proper to the good; in a third way, it is proper to the wicked. For it is common to all for each one to love what he thinks himself to be. Now a man is said to be a thing, in two ways: first, in respect of his substance and nature, and, this way all think themselves to be what they are, that is, composed of a soul and body. In this way too, all men, both good and wicked, love themselves, in so far as they love their own preservation.

Secondly, a man is said to be something in respect of some predominance, as the sovereign of a state is spoken of as being the state, and so, what the sovereign does, the state is said to do. In this way, all do not think themselves to be what they are. For the reasoning mind is the predominant part of man, while the sensitive and corporeal nature takes the second place, the former of which the Apostle calls the “inward man,” and the latter, the “outward man” (~~2~~ 2 Corinthians 4:16). Now the good look

upon their rational nature or the inward man as being the chief thing in them, wherefore in this way they think themselves to be what they are. On the other hand, the wicked reckon their sensitive and corporeal nature, or the outward man, to hold the first place. Wherefore, since they know not themselves aright, they do not love themselves aright, but love what they think themselves to be. But the good know themselves truly, and therefore truly love themselves.

The Philosopher proves this from five things that are proper to friendship. For in the first place, every friend wishes his friend to be and to live; secondly, he desires good things for him; thirdly, he does good things to him; fourthly, he takes pleasure in his company; fifthly, he is of one mind with him, rejoicing and sorrowing in almost the same things. In this way the good love themselves, as to the inward man, because they wish the preservation thereof in its integrity, they desire good things for him, namely spiritual goods, indeed they do their best to obtain them, and they take pleasure in entering into their own hearts, because they find there good thoughts in the present, the memory of past good, and the hope of future good, all of which are sources of pleasure. Likewise they experience no clashing of wills, since their whole soul tends to one thing.

On the other hand, the wicked have no wish to be preserved in the integrity of the inward man, nor do they desire spiritual goods for him, nor do they work for that end, nor do they take pleasure in their own company by entering into their own hearts, because whatever they find there, present, past and future, is evil and horrible; nor do they agree with themselves, on account of the gnawings of conscience, according to ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 49:21: “I will reprove thee and set before thy face.”

In the same manner it may be shown that the wicked love themselves, as regards the corruption of the outward man, whereas the good do not love themselves thus.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(7)-RO(1) — The love of self which is the principle of sin is that which is proper to the wicked, and reaches “to the contempt of God,” as stated in the passage quoted, because the wicked so desire external goods as to despise spiritual goods.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(7)-RO(2) — Although natural love is not altogether forfeited by wicked men, yet it is perverted in them, as explained above.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(7)-RO(3) — The wicked have some share of self-love, in so far as they think themselves good. Yet such love of self is not true but apparent: and even this is not possible in those who are very wicked.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(8)

Whether charity requires that we should love our enemies?

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that charity does not require us to love our enemies. For Augustine says (Enchiridion lxxiii) that “this great good,” namely, the love of our enemies, is “not so universal in its application, as the object of our petition when we say: Forgive us our trespasses.” Now no one is forgiven sin without he have charity, because, according to ^{<100>}Proverbs 10:12, “charity covereth all sins.” Therefore charity does not require that we should love our enemies.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, charity does not do away with nature. Now everything, even an irrational being, naturally hates its contrary, as a lamb hates a wolf, and water fire. Therefore charity does not make us love our enemies.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, charity “doth nothing perversely” (^{<130>}1 Corinthians 13:4). Now it seems perverse to love one’s enemies, as it would be to hate one’s friends: hence Joab upbraided David by saying (^{<120>}2 Kings 19:6): “Thou lovest them that hate thee, and thou hatest them that love thee.” Therefore charity does not make us love our enemies.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, Our Lord said (^{<100>}Matthew 4:44):

“Love your enemies.”

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(8) — *I answer that*, Love of one’s enemies may be understood in three ways. First, as though we were to love our enemies as such: this is perverse, and contrary to charity, since it implies love of that which is evil in another.

Secondly love of one's enemies may mean that we love them as to their nature, but in general: and in this sense charity requires that we should love our enemies, namely, that in loving God and our neighbor, we should not exclude our enemies from the love given to our neighbor in general.

Thirdly, love of one's enemies may be considered as specially directed to them, namely, that we should have a special movement of love towards our enemies. Charity does not require this absolutely, because it does not require that we should have a special movement of love to every individual man, since this would be impossible. Nevertheless charity does require this, in respect of our being prepared in mind, namely, that we should be ready to love our enemies individually, if the necessity were to occur. That man should actually do so, and love his enemy for God's sake, without it being necessary for him to do so, belongs to the perfection of charity. For since man loves his neighbor, out of charity, for God's sake, the more he loves God, the more does he put enmities aside and show love towards his neighbor: thus if we loved a certain man very much, we would love his children though they were unfriendly towards us. This is the sense in which Augustine speaks in the passage quoted in the First Objection, the Reply to which is therefore evident.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(8)-RO(2) — Everything naturally hates its contrary as such. Now our enemies are contrary to us, as enemies, wherefore this itself should be hateful to us, for their enmity should displease us. They are not, however, contrary to us, as men and capable of happiness: and it is as such that we are bound to love them.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(8)-RO(3) — It is wrong to love one's enemies as such: charity does not do this, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(9)

Whether it is necessary for salvation that we should show our enemies the signs and effects of love?

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that charity demands of a man to show his enemy the signs or effects of love. For it is written (^{GL188} 1 John 3:18): "Let us not love in word nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth."

Now a man loves in deed by showing the one he loves signs and effects of love. Therefore charity requires that a man show his enemies such signs and effects of love.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, Our Lord said in the same breath (⁴¹⁵⁴Matthew 5:44): “Love your enemies,” and, “Do good to them that hate you.” Now charity demands that we love our enemies. Therefore it demands also that we should “do good to them.”

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, not only God but also our neighbor is the object of charity. Now Gregory says in a homily for Pentecost (In Evang. xxx), that “love of God cannot be idle for wherever it is it does great things, and if it ceases to work, it is no longer love.” Hence charity towards our neighbor cannot be without producing works. But charity requires us to love our neighbor without exception, though he be an enemy. Therefore charity requires us to show the signs and effects of love towards our enemies.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on ⁴¹⁵⁴Matthew 5:44, “Do good to them that hate you,” says: “To do good to one’s enemies is the height of perfection” [*Augustine, Enchiridion lxxiii]. Now charity does not require us to do that which belongs to its perfection. Therefore charity does not require us to show the signs and effects of love to our enemies.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(9) — *I answer that*, The effects and signs of charity are the result of inward love, and are in proportion with it. Now it is absolutely necessary, for the fulfilment of the precept, that we should inwardly love our enemies in general, but not individually, except as regards the mind being prepared to do so, as explained above (**A(8)**).

We must accordingly apply this to the showing of the effects and signs of love. For some of the signs and favors of love are shown to our neighbors in general, as when we pray for all the faithful, or for a whole people, or when anyone bestows a favor on a whole community: and the fulfilment of the precept requires that we should show such like favors or signs of love towards our enemies. For if we did not so, it would be a proof of vengeful spite, and contrary to what is written (⁴¹⁵⁵Leviticus 19:18): “Seek not revenge, nor be mindful of the injury of thy citizens.” But there are other favors or signs of love, which one shows to certain persons in particular:

and it is not necessary for salvation that we show our enemies such like favors and signs of love, except as regards being ready in our minds, for instance to come to their assistance in a case of urgency, according to ⁴¹⁵³Proverbs 25:21: “If thy enemy be hungry, give him to eat; if he thirst, give him... drink.” Outside cases of urgency, to show such like favors to an enemy belongs to the perfection of charity, whereby we not only beware, as in duty bound, of being overcome by evil, but also wish to overcome evil by good [⁴⁶²²*Romans 12:21], which belongs to perfection: for then we not only beware of being drawn into hatred on account of the hurt done to us, but purpose to induce our enemy to love us on account of our kindness.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(10)

Whether we ought to love the angels out of charity?

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that we are not bound to love the angels out of charity. For, as Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i), charity is a twofold love: the love of God and of our neighbor. Now love of the angels is not contained in the love of God, since they are created substances; nor is it, seemingly, contained in the love of our neighbor, since they do not belong with us to a common species. Therefore we are not bound to love them out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, dumb animals have more in common with us than the angels have, since they belong to the same proximate genus as we do. But we have not charity towards dumb animals, as stated above (**A(3)**). Neither, therefore, have we towards the angels.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, nothing is so proper to friends as companionship with one another (Ethic. viii, 5). But the angels are not our companions; we cannot even see them. Therefore we are unable to give them the friendship of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 30): “If the name of neighbor is given either to those whom we pity, or to those who pity us, it is evident that the precept binding us to love our

neighbor includes also the holy angels from whom we receive many merciful favors.”

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(10) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(23)**, **A(1)**), the friendship of charity is founded upon the fellowship of everlasting happiness, in which men share in common with the angels. For it is written (⁴²³Matthew 22:30) that “in the resurrection... men shall be as the angels of God in heaven.” It is therefore evident that the friendship of charity extends also to the angels.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(10)-RO(1) — Our neighbor is not only one who is united to us in a common species, but also one who is united to us by sharing in the blessings pertaining to everlasting life, and it is on the latter fellowship that the friendship of charity is founded.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(10)-RO(2) — Dumb animals are united to us in the proximate genus, by reason of their sensitive nature; whereas we are partakers of everlasting happiness, by reason not of our sensitive nature but of our rational mind wherein we associate with the angels.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(10)-RO(3) — The companionship of the angels does not consist in outward fellowship, which we have in respect of our sensitive nature; it consists in a fellowship of the mind, imperfect indeed in this life, but perfect in heaven, as stated above (**Q(23)**, **A(1)**, ad 1).

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(11)

Whether we are bound to love the demons out of charity?

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(11)-O(1) — It would seem that we ought to love the demons out of charity. For the angels are our neighbors by reason of their fellowship with us in a rational mind. But the demons also share in our fellowship thus, since natural gifts, such as life and understanding, remain in them unimpaired, as Dionysius states (Div. Nom. iv). Therefore we ought to love the demons out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(11)-O(2) — Further, the demons differ from the blessed angels in the matter of sin, even as sinners from just men. Now the just

man loves the sinner out of charity. Therefore he ought to love the demons also out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(11)-O(3) — Further, we ought, out of charity, to love, as being our neighbors, those from whom we receive favors, as appears from the passage of Augustine quoted above (**A(9)**). Now the demons are useful to us in many things, for “by tempting us they work crowns for us,” as Augustine says (*De Civ. Dei* xi, 17). Therefore we ought to love the demons out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(11) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~22~~ Isaiah 28:18):

“Your league with death shall be abolished, and your covenant with hell shall not stand.”

Now the perfection of a peace and covenant is through charity. Therefore we ought not to have charity for the demons who live in hell and compass death.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(11) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(6)**), in the sinner, we are bound, out of charity, to love his nature, but to hate his sin. But the name of demon is given to designate a nature deformed by sin, wherefore demons should not be loved out of charity. Without however laying stress on the word, the question as to whether the spirits called demons ought to be loved out of charity, must be answered in accordance with the statement made above (**AA(2),3**), that a thing may be loved out of charity in two ways. First, a thing may be loved as the person who is the object of friendship, and thus we cannot have the friendship of charity towards the demons. For it is an essential part of friendship that one should be a well-wisher towards one’s friend; and it is impossible for us, out of charity, to desire the good of everlasting life, to which charity is referred, for those spirits whom God has condemned eternally, since this would be in opposition to our charity towards God whereby we approve of His justice.

Secondly, we love a thing as being that which we desire to be enduring as another’s good. In this way we love irrational creatures out of charity, in as much as we wish them to endure, to give glory to God and be useful to man, as stated above (**A(3)**): and in this way too we can love the nature of

the demons even out of charity, in as much as we desire those spirits to endure, as to their natural gifts, unto God's glory.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(11)-RO(1) — The possession of everlasting happiness is not impossible for the angelic mind as it is for the mind of a demon; consequently the friendship of charity which is based on the fellowship of everlasting life, rather than on the fellowship of nature, is possible towards the angels, but not towards the demons.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(11)-RO(2) — In this life, men who are in sin retain the possibility of obtaining everlasting happiness: not so those who are lost in hell, who, in this respect, are in the same case as the demons.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(11)-RO(3) — That the demons are useful to us is due not to their intention but to the ordering of Divine providence; hence this leads us to be friends, not with them, but with God, Who turns their perverse intention to our profit.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(12)

Whether four things are rightly reckoned as to be loved out of charity, viz. God, our neighbor, our body and ourselves?

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(12)-O(1) — It would seem that these four things are not rightly reckoned as to be loved out of charity, to wit: God, our neighbor, our body, and ourselves. For, as Augustine states (Tract. super Joan. lxxxiii), "he that loveth not God, loveth not himself." Hence love of oneself is included in the love of God. Therefore love of oneself is not distinct from the love of God.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(12)-O(2) — Further, a part ought not to be condivided with the whole. But our body is part of ourselves. Therefore it ought not to be condivided with ourselves as a distinct object of love.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(12)-O(3) — Further, just as a man has a body, so has his neighbor. Since then the love with which a man loves his neighbor, is distinct from the love with which a man loves himself, so the love with which a man loves his neighbor's body, ought to be distinct from the love with which he loves his own body. Therefore these four things are not rightly distinguished as objects to be loved out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(12) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 23): “There are four things to be loved; one which is above us,” namely God, “another, which is ourselves, a third which is nigh to us,” namely our neighbor, “and a fourth which is beneath us,” namely our own body.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(12) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(23)**, **AA(1),5**), the friendship of charity is based on the fellowship of happiness. Now, in this fellowship, one thing is considered as the principle from which happiness flows, namely God; a second is that which directly partakes of happiness, namely men and angels; a third is a thing to which happiness comes by a kind of overflow, namely the human body.

Now the source from which happiness flows is lovable by reason of its being the cause of happiness: that which is a partaker of happiness, can be an object of love for two reasons, either through being identified with ourselves, or through being associated with us in partaking of happiness, and in this respect, there are two things to be loved out of charity, in as much as man loves both himself and his neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(12)-RO(1) — The different relations between a lover and the various things loved make a different kind of lovableness. Accordingly, since the relation between the human lover and God is different from his relation to himself, these two are reckoned as distinct objects of love, for the love of the one is the cause of the love of the other, so that the former love being removed the latter is taken away.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(12)-RO(2) — The subject of charity is the rational mind that can be capable of obtaining happiness, to which the body does not reach directly, but only by a kind of overflow. Hence, by his reasonable mind which holds the first place in him, man, out of charity, loves himself in one way, and his own body in another.

P(2b)-Q(25)-A(12)-RO(3) — Man loves his neighbor, both as to his soul and as to his body, by reason of a certain fellowship in happiness. Wherefore, on the part of his neighbor, there is only one reason for loving him; and our neighbor’s body is not reckoned as a special object of love.

QUESTION 26

OF THE ORDER OF CHARITY

(THIRTEEN ARTICLES)

We must now consider the order of charity, under which head there are thirteen points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether there is an order in charity?
- (2) Whether man ought to love God more than his neighbor?
- (3) Whether more than himself?
- (4) Whether he ought to love himself more than his neighbor?
- (5) Whether man ought to love his neighbor more than his own body?
- (6) Whether he ought to love one neighbor more than another?
- (7) Whether he ought to love more, a neighbor who is better, or one who is more closely united to him?
- (8) Whether he ought to love more, one who is akin to him by blood, or one who is united to him by other ties?
- (9) Whether, out of charity, a man ought to love his son more than his father ?
- (10) Whether he ought to love his mother more than his father?
- (11) Whether he ought to love his wife more than his father or mother?
- (12) Whether we ought to love those who are kind to us more than those whom we are kind to?
- (13) Whether the order of charity endures in heaven?

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(1)

Whether there is order in charity?

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that there is no order in charity. For charity is a virtue. But no order is assigned to the other virtues. Neither, therefore, should any order be assigned to charity.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, just as the object of faith is the First Truth, so is the object of charity the Sovereign Good. Now no order is appointed for faith, but all things are believed equally. Neither, therefore, ought there to be any order in charity.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, charity is in the will: whereas ordering belongs, not to the will, but to the reason. Therefore no order should be ascribed to charity.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (Cant 2:4): “He brought me into the cellar of wine, he set in order charity in me.”

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As the Philosopher says (Metaph. v, text. 16), the terms “before” and “after” are used in reference to some principle. Now order implies that certain things are, in some way, before or after. Hence wherever there is a principle, there must needs be also order of some kind. But it has been said above (**Q(23)**, **A(1)**; **Q(25)**, **A(12)**) that the love of charity tends to God as to the principle of happiness, on the fellowship of which the friendship of charity is based. Consequently there must needs be some order in things loved out of charity, which order is in reference to the first principle of that love, which is God.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(1)-RO(1) — Charity tends towards the last end considered as last end: and this does not apply to any other virtue, as stated above (**Q(23)**, **A(6)**). Now the end has the character of principle in matters of appetite and action, as was shown above (**Q(23)**, **A(7)**, ad 2; **P(2a)**, **A(1)**, ad 1). Wherefore charity, above all, implies relation to the First Principle, and consequently, in charity above all, we find an order in reference to the First Principle.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(1)-RO(2) — Faith pertains to the cognitive power, whose operation depends on the thing known being in the knower. On the other

hand, charity is in an appetitive power, whose operation consists in the soul tending to things themselves. Now order is to be found in things themselves, and flows from them into our knowledge. Hence order is more appropriate to charity than to faith.

And yet there is a certain order in faith, in so far as it is chiefly about God, and secondarily about things referred to God.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(1)-RO(3) — Order belongs to reason as the faculty that orders, and to the appetitive power as to the faculty which is ordered. It is in this way that order is stated to be in charity.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(2)

Whether God ought to be loved more than our neighbor?

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that God ought not to be loved more than our neighbor. For it is written (^{Gen}1 John 4:20): “He that loveth not his brother whom he seeth, how can he love God, Whom he seeth not?” Whence it seems to follow that the more a thing is visible the more lovable it is, since loving begins with seeing, according to Ethic. ix, 5,12. Now God is less visible than our neighbor. Therefore He is less lovable, out of charity, than our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, likeness causes love, according to Eccclus. 13:19: “Every beast loveth its like.” Now man bears more likeness to his neighbor than to God. Therefore man loves his neighbor, out of charity, more than he loves God.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, what charity loves in a neighbor, is God, according to Augustine (De Doctr. Christ. i, 22,27). Now God is not greater in Himself than He is in our neighbor. Therefore He is not more to be loved in Himself than in our neighbor. Therefore we ought not to love God more than our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(2) — On the contrary, A thing ought to be loved more, if others ought to be hated on its account. Now we ought to hate our neighbor for God’s sake, if, to wit, he leads us astray from God, according to ^{Luke}Luke 14:26:

“If any man come to Me and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters... he cannot be My disciple.”

Therefore we ought to love God, out of charity, more than our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Each kind of friendship regards chiefly the subject in which we chiefly find the good on the fellowship of which that friendship is based: thus civil friendship regards chiefly the ruler of the state, on whom the entire common good of the state depends; hence to him before all, the citizens owe fidelity and obedience. Now the friendship of charity is based on the fellowship of happiness, which consists essentially in God, as the First Principle, whence it flows to all who are capable of happiness.

Therefore God ought to be loved chiefly and before all out of charity: for He is loved as the cause of happiness, whereas our neighbor is loved as receiving together with us a share of happiness from Him.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(2)-RO(1) — A thing is a cause of love in two ways: first, as being the reason for loving. In this way good is the cause of love, since each thing is loved according to its measure of goodness. Secondly, a thing causes love, as being a way to acquire love. It is in this way that seeing is the cause of loving, not as though a thing were lovable according as it is visible, but because by seeing a thing we are led to love it. Hence it does not follow that what is more visible is more lovable, but that as an object of love we meet with it before others: and that is the sense of the Apostle’s argument. For, since our neighbor is more visible to us, he is the first lovable object we meet with, because “the soul learns, from those things it knows, to love what it knows not,” as Gregory says in a homily (In Evang. xi). Hence it can be argued that, if any man loves not his neighbor, neither does he love God, not because his neighbor is more lovable, but because he is the first thing to demand our love: and God is more lovable by reason of His greater goodness.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(2)-RO(2) — The likeness we have to God precedes and causes the likeness we have to our neighbor: because from the very fact that we share along with our neighbor in something received from God, we

become like to our neighbor. Hence by reason of this likeness we ought to love God more than we love our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(2)-RO(3) — Considered in His substance, God is equally in all, in whomsoever He may be, for He is not lessened by being in anything. And yet our neighbor does not possess God's goodness equally with God, for God has it essentially, and our neighbor by participation.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(3)

***Whether out of charity, man is bound to love
God more than himself?***

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that man is not bound, out of charity, to love God more than himself. For the Philosopher says (Ethic. ix, 8) that "a man's friendly relations with others arise from his friendly relations with himself." Now the cause is stronger than its effect. Therefore man's friendship towards himself is greater than his friendship for anyone else. Therefore he ought to love himself more than God.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, one loves a thing in so far as it is one's own good. Now the reason for loving a thing is more loved than the thing itself which is loved for that reason, even as the principles which are the reason for knowing a thing are more known. Therefore man loves himself more than any other good loved by him. Therefore he does not love God more than himself.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, a man loves God as much as he loves to enjoy God. But a man loves himself as much as he loves to enjoy God; since this is the highest good a man can wish for himself. Therefore man is not bound, out of charity, to love God more than himself.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 22): "If thou oughtest to love thyself, not for thy own sake, but for the sake of Him in Whom is the rightest end of thy love, let no other man take offense if him also thou lovest for God's sake." Now "the cause of a thing being such is yet more so." Therefore man ought to love God more than himself.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(3) — *I answer that,* The good we receive from God is twofold, the good of nature, and the good of grace. Now the fellowship of natural goods bestowed on us by God is the foundation of natural love, in virtue of which not only man, so long as his nature remains unimpaired, loves God above all things and more than himself, but also every single creature, each in its own way, i.e. either by an intellectual, or by a rational, or by an animal, or at least by a natural love, as stones do, for instance, and other things bereft of knowledge, because each part naturally loves the common good of the whole more than its own particular good. This is evidenced by its operation, since the principal inclination of each part is towards common action conducive to the good of the whole. It may also be seen in civic virtues whereby sometimes the citizens suffer damage even to their own property and persons for the sake of the common good. Wherefore much more is this realized with regard to the friendship of charity which is based on the fellowship of the gifts of grace.

Therefore man ought, out of charity, to love God, Who is the common good of all, more than himself: since happiness is in God as in the universal and fountain principle of all who are able to have a share of that happiness.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(3)-RO(1) — The Philosopher is speaking of friendly relations towards another person in whom the good, which is the object of friendship, resides in some restricted way; and not of friendly relations with another in whom the aforesaid good resides in totality.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(3)-RO(2) — The part does indeed love the good of the whole, as becomes a part, not however so as to refer the good of the whole to itself, but rather itself to the good of the whole.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(3)-RO(3) — That a man wishes to enjoy God pertains to that love of God which is love of concupiscence. Now we love God with the love of friendship more than with the love of concupiscence, because the Divine good is greater in itself, than our share of good in enjoying Him. Hence, out of charity, man simply loves God more than himself.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(4)

Whether our of charity, man ought to love himself more than his neighbor?

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that a man ought not, out of charity, to love himself more than his neighbor. For the principal object of charity is God, as stated above (A(2); Q(25), AA(1),12). Now sometimes our neighbor is more closely united to God than we are ourselves. Therefore we ought to love such a one more than ourselves.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the more we love a person, the more we avoid injuring him. Now a man, out of charity, submits to injury for his neighbor's sake, according to ^{<102>}Proverbs 12:26: "He that neglecteth a loss for the sake of a friend, is just." Therefore a man ought, out of charity, to love his neighbor more than himself.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, it is written (^{<433>}1 Corinthians 13:5) "charity seeketh not its own." Now the thing we love most is the one whose good we seek most. Therefore a man does not, out of charity, love himself more than his neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<102>}Leviticus 19:18, ^{<102>}Matthew 22:39): "Thou shalt love thy neighbor (^{<102>}Leviticus 19:18: 'friend') as thyself." Whence it seems to follow that man's love for himself is the model of his love for another. But the model exceeds the copy. Therefore, out of charity, a man ought to love himself more than his neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(4) — *I answer that*, There are two things in man, his spiritual nature and his corporeal nature. And a man is said to love himself by reason of his loving himself with regard to his spiritual nature, as stated above (Q(25), A(7)): so that accordingly, a man ought, out of charity, to love himself more than he loves any other person.

This is evident from the very reason for loving: since, as stated above (Q(25), AA(1),12), God is loved as the principle of good, on which the love of charity is founded; while man, out of charity, loves himself by reason of his being a partaker of the aforesaid good, and loves his neighbor

by reason of his fellowship in that good. Now fellowship is a reason for love according to a certain union in relation to God. Wherefore just as unity surpasses union, the fact that man himself has a share of the Divine good, is a more potent reason for loving than that another should be a partner with him in that share. Therefore man, out of charity, ought to love himself more than his neighbor: in sign whereof, a man ought not to give way to any evil of sin, which counteracts his share of happiness, not even that he may free his neighbor from sin.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(4)-RO(1) — The love of charity takes its quantity not only from its object which is God, but also from the lover, who is the man that has charity, even as the quantity of any action depends in some way on the subject. Wherefore, though a better neighbor is nearer to God, yet because he is not as near to the man who has charity, as this man is to himself, it does not follow that a man is bound to love his neighbor more than himself.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(4)-RO(2) — A man ought to bear bodily injury for his friend's sake, and precisely in so doing he loves himself more as regards his spiritual mind, because it pertains to the perfection of virtue, which is a good of the mind. In spiritual matters, however, man ought not to suffer injury by sinning, in order to free his neighbor from sin, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(4)-RO(3) — As Augustine says in his Rule (Ep. ccxi), the saying, “‘charity seeks not her own,’ means that it prefers the common to the private good.” Now the common good is always more lovable to the individual than his private good, even as the good of the whole is more lovable to the part, than the latter's own partial good, as stated above (**A(3)**).

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(5)

***Whether a man ought to love his
neighbor more than his own body?***

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that a man is not bound to love his neighbor more than his own body. For his neighbor includes his neighbor's body. If therefore a man ought to love his neighbor more than

his own body, it follows that he ought to love his neighbor's body more than his own.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, a man ought to love his own soul more than his neighbor's, as stated above (**A(4)**). Now a man's own body is nearer to his soul than his neighbor. Therefore we ought to love our body more than our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, a man imperils that which he loves less for the sake of what he loves more. Now every man is not bound to imperil his own body for his neighbor's safety: this belongs to the perfect, according to ^{CRS}John 15:13: "Greater love than this no man hath, that a man lay down his life for his friends." Therefore a man is not bound, out of charity, to love his neighbor more than his own body.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 27) that "we ought to love our neighbor more than our own body."

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Out of charity we ought to love more that which has more fully the reason for being loved out of charity, as stated above (**A(2)**; **Q(25)**, **A(12)**). Now fellowship in the full participation of happiness which is the reason for loving one's neighbor, is a greater reason for loving, than the participation of happiness by way of overflow, which is the reason for loving one's own body. Therefore, as regards the welfare of the soul we ought to love our neighbor more than our own body.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(5)-RO(1) — According to the Philosopher (Ethic. ix, 8) a thing seems to be that which is predominant in it: so that when we say that we ought to love our neighbor more than our own body, this refers to his soul, which is his predominant part.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(5)-RO(2) — Our body is nearer to our soul than our neighbor, as regards the constitution of our own nature: but as regards the participation of happiness, our neighbor's soul is more closely associated with our own soul, than even our own body is.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(5)-RO(3) — Every man is immediately concerned with the care of his own body, but not with his neighbor's welfare, except perhaps in cases of urgency: wherefore charity does not necessarily require a man

to imperil his own body for his neighbor's welfare, except in a case where he is under obligation to do so and if a man of his own accord offer himself for that purpose, this belongs to the perfection of charity.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(6)

Whether we ought to love one neighbor more than another?

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that we ought not to love one neighbor more than another. For Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 28): “One ought to love all men equally. Since, however, one cannot do good to all, we ought to consider those chiefly who by reason of place, time or any other circumstance, by a kind of chance, are more closely united to us.” Therefore one neighbor ought not to be loved more than another.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, where there is one and the same reason for loving several, there should be no inequality of love. Now there is one and the same reason for loving all one's neighbors, which reason is God, as Augustine states (De Doctr. Christ. i, 27). Therefore we ought to love all our neighbors equally.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, to love a man is to wish him good things, as the Philosopher states (Rhet. ii, 4). Now to all our neighbors we wish an equal good, viz. everlasting life. Therefore we ought to love all our neighbors equally.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, One's obligation to love a person is proportionate to the gravity of the sin one commits in acting against that love. Now it is a more grievous sin to act against the love of certain neighbors, than against the love of others. Hence the commandment (~~CRIB~~ Leviticus 10:9), “He that curseth his father or mother, dying let him die,” which does not apply to those who cursed others than the above. Therefore we ought to love some neighbors more than others.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(6) — *I answer that*, There have been two opinions on this question: for some have said that we ought, out of charity, to love all our neighbors equally, as regards our affection, but not as regards the outward effect. They held that the order of love is to be understood as applying to outward favors, which we ought to confer on those who are connected

with us in preference to those who are unconnected, and not to the inward affection, which ought to be given equally to all including our enemies.

But this is unreasonable. For the affection of charity, which is the inclination of grace, is not less orderly than the natural appetite, which is the inclination of nature, for both inclinations flow from Divine wisdom. Now we observe in the physical order that the natural inclination in each thing is proportionate to the act or movement that is becoming to the nature of that thing: thus in earth the inclination of gravity is greater than in water, because it is becoming to earth to be beneath water.

Consequently the inclination also of grace which is the effect of charity, must needs be proportionate to those actions which have to be performed outwardly, so that, to wit, the affection of our charity be more intense towards those to whom we ought to behave with greater kindness.

We must, therefore, say that, even as regards the affection we ought to love one neighbor more than another. The reason is that, since the principle of love is God, and the person who loves, it must needs be that the affection of love increases in proportion to the nearness to one or the other of those principles. For as we stated above (**A(1)**), wherever we find a principle, order depends on relation to that principle.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(6)-RO(1) — Love can be unequal in two ways: first on the part of the good we wish our friend. In this respect we love all men equally out of charity: because we wish them all one same generic good, namely everlasting happiness. Secondly love is said to be greater through its action being more intense: and in this way we ought not to love all equally.

Or we may reply that we have unequal love for certain persons in two ways: first, through our loving some and not loving others. As regards beneficence we are bound to observe this inequality, because we cannot do good to all: but as regards benevolence, love ought not to be thus unequal. The other inequality arises from our loving some more than others: and Augustine does not mean to exclude the latter inequality, but the former, as is evident from what he says of beneficence.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(6)-RO(2) — Our neighbors are not all equally related to God; some are nearer to Him, by reason of their greater goodness, and

those we ought, out of charity, to love more than those who are not so near to Him.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(6)-RO(3) — This argument considers the quantity of love on the part of the good which we wish our friends.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(7)

Whether we ought to love those who are better more those who are more closely united us?

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that we ought to love those who are better more than those who are more closely united to us. For that which is in no way hateful seems more lovable than that which is hateful for some reason: just as a thing is all the whiter for having less black mixed with it. Now those who are connected with us are hateful for some reason, according to ^{<146>}Luke 14:26: “If any man come to Me, and hate not his father,” etc. On the other hand good men are not hateful for any reason. Therefore it seems that we ought to love those who are better more than those who are more closely connected with us.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, by charity above all, man is likened to God. But God loves more the better man. Therefore man also, out of charity, ought to love the better man more than one who is more closely united to him.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, in every friendship that ought to be loved most which has most to do with the foundation of that friendship: for, by natural friendship we love most those who are connected with us by nature, our parents for instance, or our children. Now the friendship of charity is founded upon the fellowship of happiness, which has more to do with better men than with those who are more closely united to us. Therefore, out of charity, we ought to love better men more than those who are more closely connected with us.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<148>}1 Timothy 5:8):

“If any man have not care of his own and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.”

Now the inward affection of charity ought to correspond to the outward effect. Therefore charity regards those who are nearer to us before those who are better.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(7) — *I answer that*, Every act should be proportionate both to its object and to the agent. But from its object it takes its species, while, from the power of the agent it takes the mode of its intensity: thus movement has its species from the term to which it tends, while the intensity of its speed arises from the disposition of the thing moved and the power of the mover. Accordingly love takes its species from its object, but its intensity is due to the lover.

Now the object of charity's love is God, and man is the lover. Therefore the specific diversity of the love which is in accordance with charity, as regards the love of our neighbor, depends on his relation to God, so that, out of charity, we should wish a greater good to one who is nearer to God; for though the good which charity wishes to all, viz. everlasting happiness, is one in itself, yet it has various degrees according to various shares of happiness, and it belongs to charity to wish God's justice to be maintained, in accordance with which better men have a fuller share of happiness. And this regards the species of love; for there are different species of love according to the different goods that we wish for those whom we love.

On the other hand, the intensity of love is measured with regard to the man who loves, and accordingly man loves those who are more closely united to him, with more intense affection as to the good he wishes for them, than he loves those who are better as to the greater good he wishes for them.

Again a further difference must be observed here: for some neighbors are connected with us by their natural origin, a connection which cannot be severed, since that origin makes them to be what they are. But the goodness of virtue, wherein some are close to God, can come and go, increase and decrease, as was shown above (**Q(24), AA(4),10,11**). Hence it is possible for one, out of charity, to wish this man who is more closely united to one, to be better than another, and so reach a higher degree of happiness.

Moreover there is yet another reason for which, out of charity, we love more those who are more nearly connected with us, since we love them in more ways. For, towards those who are not connected with us we have no other friendship than charity, whereas for those who are connected with us, we have certain other friendships, according to the way in which they are connected. Now since the good on which every other friendship of the virtuous is based, is directed, as to its end, to the good on which charity is based, it follows that charity commands each act of another friendship, even as the art which is about the end commands the art which is about the means. Consequently this very act of loving someone because he is akin or connected with us, or because he is a fellow-countryman or for any like reason that is referable to the end of charity, can be commanded by charity, so that, out of charity both eliciting and commanding, we love in more ways those who are more nearly connected with us.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(7)-RO(1) — We are commanded to hate, in our kindred, not their kinship, but only the fact of their being an obstacle between us and God. In this respect they are not akin but hostile to us, according to ^{<3000}Micah 7:6: “A men’s enemies are they of his own household.”

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(7)-RO(2) — Charity conforms man to God proportionately, by making man comport himself towards what is his, as God does towards what is His. For we may, out of charity, will certain things as becoming to us which God does not will, because it becomes Him not to will them, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(19)**, **A(10)**), when we were treating of the goodness of the will.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(7)-RO(3) — Charity elicits the act of love not only as regards the object, but also as regards the lover, as stated above. The result is that the man who is more nearly united to us is more loved.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(8)

Whether we ought to love more those who are connected with us by ties of blood?

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that we ought not to love more those who are more closely united to us by ties of blood. For it is written

(~~2189~~ Proverbs 18:24): “A man amiable in society, shall be more friendly than a brother.” Again, Valerius Maximus says (Fact. et Dict. Memor. iv 7): “The ties of friendship are most strong and in no way yield to the ties of blood.” Moreover it is quite certain and undeniable, that as to the latter, the lot of birth is fortuitous, whereas we contract the former by an untrammelled will, and a solid pledge. Therefore we ought not to love more than others those who are united to us by ties of blood.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, Ambrose says (De Officiis i, 7): “I love not less you whom I have begotten in the Gospel, than if I had begotten you in wedlock, for nature is no more eager to love than grace.” Surely we ought to love those whom we expect to be with us for ever more than those who will be with us only in this world. Therefore we should not love our kindred more than those who are otherwise connected with us.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, “Love is proved by deeds,” as Gregory states (Hom. in Evang. xxx). Now we are bound to do acts of love to others than our kindred: thus in the army a man must obey his officer rather than his father. Therefore we are not bound to love our kindred most of all.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, The commandments of the decalogue contain a special precept about the honor due to our parents (~~2190~~ Exodus 20:12). Therefore we ought to love more specially those who are united to us by ties of blood.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(8) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(7)**), we ought out of charity to love those who are more closely united to us more, both because our love for them is more intense, and because there are more reasons for loving them. Now intensity of love arises from the union of lover and beloved: and therefore we should measure the love of different persons according to the different kinds of union, so that a man is more loved in matters touching that particular union in respect of which he is loved. And, again, in comparing love to love we should compare one union with another. Accordingly we must say that friendship among blood relations is based upon their connection by natural origin, the friendship of fellow-citizens on their civic fellowship, and the friendship of those who are fighting side by side on the comradeship of battle. Wherefore in matters

pertaining to nature we should love our kindred most, in matters concerning relations between citizens, we should prefer our fellow-citizens, and on the battlefield our fellow-soldiers. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. ix, 2) that “it is our duty to render to each class of people such respect as is natural and appropriate. This is in fact the principle upon which we seem to act, for we invite our relations to a wedding... It would seem to be a special duty to afford our parents the means of living... and to honor them.”

The same applies to other kinds of friendship.

If however we compare union with union, it is evident that the union arising from natural origin is prior to, and more stable than, all others, because it is something affecting the very substance, whereas other unions supervene and may cease altogether. Therefore the friendship of kindred is more stable, while other friendships may be stronger in respect of that which is proper to each of them.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(8)-RO(1) — In as much as the friendship of comrades originates through their own choice, love of this kind takes precedence of the love of kindred in matters where we are free to do as we choose, for instance in matters of action. Yet the friendship of kindred is more stable, since it is more natural, and preponderates over others in matters touching nature: consequently we are more beholden to them in the providing of necessities.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(8)-RO(2) — Ambrose is speaking of love with regard to favors respecting the fellowship of grace, namely, moral instruction. For in this matter, a man ought to provide for his spiritual children whom he has begotten spiritually, more than for the sons of his body, whom he is bound to support in bodily sustenance.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(8)-RO(3) — The fact that in the battle a man obeys his officer rather than his father proves, that he loves his father less, not simply relatively, i.e. as regards the love which is based on fellowship in battle.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(9)

Whether a man ought, out of charity, to love his children more than his father?

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(9)-O(1) — It seems that a man ought, out of charity, to love his children more than his father. For we ought to love those more to whom we are more bound to do good. Now we are more bound to do good to our children than to our parents, since the Apostle says (⁴⁷⁰⁴2 Corinthians 12:14): “Neither ought the children to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children.” Therefore a man ought to love his children more than his parents.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, grace perfects nature. But parents naturally love their children more than these love them, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. viii, 12). Therefore a man ought to love his children more than his parents.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, man’s affections are conformed to God by charity. But God loves His children more than they love Him. Therefore we also ought to love our children more than our parents.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, Ambrose [*Origen, Hom. ii in Cant.] says: “We ought to love God first, then our parents, then our children, and lastly those of our household.”

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(9) — *I answer that*, As stated above (A(4), ad 1; A(7)), the degrees of love may be measured from two standpoints. First, from that of the object. In this respect the better a thing is, and the more like to God, the more is it to be loved: and in this way a man ought to love his father more than his children, because, to wit, he loves his father as his principle, in which respect he is a more exalted good and more like God.

Secondly, the degrees of love may be measured from the standpoint of the lover, and in this respect a man loves more that which is more closely connected with him, in which way a man’s children are more lovable to him than his father, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. viii). First, because parents love their children as being part of themselves, whereas the father is not part of his son, so that the love of a father for his children, is more

like a man's love for himself. Secondly, because parents know better that so and so is their child than vice versa. Thirdly, because children are nearer to their parents, as being part of them, than their parents are to them to whom they stand in the relation of a principle. Fourthly, because parents have loved longer, for the father begins to love his child at once, whereas the child begins to love his father after a lapse of time; and the longer love lasts, the stronger it is, according to Ecclus. 9:14: "Forsake not an old friend, for the new will not be like to him."

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(9)-RO(1) — The debt due to a principle is submission of respect and honor, whereas that due to the effect is one of influence and care. Hence the duty of children to their parents consists chiefly in honor: while that of parents to their children is especially one of care.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(9)-RO(2) — It is natural for a man as father to love his children more, if we consider them as closely connected with him: but if we consider which is the more exalted good, the son naturally loves his father more.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(9)-RO(3) — As Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 32), God loves us for our good and for His honor. Wherefore since our father is related to us as principle, even as God is, it belongs properly to the father to receive honor from his children, and to the children to be provided by their parents with what is good for them. Nevertheless in cases of necessity the child is bound out of the favors received to provide for his parents before all.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(10)

***Whether a man ought to love his mother
more than his father?***

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that a man ought to love his mother more than his father. For, as the Philosopher says (De Gener. Animal. i, 20), "the female produces the body in generation." Now man receives his soul, not from his father, but from God by creation, as stated in the **P(1) Q(90), A(2); Q(118)**. Therefore a man receives more from his

mother than from his father: and consequently he ought to love her more than him.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, where greater love is given, greater love is due. Now a mother loves her child more than the father does: for the Philosopher says (Ethic. ix, 7) that “mothers have greater love for their children. For the mother labors more in child-bearing, and she knows more surely than the father who are her children.”

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, love should be more fond towards those who have labored for us more, according to ~~511~~ Romans 16:6: “Salute Mary, who hath labored much among you.” Now the mother labors more than the father in giving birth and education to her child; wherefore it is written (Ecclus. 7:29): “Forget not the groanings of thy mother.” Therefore a man ought to love his mother more than his father.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, Jerome says on ~~342~~ Ezekiel 44:25 that “man ought to love God the Father of all, and then his own father,” and mentions the mother afterwards.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(10) — *I answer that*, In making such comparisons as this, we must take the answer in the strict sense, so that the present question is whether the father as father, ought to be loved more than the mother as mother. The reason is that virtue and vice may make such a difference in such like matters, that friendship may be diminished or destroyed, as the Philosopher remarks (Ethic. viii, 7). Hence Ambrose [*Origen, Hom. ii in Cant.] says: “Good servants should be preferred to wicked children.”

Strictly speaking, however, the father should be loved more than the mother. For father and mother are loved as principles of our natural origin. Now the father is principle in a more excellent way than the mother, because he is the active principle, while the mother is a passive and material principle. Consequently, strictly speaking, the father is to be loved more.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(10)-RO(1) — In the begetting of man, the mother supplies the formless matter of the body; and the latter receives its form through the formative power that is in the semen of the father. And though this power cannot create the rational soul, yet it disposes the matter of the body to receive that form.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(10)-RO(2) — This applies to another kind of love. For the friendship between lover and lover differs specifically from the friendship between child and parent: while the friendship we are speaking of here, is that which a man owes his father and mother through being begotten of them.

The Reply to the Third Objection is evident.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(11)

Whether a man ought to love his wife more than his father and mother?

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(11)-O(1) — It would seem that a man ought to love his wife more than his father and mother. For no man leaves a thing for another unless he love the latter more. Now it is written (~~Gen~~ Genesis 2:24) that “a man shall leave father and mother” on account of his wife. Therefore a man ought to love his wife more than his father and mother.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(11)-O(2) — Further, the Apostle says (~~Eph~~ Ephesians 5:33) that a husband should “love his wife as himself.” Now a man ought to love himself more than his parents. Therefore he ought to love his wife also more than his parents.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(11)-O(2) — Further, love should be greater where there are more reasons for loving. Now there are more reasons for love in the friendship of a man towards his wife. For the Philosopher says (Ethic. viii, 12) that “in this friendship there are the motives of utility, pleasure, and also of virtue, if husband and wife are virtuous.” Therefore a man’s love for his wife ought to be greater than his love for his parents.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(11) — *On the contrary*, According to ~~Eph~~ Ephesians 5:28, “men ought to love their wives as their own bodies.” Now a man ought to love his body less than his neighbor, as stated above (**A(5)**): and among his neighbors he should love his parents most. Therefore he ought to love his parents more than his wife.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(11) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(9)**), the degrees of love may be taken from the good (which is loved), or from the union

between those who love. On the part of the good which is the object loved, a man should love his parents more than his wife, because he loves them as his principles and considered as a more exalted good.

But on the part of the union, the wife ought to be loved more, because she is united with her husband, as one flesh, according to ~~4th~~ Matthew 19:6: “Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh.” Consequently a man loves his wife more intensely, but his parents with greater reverence.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(11)-RO(1) — A man does not in all respects leave his father and mother for the sake of his wife: for in certain cases a man ought to succor his parents rather than his wife. He does however leave all his kinsfolk, and cleaves to his wife as regards the union of carnal connection and co-habitation.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(11)-RO(2) — The words of the Apostle do not mean that a man ought to love his wife equally with himself, but that a man’s love for himself is the reason for his love of his wife, since she is one with him.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(11)-RO(3) — There are also several reasons for a man’s love for his father; and these, in a certain respect, namely, as regards good, are more weighty than those for which a man loves his wife; although the latter outweigh the former as regards the closeness of the union.

As to the argument in the contrary sense, it must be observed that in the words quoted, the particle “as” denotes not equality of love but the motive of love. For the principal reason why a man loves his wife is her being united to him in the flesh.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(12)

Whether a man ought to love more his benefactor than one he has benefited?

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(12)-O(1) — It would seem that a man ought to love his benefactor more than one he has benefited. For Augustine says (De Catech. Rud. iv): “Nothing will incite another more to love you than that you love him first: for he must have a hard heart indeed, who not only refuses to love, but declines to return love already given.” Now a man’s

benefactor forestalls him in the kindly deeds of charity. Therefore we ought to love our benefactors above all.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(12)-O(2) — Further, the more grievously we sin by ceasing to love a man or by working against him, the more ought we to love him. Now it is a more grievous sin to cease loving a benefactor or to work against him, than to cease loving one to whom one has hitherto done kindly actions. Therefore we ought to love our benefactors more than those to whom we are kind.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(12)-O(3) — Further, of all things lovable, God is to be loved most, and then one's father, as Jerome says [*Comment. in Ezechiel xliv, 25]. Now these are our greatest benefactors. Therefore a benefactor should be loved above all others.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(12) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. ix, 7), that "benefactors seem to love recipients of their benefactions, rather than vice versa."

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(12) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**AA(9),11**), a thing is loved more in two ways: first because it has the character of a more excellent good, secondly by reason of a closer connection. In the first way we ought to love our benefactor most, because, since he is a principle of good to the man he has benefited, he has the character of a more excellent good, as stated above with regard to one's father (**A(9)**).

In the second way, however, we love those more who have received benefactions from us, as the Philosopher proves (Ethic. ix, 7) by four arguments. First because the recipient of benefactions is the handiwork of the benefactor, so that we are wont to say of a man: "He was made by so and so." Now it is natural to a man to love his own work (thus it is to be observed that poets love their own poems): and the reason is that we love "to be" and "to live," and these are made manifest in our "action." Secondly, because we all naturally love that in which we see our own good. Now it is true that the benefactor has some good of his in the recipient of his benefaction, and the recipient some good in the benefactor; but the benefactor sees his virtuous good in the recipient, while the recipient sees his useful good in the benefactor. Now it gives more pleasure to see one's virtuous good than one's useful good, both because it is more enduring for

usefulness quickly flits by, and the pleasure of calling a thing to mind is not like the pleasure of having it present and because it is more pleasant to recall virtuous goods than the profit we have derived from others. Thirdly, because is it the lover's part to act, since he wills and works the good of the beloved, while the beloved takes a passive part in receiving good, so that to love surpasses being loved, for which reason the greater love is on the part of the benefactor. Fourthly because it is more difficult to give than to receive favors: and we are most fond of things which have cost us most trouble, while we almost despise what comes easy to us.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(12)-RO(1) — It is some thing in the benefactor that incites the recipient to love him: whereas the benefactor loves the recipient, not through being incited by him, but through being moved thereto of his own accord: and what we do of our own accord surpasses what we do through another.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(12)-RO(2) — The love of the beneficiary for the benefactor is more of a duty, wherefore the contrary is the greater sin. On the other hand, the love of the benefactor for the beneficiary is more spontaneous, wherefore it is quicker to act.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(12)-RO(3) — God also loves us more than we love Him, and parents love their children more than these love them. Yet it does not follow that we love all who have received good from us, more than any of our benefactors. For we prefer such benefactors as God and our parents, from whom we have received the greatest favors, to those on whom we have bestowed lesser benefits.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(13)

Whether the order of charity endures in heaven?

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(13)-O(1) — It would seem that the order of charity does not endure in heaven. For Augustine says (De Vera Relig. xlviii): "Perfect charity consists in loving greater goods more, and lesser goods less." Now charity will be perfect in heaven. Therefore a man will love those who are better more than either himself or those who are connected with him.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(13)-O(2) — Further, we love more him to whom we wish a greater good. Now each one in heaven wishes a greater good for those who have more good, else his will would not be conformed in all things to God's will: and there to be better is to have more good. Therefore in heaven each one loves more those who are better, and consequently he loves others more than himself, and one who is not connected with him, more than one who is.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(13)-O(3) — Further, in heaven love will be entirely for God's sake, for then will be fulfilled the words of ~~1~~¹ Corinthians 15:28: "That God may be all in all." Therefore he who is nearer God will be loved more, so that a man will love a better man more than himself, and one who is not connected with him, more than one who is.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(13) — *On the contrary*, Nature is not done away, but perfected, by glory. Now the order of charity given above (**AA(2),3,4**) is derived from nature: since all things naturally love themselves more than others. Therefore this order of charity will endure in heaven.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(13) — *I answer that*, The order of charity must needs remain in heaven, as regards the love of God above all things. For this will be realized simply when man shall enjoy God perfectly. But, as regards the order between man himself and other men, a distinction would seem to be necessary, because, as we stated above (**AA(7),9**), the degrees of love may be distinguished either in respect of the good which a man desires for another, or according to the intensity of love itself. In the first way a man will love better men more than himself, and those who are less good, less than himself: because, by reason of the perfect conformity of the human to the Divine will, each of the blessed will desire everyone to have what is due to him according to Divine justice. Nor will that be a time for advancing by means of merit to a yet greater reward, as happens now while it is possible for a man to desire both the virtue and the reward of a better man, whereas then the will of each one will rest within the limits determined by God. But in the second way a man will love himself more than even his better neighbors, because the intensity of the act of love arises on the part of the person who loves, as stated above (**AA(7),9**). Moreover it is for this that the gift of charity is bestowed by God on each one, namely, that he may first of all direct his mind to God, and this

pertains to a man's love for himself, and that, in the second place, he may wish other things to be directed to God, and even work for that end according to his capacity.

As to the order to be observed among our neighbors, a man will simply love those who are better, according to the love of charity. Because the entire life of the blessed consists in directing their minds to God, wherefore the entire ordering of their love will be ruled with respect to God, so that each one will love more and reckon to be nearer to himself those who are nearer to God. For then one man will no longer succor another, as he needs to in the present life, wherein each man has to succor those who are closely connected with him rather than those who are not, no matter what be the nature of their distress: hence it is that in this life, a man, by the inclination of charity, loves more those who are more closely united to him, for he is under a greater obligation to bestow on them the effect of charity. It will however be possible in heaven for a man to love in several ways one who is connected with him, since the causes of virtuous love will not be banished from the mind of the blessed. Yet all these reasons are incomparably surpassed by that which is taken from nighness to God.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(13)-RO(1) — This argument should be granted as to those who are connected together; but as regards man himself, he ought to love himself so much the more than others, as his charity is more perfect, since perfect entire reason of his love, for God is man's charity directs man to God perfectly, and this belongs to love of oneself, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(13)-RO(2) — This argument considers the order of charity in respect of the degree of good one wills the person one loves.

P(2b)-Q(26)-A(13)-RO(3) — God will be to each one the entire reason of his love, for God is man's entire good. For if we make the impossible supposition that God were not man's good, He would not be man's reason for loving. Hence it is that in the order of love man should love himself more than all else after God.

QUESTION 27

OF THE PRINCIPLE ACT OF CHARITY, WHICH IS TO LOVE

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

We must now consider the act of charity, and

- (1) the principal act of charity, which is to love,
- (2) the other acts or effects which follow from that act.

Under the first head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Which is the more proper to charity, to love or to be loved?
- (2) Whether to love considered as an act of charity is the same as goodwill?
- (3) Whether God should be loved for His own sake?
- (4) Whether God can be loved immediately in this life?
- (5) Whether God can be loved wholly?
- (6) Whether the love of God is according to measure?
- (7) Which is the better, to love one's friend, or one's enemy? (8)
Which is the better, to love God, or one's neighbor?

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(1)

Whether to be loved is more proper to charity than to love?

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that it is more proper to charity to be loved than to love. For the better charity is to be found in those who are themselves better. But those who are better should be more loved. Therefore to be loved is more proper to charity.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, that which is to be found in more subjects seems to be more in keeping with nature, and, for that reason, better. Now, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. viii, 8), “many would rather be loved than love, and lovers of flattery always abound.” Therefore it is better to be loved than to love, and consequently it is more in keeping with charity.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, “the cause of anything being such is yet more so.” Now men love because they are loved, for Augustine says (De Catech. Rud. iv) that “nothing incites another more to love you than that you love him first.” Therefore charity consists in being loved rather than in loving.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. viii, 8) that friendship consists in loving rather than in being loved. Now charity is a kind of friendship. Therefore it consists in loving rather than in being loved.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(1) — *I answer that*, To love belongs to charity as charity. For, since charity is a virtue, by its very essence it has an inclination to its proper act. Now to be loved is not the act of the charity of the person loved; for this act is to love: and to be loved is competent to him as coming under the common notion of good, in so far as another tends towards his good by an act of charity. Hence it is clear that to love is more proper to charity than to be loved: for that which befits a thing by reason of itself and its essence is more competent to it than that which is befitting to it by reason of something else. This can be exemplified in two ways. First, in the fact that friends are more commended for loving than for being loved, indeed, if they be loved and yet love not, they are blamed. Secondly, because a mother, whose love is the greatest, seeks rather to love than to be loved: for “some women,” as the Philosopher observes (Ethic. viii, 8) “entrust their children to a nurse; they do love them indeed, yet seek not to be loved in return, if they happen not to be loved.”

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(1)-RO(1) — A better man, through being better, is more lovable; but through having more perfect charity, loves more. He loves more, however, in proportion to the person he loves. For a better man does not love that which is beneath him less than it ought to be loved:

whereas he who is less good fails to love one who is better, as much as he ought to be loved.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(1)-RO(2) — As the Philosopher says (Ethic. viii, 8), “men wish to be loved in as much as they wish to be honored.” For just as honor is bestowed on a man in order to bear witness to the good which is in him, so by being loved a man is shown to have some good, since good alone is lovable. Accordingly men seek to be loved and to be honored, for the sake of something else, viz. to make known the good which is in the person loved. On the other hand, those who have charity seek to love for the sake of loving, as though this were itself the good of charity, even as the act of any virtue is that virtue’s good. Hence it is more proper to charity to wish to love than to wish to be loved.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(1)-RO(3) — Some love on account of being loved, not so that to be loved is the end of their loving, but because it is a kind of way leading a man to love.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(2)

*Whether to love considered as an act of charity
is the same as goodwill?*

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that to love, considered as an act of charity, is nothing else than goodwill. For the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 4) that “to love is to wish a person well”; and this is goodwill. Therefore the act of charity is nothing but goodwill.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the act belongs to the same subject as the habit. Now the habit of charity is in the power of the will, as stated above (**Q(24), A(1)**). Therefore the act of charity is also an act of the will. But it tends to good only, and this is goodwill. Therefore the act of charity is nothing else than goodwill.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the Philosopher reckons five things pertaining to friendship (Ethic. ix, 4), the first of which is that a man should wish his friend well; the second, that he should wish him to be and to live; the third, that he should take pleasure in his company; the fourth, that he should make choice of the same things; the fifth, that he should

grieve and rejoice with him. Now the first two pertain to goodwill. Therefore goodwill is the first act of charity.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. ix, 5) that “goodwill is neither friendship nor love, but the beginning of friendship.” Now charity is friendship, as stated above (**Q(23), A(1)**). Therefore goodwill is not the same as to love considered as an act of charity.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Goodwill properly speaking is that act of the will whereby we wish well to another. Now this act of the will differs from actual love, considered not only as being in the sensitive appetite but also as being in the intellective appetite or will. For the love which is in the sensitive appetite is a passion. Now every passion seeks its object with a certain eagerness. And the passion of love is not aroused suddenly, but is born of an earnest consideration of the object loved; wherefore the Philosopher, showing the difference between goodwill and the love which is a passion, says (Ethic. ix, 5) that goodwill does not imply impetuosity or desire, that is to say, has not an eager inclination, because it is by the sole judgment of his reason that one man wishes another well. Again such like love arises from previous acquaintance, whereas goodwill sometimes arises suddenly, as happens to us if we look on at a boxing-match, and we wish one of the boxers to win. But the love, which is in the intellective appetite, also differs from goodwill, because it denotes a certain union of affections between the lover and the beloved, in as much as the lover deems the beloved as somewhat united to him, or belonging to him, and so tends towards him. On the other hand, goodwill is a simple act of the will, whereby we wish a person well, even without presupposing the aforesaid union of the affections with him. Accordingly, to love, considered as an act of charity, includes goodwill, but such dilection or love adds union of affections, wherefore the Philosopher says (Ethic. ix, 5) that “goodwill is a beginning of friendship.”

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(2)-RO(1) — The Philosopher, by thus defining “to love,” does not describe it fully, but mentions only that part of its definition in which the act of love is chiefly manifested.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(2)-RO(2) — To love is indeed an act of the will tending to the good, but it adds a certain union with the beloved, which union is not denoted by goodwill.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(2)-RO(3) — These things mentioned by the Philosopher belong to friendship because they arise from a man's love for himself, as he says in the same passage, in so far as a man does all these things in respect of his friend, even as he does them to himself: and this belongs to the aforesaid union of the affections.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(3)

Whether out of charity God ought to be loved for Himself?

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that God is loved out of charity, not for Himself but for the sake of something else. For Gregory says in a homily (In Evang. xi): "The soul learns from the things it knows, to love those it knows not," where by things unknown he means the intelligible and the Divine, and by things known he indicates the objects of the senses. Therefore God is to be loved for the sake of something else.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, love follows knowledge. But God is known through something else, according to ⁴⁰⁰Romans 1:20:

"The invisible things of God are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made."

Therefore He is also loved on account of something else and not for Himself.


P(2b)-Q(27)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, "hope begets charity" as a gloss says on ⁴⁰¹Matthew 1:1, and "fear leads to charity," according to Augustine in his commentary on the First Canonical Epistle of John (In prim. canon. Joan. Tract. ix). Now hope looks forward to obtain something from God, while fear shuns something which can be inflicted by God. Therefore it seems that God is to be loved on account of some good we hope for, or some evil to be feared. Therefore He is not to be loved for Himself.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, According to Augustine (De Doctr. Christ. i), to enjoy is to cleave to something for its own sake. Now "God

is to be enjoyed” as he says in the same book. Therefore God is to be loved for Himself.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(3) — *I answer that,* The preposition “for” denotes a relation of causality. Now there are four kinds of cause, viz., final, formal, efficient, and material, to which a material disposition also is to be reduced, though it is not a cause simply but relatively. According to these four different causes one thing is said to be loved for another. In respect of the final cause, we love medicine, for instance, for health; in respect of the formal cause, we love a man for his virtue, because, to wit, by his virtue he is formally good and therefore lovable; in respect of the efficient cause, we love certain men because, for instance, they are the sons of such and such a father; and in respect of the disposition which is reducible to the genus of a material cause, we speak of loving something for that which disposed us to love it, e.g. we love a man for the favors received from him, although after we have begun to love our friend, we no longer love him for his favors, but for his virtue. Accordingly, as regards the first three ways, we love God, not for anything else, but for Himself. For He is not directed to anything else as to an end, but is Himself the last end of all things; nor does He require to receive any form in order to be good, for His very substance is His goodness, which is itself the exemplar of all other good things; nor again does goodness accrue to Him from aught else, but from Him to all other things. In the fourth way, however, He can be loved for something else, because we are disposed by certain things to advance in His love, for instance, by favors bestowed by Him, by the rewards we hope to receive from Him, or even by the punishments which we are minded to avoid through Him.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(3)-RO(1) — From the things it knows the soul learns to love what it knows not, not as though the things it knows were the reason for its loving things it knows not, through being the formal, final, or efficient cause of this love, but because this knowledge disposes man to love the unknown.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(3)-RO(2) — Knowledge of God is indeed acquired through other things, but after He is known, He is no longer known through them, but through Himself, according to  John 4:42:

“We now believe, not for thy saying: for we ourselves have heard Him, and know that this is indeed the Savior of the world.”

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(3)-RO(3) — Hope and fear lead to charity by way of a certain disposition, as was shown above (**Q(17)**, **A(8)**; **Q(19)**, **AA(4,7,10)**).

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(4)

Whether God can be loved immediately in this life?

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that God cannot be loved immediately in this life. For the “unknown cannot be loved” as Augustine says (De Trin. x, 1). Now we do not know God immediately in this life, since “we see now through a glass, in a dark manner” (⁴³⁰1 Corinthians 13:12). Neither, therefore, do we love Him immediately.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, he who cannot do what is less, cannot do what is more. Now it is more to love God than to know Him, since “he who is joined” to God by love, is “one spirit with Him” (⁴³⁷1 Corinthians 6:17). But man cannot know God immediately. Therefore much less can he love Him immediately.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, man is severed from God by sin, according to ²⁸⁰Isaiah 59:2: “Your iniquities have divided between you and your God.” Now sin is in the will rather than in the intellect. Therefore man is less able to love God immediately than to know Him immediately.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(4) — On the contrary, Knowledge of God, through being mediate, is said to be “enigmatic,” and “falls away” in heaven, as stated in ⁴³⁰1 Corinthians 13:12. But charity “does not fall away” as stated in the same passage (⁴³⁰1 Corinthians 13:12). Therefore the charity of the way adheres to God immediately.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(4) — I answer that, As stated above (**P(1) Q(82)**, **A(3)**; **Q(84)**, **A(7)**), the act of a cognitive power is completed by the thing known being in the knower, whereas the act of an appetitive power consists in the appetite being inclined towards the thing in itself. Hence it follows that the movement of the appetitive power is towards things in

respect of their own condition, whereas the act of a cognitive power follows the mode of the knower.

Now in itself the very order of things is such, that God is knowable and lovable for Himself, since He is essentially truth and goodness itself, whereby other things are known and loved: but with regard to us, since our knowledge is derived through the senses, those things are knowable first which are nearer to our senses, and the last term of knowledge is that which is most remote from our senses.

Accordingly, we must assert that to love which is an act of the appetitive power, even in this state of life, tends to God first, and flows on from Him to other things, and in this sense charity loves God immediately, and other things through God. On the other hand, with regard to knowledge, it is the reverse, since we know God through other things, either as a cause through its effects, or by way of pre-eminence or negation as Dionysius states (Div. Nom. i; cf. **P(1) Q(12), A(12)**).

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(4)-RO(1) — Although the unknown cannot be loved, it does not follow that the order of knowledge is the same as the order of love, since love is the term of knowledge, and consequently, love can begin at once where knowledge ends, namely in the thing itself which is known through another thing.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(4)-RO(2) — Since to love God is something greater than to know Him, especially in this state of life, it follows that love of God presupposes knowledge of God. And because this knowledge does not rest in creatures, but, through them, tends to something else, love begins there, and thence goes on to other things by a circular movement so to speak; for knowledge begins from creatures, tends to God, and love begins with God as the last end, and passes on to creatures.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(4)-RO(3) — Aversion from God, which is brought about by sin, is removed by charity, but not by knowledge alone: hence charity, by loving God, unites the soul immediately to Him with a chain of spiritual union.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(5)

Whether God can be loved wholly?

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that God cannot be loved wholly. For love follows knowledge. Now God cannot be wholly known by us, since this would imply comprehension of Him. Therefore He cannot be wholly loved by us.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, love is a kind of union, as Dionysius shows (Div. Nom. iv). But the heart of man cannot be wholly united to God, because “God is greater than our heart” (~~CRB~~ 1 John 3:20). Therefore God cannot be loved wholly.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, God loves Himself wholly. If therefore He be loved wholly by another, this one will love Him as much as God loves Himself. But this is unreasonable. Therefore God cannot be wholly loved by a creature.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~CRB~~ Deuteronomy 6:5): “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart.”

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Since love may be considered as something between lover and beloved, when we ask whether God can be wholly loved, the question may be understood in three ways, first so that the qualification “wholly” be referred to the thing loved, and thus God is to be loved wholly, since man should love all that pertains to God.

Secondly, it may be understood as though “wholly” qualified the lover: and thus again God ought to be loved wholly, since man ought to love God with all his might, and to refer all he has to the love of God, according to ~~CRB~~ Deuteronomy 6:5:

“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart.”

Thirdly, it may be understood by way of comparison of the lover to the thing loved, so that the mode of the lover equal the mode of the thing loved. This is impossible: for, since a thing is lovable in proportion to its goodness, God is infinitely lovable, since His goodness is infinite. Now no

creature can love God infinitely, because all power of creatures, whether it be natural or infused, is finite.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections, because the first three objections consider the question in this third sense, while the last takes it in the second sense.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(6)

Whether in loving God we ought to observe any mode?

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that we ought to observe some mode in loving God. For the notion of good consists in mode, species and order, as Augustine states (De Nat. Boni iii, iv). Now the love of God is the best thing in man, according to ^{<SIC>}Colossians 3:14: “Above all... things, have charity.” Therefore there ought to be a mode of the love of God.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, Augustine says (De Morib. Eccl. viii): “Prithee, tell me which is the mode of love. For I fear lest I burn with the desire and love of my Lord, more or less than I ought.” But it would be useless to seek the mode of the Divine love, unless there were one. Therefore there is a mode of the love of God.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, as Augustine says (Genesis ad lit. iv, 3), “the measure which nature appoints to a thing, is its mode.” Now the measure of the human will, as also of external action, is the reason. Therefore just as it is necessary for the reason to appoint a mode to the exterior effect of charity, according to ^{<SIC>}Romans 12:1: “Your reasonable service,” so also the interior love of God requires a mode.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Bernard says (De Dilig. Deum 1) that “God is the cause of our loving God; the measure is to love Him without measure.”

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(6) — *I answer that*, As appears from the words of Augustine quoted above (**O(3)**) mode signifies a determination of measure; which determination is to be found both in the measure and in the thing measured, but not in the same way. For it is found in the measure essentially, because a measure is of itself the determining and modifying

rule of other things; whereas in the things measured, it is found relatively, that is in so far as they attain to the measure. Hence there can be nothing unmodified in the measure whereas the thing measured is unmodified if it fails to attain to the measure, whether by deficiency or by excess.

Now in all matters of appetite and action the measure is the end, because the proper reason for all that we desire or do should be taken from the end, as the Philosopher proves (Phys. ii, 9). Therefore the end has a mode by itself, while the means take their mode from being proportionate to the end. Hence, according to the Philosopher (Polit. i, 3), “in every art, the desire for the end is endless and unlimited,” whereas there is a limit to the means: thus the physician does not put limits to health, but makes it as perfect as he possibly can; but he puts a limit to medicine, for he does not give as much medicine as he can, but according as health demands so that if he give too much or too little, the medicine would be immoderate.

Again, the end of all human actions and affections is the love of God, whereby principally we attain to our last end, as stated above (**Q(23), A(6)**), wherefore the mode in the love of God, must not be taken as in a thing measured where we find too much or too little, but as in the measure itself, where there cannot be excess, and where the more the rule is attained the better it is, so that the more we love God the better our love is.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(6)-RO(1) — That which is so by its essence takes precedence of that which is so through another, wherefore the goodness of the measure which has the mode essentially, takes precedence of the goodness of the thing measured, which has its mode through something else; and so too, charity, which has a mode as a measure has, stands before the other virtues, which have a mode through being measured .

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(6)-RO(2) — As Augustine adds in the same passage, “the measure of our love for God is to love Him with our whole heart,” that is to love Him as much as He can be loved, and this belongs to the mode which is proper to the measure.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(6)-RO(3) — An affection, whose object is subject to reason’s judgment, should be measured by reason. But the object of the Divine love which is God surpasses the judgment of reason, wherefore it is not measured by reason but transcends it. Nor is there parity between the

interior act and external acts of charity. For the interior act of charity has the character of an end, since man's ultimate good consists in his soul cleaving to God, according to ^{<911>}Psalm 72:28: "It is good for me to adhere to my God"; whereas the exterior acts are as means to the end, and so have to be measured both according to charity and according to reason.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(7)

Whether it is more meritorious to love an enemy than to love a friend?

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem more meritorious to love an enemy than to love a friend. For it is written (^{<4156>}Matthew 5:46): "If you love them that love you, what reward shall you have?" Therefore it is not deserving of reward to love one's friend: whereas, as the same passage proves, to love one's enemy is deserving of a reward. Therefore it is more meritorious to love one's enemy than to love one's friend.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, an act is the more meritorious through proceeding from a greater charity. But it belongs to the perfect children of God to love their enemies, whereas those also who have imperfect charity love their friends. Therefore it is more meritorious to love one's enemy than to love one's friend.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, where there is more effort for good, there seems to be more merit, since "every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor" (^{<4088>}1 Corinthians 3:8). Now a man has to make a greater effort to love his enemy than to love his friend, because it is more difficult. Therefore it seems more meritorious to love one's enemy than to love one's friend.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, The better an action is, the more meritorious it is. Now it is better to love one's friend, since it is better to love a better man, and the friend who loves you is better than the enemy who hates you. Therefore it is more meritorious to love one's friend than to love one's enemy.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(7) — *I answer that*, God is the reason for our loving our neighbor out of charity, as stated above (**Q(25), A(1)**). When therefore it is

asked which is better or more meritorious, to love one's friend or one's enemy, these two loves may be compared in two ways, first, on the part of our neighbor whom we love, secondly, on the part of the reason for which we love him.

In the first way, love of one's friend surpasses love of one's enemy, because a friend is both better and more closely united to us, so that he is a more suitable matter of love and consequently the act of love that passes over this matter, is better, and therefore its opposite is worse, for it is worse to hate a friend than an enemy.

In the second way, however, it is better to love one's enemy than one's friend, and this for two reasons. First, because it is possible to love one's friend for another reason than God, whereas God is the only reason for loving one's enemy. Secondly, because if we suppose that both are loved for God, our love for God is proved to be all the stronger through carrying a man's affections to things which are furthest from him, namely, to the love of his enemies, even as the power of a furnace is proved to be the stronger, according as it throws its heat to more distant objects. Hence our love for God is proved to be so much the stronger, as the more difficult are the things we accomplish for its sake, just as the power of fire is so much the stronger, as it is able to set fire to a less inflammable matter.

Yet just as the same fire acts with greater force on what is near than on what is distant, so too, charity loves with greater fervor those who are united to us than those who are far removed; and in this respect the love of friends, considered in itself, is more ardent and better than the love of one's enemy.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(7)-RO(1) — The words of Our Lord must be taken in their strict sense: because the love of one's friends is not meritorious in God's sight when we love them merely because they are our friends: and this would seem to be the case when we love our friends in such a way that we love not our enemies. On the other hand the love of our friends is meritorious, if we love them for God's sake, and not merely because they are our friends.

The Reply to the other Objections is evident from what has been said in the article, because the two arguments that follow consider the reason for

loving, while the last considers the question on the part of those who are loved.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(8)

Whether it is more meritorious to love one's neighbor than to love God?

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that it is more meritorious to love one's neighbor than to love God. For the more meritorious thing would seem to be what the Apostle preferred. Now the Apostle preferred the love of our neighbor to the love of God, according to ~~¶~~Romans 9:3: "I wished myself to be an anathema from Christ for my brethren." Therefore it is more meritorious to love one's neighbor than to love God.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, in a certain sense it seems to be less meritorious to love one's friend, as stated above (**A(7)**). Now God is our chief friend, since "He hath first loved us" (~~¶~~1 John 4:10). Therefore it seems less meritorious to love God.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, whatever is more difficult seems to be more virtuous and meritorious since "virtue is about that which is difficult and good" (Ethic. ii, 3). Now it is easier to love God than to love one's neighbor, both because all things love God naturally, and because there is nothing unlovable in God, and this cannot be said of one's neighbor. Therefore it is more meritorious to love one's neighbor than to love God.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, That on account of which a thing is such, is yet more so. Now the love of one's neighbor is not meritorious, except by reason of his being loved for God's sake. Therefore the love of God is more meritorious than the love of our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(8) — *I answer that*, This comparison may be taken in two ways. First, by considering both loves separately: and then, without doubt, the love of God is the more meritorious, because a reward is due to it for its own sake, since the ultimate reward is the enjoyment of God, to Whom the movement of the Divine love tends: hence a reward is promised to him that loves God (~~¶~~John 14:21):

“He that loveth Me, shall be loved of My Father, and I will...
manifest Myself to him.”

Secondly, the comparison may be understood to be between the love of God alone on the one side, and the love of one's neighbor for God's sake, on the other. In this way love of our neighbor includes love of God, while love of God does not include love of our neighbor. Hence the comparison will be between perfect love of God, extending also to our neighbor, and inadequate and imperfect love of God, for

“this commandment we have from God, that he, who loveth God,
love also his brother” (~~good~~ 1 John 4:21).

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(8)-RO(1) — According to one gloss, the Apostle did not desire this, viz. to be severed from Christ for his brethren, when he was in a state of grace, but had formerly desired it when he was in a state of unbelief, so that we should not imitate him in this respect.

We may also reply, with Chrysostom (De Compunct. i, 8) [*Hom. xvi in Ep. ad Rom.] that this does not prove the Apostle to have loved his neighbor more than God, but that he loved God more than himself. For he wished to be deprived for a time of the Divine fruition which pertains to love of one self, in order that God might be honored in his neighbor, which pertains to the love of God.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(8)-RO(2) — A man's love for his friends is sometimes less meritorious in so far as he loves them for their sake, so as to fall short of the true reason for the friendship of charity, which is God. Hence that God be loved for His own sake does not diminish the merit, but is the entire reason for merit.

P(2b)-Q(27)-A(8)-RO(3) — The “good” has, more than the “difficult,” to do with the reason of merit and virtue. Therefore it does not follow that whatever is more difficult is more meritorious, but only what is more difficult, and at the same time better.

QUESTION 28

OF JOY

(FOUR ARTICLES)

WE must now consider the effects which result from the principal act of charity which is love, and

- (1) the interior effects,
- (2) the exterior effects.

As to the first, three things have to be considered:

- (1) Joy,
- (2) Peace,
- (3) Mercy.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether joy is an effect of charity?
- (2) Whether this kind of joy is compatible with sorrow?
- (3) Whether this joy can be full?
- (4) Whether it is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(1)

Whether joy is effected in us by charity?

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that joy is not effected in us by charity. For the absence of what we love causes sorrow rather than joy. But God, Whom we love by charity, is absent from us, so long as we are in this state of life, since “while we are in the body, we are absent from the Lord” (1st 2 Corinthians 5:6). Therefore charity causes sorrow in us rather than joy.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, it is chiefly through charity that we merit happiness. Now mourning, which pertains to sorrow, is reckoned among those things whereby we merit happiness, according to ^{<108>}Matthew 5:5: “Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted.” Therefore sorrow, rather than joy, is an effect of charity.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, charity is a virtue distinct from hope, as shown above (**Q(17), A(6)**). Now joy is the effect of hope, according to ^{<512>}Romans 12:12: “Rejoicing in hope.” Therefore it is not the effect of charity.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<888>}Romans 5:5)

“The charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, Who is given to us.”

But joy is caused in us by the Holy Ghost according to ^{<547>}Romans 14:17:

“The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but justice and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.”

Therefore charity is a cause of joy.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(25), AA(1),2,3**), when we were treating of the passions, joy and sorrow proceed from love, but in contrary ways. For joy is caused by love, either through the presence of the thing loved, or because the proper good of the thing loved exists and endures in it; and the latter is the case chiefly in the love of benevolence, whereby a man rejoices in the well-being of his friend, though he be absent. On the other hand sorrow arises from love, either through the absence of the thing loved, or because the loved object to which we wish well, is deprived of its good or afflicted with some evil. Now charity is love of God, Whose good is unchangeable, since He is His goodness, and from the very fact that He is loved, He is in those who love Him by His most excellent effect, according to ^{<518>}1 John 4:16: “He that abideth in charity, abideth in God, and God in him.” Therefore spiritual joy, which is about God, is caused by charity.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(1)-RO(1) — So long as we are in the body, we are said to be “absent from the Lord,” in comparison with that presence whereby He is present to some by the vision of “sight”; wherefore the Apostle goes on

to say (^{488b}2 Corinthians 5:6): “For we walk by faith and not by sight.” Nevertheless, even in this life, He is present to those who love Him, by the indwelling of His grace.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(1)-RO(2) — The mourning that merits happiness, is about those things that are contrary to happiness. Wherefore it amounts to the same that charity causes this mourning, and this spiritual joy about God, since to rejoice in a certain good amounts to the same as to grieve for things that are contrary to it.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(1)-RO(3) — There can be spiritual joy about God in two ways. First, when we rejoice in the Divine good considered in itself; secondly, when we rejoice in the Divine good as participated by us. The former joy is the better, and proceeds from charity chiefly: while the latter joy proceeds from hope also, whereby we look forward to enjoy the Divine good, although this enjoyment itself, whether perfect or imperfect, is obtained according to the measure of one’s charity.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(2)

Whether the spiritual joy, which results from charity, is compatible with an admixture of sorrow?

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the spiritual joy that results from charity is compatible with an admixture of sorrow. For it belongs to charity to rejoice in our neighbor’s good, according to ^{488b}1 Corinthians 13:4,6: “Charity... rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth with the truth.” But this joy is compatible with an admixture of sorrow, according to ^{512b}Romans 12:15: “Rejoice with them that rejoice, weep with them that weep.” Therefore the spiritual joy of charity is compatible with an admixture of sorrow.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, according to Gregory (Hom. in Evang. xxxiv), “penance consists in deploring past sins, and in not committing again those we have deplored.” But there is no true penance without charity. Therefore the joy of charity has an admixture of sorrow.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it is through charity that man desires to be with Christ according to ^{302b}Philippians 1:23: “Having a desire to be

dissolved and to be with Christ.” Now this desire gives rise, in man, to a certain sadness, according to ^{<HB5>}Psalm 119:5: “Woe is me that my sojourning is prolonged!” Therefore the joy of charity admits of a seasoning of sorrow.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The joy of charity is joy about the Divine wisdom. Now such like joy has no admixture of sorrow, according to Wis. 8:16: “Her conversation hath no bitterness.” Therefore the joy of charity is incompatible with an admixture of sorrow.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**, ad 3), a twofold joy in God arises from charity. One, the more excellent, is proper to charity; and with this joy we rejoice in the Divine good considered in itself. This joy of charity is incompatible with an admixture of sorrow, even as the good which is its object is incompatible with any admixture of evil: hence the Apostle says (^{<3000>}Philippians 4:4): “Rejoice in the Lord always.”

The other is the joy of charity whereby we rejoice in the Divine good as participated by us. This participation can be hindered by anything contrary to it, wherefore, in this respect, the joy of charity is compatible with an admixture of sorrow, in so far as a man grieves for that which hinders the participation of the Divine good, either in us or in our neighbor, whom we love as ourselves.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(2)-RO(1) — Our neighbor does not weep save on account of some evil. Now every evil implies lack of participation in the sovereign good: hence charity makes us weep with our neighbor in so far as he is hindered from participating in the Divine good.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(2)-RO(2) — Our sins divide between us and God, according to ^{<2500>}Isaiah 59:2; wherefore this is the reason why we grieve for our past sins, or for those of others, in so far as they hinder us from participating in the Divine good.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(2)-RO(3) — Although in this unhappy abode we participate, after a fashion, in the Divine good, by knowledge and love, yet the unhappiness of this life is an obstacle to a perfect participation in the Divine good: hence this very sorrow, whereby a man grieves for the delay

of glory, is connected with the hindrance to a participation of the Divine good.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(3)

Whether the spiritual joy which proceeds from charity, can be filled?

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that the spiritual joy which proceeds from charity cannot be filled. For the more we rejoice in God, the more is our joy in Him filled. But we can never rejoice in Him as much as it is meet that we should rejoice in God, since His goodness which is infinite, surpasses the creature's joy which is finite. Therefore joy in God can never be filled.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, that which is filled cannot be increased. But the joy, even of the blessed, can be increased, since one's joy is greater than another's. Therefore joy in God cannot be filled in a creature.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, comprehension seems to be nothing else than the fulness of knowledge. Now, just as the cognitive power of a creature is finite, so is its appetitive power. Since therefore God cannot be comprehended by any creature, it seems that no creature's joy in God can be filled.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Our Lord said to His disciples (^{RS}John 15:11): "That My joy may be in you, and your joy may be filled."

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Fulness of joy can be understood in two ways; first, on the part of the thing rejoiced in, so that one rejoice in it as much as it is meet that one should rejoice in it, and thus God's joy alone in Himself is filled, because it is infinite; and this is condignly due to the infinite goodness of God: but the joy of any creature must needs be finite. Secondly, fulness of joy may be understood on the part of the one who rejoices. Now joy is compared to desire, as rest to movement, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(25), AA(1,2)**), when we were treating of the passions: and rest is full when there is no more movement. Hence joy is full, when there

remains nothing to be desired. But as long as we are in this world, the movement of desire does not cease in us, because it still remains possible for us to approach nearer to God by grace, as was shown above (**Q(24), AA(4),7**). When once, however, perfect happiness has been attained, nothing will remain to be desired, because then there will be full enjoyment of God, wherein man will obtain whatever he had desired, even with regard to other goods, according to ^{491P}Psalm 102:5: “Who satisfieth thy desire with good things.” Hence desire will be at rest, not only our desire for God, but all our desires: so that the joy of the blessed is full to perfection — indeed over-full, since they will obtain more than they were capable of desiring: for “neither hath it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love Him” (^{410B}1 Corinthians 2:9). This is what is meant by the words of ^{416B}Luke 6:38: “Good measure and pressed down, and shaken together, and running over shall they give into your bosom.” Yet, since no creature is capable of the joy condignly due to God, it follows that this perfectly full joy is not taken into man, but, *on the contrary*, man enters into it, according to ^{415C}Matthew 25:21

“Enter into the joy of thy Lord.”

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(3)-RO(1) — This argument takes the fulness of joy in reference to the thing in which we rejoice.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(3)-RO(2) — When each one attains to happiness he will reach the term appointed to him by Divine predestination, and nothing further will remain to which he may tend, although by reaching that term, some will approach nearer to God than others. Hence each one’s joy will be full with regard to himself, because his desire will be fully set at rest; yet one’s joy will be greater than another’s, on account of a fuller participation of the Divine happiness.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(3)-RO(3) — Comprehension denotes fulness of knowledge in respect of the thing known, so that it is known as much as it can be. There is however a fulness of knowledge in respect of the knower, just as we have said of joy. Wherefore the Apostle says (^{500B}Colossians 1:9):

“That you may be filled with the knowledge of His will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding.”

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(4)***Whether joy is a virtue?***

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that joy is a virtue. For vice is contrary to virtue. Now sorrow is set down as a vice, as in the case of sloth and envy. Therefore joy also should be accounted a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, as love and hope are passions, the object of which is “good,” so also is joy. Now love and hope are reckoned to be virtues. Therefore joy also should be reckoned a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the precepts of the Law are about acts of virtue. But we are commanded to rejoice in the Lord, according to ^{<100b>}Philippians 4:4: “Rejoice in the Lord always.” Therefore joy is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is not numbered among the theological virtues, nor among the moral, nor among the intellectual virtues, as is evident from what has been said above (**P(2a)**, **QQ(57),60,62**).

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(55)**, **AA(2),4**), virtue is an operative habit, wherefore by its very nature it has an inclination to a certain act. Now it may happen that from the same habit there proceed several ordinate and homogeneous acts, each of which follows from another. And since the subsequent acts do not proceed from the virtuous habit except through the preceding act, hence it is that the virtue is defined and named in reference to that preceding act, although those other acts also proceed from the virtue. Now it is evident from what we have said about the passions (**P(2a)**, **Q(25)**, **AA(2),4**) that love is the first affection of the appetitive power, and that desire and joy follow from it. Hence the same virtuous habit inclines us to love and desire the beloved good, and to rejoice in it. But in as much as love is the first of these acts, that virtue takes its name, not from joy, nor from desire, but from love, and is called charity. Hence joy is not a virtue distinct from charity, but an act, or effect, of charity: for which reason it is numbered among the Fruits (^{<100b>}Galatians 5:22).

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(4)-RO(1) — The sorrow which is a vice is caused by inordinate self-love, and this is not a special vice, but a general source of

the vices, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(77)**, **A(4)**); so that it was necessary to account certain particular sorrows as special vices, because they do not arise from a special, but from a general vice. On the other hand love of God is accounted a special virtue, namely charity, to which joy must be referred, as its proper act, as stated above (here and **A(2)**).

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(4)-RO(2) — Hope proceeds from love even as joy does, but hope adds, on the part of the object, a special character, viz. “difficult,” and “possible to obtain”; for which reason it is accounted a special virtue. On the other hand joy does not add to love any special aspect, that might cause a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(28)-A(4)-RO(3) — The Law prescribes joy, as being an act of charity, albeit not its first act.

QUESTION 29

OF PEACE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider Peace, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether peace is the same as concord?
- (2) Whether all things desire peace?
- (3) Whether peace is an effect of charity?
- (4) Whether peace is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(1)

Whether peace is the same as concord?

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that peace is the same as concord. For Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xix, 13): “Peace among men is well ordered concord.” Now we are speaking here of no other peace than that of men. Therefore peace is the same as concord.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, concord is union of wills. Now the nature of peace consists in such like union, for Dionysius says (Div. Nom. xi) that peace unites all, and makes them of one mind. Therefore peace is the same as concord.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, things whose opposites are identical are themselves identical. Now the one same thing is opposed to concord and peace, viz. dissension; hence it is written (~~1~~² 1 Corinthians 16:33): “God is not the God of dissension but of peace.” Therefore peace is the same as concord.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, There can be concord in evil between wicked men. But “there is no peace to the wicked” (²³⁸²Isaiah 48:22). Therefore peace is not the same as concord.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Peace includes concord and adds something thereto. Hence wherever peace is, there is concord, but there is not peace, wherever there is concord, if we give peace its proper meaning.

For concord, properly speaking, is between one man and another, in so far as the wills of various hearts agree together in consenting to the same thing. Now the heart of one man may happen to tend to diverse things, and this in two ways. First, in respect of the diverse appetitive powers: thus the sensitive appetite tends sometimes to that which is opposed to the rational appetite, according to ²³⁸⁷Galatians 5:17: “The flesh lusteth against the spirit.” Secondly, in so far as one and the same appetitive power tends to diverse objects of appetite, which it cannot obtain all at the same time: so that there must needs be a clashing of the movements of the appetite. Now the union of such movements is essential to peace, because man’s heart is not at peace, so long as he has not what he wants, or if, having what he wants, there still remains something for him to want, and which he cannot have at the same time. On the other hand this union is not essential to concord: wherefore concord denotes union of appetites among various persons, while peace denotes, in addition to this union, the union of the appetites even in one man.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(1)-RO(1) — Augustine is speaking there of that peace which is between one man and another, and he says that this peace is concord, not indeed any kind of concord, but that which is well ordered, through one man agreeing with another in respect of something befitting to both of them. For if one man concord with another, not of his own accord, but through being forced, as it were, by the fear of some evil that besets him, such concord is not really peace, because the order of each concordant is not observed, but is disturbed by some fear-inspiring cause. For this reason he premises that “peace is tranquillity of order,” which tranquillity consists in all the appetitive movements in one man being set at rest together.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(1)-RO(2) — If one man consent to the same thing together with another man, his consent is nevertheless not perfectly united to

himself, unless at the same time all his appetitive movements be in agreement.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(1)-RO(3) — A twofold dissension is opposed to peace, namely dissension between a man and himself, and dissension between one man and another. The latter alone is opposed to concord.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(2)

Whether all things desire peace?

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that not all things desire peace. For, according to Dionysius (Div. Nom. xi), peace “unites consent.” But there cannot be unity of consent in things which are devoid of knowledge. Therefore such things cannot desire peace.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the appetite does not tend to opposite things at the same time. Now many desire war and dissension. Therefore all men do not desire peace.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, good alone is an object of appetite. But a certain peace is, seemingly, evil, else Our Lord would not have said (⁴⁰⁹ Matthew 10:34): “I came not to send peace.” Therefore all things do not desire peace.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, that which all desire is, seemingly, the sovereign good which is the last end. But this is not true of peace, since it is attainable even by a wayfarer; else Our Lord would vainly command (⁴¹⁰ Mark 9:49): “Have peace among you.” Therefore all things do not desire peace.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xix, 12,14) that “all things desire peace”: and Dionysius says the same (Div. Nom. xi).

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(2) — *I answer that*, From the very fact that a man desires a certain thing it follows that he desires to obtain what he desires, and, in consequence, to remove whatever may be an obstacle to his obtaining it. Now a man may be hindered from obtaining the good he desires, by a contrary desire either of his own or of some other, and both are removed

by peace, as stated above. Hence it follows of necessity that whoever desires anything desires peace, in so far as he who desires anything, desires to attain, with tranquillity and without hindrance, to that which he desires: and this is what is meant by peace which Augustine defines (*De Civ. Dei* xix, 13) “the tranquillity of order.”

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(2)-RO(1) — Peace denotes union not only of the intellective or rational appetite, or of the animal appetite, in both of which consent may be found, but also of the natural appetite. Hence Dionysius says that “peace is the cause of consent and of connaturalness,” where “consent” denotes the union of appetites proceeding from knowledge, and “connaturalness,” the union of natural appetites.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(2)-RO(2) — Even those who seek war and dissension, desire nothing but peace, which they deem themselves not to have. For as we stated above, there is no peace when a man concords with another man counter to what he would prefer. Consequently men seek by means of war to break this concord, because it is a defective peace, in order that they may obtain peace, where nothing is contrary to their will. Hence all wars are waged that men may find a more perfect peace than that which they had heretofore.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(2)-RO(3) — Peace gives calm and unity to the appetite. Now just as the appetite may tend to what is good simply, or to what is good apparently, so too, peace may be either true or apparent. There can be no true peace except where the appetite is directed to what is truly good, since every evil, though it may appear good in a way, so as to calm the appetite in some respect, has, nevertheless many defects, which cause the appetite to remain restless and disturbed. Hence true peace is only in good men and about good things. The peace of the wicked is not a true peace but a semblance thereof, wherefore it is written (*Wis. 14:22*): “Whereas they lived in a great war of ignorance, they call so many and so great evils peace.”

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(2)-RO(4) — Since true peace is only about good things, as the true good is possessed in two ways, perfectly and imperfectly, so there is a twofold true peace. One is perfect peace. It consists in the perfect enjoyment of the sovereign good, and unites all one’s desires by giving them rest in one object. This is the last end of the rational creature,

according to ^{<957B>}Psalm 147:3: “Who hath placed peace in thy borders.” The other is imperfect peace, which may be had in this world, for though the chief movement of the soul finds rest in God, yet there are certain things within and without which disturb the peace.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(3)

Whether peace is the proper effect of charity?

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that peace is not the proper effect of charity. For one cannot have charity without sanctifying grace. But some have peace who have not sanctifying grace, thus heathens sometimes have peace. Therefore peace is not the effect of charity.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, if a certain thing is caused by charity, its contrary is not compatible with charity. But dissension, which is contrary to peace, is compatible with charity, for we find that even holy doctors, such as Jerome and Augustine, dissented in some of their opinions. We also read that Paul and Barnabas dissented from one another (^{<445E>}Acts 15). Therefore it seems that peace is not the effect of charity.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the same thing is not the proper effect of different things. Now peace is the effect of justice, according to ^{<2307>}Isaiah 32:17: “And the work of justice shall be peace.” Therefore it is not the effect of charity.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<185E>}Psalm 118:165):

“Much peace have they that love Thy Law.”

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Peace implies a twofold union, as stated above (**A(1)**). The first is the result of one’s own appetites being directed to one object; while the other results from one’s own appetite being united with the appetite of another: and each of these unions is effected by charity — the first, in so far as man loves God with his whole heart, by referring all things to Him, so that all his desires tend to one object — the second, in so far as we love our neighbor as ourselves, the result being that we wish to fulfil our neighbor’s will as though it were ours: hence it is reckoned a sign of friendship if people “make choice of the

same things” (Ethic. ix, 4), and Tully says (De Amicitia) that friends “like and dislike the same things” (Sallust, Catilin.)

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(3)-RO(1) — Without sin no one falls from a state of sanctifying grace, for it turns man away from his due end by making him place his end in something undue: so that his appetite does not cleave chiefly to the true final good, but to some apparent good. Hence, without sanctifying grace, peace is not real but merely apparent.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(3)-RO(2) — As the Philosopher says (Ethic. ix, 6) friends need not agree in opinion, but only upon such goods as conduce to life, and especially upon such as are important; because dissension in small matters is scarcely accounted dissension. Hence nothing hinders those who have charity from holding different opinions. Nor is this an obstacle to peace, because opinions concern the intellect, which precedes the appetite that is united by peace. In like manner if there be concord as to goods of importance, dissension with regard to some that are of little account is not contrary to charity: for such a dissension proceeds from a difference of opinion, because one man thinks that the particular good, which is the object of dissension, belongs to the good about which they agree, while the other thinks that it does not. Accordingly such like dissension about very slight matters and about opinions is inconsistent with a state of perfect peace, wherein the truth will be known fully, and every desire fulfilled; but it is not inconsistent with the imperfect peace of the wayfarer.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(3)-RO(3) — Peace is the “work of justice” indirectly, in so far as justice removes the obstacles to peace: but it is the work of charity directly, since charity, according to its very nature, causes peace. For love is “a unitive force” as Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv): and peace is the union of the appetite’s inclinations.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(4)

Whether peace is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that peace is a virtue. For nothing is a matter of precept, unless it be an act of virtue. But there are

precepts about keeping peace, for example: “Have peace among you” (^{<499>}Mark 9:49). Therefore peace is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, we do not merit except by acts of virtue. Now it is meritorious to keep peace, according to ^{<499>}Matthew 5:9: “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.” Therefore peace is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, vices are opposed to virtues. But dissensions, which are contrary to peace, are numbered among the vices (^{<499>}Galatians 5:20). Therefore peace is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Virtue is not the last end, but the way thereto. But peace is the last end, in a sense, as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xix, 11). Therefore peace is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(28)**, **A(4)**), when a number of acts all proceeding uniformly from an agent, follow one from the other, they all arise from the same virtue, nor do they each have a virtue from which they proceed, as may be seen in corporeal things. For, though fire by heating, both liquefies and rarefies, there are not two powers in fire, one of liquefaction, the other of rarefaction: and fire produces all such actions by its own power of calefaction.

Since then charity causes peace precisely because it is love of God and of our neighbor, as shown above (**A(3)**), there is no other virtue except charity whose proper act is peace, as we have also said in reference to joy (**Q(28)**, **A(4)**).

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(4)-RO(1) — We are commanded to keep peace because it is an act of charity; and for this reason too it is a meritorious act. Hence it is placed among the beatitudes, which are acts of perfect virtue, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(69)**, **AA(1),3**). It is also numbered among the fruits, in so far as it is a final good, having spiritual sweetness.

This suffices for the Reply to the Second Objection.

P(2b)-Q(29)-A(4)-RO(3) — Several vices are opposed to one virtue in respect of its various acts: so that not only is hatred opposed to charity, in respect of its act which is love, but also sloth and envy, in respect of joy, and dissension in respect of peace.

QUESTION 30

OF MERCY

(FOUR ARTICLES)

[*The one Latin word “misericordia” signifies either pity or mercy. The distinction between these two is that pity may stand either for the act or for the virtue, whereas mercy stands only for the virtue.]

We must now go on to consider Mercy, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether evil is the cause of mercy on the part of the person pitied?
- (2) To whom does it belong to pity?
- (3) Whether mercy is a virtue?
- (4) Whether it is the greatest of virtues?

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(1)

Whether evil is properly the motive of mercy?

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that, properly speaking, evil is not the motive of mercy. For, as shown above (**Q(19)**, **A(1)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(79)**, **A(1)**, ad 4; **P(1)** **Q(48)**, **A(6)**), fault is an evil rather than punishment. Now fault provokes indignation rather than mercy. Therefore evil does not excite mercy.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, cruelty and harshness seem to excel other evils. Now the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 8) that “harshness does not call for pity but drives it away.” Therefore evil, as such, is not the motive of mercy.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, signs of evils are not true evils. But signs of evils excite one to mercy, as the Philosopher states (Rhet. ii, 8). Therefore evil, properly speaking, is not an incentive to mercy.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Damascene says (De Fide Orth. ii, 2) that mercy is a kind of sorrow. Now evil is the motive of sorrow. Therefore it is the motive of mercy.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As Augustine says (De Civ. Dei ix, 5), mercy is heartfelt sympathy for another's distress, impelling us to succor him if we can. For mercy takes its name "misericordia" from denoting a man's compassionate heart [misericor] for another's unhappiness. Now unhappiness is opposed to happiness: and it is essential to beatitude or happiness that one should obtain what one wishes; for, according to Augustine (De Trin. xiii, 5), "happy is he who has whatever he desires, and desires nothing amiss." Hence, on the other hand, it belongs to unhappiness that a man should suffer what he wishes not.

Now a man wishes a thing in three ways: first, by his natural appetite; thus all men naturally wish to be and to live: secondly, a man wishes a thing from deliberate choice: thirdly, a man wishes a thing, not in itself, but in its cause, thus, if a man wishes to eat what is bad for him, we say that, in a way, he wishes to be ill.

Accordingly the motive of "mercy," being something pertaining to "misery," is, in the first way, anything contrary to the will's natural appetite, namely corruptive or distressing evils, the contrary of which man desires naturally, wherefore the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 8) that "pity is sorrow for a visible evil, whether corruptive or distressing." Secondly, such like evils are yet more provocative of pity if they are contrary to deliberate choice, wherefore the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 8) that evil excites our pity "when it is the result of an accident, as when something turns out ill, whereas we hoped well of it." Thirdly, they cause yet greater pity, if they are entirely contrary to the will, as when evil befalls a man who has always striven to do well: wherefore the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 8) that "we pity most the distress of one who suffers undeservedly."

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(1)-RO(1) — It is essential to fault that it be voluntary; and in this respect it deserves punishment rather than mercy. Since, however, fault may be, in a way, a punishment, through having something connected with it that is against the sinner's will, it may, in this respect, call for mercy. It is in this sense that we pity and commiserate sinners. Thus Gregory says in a homily (Hom. in Evang. xxxiv) that "true godliness

is not disdainful but compassionate,” and again it is written (⁴⁰⁸Matthew 9:36) that Jesus “seeing the multitudes, had compassion on them: because they were distressed, and lying like sheep that have no shepherd.”

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(1)-RO(2) — Since pity is sympathy for another’s distress, it is directed, properly speaking, towards another, and not to oneself, except figuratively, like justice, according as a man is considered to have various parts (Ethic. v, 11). Thus it is written (Ecclus. 30:24): “Have pity on thy own soul, pleasing God” [*Cf. **Q(106), A(3)**, ad 1].

Accordingly just as, properly speaking, a man does not pity himself, but suffers in himself, as when we suffer cruel treatment in ourselves, so too, in the case of those who are so closely united to us, as to be part of ourselves, such as our children or our parents, we do not pity their distress, but suffer as for our own sores; in which sense the Philosopher says that “harshness drives pity away.”

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(1)-RO(3) — Just as pleasure results from hope and memory of good things, so does sorrow arise from the prospect or the recollection of evil things; though not so keenly as when they are present to the senses. Hence the signs of evil move us to pity, in so far as they represent as present, the evil that excites our pity.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(2)

***Whether the reason for taking pity
is a defect in the person who pities?***

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the reason for taking pity is not a defect in the person who takes pity. For it is proper to God to be merciful, wherefore it is written (⁴⁰⁹Psalm 144:9): “His tender mercies are over all His works.” But there is no defect in God. Therefore a defect cannot be the reason for taking pity.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, if a defect is the reason for taking pity, those in whom there is most defect, must needs take most pity. But this is false: for the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 8) that “those who are in a desperate state are pitiless.” Therefore it seems that the reason for taking pity is not a defect in the person who pities.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, to be treated with contempt is to be defective. But the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 8) that “those who are disposed to contumely are pitiless.” Therefore the reason for taking pity, is not a defect in the person who pities.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Pity is a kind of sorrow. But a defect is the reason of sorrow, wherefore those who are in bad health give way to sorrow more easily, as we shall say further on (**Q(35)**, **A(1)**, ad 2). Therefore the reason why one takes pity is a defect in oneself.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Since pity is grief for another’s distress, as stated above (**A(1)**), from the very fact that a person takes pity on anyone, it follows that another’s distress grieves him. And since sorrow or grief is about one’s own ills, one grieves or sorrows for another’s distress, in so far as one looks upon another’s distress as one’s own.

Now this happens in two ways: first, through union of the affections, which is the effect of love. For, since he who loves another looks upon his friend as another self, he counts his friend’s hurt as his own, so that he grieves for his friend’s hurt as though he were hurt himself. Hence the Philosopher (Ethic. ix, 4) reckons “grieving with one’s friend” as being one of the signs of friendship, and the Apostle says (~~612~~ Romans 12:15):

“Rejoice with them that rejoice, weep with them that weep.”

Secondly, it happens through real union, for instance when another’s evil comes near to us, so as to pass to us from him. Hence the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 8) that men pity such as are akin to them, and the like, because it makes them realize that the same may happen to themselves. This also explains why the old and the wise who consider that they may fall upon evil times, as also feeble and timorous persons, are more inclined to pity: whereas those who deem themselves happy, and so far powerful as to think themselves in no danger of suffering any hurt, are not so inclined to pity.

Accordingly a defect is always the reason for taking pity, either because one looks upon another’s defect as one’s own, through being united to him by love, or on account of the possibility of suffering in the same way.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(2)-RO(1) — God takes pity on us through love alone, in as much as He loves us as belonging to Him.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(2)-RO(2) — Those who are already in infinite distress, do not fear to suffer more, wherefore they are without pity. In like manner this applies to those also who are in great fear, for they are so intent on their own passion, that they pay no attention to the suffering of others.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(2)-RO(3) — Those who are disposed to contumely, whether through having been contemned, or because they wish to condemn others, are incited to anger and daring, which are manly passions and arouse the human spirit to attempt difficult things. Hence they make a man think that he is going to suffer something in the future, so that while they are disposed in that way they are pitiless, according to ¹⁷⁷⁸Proverbs 27:4: “Anger hath no mercy, nor fury when it breaketh forth.” For the same reason the proud are without pity, because they despise others, and think them wicked, so that they account them as suffering deservedly whatever they suffer. Hence Gregory says (Hom. in Evang. xxxiv) that “false godliness,” i.e. of the proud, “is not compassionate but disdainful.”

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(3)

Whether mercy is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that mercy is not a virtue. For the chief part of virtue is choice as the Philosopher states (Ethic. ii, 5). Now choice is “the desire of what has been already counselled” (Ethic. iii, 2). Therefore whatever hinders counsel cannot be called a virtue. But mercy hinders counsel, according to the saying of Sallust (Catilin.): “All those that take counsel about matters of doubt, should be free from... anger... and mercy, because the mind does not easily see aright, when these things stand in the way.” Therefore mercy is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, nothing contrary to virtue is praiseworthy. But nemesis is contrary to mercy, as the Philosopher states (Rhet. ii, 9), and yet it is a praiseworthy passion (Rhet. ii, 9). Therefore mercy is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, joy and peace are not special virtues, because they result from charity, as stated above (**Q(28)**, **A(4)**; **Q(29)**, **A(4)**). Now mercy, also, results from charity; for it is out of charity that we weep with them that weep, as we rejoice with them that rejoice. Therefore mercy is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(3)-O(4) — Further, since mercy belongs to the appetitive power, it is not an intellectual virtue, and, since it has not God for its object, neither is it a theological virtue. Moreover it is not a moral virtue, because neither is it about operations, for this belongs to justice; nor is it about passions, since it is not reduced to one of the twelve means mentioned by the Philosopher (Ethic. ii, 7). Therefore mercy is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei ix, 5): “Cicero in praising Caesar expresses himself much better and in a fashion at once more humane and more in accordance with religious feeling, when he says: ‘Of all thy virtues none is more marvelous or more graceful than thy mercy.’” Therefore mercy is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Mercy signifies grief for another’s distress. Now this grief may denote, in one way, a movement of the sensitive appetite, in which case mercy is not a virtue but a passion; whereas, in another way, it may denote a movement of the intellective appetite, in as much as one person’s evil is displeasing to another. This movement may be ruled in accordance with reason, and in accordance with this movement regulated by reason, the movement of the lower appetite may be regulated. Hence Augustine says (De Civ. Dei ix, 5) that “this movement of the mind” (viz. mercy) “obeys the reason, when mercy is vouchsafed in such a way that justice is safeguarded, whether we give to the needy or forgive the repentant.” And since it is essential to human virtue that the movements of the soul should be regulated by reason, as was shown above (**P(2a)**, **Q(59)**, **AA(4),5**), it follows that mercy is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(3)-RO(1) — The words of Sallust are to be understood as applying to the mercy which is a passion unregulated by reason: for thus it impedes the counselling of reason, by making it wander from justice.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(3)-RO(2) — The Philosopher is speaking there of pity and nemesis, considered, both of them, as passions. They are contrary to one another on the part of their respective estimation of another's evils, for which pity grieves, in so far as it esteems someone to suffer undeservedly, whereas nemesis rejoices, in so far as it esteems someone to suffer deservedly, and grieves, if things go well with the undeserving: "both of these are praiseworthy and come from the same disposition of character" (Rhet. ii, 9). Properly speaking, however, it is envy which is opposed to pity, as we shall state further on (**Q(36), A(3)**).

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(3)-RO(3) — Joy and peace add nothing to the aspect of good which is the object of charity, wherefore they do not require any other virtue besides charity. But mercy regards a certain special aspect, namely the misery of the person pitied.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(3)-RO(4) — Mercy, considered as a virtue, is a moral virtue having relation to the passions, and it is reduced to the mean called nemesis, because "they both proceed from the same character" (Rhet. ii, 9). Now the Philosopher proposes these means not as virtues, but as passions, because, even as passions, they are praiseworthy. Yet nothing prevents them from proceeding from some elective habit, in which case they assume the character of a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(4)

Whether mercy is the greatest of the virtues?

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that mercy is the greatest of the virtues. For the worship of God seems a most virtuous act. But mercy is preferred before the worship of God, according to ^{<2006}Hosea 6:6 and ^{<1007}Matthew 12:7: "I have desired mercy and not sacrifice." Therefore mercy is the greatest virtue.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, on the words of ^{<5008}1 Timothy 4:8: "Godliness is profitable to all things," a gloss says: "The sum total of a Christian's rule of life consists in mercy and godliness." Now the Christian rule of life embraces every virtue. Therefore the sum total of all virtues is contained in mercy.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, “Virtue is that which makes its subject good,” according to the Philosopher. Therefore the more a virtue makes a man like God, the better is that virtue: since man is the better for being more like God. Now this is chiefly the result of mercy, since of God is it said (^{<1849>}Psalm 144:9) that “His tender mercies are over all His works,” and (^{<1849>}Luke 6:36) Our Lord said: “Be ye... merciful, as your Father also is merciful.” Therefore mercy is the greatest of virtues.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle after saying (^{<1849>}Colossians 3:12): “Put ye on... as the elect of God... the bowels of mercy,” etc., adds (^{<1849>}Colossians 3:14): “Above all things have charity.” Therefore mercy is not the greatest of virtues.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(4) — *I answer that*, A virtue may take precedence of others in two ways: first, in itself; secondly, in comparison with its subject. In itself, mercy takes precedence of other virtues, for it belongs to mercy to be bountiful to others, and, what is more, to succor others in their wants, which pertains chiefly to one who stands above. Hence mercy is accounted as being proper to God: and therein His omnipotence is declared to be chiefly manifested [*Collect, Tenth Sunday after Pentecost].

On the other hand, with regard to its subject, mercy is not the greatest virtue, unless that subject be greater than all others, surpassed by none and excelling all: since for him that has anyone above him it is better to be united to that which is above than to supply the defect of that which is beneath. [*“The quality of mercy is not strained. Tis mightiest in the mightiest: it becomes The throned monarch better than his crown.” Merchant of Venice, Act IV, Scene i.]. Hence, as regards man, who has God above him, charity which unites him to God, is greater than mercy, whereby he supplies the defects of his neighbor. But of all the virtues which relate to our neighbor, mercy is the greatest, even as its act surpasses all others, since it belongs to one who is higher and better to supply the defect of another, in so far as the latter is deficient.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(4)-RO(1) — We worship God by external sacrifices and gifts, not for His own profit, but for that of ourselves and our neighbor. For He needs not our sacrifices, but wishes them to be offered to Him, in order to arouse our devotion and to profit our neighbor. Hence mercy, whereby we supply others’ defects is a sacrifice more acceptable to Him,

as conducing more directly to our neighbor's well-being, according to
~~Heb~~ Hebrews 13:16:

“Do not forget to do good and to impart, for by such sacrifices
 God's favor is obtained.”

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(4)-RO(2) — The sum total of the Christian religion consists in mercy, as regards external works: but the inward love of charity, whereby we are united to God preponderates over both love and mercy for our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(30)-A(4)-RO(3) — Charity likens us to God by uniting us to Him in the bond of love: wherefore it surpasses mercy, which likens us to God as regards similarity of works.

QUESTION 31

OF BENEFICENCE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the outward acts or effects of charity,

- (1) Beneficence,
- (2) Almsdeeds, which are a part of beneficence,
- (3) Fraternal correction, which is a kind of alms.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether beneficence is an act of charity ?
- (2) Whether we ought to be beneficent to all?
- (3) Whether we ought to be more beneficent to those who are more closely united to us?
- (4) Whether beneficence is a special virtue?

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(1)

Whether beneficence is an act of charity?

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that beneficence is not an act of charity. For charity is chiefly directed to God. Now we cannot benefit God, according to ¹⁸⁸¹⁷Job 35:7: “What shalt thou give Him? or what shall He receive of thy hand?” Therefore beneficence is not an act of charity.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, beneficence consists chiefly in making gifts. But this belongs to liberality. Therefore beneficence is an act of liberality and not of charity.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, what a man gives, he gives either as being due, or as not due. But a benefit conferred as being due belongs to justice while a benefit conferred as not due, is gratuitous, and in this

respect is an act of mercy. Therefore every benefit conferred is either an act of justice, or an act of mercy. Therefore it is not an act of charity.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Charity is a kind of friendship, as stated above (**Q(23), A(1)**). Now the Philosopher reckons among the acts of friendship (Ethic. ix, 1) “doing good,” i.e. being beneficent, “to one’s friends.” Therefore it is an act of charity to do good to others.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Beneficence simply means doing good to someone. This good may be considered in two ways, first under the general aspect of good, and this belongs to beneficence in general, and is an act of friendship, and, consequently, of charity: because the act of love includes goodwill whereby a man wishes his friend well, as stated above (**Q(23), A(1); Q(27), A(2)**). Now the will carries into effect if possible, the things it wills, so that, consequently, the result of an act of love is that a man is beneficent to his friend. Therefore beneficence in its general acceptance is an act of friendship or charity.

But if the good which one man does another, be considered under some special aspect of good, then beneficence will assume a special character and will belong to some special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(1)-RO(1) — According to Dionysius (Div. Nom. iv), “love moves those, whom it unites, to a mutual relationship: it turns the inferior to the superior to be perfected thereby; it moves the superior to watch over the inferior:” and in this respect beneficence is an effect of love. Hence it is not for us to benefit God, but to honor Him by obeying Him, while it is for Him, out of His love, to bestow good things on us.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(1)-RO(2) — Two things must be observed in the bestowal of gifts. One is the thing given outwardly, while the other is the inward passion that a man has in the delight of riches. It belongs to liberality to moderate this inward passion so as to avoid excessive desire and love for riches; for this makes a man more ready to part with his wealth. Hence, if a man makes some great gift, while yet desiring to keep it for himself, his is not a liberal giving. On the other hand, as regards the outward gift, the act of beneficence belongs in general to friendship or charity. Hence it does not detract from a man’s friendship, if, through love, he give his friend

something he would like to I keep for himself; rather does this prove the perfection of his friendship.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(1)-RO(3) — Just as friendship or charity sees, in the benefit bestowed, the general aspect of good, so does justice see therein the aspect of debt, while pity considers the relieving of distress or defect.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(2)

Whether we ought to do good to all?

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that we are not bound to do good to all. For Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 28) that we “are unable to do good to everyone.” Now virtue does not incline one to the impossible. Therefore it is not necessary to do good to all.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, it is written (Ecclus. 12:5) “Give to the good, and receive not a sinner.” But many men are sinners. Therefore we need not do good to all.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, “Charity dealeth not perversely” (~~Ecclus~~ 1 Corinthians 13:4). Now to do good to some is to deal perversely: for instance if one were to do good to an enemy of the common weal, or if one were to do good to an excommunicated person, since, by doing so, he would be holding communion with him. Therefore, since beneficence is an act of charity, we ought not to do good to all.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (~~Ecclus~~ Galatians 6:10):

“Whilst we have time, let us work good to all men.”

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**, ad 1), beneficence is an effect of love in so far as love moves the superior to watch over the inferior. Now degrees among men are not unchangeable as among angels, because men are subject to many failings, so that he who is superior in one respect, is or may be inferior in another. Therefore, since the love of charity extends to all, beneficence also should extend to all, but according as time and place require: because all acts of virtue must be modified with a view to their due circumstances.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(2)-RO(1) — Absolutely speaking it is impossible to do good to every single one: yet it is true of each individual that one may be bound to do good to him in some particular case. Hence charity binds us, though not actually doing good to someone, to be prepared in mind to do good to anyone if we have time to spare. There is however a good that we can do to all, if not to each individual, at least to all in general, as when we pray for all, for unbelievers as well as for the faithful.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(2)-RO(2) — In a sinner there are two things, his guilt and his nature. Accordingly we are bound to succor the sinner as to the maintenance of his nature, but not so as to abet his sin, for this would be to do evil rather than good.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(2)-RO(3) — The excommunicated and the enemies of the common weal are deprived of all beneficence, in so far as this prevents them from doing evil deeds. Yet if their nature be in urgent need of succor lest it fail, we are bound to help them: for instance, if they be in danger of death through hunger or thirst, or suffer some like distress, unless this be according to the order of justice.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(3)

Whether we ought to do good to those rather who are more closely united to us?

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that we are nor bound to do good to those rather who are more closely united to us. For it is written (^{Q412}Luke 14:12):

“When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, nor thy kinsmen.”

Now these are the most closely united to us. Therefore we are not bound to do good to those rather who are more closely united to us, but preferably to strangers and to those who are in want: hence the text goes on: “But, when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed,” etc.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, to help another in the battle is an act of very great goodness. But a soldier on the battlefield is bound to help a

fellow-soldier who is a stranger rather than a kinsman who is a foe. Therefore in doing acts of kindness we are not bound to give the preference to those who are most closely united to us.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, we should pay what is due before conferring gratuitous favors. But it is a man's duty to be good to those who have been good to him. Therefore we ought to do good to our benefactors rather than to those who are closely united to us.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(3)-O(4) — Further, a man ought to love his parents more than his children, as stated above (**Q(26)**, **A(9)**). Yet a man ought to be more beneficent to his children, since “neither ought the children to lay up for the parents,” according to ⁴⁷²⁴2 Corinthians 12:14. Therefore we are not bound to be more beneficent to those who are more closely united to us.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 28): “Since one cannot do good to all, we ought to consider those chiefly who by reason of place, time or any other circumstance, by a kind of chance are more closely united to us.”

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Grace and virtue imitate the order of nature, which is established by Divine wisdom. Now the order of nature is such that every natural agent pours forth its activity first and most of all on the things which are nearest to it: thus fire heats most what is next to it. In like manner God pours forth the gifts of His goodness first and most plentifully on the substances which are nearest to Him, as Dionysius declares (Coel. Hier. vii). But the bestowal of benefits is an act of charity towards others. Therefore we ought to be most beneficent towards those who are most closely connected with us.

Now one man's connection with another may be measured in reference to the various matters in which men are engaged together; (thus the intercourse of kinsmen is in natural matters, that of fellow-citizens is in civic matters, that of the faithful is in spiritual matters, and so forth): and various benefits should be conferred in various ways according to these various connections, because we ought in preference to bestow on each one such benefits as pertain to the matter in which, speaking simply, he is most closely connected with us. And yet this may vary according to the various requirements of time, place, or matter in hand: because in certain

cases one ought, for instance, to succor a stranger, in extreme necessity, rather than one's own father, if he is not in such urgent need.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(3)-RO(1) — Our Lord did not absolutely forbid us to invite our friends and kinsmen to eat with us, but to invite them so that they may invite us in return, since that would be an act not of charity but of cupidity. The case may occur, however, that one ought rather to invite strangers, on account of their greater want. For it must be understood that, other things being equal, one ought to succor those rather who are most closely connected with us. And if of two, one be more closely connected, and the other in greater want, it is not possible to decide, by any general rule, which of them we ought to help rather than the other, since there are various degrees of want as well as of connection: and the matter requires the judgment of a prudent man.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(3)-RO(2) — The common good of many is more Godlike than the good of an individual. Wherefore it is a virtuous action for a man to endanger even his own life, either for the spiritual or for the temporal common good of his country. Since therefore men engage together in warlike acts in order to safeguard the common weal, the soldier who with this in view succors his comrade, succors him not as a private individual, but with a view to the welfare of his country as a whole: wherefore it is not a matter for wonder if a stranger be preferred to one who is a blood relation.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(3)-RO(3) — A thing may be due in two ways. There is one which should be reckoned, not among the goods of the debtor, but rather as belonging to the person to whom it is due: for instance, a man may have another's goods, whether in money or in kind, either because he has stolen them, or because he has received them on loan or in deposit or in some other way. In this case a man ought to pay what he owes, rather than benefit his connections out of it, unless perchance the case be so urgent that it would be lawful for him to take another's property in order to relieve the one who is in need. Yet, again, this would not apply if the creditor were in equal distress: in which case, however, the claims on either side would have to be weighed with regard to such other conditions as a prudent man would take into consideration, because, on account of the

different particular cases, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. ix, 2), it is impossible to lay down a general rule.

The other kind of due is one which is reckoned among the goods of the debtor and not of the creditor; for instance, a thing may be due, not because justice requires it, but on account of a certain moral equity, as in the case of benefits received gratis. Now no benefactor confers a benefit equal to that which a man receives from his parents: wherefore in paying back benefits received, we should give the first place to our parents before all others, unless, on the other side, there be such weightier motives, as need or some other circumstance, for instance the common good of the Church or state. In other cases we must take to account the connection and the benefit received; and here again no general rule can laid down.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(3)-RO(4) — Parents are like superiors, and so a parent's love tends to conferring benefits, while the children's love tends to honor their parents. Nevertheless in a case of extreme urgency it would be lawful to abandon one's children rather than one's parents, to abandon whom it is by no means lawful, on account of the obligation we lie under towards them for the benefits we have received from them, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. iii, 14).

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(4)

Whether beneficence is a special virtue?

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that beneficence is a special virtue. For precepts are directed to virtue, since lawgivers purpose to make men virtuous (Ethic. i 9,13; ii, 1). Now beneficence and love are prescribed as distinct from one another, for it is written (~~400~~ Matthew 4:44): "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you." Therefore beneficence is a virtue distinct from charity.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, vices are opposed to virtues. Now there are opposed to beneficence certain vices whereby a hurt is inflicted on our neighbor, for instance, rapine, theft and so forth. Therefore beneficence is a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, charity is not divided into several species: whereas there would seem to be several kinds of beneficence, according to the various kinds of benefits. Therefore beneficence is a distinct virtue from charity.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The internal and the external act do not require different virtues. Now beneficence and goodwill differ only as external and internal act, since beneficence is the execution of goodwill. Therefore as goodwill is not a distinct virtue from charity, so neither is beneficence.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Virtues differ according to the different aspects of their objects. Now the formal aspect of the object of charity and of beneficence is the same, since both virtues regard the common aspect of good, as explained above (**A(1)**). Wherefore beneficence is not a distinct virtue from charity, but denotes an act of charity.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(4)-RO(1) — Precepts are given, not about habits but about acts of virtue: wherefore distinction of precept denotes distinction, not of habits, but of acts.

P(2b)-Q(31)-A(4)-RO(2) — Even as all benefits conferred on our neighbor, if we consider them under the common aspect of good, are to be traced to love, so all hurts considered under the common aspect of evil, are to be traced to hatred. But if we consider these same things under certain special aspects of good or of evil, they are to be traced to certain special virtues or vices, and in this way also there are various kinds of benefits.

Hence the Reply to the Third Objection is evident.

QUESTION 32

OF ALMSDEEDS

(TEN ARTICLES)

We must now consider almsdeeds, under which head there are ten points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether almsgiving is an act of charity?
- (2) Of the different kinds of alms;
- (3) Which alms are of greater account, spiritual or corporal?
- (4) Whether corporal alms have a spiritual effect?
- (5) Whether the giving of alms is a matter of precept?
- (6) Whether corporal alms should be given out of the things we need?
- (7) Whether corporal alms should be given out of ill-gotten goods?
- (8) Who can give alms?
- (9) To whom should we give alms?
- (10) How should alms be given ?

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(1)

Whether almsgiving is an act of charity?

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that almsgiving is not an act of charity. For without charity one cannot do acts of charity. Now it is possible to give alms without having charity, according to ~~413~~ 1 Corinthians 13:3:

“If I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor...
nd have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.”

Therefore almsgiving is not an act of charity.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, almsdeeds are reckoned among works of satisfaction, according to ^{270B}Daniel 4:24: “Redeem thou thy sins with alms.” Now satisfaction is an act of justice. Therefore almsgiving is an act of justice and not of charity.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the offering of sacrifices to God is an act of religion. But almsgiving is offering a sacrifice to God, according to ^{283C}Hebrews 13:16:

“Do not forget to do good and to impart,
for by such sacrifices God’s favor is obtained.”

Therefore almsgiving is not an act of charity, but of religion.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1) that to give for a good purpose is an act of liberality. Now this is especially true of almsgiving. Therefore almsgiving is not an act of charity.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written 2 ^{287A}John 3:17:

“He that hath the substance of this world,
and shall see his brother in need, and shall put up his bowels
from him, how doth the charity of God abide in him?”

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(1) — *I answer that*, External acts belong to that virtue which regards the motive for doing those acts. Now the motive for giving alms is to relieve one who is in need. Wherefore some have defined alms as being “a deed whereby something is given to the needy, out of compassion and for God’s sake,” which motive belongs to mercy, as stated above (**Q(30), AA(1),2**). Hence it is clear that almsgiving is, properly speaking, an act of mercy. This appears in its very name, for in Greek {eleemosyne} it is derived from having mercy {eleein} even as the Latin “miseratio” is. And since mercy is an effect of charity, as shown above (**Q(30), A(2), A(3), O(3)**), it follows that almsgiving is an act of charity through the medium of mercy.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(1)-RO(1) — An act of virtue may be taken in two ways: first materially, thus an act of justice is to do what is just; and such an act of virtue can be without the virtue, since many, without having the habit of justice, do what is just, led by the natural light of reason, or through fear, or in the hope of gain. Secondly, we speak of a thing being an act of justice

formally, and thus an act of justice is to do what is just, in the same way as a just man, i.e. with readiness and delight, and such an act of virtue cannot be without the virtue.

Accordingly almsgiving can be materially without charity, but to give alms formally, i.e. for God's sake, with delight and readiness, and altogether as one ought, is not possible without charity.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(1)-RO(2) — Nothing hinders the proper elicited act of one virtue being commanded by another virtue as commanding it and directing it to this other virtue's end. It is in this way that almsgiving is reckoned among works of satisfaction in so far as pity for the one in distress is directed to the satisfaction for his sin; and in so far as it is directed to placate God, it has the character of a sacrifice, and thus it is commanded by religion.

Wherefore the Reply to the Third Objection is evident.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(1)-RO(4) — Almsgiving belongs to liberality, in so far as liberality removes an obstacle to that act, which might arise from excessive love of riches, the result of which is that one clings to them more than one ought.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(2)

***Whether the different kinds of alms
deeds are suitably enumerated?***

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the different kinds of almsdeeds are unsuitably enumerated. For we reckon seven corporal almsdeeds, namely, to feed the hungry, to give drink to the thirsty, to clothe the naked, to harbor the harborless, to visit the sick, to ransom the captive, to bury the dead; all of which are expressed in the following verse: "To visit, to quench, to feed, to ransom, clothe, harbor or bury."

Again we reckon seven spiritual alms, namely, to instruct the ignorant, to counsel the doubtful, to comfort the sorrowful, to reprove the sinner, to forgive injuries, to bear with those who trouble and annoy us, and to pray for all, which are all contained in the following verse: "To counsel, reprove,

console, to pardon, forbear, and to pray,” yet so that counsel includes both advice and instruction.

And it seems that these various almsdeeds are unsuitably enumerated. For the purpose of almsdeeds is to succor our neighbor. But a dead man profits nothing by being buried, else Our Lord would not have spoken truly when He said (⁴⁰⁰⁸Matthew 10:28): “Be not afraid of them who kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do.” [*The quotation is from ⁴⁰⁰⁹Luke 12:4.] This explains why Our Lord, in enumerating the works of mercy, made no mention of the burial of the dead (⁴⁰³⁵Matthew 25:35,36). Therefore it seems that these almsdeeds are unsuitably enumerated.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, as stated above (**A(1)**), the purpose of giving alms is to relieve our neighbor’s need. Now there are many needs of human life other than those mentioned above, for instance, a blind man needs a leader, a lame man needs someone to lean on, a poor man needs riches. Therefore these almsdeeds are unsuitably enumerated.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, almsgiving is a work of mercy. But the reproof of the wrong-doer savors, apparently, of severity rather than of mercy. Therefore it ought not to be reckoned among the spiritual almsdeeds.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, almsgiving is intended for the supply of a defect. But no man is without the defect of ignorance in some matter or other. Therefore, apparently, each one ought to instruct anyone who is ignorant of what he knows himself.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Nom. in Evang. ix): “Let him that hath understanding beware lest he withhold his knowledge; let him that hath abundance of wealth, watch lest he slacken his merciful bounty; let him who is a servant to art be most solicitous to share his skill and profit with his neighbor; let him who has an opportunity of speaking with the wealthy, fear lest he be condemned for retaining his talent, if when he has the chance he plead not with him the cause of the poor.” Therefore the aforesaid almsdeeds are suitably enumerated in respect of those things whereof men have abundance or insufficiency.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(2) — *I answer that*, The aforesaid distinction of almsdeeds is suitably taken from the various needs of our neighbor: some of which

affect the soul, and are relieved by spiritual almsdeeds, while others affect the body, and are relieved by corporal almsdeeds. For corporal need occurs either during this life or afterwards. If it occurs during this life, it is either a common need in respect of things needed by all, or it is a special need occurring through some accident supervening. In the first case, the need is either internal or external. Internal need is twofold: one which is relieved by solid food, viz. hunger, in respect of which we have “to feed the hungry”; while the other is relieved by liquid food, viz. thirst, and in respect of this we have “to give drink to the thirsty.” The common need with regard to external help is twofold; one in respect of clothing, and as to this we have “to clothe the naked”: while the other is in respect of a dwelling place, and as to this we have “to harbor the harborless.” Again if the need be special, it is either the result of an internal cause, like sickness, and then we have “to visit the sick,” or it results from an external cause, and then we have “to ransom the captive.” After this life we give “burial to the dead.”

In like manner spiritual needs are relieved by spiritual acts in two ways, first by asking for help from God, and in this respect we have “prayer,” whereby one man prays for others; secondly, by giving human assistance, and this in three ways. First, in order to relieve a deficiency on the part of the intellect, and if this deficiency be in the speculative intellect, the remedy is applied by “instructing,” and if in the practical intellect, the remedy is applied by “counselling.” Secondly, there may be a deficiency on the part of the appetitive power, especially by way of sorrow, which is remedied by “comforting.” Thirdly, the deficiency may be due to an inordinate act; and this may be the subject of a threefold consideration. First, in respect of the sinner, inasmuch as the sin proceeds from his inordinate will, and thus the remedy takes the form of “reproof.” Secondly, in respect of the person sinned against; and if the sin be committed against ourselves, we apply the remedy by “pardoning the injury,” while, if it be committed against God or our neighbor, it is not in our power to pardon, as Jerome observes (Super Matth. xviii, 15). Thirdly, in respect of the result of the inordinate act, on account of which the sinner is an annoyance to those who live with him, even beside his intention; in which case the remedy is applied by “bearing with him,” especially with regard to those who sin out of weakness, according to

659b Romans 15:1: “We that are stronger, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak,” and not only as regards their being infirm and consequently troublesome on account of their unruly actions, but also by bearing any other burdens of theirs with them, according to **660b** Galatians 6:2: “Bear ye one another’s burdens.”

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(2)-RO(1) — Burial does not profit a dead man as though his body could be capable of perception after death. In this sense Our Lord said that those who kill the body “have no more that they can do”; and for this reason He did not mention the burial of the dead with the other works of mercy, but those only which are more clearly necessary. Nevertheless it does concern the deceased what is done with his body: both that he may live in the memory of man whose respect he forfeits if he remain without burial, and as regards a man’s fondness for his own body while he was yet living, a fondness which kindly persons should imitate after his death. It is thus that some are praised for burying the dead, as Tobias, and those who buried Our Lord; as Augustine says (*De Cura pro Mort.* iii).

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(2)-RO(2) — All other needs are reduced to these, for blindness and lameness are kinds of sickness, so that to lead the blind, and to support the lame, come to the same as visiting the sick. In like manner to assist a man against any distress that is due to an extrinsic cause comes to the same as the ransom of captives. And the wealth with which we relieve the poor is sought merely for the purpose of relieving the aforesaid needs: hence there was no reason for special mention of this particular need.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(2)-RO(3) — The reproof of the sinner, as to the exercise of the act of reproof, seems to imply the severity of justice, but, as to the intention of the reprover, who wishes to free a man from the evil of sin, it is an act of mercy and lovingkindness, according to **670b** Proverbs 27:6:

“Better are the wounds of a friend,
than the deceitful kisses of an enemy.”

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(2)-RO(4) — Nescience is not always a defect, but only when it is about what one ought to know, and it is a part of almsgiving to supply this defect by instruction. In doing this however we should

observe the due circumstances of persons, place and time, even as in other virtuous acts.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(3)

Whether corporal alms are of more account than spiritual alms?

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that corporal alms are of more account than spiritual alms. For it is more praiseworthy to give an alms to one who is in greater want, since an almsdeed is to be praised because it relieves one who is in need. Now the body which is relieved by corporal alms, is by nature more needy than the spirit which is relieved by spiritual alms. Therefore corporal alms are of more account.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, an alms is less praiseworthy and meritorious if the kindness is compensated, wherefore Our Lord says (^{<4142>}Luke 14:12): “When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy neighbors who are rich, lest perhaps they also invite thee again. Now there is always compensation in spiritual almsdeeds, since he who prays for another, profits thereby, according to ^{<43813>}Psalms 34:13: “My prayer shall be turned into my bosom: and he who teaches another, makes progress in knowledge, which cannot be said of corporal almsdeeds. Therefore corporal almsdeeds are of more account than spiritual almsdeeds.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, an alms is to be commended if the needy one is comforted by it: wherefore it is written (^{<43817>}Job 31:20): “If his sides have not blessed me,” and the Apostle says to Philemon (^{<5007>}verse 7): “The bowels of the saints have been refreshed by thee, brother.” Now a corporal alms is sometimes more welcome to a needy man than a spiritual alms. Therefore bodily almsdeeds are of more account than spiritual almsdeeds.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(3) — On the contrary, Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte i, 20) on the words, “Give to him that asketh of thee” (^{<4152>}Matthew 5:42):

“You should give so as to injure neither yourself nor another, and when you refuse what another asks you must not lose sight of the

claims of justice, and send him away empty; at times indeed you will give what is better than what is asked for, if you reprove him that asks unjustly.”

Now reproof is a spiritual alms. Therefore spiritual almsdeeds are preferable to corporal almsdeeds.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(3) — *I answer that*, There are two ways of comparing these almsdeeds. First, simply; and in this respect, spiritual almsdeeds hold the first place, for three reasons. First, because the offering is more excellent, since it is a spiritual gift, which surpasses a corporal gift, according to ~~2000~~ Proverbs 4:2: “I will give you a good gift, forsake not My Law.” Secondly, on account of the object succored, because the spirit is more excellent than the body, wherefore, even as a man in looking after himself, ought to look to his soul more than to his body, so ought he in looking after his neighbor, whom he ought to love as himself. Thirdly, as regards the acts themselves by which our neighbor is succored, because spiritual acts are more excellent than corporal acts, which are, in a fashion, servile.

Secondly, we may compare them with regard to some particular case, when some corporal alms excels some spiritual alms: for instance, a man in hunger is to be fed rather than instructed, and as the Philosopher observes (Topic. iii, 2), for a needy man “money is better than philosophy,” although the latter is better simply.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(3)-RO(1) — It is better to give to one who is in greater want, other things being equal, but if he who is less needy is better, and is in want of better things, it is better to give to him: and it is thus in the case in point.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(3)-RO(2) — Compensation does not detract from merit and praise if it be not intended, even as human glory, if not intended, does not detract from virtue. Thus Sallust says of Cato (Catilin.), that “the less he sought fame, the more he became famous”: and thus it is with spiritual almsdeeds.

Nevertheless the intention of gaining spiritual goods does not detract from merit, as the intention of gaining corporal goods.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(3)-RO(3) — The merit of an almsgiver depends on that in which the will of the recipient rests reasonably, and not on that in which it rests when it is inordinate.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(4)

Whether corporal almsdeeds have a spiritual effect?

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that corporal almsdeeds have not a spiritual effect. For no effect exceeds its cause. But spiritual goods exceed corporal goods. Therefore corporal almsdeeds have no spiritual effect.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the sin of simony [i.e., the buying and selling of positions in the Church] consists in giving the corporal for the spiritual, and it is to be utterly avoided. Therefore one ought not to give alms in order to receive a spiritual effect.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, to multiply the cause is to multiply the effect. If therefore corporal almsdeeds cause a spiritual effect, the greater the alms, the greater the spiritual profit, which is contrary to what we read (^{42b}Luke 21:3) of the widow who cast two brass mites into the treasury, and in Our Lord's own words "cast in more than... all." Therefore bodily almsdeeds have no spiritual effect.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (Ecclus. 17:18): "The alms of a man... shall preserve the grace of a man as the apple of the eye."

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Corporal almsdeeds may be considered in three ways. First, with regard to their substance, and in this way they have merely a corporal effect, inasmuch as they supply our neighbor's corporal needs. Secondly, they may be considered with regard to their cause, in so far as a man gives a corporal alms out of love for God and his neighbor, and in this respect they bring forth a spiritual fruit, according to Ecclus. 29:13, 14: "Lose thy money for thy brother... place thy treasure in the commandments of the Most High, and it shall bring thee more profit than gold."

Thirdly, with regard to the effect, and in this way again, they have a spiritual fruit, inasmuch as our neighbor, who is succored by a corporal alms, is moved to pray for his benefactor; wherefore the above text goes on (Ecclus. 29:15): “Shut up alms in the heart of the poor, and it shall obtain help for thee from all evil.”

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(4)-RO(1) — This argument considers corporal almsdeeds as to their substance.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(4)-RO(2) — He who gives an alms does not intend to buy a spiritual thing with a corporal thing, for he knows that spiritual things infinitely surpass corporal things, but he intends to merit a spiritual fruit through the love of charity.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(4)-RO(3) — The widow who gave less in quantity, gave more in proportion; and thus we gather that the fervor of her charity, whence corporal almsdeeds derive their spiritual efficacy, was greater.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(5)

Whether almsgiving is a matter of precept?

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that almsgiving is not a matter of precept. For the counsels are distinct from the precepts. Now almsgiving is a matter of counsel, according to ^{200b} Daniel 4:24:

“Let my counsel be acceptable to the King; [Vulg.: ‘to thee, and’]
redeem thou thy sins with alms.”

Therefore almsgiving is not a matter of precept.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, it is lawful for everyone to use and to keep what is his own. Yet by keeping it he will not give alms. Therefore it is lawful not to give alms: and consequently almsgiving is not a matter of precept.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, whatever is a matter of precept binds the transgressor at some time or other under pain of mortal sin, because positive precepts are binding for some fixed time. Therefore, if almsgiving were a matter of precept, it would be possible to point to some fixed time

when a man would commit a mortal sin unless he gave an alms. But it does not appear how this can be so, because it can always be deemed probable that the person in need can be relieved in some other way, and that what we would spend in almsgiving might be needful to ourselves either now or in some future time. Therefore it seems that almsgiving is not a matter of precept.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(5)-O(4) — Further, every commandment is reducible to the precepts of the Decalogue. But these precepts contain no reference to almsgiving. Therefore almsgiving is not a matter of precept.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, No man is punished eternally for omitting to do what is not a matter of precept. But some are punished eternally for omitting to give alms, as is clear from ^{<125>}Matthew 25:41-43. Therefore almsgiving is a matter of precept.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As love of our neighbor is a matter of precept, whatever is a necessary condition to the love of our neighbor is a matter of precept also. Now the love of our neighbor requires that not only should we be our neighbor's well-wishers, but also his well-doers, according to ^{<126>}1 John 3:18: "Let us not love in word, nor in tongue, but in deed, and in truth." And in order to be a person's well-wisher and well-doer, we ought to succor his needs: this is done by almsgiving. Therefore almsgiving is a matter of precept.

Since, however, precepts are about acts of virtue, it follows that all almsgiving must be a matter of precept, in so far as it is necessary to virtue, namely, in so far as it is demanded by right reason. Now right reason demands that we should take into consideration something on the part of the giver, and something on the part of the recipient. On the part of the giver, it must be noted that he should give of his surplus, according to ^{<127>}Luke 11:41: "That which remaineth, give alms." This surplus is to be taken in reference not only to himself, so as to denote what is unnecessary to the individual, but also in reference to those of whom he has charge (in which case we have the expression "necessary to the person" [*The official necessities of a person in position] taking the word "person" as expressive of dignity). Because each one must first of all look after himself and then after those over whom he has charge, and afterwards with what remains relieve the needs of others. Thus nature first, by its nutritive

power, takes what it requires for the upkeep of one's own body, and afterwards yields the residue for the formation of another by the power of generation.

On the part of the recipient it is requisite that he should be in need, else there would be no reason for giving him alms: yet since it is not possible for one individual to relieve the needs of all, we are not bound to relieve all who are in need, but only those who could not be succored if we not did succor them. For in such cases the words of Ambrose apply, "Feed him that dies of hunger: if thou hast not fed him, thou hast slain him" [*Cf. Canon Pasce, dist. lxxxvi, whence the words, as quoted, are taken]. Accordingly we are bound to give alms of our surplus, as also to give alms to one whose need is extreme: otherwise almsgiving, like any other greater good, is a matter of counsel.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(5)-RO(1) — Daniel spoke to a king who was not subject to God's Law, wherefore such things as were prescribed by the Law which he did not profess, had to be counselled to him. Or he may have been speaking in reference to a case in which almsgiving was not a matter of precept.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(5)-RO(2) — The temporal goods which God grants us, are ours as to the ownership, but as to the use of them, they belong not to us alone but also to such others as we are able to succor out of what we have over and above our needs. Hence Basil says [*Hom. super Luc. xii, 18]: "If you acknowledge them," viz. your temporal goods, "as coming from God, is He unjust because He apportions them unequally? Why are you rich while another is poor, unless it be that you may have the merit of a good stewardship, and he the reward of patience? It is the hungry man's bread that you withhold, the naked man's cloak that you have stored away, the shoe of the barefoot that you have left to rot, the money of the needy that you have buried underground: and so you injure as many as you might help." Ambrose expresses himself in the same way.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(5)-RO(3) — There is a time when we sin mortally if we omit to give alms; on the part of the recipient when we see that his need is evident and urgent, and that he is not likely to be succored otherwise — on the part of the giver, when he has superfluous goods, which he does not need for the time being, as far as he can judge with probability. Nor need

he consider every case that may possibly occur in the future, for this would be to think about the morrow, which Our Lord forbade us to do (^{406b}Matthew 6:34), but he should judge what is superfluous and what necessary, according as things probably and generally occur.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(5)-RO(4) — All succor given to our neighbor is reduced to the precept about honoring our parents. For thus does the Apostle interpret it (^{500b}1 Timothy 4:8) where he says: “Dutifulness* [Douay: ‘Godliness’] is profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come,” and he says this because the precept about honoring our parents contains the promise, “that thou mayest be longlived upon the land” (^{470c}Exodus 20:12): and dutifulness comprises all kinds of almsgiving. [*“Pietas,” whence our English word “Piety.” Cf. also inf. **Q(101), A(2).**]

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(6)

Whether one ought to give alms out of what one needs?

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that one ought not to give alms out of what one needs. For the order of charity should be observed not only as regards the effect of our benefactions but also as regards our interior affections. Now it is a sin to contravene the order of charity, because this order is a matter of precept. Since, then, the order of charity requires that a man should love himself more than his neighbor, it seems that he would sin if he deprived himself of what he needed, in order to succor his neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, whoever gives away what he needs himself, squanders his own substance, and that is to be a prodigal, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 1). But no sinful deed should be done. Therefore we should not give alms out of what we need.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, the Apostle says (^{518b}1 Timothy 5:8): “If any man have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.” Now if a man gives of what he needs for himself or for his charge, he seems to detract from the

care he should have for himself or his charge. Therefore it seems that whoever gives alms from what he needs, sins gravely.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Our Lord said (⁴⁰²Matthew 19:21): “If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor.”

Now he that gives all he has to the poor, gives not only what he needs not, but also what he needs. Therefore a man may give alms out of what he needs.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(6) — *I answer that*, A thing is necessary in two ways: first, because without it something is impossible, and it is altogether wrong to give alms out of what is necessary to us in this sense; for instance, if a man found himself in the presence of a case of urgency, and had merely sufficient to support himself and his children, or others under his charge, he would be throwing away his life and that of others if he were to give away in alms, what was then necessary to him. Yet I say this without prejudice to such a case as might happen, supposing that by depriving himself of necessities a man might help a great personage, and a support of the Church or State, since it would be a praiseworthy act to endanger one’s life and the lives of those who are under our charge for the delivery of such a person, since the common good is to be preferred to one’s own.

Secondly, a thing is said to be necessary, if a man cannot without it live in keeping with his social station, as regards either himself or those of whom he has charge. The “necessary” considered thus is not an invariable quantity, for one might add much more to a man’s property, and yet not go beyond what he needs in this way, or one might take much from him, and he would still have sufficient for the decencies of life in keeping with his own position. Accordingly it is good to give alms of this kind of “necessary”; and it is a matter not of precept but of counsel. Yet it would be inordinate to deprive oneself of one’s own, in order to give to others to such an extent that the residue would be insufficient for one to live in keeping with one’s station and the ordinary occurrences of life: for no man ought to live unbecomingly. There are, however, three exceptions to the above rule. The first is when a man changes his state of life, for instance, by entering religion, for then he gives away all his possessions for Christ’s sake, and does the deed of perfection by transferring himself to another state. Secondly, when that which he deprives himself of, though it be

required for the decencies of life, can nevertheless easily be recovered, so that he does not suffer extreme inconvenience. Thirdly, when he is in presence of extreme indigence in an individual, or great need on the part of the common weal. For in such cases it would seem praiseworthy to forego the requirements of one's station, in order to provide for a greater need.

The objections may be easily solved from what has been said.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(7)

Whether one may give alms out of ill-gotten goods?

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that one may give alms out of ill-gotten goods. For it is written (~~2b1~~ Luke 16:9): "Make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity." Now mammon signifies riches. Therefore it is lawful to make unto oneself spiritual friends by giving alms out of ill-gotten riches.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, all filthy lucre seems to be ill-gotten. But the profits from whoredom are filthy lucre; wherefore it was forbidden (~~2b2~~ Deuteronomy 23:18) to offer therefrom sacrifices or oblations to God: "Thou shalt not offer the hire of a strumpet... in the house of... thy God." In like manner gains from games of chance are ill-gotten, for, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1), "we take such like gains from our friends to whom we ought rather to give." And most of all are the profits from simony [i.e., the buying and selling of positions in the Church] ill-gotten, since thereby the Holy Ghost is wronged. Nevertheless out of such gains it is lawful to give alms. Therefore one may give alms out of ill-gotten goods.


P(2b)-Q(32)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, greater evils should be avoided more than lesser evils. Now it is less sinful to keep back another's property than to commit murder, of which a man is guilty if he fails to succor one who is in extreme need, as appears from the words of Ambrose who says (Cf. Canon Pasce dist. lxxxvi, whence the words, as quoted, are taken): "Feed him that dies of hunger, if thou hast not fed him, thou hast slain him". Therefore, in certain cases, it is lawful to give alms of ill-gotten goods.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Verb. Dom. xxxv, 2): “Give alms from your just labors. For you will not bribe Christ your judge, not to hear you with the poor whom you rob... Give not alms from interest and usury: I speak to the faithful to whom we dispense the Body of Christ.”

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(7) — *I answer that*, A thing may be ill-gotten in three ways. In the first place a thing is ill-gotten if it be due to the person from whom it is gotten, and may not be kept by the person who has obtained possession of it; as in the case of rapine, theft and usury, and of such things a man may not give alms since he is bound to restore them.

Secondly, a thing is ill-gotten, when he that has it may not keep it, and yet he may not return it to the person from whom he received it, because he received it unjustly, while the latter gave it unjustly. This happens in simony, wherein both giver and receiver contravene the justice of the Divine Law, so that restitution is to be made not to the giver, but by giving alms. The same applies to all similar cases of illegal giving and receiving.

Thirdly, a thing is ill-gotten, not because the taking was unlawful, but because it is the outcome of something unlawful, as in the case of a woman’s profits from whoredom. This is filthy lucre properly so called, because the practice of whoredom is filthy and against the Law of God, yet the woman does not act unjustly or unlawfully in taking the money. Consequently it is lawful to keep and to give in alms what is thus acquired by an unlawful action.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(7)-RO(1) — As Augustine says (De Verb. Dom. 2), “Some have misunderstood this saying of Our Lord, so as to take another’s property and give thereof to the poor, thinking that they are fulfilling the commandment by so doing. This interpretation must be amended. Yet all riches are called riches of iniquity, as stated in De Quaest. Ev. ii, 34, because “riches are not unjust save for those who are themselves unjust, and put all their trust in them. Or, according to Ambrose in his commentary on  Luke 16:9, “Make unto yourselves friends,” etc., “He calls mammon unjust, because it draws our affections by the various allurements of wealth.” Or, because “among the many ancestors whose property you inherit, there is one who took the property of others unjustly, although you know nothing about it,” as Basil says in a homily

(Hom. super Luc. A, 5). Or, all riches are styled riches “of iniquity,” i.e., of “inequality,” because they are not distributed equally among all, one being in need, and another in affluence.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(7)-RO(2) — We have already explained how alms may be given out of the profits of whoredom. Yet sacrifices and oblations were not made therefrom at the altar, both on account of the scandal, and through reverence for sacred things. It is also lawful to give alms out of the profits of simony, because they are not due to him who paid, indeed he deserves to lose them. But as to the profits from games of chance, there would seem to be something unlawful as being contrary to the Divine Law, when a man wins from one who cannot alienate his property, such as minors, lunatics and so forth, or when a man, with the desire of making money out of another man, entices him to play, and wins from him by cheating. In these cases he is bound to restitution, and consequently cannot give away his gains in alms. Then again there would seem to be something unlawful as being against the positive civil law, which altogether forbids any such profits. Since, however, a civil law does not bind all, but only those who are subject to that law, and moreover may be abrogated through desuetude, it follows that all such as are bound by these laws are bound to make restitution of such gains, unless perchance the contrary custom prevail, or unless a man win from one who enticed him to play, in which case he is not bound to restitution, because the loser does not deserve to be paid back: and yet he cannot lawfully keep what he has won, so long as that positive law is in force, wherefore in this case he ought to give it away in alms.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(7)-RO(3) — All things are common property in a case of extreme necessity. Hence one who is in such dire straits may take another’s goods in order to succor himself, if he can find no one who is willing to give him something. For the same reason a man may retain what belongs to another, and give alms thereof; or even take something if there be no other way of succoring the one who is in need. If however this be possible without danger, he must ask the owner’s consent, and then succor the poor man who is in extreme necessity.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(8)

Whether one who is under another's power can give alms?

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that one who is under another's power can give alms. For religious are under the power of their prelates to whom they have vowed obedience. Now if it were unlawful for them to give alms, they would lose by entering the state of religion, for as Ambrose [*The quotation is from the works of Ambrosiaster. Cf. Index to ecclesiastical authorities quoted by St. Thomas] says on ~~508~~1 Timothy 4:8:

“‘Dutifulness [Douay: ‘godliness’] is profitable to all things’: The sum total of the Christian religion consists in doing one's duty by all,”

and the most creditable way of doing this is to give alms. Therefore those who are in another's power can give alms.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, a wife is under her husband's power (~~509~~Genesis 3:16). But a wife can give alms since she is her husband's partner; hence it is related of the Blessed Lucy that she gave alms without the knowledge of her betrothed [*“Sponsus” The matrimonial institutions of the Romans were so entirely different from ours that “sponsus” is no longer accurately rendered either “husband” or “betrothed.”] Therefore a person is not prevented from giving alms, by being under another's power.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, the subjection of children to their parents is founded on nature, wherefore the Apostle says (~~510~~Ephesians 6:1): “Children, obey your parents in the Lord.” But, apparently, children may give alms out of their parents' property. For it is their own, since they are the heirs; wherefore, since they can employ it for some bodily use, it seems that much more can they use it in giving alms so as to profit their souls. Therefore those who are under another's power can give alms.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(8)-O(4) — Further, servants are under their master's power, according to ~~511~~Titus 2:9: “Exhort servants to be obedient to their masters.” Now they may lawfully do anything that will profit their masters: and this would be especially the case if they gave alms for them. Therefore those who are under another's power can give alms.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, Alms should not be given out of another's property; and each one should give alms out of the just profit of his own labor as Augustine says (De Verb. Dom. xxxv, 2). Now if those who are subject to anyone were to give alms, this would be out of another's property. Therefore those who are under another's power cannot give alms.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(8) — *I answer that*, Anyone who is under another's power must, as such, be ruled in accordance with the power of his superior: for the natural order demands that the inferior should be ruled according to its superior. Therefore in those matters in which the inferior is subject to his superior, his ministrations must be subject to the superior's permission.

Accordingly he that is under another's power must not give alms of anything in respect of which he is subject to that other, except in so far as he has been commissioned by his superior. But if he has something in respect of which he is not under the power of his superior, he is no longer subject to another in its regard, being independent in respect of that particular thing, and he can give alms therefrom.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(8)-RO(1) — If a monk be dispensed through being commissioned by his superior, he can give alms from the property of his monastery, in accordance with the terms of his commission; but if he has no such dispensation, since he has nothing of his own, he cannot give alms without his abbot's permission either express or presumed for some probable reason: except in a case of extreme necessity, when it would be lawful for him to commit a theft in order to give an alms. Nor does it follow that he is worse off than before, because, as stated in De Ecclesiastes Dogm. lxxi, "it is a good thing to give one's property to the poor little by little, but it is better still to give all at once in order to follow Christ, and being freed from care, to be needy with Christ."

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(8)-RO(2) — A wife, who has other property besides her dowry which is for the support of the burdens of marriage, whether that property be gained by her own industry or by any other lawful means, can give alms, out of that property, without asking her husband's permission: yet such alms should be moderate, lest through giving too much she impoverish her husband. Otherwise she ought not to give alms without the

express or presumed consent of her husband, except in cases of necessity as stated, in the case of a monk, in the preceding Reply. For though the wife be her husband's equal in the marriage act, yet in matters of housekeeping, the head of the woman is the man, as the Apostle says (^{410B}1 Corinthians 11:3). As regards Blessed Lucy, she had a betrothed, not a husband, wherefore she could give alms with her mother's consent.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(8)-RO(3) — What belongs to the children belongs also to the father: wherefore the child cannot give alms, except in such small quantity that one may presume the father to be willing: unless, perchance, the father authorize his child to dispose of any particular property. The same applies to servants. Hence the Reply to the Fourth Objection is clear.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(9)

Whether one ought to give alms to those rather who are more closely united to us?

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that one ought not to give alms to those rather who are more closely united to us. For it is written (Ecclus. 12:4,6): "Give to the merciful and uphold not the sinner... Do good to the humble and give not to the ungodly." Now it happens sometimes that those who are closely united to us are sinful and ungodly. Therefore we ought not to give alms to them in preference to others.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, alms should be given that we may receive an eternal reward in return, according to ^{410B}Matthew 6:18: "And thy Father Who seeth in secret, will repay thee." Now the eternal reward is gained chiefly by the alms which are given to the saints, according to ^{410B}Luke 16:9: "Make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity, that when you shall fail, they may receive you into everlasting dwellings, which passage Augustine expounds (De Verb. Dom. xxxv, 1): "Who shall have everlasting dwellings unless the saints of God? And who are they that shall be received by them into their dwellings, if not those who succor them in their needs? Therefore alms should be given to the more holy persons rather than to those who are more closely united to us.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, man is more closely united to himself. But a man cannot give himself an alms. Therefore it seems that we are not bound to give alms to those who are most closely united to us.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (⁵⁰⁸⁸1 Timothy 5:8):

“If any man have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.”

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(9) — *I answer that*, As Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 28), “it falls to us by lot, as it were, to have to look to the welfare of those who are more closely united to us.” Nevertheless in this matter we must employ discretion, according to the various degrees of connection, holiness and utility. For we ought to give alms to one who is much holier and in greater want, and to one who is more useful to the common weal, rather than to one who is more closely united to us, especially if the latter be not very closely united, and has no special claim on our care then and there, and who is not in very urgent need.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(9)-RO(1) — We ought not to help a sinner as such, that is by encouraging him to sin, but as man, that is by supporting his nature.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(9)-RO(2) — Almsdeeds deserve on two counts to receive an eternal reward. First because they are rooted in charity, and in this respect an almsdeed is meritorious in so far as it observes the order of charity, which requires that, other things being equal, we should, in preference, help those who are more closely connected with us. Wherefore Ambrose says (De Officiis i, 30): “It is with commendable liberality that you forget not your kindred, if you know them to be in need, for it is better that you should yourself help your own family, who would be ashamed to beg help from others.” Secondly, almsdeeds deserve to be rewarded eternally, through the merit of the recipient, who prays for the giver, and it is in this sense that Augustine is speaking.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(9)-RO(3) — Since almsdeeds are works of mercy, just as a man does not, properly speaking, pity himself, but only by a kind of comparison, as stated above (**Q(30)**, **AA(1),2**), so too, properly speaking, no man gives himself an alms, unless he act in another’s person; thus when

a man is appointed to distribute alms, he can take something for himself, if he be in want, on the same ground as when he gives to others.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(10)

Whether alms should be given in abundance?

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that alms should not be given in abundance. For we ought to give alms to those chiefly who are most closely connected with us. But we ought not to give to them in such a way that they are likely to become richer thereby, as Ambrose says (De Officiis i, 30). Therefore neither should we give abundantly to others.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, Ambrose says (De Officiis i, 30): “We should not lavish our wealth on others all at once, we should dole it out by degrees.” But to give abundantly is to give lavishly. Therefore alms should not be given in abundance.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, the Apostle says (~~4th~~ 2 Corinthians 8:13): “Not that others should be eased,” i.e. should live on you without working themselves, “and you burthened,” i.e. impoverished. But this would be the result if alms were given in abundance. Therefore we ought not to give alms abundantly.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, It is written (Tobias 4:93): “If thou have much, give abundantly.”

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(10) — *I answer that*, Alms may be considered abundant in relation either to the giver, or to the recipient: in relation to the giver, when that which a man gives is great as compared with his means. To give thus is praiseworthy, wherefore Our Lord (~~4th~~ Luke 21:3,4) commended the widow because “of her want, she cast in all the living that she had.” Nevertheless those conditions must be observed which were laid down when we spoke of giving alms out of one’s necessary goods (**A(9)**).

On the part of the recipient, an alms may be abundant in two ways; first, by relieving his need sufficiently, and in this sense it is praiseworthy to give alms: secondly, by relieving his need more than sufficiently; this is not praiseworthy, and it would be better to give to several that are in need,

wherefore the Apostle says (~~403~~ 1 Corinthians 13:3): “If I should distribute... to feed the poor,” on which words a gloss comments: “Thus we are warned to be careful in giving alms, and to give, not to one only, but to many, that we may profit many.”

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(10)-RO(1) — This argument considers abundance of alms as exceeding the needs of the recipient.

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(10)-RO(2) — The passage quoted considers abundance of alms on the part of the giver; but the sense is that God does not wish a man to lavish all his wealth at once, except when he changes his state of life, wherefore he goes on to say:

“Except we imitate Eliseus who slew his oxen and fed the poor with what he had, so that no household cares might keep him back” (~~412~~ 1 Kings 19:21).

P(2b)-Q(32)-A(10)-RO(3) — In the passage quoted the words, “not that others should be eased or refreshed,” refer to that abundance of alms which surpasses the need of the recipient, to whom one should give alms not that he may have an easy life, but that he may have relief. Nevertheless we must bring discretion to bear on the matter, on account of the various conditions of men, some of whom are more daintily nurtured, and need finer food and clothing. Hence Ambrose says (*De Officiis* i, 30): “When you give an alms to a man, you should take into consideration his age and his weakness; and sometimes the shame which proclaims his good birth; and again that perhaps he has fallen from riches to indigence through no fault of his own.”

With regard to the words that follow, “and you burdened,” they refer to abundance on the part of the giver. Yet, as a gloss says on the same passage, “he says this, not because it would be better to give in abundance, but because he fears for the weak, and he admonishes them so to give that they lack not for themselves.”

QUESTION 33

OF FRATERNAL CORRECTION

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

We must now consider Fraternal Correction, under which head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether fraternal correction is an act of charity?
- (2) Whether it is a matter of precept?
- (3) Whether this precept binds all, or only superiors?
- (4) Whether this precept binds the subject to correct his superior?
- (5) Whether a sinner may correct anyone?
- (6) Whether one ought to correct a person who becomes worse through being corrected?
- (7) Whether secret correction should precede denouncement?
- (8) Whether witnesses should be called before denouncement?

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(1)

Whether fraternal correction is an act of charity?

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that fraternal correction is not an act of charity. For a gloss on ⁴¹⁵Matthew 18:15, “If thy brother shall offend against thee,” says that “a man should reprove his brother out of zeal for justice.” But justice is a distinct virtue from charity. Therefore fraternal correction is an act, not of charity, but of justice.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, fraternal correction is given by secret admonition. Now admonition is a kind of counsel, which is an act of prudence, for a prudent man is one who is of good counsel (Ethic. vi, 5). Therefore fraternal correction is an act, not of charity, but of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, contrary acts do not belong to the same virtue. Now it is an act of charity to bear with a sinner, according to ~~ROM~~ Galatians 6:2: “Bear ye one another’s burdens, and so you shall fulfil the law of Christ,” which is the law of charity. Therefore it seems that the correction of a sinning brother, which is contrary to bearing with him, is not an act of charity.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, To correct the wrongdoer is a spiritual almsdeed. But almsdeeds are works of charity, as stated above (**Q(32), A(1)**). Therefore fraternal correction is an act of charity.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(1) — *I answer that*, The correction of the wrongdoer is a remedy which should be employed against a man’s sin. Now a man’s sin may be considered in two ways, first as being harmful to the sinner, secondly as conducing to the harm of others, by hurting or scandalizing them, or by being detrimental to the common good, the justice of which is disturbed by that man’s sin.

Consequently the correction of a wrongdoer is twofold, one which applies a remedy to the sin considered as an evil of the sinner himself. This is fraternal correction properly so called, which is directed to the amendment of the sinner. Now to do away with anyone’s evil is the same as to procure his good: and to procure a person’s good is an act of charity, whereby we wish and do our friend well. Consequently fraternal correction also is an act of charity, because thereby we drive out our brother’s evil, viz. sin, the removal of which pertains to charity rather than the removal of an external loss, or of a bodily injury, in so much as the contrary good of virtue is more akin to charity than the good of the body or of external things. Therefore fraternal correction is an act of charity rather than the healing of a bodily infirmity, or the relieving of an external bodily need. There is another correction which applies a remedy to the sin of the wrongdoer, considered as hurtful to others, and especially to the common good. This correction is an act of justice, whose concern it is to safeguard the rectitude of justice between one man and another.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(1)-RO(1) — This gloss speaks of the second correction which is an act of justice. Or if it speaks of the first correction, then it takes justice as denoting a general virtue, as we shall state further on

(**Q(58), A(5)**), in which sense again all “sin is iniquity” (~~1~~¹ John 3:4), through being contrary to justice.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(1)-RO(2) — According to the Philosopher (Ethic. vi, 12), prudence regulates whatever is directed to the end, about which things counsel and choice are concerned. Nevertheless when, guided by prudence, we perform some action aright which is directed to the end of some virtue, such as temperance or fortitude, that action belongs chiefly to the virtue to whose end it is directed. Since, then, the admonition which is given in fraternal correction is directed to the removal of a brother’s sin, which removal pertains to charity, it is evident that this admonition is chiefly an act of charity, which virtue commands it, so to speak, but secondarily an act of prudence, which executes and directs the action.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(1)-RO(3) — Fraternal correction is not opposed to forbearance with the weak, on the contrary it results from it. For a man bears with a sinner, in so far as he is not disturbed against him, and retains his goodwill towards him: the result being that he strives to make him do better.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(2)

Whether fraternal correction is a matter of precept?

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that fraternal correction is not a matter of precept. For nothing impossible is a matter of precept, according to the saying of Jerome [*Pelagius, Expos. Symb. ad Damas]: “Accursed be he who says that God has commanded any. thing impossible.” Now it is written (~~2074~~²⁰⁷⁴ Ecclesiastes 7:14): “Consider the works of God, that no man can correct whom He hath despised.” Therefore fraternal correction is not a matter of precept.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, all the precepts of the Divine Law are reduced to the precepts of the Decalogue. But fraternal correction does not come under any precept of the Decalogue. Therefore it is not a matter of precept.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the omission of a Divine precept is a mortal sin, which has no place in a holy man. Yet holy and spiritual men

are found to omit fraternal correction: since Augustine says (De Civ. Dei i, 9): “Not only those of low degree, but also those of high position, refrain from reproving others, moved by a guilty cupidity, not by the claims of charity.” Therefore fraternal correction is not a matter of precept.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, whatever is a matter of precept is something due. If, therefore, fraternal correction is a matter of precept, it is due to our brethren that we correct them when they sin. Now when a man owes anyone a material due, such as the payment of a sum of money, he must not be content that his creditor come to him, but he should seek him out, that he may pay him his due. Hence we should have to go seeking for those who need correction, in order that we might correct them; which appears to be inconvenient, both on account of the great number of sinners, for whose correction one man could not suffice, and because religious would have to leave the cloister in order to reprove men, which would be unbecoming. Therefore fraternal correction is not a matter of precept.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Verb. Dom. xvi, 4): “You become worse than the sinner if you fail to correct him.” But this would not be so unless, by this neglect, one omitted to observe some precept. Therefore fraternal correction is a matter of precept.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Fraternal correction is a matter of precept. We must observe, however, that while the negative precepts of the Law forbid sinful acts, the positive precepts inculcate acts of virtue. Now sinful acts are evil in themselves, and cannot become good, no matter how, or when, or where, they are done, because of their very nature they are connected with an evil end, as stated in Ethic. ii, 6: wherefore negative precepts bind always and for all times. On the other hand, acts of virtue must not be done anyhow, but by observing the due circumstances, which are requisite in order that an act be virtuous; namely, that it be done where, when, and how it ought to be done. And since the disposition of whatever is directed to the end depends on the formal aspect of the end, the chief of these circumstances of a virtuous act is this aspect of the end, which in this case is the good of virtue. If therefore such a circumstance be omitted from a virtuous act, as entirely takes away the good of virtue, such an act is contrary to a precept. If, however, the circumstance omitted from a

virtuous act be such as not to destroy the virtue altogether, though it does not perfectly attain the good of virtue, it is not against a precept. Hence the Philosopher (*Ethic. ii, 9*) says that if we depart but little from the mean, it is not contrary to the virtue, whereas if we depart much from the mean virtue is destroyed in its act. Now fraternal correction is directed to a brother's amendment: so that it is a matter of precept, in so far as it is necessary for that end, but not so as we have to correct our erring brother at all places and times.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(2)-RO(1) — In all good deeds man's action is not efficacious without the Divine assistance: and yet man must do what is in his power. Hence Augustine says (*De Correp. et Gratia xv*): "Since we ignore who is predestined and who is not, charity should so guide our feelings, that we wish all to be saved." Consequently we ought to do our brethren the kindness of correcting them, with the hope of God's help.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(2)-RO(2) — As stated above (**Q(32)**, **A(5)**, ad 4), all the precepts about rendering service to our neighbor are reduced to the precept about the honor due to parents.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(2)-RO(3) — Fraternal correction may be omitted in three ways.

First, meritoriously, when out of charity one omits to correct someone. For Augustine says (*De Civ. Dei i, 9*): "If a man refrains from chiding and reproving wrongdoers, because he awaits a suitable time for so doing, or because he fears lest, if he does so, they may become worse, or hinder, oppress, or turn away from the faith, others who are weak and need to be instructed in a life of goodness and virtue, this does not seem to result from covetousness, but to be counselled by charity."

Secondly, fraternal correction may be omitted in such a way that one commits a mortal sin, namely, "when" (as he says in the same passage) "one fears what people may think, or lest one may suffer grievous pain or death; provided, however, that the mind is so dominated by such things, that it gives them the preference to fraternal charity." This would seem to be the case when a man reckons that he might probably withdraw some wrongdoer from sin, and yet omits to do so, through fear or covetousness.

Thirdly, such an omission is a venial sin, when through fear or covetousness, a man is loth to correct his brother's faults, and yet not to such a degree, that if he saw clearly that he could withdraw him from sin, he would still forbear from so doing, through fear or covetousness, because in his own mind he prefers fraternal charity to these things. It is in this way that holy men sometimes omit to correct wrongdoers.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(2)-RO(4) — We are bound to pay that which is due to some fixed and certain person, whether it be a material or a spiritual good, without waiting for him to come to us, but by taking proper steps to find him. Wherefore just as he that owes money to a creditor should seek him, when the time comes, so as to pay him what he owes, so he that has spiritual charge of some person is bound to seek him out, in order to reprove him for a sin. On the other hand, we are not bound to seek someone on whom to bestow such favors as are due, not to any certain person, but to all our neighbors in general, whether those favors be material or spiritual goods, but it suffices that we bestow them when the opportunity occurs; because, as Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 28), we must look upon this as a matter of chance. For this reason he says (De Verb. Dom. xvi, 1) that “Our Lord warns us not to be listless in regard of one another's sins: not indeed by being on the lookout for something to denounce, but by correcting what we see”: else we should become spies on the lives of others, which is against the saying of ~~1889~~ Proverbs 24:19: “Lie not in wait, nor seek after wickedness in the house of the just, nor spoil his rest.” It is evident from this that there is no need for religious to leave their cloister in order to rebuke evil-doers.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(3)

Whether fraternal correction belongs only to prelates?

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that fraternal correction belongs to prelates alone. For Jerome [*Origen, Hom. vii in Joan.] says: “Let priests endeavor to fulfil this saying of the Gospel: ‘If thy brother sin against thee,’” etc. Now prelates having charge of others were usually designated under the name of priests. Therefore it seems that fraternal correction belongs to prelates alone.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, fraternal correction is a spiritual alms. Now corporal almsgiving belongs to those who are placed above others in temporal matters, i.e. to the rich. Therefore fraternal correction belongs to those who are placed above others in spiritual matters, i.e. to prelates.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, when one man reproves another he moves him by his rebuke to something better. Now in the physical order the inferior is moved by the superior. Therefore in the order of virtue also, which follows the order of nature, it belongs to prelates alone to correct inferiors.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (Dist. xxiv, qu. 3, Can. Tam Sacerdotes): “Both priests and all the rest of the faithful should be most solicitous for those who perish, so that their reproof may either correct their sinful ways. or, if they be incorrigible, cut them off from the Church.”

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), correction is twofold. One is an act of charity, which seeks in a special way the recovery of an erring brother by means of a simple warning: such like correction belongs to anyone who has charity, be he subject or prelate.

But there is another correction which is an act of justice purposing the common good, which is procured not only by warning one’s brother, but also, sometimes, by punishing him, that others may, through fear, desist from sin. Such a correction belongs only to prelates, whose business it is not only to admonish, but also to correct by means of punishments.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(3)-RO(1) — Even as regards that fraternal correction which is common to all, prelates have a grave responsibility, as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei i, 9): “for just as a man ought to bestow temporal favors on those especially of whom he has temporal care, so too ought he to confer spiritual favors, such as correction, teaching and the like, on those who are entrusted to his spiritual care.” Therefore Jerome does not mean that the precept of fraternal correction concerns priests only, but that it concerns them chiefly.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(3)-RO(2) — Just as he who has the means wherewith to give corporal assistance is rich in this respect, so he whose reason is gifted

with a sane judgment, so as to be able to correct another's wrong-doing, is, in this respect, to be looked on as a superior.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(3)-RO(3) — Even in the physical order certain things act mutually on one another, through being in some respect higher than one another, in so far as each is somewhat in act, and somewhat in potentiality with regard to another. In like manner one man can correct another in so far as he has a sane judgment in a matter wherein the other sins, though he is not his superior simply.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(4)

Whether a mann is bound to correct his prelate?

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that no man is bound to correct his prelate. For it is written (^{<299>}Exodus 19:12): “The beast that shall touch the mount shall be stoned,” [*Vulg.: ‘Everyone that shall touch the mount, dying he shall die.’] and (^{<100>}2 Kings 6:7) it is related that the Lord struck Oza for touching the ark. Now the mount and the ark signify our prelates. Therefore prelates should not be corrected by their subjects.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, a gloss on ^{<401>}Galatians 2:11, “I withstood him to the face,” adds: “as an equal.” Therefore, since a subject is not equal to his prelate, he ought not to correct him.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. xxiii, 8) that “one ought not to presume to reprove the conduct of holy men, unless one thinks better of oneself.” But one ought not to think better of oneself than of one's prelate. Therefore one ought not to correct one's prelate.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says in his Rule: “Show mercy not only to yourselves, but also to him who, being in the higher position among you, is therefore in greater danger.” But fraternal correction is a work of mercy. Therefore even prelates ought to be corrected.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(4) — *I answer that*, A subject is not competent to administer to his prelate the correction which is an act of justice through the coercive nature of punishment: but the fraternal correction which is an act of charity is within the competency of everyone in respect of any

person towards whom he is bound by charity, provided there be something in that person which requires correction.

Now an act which proceeds from a habit or power extends to whatever is contained under the object of that power or habit: thus vision extends to all things comprised in the object of sight. Since, however, a virtuous act needs to be moderated by due circumstances, it follows that when a subject corrects his prelate, he ought to do so in a becoming manner, not with impudence and harshness, but with gentleness and respect. Hence the Apostle says (~~SIRL~~ 1 Timothy 5:1): “An ancient man rebuke not, but entreat him as a father.” Wherefore Dionysius finds fault with the monk Demophilus (Ep. viii), for rebuking a priest with insolence, by striking and turning him out of the church.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(4)-RO(1) — It would seem that a subject touches his prelate inordinately when he upbraids him with insolence, as also when he speaks ill of him: and this is signified by God’s condemnation of those who touched the mount and the ark.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(4)-RO(2) — To withstand anyone in public exceeds the mode of fraternal correction, and so Paul would not have withstood Peter then, unless he were in some way his equal as regards the defense of the faith. But one who is not an equal can reprove privately and respectfully. Hence the Apostle in writing to the Colossians (~~SIRL~~ 4:17) tells them to admonish their prelate: “Say to Archippus: Fulfil thy ministry [*Vulg.: ‘Take heed to the ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.’ Cf. ~~SIRL~~ 2 Timothy 4:5].” It must be observed, however, that if the faith were endangered, a subject ought to rebuke his prelate even publicly. Hence Paul, who was Peter’s subject, rebuked him in public, on account of the imminent danger of scandal concerning faith, and, as the gloss of Augustine says on ~~ROD~~ Galatians 2:11,

“Peter gave an example to superiors, that if at any time they should happen to stray from the straight path, they should not disdain to be reprov’d by their subjects.”

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(4)-RO(3) — To presume oneself to be simply better than one’s prelate, would seem to savor of presumptuous pride; but there is no presumption in thinking oneself better in some respect, because, in this

life, no man is without some fault. We must also remember that when a man reproves his prelate charitably, it does not follow that he thinks himself any better, but merely that he offers his help to one who, “being in the higher position among you, is therefore in greater danger,” as Augustine observes in his Rule quoted above.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(5)

Whether a sinner ought to reprove a wrongdoer?

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that a sinner ought to reprove a wrongdoer. For no man is excused from obeying a precept by having committed a sin. But fraternal correction is a matter of precept, as stated above (**A(2)**). Therefore it seems that a man ought not to forbear from such like correction for the reason that he has committed a sin.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, spiritual almsdeeds are of more account than corporal almsdeeds. Now one who is in sin ought not to abstain from administering corporal alms. Much less therefore ought he, on account of a previous sin, to refrain from correcting wrongdoers.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, it is written (⁴¹⁸1 John 1:8): “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves.” Therefore if, on account of a sin, a man is hindered from reproving his brother, there will be none to reprove the wrongdoer. But the latter proposition is unreasonable: therefore the former is also.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Isidore says (De Summo Bono iii, 32): “He that is subject to vice should not correct the vices of others.” Again it is written (⁴¹⁹Romans 2:1):

“Wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself. For thou dost the same things which thou judgest.”

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(3)**, ad 2), to correct a wrongdoer belongs to a man, in so far as his reason is gifted with right judgment. Now sin, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(85)**, **AA(1),2**), does not destroy the good of nature so as to deprive the sinner’s reason of all right judgment, and in this respect he may be competent to find fault with

others for committing sin. Nevertheless a previous sin proves somewhat of a hindrance to this correction, for three reasons. First because this previous sin renders a man unworthy to rebuke another; and especially is he unworthy to correct another for a lesser sin, if he himself has committed a greater. Hence Jerome says on the words, “Why seest thou the mote?” etc. (~~408~~ Matthew 7:3):

“He is speaking of those who, while they are themselves guilty of mortal sin, have no patience with the lesser sins of their brethren.”

Secondly, such like correction becomes unseemly, on account of the scandal which ensues therefrom, if the corrector’s sin be well known, because it would seem that he corrects, not out of charity, but more for the sake of ostentation. Hence the words of ~~409~~ Matthew 7:4, “How sayest thou to thy brother?” etc. are expounded by Chrysostom [*Hom. xvii in the Opus Imperfectum falsely ascribed to St. John Chrysostom] thus: “That is — ‘With what object?’ Out of charity, think you, that you may save your neighbor?” No, “because you would look after your own salvation first. What you want is, not to save others, but to hide your evil deeds with good teaching, and to seek to be praised by men for your knowledge.”

Thirdly, on account of the rebuker’s pride; when, for instance, a man thinks lightly of his own sins, and, in his own heart, sets himself above his neighbor, judging the latter’s sins with harsh severity, as though he himself were just man. Hence Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 19): “To reprove the faults of others is the duty of good and kindly men: when a wicked man rebukes anyone, his rebuke is the latter’s acquittal.” And so, as Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 19): “When we have to find fault with anyone, we should think whether we were never guilty of his sin; and then we must remember that we are men, and might have been guilty of it; or that we once had it on our conscience, but have it no longer: and then we should bethink ourselves that we are all weak, in order that our reproof may be the outcome, not of hatred, but of pity. But if we find that we are guilty of the same sin, we must not rebuke him, but groan with him, and invite him to repent with us.” It follows from this that, if a sinner reprove a wrongdoer with humility, he does not sin, nor does he bring a further condemnation on himself, although thereby he proves himself

deserving of condemnation, either in his brother's or in his own conscience, on account of his previous sin.

Hence the Replies to the Objections are clear.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(6)

Whether one ought to forbear from correcting someone, through fear lest he become worse?

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that one ought not to forbear from correcting someone through fear lest he become worse. For sin is weakness of the soul, according to ^{<1000>}Psalm 6:3: “Have mercy on me, O Lord, for I am weak.” Now he that has charge of a sick person, must not cease to take care of him, even if he be fractious or contemptuous, because then the danger is greater, as in the case of madmen. Much more, therefore should one correct a sinner, no matter how badly he takes it.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, according to Jerome vital truths are not to be foregone on account of scandal. Now God's commandments are vital truths. Since, therefore, fraternal correction is a matter of precept, as stated above (**A(2)**), it seems that it should not be foregone for fear of scandalizing the person to be corrected.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, according to the Apostle (^{<1000>}Romans 3:8) we should not do evil that good may come of it. Therefore, in like manner, good should not be omitted lest evil befall. Now fraternal correction is a good thing. Therefore it should not be omitted for fear lest the person corrected become worse.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<1000>}Proverbs 9:8): “Rebuke not a scorner lest he hate thee,” where a gloss remarks: “You must not fear lest the scorner insult you when you rebuke him: rather should you bear in mind that by making him hate you, you may make him worse.” Therefore one ought to forego fraternal correction, when we fear lest we may make a man worse.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(6) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(3)**) the correction of the wrongdoer is twofold. One, which belongs to prelates, and is

directed to the common good, has coercive force. Such correction should not be omitted lest the person corrected be disturbed, both because if he is unwilling to amend his ways of his own accord, he should be made to cease sinning by being punished, and because, if he be incorrigible, the common good is safeguarded in this way, since the order of justice is observed, and others are deterred by one being made an example of. Hence a judge does not desist from pronouncing sentence of condemnation against a sinner, for fear of disturbing him or his friends.

The other fraternal correction is directed to the amendment of the wrongdoer, whom it does not coerce, but merely admonishes. Consequently when it is deemed probable that the sinner will not take the warning, and will become worse, such fraternal correction should be foregone, because the means should be regulated according to the requirements of the end.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(6)-RO(1) — The doctor uses force towards a madman, who is unwilling to submit to his treatment; and this may be compared with the correction administered by prelates, which has coercive power, but not with simple fraternal correction.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(6)-RO(2) — Fraternal correction is a matter of precept, in so far as it is an act of virtue, and it will be a virtuous act in so far as it is proportionate to the end. Consequently whenever it is a hindrance to the end, for instance when a man becomes worse through it, it is longer a vital truth, nor is it a matter precept.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(6)-RO(3) — Whatever is directed to end, becomes good through being directed to the end. Hence whenever fraternal correction hinders the end, namely the amendment of our brother, it is no longer good, so that when such a correction is omitted, good is not omitted lest evil should befall.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7)***Whether the precept of fraternal correction demands that a private admonition should precede denunciation?***

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that the precept of fraternal correction does not demand that a private admonition should precede denunciation. For, in works of charity, we should above all follow the example of God, according to ~~(^{488A})~~ Ephesians 5:1,2: “Be ye followers of God, as most dear children, and walk in love.” Now God sometimes punishes a man for a sin, without previously warning him in secret. Therefore it seems that there is no need for a private admonition to precede denunciation.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, according to Augustine (De Mendacio xv), we learn from the deeds of holy men how we ought to understand the commandments of Holy Writ. Now among the deeds of holy men we find that a hidden sin is publicly denounced, without any previous admonition in private. Thus we read (~~(^{488D})~~ Genesis 37:2) that “Joseph accused his brethren to his father of a most wicked crime”: and (~~(^{488E})~~ Acts 5:4,9) that Peter publicly denounced Ananias and Saphira who had secretly “by fraud kept back the price of the land,” without beforehand admonishing them in private: nor do we read that Our Lord admonished Judas in secret before denouncing him. Therefore the precept does not require that secret admonition should precede public denunciation.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, it is a graver matter to accuse than to denounce. Now one may go to the length of accusing a person publicly, without previously admonishing him in secret: for it is decided in the Decretal (Cap. Qualiter, xiv, De Accusationibus) that “nothing else need precede accusation except inscription.” [*The accuser was bound by Roman Law to endorse (se inscribere) the writ of accusation. The effect of this endorsement or inscription was that the accuser bound himself, if he failed to prove the accusation, to suffer the same punishment as the accused would have to suffer if proved guilty.] Therefore it seems that the precept does not require that a secret admonition should precede public denunciation.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7)-O(4) — Further, it does not seem probable that the customs observed by religious in general are contrary to the precepts of Christ. Now it is customary among religious orders to proclaim this or that one for a fault, without any previous secret admonition. Therefore it seems that this admonition is not required by the precept.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7)-O(5) — Further, religious are bound to obey their prelates. Now a prelate sometimes commands either all in general, or someone in particular, to tell him if they know of anything that requires correction. Therefore it would seem that they are bound to tell them this, even before any secret admonition. Therefore the precept does not require secret admonition before public denunciation.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Verb. Dom. xvi, 4) on the words, “Rebuke him between thee and him alone” (⁴⁸⁵Matthew 18:15): “Aiming at his amendment, while avoiding his disgrace: since perhaps from shame he might begin to defend his sin; and him whom you thought to make a better man, you make worse.” Now we are bound by the precept of charity to beware lest our brother become worse. Therefore the order of fraternal correction comes under the precept.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7) — *I answer that*, With regard to the public denunciation of sins it is necessary to make a distinction: because sins may be either public or secret. In the case of public sins, a remedy is required not only for the sinner, that he may become better, but also for others, who know of his sin, lest they be scandalized. Wherefore such like sins should be denounced in public, according to the saying of the Apostle (⁵⁴¹1 Timothy 5:20): “Them that sin reprove before all, that the rest also may have fear,” which is to be understood as referring to public sins, as Augustine states (De Verb. Dom. xvi, 7).

On the other hand, in the case of secret sins, the words of Our Lord seem to apply (⁴⁸⁵Matthew 18:15): “If thy brother shall offend against thee,” etc. For if he offend thee publicly in the presence of others, he no longer sins against thee alone, but also against others whom he ‘disturbs. Since, however, a man’s neighbor may take offense even at his secret sins, it seems that we must make yet a further distinction. For certain secret sins are hurtful to our neighbor either in his body or in his soul, as, for instance, when a man plots secretly to betray his country to its enemies, or when a

heretic secretly turns other men away from the faith. And since he that sins thus in secret, sins not only against you in particular, but also against others, it is necessary to take steps to denounce him at once, in order to prevent him doing such harm, unless by chance you were firmly persuaded that this evil result would be prevented by admonishing him secretly. On the other hand there are other sins which injure none but the sinner, and the person sinned against, either because he alone is hurt by the sinner, or at least because he alone knows about his sin, and then our one purpose should be to succor our sinning brother: and just as the physician of the body restores the sick man to health, if possible, without cutting off a limb, but, if this be unavoidable, cuts off a limb which is least indispensable, in order to preserve the life of the whole body, so too he who desires his brother's amendment should, if possible, so amend him as regards his conscience, that he keep his good name.

For a good name is useful, first of all to the sinner himself, not only in temporal matters wherein a man suffers many losses, if he lose his good name, but also in spiritual matters, because many are restrained from sinning, through fear of dishonor, so that when a man finds his honor lost, he puts no curb on his sinning. Hence Jerome says on ¹⁸³⁵Matthew 18:15:

“If he sin against thee, thou shouldst rebuke him in private, lest he persist in his sin if he should once become shameless or unabashed.”

Secondly, we ought to safeguard our sinning brother's good name, both because the dishonor of one leads to the dishonor of others, according to the saying of Augustine (Ep. ad pleb. Hipponens. lxxviii): “When a few of those who bear a name for holiness are reported falsely or proved in truth to have done anything wrong, people will seek by busily repeating it to make it believed of all”: and also because when one man's sin is made public others are incited to sin likewise.

Since, however, one's conscience should be preferred to a good name, Our Lord wished that we should publicly denounce our brother and so deliver his conscience from sin, even though he should forfeit his good name. Therefore it is evident that the precept requires a secret admonition to precede public denunciation.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7)-RO(1) — Whatever is hidden, is known to God, wherefore hidden sins are to the judgment of God, just what public sins are to the judgment of man. Nevertheless God does rebuke sinners sometimes by secretly admonishing them, so to speak, with an inward inspiration, either while they wake or while they sleep, according to ~~Job~~ Job 33:15-17:

“By a dream in a vision by night, when deep sleep falleth upon men... then He openeth the ears of men, and teaching instructeth them in what they are to learn, that He may withdraw a man from the things he is doing.”

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7)-RO(2) — Our Lord as God knew the sin of Judas as though it were public, wherefore He could have made it known at once. Yet He did not, but warned Judas of his sin in words that were obscure. The sin of Ananias and Saphira was denounced by Peter acting as God’s executor, by Whose revelation he knew of their sin. With regard to Joseph it is probable that he warned his brethren, though Scripture does not say so. Or we may say that the sin was public with regard to his brethren, wherefore it is stated in the plural that he accused “his brethren.”

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7)-RO(3) — When there is danger to a great number of people, those words of Our Lord do not apply, because then thy brother does not sin against thee alone.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7)-RO(4) — Proclamations made in the chapter of religious are about little faults which do not affect a man’s good name, wherefore they are reminders of forgotten faults rather than accusations or denunciations. If, however, they should be of such a nature as to injure our brother’s good name, it would be contrary to Our Lord’s precept, to denounce a brother’s fault in this manner.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(7)-RO(5) — A prelate is not to be obeyed contrary to a Divine precept, according to ~~Acts~~ Acts 5:29: “We ought to obey God rather than men.” Therefore when a prelate commands anyone to tell him anything that he knows to need correction, the command rightly understood supports the safeguarding of the order of fraternal correction, whether the command be addressed to all in general, or to some particular individual. If, on the other hand, a prelate were to issue a command in express opposition to this order instituted by Our Lord, both would sin,

the one commanding, and the one obeying him, as disobeying Our Lord's command. Consequently he ought not to be obeyed, because a prelate is not the judge of secret things, but God alone is, wherefore he has no power to command anything in respect of hidden matters, except in so far as they are made known through certain signs, as by ill-repute or suspicion; in which cases a prelate can command just as a judge, whether secular or ecclesiastical, can bind a man under oath to tell the truth.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(8)

Whether before the public denunciation witnesses ought to be brought forward?

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that before the public denunciation witnesses ought not to be brought forward. For secret sins ought not to be made known to others, because by so doing “a man would betray his brother's sins instead of correcting them,” as Augustine says (De Verb. Dom. xvi, 7). Now by bringing forward witnesses one makes known a brother's sin to others. Therefore in the case of secret sins one ought not to bring witnesses forward before the public denunciation.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, man should love his neighbor as himself. Now no man brings in witnesses to prove his own secret sin. Neither therefore ought one to bring forward witnesses to prove the secret sin of our brother.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, witnesses are brought forward to prove something. But witnesses afford no proof in secret matters. Therefore it is useless to bring witnesses forward in such cases.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(8)-O(4) — Further, Augustine says in his Rule that “before bringing it to the notice of witnesses... it should be put before the superior.” Now to bring a matter before a superior or a prelate is to tell the Church. Therefore witnesses should not be brought forward before the public denunciation.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, Our Lord said (~~4189~~ Matthew 18:16):

“Take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two,” etc.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(8) — *I answer that*, The right way to go from one extreme to another is to pass through the middle space. Now Our Lord wished the beginning of fraternal correction to be hidden, when one brother corrects another between this one and himself alone, while He wished the end to be public, when such a one would be denounced to the Church. Consequently it is befitting that a citation of witnesses should be placed between the two extremes, so that at first the brother's sin be indicated to a few, who will be of use without being a hindrance, and thus his sin be amended without dishonoring him before the public.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(8)-RO(1) — Some have understood the order of fraternal correction to demand that we should first of all rebuke our brother secretly, and that if he listens, it is well; but if he listen not, and his sin be altogether hidden, they say that we should go no further in the matter, whereas if it has already begun to reach the ears of several by various signs, we ought to prosecute the matter, according to Our Lord's command. But this is contrary to what Augustine says in his Rule that "we are bound to reveal" a brother's sin, if it "will cause a worse corruption in the heart." Wherefore we must say otherwise that when the secret admonition has been given once or several times, as long as there is probable hope of his amendment, we must continue to admonish him in private, but as soon as we are able to judge with any probability that the secret admonition is of no avail, we must take further steps, however secret the sin may be, and call witnesses, unless perhaps it were thought probable that this would not conduce to our brother's amendment, and that he would become worse: because on that account one ought to abstain altogether from correcting him, as stated above (**A(6)**).

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(8)-RO(2) — A man needs no witnesses that he may amend his own sin: yet they may be necessary that we may amend a brother's sin. Hence the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(8)-RO(3) — There may be three reasons for citing witnesses. First, to show that the deed in question is a sin, as Jerome says: secondly, to prove that the deed was done, if repeated, as Augustine says (in his Rule): thirdly, "to prove that the man who rebuked his brother, has done what he could," as Chrysostom says (Hom. in Matth. lx).

P(2b)-Q(33)-A(8)-RO(4) — Augustine means that the matter ought to be made known to the prelate before it is stated to the witnesses, in so far as

the prelate is a private individual who is able to be of more use than others, but not that it is to be told him as to the Church, i.e. as holding the position of judge.

QUESTION 34

OF HATRED

(SIX ARTICLES)

We must now consider the vices opposed to charity:

- (1) hatred, which is opposed to love;
- (2) sloth and envy, which are opposed to the joy of charity;
- (3) discord and schism, which are contrary to peace;
- (4) offense and scandal, which are contrary to beneficence and fraternal correction.

Under the first head there are six points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether it is possible to hate God?
- (2) Whether hatred of God is the greatest of sins?
- (3) Whether hatred of one's neighbor is always a sin?
- (4) Whether it is the greatest of all sins against our neighbor?
- (5) Whether it is a capital sin?
- (6) From what capital sin does it arise?

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(1)

Whether it is possible for anyone to hate God?

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that no man can hate God. For Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that “the first good and beautiful is an object of love and dilection to all.” But God is goodness and beauty itself. Therefore He is hated by none.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, in the Apocryphal books of 3 Esdras 4:36,[39] it is written that “all things call upon truth... and (all men) do

well like of her works.” Now God is the very truth according to ^{<B46>}John 14:6. Therefore all love God, and none can hate Him.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, hatred is a kind of aversion. But according to Dionysius (Div. Nom. i) God draws all things to Himself. Therefore none can hate Him.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<B73>}Psalm 73:23): “The pride of them that hate Thee ascendeth continually,” and (^{<B54>}John 15:24):

“But now they have both seen and hated both Me and My Father.”

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As shown above (**P(2a), Q(29), A(1)**), hatred is a movement of the appetitive power, which power is not set in motion save by something apprehended. Now God can be apprehended by man in two ways; first, in Himself, as when He is seen in His Essence; secondly, in His effects, when, to wit, “the invisible things” of God... “are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made” (^{<B10>}Romans 1:20). Now God in His Essence is goodness itself, which no man can hate — for it is natural to good to be loved. Hence it is impossible for one who sees God in His Essence, to hate Him.

Moreover some of His effects are such that they can nowise be contrary to the human will, since “to be, to live, to understand,” which are effects of God, are desirable and lovable to all. Wherefore again God cannot be an object of hatred if we consider Him as the Author of such like effects. Some of God’s effects, however, are contrary to an inordinate will, such as the infliction of punishment, and the prohibition of sin by the Divine Law. Such like effects are repugnant to a will debased by sin, and as regards the consideration of them, God may be an object of hatred to some, in so far as they look upon Him as forbidding sin, and inflicting punishment.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(1)-RO(1) — This argument is true of those who see God’s Essence, which is the very essence of goodness.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(1)-RO(2) — This argument is true in so far as God is apprehended as the cause of such effects as are naturally beloved of all, among which are the works of Truth who reveals herself to men.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(1)-RO(3) — God draws all things to Himself, in so far as He is the source of being, since all things, in as much as they are, tend to be like God, Who is Being itself.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(2)

Whether hatred of God is the greatest of sins?

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that hatred of God is not the greatest of sins. For the most grievous sin is the sin against the Holy Ghost, since it cannot be forgiven, according to ⁴¹²³Matthew 12:32. Now hatred of God is not reckoned among the various kinds of sin against the Holy Ghost, as may be seen from what has been said above (**Q(14), A(2)**). Therefore hatred of God is not the most grievous sin.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, sin consists in withdrawing oneself from God. Now an unbeliever who has not even knowledge of God seems to be further away from Him than a believer, who though he hate God, nevertheless knows Him. Therefore it seems that the sin of unbelief is graver than the sin of hatred against God.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, God is an object of hatred, only by reason of those of His effects that are contrary to the will: the chief of which is punishment. But hatred of punishment is not the most grievous sin. Therefore hatred of God is not the most grievous sin.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The best is opposite to the worst, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. viii, 10). But hatred of God is contrary to the love of God, wherein man's best consists. Therefore hatred of God is man's worst sin.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(2) — *I answer that*, The defect in sin consists in its aversion from God, as stated above (**Q(10), A(3)**): and this aversion would not have the character of guilt, were it not voluntary. Hence the nature of guilt consists in a voluntary aversion from God.

Now this voluntary aversion from God is directly implied in the hatred of God, but in other sins, by participation and indirectly. For just as the will cleaves directly to what it loves, so does it directly shun what it hates.

Hence when a man hates God, his will is directly averted from God, whereas in other sins, fornication for instance, a man turns away from God, not directly, but indirectly, in so far, namely, as he desires an inordinate pleasure, to which aversion from God is connected. Now that which is so by itself, always takes precedence of that which is so by another. Wherefore hatred of God is more grievous than other sins.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(2)-RO(1) — According to Gregory (Moral. xxv, 11), “it is one thing not to do good things, and another to hate the giver of good things, even as it is one thing to sin indeliberately, and another to sin deliberately.” This implies that to hate God, the giver of all good things, is to sin deliberately, and this is a sin against the Holy Ghost. Hence it is evident that hatred of God is chiefly a sin against the Holy Ghost, in so far as the sin against the Holy Ghost denotes a special kind of sin: and yet it is not reckoned among the kinds of sin against the Holy Ghost, because it is universally found in every kind of that sin.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(2)-RO(2) — Even unbelief is not sinful unless it be voluntary: wherefore the more voluntary it is, the more it is sinful. Now it becomes voluntary by the fact that a man hates the truth that is proposed to him. Wherefore it is evident that unbelief derives its sinfulness from hatred of God, Whose truth is the object of faith; and hence just as a cause is greater than its effect, so hatred of God is a greater sin than unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(2)-RO(3) — Not everyone who hates his punishment, hates God the author of punishments. For many hate the punishments inflicted on them, and yet they bear them patiently out of reverence for the Divine justice. Wherefore Augustine says (Confess. x) that God commands us to bear with penal evils, not to love them. On the other hand, to break out into hatred of God when He inflicts those punishments, is to hate God’s very justice, and that is a most grievous sin. Hence Gregory says (Moral. xxv, 11): “Even as sometimes it is more grievous to love sin than to do it, so is it more wicked to hate justice than, not to have done it.”

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(3)

Whether hatred of one's neighbor is always a sin?

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that hatred of one's neighbor is not always a sin. For no sin is commanded or counselled by God, according to ^{<1000>}Proverbs 8:8: "All My words are just, there is nothing wicked nor perverse in them." Now, it is written (^{<2100>}Luke 14:26):

"If any man come to Me, and hate not his father and mother... he
cannot be My disciple."

Therefore hatred of one's neighbor is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, nothing wherein we imitate God can be a sin. But it is in imitation of God that we hate certain people: for it is written (^{<810>}Romans 1:30): "Detractors, hateful to God." Therefore it is possible to hate certain people without committing a sin.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, nothing that is natural is a sin, for sin is a "wandering away from what is according to nature," according to Damascene (De Fide Orth. ii, 4,30; iv, 20). Now it is natural to a thing to hate whatever is contrary to it, and to aim at its undoing. Therefore it seems that it is not a sin to hate one's I enemy.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<1010>}1 John 2:9): "He that... hateth his brother, is in darkness." Now spiritual darkness is sin. Therefore there cannot be hatred of one's neighbor without sin.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Hatred is opposed to love, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(29)**, **A(2)**); so that hatred of a thing is evil according as the love of that thing is good. Now love is due to our neighbor in respect of what he holds from God, i.e. in respect of nature and grace, but not in respect of what he has of himself and from the devil, i.e. in respect of sin and lack of justice.

Consequently it is lawful to hate the sin in one's brother, and whatever pertains to the defect of Divine justice, but we cannot hate our brother's nature and grace without sin. Now it is part of our love for our brother that we hate the fault and the lack of good in him, since desire for another's

good is equivalent to hatred of his evil. Consequently the hatred of one's brother, if we consider it simply, is always sinful.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(3)-RO(1) — By the commandment of God (^{<1712>}Exodus 20:12) we must honor our parents — as united to us in nature and kinship. But we must hate them in so far as they prove an obstacle to our attaining the perfection of Divine justice.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(3)-RO(2) — God hates the sin which is in the detractor, not his nature: so that we can hate detractors without committing a sin.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(3)-RO(3) — Men are not opposed to us in respect of the goods which they have received from God: wherefore, in this respect, we should love them. But they are opposed to us, in so far as they show hostility towards us, and this is sinful in them. In this respect we should hate them, for we should hate in them the fact that they are hostile to us.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(4)

Whether hatred of our neighbor is the most grievous sin against our neighbor?

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that hatred of our neighbor is the most grievous sin against our neighbor. For it is written (^{<1715>}1 John 3:15): "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer." Now murder is the most grievous of sins against our neighbor. Therefore hatred is also.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, worst is opposed to best. Now the best thing we give our neighbor is love, since all other things are referable to love. Therefore hatred is the worst.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, A thing is said to be evil, because it hurts, as Augustine observes (Enchiridion xii). Now there are sins by which a man hurts his neighbor more than by hatred, e.g. theft, murder and adultery. Therefore hatred is not the most grievous sin.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(4) — Moreover, Chrysostom [*Hom. x in the Opus Imperfectum, falsely ascribed to St. John Chrysostom] commenting on ^{<1718>}Matthew 5:19, "He that shall break one of these least commandments," says: "The commandments of Moses, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not

commit adultery, count for little in their reward, but they count for much if they be disobeyed. On the other hand the commandments of Christ such as, Thou shalt not be angry, Thou shalt not desire, are reckoned great in their reward, but little in the transgression.” Now hatred is an internal movement like anger and desire. Therefore hatred of one’s brother is a less grievous sin than murder.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Sins committed against our neighbor are evil on two counts; first by reason of the disorder in the person who sins, secondly by reason of the hurt inflicted on the person sinned against. On the first count, hatred is a more grievous sin than external actions that hurt our neighbor, because hatred is a disorder of man’s will, which is the chief part of man, and wherein is the root of sin, so that if a man’s outward actions were to be inordinate, without any disorder in his will, they would not be sinful, for instance, if he were to kill a man, through ignorance or out of zeal for justice: and if there be anything sinful in a man’s outward sins against his neighbor, it is all to be traced to his inward hatred.

On the other hand, as regards the hurt inflicted on his neighbor, a man’s outward sins are worse than his inward hatred. This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(5)

Whether hatred is a capital sin?

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that hatred is a capital sin. For hatred is directly opposed to charity. Now charity is the foremost among the virtues, and the mother of all others. Therefore hatred is the chief of the capital sins, and the origin of all others.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, sins arise in us on account of the inclinations of our passions, according to ~~ROM~~ Romans 7:5:

“The passions of sins... did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.”

Now all other passions of the soul seem to arise from love and hatred, as was shown above (**P(2a), Q(25), AA(1),2**). Therefore hatred should be reckoned one of the capital sins.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, vice is a moral evil. Now hatred regards evil more than any other passion does. Therefore it seems that hatred should be reckoned a capital sin.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Gregory (Moral. xxxi) does not reckon hatred among the seven capital sins.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(84), AA(3),4**), a capital vice is one from which other vices arise most frequently. Now vice is contrary to man's nature, in as much as he is a rational animal: and when a thing acts contrary to its nature, that which is natural to it is corrupted little by little. Consequently it must first of all fail in that which is less in accordance with its nature, and last of all in that which is most in accordance with its nature, since what is first in construction is last in destruction. Now that which, first and foremost, is most natural to man, is the love of what is good, and especially love of the Divine good, and of his neighbor's good. Wherefore hatred, which is opposed to this love, is not the first but the last thing in the downfall of virtue resulting from vice: and therefore it is not a capital vice.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(5)-RO(1) — As stated in Phys. vii, text. 18, "the virtue of a thing consists in its being well disposed in accordance with its nature." Hence what is first and foremost in the virtues must be first and foremost in the natural order. Hence charity is reckoned the foremost of the virtues, and for the same reason hatred cannot be first among the vices, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(5)-RO(2) — Hatred of the evil that is contrary to one's natural good, is the first of the soul's passions, even as love of one's natural good is. But hatred of one's connatural good cannot be first, but is something last, because such like hatred is a proof of an already corrupted nature, even as love of an extraneous good.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(5)-RO(3) — Evil is twofold. One is a true evil, for the reason that it is incompatible with one's natural good, and the hatred of such an evil may have priority over the other passions. There is, however,

another which is not a true, but an apparent evil, which, namely, is a true and connatural good, and yet is reckoned evil on account of the corruption of nature: and the hatred of such an evil must needs come last. This hatred is vicious, but the former is not.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(6)

Whether hatred arises from envy?

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(6)-O(1) — It seems that hatred does not arise from envy. For envy is sorrow for another's good. Now hatred does not arise from sorrow, for, *on the contrary*, we grieve for the presence of the evil we hate. Therefore hatred does not arise from envy.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, hatred is opposed to love. Now love of our neighbor is referred to our love of God, as stated above (**Q(25)**, **A(1)**; **Q(26)**, **A(2)**). Therefore hatred of our neighbor is referred to our hatred of God. But hatred of God does not arise from envy, for we do not envy those who are very far removed from us, but rather those who seem to be near us, as the Philosopher states (Rhet. ii). Therefore hatred does not arise from envy.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, to one effect there is one cause. Now hatred is caused by anger, for Augustine says in his Rule that "anger grows into hatred." Therefore hatred does not arise from envy.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 45) that "out of envy cometh hatred."

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(6) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(5)**), hatred of his neighbor is a man's last step in the path of sin, because it is opposed to the love which he naturally has for his neighbor. Now if a man declines from that which is natural, it is because he intends to avoid that which is naturally an object to be shunned. Now every animal naturally avoids sorrow, just as it desires pleasure, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. vii, x). Accordingly just as love arises from pleasure, so does hatred arise from sorrow. For just as we are moved to love whatever gives us pleasure, in as much as for that very reason it assumes the aspect of good; so we are moved to hate whatever displeases us, in so far as for this very reason it

assumes the aspect of evil. Wherefore, since envy is sorrow for our neighbor's good, it follows that our neighbor's good becomes hateful to us, so that "out of envy cometh hatred."

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(6)-RO(1) — Since the appetitive power, like the apprehensive power, reflects on its own acts, it follows that there is a kind of circular movement in the actions of the appetitive power. And so according to the first forward course of the appetitive movement, love gives rise to desire, whence follows pleasure when one has obtained what one desired. And since the very fact of taking pleasure in the good one loves is a kind of good, it follows that pleasure causes love. And in the same way sorrow causes hatred.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(6)-RO(2) — Love and hatred are essentially different, for the object of love is good, which flows from God to creatures, wherefore love is due to God in the first place, and to our neighbor afterwards. On the other hand, hatred is of evil, which has no place in God Himself, but only in His effects, for which reason it has been stated above (**A(1)**), that God is not an object of hatred, except in so far as He is considered in relation to His effects, and consequently hatred is directed to our neighbor before being directed to God. Therefore, since envy of our neighbor is the mother of hatred of our neighbor, it becomes, in consequence, the cause of hatred towards God.

P(2b)-Q(34)-A(6)-RO(3) — Nothing prevents a thing arising from various causes in various respects, and accordingly hatred may arise both from anger and from envy. However it arises more directly from envy, which looks upon the very good of our neighbor as displeasing and therefore hateful, whereas hatred arises from anger by way of increase. For at first, through anger, we desire our neighbor's evil according to a certain measure, that is in so far as that evil has the aspect of vengeance: but afterwards, through the continuance of anger, man goes so far as absolutely to desire his neighbor's evil, which desire is part of hatred. Wherefore it is evident that hatred is caused by envy formally as regards the aspect of the object, but dispositively by anger.

QUESTION 35

OF SLOTH

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the vices opposed to the joy of charity. This joy is either about the Divine good, and then its contrary is sloth, or about our neighbor's good, and then its contrary is envy. Wherefore we must consider

(1) Sloth and

(2) Envy.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

(1) Whether sloth is a sin?

(2) Whether it is a special vice?

(3) Whether it is a mortal sin?

(4) Whether it is a capital sin?

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(1)

Whether sloth is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that sloth is not a sin. For we are neither praised nor blamed for our passions, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. ii, 5). Now sloth is a passion, since it is a kind of sorrow, according to Damascene (De Fide Orth. ii, 14), and as we stated above (**P(2a), Q(35), A(8)**). Therefore sloth is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, no bodily failing that occurs at fixed times is a sin. But sloth is like this, for Cassian says (De Instit. Monast. x, [*De Institutione Caebiorum]): “The monk is troubled with sloth chiefly about the sixth hour: it is like an intermittent fever, and inflicts the soul of

the one it lays low with burning fires at regular and fixed intervals.”
Therefore sloth is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, that which proceeds from a good root is, seemingly, no sin. Now sloth proceeds from a good root, for Cassian says (De Instit. Monast. x) that “sloth arises from the fact that we sigh at being deprived of spiritual fruit, and think that other monasteries and those which are a long way off are much better than the one we dwell in”: all of which seems to point to humility. Therefore sloth is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, all sin is to be avoided, according to Eccus. 21:2: “Flee from sins as from the face of a serpent.” Now Cassian says (De Instit. Monast. x): “Experience shows that the onslaught of sloth is not to be evaded by flight but to be conquered by resistance.” Therefore sloth is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Whatever is forbidden in Holy Writ is a sin. Now such is sloth [acedia]: for it is written (Eccus. 6:26): “Bow down thy shoulder, and bear her,” namely spiritual wisdom, “and be not grieved [acedieris] with her bands.” Therefore sloth is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Sloth, according to Damascene (De Fide Orth. ii, 14) is an oppressive sorrow, which, to wit, so weighs upon man’s mind, that he wants to do nothing; thus acid things are also cold. Hence sloth implies a certain weariness of work, as appears from a gloss on ^{<100>}Psalm 106:18, “Their soul abhorred all manner of meat,” and from the definition of some who say that sloth is a “sluggishness of the mind which neglects to begin good.”

Now this sorrow is always evil, sometimes in itself, sometimes in its effect. For sorrow is evil in itself when it is about that which is apparently evil but good in reality, even as, on the other hand, pleasure is evil if it is about that which seems to be good but is, in truth, evil. Since, then, spiritual good is a good in very truth, sorrow about spiritual good is evil in itself. And yet that sorrow also which is about a real evil, is evil in its effect, if it so oppresses man as to draw him away entirely from good deeds. Hence the Apostle (^{<100>}2 Corinthians 2:7) did not wish those who repented to be “swallowed up with overmuch sorrow.”

Accordingly, since sloth, as we understand it here, denotes sorrow for spiritual good, it is evil on two counts, both in itself and in point of its effect. Consequently it is a sin, for by sin we mean an evil movement of the appetite, as appears from what has been said above (**Q(10)**, **A(2)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(74)**, **A(4)**).

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(1)-RO(1) — Passions are not sinful in themselves; but they are blameworthy in so far as they are applied to something evil, just as they deserve praise in so far as they are applied to something good. Wherefore sorrow, in itself, calls neither for praise nor for blame: whereas moderate sorrow for evil calls for praise, while sorrow for good, and again immoderate sorrow for evil, call for blame. It is in this sense that sloth is said to be a sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(1)-RO(2) — The passions of the sensitive appetite may either be venial sins in themselves, or incline the soul to mortal sin. And since the sensitive appetite has a bodily organ, it follows that on account of some bodily transmutation a man becomes apt to commit some particular sin. Hence it may happen that certain sins may become more insistent, through certain bodily transmutations occurring at certain fixed times. Now all bodily effects, of themselves, dispose one to sorrow; and thus it is that those who fast are harassed by sloth towards mid-day, when they begin to feel the want of food, and to be parched by the sun's heat.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(1)-RO(3) — It is a sign of humility if a man does not think too much of himself, through observing his own faults; but if a man contemns the good things he has received from God, this, far from being a proof of humility, shows him to be ungrateful: and from such like contempt results sloth, because we sorrow for things that we reckon evil and worthless. Accordingly we ought to think much of the goods of others, in such a way as not to disparage those we have received ourselves, because if we did they would give us sorrow.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(1)-RO(4) — Sin is ever to be shunned, but the assaults of sin should be overcome, sometimes by flight, sometimes by resistance; by flight when a continued thought increases the incentive to sin, as in lust; for which reason it is written (~~468~~ 1 Corinthians 6:18): "Fly fornication"; by resistance, when perseverance in the thought diminishes the incentive to sin, which incentive arises from some trivial consideration. This is the case

with sloth, because the more we think about spiritual goods, the more pleasing they become to us, and forthwith sloth dies away.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(2)

Whether sloth is a special vice?

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that sloth is not a special vice. For that which is common to all vices does not constitute a special kind of vice. But every vice makes a man sorrowful about the opposite spiritual good: for the lustful man is sorrowful about the good of continence, and the glutton about the good of abstinence. Since then sloth is sorrow for spiritual good, as stated above (**A(1)**), it seems that sloth is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, sloth, through being a kind of sorrow, is opposed to joy. Now joy is not accounted one special virtue. Therefore sloth should not be reckoned a special vice.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, since spiritual good is a general kind of object, which virtue seeks, and vice shuns, it does not constitute a special virtue or vice, unless it be determined by some addition. Now nothing, seemingly, except toil, can determine it to sloth, if this be a special vice; because the reason why a man shuns spiritual goods, is that they are toilsome, wherefore sloth is a kind of weariness: while dislike of toil, and love of bodily repose seem to be due to the same cause, viz. idleness. Hence sloth would be nothing but laziness, which seems untrue, for idleness is opposed to carefulness, whereas sloth is opposed to joy. Therefore sloth is not a special vice.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45) distinguishes sloth from the other vices. Therefore it is a special vice.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Since sloth is sorrow for spiritual good, if we take spiritual good in a general way, sloth will not be a special vice, because, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(71)**, **A(1)**), every vice shuns the spiritual good of its opposite virtue. Again it cannot be said that sloth is a special vice, in so far as it shuns spiritual good, as toilsome, or troublesome to the body, or as a hindrance to the body's pleasure, for this

again would not sever sloth from carnal vices, whereby a man seeks bodily comfort and pleasure.

Wherefore we must say that a certain order exists among spiritual goods, since all the spiritual goods that are in the acts of each virtue are directed to one spiritual good, which is the Divine good, about which there is a special virtue, viz. charity. Hence it is proper to each virtue to rejoice in its own spiritual good, which consists in its own act, while it belongs specially to charity to have that spiritual joy whereby one rejoices in the Divine good. In like manner the sorrow whereby one is displeased at the spiritual good which is in each act of virtue, belongs, not to any special vice, but to every vice, but sorrow in the Divine good about which charity rejoices, belongs to a special vice, which is called sloth. This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(3)

Whether sloth is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that sloth is not a mortal sin. For every mortal sin is contrary to a precept of the Divine Law. But sloth seems contrary to no precept, as one may see by going through the precepts of the Decalogue. Therefore sloth is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, in the same genus, a sin of deed is no less grievous than a sin of thought. Now it is not a mortal sin to refrain in deed from some spiritual good which leads to God, else it would be a mortal sin not to observe the counsels. Therefore it is not a mortal sin to refrain in thought from such like spiritual works. Therefore sloth is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, no mortal sin is to be found in a perfect man. But sloth is to be found in a perfect man: for Cassian says (De Instit. Caenob. x, 1) that “sloth is well known to the solitary, and is a most vexatious and persistent foe to the hermit.” Therefore sloth is not always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~1~~2 Corinthians 7:20): “The sorrow of the world worketh death.” But such is sloth; for it is not

sorrow “according to God,” which is contrasted with sorrow of the world. Therefore it is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(3) — *I answer that,* As stated above (**P(2a), Q(88), AA(1),2**), mortal sin is so called because it destroys the spiritual life which is the effect of charity, whereby God dwells in us. Wherefore any sin which by its very nature is contrary to charity is a mortal sin by reason of its genus. And such is sloth, because the proper effect of charity is joy in God, as stated above (**Q(28), A(1)**), while sloth is sorrow about spiritual good in as much as it is a Divine good. Therefore sloth is a mortal sin in respect of its genus. But it must be observed with regard to all sins that are mortal in respect of their genus, that they are not mortal, save when they attain to their perfection. Because the consummation of sin is in the consent of reason: for we are speaking now of human sins consisting in human acts, the principle of which is the reason. Wherefore if the sin be a mere beginning of sin in the sensuality alone, without attaining to the consent of reason, it is a venial sin on account of the imperfection of the act. Thus in the genus of adultery, the concupiscence that goes no further than the sensuality is a venial sin, whereas if it reach to the consent of reason, it is a mortal sin. So too, the movement of sloth is sometimes in the sensuality alone, by reason of the opposition of the flesh to the spirit, and then it is a venial sin; whereas sometimes it reaches to the reason, which consents in the dislike, horror and detestation of the Divine good, on account of the flesh utterly prevailing over the spirit. In this case it is evident that sloth is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(3)-RO(1) — Sloth is opposed to the precept about hallowing the Sabbath day. For this precept, in so far as it is a moral precept, implicitly commands the mind to rest in God: and sorrow of the mind about the Divine good is contrary thereto.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(3)-RO(2) — Sloth is not an aversion of the mind from any spiritual good, but from the Divine good, to which the mind is obliged to adhere. Wherefore if a man is sorry because someone forces him to do acts of virtue that he is not bound to do, this is not a sin of sloth; but when he is sorry to have to do something for God’s sake.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(3)-RO(3) — Imperfect movements of sloth are to be found in holy men, but they do not reach to the consent of reason.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(4)

Whether sloth should be accounted a capital vice?

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that sloth ought not to be accounted a capital vice. For a capital vice is one that moves a man to sinful acts, as stated above (**Q(34)**, **A(5)**). Now sloth does not move one to action, but on the contrary withdraws one from it. Therefore it should not be accounted a capital sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, a capital sin is one to which daughters are assigned. Now Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45) assigns six daughters to sloth, viz. “malice, spite, faint-heartedness, despair, sluggishness in regard to the commandments, wandering of the mind after unlawful things.” Now these do not seem in reality to arise from sloth. For “spite” is, seemingly the same as hatred, which arises from envy, as stated above (**Q(34)**, **A(6)**); “malice” is a genus which contains all vices, and, in like manner, a “wandering” of the mind after unlawful things is to be found in every vice; “sluggishness” about the commandments seems to be the same as sloth, while “faint-heartedness” and “despair” may arise from any sin. Therefore sloth is not rightly accounted a capital sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, Isidore distinguishes the vice of sloth from the vice of sorrow, saying (De Summo Bono ii, 37) that in so far as a man shirks his duty because it is distasteful and burdensome, it is sorrow, and in so far as he is inclined to undue repose, it is sloth: and of sorrow he says that it gives rise to “spite, faint-heartedness, bitterness, despair,” whereas he states that from sloth seven things arise, viz. “idleness, drowsiness, uneasiness of the mind, restlessness of the body, instability, loquacity, curiosity.” Therefore it seems that either Gregory or Isidore has wrongly assigned sloth as a capital sin together with its daughters.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The same Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45) states that sloth is a capital sin, and has the daughters aforesaid.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(84)**, **AA(3),4**), a capital vice is one which easily gives rise to others as being their final cause. Now just as we do many things on account of pleasure, both in order to obtain it, and through being moved to do something under

the impulse of pleasure, so again we do many things on account of sorrow, either that we may avoid it, or through being exasperated into doing something under pressure thereof. Wherefore, since sloth is a kind of sorrow, as stated above (**A(2)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(85)**, **A(8)**), it is fittingly reckoned a capital sin.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(4)-RO(1) — Sloth by weighing on the mind, hinders us from doing things that cause sorrow: nevertheless it induces the mind to do certain things, either because they are in harmony with sorrow, such as weeping, or because they are a means of avoiding sorrow.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(4)-RO(2) — Gregory fittingly assigns the daughters of sloth. For since, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. viii, 5,6) “no man can be a long time in company with what is painful and unpleasant,” it follows that something arises from sorrow in two ways: first, that man shuns whatever causes sorrow; secondly, that he passes to other things that give him pleasure: thus those who find no joy in spiritual pleasures, have recourse to pleasures of the body, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. x, 6). Now in the avoidance of sorrow the order observed is that man at first flies from unpleasant objects, and secondly he even struggles against such things as cause sorrow. Now spiritual goods which are the object of the sorrow of sloth, are both end and means. Avoidance of the end is the result of “despair,” while avoidance of those goods which are the means to the end, in matters of difficulty which come under the counsels, is the effect of “faint-heartedness,” and in matters of common righteousness, is the effect of “sluggishness about the commandments.” The struggle against spiritual goods that cause sorrow is sometimes with men who lead others to spiritual goods, and this is called “spite”; and sometimes it extends to the spiritual goods themselves, when a man goes so far as to detest them, and this is properly called “malice.” In so far as a man has recourse to eternal objects of pleasure, the daughter of sloth is called “wandering after unlawful things.” From this it is clear how to reply to the objections against each of the daughters: for “malice” does not denote here that which is generic to all vices, but must be understood as explained. Nor is “spite” taken as synonymous with hatred, but for a kind of indignation, as stated above: and the same applies to the others.

P(2b)-Q(35)-A(4)-RO(3) — This distinction between sorrow and sloth is also given by Cassian (*De Instit. Caenob.* x, 1). But Gregory more fittingly (*Moral.* xxxi, 45) calls sloth a kind of sorrow, because, as stated above (**A(2)**), sorrow is not a distinct vice, in so far as a man shirks a distasteful and burdensome work, or sorrows on account of any other cause whatever, but only in so far as he is sorry on account of the Divine good, which sorrow belongs essentially to sloth; since sloth seeks undue rest in so far as it spurns the Divine good. Moreover the things which Isidore reckons to arise from sloth and sorrow, are reduced to those mentioned by Gregory: for “bitterness” which Isidore states to be the result of sorrow, is an effect of “spite.” “Idleness” and “drowsiness” are reduced to “sluggishness about the precepts”: for some are idle and omit them altogether, while others are drowsy and fulfil them with negligence. All the other five which he reckons as effects of sloth, belong to the “wandering of the mind after unlawful things.” This tendency to wander, if it reside in the mind itself that is desirous of rushing after various things without rhyme or reason, is called “uneasiness of the mind,” but if it pertains to the imaginative power, it is called “curiosity”; if it affect the speech it is called “loquacity”; and in so far as it affects a body that changes place, it is called “restlessness of the body,” when, to wit, a man shows the unsteadiness of his mind, by the inordinate movements of members of his body; while if it causes the body to move from one place to another, it is called “instability”; or “instability” may denote changeableness of purpose.

QUESTION 36

OF ENVY

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider envy, and under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) What is envy?
- (2) Whether it is a sin?
- (3) Whether it is a mortal sin?
- (4) Whether it is a capital sin, and which are its daughters?

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(1)

Whether envy is a kind of sorrow?

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that envy is not a kind of sorrow. For the object of envy is a good, for Gregory says (Moral. v, 46) of the envious man that “self-inflicted pain wounds the pining spirit, which is racked by the prosperity of another.” Therefore envy is not a kind of sorrow.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, likeness is a cause, not of sorrow but rather of pleasure. But likeness is a cause of envy: for the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 10): “Men are envious of such as are like them in genus, in knowledge, in stature, in habit, or in reputation.” Therefore envy is not a kind of sorrow.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, sorrow is caused by a defect, wherefore those who are in great defect are inclined to sorrow, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(47), A(3)**) when we were treating of the passions. Now those who lack little, and who love honors, and who are considered wise, are envious, according to the Philosopher (Rhet. ii, 10). Therefore envy is not a kind of sorrow.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, sorrow is opposed to pleasure. Now opposite effects have not one and the same cause. Therefore, since the recollection of goods once possessed is a cause of pleasure, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(32), A(3)**) it will not be a cause of sorrow. But it is a cause of envy; for the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 10) that “we envy those who have or have had things that befitted ourselves, or which we possessed at some time.” Therefore sloth is not a kind of sorrow.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Damascene (De Fide Orth. ii, 14) calls envy a species of sorrow, and says that “envy is sorrow for another’s good.”

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(1) — *I answer that*, The object of a man’s sorrow is his own evil. Now it may happen that another’s good is apprehended as one’s own evil, and in this way sorrow can be about another’s good. But this happens in two ways: first, when a man is sorry about another’s good, in so far as it threatens to be an occasion of harm to himself, as when a man grieves for his enemy’s prosperity, for fear lest he may do him some harm: such like sorrow is not envy, but rather an effect of fear, as the Philosopher states (Rhet. ii, 9).

Secondly, another’s good may be reckoned as being one’s own evil, in so far as it conduces to the lessening of one’s own good name or excellence. It is in this way that envy grieves for another’s good: and consequently men are envious of those goods in which a good name consists, and about which men like to be honored and esteemed, as the Philosopher remarks (Rhet. ii, 10).

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(1)-RO(1) — Nothing hinders what is good for one from being reckoned as evil for another: and in this way it is possible for sorrow to be about good, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(1)-RO(2) — Since envy is about another’s good name in so far as it diminishes the good name a man desires to have, it follows that a man is envious of those only whom he wishes to rival or surpass in reputation. But this does not apply to people who are far removed from one another: for no man, unless he be out of his mind, endeavors to rival or surpass in reputation those who are far above him. Thus a commoner does not envy the king, nor does the king envy a commoner whom he is far

above. Wherefore a man envies not those who are far removed from him, whether in place, time, or station, but those who are near him, and whom he strives to rival or surpass. For it is against our will that these should be in better repute than we are, and that gives rise to sorrow. On the other hand, likeness causes pleasure in so far as it is in agreement with the will.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(1)-RO(3) — A man does not strive for mastery in matters where he is very deficient; so that he does not envy one who surpasses him in such matters, unless he surpass him by little, for then it seems to him that this is not beyond him, and so he makes an effort; wherefore, if his effort fails through the other's reputation surpassing his, he grieves. Hence it is that those who love to be honored are more envious; and in like manner the faint-hearted are envious, because all things are great to them, and whatever good may befall another, they reckon that they themselves have been bested in something great. Hence it is written (^{<RRP>}Job 5:2): "Envy slayeth the little one," and Gregory says (Moral. v, 46) that "we can envy those only whom we think better in some respect than ourselves."

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(1)-RO(4) — Recollection of past goods in so far as we have had them, causes pleasure; in so far as we have lost them, causes sorrow; and in so far as others have them, causes envy, because that, above all, seems to belittle our reputation. Hence the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii) that the old envy the young, and those who have spent much in order to get something, envy those who have got it by spending little, because they grieve that they have lost their goods, and that others have acquired goods.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(2)

Whether envy is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that envy is not a sin. For Jerome says to Laeta about the education of her daughter (Ep. cvii): "Let her have companions, so that she may learn together with them, envy them, and be nettled when they are praised." But no one should be advised to commit a sin. Therefore envy is not a sin

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(2)-O(1) — Further, “Envy is sorrow for another’s good,” as Damascene says (De Fide Orth. ii, 14). But this is sometimes praiseworthy: for it is written (~~191b~~ Proverbs 29:2): “When the wicked shall bear rule, the people shall mourn.” Therefore envy is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, envy denotes a kind of zeal. But there is a good zeal, according to ~~191b~~ Psalm 68:10: “The zeal of Thy house hath eaten me up.” Therefore envy is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, punishment is condivided with fault. But envy is a kind of punishment: for Gregory says (Moral. v, 46): “When the foul sore of envy corrupts the vanquished heart, the very exterior itself shows how forcibly the mind is urged by madness. For paleness seizes the complexion, the eyes are weighed down, the spirit is inflamed, while the limbs are chilled, there is frenzy in the heart, there is gnashing with the teeth.” Therefore envy is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~191b~~ Galatians 5:26):

“Let us not be made desirous of vainglory, provoking one another, envying one another.”

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), envy is sorrow for another’s good. Now this sorrow may come about in four ways. First, when a man grieves for another’s good, through fear that it may cause harm either to himself, or to some other goods. This sorrow is not envy, as stated above (**A(1)**), and may be void of sin. Hence Gregory says (Moral. xxii, 11): “It very often happens that without charity being lost, both the destruction of an enemy rejoices us, and again his glory, without any sin of envy, saddens us, since, when he falls, we believe that some are deservedly set up, and when he prospers, we dread lest many suffer unjustly.”

Secondly, we may grieve over another’s good, not because he has it, but because the good which he has, we have not: and this, properly speaking, is zeal, as the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 9). And if this zeal be about virtuous goods, it is praiseworthy, according to ~~191b~~ 1 Corinthians 14:1: “Be zealous for spiritual gifts”: while, if it be about temporal goods, it may be either sinful or sinless. Thirdly, one may grieve over another’s good, because he who happens to have that good is unworthy of it. Such sorrow

as this cannot be occasioned by virtuous goods, which make a man righteous, but, as the Philosopher states, is about riches, and those things which can accrue to the worthy and the unworthy; and he calls this sorrow {nemesis} [*The nearest equivalent is “indignation.” The use of the word “nemesis” to signify “revenge” does not represent the original Greek.], saying that it belongs to good morals. But he says this because he considered temporal goods in themselves, in so far as they may seem great to those who look not to eternal goods: whereas, according to the teaching of faith, temporal goods that accrue to those who are unworthy, are so disposed according to God’s just ordinance, either for the correction of those men, or for their condemnation, and such goods are as nothing in comparison with the goods to come, which are prepared for good men. Wherefore sorrow of this kind is forbidden in Holy Writ, according to ~~P(2b)~~ Psalm 36:1: “Be not emulous of evil doers, nor envy them that work iniquity,” and elsewhere (~~P(2b)~~ Psalm 72:2,3):

“My steps had well nigh slipped, for I was envious of the wicked, when I saw the prosperity of sinners [*Douay: ‘because I had a zeal on occasion of the wicked, seeing the prosperity of sinners’].”

Fourthly, we grieve over a man’s good, in so far as his good surpasses ours; this is envy properly speaking, and is always sinful, as also the Philosopher states (Rhet. ii, 10), because to do so is to grieve over what should make us rejoice, viz. over our neighbor’s good.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(2)-RO(1) — Envy there denotes the zeal with which we ought to strive to progress with those who are better than we are.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(2)-RO(2) — This argument considers sorrow for another’s good in the first sense given above.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(2)-RO(3) — Envy differs from zeal, as stated above. Hence a certain zeal may be good, whereas envy is always evil.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(2)-RO(4) — Nothing hinders a sin from being penal accidentally, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(87)**, **A(2)**) when we were treating of sins.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(3)

Whether envy is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that envy is not a mortal sin. For since envy is a kind of sorrow, it is a passion of the sensitive appetite. Now there is no mortal sin in the sensuality, but only in the reason, as Augustine declares (De Trin. xii, 12) [**Cf. P(2a), Q(74), A(4)*]. Therefore envy is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, there cannot be mortal sin in infants. But envy can be in them, for Augustine says (Confess. i): “I myself have seen and known even a baby envious, it could not speak, yet it turned pale and looked bitterly on its foster-brother.” Therefore envy is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, every mortal sin is contrary to some virtue. But envy is contrary, not to a virtue but to {nemesis}, which is a passion, according to the Philosopher (Rhet. ii, 9). Therefore envy is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~ROM~~ Job 5:2): “Envy slayeth the little one.” Now nothing slays spiritually, except mortal sin. Therefore envy is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Envy is a mortal sin, in respect of its genus. For the genus of a sin is taken from its object; and envy according to the aspect of its object is contrary to charity, whence the soul derives its spiritual life, according to ~~GRH~~ 1 John 3:14:

“We know that we have passed from death to life,
because we love the brethren.”

Now the object both of charity and of envy is our neighbor’s good, but by contrary movements, since charity rejoices in our neighbor’s good, while envy grieves over it, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore it is evident that envy is a mortal sin in respect of its genus.

Nevertheless, as stated above (**Q(35), A(4); P(2a), Q(72), A(5)**, ad 1), in every kind of mortal sin we find certain imperfect movements in the

sensuality, which are venial sins: such are the first movement of concupiscence, in the genus of adultery, and the first movement of anger, in the genus of murder, and so in the genus of envy we find sometimes even in perfect men certain first movements, which are venial sins.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(3)-RO(1) — The movement of envy in so far as it is a passion of the sensuality, is an imperfect thing in the genus of human acts, the principle of which is the reason, so that envy of that kind is not a mortal sin. The same applies to the envy of little children who have not the use of reason: wherefore the Reply to the Second Objection is manifest.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(3)-RO(3) — According to the Philosopher (Rhet. ii, 9), envy is contrary both to {nemesis} and to pity, but for different reasons. For it is directly contrary to pity, their principal objects being contrary to one another, since the envious man grieves over his neighbor's good, whereas the pitiful man grieves over his neighbor's evil, so that the envious have no pity, as he states in the same passage, nor is the pitiful man envious. On the other hand, envy is contrary to {nemesis} on the part of the man whose good grieves the envious man, for {nemesis} is sorrow for the good of the undeserving according to ^{497B}Psalm 72:3: "I was envious of the wicked, when I saw the prosperity of sinners" [*Douay: 'because I had a zeal on occasion of the wicked, seeing the prosperity of sinners'], whereas the envious grieves over the good of those who are deserving of it. Hence it is clear that the former contrariety is more direct than the latter. Now pity is a virtue, and an effect proper to charity: so that envy is contrary to pity and charity.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(4)

Whether envy is a capital vice?

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that envy is not a capital vice. For the capital vices are distinct from their daughters. Now envy is the daughter of vainglory; for the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 10) that "those who love honor and glory are more envious." Therefore envy is not a capital vice.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the capital vices seem to be less grave than the other vices which arise from them. For Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 45): “The leading vices seem to worm their way into the deceived mind under some kind of pretext, but those which follow them provoke the soul to all kinds of outrage, and confuse the mind with their wild outcry.” Now envy is seemingly a most grave sin, for Gregory says (Moral. v, 46): “Though in every evil thing that is done, the venom of our old enemy is infused into the heart of man, yet in this wickedness the serpent stirs his whole bowels and discharges the bane of spite fitted to enter deep into the mind.” Therefore envy is not a capital sin.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, it seems that its daughters are unfittingly assigned by Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45), who says that from envy arise “hatred, tale-bearing, detraction, joy at our neighbor’s misfortunes, and grief for his prosperity.” For joy at our neighbor’s misfortunes and grief for his prosperity seem to be the same as envy, as appears from what has been said above (**A(3)**). Therefore these should not be assigned as daughters of envy.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(4) — On the contrary stands the authority of Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45) who states that envy is a capital sin and assigns the aforesaid daughters thereto.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Just as sloth is grief for a Divine spiritual good, so envy is grief for our neighbor’s good. Now it has been stated above (**Q(35)**, **A(4)**) that sloth is a capital vice for the reason that it incites man to do certain things, with the purpose either of avoiding sorrow or of satisfying its demands. Wherefore envy is accounted a capital vice for the same reason.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(4)-RO(1) — As Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 45), “the capital vices are so closely akin to one another that one springs from the other. For the first offspring of pride is vainglory, which by corrupting the mind it occupies begets envy, since while it craves for the power of an empty name, it repines for fear lest another should acquire that power.” Consequently the notion of a capital vice does not exclude its originating from another vice, but it demands that it should have some principal reason for being itself the origin of several kinds of sin. However it is perhaps because envy manifestly arises from vainglory, that it is not

reckoned a capital sin, either by Isidore (De Summo Bono) or by Cassian (De Instit. Caenob. v, 1).

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(4)-RO(2) — It does not follow from the passage quoted that envy is the greatest of sins, but that when the devil tempts us to envy, he is enticing us to that which has its chief place in his heart, for as quoted further on in the same passage, “by the envy of the devil, death came into the world” (Wis. 2:24).

There is, however, a kind of envy which is accounted among the most grievous sins, viz. envy of another’s spiritual good, which envy is a sorrow for the increase of God’s grace, and not merely for our neighbor’s good. Hence it is accounted a sin against the Holy Ghost, because thereby a man envies, as it were, the Holy Ghost Himself, Who is glorified in His works.

P(2b)-Q(36)-A(4)-RO(3) — The number of envy’s daughters may be understood for the reason that in the struggle aroused by envy there is something by way of beginning, something by way of middle, and something by way of term. The beginning is that a man strives to lower another’s reputation, and this either secretly, and then we have “tale-bearing,” or openly, and then we have “detraction.” The middle consists in the fact that when a man aims at defaming another, he is either able to do so, and then we have “joy at another’s misfortune,” or he is unable, and then we have “grief at another’s prosperity.” The term is hatred itself, because just as good which delights causes love, so does sorrow cause hatred, as stated above (**Q(34), A(6)**). Grief at another’s prosperity is in one way the very same as envy, when, to Wit, a man grieves over another’s prosperity, in so far as it gives the latter a good name, but in another way it is a daughter of envy, in so far as the envious man sees his neighbor prosper notwithstanding his efforts to prevent it. On the other hand, “joy at another’s misfortune” is not directly the same as envy, but is a result thereof, because grief over our neighbor’s good which is envy, gives rise to joy in his evil.

QUESTION 37

OF DISCORD, WHICH IS CONTRARY TO PEACE

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the sins contrary to peace, and first we shall consider discord which is in the heart, secondly contention, which is on the lips, thirdly, those things which consist in deeds, viz. schism, quarrelling, war, and sedition. Under the first head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether discord is a sin?
- (2) Whether it is a daughter of vainglory?

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(1)

Whether discord is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that discord is not a sin. For to disaccord with man is to sever oneself from another's will. But this does not seem to be a sin, because God's will alone, and not our neighbor's, is the rule of our own will. Therefore discord is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, whoever induces another to sin, sins also himself. But it appears not to be a sin to incite others to discord, for it is written (^{<4216>}Acts 23:6) that Paul, knowing that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, cried out in the council: "Men brethren, I am a Pharisee, the son of Pharisees, concerning the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question. And when he had so said, there arose a dissension between the Pharisees and the Sadducees." Therefore discord is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, sin, especially mortal sin, is not to be found in a holy man. But discord is to be found even among holy men, for it is written (^{<4159>}Acts 15:39): "There arose a dissension" between Paul and Barnabas, "so that they departed one from another." Therefore discord is not a sin. and least of all a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, “Dissensions,” that is, discords, are reckoned among the works of the flesh (^{ⓀⓁⓂ}Galatians 5:20), of which it is said afterwards (^{ⓀⓁⓂ}Galatians 5:21) that “they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God.” Now nothing, save mortal sin, excludes man from the kingdom of God. Therefore discord is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Discord is opposed to concord. Now, as stated above (**Q(29), AA(1),3**) concord results from charity, in as much as charity directs many hearts together to one thing, which is chiefly the Divine good, secondarily, the good of our neighbor. Wherefore discord is a sin, in so far as it is opposed to this concord.

But it must be observed that this concord is destroyed by discord in two ways: first, directly; secondly, accidentally. Now, human acts and movements are said to be direct when they are according to one’s intention. Wherefore a man directly disaccords with his neighbor, when he knowingly and intentionally dissents from the Divine good and his neighbor’s good, to which he ought to consent. This is a mortal sin in respect of its genus, because it is contrary to charity, although the first movements of such discord are venial sins by reason of their being imperfect acts.

The accidental in human acts is that which occurs beside the intention. Hence when several intend a good pertaining to God’s honor, or our neighbor’s profit, while one deems a certain thing good, and another thinks contrariwise, the discord is in this case accidentally contrary to the Divine good or that of our neighbor. Such like discord is neither sinful nor against charity, unless it be accompanied by an error about things necessary to salvation, or by undue obstinacy, since it has also been stated above (**Q(29), AA(1),3**, ad 2) that the concord which is an effect of charity, is union of wills not of opinions. It follows from this that discord is sometimes the sin of one party only, for instance, when one wills a good which the other knowingly resists; while sometimes it implies sin in both parties, as when each dissents from the other’s good, and loves his own.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(1)-RO(1) — One man’s will considered in itself is not the rule of another man’s will; but in so far as our neighbor’s will adheres to God’s will, it becomes in consequence, a rule regulated according to its

proper measure. Wherefore it is a sin to disaccord with such a will, because by that very fact one disaccords with the Divine rule.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(1)-RO(2) — Just as a man's will that adheres to God is a right rule, to disaccord with which is a sin, so too a man's will that is opposed to God is a perverse rule, to disaccord with which is good. Hence to cause a discord, whereby a good concord resulting from charity is destroyed, is a grave sin: wherefore it is written (²¹⁸⁶Proverbs 6:16):

“Six things there are, which the Lord hateth, and the seventh His soul detesteth,”

which seventh is stated (²¹⁸⁹Proverbs 6:19) to be “him that soweth discord among brethren.” On the other hand, to arouse a discord whereby an evil concord (i.e. concord in an evil will) is destroyed, is praiseworthy. In this way Paul was to be commended for sowing discord among those who concorded together in evil, because Our Lord also said of Himself (²¹⁸⁸Matthew 10:34):

“I came not to send peace, but the sword.”

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(1)-RO(3) — The discord between Paul and Barnabas was accidental and not direct: because each intended some good, yet the one thought one thing good, while the other thought something else, which was owing to human deficiency: for that controversy was not about things necessary to salvation. Moreover all this was ordained by Divine providence, on account of the good which would ensue.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(2)

Whether discord is a daughter of vainglory?

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that discord is not a daughter of vainglory. For anger is a vice distinct from vainglory. Now discord is apparently the daughter of anger, according to (²¹⁵⁸Proverbs 15:18: “A passionate man stirreth up strifes.” Therefore it is not a daughter of vainglory.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, Augustine expounding the words of (²¹⁷⁹John 7:39, “As yet the Spirit was not given,” says (Tract. xxxii) “Malice

severs, charity unites.” Now discord is merely a separation of wills. Therefore discord arises from malice, i.e. envy, rather than from vainglory.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, whatever gives rise to many evils, would seem to be a capital vice. Now such is discord, because Jerome in commenting on ⁴¹⁰²Matthew 12:25, “Every kingdom divided against itself shall be made desolate,” says: “Just as concord makes small things thrive, so discord brings the greatest things to ruin.” Therefore discord should itself be reckoned a capital vice, rather than a daughter of vainglory.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(2) — On the contrary stands the authority of Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45).

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Discord denotes a certain disunion of wills, in so far, to wit, as one man’s will holds fast to one thing, while the other man’s will holds fast to something else. Now if a man’s will holds fast to its own ground, this is due to the act that he prefers what is his own to that which belongs to others, and if he do this inordinately, it is due to pride and vainglory. Therefore discord, whereby a man holds to his own way of thinking, and departs from that of others, is reckoned to be a daughter of vainglory.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(2)-RO(1) — Strife is not the same as discord, for strife consists in external deeds, wherefore it is becoming that it should arise from anger, which incites the mind to hurt one’s neighbor; whereas discord consists in a divergence in the movements of wills, which arises from pride or vainglory, for the reason given above.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(2)-RO(2) — In discord we may consider that which is the term “wherefrom,” i.e. another’s will from which we recede, and in this respect it arises from envy; and again we may consider that which is the term “whither,” i.e. something of our own to which we cling, and in this respect it is caused by vainglory. And since in every moment the term “whither” is more important than the term “wherefrom” (because the end is of more account than the beginning), discord is accounted a daughter of vainglory rather than of envy, though it may arise from both for different reasons, as stated.

P(2b)-Q(37)-A(2)-RO(3) — The reason why concord makes small things thrive, while discord brings the greatest to ruin, is because “the more

united a force is, the stronger it is, while the more disunited it is the weaker it becomes” (De Causis xvii). Hence it is evident that this is part of the proper effect of discord which is a disunion of wills, and in no way indicates that other vices arise from discord, as though it were a capital vice.

QUESTION 38

OF CONTENTION

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider contention, in respect of which there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether contention is a mortal sin?
- (2) Whether it is a daughter of vainglory?

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(1)

Whether contention is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that contention is not a mortal sin. For there is no mortal sin in spiritual men: and yet contention is to be found in them, according to ^{<1222>}Luke 22:24: “And there was also a strife amongst” the disciples of Jesus, “which of them should... be the greatest.” Therefore contention is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, no well disposed man should be pleased that his neighbor commit a mortal sin. But the Apostle says (^{<3017>}Philippians 1:17): “Some out of contention preach Christ,” and afterwards he says (^{<3018>}Philippians 1:18): “In this also I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.” Therefore contention is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, it happens that people contend either in the courts or in disputations, without any spiteful purpose, and with a good intention, as, for example, those who contend by disputing with heretics. Hence a gloss on ^{<1141>}1 Kings 14:1, “It came to pass one day,” etc. says: “Catholics do not raise contentions with heretics, unless they are first challenged to dispute.” Therefore contention is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, Job seems to have contended with God, according to ^{<339B>}Job 39:32: “Shall he that contendeth with God be so

easily silenced?” And yet Job was not guilty of mortal sin, since the Lord said of him (^{<RB>}Job 42:7): “You have not spoken the thing that is right before me, as my servant Job hath.” Therefore contention is not always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is against the precept of the Apostle who says (^{<RB>}2 Timothy 2:14): “Contend not in words.” Moreover (^{<RB>}Galatians 5:20) contention is included among the works of the flesh, and as stated there (^{<RB>}Galatians 5:21) “they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God.” Now whatever excludes a man from the kingdom of God and is against a precept, is a mortal sin. Therefore contention is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(1) — *I answer that*, To contend is to tend against some one. Wherefore just as discord denotes a contrariety of wills, so contention signifies contrariety of speech. For this reason when a man contrasts various contrary things in a speech, this is called “contentio,” which Tully calls one of the rhetorical colors (De Rhet. ad Heren. iv), where he says that “it consists in developing a speech from contrary things,” for instance: “Adulation has a pleasant beginning, and a most bitter end.”

Now contrariety of speech may be looked at in two ways: first with regard to the intention of the contentious party, secondly, with regard to the manner of contending. As to the intention, we must consider whether he contends against the truth, and then he is to be blamed, or against falsehood, and then he should be praised. As to the manner, we must consider whether his manner of contending is in keeping with the persons and the matter in dispute, for then it would be praiseworthy, hence Tully says (De Rhet. ad Heren. iii) that “contention is a sharp speech suitable for proof and refutation” — or whether it exceeds the demands of the persons and matter in dispute, in which case it is blameworthy.

Accordingly if we take contention as denoting a disclaimer of the truth and an inordinate manner, it is a mortal sin. Thus Ambrose [^{<RB>}*Cf. Gloss. Ord. in ^{<RB>}Romans 1:29] defines contention: “Contention is a disclaimer of the truth with clamorous confidence.” If, however, contention denote a disavowal of what is false, with the proper measure of acrimony, it is praiseworthy: whereas, if it denote a disavowal of falsehood, together with an inordinate manner, it can be a venial sin, unless the contention be

conducted so inordinately, as to give scandal to others. Hence the Apostle after saying (³⁸¹⁴2 Timothy 2:14):

“Contend not in words,” adds, “for it is to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers.”

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(1)-RO(1) — The disciples of Christ contended together, not with the intention of disclaiming the truth, since each one stood up for what he thought was true. Yet there was inordinateness in their contention, because they contended about a matter which they ought not to have contended about, viz. the primacy of honor; for they were not spiritual men as yet, as a gloss says on the same passage; and for this reason Our Lord checked them.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(1)-RO(2) — Those who preached Christ “out of contention,” were to be blamed, because, although they did not gainsay the truth of faith, but preached it, yet they did gainsay the truth, by the fact that they thought they would “raise affliction” to the Apostle who was preaching the truth of faith. Hence the Apostle rejoiced not in their contention, but in the fruit that would result therefrom, namely that Christ would be made known — since evil is sometimes the occasion of good results.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(1)-RO(3) — Contention is complete and is a mortal sin when, in contending before a judge, a man gainsays the truth of justice, or in a disputation, intends to impugn the true doctrine. In this sense Catholics do not contend against heretics, but the reverse. But when, whether in court or in a disputation, it is incomplete, i.e. in respect of the acrimony of speech, it is not always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(1)-RO(4) — Contention here denotes an ordinary dispute. For Job had said (³⁸¹³13:3): “I will speak to the Almighty, and I desire to reason with God”: yet he intended not to impugn the truth, but to defend it, and in seeking the truth thus, he had no wish to be inordinate in mind or in speech.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(2)

Whether contention is a daughter of vainglory?

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that contention is not a daughter of vainglory. For contention is akin to zeal, wherefore it is written (~~xxx~~¹ 1 Corinthians 3:3): “Whereas there is among you zeal [Douay: ‘envying’] and contention, are you not carnal, and walk according to men?” Now zeal pertains to envy. Therefore contention arises rather from envy.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, contention is accompanied by raising of the voice. But the voice is raised on account of anger, as Gregory declares (Moral. xxxi, 14). Therefore contention too arises from anger.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, among other things knowledge seems to be the matter of pride and vainglory, according to ~~xxx~~¹ 1 Corinthians 8:1: “Knowledge puffeth up.” Now contention is often due to lack of knowledge, and by knowledge we do not impugn the truth, we know it. Therefore contention is not a daughter of vainglory.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(2) — On the contrary stands the authority of Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 14).

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(37)**, **A(2)**), discord is a daughter of vainglory, because each of the disaccording parties clings to his own opinion, rather than acquiesce with the other. Now it is proper to pride and vainglory to seek one’s own glory. And just as people are discordant when they hold to their own opinion in their hearts, so are they contentious when each defends his own opinion by words. Consequently contention is reckoned a daughter of vainglory for the same reason as discord.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(2)-RO(1) — Contention, like discord, is akin to envy in so far as a man severs himself from the one with whom he is discordant, or with whom he contends, but in so far as a contentious man holds to something, it is akin to pride and vainglory, because, to wit, he clings to his own opinion, as stated above (**Q(37)**, **A(2)**, ad 1).

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(2)-RO(2) — The contention of which we are speaking puts on a loud voice, for the purpose of impugning the truth, so that it is

not the chief part of contention. Hence it does not follow that contention arises from the same source as the raising of the voice.

P(2b)-Q(38)-A(2)-RO(3) — Pride and vainglory are occasioned chiefly by goods even those that are contrary to them, for instance, when a man is proud of his humility: for when a thing arises in this way, it does so not directly but accidentally, in which way nothing hinders one contrary from arising out of another. Hence there is no reason why the “per se” and direct effects of pride or vainglory, should not result from the contraries of those things which are the occasion of pride.

QUESTION 39

OF SCHISM

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the vices contrary to peace, which belong to deeds: such are schism, strife, sedition, and war. In the first place, then, about schism, there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether schism is a special sin?
- (2) Whether it is graver than unbelief?
- (3) Of the power exercised by schismatics;
- (4) Of the punishment inflicted on them.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(1)

Whether schism is a special sin?

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that schism is not a special sin. For “schism,” as Pope Pelagius I says (Epist. ad Victor. et Pancrat.), “denotes a division.” But every sin causes a division, according to Isaiah 59:: “Your sins have divided between you and your God.” Therefore schism is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, a man is apparently a schismatic if he disobey the Church. But every sin makes a man disobey the commandments of the Church, because sin, according to Ambrose (De Parad. viii) “is disobedience against the heavenly commandments.” Therefore every sin is a schism.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, heresy also divides a man from the unity of faith. If, therefore, the word schism denotes a division, it would seem not to differ, as a special sin, from the sin of unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine (Contra Faust. xx, 3; Contra Crescon. ii, 4) distinguishes between schism and heresy, for he says that a “schismatic is one who holds the same faith, and practises the same worship, as others, and takes pleasure in the mere disunion of the community, whereas a heretic is one who holds another faith from that of the Catholic Church.” Therefore schism is not a generic sin.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As Isidore says (Etym. viii, 3), schism takes its name “from being a scission of minds,” and scission is opposed to unity. Wherefore the sin of schism is one that is directly and essentially opposed to unity. For in the moral, as in the physical order, the species is not constituted by that which is accidental. Now, in the moral order, the essential is that which is intended, and that which results beside the intention, is, as it were, accidental. Hence the sin of schism is, properly speaking, a special sin, for the reason that the schismatic intends to sever himself from that unity which is the effect of charity: because charity unites not only one person to another with the bond of spiritual love, but also the whole Church in unity of spirit.

Accordingly schismatics properly so called are those who, wilfully and intentionally separate themselves from the unity of the Church; for this is the chief unity, and the particular unity of several individuals among themselves is subordinate to the unity of the Church, even as the mutual adaptation of each member of a natural body is subordinate to the unity of the whole body. Now the unity of the Church consists in two things; namely, in the mutual connection or communion of the members of the Church, and again in the subordination of all the members of the Church to the one head, according to ^{scilicet} Colossians 2:18,19:

“Puffed up by the sense of his flesh, and not holding the Head, from which the whole body, by joints and bands, being supplied with nourishment and compacted, groweth unto the increase of God.”

Now this Head is Christ Himself, Whose viceregent in the Church is the Sovereign Pontiff. Wherefore schismatics are those who refuse to submit to the Sovereign Pontiff, and to hold communion with those members of the Church who acknowledge his supremacy.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(1)-RO(1) — The division between man and God that results from sin is not intended by the sinner: it happens beside his intention as a result of his turning inordinately to a mutable good, and so it is not schism properly so called.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(1)-RO(2) — The essence of schism consists in rebelliously disobeying the commandments: and I say “rebelliously,” since a schismatic both obstinately scorns the commandments of the Church, and refuses to submit to her judgment. But every sinner does not do this, wherefore not every sin is a schism.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(1)-RO(3) — Heresy and schism are distinguished in respect of those things to which each is opposed essentially and directly. For heresy is essentially opposed to faith, while schism is essentially opposed to the unity of ecclesiastical charity. Wherefore just as faith and charity are different virtues, although whoever lacks faith lacks charity, so too schism and heresy are different vices, although whoever is a heretic is also a schismatic, but not conversely. This is what Jerome says in his commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians [*In Ep. ad Tit. iii, 10]: “I consider the difference between schism and heresy to be that heresy holds false doctrine while schism severs a man from the Church.” Nevertheless, just as the loss of charity is the road to the loss of faith, according to ⁵⁰⁰⁶1 Timothy 1:6: “From which things,” i.e. charity and the like, “some going astray, are turned aside into vain babbling,” so too, schism is the road to heresy. Wherefore Jerome adds (In Ep. ad Tit. iii, 10) that “at the outset it is possible, in a certain respect, to find a difference between schism and heresy: yet there is no schism that does not devise some heresy for itself, that it may appear to have had a reason for separating from the Church.”

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(2)

Whether schism is a graver sin than unbelief?

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that schism is a graver sin than unbelief. For the graver sin meets with a graver punishment, according to ⁵⁰⁰⁷Deuteronomy 25:2: “According to the measure of the sin shall the measure also of the stripes be.” Now we find the sin of schism punished more severely than even the sin of unbelief or idolatry: for we read

(^{<1328}Exodus 32:28) that some were slain by the swords of their fellow men on account of idolatry: whereas of the sin of schism we read (^{<1415}Numbers 16:30):

“If the Lord do a new thing, and the earth opening her mouth swallow them down, and all things that belong to them, and they go down alive into hell, you shall know that they have blasphemed the Lord God.”

Moreover the ten tribes who were guilty of schism in revolting from the rule of David were most severely punished (^{<1274}2 Kings 17). Therefore the sin of schism is graver than the sin of unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, “The good of the multitude is greater and more godlike than the good of the individual,” as the Philosopher states (Ethic. i, 2). Now schism is opposed to the good of the multitude, namely, ecclesiastical unity, whereas unbelief is contrary to the particular good of one man, namely the faith of an individual. Therefore it seems that schism is a graver sin than unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, a greater good is opposed to a greater evil, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. viii, 10). Now schism is opposed to charity, which is a greater virtue than faith to which unbelief is opposed, as shown above (**Q(10), A(2); Q(23), A(6)**). Therefore schism is a graver sin than unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, That which results from an addition to something else surpasses that thing either in good or in evil. Now heresy results from something being added to schism, for it adds corrupt doctrine, as Jerome declares in the passage quoted above (**A(1)**, ad 3). Therefore schism is a less grievous sin than unbelief.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(2) — *I answer that*, The gravity of a sin can be considered in two ways: first, according to the species of that sin, secondly, according to its circumstances. And since particular circumstances are infinite in number, so too they can be varied in an infinite number of ways: wherefore if one were to ask in general which of two sins is the graver, the question must be understood to refer to the gravity derived from the sin’s genus. Now the genus or species of a sin is taken from its object, as shown above (**P(2a), Q(72), A(1); P(2a), Q(73), A(3)**). Wherefore the sin which is

opposed to the greater good is, in respect of its genus, more grievous, for instance a sin committed against God is graver than a sin committed against one's neighbor.

Now it is evident that unbelief is a sin committed against God Himself, according as He is Himself the First Truth, on which faith is founded; whereas schism is opposed to ecclesiastical unity, which is a participated good, and a lesser good than God Himself. Wherefore it is manifest that the sin of unbelief is generically more grievous than the sin of schism, although it may happen that a particular schismatic sins more grievously than a particular unbeliever, either because his contempt is greater, or because his sin is a source of greater danger, or for some similar reason.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(2)-RO(1) — It had already been declared to that people by the law which they had received that there was one God, and that no other God was to be worshipped by them; and the same had been confirmed among them by many kinds of signs. Consequently there was no need for those who sinned against this faith by falling into idolatry, to be punished in an unwonted manner: it was enough that they should be punished in the usual way. On the other hand, it was not so well known among them that Moses was always to be their ruler, and so it behooved those who rebelled against his authority to be punished in a miraculous and unwonted manner.

We may also reply by saying that the sin of schism was sometimes more severely punished in that people, because they were inclined to seditions and schisms. For it is written (1 Esdra 4:15): "This city since days gone by has rebelled against its kings: and seditions and wars were raised therein [*Vulg.: 'This city is a rebellious city, and hurtful to the kings and provinces, and... wars were raised therein of old']." Now sometimes a more severe punishment is inflicted for an habitual sin (as stated above, **P(2a), Q(105), A(2)**, ad 9), because punishments are medicines intended to keep man away from sin: so that where there is greater proneness to sin, a more severe punishment ought to be inflicted. As regards the ten tribes, they were punished not only for the sin of schism, but also for that of idolatry as stated in the passage quoted.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(2)-RO(2) — Just as the good of the multitude is greater than the good of a unit in that multitude, so is it less than the extrinsic

good to which that multitude is directed, even as the good of a rank in the army is less than the good of the commander-in-chief. In like manner the good of ecclesiastical unity, to which schism is opposed, is less than the good of Divine truth, to which unbelief is opposed.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(2)-RO(3) — Charity has two objects; one is its principal object and is the Divine goodness, the other is its secondary object and is our neighbor's good. Now schism and other sins against our neighbor, are opposed to charity in respect of its secondary good, which is less than the object of faith, for this is God Himself; and so these sins are less grievous than unbelief. On the other hand, hatred of God, which is opposed to charity in respect of its principal object, is not less grievous than unbelief. Nevertheless of all sins committed by man against his neighbor, the sin of schism would seem to be the greatest, because it is opposed to the spiritual good of the multitude.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(3)

Whether schismatics have any power?

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that schismatics have some power. For Augustine says (Contra Donat. i, 1): “Just as those who come back to the Church after being baptized, are not baptized again, so those who return after being ordained, are not ordained again.” Now Order is a kind of power. Therefore schismatics have some power since they retain their Orders.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, Augustine says (De Unico Bapt. [*De Bap. contra Donat. vi, 5]): “One who is separated can confer a sacrament even as he can have it.” But the power of conferring a sacrament is a very great power. Therefore schismatics who are separated from the Church, have a spiritual power.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, Pope Urban II [*Council of Piacenza, cap. x; cf. Can. Ordinationes, ix, qu. 1] says: “We command that persons consecrated by bishops who were themselves consecrated according to the Catholic rite, but have separated themselves by schism from the Roman Church, should be received mercifully and that their Orders should be

acknowledged, when they return to the unity of the Church, provided they be of commendable life and knowledge.” But this would not be so, unless spiritual power were retained by schismatics. Therefore schismatics have spiritual power.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Cyprian says in a letter (Ep. lii, quoted vii, qu. 1, can. Novatianus): “He who observes neither unity of spirit nor the concord of peace, and severs himself from the bonds of the Church, and from the fellowship of her priests, cannot have episcopal power or honor.”

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Spiritual power is twofold, the one sacramental, the other a power of jurisdiction. The sacramental power is one that is conferred by some kind of consecration. Now all the consecrations of the Church are immovable so long as the consecrated thing remains: as appears even in inanimate things, since an altar, once consecrated, is not consecrated again unless it has been broken up. Consequently such a power as this remains, as to its essence, in the man who has received it by consecration, as long as he lives, even if he fall into schism or heresy: and this is proved from the fact that if he come back to the Church, he is not consecrated anew. Since, however, the lower power ought not to exercise its act, except in so far as it is moved by the higher power, as may be seen also in the physical order, it follows that such persons lose the use of their power, so that it is not lawful for them to use it. Yet if they use it, this power has its effect in sacramental acts, because therein man acts only as God’s instrument, so that sacramental effects are not precluded on account of any fault whatever in the person who confers the sacrament.

On the other hand, the power of jurisdiction is that which is conferred by a mere human appointment. Such a power as this does not adhere to the recipient immovably: so that it does not remain in heretics and schismatics; and consequently they neither absolve nor excommunicate, nor grant indulgence, nor do anything of the kind, and if they do, it is invalid.

Accordingly when it is said that such like persons have no spiritual power, it is to be understood as referring either to the second power, or if it be referred to the first power, not as referring to the essence of the power, but to its lawful use.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(4)

Whether it is right that schismatics should be punished with excommunication?

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that schismatics are not rightly punished with excommunication. For excommunication deprives a man chiefly of a share in the sacraments. But Augustine says (*Contra Donat. vi, 5*) that “Baptism can be received from a schismatic.” Therefore it seems that excommunication is not a fitting punishment for schismatics.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, it is the duty of Christ’s faithful to lead back those who have gone astray, wherefore it is written against certain persons (^{280b} *Ezekiel 34:4*): “That which was driven away you have not brought again, neither have you sought that which was lost.” Now schismatics are more easily brought back by such as may hold communion with them. Therefore it seems that they ought not to be excommunicated.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, a double punishment is not inflicted for one and the same sin, according to ^{300b} *Nahum 1:9*: “God will not judge the same twice” [**Septuagint version*]. Now some receive a temporal punishment for the sin of schism, according to **Q(23), A(5)**, where it is stated: “Both divine and earthly laws have laid down that those who are severed from the unity of the Church, and disturb her peace, must be punished by the secular power.” Therefore they ought not to be punished with excommunication.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{400b} *Numbers 16:26*): “Depart from the tents of these wicked men,” those, to wit, who had caused the schism, “and touch nothing of theirs, lest you be involved in their sins.”

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(4) — *I answer that*, According to *Wis. 11:11*, “By what things a man sinneth, by the same also he should be punished” [*Vulg.*: ‘he is tormented’]. Now a schismatic, as shown above (**A(1)**), commits a twofold sin: first by separating himself from communion with the members of the Church, and in this respect the fitting punishment for

schismatics is that they be excommunicated. Secondly, they refuse submission to the head of the Church, wherefore, since they are unwilling to be controlled by the Church's spiritual power, it is just that they should be compelled by the secular power.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(4)-RO(1) — It is not lawful to receive Baptism from a schismatic, save in a case of necessity, since it is better for a man to quit this life, marked with the sign of Christ, no matter from whom he may receive it, whether from a Jew or a pagan, than deprived of that mark, which is bestowed in Baptism.

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(4)-RO(2) — Excommunication does not forbid the intercourse whereby a person by salutary admonitions leads back to the unity of the Church those who are separated from her. Indeed this very separation brings them back somewhat, because through confusion at their separation, they are sometimes led to do penance

P(2b)-Q(39)-A(4)-RO(3) — The punishments of the present life are medicinal, and therefore when one punishment does not suffice to compel a man, another is added: just as physicians employ several body medicines when one has no effect. In like manner the Church, when excommunication does not sufficiently restrain certain men, employs the compulsion of the secular arm. If, however, one punishment suffices, another should not be employed.

QUESTION 40

OF WAR

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider war, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether some kind of war is lawful?
- (2) Whether it is lawful for clerics to fight?
- (3) Whether it is lawful for belligerents to lay ambushes?
- (4) Whether it is lawful to fight on holy days?

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(1)

Whether it is always sinful to wage war?

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that it is always sinful to wage war. Because punishment is not inflicted except for sin. Now those who wage war are threatened by Our Lord with punishment, according to ^{<105>}Matthew 26:52: “All that take the sword shall perish with the sword.” Therefore all wars are unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, whatever is contrary to a Divine precept is a sin. But war is contrary to a Divine precept, for it is written (^{<105>}Matthew 5:39): “But I say to you not to resist evil”; and (^{<526>}Romans 12:19): “Not revenging yourselves, my dearly beloved, but give place unto wrath.” Therefore war is always sinful.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, nothing, except sin, is contrary to an act of virtue. But war is contrary to peace. Therefore war is always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, the exercise of a lawful thing is itself lawful, as is evident in scientific exercises. But warlike exercises which take place in tournaments are forbidden by the Church, since those who are

slain in these trials are deprived of ecclesiastical burial. Therefore it seems that war is a sin in itself.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says in a sermon on the son of the centurion [*Ep. ad Marcel. cxxxviii]: “If the Christian Religion forbade war altogether, those who sought salutary advice in the Gospel would rather have been counselled to cast aside their arms, and to give up soldiering altogether. *On the contrary*, they were told: ‘Do violence to no man... and be content with your pay’ [*⁴⁸⁴ Luke 3:14]. If he commanded them to be content with their pay, he did not forbid soldiering.”

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(1) — *I answer that*, In order for a war to be just, three things are necessary. First, the authority of the sovereign by whose command the war is to be waged. For it is not the business of a private individual to declare war, because he can seek for redress of his rights from the tribunal of his superior. Moreover it is not the business of a private individual to summon together the people, which has to be done in wartime. And as the care of the common weal is committed to those who are in authority, it is their business to watch over the common weal of the city, kingdom or province subject to them. And just as it is lawful for them to have recourse to the sword in defending that common weal against internal disturbances, when they punish evil-doers, according to the words of the Apostle (⁴⁸⁵ Romans 13:4):

“He beareth not the sword in vain: for he is God’s minister, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doth evil”;

so too, it is their business to have recourse to the sword of war in defending the common weal against external enemies. Hence it is said to those who are in authority (⁴⁸⁶ Psalm 81:4): “Rescue the poor: and deliver the needy out of the hand of the sinner”; and for this reason Augustine says (Contra Faust. xxii, 75): “The natural order conducive to peace among mortals demands that the power to declare and counsel war should be in the hands of those who hold the supreme authority.”

Secondly, a just cause is required, namely that those who are attacked, should be attacked because they deserve it on account of some fault. Wherefore Augustine says (QQ. in Hept., qu. x, super Jos.): “A just war is wont to be described as one that avenges wrongs, when a nation or state

has to be punished, for refusing to make amends for the wrongs inflicted by its subjects, or to restore what it has seized unjustly.”

Thirdly, it is necessary that the belligerents should have a rightful intention, so that they intend the advancement of good, or the avoidance of evil. Hence Augustine says (*De Verb. Dom.* [*The words quoted are to be found not in St. Augustine’s works, but *Can. Apud. Caus. xxiii, qu. 1*]): “True religion looks upon as peaceful those wars that are waged not for motives of aggrandizement, or cruelty, but with the object of securing peace, of punishing evil-doers, and of uplifting the good.” For it may happen that the war is declared by the legitimate authority, and for a just cause, and yet be rendered unlawful through a wicked intention. Hence Augustine says (*Contra Faust. xxii, 74*): “The passion for inflicting harm, the cruel thirst for vengeance, an unpacific and relentless spirit, the fever of revolt, the lust of power, and such like things, all these are rightly condemned in war.”

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(1)-RO(1) — As Augustine says (*Contra Faust. xxii, 70*): “To take the sword is to arm oneself in order to take the life of anyone, without the command or permission of superior or lawful authority.” On the other hand, to have recourse to the sword (as a private person) by the authority of the sovereign or judge, or (as a public person) through zeal for justice, and by the authority, so to speak, of God, is not to “take the sword,” but to use it as commissioned by another, wherefore it does not deserve punishment. And yet even those who make sinful use of the sword are not always slain with the sword, yet they always perish with their own sword, because, unless they repent, they are punished eternally for their sinful use of the sword.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(1)-RO(2) — Such like precepts, as Augustine observes (*De Serm. Dom. in Monte i, 19*), should always be borne in readiness of mind, so that we be ready to obey them, and, if necessary, to refrain from resistance or self-defense. Nevertheless it is necessary sometimes for a man to act otherwise for the common good, or for the good of those with whom he is fighting. Hence Augustine says (*Ep. ad Marcellin. cxxxviii*): “Those whom we have to punish with a kindly severity, it is necessary to handle in many ways against their will. For when we are stripping a man of the lawlessness of sin, it is good for him to be vanquished, since nothing

is more hopeless than the happiness of sinners, whence arises a guilty impunity, and an evil will, like an internal enemy.”

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(1)-RO(3) — Those who wage war justly aim at peace, and so they are not opposed to peace, except to the evil peace, which Our Lord “came not to send upon earth” (~~cf.~~ Matthew 10:34). Hence Augustine says (Ep. ad Bonif. clxxxix): “We do not seek peace in order to be at war, but we go to war that we may have peace. Be peaceful, therefore, in warring, so that you may vanquish those whom you war against, and bring them to the prosperity of peace.”

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(1)-RO(4) — Manly exercises in warlike feats of arms are not all forbidden, but those which are inordinate and perilous, and end in slaying or plundering. In olden times warlike exercises presented no such danger, and hence they were called “exercises of arms” or “bloodless wars,” as Jerome states in an epistle [*Reference incorrect: cf. Veget., De Re Milit. i].

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(2)

Whether it is lawful for clerics and bishops to fight?

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem lawful for clerics and bishops to fight. For, as stated above (**A(1)**), wars are lawful and just in so far as they protect the poor and the entire common weal from suffering at the hands of the foe. Now this seems to be above all the duty of prelates, for Gregory says (Hom. in Ev. xiv): “The wolf comes upon the sheep, when any unjust and rapacious man oppresses those who are faithful and humble. But he who was thought to be the shepherd, and was not, leaveth the sheep, and flieth, for he fears lest the wolf hurt him, and dares not stand up against his injustice.” Therefore it is lawful for prelates and clerics to fight.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, Pope Leo IV writes (xxiii, qu. 8, can. Igitur): “As untoward tidings had frequently come from the Saracen side, some said that the Saracens would come to the port of Rome secretly and covertly; for which reason we commanded our people to gather together, and ordered them to go down to the seashore.” Therefore it is lawful for bishops to fight.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, apparently, it comes to the same whether a man does a thing himself, or consents to its being done by another, according to ⁴¹³Romans 1:32:

“They who do such things, are worthy of death, and not only they that do them, but they also that consent to them that do them.”

Now those, above all, seem to consent to a thing, who induce others to do it. But it is lawful for bishops and clerics to induce others to fight: for it is written (xxiii, qu. 8, can. Hortatu) that Charles went to war with the Lombards at the instance and entreaty of Adrian, bishop of Rome. Therefore they also are allowed to fight.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, whatever is right and meritorious in itself, is lawful for prelates and clerics. Now it is sometimes right and meritorious to make war, for it is written (xxiii, qu. 8, can. Omni timore) that if “a man die for the true faith, or to save his country, or in defense of Christians, God will give him a heavenly reward.” Therefore it is lawful for bishops and clerics to fight.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It was said to Peter as representing bishops and clerics (⁴¹⁵Matthew 16:52): “Put up again thy sword into the scabbard [Vulg.: ‘its place’] [*”Scabbard” is the reading in ⁴²¹John 18:11].” Therefore it is not lawful for them to fight.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Several things are requisite for the good of a human society: and a number of things are done better and quicker by a number of persons than by one, as the Philosopher observes (Polit. i, 1), while certain occupations are so inconsistent with one another, that they cannot be fittingly exercised at the same time; wherefore those who are deputed to important duties are forbidden to occupy themselves with things of small importance. Thus according to human laws, soldiers who are deputed to warlike pursuits are forbidden to engage in commerce [*Cod. xii, 35, De Re Milit.].

Now warlike pursuits are altogether incompatible with the duties of a bishop and a cleric, for two reasons. The first reason is a general one, because, to wit, warlike pursuits are full of unrest, so that they hinder the mind very much from the contemplation of Divine things, the praise of God, and prayers for the people, which belong to the duties of a cleric.

Wherefore just as commercial enterprises are forbidden to clerics, because they unsettle the mind too much, so too are warlike pursuits, according to ~~2~~ Timothy 2:4: “No man being a soldier to God, entangleth himself with secular business.” The second reason is a special one, because, to wit, all the clerical Orders are directed to the ministry of the altar, on which the Passion of Christ is represented sacramentally, according to ~~1~~ Corinthians 11:26:

“As often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord, until He come.”

Wherefore it is unbecoming for them to slay or shed blood, and it is more fitting that they should be ready to shed their own blood for Christ, so as to imitate in deed what they portray in their ministry. For this reason it has been decreed that those who shed blood, even without sin, become irregular. Now no man who has a certain duty to perform, can lawfully do that which renders him unfit for that duty. Wherefore it is altogether unlawful for clerics to fight, because war is directed to the shedding of blood.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(2)-RO(1) — Prelates ought to withstand not only the wolf who brings spiritual death upon the flock, but also the pillager and the oppressor who work bodily harm; not, however, by having recourse themselves to material arms, but by means of spiritual weapons, according to the saying of the Apostle (~~2~~ 2 Corinthians 10:4): “The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God.” Such are salutary warnings, devout prayers, and, for those who are obstinate, the sentence of excommunication.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(2)-RO(2) — Prelates and clerics may, by the authority of their superiors, take part in wars, not indeed by taking up arms themselves, but by affording spiritual help to those who fight justly, by exhorting and absolving them, and by other like spiritual helps. Thus in the Old Testament (~~6~~ Joshua 6:4) the priests were commanded to sound the sacred trumpets in the battle. It was for this purpose that bishops or clerics were first allowed to go to the front: and it is an abuse of this permission, if any of them take up arms themselves.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(2)-RO(3) — As stated above (**Q(23)**, **A(4)**, ad 2) every power, art or virtue that regards the end, has to dispose that which is

directed to the end. Now, among the faithful, carnal wars should be considered as having for their end the Divine spiritual good to which clerics are deputed. Wherefore it is the duty of clerics to dispose and counsel other men to engage in just wars. For they are forbidden to take up arms, not as though it were a sin, but because such an occupation is unbecoming their personality.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(2)-RO(4) — Although it is meritorious to wage a just war, nevertheless it is rendered unlawful for clerics, by reason of their being deputed to works more meritorious still. Thus the marriage act may be meritorious; and yet it becomes reprehensible in those who have vowed virginity, because they are bound to a yet greater good.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(3)

Whether it is lawful to lay ambushes in war?

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that it is unlawful to lay ambushes in war. For it is written (⁶¹⁰Deuteronomy 16:20): “Thou shalt follow justly after that which is just.” But ambushes, since they are a kind of deception, seem to pertain to injustice. Therefore it is unlawful to lay ambushes even in a just war.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, ambushes and deception seem to be opposed to faithfulness even as lies are. But since we are bound to keep faith with all men, it is wrong to lie to anyone, as Augustine states (Contra Mend. xv). Therefore, as one is bound to keep faith with one’s enemy, as Augustine states (Ep. ad Bonif. clxxxix), it seems that it is unlawful to lay ambushes for one’s enemies.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, it is written (⁴¹⁰Matthew 7:12):

“Whatsoever you would that men should do to you,
do you also to them”:

and we ought to observe this in all our dealings with our neighbor. Now our enemy is our neighbor. Therefore, since no man wishes ambushes or deceptions to be prepared for himself, it seems that no one ought to carry on war by laying ambushes.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (QQ. in Hept. qu. x super Jos): “Provided the war be just, it is no concern of justice whether it

be carried on openly or by ambushes”: and he proves this by the authority of the Lord, Who commanded Joshua to lay ambushes for the city of Hai (~~Ex~~ Joshua 8:2).

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(3) — *I answer that*, The object of laying ambushes is in order to deceive the enemy. Now a man may be deceived by another’s word or deed in two ways. First, through being told something false, or through the breaking of a promise, and this is always unlawful. No one ought to deceive the enemy in this way, for there are certain “rights of war and covenants, which ought to be observed even among enemies,” as Ambrose states (De Officiis i).

Secondly, a man may be deceived by what we say or do, because we do not declare our purpose or meaning to him. Now we are not always bound to do this, since even in the Sacred Doctrine many things have to be concealed, especially from unbelievers, lest they deride it, according to ~~Ex~~ Matthew 7:6: “Give not that which is holy, to dogs.” Wherefore much more ought the plan of campaign to be hidden from the enemy. For this reason among other things that a soldier has to learn is the art of concealing his purpose lest it come to the enemy’s knowledge, as stated in the Book on Strategy [*Stratagematum i, 1] by Frontinus. Such like concealment is what is meant by an ambush which may be lawfully employed in a just war.

Nor can these ambushes be properly called deceptions, nor are they contrary to justice or to a well-ordered will. For a man would have an inordinate will if he were unwilling that others should hide anything from him

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(4)

Whether it is lawful to fight on holy days?

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful to fight on holy days. For holy days are instituted that we may give our time to the things of God. Hence they are included in the keeping of the Sabbath prescribed ~~Ex~~ Exodus 20:8: for “sabbath” is interpreted “rest.” But wars are full of unrest. Therefore by no means is it lawful to fight on holy days.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, certain persons are reproached (^{<281B>}Isaiah 58:3) because on fast-days they exacted what was owing to them, were guilty of strife, and of smiting with the fist. Much more, therefore, is it unlawful to fight on holy days.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, no ill deed should be done to avoid temporal harm. But fighting on a holy day seems in itself to be an ill deed. Therefore no one should fight on a holy day even through the need of avoiding temporal harm.

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (1 Machab 2:41): The Jews rightly determined... saying: “Whosoever shall come up against us to fight on the Sabbath-day, we will fight against him.”

P(2b)-Q(40)-A(4) — *I answer that*, The observance of holy days is no hindrance to those things which are ordained to man’s safety, even that of his body. Hence Our Lord argued with the Jews, saying (^{<412>}John 7:23):

“Are you angry at Me because I have healed the
whole man on the Sabbath-day?”

Hence physicians may lawfully attend to their patients on holy days. Now there is much more reason for safeguarding the common weal (whereby many are saved from being slain, and innumerable evils both temporal and spiritual prevented), than the bodily safety of an individual. Therefore, for the purpose of safeguarding the common weal of the faithful, it is lawful to carry on a war on holy days, provided there be need for doing so: because it would be to tempt God, if notwithstanding such a need, one were to choose to refrain from fighting.

However, as soon as the need ceases, it is no longer lawful to fight on a holy day, for the reasons given: wherefore this suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

QUESTION 41

OF STRIFE

(TWO ARTICLES)

[*Strife here denotes fighting between individuals]

We must now consider strife, under which head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether strife is a sin?
- (2) Whether it is a daughter of anger?

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(1)

Whether strife is always a sin?

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that strife is not always a sin. For strife seems a kind of contention: hence Isidore says (Etym. x) that the word “rixosus [quarrelsome] is derived from the snarling [rictu] of a dog, because the quarrelsome man is ever ready to contradict; he delights in brawling, and provokes contention.” Now contention is not always a sin. Neither, therefore, is strife.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, it is related (^{412a}Genesis 26:21) that the servants of Isaac “digged” another well, “and for that they quarrelled likewise.” Now it is not credible that the household of Isaac quarrelled publicly, without being reproved by him, supposing it were a sin. Therefore strife is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, strife seems to be a war between individuals. But war is not always sinful. Therefore strife is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Strifes [*The Douay version has ‘quarrels’] are reckoned among the works of the flesh (^{415a}Galatians 5:20),

and “they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God.” Therefore strifes are not only sinful, but they are even mortal sins.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(1) — *I answer that,* While contention implies a contradiction of words, strife denotes a certain contradiction of deeds. Wherefore a gloss on ^{<RT>}Galatians 5:20 says that “strifes are when persons strike one another through anger.” Hence strife is a kind of private war, because it takes place between private persons, being declared not by public authority, but rather by an inordinate will. Therefore strife is always sinful. In fact it is a mortal sin in the man who attacks another unjustly, for it is not without mortal sin that one inflicts harm on another even if the deed be done by the hands. But in him who defends himself, it may be without sin, or it may sometimes involve a venial sin, or sometimes a mortal sin; and this depends on his intention and on his manner of defending himself. For if his sole intention be to withstand the injury done to him, and he defend himself with due moderation, it is no sin, and one cannot say properly that there is strife on his part. But if, on the other hand, his self-defense be inspired by vengeance and hatred, it is always a sin. It is a venial sin, if a slight movement of hatred or vengeance obtrude itself, or if he does not much exceed moderation in defending himself: but it is a mortal sin if he makes for his assailant with the fixed intention of killing him, or inflicting grievous harm on him.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(1)-RO(1) — Strife is not just the same as contention: and there are three things in the passage quoted from Isidore, which express the inordinate nature of strife. First, the quarrelsome man is always ready to fight, and this is conveyed by the words, “ever ready to contradict,” that is to say, whether the other man says or does well or ill. Secondly, he delights in quarrelling itself, and so the passage proceeds, “and delights in brawling.” Thirdly, “he” provokes others to quarrel, wherefore it goes on, “and provokes contention.”

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(1)-RO(1) — The sense of the text is not that the servants of Isaac quarrelled, but that the inhabitants of that country quarrelled with them: wherefore these sinned, and not the servants of Isaac, who bore the calumny [^{<RT>}*Cf. ^{<RT>}Genesis 26:20].

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(1)-RO(3) — In order for a war to be just it must be declared by authority of the governing power, as stated above (**Q(40)**),

A(1); whereas strife proceeds from a private feeling of anger or hatred. For if the servants of a sovereign or judge, in virtue of their public authority, attack certain men and these defend themselves, it is not the former who are said to be guilty of strife, but those who resist the public authority. Hence it is not the assailants in this case who are guilty of strife and commit sin, but those who defend themselves inordinately.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2)

Whether strife is a daughter of anger?

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that strife is not a daughter of anger. For it is written (³⁰⁰¹James 4:1):

“Whence are wars and contentions? Are they not... from your
concupiscences, which war in your members?”

But anger is not in the concupiscible faculty. Therefore strife is a daughter, not of anger, but of concupiscence.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, it is written (³¹⁸⁵Proverbs 28:25): “He that boasteth and puffeth up himself, stirreth up quarrels.” Now strife is apparently the same as quarrel. Therefore it seems that strife is a daughter of pride or vainglory which makes a man boast and puff himself up.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it is written (³¹⁸⁶Proverbs 18:6): “The lips of a fool intermeddle with strife.” Now folly differs from anger, for it is opposed, not to meekness, but to wisdom or prudence. Therefore strife is not a daughter of anger.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, it is written (³¹⁸⁷Proverbs 10:12): “Hatred stirreth up strifes.” But hatred arises from envy, according to Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 17). Therefore strife is not a daughter of anger, but of envy.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2)-O(5) — Further, it is written (³¹⁷⁹Proverbs 17:19): “He that studieth discords, soweth [Vulg.: ‘loveth’] quarrels.” But discord is a daughter of vainglory, as stated above (**Q(37)**, **A(2)**). Therefore strife is also.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 17) that “anger gives rise to strife”; and it is written (²¹⁵⁸Proverbs 15:18; 29:22): “A passionate man stirreth up strifes.”

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), strife denotes an antagonism extending to deeds, when one man designs to harm another. Now there are two ways in which one man may intend to harm another. In one way it is as though he intended absolutely the other’s hurt, which in this case is the outcome of hatred, for the intention of hatred is directed to the hurt of one’s enemy either openly or secretly. In another way a man intends to hurt another who knows and withstands his intention. This is what we mean by strife, and belongs properly to anger which is the desire of vengeance: for the angry man is not content to hurt secretly the object of his anger, he even wishes him to feel the hurt and know that what he suffers is in revenge for what he has done, as may be seen from what has been said above about the passion of anger (**P(2a)**, **Q(46)**, **A(6)**, ad 2). Therefore, properly speaking, strife arises from anger.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2)-RO(1) — As stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(25)**, **AA(1),2**), all the irascible passions arise from those of the concupiscible faculty, so that whatever is the immediate outcome of anger, arises also from concupiscence as from its first root.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2)-RO(2) — Boasting and puffing up of self which are the result of anger or vainglory, are not the direct but the occasional cause of quarrels or strife, because, when a man resents another being preferred to him, his anger is aroused, and then his anger results in quarrel and strife.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2)-RO(3) — Anger, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(48)**, **A(3)**) hinders the judgment of the reason, so that it bears a likeness to folly. Hence they have a common effect, since it is due to a defect in the reason that a man designs to hurt another inordinately.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2)-RO(4) — Although strife sometimes arises from hatred, it is not the proper effect thereof, because when one man hates another it is beside his intention to hurt him in a quarrelsome and open manner, since sometimes he seeks to hurt him secretly. When, however, he sees himself prevailing, he endeavors to harm him with strife and quarrel. But to hurt a man in a quarrel is the proper effect of anger, for the reason given above.

P(2b)-Q(41)-A(2)-RO(5) — Strifes give rise to hatred and discord in the hearts of those who are guilty of strife, and so he that “studies,” i.e., intends to sow discord among others, causes them to quarrel among themselves. Even so any sin may command the act of another sin, by directing it to its own end. This does not, however, prove that strife is the daughter of vainglory properly and directly.

QUESTION 42

OF SEDITION

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider sedition, under which head there are two points of inquiry:

(1) Whether it is a special sin?

(2) Whether it is a mortal sin?


P(2b)-Q(42)-A(1)

Whether sedition is a special sin distinct from other sins?

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that sedition is not a special sin distinct from other sins. For, according to Isidore (Etym. x), “a seditious man is one who sows dissent among minds, and begets discord.” Now, by provoking the commission of a sin, a man sins by no other kind of sin than that which he provoked. Therefore it seems that sedition is not a special sin distinct from discord.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, sedition denotes a kind of division. Now schism takes its name from scission, as stated above (**Q(39), A(1)**). Therefore, seemingly, the sin of sedition is not distinct from that of schism.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, every special sin that is distinct from other sins, is either a capital vice, or arises from some capital vice. Now sedition is reckoned neither among the capital vices, nor among those vices which arise from them, as appears from Moral. xxxi, 45, where both kinds of vice are enumerated. Therefore sedition is not a special sin, distinct from other sins.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Seditions are mentioned as distinct from other sins ( 2 Corinthians 12:20).

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Sedition is a special sin, having something in common with war and strife, and differing somewhat from them. It has something in common with them, in so far as it implies a certain antagonism, and it differs from them in two points. First, because war and strife denote actual aggression on either side, whereas sedition may be said to denote either actual aggression, or the preparation for such aggression. Hence a gloss on ~~2~~¹2 Corinthians 12:20 says that “seditions are tumults tending to fight,” when, to wit, a number of people make preparations with the intention of fighting. Secondly, they differ in that war is, properly speaking, carried on against external foes, being as it were between one people and another, whereas strife is between one individual and another, or between few people on one side and few on the other side, while sedition, in its proper sense, is between mutually dissentient parts of one people, as when one part of the state rises in tumult against another part. Wherefore, since sedition is opposed to a special kind of good, namely the unity and peace of a people, it is a special kind of sin.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(1)-RO(1) — A seditious man is one who incites others to sedition, and since sedition denotes a kind of discord, it follows that a seditious man is one who creates discord, not of any kind, but between the parts of a multitude. And the sin of sedition is not only in him who sows discord, but also in those who dissent from one another inordinately.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(1)-RO(2) — Sedition differs from schism in two respects. First, because schism is opposed to the spiritual unity of the multitude, viz. ecclesiastical unity, whereas sedition is contrary to the temporal or secular unity of the multitude, for instance of a city or kingdom. Secondly, schism does not imply any preparation for a material fight as sedition does, but only for a spiritual dissent.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(1)-RO(3) — Sedition, like schism, is contained under discord, since each is a kind of discord, not between individuals, but between the parts of a multitude.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(2)

Whether sedition is always a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that sedition is not always a mortal sin. For sedition denotes “a tumult tending to fight,” according to the gloss quoted above (**A(1)**). But fighting is not always a mortal sin, indeed it is sometimes just and lawful, as stated above (**Q(40)**, **A(1)**). Much more, therefore, can sedition be without a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, sedition is a kind of discord, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 3). Now discord can be without mortal sin, and sometimes without any sin at all. Therefore sedition can be also.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it is praiseworthy to deliver a multitude from a tyrannical rule. Yet this cannot easily be done without some dissension in the multitude, if one part of the multitude seeks to retain the tyrant, while the rest strive to dethrone him. Therefore there can be sedition without mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle forbids seditions together with other things that are mortal sins (~~1~~² 2 Corinthians 12:20).

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**, ad 2), sedition is contrary to the unity of the multitude, viz. the people of a city or kingdom. Now Augustine says (De Civ. Dei ii, 21) that “wise men understand the word people to designate not any crowd of persons, but the assembly of those who are united together in fellowship recognized by law and for the common good.” Wherefore it is evident that the unity to which sedition is opposed is the unity of law and common good: whence it follows manifestly that sedition is opposed to justice and the common good. Therefore by reason of its genus it is a mortal sin, and its gravity will be all the greater according as the common good which it assails surpasses the private good which is assailed by strife.

Accordingly the sin of sedition is first and chiefly in its authors, who sin most grievously; and secondly it is in those who are led by them to disturb the common good. Those, however, who defend the common good, and withstand the seditious party, are not themselves seditious, even as neither

is a man to be called quarrelsome because he defends himself, as stated above (**Q(41), A(1)**).

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(2)-RO(1) — It is lawful to fight, provided it be for the common good, as stated above (**Q(40), A(1)**). But sedition runs counter to the common good of the multitude, so that it is always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(2)-RO(2) — Discord from what is not evidently good, may be without sin, but discord from what is evidently good, cannot be without sin: and sedition is discord of this kind, for it is contrary to the unity of the multitude, which is a manifest good.

P(2b)-Q(42)-A(2)-RO(3) — A tyrannical government is not just, because it is directed, not to the common good, but to the private good of the ruler, as the Philosopher states (Polit. iii, 5; Ethic. viii, 10). Consequently there is no sedition in disturbing a government of this kind, unless indeed the tyrant's rule be disturbed so inordinately, that his subjects suffer greater harm from the consequent disturbance than from the tyrant's government. Indeed it is the tyrant rather that is guilty of sedition, since he encourages discord and sedition among his subjects, that he may lord over them more securely; for this is tyranny, being conducive to the private good of the ruler, and to the injury of the multitude.

QUESTION 43

OF SCANDAL

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

It remains for us to consider the vices which are opposed to beneficence, among which some come under the head of injustice, those, to wit, whereby one harms one's neighbor unjustly. But scandal seems to be specially opposed to charity. Accordingly we must here consider scandal, under which head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) What is scandal?
- (2) Whether scandal is a sin?
- (3) Whether it is a special sin?
- (4) Whether it is a mortal sin?
- (5) Whether the perfect can be scandalized?
- (6) Whether they can give scandal?
- (7) Whether spiritual goods are to be foregone on account of scandal?
- (8) Whether temporal things are to be foregone on account of scandal?

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1)

Whether scandal is fittingly defined as being something less rightly said or done that occasions spiritual downfall?

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that scandal is unfittingly defined as “something less rightly said or done that occasions spiritual downfall.” For scandal is a sin as we shall state further on (**A(2)**). Now, according to Augustine (Contra Faust. xxii, 27), a sin is a “word, deed, or desire contrary to the law of God.” Therefore the definition given above is insufficient, since it omits “thought” or “desire.”

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, since among virtuous or right acts one is more virtuous or more right than another, that one alone which has perfect rectitude would not seem to be a “less” right one. If, therefore, scandal is something “less” rightly said or done, it follows that every virtuous act except the best of all, is a scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, an occasion is an accidental cause. But nothing accidental should enter a definition, because it does not specify the thing defined. Therefore it is unfitting, in defining scandal, to say that it is an “occasion.”

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, whatever a man does may be the occasion of another’s spiritual downfall, because accidental causes are indeterminate. Consequently, if scandal is something that occasions another’s spiritual downfall, any deed or word can be a scandal: and this seems unreasonable.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, a man occasions his neighbor’s spiritual downfall when he offends or weakens him. Now scandal is condivided with offense and weakness, for the Apostle says (◀64◀) Romans 14:21):

“It is good not to eat flesh, and not to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother is offended or scandalized, or weakened.”

Therefore the aforesaid definition of scandal is unfitting.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Jerome in expounding ◀152◀ Matthew 15:12, “Dost thou know that the Pharisees, when they heard this word,” etc. says: “When we read ‘Whosoever shall scandalize,’ the sense is ‘Whosoever shall, by deed or word, occasion another’s spiritual downfall.’“

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As Jerome observes the Greek {skandalon} may be rendered offense, downfall, or a stumbling against something. For when a body, while moving along a path, meets with an obstacle, it may happen to stumble against it, and be disposed to fall down: such an obstacle is a {skandalon}.

In like manner, while going along the spiritual way, a man may be disposed to a spiritual downfall by another’s word or deed, in so far, to wit, as one

man by his injunction, inducement or example, moves another to sin; and this is scandal properly so called.

Now nothing by its very nature disposes a man to spiritual downfall, except that which has some lack of rectitude, since what is perfectly right, secures man against a fall, instead of conducing to his downfall. Scandal is, therefore, fittingly defined as “something less rightly done or said, that occasions another’s spiritual downfall.”

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1)-RO(1) — The thought or desire of evil lies hidden in the heart, wherefore it does not suggest itself to another man as an obstacle conducing to his spiritual downfall: hence it cannot come under the head of scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1)-RO(2) — A thing is said to be less right, not because something else surpasses it in rectitude, but because it has some lack of rectitude, either through being evil in itself, such as sin, or through having an appearance of evil. Thus, for instance, if a man were to “sit at meat in the idol’s temple” (⁽⁴¹⁸⁰⁾1 Corinthians 8:10), though this is not sinful in itself, provided it be done with no evil intention, yet, since it has a certain appearance of evil, and a semblance of worshipping the idol, it might occasion another man’s spiritual downfall. Hence the Apostle says (⁽⁴¹⁸²⁾1 Thessalonians 5:22): “From all appearance of evil refrain yourselves.” Scandal is therefore fittingly described as something done “less rightly,” so as to comprise both whatever is sinful in itself, and all that has an appearance of evil.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1)-RO(3) — As stated above (**P(2a), Q(75), AA(2),3; P(2a), Q(80), A(1)**), nothing can be a sufficient cause of a man’s spiritual downfall, which is sin, save his own will. Wherefore another man’s words or deeds can only be an imperfect cause, conducing somewhat to that downfall. For this reason scandal is said to afford not a cause, but an occasion, which is an imperfect, and not always an accidental cause. Nor is there any reason why certain definitions should not make mention of things that are accidental, since what is accidental to one, may be proper to something else: thus the accidental cause is mentioned in the definition of chance (Phys. ii, 5).

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1)-RO(4) — Another’s words or deed may be the cause of another’s sin in two ways, directly and accidentally. Directly, when a man either intends, by his evil word or deed, to lead another man into sin, or, if he does not so intend, when his deed is of such a nature as to lead another into sin: for instance, when a man publicly commits a sin or does something that has an appearance of sin. In this case he that does such an act does, properly speaking, afford an occasion of another’s spiritual downfall, wherefore his act is called “active scandal.” One man’s word or deed is the accidental cause of another’s sin, when he neither intends to lead him into sin, nor does what is of a nature to lead him into sin, and yet this other one, through being ill-disposed, is led into sin, for instance, into envy of another’s good, and then he who does this righteous act, does not, so far as he is concerned, afford an occasion of the other’s downfall, but it is this other one who takes the occasion according to ~~STB~~ Romans 7:8: “Sin taking occasion by the commandment wrought in me all manner of concupiscence.” Wherefore this is “passive,” without “active scandal,” since he that acts rightly does not, for his own part, afford the occasion of the other’s downfall. Sometimes therefore it happens that there is active scandal in the one together with passive scandal in the other, as when one commits a sin being induced thereto by another; sometimes there is active without passive scandal, for instance when one, by word or deed, provokes another to sin, and the latter does not consent; and sometimes there is passive without active scandal, as we have already said.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(1)-RO(5) — “Weakness” denotes proneness to scandal; while “offense” signifies resentment against the person who commits a sin, which resentment may be sometimes without spiritual downfall; and “scandal” is the stumbling that results in downfall.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(2)

Whether scandal is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that scandal is not a sin. For sins do not occur from necessity, since all sin is voluntary, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(74)**, **AA(1,2)**). Now it is written (~~STB~~ Matthew 18:7): “It must needs be that scandals come.” Therefore scandal is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, no sin arises from a sense of dutifulness, because “a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit” (¹⁰⁷⁸Matthew 7:18). But scandal may come from a sense of dutifulness, for Our Lord said to Peter (¹⁰²³Matthew 16:23): “Thou art a scandal unto Me,” in reference to which words Jerome says that “the Apostle’s error was due to his sense of dutifulness, and such is never inspired by the devil.” Therefore scandal is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, scandal denotes a stumbling. But he that stumbles does not always fall. Therefore scandal, which is a spiritual fall, can be without sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Scandal is “something less rightly said or done.” Now anything that lacks rectitude is a sin. Therefore scandal is always with sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As already said (**A(1)**, ad 4), scandal is of two kinds, passive scandal in the person scandalized, and active scandal in the person who gives scandal, and so occasions a spiritual downfall. Accordingly passive scandal is always a sin in the person scandalized; for he is not scandalized except in so far as he succumbs to a spiritual downfall, and that is a sin.

Yet there can be passive scandal, without sin on the part of the person whose action has occasioned the scandal, as for instance, when a person is scandalized at another’s good deed. In like manner active scandal is always a sin in the person who gives scandal, since either what he does is a sin, or if it only have the appearance of sin, it should always be left undone out of that love for our neighbor which binds each one to be solicitous for his neighbor’s spiritual welfare; so that if he persist in doing it he acts against charity.

Yet there can be active scandal without sin on the part of the person scandalized, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 4).

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(2)-RO(1) — These words, “It must needs be that scandals come,” are to be understood to convey, not the absolute, but the conditional necessity of scandal; in which sense it is necessary that whatever God foresees or foretells must happen, provided it be taken

conjointly with such foreknowledge, as explained in the **P(1) Q(14), A(13)**, ad 3; **P(1) Q(23), A(6)**, ad 2.

Or we may say that the necessity of scandals occurring is a necessity of end, because they are useful in order that “they... who are reproved may be made manifest” (~~ad~~ 1 Corinthians 11:19).

Or scandals must needs occur, seeing the condition of man who fails to shield himself from sin. Thus a physician on seeing a man partaking of unsuitable food might say that such a man must needs injure his health, which is to be understood on the condition that he does not change his diet. In like manner it must needs be that scandals come, so long as men fail to change their evil mode of living.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(2)-RO(2) — In that passage scandal denotes any kind of hindrance: for Peter wished to hinder Our Lord’s Passion out of a sense of dutifulness towards Christ.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(2)-RO(3) — No man stumbles spiritually, without being kept back somewhat from advancing in God’s way, and that is at least a venial sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(3)

Whether scandal is a special sin?

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that scandal is not a special sin. For scandal is “something said or done less rightly.” But this applies to every kind of sin. Therefore every sin is a scandal, and consequently, scandal is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, every special kind of sin, or every special kind of injustice, may be found separately from other kinds, as stated in Ethic. v, 3,5. But scandal is not to be found separately from other sins. Therefore it is not a special kind of sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, every special sin is constituted by something which specifies the moral act. But the notion of scandal consists in its being something done in the presence of others: and the fact of a sin being committed openly, though it is an aggravating circumstance, does not

seem to constitute the species of a sin. Therefore scandal is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, A special virtue has a special sin opposed to it. But scandal is opposed to a special virtue, viz. charity. For it is written (~~scilicet~~ Romans 14:15):

“If, because of thy meat, thy brother be grieved, thou walkest not now according to charity.”

Therefore scandal is a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(2)**), scandal is twofold, active and passive. Passive scandal cannot be a special sin, because through another’s word or deed a man may fall into any kind of sin: and the fact that a man takes occasion to sin from another’s word or deed, does not constitute a special kind of sin, because it does not imply a special deformity in opposition to a special virtue.

On the other hand, active scandal may be understood in two ways, directly and accidentally. The scandal is accidental when it is beside the agent’s intention, as when a man does not intend, by his inordinate deed or word, to occasion another’s spiritual downfall, but merely to satisfy his own will. In such a case even active scandal is not a special sin, because a species is not constituted by that which is accidental.

Active scandal is direct when a man intends, by his inordinate word or deed, to draw another into sin, and then it becomes a special kind of sin on account of the intention of a special kind of end, because moral actions take their species from their end, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(1), A(3); P(2a), Q(18), AA(4),6**). Hence, just as theft and murder are special kinds of sin, on account of their denoting the intention of doing a special injury to one’s neighbor: so too, scandal is a special kind of sin, because thereby a man intends a special harm to his neighbor, and it is directly opposed to fraternal correction, whereby a man intends the removal of a special kind of harm.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(3)-RO(1) — Any sin may be the matter of active scandal, but it may derive the formal aspect of a special sin from the end intended, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(3)-RO(2) — Active scandal can be found separate from other sins, as when a man scandalizes his neighbor by a deed which is not a sin in itself, but has an appearance of evil.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(3)-RO(3) — Scandal does not derive the species of a special sin from the circumstance in question, but from the intention of the end, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(4)

Whether scandal is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that scandal is a mortal sin. For every sin that is contrary to charity is a mortal sin, as stated above (**Q(24)**, **A(12)**; **Q(35)**, **A(3)**). But scandal is contrary to charity, as stated above (**AA(2),3**). Therefore scandal is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, no sin, save mortal sin, deserves the punishment of eternal damnation. But scandal deserves the punishment of eternal damnation, according to ^{<4080>}Matthew 18:6:

“He that shall scandalize one of these little ones, that believe in Me, it were better for him that a mill-stone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the depth of the sea.”

For, as Jerome says on this passage, “it is much better to receive a brief punishment for a fault, than to await everlasting torments.” Therefore scandal is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, every sin committed against God is a mortal sin, because mortal sin alone turns man away from God. Now scandal is a sin against God, for the Apostle says (^{<4082>}1 Corinthians 8:12):

“When you wound the weak conscience of the brethren [*Vulg.: ‘When you sin thus against the brethren and wound their weak conscience’], you sin against Christ.”

Therefore scandal is always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It may be a venial sin to lead a person into venial sin: and yet this would be to give scandal. Therefore scandal may be a venial sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), scandal denotes a stumbling whereby a person is disposed to a spiritual downfall. Consequently passive scandal may sometimes be a venial sin, when it consists in a stumbling and nothing more; for instance, when a person is disturbed by a movement of venial sin occasioned by another's inordinate word or deed: while sometimes it is a mortal sin, when the stumbling results in a downfall, for instance, when a person goes so far as to commit a mortal sin through another's inordinate word or deed.

Active scandal, if it be accidental, may sometimes be a venial sin; for instance, when, through a slight indiscretion, a person either commits a venial sin, or does something that is not a sin in itself, but has some appearance of evil. On the other hand, it is sometimes a mortal sin, either because a person commits a mortal sin, or because he has such contempt for his neighbor's spiritual welfare that he declines, for the sake of procuring it, to forego doing what he wishes to do. But in the case of active direct scandal, as when a person intends to lead another into sin, if he intends to lead him into mortal sin, his own sin will be mortal; and in like manner if he intends by committing a mortal sin himself, to lead another into venial sin; whereas if he intends, by committing a venial sin, to lead another into venial sin, there will be a venial sin of scandal.

And this suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(5)

Whether passive scandal may happen even to the perfect?

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that passive scandal may happen even to the perfect. For Christ was supremely perfect: and yet He said to Peter (⁴¹⁶³Matthew 16:23): "Thou art a scandal to Me." Much more therefore can other perfect men suffer scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, scandal denotes an obstacle which is put in a person's spiritual way. Now even perfect men can be hindered in

their progress along the spiritual way, according to ^{<512>}1 Thessalonians 2:18: “We would have come to you, I Paul indeed, once and again; but Satan hath hindered us.” Therefore even perfect men can suffer scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, even perfect men are liable to venial sins, according to ^{<610>}1 John 1:8: “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves.” Now passive scandal is not always a mortal sin, but is sometimes venial, as stated above (**A(4)**). Therefore passive scandal may be found in perfect men.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Jerome, in commenting on ^{<108>}Matthew 18:6, “He that shall scandalize one of these little ones,” says: “Observe that it is the little one that is scandalized, for the elders do not take scandal.”

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Passive scandal implies that the mind of the person who takes scandal is unsettled in its adherence to good. Now no man can be unsettled, who adheres firmly to something immovable. The elders, i.e. the perfect, adhere to God alone, Whose goodness is unchangeable, for though they adhere to their superiors, they do so only in so far as these adhere to Christ, according to ^{<416>}1 Corinthians 4:16: “Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ.” Wherefore, however much others may appear to them to conduct themselves ill in word or deed, they themselves do not stray from their righteousness, according to ^{<501>}Psalms 124:1:

“They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Sion: he shall not be moved for ever that dwelleth in Jerusalem.”

Therefore scandal is not found in those who adhere to God perfectly by love, according to ^{<481>}Psalms 118:165:

“Much peace have they that love Thy law, and to them there is no stumbling-block [scandalum].”

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(5)-RO(1) — As stated above (**A(2)**, ad 2), in this passage, scandal is used in a broad sense, to denote any kind of hindrance. Hence Our Lord said to Peter: “Thou art a scandal to Me,” because he was endeavoring to weaken Our Lord’s purpose of undergoing His Passion.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(5)-RO(2) — Perfect men may be hindered in the performance of external actions. But they are not hindered by the words or deeds of others, from tending to God in the internal acts of the will, according to ^{<818>}Romans 8:38,39:

“Neither death, nor life...
shall be able to separate us from the love of God.”

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(5)-RO(3) — Perfect men sometimes fall into venial sins through the weakness of the flesh; but they are not scandalized (taking scandal in its true sense), by the words or deeds of others, although there can be an approach to scandal in them, according to ^{<871D>}Psalms 72:2: “My feet were almost moved.”

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(6)

Whether active scandal can be found in the perfect?

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that active scandal can be found in the perfect. For passion is the effect of action. Now some are scandalized passively by the words or deeds of the perfect, according to ^{<115D>}Matthew 15:12:

“Dost thou know that the Pharisees,
when they heard this word, were scandalized?”

Therefore active scandal can be found in the perfect.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, Peter, after receiving the Holy Ghost, was in the state of the perfect. Yet afterwards he scandalized the gentiles: for it is written (^{<814>}Galatians 2:14):

“When I saw that they walked not uprightly unto the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas,” i.e. Peter, “before them all: If thou being a Jew, livest after the manner of the gentiles, and not as the Jews do, how dost thou compel the gentiles to live as do the Jews?”

Therefore active scandal can be in the perfect.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, active scandal is sometimes a venial sin. But venial sins may be in perfect men. Therefore active scandal may be in perfect men.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Active scandal is more opposed to perfection, than passive scandal. But passive scandal cannot be in the perfect. Much less, therefore, can active scandal be in them.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(6) — *I answer that*, Active scandal, properly so called, occurs when a man says or does a thing which in itself is of a nature to occasion another's spiritual downfall, and that is only when what he says or does is inordinate. Now it belongs to the perfect to direct all their actions according to the rule of reason, as stated in ~~4340~~ 1 Corinthians 14:40: "Let all things be done decently and according to order"; and they are careful to do this in those matters chiefly wherein not only would they do wrong, but would also be to others an occasion of wrongdoing. And if indeed they fail in this moderation in such words or deeds as come to the knowledge of others, this has its origin in human weakness wherein they fall short of perfection. Yet they do not fall short so far as to stray far from the order of reason, but only a little and in some slight matter: and this is not so grave that anyone can reasonably take therefrom an occasion for committing sin.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(6)-RO(1) — Passive scandal is always due to some active scandal; yet this active scandal is not always in another, but in the very person who is scandalized, because, to wit, he scandalizes himself.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(6)-RO(2) — In the opinion of Augustine (Ep. xxviii, xl, lxxxii) and of Paul also, Peter sinned and was to be blamed, in withdrawing from the gentiles in order to avoid the scandal of the Jews, because he did this somewhat imprudently, so that the gentiles who had been converted to the faith were scandalized. Nevertheless Peter's action was not so grave a sin as to give others sufficient ground for scandal. Hence they were guilty of passive scandal, while there was no active scandal in Peter.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(6)-RO(3) — The venial sins of the perfect consist chiefly in sudden movements, which being hidden cannot give scandal. If, however, they commit any venial sins even in their external words or deeds, these are so slight as to be insufficient in themselves to give scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7)

Whether spiritual goods should be foregone on account of scandal?

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that spiritual goods ought to be foregone on account of scandal. For Augustine (Contra Ep. Parmen. iii, 2) teaches that “punishment for sin should cease, when the peril of schism is feared.” But punishment of sins is a spiritual good, since it is an act of justice. Therefore a spiritual good is to be foregone on account of scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, the Sacred Doctrine is a most spiritual thing. Yet one ought to desist therefrom on account of scandal, according to ~~400~~ Matthew 7:6:

“Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine lest... turning upon you, they tear you.”

Therefore a spiritual good should be foregone on account of scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, since fraternal correction is an act of charity, it is a spiritual good. Yet sometimes it is omitted out of charity, in order to avoid giving scandal to others, as Augustine observes (De Civ. Dei i, 9). Therefore a spiritual good should be foregone on account of scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7)-O(4) — Further, Jerome [*Hugh de S. Cher., In Matth. xviii; in Luc. xvii, 2] says that in order to avoid scandal we should forego whatever it is possible to omit without prejudice to the threefold truth, i.e. “the truth of life, of justice and of doctrine.” Now the observance of the counsels, and the bestowal of alms may often be omitted without prejudice to the aforesaid threefold truth, else whoever omitted them would always be guilty of sin, and yet such things are the greatest of spiritual works. Therefore spiritual works should be omitted on account of scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7)-O(5) — Further, the avoidance of any sin is a spiritual good, since any sin brings spiritual harm to the sinner. Now it seems that one ought sometimes to commit a venial sin in order to avoid scandalizing one’s neighbor, for instance, when by sinning venially, one would prevent someone else from committing a mortal sin: because one is bound to hinder the damnation of one’s neighbor as much as one can without prejudice to

one's own salvation, which is not precluded by a venial sin. Therefore one ought to forego a spiritual good in order to avoid scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Hom. Super Ezekiel vii): “If people are scandalized at the truth, it is better to allow the birth of scandal, than to abandon the truth.” Now spiritual goods belong, above all others, to the truth. Therefore spiritual goods are not to be foregone on account of scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7) — *I answer that*, Whereas scandal is twofold, active and passive, the present question does not apply to active scandal, for since active scandal is “something said or done less rightly,” nothing ought to be done that implies active scandal. The question does, however, apply to passive scandal, and accordingly we have to see what ought to be foregone in order to avoid scandal. Now a distinction must be made in spiritual goods. For some of them are necessary for salvation, and cannot be foregone without mortal sin: and it is evident that no man ought to commit a mortal sin, in order to prevent another from sinning, because according to the order of charity, a man ought to love his own spiritual welfare more than another's. Therefore one ought not to forego that which is necessary for salvation, in order to avoid giving scandal.

Again a distinction seems necessary among spiritual things which are not necessary for salvation: because the scandal which arises from such things sometimes proceeds from malice, for instance when a man wishes to hinder those spiritual goods by stirring up scandal. This is the “scandal of the Pharisees,” who were scandalized at Our Lord's teaching: and Our Lord teaches (⁴¹⁵⁴ Matthew 15:14) that we ought to treat such like scandal with contempt. Sometimes scandal proceeds from weakness or ignorance, and such is the “scandal of little ones.” In order to avoid this kind of scandal, spiritual goods ought to be either concealed, or sometimes even deferred (if this can be done without incurring immediate danger), until the matter being explained the scandal cease. If, however, the scandal continue after the matter has been explained, it would seem to be due to malice, and then it would no longer be right to forego that spiritual good in order to avoid such like scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7)-RO(1) — In the infliction of punishment it is not the punishment itself that is the end in view, but its medicinal properties in

checking sin; wherefore punishment partakes of the nature of justice, in so far as it checks sin. But if it is evident that the infliction of punishment will result in more numerous and more grievous sins being committed, the infliction of punishment will no longer be a part of justice. It is in this sense that Augustine is speaking, when, to wit, the excommunication of a few threatens to bring about the danger of a schism, for in that case it would be contrary to the truth of justice to pronounce excommunication.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7)-RO(2) — With regard to a man's doctrine two points must be considered, namely, the truth which is taught, and the act of teaching. The first of these is necessary for salvation, to wit, that he whose duty it is to teach should not teach what is contrary to the truth, and that he should teach the truth according to the requirements of times and persons: wherefore on no account ought he to suppress the truth and teach error in order to avoid any scandal that might ensue. But the act itself of teaching is one of the spiritual almsdeeds, as stated above (**Q(32), A(2)**), and so the same is to be said of it as of the other works of mercy, of which we shall speak further on (ad 4).

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7)-RO(3) — As stated above (**Q(33), A(1)**), fraternal correction aims at the correction of a brother, wherefore it is to be reckoned among spiritual goods in so far as this end can be obtained, which is not the case if the brother be scandalized through being corrected. And so, if the correction be omitted in order to avoid scandal, no spiritual good is foregone.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7)-RO(4) — The truth of life, of doctrine, and of justice comprises not only whatever is necessary for salvation, but also whatever is a means of obtaining salvation more perfectly, according to ¹ ~~1231~~ Corinthians 12:31: "Be zealous for the better gifts." Wherefore neither the counsels nor even the works of mercy are to be altogether omitted in order to avoid scandal; but sometimes they should be concealed or deferred, on account of the scandal of the little ones, as stated above. Sometimes, however, the observance of the counsels and the fulfilment of the works of mercy are necessary for salvation. This may be seen in the case of those who have vowed to keep the counsels, and of those whose duty it is to relieve the wants of others, either in temporal matters (as by feeding the hungry), or in spiritual matters (as by instructing the ignorant), whether

such duties arise from their being enjoined as in the case of prelates, or from the need on the part of the person in want; and then the same applies to these things as to others that are necessary for salvation.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(7)-RO(5) — Some have said that one ought to commit a venial sin in order to avoid scandal. But this implies a contradiction, since if it ought to be done, it is no longer evil or sinful, for a sin cannot be a matter of choice. It may happen however that, on account of some circumstance, something is not a venial sin, though it would be were it not for that circumstance: thus an idle word is a venial sin, when it is uttered uselessly; yet if it be uttered for a reasonable cause, it is neither idle nor sinful. And though venial sin does not deprive a man of grace which is his means of salvation, yet, in so far as it disposes him to mortal sin, it tends to the loss of salvation.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8)

Whether temporal goods should be foregone on account of scandal?

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that temporal goods should be foregone on account of scandal. For we ought to love our neighbor's spiritual welfare which is hindered by scandal, more than any temporal goods whatever. But we forego what we love less for the sake of what we love more. Therefore we should forego temporal goods in order to avoid scandalizing our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, according to Jerome's rule [*Cf. **A(7)**, OBJ[4]], whatever can be foregone without prejudice to the threefold truth, should be omitted in order to avoid scandal. Now temporal goods can be foregone without prejudice to the threefold truth. Therefore they should be foregone in order to avoid scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, no temporal good is more necessary than food. But we ought to forego taking food on account of scandal, according to ⁵¹⁴⁵Romans 14:15: "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." Much more therefore should all other temporal goods be foregone on account of scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8)-O(4) — Further, the most fitting way of safeguarding and recovering temporal goods is the court of justice. But it is unlawful to have recourse to justice, especially if scandal ensues: for it is written (~~4150~~ Matthew 5:40):

“If a man will contend with thee in judgment, and take away thy coat, let ego thy cloak also unto him”;

and (~~4161~~ 1 Corinthians 6:7):

“Already indeed there is plainly a fault among you, that you have lawsuits one with another. Why do you not rather take wrong? why do you not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?”

Therefore it seems that we ought to forego temporal goods on account of scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8)-O(5) — Further, we ought, seemingly, to forego least of all those temporal goods which are connected with spiritual goods: and yet we ought to forego them on account of scandal. For the Apostle while sowing spiritual things did not accept a temporal stipend lest he “should give any hindrance to the Gospel of Christ” as we read ~~4162~~ 1 Corinthians 9:12. For a like reason the Church does not demand tithes in certain countries, in order to avoid scandal. Much more, therefore, ought we to forego other temporal goods in order to avoid scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, Blessed Thomas of Canterbury demanded the restitution of Church property, notwithstanding that the king took scandal from his doing so.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8) — *I answer that*, A distinction must be made in temporal goods: for either they are ours, or they are consigned to us to take care of them for someone else; thus the goods of the Church are consigned to prelates, and the goods of the community are entrusted to all such persons as have authority over the common weal. In this latter case the care of such things (as of things held in deposit) devolves of necessity on those persons to whom they are entrusted, wherefore, even as other things that are necessary for salvation, they are not to be foregone on account of scandal. On the other hand, as regards those temporalities of which we have the dominion, sometimes, on account of scandal, we are

bound to forego them, and sometimes we are not so bound, whether we forego them by giving them up, if we have them in our possession, or by omitting to claim them, if they are in the possession of others. For if the scandal arise therefrom through the ignorance or weakness of others (in which case, as stated above, **A(7)**, it is scandal of the little ones) we must either forego such temporalities altogether, or the scandal must be abated by some other means, namely, by some kind of admonition. Hence Augustine says (*De Serm. Dom. in Monte i*, 20): “Thou shouldst give so as to injure neither thyself nor another, as much as thou canst lend, and if thou refusest what is asked, thou must yet be just to him, indeed thou wilt give him something better than he asks, if thou reprove him that asks unjustly.” Sometimes, however, scandal arises from malice. This is scandal of the Pharisees: and we ought not to forego temporal goods for the sake of those who stir up scandals of this kind, for this would both be harmful to the common good, since it would give wicked men an opportunity of plunder, and would be injurious to the plunderers themselves, who would remain in sin as long as they were in possession of another’s property. Hence Gregory says (*Moral. xxxi*, 13): “Sometimes we ought to suffer those who rob us of our temporalities, while sometimes we should resist them, as far as equity allows, in the hope not only that we may safeguard our property, but also lest those who take what is not theirs may lose themselves.”

This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8)-RO(2) — If it were permissible for wicked men to rob other people of their property, this would tend to the detriment of the truth of life and justice. Therefore we are not always bound to forego our temporal goods in order to avoid scandal.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8)-RO(3) — The Apostle had no intention of counselling total abstinence from food on account of scandal, because our welfare requires that we should take food: but he intended to counsel abstinence from a particular kind of food, in order to avoid scandal, according to **1** ~~Cor~~ ¹ Corinthians 8:13:

“I will never eat flesh, lest I should scandalize my brother.”

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8)-RO(4) — According to Augustine (De Serm. Dom. in Monte i, 19) this precept of Our Lord is to be understood of the preparedness of the mind, namely, that man should be prepared, if it be expedient, to suffer being harmed or defrauded, rather than go to law. But sometimes it is not expedient, as stated above (ad 2). The same applies to the saying of the Apostle.

P(2b)-Q(43)-A(8)-RO(5) — The scandal which the Apostle avoided, arose from an error of the gentiles who were not used to this payment. Hence it behooved him to forego it for the time being, so that they might be taught first of all that such a payment was a duty. For a like reason the Church refrains from demanding tithes in those countries where it is not customary to pay them.

QUESTION 44

OF THE PRECEPTS OF CHARITY

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

We must now consider the Precepts of Charity, under which there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether precepts should be given about charity?
- (2) Whether there should be one or two?
- (3) Whether two suffice?
- (4) Whether it is fittingly prescribed that we should love God, “with thy whole heart”?
- (5) Whether it is fittingly added: “With thy whole mind,” etc.?
- (6) Whether it is possible to fulfil this precept in this life?
- (7) Of the precept: “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself”;
- (8) Whether the order of charity is included in the precept?

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(1)

Whether any precept should be given about charity?

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that no precept should be given about charity. For charity imposes the mode on all acts of virtue, since it is the form of the virtues as stated above (**Q(23)**, **A(8)**), while the precepts are about the virtues themselves. Now, according to the common saying, the mode is not included in the precept. Therefore no precepts should be given about charity.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, charity, which “is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost” (^{<ART>} Romans 5:5), makes us free, since “where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty” (^{<ART>} 2 Corinthians 3:17). Now the

obligation that arises from a precept is opposed to liberty, since it imposes a necessity. Therefore no precept should be given about charity.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, charity is the foremost among all the virtues, to which the precepts are directed, as shown above (**P(2a), Q(90), A(2); P(2a), Q(100), A(9)**). If, therefore, any precepts were given about charity, they should have a place among the chief precepts which are those of the decalogue. But they have no place there. Therefore no precepts should be given about charity.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Whatever God requires of us is included in a precept. Now God requires that man should love Him, according to ⁽⁵⁰⁰⁾Deuteronomy 10:12. Therefore it behooved precepts to be given about the love of charity, which is the love of God.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(16), A(1); P(2a), Q(99), A(1)**), a precept implies the notion of something due. Hence a thing is a matter of precept, in so far as it is something due. Now a thing is due in two ways, for its own sake, and for the sake of something else. In every affair, it is the end that is due for its own sake, because it has the character of a good for its own sake: while that which is directed to the end is due for the sake of something else: thus for a physician, it is due for its own sake, that he should heal, while it is due for the sake of something else that he should give a medicine in order to heal. Now the end of the spiritual life is that man be united to God, and this union is effected by charity, while all things pertaining to the spiritual life are ordained to this union, as to their end. Hence the Apostle says (⁽⁵⁰⁰⁾1 Timothy 1:5):

“The end of the commandment is charity from a pure heart, and a good conscience, and an unfeigned faith.”

For all the virtues, about whose acts the precepts are given, are directed either to the freeing of the heart from the whirl of the passions — such are the virtues that regulate the passions — or at least to the possession of a good conscience — such are the virtues that regulate operations — or to the having of a right faith — such are those which pertain to the worship of God: and these three things are required of man that he may love God. For an impure heart is withdrawn from loving God, on account of the passion that inclines it to earthly things; an evil conscience gives man a

horror for God's justice, through fear of His punishments; and an untrue faith draws man's affections to an untrue representation of God, and separates him from the truth of God. Now in every genus that which is for its own sake takes precedence of that which is for the sake of another, wherefore the greatest precept is that of charity, as stated in ^{<123>}Matthew 22:39.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(1)-RO(1) — As stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(100)**, **A(10)**) when we were treating of the commandments, the mode of love does not come under those precepts which are about the other acts of virtue: for instance, this precept, "Honor thy father and thy mother," does not prescribe that this should be done out of charity. The act of love does, however, fall under special precepts.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(1)-RO(2) — The obligation of a precept is not opposed to liberty, except in one whose mind is averted from that which is prescribed, as may be seen in those who keep the precepts through fear alone. But the precept of love cannot be fulfilled save of one's own will, wherefore it is not opposed to charity.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(1)-RO(3) — All the precepts of the decalogue are directed to the love of God and of our neighbor: and therefore the precepts of charity had not to be enumerated among the precepts of the decalogue, since they are included in all of them.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(2)

Whether there should have been given two precepts of charity?

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that there should not have been given two precepts of charity. For the precepts of the Law are directed to virtue, as stated above (**A(1)**, **O(3)**). Now charity is one virtue, as shown above (**Q(33)**, **A(5)**). Therefore only one precept of charity should have been given.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, as Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 22,27), charity loves none but God in our neighbor. Now we are sufficiently directed to love God by the precept, "Thou shalt love the

Lord thy God.” Therefore there was no need to add the precept about loving our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, different sins are opposed to different precepts. But it is not a sin to put aside the love of our neighbor, provided we put not aside the love of God; indeed, it is written (~~Q(44)~~ Luke 15:26):

“If any man come to Me, and hate not his father,
and mother... he cannot be My disciple.”

Therefore the precept of the love of God is not distinct from the precept of the love of our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, the Apostle says (~~Q(44)~~ Romans 13:8): “He that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the Law.” But a law is not fulfilled unless all its precepts be observed. Therefore all the precepts are included in the love of our neighbor: and consequently the one precept of the love of our neighbor suffices. Therefore there should not be two precepts of charity.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~Q(44)~~ 1 John 4:21):

“This commandment we have from God,
that he who loveth God, love also his brother.”

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(91), A(3); P(2a), Q(94), A(2)**) when we were treating of the commandments, the precepts are to the Law what propositions are to speculative sciences, for in these latter, the conclusions are virtually contained in the first principles. Hence whoever knows the principles as to their entire virtual extent has no need to have the conclusions put separately before him. Since, however, some who know the principles are unable to consider all that is virtually contained therein, it is necessary, for their sake, that scientific conclusions should be traced to their principles. Now in practical matters wherein the precepts of the Law direct us, the end has the character of principle, as stated above (**Q(23), A(7)**, ad 2; **Q(26), A(1)**, ad 1): and the love of God is the end to which the love of our neighbor is directed. Therefore it behooved us to receive precepts not only of the love of God but also of the love of our neighbor, on account of those who are less intelligent, who do not easily understand that one of these precepts is included in the other.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(2)-RO(1) — Although charity is one virtue, yet it has two acts, one of which is directed to the other as to its end. Now precepts are given about acts of virtue, and so there had to be several precepts of charity.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(2)-RO(2) — God is loved in our neighbor, as the end is loved in that which is directed to the end; and yet there was need for an explicit precept about both, for the reason given above.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(2)-RO(3) — The means derive their goodness from their relation to the end, and accordingly aversion from the means derives its malice from the same source and from no other

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(2)-RO(4) — Love of our neighbor includes love of God, as the end is included in the means, and vice versa: and yet it behooved each precept to be given explicitly, for the reason given above.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(3)

Whether two precepts of charity suffice?

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that two precepts of charity do not suffice. For precepts are given about acts of virtue. Now acts are distinguished by their objects. Since, then, man is bound to love four things out of charity, namely, God, himself, his neighbor and his own body, as shown above (**Q(25)**, **A(12)**; **Q(26)**), it seems that there ought to be four precepts of charity, so that two are not sufficient.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, love is not the only act of charity, but also joy, peace and beneficence. But precepts should be given about the acts of the virtues. Therefore two precepts of charity do not suffice.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, virtue consists not only in doing good but also in avoiding evil. Now we are led by the positive precepts to do good, and by the negative precepts to avoid evil. Therefore there ought to have been not only positive, but also negative precepts about charity; and so two precepts of charity are not sufficient.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Our Lord said (⁴²⁴Matthew 22:40):

“On these two commandments dependeth
the whole Law and the prophets.”

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Charity, as stated above (**Q(23)**, **A(1)**), is a kind of friendship. Now friendship is between one person and another, wherefore Gregory says (Hom. in Ev. xvii): “Charity is not possible between less than two”: and it has been explained how one may love oneself out of charity (**Q(25)**, **A(4)**). Now since good is the object of dilection and love, and since good is either an end or a means, it is fitting that there should be two precepts of charity, one whereby we are induced to love God as our end, and another whereby we are led to love our neighbor for God’s sake, as for the sake of our end

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(3)-RO(1) — As Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 23), “though four things are to be loved out of charity, there was no need of a precept as regards the second and fourth,” i.e. love of oneself and of one’s own body. “For however much a man may stray from the truth, the love of himself and of his own body always remains in him.” And yet the mode of this love had to be prescribed to man, namely, that he should love himself and his own body in an ordinate manner, and this is done by his loving God and his neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(3)-RO(2) — As stated above (**Q(28)**, **A(4)**; **Q(29)**, **A(3)**), the other acts of charity result from the act of love as effects from their cause. Hence the precepts of love virtually include the precepts about the other acts. And yet we find that, for the sake of the laggards, special precepts were given about each act — about joy (³⁰⁰⁶Philippians 4:4): “Rejoice in the Lord always” — about peace (³⁰²⁴Hebrews 12:14): “Follow peace with all men” — about beneficence (³⁰³⁰Galatians 6:10): “Whilst we have time, let us work good to all men” — and Holy Writ contains precepts about each of the parts of beneficence, as may be seen by anyone who considers the matter carefully.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(3)-RO(3) — To do good is more than to avoid evil, and therefore the positive precepts virtually include the negative precepts. Nevertheless we find explicit precepts against the vices contrary to charity: for, against hatred it is written (³⁰³²Leviticus 12:17): “Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart”; against sloth (Ecclus. 6:26): “Be not grieved with her bands”; against envy (³⁰³³Galatians 5:26):

“Let us not be made desirous of vainglory, provoking one another,
envying one another”;

against discord (~~410~~ 1 Corinthians 1:10): “That you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you”; and against scandal (~~640~~ Romans 14:13):

“That you put not a stumbling-block or a scandal in your brother’s way.”

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(4)

*Whether it is fittingly commanded
that man should love God with his whole heart?*

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that it is unfittingly commanded that man should love God with his whole heart. For the mode of a virtuous act is not a matter of precept, as shown above (**A(1)**, ad 1; **P(2a)**, **Q(100)**, **A(9)**). Now the words “with thy whole heart” signify the mode of the love of God. Therefore it is unfittingly commanded that man should love God with his whole heart.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, “A thing is whole and perfect when it lacks nothing” (Phys. iii, 6). If therefore it is a matter of precept that God be loved with the whole heart, whoever does something not pertaining to the love of God, acts counter to the precept, and consequently sins mortally. Now a venial sin does not pertain to the love of God. Therefore a venial sin is a mortal sin, which is absurd.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, to love God with one’s whole heart belongs to perfection, since according to the Philosopher (Phys. iii, text. 64), “to be whole is to be perfect.” But that which belongs to perfection is not a matter of precept, but a matter of counsel. Therefore we ought not to be commanded to love God with our whole heart.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~1000~~ Deuteronomy 6:5):

“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart.”

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Since precepts are given about acts of virtue, an act is a matter of precept according as it is an act of virtue. Now it is requisite for an act of virtue that not only should it fall on its own matter, but also that it should be endued with its due circumstances, whereby it is adapted to that matter. But God is to be loved as the last

end, to which all things are to be referred. Therefore some kind of totality was to be indicated in connection with the precept of the love of God.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(4)-RO(1) — The commandment that prescribes an act of virtue does not prescribe the mode which that virtue derives from another and higher virtue, but it does prescribe the mode which belongs to its own proper virtue, and this mode is signified in the words “with thy whole heart.”

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(4)-RO(2) — To love God with one’s whole heart has a twofold signification. First, actually, so that a man’s whole heart be always actually directed to God: this is the perfection of heaven. Secondly, in the sense that a man’s whole heart be habitually directed to God, so that it consent to nothing contrary to the love of God, and this is the perfection of the way. Venial sin is not contrary to this latter perfection, because it does not destroy the habit of charity, since it does not tend to a contrary object, but merely hinders the use of charity.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(4)-RO(3) — That perfection of charity to which the counsels are directed, is between the two perfections mentioned in the preceding reply: and it consists in man renouncing, as much as possible, temporal things, even such as are lawful, because they occupy the mind and hinder the actual movement of the heart towards God.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(5)

Whether to the words, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart,” it was fitting to add “and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole strength”?

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that it was unfitting to the words, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with thy whole heart,” to add, “and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole strength” (^{CRS}Deuteronomy 6:5). For heart does not mean here a part of the body, since to love God is not a bodily action: and therefore heart is to be taken here in a spiritual sense. Now the heart understood spiritually is either the soul itself or part of the soul. Therefore it is superfluous to mention both heart and soul.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, a man’s strength whether spiritual or corporal depends on the heart. Therefore after the words, “Thou shalt love

the Lord thy God with thy whole heart,” it was unnecessary to add, “with all thy strength.”

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, in ^{<127>}Matthew 22:37 we read: “With all thy mind,” which words do not occur here. Therefore it seems that this precept is unfittingly worded in ^{<111>}Deuteronomy 6.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(5) — On the contrary stands the authority of Scripture.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(5) — *I answer that*, This precept is differently worded in various places: for, as we said in the first objection, in Deuteronomy 6 three points are mentioned: “with thy whole heart,” and “with thy whole soul,” and “with thy whole strength.” In ^{<121>}Matthew 22 we find two of these mentioned, viz. “with thy whole heart” and “with thy whole soul,” while “with thy whole strength” is omitted, but “with thy whole mind” is added. Yet in ^{<111>}Mark 12 we find all four, viz. “with thy whole heart,” and “with thy whole soul,” and “with thy whole mind,” and “with thy whole force” which is the same as “strength.” Moreover, these four are indicated in Luke 10, where in place of “strength” or “force” we read “with all thy might.” [*St. Thomas is explaining the Latin text which reads “ex tota fortitudine tua” (Dt.), “ex tota virtute tua” (Mk.), and “ex omnibus tuis” (Lk.), although the Greek in all three cases has {ex holes tes ischyos}, which the Douay renders “with thy whole strength.”]

Accordingly these four have to be explained, since the fact that one of them is omitted here or there is due to one implying another. We must therefore observe that love is an act of the will which is here denoted by the “heart,” because just as the bodily heart is the principle of all the movements of the body, so too the will, especially as regards the intention of the last end which is the object of charity, is the principle of all the movements of the soul. Now there are three principles of action that are moved by the will, namely, the intellect which is signified by “the mind,” the lower appetitive power, signified by “the soul”; and the exterior executive power signified by “strength,” “force” or “might.” Accordingly we are commanded to direct our whole intention to God, and this is signified by the words “with thy whole heart”; to submit our intellect to God, and this is expressed in the words “with thy whole mind”; to regulate our appetite according to God, in the words “with thy whole soul”; and to

obey God in our external actions, and this is to love God with our whole “strength,” “force” or “might.”

Chrysostom [*The quotation is from an anonymous author’s unfinished work (Opus imperf. Hom. xlii, in Matth.) which is included in Chrysostom’s works], on the other hand, takes “heart” and “soul” in the contrary sense; and Augustine (De Doctr. Christ. i, 22) refers “heart” to the thought, “soul” to the manner of life, and “mind” to the intellect. Again some explain “with thy whole heart” as denoting the intellect, “with thy whole soul” as signifying the will, “with thy mind” as pointing to the memory. And again, according to Gregory of Nyssa (De Hom. Opif. viii), “heart” signifies the vegetative soul, “soul” the sensitive, and “mind” the intellective soul, because our nourishment, sensation, and understanding ought all to be referred by us to God.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(6)

Whether it is possible in this life to fulfil this precept of the love of God?

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that in this life it is possible to fulfil this precept of the love of God. For according to Jerome [*Pelagius, Exposit. Cath. Fid.] “accursed is he who says that Cod has commanded anything impossible.” But God gave this commandment, as is clear from ⁴⁰⁰⁵Deuteronomy 6:5. Therefore it is possible to fulfil this precept in this life.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, whoever does not fulfil a precept sins mortally, since according to Ambrose (De Parad. viii) sin is nothing else than “a transgression of the Divine Law, and disobedience of the heavenly commandments.” If therefore this precept cannot be fulfilled by wayfarers, it follows that in this life no man can be without mortal sin, and this is against the saying of the Apostle (⁴⁰⁰⁵1 Corinthians 1:8):

“(Who also) will confirm you unto the end without crime,”
and (⁵⁰⁸⁰1 Timothy 3:10):

“Let them minister, having no crime.”

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, precepts are given in order to direct man in the way of salvation, according to ^{498b}Psalm 18:9: “The commandment of the Lord is lightsome, enlightening the eyes.” Now it is useless to direct anyone to what is impossible. Therefore it is not impossible to fulfill this precept in this life.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Perfect. Justit. viii): “In the fulness of heavenly charity this precept will be fulfilled: Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,” etc. For as long as any carnal concupiscence remains, that can be restrained by continence, man cannot love God with all his heart.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(6) — *I answer that*, A precept can be fulfilled in two ways; perfectly, and imperfectly. A precept is fulfilled perfectly, when the end intended by the author of the precept is reached; yet it is fulfilled, imperfectly however, when although the end intended by its author is not reached, nevertheless the order to that end is not departed from. Thus if the commander of an army order his soldiers to fight, his command will be perfectly obeyed by those who fight and conquer the foe, which is the commander’s intention; yet it is fulfilled, albeit imperfectly, by those who fight without gaining the victory, provided they do nothing contrary to military discipline. Now God intends by this precept that man should be entirely united to Him, and this will be realized in heaven, when God will be “all in all,” according to ^{498b}1 Corinthians 15:28. Hence this precept will be observed fully and perfectly in heaven; yet it is fulfilled, though imperfectly, on the way. Nevertheless on the way one man will fulfil it more perfectly than another, and so much the more, as he approaches by some kind of likeness to the perfection of heaven.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(6)-RO(1) — This argument proves that the precept can be fulfilled after a fashion on the way, but not perfectly.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(6)-RO(2) — Even as the soldier who fights legitimately without conquering is not blamed nor deserves to be punished for this, so too he that does not fulfil this precept on the way, but does nothing against the love of God, does not sin mortally.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(6)-RO(3) — As Augustine says (De Perfect. Justit. viii), “why should not this perfection be prescribed to man, although no man

attains it in this life? For one cannot run straight unless one knows whither to run. And how would one know this if no precept pointed it out.”

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(7)

Whether the precept of love of our neighbor is fittingly expressed?

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that the precept of the love of our neighbor is unfittingly expressed. For the love of charity extends to all men, even to our enemies, as may be seen in ^{<4154>}Matthew 5:44. But the word “neighbor” denotes a kind of “nighness” which does not seem to exist towards all men. Therefore it seems that this precept is unfittingly expressed.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. ix, 8) “the origin of our friendly relations with others lies in our relation to ourselves,” whence it seems to follow that love of self is the origin of one’s love for one’s neighbor. Now the principle is greater than that which results from it. Therefore man ought not to love his neighbor as himself.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, man loves himself, but not his neighbor, naturally. Therefore it is unfitting that he should be commanded to love his neighbor as himself.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<4124>}Matthew 22:39): “The second” commandment “is like to this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.”

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(7) — *I answer that*, This precept is fittingly expressed, for it indicates both the reason for loving and the mode of love. The reason for loving is indicated in the word “neighbor,” because the reason why we ought to love others out of charity is because they are nigh to us, both as to the natural image of God, and as to the capacity for glory. Nor does it matter whether we say “neighbor,” or “brother” according to ^{<4121>}1 John 4:21, or “friend,” according to ^{<4125>}Leviticus 19:18, because all these words express the same affinity.

The mode of love is indicated in the words “as thyself.” This does not mean that a man must love his neighbor equally as himself, but in like manner as himself, and this in three ways. First, as regards the end,

namely, that he should love his neighbor for God's sake, even as he loves himself for God's sake, so that his love for his neighbor is a "holy" love. Secondly, as regards the rule of love, namely, that a man should not give way to his neighbor in evil, but only in good things, even as he ought to gratify his will in good things alone, so that his love for his neighbor may be a "righteous" love. Thirdly, as regards the reason for loving, namely, that a man should love his neighbor, not for his own profit, or pleasure, but in the sense of wishing his neighbor well, even as he wishes himself well, so that his love for his neighbor may be a "true" love: since when a man loves his neighbor for his own profit or pleasure, he does not love his neighbor truly, but loves himself.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(8)

Whether the order of charity is included in the precept?

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that the order of charity is not included in the precept. For whoever transgresses a precept does a wrong. But if man loves some one as much as he ought, and loves any other man more, he wrongs no man. Therefore he does not transgress the precept. Therefore the order of charity is not included in the precept.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, whatever is a matter of precept is sufficiently delivered to us in Holy Writ. Now the order of charity which was given above (**Q(26)**) is nowhere indicated in Holy Writ. Therefore it is not included in the precept.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, order implies some kind of distinction. But the love of our neighbor is prescribed without any distinction, in the words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Therefore the order of charity is not included in the precept.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(8) — On the contrary, Whatever God works in us by His grace, He teaches us first of all by His Law, according to ²⁴⁸³Jeremiah 31:33: "I will give My Law in their heart [*Vulg.: 'in their bowels, and I will write it in their heart']." Now God causes in us the order of charity, according to Cant 2:4: "He set in order charity in me." Therefore the order of charity comes under the precept of the Law.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(8) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(4)**, ad 1), the mode which is essential to an act of virtue comes under the precept which prescribes that virtuous act. Now the order of charity is essential to the virtue, since it is based on the proportion of love to the thing beloved, as shown above (**Q(25)**, **A(12)**; **Q(26)**, **AA(1,2)**). It is therefore evident that the order of charity must come under the precept.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(8)-RO(1) — A man gratifies more the person he loves more, so that if he loved less one whom he ought to love more, he would wish to gratify more one whom he ought to gratify less, and so he would do an injustice to the one he ought to love more.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(8)-RO(2) — The order of those four things we have to love out of charity is expressed in Holy Writ. For when we are commanded to love God with our “whole heart,” we are given to understand that we must love Him above all things. When we are commanded to love our neighbor “as ourselves,” the love of self is set before love of our neighbor. In like manner where we are commanded (^{GEN}1 John 3:16) “to lay down our souls,” i.e. the life of our bodies, “for the brethren,” we are given to understand that a man ought to love his neighbor more than his own body; and again when we are commanded (^{ROM} Galatians 6:10) to “work good... especially to those who are of the household of the faith,” and when a man is blamed (^{SUB}1 Timothy 5:8) if he “have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house,” it means that we ought to love most those of our neighbors who are more virtuous or more closely united to us.

P(2b)-Q(44)-A(8)-RO(3) — It follows from the very words, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor” that those who are nearer to us are to be loved more.

QUESTION 45

OF THE GIFT OF WISDOM

(SIX ARTICLES)

We must now consider the gift of wisdom which corresponds to charity; and firstly, wisdom itself, secondly, the opposite vice. Under the first head there are six points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether wisdom should be reckoned among the gifts of the Holy Ghost?
- (2) What is its subject?
- (3) Whether wisdom is only speculative or also practical?
- (4) Whether the wisdom that is a gift is compatible with mortal sin?
- (5) Whether it is in all those who have sanctifying grace?
- (6) Which beatitude corresponds to it?

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(1)

Whether wisdom should be reckoned among the gifts of the Holy Ghost?

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that wisdom ought not to be reckoned among the gifts of the Holy Ghost. For the gifts are more perfect than the virtues, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(68)**, **A(8)**). Now virtue is directed to the good alone, wherefore Augustine says (De Lib. Arb. ii, 19) that “no man makes bad use of the virtues.” Much more therefore are the gifts of the Holy Ghost directed to the good alone. But wisdom is directed to evil also, for it is written (⁵⁰⁸⁵James 3:15) that a certain wisdom is “earthly, sensual, devilish.” Therefore wisdom should not be reckoned among the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, according to Augustine (De Trin. xii, 14) “wisdom is the knowledge of Divine things.” Now that knowledge of Divine things which man can acquire by his natural endowments, belongs to the wisdom which is an intellectual virtue, while the supernatural knowledge of Divine things belongs to faith which is a theological virtue, as explained above (**Q(4), A(5); P(2a), Q(62), A(3)**). Therefore wisdom should be called a virtue rather than a gift.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, it is written (⁴⁰³⁸Job 28:28): “Behold the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom, and to depart from evil, that is understanding.” And in this passage according to the rendering of the Septuagint which Augustine follows (De Trin. xii, 14; xiv, 1) we read: “Behold piety, that is wisdom.” Now both fear and piety are gifts of the Holy Ghost. Therefore wisdom should not be reckoned among the gifts of the Holy Ghost, as though it were distinct from the others.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{2911P}Isaiah 11:2):

“The Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon Him; the spirit of wisdom
and of understanding.”

I answer that, According to the Philosopher (Metaph. i: 2), it belongs to wisdom to consider the highest cause. By means of that cause we are able to form a most certain judgment about other causes, and according thereto all things should be set in order. Now the highest cause may be understood in two ways, either simply or in some particular genus. Accordingly he that knows the highest cause in any particular genus, and by its means is able to judge and set in order all the things that belong to that genus, is said to be wise in that genus, for instance in medicine or architecture, according to ⁴¹⁸⁰1 Corinthians 3:10: “As a wise architect, I have laid a foundation.” On the other hand, he who knows the cause that is simply the highest, which is God, is said to be wise simply, because he is able to judge and set in order all things according to Divine rules.

Now man obtains this judgment through the Holy Ghost, according to ⁴¹²⁵1 Corinthians 2:15: “The spiritual man judgeth all things,” because as stated in the same chapter (⁴¹²⁰1 Corinthians 2:10), “the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God.” Wherefore it is evident that wisdom is a gift of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(1)-RO(1) — A thing is said to be good in two senses: first in the sense that it is truly good and simply perfect, secondly, by a kind of likeness, being perfect in wickedness; thus we speak of a good or a perfect thief, as the Philosopher observes (Metaph. v, text. 21). And just as with regard to those things which are truly good, we find a highest cause, namely the sovereign good which is the last end, by knowing which, man is said to be truly wise, so too in evil things something is to be found to which all others are to be referred as to a last end, by knowing which, man is said to be wise unto evil doing, according to ²⁰⁰²Jeremiah 4:22: “They are wise to do evils, but to do good they have no knowledge.” Now whoever turns away from his due end, must needs fix on some undue end, since every agent acts for an end. Wherefore, if he fixes his end in external earthly things, his “wisdom” is called “earthly,” if in the goods of the body, it is called “sensual wisdom,” if in some excellence, it is called “devilish wisdom” because it imitates the devil’s pride, of which it is written (¹⁸¹²⁵Job 41:25): “He is king over all the children of pride.”

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(1)-RO(2) — The wisdom which is called a gift of the Holy Ghost, differs from that which is an acquired intellectual virtue, for the latter is attained by human effort, whereas the latter is “descending from above” (¹⁸¹²⁵James 3:15). In like manner it differs from faith, since faith assents to the Divine truth in itself, whereas it belongs to the gift of wisdom to judge according to the Divine truth. Hence the gift of wisdom presupposes faith, because “a man judges well what he knows” (Ethic. i, 3).

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(1)-RO(3) — Just as piety which pertains to the worship of God is a manifestation of faith, in so far as we make profession of faith by worshipping God, so too, piety manifests wisdom. For this reason piety is stated to be wisdom, and so is fear, for the same reason, because if a man fear and worship God, this shows that he has a right judgment about Divine things.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(2)

Whether wisdom is in the intellect as its subject?

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that wisdom is not in the intellect as its subject. For Augustine says (Ep. cxx) that “wisdom is the charity of God.” Now charity is in the will as its subject, and not in the intellect, as stated above (**Q(24), A(1)**). Therefore wisdom is not in the intellect as its subject.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, it is written (Ecclus. 6:23): “The wisdom of doctrine is according to her name,” for wisdom [sapientia] may be described as “sweet-tasting science [sapida scientia],” and this would seem to regard the appetite, to which it belongs to taste spiritual pleasure or sweetness. Therefore wisdom is in the appetite rather than in the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the intellective power is sufficiently perfected by the gift of understanding. Now it is superfluous to require two things where one suffices for the purpose. Therefore wisdom is not in the intellect.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. ii, 49) that “wisdom is contrary to folly.” But folly is in the intellect. Therefore wisdom is also.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), wisdom denotes a certain rectitude of judgment according to the Eternal Law. Now rectitude of judgment is twofold: first, on account of perfect use of reason, secondly, on account of a certain connaturality with the matter about which one has to judge. Thus, about matters of chastity, a man after inquiring with his reason forms a right judgment, if he has learnt the science of morals, while he who has the habit of chastity judges of such matters by a kind of connaturality.

Accordingly it belongs to the wisdom that is an intellectual virtue to pronounce right judgment about Divine things after reason has made its inquiry, but it belongs to wisdom as a gift of the Holy Ghost to judge aright about them on account of connaturality with them: thus Dionysius

says (Div. Nom. ii) that “Hierotheus is perfect in Divine things, for he not only learns, but is patient of, Divine things.”

Now this sympathy or connaturality for Divine things is the result of charity, which unites us to God, according to ~~407~~1 Corinthians 6:17: “He who is joined to the Lord, is one spirit.” Consequently wisdom which is a gift, has its cause in the will, which cause is charity, but it has its essence in the intellect, whose act is to judge aright, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(14), A(1)**).

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(2)-RO(1) — Augustine is speaking of wisdom as to its cause, whence also wisdom [sapientia] takes its name, in so far as it denotes a certain sweetness [saporem]. Hence the Reply to the Second Objection is evident, that is if this be the true meaning of the text quoted. For, apparently this is not the case, because such an exposition of the text would only fit the Latin word for wisdom, whereas it does not apply to the Greek and perhaps not in other languages. Hence it would seem that in the text quoted wisdom stands for the renown of doctrine, for which it is praised by all.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(2)-RO(3) — The intellect exercises a twofold act, perception and judgment. The gift of understanding regards the former; the gift of wisdom regards the latter according to the Divine ideas, the gift of knowledge, according to human ideas.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(3)

Whether wisdom is merely speculative, or practical also?

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that wisdom is not practical but merely speculative. For the gift of wisdom is more excellent than the wisdom which is an intellectual virtue. But wisdom, as an intellectual virtue, is merely speculative. Much more therefore is wisdom, as a gift, speculative and not practical.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, the practical intellect is about matters of operation which are contingent. But wisdom is about Divine things which are eternal and necessary. Therefore wisdom cannot be practical.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. vi, 37) that “in contemplation we seek the Beginning which is God, but in action we labor under a mighty bundle of wants.” Now wisdom regards the vision of Divine things, in which there is no toiling under a load, since according to Wis. 8:16, “her conversation hath no bitterness, nor her company any tediousness.” Therefore wisdom is merely contemplative, and not practical or active.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~Scilicet~~ Colossians 4:5): “Walk with wisdom towards them that are without.” Now this pertains to action. Therefore wisdom is not merely speculative, but also practical.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As Augustine says (De Trin. xii, 14), the higher part of the reason is the province of wisdom, while the lower part is the domain of knowledge. Now the higher reason according to the same authority (De Trin. xii, 7) “is intent on the consideration and consultation of the heavenly,” i.e. Divine, “types” [*Cf. **P(1), Q(79), A(9); P(2a), Q(74), A(7)**]; it considers them, in so far as it contemplates Divine things in themselves, and it consults them, in so far as it judges of human acts by Divine things, and directs human acts according to Divine rules.

Accordingly wisdom as a gift, is not merely speculative but also practical.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(3)-RO(1) — The higher a virtue is, the greater the number of things to which it extends, as stated in De Causis, prop. x, 17: Wherefore from the very fact that wisdom as a gift is more excellent than wisdom as an intellectual virtue, since it attains to God more intimately by a kind of union of the soul with Him, it is able to direct us not only in contemplation but also in action.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(3)-RO(2) — Divine things are indeed necessary and eternal in themselves, yet they are the rules of the contingent things which are the subject-matter of human actions.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(3)-RO(3) — A thing is considered in itself before being compared with something else. Wherefore to wisdom belongs first of all contemplation which is the vision of the Beginning, and afterwards the direction of human acts according to the Divine rules. Nor from the direction of wisdom does there result any bitterness or toil in human acts;

on the contrary the result of wisdom is to make the bitter sweet, and labor a rest.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(4)

Whether wisdom can be without grace, and with mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that wisdom can be without grace and with mortal sin. For saints glory chiefly in such things as are incompatible with mortal sin, according to ⁴⁰¹²2 Corinthians 1:12: “Our glory is this, the testimony of our conscience.” Now one ought not to glory in one’s wisdom, according to ⁴⁰²³Jeremiah 9:23: “Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom.” Therefore wisdom can be without grace and with mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, wisdom denotes knowledge of Divine things, as stated above (**A(1)**). Now one in mortal sin may have knowledge of the Divine truth, according to ⁴⁰¹⁸Romans 1:18: “(Those men that) detain the truth of God in injustice.” Therefore wisdom is compatible with mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, Augustine says (De Trin. xv, 18) while speaking of charity: “Nothing surpasses this gift of God, it is this alone that divides the children of the eternal kingdom from the children of eternal perdition.” But wisdom is distinct from charity. Therefore it does not divide the children of the kingdom from the children of perdition. Therefore it is compatible with mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (Wis. 1:4): “Wisdom will not enter into a malicious soul, nor dwell in a body subject to sins.”

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(4) — *I answer that*, The wisdom which is a gift of the Holy Ghost, as stated above (**A(1)**), enables us to judge aright of Divine things, or of other things according to Divine rules, by reason of a certain connaturalness or union with Divine things, which is the effect of charity, as stated above (**A(2)**; **Q(23)**, **A(5)**). Hence the wisdom of which we are speaking presupposes charity. Now charity is incompatible with mortal sin, as shown above (**Q(24)**, **A(12)**). Therefore it follows that the wisdom of which we are speaking cannot be together with mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(4)-RO(1) — These words are to be understood as referring to worldly wisdom, or to wisdom in Divine things acquired through human reasons. In such wisdom the saints do not glory, according to ^{<116>}Proverbs 30:2: “The wisdom of men is not with Me”: But they do glory in Divine wisdom according to ^{<116>}1 Corinthians 1:30: “(Who) of God is made unto us wisdom.”

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(4)-RO(2) — This argument considers, not the wisdom of which we speak but that which is acquired by the study and research of reason, and is compatible with mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(4)-RO(3) — Although wisdom is distinct from charity, it presupposes it, and for that very reason divides the children of perdition from the children of the kingdom.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(5)

Whether wisdom is in all who have grace?

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that wisdom is not in all who have grace. For it is more to have wisdom than to hear wisdom. Now it is only for the perfect to hear wisdom, according to ^{<116>}1 Corinthians 2:6: “We speak wisdom among the perfect.” Since then not all who have grace are perfect, it seems that much less all who have grace have wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, “The wise man sets things in order,” as the Philosopher states (Metaph. i, 2): and it is written (^{<116>}James 3:17) that the wise man “judges without dissimulation [*Vulg.: ‘The wisdom that is from above... is... without judging, without dissimulation’]”. Now it is not for all that have grace, to judge, or put others in order, but only for those in authority. Therefore wisdom is not in all that have grace.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, “Wisdom is a remedy against folly,” as Gregory says (Moral. ii, 49). Now many that have grace are naturally foolish, for instance madmen who are baptized or those who without being guilty of mortal sin have become insane. Therefore wisdom is not in all that have grace.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Whoever is without mortal sin, is beloved of God; since he has charity, whereby he loves God, and God loves them that love Him (^{<2087>}Proverbs 8:17). Now it is written (Wis. 7:28) that “God loveth none but him that dwelleth with wisdom.” Therefore wisdom is in all those who have charity and are without mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(5) — *I answer that*, The wisdom of which we are speaking, as stated above (**A(4)**), denotes a certain rectitude of judgment in the contemplation and consultation of Divine things, and as to both of these men obtain various degrees of wisdom through union with Divine things. For the measure of right judgment attained by some, whether in the contemplation of Divine things or in directing human affairs according to Divine rules, is no more than suffices for their salvation. This measure is wanting to none who is without mortal sin through having sanctifying grace, since if nature does not fail in necessities, much less does grace fail: wherefore it is written (^{<1077>}1 John 2:27):

“(His) unction teacheth you of all things.”

Some, however, receive a higher degree of the gift of wisdom, both as to the contemplation of Divine things (by both knowing more exalted mysteries and being able to impart this knowledge to others) and as to the direction of human affairs according to Divine rules (by being able to direct not only themselves but also others according to those rules). This degree of wisdom is not common to all that have sanctifying grace, but belongs rather to the gratuitous graces, which the Holy Ghost dispenses as He will, according to ^{<1278>}1 Corinthians 12:8:

“To one indeed by the Spirit is given the word of wisdom,” etc.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(5)-RO(1) — The Apostle speaks there of wisdom, as extending to the hidden mysteries of Divine things, as indeed he says himself (^{<1000>}2 Corinthians 1:7):

“We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery,
a wisdom which is hidden.”

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(5)-RO(2) — Although it belongs to those alone who are in authority to direct and judge other men, yet every man is competent to

direct and judge his own actions, as Dionysius declares (Ep. ad Demophil.).

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(5)-RO(3) — Baptized idiots, like little children, have the habit of wisdom, which is a gift of the Holy Ghost, but they have not the act, on account of the bodily impediment which hinders the use of reason in them.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(6)

*Whether the seventh beatitude
corresponds to the gift of wisdom?*

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(6)-O(1) — It seems that the seventh beatitude does not correspond to the gift of wisdom. For the seventh beatitude is: “Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.” Now both these things belong to charity: since of peace it is written (⁴³⁸⁶Psalm 118:165): “Much peace have they that love Thy law,” and, as the Apostle says (⁴³⁸⁵Romans 5:5), “the charity of God is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost Who is given to us,” and Who is “the Spirit of adoption of sons, whereby we cry: Abba [Father]” (⁴³⁸⁵Romans 8:15). Therefore the seventh beatitude ought to be ascribed to charity rather than to wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, a thing is declared by its proximate effect rather than by its remote effect. Now the proximate effect of wisdom seems to be charity, according to Wis. 7:27: “Through nations she conveyeth herself into holy souls; she maketh the friends of God and prophets”: whereas peace and the adoption of sons seem to be remote effects, since they result from charity, as stated above (**Q(29), A(3)**). Therefore the beatitude corresponding to wisdom should be determined in respect of the love of charity rather than in respect of peace.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, it is written (⁵⁰⁸⁷James 3:17):

“The wisdom, that is from above, first indeed is chaste, then peaceable, modest, easy to be persuaded, consenting to the good, full of mercy and good fruits, judging without dissimulation [*Vulg.: ‘without judging, without dissimulation’].”

Therefore the beatitude corresponding to wisdom should not refer to peace rather than to the other effects of heavenly wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte i, 4) that “wisdom is becoming to peacemakers, in whom there is no movement of rebellion, but only obedience to reason.”

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(6) — *I answer that*, The seventh beatitude is fittingly ascribed to the gift of wisdom, both as to the merit and as to the reward. The merit is denoted in the words, “Blessed are the peacemakers.” Now a peacemaker is one who makes peace, either in himself, or in others: and in both cases this is the result of setting in due order those things in which peace is established, for “peace is the tranquillity of order,” according to Augustine (De Civ. Dei xix, 13). Now it belongs to wisdom to set things in order, as the Philosopher declares (Metaph. i, 2), wherefore peaceableness is fittingly ascribed to wisdom. The reward is expressed in the words, “they shall be called the children of God.” Now men are called the children of God in so far as they participate in the likeness of the only-begotten and natural Son of God, according to ~~✠~~Romans 8:29,

“Whom He foreknew...
to be made conformable to the image of His Son,”

Who is Wisdom Begotten. Hence by participating in the gift of wisdom, man attains to the sonship of God.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(6)-RO(1) — It belongs to charity to be at peace, but it belongs to wisdom to make peace by setting things in order. Likewise the Holy Ghost is called the “Spirit of adoption” in so far as we receive from Him the likeness of the natural Son, Who is the Begotten Wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(6)-RO(2) — These words refer to the Uncreated Wisdom, which in the first place unites itself to us by the gift of charity, and consequently reveals to us the mysteries the knowledge of which is infused wisdom. Hence, the infused wisdom which is a gift, is not the cause but the effect of charity.

P(2b)-Q(45)-A(6)-RO(3) — As stated above (**A(3)**) it belongs to wisdom, as a gift, not only to contemplate Divine things, but also to regulate human acts. Now the first thing, to be effected in this direction of human acts is

the removal of evils opposed to wisdom: wherefore fear is said to be “the beginning of wisdom,” because it makes us shun evil, while the last thing is like an end, whereby all things are reduced to their right order; and it is this that constitutes peace. Hence James said with reason that “the wisdom that is from above” (and this is the gift of the Holy Ghost) “first indeed is chaste,” because it avoids the corruption of sin, and “then peaceable,” wherein lies the ultimate effect of wisdom, for which reason peace is numbered among the beatitudes. As to the things that follow, they declare in becoming order the means whereby wisdom leads to peace. For when a man, by chastity, avoids the corruption of sin, the first thing he has to do is, as far as he can, to be moderate in all things, and in this respect wisdom is said to be modest. Secondly, in those matters in which he is not sufficient by himself, he should be guided by the advice of others, and as to this we are told further that wisdom is “easy to be persuaded.” These two are conditions required that man may be at peace with himself. But in order that man may be at peace with others it is furthermore required, first that he should not be opposed to their good; this is what is meant by “consenting to the good.” Secondly, that he should bring to his neighbor’s deficiencies, sympathy in his heart, and succor in his actions, and this is denoted by the words “full of mercy and good fruits.” Thirdly, he should strive in all charity to correct the sins of others, and this is indicated by the words “judging without dissimulation [*Vulg.: ‘The wisdom that is from above... is... without judging, without dissimulation’],” lest he should purpose to sate his hatred under cover of correction.

QUESTION 46

OF FOLLY WHICH IS OPPOSED TO WISDOM

(THREE ARTICLES)

We must now consider folly which is opposed to wisdom; and under this head there are three points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether folly is contrary to wisdom?
- (2) Whether folly is a sin?
- (3) To which capital sin is it reducible?

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(1)

Whether folly is contrary to wisdom?

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that folly is not contrary to wisdom. For seemingly un wisdom is directly opposed to wisdom. But folly does not seem to be the same as un wisdom, for the latter is apparently about Divine things alone, whereas folly is about both Divine and human things. Therefore folly is not contrary to wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, one contrary is not the way to arrive at the other. But folly is the way to arrive at wisdom, for it is written (⁴¹⁸⁵1 Corinthians 3:18):

“If any man among you seem to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise.”

Therefore folly is not opposed to wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, one contrary is not the cause of the other. But wisdom is the cause of folly; for it is written (²⁴¹⁴Jeremiah 10:14): “Every man is become a fool for knowledge,” and wisdom is a kind of knowledge. Moreover, it is written (²³⁷⁰Isaiah 47:10): “Thy wisdom and

thy knowledge, this hath deceived thee.” Now it belongs to folly to be deceived. Therefore folly is not contrary to wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, Isidore says (Etym. x, under the letter S) that “a fool is one whom shame does not incite to sorrow, and who is unconcerned when he is injured.” But this pertains to spiritual wisdom, according to Gregory (Moral. x, 49). Therefore folly is not opposed to wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. ii, 26) that “the gift of wisdom is given as a remedy against folly.”

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Stultitia [Folly] seems to take its name from “stupor”; wherefore Isidore says (Etym. x, under the letter of S): “A fool is one who through dullness [stuporem] remains unmoved.” And folly differs from fatuity, according to the same authority (Etym. x), in that folly implies apathy in the heart and dullness in the senses, while fatuity denotes entire privation of the spiritual sense. Therefore folly is fittingly opposed to wisdom.

For “sapiens” [wise] as Isidore says (Etym. x) “is so named from sapor [savor], because just as the taste is quick to distinguish between savors of meats, so is a wise man in discerning things and causes.” Wherefore it is manifest that “folly” is opposed to “wisdom” as its contrary, while “fatuity” is opposed to it as a pure negation: since the fatuous man lacks the sense of judgment, while the fool has the sense, though dulled, whereas the wise man has the sense acute and penetrating.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(1)-RO(1) — According to Isidore (Etym. x), “unwisdom is contrary to wisdom because it lacks the savor of discretion and sense”; so that unwisdom is seemingly the same as folly. Yet a man would appear to be a fool chiefly through some deficiency in the verdict of that judgment, which is according to the highest cause, for if a man fails in judgment about some trivial matter, he is not for that reason called a fool.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(1)-RO(2) — Just as there is an evil wisdom, as stated above (**Q(45)**, **A(1)**, ad 1), called “worldly wisdom,” because it takes for the highest cause and last end some worldly good, so too there is a good folly opposed to this evil wisdom, whereby man despises worldly things: and it is of this folly that the Apostle speaks.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(1)-RO(3) — It is the wisdom of the world that deceives and makes us foolish in God’s sight, as is evident from the Apostle’s words (~~418B~~ 1 Corinthians 3:19).

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(1)-RO(4) — To be unconcerned when one is injured is sometimes due to the fact that one has no taste for worldly things, but only for heavenly things. Hence this belongs not to worldly but to Divine wisdom, as Gregory declares (Moral. x, 49). Sometimes however it is the result of a man’s being simply stupid about everything, as may be seen in idiots, who do not discern what is injurious to them, and this belongs to folly simply.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(2)

Whether folly is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that folly is not a sin. For no sin arises in us from nature. But some are fools naturally. Therefore folly is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, “Every sin is voluntary,” according to Augustine (De Vera Relig. xiv). But folly is not voluntary. Therefore it is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, every sin is contrary to a Divine precept. But folly is not contrary to any precept. Therefore folly is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~418C~~ Proverbs 1:32): “The prosperity of fools shall destroy them.” But no man is destroyed save for sin. Therefore folly is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Folly, as stated above (**A(1)**), denotes dullness of sense in judging, and chiefly as regards the highest cause, which is the last end and the sovereign good. Now a man may in this respect contract dullness in judgment in two ways. First, from a natural indisposition, as in the case of idiots, and such like folly is no sin. Secondly, by plunging his sense into earthly things, whereby his sense is

rendered incapable of perceiving Divine things, according to ^{<412>}1 Corinthians 2:14,

“The sensual man perceiveth not these
things that are of the Spirit of God,”

even as sweet things have no savor for a man whose taste is infected with an evil humor: and such like folly is a sin.

This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(2)-RO(2) — Though no man wishes to be a fool, yet he wishes those things of which folly is a consequence, viz. to withdraw his sense from spiritual things and to plunge it into earthly things. The same thing happens in regard to other sins; for the lustful man desires pleasure, without which there is no sin, although he does not desire sin simply, for he would wish to enjoy the pleasure without sin.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(2)-RO(3) — Folly is opposed to the precepts about the contemplation of truth, of which we have spoken above (**Q(16)**) when we were treating of knowledge and understanding.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(3)

Whether folly is a daughter of lust?

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that folly is not a daughter of lust. For Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45) enumerates the daughters of lust, among which however he makes no mention of folly. Therefore folly does not proceed from lust.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, the Apostle says (^{<412>}1 Corinthians 3:19): “The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.” Now, according to Gregory (Moral. x, 29) “the wisdom of this world consists in covering the heart with crafty devices;” and this savors of duplicity. Therefore folly is a daughter of duplicity rather than of lust.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, anger especially is the cause of fury and madness in some persons; and this pertains to folly. Therefore folly arises from anger rather than from lust.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (³¹⁰⁷²Proverbs 7:22):

“Immediately he followeth her,” i.e. the harlot... “not knowing that he is drawn like a fool to bonds.”

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As already stated (**A(2)**), folly, in so far as it is a sin, is caused by the spiritual sense being dulled, so as to be incapable of judging spiritual things. Now man’s sense is plunged into earthly things chiefly by lust, which is about the greatest of pleasures; and these absorb the mind more than any others. Therefore the folly which is a sin, arises chiefly from lust.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(3)-RO(1) — It is part of folly that a man should have a distaste for God and His gifts. Hence Gregory mentions two daughters of lust, pertaining to folly, namely, “hatred of God” and “despair of the life to come”; thus he divides folly into two parts as it were.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(3)-RO(2) — These words of the Apostle are to be understood, not causally but essentially, because, to wit, worldly wisdom itself is folly with God. Hence it does not follow that whatever belongs to worldly wisdom, is a cause of this folly.

P(2b)-Q(46)-A(3)-RO(3) — Anger by reason of its keenness, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(48)**, **AA(2),3,4**), produces a great change in the nature of the body, wherefore it conduces very much to the folly which results from a bodily impediment. On the other hand the folly which is caused by a spiritual impediment, viz. by the mind being plunged into earthly things, arises chiefly from lust, as stated above.

TREATISE ON THE CARDINAL VIRTUES

QUESTIONS 47-170

ON PRUDENCE

QUESTIONS 47-56

QUESTION 47

OF PRUDENCE, CONSIDERED IN ITSELF

(SIXTEEN ARTICLES)

After treating of the theological virtues, we must in due sequence consider the cardinal virtues. In the first place we shall consider prudence in itself; secondly, its parts; thirdly, the corresponding gift; fourthly, the contrary vices; fifthly, the precepts concerning prudence.

Under the first head there are sixteen points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether prudence is in the will or in the reason?
- (2) If in the reason, whether it is only in the practical, or also in the speculative reason?
- (3) Whether it takes cognizance of singulars?
- (4) Whether it is virtue?
- (5) Whether it is a special virtue?
- (6) Whether it appoints the end to the moral virtues?
- (7) Whether it fixes the mean in the moral virtues?

- (8) Whether its proper act is command?
- (9) Whether solicitude or watchfulness belongs to prudence?
- (10) Whether prudence extends to the governing of many?
- (11) Whether the prudence which regards private good is the same in species as that which regards the common good?
- (12) Whether prudence is in subjects, or only in their rulers?
- (13) Whether prudence is in the wicked?
- (14) Whether prudence is in all good men?
- (15) Whether prudence is in us naturally?
- (16) Whether prudence is lost by forgetfulness ?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(1)

Whether prudence is in the cognitive or in the appetitive faculty?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence is not in the cognitive but in the appetitive faculty. For Augustine says (De Morib. Eccl. xv): “Prudence is love choosing wisely between the things that help and those that hinder.” Now love is not in the cognitive, but in the appetitive faculty. Therefore prudence is in the appetitive faculty.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, as appears from the foregoing definition it belongs to prudence “to choose wisely.” But choice is an act of the appetitive faculty, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(13)**, **A(1)**). Therefore prudence is not in the cognitive but in the appetitive faculty.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 5) that “in art it is better to err voluntarily than involuntarily, whereas in the case of prudence, as of the virtues, it is worse.” Now the moral virtues, of which he is treating there, are in the appetitive faculty, whereas art is in the reason. Therefore prudence is in the appetitive rather than in the rational faculty.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (QQ. lxxxiii, qu. 61): “Prudence is the knowledge of what to seek and what to avoid.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As Isidore says (Etym. x): “A prudent man is one who sees as it were from afar, for his sight is keen, and he foresees the event of uncertainties.” Now sight belongs not to the appetitive but to the cognitive faculty. Wherefore it is manifest that prudence belongs directly to the cognitive, and not to the sensitive faculty, because by the latter we know nothing but what is within reach and offers itself to the senses: while to obtain knowledge of the future from knowledge of the present or past, which pertains to prudence, belongs properly to the reason, because this is done by a process of comparison. It follows therefore that prudence, properly speaking, is in the reason.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(1)-RO(1) — As stated above (**P(1)**, **Q(82)**, **A(4)**) the will moves all the faculties to their acts. Now the first act of the appetitive faculty is love, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(25)**, **AA(1,2)**). Accordingly prudence is said to be love, not indeed essentially, but in so far as love moves to the act of prudence. Wherefore Augustine goes on to say that “prudence is love discerning aright that which helps from that which hinders us in tending to God.” Now love is said to discern because it moves the reason to discern.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(1)-RO(2) — The prudent man considers things afar off, in so far as they tend to be a help or a hindrance to that which has to be done at the present time. Hence it is clear that those things which prudence considers stand in relation to this other, as in relation to the end. Now of those things that are directed to the end there is counsel in the reason, and choice in the appetite, of which two, counsel belongs more properly to prudence, since the Philosopher states (Ethic. vi, 5,7,9) that a prudent man “takes good counsel.” But as choice presupposes counsel, since it is “the desire for what has been already counselled” (Ethic. iii, 2), it follows that choice can also be ascribed to prudence indirectly, in so far, to wit, as prudence directs the choice by means of counsel.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(1)-RO(3) — The worth of prudence consists not in thought merely, but in its application to action, which is the end of the practical reason. Wherefore if any defect occur in this, it is most contrary to prudence, since, the end being of most import in everything, it follows

that a defect which touches the end is the worst of all. Hence the Philosopher goes on to say (Ethic. vi, 5) that prudence is “something more than a merely rational habit,” such as art is, since, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(57)**, **A(4)**) it includes application to action, which application is an act of the will.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(2)

Whether prudence belongs to the practical reason alone or also to the speculative reason?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence belongs not only to the practical, but also to the speculative reason. For it is written (~~2003~~ Proverbs 10:23): “Wisdom is prudence to a man.” Now wisdom consists chiefly in contemplation. Therefore prudence does also.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, Ambrose says (De Offic. i, 24): “Prudence is concerned with the quest of truth, and fills us with the desire of fuller knowledge.” Now this belongs to the speculative reason. Therefore prudence resides also in the speculative reason.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the Philosopher assigns art and prudence to the same part of the soul (Ethic. vi, 1). Now art may be not only practical but also speculative, as in the case of the liberal arts. Therefore prudence also is both practical and speculative.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(2) — On the contrary, The Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 5) that prudence is right reason applied to action. Now this belongs to none but the practical reason. Therefore prudence is in the practical reason only.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(2) — I answer that, According to the Philosopher (Ethic. vi, 5) “a prudent man is one who is capable of taking good counsel.” Now counsel is about things that we have to do in relation to some end: and the reason that deals with things to be done for an end is the practical reason. Hence it is evident that prudence resides only in the practical reason.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(2)-RO(1) — As stated above (**Q(45)**, **AA(1),3**), wisdom considers the absolutely highest cause: so that the consideration of the highest cause in any particular genus belongs to wisdom in that genus.

Now in the genus of human acts the highest cause is the common end of all human life, and it is this end that prudence intends. For the Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 5) that just as he who reasons well for the realization of a particular end, such as victory, is said to be prudent, not absolutely, but in a particular genus, namely warfare, so he that reasons well with regard to right conduct as a whole, is said to be prudent absolutely. Wherefore it is clear that prudence is wisdom about human affairs: but not wisdom absolutely, because it is not about the absolutely highest cause, for it is about human good, and this is not the best thing of all. And so it is stated significantly that “prudence is wisdom for man,” but not wisdom absolutely.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(2)-RO(2) — Ambrose, and Tully also (De Invent. ii, 53) take the word prudence in a broad sense for any human knowledge, whether speculative or practical. And yet it may also be replied that the act itself of the speculative reason, in so far as it is voluntary, is a matter of choice and counsel as to its exercise; and consequently comes under the direction of prudence. On the other hand, as regards its specification in relation to its object which is the “necessary true,” it comes under neither counsel nor prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(2)-RO(3) — Every application of right reason in the work of production belongs to art: but to prudence belongs only the application of right reason in matters of counsel, which are those wherein there is no fixed way of obtaining the end, as stated in Ethic. iii, 3. Since then, the speculative reason makes things such as syllogisms, propositions and the like, wherein the process follows certain and fixed rules, consequently in respect of such things it is possible to have the essentials of art, but not of prudence; and so we find such a thing as a speculative art, but not a speculative prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(3)

Whether prudence takes cognizance of singulars?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence does not take cognizance of singulars. For prudence is in the reason, as stated above

(AA(1),2). But “reason deals with universals,” according to Phys. i, 5. Therefore prudence does not take cognizance except of universals.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, singulars are infinite in number. But the reason cannot comprehend an infinite number of things. Therefore prudence which is right reason, is not about singulars.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, particulars are known by the senses. But prudence is not in a sense, for many persons who have keen outward senses are devoid of prudence. Therefore prudence does not take cognizance of singulars.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 7) that “prudence does not deal with universals only, but needs to take cognizance of singulars also.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (A(1), ad 3), to prudence belongs not only the consideration of the reason, but also the application to action, which is the end of the practical reason. But no man can conveniently apply one thing to another, unless he knows both the thing to be applied, and the thing to which it has to be applied. Now actions are in singular matters: and so it is necessary for the prudent man to know both the universal principles of reason, and the singulars about which actions are concerned.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(3)-RO(1) — Reason first and chiefly is concerned with universals, and yet it is able to apply universal rules to particular cases: hence the conclusions of syllogisms are not only universal, but also particular, because the intellect by a kind of reflection extends to matter, as stated in De Anima iii.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(3)-RO(2) — It is because the infinite number of singulars cannot be comprehended by human reason, that “our counsels are uncertain” (Wis. 9:14). Nevertheless experience reduces the infinity of singulars to a certain finite number which occur as a general rule, and the knowledge of these suffices for human prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(3)-RO(3) — As the Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 8), prudence does not reside in the external senses whereby we know sensible objects, but in the interior sense, which is perfected by memory and

experience so as to judge promptly of particular cases. This does not mean however that prudence is in the interior sense as in its principle subject, for it is chiefly in the reason, yet by a kind of application it extends to this sense.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(4)

Whether prudence is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence is not a virtue. For Augustine says (De Lib. Arb. i, 13) that “prudence is the science of what to desire and what to avoid.” Now science is condivided with virtue, as appears in the Predicaments (vi). Therefore prudence is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, there is no virtue of a virtue: but “there is a virtue of art,” as the Philosopher states (Ethic. vi, 5): wherefore art is not a virtue. Now there is prudence in art, for it is written (2 Paralip. ii, 14) concerning Hiram, that he knew “to grave all sort of graving, and to devise ingeniously [prudenter] all that there may be need of in the work.” Therefore prudence is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, no virtue can be immoderate. But prudence is immoderate, else it would be useless to say (¹²⁰⁴Proverbs 23:4): “Set bounds to thy prudence.” Therefore prudence is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Gregory states (Moral. ii, 49) that prudence, temperance, fortitude and justice are four virtues.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(55), A(3); P(2a), Q(56), A(1)**) when we were treating of virtues in general, “virtue is that which makes its possessor good, and his work good likewise.” Now good may be understood in a twofold sense: first, materially, for the thing that is good, secondly, formally, under the aspect of good. Good, under the aspect of good, is the object of the appetitive power. Hence if any habits rectify the consideration of reason, without regarding the rectitude of the appetite, they have less of the nature of a virtue since they direct man to good materially, that is to say, to the thing which is good, but without considering it under the aspect of good. On the other hand those virtues which regard the rectitude of the appetite, have more of the nature of

virtue, because they consider the good not only materially, but also formally, in other words, they consider that which is good under the aspect of good.

Now it belongs to prudence, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 3; **A(3)**) to apply right reason to action, and this is not done without a right appetite. Hence prudence has the nature of virtue not only as the other intellectual virtues have it, but also as the moral virtues have it, among which virtues it is enumerated.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(4)-RO(1) — Augustine there takes science in the broad sense for any kind of right reason.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(4)-RO(2) — The Philosopher says that there is a virtue of art, because art does not require rectitude of the appetite; wherefore in order that a man may make right use of his art, he needs to have a virtue which will rectify his appetite. Prudence however has nothing to do with the matter of art, because art is both directed to a particular end, and has fixed means of obtaining that end. And yet, by a kind of comparison, a man may be said to act prudently in matters of art. Moreover in certain arts, on account of the uncertainty of the means for obtaining the end, there is need for counsel, as for instance in the arts of medicine and navigation, as stated in *Ethic.* iii, 3.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(4)-RO(3) — This saying of the wise man does not mean that prudence itself should be moderate, but that moderation must be imposed on other things according to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(5)

Whether prudence is a special virtue?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence is not a special virtue. For no special virtue is included in the definition of virtue in general, since virtue is defined (*Ethic.* ii, 6) “an elective habit that follows a mean appointed by reason in relation to ourselves, even as a wise man decides.” Now right reason is reason in accordance with prudence, as stated in *Ethic.* vi, 13. Therefore prudence is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, the Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 13) that “the effect of moral virtue is right action as regards the end, and that of prudence, right action as regards the means.” Now in every virtue certain things have to be done as means to the end. Therefore prudence is in every virtue, and consequently is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, a special virtue has a special object. But prudence has not a special object, for it is right reason “applied to action” (Ethic. vi, 5); and all works of virtue are actions. Therefore prudence is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, It is distinct from and numbered among the other virtues, for it is written (Wis. 8:7): “She teacheth temperance and prudence, justice and fortitude.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Since acts and habits take their species from their objects, as shown above (**P(2a), Q(1), A(3); P(2a), Q(18), A(2); P(2a), Q(54), A(2)**), any habit that has a corresponding special object, distinct from other objects, must needs be a special habit, and if it be a good habit, it must be a special virtue. Now an object is called special, not merely according to the consideration of its matter, but rather according to its formal aspect, as explained above (**P(2a), Q(54), A(2)**, ad 1). Because one and the same thing is the subject matter of the acts of different habits, and also of different powers, according to its different formal aspects. Now a yet greater difference of object is requisite for a difference of powers than for a difference of habits, since several habits are found in the same power, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(54), A(1)**). Consequently any difference in the aspect of an object, that requires a difference of powers, will “a fortiori” require a difference of habits.

Accordingly we must say that since prudence is in the reason, as stated above (**A(2)**), it is differentiated from the other intellectual virtues by a material difference of objects. “Wisdom,” “knowledge” and “understanding” are about necessary things, whereas “art” and “prudence” are about contingent things, art being concerned with “things made,” that is, with things produced in external matter, such as a house, a knife and so forth; and prudence, being concerned with “things done,” that is, with things that have their being in the doer himself, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(57), A(4)**). On the other hand prudence is differentiated from the moral

virtues according to a formal aspect distinctive of powers, i.e. the intellective power, wherein is prudence, and the appetitive power, wherein is moral virtue. Hence it is evident that prudence is a special virtue, distinct from all other virtues.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(5)-RO(1) — This is not a definition of virtue in general, but of moral virtue, the definition of which fittingly includes an intellectual virtue, viz., prudence, which has the same matter in common with moral virtue; because, just as the subject of moral virtue is something that partakes of reason, so moral virtue has the aspect of virtue, in so far as it partakes of intellectual virtue.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(5)-RO(2) — This argument proves that prudence helps all the virtues, and works in all of them; but this does not suffice to prove that it is not a special virtue; for nothing prevents a certain genus from containing a species which is operative in every other species of that same genus, even as the sun has an influence over all bodies.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(5)-RO(3) — Things done are indeed the matter of prudence, in so far as they are the object of reason, that is, considered as true: but they are the matter of the moral virtues, in so far as they are the object of the appetitive power, that is, considered as good.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(6)

Whether prudence appoints the end to moral virtues?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence appoints the end to moral virtues. Since prudence is in the reason, while moral virtue is in the appetite, it seems that prudence stands in relation to moral virtue, as reason to the appetite. Now reason appoints the end to the appetitive power. Therefore prudence appoints the end to the moral virtues.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, man surpasses irrational beings by his reason, but he has other things in common with them. Accordingly the other parts of man are in relation to his reason, what man is in relation to irrational creatures. Now man is the end of irrational creatures, according to Polit. i, 3. Therefore all the other parts of man are directed to reason as to their end. But prudence is “right reason applied to action,” as stated above

(A(2)). Therefore all actions are directed to prudence as their end. Therefore prudence appoints the end to all moral virtues.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, it belongs to the virtue, art, or power that is concerned about the end, to command the virtues or arts that are concerned about the means. Now prudence disposes of the other moral virtues, and commands them. Therefore it appoints their end to them.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 12) that “moral virtue ensures the rectitude of the intention of the end, while prudence ensures the rectitude of the means.” Therefore it does not belong to prudence to appoint the end to moral virtues, but only to regulate the means.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(6) — *I answer that*, The end of moral virtues is human good. Now the good of the human soul is to be in accord with reason, as Dionysius declares (Div. Nom. iv). Wherefore the ends of moral virtue must of necessity pre-exist in the reason.

Now, just as, in the speculative reason, there are certain things naturally known, about which is “understanding,” and certain things of which we obtain knowledge through them, viz. conclusions, about which is “science,” so in the practical reason, certain things pre-exist, as naturally known principles, and such are the ends of the moral virtues, since the end is in practical matters what principles are in speculative matters, as stated above (**Q(23)**, **A(7)**, ad 2; **P(2a)**, **Q(13)**, **A(3)**); while certain things are in the practical reason by way of conclusions, and such are the means which we gather from the ends themselves. About these is prudence, which applies universal principles to the particular conclusions of practical matters. Consequently it does not belong to prudence to appoint the end to moral virtues, but only to regulate the means.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(6)-RO(1) — Natural reason known by the name of “synderesis” appoints the end to moral virtues, as stated above (**P(1)**, **Q(79)**, **A(12)**): but prudence does not do this for the reason given above.

This suffices for the Reply to the Second Objection.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(6)-RO(3) — The end concerns the moral virtues, not as though they appointed the end, but because they tend to the end which is

appointed by natural reason. In this they are helped by prudence, which prepares the way for them, by disposing the means. Hence it follows that prudence is more excellent than the moral virtues, and moves them: yet “synderesis” moves prudence, just as the understanding of principles moves science.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(7)

Whether it belongs to prudence to find the mean in moral virtues?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that it does not belong to prudence to find the mean in moral virtues. For the achievement of the mean is the end of moral virtues. But prudence does not appoint the end to moral virtues, as shown above (**A(6)**). Therefore it does not find the mean in them.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, that which of itself has being, would seem to have no cause, but its very being is its cause, since a thing is said to have being by reason of its cause. Now “to follow the mean” belongs to moral virtue by reason of itself, as part of its definition, as shown above (**A(5)**, **O(1)**). Therefore prudence does not cause the mean in moral virtues.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, prudence works after the manner of reason. But moral virtue tends to the mean after the manner of nature, because, as Tully states (*De Invent. Rhet.* ii, 53), “virtue is a habit like a second nature in accord with reason.” Therefore prudence does not appoint the mean to moral virtues.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, In the foregoing definition of moral virtue (**A(5)**, **O(1)**) it is stated that it “follows a mean appointed by reason... even as a wise man decides.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(7) — *I answer that*, The proper end of each moral virtue consists precisely in conformity with right reason. For temperance intends that man should not stray from reason for the sake of his concupiscences; fortitude, that he should not stray from the right judgment of reason through fear or daring. Moreover this end is appointed to man according to

natural reason, since natural reason dictates to each one that he should act according to reason.

But it belongs to the ruling of prudence to decide in what manner and by what means man shall obtain the mean of reason in his deeds. For though the attainment of the mean is the end of a moral virtue, yet this mean is found by the right disposition of these things that are directed to the end.

This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(7)-RO(2) — Just as a natural agent makes form to be in matter, yet does not make that which is essential to the form to belong to it, so too, prudence appoints the mean in passions and operations, and yet does not make the searching of the mean to belong to virtue.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(7)-RO(3) — Moral virtue after the manner of nature intends to attain the mean. Since, however, the mean as such is not found in all matters after the same manner, it follows that the inclination of nature which ever works in the same manner, does not suffice for this purpose, and so the ruling of prudence is required.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(8)

Whether command is the chief act of prudence?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that command is not the chief act of prudence. For command regards the good to be ensued. Now Augustine (De Trin. xiv, 9) states that it is an act of prudence “to avoid ambushes.” Therefore command is not the chief act of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, the Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 5) that “the prudent man takes good counsel.” Now “to take counsel” and “to command” seem to be different acts, as appears from what has been said above (**P(2a)**, **Q(57)**, **A(6)**). Therefore command is not the chief act of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, it seems to belong to the will to command and to rule, since the will has the end for its object, and moves the other powers of the soul. Now prudence is not in the will, but in the reason. Therefore command is not an act of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 10) that “prudence commands.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(8) — *I answer that*, Prudence is “right reason applied to action,” as stated above (**A(2)**). Hence that which is the chief act of reason in regard to action must needs be the chief act of prudence. Now there are three such acts. The first is “to take counsel,” which belongs to discovery, for counsel is an act of inquiry, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(14)**, **A(1)**). The second act is “to judge of what one has discovered,” and this is an act of the speculative reason. But the practical reason, which is directed to action, goes further, and its third act is “to command,” which act consists in applying to action the things counselled and judged. And since this act approaches nearer to the end of the practical reason, it follows that it is the chief act of the practical reason, and consequently of prudence.

In confirmation of this we find that the perfection of art consists in judging and not in commanding: wherefore he who sins voluntarily against his craft is reputed a better craftsman than he who does so involuntarily, because the former seems to do so from right judgment, and the latter from a defective judgment. On the other hand it is the reverse in prudence, as stated in Ethic. vi, 5, for it is more imprudent to sin voluntarily, since this is to be lacking in the chief act of prudence, viz. command, than to sin involuntarily.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(8)-RO(1) — The act of command extends both to the ensuing of good and to the avoidance of evil. Nevertheless Augustine ascribes “the avoidance of ambushes” to prudence, not as its chief act, but as an act of prudence that does not continue in heaven.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(8)-RO(2) — Good counsel is required in order that the good things discovered may be applied to action: wherefore command belongs to prudence which takes good counsel.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(8)-RO(3) — Simply to move belongs to the will: but command denotes motion together with a kind of ordering, wherefore it is an act of the reason, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(17)**, **A(1)**).

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(9)

Whether solicitude belongs to prudence?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that solicitude does not belong to prudence. For solicitude implies disquiet, wherefore Isidore says (Etym. x) that “a solicitous man is a restless man.” Now motion belongs chiefly to the appetitive power: wherefore solicitude does also. But prudence is not in the appetitive power, but in the reason, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore solicitude does not belong to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, the certainty of truth seems opposed to solicitude, wherefore it is related (¹³³⁰1 Kings 9:20) that Samuel said to Saul: “As for the asses which were lost three days ago, be not solicitous, because they are found.” Now the certainty of truth belongs to prudence, since it is an intellectual virtue. Therefore solicitude is in opposition to prudence rather than belonging to it.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 3) the “magnanimous man is slow and leisurely.” Now slowness is contrary to solicitude. Since then prudence is not opposed to magnanimity, for “good is not opposed to good,” as stated in the Predicaments (viii) it would seem that solicitude does not belong to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(9) — On the contrary, It is written (¹³³¹1 Peter 4:7): “Be prudent... and watch in prayers.” But watchfulness is the same as solicitude. Therefore solicitude belongs to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(9) — I answer that, According to Isidore (Etym. x), a man is said to be solicitous through being shrewd [solers] and alert [citus], in so far as a man through a certain shrewdness of mind is on the alert to do whatever has to be done. Now this belongs to prudence, whose chief act is a command about what has been already counselled and judged in matters of action. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 9) that “one should be quick in carrying out the counsel taken, but slow in taking counsel.” Hence it is that solicitude belongs properly to prudence, and for this reason Augustine says (De Morib. Eccl. xxiv) that “prudence keeps most careful watch and ward, lest by degrees we be deceived unawares by evil counsel.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(9)-RO(1) — Movement belongs to the appetitive power as to the principle of movement, in accordance however, with the direction and command of reason, wherein solicitude consists.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(9)-RO(2) — According to the Philosopher (Ethic. i, 3), “equal certainty should not be sought in all things, but in each matter according to its proper mode.” And since the matter of prudence is the contingent singulars about which are human actions, the certainty of prudence cannot be so great as to be devoid of all solicitude.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(9)-RO(3) — The magnanimous man is said to be “slow and leisurely” not because he is solicitous about nothing, but because he is not over-solicitous about many things, and is trustful in matters where he ought to have trust, and is not over-solicitous about them: for over-much fear and distrust are the cause of over-solicitude, since fear makes us take counsel, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(44), A(2)**) when we were treating of the passion of fear.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(10)

Whether solicitude belongs to prudence?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence does not extend to the governing of many, but only to the government of oneself. For the Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 1) that virtue directed to the common good is justice. But prudence differs from justice. Therefore prudence is not directed to the common good.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, he seems to be prudent, who seeks and does good for himself. Now those who seek the common good often neglect their own. Therefore they are not prudent.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, prudence is specifically distinct from temperance and fortitude. But temperance and fortitude seem to be related only to a man’s own good. Therefore the same applies to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, Our Lord said (⁴¹⁴⁵Matthew 24:45):

“Who, thinkest thou, is a faithful and prudent [Douay: ‘wise’]
servant whom his lord hath appointed over his family?”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(10) — *I answer that*, According to the Philosopher (Ethic. vi, 8) some have held that prudence does not extend to the common good, but only to the good of the individual, and this because they thought that man is not bound to seek other than his own good. But this opinion is opposed to charity, which “seeketh not her own” (~~433B~~ 1 Corinthians 13:5): wherefore the Apostle says of himself (~~433B~~ 1 Corinthians 10:33):

“Not seeking that which is profitable to myself, but to many, that
they may be saved.”

Moreover it is contrary to right reason, which judges the common good to be better than the good of the individual.

Accordingly, since it belongs to prudence rightly to counsel, judge, and command concerning the means of obtaining a due end, it is evident that prudence regards not only the private good of the individual, but also the common good of the multitude.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(10)-RO(1) — The Philosopher is speaking there of moral virtue. Now just as every moral virtue that is directed to the common good is called “legal” justice, so the prudence that is directed to the common good is called “political” prudence, for the latter stands in the same relation to legal justice, as prudence simply so called to moral virtue.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(10)-RO(2) — He that seeks the good of the many, seeks in consequence his own good, for two reasons. First, because the individual good is impossible without the common good of the family, state, or kingdom. Hence Valerius Maximus says [**Fact. et Dict. Memor. iv, 6*] of the ancient Romans that “they would rather be poor in a rich empire than rich in a poor empire.” Secondly, because, since man is a part of the home and state, he must needs consider what is good for him by being prudent about the good of the many. For the good disposition of parts depends on their relation to the whole; thus Augustine says (Confess. iii, 8) that “any part which does not harmonize with its whole, is offensive.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(10)-RO(3) — Even temperance and fortitude can be directed to the common good, hence there are precepts of law concerning

them as stated in Ethic. v, 1: more so, however, prudence and justice, since these belong to the rational faculty which directly regards the universal, just as the sensitive part regards singulars.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(11)

Whether prudence about one's own good is specifically the same as that which extends to the common good?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(11)-O(1) — It seems that prudence about one's own good is the same specifically as that which extends to the common good. For the Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 8) that “political prudence, and prudence are the same habit, yet their essence is not the same.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(11)-O(2) — Further, the Philosopher says (Polit. iii, 2) that “virtue is the same in a good man and in a good ruler.” Now political prudence is chiefly in the ruler, in whom it is architectonic, as it were. Since then prudence is a virtue of a good man, it seems that prudence and political prudence are the same habit.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(11)-O(3) — Further, a habit is not diversified in species or essence by things which are subordinate to one another. But the particular good, which belongs to prudence simply so called, is subordinate to the common good, which belongs to political prudence. Therefore prudence and political prudence differ neither specifically nor essentially.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(11) — *On the contrary*, “Political prudence,” which is directed to the common good of the state, “domestic economy” which is of such things as relate to the common good of the household or family, and “monastic economy” which is concerned with things affecting the good of one person, are all distinct sciences. Therefore in like manner there are different kinds of prudence, corresponding to the above differences of matter.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(11) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(5)**; **Q(54)**, **A(2)**, ad 1), the species of habits differ according to the difference of object considered in its formal aspect. Now the formal aspect of all things directed to the end, is taken from the end itself, as shown above (**P(2a)**, Prolog.; **P(2a)**, **Q(102)**, **A(1)**), wherefore the species of habits differ by

their relation to different ends. Again the individual good, the good of the family, and the good of the city and kingdom are different ends. Wherefore there must needs be different species of prudence corresponding to these different ends, so that one is “prudence” simply so called, which is directed to one’s own good; another, “domestic prudence” which is directed to the common good of the home; and a third, “political prudence,” which is directed to the common good of the state or kingdom.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(11)-RO(1) — The Philosopher means, not that political prudence is substantially the same habit as any kind of prudence, but that it is the same as the prudence which is directed to the common good. This is called “prudence” in respect of the common notion of prudence, i.e. as being right reason applied to action, while it is called “political,” as being directed to the common good.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(11)-RO(2) — As the Philosopher declares (Polit. iii, 2), “it belongs to a good man to be able to rule well and to obey well,” wherefore the virtue of a good man includes also that of a good ruler. Yet the virtue of the ruler and of the subject differs specifically, even as the virtue of a man and of a woman, as stated by the same authority (Polit. iii, 2).

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(11)-RO(3) — Even different ends, one of which is subordinate to the other, diversify the species of a habit, thus for instance, habits directed to riding, soldiering, and civic life, differ specifically although their ends are subordinate to one another. In like manner, though the good of the individual is subordinate to the good of the many, that does not prevent this difference from making the habits differ specifically; but it follows that the habit which is directed to the last end is above the other habits and commands them.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(12)

Whether prudence is in subjects, or only in their rulers?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(12)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence is not in subjects but only in their rulers. For the Philosopher says (Polit. iii, 2) that “prudence alone is the virtue proper to a ruler, while other virtues are

common to subjects and rulers, and the prudence of the subject is not a virtue but a true opinion.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(12)-O(2) — Further, it is stated in Polit. i, 5 that “a slave is not competent to take counsel.” But prudence makes a man take good counsel (Ethic. vi, 5). Therefore prudence is not befitting slaves or subjects.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(12)-O(3) — Further, prudence exercises command, as stated above (**A(8)**). But command is not in the competency of slaves or subjects but only of rulers. Therefore prudence is not in subjects but only in rulers.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(12) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 8) that there are two kinds of political prudence, one of which is “legislative” and belongs to rulers, while the other “retains the common name political,” and is about “individual actions.” Now it belongs also to subjects to perform these individual actions. Therefore prudence is not only in rulers but also in subjects.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(12) — *I answer that*, Prudence is in the reason. Now ruling and governing belong properly to the reason; and therefore it is proper to a man to reason and be prudent in so far as he has a share in ruling and governing. But it is evident that the subject as subject, and the slave as slave, are not competent to rule and govern, but rather to be ruled and governed. Therefore prudence is not the virtue of a slave as slave, nor of a subject as subject.

Since, however, every man, for as much as he is rational, has a share in ruling according to the judgment of reason, he is proportionately competent to have prudence. Wherefore it is manifest that prudence is in the ruler “after the manner of a mastercraft” (Ethic. vi, 8), but in the subjects, “after the manner of a handicraft.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(12)-RO(1) — The saying of the Philosopher is to be understood strictly, namely, that prudence is not the virtue of a subject as such.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(12)-RO(2) — A slave is not capable of taking counsel, in so far as he is a slave (for thus he is the instrument of his master), but he does take counsel in so far as he is a rational animal.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(12)-RO(3) — By prudence a man commands not only others, but also himself, in so far as the reason is said to command the lower powers.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(13)

Whether prudence can be in sinners?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(13)-O(1) — It would seem that there can be prudence in sinners. For our Lord said (~~Q(47)~~ Luke 16:8):

“The children of this world are more prudent [Douay: ‘wiser’] in their generation than the children of light.”

Now the children of this world are sinners. Therefore there be prudence in sinners.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(13)-O(2) — Further, faith is a more excellent virtue than prudence. But there can be faith in sinners. Therefore there can be prudence also.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(13)-O(3) — Further, according to Ethic. vi, 7, “we say that to be of good counsel is the work of prudent man especially.” Now many sinners can take good counsel. Therefore sinners can have prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(13) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher declares (Ethic. vi, 12) that “it is impossible for a man be prudent unless he be good.” Now no inner is a good man. Therefore no sinner is prudent.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(13) — *I answer that*, Prudence is threefold. There is a false prudence, which takes its name from its likeness to true prudence. For since a prudent man is one who disposes well of the things that have to be done for a good end, whoever disposes well of such things as are fitting for an evil end, has false prudence, in far as that which he takes for an end, is good, not in truth but in appearance. Thus man is called “a good robber,” and in this way may speak of “a prudent robber,” by way of similarity,

because he devises fitting ways of committing robbery. This is the prudence of which the Apostle says (~~ROM~~ Romans 8:6): “The prudence [Douay: ‘wisdom’] of the flesh is death,” because, to wit, it places its ultimate end in the pleasures of the flesh.

The second prudence is indeed true prudence, because it devises fitting ways of obtaining a good end; and yet it is imperfect, from a twofold source. First, because the good which it takes for an end, is not the common end of all human life, but of some particular affair; thus when a man devises fitting ways of conducting business or of sailing a ship, he is called a prudent businessman, or a prudent sailor; secondly, because he fails in the chief act of prudence, as when a man takes counsel aright, and forms a good judgment, even about things concerning life as a whole, but fails to make an effective command.

The third prudence is both true and perfect, for it takes counsel, judges and commands aright in respect of the good end of man’s whole life: and this alone is prudence simply so-called, and cannot be in sinners, whereas the first prudence is in sinners alone, while imperfect prudence is common to good and wicked men, especially that which is imperfect through being directed to a particular end, since that which is imperfect on account of a failing in the chief act, is only in the wicked.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(13)-RO(1) — This saying of our Lord is to be understood of the first prudence, wherefore it is not said that they are prudent absolutely, but that they are prudent in “their generation.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(13)-RO(2) — The nature of faith consists not in conformity with the appetite for certain right actions, but in knowledge alone. On the other hand prudence implies a relation to a right appetite. First because its principles are the ends in matters of action; and of such ends one forms a right estimate through the habits of moral virtue, which rectify the appetite: wherefore without the moral virtues there is no prudence, as shown above (**P(2a), Q(58), A(5)**); secondly because prudence commands right actions, which does not happen unless the appetite be right. Wherefore though faith on account of its object is more excellent than prudence, yet prudence, by its very nature, is more opposed to sin, which arises from a disorder of the appetite.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(13)-RO(3) — Sinners can take good counsel for an evil end, or for some particular good, but they do not perfectly take good counsel for the end of their whole life, since they do not carry that counsel into effect. Hence they lack prudence which is directed to the good only; and yet in them, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. vi, 12) there is “cleverness,” [*{deinotike}] i.e. natural diligence which may be directed to both good and evil; or “cunning,” [*{panourgia}] which is directed only to evil, and which we have stated above, to be “false prudence” or “prudence of the flesh.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(14)

Whether prudence is in all who have grace?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(14)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence is not in all who have grace. Prudence requires diligence, that one may foresee aright what has to be done. But many who have grace have not this diligence. Therefore not all who have grace have prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(14)-O(2) — Further, a prudent man is one who takes good counsel, as stated above (**A(8), O(2), A(13), O(3)**). Yet many have grace who do not take good counsel, and need to be guided by the counsel of others. Therefore not all who have grace, have prudence

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(14)-O(3) — Further, the Philosopher says (Topic. iii, 2) that “young people are not obviously prudent.” Yet many young people have grace. Therefore prudence is not to be found in all who have grace.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(14) — *On the contrary*, No man has grace unless he be virtuous. Now no man can be virtuous without prudence, for Gregory says (Moral. ii, 46) that “the other virtues cannot be virtues at all unless they effect prudently what they desire to accomplish.” Therefore all who have grace have prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(14) — *I answer that*, The virtues must needs be connected together, so that whoever has one has all, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(65), A(1)**). Now whoever has grace has charity, so that he must needs have all the other virtues, and hence, since prudence is a virtue, as shown above (**A(4)**), he must, of necessity, have prudence also.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(14)-RO(1) — Diligence is twofold: one is merely sufficient with regard to things necessary for salvation; and such diligence is given to all who have grace, whom “His unction teacheth of all things” (^{<6127>}1 John 2:27). There is also another diligence which is more than sufficient, whereby a man is able to make provision both for himself and for others, not only in matters necessary for salvation, but also in all things relating to human life; and such diligence as this is not in all who have grace.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(14)-RO(2) — Those who require to be guided by the counsel of others, are able, if they have grace, to take counsel for themselves in this point at least, that they require the counsel of others and can discern good from evil counsel.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(14)-RO(3) — Acquired prudence is caused by the exercise of acts, wherefore “its acquisition demands experience and time” (Ethic. ii, 1), hence it cannot be in the young, neither in habit nor in act. On the other hand gratuitous prudence is caused by divine infusion. Wherefore, in children who have been baptized but have not come to the use of reason, there is prudence as to habit but not as to act, even as in idiots; whereas in those who have come to the use of reason, it is also as to act, with regard to things necessary for salvation. This by practice merits increase, until it becomes perfect, even as the other virtues. Hence the Apostle says (^{<3654>}Hebrews 5:14) that “strong meat is for the perfect, for them who by custom have their senses exercised to the discerning of good and evil.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(15)

Whether prudence is in us by nature?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(15)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence is in us by nature. The Philosopher says that things connected with prudence “seem to be natural,” namely “synesis, gnome” [*{synesis} and {gnome}, Cf. **P(2a), Q(57), A(6)**] and the like, but not those which are connected with speculative wisdom. Now things belonging to the same genus have the same kind of origin. Therefore prudence also is in us from nature.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(15)-O(2) — Further, the changes of age are according to nature. Now prudence results from age, according to ~~187D~~ Job 12:12: “In the ancient is wisdom, and in length of days prudence.” Therefore prudence is natural.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(15)-O(3) — Further, prudence is more consistent with human nature than with that of dumb animals. Now there are instances of a certain natural prudence in dumb animals, according to the Philosopher (De Hist. Anim. viii, 1). Therefore prudence is natural.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(15) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 1) that “intellectual virtue is both originated and fostered by teaching; it therefore demands experience and time.” Now prudence is an intellectual virtue, as stated above (**A(4)**). Therefore prudence is in us, not by nature, but by teaching and experience.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(15) — *I answer that*, As shown above (**A(3)**), prudence includes knowledge both of universals, and of the singular matters of action to which prudence applies the universal principles. Accordingly, as regards the knowledge of universals, the same is to be said of prudence as of speculative science, because the primary universal principles of either are known naturally, as shown above (**A(6)**): except that the common principles of prudence are more connatural to man; for as the Philosopher remarks (Ethic. x, 7) “the life which is according to the speculative reason is better than that which is according to man”: whereas the secondary universal principles, whether of the speculative or of the practical reason, are not inherited from nature, but are acquired by discovery through experience, or through teaching.

On the other hand, as regards the knowledge of particulars which are the matter of action, we must make a further distinction, because this matter of action is either an end or the means to an end. Now the right ends of human life are fixed; wherefore there can be a natural inclination in respect of these ends; thus it has been stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(51)**, **A(1)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(63)**, **A(1)**) that some, from a natural inclination, have certain virtues whereby they are inclined to right ends; and consequently they also have naturally a right judgment about such like ends.

But the means to the end, in human concerns, far from being fixed, are of manifold variety according to the variety of persons and affairs. Wherefore since the inclination of nature is ever to something fixed, the knowledge of those means cannot be in man naturally, although, by reason of his natural disposition, one man has a greater aptitude than another in discerning them, just as it happens with regard to the conclusions of speculative sciences. Since then prudence is not about the ends, but about the means, as stated above (**A(6)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(57)**, **A(5)**), it follows that prudence is not from nature.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(15)-RO(1) — The Philosopher is speaking there of things relating to prudence, in so far as they are directed to ends. Wherefore he had said before (Ethic. vi, 5, 11) that “they are the principles of the {ou heneka}” [*Literally, ‘for the sake of which’ (are the means)], namely, the end; and so he does not mention {euboulia} among them, because it takes counsel about the means.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(15)-RO(2) — Prudence is rather in the old, not only because their natural disposition calms the movement of the sensitive passions, but also because of their long experience.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(15)-RO(3) — Even in dumb animals there are fixed ways of obtaining an end, wherefore we observe that all the animals of a same species act in like manner. But this is impossible in man, on account of his reason, which takes cognizance of universals, and consequently extends to an infinity of singulars.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(16)

Whether prudence can be lost through forgetfulness?

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(16)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence can be lost through forgetfulness. For since science is about necessary things, it is more certain than prudence which is about contingent matters of action. But science is lost by forgetfulness. Much more therefore is prudence.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(16)-O(2) — Further, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 3) “the same things, but by a contrary process, engender and corrupt virtue.” Now the engendering of prudence requires experience which is made up

“of many memories,” as he states at the beginning of his *Metaphysics* (i, 1). Therefore since forgetfulness is contrary to memory, it seems that prudence can be lost through forgetfulness.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(16)-O(3) — Further, there is no prudence without knowledge of universals. But knowledge of universals can be lost through forgetfulness. Therefore prudence can also.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(16) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (*Ethic.* vi, 5) that “forgetfulness is possible to art but not to prudence.”

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(16) — *I answer that*, Forgetfulness regards knowledge only, wherefore one can forget art and science, so as to lose them altogether, because they belong to the reason. But prudence consists not in knowledge alone, but also in an act of the appetite, because as stated above (**A(8)**), its principal act is one of command, whereby a man applies the knowledge he has, to the purpose of appetite and operation. Hence prudence is not taken away directly by forgetfulness, but rather is corrupted by the passions. For the Philosopher says (*Ethic.* vi, 5) that “pleasure and sorrow pervert the estimate of prudence”: wherefore it is written (*Daniel* 13:56): “Beauty hath deceived thee, and lust hath subverted thy heart,” and (⁴²³⁸*Exodus* 23:8):

“Neither shalt thou take bribes which blind even the prudent
[Douay: ‘wise’].”

Nevertheless forgetfulness may hinder prudence, in so far as the latter’s command depends on knowledge which may be forgotten.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(16)-RO(1) — Science is in the reason only: hence the comparison fails, as stated above [*Cf. **P(2a)**, **Q(53)**, **A(1)**].

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(16)-RO(2) — The experience required by prudence results not from memory alone, but also from the practice of commanding aright.

P(2b)-Q(47)-A(16)-RO(3) — Prudence consists chiefly, not in the knowledge of universals, but in applying them to action, as stated above (**A(3)**). Wherefore forgetting the knowledge of universals does not destroy the principal part of prudence, but hinders it somewhat, as stated above.

QUESTION 48

OF THE PARTS OF PRUDENCE

(ONE ARTICLE)

We must now consider the parts of prudence, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Which are the parts of prudence?
- (2) Of its integral parts;
- (3) Of its subjective parts;
- (4) Of its potential parts.

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1)*Whether three parts of prudence are fittingly assigned?*

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that the parts of prudence are assigned unfittingly. Tully (De Invent. Rhet. ii, 53) assigns three parts of prudence, namely, “memory,” “understanding” and “foresight.” Macrobius (In Somn. Scip. i) following the opinion of Plotinus ascribes to prudence six parts, namely, “reasoning,” “understanding,” “circumspection,” “foresight,” “docility” and “caution.” Aristotle says (Ethic. vi, 9,10,11) that “good counsel,” “synesis” and “gnome” belong to prudence. Again under the head of prudence he mentions “conjecture,” “shrewdness,” “sense” and “understanding.” And another Greek philosopher [*Andronicus; Cf. **Q(80), O(4)**] says that ten things are connected with prudence, namely, “good counsel,” “shrewdness,” “foresight,” “regnative [*Regnativa],” “military,” “political” and “domestic prudence,” “dialectics,” “rhetoric” and “physics.” Therefore it seems that one or the other enumeration is either excessive or deficient.

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, prudence is specifically distinct from science. But politics, economics, logic, rhetoric, physics are sciences. Therefore they are not parts of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the parts do not exceed the whole. Now the intellective memory or intelligence, reason, sense and docility, belong not only to prudence but also to all the cognitive habits. Therefore they should not be set down as parts of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, just as counselling, judging and commanding are acts of the practical reason, so also is using, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(16)**, **A(1)**). Therefore, just as “eubulia” which refers to counsel, is connected with prudence, and “synesis” and “gnome” which refer to judgment, so also ought something to have been assigned corresponding to use.

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, solicitude pertains to prudence, as stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(9)**). Therefore solicitude also should have been mentioned among the parts of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Parts are of three kinds, namely, “integral,” as wall, roof, and foundations are parts of a house; “subjective,” as ox and lion are parts of animal; and “potential,” as the nutritive and sensitive powers are parts of the soul. Accordingly, parts can be assigned to a virtue in three ways. First, in likeness to integral parts, so that the things which need to concur for the perfect act of a virtue, are called the parts of that virtue. In this way, out of all the things mentioned above, eight may be taken as parts of prudence, namely, the six assigned by Macrobius; with the addition of a seventh, viz. “memory” mentioned by Tully; and {eustochia} or “shrewdness” mentioned by Aristotle. For the “sense” of prudence is also called “understanding”: wherefore the Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 11): “Of such things one needs to have the sense, and this is understanding.” Of these eight, five belong to prudence as a cognitive virtue, namely, “memory,” “reasoning,” “understanding,” “docility” and “shrewdness”: while the three others belong thereto, as commanding and applying knowledge to action, namely, “foresight,” “circumspection” and “caution.” The reason of their difference is seen from the fact that three things may be observed in reference to knowledge. In the first place, knowledge itself, which, if it be of the past, is called

“memory,” if of the present, whether contingent or necessary, is called “understanding” or “intelligence.” Secondly, the acquiring of knowledge, which is caused either by teaching, to which pertains “docility,” or by “discovery,” and to this belongs to {eustochia}, i.e. “a happy conjecture,” of which “shrewdness” is a part, which is a “quick conjecture of the middle term,” as stated in Poster. i, 9. Thirdly, the use of knowledge, in as much as we proceed from things known to knowledge or judgment of other things, and this belongs to “reasoning.” And the reason, in order to command aright, requires to have three conditions. First, to order that which is befitting the end, and this belongs to “foresight”; secondly, to attend to the circumstances of the matter in hand, and this belongs to “circumspection”; thirdly, to avoid obstacles, and this belongs to “caution.”

The subjective parts of a virtue are its various species. In this way the parts of prudence, if we take them properly, are the prudence whereby a man rules himself, and the prudence whereby a man governs a multitude, which differ specifically as stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(11)**). Again, the prudence whereby a multitude is governed, is divided into various species according to the various kinds of multitude. There is the multitude which is united together for some particular purpose; thus an army is gathered together to fight, and the prudence that governs this is called “military.” There is also the multitude that is united together for the whole of life; such is the multitude of a home or family, and this is ruled by “domestic prudence”: and such again is the multitude of a city or kingdom, the ruling principle of which is “regnative prudence” in the ruler, and “political prudence,” simply so called, in the subjects.

If, however, prudence be taken in a wide sense, as including also speculative knowledge, as stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(2)**, ad 2) then its parts include “dialectics,” “rhetoric” and “physics,” according to three methods of prudence in the sciences. The first of these is the attaining of science by demonstration, which belongs to “physics” (if physics be understood to comprise all demonstrative sciences). The second method is to arrive at an opinion through probable premises, and this belongs to “dialectics.” The third method is to employ conjectures in order to induce a certain suspicion, or to persuade somewhat, and this belongs to “rhetoric.” It may be said, however, that these three belong also to prudence properly so

called, since it argues sometimes from necessary premises, sometimes from probabilities, and sometimes from conjectures.

The potential parts of a virtue are the virtues connected with it, which are directed to certain secondary acts or matters, not having, as it were, the whole power of the principal virtue. In this way the parts of prudence are “good counsel,” which concerns counsel, “synesis,” which concerns judgment in matters of ordinary occurrence, and “gnome,” which concerns judgment in matters of exception to the law: while “prudence” is about the chief act, viz. that of commanding.

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1)-RO(1) — The various enumerations differ, either because different kinds of parts are assigned, or because that which is mentioned in one enumeration includes several mentioned in another enumeration. Thus Tully includes “caution” and “circumspection” under “foresight,” and “reasoning,” “docility” and “shrewdness” under “understanding.”

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1)-RO(2) — Here domestic and civic prudence are not to be taken as sciences, but as kinds of prudence. As to the other three, the reply may be gathered from what has been said.

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1)-RO(3) — All these things are reckoned parts of prudence, not by taking them altogether, but in so far as they are connected with things pertaining to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1)-RO(4) — Right command and right use always go together, because the reason’s command is followed by obedience on the part of the lower powers, which pertain to use.

P(2b)-Q(48)-A(1)-RO(5) — Solicitude is included under foresight.

QUESTION 49

OF EACH QUASI-INTEGRAL PART OF PRUDENCE

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

We must now consider each quasi-integral part of prudence, and under this head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Memory;
- (2) Understanding or Intelligence;
- (3) Docility;
- (4) Shrewdness;
- (5) Reason;
- (6) Foresight;
- (7) Circumspection;
- (8) Caution.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(1)*Whether memory is a part of prudence?*

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that memory is not a part of prudence. For memory, as the Philosopher proves (De Memor. et Remin. i), is in the sensitive part of the soul: whereas prudence is in the rational part (Ethic. vi, 5). Therefore memory is not a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, prudence is acquired and perfected by experience, whereas memory is in us from nature. Therefore memory is not a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, memory regards the past, whereas prudence regards future matters of action, about which counsel is

concerned, as stated in Ethic. vi, 2,7. Therefore memory is not a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Tully (De Invent. Rhet. ii, 53) places memory among the parts of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Prudence regards contingent matters of action, as stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(5)**). Now in such like matters a man can be directed, not by those things that are simply and necessarily true, but by those which occur in the majority of cases: because principles must be proportionate to their conclusions, and “like must be concluded from like” (Ethic. vi [*Anal. Post. 1:32]). But we need experience to discover what is true in the majority of cases: wherefore the Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 1) that “intellectual virtue is engendered and fostered by experience and time.” Now experience is the result of many memories as stated in Metaph. i, 1, and therefore prudence requires the memory of many things. Hence memory is fittingly accounted a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(1)-RO(1) — As stated above (**Q(47)**, **AA(3),6**), prudence applies universal knowledge to particulars which are objects of sense: hence many things belonging to the sensitive faculties are requisite for prudence, and memory is one of them.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(1)-RO(2) — Just as aptitude for prudence is in our nature, while its perfection comes through practice or grace, so too, as Tully says in his Rhetoric [*Ad Herenn. de Arte Rhet. iii, 16,24], memory not only arises from nature, but is also aided by art and diligence.

There are four things whereby a man perfects his memory. First, when a man wishes to remember a thing, he should take some suitable yet somewhat unwonted illustration of it, since the unwonted strikes us more, and so makes a greater and stronger impression on the mind; the mind; and this explains why we remember better what we saw when we were children. Now the reason for the necessity of finding these illustrations or images, is that simple and spiritual impressions easily slip from the mind, unless they be tied as it were to some corporeal image, because human knowledge has a greater hold on sensible objects. For this reason memory is assigned to the sensitive part of the soul. Secondly, whatever a man wishes to retain in his memory he must carefully consider and set in order,

so that he may pass easily from one memory to another. Hence the Philosopher says (De Memor. et Remin. ii): “Sometimes a place brings memories back to us: the reason being that we pass quickly from the one to the other.” Thirdly, we must be anxious and earnest about the things we wish to remember, because the more a thing is impressed on the mind, the less it is liable to slip out of it. Wherefore Tully says in his Rhetoric [*Ad Herenn. de Arte Rhet. iii.] that “anxiety preserves the figures of images entire.” Fourthly, we should often reflect on the things we wish to remember. Hence the Philosopher says (De Memoria i) that “reflection preserves memories,” because as he remarks (De Memoria ii) “custom is a second nature”: wherefore when we reflect on a thing frequently, we quickly call it to mind, through passing from one thing to another by a kind of natural order.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(1)-RO(3) — It behooves us to argue, as it were, about the future from the past; wherefore memory of the past is necessary in order to take good counsel for the future.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(2)

Whether understanding is a part of prudence?
(*Otherwise intuition; Aristotle’s word is {nous})*

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that understanding is not a part of prudence. When two things are members of a division, one is not part of the other. But intellectual virtue is divided into understanding and prudence, according to Ethic. vi, 3. Therefore understanding should not be reckoned a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, understanding is numbered among the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and corresponds to faith, as stated above (**Q(8), AA(1),8**). But prudence is a virtue other than faith, as is clear from what has been said above (**Q(4), A(8); P(2a), Q(62), A(2)**). Therefore understanding does not pertain to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, prudence is about singular matters of action (Ethic. vi, 7): whereas understanding takes cognizance of universal

and immaterial objects (De Anima iii, 4). Therefore understanding is not a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Tully [*De Invent. Rhet. ii, 53] accounts “intelligence” a part of prudence, and Macrobius [*In Somn. Scip. i, 8] mentions “understanding,” which comes to the same.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Understanding denotes here, not the intellectual power, but the right estimate about some final principle, which is taken as self-evident: thus we are said to understand the first principles of demonstrations. Now every deduction of reason proceeds from certain statements which are taken as primary: wherefore every process of reasoning must needs proceed from some understanding. Therefore since prudence is right reason applied to action, the whole process of prudence must needs have its source in understanding. Hence it is that understanding is reckoned a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(2)-RO(1) — The reasoning of prudence terminates, as in a conclusion, in the particular matter of action, to which, as stated above (Q(47), AA(3),6), it applies the knowledge of some universal principle. Now a singular conclusion is argued from a universal and a singular proposition. Wherefore the reasoning of prudence must proceed from a twofold understanding. The one is cognizant of universals, and this belongs to the understanding which is an intellectual virtue, whereby we know naturally not only speculative principles, but also practical universal principles, such as “One should do evil to no man,” as shown above (Q(47), A(6)). The other understanding, as stated in Ethic. vi, 11, is cognizant of an extreme, i.e. of some primary singular and contingent practical matter, viz. the minor premiss, which must needs be singular in the syllogism of prudence, as stated above (Q(47), AA(3),6). Now this primary singular is some singular end, as stated in the same place. Wherefore the understanding which is a part of prudence is a right estimate of some particular end.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(2)-RO(2) — The understanding which is a gift of the Holy Ghost, is a quick insight into divine things, as shown above (Q(8), AA(1),2). It is in another sense that it is accounted a part of prudence, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(2)-RO(3) — The right estimate about a particular end is called both “understanding,” in so far as its object is a principle, and “sense,” in so far as its object is a particular. This is what the Philosopher means when he says (Ethic. v, 11): “Of such things we need to have the sense, and this is understanding.” But this is to be understood as referring, not to the particular sense whereby we know proper sensibles, but to the interior sense, whereby we judge of a particular.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(3)

Whether docility should be accounted a part of prudence?

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that docility should not be accounted a part of prudence. For that which is a necessary condition of every intellectual virtue, should not be appropriated to one of them. But docility is requisite for every intellectual virtue. Therefore it should not be accounted a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, that which pertains to a human virtue is in our power, since it is for things that are in our power that we are praised or blamed. Now it is not in our power to be docile, for this is befitting to some through their natural disposition. Therefore it is not a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, docility is in the disciple: whereas prudence, since it makes precepts, seems rather to belong to teachers, who are also called “preceptors.” Therefore docility is not a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Macrobius [*In Somn. Scip. i, 8] following the opinion of Plotinus places docility among the parts of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (A(2), ad 1; Q(47), A(3)) prudence is concerned with particular matters of action, and since such matters are of infinite variety, no one man can consider them all sufficiently; nor can this be done quickly, for it requires length of time. Hence in matters of prudence man stands in very great need of being taught by others, especially by old folk who have acquired a sane understanding of the ends in practical matters. Wherefore the Philosopher says (Ethic. vi,

11): “It is right to pay no less attention to the undemonstrated assertions and opinions of such persons as are experienced, older than we are, and prudent, than to their demonstrations, for their experience gives them an insight into principles.” Thus it is written (²⁰¹⁵Proverbs 3:5): “Lean not on thy own prudence,” and (Ecclus. 6:35): “Stand in the multitude of the ancients” (i.e. the old men), “that are wise, and join thyself from thy heart to their wisdom.” Now it is a mark of docility to be ready to be taught: and consequently docility is fittingly reckoned a part of prudence

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(3)-RO(1) — Although docility is useful for every intellectual virtue, yet it belongs to prudence chiefly, for the reason given above.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(3)-RO(2) — Man has a natural aptitude for docility even as for other things connected with prudence. Yet his own efforts count for much towards the attainment of perfect docility: and he must carefully, frequently and reverently apply his mind to the teachings of the learned, neither neglecting them through laziness, nor despising them through pride.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(3)-RO(3) — By prudence man makes precepts not only for others, but also for himself, as stated above (**Q(47), A(12)**, ad 3). Hence as stated (Ethic. vi, 11), even in subjects, there is place for prudence; to which docility pertains. And yet even the learned should be docile in some respects, since no man is altogether self-sufficient in matters of prudence, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(4)

Whether shrewdness is part of prudence?

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that shrewdness is not a part of prudence. For shrewdness consists in easily finding the middle term for demonstrations, as stated in Poster. i, 34. Now the reasoning of prudence is not a demonstration since it deals with contingencies. Therefore shrewdness does not pertain to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, good counsel pertains to prudence according to Ethic. vi, 5,7,9. Now there is no place in good counsel for shrewdness [*Ethic. vi, 9; Poster. i, 34] which is a kind of {eustochia}, i.e.

“a happy conjecture”: for the latter is “unreasoning and rapid,” whereas counsel needs to be slow, as stated in *Ethic.* vi, 9. Therefore shrewdness should not be accounted a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, shrewdness as stated above (**Q(48)**) is a “happy conjecture.” Now it belongs to rhetoricians to make use of conjectures. Therefore shrewdness belongs to rhetoric rather than to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Isidore says (*Etym.* x): “A solicitous man is one who is shrewd and alert [*solers citus*].” But solicitude belongs to prudence, as stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(9)**). Therefore shrewdness does also.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Prudence consists in a right estimate about matters of action. Now a right estimate or opinion is acquired in two ways, both in practical and in speculative matters, first by discovering it oneself, secondly by learning it from others. Now just as docility consists in a man being well disposed to acquire a right opinion from another man, so shrewdness is an apt disposition to acquire a right estimate by oneself, yet so that shrewdness be taken for {eustochia}, of which it is a part. For {eustochia} is a happy conjecture about any matter, while shrewdness is “an easy and rapid conjecture in finding the middle term” (*Poster.* i, 34). Nevertheless the philosopher [*Andronicus; Cf. **Q(48)**, **O(1)**] who calls shrewdness a part of prudence, takes it for {eustochia}, in general, hence he says: “Shrewdness is a habit whereby congruities are discovered rapidly.”

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(4)-RO(1) — Shrewdness is concerned with the discovery of the middle term not only in demonstrative, but also in practical syllogisms, as, for instance, when two men are seen to be friends they are reckoned to be enemies of a third one, as the Philosopher says (*Poster.* i, 34). In this way shrewdness belongs to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(4)-RO(2) — The Philosopher adduces the true reason (*Ethic.* vi, 9) to prove that {euboulia}, i.e. good counsel, is not {eustochia}, which is commended for grasping quickly what should be done. Now a man may take good counsel, though he be long and slow in so doing, and yet this does not discount the utility of a happy conjecture in

taking good counsel: indeed it is sometimes a necessity, when, for instance, something has to be done without warning. It is for this reason that shrewdness is fittingly reckoned a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(4)-RO(3) — Rhetoric also reasons about practical matters, wherefore nothing hinders the same thing belonging both to rhetoric and prudence. Nevertheless, conjecture is taken here not only in the sense in which it is employed by rhetoricians, but also as applicable to all matters whatsoever wherein man is said to conjecture the truth.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(5)

Whether reason should be reckoned a part of prudence?

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that reason should not be reckoned a part of prudence. For the subject of an accident is not a part thereof. But prudence is in the reason as its subject (Ethic. vi, 5). Therefore reason should not be reckoned a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, that which is common to many, should not be reckoned a part of any one of them; or if it be so reckoned, it should be reckoned a part of that one to which it chiefly belongs. Now reason is necessary in all the intellectual virtues, and chiefly in wisdom and science, which employ a demonstrative reason. Therefore reason should not be reckoned a part of prudence

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, reason as a power does not differ essentially from the intelligence, as stated above (**P(1), Q(79), A(8)**). If therefore intelligence be reckoned a part of prudence, it is superfluous to add reason.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Macrobius [*In Somn. Scip. i], following the opinion of Plotinus, numbers reason among the parts of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(5) — *I answer that*, The work of prudence is to take good counsel, as stated in Ethic. vi, 7. Now counsel is a research proceeding from certain things to others. But this is the work of reason. Wherefore it is requisite for prudence that man should be an apt reasoner. And since the

things required for the perfection of prudence are called requisite or quasi-integral parts of prudence, it follows that reason should be numbered among these parts.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(5)-RO(1) — Reason denotes here, not the power of reason, but its good use.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(5)-RO(2) — The certitude of reason comes from the intellect. Yet the need of reason is from a defect in the intellect, since those things in which the intellective power is in full vigor, have no need for reason, for they comprehend the truth by their simple insight, as do God and the angels. On the other hand particular matters of action, wherein prudence guides, are very far from the condition of things intelligible, and so much the farther, as they are less certain and fixed. Thus matters of art, though they are singular, are nevertheless more fixed and certain, wherefore in many of them there is no room for counsel on account of their certitude, as stated in Ethic. iii, 3. Hence, although in certain other intellectual virtues reason is more certain than in prudence, yet prudence above all requires that man be an apt reasoner, so that he may rightly apply universals to particulars, which latter are various and uncertain.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(5)-RO(3) — Although intelligence and reason are not different powers, yet they are named after different acts. For intelligence takes its name from being an intimate penetration of the truth [*Cf. **P(2b), Q(8), A(1)**], while reason is so called from being inquisitive and discursive. Hence each is accounted a part of reason as explained above (**A(2); Q(47), A(2),3**).

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(6)

Whether foresight should be accounted a part of prudence?
(*"Providentia," which may be translated
either "providence" or "foresight.")*

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that foresight should not be accounted a part of prudence. For nothing is part of itself. Now foresight seems to be the same as prudence, because according to Isidore (Etym. x), "a prudent man is one who sees from afar [porro videns]": and this is also

the derivation of “providentia [foresight],” according to Boethius (De Consol. v). Therefore foresight is not a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, prudence is only practical, whereas foresight may be also speculative, because “seeing,” whence we have the word “to foresee,” has more to do with speculation than operation. Therefore foresight is not a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, the chief act of prudence is to command, while its secondary act is to judge and to take counsel. But none of these seems to be properly implied by foresight. Therefore foresight is not part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(6) — On the contrary stands the authority of Tully and Macrobius, who number foresight among the parts of prudence, as stated above (**Q(48)**).

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(6) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(1)**, ad 2, **AA(6),13**), prudence is properly about the means to an end, and its proper work is to set them in due order to the end. And although certain things are necessary for an end, which are subject to divine providence, yet nothing is subject to human providence except the contingent matters of actions which can be done by man for an end. Now the past has become a kind of necessity, since what has been done cannot be undone. In like manner, the present as such, has a kind of necessity, since it is necessary that Socrates sit, so long as he sits.

Consequently, future contingents, in so far as they can be directed by man to the end of human life, are the matter of prudence: and each of these things is implied in the word foresight, for it implies the notion of something distant, to which that which occurs in the present has to be directed. Therefore foresight is part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(6)-RO(1) — Whenever many things are requisite for a unity, one of them must needs be the principal to which all the others are subordinate. Hence in every whole one part must be formal and predominant, whence the whole has unity. Accordingly foresight is the principal of all the parts of prudence, since whatever else is required for prudence, is necessary precisely that some particular thing may be rightly

directed to its end. Hence it is that the very name of prudence is taken from foresight [providential] as from its principal part.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(6)-RO(2) — Speculation is about universal and necessary things, which, in themselves, are not distant, since they are everywhere and always, though they are distant from us, in so far as we fail to know them. Hence foresight does not apply properly to speculative, but only to practical matters.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(6)-RO(3) — Right order to an end which is included in the notion of foresight, contains rectitude of counsel, judgment and command, without which no right order to the end is possible.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(7)

Whether circumspection can be a part of prudence?

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that circumspection cannot be a part of prudence. For circumspection seems to signify looking at one's surroundings. But these are of infinite number, and cannot be considered by the reason wherein is prudence. Therefore circumspection should not be reckoned a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, circumstances seem to be the concern of moral virtues rather than of prudence. But circumspection seems to denote nothing but attention to circumstances. Therefore circumspection apparently belongs to the moral virtues rather than to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, whoever can see things afar off can much more see things that are near. Now foresight enables a man to look on distant things. Therefore there is no need to account circumspection a part of prudence in addition to foresight.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(7) — On the contrary stands the authority of Macrobius, quoted above (**Q(48)**).

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(7) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(6)**), it belongs to prudence chiefly to direct something aright to an end; and this is not done aright unless both the end be good, and the means good and suitable.

Since, however, prudence, as stated above (**Q(47), A(3)**) is about singular matters of action, which contain many combinations of circumstances, it happens that a thing is good in itself and suitable to the end, and nevertheless becomes evil or unsuitable to the end, by reason of some combination of circumstances. Thus to show signs of love to someone seems, considered in itself, to be a fitting way to arouse love in his heart, yet if pride or suspicion of flattery arise in his heart, it will no longer be a means suitable to the end. Hence the need of circumspection in prudence, viz. of comparing the means with the circumstances.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(7)-RO(1) — Though the number of possible circumstances be infinite, the number of actual circumstances is not; and the judgment of reason in matters of action is influenced by things which are few in number

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(7)-RO(2) — Circumstances are the concern of prudence, because prudence has to fix them; on the other hand they are the concern of moral virtues, in so far as moral virtues are perfected by the fixing of circumstances.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(7)-RO(3) — Just as it belongs to foresight to look on that which is by its nature suitable to an end, so it belongs to circumspection to consider whether it be suitable to the end in view of the circumstances. Now each of these presents a difficulty of its own, and therefore each is reckoned a distinct part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(8)

Whether caution should be reckoned a part of prudence?

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that caution should not be reckoned a part of prudence. For when no evil is possible, no caution is required. Now no man makes evil use of virtue, as Augustine declares (De Lib. Arb. ii, 19). Therefore caution does not belong to prudence which directs the virtues.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, to foresee good and to avoid evil belong to the same faculty, just as the same art gives health and cures ill-health. Now it belongs to foresight to foresee good, and consequently, also

to avoid evil. Therefore caution should not be accounted a part of prudence, distinct from foresight.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, no prudent man strives for the impossible. But no man can take precautions against all possible evils. Therefore caution does not belong to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (~~4915~~ Ephesians 5:15):

“See how you walk cautiously [Douay: ‘circumspectly’].”

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(8) — *I answer that*, The things with which prudence is concerned, are contingent matters of action, wherein, even as false is found with true, so is evil mingled with good, on account of the great variety of these matters of action, wherein good is often hindered by evil, and evil has the appearance of good. Wherefore prudence needs caution, so that we may have such a grasp of good as to avoid evil.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(8)-RO(1) — Caution is required in moral acts, that we may be on our guard, not against acts of virtue, but against the hindrance of acts of virtue.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(8)-RO(2) — It is the same in idea, to ensue good and to avoid the opposite evil, but the avoidance of outward hindrances is different in idea. Hence caution differs from foresight, although they both belong to the one virtue of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(49)-A(8)-RO(3) — Of the evils which man has to avoid, some are of frequent occurrence; the like can be grasped by reason, and against them caution is directed, either that they may be avoided altogether, or that they may do less harm. Others there are that occur rarely and by chance, and these, since they are infinite in number, cannot be grasped by reason, nor is man able to take precautions against them, although by exercising prudence he is able to prepare against all the surprises of chance, so as to suffer less harm thereby.

QUESTION 50

OF THE SUBJECTIVE PARTS OF PRUDENCE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must, in due sequence, consider the subjective parts of prudence. And since we have already spoken of the prudence with which a man rules himself (**Q(47)**, seqq.), it remains for us to discuss the species of prudence whereby a multitude is governed. Under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether a species of prudence is regnative?
- (2) Whether political and
- (3) domestic economy are species of prudence?
- (4) Whether military prudence is?

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(1)

Whether a species of prudence is regnative?

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that regnative should not be reckoned a species of prudence. For regnative prudence is directed to the preservation of justice, since according to Ethic. v, 6 the prince is the guardian of justice. Therefore regnative prudence belongs to justice rather than to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, according to the Philosopher (Polit. iii, 5) a kingdom [regnum] is one of six species of government. But no species of prudence is ascribed to the other five forms of government, which are “aristocracy,” “polity,” also called “timocracy” [*Cf. Ethic. viii, 10], “tyranny,” “oligarchy” and “democracy.” Therefore neither should a regnative species be ascribed to a kingdom.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, lawgiving belongs not only to kings, but also to certain others placed in authority, and even to the people,

according to Isidore (Etym. v). Now the Philosopher (Ethic. vi, 8) reckons a part of prudence to be “legislative.” Therefore it is not becoming to substitute regnative prudence in its place.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Polit. iii, 11) that “prudence is a virtue which is proper to the prince.” Therefore a special kind of prudence is regnative.

I answer that, As stated above (**Q(47)**, **AA(8),10**), it belongs to prudence to govern and command, so that wherever in human acts we find a special kind of governance and command, there must be a special kind of prudence. Now it is evident that there is a special and perfect kind of governance in one who has to govern not only himself but also the perfect community of a city or kingdom; because a government is the more perfect according as it is more universal, extends to more matters, and attains a higher end. Hence prudence in its special and most perfect sense, belongs to a king who is charged with the government of a city or kingdom: for which reason a species of prudence is reckoned to be regnative.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(1)-RO(1) — All matters connected with moral virtue belong to prudence as their guide, wherefore “right reason in accord with prudence” is included in the definition of moral virtue, as stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(5)**, ad 1; **P(2a)**, **Q(58)**, **A(2)**, ad 4). For this reason also the execution of justice in so far as it is directed to the common good, which is part of the kingly office, needs the guidance of prudence. Hence these two virtues — prudence and justice — belong most properly to a king, according to ²²¹⁵Jeremiah 23:5:

“A king shall reign and shall be wise, and shall execute justice and judgment in the earth.”

Since, however, direction belongs rather to the king, and execution to his subjects, regnative prudence is reckoned a species of prudence which is directive, rather than to justice which is executive.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(1)-RO(2) — A kingdom is the best of all governments, as stated in Ethic. viii, 10: wherefore the species of prudence should be denominated rather from a kingdom, yet so as to comprehend under regnative all other rightful forms of government, but not perverse forms

which are opposed to virtue, and which, accordingly, do not pertain to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(1)-RO(3) — The Philosopher names regnative prudence after the principal act of a king which is to make laws, and although this applies to the other forms of government, this is only in so far as they have a share of kingly government.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(2)

***Whether political prudence
is fittingly accounted a part of prudence?***

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that political prudence is not fittingly accounted a part of prudence. For regnative is a part of political prudence, as stated above (**A(1)**). But a part should not be reckoned a species with the whole. Therefore political prudence should not be reckoned a part of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the species of habits are distinguished by their various objects. Now what the ruler has to command is the same as what the subject has to execute. Therefore political prudence as regards the subjects, should not be reckoned a species of prudence distinct from regnative prudence.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, each subject is an individual person. Now each individual person can direct himself sufficiently by prudence commonly so called. Therefore there is no need of a special kind of prudence called political.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 8) that “of the prudence which is concerned with the state one kind is a master-prudence and is called legislative; another kind bears the common name political, and deals with individuals.”

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(2) — *I answer that*, A slave is moved by his master, and a subject by his ruler, by command, but otherwise than as irrational and inanimate beings are set in motion by their movers. For irrational and inanimate beings are moved only by others and do not put themselves in

motion, since they have no free-will whereby to be masters of their own actions, wherefore the rectitude of their government is not in their power but in the power of their movers. On the other hand, men who are slaves or subjects in any sense, are moved by the commands of others in such a way that they move themselves by their free-will; wherefore some kind of rectitude of government is required in them, so that they may direct themselves in obeying their superiors; and to this belongs that species of prudence which is called political.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(2)-RO(1) — As stated above, regnative is the most perfect species of prudence, wherefore the prudence of subjects, which falls short of regnative prudence, retains the common name of political prudence, even as in logic a convertible term which does not denote the essence of a thing retains the name of “proper.”

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(2)-RO(2) — A different aspect of the object diversifies the species of a habit, as stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(5)**). Now the same actions are considered by the king, but under a more general aspect, as by his subjects who obey: since many obey one king in various departments. Hence regnative prudence is compared to this political prudence of which we are speaking, as mastercraft to handicraft.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(2)-RO(3) — Man directs himself by prudence commonly so called, in relation to his own good, but by political prudence, of which we speak, he directs himself in relation to the common good.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(3)

*Whether a part of prudence
should be reckoned to be domestic?*

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that domestic should not be reckoned a part of prudence. For, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. vi, 5) “prudence is directed to a good life in general”: whereas domestic prudence is directed to a particular end, viz. wealth, according to Ethic. i, 1. Therefore a species of prudence is not domestic.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, as stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(13)**) prudence is only in good people. But domestic prudence may be also in

wicked people, since many sinners are provident in governing their household. Therefore domestic prudence should not be reckoned a species of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, just as in a kingdom there is a ruler and subject, so also is there in a household. If therefore domestic like political is a species of prudence, there should be a paternal corresponding to regnative prudence. Now there is no such prudence. Therefore neither should domestic prudence be accounted a species of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher states (Ethic. vi, 8) that there are various kinds of prudence in the government of a multitude, “one of which is domestic, another legislative, and another political.”

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Different aspects of an object, in respect of universality and particularity, or of totality and partiality, diversify arts and virtues; and in respect of such diversity one act of virtue is principal as compared with another. Now it is evident that a household is a mean between the individual and the city or kingdom, since just as the individual is part of the household, so is the household part of the city or kingdom. And therefore, just as prudence commonly so called which governs the individual, is distinct from political prudence, so must domestic prudence be distinct from both.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(3)-RO(1) — Riches are compared to domestic prudence, not as its last end, but as its instrument, as stated in Polit. i, 3. On the other hand, the end of political prudence is “a good life in general” as regards the conduct of the household. In Ethic. i, 1 the Philosopher speaks of riches as the end of political prudence, by way of example and in accordance with the opinion of many.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(3)-RO(2) — Some sinners may be provident in certain matters of detail concerning the disposition of their household, but not in regard to “a good life in general” as regards the conduct of the household, for which above all a virtuous life is required.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(3)-RO(3) — The father has in his household an authority like that of a king, as stated in Ethic. viii, 10, but he has not the full power

of a king, wherefore paternal government is not reckoned a distinct species of prudence, like regnative prudence.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(4)

Whether military prudence should be reckoned a part of prudence?

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that military prudence should not be reckoned a part of prudence. For prudence is distinct from art, according to Ethic. vi, 3. Now military prudence seems to be the art of warfare, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iii, 8). Therefore military prudence should not be accounted a species of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, just as military business is contained under political affairs, so too are many other matters, such as those of tradesmen, craftsmen, and so forth. But there are no species of prudence corresponding to other affairs in the state. Neither therefore should any be assigned to military business.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the soldiers' bravery counts for a great deal in warfare. Therefore military prudence pertains to fortitude rather than to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (³¹⁸Proverbs 24:6):

“War is managed by due ordering, and there shall be safety where
there are many counsels.”

Now it belongs to prudence to take counsel. Therefore there is great need in warfare for that species of prudence which is called “military.”

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Whatever things are done according to art or reason, should be made to conform to those which are in accordance with nature, and are established by the Divine Reason. Now nature has a twofold tendency: first, to govern each thing in itself, secondly, to withstand outward assailants and corruptives: and for this reason she has provided animals not only with the concupiscible faculty, whereby they are moved to that which is conducive to their well-being, but also with the irascible power, whereby the animal withstands an assailant. Therefore in

those things also which are in accordance with reason, there should be not only “political” prudence, which disposes in a suitable manner such things as belong to the common good, but also a “military” prudence, whereby hostile attacks are repelled.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(4)-RO(1) — Military prudence may be an art, in so far as it has certain rules for the right use of certain external things, such as arms and horses, but in so far as it is directed to the common good, it belongs rather to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(4)-RO(2) — Other matters in the state are directed to the profit of individuals, whereas the business of soldiering is directed to the service belongs to fortitude, but the direction, protection of the entire common good.

P(2b)-Q(50)-A(4)-RO(3) — The execution of military service belongs to fortitude, but the direction, especially in so far as it concerns the commander-in-chief, belongs to prudence.

QUESTION 51

OF THE VIRTUES WHICH ARE CONNECTED WITH PRUDENCE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

In due sequence, we must consider the virtues that are connected with prudence, and which are its quasi-potential parts. Under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether {euboulia}, is a virtue?
- (2) Whether it is a special virtue, distinct from prudence?
- (3) Whether {synesis} is a special virtue?
- (4) Whether {gnome} is a special virtue?

[*These three Greek words may be rendered as the faculties of deliberating well {euboulia}, of judging well according to common law {synesis}, and of judging well according to general law {gnome}, respectively.]

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(1)

Whether {euboulia} (deliberating well) is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that {euboulia} (deliberating well) is not a virtue. For, according to Augustine (De Lib. Arb. ii, 18,19) “no man makes evil use of virtue.” Now some make evil use of {euboulia} (deliberating well) or good counsel, either through devising crafty counsels in order to achieve evil ends, or through committing sin in order that they may achieve good ends, as those who rob that they may give alms. Therefore {euboulia} (deliberating well) is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, virtue is a perfection, according to Phys. 7: But {euboulia} (deliberating well) is concerned with counsel, which implies doubt and research, and these are marks of imperfection. Therefore {euboulia} (deliberating well) is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, virtues are connected with one another, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(65)**). Now {euboulia} (deliberating well) is not connected with the other virtues, since many sinners take good-counsel, and many godly men are slow in taking counsel. Therefore {euboulia} (deliberating well) is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, According to the Philosopher (Ethic. vi, 9) {euboulia} (deliberating well) “is a right counselling.” Now the perfection of virtue consists in right reason. Therefore {euboulia} (deliberating well) is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(4)**) the nature of a human virtue consists in making a human act good. Now among the acts of man, it is proper to him to take counsel, since this denotes a research of the reason about the actions he has to perform and whereof human life consists, for the speculative life is above man, as stated in Ethic. 10:But {euboulia} (deliberating well) signifies goodness of counsel, for it is derived from the {eu}, good, and {boule}, counsel, being “a good counsel” or rather “a disposition to take good counsel.” Hence it is evident that {euboulia} (deliberating well) is a human virtue.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(1)-RO(1) — There is no good counsel either in deliberating for an evil end, or in discovering evil means for attaining a good end, even as in speculative matters, there is no good reasoning either in coming to a false conclusion, or in coming to a true conclusion from false premisses through employing an unsuitable middle term. Hence both the aforesaid processes are contrary to {euboulia} (deliberating well), as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. vi, 9).

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(1)-RO(2) — Although virtue is essentially a perfection, it does not follow that whatever is the matter of a virtue implies perfection. For man needs to be perfected by virtues in all his parts, and this not only as regards the acts of reason, of which counsel is one, but also as regards the passions of the sensitive appetite, which are still more imperfect.

It may also be replied that human virtue is a perfection according to the mode of man, who is unable by simple insight to comprehend with certainty the truth of things, especially in matters of action which are contingent.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(1)-RO(3) — In no sinner as such is {euboulia} (deliberating well) to be found: since all sin is contrary to taking good counsel. For good counsel requires not only the discovery or devising of fit means for the end, but also other circumstances. Such are suitable time, so that one be neither too slow nor too quick in taking counsel, and the mode of taking counsel, so that one be firm in the counsel taken, and other like due circumstances, which sinners fail to observe when they sin. On the other hand, every virtuous man takes good counsel in those things which are directed to the end of virtue, although perhaps he does not take good counsel in other particular matters, for instance in matters of trade, or warfare, or the like.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(2)

Whether {euboulia} (deliberating well) is a special virtue, distinct from prudence?

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that {euboulia} (deliberating well) is not a distinct virtue from prudence. For, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. vi, 5), the “prudent man is, seemingly, one who takes good counsel.” Now this belongs to {euboulia} (deliberating well) as stated above. Therefore {euboulia} (deliberating well) is not distinct from prudence.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, human acts to which human virtues are directed, are specified chiefly by their end, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(1), A(3); P(2a), Q(18), AA(4),6**). Now {euboulia} (deliberating well) and prudence are directed to the same end, as stated in Ethic. vi, 9, not indeed to some particular end, but to the common end of all life. Therefore {euboulia} (deliberating well) is not a distinct virtue from prudence.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, in speculative sciences, research and decision belong to the same science. Therefore in like manner these belong to the same virtue in practical matters. Now research belongs to {euboulia} (deliberating well), while decision belongs to prudence. Therefore {euboulia} (deliberating well) is not a distinct virtue from prudence.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Prudence is preceptive, according to Ethic. vi, 10. But this does not apply to {euboulia} (deliberating well). Therefore {euboulia} (deliberating well) is a distinct virtue from prudence.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), virtue is properly directed to an act which it renders good; and consequently virtues must differ according to different acts, especially when there is a different kind of goodness in the acts. For, if various acts contained the same kind of goodness, they would belong to the same virtue: thus the goodness of love, desire and joy depends on the same, wherefore all these belong to the same virtue of charity.

Now acts of the reason that are ordained to action are diverse, nor have they the same kind of goodness: since it is owing to different causes that a man acquires good counsel, good judgment, or good command, inasmuch as these are sometimes separated from one another. Consequently {euboulia} (deliberating well) which makes man take good counsel must needs be a distinct virtue from prudence, which makes man command well. And since counsel is directed to command as to that which is principal, so {euboulia} (deliberating well) is directed to prudence as to a principal virtue, without which it would be no virtue at all, even as neither are the moral virtues without prudence, nor the other virtues without charity.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(2)-RO(1) — It belongs to prudence to take good counsel by commanding it, to {euboulia} (deliberating well) by eliciting it.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(2)-RO(2) — Different acts are directed in different degrees to the one end which is “a good life in general” [*Ethic. vi, 5]: for counsel comes first, judgment follows, and command comes last. The last named has an immediate relation to the last end: whereas the other two acts are related thereto remotely. Nevertheless these have certain proximate ends of their own, the end of counsel being the discovery of what has to be done, and the end of judgment, certainty. Hence this proves not that {euboulia} (deliberating well) is not a distinct virtue from prudence, but that it is subordinate thereto, as a secondary to a principal virtue.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(2)-RO(3) — Even in speculative matters the rational science of dialectics, which is directed to research and discovery, is distinct from demonstrative science, which decides the truth.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(3)

Whether {synesis} (judging well according to common law) is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that {synesis} is not a virtue. Virtues are not in us by nature, according to Ethic. ii, 1. But {synesis} (judging well according to common law) is natural to some, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. vi, 11). Therefore {synesis} (judging well according to common law) is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, as stated in the same book (10), {synesis} (judging well according to common law) is nothing but “a faculty of judging.” But judgment without command can be even in the wicked. Since then virtue is only in the good, it seems that {synesis} (judging well according to common law) is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, there is never a defective command, unless there be a defective judgment, at least in a particular matter of action; for it is in this that every wicked man errs. If therefore {synesis} (judging well according to common law) be reckoned a virtue directed to good judgment, it seems that there is no need for any other virtue directed to good command: and consequently prudence would be superfluous, which is not reasonable. Therefore {synesis} (judging well according to common law) is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Judgment is more perfect than counsel. But {euboulia}, or good counsel, is a virtue. Much more, therefore, is {synesis} (judging well according to common law) a virtue, as being good judgment.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(3) — *I answer that*, {synesis} (judging well according to common law) signifies a right judgment, not indeed about speculative matters, but about particular practical matters, about which also is prudence. Hence in Greek some, in respect of {synesis} (judging well according to common law) are said to be {synetoi}, i.e. “persons of sense,” or {eusynetoi}, i.e. “men of good sense,” just as on the other hand, those who lack this virtue are called {asynetoi}, i.e. “senseless.”

Now, different acts which cannot be ascribed to the same cause, must correspond to different virtues. And it is evident that goodness of counsel and goodness of judgment are not reducible to the same cause, for many can take good counsel, without having good sense so as to judge well. Even so, in speculative matters some are good at research, through their reason being quick at arguing from one thing to another (which seems to be due to a disposition of their power of imagination, which has a facility in forming phantasms), and yet such persons sometimes lack good judgment (and this is due to a defect in the intellect arising chiefly from a defective disposition of the common sense which fails to judge aright). Hence there is need, besides {euboulia} (deliberating well), for another virtue, which judges well, and this is called {synesis} (judging well according to common law).

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(3)-RO(1) — Right judgment consists in the cognitive power apprehending a thing just as it is in reality, and this is due to the right disposition of the apprehensive power. Thus if a mirror be well disposed the forms of bodies are reflected in it just as they are, whereas if it be ill disposed, the images therein appear distorted and misshapen. Now that the cognitive power be well disposed to receive things just as they are in reality, is radically due to nature, but, as to its consummation, is due to practice or to a gift of grace, and this in two ways. First directly, on the part of the cognitive power itself, for instance, because it is imbued, not with distorted, but with true and correct ideas: this belongs to {synesis} (judging well according to common law) which in this respect is a special virtue. Secondly indirectly, through the good disposition of the appetitive power, the result being that one judges well of the objects of appetite: and thus a good judgment of virtue results from the habits of moral virtue; but this judgment is about the ends, whereas {synesis} (judging well according to common law) is rather about the means.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(3)-RO(2) — In wicked men there may be right judgment of a universal principle, but their judgment is always corrupt in the particular matter of action, as stated above (**Q(47), A(13)**).

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(3)-RO(3) — Sometimes after judging aright we delay to execute or execute negligently or inordinately. Hence after the virtue which judges aright there is a further need of a final and principal virtue, which commands aright, and this is prudence.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(4)***Whether {gnome} (judging well according to general law) is a special virtue?***

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that {gnome} (judging well according to general law) is not a special virtue distinct from {synesis} (judging well according to common law). For a man is said, in respect of {synesis} (judging well according to common law), to have good judgment. Now no man can be said to have good judgment, unless he judge aright in all things. Therefore {synesis} (judging well according to common law) extends to all matters of judgment, and consequently there is no other virtue of good judgment called {gnome} (judging well according to general law).

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, judgment is midway between counsel and precept. Now there is only one virtue of good counsel, viz. {euboulia} (deliberating well) and only one virtue of good command, viz. prudence. Therefore there is only one virtue of good judgment, viz. {synesis} (judging well according to common law).

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, rare occurrences wherein there is need to depart from the common law, seem for the most part to happen by chance, and with such things reason is not concerned, as stated in Phys. ii, 5. Now all the intellectual virtues depend on right reason. Therefore there is no intellectual virtue about such matters.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher concludes (Ethic. vi, 11) that {gnome} (judging well according to general law) is a special virtue.

I answer that cognitive habits differ according to higher and lower principles: thus in speculative matters wisdom considers higher principles than science does, and consequently is distinguished from it; and so must it be also in practical matters. Now it is evident that what is beside the order of a lower principle or cause, is sometimes reducible to the order of a higher principle; thus monstrous births of animals are beside the order of the active seminal force, and yet they come under the order of a higher principle, namely, of a heavenly body, or higher still, of Divine

Providence. Hence by considering the active seminal force one could not pronounce a sure judgment on such monstrosities, and yet this is possible if we consider Divine Providence.

Now it happens sometimes that something has to be done which is not covered by the common rules of actions, for instance in the case of the enemy of one's country, when it would be wrong to give him back his deposit, or in other similar cases. Hence it is necessary to judge of such matters according to higher principles than the common laws, according to which {synesis} (judging according to common law) judges: and corresponding to such higher principles it is necessary to have a higher virtue of judgment, which is called {gnome} (judging according to general law), and which denotes a certain discrimination in judgment.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(4)-RO(1) — {Synesis} (judging well according to common law) judges rightly about all actions that are covered by the common rules: but certain things have to be judged beside these common rules, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(4)-RO(2) — Judgment about a thing should be formed from the proper principles thereof, whereas research is made by employing also common principles. Wherefore also in speculative matters, dialectics which aims at research proceeds from common principles; while demonstration which tends to judgment, proceeds from proper principles. Hence {euboulia} (deliberating well) to which the research of counsel belongs is one for all, but not so {synesis} (judging well according to common law) whose act is judicial. Command considers in all matters the one aspect of good, wherefore prudence also is only one.

P(2b)-Q(51)-A(4)-RO(3) — It belongs to Divine Providence alone to consider all things that may happen beside the common course. On the other hand, among men, he who is most discerning can judge a greater number of such things by his reason: this belongs to {gnome} (judging well according to general law), which denotes a certain discrimination in judgment.

QUESTION 52

OF THE GIFT OF COUNSEL

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the gift of counsel which corresponds to prudence. Under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether counsel should be reckoned among the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost?
- (2) Whether the gift of counsel corresponds to prudence?
- (3) Whether the gift of counsel remains in heaven?
- (4) Whether the fifth beatitude, “Blessed are the merciful,” etc. corresponds to the gift of counsel?

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(1)

Whether counsel should be reckoned among the gifts of the Holy Ghost?

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that counsel should not be reckoned among the gifts of the Holy Ghost. The gifts of the Holy Ghost are given as a help to the virtues, according to Gregory (Moral. ii, 49). Now for the purpose of taking counsel, man is sufficiently perfected by the virtue of prudence, or even of {euboulia} (deliberating well), as is evident from what has been said (**Q(47)**, **A(1)**, ad 2; **Q(51)**, **AA(1),2**). Therefore counsel should not be reckoned among the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the difference between the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost and the gratuitous graces seems to be that the latter are not given to all, but are divided among various people, whereas the gifts of the Holy Ghost are given to all who have the Holy Ghost. But counsel seems to be one of those things which are given by the Holy Ghost

specially to certain persons, according to 1 Macc. 2:65: “Behold... your brother Simon is a man of counsel.” Therefore counsel should be numbered among the gratuitous graces rather than among the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, it is written (²¹⁸⁴ Romans 8:14): “Whosoever are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.” But counselling is not consistent with being led by another. Since then the gifts of the Holy Ghost are most befitting the children of God, who “have received the spirit of adoption of sons,” it would seem that counsel should not be numbered among the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (²¹⁸⁵ Isaiah 11:2):

“(The Spirit of the Lord) shall rest upon him... the spirit of counsel, and of fortitude.”

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(68), A(1)**), the gifts of the Holy Ghost are dispositions whereby the soul is rendered amenable to the motion of the Holy Ghost. Now God moves everything according to the mode of the thing moved: thus He moves the corporeal creature through time and place, and the spiritual creature through time, but not through place, as Augustine declares (Genesis ad lit. viii, 20,22). Again, it is proper to the rational creature to be moved through the research of reason to perform any particular action, and this research is called counsel. Hence the Holy Ghost is said to move the rational creature by way of counsel, wherefore counsel is reckoned among the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(1)-RO(1) — Prudence or {euboulia} (deliberating well), whether acquired or infused, directs man in the research of counsel according to principles that the reason can grasp; hence prudence or {euboulia} (deliberating well) makes man take good counsel either for himself or for another. Since, however, human reason is unable to grasp the singular and contingent things which may occur, the result is that “the thoughts of mortal men are fearful, and our counsels uncertain” (Wis. 9:14). Hence in the research of counsel, man requires to be directed by God who comprehends all things: and this is done through the gift of counsel, whereby man is directed as though counseled by God, just as, in human

affairs, those who are unable to take counsel for themselves, seek counsel from those who are wiser.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(1)-RO(2) — That a man be of such good counsel as to counsel others, may be due to a gratuitous grace; but that a man be counselled by God as to what he ought to do in matters necessary for salvation is common to all holy persons.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(1)-RO(3) — The children of God are moved by the Holy Ghost according to their mode, without prejudice to their free-will which is the “faculty of will and reason” [*Sent. iii, D, 24]. Accordingly the gift of counsel is befitting the children of God in so far as the reason is instructed by the Holy Ghost about what we have to do.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(2)

***Whether the gift of counsel
corresponds to the virtue of prudence?***

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the gift of counsel does not fittingly correspond to the virtue of prudence. For “the highest point of that which is underneath touches that which is above,” as Dionysius observes (Div. Nom. vii), even as a man comes into contact with the angel in respect of his intellect. Now cardinal virtues are inferior to the gifts, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(68)**, **A(8)**). Since, then, counsel is the first and lowest act of prudence, while command is its highest act, and judgment comes between, it seems that the gift corresponding to prudence is not counsel, but rather a gift of judgment or command.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, one gift suffices to help one virtue, since the higher a thing is the more one it is, as proved in De Causis. Now prudence is helped by the gift of knowledge, which is not only speculative but also practical, as shown above (**Q(9)**, **A(3)**). Therefore the gift of counsel does not correspond to the virtue of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it belongs properly to prudence to direct, as stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(8)**). But it belongs to the gift of counsel that man should be directed by God, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore the gift of counsel does not correspond to the virtue of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The gift of counsel is about what has to be done for the sake of the end. Now prudence is about the same matter. Therefore they correspond to one another.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(2) — *I answer that*, A lower principle of movement is helped chiefly, and is perfected through being moved by a higher principle of movement, as a body through being moved by a spirit. Now it is evident that the rectitude of human reason is compared to the Divine Reason, as a lower motive principle to a higher: for the Eternal Reason is the supreme rule of all human rectitude. Consequently prudence, which denotes rectitude of reason, is chiefly perfected and helped through being ruled and moved by the Holy Ghost, and this belongs to the gift of counsel, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore the gift of counsel corresponds to prudence, as helping and perfecting it.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(2)-RO(1) — To judge and command belongs not to the thing moved, but to the mover. Wherefore, since in the gifts of the Holy Ghost, the position of the human mind is of one moved rather than of a mover, as stated above (**A(1)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(68)**, **A(1)**), it follows that it would be unfitting to call the gift corresponding to prudence by the name of command or judgment rather than of counsel whereby it is possible to signify that the counselled mind is moved by another counselling it.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(2)-RO(2) — The gift of knowledge does not directly correspond to prudence, since it deals with speculative matters: yet by a kind of extension it helps it. On the other hand the gift of counsel corresponds to prudence directly, because it is concerned about the same things.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(2)-RO(3) — The mover that is moved, moves through being moved. Hence the human mind, from the very fact that it is directed by the Holy Ghost, is enabled to direct itself and others.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(3)

Whether the gift of counsel remains in heaven?

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that the gift of counsel does not remain in heaven. For counsel is about what has to be done for the sake of

an end. But in heaven nothing will have to be done for the sake of an end, since there man possesses the last end. Therefore the gift of counsel is not in heaven.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, counsel implies doubt, for it is absurd to take counsel in matters that are evident, as the Philosopher observes (Ethic. iii, 3). Now all doubt will cease in heaven. Therefore there is no counsel in heaven.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the saints in heaven are most conformed to God, according to ^{<GREG>}1 John 3:2, “When He shall appear, we shall be like to Him.” But counsel is not becoming to God, according to ^{<GREG>}Romans 11:34, “Who hath been His counsellor?” Therefore neither to the saints in heaven is the gift of counsel becoming.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. xvii, 12): “When either the guilt or the righteousness of each nation is brought into the debate of the heavenly Court, the guardian of that nation is said to have won in the conflict, or not to have won.”

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(2)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(68)**, **A(1)**), the gifts of the Holy Ghost are connected with the motion of the rational creature by God. Now we must observe two points concerning the motion of the human mind by God. First, that the disposition of that which is moved, differs while it is being moved from its disposition when it is in the term of movement. Indeed if the mover is the principle of the movement alone, when the movement ceases, the action of the mover ceases as regards the thing moved, since it has already reached the term of movement, even as a house, after it is built, ceases being built by the builder. On the other hand, when the mover is cause not only of the movement, but also of the form to which the movement tends, then the action of the mover does not cease even after the form has been attained: thus the sun lightens the air even after it is lightened. In this way, then, God causes in us virtue and knowledge, not only when we first acquire them, but also as long as we persevere in them: and it is thus that God causes in the blessed a knowledge of what is to be done, not as though they were ignorant, but by continuing that knowledge in them.

Nevertheless there are things which the blessed, whether angels or men, do not know: such things are not essential to blessedness, but concern the government of things according to Divine Providence. As regards these, we must make a further observation, namely, that God moves the mind of the blessed in one way, and the mind of the wayfarer, in another. For God moves the mind of the wayfarer in matters of action, by soothing the pre-existing anxiety of doubt; whereas there is simple nescience in the mind of the blessed as regards the things they do not know. From this nescience the angel's mind is cleansed, according to Dionysius (Coel. Hier. vii), nor does there precede in them any research of doubt, for they simply turn to God; and this is to take counsel of God, for as Augustine says (Genesis ad lit. v, 19) "the angels take counsel of God about things beneath them": wherefore the instruction which they receive from God in such matters is called "counsel."

Accordingly the gift of counsel is in the blessed, in so far as God preserves in them the knowledge that they have, and enlightens them in their nescience of what has to be done.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(3)-RO(1) — Even in the blessed there are acts directed to an end, or resulting, as it were, from their attainment of the end, such as the acts of praising God, or of helping on others to the end which they themselves have attained, for example the ministrations of the angels, and the prayers of the saints. In this respect the gift of counsel finds a place in them.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(3)-RO(2) — Doubt belongs to counsel according to the present state of life, but not to that counsel which takes place in heaven. Even so neither have the theological virtues quite the same acts in heaven as on the way thither.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(3)-RO(3) — Counsel is in God, not as receiving but as giving it: and the saints in heaven are conformed to God, as receivers to the source whence they receive.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(4)

Whether the fifth beatitude, which is that of mercy, corresponds to the gift of counsel?

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the fifth beatitude, which is that of mercy, does not correspond to the gift of counsel. For all the beatitudes are acts of virtue, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(69), A(1)**). Now we are directed by counsel in all acts of virtue. Therefore the fifth beatitude does not correspond more than any other to counsel.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, precepts are given about matters necessary for salvation, while counsel is given about matters which are not necessary for salvation. Now mercy is necessary for salvation, according to ^{<50B3}James 2:13, “Judgment without mercy to him that hath not done mercy.” On the other hand poverty is not necessary for salvation, but belongs to the life of perfection, according to ^{<1029}Matthew 19:21. Therefore the beatitude of poverty corresponds to the gift of counsel, rather than to the beatitude of mercy.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the fruits result from the beatitudes, for they denote a certain spiritual delight resulting from perfect acts of virtue. Now none of the fruits correspond to the gift of counsel, as appears from ^{<4852}Galatians 5:22, 23. Therefore neither does the beatitude of mercy correspond to the gift of counsel.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. iv): “Counsel is befitting the merciful, because the one remedy is to be delivered from evils so great, to pardon, and to give.”

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Counsel is properly about things useful for an end. Hence such things as are of most use for an end, should above all correspond to the gift of counsel. Now such is mercy, according to ^{<50B8}1 Timothy 4:8, “Godliness [*]Pietas,’ which our English word ‘pity,’ which is the same as mercy; see note on **P(2b), Q(30), A(1)**] is profitable to all things.” Therefore the beatitude of mercy specially corresponds to the gift of counsel, not as eliciting but as directing mercy.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(4)-RO(1) — Although counsel directs in all the acts of virtue, it does so in a special way in works of mercy, for the reason given above.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(4)-RO(2) — Counsel considered as a gift of the Holy Ghost guides us in all matters that are directed to the end of eternal life whether they be necessary for salvation or not, and yet not every work of mercy is necessary for salvation.

P(2b)-Q(52)-A(4)-RO(3) — Fruit denotes something ultimate. Now the ultimate in practical matters consists not in knowledge but in an action which is the end. Hence nothing pertaining to practical knowledge is numbered among the fruits, but only such things as pertain to action, in which practical knowledge is the guide. Among these we find “goodness” and “benignity” which correspond to mercy.

QUESTION 53

OF IMPRUDENCE

(SIX ARTICLES)

We must now consider the vices opposed to prudence. For Augustine says (Contra Julian. iv, 3): “There are vices opposed to every virtue, not only vices that are in manifest opposition to virtue, as temerity is opposed to prudence, but also vices which have a kind of kinship and not a true but a spurious likeness to virtue; thus in opposition to prudence we have craftiness.”

Accordingly we must consider first of all those vices which are in evident opposition to prudence, those namely which are due to a defect either of prudence or of those things which are requisite for prudence, and secondly those vices which have a false resemblance to prudence, those namely which are due to abuse of the things required for prudence. And since solicitude pertains to prudence, the first of these considerations will be twofold:

- (1) Of imprudence;
- (2) Of negligence which is opposed to solicitude.

Under the first head there are six points of inquiry:

- (1) Concerning imprudence, whether it is a sin?
- (2) Whether it is a special sin?
- (3) Of precipitation or temerity;
- (4) Of thoughtlessness;
- (5) Of inconstancy;
- (6) Concerning the origin of these vices.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(1)***Whether imprudence is a sin?***

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that imprudence is not a sin. For every sin is voluntary, according to Augustine [*De Vera Relig. xiv]; whereas imprudence is not voluntary, since no man wishes to be imprudent. Therefore imprudence is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, none but original sin comes to man with his birth. But imprudence comes to man with his birth, wherefore the young are imprudent; and yet it is not original sin which is opposed to original justice. Therefore imprudence is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, every sin is taken away by repentance. But imprudence is not taken away by repentance. Therefore imprudence is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The spiritual treasure of grace is not taken away save by sin. But it is taken away by imprudence, according to ~~xxx~~ Proverbs 21:20,

“There is a treasure to be desired, and oil in the dwelling of the just, and the imprudent [Douay: ‘foolish’] man shall spend it.”

Therefore imprudence is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Imprudence may be taken in two ways, first, as a privation, secondly, as a contrary. Properly speaking it is not taken as a negation, so as merely to signify the absence of prudence, for this can be without any sin. Taken as a privation, imprudence denotes lack of that prudence which a man can and ought to have, and in this sense imprudence is a sin by reason of a man’s negligence in striving to have prudence.

Imprudence is taken as a contrary, in so far as the movement or act of reason is in opposition to prudence: for instance, whereas the right reason of prudence acts by taking counsel, the imprudent man despises counsel, and the same applies to the other conditions which require consideration in the act of prudence. In this way imprudence is a sin in respect of prudence considered under its proper aspect, since it is not possible for a man to act against prudence, except by infringing the rules on which the right reason

of prudence depends. Wherefore, if this should happen through aversion from the Divine Law, it will be a mortal sin, as when a man acts precipitately through contempt and rejection of the Divine teaching: whereas if he act beside the Law and without contempt, and without detriment to things necessary for salvation, it will be a venial sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(1)-RO(1) — No man desires the deformity of imprudence, but the rash man wills the act of imprudence, because he wishes to act precipitately. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 5) that “he who sins willingly against prudence is less to be commended.”

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(1)-RO(2) — This argument takes imprudence in the negative sense. It must be observed however that lack of prudence or of any other virtue is included in the lack of original justice which perfected the entire soul. Accordingly all such lack of virtue may be ascribed to original sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(1)-RO(3) — Repentance restores infused prudence, and thus the lack of this prudence ceases; but acquired prudence is not restored as to the habit, although the contrary act is taken away, wherein properly speaking the sin of imprudence consists.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(2)

Whether imprudence is a special sin?

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that imprudence is not a special sin. For whoever sins, acts against right reason, i.e. against prudence. But imprudence consists in acting against prudence, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore imprudence is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, prudence is more akin to moral action than knowledge is. But ignorance which is opposed to knowledge, is reckoned one of the general causes of sin. Much more therefore should imprudence be reckoned among those causes.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, sin consists in the corruption of the circumstances of virtue, wherefore Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that “evil results from each single defect.” Now many things are requisite for prudence; for instance, reason, intelligence docility, and so on, as stated above (**QQ(48),49**). Therefore there are many species of imprudence, so that it is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Imprudence is opposed to prudence, as stated above (**A(1)**). Now prudence is a special virtue. Therefore imprudence too is one special vice.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(2) — *I answer that*, A vice or sin may be styled general in two ways; first, absolutely, because, to wit, it is general in respect of all sins; secondly, because it is general in respect of certain vices, which are its species. In the first way, a vice may be said to be general on two counts: first, essentially, because it is predicated of all sins: and in this way imprudence is not a general sin, as neither is prudence a general virtue: since it is concerned with special acts, namely the very acts of reason: secondly, by participation; and in this way imprudence is a general sin: for, just as all the virtues have a share of prudence, in so far as it directs them, so have all vices and sins a share of imprudence, because no sin can occur, without some defect in an act of the directing reason, which defect belongs to imprudence.

If, on the other hand, a sin be called general, not simply but in some particular genus, that is, as containing several species of sin, then imprudence is a general sin. For it contains various species in three ways. First, by opposition to the various subjective parts of prudence, for just as we distinguish the prudence that guides the individual, from other kinds that govern communities, as stated above (**Q(48)**; **Q(50)**, **A(7)**), so also we distinguish various kinds of imprudence. Secondly, in respect of the quasi-potential parts of prudence, which are virtues connected with it, and correspond to the several acts of reason. Thus, by defect of “counsel” to which {euboulia} (deliberating well) corresponds, “precipitation” or “temerity” is a species of imprudence; by defect of “judgment,” to which {synesis} (judging well according to common law) and {gnome} (judging well according to general law) refer, there is “thoughtlessness”; while “inconstancy” and “negligence” correspond to the “command” which is the proper act of prudence. Thirdly, this may be taken by opposition to those things which are requisite for prudence, which are the quasi-integral parts of prudence. Since however all these things are intended for the direction of the aforesaid three acts of reason, it follows that all the opposite defects are reducible to the four parts mentioned above. Thus incautiousness and incircumspection are included in “thoughtlessness”; lack of docility,

memory, or reason is referable to “precipitation”; improvidence, lack of intelligence and of shrewdness, belong to “negligence” and “inconstancy.”

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(2)-RO(1) — This argument considers generality by participation.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(2)-RO(2) — Since knowledge is further removed from morality than prudence is, according to their respective proper natures, it follows that ignorance has the nature of mortal sin, not of itself, but on account either of a preceding negligence, or of the consequent result, and for this reason it is reckoned one of the general causes of sin. On the other hand imprudence, by its very nature, denotes a moral vice; and for this reason it can be called a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(2)-RO(3) — When various circumstances are corrupted for the same motive, the species of sin is not multiplied: thus it is the same species of sin to take what is not one’s own, where one ought not, and when one ought not. If, however, there be various motives, there are various species: for instance, if one man were to take another’s property from where he ought not, so as to wrong a sacred place, this would constitute the species called sacrilege, while if another were to take another’s property when he ought not, merely through the lust of possession, this would be a case of simple avarice. Hence the lack of those things which are requisite for prudence, does not constitute a diversity of species, except in so far as they are directed to different acts of reason, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(3)

Whether precipitation is a sin included in imprudence?

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that precipitation is not a sin included in imprudence. Imprudence is opposed to the virtue of prudence; whereas precipitation is opposed to the gift of counsel, according to Gregory, who says (Moral. ii, 49) that the gift of “counsel is given as a remedy to precipitation.” Therefore precipitation is not a sin contained under imprudence.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, precipitation seemingly pertains to rashness. Now rashness implies presumption, which pertains to pride. Therefore precipitation is not a vice contained under imprudence.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, precipitation seems to denote inordinate haste. Now sin happens in counselling not only through being over hasty but also through being over slow, so that the opportunity for action passes by, and through corruption of other circumstances, as stated in Ethic. vi, 9. Therefore there is no reason for reckoning precipitation as a sin contained under imprudence, rather than slowness, or something else of the kind pertaining to inordinate counsel.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~2THE~~ Proverbs 4:19): “The way of the wicked is darksome, they know not where they fall.” Now the darksome ways of ungodliness belong to imprudence. Therefore imprudence leads a man to fall or to be precipitate.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Precipitation is ascribed metaphorically to acts of the soul, by way of similitude to bodily movement. Now a thing is said to be precipitated as regards bodily movement, when it is brought down from above by the impulse either of its own movement or of another’s, and not in orderly fashion by degrees. Now the summit of the soul is the reason, and the base is reached in the action performed by the body; while the steps that intervene by which one ought to descend in orderly fashion are “memory” of the past, “intelligence” of the present, “shrewdness” in considering the future outcome, “reasoning” which compares one thing with another, “docility” in accepting the opinions of others. He that takes counsel descends by these steps in due order, whereas if a man is rushed into action by the impulse of his will or of a passion, without taking these steps, it will be a case of precipitation. Since then inordinate counsel pertains to imprudence, it is evident that the vice of precipitation is contained under imprudence.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(3)-RO(1) — Rectitude of counsel belongs to the gift of counsel and to the virtue of prudence; albeit in different ways, as stated above (**Q(52), A(2)**), and consequently precipitation is opposed to both.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(3)-RO(2) — Things are said to be done rashly when they are not directed by reason: and this may happen in two ways; first through the impulse of the will or of a passion, secondly through contempt of the directing rule; and this is what is meant by rashness properly speaking, wherefore it appears to proceed from that root of pride, which refuses to submit to another’s ruling. But precipitation refers to both, so that

rashness is contained under precipitation, although precipitation refers rather to the first.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(3)-RO(3) — Many things have to be considered in the research of reason; hence the Philosopher declares (Ethic. vi, 9) that “one should be slow in taking counsel.” Hence precipitation is more directly opposed to rectitude of counsel than over slowness is, for the latter bears a certain likeness to right counsel.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(4)

*Whether thoughtlessness
is a special sin included in prudence?*

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that thoughtlessness is not a special sin included in imprudence. For the Divine law does not incite us to any sin, according to ^{<1818>}Psalm 18:8, “The law of the Lord is unspotted”; and yet it incites us to be thoughtless, according to ^{<1009>}Matthew 10:19, “Take no thought how or what to speak.” Therefore thoughtlessness is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, whoever takes counsel must needs give thought to many things. Now precipitation is due to a defect of counsel and therefore to a defect of thought. Therefore precipitation is contained under thoughtlessness: and consequently thoughtlessness is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, prudence consists in acts of the practical reason, viz. “counsel,” “judgment” about what has been counselled, and “command” [*Cf. **Q(47)**, **A(8)**]. Now thought precedes all these acts, since it belongs also to the speculative intellect. Therefore thoughtlessness is not a special sin contained under imprudence.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(4) — On the contrary, It is written (^{<1005>}Proverbs 4:25):

“Let thy eyes look straight on,
and let thine eye-lids go before thy steps.”

Now this pertains to prudence, while the contrary pertains to thoughtlessness. Therefore thoughtlessness is a special sin contained under imprudence.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Thought signifies the act of the intellect in considering the truth about something. Now just as research belongs to the reason, so judgment belongs to the intellect. Wherefore in speculative matters a demonstrative science is said to exercise judgment, in so far as it judges the truth of the results of research by tracing those results back to the first indemonstrable principles. Hence thought pertains chiefly to judgment; and consequently the lack of right judgment belongs to the vice of thoughtlessness, in so far, to wit, as one fails to judge rightly through contempt or neglect of those things on which a right judgment depends. It is therefore evident that thoughtlessness is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(4)-RO(1) — Our Lord did not forbid us to take thought, when we have the opportunity, about what we ought to do or say, but, in the words quoted, He encourages His disciples, so that when they had no opportunity of taking thought, either through lack of knowledge or through a sudden call, they should trust in the guidance of God alone, because “as we know not what to do, we can only turn our eyes to God,” according to 2 Paral 20:12: else if man, instead of doing what he can, were to be content with awaiting God’s assistance, he would seem to tempt God.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(4)-RO(2) — All thought about those things of which counsel takes cognizance, is directed to the formation of a right judgment, wherefore this thought is perfected in judgment. Consequently thoughtlessness is above all opposed to the rectitude of judgment.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(4)-RO(3) — Thoughtlessness is to be taken here in relation to a determinate matter, namely, that of human action, wherein more things have to be thought about for the purpose of right judgment, than in speculative matters, because actions are about singulars.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(5)

Whether inconstancy is a vice contained under prudence?

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that inconstancy is not a vice contained under imprudence. For inconstancy consists seemingly in a lack of perseverance in matters of difficulty. But perseverance in difficult matters belongs to fortitude. Therefore inconstancy is opposed to fortitude rather than to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, it is written (³⁴⁸⁶James 3:16):

“Where jealousy [Douay: ‘envy’] and contention are, there are inconstancy and every evil work.”

But jealousy pertains to envy. Therefore inconstancy pertains not to imprudence but to envy.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, a man would seem to be inconstant who fails to persevere in what he has proposed to do. Now this is a mark of “incontinency” in pleasurable matters, and of “effeminacy” or “squeamishness” in unpleasant matters, according to Ethic. vii, 1. Therefore inconstancy does not pertain to imprudence.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, It belongs to prudence to prefer the greater good to the lesser. Therefore to forsake the greater good belongs to imprudence. Now this is inconstancy. Therefore inconstancy belongs to imprudence.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Inconstancy denotes withdrawal from a definite good purpose. Now the origin of this withdrawal is in the appetite, for a man does not withdraw from a previous good purpose, except on account of something being inordinately pleasing to him: nor is this withdrawal completed except through a defect of reason, which is deceived in rejecting what before it had rightly accepted. And since it can resist the impulse of the passions, if it fail to do this, it is due to its own weakness in not standing to the good purpose it has conceived; hence inconstancy, as to its completion, is due to a defect in the reason. Now just as all rectitude of the practical reason belongs in some degree to prudence, so all lack of that rectitude belongs to imprudence. Consequently inconstancy, as to its completion, belongs to imprudence. And just as precipitation is due to a defect in the act of counsel, and thoughtlessness to a defect in the act of judgment, so inconstancy arises from a defect in the act of command. For a man is stated to be inconstant because his reason fails in commanding what has been counselled and judged.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(5)-RO(1) — The good of prudence is shared by all the moral virtues, and accordingly perseverance in good belongs to all moral virtues, chiefly, however, to fortitude, which suffers a greater impulse to the contrary.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(5)-RO(2) — Envy and anger, which are the source of contention, cause inconstancy on the part of the appetite, to which power the origin of inconstancy is due, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(5)-RO(3) — Continency and perseverance seem to be not in the appetitive power, but in the reason. For the continent man suffers evil concupiscences, and the persevering man suffers grievous sorrows (which points to a defect in the appetitive power); but reason stands firm, in the continent man, against concupiscence, and in the persevering man, against sorrow. Hence continency and perseverance seem to be species of constancy which pertains to reason; and to this power inconstancy pertains also.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(6)

Whether the aforesaid vices arise from lust?

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that the aforesaid vices do not arise from lust. For inconstancy arises from envy, as stated above (**A(5)**, ad 2). But envy is a distinct vice from lust.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, it is written (³⁰⁰⁸James 1:8): “A double-minded man is inconstant in all his ways.” Now duplicity does not seem to pertain to lust, but rather to deceitfulness, which is a daughter of covetousness, according to Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45). Therefore the aforesaid vices do not arise from lust.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, the aforesaid vices are connected with some defect of reason. Now spiritual vices are more akin to the reason than carnal vices. Therefore the aforesaid vices arise from spiritual vices rather than from carnal vices.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Gregory declares (Moral. xxxi, 45) that the aforesaid vices arise from lust.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(6) — *I answer that*, As the Philosopher states (Ethic. vi, 5) “pleasure above all corrupts the estimate of prudence,” and chiefly sexual pleasure which absorbs the mind, and draws it to sensible delight. Now the perfection of prudence and of every intellectual virtue consists in abstraction from sensible objects. Wherefore, since the aforesaid vices involve a defect of prudence and of the practical reason, as stated above (**AA(2),5**), it follows that they arise chiefly from lust.

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(6)-RO(1) — Envy and anger cause inconstancy by drawing away the reason to something else; whereas lust causes inconstancy by destroying the judgment of reason entirely. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. vii, 6) that “the man who is incontinent through anger listens to reason, yet not perfectly, whereas he who is incontinent through lust does not listen to it at all.”

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(6)-RO(2) — Duplicity also is something resulting from lust, just as inconstancy is, if by duplicity we understand fluctuation of the mind from one thing to another. Hence Terence says (Eunuch. act 1, sc. 1) that “love leads to war, and likewise to peace and truce.”

P(2b)-Q(53)-A(6)-RO(3) — Carnal vices destroy the judgment of reason so much the more as they lead us away from reason.

QUESTION 54

OF NEGLIGENCE

(THREE ARTICLES)

We must now consider negligence, under which head there are three points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether negligence is a special sin?
- (2) To which virtue is it opposed?
- (3) Whether negligence is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(1)

Whether negligence is a special sin?

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that negligence is not a special sin. For negligence is opposed to diligence. But diligence is required in every virtue. Therefore negligence is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, that which is common to every sin is not a special sin. Now negligence is common to every sin, because he who sins neglects that which withdraws him from sin, and he who perseveres in sin neglects to be contrite for his sin. Therefore negligence is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, every special sin had a determinate matter. But negligence seems to have no determinate matter: since it is neither about evil or indifferent things (for no man is accused of negligence if he omit them), nor about good things, for if these be done negligently, they are no longer good. Therefore it seems that negligence is not a special vice.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Sins committed through negligence, are distinguished from those which are committed through contempt.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Negligence denotes lack of due solicitude. Now every lack of a due act is sinful: wherefore it is evident that negligence is a sin, and that it must needs have the character of a special sin according as solicitude is the act of a special virtue. For certain sins are special through being about a special matter, as lust is about sexual matters, while some vices are special on account of their having a special kind of act which extends to all kinds of matter, and such are all vices affecting an act of reason, since every act of reason extends to any kind of moral matter. Since then solicitude is a special act of reason, as stated above (**Q(47), A(9)**), it follows that negligence, which denotes lack of solicitude, is a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(1)-RO(1) — Diligence seems to be the same as solicitude, because the more we love [diligimus] a thing the more solicitous are we about it. Hence diligence, no less than solicitude, is required for every virtue, in so far as due acts of reason are requisite for every virtue.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(1)-RO(2) — In every sin there must needs be a defect affecting an act of reason, for instance a defect in counsel or the like. Hence just as precipitation is a special sin on account of a special act of reason which is omitted, namely counsel, although it may be found in any kind of sin; so negligence is a special sin on account of the lack of a special act of reason, namely solicitude, although it is found more or less in all sins.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(1)-RO(3) — Properly speaking the matter of negligence is a good that one ought to do, not that it is a good when it is done negligently, but because on account of negligence it incurs a lack of goodness, whether a due act be entirely omitted through lack of solicitude, or some due circumstance be omitted.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(2)

Whether negligence is opposed to prudence?

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that negligence is not opposed to prudence. For negligence seems to be the same as idleness or laziness, which belongs to sloth, according to Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45). Now sloth

is not opposed to prudence, but to charity, as stated above (**Q(35), A(3)**). Therefore negligence is not opposed to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, every sin of omission seems to be due to negligence. But sins of omission are not opposed to prudence, but to the executive moral virtues. Therefore negligence is not opposed to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, imprudence relates to some act of reason. But negligence does not imply a defect of counsel, for that is “precipitation,” nor a defect of judgment, since that is “thoughtlessness,” nor a defect of command, because that is “inconstancy.” Therefore negligence does not pertain to imprudence.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, it is written (^{207b} Ecclesiastes 7:19): “He that feareth God, neglecteth nothing.” But every sin is excluded by the opposite virtue. Therefore negligence is opposed to fear rather than to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (Ecclus. 20:7): “A babblers and a fool [imprudens] will regard no time.” Now this is due to negligence. Therefore negligence is opposed to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Negligence is directly opposed to solicitude. Now solicitude pertains to the reason, and rectitude of solicitude to prudence. Hence, on the other hand, negligence pertains to imprudence. This appears from its very name, because, as Isidore observes (Etym. x) “a negligent man is one who fails to choose [nec eligens]”: and the right choice of the means belongs to prudence. Therefore negligence pertains to imprudence.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(2)-RO(1) — Negligence is a defect in the internal act, to which choice also belongs: whereas idleness and laziness denote slowness of execution, yet so that idleness denotes slowness in setting about the execution, while laziness denotes remissness in the execution itself. Hence it is becoming that laziness should arise from sloth, which is “an oppressive sorrow,” i.e. hindering, the mind from action [*Cf. **Q(35), A(1); P(2a), Q(35), A(8)**].

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(2)-RO(2) — Omission regards the external act, for it consists in failing to perform an act which is due. Hence it is opposed to

justice, and is an effect of negligence, even as the execution of a just deed is the effect of right reason.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(2)-RO(3) — Negligence regards the act of command, which solicitude also regards. Yet the negligent man fails in regard to this act otherwise than the inconstant man: for the inconstant man fails in commanding, being hindered as it were, by something, whereas the negligent man fails through lack of a prompt will.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(2)-RO(4) — The fear of God helps us to avoid all sins, because according to ²¹⁶⁷Proverbs 15:27, “by the fear of the Lord everyone declineth from evil.” Hence fear makes us avoid negligence, yet not as though negligence were directly opposed to fear, but because fear incites man to acts of reason. Wherefore also it has been stated above (**P(2a), Q(44), A(2)**) when we were treating of the passions, that “fear makes us take counsel.”

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(3)

Whether negligence can be a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that negligence cannot be a mortal sin. For a gloss of Gregory [^{*}Moral. 9:34] on ²¹⁶⁸Job 9:28, “I feared all my works,” etc. says that “too little love of God aggravates the former,” viz. negligence. But wherever there is mortal sin, the love of God is done away with altogether. Therefore negligence is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, a gloss on Eccclus. 7:34, “For thy negligences purify thyself with a few,” says: “Though the offering be small it cleanses the negligences of many sins.” Now this would not be, if negligence were a mortal sin. Therefore negligence is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, under the law certain sacrifices were prescribed for mortal sins, as appears from the book of Leviticus. Yet no sacrifice was prescribed for negligence. Therefore negligence is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(3) — On the contrary, It is written (²¹⁶⁹Proverbs 19:16):

“He that neglecteth his own life [Vulg.: ‘way’] shall die.”

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(2)**, ad 3), negligence arises out of a certain remissness of the will, the result being a lack of solicitude on the part of the reason in commanding what it should command, or as it should command. Accordingly negligence may happen to be a mortal sin in two ways. First on the part of that which is omitted through negligence. If this be either an act or a circumstance necessary for salvation, it will be a mortal sin. Secondly on the part of the cause: for if the will be so remiss about Divine things, as to fall away altogether from the charity of God, such negligence is a mortal sin, and this is the case chiefly when negligence is due to contempt.

But if negligence consists in the omission of an act or circumstance that is not necessary for salvation, it is not a mortal but a venial sin, provided the negligence arise, not from contempt, but from some lack of fervor, to which venial sin is an occasional obstacle.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(3)-RO(1) — Man may be said to love God less in two ways. First through lack of the fervor of charity, and this causes the negligence that is a venial sin: secondly through lack of charity itself, in which sense we say that a man loves God less when he loves Him with a merely natural love; and this causes the negligence that is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(3)-RO(2) — According to the same authority (gloss), a small offering made with a humble mind and out of pure love, cleanses man not only from venial but also from mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(54)-A(3)-RO(3) — When negligence consists in the omission of that which is necessary for salvation, it is drawn to the other more manifest genus of sin. Because those sins that consist of inward actions, are more hidden, wherefore no special sacrifices were prescribed for them in the Law, since the offering of sacrifices was a kind of public confession of sin, whereas hidden sins should not be confessed in public.

QUESTION 55

OF VICES OPPOSED TO PRUDENCE BY WAY OF RESEMBLANCE

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

We must now consider those vices opposed to prudence, which have a resemblance thereto. Under this head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether prudence of the flesh is a sin?
- (2) Whether it is a mortal sin?
- (3) Whether craftiness is a special sin?
- (4) Of guile;
- (5) Of fraud;
- (6) Of solicitude about temporal things;
- (7) Of solicitude about the future;
- (8) Of the origin of these vices.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(1)

Whether prudence of the flesh is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence of the flesh is not a sin. For prudence is more excellent than the other moral virtues, since it governs them all. But no justice or temperance is sinful. Neither therefore is any prudence a sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, it is not a sin to act prudently for an end which it is lawful to love. But it is lawful to love the flesh, “for no man ever hated his own flesh” (^{<HR>}Ephesians 5:29). Therefore prudence of the flesh is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, just as man is tempted by the flesh, so too is he tempted by the world and the devil. But no prudence of the world, or of the devil is accounted a sin. Therefore neither should any prudence of the flesh be accounted among sins.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, No man is an enemy to God save for wickedness according to Wis. 14:9, “To God the wicked and his wickedness are hateful alike.” Now it is written (~~ROM~~ Romans 8:7): “The prudence [Vulg.: ‘wisdom’] of the flesh is an enemy to God.” Therefore prudence of the flesh is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(47), A(13)**), prudence regards things which are directed to the end of life as a whole. Hence prudence of the flesh signifies properly the prudence of a man who looks upon carnal goods as the last end of his life. Now it is evident that this is a sin, because it involves a disorder in man with respect to his last end, which does not consist in the goods of the body, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(2), A(5)**). Therefore prudence of the flesh is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(1)-RO(1) — Justice and temperance include in their very nature that which ranks them among the virtues, viz. equality and the curbing of concupiscence; hence they are never taken in a bad sense. On the other hand prudence is so called from foreseeing [providendo], as stated above (**Q(47), A(1); Q(49), A(6)**), which can extend to evil things also. Therefore, although prudence is taken simply in a good sense, yet, if something be added, it may be taken in a bad sense: and it is thus that prudence of the flesh is said to be a sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(1)-RO(2) — The flesh is on account of the soul, as matter is on account of the form, and the instrument on account of the principal agent. Hence the flesh is loved lawfully, if it be directed to the good of the soul as its end. If, however, a man place his last end in a good of the flesh, his love will be inordinate and unlawful, and it is thus that the prudence of the flesh is directed to the love of the flesh.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(1)-RO(3) — The devil tempts us, not through the good of the appetible object, but by way of suggestion. Wherefore, since prudence implies direction to some appetible end, we do not speak of “prudence of the devil,” as of a prudence directed to some evil end, which is the aspect

under which the world and the flesh tempt us, in so far as worldly or carnal goods are proposed to our appetite. Hence we speak of “carnal” and again of “worldly” prudence, according to ^{<D668>}Luke 16:8,

“The children of this world are more prudent [Douay: ‘wiser’] in their generation,” etc.

The Apostle includes all in the “prudence of the flesh,” because we covet the external things of the world on account of the flesh.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(1)-RO(3)

We may also reply that since prudence is in a certain sense called “wisdom,” as stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(2)**, ad 1), we may distinguish a threefold prudence corresponding to the three kinds of temptation. Hence it is written (^{<S985>}James 3:15) that there is a wisdom which is “earthly, sensual and devilish,” as explained above (**Q(45)**, **A(1)**, ad 1), when we were treating of wisdom.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(2)

Whether prudence of the flesh is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that prudence of the flesh is a mortal sin. For it is a mortal sin to rebel against the Divine law, since this implies contempt of God. Now “the prudence [Douay: ‘wisdom’] of the flesh... is not subject to the law of God” (^{<R600>}Romans 8:7). Therefore prudence of the flesh is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, every sin against the Holy Ghost is a mortal sin. Now prudence of the flesh seems to be a sin against the Holy Ghost, for “it cannot be subject to the law of God” (^{<R600>}Romans 8:7), and so it seems to be an unpardonable sin, which is proper to the sin against the Holy Ghost. Therefore prudence of the flesh is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the greatest evil is opposed to the greatest good, as stated in Ethic. viii, 10. Now prudence of the flesh is opposed to that prudence which is the chief of the moral virtues. Therefore prudence of the flesh is chief among mortal sins, so that it is itself a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, That which diminishes a sin has not of itself the nature of a mortal sin. Now the thoughtful quest of things pertaining to the care of the flesh, which seems to pertain to carnal prudence, diminishes sin [*Cf. ²⁰⁶Proverbs 6:30]. Therefore prudence of the flesh has not of itself the nature of a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(47), A(2)**, ad 1; **A(13)**), a man is said to be prudent in two ways. First, simply, i.e. in relation to the end of life as a whole. Secondly, relatively, i.e. in relation to some particular end; thus a man is said to be prudent in business or something else of the kind. Accordingly if prudence of the flesh be taken as corresponding to prudence in its absolute signification, so that a man place the last end of his whole life in the care of the flesh, it is a mortal sin, because he turns away from God by so doing, since he cannot have several last ends, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(1), A(5)**).

If, on the other hand, prudence of the flesh be taken as corresponding to particular prudence, it is a venial sin. For it happens sometimes that a man has an inordinate affection for some pleasure of the flesh, without turning away from God by a mortal sin; in which case he does not place the end of his whole life in carnal pleasure. To apply oneself to obtain this pleasure is a venial sin and pertains to prudence of the flesh. But if a man actually refers the care of the flesh to a good end, as when one is careful about one's food in order to sustain one's body, this is no longer prudence of the flesh, because then one uses the care of the flesh as a means to an end.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(2)-RO(1) — The Apostle is speaking of that carnal prudence whereby a man places the end of his whole life in the goods of the flesh, and this is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(2)-RO(2) — Prudence of the flesh does not imply a sin against the Holy Ghost. For when it is stated that "it cannot be subject to the law of God," this does not mean that he who has prudence of the flesh, cannot be converted and submit to the law of God, but that carnal prudence itself cannot be subject to God's law, even as neither can injustice be just, nor heat cold, although that which is hot may become cold.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(2)-RO(3) — Every sin is opposed to prudence, just as prudence is shared by every virtue. But it does not follow that every sin opposed to prudence is most grave, but only when it is opposed to prudence in some very grave matter.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(3)

Whether craftiness is a special sin?

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that craftiness is not a special sin. For the words of Holy Writ do not induce anyone to sin; and yet they induce us to be crafty, according to ^{<1000>}Proverbs 1:4, “To give craftiness [Douay: ‘subtlety’] to little ones.” Therefore craftiness is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it is written (^{<1036>}Proverbs 13:16): “The crafty [Douay: ‘prudent’] man doth all things with counsel.” Therefore, he does so either for a good or for an evil end. If for a good end, there is no sin seemingly, and if for an evil end, it would seem to pertain to carnal or worldly prudence. Therefore craftiness is not a special sin distinct from prudence of the flesh.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, Gregory expounding the words of Job 12, “The simplicity of the just man is laughed to scorn,” says (Moral. x, 29): “The wisdom of this world is to hide one’s thoughts by artifice, to conceal one’s meaning by words, to represent error as truth, to make out the truth to be false,” and further on he adds: “This prudence is acquired by the young, it is learnt at a price by children.” Now the above things seem to belong to craftiness. Therefore craftiness is not distinct from carnal or worldly prudence, and consequently it seems not to be a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(3) — On the contrary, The Apostle says (^{<1000>}2 Corinthians 4:2):

“We renounce the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor adulterating the word of God.”

Therefore craftiness is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Prudence is “right reason applied to action,” just as science is “right reason applied to knowledge.” In speculative matters one may sin against rectitude of knowledge in two ways: in one way when the reason is led to a false conclusion that appears to be true; in another way when the reason proceeds from false premises, that appear to be true, either to a true or to a false conclusion. Even so a sin may be against prudence, through having some resemblance thereto, in two ways. First, when the purpose of the reason is directed to an end which is good not in truth but in appearance, and this pertains to prudence of the flesh; secondly, when, in order to obtain a certain end, whether good or evil, a man uses means that are not true but fictitious and counterfeit, and this belongs to the sin of craftiness. This is consequently a sin opposed to prudence, and distinct from prudence of the flesh.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(3)-RO(1) — As Augustine observes (Contra Julian. iv, 3) just as prudence is sometimes improperly taken in a bad sense, so is craftiness sometimes taken in a good sense, and this on account of their mutual resemblance. Properly speaking, however, craftiness is taken in a bad sense, as the Philosopher states in Ethic. vi, 12.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(3)-RO(2) — Craftiness can take counsel both for a good end and for an evil end: nor should a good end be pursued by means that are false and counterfeit but by such as are true. Hence craftiness is a sin if it be directed to a good end.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(3)-RO(3) — Under “worldly prudence” Gregory included everything that can pertain to false prudence, so that it comprises craftiness also.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(4)

Whether guile is a sin pertaining to craftiness?

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that guile is not a sin pertaining to craftiness. For sin, especially mortal, has no place in perfect men. Yet a certain guile is to be found in them, according to ~~2~~¹ Corinthians 12:16, “Being crafty I caught you by guile.” Therefore guile is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, guile seems to pertain chiefly to the tongue, according to ^{<4981>}Psalm 5:11, “They dealt deceitfully with their tongues.” Now craftiness like prudence is in the very act of reason. Therefore guile does not pertain to craftiness.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, it is written (^{<1071>}Proverbs 12:20): “Guile [Douay: ‘Deceit’] is in the heart of them that think evil things.” But the thought of evil things does not always pertain to craftiness. Therefore guile does not seem to belong to craftiness.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Craftiness aims at lying in wait, according to ^{<1084>}Ephesians 4:14, “By cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive”: and guile aims at this also. Therefore guile pertains to craftiness.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(3)**), it belongs to craftiness to adopt ways that are not true but counterfeit and apparently true, in order to attain some end either good or evil. Now the adopting of such ways may be subjected to a twofold consideration; first, as regards the process of thinking them out, and this belongs properly to craftiness, even as thinking out right ways to a due end belongs to prudence. Secondly the adopting of such like ways may be considered with regard to their actual execution, and in this way it belongs to guile. Hence guile denotes a certain execution of craftiness, and accordingly belongs thereto.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(4)-RO(1) — Just as craftiness is taken properly in a bad sense, and improperly in a good sense, so too is guile which is the execution of craftiness.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(4)-RO(2) — The execution of craftiness with the purpose of deceiving, is effected first and foremost by words, which hold the chief place among those signs whereby a man signifies something to another man, as Augustine states (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 3), hence guile is ascribed chiefly to speech. Yet guile may happen also in deeds, according to ^{<1942>}Psalm 104:25, “And to deal deceitfully with his servants.” Guile is also in the heart, according to Ecclus. 19:23, “His interior is full of deceit,” but this is to devise deceits, according to ^{<1971>}Psalm 37:13: “They studied deceits all the day long.”

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(4)-RO(3) — Whoever purposes to do some evil deed, must needs devise certain ways of attaining his purpose, and for the most part he devises deceitful ways, whereby the more easily to obtain his end. Nevertheless it happens sometimes that evil is done openly and by violence without craftiness and guile; but as this is more difficult, it is of less frequent occurrence.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(5)

Whether fraud pertains to craftiness?

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that fraud does not pertain to craftiness. For a man does not deserve praise if he allows himself to be deceived, which is the object of craftiness; and yet a man deserves praise for allowing himself to be defrauded, according to ~~4th~~ 1 Corinthians 6:1, “Why do you not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?” Therefore fraud does not belong to craftiness.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, fraud seems to consist in unlawfully taking or receiving external things, for it is written (~~4th~~ Acts 5:1) that

“a certain man named Ananias with Saphira his wife, sold a piece of land, and by fraud kept back part of the price of the land.”

Now it pertains to injustice or illiberality to take possession of or retain external things unjustly. Therefore fraud does not belong to craftiness which is opposed to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, no man employs craftiness against himself. But the frauds of some are against themselves, for it is written (~~2nd~~ Proverbs 1:18) concerning some “that they practice frauds [Douay: ‘deceits’] against their own souls.” Therefore fraud does not belong to craftiness.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, The object of fraud is to deceive, according to ~~8th~~ Job 13:9,

“Shall he be deceived as a man, with your fraudulent [Douay: ‘deceitful’] dealings?”

Now craftiness is directed to the same object. Therefore fraud pertains to craftiness.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Just as “guile” consists in the execution of craftiness, so also does “fraud.” But they seem to differ in the fact that “guile” belongs in general to the execution of craftiness, whether this be effected by words, or by deeds, whereas “fraud” belongs more properly to the execution of craftiness by deeds.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(5)-RO(1) — The Apostle does not counsel the faithful to be deceived in their knowledge, but to bear patiently the effect of being deceived, and to endure wrongs inflicted on them by fraud.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(5)-RO(2) — The execution of craftiness may be carried out by another vice, just as the execution of prudence by the virtues: and accordingly nothing hinders fraud from pertaining to covetousness or illiberality.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(5)-RO(3) — Those who commit frauds, do not design anything against themselves or their own souls; it is through God’s just judgment that what they plot against others, recoils on themselves, according to ^{<5076>}Psalm 7:16, “He is fallen into the hole he made.”

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(6)

Whether it is lawful to be solicitous about temporal matters?

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem lawful to be solicitous about temporal matters. Because a superior should be solicitous for his subjects, according to ^{<5078>}Romans 12:8, “He that ruleth, with solicitude.” Now according to the Divine ordering, man is placed over temporal things, according to ^{<5088>}Psalm 8:8, “Thou hast subjected all things under his feet,” etc. Therefore man should be solicitous about temporal things.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, everyone is solicitous about the end for which he works. Now it is lawful for a man to work for the temporal things whereby he sustains life, wherefore the Apostle says (^{<5090>}2 Thessalonians 3:10): “If any man will not work, neither let him eat.” Therefore it is lawful to be solicitous about temporal things.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, solicitude about works of mercy is praiseworthy, according to ⁽⁴¹¹⁷⁾2 Timothy 1:17, “When he was come to Rome, he carefully sought me.” Now solicitude about temporal things is sometimes connected with works of mercy; for instance, when a man is solicitous to watch over the interests of orphans and poor persons. Therefore solicitude about temporal things is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Our Lord said (⁽⁴¹⁶⁸⁾Matthew 6:31):

“Be not solicitous... saying, What shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed?”

And yet such things are very necessary.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(6) — *I answer that*, Solicitude denotes an earnest endeavor to obtain something. Now it is evident that the endeavor is more earnest when there is fear of failure, so that there is less solicitude when success is assured. Accordingly solicitude about temporal things may be unlawful in three ways. First on the part of the object of solicitude; that is, if we seek temporal things as an end. Hence Augustine says (De Operibus Monach. xxvi): “When Our Lord said: ‘Be not solicitous,’ etc.... He intended to forbid them either to make such things their end, or for the sake of these things to do whatever they were commanded to do in preaching the Gospel.” Secondly, solicitude about temporal things may be unlawful, through too much earnestness in endeavoring to obtain temporal things, the result being that a man is drawn away from spiritual things which ought to be the chief object of his search, wherefore it is written (⁽⁴¹³²⁾Matthew 13:22) that “the care of this world... chokes up the word.” Thirdly, through over much fear, when, to wit, a man fears to lack necessary things if he do what he ought to do. Now our Lord gives three motives for laying aside this fear. First, on account of the yet greater favors bestowed by God on man, independently of his solicitude, viz. his body and soul (⁽⁴¹⁶³⁾Matthew 6:26); secondly, on account of the care with which God watches over animals and plants without the assistance of man, according to the requirements of their nature; thirdly, because of Divine providence, through ignorance of which the gentiles are solicitous in seeking temporal goods before all others. Consequently He concludes that we should be solicitous most of all about spiritual goods, hoping that temporal goods

also may be granted us according to our needs, if we do what we ought to do.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(6)-RO(1) — Temporal goods are subjected to man that he may use them according to his needs, not that he may place his end in them and be over solicitous about them.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(6)-RO(2) — The solicitude of a man who gains his bread by bodily labor is not superfluous but proportionate; hence Jerome says on ^{ad}Matthew 6:31, “Be not solicitous,” that “labor is necessary, but solicitude must be banished,” namely superfluous solicitude which unsettles the mind.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(6)-RO(3) — In the works of mercy solicitude about temporal things is directed to charity as its end, wherefore it is not unlawful, unless it be superfluous.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(7)

Whether we should be solicitous about the future?

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that we should be solicitous about the future. For it is written (^{ad}Proverbs 6:6-8):

“Go to the ant, O sluggard, and consider her ways and learn wisdom; which, although she hath no guide, nor master... provideth her meat for herself in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest.”

Now this is to be solicitous about the future. Therefore solicitude about the future is praiseworthy.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, solicitude pertains to prudence. But prudence is chiefly about the future, since its principal part is “foresight of future things,” as stated above (**Q(49)**, **A(6)**, ad 1). Therefore it is virtuous to be solicitous about the future.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, whoever puts something by that he may keep it for the morrow, is solicitous about the future. Now we read (^{ad}John 12:6) that Christ had a bag for keeping things in, which Judas

carried, and (⁴⁰⁶Acts 4:34-37) that the Apostles kept the price of the land, which had been laid at their feet. Therefore it is lawful to be solicitous about the future.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, Our Lord said (⁴⁰⁵Matthew 6:34): “Be not... solicitous for tomorrow”; where “tomorrow” stands for the future, as Jerome says in his commentary on this passage.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(7) — *I answer that*, No work can be virtuous, unless it be vested with its due circumstances, and among these is the due time, according to (²⁰⁰Ecclesiastes 8:6, “There is a time and opportunity for every business”; which applies not only to external deeds but also to internal solicitude. For every time has its own fitting proper solicitude; thus solicitude about the crops belongs to the summer time, and solicitude about the vintage to the time of autumn. Accordingly if a man were solicitous about the vintage during the summer, he would be needlessly forestalling the solicitude belonging to a future time. Hence Our Lord forbids such like excessive solicitude, saying: “Be... not solicitous for tomorrow,” wherefore He adds, “for the morrow will be solicitous for itself,” that is to say, the morrow will have its own solicitude, which will be burden enough for the soul. This is what He means by adding: “Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof,” namely, the burden of solicitude.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(7)-RO(1) — The ant is solicitous at a befitting time, and it is this that is proposed for our example.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(7)-RO(2) — Due foresight of the future belongs to prudence. But it would be an inordinate foresight or solicitude about the future, if a man were to seek temporal things, to which the terms “past” and “future” apply, as ends, or if he were to seek them in excess of the needs of the present life, or if he were to forestall the time for solicitude.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(7)-RO(3) — As Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 17), “when we see a servant of God taking thought lest he lack these needful things, we must not judge him to be solicitous for the morrow, since even Our Lord deigned for our example to have a purse, and we read in the Acts of the Apostles that they procured the necessary means of livelihood in view of the future on account of a threatened

famine. Hence Our Lord does not condemn those who according to human custom, provide themselves with such things, but those who oppose themselves to God for the sake of these things.”

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(8)

Whether these vices arise from covetousness?

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that these vices do not arise from covetousness. As stated above (**Q(43)**, **A(6)**) lust is the chief cause of lack of rectitude in the reason. Now these vices are opposed to right reason, i.e. to prudence. Therefore they arise chiefly from lust; especially since the Philosopher says (Ethic. vii, 6) that “Venus is full of guile and her girdle is many colored” and that “he who is incontinent in desire acts with cunning.”

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, these vices bear a certain resemblance to prudence, as stated above (**Q(47)**, **A(13)**). Now, since prudence is in the reason, the more spiritual vices seem to be more akin thereto, such as pride and vainglory. Therefore the aforesaid vices seem to arise from pride rather than from covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, men make use of stratagems not only in laying hold of other people’s goods, but also in plotting murders, the former of which pertains to covetousness, and the latter to anger. Now the use of stratagems pertains to craftiness, guile, and fraud. Therefore the aforesaid vices arise not only from covetousness, but also from anger.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45) states that fraud is a daughter of covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(8) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(3)**; **Q(47)**, **A(13)**), carnal prudence and craftiness, as well as guile and fraud, bear a certain resemblance to prudence in some kind of use of the reason. Now among all the moral virtues it is justice wherein the use of right reason appears chiefly, for justice is in the rational appetite. Hence the undue use of reason appears chiefly in the vices opposed to justice, the chief of which is covetousness. Therefore the aforesaid vices arise chiefly from covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(8)-RO(1) — On account of the vehemence of pleasure and of concupiscence, lust entirely suppresses the reason from exercising its act: whereas in the aforesaid vices there is some use of reason, albeit inordinate. Hence these vices do not arise directly from lust. When the Philosopher says that “Venus is full of guile,” he is referring to a certain resemblance, in so far as she carries man away suddenly, just as he is moved in deceitful actions, yet not by means of craftiness but rather by the vehemence of concupiscence and pleasure; wherefore he adds that “Venus doth cozen the wits of the wisest man” [*Cf. Iliad xiv, 214-217].

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(8)-RO(2) — To do anything by stratagem seems to be due to pusillanimity: because a magnanimous man wishes to act openly, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 3). Wherefore, as pride resembles or apes magnanimity, it follows that the aforesaid vices which make use of fraud and guile, do not arise directly from pride, but rather from covetousness, which seeks its own profit and sets little by excellence.

P(2b)-Q(55)-A(8)-RO(3) — Anger’s movement is sudden, hence it acts with precipitation, and without counsel, contrary to the use of the aforesaid vices, though these use counsel inordinately. That men use stratagems in plotting murders, arises not from anger but rather from hatred, because the angry man desires to harm manifestly, as the Philosopher states (Rhet. ii, 2,3) [*Cf. Ethic. vii, 6].

QUESTION 56

OF THE PRECEPTS RELATING TO PRUDENCE

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the precepts relating to prudence, under which head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) The precepts of prudence;
- (2) The precepts relating to the opposite vices.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(1)

Whether the precepts of the decalogue should have included a precept of prudence?

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that the precepts of the decalogue should have included a precept of prudence. For the chief precepts should include a precept of the chief virtue. Now the chief precepts are those of the decalogue. Since then prudence is the chief of the moral virtues, it seems that the precepts of the decalogue should have included a precept of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the teaching of the Gospel contains the Law especially with regard to the precepts of the decalogue. Now the teaching of the Gospel contains a precept of prudence (⁴⁰⁰⁶Matthew 10:16): “Be ye... prudent [Douay: ‘wise’] as serpents.” Therefore the precepts of the decalogue should have included a precept of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the other lessons of the Old Testament are directed to the precepts of the decalogue: wherefore it is written (³⁰⁰⁶Malachi 4:4):

“Remember the law of Moses My servant,
which I commanded him in Horeb.”

Now the other lessons of the Old Testament include precepts of prudence; for instance (³¹⁸⁵Proverbs 3:5): “Lean not upon thy own prudence”; and further on (³¹⁰⁵Proverbs 4:25): “Let thine eyelids go before thy steps.” Therefore the Law also should have contained a precept of prudence, especially among the precepts of the decalogue.

The contrary however appears to anyone who goes through the precepts of the decalogue.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(100), A(3); A(5)**, ad 1) when we were treating of precepts, the commandments of the decalogue being given to the whole people, are a matter of common knowledge to all, as coming under the purview of natural reason. Now foremost among the things dictated by natural reason are the ends of human life, which are to the practical order what naturally known principles are to the speculative order, as shown above (**Q(47), A(6)**). Now prudence is not about the end, but about the means, as stated above (**Q(47), A(6)**). Hence it was not fitting that the precepts of the decalogue should include a precept relating directly to prudence. And yet all the precepts of the decalogue are related to prudence, in so far as it directs all virtuous acts.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(1)-RO(1) — Although prudence is simply foremost among all the moral virtues, yet justice, more than any other virtue, regards its object under the aspect of something due, which is a necessary condition for a precept, as stated above (**Q(44), A(1); P(2a), Q(99), AA(1),5**). Hence it behooved the chief precepts of the Law, which are those of the decalogue, to refer to justice rather than to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(1)-RO(2) — The teaching of the Gospel is the doctrine of perfection. Therefore it needed to instruct man perfectly in all matters relating to right conduct, whether ends or means: wherefore it behooved the Gospel teaching to contain precepts also of prudence.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(1)-RO(3) — Just as the rest of the teaching of the Old Testament is directed to the precepts of the decalogue as its end, so it behooved man to be instructed by the subsequent lessons of the Old Testament about the act of prudence which is directed to the means.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(2)

Whether the prohibitive precepts relating to the vices opposed to prudence are fittingly propounded in the Old Law?

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the prohibitive precepts relating to the vices opposed to prudence are unfittingly propounded in the Old Law. For such vices as imprudence and its parts which are directly opposed to prudence are not less opposed thereto, than those which bear a certain resemblance to prudence, such as craftiness and vices connected with it. Now the latter vices are forbidden in the Law: for it is written (~~CRS~~ Leviticus 19:13): “Thou shalt not calumniate thy neighbor,” and (~~CRS~~ Deuteronomy 25:13): “Thou shalt not have divers weights in thy bag, a greater and a less.” Therefore there should have also been prohibitive precepts about the vices directly opposed to prudence.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, there is room for fraud in other things than in buying and selling. Therefore the Law unfittingly forbade fraud solely in buying and selling.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, there is the same reason for prescribing an act of virtue as for prohibiting the act of a contrary vice. But acts of prudence are not prescribed in the Law. Therefore neither should any contrary vices have been forbidden in the Law.

The contrary, however, appears from the precepts of the Law which are quoted in the first objection.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (A(1)), justice, above all, regards the aspect of something due, which is a necessary condition for a precept, because justice tends to render that which is due to another, as we shall state further on (Q(58), A(2)). Now craftiness, as to its execution, is committed chiefly in matters of justice, as stated above (Q(55), A(8)): and so it was fitting that the Law should contain precepts forbidding the execution of craftiness, in so far as this pertains to injustice, as when a man uses guile and fraud in calumniating another or in stealing his goods.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(2)-RO(1) — Those vices that are manifestly opposed to prudence, do not pertain to injustice in the same way as the execution of

craftiness, and so they are not forbidden in the Law, as fraud and guile are, which latter pertain to injustice

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(2)-RO(2) — All guile and fraud committed in matters of injustice, can be understood to be forbidden in the prohibition of calumny (~~Q(56)~~ Leviticus 19:13). Yet fraud and guile are wont to be practiced chiefly in buying and selling, according to Ecclus. 26:28, “A huckster shall not be justified from the sins of the lips”: and it is for this reason that the Law contained a special precept forbidding fraudulent buying and selling.

P(2b)-Q(56)-A(2)-RO(3) — All the precepts of the Law that relate to acts of justice pertain to the execution of prudence, even as the precepts prohibitive of stealing, calumny and fraudulent selling pertain to the execution of craftiness.

ON JUSTICE

QUESTIONS 57-62

QUESTION 57

OF RIGHT

(FOUR ARTICLES)

After considering prudence we must in due sequence consider justice, the consideration of which will be fourfold:

- (1) Of justice;
- (2) Of its parts;
- (3) Of the corresponding gift;
- (4) Of the precepts relating to justice.

Four points will have to be considered about justice:

- (1) Right;
- (2) Justice itself;
- (3) Injustice;
- (4) Judgment.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether right is the object of justice?
- (2) Whether right is fittingly divided into natural and positive right?
- (3) Whether the right of nations is the same as natural right?
- (4) Whether right of dominion and paternal right are distinct species?

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(1)

Whether right is the object of justice?

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that right is not the object of justice. For the jurist Celsus says [*Digest. i, 1; De Just. et Jure 1] that “right is the art of goodness and equality.” Now art is not the object of justice, but is by itself an intellectual virtue. Therefore right is not the object of justice.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, “Law,” according to Isidore (Etym. v, 3), “is a kind of right.” Now law is the object not of justice but of prudence, wherefore the Philosopher [*Ethic. vi, 8] reckons “legislative” as one of the parts of prudence. Therefore right is not the object of justice.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, justice, before all, subjects man to God: for Augustine says (De Moribus Eccl. xv) that “justice is love serving God alone, and consequently governing aright all things subject to man.” Now right [jus] does not pertain to Divine things, but only to human affairs, for Isidore says (Etym. v, 2) that “‘fas’ is the Divine law, and ‘jus,’ the human law.” Therefore right is not the object of justice.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Isidore says (Etym. v, 2) that “‘jus’ [right] is so called because it is just.” Now the “just” is the object of justice, for the Philosopher declares (Ethic. v, 1) that “all are agreed in giving the name of justice to the habit which makes men capable of doing just actions.”

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(1) — *I answer that*, It is proper to justice, as compared with the other virtues, to direct man in his relations with others: because it denotes a kind of equality, as its very name implies; indeed we are wont to say that things are adjusted when they are made equal, for equality is in reference of one thing to some other. On the other hand the other virtues perfect man in those matters only which befit him in relation to himself. Accordingly that which is right in the works of the other virtues, and to which the intention of the virtue tends as to its proper object, depends on its relation to the agent only, whereas the right in a work of justice, besides its relation to the agent, is set up by its relation to others. Because a man’s work is said to be just when it is related to some other by way of some

kind of equality, for instance the payment of the wage due for a service rendered. And so a thing is said to be just, as having the rectitude of justice, when it is the term of an act of justice, without taking into account the way in which it is done by the agent: whereas in the other virtues nothing is declared to be right unless it is done in a certain way by the agent. For this reason justice has its own special proper object over and above the other virtues, and this object is called the just, which is the same as “right.” Hence it is evident that right is the object of justice.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(1)-RO(1) — It is usual for words to be distorted from their original signification so as to mean something else: thus the word “medicine” was first employed to signify a remedy used for curing a sick person, and then it was drawn to signify the art by which this is done. In like manner the word “jus” [right] was first of all used to denote the just thing itself, but afterwards it was transferred to designate the art whereby it is known what is just, and further to denote the place where justice is administered, thus a man is said to appear “in jure” [*In English we speak of a court of law, a barrister at law, etc.], and yet further, we say even that a man, who has the office of exercising justice, administers the jus even if his sentence be unjust.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(1)-RO(2) — Just as there pre-exists in the mind of the craftsman an expression of the things to be made externally by his craft, which expression is called the rule of his craft, so too there pre-exists in the mind an expression of the particular just work which the reason determines, and which is a kind of rule of prudence. If this rule be expressed in writing it is called a “law,” which according to Isidore (Etym. v, 1) is “a written decree”: and so law is not the same as right, but an expression of right.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(1)-RO(3) — Since justice implies equality, and since we cannot offer God an equal return, it follows that we cannot make Him a perfectly just repayment. For this reason the Divine law is not properly called “jus” but “fas,” because, to wit, God is satisfied if we accomplish what we can. Nevertheless justice tends to make man repay God as much as he can, by subjecting his mind to Him entirely.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(2)

Whether right is fittingly divided into natural right and positive right?

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that right is not fittingly divided into natural right and positive right. For that which is natural is unchangeable, and is the same for all. Now nothing of the kind is to be found in human affairs, since all the rules of human right fail in certain cases, nor do they obtain force everywhere. Therefore there is no such thing as natural right.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, a thing is called “positive” when it proceeds from the human will. But a thing is not just, simply because it proceeds from the human will, else a man’s will could not be unjust. Since then the “just” and the “right” are the same, it seems that there is no positive right.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, Divine right is not natural right, since it transcends human nature. In like manner, neither is it positive right, since it is based not on human, but on Divine authority. Therefore right is unfittingly divided into natural and positive.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 7) that “political justice is partly natural and partly legal,” i.e. established by law.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**) the “right” or the “just” is a work that is adjusted to another person according to some kind of equality. Now a thing can be adjusted to a man in two ways: first by its very nature, as when a man gives so much that he may receive equal value in return, and this is called “natural right.” In another way a thing is adjusted or commensurated to another person, by agreement, or by common consent, when, to wit, a man deems himself satisfied, if he receive so much. This can be done in two ways: first by private agreement, as that which is confirmed by an agreement between private individuals; secondly, by public agreement, as when the whole community agrees that something should be deemed as though it were adjusted and commensurated to

another person, or when this is decreed by the prince who is placed over the people, and acts in its stead, and this is called “positive right.”

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(2)-RO(1) — That which is natural to one whose nature is unchangeable, must needs be such always and everywhere. But man’s nature is changeable, wherefore that which is natural to man may sometimes fail. Thus the restitution of a deposit to the depositor is in accordance with natural equality, and if human nature were always right, this would always have to be observed; but since it happens sometimes that man’s will is unrighteous there are cases in which a deposit should not be restored, lest a man of unrighteous will make evil use of the thing deposited: as when a madman or an enemy of the common weal demands the return of his weapons.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(2)-RO(2) — The human will can, by common agreement, make a thing to be just provided it be not, of itself, contrary to natural justice, and it is in such matters that positive right has its place. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 7) that “in the case of the legal just, it does not matter in the first instance whether it takes one form or another, it only matters when once it is laid down.” If, however, a thing is, of itself, contrary to natural right, the human will cannot make it just, for instance by decreeing that it is lawful to steal or to commit adultery. Hence it is written (²⁰⁰Isaiah 10:1): “Woe to them that make wicked laws.”

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(2)-RO(3) — The Divine right is that which is promulgated by God. Such things are partly those that are naturally just, yet their justice is hidden to man, and partly are made just by God’s decree. Hence also Divine right may be divided in respect of these two things, even as human right is. For the Divine law commands certain things because they are good, and forbids others, because they are evil, while others are good because they are prescribed, and others evil because they are forbidden.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(3)

Whether the right of nations is the same as the natural right?

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that the right of nations is the same as the natural right. For all men do not agree save in that which is

natural to them. Now all men agree in the right of nations; since the jurist [*Ulpian: Digest. i, 1; De Just. et Jure i] “the right of nations is that which is in use among all nations.” Therefore the right of nations is the natural right.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, slavery among men is natural, for some are naturally slaves according to the Philosopher (Polit. i, 2). Now “slavery belongs to the right of nations,” as Isidore states (Etym. v, 4). Therefore the right of nations is a natural right.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, right as stated above (**A(2)**) is divided into natural and positive. Now the right of nations is not a positive right, since all nations never agreed to decree anything by common agreement. Therefore the right of nations is a natural right.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Isidore says (Etym. v, 4) that “right is either natural, or civil, or right of nations,” and consequently the right of nations is distinct from natural right.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(2)**), the natural right or just is that which by its very nature is adjusted to or commensurate with another person. Now this may happen in two ways; first, according as it is considered absolutely: thus a male by its very nature is commensurate with the female to beget offspring by her, and a parent is commensurate with the offspring to nourish it. Secondly a thing is naturally commensurate with another person, not according as it is considered absolutely, but according to something resultant from it, for instance the possession of property. For if a particular piece of land be considered absolutely, it contains no reason why it should belong to one man more than to another, but if it be considered in respect of its adaptability to cultivation, and the unmolested use of the land, it has a certain commensuration to be the property of one and not of another man, as the Philosopher shows (Polit. ii, 2).

Now it belongs not only to man but also to other animals to apprehend a thing absolutely: wherefore the right which we call natural, is common to us and other animals according to the first kind of commensuration. But the right of nations falls short of natural right in this sense, as the jurist [*Digest. i, 1; De Just. et Jure i] says because “the latter is common to all

animals, while the former is common to men only.” On the other hand to consider a thing by comparing it with what results from it, is proper to reason, wherefore this same is natural to man in respect of natural reason which dictates it. Hence the jurist Gaius says (Digest. i, 1; De Just. et Jure i, 9): “whatever natural reason decrees among all men, is observed by all equally, and is called the right of nations.” This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(3)-RO(2) — Considered absolutely, the fact that this particular man should be a slave rather than another man, is based, not on natural reason, but on some resultant utility, in that it is useful to this man to be ruled by a wiser man, and to the latter to be helped by the former, as the Philosopher states (Polit. i, 2). Wherefore slavery which belongs to the right of nations is natural in the second way, but not in the first.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(3)-RO(3) — Since natural reason dictates matters which are according to the right of nations, as implying a proximate equality, it follows that they need no special institution, for they are instituted by natural reason itself, as stated by the authority quoted above

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(4)

Whether paternal right and right of dominion should be distinguished as special species?

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that “paternal right” and “right of dominion” should not be distinguished as special species. For it belongs to justice to render to each one what is his, as Ambrose states (De Offic. i, 24). Now right is the object of justice, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore right belongs to each one equally; and we ought not to distinguish the rights of fathers and masters as distinct species.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the law is an expression of what is just, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 2). Now a law looks to the common good of a city or kingdom, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(90)**, **A(2)**), but not to the private good of an individual or even of one household. Therefore there is no need for a special right of dominion or paternal right, since the master and the father pertain to a household, as stated in Polit. i, 2.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, there are many other differences of degrees among men, for instance some are soldiers, some are priests, some are princes. Therefore some special kind of right should be allotted to them.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher (Ethic. v, 6) distinguishes right of dominion, paternal right and so on as species distinct from civil right.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Right or just depends on commensuration with another person. Now “another” has a twofold signification. First, it may denote something that is other simply, as that which is altogether distinct; as, for example, two men neither of whom is subject to the other, and both of whom are subjects of the ruler of the state; and between these according to the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 6) there is the “just” simply. Secondly a thing is said to be other from something else, not simply, but as belonging in some way to that something else: and in this way, as regards human affairs, a son belongs to his father, since he is part of him somewhat, as stated in Ethic. viii, 12, and a slave belongs to his master, because he is his instrument, as stated in Polit. i, 2 [*Cf. Ethic. viii, 11]. Hence a father is not compared to his son as to another simply, and so between them there is not the just simply, but a kind of just, called “paternal.” In like manner neither is there the just simply, between master and servant, but that which is called “dominative.” A wife, though she is something belonging to the husband, since she stands related to him as to her own body, as the Apostle declares (~~cf.~~ Ephesians 5:28), is nevertheless more distinct from her husband, than a son from his father, or a slave from his master: for she is received into a kind of social life, that of matrimony, wherefore according to the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 6) there is more scope for justice between husband and wife than between father and son, or master and slave, because, as husband and wife have an immediate relation to the community of the household, as stated in Polit. i, 2,5, it follows that between them there is “domestic justice” rather than “civic.”

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(4)-RO(1) — It belongs to justice to render to each one his right, the distinction between individuals being presupposed: for if a man gives himself his due, this is not strictly called “just.” And since what belongs to the son is his father’s, and what belongs to the slave is his

master's, it follows that properly speaking there is not justice of father to son, or of master to slave.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(4)-RO(2) — A son, as such, belongs to his father, and a slave, as such, belongs to his master; yet each, considered as a man, is something having separate existence and distinct from others. Hence in so far as each of them is a man, there is justice towards them in a way: and for this reason too there are certain laws regulating the relations of father to his son, and of a master to his slave; but in so far as each is something belonging to another, the perfect idea of “right” or “just” is wanting to them.

P(2b)-Q(57)-A(4)-RO(3) — All other differences between one person and another in a state, have an immediate relation to the community of the state and to its ruler, wherefore there is just towards them in the perfect sense of justice. This “just” however is distinguished according to various offices, hence when we speak of “military,” or “magisterial,” or “priestly” right, it is not as though such rights fell short of the simply right, as when we speak of “paternal” right, or right of “dominion,” but for the reason that something proper is due to each class of person in respect of his particular office.

QUESTION 58

OF JUSTICE

(TWELVE ARTICLES)

We must now consider justice. Under this head there are twelve points of inquiry:

- (1) What is justice?
- (2) Whether justice is always towards another?
- (3) Whether it is a virtue?
- (4) Whether it is in the will as its subject?
- (5) Whether it is a general virtue?
- (6) Whether, as a general virtue, it is essentially the same as every virtue?
- (7) Whether there is a particular justice?
- (8) Whether particular justice has a matter of its own?
- (9) Whether it is about passions, or about operations only?
- (10) Whether the mean of justice is the real mean?
- (11) Whether the act of justice is to render to everyone his own?
- (12) Whether justice is the chief of the moral virtues?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)

Whether justice is fittingly defined as being the perpetual and constant will to render to each one his right?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that lawyers have unfittingly defined justice as being “the perpetual and constant will to render to each one his right” [*Digest. i, 1; De Just. et Jure 10]. For, according to the

Philosopher (Ethic. v, 1), justice is a habit which makes a man “capable of doing what is just, and of being just in action and in intention.” Now “will” denotes a power, or also an act. Therefore justice is unfittingly defined as being a will.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, rectitude of the will is not the will; else if the will were its own rectitude, it would follow that no will is unrighteous. Yet, according to Anselm (De Veritate xii), justice is rectitude. Therefore justice is not the will.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, no will is perpetual save God’s. If therefore justice is a perpetual will, in God alone will there be justice.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, whatever is perpetual is constant, since it is unchangeable. Therefore it is needless in defining justice, to say that it is both “perpetual” and “constant.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, it belongs to the sovereign to give each one his right. Therefore, if justice gives each one his right, it follows that it is in none but the sovereign: which is absurd.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-O(6) — Further, Augustine says (De Moribus Eccl. xv) that “justice is love serving God alone.” Therefore it does not render to each one his right.

I answer that, The aforesaid definition of justice is fitting if understood aright. For since every virtue is a habit that is the principle of a good act, a virtue must needs be defined by means of the good act bearing on the matter proper to that virtue. Now the proper matter of justice consists of those things that belong to our intercourse with other men, as shall be shown further on (**A(2)**). Hence the act of justice in relation to its proper matter and object is indicated in the words, “Rendering to each one his right,” since, as Isidore says (Etym. x), “a man is said to be just because he respects the rights [jus] of others.”

Now in order that an act bearing upon any matter whatever be virtuous, it requires to be voluntary, stable, and firm, because the Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 4) that in order for an act to be virtuous it needs first of all to be done “knowingly,” secondly to be done “by choice,” and “for a due end,” thirdly to be done “immovably.” Now the first of these is included in the

second, since “what is done through ignorance is involuntary” (Ethic. iii, 1). Hence the definition of justice mentions first the “will,” in order to show that the act of justice must be voluntary; and mention is made afterwards of its “constancy” and “perpetuity” in order to indicate the firmness of the act.

Accordingly, this is a complete definition of justice; save that the act is mentioned instead of the habit, which takes its species from that act, because habit implies relation to act. And if anyone would reduce it to the proper form of a definition, he might say that “justice is a habit whereby a man renders to each one his due by a constant and perpetual will”: and this is about the same definition as that given by the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 5) who says that “justice is a habit whereby a man is said to be capable of doing just actions in accordance with his choice.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-RO(1) — Will here denotes the act, not the power: and it is customary among writers to define habits by their acts: thus Augustine says (Tract. in Joan. xl) that “faith is to believe what one sees not.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-RO(2) — Justice is the same as rectitude, not essentially but causally; for it is a habit which rectifies the deed and the will.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-RO(3) — The will may be called perpetual in two ways. First on the part of the will’s act which endures for ever, and thus God’s will alone is perpetual. Secondly on the part of the subject, because, to wit, a man wills to do a certain thing always. and this is a necessary condition of justice. For it does not satisfy the conditions of justice that one wish to observe justice in some particular matter for the time being, because one could scarcely find a man willing to act unjustly in every case; and it is requisite that one should have the will to observe justice at all times and in all cases.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-RO(4) — Since “perpetual” does not imply perpetuity of the act of the will, it is not superfluous to add “constant”: for while the “perpetual will” denotes the purpose of observing justice always, “constant” signifies a firm perseverance in this purpose.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-RO(5) — A judge renders to each one what belongs to him, by way of command and direction, because a judge is the “personification of justice,” and “the sovereign is its guardian” (Ethic. v, 4). On the other hand, the subjects render to each one what belongs to him, by way of execution.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(1)-RO(6) — Just as love of God includes love of our neighbor, as stated above (**Q(25), A(1)**), so too the service of God includes rendering to each one his due.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(2)

Whether justice is always towards one another?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that justice is not always towards another. For the Apostle says (~~RE~~ Romans 3:22) that “the justice of God is by faith of Jesus Christ.” Now faith does not concern the dealings of one man with another. Neither therefore does justice.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, according to Augustine (De Moribus Eccl. xv), “it belongs to justice that man should direct to the service of God his authority over the things that are subject to him.” Now the sensitive appetite is subject to man, according to ~~CO~~ Genesis 4:7, where it is written: “The lust thereof,” viz. of sin, “shall be under thee, and thou shalt have dominion over it.” Therefore it belongs to justice to have dominion over one’s own appetite: so that justice is towards oneself.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the justice of God is eternal. But nothing else is co-eternal with God. Therefore justice is not essentially towards another.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, man’s dealings with himself need to be rectified no less than his dealings with another. Now man’s dealings are rectified by justice, according to ~~CO~~ Proverbs 11:5, “The justice of the upright shall make his way prosperous.” Therefore justice is about our dealings not only with others, but also with ourselves.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Tully says (De Officiis i, 7) that “the object of justice is to keep men together in society and mutual

intercourse.” Now this implies relationship of one man to another. Therefore justice is concerned only about our dealings with others.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(57), A(1)**) since justice by its name implies equality, it denotes essentially relation to another, for a thing is equal, not to itself, but to another. And forasmuch as it belongs to justice to rectify human acts, as stated above (**Q(57), A(1); P(2a), Q(113), A(1)**) this otherness which justice demands must needs be between beings capable of action. Now actions belong to supposits [*Cf. **P(1), Q(29), A(2)**] and wholes and, properly speaking, not to parts and forms or powers, for we do not say properly that the hand strikes, but a man with his hand, nor that heat makes a thing hot, but fire by heat, although such expressions may be employed metaphorically. Hence, justice properly speaking demands a distinction of supposits, and consequently is only in one man towards another. Nevertheless in one and the same man we may speak metaphorically of his various principles of action such as the reason, the irascible, and the concupiscible, as though they were so many agents: so that metaphorically in one and the same man there is said to be justice in so far as the reason commands the irascible and concupiscible, and these obey reason; and in general in so far as to each part of man is ascribed what is becoming to it. Hence the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 11) calls this “metaphorical justice.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(2)-RO(1) — The justice which faith works in us, is that whereby the ungodly is justified it consists in the due coordination of the parts of the soul, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(113), A(1)**) where we were treating of the justification of the ungodly. Now this belongs to metaphorical justice, which may be found even in a man who lives all by himself.

This suffices for the Reply to the Second Objection.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(2)-RO(3) — God’s justice is from eternity in respect of the eternal will and purpose (and it is chiefly in this that justice consists); although it is not eternal as regards its effect, since nothing is co-eternal with God.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(2)-RO(4) — Man’s dealings with himself are sufficiently rectified by the rectification of the passions by the other moral virtues.

But his dealings with others need a special rectification, not only in relation to the agent, but also in relation to the person to whom they are directed. Hence about such dealings there is a special virtue, and this is justice.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(3)

Whether justice is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that justice is not a virtue. For it is written (^{Q(58)}Luke 17:10): “When you shall have done all these things that are commanded you, say: We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which we ought to do.” Now it is not unprofitable to do a virtuous deed: for Ambrose says (De Officiis ii, 6): “We look to a profit that is estimated not by pecuniary gain but by the acquisition of godliness.” Therefore to do what one ought to do, is not a virtuous deed. And yet it is an act of justice. Therefore justice is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, that which is done of necessity, is not meritorious. But to render to a man what belongs to him, as justice requires, is of necessity. Therefore it is not meritorious. Yet it is by virtuous actions that we gain merit. Therefore justice is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, every moral virtue is about matters of action. Now those things which are wrought externally are not things concerning behavior but concerning handicraft, according to the Philosopher (Metaph. ix) [*Didot ed., viii, 8]. Therefore since it belongs to justice to produce externally a deed that is just in itself, it seems that justice is not a moral virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. ii, 49) that “the entire structure of good works is built on four virtues,” viz. temperance, prudence, fortitude and justice

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(3) — *I answer that*, A human virtue is one “which renders a human act and man himself good” [*Ethic. ii, 6], and this can be applied to justice. For a man’s act is made good through attaining the rule of reason, which is the rule whereby human acts are regulated. Hence, since justice regulates human operations, it is evident that it renders man’s

operations good, and, as Tully declares (De Officiis i, 7), good men are so called chiefly from their justice, wherefore, as he says again (De Officiis i, 7) “the luster of virtue appears above all in justice.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(3)-RO(1) — When a man does what he ought, he brings no gain to the person to whom he does what he ought, but only abstains from doing him a harm. He does however profit himself, in so far as he does what he ought, spontaneously and readily, and this is to act virtuously. Hence it is written (Wis. 8:7) that Divine wisdom “teacheth temperance, and prudence, and justice, and fortitude, which are such things as men (i.e. virtuous men) can have nothing more profitable in life.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(3)-RO(2) — Necessity is twofold. One arises from “constraint,” and this removes merit, since it runs counter to the will. The other arises from the obligation of a “command,” or from the necessity of obtaining an end, when, to wit, a man is unable to achieve the end of virtue without doing some particular thing. The latter necessity does not remove merit, when a man does voluntarily that which is necessary in this way. It does however exclude the credit of supererogation, according to ¹1 Corinthians 9:16,

“If I preach the Gospel, it is no glory to me,
for a necessity lieth upon me.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(3)-RO(3) — Justice is concerned about external things, not by making them, which pertains to art, but by using them in our dealings with other men.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(4)

Whether justice is in the will as its subject?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that justice is not in the will as its subject. For justice is sometimes called truth. But truth is not in the will, but in the intellect. Therefore justice is not in the will as its subject.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, justice is about our dealings with others. Now it belongs to the reason to direct one thing in relation to another. Therefore justice is not in the will as its subject but in the reason.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, justice is not an intellectual virtue, since it is not directed to knowledge; wherefore it follows that it is a moral virtue. Now the subject of moral virtue is the faculty which is “rational by participation,” viz. the irascible and the concupiscible, as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. i, 13). Therefore justice is not in the will as its subject, but in the irascible and concupiscible.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Anselm says (De Verit. xii) that “justice is rectitude of the will observed for its own sake.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(4) — *I answer that*, The subject of a virtue is the power whose act that virtue aims at rectifying. Now justice does not aim at directing an act of the cognitive power, for we are not said to be just through knowing something aright. Hence the subject of justice is not the intellect or reason which is a cognitive power. But since we are said to be just through doing something aright, and because the proximate principle of action is the appetitive power, justice must needs be in some appetitive power as its subject.

Now the appetite is twofold; namely, the will which is in the reason and the sensitive appetite which follows on sensitive apprehension, and is divided into the irascible and the concupiscible, as stated in the **P(1), Q(81), A(2)**. Again the act of rendering his due to each man cannot proceed from the sensitive appetite, because sensitive apprehension does not go so far as to be able to consider the relation of one thing to another; but this is proper to the reason. Therefore justice cannot be in the irascible or concupiscible as its subject, but only in the will: hence the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 1) defines justice by an act of the will, as may be seen above (**A(1)**).

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(4)-RO(1) — Since the will is the rational appetite, when the rectitude of the reason which is called truth is imprinted on the will on account of its likeness to the reason, this imprint retains the name of truth; and hence it is that justice sometimes goes by the name of truth.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(4)-RO(2) — The will is borne towards its object consequently on the apprehension of reason: wherefore, since the reason directs one thing in relation to another, the will can will one thing in relation to another, and this belongs to justice.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(4)-RO(3) — Not only the irascible and concupiscible parts are “rational by participation,” but the entire “appetitive” faculty, as stated in Ethic. i, 13, because all appetite is subject to reason. Now the will is contained in the appetitive faculty, wherefore it can be the subject of moral virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(5)

Whether justice is a general virtue?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that justice is not a general virtue. For justice is specified with the other virtues, according to Wis. 8:7, “She teacheth temperance and prudence, and justice, and fortitude.” Now the “general” is not specified or reckoned together with the species contained under the same “general.” Therefore justice is not a general virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, as justice is accounted a cardinal virtue, so are temperance and fortitude. Now neither temperance nor fortitude is reckoned to be a general virtue. Therefore neither should justice in any way be reckoned a general virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, justice is always towards others, as stated above (**A(2)**). But a sin committed against one’s neighbor cannot be a general sin, because it is condivided with sin committed against oneself. Therefore neither is justice a general virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 1) that “justice is every virtue.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Justice, as stated above (**A(2)**) directs man in his relations with other men. Now this may happen in two ways: first as regards his relation with individuals, secondly as regards his relations with others in general, in so far as a man who serves a community, serves all those who are included in that community. Accordingly justice in its proper acceptation can be directed to another in both these senses. Now it is evident that all who are included in a community, stand in relation to that community as parts to a whole; while a part, as such, belongs to a whole, so that whatever is the good of a part

can be directed to the good of the whole. It follows therefore that the good of any virtue, whether such virtue direct man in relation to himself, or in relation to certain other individual persons, is referable to the common good, to which justice directs: so that all acts of virtue can pertain to justice, in so far as it directs man to the common good. It is in this sense that justice is called a general virtue. And since it belongs to the law to direct to the common good, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(90), A(2)**), it follows that the justice which is in this way styled general, is called “legal justice,” because thereby man is in harmony with the law which directs the acts of all the virtues to the common good.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(5)-RO(1) — Justice is specified or enumerated with the other virtues, not as a general but as a special virtue, as we shall state further on (**AA(7),12**).

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(5)-RO(2) — Temperance and fortitude are in the sensitive appetite, viz. in the concupiscible and irascible. Now these powers are appetitive of certain particular goods, even as the senses are cognitive of particulars. On the other hand justice is in the intellective appetite as its subject, which can have the universal good as its object, knowledge whereof belongs to the intellect. Hence justice can be a general virtue rather than temperance or fortitude.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(5)-RO(3) — Things referable to oneself are referable to another, especially in regard to the common good. Wherefore legal justice, in so far as it directs to the common good, may be called a general virtue: and in like manner injustice may be called a general sin; hence it is written (^{Gen 9:11}1 John 3:4) that all “sin is iniquity.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(6)

*Whether justice, as a general virtue,
is essentially the same as all virtue?*

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that justice, as a general virtue, is essentially the same as all virtue. For the Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 1) that “virtue and legal justice are the same as all virtue, but differ in their mode of being.” Now things that differ merely in their mode of being or

logically do not differ essentially. Therefore justice is essentially the same as every virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, every virtue that is not essentially the same as all virtue is a part of virtue. Now the aforesaid justice, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. 5:1) “is not a part but the whole of virtue.” Therefore the aforesaid justice is essentially the same as all virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, the essence of a virtue does not change through that virtue directing its act to some higher end even as the habit of temperance remains essentially the same even though its act be directed to a Divine good. Now it belongs to legal justice that the acts of all the virtues are directed to a higher end, namely the common good of the multitude, which transcends the good of one single individual. Therefore it seems that legal justice is essentially all virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(6)-O(4) — Further, every good of a part can be directed to the good of the whole, so that if it be not thus directed it would seem without use or purpose. But that which is in accordance with virtue cannot be so. Therefore it seems that there can be no act of any virtue, that does not belong to general justice, which directs to the common good; and so it seems that general justice is essentially the same as all virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 1) that “many are able to be virtuous in matters affecting themselves, but are unable to be virtuous in matters relating to others,” and (Polit. iii, 2) that “the virtue of the good man is not strictly the same as the virtue of the good citizen.” Now the virtue of a good citizen is general justice, whereby a man is directed to the common good. Therefore general justice is not the same as virtue in general, and it is possible to have one without the other.

I answer that, A thing is said to be “general” in two ways. First, by “predication”: thus “animal” is general in relation to man and horse and the like: and in this sense that which is general must needs be essentially the same as the things in relation to which it is general, for the reason that the genus belongs to the essence of the species, and forms part of its definition. Secondly a thing is said to be general “virtually”; thus a universal cause is general in relation to all its effects, the sun, for instance, in relation to all bodies that are illumined, or transmuted by its power; and

in this sense there is no need for that which is “general” to be essentially the same as those things in relation to which it is general, since cause and effect are not essentially the same. Now it is in the latter sense that, according to what has been said (**A(5)**), legal justice is said to be a general virtue, in as much, to wit, as it directs the acts of the other virtues to its own end, and this is to move all the other virtues by its command; for just as charity may be called a general virtue in so far as it directs the acts of all the virtues to the Divine good, so too is legal justice, in so far as it directs the acts of all the virtues to the common good. Accordingly, just as charity which regards the Divine good as its proper object, is a special virtue in respect of its essence, so too legal justice is a special virtue in respect of its essence, in so far as it regards the common good as its proper object. And thus it is in the sovereign principally and by way of a mastercraft, while it is secondarily and administratively in his subjects.

However the name of legal justice can be given to every virtue, in so far as every virtue is directed to the common good by the aforesaid legal justice, which though special essentially is nevertheless virtually general. Speaking in this way, legal justice is essentially the same as all virtue, but differs therefrom logically: and it is in this sense that the Philosopher speaks.

Wherefore the Replies to the First and Second Objections are manifest.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(6)-RO(3) — This argument again takes legal justice for the virtue commanded by legal justice.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(6)-RO(4) — Every virtue strictly speaking directs its act to that virtue’s proper end: that it should happen to be directed to a further end either always or sometimes, does not belong to that virtue considered strictly, for it needs some higher virtue to direct it to that end. Consequently there must be one supreme virtue essentially distinct from every other virtue, which directs all the virtues to the common good; and this virtue is legal justice.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(7)

Whether there is a particular besides a general justice?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that there is not a particular besides a general justice. For there is nothing superfluous in the virtues, as neither is there in nature. Now general justice directs man sufficiently in all his relations with other men. Therefore there is no need for a particular justice.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, the species of a virtue does not vary according to “one” and “many.” But legal justice directs one man to another in matters relating to the multitude, as shown above (**AA(5),6**). Therefore there is not another species of justice directing one man to another in matters relating to the individual.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, between the individual and the general public stands the household community. Consequently, if in addition to general justice there is a particular justice corresponding to the individual, for the same reason there should be a domestic justice directing man to the common good of a household: and yet this is not the case. Therefore neither should there be a particular besides a legal justice.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, Chrysostom in his commentary on ⁴¹⁰⁰Matthew 5:6, “Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice,” says (Hom. xv in Matth.): “By justice He signifies either the general virtue, or the particular virtue which is opposed to covetousness.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(7) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(6)**), legal justice is not essentially the same as every virtue, and besides legal justice which directs man immediately to the common good, there is a need for other virtues to direct him immediately in matters relating to particular goods: and these virtues may be relative to himself or to another individual person. Accordingly, just as in addition to legal justice there is a need for particular virtues to direct man in relation to himself, such as temperance and fortitude, so too besides legal justice there is need for particular justice to direct man in his relations to other individuals.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(7)-RO(1) — Legal justice does indeed direct man sufficiently in his relations towards others. As regards the common good it does so immediately, but as to the good of the individual, it does so mediately. Wherefore there is need for particular justice to direct a man immediately to the good of another individual.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(7)-RO(2) — The common good of the realm and the particular good of the individual differ not only in respect of the “many” and the “few,” but also under a formal aspect. For the aspect of the “common” good differs from the aspect of the “individual” good, even as the aspect of “whole” differs from that of “part.” Wherefore the Philosopher says (Polit. i, 1) that “they are wrong who maintain that the State and the home and the like differ only as many and few and not specifically.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(7)-RO(3) — The household community, according to the Philosopher (Polit. i, 2), differs in respect of a threefold fellowship; namely “of husband and wife, father and son, master and slave,” in each of which one person is, as it were, part of the other. Wherefore between such persons there is not justice simply, but a species of justice, viz. “domestic” justice, as stated in Ethic. v, 6.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(8)

Whether particular justice has a special matter?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that particular justice has no special matter. Because a gloss on ^{OLD}Genesis 2:14, “The fourth river is Euphrates,” says: “Euphrates signifies ‘fruitful’; nor is it stated through what country it flows, because justice pertains to all the parts of the soul.” Now this would not be the case, if justice had a special matter, since every special matter belongs to a special power. Therefore particular justice has no special matter.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, Augustine says (QQ. lxxxiii, qu. 61) that “the soul has four virtues whereby, in this life, it lives spiritually, viz. temperance, prudence, fortitude and justice;” and he says that “the fourth

is justice, which pervades all the virtues.” Therefore particular justice, which is one of the four cardinal virtues, has no special matter.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, justice directs man sufficiently in matters relating to others. Now a man can be directed to others in all matters relating to this life. Therefore the matter of justice is general and not special.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher reckons (Ethic. v, 2) particular justice to be specially about those things which belong to social life.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(8) — *I answer that*, Whatever can be rectified by reason is the matter of moral virtue, for this is defined in reference to right reason, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. ii, 6). Now the reason can rectify not only the internal passions of the soul, but also external actions, and also those external things of which man can make use. And yet it is in respect of external actions and external things by means of which men can communicate with one another, that the relation of one man to another is to be considered; whereas it is in respect of internal passions that we consider man’s rectitude in himself. Consequently, since justice is directed to others, it is not about the entire matter of moral virtue, but only about external actions and things, under a certain special aspect of the object, in so far as one man is related to another through them.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(8)-RO(1) — It is true that justice belongs essentially to one part of the soul, where it resides as in its subject; and this is the will which moves by its command all the other parts of the soul; and accordingly justice belongs to all the parts of the soul, not directly but by a kind of diffusion.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(8)-RO(2) — As stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(61)**, **AA(3),4**), the cardinal virtues may be taken in two ways: first as special virtues, each having a determinate matter; secondly, as certain general modes of virtue. In this latter sense Augustine speaks in the passage quoted: for he says that “prudence is knowledge of what we should seek and avoid, temperance is the curb on the lust for fleeting pleasures, fortitude is strength of mind in bearing with passing trials, justice is the love of God

and our neighbor which pervades the other virtues, that is to say, is the common principle of the entire order between one man and another.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(8)-RO(3) — A man’s internal passions which are a part of moral matter, are not in themselves directed to another man, which belongs to the specific nature of justice; yet their effects, i.e. external actions, are capable of being directed to another man. Consequently it does not follow that the matter of justice is general.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(9)

Whether justice is about the passions?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that justice is about the passions. For the Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 3) that “moral virtue is about pleasure and pain.” Now pleasure or delight, and pain are passions, as stated above [***P(2a), Q(23), A(4); P(2a), Q(31), A(1); P(2a), Q(35), A(1)**] when we were treating of the passions. Therefore justice, being a moral virtue, is about the passions.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, justice is the means of rectifying a man’s operations in relation to another man. Now such like operations cannot be rectified unless the passions be rectified, because it is owing to disorder of the passions that there is disorder in the aforesaid operations: thus sexual lust leads to adultery, and overmuch love of money leads to theft. Therefore justice must needs be about the passions.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, even as particular justice is towards another person so is legal justice. Now legal justice is about the passions, else it would not extend to all the virtues, some of which are evidently about the passions. Therefore justice is about the passions.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 1) that justice is about operations.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(9) — *I answer that*, The true answer to this question may be gathered from a twofold source. First from the subject of justice, i.e. from the will, whose movements or acts are not passions, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(22), A(3); P(2a), Q(59), A(4)**), for it is only the sensitive

appetite whose movements are called passions. Hence justice is not about the passions, as are temperance and fortitude, which are in the irascible and concupiscible parts. Secondly, on the part of the matter, because justice is about man's relations with another, and we are not directed immediately to another by the internal passions. Therefore justice is not about the passions.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(9)-RO(1) — Not every moral virtue is about pleasure and pain as its proper matter, since fortitude is about fear and daring: but every moral virtue is directed to pleasure and pain, as to ends to be acquired, for, as the Philosopher says (*Ethic.* vii, 11), “pleasure and pain are the principal end in respect of which we say that this is an evil, and that a good”: and in this way too they belong to justice, since “a man is not just unless he rejoice in just actions” (*Ethic.* i, 8).

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(9)-RO(2) — External operations are as it were between external things, which are their matter, and internal passions, which are their origin. Now it happens sometimes that there is a defect in one of these, without there being a defect in the other. Thus a man may steal another's property, not through the desire to have the thing, but through the will to hurt the man; or vice versa, a man may covet another's property without wishing to steal it. Accordingly the directing of operations in so far as they tend towards external things, belongs to justice, but in so far as they arise from the passions, it belongs to the other moral virtues which are about the passions. Hence justice hinders theft of another's property, in so far as stealing is contrary to the equality that should be maintained in external things, while liberality hinders it as resulting from an immoderate desire for wealth. Since, however, external operations take their species, not from the internal passions but from external things as being their objects, it follows that, external operations are essentially the matter of justice rather than of the other moral virtues.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(9)-RO(3) — The common good is the end of each individual member of a community, just as the good of the whole is the end of each part. On the other hand the good of one individual is not the end of another individual: wherefore legal justice which is directed to the common good, is more capable of extending to the internal passions whereby man is disposed in some way or other in himself, than particular justice which is

directed to the good of another individual: although legal justice extends chiefly to other virtues in the point of their external operations, in so far, to wit, as “the law commands us to perform the actions of a courageous person... the actions of a temperate person... and the actions of a gentle person” (Ethic. v, 5).

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(10)

Whether the mean of justice is the real mean?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that the mean of justice is not the real mean. For the generic nature remains entire in each species. Now moral virtue is defined (Ethic. ii, 6) to be “an elective habit which observes the mean fixed, in our regard, by reason.” Therefore justice observes the rational and not the real mean.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, in things that are good simply, there is neither excess nor defect, and consequently neither is there a mean; as is clearly the case with the virtues, according to Ethic. ii, 6. Now justice is about things that are good simply, as stated in Ethic. 5: Therefore justice does not observe the real mean.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, the reason why the other virtues are said to observe the rational and not the real mean, is because in their case the mean varies according to different persons, since what is too much for one is too little for another (Ethic. ii, 6). Now this is also the case in justice: for one who strikes a prince does not receive the same punishment as one who strikes a private individual. Therefore justice also observes, not the real, but the rational mean.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 6; v, 4) that the mean of justice is to be taken according to “arithmetical” proportion, so that it is the real mean.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(10) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(9)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(59)**, **A(4)**), the other moral virtues are chiefly concerned with the passions, the regulation of which is gauged entirely by a comparison with the very man who is the subject of those passions, in so far as his anger and desire are vested with their various due circumstances. Hence the mean in such like

virtues is measured not by the proportion of one thing to another, but merely by comparison with the virtuous man himself, so that with them the mean is only that which is fixed by reason in our regard.

On the other hand, the matter of justice is external operation, in so far as an operation or the thing used in that operation is duly proportionate to another person, wherefore the mean of justice consists in a certain proportion of equality between the external thing and the external person. Now equality is the real mean between greater and less, as stated in Metaph. x [*Didot ed., ix, 5; Cf. Ethic. v, 4]: wherefore justice observes the real mean.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(10)-RO(1) — This real mean is also the rational mean, wherefore justice satisfies the conditions of a moral virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(10)-RO(2) — We may speak of a thing being good simply in two ways. First a thing may be good in every way: thus the virtues are good; and there is neither mean nor extremes in things that are good simply in this sense. Secondly a thing is said to be good simply through being good absolutely i.e. in its nature, although it may become evil through being abused. Such are riches and honors; and in the like it is possible to find excess, deficiency and mean, as regards men who can use them well or ill: and it is in this sense that justice is about things that are good simply.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(10)-RO(3) — The injury inflicted bears a different proportion to a prince from that which it bears to a private person: wherefore each injury requires to be equalized by vengeance in a different way: and this implies a real and not merely a rational diversity.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(11)

Whether the act of justice is to render to each one his own?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(11)-O(1) — It would seem that the act of justice is not to render to each one his own. For Augustine (De Trin. xiv, 9) ascribes to justice the act of succoring the needy. Now in succoring the needy we give them what is not theirs but ours. Therefore the act of justice does not consist in rendering to each one his own.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(11)-O(2) — Further, Tully says (De Offic. i, 7) that “beneficence which we may call kindness or liberality, belongs to justice.” Now it pertains to liberality to give to another of one’s own, not of what is his. Therefore the act of justice does not consist in rendering to each one his own.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(11)-O(3) — Further, it belongs to justice not only to distribute things duly, but also to repress injurious actions, such as murder, adultery and so forth. But the rendering to each one of what is his seems to belong solely to the distribution of things. Therefore the act of justice is not sufficiently described by saying that it consists in rendering to each one his own.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(11) — *On the contrary*, Ambrose says (De Offic. i, 24): “It is justice that renders to each one what is his, and claims not another’s property; it disregards its own profit in order to preserve the common equity.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(11) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**AA(8),10**), the matter of justice is an external operation in so far as either it or the thing we use by it is made proportionate to some other person to whom we are related by justice. Now each man’s own is that which is due to him according to equality of proportion. Therefore the proper act of justice is nothing else than to render to each one his own.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(11)-RO(1) — Since justice is a cardinal virtue, other secondary virtues, such as mercy, liberality and the like are connected with it, as we shall state further on (**Q(80), A(1)**). Wherefore to succor the needy, which belongs to mercy or pity, and to be liberally beneficent, which pertains to liberality, are by a kind of reduction ascribed to justice as to their principal virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(11)-RO(1)

This suffices for the Reply to the Second Objection.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(11)-RO(3) — As the Philosopher states (Ethic. v, 4), in matters of justice, the name of “profit” is extended to whatever is excessive, and whatever is deficient is called “loss.” The reason for this is that justice is first of all and more commonly exercised in voluntary

interchanges of things, such as buying and selling, wherein those expressions are properly employed; and yet they are transferred to all other matters of justice. The same applies to the rendering to each one of what is his own.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(12)

Whether justice stands foremost among all moral virtues?

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(12)-O(1) — It would seem that justice does not stand foremost among all the moral virtues. Because it belongs to justice to render to each one what is his, whereas it belongs to liberality to give of one's own, and this is more virtuous. Therefore liberality is a greater virtue than justice.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(12)-O(2) — Further, nothing is adorned by a less excellent thing than itself. Now magnanimity is the ornament both of justice and of all the virtues, according to Ethic. iv, 3. Therefore magnanimity is more excellent than justice.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(12)-O(3) — Further, virtue is about that which is “difficult” and “good,” as stated in Ethic. ii, 3. But fortitude is about more difficult things than justice is, since it is about dangers of death, according to Ethic. iii, 6. Therefore fortitude is more excellent than justice.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(12) — *On the contrary*, Tully says (De Offic. i, 7): “Justice is the most resplendent of the virtues, and gives its name to a good man.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(12) — *I answer that*, If we speak of legal justice, it is evident that it stands foremost among all the moral virtues, for as much as the common good transcends the individual good of one person. In this sense the Philosopher declares (Ethic. v, 1) that “the most excellent of the virtues would seem to be justice, and more glorious than either the evening or the morning star.” But, even if we speak of particular justice, it excels the other moral virtues for two reasons. The first reason may be taken from the subject, because justice is in the more excellent part of the soul, viz. the rational appetite or will, whereas the other moral virtues are in the sensitive appetite, whereunto appertain the passions which are the matter

of the other moral virtues. The second reason is taken from the object, because the other virtues are commendable in respect of the sole good of the virtuous person himself, whereas justice is praiseworthy in respect of the virtuous person being well disposed towards another, so that justice is somewhat the good of another person, as stated in *Ethic. v, 1*. Hence the Philosopher says (*Rhet. i, 9*): “The greatest virtues must needs be those which are most profitable to other persons, because virtue is a faculty of doing good to others. For this reason the greatest honors are accorded the brave and the just, since bravery is useful to others in warfare, and justice is useful to others both in warfare and in time of peace.”

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(12)-RO(1) — Although the liberal man gives of his own, yet he does so in so far as he takes into consideration the good of his own virtue, while the just man gives to another what is his, through consideration of the common good. Moreover justice is observed towards all, whereas liberality cannot extend to all. Again liberality which gives of a man’s own is based on justice, whereby one renders to each man what is his.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(12)-RO(2) — When magnanimity is added to justice it increases the latter’s goodness; and yet without justice it would not even be a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(58)-A(12)-RO(3) — Although fortitude is about the most difficult things, it is not about the best, for it is only useful in warfare, whereas justice is useful both in war and in peace, as stated above.

QUESTION 59

OF INJUSTICE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider injustice, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether injustice is a special vice?
- (2) Whether it is proper to the unjust man to do unjust deeds?
- (3) Whether one can suffer injustice willingly?
- (4) Whether injustice is a mortal sin according to its genus?

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(1)

Whether injustice is a special virtue?

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that injustice is not a special vice. For it is written (¹ John 3:4): “All sin is iniquity [*Vulg.: ‘Whosoever committeth sin, committeth also iniquity; and sin is iniquity’].” Now iniquity would seem to be the same as injustice, because justice is a kind of equality, so that injustice is apparently the same as inequality or iniquity. Therefore injustice is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, no special sin is contrary to all the virtues. But injustice is contrary to all the virtues: for as regards adultery it is opposed to chastity, as regards murder it is opposed to meekness, and in like manner as regards the other sins. Therefore injustice is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, injustice is opposed to justice which is in the will. But every sin is in the will, as Augustine declares (De Duabus Anim. x). Therefore injustice is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Injustice is contrary to justice. But justice is a special virtue. Therefore injustice is a special vice.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Injustice is twofold. First there is illegal injustice which is opposed to legal justice: and this is essentially a special vice, in so far as it regards a special object, namely the common good which it contemns; and yet it is a general vice, as regards the intention, since contempt of the common good may lead to all kinds of sin. Thus too all vices, as being repugnant to the common good, have the character of injustice, as though they arose from injustice, in accord with what has been said above about justice (**Q(58)**, **AA(5),6**). Secondly we speak of injustice in reference to an inequality between one person and another, when one man wishes to have more goods, riches for example, or honors, and less evils, such as toil and losses, and thus injustice has a special matter and is a particular vice opposed to particular justice.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(1)-RO(1) — Even as legal justice is referred to human common good, so Divine justice is referred to the Divine good, to which all sin is repugnant, and in this sense all sin is said to be iniquity.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(1)-RO(2) — Even particular justice is indirectly opposed to all the virtues; in so far, to wit, as even external acts pertain both to justice and to the other moral virtues, although in different ways as stated above (**Q(58)**, **A(9)**, ad 2).

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(1)-RO(3) — The will, like the reason, extends to all moral matters, i.e. passions and those external operations that relate to another person. On the other hand justice perfects the will solely in the point of its extending to operations that relate to another: and the same applies to injustice.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(2)

***Whether a man is called unjust
through doing an unjust thing?***

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that a man is called unjust through doing an unjust thing. For habits are specified by their objects, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(54)**, **A(2)**). Now the proper object of justice is the

just, and the proper object of injustice is the unjust. Therefore a man should be called just through doing a just thing, and unjust through doing an unjust thing.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the Philosopher declares (Ethic. v, 9) that they hold a false opinion who maintain that it is in a man's power to do suddenly an unjust thing, and that a just man is no less capable of doing what is unjust than an unjust man. But this opinion would not be false unless it were proper to the unjust man to do what is unjust. Therefore a man is to be deemed unjust from the fact that he does an unjust thing.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, every virtue bears the same relation to its proper act, and the same applies to the contrary vices. But whoever does what is intemperate, is said to be intemperate. Therefore whoever does an unjust thing, is said to be unjust.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 6) that "a man may do an unjust thing without being unjust."

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Even as the object of justice is something equal in external things, so too the object of injustice is something unequal, through more or less being assigned to some person than is due to him. To this object the habit of injustice is compared by means of its proper act which is called an injustice. Accordingly it may happen in two ways that a man who does an unjust thing, is not unjust: first, on account of a lack of correspondence between the operation and its proper object. For the operation takes its species and name from its direct and not from its indirect object: and in things directed to an end the direct is that which is intended, and the indirect is what is beside the intention. Hence if a man do that which is unjust, without intending to do an unjust thing, for instance if he do it through ignorance, being unaware that it is unjust, properly speaking he does an unjust thing, not directly, but only indirectly, and, as it were, doing materially that which is unjust: hence such an operation is not called an injustice. Secondly, this may happen on account of a lack of proportion between the operation and the habit. For an injustice may sometimes arise from a passion, for instance, anger or desire, and sometimes from choice, for instance when the injustice itself is the direct object of one's complacency. In the latter case properly speaking it arises from a habit, because whenever a man has a habit,

whatever befits that habit is, of itself, pleasant to him. Accordingly, to do what is unjust intentionally and by choice is proper to the unjust man, in which sense the unjust man is one who has the habit of injustice: but a man may do what is unjust, unintentionally or through passion, without having the habit of injustice.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(2)-RO(1) — A habit is specified by its object in its direct and formal acceptance, not in its material and indirect acceptance.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(2)-RO(2) — It is not easy for any man to do an unjust thing from choice, as though it were pleasing for its own sake and not for the sake of something else: this is proper to one who has the habit, as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. v, 9).

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(2)-RO(3) — The object of temperance is not something established externally, as is the object of justice: the object of temperance, i.e. the temperate thing, depends entirely on proportion to the man himself. Consequently what is accidental and unintentional cannot be said to be temperate either materially or formally. In like manner neither can it be called intemperate: and in this respect there is dissimilarity between justice and the other moral virtues; but as regards the proportion between operation and habit, there is similarity in all respects.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(3)

Whether we can suffer injustice willingly?

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that one can suffer injustice willingly. For injustice is inequality, as stated above (**A(2)**). Now a man by injuring himself, departs from equality, even as by injuring another. Therefore a man can do an injustice to himself, even as to another. But whoever does himself an injustice, does so involuntarily. Therefore a man can voluntarily suffer injustice especially if it be inflicted by himself.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, no man is punished by the civil law, except for having committed some injustice. Now suicides were formerly punished according to the law of the state by being deprived of an honorable burial, as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. v, 11). Therefore a

man can do himself an injustice, and consequently it may happen that a man suffers injustice voluntarily.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, no man does an injustice save to one who suffers that injustice. But it may happen that a man does an injustice to one who wishes it, for instance if he sell him a thing for more than it is worth. Therefore a man may happen to suffer an injustice voluntarily.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, To suffer an injustice and to do an injustice are contraries. Now no man does an injustice against his will. Therefore on the other hand no man suffers an injustice except against his will.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Action by its very nature proceeds from an agent, whereas passion as such is from another: wherefore the same thing in the same respect cannot be both agent and patient, as stated in Phys. iii, 1; viii, 5. Now the proper principle of action in man is the will, wherefore man does properly and essentially what he does voluntarily, and on the other hand a man suffers properly what he suffers against his will, since in so far as he is willing, he is a principle in himself, and so, considered thus, he is active rather than passive. Accordingly we must conclude that properly and strictly speaking no man can do an injustice except voluntarily, nor suffer an injustice save involuntarily; but that accidentally and materially so to speak, it is possible for that which is unjust in itself either to be done involuntarily (as when a man does anything unintentionally), or to be suffered voluntarily (as when a man voluntarily gives to another more than he owes him).

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(3)-RO(1) — When one man gives voluntarily to another that which he does not owe him, he causes neither injustice nor inequality. For a man's ownership depends on his will, so there is no disproportion if he forfeit something of his own free-will, either by his own or by another's action.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(3)-RO(2) — An individual person may be considered in two ways. First, with regard to himself; and thus, if he inflict an injury on himself, it may come under the head of some other kind of sin, intemperance for instance or imprudence, but not injustice; because injustice no less than justice, is always referred to another person.

Secondly, this or that man may be considered as belonging to the State as part thereof, or as belonging to God, as His creature and image; and thus a man who kills himself, does an injury not indeed to himself, but to the State and to God. Wherefore he is punished in accordance with both Divine and human law, even as the Apostle declares in respect of the fornicator (~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 3:17):

“If any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy.”

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(3)-RO(3) — Suffering is the effect of external action. Now in the point of doing and suffering injustice, the material element is that which is done externally, considered in itself, as stated above (**A(2)**), and the formal and essential element is on the part of the will of agent and patient, as stated above (**A(2)**). Accordingly we must reply that injustice suffered by one man and injustice done by another man always accompany one another, in the material sense. But if we speak in the formal sense a man can do an injustice with the intention of doing an injustice, and yet the other man does not suffer an injustice, because he suffers voluntarily; and on the other hand a man can suffer an injustice if he suffer an injustice against his will, while the man who does the injury unknowingly, does an injustice, not formally but only materially.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(4)

Whether whoever does an injustice sins mortally?

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that not everyone who does an injustice sins mortally. For venial sin is opposed to mortal sin. Now it is sometimes a venial sin to do an injury: for the Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 8) in reference to those who act unjustly: “Whatever they do not merely in ignorance but through ignorance is a venial matter.” Therefore not everyone that does an injustice sins mortally.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, he who does an injustice in a small matter, departs but slightly from the mean. Now this seems to be insignificant and should be accounted among the least of evils, as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. ii, 9). Therefore not everyone that does an injustice sins mortally.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, charity is the “mother of all the virtues” [*Peter Lombard, Sent. iii, D. 23], and it is through being contrary thereto that a sin is called mortal. But not all the sins contrary to the other virtues are mortal. Therefore neither is it always a mortal sin to do an injustice.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Whatever is contrary to the law of God is a mortal sin. Now whoever does an injustice does that which is contrary to the law of God, since it amounts either to theft, or to adultery, or to murder, or to something of the kind, as will be shown further on (**Q(64)**, seq.). Therefore whoever does an injustice sins mortally.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(12)**, **A(5)**), when we were treating of the distinction of sins, a mortal sin is one that is contrary to charity which gives life to the soul. Now every injury inflicted on another person is of itself contrary to charity, which moves us to will the good of another. And so since injustice always consists in an injury inflicted on another person, it is evident that to do an injustice is a mortal sin according to its genus.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(4)-RO(1) — This saying of the Philosopher is to be understood as referring to ignorance of fact, which he calls “ignorance of particular circumstances” [*Ethic. iii, 1], and which deserves pardon, and not to ignorance of the law which does not excuse: and he who does an injustice through ignorance, does no injustice except accidentally, as stated above (**A(2)**)

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(4)-RO(2) — He who does an injustice in small matters falls short of the perfection on an unjust deed, in so far as what he does may be deemed not altogether contrary to the will of the person who suffers therefrom: for instance, if a man take an apple or some such thing from another man, in which case it is probable that the latter is not hurt or displeased.

P(2b)-Q(59)-A(4)-RO(3) — The sins which are contrary to the other virtues are not always hurtful to another person, but imply a disorder affecting human passions; hence there is no comparison.

QUESTION 60

OF JUDGMENT

(SIX ARTICLES)

In due sequence we must consider judgment, under which head there are six points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether judgment is an act of justice?
- (2) Whether it is lawful to judge?
- (3) Whether judgment should be based on suspicions?
- (4) Whether doubts should be interpreted favorably?
- (5) Whether judgment should always be given according to the written law?
- (6) Whether judgment is perverted by being usurped?

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(1)

Whether judgment is an act of justice?

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that judgment is not an act of justice. The Philosopher says (Ethic. i, 3) that “everyone judges well of what he knows,” so that judgment would seem to belong to the cognitive faculty. Now the cognitive faculty is perfected by prudence. Therefore judgment belongs to prudence rather than to justice, which is in the will, as stated above (**Q(58), A(4)**).

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the Apostle says (~~1~~¹ 1 Corinthians 2:15): “The spiritual man judgeth all things.” Now man is made spiritual chiefly by the virtue of charity, which “is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost Who is given to us” (~~1~~¹ Romans 5:5). Therefore judgment belongs to charity rather than to justice.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, it belongs to every virtue to judge aright of its proper matter, because “the virtuous man is the rule and measure in everything,” according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iii, 4). Therefore judgment does not belong to justice any more than to the other moral virtues.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, judgment would seem to belong only to judges. But the act of justice is to be found in every just man. Since then judges are not the only just men, it seems that judgment is not the proper act of justice.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 93:15):

“Until justice be turned into judgment.”

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Judgment properly denotes the act of a judge as such. Now a judge [judex] is so called because he asserts the right [jus dicens] and right is the object of justice, as stated above (**Q(57), A(1)**). Consequently the original meaning of the word “judgment” is a statement or decision of the just or right. Now to decide rightly about virtuous deeds proceeds, properly speaking, from the virtuous habit; thus a chaste person decides rightly about matters relating to chastity. Therefore judgment, which denotes a right decision about what is just, belongs properly to justice. For this reason the Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 4) that “men have recourse to a judge as to one who is the personification of justice.”

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(1)-RO(1) — The word “judgment,” from its original meaning of a right decision about what is just, has been extended to signify a right decision in any matter whether speculative or practical. Now a right judgment in any matter requires two things. The first is the virtue itself that pronounces judgment: and in this way, judgment is an act of reason, because it belongs to the reason to pronounce or define. The other is the disposition of the one who judges, on which depends his aptness for judging aright. In this way, in matters of justice, judgment proceeds from justice, even as in matters of fortitude, it proceeds from fortitude. Accordingly judgment is an act of justice in so far as justice inclines one to judge aright, and of prudence in so far as prudence pronounces judgment: wherefore {synesis} (judging well according to common law) which

belongs to prudence is said to “judge rightly,” as stated above (**Q(51), A(3)**).

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(1)-RO(2) — The spiritual man, by reason of the habit of charity, has an inclination to judge aright of all things according to the Divine rules; and it is in conformity with these that he pronounces judgment through the gift of wisdom: even as the just man pronounces judgment through the virtue of prudence conformably with the ruling of the law.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(1)-RO(3) — The other virtues regulate man in himself, whereas justice regulates man in his dealings with others, as shown above (**Q(58), A(2)**). Now man is master in things concerning himself, but not in matters relating to others. Consequently where the other virtues are in question, there is no need for judgment other than that of a virtuous man, taking judgment in its broader sense, as explained above (ad 1). But in matters of justice, there is further need for the judgment of a superior, who is “able to reprove both, and to put his hand between both” [⁴⁰⁰³* Job 9:33]. Hence judgment belongs more specifically to justice than to any other virtue.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(1)-RO(4) — Justice is in the sovereign as a master-virtue [⁴⁰⁰⁴*Cf. **Q(58), A(6)**], commanding and prescribing what is just; while it is in the subjects as an executive and administrative virtue. Hence judgment, which denotes a decision of what is just, belongs to justice, considered as existing chiefly in one who has authority.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(2)

Whether it is lawful to judge?

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful to judge. For nothing is punished except what is unlawful. Now those who judge are threatened with punishment, which those who judge not will escape, according to ⁴⁰⁰⁵Matthew 7:1, “Judge not, and ye shall not be judged.” Therefore it is unlawful to judge.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, it is written (⁴⁰⁰⁶Romans 14:4):

“Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant. To his own lord
he standeth or falleth.”

Now God is the Lord of all. Therefore to no man is it lawful to judge.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, no man is sinless, according to ~~600~~1 John 1:8, “If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves.” Now it is unlawful for a sinner to judge, according to ~~601~~Romans 2:1, “Thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art, that judgest; for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself, for thou dost the same things which thou judgest.” Therefore to no man is it lawful to judge.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~602~~Deuteronomy 16:18):

“Thou shalt appoint judges and magistrates in all thy gates... that
they may judge the people with just judgment.”

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Judgment is lawful in so far as it is an act of justice. Now it follows from what has been stated above (**A(1)**, ad 1,3) that three conditions are requisite for a judgment to be an act of justice: first, that it proceed from the inclination of justice; secondly, that it come from one who is in authority; thirdly, that it be pronounced according to the right ruling of prudence. If any one of these be lacking, the judgment will be faulty and unlawful. First, when it is contrary to the rectitude of justice, and then it is called “perverted” or “unjust”: secondly, when a man judges about matters wherein he has no authority, and this is called judgment “by usurpation”: thirdly, when the reason lacks certainty, as when a man, without any solid motive, forms a judgment on some doubtful or hidden matter, and then it is called judgment by “suspicion” or “rash” judgment.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(2)-RO(1) — In these words our Lord forbids rash judgment which is about the inward intention, or other uncertain things, as Augustine states (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 18). Or else He forbids judgment about Divine things, which we ought not to judge, but simply believe, since they are above us, as Hilary declares in his commentary on Matthew 5. Or again according to Chrysostom [*Hom. xvii in Matth. in the Opus Imperfectum falsely ascribed to St. John of the Cross], He

forbids the judgment which proceeds not from benevolence but from bitterness of heart.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(2)-RO(2) — A judge is appointed as God's servant; wherefore it is written (^{CR16}Deuteronomy 1:16): "Judge that which is just," and further on (^{CR17}Deuteronomy 1:17), "because it is the judgment of God."

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(2)-RO(3) — Those who stand guilty of grievous sins should not judge those who are guilty of the same or lesser sins, as Chrysostom [*Hom. xxiv] says on the words of ^{CR18}Matthew 7:1, "Judge not." Above all does this hold when such sins are public, because there would be an occasion of scandal arising in the hearts of others. If however they are not public but hidden, and there be an urgent necessity for the judge to pronounce judgment, because it is his duty, he can reprove or judge with humility and fear. Hence Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 19): "If we find that we are guilty of the same sin as another man, we should groan together with him, and invite him to strive against it together with us." And yet it is not through acting thus that a man condemns himself so as to deserve to be condemned once again, but when, in condemning another, he shows himself to be equally deserving of condemnation on account of another or a like sin.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(3)

Whether it is unlawful to form a judgment from suspicions?

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not unlawful to form a judgment from suspicions. For suspicion is seemingly an uncertain opinion about an evil, wherefore the Philosopher states (Ethic. vi, 3) that suspicion is about both the true and the false. Now it is impossible to have any but an uncertain opinion about contingent singulars. Since then human judgment is about human acts, which are about singular and contingent matters, it seems that no judgment would be lawful, if it were not lawful to judge from suspicions.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, a man does his neighbor an injury by judging him unlawfully. But an evil suspicion consists in nothing more

than a man's opinion, and consequently does not seem to pertain to the injury of another man. Therefore judgment based on suspicion is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, if it is unlawful, it must needs be reducible to an injustice, since judgment is an act of justice, as stated above (**A(1)**). Now an injustice is always a mortal sin according to its genus, as stated above (**Q(59), A(4)**). Therefore a judgment based on suspicion would always be a mortal sin, if it were unlawful. But this is false, because “we cannot avoid suspicions,” according to a gloss of Augustine (Tract. xc in Joan.) on ~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 4:5, “Judge not before the time.” Therefore a judgment based on suspicion would seem not to be unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Chrysostom [*Hom. xvii in Matth. in the Opus Imperfectum falsely ascribed to St. John of the Cross] in comment on the words of ~~100~~ Matthew 7:1, “Judge not,” etc., says: “By this commandment our Lord does not forbid Christians to reprove others from kindly motives, but that Christian should despise Christian by boasting his own righteousness, by hating and condemning others for the most part on mere suspicion.”

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As Tully says (De Invent. Rhet. ii), suspicion denotes evil thinking based on slight indications, and this is due to three causes. First, from a man being evil in himself, and from this very fact, as though conscious of his own wickedness, he is prone to think evil of others, according to ~~200~~ Ecclesiastes 10:3,

“The fool when he walketh in the way, whereas he himself is a
fool, esteemeth all men fools.”

Secondly, this is due to a man being ill-disposed towards another: for when a man hates or despises another, or is angry with or envious of him, he is led by slight indications to think evil of him, because everyone easily believes what he desires. Thirdly, this is due to long experience: wherefore the Philosopher says (Rhet. ii, 13) that “old people are very suspicious, for they have often experienced the faults of others.” The first two causes of suspicion evidently connote perversity of the affections, while the third diminishes the nature of suspicion, in as much as experience leads to certainty which is contrary to the nature of suspicion. Consequently

suspicion denotes a certain amount of vice, and the further it goes, the more vicious it is.

Now there are three degrees of suspicion. The first degree is when a man begins to doubt of another's goodness from slight indications. This is a venial and a light sin; for "it belongs to human temptation without which no man can go through this life," according to a gloss on ~~408~~ 1 Corinthians 4:5, "Judge not before the time." The second degree is when a man, from slight indications, esteems another man's wickedness as certain. This is a mortal sin, if it be about a grave matter, since it cannot be without contempt of one's neighbor. Hence the same gloss goes on to say: "If then we cannot avoid suspicions, because we are human, we must nevertheless restrain our judgment, and refrain from forming a definite and fixed opinion." The third degree is when a judge goes so far as to condemn a man on suspicion: this pertains directly to injustice, and consequently is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(3)-RO(1) — Some kind of certainty is found in human acts, not indeed the certainty of a demonstration, but such as is befitting the matter in point, for instance when a thing is proved by suitable witnesses.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(3)-RO(2) — From the very fact that a man thinks evil of another without sufficient cause, he despises him unduly, and therefore does him an injury.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(3)-RO(3) — Since justice and injustice are about external operations, as stated above (**Q(58), AA(8),10,11; Q(59), A(1)**, ad 3), the judgment of suspicion pertains directly to injustice when it is betrayed by external action, and then it is a mortal sin, as stated above. The internal judgment pertains to justice, in so far as it is related to the external judgment, even as the internal to the external act, for instance as desire is related to fornication, or anger to murder.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(4)

Whether doubts should be interpreted for the best?

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that doubts should not be interpreted for the best. Because we should judge from what happens for the most part. But it happens for the most part that evil is done, since “the number of fools is infinite” (²⁰¹⁵Ecclesiastes 1:15), “for the imagination and thought of man’s heart are prone to evil from his youth” (¹⁰⁰²Genesis 8:21). Therefore doubts should be interpreted for the worst rather than for the best.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 27) that “he leads a godly and just life who is sound in his estimate of things, and turns neither to this side nor to that.” Now he who interprets a doubtful point for the best, turns to one side. Therefore this should not be done.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, man should love his neighbor as himself. Now with regard to himself, a man should interpret doubtful matters for the worst, according to ⁸³²⁸Job 9:28, “I feared all my works.” Therefore it seems that doubtful matters affecting one’s neighbor should be interpreted for the worst.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on ⁶¹⁴⁸Romans 14:3,

“He that eateth not, let him not judge him that eateth,” says:
“Doubts should be interpreted in the best sense.”

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (A(3), ad 2), things from the very fact that a man thinks ill of another without sufficient cause, he injures and despises him. Now no man ought to despise or in any way injure another man without urgent cause: and, consequently, unless we have evident indications of a person’s wickedness, we ought to deem him good, by interpreting for the best whatever is doubtful about him.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(4)-RO(1) — He who interprets doubtful matters for the best, may happen to be deceived more often than not; yet it is better to err frequently through thinking well of a wicked man, than to err less

frequently through having an evil opinion of a good man, because in the latter case an injury is inflicted, but not in the former.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(4)-RO(2) — It is one thing to judge of things and another to judge of men. For when we judge of things, there is no question of the good or evil of the thing about which we are judging, since it will take no harm no matter what kind of judgment we form about it; but there is question of the good of the person who judges, if he judge truly, and of his evil if he judge falsely because “the true is the good of the intellect, and the false is its evil,” as stated in *Ethic. vi, 2*, wherefore everyone should strive to make his judgment accord with things as they are. On the other hand when we judge of men, the good and evil in our judgment is considered chiefly on the part of the person about whom judgment is being formed; for he is deemed worthy of honor from the very fact that he is judged to be good, and deserving of contempt if he is judged to be evil. For this reason we ought, in this kind of judgment, to aim at judging a man good, unless there is evident proof of the contrary. And though we may judge falsely, our judgment in thinking well of another pertains to our good feeling and not to the evil of the intellect, even as neither does it pertain to the intellect’s perfection to know the truth of contingent singulars in themselves.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(4)-RO(3) — One may interpret something for the worst or for the best in two ways. First, by a kind of supposition; and thus, when we have to apply a remedy to some evil, whether our own or another’s, in order for the remedy to be applied with greater certainty of a cure, it is expedient to take the worst for granted, since if a remedy be efficacious against a worse evil, much more is it efficacious against a lesser evil. Secondly we may interpret something for the best or for the worst, by deciding or determining, and in this case when judging of things we should try to interpret each thing according as it is, and when judging of persons, to interpret things for the best as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(5)

Whether we should always judge according to the written law?

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that we ought not always to judge according to the written law. For we ought always to avoid judging unjustly. But written laws sometimes contain injustice, according to ²⁰⁰¹Isaiah 10:1,

“Woe to them that make wicked laws,
and when they write, write injustice.”

Therefore we ought not always to judge according to the written law.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, judgment has to be formed about individual happenings. But no written law can cover each and every individual happening, as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. v, 10). Therefore it seems that we are not always bound to judge according to the written law.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, a law is written in order that the lawgiver’s intention may be made clear. But it happens sometimes that even if the lawgiver himself were present he would judge otherwise. Therefore we ought not always to judge according to the written law.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Vera Relig. xxxi): “In these earthly laws, though men judge about them when they are making them, when once they are established and passed, the judges may judge no longer of them, but according to them.”

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), judgment is nothing else but a decision or determination of what is just. Now a thing becomes just in two ways: first by the very nature of the case, and this is called “natural right,” secondly by some agreement between men, and this is called “positive right,” as stated above (**Q(57)**, **A(2)**). Now laws are written for the purpose of manifesting both these rights, but in different ways. For the written law does indeed contain natural right, but it does not establish it, for the latter derives its force, not from the law but from

nature: whereas the written law both contains positive right, and establishes it by giving it force of authority.

Hence it is necessary to judge according to the written law, else judgment would fall short either of the natural or of the positive right.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(5)-RO(1) — Just as the written law does not give force to the natural right, so neither can it diminish or annul its force, because neither can man's will change nature. Hence if the written law contains anything contrary to the natural right, it is unjust and has no binding force. For positive right has no place except where "it matters not," according to the natural right, "whether a thing be done in one way or in another"; as stated above (**Q(57), A(2)**, ad 2). Wherefore such documents are to be called, not laws, but rather corruptions of law, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(95), A(2)**): and consequently judgment should not be delivered according to them.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(5)-RO(2) — Even as unjust laws by their very nature are, either always or for the most part, contrary to the natural right, so too laws that are rightly established, fail in some cases, when if they were observed they would be contrary to the natural right. Wherefore in such cases judgment should be delivered, not according to the letter of the law, but according to equity which the lawgiver has in view. Hence the jurist says [*Digest. i, 3; De leg. senatusque consult. 25]: "By no reason of law, or favor of equity, is it allowable for us to interpret harshly, and render burdensome, those useful measures which have been enacted for the welfare of man." In such cases even the lawgiver himself would decide otherwise; and if he had foreseen the case, he might have provided for it by law.

This suffices for the Reply to the Third Objection.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(6)

Whether judgment is rendered perverse by being usurped?

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that judgment is not rendered perverse by being usurped. For justice is rectitude in matters of action. Now truth is not impaired, no matter who tells it, but it may suffer from

the person who ought to accept it. Therefore again justice loses nothing, no matter who declares what is just, and this is what is meant by judgment.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, it belongs to judgment to punish sins. Now it is related to the praise of some that they punished sins without having authority over those whom they punished; such as Moses in slaying the Egyptian (^{<1107>}Exodus 2:12), and Phinees the son of Eleazar in slaying Zambri the son of Salu (^{<0210>}Numbers 25:7-14), and “it was reputed to him unto justice” (^{<0458>}Psalms 105:31). Therefore usurpation of judgment pertains not to injustice.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, spiritual power is distinct from temporal. Now prelates having spiritual power sometimes interfere in matters concerning the secular power. Therefore usurped judgment is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(6)-O(4) — Further, even as the judge requires authority in order to judge aright, so also does he need justice and knowledge, as shown above (**A(1)**, ad 1,3; **A(2)**). But a judgment is not described as unjust, if he who judges lacks the habit of justice or the knowledge of the law. Neither therefore is it always unjust to judge by usurpation, i.e. without authority.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<610>}Romans 14:4):

“Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant?”

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(6) — *I answer that*, Since judgment should be pronounced according to the written law, as stated above (**A(5)**), he that pronounces judgment, interprets, in a way, the letter of the law, by applying it to some particular case. Now since it belongs to the same authority to interpret and to make a law, just as a law cannot be made save by public authority, so neither can a judgment be pronounced except by public authority, which extends over those who are subject to the community. Wherefore even as it would be unjust for one man to force another to observe a law that was not approved by public authority, so too it is unjust, if a man compels another to submit to a judgment that is pronounced by other than the public authority.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(6)-RO(1) — When the truth is declared there is no obligation to accept it, and each one is free to receive it or not, as he

wishes. On the other hand judgment implies an obligation, wherefore it is unjust for anyone to be judged by one who has no public authority.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(6)-RO(2) — Moses seems to have slain the Egyptian by authority received as it were, by divine inspiration; this seems to follow from ~~417b~~ Acts 7:24, 25, where it is said that “striking the Egyptian... he thought that his brethren understood that God by his hand would save Israel [Vulg.: ‘them’].” Or it may be replied that Moses slew the Egyptian in order to defend the man who was unjustly attacked, without himself exceeding the limits of a blameless defence. Wherefore Ambrose says (De Offic. i, 36) that “whoever does not ward off a blow from a fellow man when he can, is as much in fault as the striker”; and he quotes the example of Moses. Again we may reply with Augustine (QQ. Exodus qu. 2) [*Cf. Contra Faust. xxii, 70] that just as “the soil gives proof of its fertility by producing useless herbs before the useful seeds have grown, so this deed of Moses was sinful although it gave a sign of great fertility,” in so far, to wit, as it was a sign of the power whereby he was to deliver his people.

With regard to Phinees the reply is that he did this out of zeal for God by Divine inspiration; or because though not as yet high-priest, he was nevertheless the high-priest’s son, and this judgment was his concern as of the other judges, to whom this was commanded [*~~422b~~ Exodus 22:20; ~~431b~~ Leviticus 20; ~~433b~~ Deuteronomy 13,17].

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(6)-RO(3) — The secular power is subject to the spiritual, even as the body is subject to the soul. Consequently the judgment is not usurped if the spiritual authority interferes in those temporal matters that are subject to the spiritual authority or which have been committed to the spiritual by the temporal authority.

P(2b)-Q(60)-A(6)-RO(4) — The habits of knowledge and justice are perfections of the individual, and consequently their absence does not make a judgment to be usurped, as in the absence of public authority which gives a judgment its coercive force.

QUESTION 61**OF THE PARTS OF JUSTICE****(FOUR ARTICLES)**

We must now consider the parts of justice;

- (1) the subjective parts, which are the species of justice, i.e. distributive and commutative justice;
- (2) the quasi-integral parts;
- (3) the quasi-potential parts, i.e. the virtues connected with justice.

The first consideration will be twofold:

- (1) The parts of justice;
- (2) their opposite vices.

And since restitution would seem to be an act of commutative justice, we must consider

- (1) the distinction between commutative and distributive justice;
- (2) restitution.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether there are two species of justice, viz. distributive and commutative?
- (2) Whether in either case the mean is take in the same way?
- (3) Whether their matter is uniform or manifold?
- (4) Whether in any of these species the just is the same as counter-passion?

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1)

Whether two species of justice are suitably assigned, viz. commutative and distributive?

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that the two species of justice are unsuitably assigned, viz. distributive and commutative. That which is hurtful to the many cannot be a species of justice, since justice is directed to the common good. Now it is hurtful to the common good of the many, if the goods of the community are distributed among many, both because the goods of the community would be exhausted, and because the morals of men would be corrupted. For Tully says (De Offic. ii, 15): “He who receives becomes worse, and the more ready to expect that he will receive again.” Therefore distribution does not belong to any species of justice.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the act of justice is to render to each one what is his own, as stated above (**Q(58), A(2)**). But when things are distributed, a man does not receive what was his, but becomes possessed of something which belonged to the community. Therefore this does not pertain to justice.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, justice is not only in the sovereign, but also in the subject, as stated above (**Q(58), A(6)**). But it belongs exclusively to the sovereign to distribute. Therefore distribution does not always belong to justice.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, “Distributive justice regards common goods” (Ethic. v, 4). Now matters regarding the community pertain to legal justice. Therefore distributive justice is a part, not of particular, but of legal justice.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, unity or multitude do not change the species of a virtue. Now commutative justice consists in rendering something to one person, while distributive justice consists in giving something to many. Therefore they are not different species of justice.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher assigns two parts to justice and says (Ethic. v, 2) that “one directs distributions, the other, commutations.”

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(58)**, **AA(7),8**), particular justice is directed to the private individual, who is compared to the community as a part to the whole. Now a twofold order may be considered in relation to a part. In the first place there is the order of one part to another, to which corresponds the order of one private individual to another. This order is directed by commutative justice, which is concerned about the mutual dealings between two persons. In the second place there is the order of the whole towards the parts, to which corresponds the order of that which belongs to the community in relation to each single person. This order is directed by distributive justice, which distributes common goods proportionately. Hence there are two species of justice, distributive and commutative.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1)-RO(1) — Just as a private individual is praised for moderation in his bounty, and blamed for excess therein, so too ought moderation to be observed in the distribution of common goods, wherein distributive justice directs.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1)-RO(2) — Even as part and whole are somewhat the same, so too that which pertains to the whole, pertains somewhat to the part also: so that when the goods of the community are distributed among a number of individuals each one receives that which, in a way, is his own.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1)-RO(3) — The act of distributing the goods of the community, belongs to none but those who exercise authority over those goods; and yet distributive justice is also in the subjects to whom those goods are distributed in so far as they are contented by a just distribution. Moreover distribution of common goods is sometimes made not to the state but to the members of a family, and such distribution can be made by authority of a private individual.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1)-RO(4) — Movement takes its species from the term “whereunto.” Hence it belongs to legal justice to direct to the common good those matters which concern private individuals: whereas on the contrary it belongs to particular justice to direct the common good to particular individuals by way of distribution.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(1)-RO(5) — Distributive and commutative justice differ not only in respect of unity and multitude, but also in respect of different

kinds of due: because common property is due to an individual in one way, and his personal property in another way.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(2)

Whether the mean is to be observed in the same way in distributive as in commutative justice?

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the mean in distributive justice is to be observed in the same way as in commutative justice. For each of these is a kind of particular justice, as stated above (**A(1)**). Now the mean is taken in the same way in all the parts of temperance or fortitude. Therefore the mean should also be observed in the same way in both distributive and commutative justice.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the form of a moral virtue consists in observing the mean which is determined in accordance with reason. Since, then, one virtue has one form, it seems that the mean for both should be the same.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, in order to observe the mean in distributive justice we have to consider the various deserts of persons. Now a person's deserts are considered also in commutative justice, for instance, in punishments; thus a man who strikes a prince is punished more than one who strikes a private individual. Therefore the mean is observed in the same way in both kinds of justice.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 3,4) that the mean in distributive justice is observed according to "geometrical proportion," whereas in commutative justice it follows "arithmetical proportion."

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), in distributive justice something is given to a private individual, in so far as what belongs to the whole is due to the part, and in a quantity that is proportionate to the importance of the position of that part in respect of the whole. Consequently in distributive justice a person receives all the more of the common goods, according as he holds a more prominent position in the community. This prominence in an aristocratic community is gauged

according to virtue, in an oligarchy according to wealth, in a democracy according to liberty, and in various ways according to various forms of community. Hence in distributive justice the mean is observed, not according to equality between thing and thing, but according to proportion between things and persons: in such a way that even as one person surpasses another, so that which is given to one person surpasses that which is allotted to another. Hence the Philosopher says (*Ethic.* v, 3,4) that the mean in the latter case follows “geometrical proportion,” wherein equality depends not on quantity but on proportion. For example we say that 6 is to 4 as 3 is to 2, because in either case the proportion equals $1\frac{1}{2}$; since the greater number is the sum of the lesser plus its half: whereas the equality of excess is not one of quantity, because 6 exceeds 4 by 2, while 3 exceeds 2 by 1.

On the other hand in commutations something is paid to an individual on account of something of his that has been received, as may be seen chiefly in selling and buying, where the notion of commutation is found primarily. Hence it is necessary to equalize thing with thing, so that the one person should pay back to the other just so much as he has become richer out of that which belonged to the other. The result of this will be equality according to the “arithmetical mean” which is gauged according to equal excess in quantity. Thus 5 is the mean between 6 and 4, since it exceeds the latter and is exceeded by the former, by 1. Accordingly if, at the start, both persons have 5, and one of them receives 1 out of the other’s belongings, the one that is the receiver, will have 6, and the other will be left with 4: and so there will be justice if both be brought back to the mean, 1 being taken from him that has 6, and given to him that has 4, for then both will have 5 which is the mean.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(2)-RO(1) — In the other moral virtues the rational, not the real mean, is to be followed: but justice follows the real mean; wherefore the mean, in justice, depends on the diversity of things.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(2)-RO(2) — Equality is the general form of justice, wherein distributive and commutative justice agree: but in one we find equality of geometrical proportion, whereas in the other we find equality of arithmetical proportion.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(2)-RO(3) — In actions and passions a person's station affects the quantity of a thing: for it is a greater injury to strike a prince than a private person. Hence in distributive justice a person's station is considered in itself, whereas in commutative justice it is considered in so far as it causes a diversity of things.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(3)

Whether there is a different matter for both kinds of justice?

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that there is not a different matter for both kinds of justice. Diversity of matter causes diversity of virtue, as in the case of fortitude and temperance. Therefore, if distributive and commutative justice have different matters, it would seem that they are not comprised under the same virtue, viz. justice.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, the distribution that has to do with distributive justice is one of "wealth or of honors, or of whatever can be distributed among the members of the community" (Ethic. v, 2), which very things are the subject matter of commutations between one person and another, and this belongs to commutative justice. Therefore the matters of distributive and commutative justice are not distinct.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, if the matter of distributive justice differs from that of commutative justice, for the reason that they differ specifically, where there is no specific difference, there ought to be no diversity of matter. Now the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 2) reckons commutative justice as one species, and yet this has many kinds of matter. Therefore the matter of these species of justice is, seemingly, not of many kinds.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is stated in Ethic. v, 2 that "one kind of justice directs distributions, and another commutations."

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(51)**, **AA(8),10**), justice is about certain external operations, namely distribution and commutation. These consist in the use of certain externals, whether things, persons or even works: of things, as when one man takes from or restores to another that which is his; of persons, as when a man does an injury to

the very person of another, for instance by striking or insulting him, or even by showing respect for him; and of works, as when a man justly exacts a work of another, or does a work for him. Accordingly, if we take for the matter of each kind of justice the things themselves of which the operations are the use, the matter of distributive and commutative justice is the same, since things can be distributed out of the common property to individuals, and be the subject of commutation between one person and another; and again there is a certain distribution and payment of laborious works.

If, however, we take for the matter of both kinds of justice the principal actions themselves, whereby we make use of persons, things, and works, there is then a difference of matter between them. For distributive justice directs distributions, while commutative justice directs commutations that can take place between two persons. of these some are involuntary, some voluntary. They are involuntary when anyone uses another man's chattel, person, or work against his will, and this may be done secretly by fraud, or openly by violence. In either case the offence may be committed against the other man's chattel or person, or against a person connected with him. If the offence is against his chattel and this be taken secretly, it is called "theft," if openly, it is called "robbery." If it be against another man's person, it may affect either the very substance of his person, or his dignity. If it be against the substance of his person, a man is injured secretly if he is treacherously slain, struck or poisoned, and openly, if he is publicly slain, imprisoned, struck or maimed. If it be against his personal dignity, a man is injured secretly by false witness, detractions and so forth, whereby he is deprived of his good name, and openly, by being accused in a court of law, or by public insult. If it be against a personal connection, a man is injured in the person of his wife, secretly (for the most part) by adultery, in the person of his slave, if the latter be induced to leave his master: which things can also be done openly. The same applies to other personal connections, and whatever injury may be committed against the principal, may be committed against them also. Adultery, however, and inducing a slave to leave his master are properly injuries against the person; yet the latter, since a slave is his master's chattel, is referred to theft. Voluntary commutations are when a man voluntarily transfers his chattel to another person. And if he transfer it simply so that the recipient

incurs no debt, as in the case of gifts, it is an act, not of justice but of liberality. A voluntary transfer belongs to justice in so far as it includes the notion of debt, and this may occur in many ways. First when one man simply transfers his thing to another in exchange for another thing, as happens in selling and buying. Secondly when a man transfers his thing to another, that the latter may have the use of it with the obligation of returning it to its owner. If he grant the use of a thing gratuitously, it is called “usufruct” in things that bear fruit; and simply “borrowing” on “loan” in things that bear no fruit, such as money, pottery, etc.; but if not even the use is granted gratis, it is called “letting” or “hiring.” Thirdly, a man transfers his thing with the intention of recovering it, not for the purpose of its use, but that it may be kept safe, as in a “deposit,” or under some obligation, as when a man pledges his property, or when one man stands security for another. In all these actions, whether voluntary or involuntary, the mean is taken in the same way according to the equality of repayment. Hence all these actions belong to the one same species of justice, namely commutative justice. And this suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(4)

Whether the just is absolutely the same as retaliation?

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the just is absolutely the same as retaliation. For the judgment of God is absolutely just. Now the judgment of God is such that a man has to suffer in proportion with his deeds, according to ~~and~~ Matthew 7:2:

“With what measure you judge, you shall be judged: and with what measure you mete, it shall be measured to you again.”

Therefore the just is absolutely the same as retaliation.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, in either kind of justice something is given to someone according to a kind of equality. In distributive justice this equality regards personal dignity, which would seem to depend chiefly on what a person has done for the good of the community; while in commutative justice it regards the thing in which a person has suffered

loss. Now in respect of either equality there is retaliation in respect of the deed committed. Therefore it would seem that the just is absolutely the same as retaliation.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the chief argument against retaliation is based on the difference between the voluntary and the involuntary; for he who does an injury involuntarily is less severely punished. Now voluntary and involuntary taken in relation to ourselves, do not diversify the mean of justice since this is the real mean and does not depend on us. Therefore it would seem that the just is absolutely the same as retaliation.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher proves (Ethic. v, 5) that the just is not always the same as retaliation.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Retaliation [contrapassum] denotes equal passion repaid for previous action; and the expression applies most properly to injurious passions and actions, whereby a man harms the person of his neighbor; for instance if a man strike, that he be struck back. This kind of just is laid down in the Law (⁽¹²²⁾Exodus 21:23,24): “He shall render life for life, eye for eye,” etc. And since also to take away what belongs to another is to do an unjust thing, it follows that secondly retaliation consists in this also, that whosoever causes loss to another, should suffer loss in his belongings. This just loss is also found in the Law (⁽¹²³⁾Exodus 22:1):

“If any man steal an ox or a sheep, and kill or sell it, he shall restore five oxen for one ox and four sheep for one sheep.”

Thirdly retaliation is transferred to voluntary commutations, where action and passion are on both sides, although voluntariness detracts from the nature of passion, as stated above (**Q(59), A(3)**).

In all these cases, however, repayment must be made on a basis of equality according to the requirements of commutative justice, namely that the meed of passion be equal to the action. Now there would not always be equality if passion were in the same species as the action. Because, in the first place, when a person injures the person of one who is greater, the action surpasses any passion of the same species that he might undergo, wherefore he that strikes a prince, is not only struck back, but is much more severely punished. In like manner when a man despoils another of his

property against the latter's will, the action surpasses the passion if he be merely deprived of that thing, because the man who caused another's loss, himself would lose nothing, and so he is punished by making restitution several times over, because not only did he injure a private individual, but also the common weal, the security of whose protection he has infringed. Nor again would there be equality of passion in voluntary commutations, were one always to exchange one's chattel for another man's, because it might happen that the other man's chattel is much greater than our own: so that it becomes necessary to equalize passion and action in commutations according to a certain proportionate commensuration, for which purpose money was invented. Hence retaliation is in accordance with commutative justice: but there is no place for it in distributive justice, because in distributive justice we do not consider the equality between thing and thing or between passion and action (whence the expression 'contrapassum'), but according to proportion between things and persons, as stated above (A(2)).

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(4)-RO(1) — This form of the Divine judgment is in accordance with the conditions of commutative justice, in so far as rewards are apportioned to merits, and punishments to sins.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(4)-RO(2) — When a man who has served the community is paid for his services, this is to be referred to commutative, not distributive, justice. Because distributive justice considers the equality, not between the thing received and the thing done, but between the thing received by one person and the thing received by another according to the respective conditions of those persons.

P(2b)-Q(61)-A(4)-RO(3) — When the injurious action is voluntary, the injury is aggravated and consequently is considered as a greater thing. Hence it requires a greater punishment in repayment, by reason of a difference, not on part, but on the part of the thing.

QUESTION 62

OF RESTITUTION

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

We must now consider restitution, under which head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) of what is it an act?
- (2) Whether it is always of necessity for salvation to restore what one has taken away?
- (3) Whether it is necessary to restore more than has been taken away?
- (4) Whether it is necessary to restore what one has not taken away?
- (5) Whether it is necessary to make restitution to the person from whom something has been taken?
- (6) Whether the person who has taken something away is bound to restore it?
- (7) Whether any other person is bound to restitution?
- (8) Whether one is bound to restore at once?

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(1)

Whether restitution is an act of commutative justice?

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that restitution is not an act of commutative justice. For justice regards the notion of what is due. Now one may restore, even as one may give, that which is not due. Therefore restitution is not the act of any part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, that which has passed away and is no more cannot be restored. Now justice and injustice are about certain

actions and passions, which are unenduring and transitory. Therefore restitution would not seem to be the act of a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, restitution is repayment of something taken away. Now something may be taken away from a man not only in commutation, but also in distribution, as when, in distributing, one gives a man less than his due. Therefore restitution is not more an act of commutative than of distributive justice.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Restitution is opposed to taking away. Now it is an act of commutative injustice to take away what belongs to another. Therefore to restore it is an act of that justice which directs commutations.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(1) — *I answer that*, To restore is seemingly the same as to reinstate a person in the possession or dominion of his thing, so that in restitution we consider the equality of justice attending the payment of one thing for another, and this belongs to commutative justice. Hence restitution is an act of commutative justice, occasioned by one person having what belongs to another, either with his consent, for instance on loan or deposit, or against his will, as in robbery or theft.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(1)-RO(1) — That which is not due to another is not his properly speaking, although it may have been his at some time: wherefore it is a mere gift rather than a restitution, when anyone renders to another what is not due to him. It is however somewhat like a restitution, since the thing itself is materially the same; yet it is not the same in respect of the formal aspect of justice, which considers that thing as belonging to this particular man: and so it is not restitution properly so called.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(1)-RO(2) — In so far as the word restitution denotes something done over again, it implies identity of object. Hence it would seem originally to have applied chiefly to external things, which can pass from one person to another, since they remain the same both substantially and in respect of the right of dominion. But, even as the term “commutation” has passed from such like things to those actions and passions which confer reverence or injury, harm or profit on another person, so too the term “restitution” is applied, to things which though they be transitory in reality, yet remain in their effect; whether this touch

his body, as when the body is hurt by being struck, or his reputation, as when a man remains defamed or dishonored by injurious words.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(1)-RO(3) — Compensation is made by the distributor to the man to whom less was given than his due, by comparison of thing with thing, when the latter receives so much the more according as he received less than his due: and consequently it pertains to commutative justice.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(2)

***Whether restitution of
what has been taken away is necessary for salvation?***

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not necessary to restore what has been taken away. For that which is impossible is not necessary for salvation. But sometimes it is impossible to restore what has been taken, as when a man has taken limb or life. Therefore it does not seem necessary for salvation to restore what one has taken from another.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the commission of a sin is not necessary for salvation, for then a man would be in a dilemma. But sometimes it is impossible, without sin, to restore what has been taken, as when one has taken away another's good name by telling the truth. Therefore it is not necessary for salvation to restore what one has taken from another.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, what is done cannot be undone. Now sometimes a man loses his personal honor by being unjustly insulted. Therefore that which has been taken from him cannot be restored to him: so that it is not necessary for salvation to restore what one has taken.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, to prevent a person from obtaining a good thing is seemingly the same as to take it away from him, since "to lack little is almost the same as to lack nothing at all," as the Philosopher says (Phys. ii, 5). Now when anyone prevents a man from obtaining a benefice or the like, seemingly he is not bound to restore the benefice, since this would be sometimes impossible. Therefore it is not necessary for salvation to restore what one has taken.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (Ep. ad Maced. cxliii): “Unless a man restore what he has purloined, his sin is not forgiven.”

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Restitution as stated above (**A(1)**) is an act of commutative justice, and this demands a certain equality. Wherefore restitution denotes the return of the thing unjustly taken; since it is by giving it back that equality is reestablished. If, however, it be taken away justly, there will be equality, and so there will be no need for restitution, for justice consists in equality. Since therefore the safeguarding of justice is necessary for salvation, it follows that it is necessary for salvation to restore what has been taken unjustly.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(2)-RO(1) — When it is impossible to repay the equivalent, it suffices to repay what one can, as in the case of honor due to God and our parents, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. viii, 14). Wherefore when that which has been taken cannot be restored in equivalent, compensation should be made as far as possible: for instance if one man has deprived another of a limb, he must make compensation either in money or in honor, the condition of either party being duly considered according to the judgment of a good man.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(2)-RO(2) — There are three ways in which one may take away another’s good name. First, by saying what is true, and this justly, as when a man reveals another’s sin, while observing the right order of so doing, and then he is not bound to restitution. Secondly, by saying what is untrue and unjustly, and then he is bound to restore that man’s good name, by confessing that he told an untruth. Thirdly, by saying what is true, but unjustly, as when a man reveals another’s sin contrarily to the right order of so doing, and then he is bound to restore his good name as far as he can, and yet without telling an untruth; for instance by saying that he spoke ill, or that he defamed him unjustly; or if he be unable to restore his good name, he must compensate him otherwise, the same as in other cases, as stated above (ad 1).

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(2)-RO(3) — The action of the man who has defamed another cannot be undone, but it is possible, by showing him deference, to undo its effect, viz. the lowering of the other man’s personal dignity in the opinion of other men.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(2)-RO(4) — There are several ways of preventing a man from obtaining a benefice. First, justly: for instance, if having in view the honor of God or the good of the Church, one procures its being conferred on a more worthy subject, and then there is no obligation whatever to make restitution or compensation. Secondly, unjustly, if the intention is to injure the person whom one hinders, through hatred, revenge or the like. In this case, if before the benefice has been definitely assigned to anyone, one prevents its being conferred on a worthy subject by counseling that it be not conferred on him, one is bound to make some compensation, after taking account of the circumstances of persons and things according to the judgment of a prudent person: but one is not bound in equivalent, because that man had not obtained the benefice and might have been prevented in many ways from obtaining it. If, on the other hand, the benefice had already been assigned to a certain person, and someone, for some undue cause procures its revocation, it is the same as though he had deprived a man of what he already possessed, and consequently he would be bound to compensation in equivalent, in proportion, however, to his means.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(3)

Whether it suffices to restore the exact amount taken?

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not sufficient to restore the exact amount taken. For it is written (^{<1221>}Exodus 22:1):

“If a man shall steal an ox or a sheep and kill or sell it, he shall restore five oxen for one ox, and four sheep for one sheep.”

Now everyone is bound to keep the commandments of the Divine law. Therefore a thief is bound to restore four- or fivefold.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, “What things soever were written, were written for our learning” (^{<650>}Romans 15:4). Now Zachaeus said (^{<1208>}Luke 19:8) to our Lord: “If I have wronged any man of any thing, I restore him fourfold.” Therefore a man is bound to restore several times over the amount he has taken unjustly.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, no one can be unjustly deprived of what he is not bound to give. Now a judge justly deprives a thief of more

than the amount of his theft, under the head of damages. Therefore a man is bound to pay it, and consequently it is not sufficient to restore the exact amount.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Restitution re-establishes equality where an unjust taking has caused inequality. Now equality is restored by repaying the exact amount taken. Therefore there is no obligation to restore more than the exact amount taken.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(3) — *I answer that*, When a man takes another's thing unjustly, two things must be considered. One is the inequality on the part of the thing, which inequality is sometimes void of injustice, as is the case in loans. The other is the sin of injustice, which is consistent with equality on the part of the thing, as when a person intends to use violence but fails.

As regards the first, the remedy is applied by making restitution, since thereby equality is re-established; and for this it is enough that a man restore just so much as he has belonging to another. But as regards the sin, the remedy is applied by punishment, the infliction of which belongs to the judge: and so, until a man is condemned by the judge, he is not bound to restore more than he took, but when once he is condemned, he is bound to pay the penalty.

Hence it is clear how to answer the First Objection: because this law fixes the punishment to be inflicted by the judge. Nor is this commandment to be kept now, because since the coming of Christ no man is bound to keep the judicial precepts, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(104), A(3)**). Nevertheless the same might be determined by human law, and then the same answer would apply.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(3)-RO(2) — Zachaeus said this being willing to do more than he was bound to do; hence he had said already: "Behold... the half of my goods I give to the poor."

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(3)-RO(3) — By condemning the man justly, the judge can exact more by way of damages; and yet this was not due before the sentence.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(4)

Whether a man is bound to restore what he has not taken?

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that a man is bound to restore what he has not taken. For he that has inflicted a loss on a man is bound to remove that loss. Now it happens sometimes that the loss sustained is greater than the thing taken: for instance, if you dig up a man's seeds, you inflict on the sower a loss equal to the coming harvest, and thus you would seem to be bound to make restitution accordingly. Therefore a man is bound to restore what he has not taken.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, he who retains his creditor's money beyond the stated time, would seem to occasion his loss of all his possible profits from that money, and yet he does not really take them. Therefore it seems that a man is bound to restore what he did not take.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, human justice is derived from Divine justice. Now a man is bound to restore to God more than he has received from Him, according to ~~1536~~ Matthew 25:26,

“Thou knewest that I reap where I sow not, and gather where I
have not strewed.”

Therefore it is just that one should restore to a man also, something that one has not taken.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Restitution belongs to justice, because it re-establishes equality. But if one were to restore what one did not take, there would not be equality. Therefore it is not just to make such a restitution.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Whoever brings a loss upon another person, seemingly, takes from him the amount of the loss, since, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 4) loss is so called from a man having “less”^{*} than his due. [^{*}The derivation is more apparent in English than in Latin, where ‘damnum’ stands for ‘loss,’ and ‘minus’ for ‘less.’ Aristotle merely says that to have more than your own is called ‘gain,’ and to have less than you started with is called ‘loss.’] Therefore a man is bound to make restitution according to the loss he has brought upon another.

Now a man suffers a loss in two ways. First, by being deprived of what he actually has; and a loss of this kind is always to be made good by repayment in equivalent: for instance if a man damnifies another by destroying his house he is bound to pay him the value of the house. Secondly, a man may damnify another by preventing him from obtaining what he was on the way to obtain. A loss of this kind need not be made good in equivalent; because to have a thing virtually is less than to have it actually, and to be on the way to obtain a thing is to have it merely virtually or potentially, and so were he to be indemnified by receiving the thing actually, he would be paid, not the exact value taken from him, but more, and this is not necessary for salvation, as stated above. However he is bound to make some compensation, according to the condition of persons and things.

From this we see how to answer the First and Second Objections: because the sower of the seed in the field, has the harvest, not actually but only virtually. In like manner he that has money has the profit not yet actually but only virtually: and both may be hindered in many ways.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(4)-RO(3) — God requires nothing from us but what He Himself has sown in us. Hence this saying is to be understood as expressing either the shameful thought of the lazy servant, who deemed that he had received nothing from the other, or the fact that God expects from us the fruit of His gifts, which fruit is from Him and from us, although the gifts themselves are from God without us.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5)

Whether restitution must always be made to the person from whom a thing has been taken?

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that restitution need not always be made to the person from whom a thing has been taken. For it is not lawful to injure anyone. Now it would sometimes be injurious to the man himself, or to others, were one to restore to him what has been taken from him; if, for instance, one were to return a madman his sword. Therefore restitution need not always be made to the person from whom a thing has been taken.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, if a man has given a thing unlawfully, he does not deserve to recover it. Now sometimes a man gives unlawfully that which another accepts unlawfully, as in the case of the giver and receiver who are guilty of simony [i.e., the buying and selling of positions in the Church]. Therefore it is not always necessary to make restitution to the person from whom one has taken something.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, no man is bound to do what is impossible. Now it is sometimes impossible to make restitution to the person from whom a thing has been taken, either because he is dead, or because he is too far away, or because he is unknown to us. Therefore restitution need not always be made to the person from whom a thing has been taken.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5)-O(4) — Further, we owe more compensation to one from whom we have received a greater favor. Now we have received greater favors from others (our parents for instance) than from a lender or depositor. Therefore sometimes we ought to succor some other person rather than make restitution to one from whom we have taken something.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5)-O(5) — Further, it is useless to restore a thing which reverts to the restorer by being restored. Now if a prelate has unjustly taken something from the Church and makes restitution to the Church, it reverts into his hands, since he is the guardian of the Church's property. Therefore he ought not to restore to the Church from whom he has taken: and so restitution should not always be made to the person from whom something has been taken away

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~cf~~ Romans 13:7):

“Render... to all men their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due,
custom to whom custom.”

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Restitution re-establishes the equality of commutative justice, which equality consists in the equalizing of thing to thing, as stated above (**A(2); Q(58), A(10)**). Now this equalizing of things is impossible, unless he that has less than his due receive what is lacking to him: and for this to be done, restitution must be made to the person from whom a thing has been taken.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5)-RO(1) — When the thing to be restored appears to be grievously injurious to the person to whom it is to be restored, or to some other, it should not be restored to him there and then, because restitution is directed to the good of the person to whom it is made, since all possessions come under the head of the useful. Yet he who retains another's property must not appropriate it, but must either reserve it, that he may restore it at a fitting time, or hand it over to another to keep it more securely.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5)-RO(2) — A person may give a thing unlawfully in two ways. First through the giving itself being illicit and against the law, as is the case when a man gives a thing simoniacally. Such a man deserves to lose what he gave, wherefore restitution should not be made to him: and, since the receiver acted against the law in receiving, he must not retain the price, but must use it for some pious object. Secondly a man gives unlawfully, through giving for an unlawful purpose, albeit the giving itself is not unlawful, as when a woman receives payment for fornication: wherefore she may keep what she has received. If, however, she has extorted overmuch by fraud or deceit, she would be bound to restitution.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5)-RO(3) — If the person to whom restitution is due is unknown altogether, restitution must be made as far as possible, for instance by giving an alms for his spiritual welfare (whether he be dead or living): but not without previously making a careful inquiry about his person. If the person to whom restitution is due be dead, restitution should be made to his heir, who is looked upon as one with him. If he be very far away, what is due to him should be sent to him, especially if it be of great value and can easily be sent: else it should be deposited in a safe place to be kept for him, and the owner should be advised of the fact.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5)-RO(4) — A man is bound, out of his own property, to succor his parents, or those from whom he has received greater benefits; but he ought not to compensate a benefactor out of what belongs to others; and he would be doing this if he were to compensate one with what is due to another. Exception must be made in cases of extreme need, for then he could and should even take what belongs to another in order to succor a parent.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(5)-RO(5) — There are three ways in which a prelate can rob the Church of her property. First by laying hands on Church property which is committed, not to him but to another; for instance, if a bishop appropriates the property of the chapter. In such a case it is clear that he is bound to restitution, by handing it over to those who are its lawful owners. Secondly by transferring to another person (for instance a relative or a friend) Church property committed to himself: in which case he must make restitution to the Church, and have it under his own care, so as to hand it over to his successor. Thirdly, a prelate may lay hands on Church property, merely in intention, when, to wit, he begins to have a mind to hold it as his own and not in the name of the Church: in which case he must make restitution by renouncing his intention.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(6)

*Whether he that has taken a thing
is always bound to restitution?*

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that he who has taken a thing is not always bound to restore it. Restitution re-establishes the equality of justice, by taking away from him that has more and giving to him that has less. Now it happens sometimes that he who has taken that which belongs to another, no longer has it, through its having passed into another's hands. Therefore it should be restored, not by the person that took it, but by the one that has it.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, no man is bound to reveal his own crime. But by making restitution a man would sometimes reveal his crime, as in the case of theft. Therefore he that has taken a thing is not always bound to restitution.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, the same thing should not be restored several times. Now sometimes several persons take a thing at the same time, and one of them restores it in its entirety. Therefore he that takes a thing is not always bound to restitution.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, He that has sinned is bound to satisfaction. Now restitution belongs to satisfaction. Therefore he that has taken a thing is bound to restore it.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(6) — *I answer that*, With regard to a man who has taken another's property, two points must be considered: the thing taken, and the taking. By reason of the thing taken, he is bound to restore it as long as he has it in his possession, since the thing that he has in addition to what is his, should be taken away from him, and given to him who lacks it according to the form of commutative justice. On the other hand, the taking of the thing that is another's property, may be threefold. For sometimes it is injurious, i.e. against the will of the owner, as in theft and robbery: in which case the thief is bound to restitution not only by reason of the thing, but also by reason of the injurious action, even though the thing is no longer in his possession. For just as a man who strikes another, though he gain nothing thereby, is bound to compensate the injured person, so too he that is guilty of theft or robbery, is bound to make compensation for the loss incurred, although he be no better off; and in addition he must be punished for the injustice committed. Secondly, a man takes another's property for his own profit but without committing an injury, i.e. with the consent of the owner, as in the case of a loan: and then, the taker is bound to restitution, not only by reason of the thing, but also by reason of the taking, even if he has lost the thing: for he is bound to compensate the person who has done him a favor, and he would not be doing so if the latter were to lose thereby. Thirdly, a man takes another's property without injury to the latter or profit to himself, as in the case of a deposit; wherefore he that takes a thing thus, incurs no obligation on account of the taking, in fact by taking he grants a favor; but he is bound to restitution on account of the thing taken. Consequently if this thing be taken from him without any fault on his part, he is not bound to restitution, although he would be, if he were to lose the thing through a grievous fault on his part.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(6)-RO(1) — The chief end of restitution is, not that he who has more than his due may cease to have it, but that he who has less than his due may be compensated. Wherefore there is no place for restitution in those things which one man may receive from another without loss to the latter, as when a person takes a light from another's candle. Consequently although he that has taken something from another,

may have ceased to have what he took, through having transferred it to another, yet since that other is deprived of what is his, both are bound to restitution, he that took the thing, on account of the injurious taking, and he that has it, on account of the thing.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(6)-RO(2) — Although a man is not bound to reveal his crime to other men, yet is he bound to reveal it to God in confession; and so he may make restitution of another's property through the priest to whom he confesses.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(6)-RO(3) — Since restitution is chiefly directed to the compensation for the loss incurred by the person from whom a thing has been taken unjustly, it stands to reason that when he has received sufficient compensation from one, the others are not bound to any further restitution in his regard: rather ought they to refund the person who has made restitution, who, nevertheless, may excuse them from so doing.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(7)

Whether restitution is binding on those who have not taken?

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that restitution is not binding on those who have not taken. For restitution is a punishment of the taker. Now none should be punished except the one who sinned. Therefore none are bound to restitution save the one who has taken.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, justice does not bind one to increase another's property. Now if restitution were binding not only on the man who takes a thing but also on all those who cooperate with him in any way whatever, the person from whom the thing was taken would be the gainer, both because he would receive restitution many times over, and because sometimes a person cooperates towards a thing being taken away from someone, without its being taken away in effect. Therefore the others are not bound to restitution.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, no man is bound to expose himself to danger, in order to safeguard another's property. Now sometimes a man would expose himself to the danger of death, were he to betray a thief, or

withstand him. Therefore one is not bound to restitution, through not betraying or withstanding a thief.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~813~~ Romans 1:32):

“They who do such things are worthy of death, and not only they that do them, but also they that consent to them that do them.”

Therefore in like manner they that consent are bound to restitution.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(7) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(6)**), a person is bound to restitution not only on account of someone else’s property which he has taken, but also on account of the injurious taking. Hence whoever is cause of an unjust taking is bound to restitution. This happens in two ways, directly and indirectly. Directly, when a man induces another to take, and this in three ways. First, on the part of the taking, by moving a man to take, either by express command, counsel, or consent, or by praising a man for his courage in thieving. Secondly, on the part of the taker, by giving him shelter or any other kind of assistance. Thirdly, on the part of the thing taken, by taking part in the theft or robbery, as a fellow evil-doer. Indirectly, when a man does not prevent another from evil-doing (provided he be able and bound to prevent him), either by omitting the command or counsel which would hinder him from thieving or robbing, or by omitting to do what would have hindered him, or by sheltering him after the deed. All these are expressed as follows:

“By command, by counsel, by consent, by flattery, by receiving, by participation, by silence, by not preventing, by not denouncing.”

It must be observed, however, that in five of these cases the cooperator is always bound to restitution. First, in the case of command: because he that commands is the chief mover, wherefore he is bound to restitution principally. Secondly, in the case of consent; namely of one without whose consent the robbery cannot take place. Thirdly, in the case of receiving; when, to wit, a man is a receiver of thieves, and gives them assistance. Fourthly, in the case of participation; when a man takes part in the theft and in the booty. Fifthly, he who does not prevent the theft, whereas he is bound to do so; for instance, persons in authority who are bound to safeguard justice on earth, are bound to restitution, if by their

neglect thieves prosper, because their salary is given to them in payment of their preserving justice here below.

In the other cases mentioned above, a man is not always bound to restitution: because counsel and flattery are not always the efficacious cause of robbery. Hence the counsellor or flatterer is bound to restitution, only when it may be judged with probability that the unjust taking resulted from such causes.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(7)-RO(1) — Not only is he bound to restitution who commits the sin, but also he who is in any way cause of the sin, whether by counselling, or by commanding, or in any other way whatever.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(7)-RO(2) — He is bound chiefly to restitution, who is the principal in the deed; first of all, the “commander”; secondly, the “executor,” and in due sequence, the others: yet so that, if one of them make restitution, another is not bound to make restitution to the same person. Yet those who are principals in the deed, and who took possession of the thing, are bound to compensate those who have already made restitution. When a man commands an unjust taking that does not follow, no restitution has to be made, since its end is chiefly to restore the property of the person who has been unjustly injured.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(7)-RO(3) — He that fails to denounce a thief or does not withstand or reprehend him is not always bound to restitution, but only when he is obliged, in virtue of his office, to do so: as in the case of earthly princes who do not incur any great danger thereby; for they are invested with public authority, in order that they may maintain justice.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(8)

***Whether a man is bound to immediate restitution,
or may he put it off?***

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that a man is not bound to immediate restitution, and can lawfully delay to restore. For affirmative precepts do not bind for always. Now the necessity of making restitution is binding through an affirmative precept. Therefore a man is not bound to immediate restitution.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, no man is bound to do what is impossible. But it is sometimes impossible to make restitution at once. Therefore no man is bound to immediate restitution.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, restitution is an act of virtue, viz. of justice. Now time is one of the circumstances requisite for virtuous acts. Since then the other circumstances are not determinate for acts of virtue, but are determinable according to the dictate of prudence, it seems that neither in restitution is there any fixed time, so that a man be bound to restore at once.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, All matters of restitution seem to come under one head. Now a man who hires the services of a wage-earner, must not delay compensation, as appears from ~~CCC~~ Leviticus 19:13,

“The wages of him that hath been hired by thee shall not abide
with thee until the morning.”

Therefore neither is it lawful, in other cases of restitution, to delay, and restitution should be made at once.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(8) — *I answer that*, Even as it is a sin against justice to take another's property, so also is it to withhold it, since, to withhold the property of another against the owner's will, is to deprive him of the use of what belongs to him, and to do him an injury. Now it is clear that it is wrong to remain in sin even for a short time; and one is bound to renounce one's sin at once, according to Ecclus. 21:2, “Flee from sin as from the face of a serpent.” Consequently one is bound to immediate restitution, if possible, or to ask for a respite from the person who is empowered to grant the use of the thing.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(8)-RO(1) — Although the precept about the making of restitution is affirmative in form, it implies a negative precept forbidding us to withhold another's property.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(8)-RO(2) — When one is unable to restore at once, this very inability excuses one from immediate restitution: even as a person is altogether excused from making restitution if he is altogether unable to make it. He is, however, bound either himself or through another to ask the

person to whom he owes compensation to grant him a remission or a respite.

P(2b)-Q(62)-A(8)-RO(3) — Whenever the omission of a circumstance is contrary to virtue that circumstance must be looked upon as determinate, and we are bound to observe it: and since delay of restitution involves a sin of unjust detention which is opposed to just detention, it stands to reason that the time is determinate in the point of restitution being immediate.

VICES OPPOSED TO DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

QUESTION 63

OF RESPECT OF PERSONS

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the vices opposed to the aforesaid parts of justice. First we shall consider respect of persons which is opposed to distributive justice; secondly we shall consider the vices opposed to commutative justice.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether respect of persons is a sin?
- (2) Whether it takes place in the dispensation of spiritualities?
- (3) Whether it takes place in showing honor?
- (4) Whether it takes place in judicial sentences?

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(1)

Whether respect of persons is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that respect of persons is not a sin. For the word “person” includes a reference to personal dignity [*Cf. **P(1), Q(29), A(3)**, ad 2]. Now it belongs to distributive justice to consider personal dignity. Therefore respect of persons is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, in human affairs persons are of more importance than things, since things are for the benefit of persons and not conversely. But respect of things is not a sin. Much less, therefore, is respect of persons.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, no injustice or sin can be in God. Yet God seems to respect persons, since of two men circumstanced alike He sometimes upraises one by grace, and leaves the other in sin, according to ^{<124>}Matthew 24:40:

“Two shall be in a bed [Vulg.: ‘field’ [*‘Bed’ is the reading of ^{<173>}Luke 17:34]], one shall be taken, and one shall be left.”

Therefore respect of persons is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Nothing but sin is forbidden in the Divine law. Now respect of persons is forbidden, ^{<1017>}Deuteronomy 1:17: “Neither shall you respect any man’s person.” Therefore respect of persons is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Respect of persons is opposed to distributive justice. For the equality of distributive justice consists in allotting various things to various persons in proportion to their personal dignity. Accordingly, if one considers that personal property by reason of which the thing allotted to a particular person is due to him, this is respect not of the person but of the cause. Hence a gloss on ^{<1018>}Ephesians 6:9, “There is no respect of persons with God [Vulg.: ‘Him’],” says that “a just judge regards causes, not persons.” For instance if you promote a man to a professorship on account of his having sufficient knowledge, you consider the due cause, not the person; but if, in conferring something on someone, you consider in him not the fact that what you give him is proportionate or due to him, but the fact that he is this particular man (e.g. Peter or Martin), then there is respect of the person, since you give him something not for some cause that renders him worthy of it, but simply because he is this person. And any circumstance that does not amount to a reason why this man be worthy of this gift, is to be referred to his person: for instance if a man promote someone to a prelacy or a professorship, because he is rich or because he is a relative of his, it is respect of persons. It may happen, however, that a circumstance of person makes a man worthy as regards one thing, but not as regards another: thus consanguinity makes a man worthy to be appointed heir to an estate, but not to be chosen for a position of ecclesiastical authority: wherefore consideration of the same circumstance of person will amount to respect of persons in one matter and not in another. It follows, accordingly, that respect of persons

is opposed to distributive justice in that it fails to observe due proportion. Now nothing but sin is opposed to virtue: and therefore respect of persons is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(1)-RO(1) — In distributive justice we consider those circumstances of a person which result in dignity or right, whereas in respect of persons we consider circumstances that do not so result.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(1)-RO(2) — Persons are rendered proportionate to and worthy of things which are distributed among them, by reason of certain things pertaining to circumstances of person, wherefore such conditions ought to be considered as the proper cause. But when we consider the persons themselves, that which is not a cause is considered as though it were; and so it is clear that although persons are more worthy, absolutely speaking, yet they are not more worthy in this regard.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(1)-RO(3) — There is a twofold giving. one belongs to justice, and occurs when we give a man his due: in such like givings respect of persons takes place. The other giving belongs to liberality, when one gives gratis that which is not a man's due: such is the bestowal of the gifts of grace, whereby sinners are chosen by God. In such a giving there is no place for respect of persons, because anyone may, without injustice, give of his own as much as he will, and to whom he will, according to

 Matthew 20:14,15,

“Is it not lawful for me to do what I will?... Take what is thine, and go thy way.”

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(2)

*Whether respect of persons takes place
in the dispensation of spiritual goods?*

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that respect of persons does not take place in the dispensation of spiritual goods. For it would seem to savor of respect of persons if a man confers ecclesiastical dignity or benefice on account of consanguinity, since consanguinity is not a cause whereby a man is rendered worthy of an ecclesiastical benefice. Yet this apparently is not a sin, for ecclesiastical prelates are wont to do so.

Therefore the sin of respect of persons does not take place in the conferring of spiritual goods.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, to give preference to a rich man rather than to a poor man seems to pertain to respect of persons, according to ~~sm~~ James 2:2,3. Nevertheless dispensations to marry within forbidden degrees are more readily granted to the rich and powerful than to others. Therefore the sin of respect of persons seems not to take place in the dispensation of spiritual goods.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, according to jurists [*Cap. Cum dilectus.] it suffices to choose a good man, and it is not requisite that one choose the better man. But it would seem to savor of respect of persons to choose one who is less good for a higher position. Therefore respect of persons is not a sin in spiritual matters.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, according to the law of the Church (Cap. Cum dilectus.) the person to be chosen should be “a member of the flock.” Now this would seem to imply respect of persons, since sometimes more competent persons would be found elsewhere. Therefore respect of persons is not a sin in spiritual matters.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~sm~~ James 2:1): “Have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ... with respect of persons.” On these words a gloss of Augustine says: “Who is there that would tolerate the promotion of a rich man to a position of honor in the Church, to the exclusion of a poor man more learned and holier?” [*Augustine, Ep. ad Hieron. clxvii.]

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), respect of persons is a sin, in so far as it is contrary to justice. Now the graver the matter in which justice is transgressed, the more grievous the sin: so that, spiritual things being of greater import than temporal, respect of persons is a more grievous sin in dispensing spiritualities than in dispensing temporalities. And since it is respect of persons when something is allotted to a person out of proportion to his deserts, it must be observed that a person’s worthiness may be considered in two ways. First, simply and absolutely: and in this way the man who abounds the more in the spiritual gifts of grace is the more worthy. Secondly, in relation to the

common good; for it happens at times that the less holy and less learned man may conduce more to the common good, on account of worldly authority or activity, or something of the kind. And since the dispensation of spiritualities is directed chiefly to the common good, according to ~~401~~1 Corinthians 12:7, “The manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man unto profit,” it follows that in the dispensation of spiritualities the simply less good are sometimes preferred to the better, without respect of persons, just as God sometimes bestows gratuitous graces on the less worthy.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(2)-RO(1) — We must make a distinction with regard to a prelate’s kinsfolk: for sometimes they are less worthy, both absolutely speaking, and in relation to the common good: and then if they are preferred to the more worthy, there is a sin of respect of persons in the dispensation of spiritual goods, whereof the ecclesiastical superior is not the owner, with power to give them away as he will, but the dispenser, according to ~~401~~1 Corinthians 4:1,

“Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God.”

Sometimes however the prelate’s kinsfolk are as worthy as others, and then without respect of persons he can lawfully give preference to his kindred since there is at least this advantage, that he can trust the more in their being of one mind with him in conducting the business of the Church. Yet he would have to forego so doing for fear of scandal, if anyone might take an example from him and give the goods of the Church to their kindred without regard to their deserts.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(2)-RO(2) — Dispensations for contracting marriage came into use for the purpose of strengthening treaties of peace: and this is more necessary for the common good in relation to persons of standing, so that there is no respect of persons in granting dispensations more readily to such persons.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(2)-RO(3) — In order that an election be not rebutted in a court of law, it suffices to elect a good man, nor is it necessary to elect the better man, because otherwise every election might have a flaw. But as regards the conscience of an elector, it is necessary to elect one who is

better, either absolutely speaking, or in relation to the common good. For if it is possible to have one who is more competent for a post, and yet another be preferred, it is necessary to have some cause for this. If this cause have anything to do with the matter in point, he who is elected will, in this respect, be more competent; and if that which is taken for cause have nothing to do with the matter, it will clearly be respect of persons.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(2)-RO(4) — The man who is taken from among the members of a particular Church, is generally speaking more useful as regards the common good, since he loves more the Church wherein he was brought up. For this reason it was commanded (^{<6175>}Deuteronomy 17:15):

“Thou mayest not make a man of another nation king,
who is not thy brother.”

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(3)

*Whether respect of persons takes place
in showing honor and respect?*

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that respect of persons does not take place in showing honor and respect. For honor is apparently nothing else than “reverence shown to a person in recognition of his virtue,” as the Philosopher states (Ethic. i, 5). Now prelates and princes should be honored although they be wicked, even as our parents, of whom it is written (^{<6212>}Exodus 20:12): “Honor thy father and thy mother.” Again masters, though they be wicked, should be honored by their servants, according to ^{<5061>}1 Timothy 6:1:

“Whoever are servants under the yoke, let them count their masters
worthy of all honor.”

Therefore it seems that it is not a sin to respect persons in showing honor.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it is commanded (^{<6182>}Leviticus 19:32): “Rise up before the hoary head, and, honor the person of the aged man.” But this seems to savor of respect of persons, since sometimes old men are not virtuous; according to Daniel 13:5:

“Iniquity came out from the ancients of the people [*Vulg.:
‘Iniquity came out of Babylon from the ancient judges, that seemed
to govern the people.’].”

Therefore it is not a sin to respect persons in showing honor.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, on the words of ^{<sm>}James 2:1, “Have not the faith... with respect of persons,” a gloss of Augustine [*Ep. ad Hieron. clxvii.] says: “If the saying of James, ‘If there shall come into your assembly a man having a golden ring,’ etc., refer to our daily meetings, who sins not here, if however he sin at all?” Yet it is respect of persons to honor the rich for their riches, for Gregory says in a homily (xxviii in Evang.): “Our pride is blunted, since in men we honor, not the nature wherein they are made to God’s image, but wealth,” so that, wealth not being a due cause of honor, this will savor of respect of persons. Therefore it is not a sin to respect persons in showing honor.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on ^{<sm>}James 2:1, says: “Whoever honors the rich for their riches, sins,” and in like manner, if a man be honored for other causes that do not render him worthy of honor. Now this savors of respect of persons. Therefore it is a sin to respect persons in showing honor.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(3) — *I answer that*, To honor a person is to recognize him as having virtue, wherefore virtue alone is the due cause of a person being honored. Now it is to be observed that a person may be honored not only for his own virtue, but also for another’s: thus princes and prelates, although they be wicked, are honored as standing in God’s place, and as representing the community over which they are placed, according to ^{<sm>}Proverbs 26:8,

“As he that casteth a stone into the heap of Mercury, so is he that
giveth honor to a fool.”

For, since the gentiles ascribed the keeping of accounts to Mercury, “the heap of Mercury” signifies the casting up of an account, when a merchant sometimes substitutes a pebble [*‘Lapillus’ or ‘calculus’ whence the English word ‘calculate’] for one hundred marks. So too, is a fool honored if he stand in God’s place or represent the whole community: and in the same way parents and masters should be honored, on account of their

having a share of the dignity of God Who is the Father and Lord of all. The aged should be honored, because old age is a sign of virtue, though this sign fail at times: wherefore, according to Wis. 4:8,9, “venerable old age is not that of long time, nor counted by the number of years; but the understanding of a man is gray hairs, and a spotless life is old age.” The rich ought to be honored by reason of their occupying a higher position in the community: but if they be honored merely for their wealth, it will be the sin of respect of persons.

Hence the Replies to the Objections are clear.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(4)

Whether the sin of respect of persons takes place in judicial sentences?

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the sin of respect of persons does not take place in judicial sentences. For respect of persons is opposed to distributive justice, as stated above (**A(1)**): whereas judicial sentences seem to pertain chiefly to commutative justice. Therefore respect of persons does not take place in judicial sentences.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, penalties are inflicted according to a sentence. Now it is not a sin to respect persons in pronouncing penalties, since a heavier punishment is inflicted on one who injures the person of a prince than on one who injures the person of others. Therefore respect of persons does not take place in judicial sentences.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, it is written (Ecclus. 4:10): “In judging be merciful to the fatherless.” But this seems to imply respect of the person of the needy. Therefore in judicial sentences respect of persons is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~2181~~ Proverbs 18:5):

“It is not good to accept the person in judgment [*Vulg.: ‘It is not good to accept the person of the wicked, to decline from the truth of judgment.’].”

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(60), A(1)**), judgment is an act of justice, in as much as the judge restores to the equality of justice, those things which may cause an opposite inequality. Now respect of persons involves a certain inequality, in so far as something is allotted to a person out of that proportion to him in which the equality of justice consists. Wherefore it is evident that judgment is rendered corrupt by respect of persons.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(4)-RO(1) — A judgment may be looked at in two ways. First, in view of the thing judged, and in this way judgment is common to commutative and distributive justice: because it may be decided by judgment how some common good is to be distributed among many, and how one person is to restore to another what he has taken from him. Secondly, it may be considered in view of the form of judgment, in as much as, even in commutative justice, the judge takes from one and gives to another, and this belongs to distributive justice. In this way respect of persons may take place in any judgment.

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(4)-RO(2) — When a person is more severely punished on account of a crime committed against a greater person, there is no respect of persons, because the very difference of persons causes, in that case, a diversity of things, as stated above (**Q(58), A(10)**, ad 3; **Q(61), A(2)**, ad 3).

P(2b)-Q(63)-A(4)-RO(3) — In pronouncing judgment one ought to succor the needy as far as possible, yet without prejudice to justice: else the saying of ~~Exod~~ Exodus 23:3 would apply:

“Neither shalt thou favor a poor man in judgment.”

VICES OPPOSED TO COMMUTATIVE JUSTICE

QUESTIONS 64-81

QUESTION 64

OF MURDER

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

In due sequence we must consider the vices opposed to commutative justice. We must consider

- (1) those sins that are committed in relation to involuntary commutations;
- (2) those that are committed with regard to voluntary commutations.

Sins are committed in relation to involuntary commutations by doing an injury to one's neighbor against his will: and this can be done in two ways, namely by deed or by word. By deed when one's neighbor is injured either in his own person, or in a person connected with him, or in his possessions.

We must therefore consider these points in due order, and in the first place we shall consider murder whereby a man inflicts the greatest injury on his neighbor. Under this head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether it is a sin to kill dumb animals or even plants?
- (2) Whether it is lawful to kill a sinner?
- (3) Whether this is lawful to a private individual, or to a public person only?
- (4) Whether this is lawful to a cleric?

- (5) Whether it is lawful to kill oneself?
- (6) Whether it is lawful to kill a just man?
- (7) Whether it is lawful to kill a man in self-defense?
- (8) Whether accidental homicide is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(1)

Whether it is unlawful to kill any living thing?

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful to kill any living thing. For the Apostle says (^{<611>}Romans 13:2):

“They that resist the ordinance of God purchase to themselves damnation [*Vulg.: ‘He that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist, purchase themselves damnation.'].”

Now Divine providence has ordained that all living things should be preserved, according to (^{<618>}Psalms 146:8,9,

“Who maketh grass to grow on the mountains...
ho giveth to beasts their food.”

Therefore it seems unlawful to take the life of any living thing.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, murder is a sin because it deprives a man of life. Now life is common to all animals and plants. Hence for the same reason it is apparently a sin to slay dumb animals and plants.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, in the Divine law a special punishment is not appointed save for a sin. Now a special punishment had to be inflicted, according to the Divine law, on one who killed another man’s ox or sheep (^{<621>}Exodus 22:1). Therefore the slaying of dumb animals is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei i, 20): “When we hear it said, ‘Thou shalt not kill,’ we do not take it as referring to trees, for they have no sense, nor to irrational animals, because they

have no fellowship with us. Hence it follows that the words, ‘Thou shalt not kill’ refer to the killing of a man.”

I answer that, There is no sin in using a thing for the purpose for which it is. Now the order of things is such that the imperfect are for the perfect, even as in the process of generation nature proceeds from imperfection to perfection. Hence it is that just as in the generation of a man there is first a living thing, then an animal, and lastly a man, so too things, like the plants, which merely have life, are all alike for animals, and all animals are for man. Wherefore it is not unlawful if man use plants for the good of animals, and animals for the good of man, as the Philosopher states (Polit. i, 3).

Now the most necessary use would seem to consist in the fact that animals use plants, and men use animals, for food, and this cannot be done unless these be deprived of life: wherefore it is lawful both to take life from plants for the use of animals, and from animals for the use of men. In fact this is in keeping with the commandment of God Himself: for it is written (~~C0029~~Genesis 1:29,30):

“Behold I have given you every herb... and all trees... to be your meat, and to all beasts of the earth”:

and again (~~C0008~~Genesis 9:3):

“Everything that moveth and liveth shall be meat to you.”

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(1)-RO(1) — According to the Divine ordinance the life of animals and plants is preserved not for themselves but for man. Hence, as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei i, 20), “by a most just ordinance of the Creator, both their life and their death are subject to our use.”

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(1)-RO(2) — Dumb animals and plants are devoid of the life of reason whereby to set themselves in motion; they are moved, as it were by another, by a kind of natural impulse, a sign of which is that they are naturally enslaved and accommodated to the uses of others.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(1)-RO(3) — He that kills another’s ox, sins, not through killing the ox, but through injuring another man in his property. Wherefore this is not a species of the sin of murder but of the sin of theft or robbery.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(2)

Whether it is lawful to kill sinners?

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful to kill men who have sinned. For our Lord in the parable (⁴⁰¹Matthew 13) forbade the uprooting of the cockle which denotes wicked men according to a gloss. Now whatever is forbidden by God is a sin. Therefore it is a sin to kill a sinner.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, human justice is conformed to Divine justice. Now according to Divine justice sinners are kept back for repentance, according to ⁴⁰¹Ezekiel 33:11, “I desire not the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live.” Therefore it seems altogether unjust to kill sinners.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it is not lawful, for any good end whatever, to do that which is evil in itself, according to Augustine (Contra Mendac. vii) and the Philosopher (Ethic. ii, 6). Now to kill a man is evil in itself, since we are bound to have charity towards all men, and “we wish our friends to live and to exist,” according to Ethic. ix, 4. Therefore it is nowise lawful to kill a man who has sinned.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (⁴⁰²Exodus 22:18): “Wizards thou shalt not suffer to live”; and (⁴⁰³Psalms 100:8):

“In the morning I put to death all the wicked of the land.”

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), it is lawful to kill dumb animals, in so far as they are naturally directed to man’s use, as the imperfect is directed to the perfect. Now every part is directed to the whole, as imperfect to perfect, wherefore every part is naturally for the sake of the whole. For this reason we observe that if the health of the whole body demands the excision of a member, through its being decayed or infectious to the other members, it will be both praiseworthy and advantageous to have it cut away. Now every individual person is compared to the whole community, as part to whole. Therefore if a man be dangerous and infectious to the community, on account of some sin, it is praiseworthy and advantageous that he be killed in order to safeguard the

common good, since “a little leaven corrupteth the whole lump” (⁴⁸⁸⁶1 Corinthians 5:6).

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(2)-RO(1) — Our Lord commanded them to forbear from uprooting the cockle in order to spare the wheat, i.e. the good. This occurs when the wicked cannot be slain without the good being killed with them, either because the wicked lie hidden among the good, or because they have many followers, so that they cannot be killed without danger to the good, as Augustine says (*Contra Parmen.* iii, 2). Wherefore our Lord teaches that we should rather allow the wicked to live, and that vengeance is to be delayed until the last judgment, rather than that the good be put to death together with the wicked. When, however, the good incur no danger, but rather are protected and saved by the slaying of the wicked, then the latter may be lawfully put to death.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(2)-RO(2) — According to the order of His wisdom, God sometimes slays sinners forthwith in order to deliver the good, whereas sometimes He allows them time to repent, according as He knows what is expedient for His elect. This also does human justice imitate according to its powers; for it puts to death those who are dangerous to others, while it allows time for repentance to those who sin without grievously harming others.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(2)-RO(3) — By sinning man departs from the order of reason, and consequently falls away from the dignity of his manhood, in so far as he is naturally free, and exists for himself, and he falls into the slavish state of the beasts, by being disposed of according as he is useful to others. This is expressed in ^{498D}Psalm 48:21: “Man, when he was in honor, did not understand; he hath been compared to senseless beasts, and made like to them,” and ⁴¹¹²Proverbs 11:29: “The fool shall serve the wise.” Hence, although it be evil in itself to kill a man so long as he preserve his dignity, yet it may be good to kill a man who has sinned, even as it is to kill a beast. For a bad man is worse than a beast, and is more harmful, as the Philosopher states (*Polit.* i, 1 and *Ethic.* vii, 6).

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(3)

Whether it is lawful for a private individual to kill a man who has sinned?

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem lawful for a private individual to kill a man who has sinned. For nothing unlawful is commanded in the Divine law. Yet, on account of the sin of the molten calf, Moses commanded (⁴⁹²⁷Exodus 32:27): “Let every man kill his brother, and friend, and neighbor.” Therefore it is lawful for private individuals to kill a sinner.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, as stated above (**A(2)**, ad 3), man, on account of sin, is compared to the beasts. Now it is lawful for any private individual to kill a wild beast, especially if it be harmful. Therefore for the same reason, it is lawful for any private individual to kill a man who has sinned.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, a man, though a private individual, deserves praise for doing what is useful for the common good. Now the slaying of evildoers is useful for the common good, as stated above (**A(2)**). Therefore it is deserving of praise if even private individuals kill evil-doers.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei i) [*Can. Quicumque percutit, caus. xxiii, qu. 8]: “A man who, without exercising public authority, kills an evil-doer, shall be judged guilty of murder, and all the more, since he has dared to usurp a power which God has not given him.”

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(2)**), it is lawful to kill an evildoer in so far as it is directed to the welfare of the whole community, so that it belongs to him alone who has charge of the community’s welfare. Thus it belongs to a physician to cut off a decayed limb, when he has been entrusted with the care of the health of the whole body. Now the care of the common good is entrusted to persons of rank having public authority: wherefore they alone, and not private individuals, can lawfully put evildoers to death.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(3)-RO(1) — The person by whose authority a thing is done really does the thing as Dionysius declares (Coel. Hier. iii). Hence

according to Augustine (De Civ. Dei i, 21), “He slays not who owes his service to one who commands him, even as a sword is merely the instrument to him that wields it.” Wherefore those who, at the Lord’s command, slew their neighbors and friends, would seem not to have done this themselves, but rather He by whose authority they acted thus: just as a soldier slays the foe by the authority of his sovereign, and the executioner slays the robber by the authority of the judge.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(3)-RO(2) — A beast is by nature distinct from man, wherefore in the case of a wild beast there is no need for an authority to kill it; whereas, in the case of domestic animals, such authority is required, not for their sake, but on account of the owner’s loss. On the other hand a man who has sinned is not by nature distinct from good men; hence a public authority is requisite in order to condemn him to death for the common good.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(3)-RO(3) — It is lawful for any private individual to do anything for the common good, provided it harm nobody: but if it be harmful to some other, it cannot be done, except by virtue of the judgment of the person to whom it pertains to decide what is to be taken from the parts for the welfare of the whole.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(4)

Whether it is lawful for clerics to kill evil-doers?

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem lawful for clerics to kill evil-doers. For clerics especially should fulfil the precept of the Apostle (^{<R06>}1 Corinthians 4:16): “Be ye followers of me as I also am of Christ,” whereby we are called upon to imitate God and His saints. Now the very God whom we worship puts evildoers to death, according to ^{<R50>}Psalm 135:10, “Who smote Egypt with their firstborn.” Again Moses made the Levites slay twenty-three thousand men on account of the worship of the calf (^{<R01>}Exodus 32), the priest Phinees slew the Israelite who went in to the woman of Midian (^{<R02>}Numbers 25), Samuel killed Agag king of Amalec (^{<R01>}1 Samuel 15), Elias slew the priests of Baal (^{<R01>}1 Kings. 18), Mathathias killed the man who went up to the altar to sacrifice (1 Mach.

2); and, in the New Testament, Peter killed Ananias and Saphira (^{<481>}Acts 5). Therefore it seems that even clerics may kill evil-doers.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, spiritual power is greater than the secular and is more united to God. Now the secular power as “God’s minister” lawfully puts evil-doers to death, according to ^{<630>}Romans 13:4. Much more therefore may clerics, who are God’s ministers and have spiritual power, put evil-doers to death.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, whosoever lawfully accepts an office, may lawfully exercise the functions of that office. Now it belongs to the princely office to slay evildoers, as stated above (**A(3)**). Therefore those clerics who are earthly princes may lawfully slay malefactors.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<548>}1 Timothy 3:2,3):

“It behooveth... a bishop to be without crime [*Vulg.: ‘blameless.’
‘Without crime’ is the reading in ^{<500>}Titus 1:7]... not given to wine,
no striker.”

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(4) — *I answer that*, It is unlawful for clerics to kill, for two reasons. First, because they are chosen for the ministry of the altar, whereon is represented the Passion of Christ slain “Who, when He was struck did not strike [Vulg.: ‘When He suffered, He threatened not’]” (^{<602>}1 Peter 2:23). Therefore it becomes not clerics to strike or kill: for ministers should imitate their master, according to Ecclus. 10:2, “As the judge of the people is himself, so also are his ministers.” The other reason is because clerics are entrusted with the ministry of the New Law, wherein no punishment of death or of bodily maiming is appointed: wherefore they should abstain from such things in order that they may be fitting ministers of the New Testament.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(4)-RO(1) — God works in all things without exception whatever is right, yet in each one according to its mode. Wherefore everyone should imitate God in that which is specially becoming to him. Hence, though God slays evildoers even corporally, it does not follow that all should imitate Him in this. As regards Peter, he did not put Ananias and Saphira to death by his own authority or with his own hand, but published their death sentence pronounced by God. The Priests or Levites of the Old

Testament were the ministers of the Old Law, which appointed corporal penalties, so that it was fitting for them to slay with their own hands.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(4)-RO(2) — The ministry of clerics is concerned with better things than corporal slayings, namely with things pertaining to spiritual welfare, and so it is not fitting for them to meddle with minor matters.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(4)-RO(3) — Ecclesiastical prelates accept the office of earthly princes, not that they may inflict capital punishment themselves, but that this may be carried into effect by others in virtue of their authority.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5)

Whether it is lawful to kill oneself?

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem lawful for a man to kill himself. For murder is a sin in so far as it is contrary to justice. But no man can do an injustice to himself, as is proved in Ethic. v, 11. Therefore no man sins by killing himself.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, it is lawful, for one who exercises public authority, to kill evil-doers. Now he who exercises public authority is sometimes an evil-doer. Therefore he may lawfully kill himself.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, it is lawful for a man to suffer spontaneously a lesser danger that he may avoid a greater: thus it is lawful for a man to cut off a decayed limb even from himself, that he may save his whole body. Now sometimes a man, by killing himself, avoids a greater evil, for example an unhappy life, or the shame of sin. Therefore a man may kill himself.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5)-O(4) — Further, Samson killed himself, as related in Judges 16, and yet he is numbered among the saints (³⁰¹Hebrews 11). Therefore it is lawful for a man to kill himself.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5)-O(5) — Further, it is related (2 Mach. 14:42) that a certain Razias killed himself, “choosing to die nobly rather than to fall into the hands of the wicked, and to suffer abuses unbecoming his noble birth.”

Now nothing that is done nobly and bravely is unlawful. Therefore suicide is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei i, 20): “Hence it follows that the words ‘Thou shalt not kill’ refer to the killing of a man — not another man; therefore, not even thyself. For he who kills himself, kills nothing else than a man.”

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5) — *I answer that*, It is altogether unlawful to kill oneself, for three reasons. First, because everything naturally loves itself, the result being that everything naturally keeps itself in being, and resists corruptions so far as it can. Wherefore suicide is contrary to the inclination of nature, and to charity whereby every man should love himself. Hence suicide is always a mortal sin, as being contrary to the natural law and to charity. Secondly, because every part, as such, belongs to the whole. Now every man is part of the community, and so, as such, he belongs to the community. Hence by killing himself he injures the community, as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. v, 11). Thirdly, because life is God’s gift to man, and is subject to His power, Who kills and makes to live. Hence whoever takes his own life, sins against God, even as he who kills another’s slave, sins against that slave’s master, and as he who usurps to himself judgment of a matter not entrusted to him. For it belongs to God alone to pronounce sentence of death and life, according to ~~Deut~~ Deuteronomy 32:39, “I will kill and I will make to live.”

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5)-RO(1) — Murder is a sin, not only because it is contrary to justice, but also because it is opposed to charity which a man should have towards himself: in this respect suicide is a sin in relation to oneself. In relation to the community and to God, it is sinful, by reason also of its opposition to justice.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5)-RO(2) — One who exercises public authority may lawfully put to death an evil-doer, since he can pass judgment on him. But no man is judge of himself. Wherefore it is not lawful for one who exercises public authority to put himself to death for any sin whatever: although he may lawfully commit himself to the judgment of others.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5)-RO(3) — Man is made master of himself through his free-will: wherefore he can lawfully dispose of himself as to those matters

which pertain to this life which is ruled by man's free-will. But the passage from this life to another and happier one is subject not to man's free-will but to the power of God. Hence it is not lawful for man to take his own life that he may pass to a happier life, nor that he may escape any unhappiness whatsoever of the present life, because the ultimate and most fearsome evil of this life is death, as the Philosopher states (*Ethic. iii, 6*). Therefore to bring death upon oneself in order to escape the other afflictions of this life, is to adopt a greater evil in order to avoid a lesser. In like manner it is unlawful to take one's own life on account of one's having committed a sin, both because by so doing one does oneself a very great injury, by depriving oneself of the time needful for repentance, and because it is not lawful to slay an evildoer except by the sentence of the public authority. Again it is unlawful for a woman to kill herself lest she be violated, because she ought not to commit on herself the very great sin of suicide, to avoid the lesser sin of another. For she commits no sin in being violated by force, provided she does not consent, since "without consent of the mind there is no stain on the body," as the Blessed Lucy declared. Now it is evident that fornication and adultery are less grievous sins than taking a man's, especially one's own, life: since the latter is most grievous, because one injures oneself, to whom one owes the greatest love. Moreover it is most dangerous since no time is left wherein to expiate it by repentance. Again it is not lawful for anyone to take his own life for fear he should consent to sin, because "evil must not be done that good may come" (~~8RB~~ Romans 3:8) or that evil may be avoided especially if the evil be of small account and an uncertain event, for it is uncertain whether one will at some future time consent to a sin, since God is able to deliver man from sin under any temptation whatever.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5)-RO(4) — As Augustine says (*De Civ. Dei i, 21*), "not even Samson is to be excused that he crushed himself together with his enemies under the ruins of the house, except the Holy Ghost, Who had wrought many wonders through him, had secretly commanded him to do this." He assigns the same reason in the case of certain holy women, who at the time of persecution took their own lives, and who are commemorated by the Church.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(5)-RO(5) — It belongs to fortitude that a man does not shrink from being slain by another, for the sake of the good of virtue, and

that he may avoid sin. But that a man take his own life in order to avoid penal evils has indeed an appearance of fortitude (for which reason some, among whom was Razias, have killed themselves thinking to act from fortitude), yet it is not true fortitude, but rather a weakness of soul unable to bear penal evils, as the Philosopher (Ethic. iii, 7) and Augustine (De Civ. Dei 22,23) declare.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(6)

Whether it is lawful to kill the innocent?

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that in some cases it is lawful to kill the innocent. The fear of God is never manifested by sin, since on the contrary “the fear of the Lord driveth out sin” (Ecclus. 1:27). Now Abraham was commended in that he feared the Lord, since he was willing to slay his innocent son. Therefore one may, without sin, kill an innocent person.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, among those sins that are committed against one’s neighbor, the more grievous seem to be those whereby a more grievous injury is inflicted on the person sinned against. Now to be killed is a greater injury to a sinful than to an innocent person, because the latter, by death, passes forthwith from the unhappiness of this life to the glory of heaven. Since then it is lawful in certain cases to kill a sinful man, much more is it lawful to slay an innocent or a righteous person.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, what is done in keeping with the order of justice is not a sin. But sometimes a man is forced, according to the order of justice, to slay an innocent person: for instance, when a judge, who is bound to judge according to the evidence, condemns to death a man whom he knows to be innocent but who is convicted by false witnesses; and again the executioner, who in obedience to the judge puts to death the man who has been unjustly sentenced.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{Exodus} Exodus 23:7):

“The innocent and just person thou shalt not put to death.”

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(6) — *I answer that*, An individual man may be considered in two ways: first, in himself; secondly, in relation to something else. If we consider a man in himself, it is unlawful to kill any man, since in every man though he be sinful, we ought to love the nature which God has made, and which is destroyed by slaying him. Nevertheless, as stated above (**A(2)**) the slaying of a sinner becomes lawful in relation to the common good, which is corrupted by sin. On the other hand the life of righteous men preserves and forwards the common good, since they are the chief part of the community. Therefore it is in no way lawful to slay the innocent.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(6)-RO(1) — God is Lord of death and life, for by His decree both the sinful and the righteous die. Hence he who at God's command kills an innocent man does not sin, as neither does God Whose behest he executes: indeed his obedience to God's commands is a proof that he fears Him.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(6)-RO(2) — In weighing the gravity of a sin we must consider the essential rather than the accidental. Wherefore he who kills a just man, sins more grievously than he who slays a sinful man: first, because he injures one whom he should love more, and so acts more in opposition to charity: secondly, because he inflicts an injury on a man who is less deserving of one, and so acts more in opposition to justice: thirdly, because he deprives the community of a greater good: fourthly, because he despises God more, according to ~~2016~~ Luke 10:16, "He that despiseth you despiseth Me." On the other hand it is accidental to the slaying that the just man whose life is taken be received by God into glory.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(6)-RO(3) — If the judge knows that man who has been convicted by false witnesses, is innocent he must, like Daniel, examine the witnesses with great care, so as to find a motive for acquitting the innocent: but if he cannot do this he should remit him for judgment by a higher tribunal. If even this is impossible, he does not sin if he pronounce sentence in accordance with the evidence, for it is not he that puts the innocent man to death, but they who stated him to be guilty. He that carries out the sentence of the judge who has condemned an innocent man, if the sentence contains an inexcusable error, he should not obey, else there would be an excuse for the executions of the martyrs: if however it contain no manifest injustice, he does not have no right to discuss the judgment of

his superior; nor is it he who slays the innocent man, but the judge whose minister he is.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7)

Whether it is lawful to kill a man in self-defense?

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that nobody may lawfully kill a man in self-defense. For Augustine says to Publicola (Ep. xlvii): “I do not agree with the opinion that one may kill a man lest one be killed by him; unless one be a soldier, exercise a public office, so that one does it not for oneself but for others, having the power to do so, provided it be in keeping with one’s person.” Now he who kills a man in self-defense, kills him lest he be killed by him. Therefore this would seem to be unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, he says (De Lib. Arb. i, 5): “How are they free from sin in sight of Divine providence, who are guilty of taking a man’s life for the sake of these contemptible things?” Now among contemptible things he reckons “those which men may forfeit unwillingly,” as appears from the context (De Lib. Arb. i, 5): and the chief of these is the life of the body. Therefore it is unlawful for any man to take another’s life for the sake of the life of his own body.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, Pope Nicolas [*Nicolas I, Dist. 1, can. De his clericis] says in the Decretals: “Concerning the clerics about whom you have consulted Us, those, namely, who have killed a pagan in self-defense, as to whether, after making amends by repenting, they may return to their former state, or rise to a higher degree; know that in no case is it lawful for them to kill any man under any circumstances whatever.” Now clerics and laymen are alike bound to observe the moral precepts. Therefore neither is it lawful for laymen to kill anyone in self-defense.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7)-O(4) — Further, murder is a more grievous sin than fornication or adultery. Now nobody may lawfully commit simple fornication or adultery or any other mortal sin in order to save his own life; since the spiritual life is to be preferred to the life of the body. Therefore no man may lawfully take another’s life in self-defense in order to save his own life.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7)-O(5) — Further, if the tree be evil, so is the fruit, according to ⁽⁴⁰⁷⁾Matthew 7:17. Now self-defense itself seems to be unlawful, according to ⁽⁶²⁶⁾Romans 12:19: “Not defending [Douay: ‘revenging’] yourselves, my dearly beloved.” Therefore its result, which is the slaying of a man, is also unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written (⁽⁴²²⁾Exodus 22:2):

“If a thief be found breaking into a house or undermining it, and be wounded so as to die; he that slew him shall not be guilty of blood.”

Now it is much more lawful to defend one’s life than one’s house. Therefore neither is a man guilty of murder if he kill another in defense of his own life.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7) — *I answer that*, Nothing hinders one act from having two effects, only one of which is intended, while the other is beside the intention. Now moral acts take their species according to what is intended, and not according to what is beside the intention, since this is accidental as explained above (**Q(43)**, **A(3)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(12)**, **A(1)**). Accordingly the act of self-defense may have two effects, one is the saving of one’s life, the other is the slaying of the aggressor. Therefore this act, since one’s intention is to save one’s own life, is not unlawful, seeing that it is natural to everything to keep itself in “being,” as far as possible. And yet, though proceeding from a good intention, an act may be rendered unlawful, if it be out of proportion to the end. Wherefore if a man, in self-defense, uses more than necessary violence, it will be unlawful: whereas if he repel force with moderation his defense will be lawful, because according to the jurists [*Cap. Significasti, De Homicid. volunt. vel casual.], “it is lawful to repel force by force, provided one does not exceed the limits of a blameless defense.” Nor is it necessary for salvation that a man omit the act of moderate self-defense in order to avoid killing the other man, since one is bound to take more care of one’s own life than of another’s. But as it is unlawful to take a man’s life, except for the public authority acting for the common good, as stated above (**A(3)**), it is not lawful for a man to intend killing a man in self-defense, except for such as have public authority, who while intending to kill a man in self-defense, refer this to the public good, as in the case of a soldier fighting against the foe, and in the minister of the

judge struggling with robbers, although even these sin if they be moved by private animosity.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7)-RO(1) — The words quoted from Augustine refer to the case when one man intends to kill another to save himself from death. The passage quoted in the Second Objection is to be understood in the same sense. Hence he says pointedly, “for the sake of these things,” whereby he indicates the intention. This suffices for the Reply to the Second Objection.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7)-RO(3) — Irregularity results from the act though sinless of taking a man’s life, as appears in the case of a judge who justly condemns a man to death. For this reason a cleric, though he kill a man in self-defense, is irregular, albeit he intends not to kill him, but to defend himself.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7)-RO(4) — The act of fornication or adultery is not necessarily directed to the preservation of one’s own life, as is the act whence sometimes results the taking of a man’s life.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(7)-RO(5) — The defense forbidden in this passage is that which comes from revengeful spite. Hence a gloss says: “Not defending yourselves — that is, not striking your enemy back.”

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(8)

Whether one is guilty of murder through killing someone by chance?

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that one is guilty of murder through killing someone by chance. For we read (^{<1063>}Genesis 4:23,24) that Lamech slew a man in mistake for a wild beast [*The text of the Bible does not say so, but this was the Jewish traditional commentary on ^{<1063>}Genesis 4:23], and that he was accounted guilty of murder. Therefore one incurs the guilt of murder through killing a man by chance.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, it is written (^{<1012>}Exodus 21:22):

“If... one strike a woman with child, and she miscarry indeed... if her death ensue thereupon, he shall render life for life.”

Yet this may happen without any intention of causing her death. Therefore one is guilty of murder through killing someone by chance.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, the Decretals [*Dist. 1] contain several canons prescribing penalties for unintentional homicide. Now penalty is not due save for guilt. Therefore he who kills a man by chance, incurs the guilt of murder.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says to Publicola (Ep. xlvii): “When we do a thing for a good and lawful purpose, if thereby we unintentionally cause harm to anyone, it should by no means be imputed to us.” Now it sometimes happens by chance that a person is killed as a result of something done for a good purpose. Therefore the person who did it is not accounted guilty.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(8) — *I answer that*, According to the Philosopher (Phys. ii, 6) “chance is a cause that acts beside one’s intention.” Hence chance happenings, strictly speaking, are neither intended nor voluntary. And since every sin is voluntary, according to Augustine (De Vera Relig. xiv) it follows that chance happenings, as such, are not sins.

Nevertheless it happens that what is not actually and directly voluntary and intended, is voluntary and intended accidentally, according as that which removes an obstacle is called an accidental cause. Wherefore he who does not remove something whence homicide results whereas he ought to remove it, is in a sense guilty of voluntary homicide. This happens in two ways: first when a man causes another’s death through occupying himself with unlawful things which he ought to avoid: secondly, when he does not take sufficient care. Hence, according to jurists, if a man pursue a lawful occupation and take due care, the result being that a person loses his life, he is not guilty of that person’s death: whereas if he be occupied with something unlawful, or even with something lawful, but without due care, he does not escape being guilty of murder, if his action results in someone’s death.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(8)-RO(1) — Lamech did not take sufficient care to avoid taking a man’s life: and so he was not excused from being guilty of homicide.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(8)-RO(2) — He that strikes a woman with child does something unlawful: wherefore if there results the death either of the woman or of the animated fetus, he will not be excused from homicide, especially seeing that death is the natural result of such a blow.

P(2b)-Q(64)-A(8)-RO(3) — According to the canons a penalty, is inflicted on those who cause death unintentionally, through doing something unlawful, or failing to take sufficient care.

QUESTION 65

OF OTHER INJURIES COMMITTED ON THE PERSON

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider other sinful injuries committed on the person. Under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) The mutilation of members;
- (2) Blows;
- (3) Imprisonment;
- (4) Whether the sins that consist in inflicting such like injuries are aggravated through being perpetrated on persons connected with others?

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(1)

Whether in some cases it may be lawful to maim anyone?

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that in no case can it be lawful to maim anyone. For Damascene says (De Fide Orth. iv, 20) that “sin consists in departing from what is according to nature, towards that which is contrary to nature.” Now according to nature it is appointed by God that a man’s body should be entire in its members, and it is contrary to nature that it should be deprived of a member. Therefore it seems that it is always a sin to maim a person.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, as the whole soul is to the whole body, so are the parts of the soul to the parts of the body (De Anima ii, 1). But it is unlawful to deprive a man of his soul by killing him, except by public authority. Therefore neither is it lawful to maim anyone, except perhaps by public authority.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the welfare of the soul is to be preferred to the welfare of the body. Now it is not lawful for a man to maim himself for the sake of the soul’s welfare: since the council of Nicea

[*P. I, sect. 4, can. i] punished those who castrated themselves that they might preserve chastity. Therefore it is not lawful for any other reason to maim a person.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (¹²²³Exodus 21:24):

“Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot.”

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Since a member is part of the whole human body, it is for the sake of the whole, as the imperfect for the perfect. Hence a member of the human body is to be disposed of according as it is expedient for the body. Now a member of the human body is of itself useful to the good of the whole body, yet, accidentally it may happen to be hurtful, as when a decayed member is a source of corruption to the whole body. Accordingly so long as a member is healthy and retains its natural disposition, it cannot be cut off without injury to the whole body. But as the whole of man is directed as to his end to the whole of the community of which he is a part, as stated above (**Q(61), A(1); Q(64), AA(2),5**), it may happen that although the removal of a member may be detrimental to the whole body, it may nevertheless be directed to the good of the community, in so far as it is applied to a person as a punishment for the purpose of restraining sin. Hence just as by public authority a person is lawfully deprived of life altogether on account of certain more heinous sins, so is he deprived of a member on account of certain lesser sins. But this is not lawful for a private individual, even with the consent of the owner of the member, because this would involve an injury to the community, to whom the man and all his parts belong. If, however, the member be decayed and therefore a source of corruption to the whole body, then it is lawful with the consent of the owner of the member, to cut away the member for the welfare of the whole body, since each one is entrusted with the care of his own welfare. The same applies if it be done with the consent of the person whose business it is to care for the welfare of the person who has a decayed member: otherwise it is altogether unlawful to maim anyone.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(1)-RO(1) — Nothing prevents that which is contrary to a particular nature from being in harmony with universal nature: thus death and corruption, in the physical order, are contrary to the particular nature of the thing corrupted, although they are in keeping with universal nature.

In like manner to maim anyone, though contrary to the particular nature of the body of the person maimed, is nevertheless in keeping with natural reason in relation to the common good.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(1)-RO(2) — The life of the entire man is not directed to something belonging to man; on the contrary whatever belongs to man is directed to his life. Hence in no case does it pertain to a person to take anyone's life, except to the public authority to whom is entrusted the procuring of the common good. But the removal of a member can be directed to the good of one man, and consequently in certain cases can pertain to him.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(1)-RO(3) — A member should not be removed for the sake of the bodily health of the whole, unless otherwise nothing can be done to further the good of the whole. Now it is always possible to further one's spiritual welfare otherwise than by cutting off a member, because sin is always subject to the will: and consequently in no case is it allowable to maim oneself, even to avoid any sin whatever. Hence Chrysostom, in his exposition on ^{<190>}Matthew 19:12 (Hom. lxii in Matth.), "There are eunuchs who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven," says: "Not by maiming themselves, but by destroying evil thoughts, for a man is accursed who maims himself, since they are murderers who do such things." And further on he says: "Nor is lust tamed thereby, on the contrary it becomes more importunate, for the seed springs in us from other sources, and chiefly from an incontinent purpose and a careless mind: and temptation is curbed not so much by cutting off a member as by curbing one's thoughts."

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(2)

*Whether it is lawful for parents to strike their children,
or masters their slaves?*

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful for parents to strike their children, or masters their slaves. For the Apostle says (^{<190>}Ephesians 6:4): "You, fathers, provoke not your children to anger"; and further on (Ephesians 9:6):

"And you, masters, do the same thing to your slaves [Vulg.: 'to them'] forbearing threatenings."

Now some are provoked to anger by blows, and become more troublesome when threatened. Therefore neither should parents strike their children, nor masters their slaves.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the Philosopher says (Ethic. x, 9) that “a father’s words are admonitory and not coercive.” Now blows are a kind of coercion. Therefore it is unlawful for parents to strike their children.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, everyone is allowed to impart correction, for this belongs to the spiritual almsdeeds, as stated above (**Q(32), A(2)**). If, therefore, it is lawful for parents to strike their children for the sake of correction, for the same reason it will be lawful for any person to strike anyone, which is clearly false. Therefore the same conclusion follows.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{419a}Proverbs 13:24): “He that spareth the rod hateth his son,” and further on (^{419b}Proverbs 23:13):

“Withhold not correction from a child, for if thou strike him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and deliver his soul from hell.”

Again it is written (Ecclus. 33:28): “Torture and fetters are for a malicious slave.”

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Harm is done a body by striking it, yet not so as when it is maimed: since maiming destroys the body’s integrity, while a blow merely affects the sense with pain, wherefore it causes much less harm than cutting off a member. Now it is unlawful to do a person a harm, except by way of punishment in the cause of justice. Again, no man justly punishes another, except one who is subject to his jurisdiction. Therefore it is not lawful for a man to strike another, unless he have some power over the one whom he strikes. And since the child is subject to the power of the parent, and the slave to the power of his master, a parent can lawfully strike his child, and a master his slave that instruction may be enforced by correction.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(2)-RO(1) — Since anger is a desire for vengeance, it is aroused chiefly when a man deems himself unjustly injured, as the Philosopher states (Rhet. ii). Hence when parents are forbidden to

provoke their children to anger, they are not prohibited from striking their children for the purpose of correction, but from inflicting blows on them without moderation. The command that masters should forbear from threatening their slaves may be understood in two ways. First that they should be slow to threaten, and this pertains to the moderation of correction; secondly, that they should not always carry out their threats, that is that they should sometimes by a merciful forgiveness temper the judgment whereby they threatened punishment.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(2)-RO(2) — The greater power should exercise the greater coercion. Now just as a city is a perfect community, so the governor of a city has perfect coercive power: wherefore he can inflict irreparable punishments such as death and mutilation. On the other hand the father and the master who preside over the family household, which is an imperfect community, have imperfect coercive power, which is exercised by inflicting lesser punishments, for instance by blows, which do not inflict irreparable harm.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(2)-RO(3) — It is lawful for anyone to impart correction to a willing subject. But to impart it to an unwilling subject belongs to those only who have charge over him. To this pertains chastisement by blows.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(3)

Whether it is lawful to imprison a man?

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful to imprison a man. An act which deals with undue matter is evil in its genus, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(18), A(2)**). Now man, having a free-will, is undue matter for imprisonment which is inconsistent with free-will. Therefore it is unlawful to imprison a man.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, human justice should be ruled by Divine justice. Now according to Ecclus. 15:14, “God left man in the hand of his own counsel.” Therefore it seems that a man ought not to be coerced by chains or prisons.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, no man should be forcibly prevented except from doing an evil deed; and any man can lawfully prevent another from doing this. If, therefore, it were lawful to imprison a man, in order to

restrain him from evil deeds, it would be lawful for anyone to put a man in prison; and this is clearly false. Therefore the same conclusion follows.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, We read in ^{<R34>}Leviticus 24 that a man was imprisoned for the sin of blasphemy.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(3) — *I answer that*, In the goods three things may be considered in due order. First, the substantial integrity of the body, and this is injured by death or maiming. Secondly, pleasure or rest of the senses, and to this striking or anything causing a sense of pain is opposed. Thirdly, the movement or use of the members, and this is hindered by binding or imprisoning or any kind of detention.

Therefore it is unlawful to imprison or in any way detain a man, unless it be done according to the order of justice, either in punishment, or as a measure of precaution against some evil.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(3)-RO(1) — A man who abuses the power entrusted to him deserves to lose it, and therefore when a man by sinning abuses the free use of his members, he becomes a fitting matter for imprisonment.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(3)-RO(2) — According to the order of His wisdom God sometimes restrains a sinner from accomplishing a sin, according to ^{<R52>}Job 5:12: “Who bringeth to nought the designs of the malignant, so that their hand cannot accomplish what they had begun, while sometimes He allows them to do what they will.” In like manner, according to human justice, men are imprisoned, not for every sin but for certain ones.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(3)-RO(3) — It is lawful for anyone to restrain a man for a time from doing some unlawful deed there and then: as when a man prevents another from throwing himself over a precipice, or from striking another. But to him alone who has the right of disposing in general of the actions and of the life of another does it belong primarily to imprison or fetter, because by so doing he hinders him from doing not only evil but also good deeds.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(4)

Whether the sin is aggravated by the fact that the aforesaid injuries are perpetrated on those who are connected with others?

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the sin is not aggravated by the fact that the aforesaid injuries are perpetrated on those who are connected with others. Such like injuries take their sinful character from inflicting an injury on another against his will. Now the evil inflicted on a man's own person is more against his will than that which is inflicted on a person connected with him. Therefore an injury inflicted on a person connected with another is less grievous.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, Holy Writ reproves those especially who do injuries to orphans and widows: hence it is written (Ecclus. 35:17): "He will not despise the prayers of the fatherless, nor the widow when she poureth out her complaint." Now the widow and the orphan are not connected with other persons. Therefore the sin is not aggravated through an injury being inflicted on one who is connected with others.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the person who is connected has a will of his own just as the principal person has, so that something may be voluntary for him and yet against the will of the principal person, as in the case of adultery which pleases the woman but not the husband. Now these injuries are sinful in so far as they consist in an involuntary commutation. Therefore such like injuries are of a less sinful nature.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (⁴⁰⁸²Deuteronomy 28:32) as though indicating an aggravating circumstance:

"Thy sons and thy daughters shall be given to another people, thy eyes looking on [*Vulg.: 'May thy sons and thy daughters be given,' etc.]."

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Other things being equal, an injury is a more grievous sin according as it affects more persons; and hence it is that it is a more grievous sin to strike or injure a person in authority than a private individual, because it conduces to the injury of the whole community, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(73)**, **A(9)**). Now when an injury is inflicted on one who is connected in any way with another, that injury

affects two persons, so that, other things being equal, the sin is aggravated by this very fact. It may happen, however, that in view of certain circumstances, a sin committed against one who is not connected with any other person, is more grievous, on account of either the dignity of the person, or the greatness of the injury.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(4)-RO(1) — An injury inflicted on a person connected with others is less harmful to the persons with whom he is connected, than if it were perpetrated immediately on them, and from this point of view it is a less grievous sin. But all that belongs to the injury of the person with whom he is connected, is added to the sin of which a man is guilty through injuring the other one in himself.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(4)-RO(2) — Injuries done to widows and orphans are more insisted upon both through being more opposed to mercy, and because the same injury done to such persons is more grievous to them since they have no one to turn to for relief.

P(2b)-Q(65)-A(4)-RO(3) — The fact that the wife voluntarily consents to the adultery, lessens the sin and injury, so far as the woman is concerned, for it would be more grievous, if the adulterer oppressed her by violence. But this does not remove the injury as affecting her husband, since “the wife hath not power of her own body; but the husband” (~~1~~¹ 1 Corinthians 7:4). The same applies to similar cases. of adultery, however, as it is opposed not only to justice but also to chastity, we shall speak in the treatise on Temperance (**Q(154), A(8)**).

QUESTION 66

OF THEFT AND ROBBERY

(NINE ARTICLES)

We must now consider the sins opposed to justice, whereby a man injures his neighbor in his belongings; namely theft and robbery.

Under this head there are nine points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether it is natural to man to possess external things?
- (2) Whether it is lawful for a man to possess something as his own?
- (3) Whether theft is the secret taking of another's property?
- (4) Whether robbery is a species of sin distinct from theft?
- (5) Whether every theft is a sin?
- (6) Whether theft is a mortal sin?
- (7) Whether it is lawful to thief in a case of necessity?
- (8) Whether every robbery is a mortal sin?
- (9) Whether robbery is a more grievous sin than theft?

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(1)

Whether it is natural for man to possess external things?

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not natural for man to possess external things. For no man should ascribe to himself that which is God's. Now the dominion over all creatures is proper to God, according to ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 23:1, "The earth is the Lord's," etc. Therefore it is not natural for man to possess external things.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Basil in expounding the words of the rich man (~~Luke~~ Luke 12:18), "I will gather all things that are grown to me, and my goods," says [**Hom. in Luc. xii, 18*]: "Tell me: which are thine? where

did you take them from and bring them into being?” Now whatever man possesses naturally, he can fittingly call his own. Therefore man does not naturally possess external things.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, according to Ambrose (De Trin. i [*De Fide, ad Gratianum, i, 1]) “dominion denotes power.” But man has no power over external things, since he can work no change in their nature. Therefore the possession of external things is not natural to man.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~Gen~~ Psalm 8:8):

“Thou hast subjected all things under his feet.”

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(1) — *I answer that*, External things can be considered in two ways. First, as regards their nature, and this is not subject to the power of man, but only to the power of God Whose mere will all things obey. Secondly, as regards their use, and in this way, man has a natural dominion over external things, because, by his reason and will, he is able to use them for his own profit, as they were made on his account: for the imperfect is always for the sake of the perfect, as stated above (**Q(64), A(1)**). It is by this argument that the Philosopher proves (Polit. i, 3) that the possession of external things is natural to man. Moreover, this natural dominion of man over other creatures, which is competent to man in respect of his reason wherein God’s image resides, is shown forth in man’s creation (~~Gen~~ Genesis 1:26) by the words: “Let us make man to our image and likeness: and let him have dominion over the fishes of the sea,” etc.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(1)-RO(1) — God has sovereign dominion over all things: and He, according to His providence, directed certain things to the sustenance of man’s body. For this reason man has a natural dominion over things, as regards the power to make use of them.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(1)-RO(2) — The rich man is reproved for deeming external things to belong to him principally, as though he had not received them from another, namely from God.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(1)-RO(3) — This argument considers the dominion over external things as regards their nature. Such a dominion belongs to God alone, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(2)

Whether it is lawful for a man to possess a thing as his own?

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful for a man to possess a thing as his own. For whatever is contrary to the natural law is unlawful. Now according to the natural law all things are common property: and the possession of property is contrary to this community of goods. Therefore it is unlawful for any man to appropriate any external thing to himself.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, Basil in expounding the words of the rich man quoted above (**A(1), O(2)**), says: “The rich who deem as their own property the common goods they have seized upon, are like to those who by going beforehand to the play prevent others from coming, and appropriate to themselves what is intended for common use.” Now it would be unlawful to prevent others from obtaining possession of common goods. Therefore it is unlawful to appropriate to oneself what belongs to the community.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, Ambrose says [**Serm. lxiv, de temp.*], and his words are quoted in the Decretals [**Dist. xlvii., Can. Sicut hi.*]: “Let no man call his own that which is common property”: and by “common” he means external things, as is clear from the context. Therefore it seems unlawful for a man to appropriate an external thing to himself.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (*De Haeres., haer. 40*): “The ‘Apostolici’ are those who with extreme arrogance have given themselves that name, because they do not admit into their communion persons who are married or possess anything of their own, such as both monks and clerics who in considerable number are to be found in the Catholic Church.” Now the reason why these people are heretics was because severing themselves from the Church, they think that those who enjoy the use of the above things, which they themselves lack, have no hope of salvation. Therefore it is erroneous to maintain that it is unlawful for a man to possess property.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Two things are competent to man in respect of exterior things. One is the power to procure and dispense them, and in this regard it is lawful for man to possess property. Moreover this

is necessary to human life for three reasons. First because every man is more careful to procure what is for himself alone than that which is common to many or to all: since each one would shirk the labor and leave to another that which concerns the community, as happens where there is a great number of servants. Secondly, because human affairs are conducted in more orderly fashion if each man is charged with taking care of some particular thing himself, whereas there would be confusion if everyone had to look after any one thing indeterminately. Thirdly, because a more peaceful state is ensured to man if each one is contented with his own. Hence it is to be observed that quarrels arise more frequently where there is no division of the things possessed.

The second thing that is competent to man with regard to external things is their use. In this respect man ought to possess external things, not as his own, but as common, so that, to wit, he is ready to communicate them to others in their need. Hence the Apostle says (⁵⁰⁷1 Timothy 6:17,18):

“Charge the rich of this world...
to give easily, to communicate to others,” etc.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(2)-RO(1) — Community of goods is ascribed to the natural law, not that the natural law dictates that all things should be possessed in common and that nothing should be possessed as one’s own: but because the division of possessions is not according to the natural law, but rather arose from human agreement which belongs to positive law, as stated above (**Q(57)**, **AA(2),3**). Hence the ownership of possessions is not contrary to the natural law, but an addition thereto devised by human reason.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(2)-RO(2) — A man would not act unlawfully if by going beforehand to the play he prepared the way for others: but he acts unlawfully if by so doing he hinders others from going. In like manner a rich man does not act unlawfully if he anticipates someone in taking possession of something which at first was common property, and gives others a share: but he sins if he excludes others indiscriminately from using it. Hence Basil says (Hom. in Luc. xii, 18): “Why are you rich while another is poor, unless it be that you may have the merit of a good stewardship, and he the reward of patience?”

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(2)-RO(3) — When Ambrose says: “Let no man call his own that which is common,” he is speaking of ownership as regards use, wherefore he adds: “He who spends too much is a robber.”

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(3)

Whether the essence of theft consists in taking another's thing secretly?

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not essential to theft to take another's thing secretly. For that which diminishes a sin, does not, apparently, belong to the essence of a sin. Now to sin secretly tends to diminish a sin, just as, *on the contrary*, it is written as indicating an aggravating circumstance of the sin of some (^{218b}Isaiah 3:9):

“They have proclaimed abroad their sin as Sodom,
and they have not hid it.”

Therefore it is not essential to theft that it should consist in taking another's thing secretly.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, Ambrose says [*Serm. lxiv, de temp., **A(2), O(3)**, Can. Sicut hi.]: and his words are embodied in the Decretals [*Dist. xlvii]: “It is no less a crime to take from him that has, than to refuse to succor the needy when you can and are well off.” Therefore just as theft consists in taking another's thing, so does it consist in keeping it back.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, a man may take by stealth from another, even that which is his own, for instance a thing that he has deposited with another, or that has been taken away from him unjustly. Therefore it is not essential to theft that it should consist in taking another's thing secretly.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Isidore says (Etym. x): “‘Fur’ [thief] is derived from ‘furvus’ and so from ‘fuscus’ [dark], because he takes advantage of the night.”

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Three things combine together to constitute theft. The first belongs to theft as being contrary to justice,

which gives to each one that which is his, so that it belongs to theft to take possession of what is another's. The second thing belongs to theft as distinct from those sins which are committed against the person, such as murder and adultery, and in this respect it belongs to theft to be about a thing possessed: for if a man takes what is another's not as a possession but as a part (for instance, if he amputates a limb), or as a person connected with him (for instance, if he carry off his daughter or his wife), it is not strictly speaking a case of theft. The third difference is that which completes the nature of theft, and consists in a thing being taken secretly: and in this respect it belongs properly to theft that it consists in "taking another's thing secretly."

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(3)-RO(1) — Secrecy is sometimes a cause of sin, as when a man employs secrecy in order to commit a sin, for instance in fraud and guile. In this way it does not diminish sin, but constitutes a species of sin: and thus it is in theft. In another way secrecy is merely a circumstance of sin, and thus it diminishes sin, both because it is a sign of shame, and because it removes scandal.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(3)-RO(2) — To keep back what is due to another, inflicts the same kind of injury as taking a thing unjustly: wherefore an unjust detention is included in an unjust taking.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(3)-RO(3) — Nothing prevents that which belongs to one person simply, from belonging to another in some respect: thus a deposit belongs simply to the depositor, but with regard to its custody it is the depository's, and the thing stolen is the thief's, not simply, but as regards its custody.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(4)

Whether theft and robbery are sins of different species?

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that theft and robbery are not sins of different species. For theft and robbery differ as "secret" and "manifest": because theft is taking something secretly, while robbery is to take something violently and openly. Now in the other kinds of sins, the

secret and the manifest do not differ specifically. Therefore theft and robbery are not different species of sin.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, moral actions take their species from the end, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(1)**, **A(3)**; **Q(18)**, **A(6)**). Now theft and robbery are directed to the same end, viz. the possession of another's property. Therefore they do not differ specifically.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, just as a thing is taken by force for the sake of possession, so is a woman taken by force for pleasure: wherefore Isidore says (Etym. x) that "he who commits a rape is called a corrupter, and the victim of the rape is said to be corrupted." Now it is a case of rape whether the woman be carried off publicly or secretly. Therefore the thing appropriated is said to be taken by force, whether it be done secretly or publicly. Therefore theft and robbery do not differ.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher (Ethic. v, 2) distinguishes theft from robbery, and states that theft is done in secret, but that robbery is done openly.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Theft and robbery are vices contrary to justice, in as much as one man does another an injustice. Now "no man suffers an injustice willingly," as stated in Ethic. v, 9. Wherefore theft and robbery derive their sinful nature, through the taking being involuntary on the part of the person from whom something is taken. Now the involuntary is twofold, namely, through violence and through ignorance, as stated in Ethic. iii, 1. Therefore the sinful aspect of robbery differs from that of theft: and consequently they differ specifically.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(4)-RO(1) — In the other kinds of sin the sinful nature is not derived from something involuntary, as in the sins opposed to justice: and so where there is a different kind of involuntary, there is a different species of sin.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(4)-RO(2) — The remote end of robbery and theft is the same. But this is not enough for identity of species, because there is a difference of proximate ends, since the robber wishes to take a thing by his own power, but the thief, by cunning.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(4)-RO(3) — The robbery of a woman cannot be secret on the part of the woman who is taken: wherefore even if it be secret as regards the others from whom she is taken, the nature of robbery remains on the part of the woman to whom violence is done.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(5)

Whether theft is always a sin?

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that theft is not always a sin. For no sin is commanded by God, since it is written (Ecclus. 15:21): “He hath commanded no man to do wickedly.” Yet we find that God commanded theft, for it is written (^{<1275}Exodus 12:35,36):

“And the children of Israel did as the Lord had commanded Moses [Vulg.: ‘as Moses had commanded’]. . . and they stripped the Egyptians.”

Therefore theft is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, if a man finds a thing that is not his and takes it, he seems to commit a theft, for he takes another’s property. Yet this seems lawful according to natural equity, as the jurists hold. [*See loc. cit. in Reply.] Therefore it seems that theft is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, he that takes what is his own does not seem to sin, because he does not act against justice, since he does not destroy its equality. Yet a man commits a theft even if he secretly take his own property that is detained by or in the safe-keeping of another. Therefore it seems that theft is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<1215}Exodus 20:15): “Thou shalt not steal.”

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(5) — *I answer that*, If anyone consider what is meant by theft, he will find that it is sinful on two counts. First, because of its opposition to justice, which gives to each one what is his, so that for this reason theft is contrary to justice, through being a taking of what belongs to another. Secondly, because of the guile or fraud committed by the thief,

by laying hands on another's property secretly and cunningly. Wherefore it is evident that every theft is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(5)-RO(1) — It is no theft for a man to take another's property either secretly or openly by order of a judge who has commanded him to do so, because it becomes his due by the very fact that it is adjudicated to him by the sentence of the court. Hence still less was it a theft for the Israelites to take away the spoils of the Egyptians at the command of the Lord, Who ordered this to be done on account of the ill-treatment accorded to them by the Egyptians without any cause: wherefore it is written significantly (Wis. 10:19): "The just took the spoils of the wicked."

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(5)-RO(2) — With regard to treasure-trove a distinction must be made. For some there are that were never in anyone's possession, for instance precious stones and jewels, found on the seashore, and such the finder is allowed to keep [*Dig. I, viii, De divis. rerum: Inst. II, i, De rerum divis.]. The same applies to treasure hidden underground long since and belonging to no man, except that according to civil law the finder is bound to give half to the owner of the land, if the treasure trove be in the land of another person [*Inst. II, i, 39: Cod. X, xv, De Thesauris]. Hence in the parable of the Gospel (¹³⁴Matthew 13:44) it is said of the finder of the treasure hidden in a field that he bought the field, as though he purposed thus to acquire the right of possessing the whole treasure. On the other Land the treasure-trove may be nearly in someone's possession: and then if anyone take it with the intention, not of keeping it but of returning it to the owner who does not look upon such things as unappropriated, he is not guilty of theft. In like manner if the thing found appears to be unappropriated, and if the finder believes it to be so, although he keep it, he does not commit a theft [*Inst. II, i, 47]. In any other case the sin of theft is committed [*Dig. XLI, i, De acquirend. rerum dominio, 9: Inst. II, i, 48]: wherefore Augustine says in a homily (Serm. clxxviii; De Verb. Apost.): "If thou hast found a thing and not returned it, thou hast stolen it" (Dig. xiv, 5, can. Si quid invenisti).

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(5)-RO(3) — He who by stealth takes his own property which is deposited with another man burdens the depositary, who is bound either to restitution, or to prove himself innocent. Hence he is

clearly guilty of sin, and is bound to ease the depositary of his burden. On the other hand he who, by stealth, takes his own property, if this be unjustly detained by another, he sins indeed; yet not because he burdens the retainer, and so he is not bound to restitution or compensation: but he sins against general justice by disregarding the order of justice and usurping judgment concerning his own property. Hence he must make satisfaction to God and endeavor to allay whatever scandal he may have given his neighbor by acting this way.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(6)

Whether theft is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that theft is not a mortal sin. For it is written (^{<306>}Proverbs 6:30): “The fault is not so great when a man hath stolen.” But every mortal sin is a great fault. Therefore theft is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, mortal sin deserves to be punished with death. But in the Law theft is punished not by death but by indemnity, according to (^{<121>}Exodus 22:1,

“If any man steal an ox or a sheep... he shall restore have oxen for one ox, and four sheep for one sheep.”

Therefore theft is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, theft can be committed in small even as in great things. But it seems unreasonable for a man to be punished with eternal death for the theft of a small thing such as a needle or a quill. Therefore theft is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, No man is condemned by the Divine judgment save for a mortal sin. Yet a man is condemned for theft, according to (^{<388>}Zechariah 5:3, “This is the curse that goeth forth over the face of the earth; for every thief shall be judged as is there written.” Therefore theft is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(6) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(59), A(4); P(2a), Q(72), A(5)**), a mortal sin is one that is contrary to charity as the spiritual

life of the soul. Now charity consists principally in the love of God, and secondarily in the love of our neighbor, which is shown in our wishing and doing him well. But theft is a means of doing harm to our neighbor in his belongings; and if men were to rob one another habitually, human society would be undone. Therefore theft, as being opposed to charity, is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(6)-RO(1) — The statement that theft is not a great fault is in view of two cases. First, when a person is led to thief through necessity. This necessity diminishes or entirely removes sin, as we shall show further on (**A(7)**). Hence the text continues: “For he stealeth to fill his hungry soul.” Secondly, theft is stated not to be a great fault in comparison with the guilt of adultery, which is punished with death. Hence the text goes on to say of the thief that “if he be taken, he shall restore sevenfold... but he that is an adulterer... shall destroy his own soul.”

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(6)-RO(2) — The punishments of this life are medicinal rather than retributive. For retribution is reserved to the Divine judgment which is pronounced against sinners “according to truth” (⁶¹¹Romans 2:2). Wherefore, according to the judgment of the present life the death punishment is inflicted, not for every mortal sin, but only for such as inflict an irreparable harm, or again for such as contain some horrible deformity. Hence according to the present judgment the pain of death is not inflicted for theft which does not inflict an irreparable harm, except when it is aggravated by some grave circumstance, as in the case of sacrilege which is the theft of a sacred thing, of peculation, which is theft of common property, as Augustine states (Tract. 1, Super Joan.), and of kidnaping which is stealing a man, for which the pain of death is inflicted (⁶²¹Exodus 21:16).

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(6)-RO(3) — Reason accounts as nothing that which is little: so that a man does not consider himself injured in very little matters: and the person who takes such things can presume that this is not against the will of the owner. And if a person take such like very little things, he may be proportionately excused from mortal sin. Yet if his intention is to rob and injure his neighbor, there may be a mortal sin even in these very little things, even as there may be through consent in a mere thought.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(7)

Whether it is lawful to steal through stress of need?

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful to steal through stress of need. For penance is not imposed except on one who has sinned. Now it is stated (Extra, De furtis, Cap. Si quis): “If anyone, through stress of hunger or nakedness, steal food, clothing or beast, he shall do penance for three weeks.” Therefore it is not lawful to steal through stress of need.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, the Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 6) that “there are some actions whose very name implies wickedness,” and among these he reckons theft. Now that which is wicked in itself may not be done for a good end. Therefore a man cannot lawfully steal in order to remedy a need.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, a man should love his neighbor as himself. Now, according to Augustine (Contra Mendac. vii), it is unlawful to steal in order to succor one’s neighbor by giving him an alms. Therefore neither is it lawful to steal in order to remedy one’s own needs.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, In cases of need all things are common property, so that there would seem to be no sin in taking another’s property, for need has made it common.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(7) — *I answer that*, Things which are of human right cannot derogate from natural right or Divine right. Now according to the natural order established by Divine Providence, inferior things are ordained for the purpose of succoring man’s needs by their means. Wherefore the division and appropriation of things which are based on human law, do not preclude the fact that man’s needs have to be remedied by means of these very things. Hence whatever certain people have in superabundance is due, by natural law, to the purpose of succoring the poor. For this reason Ambrose [*Loc. cit., **A(2), O(3)**] says, and his words are embodied in the Decretals (Dist. xlvii, can. Sicut ii): “It is the hungry man’s bread that you withhold, the naked man’s cloak that you store away, the money that you bury in the earth is the price of the poor man’s ransom and freedom.”

Since, however, there are many who are in need, while it is impossible for all to be succored by means of the same thing, each one is entrusted with the stewardship of his own things, so that out of them he may come to the aid of those who are in need. Nevertheless, if the need be so manifest and urgent, that it is evident that the present need must be remedied by whatever means be at hand (for instance when a person is in some imminent danger, and there is no other possible remedy), then it is lawful for a man to succor his own need by means of another's property, by taking it either openly or secretly: nor is this properly speaking theft or robbery.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(7)-RO(1) — This decretal considers cases where there is no urgent need.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(7)-RO(2) — It is not theft, properly speaking, to take secretly and use another's property in a case of extreme need: because that which he takes for the support of his life becomes his own property by reason of that need.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(7)-RO(3) — In a case of a like need a man may also take secretly another's property in order to succor his neighbor in need.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(8)

Whether robbery may be committed without sin?

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that robbery may be committed without sin. For spoils are taken by violence, and this seems to belong to the essence of robbery, according to what has been said (**A(4)**). Now it is lawful to take spoils from the enemy; for Ambrose says (De Patriarch. 4 [*De Abraham i, 3]): "When the conqueror has taken possession of the spoils, military discipline demands that all should be reserved for the sovereign," in order, to wit, that he may distribute them. Therefore in certain cases robbery is lawful.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, it is lawful to take from a man what is not his. Now the things which unbelievers have are not theirs, for Augustine says (Ep. ad Vincent. Donat. xciii.): "You falsely call things your own, for you do not possess them justly, and according to the laws

of earthly kings you are commanded to forfeit them.” Therefore it seems that one may lawfully rob unbelievers.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, earthly princes violently extort many things from their subjects: and this seems to savor of robbery. Now it would seem a grievous matter to say that they sin in acting thus, for in that case nearly every prince would be damned. Therefore in some cases robbery is lawful.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, Whatever is taken lawfully may be offered to God in sacrifice and oblation. Now this cannot be done with the proceeds of robbery, according to ~~2608~~ Isaiah 61:8, “I am the Lord that love judgment, and hate robbery in a holocaust.” Therefore it is not lawful to take anything by robbery.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(8) — *I answer that*, Robbery implies a certain violence and coercion employed in taking unjustly from a man that which is his. Now in human society no man can exercise coercion except through public authority: and, consequently, if a private individual not having public authority takes another’s property by violence, he acts unlawfully and commits a robbery, as burglars do. As regards princes, the public power is entrusted to them that they may be the guardians of justice: hence it is unlawful for them to use violence or coercion, save within the bounds of justice — either by fighting against the enemy, or against the citizens, by punishing evil-doers: and whatever is taken by violence of this kind is not the spoils of robbery, since it is not contrary to justice. On the other hand to take other people’s property violently and against justice, in the exercise of public authority, is to act unlawfully and to be guilty of robbery; and whoever does so is bound to restitution.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(8)-RO(1) — A distinction must be made in the matter of spoils. For if they who take spoils from the enemy, are waging a just war, such things as they seize in the war become their own property. This is no robbery, so that they are not bound to restitution. Nevertheless even they who are engaged in a just war may sin in taking spoils through cupidity arising from an evil intention, if, to wit, they fight chiefly not for justice but for spoil. For Augustine says (De Verb. Dom. xix; Serm. lxxxii) that “it is a sin to fight for booty.” If, however, those who take the spoil, are

waging an unjust war, they are guilty of robbery, and are bound to restitution.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(8)-RO(2) — Unbelievers possess their goods unjustly in so far as they are ordered by the laws of earthly princes to forfeit those goods. Hence these may be taken violently from them, not by private but by public authority.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(8)-RO(3) — It is no robbery if princes exact from their subjects that which is due to them for the safe-guarding of the common good, even if they use violence in so doing: but if they extort something unduly by means of violence, it is robbery even as burglary is. Hence Augustine says (De Civ. Dei iv, 4): “If justice be disregarded, what is a king but a mighty robber? since what is a robber but a little king?” And it is written (⁴⁹⁷Ezekiel 22:27): “Her princes in the midst of her, are like wolves ravening the prey.” Wherefore they are bound to restitution, just as robbers are, and by so much do they sin more grievously than robbers, as their actions are fraught with greater and more universal danger to public justice whose wardens they are.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(9)

Whether theft is a more grievous sin than robbery?

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that theft is a more grievous sin than robbery. For theft adds fraud and guile to the taking of another’s property: and these things are not found in robbery. Now fraud and guile are sinful in themselves, as stated above (**Q(55), AA(4),5**). Therefore theft is a more grievous sin than robbery.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, shame is fear about a wicked deed, as stated in Ethic. iv, 9. Now men are more ashamed of theft than of robbery. Therefore theft is more wicked than robbery.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, the more persons a sin injures the more grievous it would seem to be. Now the great and the lowly may be injured by theft: whereas only the weak can be injured by robbery, since it is possible to use violence towards them. Therefore the sin of theft seems to be more grievous than the sin of robbery.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, According to the laws robbery is more severely punished than theft.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(9) — *I answer that*, Robbery and theft are sinful, as stated above (**AA(4),6**), on account of the involuntariness on the part of the person from whom something is taken: yet so that in theft the involuntariness is due to ignorance, whereas in robbery it is due to violence. Now a thing is more involuntary through violence than through ignorance, because violence is more directly opposed to the will than ignorance. Therefore robbery is a more grievous sin than theft. There is also another reason, since robbery not only inflicts a loss on a person in his things, but also conduces to the ignominy and injury of his person, and this is of graver import than fraud or guile which belong to theft. Hence the Reply to the First Objection is evident.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(9)-RO(2) — Men who adhere to sensible things think more of external strength which is evidenced in robbery, than of internal virtue which is forfeit through sin: wherefore they are less ashamed of robbery than of theft.

P(2b)-Q(66)-A(9)-RO(3) — Although more persons may be injured by theft than by robbery, yet more grievous injuries may be inflicted by robbery than by theft: for which reason also robbery is more odious.

BY WORDS UTILIZED IN A COURT OF LAW

QUESTIONS 67-71

QUESTION 67

OF THE INJUSTICE OF A JUDGE, IN JUDGING

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider those vices opposed to commutative justice, that consist in words injurious to our neighbors. We shall consider

- (1) those which are connected with judicial proceedings, and
- (2) injurious words uttered extra-judicially.

Under the first head five points occur for our consideration:

- (1) The injustice of a judge in judging;
- (2) The injustice of the prosecutor in accusing;
- (3) The injustice of the defendant in defending himself;
- (4) The injustice of the witnesses in giving evidence;
- (5) The injustice of the advocate in defending.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether a man can justly judge one who is not his subject?
- (2) Whether it is lawful for a judge, on account of the evidence, to deliver judgment in opposition to the truth which is known to him?
- (3) Whether a judge can justly sentence a man who is not accused?

(4) Whether he can justly remit the punishment?

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(1)

*Whether a man can justly judge
one who is not subject to his jurisdiction?*

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that a man can justly judge one who is not subject to his jurisdiction. For it is stated (Daniel 13) that Daniel sentenced the ancients who were convicted of bearing false witness. But these ancients were not subject to Daniel; indeed they were judges of the people. Therefore a man may lawfully judge one that is not subject to his jurisdiction.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Christ was no man's subject, indeed He was "King of kings and Lord of lords" (^{669b}Revelation 19:16). Yet He submitted to the judgment of a man. Therefore it seems that a man may lawfully judge one that is not subject to his jurisdiction.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, according to the law [*Cap. Licet ratione, de Foro Comp.] a man is tried in this or that court according to his kind of offense. Now sometimes the defendant is not the subject of the man whose business it is to judge in that particular place, for instance when the defendant belongs to another diocese or is exempt. Therefore it seems that a man may judge one that is not his subject.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Gregory [*Regist. xi, epist. 64] in commenting on ^{669b}Deuteronomy 23:25, "If thou go into thy friend's corn," etc. says: "Thou mayest not put the sickle of judgment to the corn that is entrusted to another."

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(1) — *I answer that*, A judge's sentence is like a particular law regarding some particular fact. Wherefore just as a general law should have coercive power, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. x, 9), so too the sentence of a judge should have coercive power, whereby either party is compelled to comply with the judge's sentence; else the judgment would be of no effect. Now coercive power is not exercised in human affairs, save by those who hold public authority: and those who have this authority are accounted the superiors of those over whom they preside whether by

ordinary or by delegated authority. Hence it is evident that no man can judge others than his subjects and this in virtue either of delegated or of ordinary authority.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(1)-RO(1) — In judging those ancients Daniel exercised an authority delegated to him by Divine instinct. This is indicated where it is said (Daniel 13:45) that “the Lord raised up the... spirit of a young boy.”

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(1)-RO(2) — In human affairs a man may submit of his own accord to the judgment of others although these be not his superiors, an example of which is when parties agree to a settlement by arbitrators. Wherefore it is necessary that the arbitrator should be upheld by a penalty, since the arbitrators through not exercising authority in the case, have not of themselves full power of coercion. Accordingly in this way did Christ of his own accord submit to human judgment: and thus too did Pope Leo [*Leo IV] submit to the judgment of the emperor [*Can. Nos si incompetenter, caus. ii, qu. 7].

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(1)-RO(3) — The bishop of the defendant’s diocese becomes the latter’s superior as regards the fault committed, even though he be exempt: unless perchance the defendant offend in a matter exempt from the bishop’s authority, for instance in administering the property of an exempt monastery. But if an exempt person commits a theft, or a murder or the like, he may be justly condemned by the ordinary.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(2)

*Whether it is lawful for a judge to pronounce judgment
against the truth that he knows,
on account of evidence to the contrary?*

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful for a judge to pronounce judgment against the truth that he knows, on account of evidence to the contrary. For it is written (^{157b}Deuteronomy 17:9):

“Thou shalt come to the priests of the Levitical race, and to the judge that shall be at that time; and thou shalt ask of them, and they shall show thee the truth of the judgment.”

Now sometimes certain things are alleged against the truth, as when something is proved by means of false witnesses. Therefore it is unlawful for a judge to pronounce judgment according to what is alleged and proved in opposition to the truth which he knows.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, in pronouncing judgment a man should conform to the Divine judgment, since “it is the judgment of God” (^{<RM7>}Deuteronomy 1:17). Now “the judgment of God is according to the truth” (^{<RM7>}Romans 2:2), and it was foretold of Christ (^{<RM7>}Isaiah 11:3,4): “He shall not judge according to the sight of the eyes, nor reprove according to the hearing of the ears. But He shall judge the poor with justice, and shall reprove with equity for the meek of the earth.” Therefore the judge ought not to pronounce judgment according to the evidence before him if it be contrary to what he knows himself.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the reason why evidence is required in a court of law, is that the judge may have a faithful record of the truth of the matter, wherefore in matters of common knowledge there is no need of judicial procedure, according to ^{<RM7>}1 Timothy 5:24, “Some men’s sins are manifest, going before to judgment.” Consequently, if the judge by his personal knowledge is aware of the truth, he should pay no heed to the evidence, but should pronounce sentence according to the truth which he knows.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, the word “conscience” denotes application of knowledge to a matter of action as stated in the **P(1), Q(79), A(13)**. Now it is a sin to act contrary to one’s knowledge. Therefore a judge sins if he pronounces sentence according to the evidence but against his conscience of the truth.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine [*Ambrose, Super Psalm 118, serm. 20] says in his commentary on the Psalter: “A good judge does nothing according to his private opinion but pronounces sentence according to the law and the right.” Now this is to pronounce judgment according to what is alleged and proved in court. Therefore a judge ought to pronounce judgment in accordance with these things, and not according to his private opinion.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**; **Q(60)**, **AA(2),6**) it is the duty of a judge to pronounce judgment in as much as he exercises public authority, wherefore his judgment should be based on information acquired by him, not from his knowledge as a private individual, but from what he knows as a public person. Now the latter knowledge comes to him both in general and in particular — in general through the public laws, whether Divine or human, and he should admit no evidence that conflicts therewith — in some particular matter, through documents and witnesses, and other legal means of information, which in pronouncing his sentence, he ought to follow rather than the information he has acquired as a private individual. And yet this same information may be of use to him, so that he can more rigorously sift the evidence brought forward, and discover its weak points. If, however, he is unable to reject that evidence juridically, he must, as stated above, follow it in pronouncing sentence.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(2)-RO(1) — The reason why, in the passage quoted, it is stated that the judges should first of all be asked their reasons, is to make it clear that the judges ought to judge the truth in accordance with the evidence.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(2)-RO(2) — To judge belongs to God in virtue of His own power: wherefore His judgment is based on the truth which He Himself knows, and not on knowledge imparted by others: the same is to be said of Christ, Who is true God and true man: whereas other judges do not judge in virtue of their own power, so that there is no comparison.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(2)-RO(3) — The Apostle refers to the case where something is well known not to the judge alone, but both to him and to others, so that the guilty party can by no means deny his guilt (as in the case of notorious criminals), and is convicted at once from the evidence of the fact. If, on the other hand, it be well known to the judge, but not to others, or to others, but not to the judge, then it is necessary for the judge to sift the evidence.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(2)-RO(4) — In matters touching his own person, a man must form his conscience from his own knowledge, but in matters concerning the public authority, he must form his conscience in accordance with the knowledge attainable in the public judicial procedure.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(3)

Whether a judge may condemn a man who is not accused?

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that a judge may pass sentence on a man who is not accused. For human justice is derived from Divine justice. Now God judges the sinner even though there be no accuser. Therefore it seems that a man may pass sentence of condemnation on a man even though there be no accuser.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, an accuser is required in judicial procedure in order that he may relate the crime to the judge. Now sometimes the crime may come to the judge's knowledge otherwise than by accusation; for instance, by denunciation, or by evil report, or through the judge himself being an eye-witness. Therefore a judge may condemn a man without there being an accuser.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the deeds of holy persons are related in Holy Writ, as models of human conduct. Now Daniel was at the same time the accuser and the judge of the wicked ancients (Daniel 13). Therefore it is not contrary to justice for a man to condemn anyone as judge while being at the same time his accuser.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Ambrose in his commentary on ^{<48D>}1 Corinthians 5:2, expounding the Apostle's sentence on the fornicator, says that "a judge should not condemn without an accuser, since our Lord did not banish Judas, who was a thief, yet was not accused."

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(3) — *I answer that*, A judge is an interpreter of justice. Wherefore, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 4), "men have recourse to a judge as to one who is the personification of justice." Now, as stated above (Q(58), A(2)), justice is not between a man and himself but between one man and another. Hence a judge must needs judge between two parties, which is the case when one is the prosecutor, and the other the defendant. Therefore in criminal cases the judge cannot sentence a man unless the latter has an accuser, according to ^{<4256>}Acts 25:16:

“It is not the custom of the Romans to condemn any man, before that he who is accused have his accusers present, and have liberty to make his answer, to clear himself of the crimes”

of which he is accused.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(3)-RO(1) — God, in judging man, takes the sinner’s conscience as his accuser, according to ^{<R15>}Romans 2:15, “Their thoughts between themselves accusing, or also defending one another”; or again, He takes the evidence of the fact as regards the deed itself, according to ^{<Q14P>}Genesis 4:10,

“The voice of thy brother’s blood crieth to Me from the earth.”

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(3)-RO(2) — Public disgrace takes the place of an accuser. Hence a gloss on ^{<Q14P>}Genesis 4:10, “The voice of thy brother’s blood,” etc. says: “There is no need of an accuser when the crime committed is notorious.” In a case of denunciation, as stated above (**Q(33), A(7)**), the amendment, not the punishment, of the sinner is intended: wherefore when a man is denounced for a sin, nothing is done against him, but for him, so that no accuser is required. The punishment that is inflicted is on account of his rebellion against the Church, and since this rebellion is manifest, it stands instead of an accuser. The fact that the judge himself was an eye-witness, does not authorize him to proceed to pass sentence, except according to the order of judicial procedure.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(3)-RO(3) — God, in judging man, proceeds from His own knowledge of the truth, whereas man does not, as stated above (**A(2)**). Hence a man cannot be accuser, witness and judge at the same time, as God is. Daniel was at once accuser and judge, because he was the executor of the sentence of God, by whose instinct he was moved, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 1).

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(4)

Whether the judge can lawfully remit the punishment?

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the judge can lawfully remit the punishment. For it is written (^{<Q13>}James 2:13): “Judgment without

mercy” shall be done “to him that hath not done mercy.” Now no man is punished for not doing what he cannot do lawfully. Therefore any judge can lawfully do mercy by remitting the punishment.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, human judgment should imitate the Divine judgment. Now God remits the punishment to sinners, because He desires not the death of the sinner, according to ^{<REB>}Ezekiel 18:23. Therefore a human judge also may lawfully remit the punishment to one who repents.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, it is lawful for anyone to do what is profitable to some one and harmful to none. Now the remission of his punishment profits the guilty man and harms nobody. Therefore the judge can lawfully loose a guilty man from his punishment.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<REB>}Deuteronomy 13:8,9) concerning anyone who would persuade a man to serve strange gods:

“Neither let thy eye spare him to pity and conceal him, but thou shalt presently put him to death”:

and of the murderer it is written (^{<REB>}Deuteronomy 19:12,13):

“He shall die. Thou shalt not pity him.”

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As may be gathered from what has been said (**AA(2),3**), with regard to the question in point, two things may be observed in connection with a judge. One is that he has to judge between accuser and defendant, while the other is that he pronounces the judicial sentence, in virtue of his power, not as a private individual but as a public person. Accordingly on two counts a judge is hindered from loosing a guilty person from his punishment. First on the part of the accuser, whose right it sometimes is that the guilty party should be punished — for instance on account of some injury committed against the accuser — because it is not in the power of a judge to remit such punishment, since every judge is bound to give each man his right. Secondly, he finds a hindrance on the part of the commonwealth, whose power he exercises, and to whose good it belongs that evil-doers should be punished.

Nevertheless in this respect there is a difference between judges of lower degree and the supreme judge, i.e. the sovereign, to whom the entire public authority is entrusted. For the inferior judge has no power to exempt a guilty man from punishment against the laws imposed on him by his superior. Wherefore Augustine in commenting on ⁴⁸¹John 19:11, “Thou shouldst not have any power against Me,” says (Tract. cxvi in Joan.): “The power which God gave Pilate was such that he was under the power of Caesar, so that he was by no means free to acquit the person accused.” On the other hand the sovereign who has full authority in the commonwealth, can lawfully remit the punishment to a guilty person, provided the injured party consent to the remission, and that this do not seem detrimental to the public good.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(4)-RO(1) — There is a place for the judge’s mercy in matters that are left to the judge’s discretion, because in like matters a good man is slow to punish as the Philosopher states (Ethic. v, 10). But in matters that are determined in accordance with Divine or human laws, it is not left to him to show mercy.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(4)-RO(2) — God has supreme power of judging, and it concerns Him whatever is done sinfully against anyone. Therefore He is free to remit the punishment, especially since punishment is due to sin chiefly because it is done against Him. He does not, however, remit the punishment, except in so far as it becomes His goodness, which is the source of all laws.

P(2b)-Q(67)-A(4)-RO(3) — If the judge were to remit punishment inordinately, he would inflict an injury on the community, for whose good it behooves ill-deeds to be punished, in order that men may avoid sin. Hence the text, after appointing the punishment of the seducer, adds (⁴⁸¹Deuteronomy 13:11): “That all Israel hearing may fear, and may do no more anything like this.” He would also inflict harm on the injured person; who is compensated by having his honor restored in the punishment of the man who has injured him.

QUESTION 68

OF MATTERS CONCERNING UNJUST ACCUSATION

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider matters pertaining to unjust accusation. Under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether a man is bound to accuse?
- (2) Whether the accusation should be made in writing?
- (3) How is an accusation vitiated?
- (4) How should those be punished who have accused a man wrongfully?

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(1)

Whether a man is bound to accuse?

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that a man is not bound to accuse. For no man is excused on account of sin from fulfilling a Divine precept, since he would thus profit by his sin. Yet on account of sin some are disqualified from accusing, such as those who are excommunicate or of evil fame, or who are accused of grievous crimes and are not yet proved to be innocent [^{<SOL>}* Timothy 1:5]. Therefore a man is not bound by a Divine precept to accuse.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, every duty depends on charity which is “the end of the precept” [^{<ERR>}*Can. Definimus, caus. iv, qu. 1; caus. vi, qu. 1]: wherefore it is written (^{<ERR>}Romans 13:8): “Owe no man anything, but to love one another.” Now that which belongs to charity is a duty that man owes to all both of high and of low degree, both superiors and inferiors. Since therefore subjects should not accuse their superiors, nor persons of

lower degree, those of a higher degree, as shown in several chapters (Decret. II, qu. vii), it seems that it is no man's duty to accuse.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, no man is bound to act against the fidelity which he owes his friend; because he ought not to do to another what he would not have others do to him. Now to accuse anyone is sometimes contrary to the fidelity that one owes a friend; for it is written (²¹¹¹³Proverbs 11:13):

“He that walketh deceitfully, revealeth secrets; but he that is faithful, concealeth the thing committed to him by his friend.”

Therefore a man is not bound to accuse.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (²¹¹¹⁴Leviticus 5:1):

“If any one sin, and hear the voice of one swearing, and is a witness either because he himself hath seen, or is privy to it: if he do not utter it, he shall bear his iniquity.”

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(33)**, **AA(6),7**; **Q(67)**, **A(3)**, ad 2), the difference between denunciation and accusation is that in denunciation we aim at a brother's amendment, whereas in accusation we intend the punishment of his crime. Now the punishments of this life are sought, not for their own sake, because this is not the final time of retribution, but in their character of medicine, conducing either to the amendment of the sinner, or to the good of the commonwealth whose calm is ensured by the punishment of evil-doers. The former of these is intended in denunciation, as stated, whereas the second regards properly accusation. Hence in the case of a crime that conduces to the injury of the commonwealth, a man is bound to accusation, provided he can offer sufficient proof, since it is the accuser's duty to prove: as, for example, when anyone's sin conduces to the bodily or spiritual corruption of the community. If, however, the sin be not such as to affect the community, or if he cannot offer sufficient proof, a man is not bound to attempt to accuse, since no man is bound to do what he cannot duly accomplish.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(1)-RO(1) — Nothing prevents a man being debarred by sin from doing what men are under an obligation to do: for instance from meriting eternal life, and from receiving the sacraments of the Church. Nor

does a man profit by this: indeed it is a most grievous fault to fail to do what one is bound to do, since virtuous acts are perfections of man.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(1)-RO(2) — Subjects are debarred from accusing their superiors, “if it is not the affection of charity but their own wickedness that leads them to defame and disparage the conduct of their superiors” [*Append. Grat. ad can. Sunt nonnulli, caus. ii, qu. 7] — or again if the subject who wishes to accuse his superior is himself guilty of crime [*Decret. II, qu. vii, can. Praesumunt.]. Otherwise, provided they be in other respects qualified to accuse, it is lawful for subjects to accuse their superiors out of charity.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(1)-RO(3) — It is contrary to fidelity to make known secrets to the injury of a person; but not if they be revealed for the good of the community, which should always be preferred to a private good. Hence it is unlawful to receive any secret in detriment to the common good: and yet a thing is scarcely a secret when there are sufficient witnesses to prove it.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(2)

Whether it is necessary for the accusation to be made in writing?

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem unnecessary for the accusation to be made in writing. For writing was devised as an aid to the human memory of the past. But an accusation is made in the present. Therefore the accusation needs not to be made in writing.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, it is laid down (Decret. II, qu. viii, can. Per scripta) that “no man may accuse or be accused in his absence.” Now writing seems to be useful in the fact that it is a means of notifying something to one who is absent, as Augustine declares (De Trin. x, 1). Therefore the accusation need not be in writing: and all the more that the canon declares that “no accusation in writing should be accepted.”

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, a man’s crime is made known by denunciation, even as by accusation. Now writing is unnecessary in denunciation. Therefore it is seemingly unnecessary in accusation.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is laid down (Decret. II, qu. viii, can. Accusatorum) that “the role of accuser must never be sanctioned without the accusation be in writing.”

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(67), A(3)**), when the process in a criminal case goes by way of accusation, the accuser is in the position of a party, so that the judge stands between the accuser and the accused for the purpose of the trial of justice, wherein it behooves one to proceed on certainties, as far as possible. Since however verbal utterances are apt to escape one’s memory, the judge would be unable to know for certain what had been said and with what qualifications, when he comes to pronounce sentence, unless it were drawn up in writing. Hence it has with reason been established that the accusation, as well as other parts of the judicial procedure, should be put into writing.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(2)-RO(1) — Words are so many and so various that it is difficult to remember each one. A proof of this is the fact that if a number of people who have heard the same words be asked what was said, they will not agree in repeating them, even after a short time. And since a slight difference of words changes the sense, even though the judge’s sentence may have to be pronounced soon afterwards, the certainty of judgment requires that the accusation be drawn up in writing.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(2)-RO(2) — Writing is needed not only on account of the absence of the person who has something to notify, or of the person to whom something is notified, but also on account of the delay of time as stated above (ad 1). Hence when the canon says, “Let no accusation be accepted in writing” it refers to the sending of an accusation by one who is absent: but it does not exclude the necessity of writing when the accuser is present.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(2)-RO(3) — The denouncer does not bind himself to give proofs: wherefore he is not punished if he is unable to prove. For this reason writing is unnecessary in a denunciation: and it suffices that the denunciation be made verbally to the Church, who will proceed, in virtue of her office, to the correction of the brother.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(3)

Whether an accusation is rendered unjust by calumny, collusion or evasion?

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that an accusation is not rendered unjust by calumny, collusion or evasion. For according to Decret. II, qu. iii [*Append. Grat. ad can. Si quem poenituerit.], “calumny consists in falsely charging a person with a crime.” Now sometimes one man falsely accuses another of a crime through ignorance of fact which excuses him. Therefore it seems that an accusation is not always rendered unjust through being slanderous.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it is stated by the same authority that “collusion consists in hiding the truth about a crime.” But seemingly this is not unlawful, because one is not bound to disclose every crime, as stated above (**A(1)**; **Q(33)**, **A(7)**). Therefore it seems that an accusation is not rendered unjust by collusion.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, it is stated by the same authority that “evasion consists in withdrawing altogether from an accusation.” But this can be done without injustice: for it is stated there also: “If a man repent of having made a wicked accusation and inscription* in a matter which he cannot prove, and come to an understanding with the innocent party whom he has accused, let them acquit one another.” [*The accuser was bound by Roman Law to endorse (se inscribere) the writ of accusation. The effect of this endorsement or inscription was that the accuser bound himself, if he failed to prove the accusation, to suffer the same punishment as the accused would have to suffer if proved guilty.] Therefore evasion does not render an accusation unjust.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is stated by the same authority: “The rashness of accusers shows itself in three ways. For they are guilty either of calumny, or of collusion, or of evasion.”

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), accusation is ordered for the common good which it aims at procuring by means of knowledge of the crime. Now no man ought to injure a person unjustly, in order to promote the common good. Wherefore a man may sin in two

ways when making an accusation: first through acting unjustly against the accused, by charging him falsely with the commission of a crime, i.e. by calumniating him; secondly, on the part of the commonwealth, whose good is intended chiefly in an accusation, when anyone with wicked intent hinders a sin being punished. This again happens in two ways: first by having recourse to fraud in making the accusation. This belongs to collusion [prevaricatio] for “he that is guilty of collusion is like one who rides astraddle [varicator], because he helps the other party, and betrays his own side” [*Append. Grat. ad can. Si quem poenituerit.]. Secondly by withdrawing altogether from the accusation. This is evasion [tergiversatio] for by desisting from what he had begun he seems to turn his back [tergum vertere].

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(3)-RO(1) — A man ought not to proceed to accuse except of what he is quite certain about, wherein ignorance of fact has no place. Yet he who falsely charges another with a crime is not a calumniator unless he gives utterance to false accusations out of malice. For it happens sometimes that a man through levity of mind proceeds to accuse someone, because he believes too readily what he hears, and this pertains to rashness; while, on the other hand sometimes a man is led to make an accusation on account of an error for which he is not to blame. All these things must be weighed according to the judge’s prudence, lest he should declare a man to have been guilty of calumny, who through levity of mind or an error for which he is not to be blamed has uttered a false accusation.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(3)-RO(2) — Not everyone who hides the truth about a crime is guilty of collusion, but only he who deceitfully hides the matter about which he makes the accusation, by collusion with the defendant, dissembling his proofs, and admitting false excuses.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(3)-RO(3) — Evasion consists in withdrawing altogether from the accusation, by renouncing the intention of accusing, not anyhow, but inordinately. There are two ways, however, in which a man may rightly desist from accusing without committing a sin — in one way, in the very process of accusation, if it come to his knowledge that the matter of his accusation is false, and then by mutual consent the accuser and the defendant acquit one another — in another way, if the accusation be

quashed by the sovereign to whom belongs the care of the common good, which it is intended to procure by the accusation.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(4)

Whether an accuser who fails to prove his indictment is bound to the punishment of retaliation?

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the accuser who fails to prove his indictment is not bound to the punishment of retaliation. For sometimes a man is led by a just error to make an accusation, in which case the judge acquit the accuser, as stated in Decret. II, qu. 3:[*Append. Grat., ad can. Si quem poenituerit.] Therefore the accuser who fails to prove his indictment is not bound to the punishment of retaliation.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, if the punishment of retaliation ought to be inflicted on one who has accused unjustly, this will be on account of the injury he has done to someone — but not on account of any injury done to the person of the accused, for in that case the sovereign could not remit this punishment, nor on account of an injury to the commonwealth, because then the accused could not acquit him. Therefore the punishment of retaliation is not due to one who has failed to prove his accusation.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the one same sin does not deserve a twofold punishment, according to ^{<300>}Nahum 1:9 [*Septuagint version]: “God shall not judge the same thing a second time.” But he who fails to prove his accusation, incurs the punishment due to defamation [*Can. Infames, caus. vi, qu. 1], which punishment even the Pope seemingly cannot remit, according to a statement of Pope Gelasius [*Callist. I, Epist. ad omn. Gall. episc.]: “Although we are able to save souls by Penance, we are unable to remove the defamation.” Therefore he is not bound to suffer the punishment of retaliation.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Pope Hadrian I says (Cap. lii): “He that fails to prove his accusation, must himself suffer the punishment which his accusation inferred.”

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (A(2)), in a case, where the procedure is by way of accusation, the accuser holds the

position of a party aiming at the punishment of the accused. Now the duty of the judge is to establish the equality of justice between them: and the equality of justice requires that a man should himself suffer whatever harm he has intended to be inflicted on another, according to ⁽¹²²⁾Exodus 21:24, “Eye for eye, tooth for tooth.” Consequently it is just that he who by accusing a man has put him in danger of being punished severely, should himself suffer a like punishment.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(4)-RO(1) — As the Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 5) justice does not always require counterpassion, because it matters considerably whether a man injures another voluntarily or not. Voluntary injury deserves punishment, involuntary deserves forgiveness. Hence when the judge becomes aware that a man has made a false accusation, not with a mind to do harm, but involuntarily through ignorance or a just error, he does not impose the punishment of retaliation.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(4)-RO(2) — He who accuses wrongfully sins both against the person of the accused and against the commonwealth; wherefore he is punished on both counts. This is the meaning of what is written (⁽¹²³⁾Deuteronomy 19:18-20):

“And when after most diligent inquisition, they shall find that the false witness hath told a lie against his brother: then shall render to him as he meant to do to his brother,”

and this refers to the injury done to the person: and afterwards, referring to the injury done to the commonwealth, the text continues: “And thou shalt take away the evil out of the midst of thee, that others hearing may fear, and may not dare to do such things.” Specially, however, does he injure the person of the accused, if he accuse him falsely. Wherefore the accused, if innocent, may condone the injury done to himself, particularly if the accusation were made not calumniously but out of levity of mind. But if the accuser desist from accusing an innocent man, through collusion with the latter’s adversary, he inflicts an injury on the commonwealth: and this cannot be condoned by the accused, although it can be remitted by the sovereign, who has charge of the commonwealth.

P(2b)-Q(68)-A(4)-RO(3) — The accuser deserves the punishment of retaliation in compensation for the harm he attempts to inflict on his

neighbor: but the punishment of disgrace is due to him for his wickedness in accusing another man calumniously. Sometimes the sovereign remits the punishment, and not the disgrace, and sometimes he removes the disgrace also: wherefore the Pope also can remove this disgrace. When Pope Gelasius says: "We cannot remove the disgrace," he may mean either the disgrace attaching to the deed [*infamia facti*], or that sometimes it is not expedient to remove it, or again he may be referring to the disgrace inflicted by the civil judge, as Gratian states (*Callist. I, Epist. ad omn. Gall. episc.*).

QUESTION 69

OF SINS COMMITTED AGAINST JUSTICE ON THE PART OF THE DEFENDANT

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider those sins which are committed against justice on the part of the defendant. Under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether it is a mortal sin to deny the truth which would lead to one's condemnation?
- (2) Whether it is lawful to defend oneself with calumnies?
- (3) Whether it is lawful to escape condemnation by appealing?
- (4) Whether it is lawful for one who has been condemned to defend himself by violence if he be able to do so?

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(1)

Whether one can, without a mortal sin, deny the truth which would lead to one's condemnation?

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem one can, without a mortal sin, deny the truth which would lead to one's condemnation. For Chrysostom says (Hom. xxxi super Ep. ad Heb.): "I do not say that you should lay bare your guilt publicly, nor accuse yourself before others." Now if the accused were to confess the truth in court, he would lay bare his guilt and be his own accuser. Therefore he is not bound to tell the truth: and so he does not sin mortally if he tell a lie in court.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, just as it is an officious lie when one tells a lie in order to rescue another man from death, so is it an officious lie when one tells a lie in order to free oneself from death, since one is more bound towards oneself than towards another. Now an officious lie is

considered not a mortal but a venial sin. Therefore if the accused denies the truth in court, in order to escape death, he does not sin mortally.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, every mortal sin is contrary to charity, as stated above (**Q(24), A(12)**). But that the accused lie by denying himself to be guilty of the crime laid to his charge is not contrary to charity, neither as regards the love we owe God, nor as to the love due to our neighbor. Therefore such a lie is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Whatever is opposed to the glory of God is a mortal sin, because we are bound by precept to “do all to the glory of God” (~~1~~¹ Corinthians 10:31). Now it is to the glory of God that the accused confess that which is alleged against him, as appears from the words of Josue to Achan,

“My son, give glory to the Lord God of Israel, and confess and tell me what thou hast done, hide it not” (~~6~~⁶ Joshua 7:19).

Therefore it is a mortal sin to lie in order to cover one’s guilt.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Whoever acts against the due order of justice, sins mortally, as stated above (**Q(59), A(4)**). Now it belongs to the order of justice that a man should obey his superior in those matters to which the rights of his authority extend. Again, the judge, as stated above (**Q(67), A(1)**), is the superior in relation to the person whom he judges. Therefore the accused is in duty bound to tell the judge the truth which the latter exacts from him according to the form of law. Hence if he refuse to tell the truth which he is under obligation to tell, or if he mendaciously deny it, he sins mortally. If, on the other hand, the judge asks of him that which he cannot ask in accordance with the order of justice, the accused is not bound to satisfy him, and he may lawfully escape by appealing or otherwise: but it is not lawful for him to lie.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(1)-RO(1) — When a man is examined by the judge according to the order of justice, he does not lay bare his own guilt, but his guilt is unmasked by another, since the obligation of answering is imposed on him by one whom he is bound to obey.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(1)-RO(2) — To lie, with injury to another person, in order to rescue a man from death is not a purely officious lie, for it has an

admixture of the pernicious lie: and when a man lies in court in order to exculpate himself, he does an injury to one whom he is bound to obey, since he refuses him his due, namely an avowal of the truth.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(1)-RO(3) — He who lies in court by denying his guilt, acts both against the love of God to whom judgment belongs, and against the love of his neighbor, and this not only as regards the judge, to whom he refuses his due, but also as regards his accuser, who is punished if he fail to prove his accusation. Hence it is written (^{<4040>}Psalm 140:4): “Incline not my heart to evil words, to make excuses in sins”: on which words a gloss says: “Shameless men are wont by lying to deny their guilt when they have been found out.” And Gregory in expounding ^{<4043>}Job 31:33, “If as a man I have hid my sin,” says (Moral. xxii, 15): “It is a common vice of mankind to sin in secret, by lying to hide the sin that has been committed, and when convicted to aggravate the sin by defending oneself.”

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(2)

Whether it is lawful for the accused to defend himself with calumnies?

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem lawful for the accused to defend himself with calumnies. Because, according to civil law (Cod. II, iv, De transact. 18), when a man is on trial for his life it is lawful for him to bribe his adversary. Now this is done chiefly by defending oneself with calumnies. Therefore the accused who is on trial for his life does not sin if he defend himself with calumnies.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, an accuser who is guilty of collusion with the accused, is punishable by law (Decret. II, qu. iii, can. Si quem poenit.). Yet no punishment is imposed on the accused for collusion with the accuser. Therefore it would seem lawful for the accused to defend himself with calumnies.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it is written (^{<2046>}Proverbs 14:16): “A wise man feareth and declineth from evil, the fool leapeth over and is confident.” Now what is done wisely is no sin. Therefore no matter how a man declines from evil, he does not sin.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, In criminal cases an oath has to be taken against calumnious allegations (Extra, De juramento calumniae, cap. Inhaerentes): and this would not be the case if it were lawful to defend oneself with calumnies. Therefore it is not lawful for the accused to defend himself with calumnies.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(2) — *I answer that*, It is one thing to withhold the truth, and another to utter a falsehood. The former is lawful sometimes, for a man is not bound to divulge all truth, but only such as the judge can and must require of him according to the order of justice; as, for instance, when the accused is already disgraced through the commission of some crime, or certain indications of his guilt have already been discovered, or again when his guilt is already more or less proven. On the other hand it is never lawful to make a false declaration.

As regards what he may do lawfully, a man can employ either lawful means, and such as are adapted to the end in view, which belongs to prudence; or he can use unlawful means, unsuitable to the proposed end, and this belongs to craftiness, which is exercised by fraud and guile, as shown above (**Q(55), AA(3), seqq.**). His conduct in the former case is praiseworthy, in the latter sinful. Accordingly it is lawful for the accused to defend himself by withholding the truth that he is not bound to avow, by suitable means, for instance by not answering such questions as he is not bound to answer. This is not to defend himself with calumnies, but to escape prudently. But it is unlawful for him, either to utter a falsehood, or to withhold a truth that he is bound to avow, or to employ guile or fraud, because fraud and guile have the force of a lie, and so to use them would be to defend oneself with calumnies.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(2)-RO(1) — Human laws leave many things unpunished, which according to the Divine judgment are sins, as, for example, simple fornication; because human law does not exact perfect virtue from man, for such virtue belongs to few and cannot be found in so great a number of people as human law has to direct. That a man is sometimes unwilling to commit a sin in order to escape from the death of the body, the danger of which threatens the accused who is on trial for his life, is an act of perfect virtue, since “death is the most fearful of all temporal things” (Ethic. iii, 6). Wherefore if the accused, who is on trial for his life, bribes his adversary,

he sins indeed by inducing him to do what is unlawful, yet the civil law does not punish this sin, and in this sense it is said to be lawful.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(2)-RO(2) — If the accuser is guilty of collusion with the accused and the latter is guilty, he incurs punishment, and so it is evident that he sins. Wherefore, since it is a sin to induce a man to sin, or to take part in a sin in any way — for the Apostle says (^{<613>}Romans 1:32), that “they... are worthy of death... that consent” to those who sin — it is evident that the accused also sins if he is guilty of collusion with his adversary. Nevertheless according to human laws no punishment is inflicted on him, for the reason given above.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(2)-RO(3) — The wise man hides himself not by slandering others but by exercising prudence.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(3)

***Whether it is lawful for the accused
to escape judgment by appealing?***

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful for the accused to escape judgment by appealing. The Apostle says (^{<614>}Romans 13:1): “Let every soul be subject to the higher powers.” Now the accused by appealing refuses to be subject to a higher power, viz. the judge. Therefore he commits a sin.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, ordinary authority is more binding than that which we choose for ourselves. Now according to the Decretals (II, qu. vi, cap. A iudicibus) it is unlawful to appeal from the judges chosen by common consent. Much less therefore is it lawful to appeal from ordinary judges.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, whatever is lawful once is always lawful. But it is not lawful to appeal after the tenth day [*Can. Anteriorum, caus. ii, qu. 6], nor a third time on the same point [*Can. Si autem, caus. ii, qu. 6]. Therefore it would seem that an appeal is unlawful in itself.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Paul appealed to Caesar (Acts 25).

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(3) — *I answer that*, There are two motives for which a man appeals. First through confidence in the justice of his cause, seeing that he is unjustly oppressed by the judge, and then it is lawful for him to appeal, because this is a prudent means of escape. Hence it is laid down (Decret. II, qu. vi, can. Omnis oppressus): “All those who are oppressed are free, if they so wish, to appeal to the judgment of the priests, and no man may stand in their way.” Secondly, a man appeals in order to cause a delay, lest a just sentence be pronounced against him. This is to defend oneself calumniously, and is unlawful as stated above (**A(2)**). For he inflicts an injury both on the judge, whom he hinders in the exercise of his office, and on his adversary, whose justice he disturbs as far as he is able. Hence it is laid down (II, qu. vi, can. Omnino puniendus): “Without doubt a man should be punished if his appeal be declared unjust.”

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(3)-RO(1) — A man should submit to the lower authority in so far as the latter observes the order of the higher authority. If the lower authority departs from the order of the higher, we ought not to submit to it, for instance “if the proconsul order one thing and the emperor another,” according to a gloss on ~~1~~ Romans 13:2. Now when a judge oppresses anyone unjustly, in this respect he departs from the order of the higher authority, whereby he is obliged to judge justly. Hence it is lawful for a man who is oppressed unjustly, to have recourse to the authority of the higher power, by appealing either before or after sentence has been pronounced. And since it is to be presumed that there is no rectitude where true faith is lacking, it is unlawful for a Catholic to appeal to an unbelieving judge, according to Decretals II, qu. vi, can. Catholicus: “The Catholic who appeals to the decision of a judge of another faith shall be excommunicated, whether his case be just or unjust.” Hence the Apostle also rebuked those who went to law before unbelievers (~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 6:6).

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(3)-RO(2) — It is due to a man’s own fault or neglect that, of his own accord, he submits to the judgment of one in whose justice he has no confidence. Moreover it would seem to point to levity of mind for a man not to abide by what he has once approved of. Hence it is with reason that the law refuses us the faculty of appealing from the decision of judges of our own choice, who have no power save by virtue of the consent of the litigants. On the other hand the authority of an ordinary judge depends,

not on the consent of those who are subject to his judgment, but on the authority of the king or prince who appointed him. Hence, as a remedy against his unjust oppression, the law allows one to have recourse to appeal, so that even if the judge be at the same time ordinary and chosen by the litigants, it is lawful to appeal from his decision, since seemingly his ordinary authority occasioned his being chosen as arbitrator. Nor is it to be imputed as a fault to the man who consented to his being arbitrator, without adverting to the fact that he was appointed ordinary judge by the prince.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(3)-RO(3) — The equity of the law so guards the interests of the one party that the other is not oppressed. Thus it allows ten days for appeal to be made, this being considered sufficient time for deliberating on the expediency of an appeal. If on the other hand there were no fixed time limit for appealing, the certainty of judgment would ever be in suspense, so that the other party would suffer an injury. The reason why it is not allowed to appeal a third time on the same point, is that it is not probable that the judges would fail to judge justly so many times.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(4)

***Whether a man who is condemned to death
may lawfully defend himself if he can?***

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that a man who is condemned to death may lawfully defend himself if he can. For it is always lawful to do that to which nature inclines us, as being of natural right, so to speak. Now, to resist corruption is an inclination of nature not only in men and animals but also in things devoid of sense. Therefore if he can do so, the accused, after condemnation, may lawfully resist being put to death.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, just as a man, by resistance, escapes the death to which he has been condemned, so does he by flight. Now it is lawful seemingly to escape death by flight, according to Eccclus. 9:18, “Keep thee far from the man that hath power to kill [and not to quicken]” [*The words in the brackets are not in the Vulgate]. Therefore it is also lawful for the accused to resist.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, it is written (²⁰⁴¹Proverbs 24:11):

“Deliver them that are led to death: and those that are drawn to death forbear not to deliver.”

Now a man is under greater obligation to himself than to another. Therefore it is lawful for a condemned man to defend himself from being put to death.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The Apostle says (⁶¹⁰Romans 13:2):

“He that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation.”

Now a condemned man, by defending himself, resists the power in the point of its being ordained by God “for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of the good” [⁶¹²⁴1 Peter 2:14]. Therefore he sins in defending himself.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(4) — *I answer that*, A man may be condemned to death in two ways. First justly, and then it is not lawful for the condemned to defend himself, because it is lawful for the judge to combat his resistance by force, so that on his part the fight is unjust, and consequently without any doubt he sins.

Secondly a man is condemned unjustly: and such a sentence is like the violence of robbers, according to Ezekiel 22:21, “Her princes in the midst of her are like wolves ravening the prey to shed blood.” Wherefore even as it is lawful to resist robbers, so is it lawful, in a like case, to resist wicked princes; except perhaps in order to avoid scandal, whence some grave disturbance might be feared to arise.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(4)-RO(1) — Reason was given to man that he might ensue those things to which his nature inclines, not in all cases, but in accordance with the order of reason. Hence not all self-defense is lawful, but only such as is accomplished with due moderation.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(4)-RO(2) — When a man is condemned to death, he has not to kill himself, but to suffer death: wherefore he is not bound to do anything from which death would result, such as to stay in the place

whence he would be led to execution. But he may not resist those who lead him to death, in order that he may not suffer what is just for him to suffer. Even so, if a man were condemned to die of hunger, he does not sin if he partakes of food brought to him secretly, because to refrain from taking it would be to kill himself.

P(2b)-Q(69)-A(4)-RO(3) — This saying of the wise man does not direct that one should deliver a man from death in opposition to the order of justice: wherefore neither should a man deliver himself from death by resisting against justice.

QUESTION 70

OF INJUSTICE WITH REGARD TO THE PERSON OF THE WITNESS

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider injustice with regard to the person of the witness. Under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether a man is bound to give evidence?
- (2) Whether the evidence of two or three witnesses suffices?
- (3) Whether a man's evidence may be rejected without any fault on his part?
- (4) Whether it is a mortal sin to bear false witness?

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(1)

Whether a man is bound to give evidence?

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that a man is not bound to give evidence. Augustine say (QQ. ^{<002>}Genesis 1:26) [*Cf. Contra Faust. xxii, 33,34], that when Abraham said of his wife (^{<002>}Genesis 20:2), “She is my sister,” he wished the truth to be concealed and not a lie be told. Now, by hiding the truth a man abstains from giving evidence. Therefore a man is not bound to give evidence.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, no man is bound to act deceitfully. Now it is written (^{<002>}Proverbs 11:13):

“He that walketh deceitfully revealeth secrets, but he that is faithful concealeth the thing committed to him by his friend.”

Therefore a man is not always bound to give evidence, especially on matters committed to him as a secret by a friend.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, clerics and priests, more than others, are bound to those things that are necessary for salvation. Yet clerics and priests are forbidden to give evidence when a man is on trial for his life. Therefore it is not necessary for salvation to give evidence.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine [*Can. Quisquis, caus. xi, qu. 3, cap. Falsidicus; cf. Isidore, Sentent. iii, 55] says: “Both he who conceals the truth and he who tells a lie are guilty, the former because he is unwilling to do good, the latter because he desires to hurt.”

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(1) — *I answer that*, We must make a distinction in the matter of giving evidence: because sometimes a certain man’s evidence is necessary, and sometimes not. If the necessary evidence is that of a man subject to a superior whom, in matters pertaining to justice, he is bound to obey, without doubt he is bound to give evidence on those points which are required of him in accordance with the order of justice, for instance on manifest things or when ill-report has preceded. If however he is required to give evidence on other points, for instance secret matters, and those of which no ill-report has preceded, he is not bound to give evidence. On the other hand, if his evidence be required by authority of a superior whom he is bound to obey, we must make a distinction: because if his evidence is required in order to deliver a man from an unjust death or any other penalty, or from false defamation, or some loss, in such cases he is bound to give evidence. Even if his evidence is not demanded, he is bound to do what he can to declare the truth to someone who may profit thereby. For it is written (^{1990a} Psalm 81:4): “Rescue the poor, and deliver the needy from the hand of the sinner”; and (^{1991a} Proverbs 24:11): “Deliver them that are led to death”; and (^{1992a} Romans 1:32): “They are worthy of death, not only they that do them, but they also that consent to them that do them,” on which words a gloss says: “To be silent when one can disprove is to consent.” In matters pertaining to a man’s condemnation, one is not bound to give evidence, except when one is constrained by a superior in accordance with the order of justice; since if the truth of such a matter be concealed, no particular injury is inflicted on anyone. Or, if some danger threatens the accuser, it matters not since he risked the danger of his own accord: whereas it is different with the accused, who incurs the danger against his will.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(1)-RO(1) — Augustine is speaking of concealment of the truth in a case when a man is not compelled by his superior's authority to declare the truth, and when such concealment is not specially injurious to any person.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(1)-RO(2) — A man should by no means give evidence on matters secretly committed to him in confession, because he knows such things, not as man but as God's minister: and the sacrament is more binding than any human precept. But as regards matters committed to man in some other way under secrecy, we must make a distinction. Sometimes they are of such a nature that one is bound to make them known as soon as they come to our knowledge, for instance if they conduce to the spiritual or corporal corruption of the community, or to some grave personal injury, in short any like matter that a man is bound to make known either by giving evidence or by denouncing it. Against such a duty a man cannot be obliged to act on the plea that the matter is committed to him under secrecy, for he would break the faith he owes to another. On the other hand sometimes they are such as one is not bound to make known, so that one may be under obligation not to do so on account of their being committed to one under secrecy. In such a case one is by no means bound to make them known, even if the superior should command; because to keep faith is of natural right, and a man cannot be commanded to do what is contrary to natural right.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(1)-RO(3) — It is unbecoming for ministers of the altar to slay a man or to cooperate in his slaying, as stated above (**Q(64), A(4)**); hence according to the order of justice they cannot be compelled to give evidence when a man is on trial for his life.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(2)

Whether the evidence of two or three persons suffices?

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that the evidence of two or three persons is not sufficient. For judgment requires certitude. Now certitude of the truth is not obtained by the assertions of two or three witnesses, for we read that Naboth was unjustly condemned on the evidence of two

witnesses (^{<1201}1 Kings 21). Therefore the evidence of two or three witnesses does not suffice.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, in order for evidence to be credible it must agree. But frequently the evidence of two or three disagrees in some point. Therefore it is of no use for proving the truth in court.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it is laid down (Decret. II, qu. iv, can. Praesul.): “A bishop shall not be condemned save on the evidence of seventy-two witnesses; nor a cardinal priest of the Roman Church, unless there be sixty-four witnesses. Nor a cardinal deacon of the Roman Church, unless there be twenty-seven witnesses; nor a subdeacon, an acolyte, an exorcist, a reader or a doorkeeper without seven witnesses.” Now the sin of one who is of higher dignity is more grievous, and consequently should be treated more severely. Therefore neither is the evidence of two or three witnesses sufficient for the condemnation of other persons.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<1706}Deuteronomy 17:6):

“By the mouth of two or three witnesses
shall he die that is to be slain,”

and further on (^{<1905}Deuteronomy 19:15): “In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall stand.”

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(2) — *I answer that*, According to the Philosopher (Ethic. i, 3), “we must not expect to find certitude equally in every matter.” For in human acts, on which judgments are passed and evidence required, it is impossible to have demonstrative certitude, because they are about things contingent and variable. Hence the certitude of probability suffices, such as may reach the truth in the greater number of cases, although it fail in the minority. No it is probable that the assertion of several witnesses contains the truth rather than the assertion of one: and since the accused is the only one who denies, while several witnesses affirm the same as the prosecutor, it is reasonably established both by Divine and by human law, that the assertion of several witnesses should be upheld. Now all multitude is comprised of three elements, the beginning, the middle and the end. Wherefore, according to the Philosopher (De Coelo i, 1), “we reckon ‘all’ and ‘whole’ to consist of three parts.” Now we have a triple voucher when

two agree with the prosecutor: hence two witnesses are required; or for the sake of greater certitude three, which is the perfect number. Wherefore it is written (^{<2042>}Ecclesiastes 4:12): “A threefold cord is not easily broken”: and Augustine, commenting on ^{<487>}John 8:17, “The testimony of two men is true,” says (Tract. xxxvi) that “there is here a mystery by which we are given to understand that Trinity wherein is perpetual stability of truth.”

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(2)-RO(1) — No matter how great a number of witnesses may be determined, the evidence might sometimes be unjust, since is written (^{<224>}Exodus 23:2): “Thou shalt not follow the multitude to do evil.” And yet the fact that in so many it is not possible to have certitude without fear of error, is no reason why we should reject the certitude which can probably be had through two or three witnesses, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(2)-RO(2) — If the witnesses disagree certain principal circumstances which change the substance of the fact, for instance in time, place, or persons, which are chiefly in question, their evidence is of no weight, because if they disagree in such things, each one would seem to be giving distinct evidence and to be speaking of different facts. For instance, one say that a certain thing happened at such and such a time or place, while another says it happened at another time or place, they seem not to be speaking of the same event. The evidence is not weakened if one witness says that he does not remember, while the other attests to a determinate time or place And if on such points as these the witness for prosecution and defense disagree altogether, and if they be equal in number on either side, and of equal standing, the accused should have the benefit of the doubt, because the judge ought to be more inclined to acquit than to condemn, except perhaps in favorable suits, such as a pleading for liberty and the like. If, however, the witnesses for the same side disagree, the judge ought to use his own discretion in discerning which side to favor, by considering either the number of witnesses, or their standing, or the favorableness of the suit, or the nature of the business and of the evidence

Much more ought the evidence of one witness to be rejected if he contradict himself when questioned about what he has seen and about what he knows; not, however, if he contradict himself when questioned

about matters of opinion and report, since he may be moved to answer differently according to the different things he has seen and heard.

On the other hand if there be discrepancy of evidence in circumstances not touching the substance of the fact, for instance, whether the weather were cloudy or fine, whether the house were painted or not, or such like matters, such discrepancy does not weaken the evidence, because men are not wont to take much notice of such things, wherefore they easily forget them. Indeed, a discrepancy of this kind renders the evidence more credible, as Chrysostom states (Hom. i in Matth.), because if the witnesses agreed in every point, even in the minutest of details, they would seem to have conspired together to say the same thing: but this must be left to the prudent discernment of the judge.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(2)-RO(3) — This passage refers specially to the bishops, priests, deacons and clerics of the Roman Church, on account of its dignity: and this for three reasons. First because in that Church those men ought to be promoted whose sanctity makes their evidence of more weight than that of many witnesses. Secondly, because those who have to judge other men, often have many opponents on account of their justice, wherefore those who give evidence against them should not be believed indiscriminately, unless they be very numerous. Thirdly, because the condemnation of any one of them would detract in public opinion from the dignity and authority of that Church, a result which would be more fraught with danger than if one were to tolerate a sinner in that same Church, unless he were very notorious and manifest, so that a grave scandal would arise if he were tolerated.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(3)

***Whether a man's evidence
can be rejected without any fault of his?***

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that a man's evidence ought not to be rejected except on account of some fault. For it a penalty on some that their evidence is inadmissible, as in the case of those who are branded with infamy. Now a penalty must not be inflicted save for a fault.

Therefore it would seem that no man's evidence ought to be rejected save on account of a fault.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, “Good is to be presumed of every one, unless the contrary appear” [*Cap. Dudum, de Praesumpt.]. Now it pertains to a man's goodness that he should give true evidence. Since therefore there can be no proof of the contrary, unless there be some fault of his, it would seem that no man's evidence should be rejected save for some fault.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, no man is rendered unfit for things necessary for salvation except by some sin. But it is necessary for salvation to give true evidence, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore no man should be excluded from giving evidence save for some fault.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Regist. xiii, 44): “As to the bishop who is said to have been accused by his servants, you are to know that they should by no means have been heard”: which words are embodied in the Decretals II, qu. 1, can. Imprimis.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(2)**), the authority of evidence is not infallible but probable; and consequently the evidence for one side is weakened by whatever strengthens the probability of the other. Now the reliability of a person's evidence is weakened, sometimes indeed on account of some fault of his, as in the case of unbelievers and persons of evil repute, as well as those who are guilty of a public crime and who are not allowed even to accuse; sometimes, without any fault on his part, and this owing either to a defect in the reason, as in the case of children, imbeciles and women, or to personal feeling, as in the case of enemies, or persons united by family or household ties, or again owing to some external condition, as in the case of poor people, slaves, and those who are under authority, concerning whom it is to be presumed that they might easily be induced to give evidence against the truth.

Thus it is manifest that a person's evidence may be rejected either with or without some fault of his.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(3)-RO(1) — If a person is disqualified from giving evidence this is done as a precaution against false evidence rather than as a punishment. Hence the argument does not prove.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(3)-RO(2) — Good is to be presumed of everyone unless the contrary appear, provided this does not threaten injury to another: because, in that case, one ought to be careful not to believe everyone readily, according to ~~1~~ 1 John 4:1: “Believe not every spirit.”

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(3)-RO(3) — To give evidence is necessary for salvation, provided the witness be competent, and the order of justice observed. Hence nothing hinders certain persons being excused from giving evidence, if they be considered unfit according to law.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(4)

Whether it is always a mortal sin to give false evidence?

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not always a mortal sin to give false evidence. For a person may happen to give false evidence, through ignorance of fact. Now such ignorance excuses from mortal sin. Therefore the giving of false evidence is not always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, a lie that benefits someone and hurts no man is officious, and this is not a mortal sin. Now sometimes a lie of this kind occurs in false evidence, as when a person gives false evidence in order to save a man from death, or from an unjust sentence which threatens him through other false witnesses or a perverse judge. Therefore in such cases it is not a mortal sin to give false evidence.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, a witness is required to take an oath in order that he may fear to commit a mortal sin of perjury. But this would not be necessary, if it were already a mortal sin to give false evidence. Therefore the giving of false evidence is not always mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~20~~ Proverbs 19:5):

“A false witness shall not be unpunished.”

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(4) — *I answer that*, False evidence has a threefold deformity. The first is owing to perjury, since witnesses are admitted only on oath and on this count it is always a mortal sin. Secondly, owing to the violation of justice, and on this account it is a mortal sin generically, even as any kind of injustice. Hence the prohibition of false evidence by the

precept of the decalogue is expressed in this form when it is said (~~Exodus~~ Exodus 20:16), “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.” For one does nothing against a man by preventing him from doing someone an injury, but only by taking away his justice. Thirdly, owing to the falsehood itself, by reason of which every lie is a sin: on this account, the giving of false evidence is not always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(4)-RO(1) — In giving evidence a man ought not to affirm as certain, as though he knew it, that about which he is not certain and he should confess his doubt in doubtful terms, and that which he is certain about, in terms of certainty. Owing however to the frailty of the human memory, a man sometimes thinks he is certain about something that is not true; and then if after thinking over the matter with due care he deems himself certain about that false thing, he does not sin mortally if he asserts it, because the evidence which he gives is not directly an intentionally, but accidentally contrary to what he intends.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(4)-RO(2) — An unjust judgment is not a judgment, wherefore the false evidence given in an unjust judgment, in order to prevent injustice is not a mortal sin by virtue of the judgment, but only by reason of the oath violated.

P(2b)-Q(70)-A(4)-RO(3) — Men abhor chiefly those sin that are against God, as being most grievous and among them is perjury: whereas they do not abhor so much sins against their neighbor. Consequently, for the greater certitude of evidence, the witness is required to take a oath.

QUESTION 71

OF INJUSTICE IN JUDGMENT ON THE PART OF COUNSEL

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the injustice which takes place in judgment on the part of counsel, and under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether an advocate is bound to defend the suits of the poor?
- (2) Whether certain persons should be prohibited from exercising the office of advocate?
- (3) Whether an advocate sins by defending an unjust cause?
- (4) Whether he sins if he accept a fee for defending a suit?

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(1)

Whether an advocate is bound to defend the suits of the poor?

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that an advocate is bound to defend the suits of the poor. For it is written (^{423B}Exodus 23:5):

“If thou see the ass of him that hateth thee lie underneath his burden, thou shalt not pass by, but shall lift him up with him.”

Now no less a danger threatens the poor man whose suit is being unjustly prejudiced, than if his ass were to lie underneath its burden. Therefore an advocate is bound to defend the suits of the poor.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Gregory says in a homily (ix in Evang.): “Let him that hath understanding beware lest he withhold his knowledge; let him that hath abundance of wealth watch lest he slacken his merciful bounty; let him who is a servant to art share his skill with his neighbor; let him who has an opportunity of speaking with the wealthy plead the cause of the poor: for the slightest gift you have received will be reputed a talent.” Now every man is bound, not to hide but faithfully to

dispense the talent committed to him; as evidenced by the punishment inflicted on the servant who hid his talent (^{<1231>}Matthew 25:30). Therefore an advocate is bound to plead for the poor.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the precept about performing works of mercy, being affirmative, is binding according to time and place, and this is chiefly in cases of need. Now it seems to be a case of need when the suit of a poor man is being prejudiced. Therefore it seems that in such a case an advocate is bound to defend the poor man's suit.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, He that lacks food is no less in need than he that lacks an advocate. Yet he that is able to give food is not always bound to feed the needy. Therefore neither is an advocate always bound to defend the suits of the poor.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Since defense of the poor man's suit belongs to the works of mercy, the answer to this inquiry is the same as the one given above with regard to the other works of mercy (**Q(32), AA(5),9**). Now no man is sufficient to bestow a work of mercy on all those who need it. Wherefore, as Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 28), "since one cannot do good to all, we ought to consider those chiefly who by reason of place, time, or any other circumstance, by a kind of chance are more closely united to us." He says "by reason of place," because one is not bound to search throughout the world for the needy that one may succor them; and it suffices to do works of mercy to those one meets with. Hence it is written (^{<1231>}Exodus 23:4): "If thou meet thy enemy's ass going astray, bring it back to him." He says also "by reason of time," because one is not bound to provide for the future needs of others, and it suffices to succor present needs. Hence it is written (^{<1231>}1 John 3:17):

"He that... shall see his brother in need, and shall put up his bowels from him, how doth the charity of God abide in him?"

Lastly he says, "or any other circumstance," because one ought to show kindness to those especially who are by any tie whatever united to us, according to ^{<5188>}1 Timothy 5:8,

"If any man have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel."

It may happen however that these circumstances concur, and then we have to consider whether this particular man stands in such a need that it is not easy to see how he can be succored otherwise, and then one is bound to bestow the work of mercy on him. If, however, it is easy to see how he can be otherwise succored, either by himself, or by some other person still more closely united to him, or in a better position to help him, one is not bound so strictly to help the one in need that it would be a sin not to do so: although it would be praiseworthy to do so where one is not bound to. Therefore an advocate is not always bound to defend the suits of the poor, but only when the aforesaid circumstances concur, else he would have to put aside all other business, and occupy himself entirely in defending the suits of poor people. The same applies to a physician with regard to attendance on the sick.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(1)-RO(1) — So long as the ass lies under the burden, there is no means of help in this case, unless those who are passing along come to the man's aid, and therefore they are bound to help. But they would not be so bound if help were possible from another quarter.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(1)-RO(2) — A man is bound to make good use of the talent bestowed on him, according to the opportunities afforded by time, place, and other circumstances, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(1)-RO(3) — Not every need is such that it is one's duty to remedy it, but only such as we have stated above.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(2)

Whether it is fitting that the law should debar certain persons from the office of advocate?

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem unfitting for the law to debar certain persons from the office of advocate. For no man should be debarred from doing works of mercy. Now it belongs to the works of mercy to defend a man's suit, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore no man should be debarred from this office.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, contrary causes have not, seemingly, the same effect. Now to be busy with Divine things and to be busy about sin are contrary to one another. Therefore it is unfitting that some should be debarred from the office of advocate, on account of religion, as monks

and clerics, while others are debarred on account of sin, as persons of ill-repute and heretics.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, a man should love his neighbor as himself. Now it is a duty of love for an advocate to plead a person's cause. Therefore it is unfitting that certain persons should be debarred from pleading the cause of others, while they are allowed to advocate their own cause.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, According to Decretals III, qu. vii, can. Infames, many persons are debarred from the office of advocate.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(2) — *I answer that*, In two ways a person is debarred from performing a certain act: first because it is impossible to him, secondly because it is unbecoming to him: but, whereas the man to whom a certain act is impossible, is absolutely debarred from performing it, he to whom an act is unbecoming is not debarred altogether, since necessity may do away with its unbecomingness. Accordingly some are debarred from the office of advocate because it is impossible to them through lack of sense — either interior, as in the case of madmen and minors — or exterior, as in the case of the deaf and dumb. For an advocate needs to have both interior skill so that he may be able to prove the justice of the cause he defends, and also speech and hearing, that he may speak and hear what is said to him. Consequently those who are defective in these points, are altogether debarred from being advocates either in their own or in another's cause. The becomingness of exercising this office is removed in two ways. First, through a man being engaged in higher things. Wherefore it is unfitting that monks or priests should be advocates in any cause whatever, or that clerics should plead in a secular court, because such persons are engaged in Divine things. Secondly, on account of some personal defect, either of body (for instance a blind man whose attendance in a court of justice would be unbecoming) or of soul, for it ill becomes one who has disdained to be just himself, to plead for the justice of another. Wherefore it is unbecoming that persons of ill repute, unbelievers, and those who have been convicted of grievous crimes should be advocates. Nevertheless this unbecomingness is outweighed by necessity: and for this reason such persons can plead either their own cause or that of persons closely connected with them. Moreover, clerics can be advocates in the cause of their own church, and

monks in the cause of their own monastery, if the abbot direct them to do so.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(2)-RO(1) — Certain persons are sometimes debarred by unbecomingness, and others by inability from performing works of mercy: for not all the works of mercy are becoming to all persons: thus it ill becomes a fool to give counsel, or the ignorant to teach.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(2)-RO(2) — Just as virtue is destroyed by “too much” and “too little,” so does a person become incompetent by “more” and “less.” For this reason some, like religious and clerics, are debarred from pleading in causes, because they are above such an office; and others because they are less than competent to exercise it, such as persons of ill-repute and unbelievers.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(2)-RO(3) — The necessity of pleading the causes of others is not so pressing as the necessity of pleading one’s own cause, because others are able to help themselves otherwise: hence the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(3)

Whether an advocate sins by defending an unjust cause?

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that an advocate does not sin by defending an unjust cause. For just as a physician proves his skill by healing a desperate disease, so does an advocate prove his skill, if he can defend an unjust cause. Now a physician is praised if he heals a desperate malady. Therefore an advocate also commits no sin, but ought to be praised, if he defends an unjust cause.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it is always lawful to desist from committing a sin. Yet an advocate is punished if he throws up his brief (Decret. II, qu. iii, can. Si quem poenit.). Therefore an advocate does not sin by defending an unjust cause, when once he has undertaken its defense.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, it would seem to be a greater sin for an advocate to use unjust means in defense of a just cause (e.g. by producing false witnesses, or alleging false laws), than to defend an unjust cause, since the former is a sin against the form, the latter against the matter of justice. Yet it is seemingly lawful for an advocate to make use of such underhand means, even as it is lawful for a soldier to lay ambushes in a

battle. Therefore it would seem that an advocate does not sin by defending an unjust cause.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is said (2 Paralip. 19:2): “Thou helpest the ungodly... and therefore thou didst deserve... the wrath of the Lord.” Now an advocate by defending an unjust cause, helps the ungodly. Therefore he sins and deserves the wrath of the Lord.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(3) — *I answer that*, It is unlawful to cooperate in an evil deed, by counseling, helping, or in any way consenting, because to counsel or assist an action is, in a way, to do it, and the Apostle says (~~1~~ Romans 1:32) that “they... are worthy of death, not only they that do” a sin, “but they also that consent to them that do” it. Hence it was stated above (**Q(62), A(7)**), that all such are bound to restitution. Now it is evident that an advocate provides both assistance and counsel to the party for whom he pleads. Wherefore, if knowingly he defends an unjust cause, without doubt he sins grievously, and is bound to restitution of the loss unjustly incurred by the other party by reason of the assistance he has provided. If, however, he defends an unjust cause unknowingly, thinking it just, he is to be excused according to the measure in which ignorance is excusable.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(3)-RO(1) — The physician injures no man by undertaking to heal a desperate malady, whereas the advocate who accepts service in an unjust cause, unjustly injures the party against whom he pleads unjustly. Hence the comparison fails. For though he may seem to deserve praise for showing skill in his art, nevertheless he sins by reason of injustice in his will, since he abuses his art for an evil end.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(3)-RO(2) — If an advocate believes from the outset that the cause is just, and discovers afterwards while the case is proceeding that it is unjust, he ought not to throw up his brief in such a way as to help the other side, or so as to reveal the secrets of his client to the other party. But he can and must give up the case, or induce his client to give way, or make some compromise without prejudice to the opposing party.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(3)-RO(3) — As stated above (**Q(40), A(3)**), it is lawful for a soldier, or a general to lay ambushes in a just war, by prudently concealing what he has a mind to do, but not by means of fraudulent falsehoods, since we should keep faith even with a foe, as Tully says (De offic. iii, 29). Hence it is lawful for an advocate, in defending his case,

prudently to conceal whatever might hinder its happy issue, but it is unlawful for him to employ any kind of falsehood.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(4)

Whether it is lawful for an advocate to take a fee for pleading?

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful for an advocate to take a fee for pleading. Works of mercy should not be done with a view to human remuneration, according to ^{<2412>}Luke 14:12,

“When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends... nor thy neighbors who are rich: lest perhaps they also invite thee again, and a recompense be made to thee.”

Now it is a work of mercy to plead another's cause, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore it is not lawful for an advocate to take payment in money for pleading.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, spiritual things are not to be bartered with temporal things. But pleading a person's cause seems to be a spiritual good since it consists in using one's knowledge of law. Therefore it is not lawful for an advocate to take a fee for pleading.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, just as the person of the advocate concurs towards the pronouncement of the verdict, so do the persons of the judge and of the witness. Now, according to Augustine (Ep. cliii ad Macedon.), “the judge should not sell a just sentence, nor the witness true evidence.” Therefore neither can an advocate sell a just pleading.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (Ep. cliii ad Macedon.) that “an advocate may lawfully sell his pleading, and a lawyer his advice.”

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(4) — *I answer that*, A man may justly receive payment for granting what he is not bound to grant. Now it is evident that an advocate is not always bound to consent to plead, or to give advice in other people's causes. Wherefore, if he sell his pleading or advice, he does not act against justice. The same applies to the physician who attends on a sick person to heal him, and to all like persons; provided, however, they take a moderate fee, with due consideration for persons, for the matter in

hand, for the labor entailed, and for the custom of the country. If, however, they wickedly extort an immoderate fee, they sin against justice. Hence Augustine says (Ep. cliii ad Macedon.) that “it is customary to demand from them restitution of what they have extorted by a wicked excess, but not what has been given to them in accordance with a commendable custom.”

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(4)-RO(1) — Man is not bound to do gratuitously whatever he can do from motives of mercy: else no man could lawfully sell anything, since anything may be given from motives of mercy. But when a man does give a thing out of mercy, he should seek, not a human, but a Divine reward. In like manner an advocate, when he mercifully pleads the cause of a poor man, should have in view not a human but a Divine meed; and yet he is not always bound to give his services gratuitously.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(4)-RO(2) — Though knowledge of law is something spiritual, the use of that knowledge is accomplished by the work of the body: hence it is lawful to take money in payment of that use, else no craftsman would be allowed to make profit by his art.

P(2b)-Q(71)-A(4)-RO(3) — The judge and witnesses are common to either party, since the judge is bound to pronounce a just verdict, and the witness to give true evidence. Now justice and truth do not incline to one side rather than to the other: and consequently judges receive out of the public funds a fixed pay for their labor; and witnesses receive their expenses (not as payment for giving evidence, but as a fee for their labor) either from both parties or from the party by whom they are adduced, because no man “serveth as a soldier at any time at his own charge [*Vulg.: ‘Who serveth as a soldier,’]” (~~1~~¹ 1 Corinthians 9:7). On the other hand an advocate defends one party only, and so he may lawfully accept fee from the party he assists.

BY WORDS UTTERED EXTRAJUDICIALLY

QUESTIONS 72-76

QUESTION 72

OF REVILING

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider injuries inflicted by words uttered extrajudicially.
We shall consider

- (1) reviling,
- (2) backbiting,
- (3) tale bearing,
- (4) derision,
- (5) cursing.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) What is reviling?
- (2) Whether every reviling is a mortal sin?
- (3) Whether one ought to check revilers?
- (4) Of the origin of reviling.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(1)

Whether reviling consists in words?

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that reviling does not consist in words. Reviling implies some injury inflicted on one's neighbor, since it is

a kind of injustice. But words seem to inflict no injury on one's neighbor, either in his person, or in his belongings. Therefore reviling does not consist in words.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, reviling seems to imply dishonor. But a man can be dishonored or slighted by deeds more than by words. Therefore it seems that reviling consists, not in words but in deeds.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, a dishonor inflicted by words is called a railing or a taunt. But reviling seems to differ from railing or taunt. Therefore reviling does not consist in words.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Nothing, save words, is perceived by the hearing. Now reviling is perceived by the hearing according to ~~300~~ Jeremiah 20:10, "I heard reviling [Douay: 'contumelies'] on every side." Therefore reviling consists in words.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Reviling denotes the dishonoring of a person, and this happens in two ways: for since honor results from excellence, one person dishonors another, first, by depriving him of the excellence for which he is honored. This is done by sins of deed, whereof we have spoken above (**Q(64)**, seqq.). Secondly, when a man publishes something against another's honor, thus bringing it to the knowledge of the latter and of other men. This reviling properly so called, and is done I some kind of signs. Now, according to Augustine (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 3), "compared with words all other signs are very few, for words have obtained the chief place among men for the purpose of expressing whatever the mind conceives." Hence reviling, properly speaking consists in words: wherefore, Isidore says (Etym. x) that a reviler [contumeliosus] "is hasty and bursts out [tudet] in injurious words." Since, however, things are also signified by deeds, which on this account have the same significance as words, it follows that reviling in a wider sense extends also to deeds. Wherefore a gloss on ~~301~~ Romans 1:30, "contumelious, proud," says: "The contumelious are those who by word or deed revile and shame others."

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(1)-RO(1) — Our words, if we consider them in their essence, i.e. as audible sound injure no man, except perhaps by jarring of the ear, as when a person speaks too loud. But, considered as signs

conveying something to the knowledge of others, they may do many kinds of harm. Such is the harm done to a man to the detriment of his honor, or of the respect due to him from others. Hence the reviling is greater if one man reproach another in the presence of many: and yet there may still be reviling if he reproach him by himself. in so far as the speaker acts unjustly against the respect due to the hearer.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(1)-RO(2) — One man slights another by deeds in so far as such deeds cause or signify that which is against that other man's honor. In the former case it is not a matter of reviling but of some other kind of injustice, of which we have spoken above (**QQ(64),65,66**): where as in the latter case there is reviling, in so far as deeds have the significant force of words.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(1)-RO(3) — Railing and taunts consist in words, even as reviling, because by all of them a man's faults are exposed to the detriment of his honor. Such faults are of three kinds. First, there is the fault of guilt, which is exposed by "reviling" words. Secondly, there is the fault of both guilt and punishment, which is exposed by "taunts" [convicium], because "vice" is commonly spoken of in connection with not only the soul but also the body. Hence if one man says spitefully to another that he is blind, he taunts but does not revile him: whereas if one man calls another a thief, he not only taunts but also reviles him. Thirdly, a man reproaches another for his inferiority or indigence, so as to lessen the honor due to him for any kind of excellence. This is done by "upbraiding" words, and properly speaking, occurs when one spitefully reminds a man that one has succored him when he was in need. Hence it is written (Ecclus. 20:15): "He will give a few things and upbraid much." Nevertheless these terms are sometimes employed one for the other.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(2)

Whether reviling or railing is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that reviling or railing is not a mortal sin. For no mortal sin is an act of virtue. Now railing is the act of a virtue, viz. of wittiness {eutrapelia} [*Cf. **P(2a), Q(60), A(5)**] to which it

pertains to rail well, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 8). Therefore railing or reviling is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, mortal sin is not to be found in perfect men; and yet these sometimes give utterance to railing or reviling. Thus the Apostle says (⁴⁸¹Galatians 3:1): “O senseless Galatians!,” and our Lord said (⁴²⁵Luke 24:25): “O foolish and slow of heart to believe!” Therefore railing or reviling is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, although that which is a venial sin by reason of its genus may become mortal, that which is mortal by reason of its genus cannot become venial, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(88), AA(4),6**). Hence if by reason of its genus it were a mortal sin to give utterance to railing or reviling, it would follow that it is always a mortal sin. But this is apparently untrue, as may be seen in the case of one who utters a reviling word indeliberately or through slight anger. Therefore reviling or railing is not a mortal sin, by reason of its genus.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Nothing but mortal sin deserves the eternal punishment of hell. Now railing or reviling deserves the punishment of hell, according to ⁴¹²Matthew 5:22, “Whosoever shall say to his brother... Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.” Therefore railing or reviling is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), words are injurious to other persons, not as sounds, but as signs, and this signification depends on the speaker’s inward intention. Hence, in sins of word, it seems that we ought to consider with what intention the words are uttered. Since then railing or reviling essentially denotes a dishonoring, if the intention of the utterer is to dishonor the other man, this is properly and essentially to give utterance to railing or reviling: and this is a mortal sin no less than theft or robbery, since a man loves his honor no less than his possessions. If, on the other hand, a man says to another a railing or reviling word, yet with the intention, not of dishonoring him, but rather perhaps of correcting him or with some like purpose, he utters a railing or reviling not formally and essentially, but accidentally and materially, in so far as he says that which might be a railing or reviling. Hence this may be sometimes a venial sin, and sometimes without any sin at all. Nevertheless there is need of discretion in such matters, and one should

use such words with moderation, because the railing might be so grave that being uttered inconsiderately it might dishonor the person against whom it is uttered. In such a case a man might commit a mortal sin, even though he did not intend to dishonor the other man: just as were a man incautiously to injure grievously another by striking him in fun, he would not be without blame.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(2)-RO(1) — It belongs to wittiness to utter some slight mockery, not with intent to dishonor or pain the person who is the object of the mockery, but rather with intent to please and amuse: and this may be without sin, if the due circumstances be observed. on the other hand if a man does not shrink from inflicting pain on the object of his witty mockery, so long as he makes others laugh, this is sinful, as stated in the passage quoted.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(2)-RO(2) — Just as it is lawful to strike a person, or damnify him in his belongings for the purpose of correction, so too, for the purpose of correction, may one say a mocking word to a person whom one has to correct. It is thus that our Lord called the disciples “foolish,” and the Apostle called the Galatians “senseless.” Yet, as Augustine says (De Sermonibus Domini in Monte ii, 19), “seldom and only when it is very necessary should we have recourse to invectives, and then so as to urge God’s service, not our own.”

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(2)-RO(3) — Since the sin of railing or reviling depends on the intention of the utterer, it may happen to be a venial sin, if it be a slight railing that does not inflict much dishonor on a man, and be uttered through lightness of heart or some slight anger, without the fixed purpose of dishonoring him, for instance when one intends by such a word to give but little pain.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(3)

Whether one ought to suffer oneself to be reviled?

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that one ought not to suffer oneself to be reviled. For he that suffers himself to be reviled, encourages

the reviler. But one ought not to do this. Therefore one ought not to suffer oneself to be reviled, but rather reply to the reviler.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, one ought to love oneself more than another. Now one ought not to suffer another to be reviled, wherefore it is written (^{<119>}Proverbs 26:10): “He that putteth a fool to silence appeaseth anger.” Therefore neither should one suffer oneself to be reviled.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, a man is not allowed to revenge himself, for it is said: “Vengeance belongeth to Me, I will repay” [^{<130>}Hebrews 10:30]. Now by submitting to be reviled a man revenges himself, according to Chrysostom (Hom. xxii, in Ep. ad Rom.): “If thou wilt be revenged, be silent; thou hast dealt him a fatal blow.” Therefore one ought not by silence to submit to reviling words, but rather answer back.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<157>}Psalms 37:13): “They that sought evils to me spoke vain things,” and afterwards (^{<157>}Psalms 37:14) he says: “But I as a deaf man, heard not; and as a dumb man not opening his mouth.”

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Just as we need patience in things done against us, so do we need it in those said against us. Now the precepts of patience in those things done against us refer to the preparedness of the mind, according to Augustine’s (De Serm. Dom. in Monte i, 19) exposition on our Lord’s precept, “If one strike thee on thy right cheek, turn to him also the other” [“The words as quoted by St. Thomas are a blending of ^{<158>}Matthew 5:39 and ^{<158>}Luke 6:29]: that is to say, a man ought to be prepared to do so if necessary. But he is not always bound to do this actually: since not even did our Lord do so, for when He received a blow, He said: “Why strikest thou Me?” (^{<158>}John 18:23). Consequently the same applies to the reviling words that are said against us. For we are bound to hold our minds prepared to submit to be reviled, if it should be expedient. Nevertheless it sometimes behooves us to withstand against being reviled, and this chiefly for two reasons. First, for the good of the reviler; namely, that his daring may be checked, and that he may not repeat the attempt, according to ^{<158>}Proverbs 26:5, “Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he imagine himself to be wise.” Secondly, for the good of many who would be prevented from progressing in virtue on account of our being reviled. Hence Gregory says (Hom. ix, Super Ezekiel):

“Those who are so placed that their life should be an example to others, ought, if possible, to silence their detractors, lest their preaching be not heard by those who could have heard it, and they continue their evil conduct through contempt of a good life.”

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(3)-RO(1) — The daring of the railing reviler should be checked with moderation, i.e. as a duty of charity, and not through lust for one’s own honor. Hence it is written (^{am}Proverbs 26:4):

“Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou be like him.”

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(3)-RO(2) — When one man prevents another from being reviled there is not the danger of lust for one’s own honor as there is when a man defends himself from being reviled: indeed rather would it seem to proceed from a sense of charity.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(3)-RO(3) — It would be an act of revenge to keep silence with the intention of provoking the reviler to anger, but it would be praiseworthy to be silent, in order to give place to anger. Hence it is written (Ecclus. 8:4): “Strive not with a man that is full of tongue, and heap not wood upon his fire.”

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(4)

Whether reviling arises from anger?

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that reviling does not arise from anger. For it is written (^{am}Proverbs 11:2): “Where pride is, there shall also be reviling [Douay: ‘reproach’].” But anger is a vice distinct from pride. Therefore reviling does not arise from anger.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, it is written (^{am}Proverbs 20:3): “All fools are meddling with revilings [Douay: ‘reproaches’].” Now folly is a vice opposed to wisdom, as stated above (**Q(46), A(1)**); whereas anger is opposed to meekness. Therefore reviling does not arise from anger.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, no sin is diminished by its cause. But the sin of reviling is diminished if one gives vent to it through anger: for it is a more grievous sin to revile out of hatred than out of anger. Therefore reviling does not arise from anger.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 45) that “anger gives rise to revilings.”

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(4) — *I answer that*, While one sin may arise from various causes, it is nevertheless said to have its source chiefly in that one from which it is wont to arise most frequently, through being closely connected with its end. Now reviling is closely connected with anger’s end, which is revenge: since the easiest way for the angry man to take revenge on another is to revile him. Therefore reviling arises chiefly from anger.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(4)-RO(1) — Reviling is not directed to the end of pride which is excellency. Hence reviling does not arise directly from pride. Nevertheless pride disposes a man to revile, in so far as those who think themselves to excel, are more prone to despise others and inflict injuries on them, because they are more easily angered, through deeming it an affront to themselves whenever anything is done against their will.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(4)-RO(2) — According to the Philosopher (Ethic. vii, 6) “anger listens imperfectly to reason”: wherefore an angry man suffers a defect of reason, and in this he is like the foolish man. Hence reviling arises from folly on account of the latter’s kinship with anger.

P(2b)-Q(72)-A(4)-RO(3) — According to the Philosopher (Rhet. ii, 4) “an angry man seeks an open offense, but he who hates does not worry about this.” Hence reviling which denotes a manifest injury belongs to anger rather than to hatred.

QUESTION 73

OF BACKBITING [*OR DETRACTION]

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider backbiting, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) What is backbiting?
- (2) Whether it is a mortal sin?
- (3) Of its comparison with other sins;
- (4) Whether it is a sin to listen to backbiting?

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(1)

*Whether backbiting is suitably defined
as the blackening of another's character by secret words?*

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that backbiting is not as defined by some [*Albert the Great, Sum. Theol. II, cxvii.], “the blackening of another’s good name by words uttered in secret.” For “secretly” and “openly” are circumstances that do not constitute the species of a sin, because it is accidental to a sin that it be known by many or by few. Now that which does not constitute the species of a sin, does not belong to its essence, and should not be included in its definition. Therefore it does not belong to the essence of backbiting that it should be done by secret words.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the notion of a good name implies something known to the public. If, therefore, a person’s good name is blackened by backbiting, this cannot be done by secret words, but by words uttered openly.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, to detract is to subtract, or to diminish something already existing. But sometimes a man’s good name is blackened, even without subtracting from the truth: for instance, when one

reveals the crimes which a man has in truth committed. Therefore not every blackening of a good name is backbiting.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{am}Ecclesiastes 10:11): “If a serpent bite in silence, he is nothing better than backbiteth.”

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Just as one man injures another by deed in two ways — openly, as by robbery or by doing him any kind of violence — and secretly, as by theft, or by a crafty blow, so again one man injures another by words in two ways — in one way, openly, and this is done by reviling him, as stated above (**Q(72), A(1)**) — and in another way secretly, and this is done by backbiting. Now from the fact that one man openly utters words against another man, he would appear to think little of him, so that for this reason he dishonors him, so that reviling is detrimental to the honor of the person reviled. On the other hand, he that speaks against another secretly, seems to respect rather than slight him, so that he injures directly, not his honor but his good name, in so far as by uttering such words secretly, he, for his own part, causes his hearers to have a bad opinion of the person against whom he speaks. For the backbiter apparently intends and aims at being believed. It is therefore evident that backbiting differs from reviling in two points: first, in the way in which the words are uttered, the reviler speaking openly against someone, and the backbiter secretly; secondly, as to the end in view, i.e. as regards the injury inflicted, the reviler injuring a man’s honor, the backbiter injuring his good name.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(1)-RO(1) — In involuntary commutations, to which are reduced all injuries inflicted on our neighbor, whether by word or by deed, the kind of sin is differentiated by the circumstances “secretly” and “openly,” because involuntariness itself is diversified by violence and by ignorance, as stated above (**Q(65), A(4); P(2a), Q(6), AA(5),8**).

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(1)-RO(2) — The words of a backbiter are said to be secret, not altogether, but in relation to the person of whom they are said, because they are uttered in his absence and without his knowledge. On the other hand, the reviler speaks against a man to his face. Wherefore if a man speaks ill of another in the presence of several, it is a case of backbiting if he be absent, but of reviling if he alone be present: although if a man speak

ill of an absent person to one man alone, he destroys his good name not altogether but partly.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(1)-RO(3) — A man is said to backbite [detrehere] another, not because he detracts from the truth, but because he lessens his good name. This is done sometimes directly, sometimes indirectly. Directly, in four ways: first, by saying that which is false about him; secondly, by stating his sin to be greater than it is; thirdly, by revealing something unknown about him; fourthly, by ascribing his good deeds to a bad intention. Indirectly, this is done either by gainsaying his good, or by maliciously concealing it, or by diminishing it.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(2)

Whether backbiting is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that backbiting is not a mortal sin. For no act of virtue is a mortal sin. Now, to reveal an unknown sin, which pertains to backbiting, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 3), is an act of the virtue of charity, whereby a man denounces his brother's sin in order that he may amend: or else it is an act of justice, whereby a man accuses his brother. Therefore backbiting is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, a gloss on ^{<100>}Proverbs 24:21, "Have nothing to do with detractors," says: "The whole human race is in peril from this vice." But no mortal sin is to be found in the whole of mankind, since many refrain from mortal sin: whereas they are venial sins that are found in all. Therefore backbiting is a venial sin.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, Augustine in a homily On the Fire of Purgatory [*Serm. civ in the appendix to St. Augustine's work] reckons it a slight sin "to speak ill without hesitation or forethought." But this pertains to backbiting. Therefore backbiting is a venial sin.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(2) — On the contrary, It is written (^{<100>}Romans 1:30): "Backbiters, hateful to God," which epithet, according to a gloss, is inserted, "lest it be deemed a slight sin because it consists in words."

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(72), A(2)**), sins of word should be judged chiefly from the intention of the speaker. Now backbiting by its very nature aims at blackening a man's good name. Wherefore, properly speaking, to backbite is to speak ill of an absent person in order to blacken his good name. Now it is a very grave matter to blacken a man's good name, because of all temporal things a man's good name seems the most precious, since for lack of it he is hindered from doing many things well. For this reason it is written (Ecclus. 41:15): "Take care of a good name, for this shall continue with thee, more than a thousand treasures precious and great." Therefore backbiting, properly speaking, is a mortal sin. Nevertheless it happens sometimes that a man utters words, whereby someone's good name is tarnished, and yet he does not intend this, but something else. This is not backbiting strictly and formally speaking, but only materially and accidentally as it were. And if such defamatory words be uttered for the sake of some necessary good, and with attention to the due circumstances, it is not a sin and cannot be called backbiting. But if they be uttered out of lightness of heart or for some unnecessary motive, it is not a mortal sin, unless perchance the spoken word be of such a grave nature, as to cause a notable injury to a man's good name, especially in matters pertaining to his moral character, because from the very nature of the words this would be a mortal sin. And one is bound to restore a man his good name, no less than any other thing one has taken from him, in the manner stated above (**Q(62), A(2)**) when we were treating of restitution.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(2)-RO(1) — As stated above, it is not backbiting to reveal a man's hidden sin in order that he may mend, whether one denounce it, or accuse him for the good of public justice.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(2)-RO(2) — This gloss does not assert that backbiting is to be found throughout the whole of mankind, but "almost," both because "the number of fools is infinite," [*²⁰¹⁵Ecclesiastes 1:15] and few are they that walk in the way of salvation, [*Cf. ⁴⁰⁷⁴Matthew 7:14] and because there are few or none at all who do not at times speak from lightness of heart, so as to injure someone's good name at least slightly, for it is written (³⁰⁸⁰James 3:2): "If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man."

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(2)-RO(3) — Augustine is referring to the case when a man utters a slight evil about someone, not intending to injure him, but through lightness of heart or a slip of the tongue.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(3)

Whether backbiting is the gravest of all sins committed against one's neighbor?

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that backbiting is the gravest of all sins committed against one's neighbor. Because a gloss on ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 108:4, "Instead of making me a return of love they detracted me," a gloss says: "Those who detract Christ in His members and slay the souls of future believers are more guilty than those who killed the flesh that was soon to rise again." From this it seems to follow that backbiting is by so much a graver sin than murder, as it is a graver matter to kill the soul than to kill the body. Now murder is the gravest of the other sins that are committed against one's neighbor. Therefore backbiting is absolutely the gravest of all.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, backbiting is apparently a graver sin than reviling, because a man can withstand reviling, but not a secret backbiting. Now backbiting is seemingly a graver sin than adultery, because adultery unites two persons in one flesh, whereas reviling severs utterly those who were united. Therefore backbiting is more grievous than adultery: and yet of all other sins a man commits against his neighbor, adultery is most grave.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, reviling arises from anger, while backbiting arises from envy, according to Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 45). But envy is a graver sin than anger. Therefore backbiting is a graver sin than reviling; and so the same conclusion follows as before.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(3)-O(4) — Further, the gravity of a sin is measured by the gravity of the defect that it causes. Now backbiting causes a most grievous defect, viz. blindness of mind. For Gregory says (Regist. xi, Ep. 2): "What else do backbiters but blow on the dust and stir up the dirt into their eyes, so that the more they breathe of detraction, the less they see of the truth?"

Therefore backbiting is the most grievous sin committed against one's neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is more grievous to sin by deed than by word. But backbiting is a sin of word, while adultery, murder, and theft are sins of deed. Therefore backbiting is not graver than the other sins committed against one's neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(3) — *I answer that*, The essential gravity of sins committed against one's neighbor must be weighed by the injury they inflict on him, since it is thence that they derive their sinful nature. Now the greater the good taken away, the greater the injury. And while man's good is threefold, namely the good of his soul, the good of his body, and the good of external things; the good of the soul, which is the greatest of all, cannot be taken from him by another save as an occasional cause, for instance by an evil persuasion, which does not induce necessity. On the other hand the two latter goods, viz. of the body and of external things, can be taken away by violence. Since, however, the goods of the body excel the goods of external things, those sins which injure a man's body are more grievous than those which injure his external things. Consequently, among other sins committed against one's neighbor, murder is the most grievous, since it deprives man of the life which he already possesses: after this comes adultery, which is contrary to the right order of human generation, whereby man enters upon life. In the last place come external goods, among which a man's good name takes precedence of wealth because it is more akin to spiritual goods, wherefore it is written (^{xxii}Proverbs 22:1): "A good name is better than great riches." Therefore backbiting according to its genus is a more grievous sin than theft, but is less grievous than murder or adultery. Nevertheless the order may differ by reason of aggravating or extenuating circumstances.

The accidental gravity of a sin is to be considered in relation to the sinner, who sins more grievously, if he sins deliberately than if he sins through weakness or carelessness. In this respect sins of word have a certain levity, in so far as they are apt to occur through a slip of the tongue, and without much forethought.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(3)-RO(1) — Those who detract Christ by hindering the faith of His members, disparage His Godhead, which is the foundation of our faith. Wherefore this is not simple backbiting but blasphemy.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(3)-RO(2) — Reviling is a more grievous sin than backbiting, in as much as it implies greater contempt of one's neighbor: even as robbery is a graver sin than theft, as stated above (**Q(66), A(9)**). Yet reviling is not a more grievous sin than adultery. For the gravity of adultery is measured, not from its being a union of bodies, but from being a disorder in human generation. Moreover the reviler is not the sufficient cause of unfriendliness in another man, but is only the occasional cause of division among those who were united, in so far, to wit, as by declaring the evils of another, he for his own part severs that man from the friendship of other men, though they are not forced by his words to do so. Accordingly a backbiter is a murderer "occasionally," since by his words he gives another man an occasion for hating or despising his neighbor. For this reason it is stated in the Epistle of Clement [*Ad Jacob. Ep. i], that "backbiters are murderers," i.e. occasionally; because "he that hateth his brother is a murderer" (^{-Q15}1 John 3:15).

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(3)-RO(3) — Anger seeks openly to be avenged, as the Philosopher states (Rhet. ii, 2): wherefore backbiting which takes place in secret, is not the daughter of anger, as reviling is, but rather of envy, which strives by any means to lessen one's neighbor's glory. Nor does it follow from this that backbiting is more grievous than reviling: since a lesser vice can give rise to a greater sin, just as anger gives birth to murder and blasphemy. For the origin of a sin depends on its inclination to an end, i.e. on the thing to which the sin turns, whereas the gravity of a sin depends on what it turns away from.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(3)-RO(4) — Since "a man rejoiceth in the sentence of his mouth" (^{-Q15}Proverbs 15:23), it follows that a backbiter more and more loves and believes what he says, and consequently more and more hates his neighbor, and thus his knowledge of the truth becomes less and less. This effect however may also result from other sins pertaining to hate of one's neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(4)***Whether it is a grave sin
for the listener to suffer the backbiter?***

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the listener who suffers a backbiter does not sin grievously. For a man is not under greater obligations to others than to himself. But it is praiseworthy for a man to suffer his own backbiters: for Gregory says (Hom. ix, super Ezech): “Just as we ought not to incite the tongue of backbiters, lest they perish, so ought we to suffer them with equanimity when they have been incited by their own wickedness, in order that our merit may be the greater.” Therefore a man does not sin if he does not withstand those who backbite others.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, it is written (Ecclus. 4:30): “In no wise speak against the truth.” Now sometimes a person tells the truth while backbiting, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 3). Therefore it seems that one is not always bound to withstand a backbiter.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, no man should hinder what is profitable to others. Now backbiting is often profitable to those who are backbitten: for Pope Pius [*St. Pius I] says [*Append. Grat. ad can. Oves, caus. vi, qu. 1]: “Not unfrequently backbiting is directed against good persons, with the result that those who have been unduly exalted through the flattery of their kindred, or the favor of others, are humbled by backbiting.” Therefore one ought not to withstand backbiters.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Jerome says (Ep. ad Nepot. lii): “Take care not to have an itching tongue, nor tingling ears, that is, neither detract others nor listen to backbiters.”

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(4) — *I answer that*, According to the Apostle (⁸¹³Romans 1:32), they “are worthy of death... not only they that” commit sins, “but they also that consent to them that do them.” Now this happens in two ways. First, directly, when, to wit, one man induces another to sin, or when the sin is pleasing to him: secondly, indirectly, that is, if he does not withstand him when he might do so, and this happens sometimes, not because the sin is pleasing to him, but on account of some human fear.

Accordingly we must say that if a man listens to backbiting without resisting it, he seems to consent to the backbiter, so that he becomes a participator in his sin. And if he induces him to backbite, or at least if the detraction be pleasing to him on account of his hatred of the person detracted, he sins no less than the detractor, and sometimes more.

Wherefore Bernard says (De Consid. ii, 13): “It is difficult to say which is the more to be condemned the backbiter or he that listens to backbiting.” If however the sin is not pleasing to him, and he fails to withstand the backbiter, through fear negligence, or even shame, he sins indeed, but much less than the backbiter, and, as a rule venially. Sometimes too this may be a mortal sin, either because it is his official duty to correct the backbiter, or by reason of some consequent danger; or on account of the radical reason for which human fear may sometimes be a mortal sin, as stated above **(Q(19), A(3))**.

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(4)-RO(1) — No man hears himself backbitten, because when a man is spoken evil of in his hearing, it is not backbiting, properly speaking, but reviling, as stated above **(A(1), ad 2)**. Yet it is possible for the detractions uttered against a person to come to his knowledge through others telling him, and then it is left to his discretion whether he will suffer their detriment to his good name, unless this endanger the good of others, as stated above **(Q(72), A(3))**. Wherefore his patience may deserve commendation for as much as he suffers patiently being detracted himself. But it is not left to his discretion to permit an injury to be done to another’s good name, hence he is accounted guilty if he fails to resist when he can, for the same reason whereby a man is bound to raise another man’s ass lying “underneath his burden,” as commanded in ¹⁵²⁴Deuteronomy 21:4 [¹⁵²⁵Exodus 23:5].

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(4)-RO(2) — One ought not always to withstand a backbiter by endeavoring to convince him of falsehood, especially if one knows that he is speaking the truth: rather ought one to reprove him with words, for that he sins in backbiting his brother, or at least by our pained demeanor show him that we are displeased with his backbiting, because according to ¹⁵²⁶Proverbs 25:23,

“the north wind driveth away rain, as doth a sad countenance a backbiting tongue.”

P(2b)-Q(73)-A(4)-RO(3) — The profit one derives from being backbitten is due, not to the intention of the backbiter, but to the ordinance of God Who produces good out of every evil. Hence we should none the less withstand backbiters, just as those who rob or oppress others, even though the oppressed and the robbed may gain merit by patience.

QUESTION 74

OF TALE-BEARING [*'SUSURRATIO,' I.E. WHISPERING]

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider tale-bearing: under which head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether tale-bearing is a sin distinct from backbiting?
- (2) Which of the two is the more grievous?

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(1)

Whether tale-bearing is a sin distinct from backbiting?

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that tale-bearing is not a distinct sin from backbiting. Isidore says (Etym. x): “The susurro [tale-bearer] takes his name from the sound of his speech, for he speaks disparagingly not to the face but into the ear.” But to speak of another disparagingly belongs to backbiting. Therefore tale-bearing is not a distinct sin from backbiting.

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, it is written (~~CREAT~~ Leviticus 19:16):

“Thou shalt not be an informer [Douay: ‘a detractor’]
nor a tale-bearer [Douay: ‘whisperer’] among the people.”

But an informer is apparently the same as a backbiter. Therefore neither does tale-bearing differ from backbiting.

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, it is written (Ecclus. 28:15): “The tale-bearer [Douay: ‘whisperer’] and the double-tongued is accursed.” But a double-tongued man is apparently the same as a backbiter, because a backbiter speaks with a double tongue, with one in your absence, with another in your presence. Therefore a tale-bearer is the same as a backbiter.

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on ⁶¹²Romans 1:29,30, “Tale-bearers, backbiters [Douay: ‘whisperers, detractors’]” says: “Tale-bearers sow discord among friends; backbiters deny or disparage others’ good points.”

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(1) — *I answer that*, The tale-bearer and the backbiter agree in matter, and also in form or mode of speaking, since they both speak evil secretly of their neighbor: and for this reason these terms are sometimes used one for the other. Hence a gloss on Ecclus. 5:16, “Be not called a tale-bearer [Douay: ‘whisperer’]” says: “i.e. a backbiter.” They differ however in end, because the backbiter intends to blacken his neighbor’s good name, wherefore he brings forward those evils especially about his neighbor which are likely to defame him, or at least to depreciate his good name: whereas a tale-bearer intends to sever friendship, as appears from the gloss quoted above and from the saying of ¹¹⁸¹Proverbs 26:20, “Where the tale-bearer is taken away, contentions shall cease.” Hence it is that a tale-bearer speaks such ill about his neighbors as may stir his hearer’s mind against them, according to Ecclus. 28:11, “A sinful man will trouble his friends, and bring in debate in the midst of them that are at peace.”

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(1)-RO(1) — A tale-bearer is called a backbiter in so far as he speaks ill of another; yet he differs from a backbiter since he intends not to speak ill as such, but to say anything that may stir one man against another, though it be good simply, and yet has a semblance of evil through being unpleasant to the hearer.

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(1)-RO(2) — An informer differs from a tale-bearer and a backbiter, for an informer is one who charges others publicly with crimes, either by accusing or by railing them, which does not apply to a backbiter or tale-bearer.

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(1)-RO(3) — A double-tongued person is properly speaking a tale-bearer. For since friendship is between two, the tale-bearer strives to sever friendship on both sides. Hence he employs a double tongue towards two persons, by speaking ill of one to the other: wherefore it is written (Ecclus. 28:15): “The tale-bearer [Douay: ‘whisperer’] and the double-tongued is accursed,” and then it is added, “for he hath troubled many that were peace.”

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(2)

Whether backbiting is a graver sin than tale-bearing?

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that backbiting is a graver sin than tale-bearing. For sins of word consist in speaking evil. Now a backbiter speaks of his neighbor things that are evil simply, for such things lead to the loss or depreciation of his good name: whereas a tale-bearer is only intent on saying what is apparently evil, because to wit they are unpleasant to the hearer. Therefore backbiting is a graver sin than tale-bearing.

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, he that deprives a man of his good name, deprives him not merely of one friend, but of many, because everyone is minded to scorn the friendship of a person with a bad name. Hence it is reproached against a certain individual [*King Josaphat] (2 Paralip 19:2): “Thou art joined in friendship with them that hate the Lord.” But tale-bearing deprives one of only one friend. Therefore backbiting is a graver sin than tale-bearing.

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it is written (⁵⁰⁴¹James 4:11): “He that backbiteth [Douay: ‘detracteth’] his brother... detracteth the law,” and consequently God the giver of the law. Wherefore the sin of backbiting seems to be a sin against God, which is most grievous, as stated above (Q(20), A(3); P(2a), Q(73), A(3)). On the other hand the sin of tale-bearing is against one’s neighbor. Therefore the sin of backbiting is graver than the sin of tale-bearing.

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (Ecclus. 5:17): “An evil mark of disgrace is upon the double-tongued; but to the tale-bearer [Douay: ‘whisperer’] hatred, and enmity, and reproach.”

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (Q(73), A(3); P(2a), Q(73), A(8)), sins against one’s neighbor are the more grievous, according as they inflict a greater injury on him: and an injury is so much the greater, according to the greatness of the good which it takes away. Now of all one’s external goods a friend takes the first place, since “no man can live without friends,” as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. viii, 1). Hence it is written (Ecclus. 6:15): “Nothing can be compared to a faithful friend.” Again, a man’s good name whereof backbiting deprives him, is most

necessary to him that he may be fitted for friendship. Therefore tale-bearing is a greater sin than backbiting or even reviling, because a friend is better than honor, and to be loved is better than to be honored, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. viii).

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(2)-RO(1) — The species and gravity of a sin depend on the end rather than on the material object, wherefore, by reason of its end, tale-bearing is worse than backbiting, although sometimes the backbiter says worse things.

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(2)-RO(2) — A good name is a disposition for friendship, and a bad name is a disposition for enmity. But a disposition falls short of the thing for which it disposes. Hence to do anything that leads to a disposition for enmity is a less grievous sin than to do what conduces directly to enmity.

P(2b)-Q(74)-A(2)-RO(3) — He that backbites his brother, seems to detract the law, in so far as he despises the precept of love for one's neighbor: while he that strives to sever friendship seems to act more directly against this precept. Hence the latter sin is more specially against God, because "God is charity" (¹¹⁸⁶1 John 4:16), and for this reason it is written (¹¹⁸⁶Proverbs 6:16): "Six things there are, which the Lord hateth, and the seventh His soul detesteth," and the seventh is "he (¹¹⁸⁶Proverbs 6:19) that soweth discord among brethren."

QUESTION 75

OF DERISION [*OR MOCKERY]

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now speak of derision, under which head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether derision is a special sin distinct from the other sins whereby one's neighbor is injured by words?
- (2) Whether derision is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(1)

*Whether derision is a special sin
distinct from those already mentioned?*

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that derision is not a special sin distinct from those mentioned above. For laughing to scorn is apparently the same as derision. But laughing to scorn pertains to reviling. Therefore derision would seem not to differ from reviling.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, no man is derided except for something reprehensible which puts him to shame. Now such are sins; and if they be imputed to a person publicly, it is a case of reviling, if privately, it amounts to backbiting or tale-bearing. Therefore derision is not distinct from the foregoing vices.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, sins of this kind are distinguished by the injury they inflict on one's neighbor. Now the injury inflicted on a man by derision affects either his honor, or his good name, or is detrimental to his friendship. Therefore derision is not a sin distinct from the foregoing.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Derision is done in jest, wherefore it is described as “making fun.” Now all the foregoing are done seriously and not in jest. Therefore derision differs from all of them.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(72), A(2)**), sins of word should be weighed chiefly by the intention of the speaker, wherefore these sins are differentiated according to the various intentions of those who speak against another. Now just as the railer intends to injure the honor of the person he rails, the backbiter to depreciate a good name, and

the tale-bearer to destroy friendship, so too the derider intends to shame the person he derides. And since this end is distinct from the others, it follows that the sin of derision is distinct from the foregoing sins.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(1)-RO(1) — Laughing to scorn and derision agree as to the end but differ in mode, because derision is done with the “mouth,” i.e. by words and laughter, while laughing to scorn is done by wrinkling the nose, as a gloss says on ^{411B}Psalm 2:4, “He that dwelleth in heaven shall laugh at them”: and such a distinction does not differentiate the species. Yet they both differ from reviling, as being shamed differs from being dishonored: for to be ashamed is “to fear dishonor,” as Damascene states (De Fide Orth. ii, 15).

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(1)-RO(2) — For doing a virtuous deed a man deserves both respect and a good name in the eyes of others, and in his own eyes the glory of a good conscience, according to ^{411D}2 Corinthians 1:12, “Our glory is this, the testimony of our conscience.” Hence, on the other hand, for doing a reprehensible, i.e. a vicious action, a man forfeits his honor and good name in the eyes of others — and for this purpose the reviler and the backbiter speak of another person — while in his own eyes, he loses the glory of his conscience through being confused and ashamed at reprehensible deeds being imputed to him — and for this purpose the derider speaks ill of him. It is accordingly evident that derision agrees with the foregoing vices as to the matter but differs as to the end.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(1)-RO(3) — A secure and calm conscience is a great good, according to ^{411E}Proverbs 15:15, “A secure mind is like a continual feast.” Wherefore he that disturbs another’s conscience by confounding him inflicts a special injury on him: hence derision is a special kind of sin.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(2)

Whether derision can be a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that derision cannot be a mortal sin. Every mortal sin is contrary to charity. But derision does not seem contrary to charity, for sometimes it takes place in jest among friends, wherefore it is known as “making fun.” Therefore derision cannot be a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the greatest derision would appear to be that which is done as an injury to God. But derision is not always a mortal sin when it tends to the injury of God: else it would be a mortal sin to relapse into a venial sin of which one has repented. For Isidore says (De Sum. Bon. ii, 16) that “he who continues to do what he has repented of, is a derider and not a penitent.” It would likewise follow that all hypocrisy is a mortal sin, because, according to Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 15) “the ostrich signifies the hypocrite, who derides the horse, i.e. the just man, and his rider, i.e. God.” Therefore derision is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, reviling and backbiting seem to be graver sins than derision, because it is more to do a thing seriously than in jest. But not all backbiting or reviling is a mortal sin. Much less therefore is derision a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{218B} Proverbs 3:34): “He derideth [Vulg.: ‘shall scorn’] the scorers.” But God’s derision is eternal punishment for mortal sin, as appears from the words of ^{219B} Psalm 2:4, “He that dwelleth in heaven shall laugh at them.” Therefore derision is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(2) — *I answer that*, The object of derision is always some evil or defect. Now when an evil is great, it is taken, not in jest, but seriously: consequently if it is taken in jest or turned to ridicule (whence the terms ‘derision’ and ‘jesting’), this is because it is considered to be slight. Now an evil may be considered to be slight in two ways: first, in itself, secondly, in relation to the person. When anyone makes game or fun of another’s evil or defect, because it is a slight evil in itself, this is a venial sin by reason of its genus. on the other hand this defect may be considered as a slight evil in relation to the person, just as we are wont to think little of the defects of children and imbeciles: and then to make game or fun of a person, is to scorn him altogether, and to think him so despicable that his misfortune troubles us not one whit, but is held as an object of derision. In this way derision is a mortal sin, and more grievous than reviling, which is also done openly: because the reviler would seem to take another’s evil seriously; whereas the derider does so in fun, and so would seem the more to despise and dishonor the other man. Wherefore, in this sense, derision is a grievous sin, and all the more grievous according as a greater respect is due to the person derided.

Consequently it is an exceedingly grievous sin to deride God and the things of God, according to ~~2372~~ Isaiah 37:23,

“Whom hast thou reproached, and whom hast thou blasphemed,
and against whom hast thou exalted thy voice?”

and he replies: “Against the Holy One of Israel.” In the second place comes derision of one’s parents, wherefore it is written (~~2372~~ Proverbs 30:17): “The eye that mocketh at his father, and that despiseth the labor of his mother in bearing him, let the ravens of the brooks pick it out, and the young eagles eat it.” Further, the derision of good persons is grievous, because honor is the reward of virtue, and against this it is written (~~2372~~ Job 12:4): “The simplicity of the just man is laughed to scorn.” Such like derision does very much harm: because it turns men away from good deeds, according to Gregory (Moral. xx, 14), “Who when they perceive any good points appearing in the acts of others, directly pluck them up with the hand of a mischievous reviling.”

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(2)-RO(1) — Jestng implies nothing contrary to charity in relation to the person with whom one jests, but it may imply something against charity in relation to the person who is the object of the jest, on account of contempt, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(2)-RO(2) — Neither he that relapses into a sin of which he has repented, nor a hypocrite, derides God explicitly, but implicitly, in so far as either’s behavior is like a derider’s. Nor is it true that to commit a venial sin is to relapse or dissimulate altogether, but only dispositively and imperfectly.

P(2b)-Q(75)-A(2)-RO(3) — Derision considered in itself is less grievous than backbiting or reviling, because it does not imply contempt, but jest. Sometimes however it includes greater contempt than reviling does, as stated above, and then it is a grave sin.

QUESTION 76

OF CURSING

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider cursing. Under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether one may lawfully curse another?
- (2) Whether one may lawfully curse an irrational creature?
- (3) Whether cursing is a mortal sin?
- (4) Of its comparison with other sins.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1)

Whether it is lawful to curse anyone?

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful to curse anyone. For it is unlawful to disregard the command of the Apostle in whom Christ spoke, according to ^{¶118}2 Corinthians 13:3. Now he commanded (^{¶624}Romans 12:14), “Bless and curse not.” Therefore it is not lawful to curse anyone.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, all are bound to bless God, according to ^{¶118}Daniel 3:82, “O ye sons of men, bless the Lord.” Now the same mouth cannot both bless God and curse man, as proved in the third chapter of James. Therefore no man may lawfully curse another man.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, he that curses another would seem to wish him some evil either of fault or of punishment, since a curse appears to be a kind of imprecation. But it is not lawful to wish ill to anyone, indeed we are bound to pray that all may be delivered from evil. Therefore it is unlawful for any man to curse.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, the devil exceeds all in malice on account of his obstinacy. But it is not lawful to curse the devil, as neither is it lawful to curse oneself; for it is written (Ecclus. 21:30): “While the ungodly curseth the devil, he curseth his own soul.” Much less therefore is it lawful to curse a man.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, a gloss on ^{<0218>}Numbers 23:8, “How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed?” says: “There cannot be a just cause for cursing a sinner if one be ignorant of his sentiments.” Now one man cannot know another man’s sentiments, nor whether he is cursed by God. Therefore no man may lawfully curse another.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<0272>}Deuteronomy 27:26):

“Cursed be he that abideth not in the words of this law.”

Moreover Eliseus cursed the little boys who mocked him (^{<1124>}2 Kings 2:24).

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1) — *I answer that*, To curse [maledicere] is the same as to speak ill [malum dicere]. Now “speaking” has a threefold relation to the thing spoken. First, by way of assertion, as when a thing is expressed in the indicative mood: in this way “maledicere” signifies simply to tell someone of another’s evil, and this pertains to backbiting, wherefore tellers of evil [maledici] are sometimes called backbiters. Secondly, speaking is related to the thing spoken, by way of cause, and this belongs to God first and foremost, since He made all things by His word, according to ^{<0310>}Psalms 32:9, “He spoke and they were made”; while secondarily it belongs to man, who, by his word, commands others and thus moves them to do something: it is for this purpose that we employ verbs in the imperative mood. Thirdly, “speaking” is related to the thing spoken by expressing the sentiments of one who desires that which is expressed in words; and for this purpose we employ the verb in the optative mood.

Accordingly we may omit the first kind of evil speaking which is by way of simple assertion of evil, and consider the other two kinds. And here we must observe that to do something and to will it are consequent on one another in the matter of goodness and wickedness, as shown above (**P(2a), Q(20), A(3)**). Hence in these two ways of evil speaking, by way of command and by way of desire, there is the same aspect of lawfulness and unlawfulness, for if a man commands or desires another’s evil, as evil, being intent on the evil itself, then evil speaking will be unlawful in both ways, and this is what is meant by cursing. On the other hand if a man commands or desires another’s evil under the aspect of good, it is lawful; and it may be called cursing, not strictly speaking, but accidentally,

because the chief intention of the speaker is directed not to evil but to good.

Now evil may be spoken, by commanding or desiring it, under the aspect of a twofold good. Sometimes under the aspect of just, and thus a judge lawfully curses a man whom he condemns to a just penalty: thus too the Church curses by pronouncing anathema. In the same way the prophets in the Scriptures sometimes call down evils on sinners, as though conforming their will to Divine justice, although such like imprecation may be taken by way of foretelling. Sometimes evil is spoken under the aspect of useful, as when one wishes a sinner to suffer sickness or hindrance of some kind, either that he may himself reform, or at least that he may cease from harming others.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1)-RO(1) — The Apostle forbids cursing strictly so called with an evil intent: and the same answer applies to the Second Objection.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1)-RO(3) — To wish another man evil under the aspect of good, is not opposed to the sentiment whereby one wishes him good simply, in fact rather is it in conformity therewith.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1)-RO(4) — In the devil both nature and guilt must be considered. His nature indeed is good and is from God nor is it lawful to curse it. On the other hand his guilt is deserving of being cursed, according to ^{<RR>}Job 3:8, “Let them curse it who curse the day.” Yet when a sinner curses the devil on account of his guilt, for the same reason he judges himself worthy of being cursed; and in this sense he is said to curse his own soul.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(1)-RO(5) — Although the sinner’s sentiments cannot be perceived in themselves, they can be perceived through some manifest sin, which has to be punished. Likewise although it is not possible to know whom God curses in respect of final reprobation, it is possible to know who is accursed of God in respect of being guilty of present sin.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(2)

Whether it is lawful to curse an irrational creature?

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that it is unlawful to curse an irrational creature. Cursing would seem to be lawful chiefly in its relation

to punishment. Now irrational creatures are not competent subjects either of guilt or of punishment. Therefore it is unlawful to curse them.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, in an irrational creature there is nothing but the nature which God made. But it is unlawful to curse this even in the devil, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore it is nowise lawful to curse an irrational creature.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, irrational creatures are either stable, as bodies, or transient, as the seasons. Now, according to Gregory (Moral. iv, 2), “it is useless to curse what does not exist, and wicked to curse what exists.” Therefore it is nowise lawful to curse an irrational creature.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, our Lord cursed the fig tree, as related in ^{<DIB>}Matthew 21:19; and Job cursed his day, according to ^{<XRE>}Job 3:1.

I answer that, Benediction and malediction, properly speaking, regard things to which good or evil may happen, viz. rational creatures: while good and evil are said to happen to irrational creatures in relation to the rational creature for whose sake they are. Now they are related to the rational creature in several ways. First by way of ministration, in so far as irrational creatures minister to the needs of man. In this sense the Lord said to man (^{<QNT>}Genesis 3:17): “Cursed is the earth in thy work,” so that its barrenness would be a punishment to man. Thus also David cursed the mountains of Gelboe, according to Gregory’s expounding (Moral. iv, 3). Again the irrational creature is related to the rational creature by way of signification: and thus our Lord cursed the fig tree in signification of Judea. Thirdly, the irrational creature is related to rational creatures as something containing them, namely by way of time or place: and thus Job cursed the day of his birth, on account of the original sin which he contracted in birth, and on account of the consequent penalties. In this sense also we may understand David to have cursed the mountains of Gelboe, as we read in 2 Kgs. 1:21, namely on account of the people slaughtered there.

But to curse irrational beings, considered as creatures of God, is a sin of blasphemy; while to curse them considered in themselves is idle and vain and consequently unlawful.

From this the Replies to the objections may easily be gathered.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(3)

Whether cursing is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that cursing is not a mortal sin. For Augustine in a homily On the Fire of Purgatory [*Serm. civ in the appendix of St. Augustine's works] reckons cursing among slight sins. But such sins are venial. Therefore cursing is not a mortal but a venial Sin.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, that which proceeds from a slight movement of the mind does not seem to be generically a mortal sin. But cursing sometimes arises from a slight movement. Therefore cursing is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, evil deeds are worse than evil words. But evil deeds are not always mortal sins. Much less therefore is cursing a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Nothing save mortal sin excludes one from the kingdom of God. But cursing excludes from the kingdom of God, according to ~~400~~ 1 Corinthians 6:10,

“Nor cursers [Douay: ‘railers’], nor extortioners shall possess the kingdom of God.”

Therefore cursing is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(3) — *I answer that*, The evil words of which we are speaking now are those whereby evil is uttered against someone by way of command or desire. Now to wish evil to another man, or to conduce to that evil by commanding it, is, of its very nature, contrary to charity whereby we love our neighbor by desiring his good. Consequently it is a mortal sin, according to its genus, and so much the graver, as the person whom we curse has a greater claim on our love and respect. Hence it is written (~~400~~ Leviticus 20:9):

“He that curseth his father, or mother, dying let him die.”

It may happen however that the word uttered in cursing is a venial sin either through the slightness of the evil invoked on another in cursing him, or on account of the sentiments of the person who utters the curse; because he may say such words through some slight movement, or in jest,

or without deliberation, and sins of word should be weighed chiefly with regard to the speaker's intention, as stated above (**Q(72), A(2)**).

From this the Replies to the Objections may be easily gathered.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(4)

Whether cursing is a graver sin than backbiting?

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that cursing is a graver sin than backbiting. Cursing would seem to be a kind of blasphemy, as implied in the canonical epistle of Jude (verse 9) where it is said that “when Michael the archangel, disputing with the devil, contended about the body of Moses, he durst not bring against him the judgment of blasphemy [Douay: ‘railing speech’],” where blasphemy stands for cursing, according to a gloss. Now blasphemy is a graver sin than backbiting. Therefore cursing is a graver sin than backbiting.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, murder is more grievous than backbiting, as stated above (**Q(73), A(3)**). But cursing is on a par with the sin of murder; for Chrysostom says (Hom. xix, super Matth.): “When thou sayest: ‘Curse him down with his house, away with everything,’ you are no better than a murderer.” Therefore cursing is graver than backbiting.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, to cause a thing is more than to signify it. But the curser causes evil by commanding it, whereas the backbiter merely signifies an evil already existing. Therefore the curser sins more grievously than the backbiter.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is impossible to do well in backbiting, whereas cursing may be either a good or an evil deed, as appears from what has been said (**A(1)**). Therefore backbiting is graver than cursing.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated in the **P(1), Q(48), A(5)**, evil is twofold, evil of fault, and evil of punishment; and of the two, evil of fault is the worse (**P(1), Q(48), A(6)**). Hence to speak evil of fault is worse than to speak evil of punishment, provided the mode of speaking be the same. Accordingly it belongs to the reviler, the tale-bearer, the backbiter and the derider to speak evil of fault, whereas it belongs to the evil-speaker, as we understand it here, to speak evil of punishment, and not evil of fault except under the aspect of punishment. But the mode of

speaking is not the same, for in the case of the four vices mentioned above, evil of fault is spoken by way of assertion, whereas in the case of cursing evil of punishment is spoken, either by causing it in the form of a command, or by wishing it. Now the utterance itself of a person's fault is a sin, in as much as it inflicts an injury on one's neighbor, and it is more grievous to inflict an injury, than to wish to inflict it, other things being equal.

Hence backbiting considered in its generic aspect is a graver sin than the cursing which expresses a mere desire; while the cursing which is expressed by way of command, since it has the aspect of a cause, will be more or less grievous than backbiting, according as it inflicts an injury more or less grave than the blackening of a man's good name. Moreover this must be taken as applying to these vices considered in their essential aspects: for other accidental points might be taken into consideration, which would aggravate or extenuate the aforesaid vices.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(4)-RO(1) — To curse a creature, as such, reflects on God, and thus accidentally it has the character of blasphemy; not so if one curse a creature on account of its fault: and the same applies to backbiting.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(4)-RO(2) — As stated above (**A(3)**), cursing, in one way, includes the desire for evil, where if the curser desire the evil of another's violent death, he does not differ, in desire, from a murderer, but he differs from him in so far as the external act adds something to the act of the will.

P(2b)-Q(76)-A(4)-RO(3) — This argument considers cursing by way of command.

BY SINS COMMITTED IN BUYING AND SELLING

QUESTION 77

OF CHEATING, WHICH IS COMMITTED IN BUYING AND SELLING

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider those sins which relate to voluntary commutations. First, we shall consider cheating, which is committed in buying and selling: secondly, we shall consider usury, which occurs in loans. In connection with the other voluntary commutations no special kind of sin is to be found distinct from rapine and theft.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Of unjust sales as regards the price; namely, whether it is lawful to sell a thing for more than its worth?
- (2) Of unjust sales on the part of the thing sold;
- (3) Whether the seller is bound to reveal a fault in the thing sold?
- (4) Whether it is lawful in trading to sell a thing at a higher price than was paid for it?

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(1)

Whether it is lawful to sell a thing for more than its worth?

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that it is lawful to sell a thing for more than its worth. In the commutations of human life, civil laws determine that which is just. Now according to these laws it is just for buyer and seller to deceive one another (Cod. IV, xlv, De Rescind. Vend. 8,15): and this occurs by the seller selling a thing for more than its worth,

and the buyer buying a thing for less than its worth. Therefore it is lawful to sell a thing for more than its worth

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, that which is common to all would seem to be natural and not sinful. Now Augustine relates that the saying of a certain jester was accepted by all, “You wish to buy for a song and to sell at a premium,” which agrees with the saying of ^(~~ant~~)Proverbs 20:14,

“It is naught, it is naught, saith every buyer: and when he is gone away, then he will boast.”

Therefore it is lawful to sell a thing for more than its worth.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, it does not seem unlawful if that which honesty demands be done by mutual agreement. Now, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. viii, 13), in the friendship which is based on utility, the amount of the recompense for a favor received should depend on the utility accruing to the receiver: and this utility sometimes is worth more than the thing given, for instance if the receiver be in great need of that thing, whether for the purpose of avoiding a danger, or of deriving some particular benefit. Therefore, in contracts of buying and selling, it is lawful to give a thing in return for more than its worth.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^(~~ant~~)Matthew 7:12):

“All things... whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you also to them.”

But no man wishes to buy a thing for more than its worth. Therefore no man should sell a thing to another man for more than its worth.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(1) — *I answer that*, It is altogether sinful to have recourse to deceit in order to sell a thing for more than its just price, because this is to deceive one’s neighbor so as to injure him. Hence Tully says (De Offic. iii, 15): “Contracts should be entirely free from double-dealing: the seller must not impose upon the bidder, nor the buyer upon one that bids against him.”

But, apart from fraud, we may speak of buying and selling in two ways. First, as considered in themselves, and from this point of view, buying and selling seem to be established for the common advantage of both parties,

one of whom requires that which belongs to the other, and vice versa, as the Philosopher states (Polit. i, 3). Now whatever is established for the common advantage, should not be more of a burden to one party than to another, and consequently all contracts between them should observe equality of thing and thing. Again, the quality of a thing that comes into human use is measured by the price given for it, for which purpose money was invented, as stated in Ethic. v, 5. Therefore if either the price exceed the quantity of the thing's worth, or, conversely, the thing exceed the price, there is no longer the equality of justice: and consequently, to sell a thing for more than its worth, or to buy it for less than its worth, is in itself unjust and unlawful.

Secondly we may speak of buying and selling, considered as accidentally tending to the advantage of one party, and to the disadvantage of the other: for instance, when a man has great need of a certain thing, while an other man will suffer if he be without it. In such a case the just price will depend not only on the thing sold, but on the loss which the sale brings on the seller. And thus it will be lawful to sell a thing for more than it is worth in itself, though the price paid be not more than it is worth to the owner. Yet if the one man derive a great advantage by becoming possessed of the other man's property, and the seller be not at a loss through being without that thing, the latter ought not to raise the price, because the advantage accruing to the buyer, is not due to the seller, but to a circumstance affecting the buyer. Now no man should sell what is not his, though he may charge for the loss he suffers.

On the other hand if a man find that he derives great advantage from something he has bought, he may, of his own accord, pay the seller something over and above: and this pertains to his honesty.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(1)-RO(1) — As stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(96)**, **A(2)**) human law is given to the people among whom there are many lacking virtue, and it is not given to the virtuous alone. Hence human law was unable to forbid all that is contrary to virtue; and it suffices for it to prohibit whatever is destructive of human intercourse, while it treats other matters as though they were lawful, not by approving of them, but by not punishing them. Accordingly, if without employing deceit the seller disposes of his goods for more than their worth, or the buyer obtain them for less than their

worth, the law looks upon this as licit, and provides no punishment for so doing, unless the excess be too great, because then even human law demands restitution to be made, for instance if a man be deceived in regard to more than half the amount of the just price of a thing [*Cod. IV, xliv, De Rescind. Vend. 2,8].

On the other hand the Divine law leaves nothing unpunished that is contrary to virtue. Hence, according to the Divine law, it is reckoned unlawful if the equality of justice be not observed in buying and selling: and he who has received more than he ought must make compensation to him that has suffered loss, if the loss be considerable. I add this condition, because the just price of things is not fixed with mathematical precision, but depends on a kind of estimate, so that a slight addition or subtraction would not seem to destroy the equality of justice.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(1)-RO(2) — As Augustine says “this jester, either by looking into himself or by his experience of others, thought that all men are inclined to wish to buy for a song and sell at a premium. But since in reality this is wicked, it is in every man’s power to acquire that justice whereby he may resist and overcome this inclination.” And then he gives the example of a man who gave the just price for a book to a man who through ignorance asked a low price for it. Hence it is evident that this common desire is not from nature but from vice, wherefore it is common to many who walk along the broad road of sin.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(1)-RO(3) — In commutative justice we consider chiefly real equality. On the other hand, in friendship based on utility we consider equality of usefulness, so that the recompense should depend on the usefulness accruing, whereas in buying it should be equal to the thing bought.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(2)

***Whether a sale is rendered unlawful
through a fault in the thing sold?***

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that a sale is not rendered unjust and unlawful through a fault in the thing sold. For less account should be

taken of the other parts of a thing than of what belongs to its substance. Yet the sale of a thing does not seem to be rendered unlawful through a fault in its substance: for instance, if a man sell instead of the real metal, silver or gold produced by some chemical process, which is adapted to all the human uses for which silver and gold are necessary, for instance in the making of vessels and the like. Much less therefore will it be an unlawful sale if the thing be defective in other ways.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, any fault in the thing, affecting the quantity, would seem chiefly to be opposed to justice which consists in equality. Now quantity is known by being measured: and the measures of things that come into human use are not fixed, but in some places are greater, in others less, as the Philosopher states (*Ethic.* v, 7). Therefore just as it is impossible to avoid defects on the part of the thing sold, it seems that a sale is not rendered unlawful through the thing sold being defective.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the thing sold is rendered defective by lacking a fitting quality. But in order to know the quality of a thing, much knowledge is required that is lacking in most buyers. Therefore a sale is not rendered unlawful by a fault (in the thing sold).

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Ambrose says (*De Offic.* iii, 11): “It is manifestly a rule of justice that a good man should not depart from the truth, nor inflict an unjust injury on anyone, nor have any connection with fraud.”

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(2) — *I answer that*, A threefold fault may be found pertaining to the thing which is sold. One, in respect of the thing’s substance: and if the seller be aware of a fault in the thing he is selling, he is guilty of a fraudulent sale, so that the sale is rendered unlawful. Hence we find it written against certain people (⁽²⁰¹²⁾ ~~(1853)~~ Isaiah 1:22), “Thy silver is turned into dross, thy wine is mingled with water”: because that which is mixed is defective in its substance.

Another defect is in respect of quantity which is known by being measured: wherefore if anyone knowingly make use of a faulty measure in selling, he is guilty of fraud, and the sale is illicit. Hence it is written (⁽¹⁸⁵³⁾ Deuteronomy 25:13,14):

“Thou shalt not have divers weights in thy bag, a greater and a less:
neither shall there be in thy house a greater bushel and a less,”

and further on (^(RS)Deuteronomy 25:16):

“For the Lord... abhorreth him that doth these things,
and He hateth all injustice.”

A third defect is on the part of the quality, for instance, if a man sell an unhealthy animal as being a healthy one: and if anyone do this knowingly he is guilty of a fraudulent sale, and the sale, in consequence, is illicit.

In all these cases not only is the man guilty of a fraudulent sale, but he is also bound to restitution. But if any of the foregoing defects be in the thing sold, and he knows nothing about this, the seller does not sin, because he does that which is unjust materially, nor is his deed unjust, as shown above (**Q(59)**, **A(2)**). Nevertheless he is bound to compensate the buyer, when the defect comes to his knowledge. Moreover what has been said of the seller applies equally to the buyer. For sometimes it happens that the seller thinks his goods to be specifically of lower value, as when a man sells gold instead of copper, and then if the buyer be aware of this, he buys it unjustly and is bound to restitution: and the same applies to a defect in quantity as to a defect in quality.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(2)-RO(1) — Gold and silver are costly not only on account of the usefulness of the vessels and other like things made from them, but also on account of the excellence and purity of their substance. Hence if the gold or silver produced by alchemists has not the true specific nature of gold and silver, the sale thereof is fraudulent and unjust, especially as real gold and silver can produce certain results by their natural action, which the counterfeit gold and silver of alchemists cannot produce. Thus the true metal has the property of making people joyful, and is helpful medicinally against certain maladies. Moreover real gold can be employed more frequently, and lasts longer in its condition of purity than counterfeit gold. If however real gold were to be produced by alchemy, it would not be unlawful to sell it for the genuine article, for nothing prevents art from employing certain natural causes for the production of natural and true effects, as Augustine says (De Trin. iii, 8) of things produced by the art of the demons.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(2)-RO(2) — The measures of salable commodities must needs be different in different places, on account of the difference of supply: because where there is greater abundance, the measures are wont to be larger. However in each place those who govern the state must determine the just measures of things salable, with due consideration for the conditions of place and time. Hence it is not lawful to disregard such measures as are established by public authority or custom.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(2)-RO(3) — As Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xi, 16) the price of things salable does not depend on their degree of nature, since at times a horse fetches a higher price than a slave; but it depends on their usefulness to man. Hence it is not necessary for the seller or buyer to be cognizant of the hidden qualities of the thing sold, but only of such as render the thing adapted to man's use, for instance, that the horse be strong, run well and so forth. Such qualities the seller and buyer can easily discover.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(3)

*Whether the seller is bound to state the defects
of the thing sold?*

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that the seller is not bound to state the defects of the thing sold. Since the seller does not bind the buyer to buy, he would seem to leave it to him to judge of the goods offered for sale. Now judgment about a thing and knowledge of that thing belong to the same person. Therefore it does not seem imputable to the seller if the buyer be deceived in his judgment, and be hurried into buying a thing without carefully inquiring into its condition.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it seems foolish for anyone to do what prevents him carrying out his work. But if a man states the defects of the goods he has for sale, he prevents their sale: wherefore Tully (De Offic. iii, 13) pictures a man as saying: "Could anything be more absurd than for a public crier, instructed by the owner, to cry: 'I offer this unhealthy horse for sale?'" Therefore the seller is not bound to state the defects of the thing sold.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, man needs more to know the road of virtue than to know the faults of things offered for sale. Now one is not bound to offer advice to all or to tell them the truth about matters pertaining to virtue, though one should not tell anyone what is false. Much less therefore is a seller bound to tell the faults of what he offers for sale, as though he were counseling the buyer.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(3)-O(4) — Further, if one were bound to tell the faults of what one offers for sale, this would only be in order to lower the price. Now sometimes the price would be lowered for some other reason, without any defect in the thing sold: for instance, if the seller carry wheat to a place where wheat fetches a high price, knowing that many will come after him carrying wheat; because if the buyers knew this they would give a lower price. But apparently the seller need not give the buyer this information. Therefore, in like manner, neither need he tell him the faults of the goods he is selling.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Ambrose says (De Offic. iii, 10): “In all contracts the defects of the salable commodity must be stated; and unless the seller make them known, although the buyer has already acquired a right to them, the contract is voided on account of the fraudulent action.”

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(3) — *I answer that*, It is always unlawful to give anyone an occasion of danger or loss, although a man need not always give another the help or counsel which would be for his advantage in any way; but only in certain fixed cases, for instance when someone is subject to him, or when he is the only one who can assist him. Now the seller who offers goods for sale, gives the buyer an occasion of loss or danger, by the very fact that he offers him defective goods, if such defect may occasion loss or danger to the buyer — loss, if, by reason of this defect, the goods are of less value, and he takes nothing off the price on that account — danger, if this defect either hinder the use of the goods or render it hurtful, for instance, if a man sells a lame for a fleet horse, a tottering house for a safe one, rotten or poisonous food for wholesome. Wherefore if such like defects be hidden, and the seller does not make them known, the sale will be illicit and fraudulent, and the seller will be bound to compensation for the loss incurred.

On the other hand, if the defect be manifest, for instance if a horse have but one eye, or if the goods though useless to the buyer, be useful to someone else, provided the seller take as much as he ought from the price, he is not bound to state the defect of the goods, since perhaps on account of that defect the buyer might want him to allow a greater rebate than he need. Wherefore the seller may look to his own indemnity, by withholding the defect of the goods.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(3)-RO(1) — Judgment cannot be pronounced save on what is manifest: for “a man judges of what he knows” (Ethic. i, 3). Hence if the defects of the goods offered for sale be hidden, judgment of them is not sufficiently left with the buyer unless such defects be made known to him. The case would be different if the defects were manifest.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(3)-RO(2) — There is no need to publish beforehand by the public crier the defects of the goods one is offering for sale, because if he were to begin by announcing its defects, the bidders would be frightened to buy, through ignorance of other qualities that might render the thing good and serviceable. Such defect ought to be stated to each individual that offers to buy: and then he will be able to compare the various points one with the other, the good with the bad: for nothing prevents that which is defective in one respect being useful in many others.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(3)-RO(3) — Although a man is not bound strictly speaking to tell everyone the truth about matters pertaining to virtue, yet he is so bound in a case when, unless he tells the truth, his conduct would endanger another man in detriment to virtue: and so it is in this case.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(3)-RO(4) — The defect in a thing makes it of less value now than it seems to be: but in the case cited, the goods are expected to be of less value at a future time, on account of the arrival of other merchants, which was not foreseen by the buyers. Wherefore the seller, since he sells his goods at the price actually offered him, does not seem to act contrary to justice through not stating what is going to happen. If however he were to do so, or if he lowered his price, it would be exceedingly virtuous on his part: although he does not seem to be bound to do this as a debt of justice.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(4)

Whether, in trading, it is lawful to sell a thing at a higher price than what was paid for it?

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not lawful, in trading, to sell a thing for a higher price than we paid for it. For Chrysostom [*Hom. xxxviii in the Opus Imperfectum, falsely ascribed to St. John Chrysostom] says on ^{<4212>}Matthew 21:12: “He that buys a thing in order that he may sell it, entire and unchanged, at a profit, is the trader who is cast out of God’s temple.” Cassiodorus speaks in the same sense in his commentary on ^{<4908>}Psalms 70:15, “Because I have not known learning, or trading” according to another version [*The Septuagint]: “What is trade,” says he, “but buying at a cheap price with the purpose of retailing at a higher price?” and he adds: “Such were the tradesmen whom Our Lord cast out of the temple.” Now no man is cast out of the temple except for a sin. Therefore such like trading is sinful.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, it is contrary to justice to sell goods at a higher price than their worth, or to buy them for less than their value, as shown above (**A(1)**). Now if you sell a thing for a higher price than you paid for it, you must either have bought it for less than its value, or sell it for more than its value. Therefore this cannot be done without sin.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, Jerome says (Ep. ad Nepot. lii): “Shun, as you would the plague, a cleric who from being poor has become wealthy, or who, from being a nobody has become a celebrity.” Now trading would net seem to be forbidden to clerics except on account of its sinfulness. Therefore it is a sin in trading, to buy at a low price and to sell at a higher price.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Augustine commenting on ^{<4908>}Psalms 70:15, “Because I have not known learning,” [*Cf. **O(1)**] says: “The greedy tradesman blasphemes over his losses; he lies and perjures himself over the price of his wares. But these are vices of the man, not of the craft, which can be exercised without these vices.” Therefore trading is not in itself unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(4) — *I answer that*, A tradesman is one whose business consists in the exchange of things. According to the Philosopher (Polit. i, 3), exchange of things is twofold; one, natural as it were, and necessary, whereby one commodity is exchanged for another, or money taken in exchange for a commodity, in order to satisfy the needs of life. Such like trading, properly speaking, does not belong to tradesmen, but rather to housekeepers or civil servants who have to provide the household or the state with the necessities of life. The other kind of exchange is either that of money for money, or of any commodity for money, not on account of the necessities of life, but for profit, and this kind of exchange, properly speaking, regards tradesmen, according to the Philosopher (Polit. i, 3). The former kind of exchange is commendable because it supplies a natural need: but the latter is justly deserving of blame, because, considered in itself, it satisfies the greed for gain, which knows no limit and tends to infinity. Hence trading, considered in itself, has a certain debasement attaching thereto, in so far as, by its very nature, it does not imply a virtuous or necessary end. Nevertheless gain which is the end of trading, though not implying, by its nature, anything virtuous or necessary, does not, in itself, connote anything sinful or contrary to virtue: wherefore nothing prevents gain from being directed to some necessary or even virtuous end, and thus trading becomes lawful. Thus, for instance, a man may intend the moderate gain which he seeks to acquire by trading for the upkeep of his household, or for the assistance of the needy: or again, a man may take to trade for some public advantage, for instance, lest his country lack the necessities of life, and seek gain, not as an end, but as payment for his labor.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(4)-RO(1) — The saying of Chrysostom refers to the trading which seeks gain as a last end. This is especially the case where a man sells something at a higher price without its undergoing any change. For if he sells at a higher price something that has changed for the better, he would seem to receive the reward of his labor. Nevertheless the gain itself may be lawfully intended, not as a last end, but for the sake of some other end which is necessary or virtuous, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(4)-RO(2) — Not everyone that sells at a higher price than he bought is a tradesman, but only he who buys that he may sell at a profit. If, *on the contrary*, he buys not for sale but for possession, and afterwards, for some reason wishes to sell, it is not a trade transaction even

if he sell at a profit. For he may lawfully do this, either because he has bettered the thing, or because the value of the thing has changed with the change of place or time, or on account of the danger he incurs in transferring the thing from one place to another, or again in having it carried by another. In this sense neither buying nor selling is unjust.

P(2b)-Q(77)-A(4)-RO(3) — Clerics should abstain not only from things that are evil in themselves, but even from those that have an appearance of evil. This happens in trading, both because it is directed to worldly gain, which clerics should despise, and because trading is open to so many vices, since “a merchant is hardly free from sins of the lips” [*’A merchant is hardly free from negligence, and a huckster shall not be justified from the sins of the lips’] (Ecclus. 26:28). There is also another reason, because trading engages the mind too much with worldly cares, and consequently withdraws it from spiritual cares; wherefore the Apostle says (~~1~~2 Timothy 2:4): “No man being a soldier to God entangleth himself with secular businesses.” Nevertheless it is lawful for clerics to engage in the first mentioned kind of exchange, which is directed to supply the necessities of life, either by buying or by selling.

BY SINS COMMITTED IN LOANS

QUESTION 78

OF THE SIN OF USURY

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the sin of usury, which is committed in loans: and under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether it is a sin to take money as a price for money lent, which is to receive usury?
- (2) Whether it is lawful to lend money for any other kind of consideration, by way of payment for the loan?
- (3) Whether a man is bound to restore just gains derived from money taken in usury?
- (4) Whether it is lawful to borrow money under a condition of usury?

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)

Whether it is a sin to take usury for money lent?

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not a sin to take usury for money lent. For no man sins through following the example of Christ. But Our Lord said of Himself (~~Q(78)~~ Luke 19:23): “At My coming I might have exacted it,” i.e. the money lent, “with usury.” Therefore it is not a sin to take usury for lending money.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, according to ~~Q(78)~~ Psalm 18:8, “The law of the Lord is unspotted,” because, to wit, it forbids sin. Now usury of a kind is allowed in the Divine law, according to ~~Q(78)~~ Deuteronomy 23:19,20:

“Thou shalt not fenerate to thy brother money,
nor corn, nor any other thing, but to the stranger”:

may more, it is even promised as a reward for the observance of the Law, according to ⁽⁶⁸²⁾Deuteronomy 28:12: “Thou shalt fenerate* to many nations, and shalt not borrow of any one.” [*‘Faeneraberis’ — ‘Thou shalt lend upon usury.’ The Douay version has simply ‘lend.’ The objection lays stress on the word ‘faeneraberis’: hence the necessity of rendering it by ‘fenerate.’] Therefore it is not a sin to take usury.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, in human affairs justice is determined by civil laws. Now civil law allows usury to be taken. Therefore it seems to be lawful.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, the counsels are not binding under sin. But, among other counsels we find (⁽⁴⁶⁵⁾Luke 6:35): “Lend, hoping for nothing thereby.” Therefore it is not a sin to take usury.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, it does not seem to be in itself sinful to accept a price for doing what one is not bound to do. But one who has money is not bound in every case to lend it to his neighbor. Therefore it is lawful for him sometimes to accept a price for lending it.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-O(6) — Further, silver made into coins does not differ specifically from silver made into a vessel. But it is lawful to accept a price for the loan of a silver vessel. Therefore it is also lawful to accept a price for the loan of a silver coin. Therefore usury is not in itself a sin.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-O(7) — Further, anyone may lawfully accept a thing which its owner freely gives him. Now he who accepts the loan, freely gives the usury. Therefore he who lends may lawfully take the usury.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (⁽⁴²²⁾Exodus 22:25):

“If thou lend money to any of thy people that is poor, that dwelleth with thee, thou shalt not be hard upon them as an extortioner, nor oppress them with usuries.”

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1) — *I answer that*, To take usury for money lent is unjust in itself, because this is to sell what does not exist, and this evidently leads to inequality which is contrary to justice. In order to make

this evident, we must observe that there are certain things the use of which consists in their consumption: thus we consume wine when we use it for drink and we consume wheat when we use it for food. Wherefore in such like things the use of the thing must not be reckoned apart from the thing itself, and whoever is granted the use of the thing, is granted the thing itself and for this reason, to lend things of this kin is to transfer the ownership. Accordingly if a man wanted to sell wine separately from the use of the wine, he would be selling the same thing twice, or he would be selling what does not exist, wherefore he would evidently commit a sin of injustice. In like manner he commits an injustice who lends wine or wheat, and asks for double payment, viz. one, the return of the thing in equal measure, the other, the price of the use, which is called usury.

On the other hand, there are things the use of which does not consist in their consumption: thus to use a house is to dwell in it, not to destroy it. Wherefore in such things both may be granted: for instance, one man may hand over to another the ownership of his house while reserving to himself the use of it for a time, or vice versa, he may grant the use of the house, while retaining the ownership. For this reason a man may lawfully make a charge for the use of his house, and, besides this, revendicate the house from the person to whom he has granted its use, as happens in renting and letting a house.

Now money, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 5; Polit. i, 3) was invented chiefly for the purpose of exchange: and consequently the proper and principal use of money is its consumption or alienation whereby it is sunk in exchange. Hence it is by its very nature unlawful to take payment for the use of money lent, which payment is known as usury: and just as a man is bound to restore other ill-gotten goods, so is he bound to restore the money which he has taken in usury.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-RO(1) — In this passage usury must be taken figuratively for the increase of spiritual goods which God exacts from us, for He wishes us ever to advance in the goods which we receive from Him: and this is for our own profit not for His.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-RO(2) — The Jews were forbidden to take usury from their brethren, i.e. from other Jews. By this we are given to understand that to take usury from any man is evil simply, because we ought to treat

every man as our neighbor and brother, especially in the state of the Gospel, whereto all are called. Hence it is said without any distinction in ^{<1445}Psalm 14:5: “He that hath not put out his money to usury,” and (^{<2388}Ezekiel 18:8): “Who hath not taken usury [*Vulg.: ‘If a man... hath not lent upon money, nor taken any increase... he is just.’].” They were permitted, however, to take usury from foreigners, not as though it were lawful, but in order to avoid a greater evil, lest, to wit, through avarice to which they were prone according to ^{<2591}Isaiah 56:11, they should take usury from the Jews who were worshippers of God.

Where we find it promised to them as a reward, “Thou shalt fenerate to many nations,” etc., fenerating is to be taken in a broad sense for lending, as in Ecclus. 29:10, where we read: “Many have refused to fenerate, not out of wickedness,” i.e. they would not lend. Accordingly the Jews are promised in reward an abundance of wealth, so that they would be able to lend to others.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-RO(3) — Human laws leave certain things unpunished, on account of the condition of those who are imperfect, and who would be deprived of many advantages, if all sins were strictly forbidden and punishments appointed for them. Wherefore human law has permitted usury, not that it looks upon usury as harmonizing with justice, but lest the advantage of many should be hindered. Hence it is that in civil law [*Inst. II, iv, de Usufructu] it is stated that “those things according to natural reason and civil law which are consumed by being used, do not admit of usufruct,” and that “the senate did not (nor could it) appoint a usufruct to such things, but established a quasi-usufruct,” namely by permitting usury. Moreover the Philosopher, led by natural reason, says (Polit. i, 3) that “to make money by usury is exceedingly unnatural.”

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-RO(4) — A man is not always bound to lend, and for this reason it is placed among the counsels. Yet it is a matter of precept not to seek profit by lending: although it may be called a matter of counsel in comparison with the maxims of the Pharisees, who deemed some kinds of usury to be lawful, just as love of one’s enemies is a matter of counsel. Or again, He speaks here not of the hope of usurious gain, but of the hope which is put in man. For we ought not to lend or do any good deed through hope in man, but only through hope in God.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-RO(5) — He that is not bound to lend, may accept repayment for what he has done, but he must not exact more. Now he is repaid according to equality of justice if he is repaid as much as he lent. Wherefore if he exacts more for the usufruct of a thing which has no other use but the consumption of its substance, he exacts a price of something non-existent: and so his exaction is unjust.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-RO(6) — The principal use of a silver vessel is not its consumption, and so one may lawfully sell its use while retaining one's ownership of it. On the other hand the principal use of silver money is sinking it in exchange, so that it is not lawful to sell its use and at the same time expect the restitution of the amount lent. It must be observed, however, that the secondary use of silver vessels may be an exchange, and such use may not be lawfully sold. In like manner there may be some secondary use of silver money; for instance, a man might lend coins for show, or to be used as security.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(1)-RO(7) — He who gives usury does not give it voluntarily simply, but under a certain necessity, in so far as he needs to borrow money which the owner is unwilling to lend without usury.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)

Whether it is lawful to ask for any other kind of consideration for money lent?

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that one may ask for some other kind of consideration for money lent. For everyone may lawfully seek to indemnify himself. Now sometimes a man suffers loss through lending money. Therefore he may lawfully ask for or even exact something else besides the money lent.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, as stated in Ethic. v, 5, one is in duty bound by a point of honor, to repay anyone who has done us a favor. Now to lend money to one who is in straits is to do him a favor for which he should be grateful. Therefore the recipient of a loan, is bound by a natural debt to repay something. Now it does not seem unlawful to bind oneself to an obligation of the natural law. Therefore it is not unlawful, in

lending money to anyone, to demand some sort of compensation as condition of the loan.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, just as there is real remuneration, so is there verbal remuneration, and remuneration by service, as a gloss says on ~~Gen~~ Isaiah 33:15, “Blessed is he that shaketh his hands from all bribes [*Vulg.: ‘Which of you shall dwell with everlasting burnings?... He that shaketh his hands from all bribes.’].” Now it is lawful to accept service or praise from one to whom one has lent money. Therefore in like manner it is lawful to accept any other kind of remuneration.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, seemingly the relation of gift to gift is the same as of loan to loan. But it is lawful to accept money for money given. Therefore it is lawful to accept repayment by loan in return for a loan granted.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-O(5) — Further, the lender, by transferring his ownership of a sum of money removes the money further from himself than he who entrusts it to a merchant or craftsman. Now it is lawful to receive interest for money entrusted to a merchant or craftsman. Therefore it is also lawful to receive interest for money lent.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-O(6) — Further, a man may accept a pledge for money lent, the use of which pledge he might sell for a price: as when a man mortgages his land or the house wherein he dwells. Therefore it is lawful to receive interest for money lent.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-O(7) — Further, it sometimes happens that a man raises the price of his goods under guise of loan, or buys another’s goods at a low figure; or raises his price through delay in being paid, and lowers his price that he may be paid the sooner. Now in all these cases there seems to be payment for a loan of money: nor does it appear to be manifestly illicit. Therefore it seems to be lawful to expect or exact some consideration for money lent.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Among other conditions requisite in a just man it is stated (~~Gen~~ Ezekiel 18:17) that he “hath not taken usury and increase.”

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2) — *I answer that*, According to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 1), a thing is reckoned as money “if its value can be measured by money.” Consequently, just as it is a sin against justice, to take money, by tacit or express agreement, in return for lending money or anything else that is consumed by being used, so also is it a like sin, by tacit or express agreement to receive anything whose price can be measured by money. Yet there would be no sin in receiving something of the kind, not as exacting it, nor yet as though it were due on account of some agreement tacit or expressed, but as a gratuity: since, even before lending the money, one could accept a gratuity, nor is one in a worse condition through lending.

On the other hand it is lawful to exact compensation for a loan, in respect of such things as are not appreciated by a measure of money, for instance, benevolence, and love for the lender, and so forth.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-RO(1) — A lender may without sin enter an agreement with the borrower for compensation for the loss he incurs of something he ought to have, for this is not to sell the use of money but to avoid a loss. It may also happen that the borrower avoids a greater loss than the lender incurs, wherefore the borrower may repay the lender with what he has gained. But the lender cannot enter an agreement for compensation, through the fact that he makes no profit out of his money: because he must not sell that which he has not yet and may be prevented in many ways from having.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-RO(2) — Repayment for a favor may be made in two ways. In one way, as a debt of justice; and to such a debt a man may be bound by a fixed contract; and its amount is measured according to the favor received. Wherefore the borrower of money or any such thing the use of which is its consumption is not bound to repay more than he received in loan: and consequently it is against justice if he be obliged to pay back more. In another way a man’s obligation to repayment for favor received is based on a debt of friendship, and the nature of this debt depends more on the feeling with which the favor was conferred than on the greatness of the favor itself. This debt does not carry with it a civil obligation, involving a kind of necessity that would exclude the spontaneous nature of such a repayment.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-RO(3) — If a man were, in return for money lent, as though there had been an agreement tacit or expressed, to expect or exact repayment in the shape of some remuneration of service or words, it would be the same as if he expected or exacted some real remuneration, because both can be priced at a money value, as may be seen in the case of those who offer for hire the labor which they exercise by work or by tongue. If on the other hand the remuneration by service or words be given not as an obligation, but as a favor, which is not to be appreciated at a money value, it is lawful to take, exact, and expect it.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-RO(4) — Money cannot be sold for a greater sum than the amount lent, which has to be paid back: nor should the loan be made with a demand or expectation of aught else but of a feeling of benevolence which cannot be priced at a pecuniary value, and which can be the basis of a spontaneous loan. Now the obligation to lend in return at some future time is repugnant to such a feeling, because again an obligation of this kind has its pecuniary value. Consequently it is lawful for the lender to borrow something else at the same time, but it is unlawful for him to bind the borrower to grant him a loan at some future time.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-RO(5) — He who lends money transfers the ownership of the money to the borrower. Hence the borrower holds the money at his own risk and is bound to pay it all back: wherefore the lender must not exact more. On the other hand he that entrusts his money to a merchant or craftsman so as to form a kind of society, does not transfer the ownership of his money to them, for it remains his, so that at his risk the merchant speculates with it, or the craftsman uses it for his craft, and consequently he may lawfully demand as something belonging to him, part of the profits derived from his money.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-RO(6) — If a man in return for money lent to him pledges something that can be valued at a price, the lender must allow for the use of that thing towards the repayment of the loan. Else if he wishes the gratuitous use of that thing in addition to repayment, it is the same as if he took money for lending, and that is usury, unless perhaps it were such a thing as friends are wont to lend to one another gratis, as in the case of the loan of a book.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(2)-RO(7) — If a man wish to sell his goods at a higher price than that which is just, so that he may wait for the buyer to pay, it is manifestly a case of usury: because this waiting for the payment of the price has the character of a loan, so that whatever he demands beyond the just price in consideration of this delay, is like a price for a loan, which pertains to usury. In like manner if a buyer wishes to buy goods at a lower price than what is just, for the reason that he pays for the goods before they can be delivered, it is a sin of usury; because again this anticipated payment of money has the character of a loan, the price of which is the rebate on the just price of the goods sold. On the other hand if a man wishes to allow a rebate on the just price in order that he may have his money sooner, he is not guilty of the sin of usury.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(3)

Whether a man is bound to restore whatever profits he has made out of money gotten by usury?

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that a man is bound to restore whatever profits he has made out of money gotten by usury. For the Apostle says (~~scilicet~~ Romans 11:16): “If the root be holy, so are the branches.” Therefore likewise if the root be rotten so are the branches. But the root was infected with usury. Therefore whatever profit is made therefrom is infected with usury. Therefore he is bound to restore it.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it is laid down (Extra, De Usuris, in the Decretal: ‘Cum tu sicut asseris’): “Property accruing from usury must be sold, and the price repaid to the persons from whom the usury was extorted.” Therefore, likewise, whatever else is acquired from usurious money must be restored.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, that which a man buys with the proceeds of usury is due to him by reason of the money he paid for it. Therefore he has no more right to the thing purchased than to the money he paid. But he was bound to restore the money gained through usury. Therefore he is also bound to restore what he acquired with it.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, A man may lawfully hold what he has lawfully acquired. Now that which is acquired by the proceeds of usury is sometimes lawfully acquired. Therefore it may be lawfully retained.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), there are certain things whose use is their consumption, and which do not admit of usufruct, according to law (*ibid.*, ad 3). Wherefore if such like things be extorted by means of usury, for instance money, wheat, wine and so forth, the lender is not bound to restore more than he received (since what is acquired by such things is the fruit not of the thing but of human industry), unless indeed the other party by losing some of his own goods be injured through the lender retaining them: for then he is bound to make good the loss.

On the other hand, there are certain things whose use is not their consumption: such things admit of usufruct, for instance house or land property and so forth. Wherefore if a man has by usury extorted from another his house or land, he is bound to restore not only the house or land but also the fruits accruing to him therefrom, since they are the fruits of things owned by another man and consequently are due to him.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(3)-RO(1) — The root has not only the character of matter, as money made by usury has; but has also somewhat the character of an active cause, in so far as it administers nourishment. Hence the comparison fails.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(3)-RO(2) — Further, Property acquired from usury does not belong to the person who paid usury, but to the person who bought it. Yet he that paid usury has a certain claim on that property just as he has on the other goods of the usurer. Hence it is not prescribed that such property should be assigned to the persons who paid usury, since the property is perhaps worth more than what they paid in usury, but it is commanded that the property be sold, and the price be restored, of course according to the amount taken in usury.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(3)-RO(3) — The proceeds of money taken in usury are due to the person who acquired them not by reason of the usurious money as instrumental cause, but on account of his own industry as principal

cause. Wherefore he has more right to the goods acquired with usurious money than to the usurious money itself.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(4)

Whether it is lawful to borrow money under a condition of usury?

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not lawful to borrow money under a condition of usury. For the Apostle says (~~418~~ Romans 1:32) that they “are worthy of death... not only they that do” these sins, “but they also that consent to them that do them.” Now he that borrows money under a condition of usury consents in the sin of the usurer, and gives him an occasion of sin. Therefore he sins also.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, for no temporal advantage ought one to give another an occasion of committing a sin: for this pertains to active scandal, which is always sinful, as stated above (**Q(43), A(2)**). Now he that seeks to borrow from a usurer gives him an occasion of sin. Therefore he is not to be excused on account of any temporal advantage.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, it seems no less necessary sometimes to deposit one’s money with a usurer than to borrow from him. Now it seems altogether unlawful to deposit one’s money with a usurer, even as it would be unlawful to deposit one’s sword with a madman, a maiden with a libertine, or food with a glutton. Neither therefore is it lawful to borrow from a usurer.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, He that suffers injury does not sin, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 11), wherefore justice is not a mean between two vices, as stated in the same book (ch. 5). Now a usurer sins by doing an injury to the person who borrows from him under a condition of usury. Therefore he that accepts a loan under a condition of usury does not sin.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(4) — *I answer that*, It is by no means lawful to induce a man to sin, yet it is lawful to make use of another’s sin for a good end, since even God uses all sin for some good, since He draws some good from every evil as stated in the Enchiridion (xi). Hence when Publicola asked

whether it were lawful to make use of an oath taken by a man swearing by false gods (which is a manifest sin, for he gives Divine honor to them) Augustine (Ep. xlvii) answered that he who uses, not for a bad but for a good purpose, the oath of a man that swears by false gods, is a party, not to his sin of swearing by demons, but to his good compact whereby he kept his word. If however he were to induce him to swear by false gods, he would sin.

Accordingly we must also answer to the question in point that it is by no means lawful to induce a man to lend under a condition of usury: yet it is lawful to borrow for usury from a man who is ready to do so and is a usurer by profession; provided the borrower have a good end in view, such as the relief of his own or another's need. Thus too it is lawful for a man who has fallen among thieves to point out his property to them (which they sin in taking) in order to save his life, after the example of the ten men who said to Ismahel (²⁴¹⁸Jeremiah 41:8): "Kill us not: for we have stores in the field."

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(4)-RO(1) — He who borrows for usury does not consent to the usurer's sin but makes use of it. Nor is it the usurer's acceptance of usury that pleases him, but his lending, which is good.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(4)-RO(2) — He who borrows for usury gives the usurer an occasion, not for taking usury, but for lending; it is the usurer who finds an occasion of sin in the malice of his heart. Hence there is passive scandal on his part, while there is no active scandal on the part of the person who seeks to borrow. Nor is this passive scandal a reason why the other person should desist from borrowing if he is in need, since this passive scandal arises not from weakness or ignorance but from malice.

P(2b)-Q(78)-A(4)-RO(3) — If one were to entrust one's money to a usurer lacking other means of practising usury; or with the intention of making a greater profit from his money by reason of the usury, one would be giving a sinner matter for sin, so that one would be a participator in his guilt. If, on the other hand, the usurer to whom one entrusts one's money has other means of practising usury, there is no sin in entrusting it to him that it may be in safer keeping, since this is to use a sinner for a good purpose.

OF THE PARTS OF JUSTICE

QUESTIONS 79-81

QUESTION 79

OF THE QUASI-INTEGRAL PARTS OF JUSTICE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the quasi-integral parts of justice, which are “to do good,” and “to decline from evil,” and the opposite vices. Under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether these two are parts of justice?
- (2) Whether transgression is a special sin?
- (3) Whether omission is a special sin?
- (4) Of the comparison between omission and transgression.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(1)

Whether to decline from evil and to do good are parts of justice?

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that to decline from evil and to do good are not parts of justice. For it belongs to every virtue to perform a good deed and to avoid an evil one. But parts do not exceed the whole. Therefore to decline from evil and to do good should not be reckoned parts of justice, which is a special kind of virtue.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, a gloss on ¹⁸⁸⁵Psalm 33:15, “Turn away from evil and do good,” says: “The former,” i.e. to turn away from evil, “avoids sin, the latter,” i.e. to do good, “deserves the life and the

palm.” But any part of a virtue deserves the life and the palm. Therefore to decline from evil is not a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, things that are so related that one implies the other, are not mutually distinct as parts of a whole. Now declining from evil is implied in doing good: since no one does evil and good at the same time. Therefore declining from evil and doing good are not parts of justice.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine (De Correp. et Grat. i) declares that “declining from evil and doing good” belong to the justice of the law.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(1) — *I answer that*, If we speak of good and evil in general, it belongs to every virtue to do good and to avoid evil: and in this sense they cannot be reckoned parts of justice, except justice be taken in the sense of “all virtue” [*Cf. **Q(58), A(5)**]. And yet even if justice be taken in this sense it regards a certain special aspect of good; namely, the good as due in respect of Divine or human law.

On the other hand justice considered as a special virtue regards good as due to one’s neighbor. And in this sense it belongs to special justice to do good considered as due to one’s neighbor, and to avoid the opposite evil, that, namely, which is hurtful to one’s neighbor; while it belongs to general justice to do good in relation to the community or in relation to God, and to avoid the opposite evil.

Now these two are said to be quasi-integral parts of general or of special justice, because each is required for the perfect act of justice. For it belongs to justice to establish equality in our relations with others, as shown above (**Q(58), A(2)**): and it pertains to the same cause to establish and to preserve that which it has established. Now a person establishes the equality of justice by doing good, i.e. by rendering to another his due: and he preserves the already established equality of justice by declining from evil, that is by inflicting no injury on his neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(1)-RO(1) — Good and evil are here considered under a special aspect, by which they are appropriated to justice. The reason why these two are reckoned parts of justice under a special aspect of good and evil, while they are not reckoned parts of any other moral virtue, is that

the other moral virtues are concerned with the passions wherein to do good is to observe the mean, which is the same as to avoid the extremes as evils: so that doing good and avoiding evil come to the same, with regard to the other virtues. On the other hand justice is concerned with operations and external things, wherein to establish equality is one thing, and not to disturb the equality established is another.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(1)-RO(2) — To decline from evil, considered as a part of justice, does not denote a pure negation, viz. "not to do evil"; for this does not deserve the palm, but only avoids the punishment. But it implies a movement of the will in repudiating evil, as the very term "decline" shows. This is meritorious; especially when a person resists against an instigation to do evil.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(1)-RO(3) — Doing good is the complete act of justice, and the principal part, so to speak, thereof. Declining from evil is a more imperfect act, and a secondary part of that virtue. Hence it is a. material part, so to speak, thereof, and a necessary condition of the formal and complete part.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(2)

Whether transgression is a special sin?

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that transgression is not a special sin. For no species is included in the definition of its genus. Now transgression is included in the definition of sin; because Ambrose says (De Parad. viii) that sin is "a transgression of the Divine law." Therefore transgression is not a species of sin.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, no species is more comprehensive than its genus. But transgression is more comprehensive than sin, because sin is a "word, deed or desire against the law of God," according to Augustine (Contra Faust. xxii, 27), while transgression is also against nature, or custom. Therefore transgression is not a species of sin.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, no species contains all the parts into which its genus is divided. Now the sin of transgression extends to all the

capital vices, as well as to sins of thought, word and deed. Therefore transgression is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is opposed to a special virtue, namely justice.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(2) — *I answer that*, The term transgression is derived from bodily movement and applied to moral actions. Now a person is said to transgress in bodily movement, when he steps [graditur] beyond [trans] a fixed boundary — and it is a negative precept that fixes the boundary that man must not exceed in his moral actions. Wherefore to transgress, properly speaking, is to act against a negative precept.

Now materially considered this may be common to all the species of sin, because man transgresses a Divine precept by any species of mortal sin. But if we consider it formally, namely under its special aspect of an act against a negative precept, it is a special sin in two ways. First, in so far as it is opposed to those kinds of sin that are opposed to the other virtues: for just as it belongs properly to legal justice to consider a precept as binding, so it belongs properly to a transgression to consider a precept as an object of contempt. Secondly, in so far as it is distinct from omission which is opposed to an affirmative precept.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(2)-RO(1) — Even as legal justice is “all virtue” (**Q(58), A(5)**) as regards its subject and matter, so legal injustice is materially “all sin.” It is in this way that Ambrose defined sin, considering it from the point of view of legal injustice.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(2)-RO(2) — The natural inclination concerns the precepts of the natural law. Again, a laudable custom has the force of a precept; since as Augustine says in an epistle On the Fast of the Sabbath (Ep. xxxvi), “a custom of God’s people should be looked upon as law.” Hence both sin and transgression may be against a laudable custom and against a natural inclination.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(2)-RO(3) — All these species of sin may include transgression, if we consider them not under their proper aspects, but under a special aspect, as stated above. The sin of omission, however, is altogether distinct from the sin of transgression.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(3)

Whether omission is a special sin?

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that omission is not a special sin. For every sin is either original or actual. Now omission is not original sin, for it is not contracted through origin nor is it actual sin, for it may be altogether without act, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(71)**, **A(5)**) when we were treating of sins in general. Therefore omission is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, every sin is voluntary. Now omission sometimes is not voluntary but necessary, as when a woman is violated after taking a vow of virginity, or when one loses that which one is under an obligation to restore, or when a priest is bound to say Mass, and is prevented from doing so. Therefore omission is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, it is possible to fix the time when any special sin begins. But this is not possible in the case of omission, since one is not altered by not doing a thing, no matter when the omission occurs, and yet the omission is not always sinful. Therefore omission is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(3)-O(4) — Further, every special sin is opposed to a special virtue. But it is not possible to assign any special virtue to which omission is opposed, both because the good of any virtue can be omitted, and because justice to which it would seem more particularly opposed, always requires an act, even in declining from evil, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 2), while omission may be altogether without act. Therefore omission is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{SCHEP}James 4:17):

“To him... who knoweth to do good
and doth it not, to him it is sin.”

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(3) — *I answer that*, omission signifies the non-fulfilment of a good, not indeed of any good, but of a good that is due. Now good under the aspect of due belongs properly to justice; to legal justice, if the thing due depends on Divine or human law; to special justice, if the due is something in relation to one's neighbor. Wherefore, in the same way as

justice is a special virtue, as stated above (**Q(58)**, **AA(6),7**), omission is a special sin distinct from the sins which are opposed to the other virtues; and just as doing good, which is the opposite of omitting it, is a special part of justice, distinct from avoiding evil, to which transgression is opposed, so too is omission distinct from transgression.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(3)-RO(2) — Omission is not original but actual sin, not as though it had some act essential to it, but for as much as the negation of an act is reduced to the genus of act, and in this sense non-action is a kind of action, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(71)**, **A(6)**, ad 1).

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(3)-RO(2) — Omission, as stated above, is only of such good as is due and to which one is bound. Now no man is bound to the impossible: wherefore no man sins by omission, if he does not do what he cannot. Accordingly she who is violated after vowing virginity, is guilty of an omission, not through not having virginity, but through not repenting of her past sin, or through not doing what she can to fulfil her vow by observing continence. Again a priest is not bound to say Mass, except he have a suitable opportunity, and if this be lacking, there is no omission. And in like manner, a person is bound to restitution, supposing he has the wherewithal; if he has not and cannot have it, he is not guilty of an omission, provided he does what he can. The same applies to other similar cases.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(3)-RO(3) — Just as the sin of transgression is opposed to negative precepts which regard the avoidance of evil, so the sin of omission is opposed to affirmative precepts, which regard the doing of good. Now affirmative precepts bind not for always, but for a fixed time, and at that time the sin of omission begins. But it may happen that then one is unable to do what one ought, and if this inability is without any fault on his part, he does not omit his duty, as stated above (ad 2; **P(2a)**, **Q(71)**, **A(5)**). On the other hand if this inability is due to some previous fault of his (for instance, if a man gets drunk at night, and cannot get up for matins, as he ought to), some say that the sin of omission begins when he engages in an action that is illicit and incompatible with the act to which he is bound. But this does not seem to be true, for supposing one were to rouse him by violence and that he went to matins, he would not omit to go, so that, evidently, the previous drunkenness was not an omission, but the cause of

an omission. Consequently, we must say that the omission begins to be imputed to him as a sin, when the time comes for the action; and yet this is on account of a preceding cause by reason of which the subsequent omission becomes voluntary.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(3)-RO(4) — Omission is directly opposed to justice, as stated above; because it is a non-fulfilment of a good of virtue, but only under the aspect of due, which pertains to justice. Now more is required for an act to be virtuous and meritorious than for it to be sinful and demeritorious, because “good results from an entire cause, whereas evil arises from each single defect” [*Dionysius, De Div. Nom. iv]. Wherefore the merit of justice requires an act, whereas an omission does not.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(4)

*Whether a sin of omission is more grievous
than a sin of transgression?*

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that a sin of omission is more grievous than a sin of transgression. For “delictum” would seem to signify the same as “derelictum” [*Augustine, QQ. in Levit., qu. xx], and therefore is seemingly the same as an omission. But “delictum” denotes a more grievous offence than transgression, because it deserves more expiation as appears from Leviticus 5. Therefore the sin of omission is more grievous than the sin of transgression.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the greater evil is opposed to the greater good, as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. viii, 10). Now to do good is a more excellent part of justice, than to decline from evil, to which transgression is opposed, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 3). Therefore omission is a graver sin than transgression.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, sins of transgression may be either venial or mortal. But sins of omission seem to be always mortal, since they are opposed to an affirmative precept. Therefore omission would seem to be a graver sin than transgression.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(4)-O(4) — Further, the pain of loss which consists in being deprived of seeing God and is inflicted for the sin of omission, is a

greater punishment than the pain of sense, which is inflicted for the sin of transgression, as Chrysostom states (Hom. xxiii super Matth.). Now punishment is proportionate to fault. Therefore the sin of omission is graver than the sin of transgression.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is easier to refrain from evil deeds than to accomplish good deeds. Therefore it is a graver sin not to refrain from an evil deed, i.e. “to transgress,” than not to accomplish a good deed, which is “to omit.”

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(4) — *I answer that*, The gravity of a sin depends on its remoteness from virtue. Now contrariety is the greatest remoteness, according to Metaph. x [*Didot. ed. ix, 4]. Wherefore a thing is further removed from its contrary than from its simple negation; thus black is further removed from white than not-white is, since every black is not-white, but not conversely. Now it is evident that transgression is contrary to an act of virtue, while omission denotes the negation thereof: for instance it is a sin of omission, if one fail to give one’s parents due reverence, while it is a sin of transgression to revile them or injure them in any way. Hence it is evident that, simply and absolutely speaking, transgression is a graver sin than omission, although a particular omission may be graver than a particular transgression.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(4)-RO(1) — “Delictum” in its widest sense denotes any kind of omission; but sometimes it is taken strictly for the omission of something concerning God, or for a man’s intentional and as it were contemptuous dereliction of duty: and then it has a certain gravity, for which reason it demands a greater expiation.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(4)-RO(2) — The opposite of “doing good” is both “not doing good,” which is an omission, and “doing evil,” which is a transgression: but the first is opposed by contradiction, the second by contrariety, which implies greater remoteness: wherefore transgression is the more grievous sin.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(4)-RO(3) — Just as omission is opposed to affirmative precepts, so is transgression opposed to negative precepts: wherefore both, strictly speaking, have the character of mortal sin. Transgression and omission, however, may be taken broadly for any infringement of an

affirmative or negative precept, disposing to the opposite of such precept: and so taking both in a broad sense they may be venial sins.

P(2b)-Q(79)-A(4)-RO(4) — To the sin of transgression there correspond both the pain of loss on account of the aversion from God, and the pain of sense, on account of the inordinate conversion to a mutable good. In like manner omission deserves not only the pain of loss, but also the pain of sense, according to ^{<407>}Matthew 7:19,

“Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit shall be cut down,
and shall be cast into the fire”;

and this on account of the root from which it grows, although it does not necessarily imply conversion to any mutable good.

QUESTION 80

OF THE POTENTIAL PARTS OF JUSTICE

(ONE ARTICLE)

We must now consider the potential parts of justice, namely the virtues annexed thereto; under which head there are two points of consideration:

- (1) What virtues are annexed to justice?
- (2) The individual virtues annexed to justice.

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1)

Whether the virtues annexed to justice are suitably enumerated?

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that the virtues annexed to justice are unsuitably enumerated Tully [*De Invent. ii, 53] reckons six, viz. “religion, piety, gratitude, revenge, observance, truth.” Now revenge is seemingly a species of commutative justice whereby revenge is taken for injuries inflicted, as stated above (**Q(61)**, **A(4)**). Therefore it should not be reckoned among the virtues annexed to justice.

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Macrobius (Super Somn. Scip. i, 8) reckons seven, viz. “innocence, friendship, concord, piety, religion, affection, humanity,” several of which are omitted by Tully. Therefore the virtues annexed to justice would seem to be insufficiently enumerated.

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, others reckon five parts of justice, viz. “obedience” in respect of one’s superiors, “discipline” with regard to inferiors, “equity” as regards equals, “fidelity” and “truthfulness” towards all; and of these “truthfulness” alone is mentioned by Tully. Therefore he would seem to have enumerated insufficiently the virtues annexed to justice.

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, the peripatetic Andronicus [*De Affectibus] reckons nine parts annexed to justice viz. “liberality, kindliness, revenge, commonsense, [*{eugnomosyne}] piety, gratitude, holiness, just exchange” and “just lawgiving”; and of all these it is evident that Tully mentions none but “revenge.” Therefore he would appear to have made an incomplete enumeration.

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, Aristotle (Ethic. v, 10) mentions {epieikeia} as being annexed to justice: and yet seemingly it is not included in any of the foregoing enumerations. Therefore the virtues annexed to justice are insufficiently enumerated.

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Two points must be observed about the virtues annexed to a principal virtue. The first is that these virtues have something in common with the principal virtue; and the second is that in some respect they fall short of the perfection of that virtue. Accordingly since justice is of one man to another as stated above (**Q(58), A(2)**), all the virtues that are directed to another person may by reason of this common aspect be annexed to justice. Now the essential character of justice consists in rendering to another his due according to equality, as stated above (**Q(58), A(11)**). Wherefore in two ways may a virtue directed to another person fall short of the perfection of justice: first, by falling short of the aspect of equality; secondly, by falling short of the aspect of due. For certain virtues there are which render another his due, but are unable to render the equal due. In the first place, whatever man renders to God is due, yet it cannot be equal, as though man rendered to God as much as he owes Him, according to ^{CHR}Psalm 115:12, “What shall I render to the Lord for all the things that He hath rendered to me?” In this respect “religion” is annexed to justice since, according to Tully (De invent. ii, 53), it consists in offering service and ceremonial rites or worship to “some superior nature that men call divine.” Secondly, it is not possible to make to one’s parents an equal return of what one owes to them, as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. viii, 14); and thus “piety” is annexed to justice, for thereby, as Tully says (De invent. ii, 53), a man “renders service and constant deference to his kindred and the well-wishers of his country.” Thirdly, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 3), man is unable to offer an equal meed for virtue, and thus “observance” is annexed to justice,

consisting according to Tully (*De invent.* ii, 53) in the “deference and honor rendered to those who excel in worth.”

A falling short of the just due may be considered in respect of a twofold due, moral or legal: wherefore the Philosopher (*Ethic.* viii, 13) assigns a corresponding twofold just. The legal due is that which one is bound to render by reason of a legal obligation; and this due is chiefly the concern of justice, which is the principal virtue. On the other hand, the moral due is that to which one is bound in respect of the rectitude of virtue: and since a due implies necessity, this kind of due has two degrees. For one due is so necessary that without it moral rectitude cannot be ensured: and this has more of the character of due. Moreover this due may be considered from the point of view of the debtor, and in this way it pertains to this kind of due that a man represent himself to others just as he is, both in word and deed. Wherefore to justice is annexed “truth,” whereby, as Tully says (*De invent.* ii, 53), present, past and future things are told without perversion. It may also be considered from the point of view of the person to whom it is due, by comparing the reward he receives with what he has done — sometimes in good things; and then annexed to justice we have “gratitude” which “consists in recollecting the friendship and kindness shown by others, and in desiring to pay them back,” as Tully states (*De invent.* ii, 53) — and sometimes in evil things, and then to justice is annexed “revenge,” whereby, as Tully states (*De invent.* ii, 53), “we resist force, injury or anything obscure* by taking vengeance or by self-defense.” [*St. Thomas read ‘obscurum,’ and explains it as meaning ‘derogatory,’ infra **Q(108), A(2)**. Cicero, however, wrote ‘obfuturum,’ i.e. ‘hurtful.’]

There is another due that is necessary in the sense that it conduces to greater rectitude, although without it rectitude may be ensured. This due is the concern of “liberality,” “affability” or “friendship,” or the like, all of which Tully omits in the aforesaid enumeration because there is little of the nature of anything due in them.

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1)-RO(1) — The revenge taken by authority of a public power, in accordance with a judge’s sentence, belongs to commutative justice: whereas the revenge which a man takes on his own initiative, though not against the law, or which a man seeks to obtain from a judge, belongs to the virtue annexed to justice.

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1)-RO(2) — Macrobius appears to have considered the two integral parts of justice, namely, “declining from evil,” to which “innocence” belongs, and “doing good,” to which the six others belong. Of these, two would seem to regard relations between equals, namely, “friendship” in the external conduct and “concord” internally; two regard our relations toward superiors, namely, “piety” to parents, and “religion” to God; while two regard our relations towards inferiors, namely, “condescension,” in so far as their good pleases us, and “humanity,” whereby we help them in their needs. For Isidore says (Etym. x) that a man is said to be “humane, through having a feeling of love and pity towards men: this gives its name to humanity whereby we uphold one another.” In this sense “friendship” is understood as directing our external conduct towards others, from which point of view the Philosopher treats of it in Ethic. iv, 6. “Friendship” may also be taken as regarding properly the affections, and as the Philosopher describes it in Ethic. viii and 9: In this sense three things pertain to friendship, namely, “benevolence” which is here called “affection”; “concord,” and “beneficence” which is here called “humanity.” These three, however, are omitted by Tully, because, as stated above, they have little of the nature of a due.

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1)-RO(3) — “Obedience” is included in observance, which Tully mentions, because both reverential honor and obedience are due to persons who excel. “Faithfulness whereby a man’s acts agree with his words” [*Cicero, De Repub. iv, De Offic. i, 7], is contained in “truthfulness” as to the observance of one’s promises: yet “truthfulness” covers a wider ground, as we shall state further on (**Q(109), AA(1),3**). “Discipline” is not due as a necessary duty, because one is under no obligation to an inferior as such, although a superior may be under an obligation to watch over his inferiors, according to ^{<125}Matthew 24:45, “A faithful and wise servant, whom his lord hath appointed over his family”: and for this reason it is omitted by Tully. It may, however, be included in humanity mentioned by Macrobius; and equity under {epieikeia} or under “friendship.”

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1)-RO(4) — This enumeration contains some belonging to true justice. To particular justice belongs “justice of exchange,” which he describes as “the habit of observing equality in commutations.” To legal justice, as regards things to be observed by all, he ascribes “legislative

justice,” which he describes as “the science of political commutations relating to the community.” As regards things which have to be done in particular cases beside the general laws, he mentions “common sense” or “good judgment*,” which is our guide in such like matters, as stated above (**Q(51), A(4)**) in the treatise on prudence: wherefore he says that it is a “voluntary justification,” because by his own free will man observes what is just according to his judgment and not according to the written law. [*St. Thomas indicates the Greek derivation: {eugnomosyne} quasi ‘bona {gnome}.’] These two are ascribed to prudence as their director, and to justice as their executor. {Eusebeia} [piety] means “good worship” and consequently is the same as religion, wherefore he says that it is the science of “the service of God” (he speaks after the manner of Socrates who said that ‘all the virtues are sciences’) [*Aristotle, *Ethic.* vi, 13]: and “holiness” comes to the same, as we shall state further on (**Q(81), A(8)**). {Eucharistia} (gratitude) means “good thanksgiving,” and is mentioned by Macrobius: wherefore Isidore says (*Etym.* x) that “a kind man is one who is ready of his own accord to do good, and is of gentle speech”: and Andronicus too says that “kindliness is a habit of voluntary beneficence.” “Liberality” would seem to pertain to “humanity.”

P(2b)-Q(80)-A(1)-RO(5) — {Epieikeia} is annexed, not to particular but to legal justice, and apparently is the same as that which goes by the name of {eugnomosyne} [common sense].

QUESTION 81

OF RELIGION

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

We must now consider each of the foregoing virtues, in so far as our present scope demands. We shall consider

- (1) religion,
- (2) piety,
- (3) observance,
- (4) gratitude,
- (5) revenge,
- (6) truth,
- (7) friendship,
- (8) liberality,
- (9) {epieikeia}.

Of the other virtues that have been mentioned we have spoken partly in the treatise on charity, viz. of concord and the like, and partly in this treatise on justice, for instance, of right commutations and of innocence. of legislative justice we spoke in the treatise on prudence.

Religion offers a threefold consideration:

- (1) Religion considered in itself;
- (2) its acts;
- (3) the opposite vices.

Under the first head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether religion regards only our relation to God?

- (2) Whether religion is a virtue?
- (3) Whether religion is one virtue?
- (4) Whether religion is a special virtue?
- (5) Whether religion is a theological virtue?
- (6) Whether religion should be preferred to the other moral virtues?
- (7) Whether religion has any external actions?
- (8) Whether religion is the same as holiness?

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1)

Whether religion directs man to God alone?

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that religion does not direct man to God alone. It is written (~~say~~ James 1:27):

“Religion clean and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their tribulation, and to keep oneself unspotted from this world.”

Now “to visit the fatherless and widows” indicates an order between oneself and one’s neighbor, and “to keep oneself unspotted from this world” belongs to the order of a man within himself. Therefore religion does not imply order to God alone.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x, 1) that “since in speaking Latin not only unlettered but even most cultured persons are wont to speak of religion as being exhibited, to our human kindred and relations as also to those who are linked with us by any kind of tie, that term does not escape ambiguity when it is a question of Divine worship, so that we be able to say without hesitation that religion is nothing else but the worship of God.” Therefore religion signifies a relation not only to God but also to our kindred.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, seemingly “latria” pertains to religion. Now “latria signifies servitude,” as Augustine states (De Civ. Dei x, 1). And we are bound to serve not only God, but also our neighbor, according

to ~~CHR~~ Galatians 5:13, “By charity of the spirit serve one another.” Therefore religion includes a relation to one’s neighbor also.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, worship belongs to religion. Now man is said to worship not only God, but also his neighbor, according to the saying of Cato [*Dionysius Cato, *Breves Sententiae*], “Worship thy parents.” Therefore religion directs us also to our neighbor, and not only to God.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, all those who are in the state of grace are subject to God. Yet not all who are in a state of grace are called religious, but only those who bind themselves by certain vows and observances, and to obedience to certain men. Therefore religion seemingly does not denote a relation of subjection of man to God.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Tully says (Rhet. ii, 53) that “religion consists in offering service and ceremonial rites to a superior nature that men call divine.”

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1) — *I answer that*, as Isidore says (Etym. x), “according to Cicero, a man is said to be religious from ‘religio,’ because he often ponders over, and, as it were, reads again [relegit], the things which pertain to the worship of God,” so that religion would seem to take its name from reading over those things which belong to Divine worship because we ought frequently to ponder over such things in our hearts, according to ~~CHR~~ Proverbs 3:6, “In all thy ways think on Him.” According to Augustine (De Civ. Dei x, 3) it may also take its name from the fact that “we ought to seek God again, whom we had lost by our neglect” [*St. Augustine plays on the words ‘reeligere,’ i.e. to choose over again, and ‘negligere,’ to neglect or despise.]. Or again, religion may be derived from “religare” [to bind together], wherefore Augustine says (De Vera Relig. 55): “May religion bind us to the one Almighty God.” However, whether religion take its name from frequent reading, or from a repeated choice of what has been lost through negligence, or from being a bond, it denotes properly a relation to God. For it is He to Whom we ought to be bound as to our unfailing principle; to Whom also our choice should be resolutely directed as to our last end; and Whom we lose when we neglect Him by sin, and should recover by believing in Him and confessing our faith.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1)-RO(1) — Religion has two kinds of acts. Some are its proper and immediate acts, which it elicits, and by which man is directed to God alone, for instance, sacrifice, adoration and the like. But it has other acts, which it produces through the medium of the virtues which it commands, directing them to the honor of God, because the virtue which is concerned with the end, commands the virtues which are concerned with the means. Accordingly “to visit the fatherless and widows in their tribulation” is an act of religion as commanding, and an act of mercy as eliciting; and “to keep oneself unspotted from this world” is an act of religion as commanding, but of temperance or of some similar virtue as eliciting.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1)-RO(2) — Religion is referred to those things one exhibits to one’s human kindred, if we take the term religion in a broad sense, but not if we take it in its proper sense. Hence, shortly before the passage quoted, Augustine says: “In a stricter sense religion seems to denote, not any kind of worship, but the worship of God.”

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1)-RO(3) — Since servant implies relation to a lord, wherever there is a special kind of lordship there must needs be a special kind of service. Now it is evident that lordship belongs to God in a special and singular way, because He made all things, and has supreme dominion over all. Consequently a special kind of service is due to Him, which is known as “latria” in Greek; and therefore it belongs to religion.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1)-RO(4) — We are said to worship those whom we honor, and to cultivate [*In the Latin the same word ‘colere’ stands for ‘worship’ and ‘cultivate’]: a man’s memory or presence: we even speak of cultivating things that are beneath us, thus a farmer [agricola] is one who cultivates the land, and an inhabitant [incola] is one who cultivates the place where he dwells. Since, however, special honor is due to God as the first principle of all things, to Him also is due a special kind of worship, which in Greek is {Eusebeia} or {Theosebeia}, as Augustine states (De Civ. Dei x, 1).

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(1)-RO(5) — Although the name “religious” may be given to all in general who worship God, yet in a special way religious are those who consecrate their whole life to the Divine worship, by withdrawing from human affairs. Thus also the term “contemplative” is applied, not to

those who contemplate, but to those who give up their whole lives to contemplation. Such men subject themselves to man, not for man's sake but for God's sake, according to the word of the Apostle (~~Galatians~~ Galatians 4:14),

“You... received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.”

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(2)

Whether religion is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that religion is not a virtue. Seemingly it belongs to religion to pay reverence to God. But reverence is an act of fear which is a gift, as stated above (**Q(19)**, **A(9)**). Therefore religion is not a virtue but a gift

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, every virtue is a free exercise of the will, wherefore it is described as an “elective” or voluntary “habit” [*Ethic. ii, 6]. Now, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 3) “latria” belongs to religion, and “latria” denotes a kind of servitude. Therefore religion is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, according to Ethic. ii, 1, aptitude for virtue is in us by nature, wherefore things pertaining to virtue belong to the dictate of natural reason. Now, it belongs to religion “to offer ceremonial worship to the Godhead” [*Cf. **A(1)**], and ceremonial matters, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(99)**, **A(3)**, ad 2; **P(2a)**, **Q(101)**), do not belong to the dictate of natural reason. Therefore religion is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is enumerated with the other virtues, as appears from what has been said above (**Q(80)**).

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(58)**, **A(3)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(55)**, **AA(3),4**) “a virtue is that which makes its possessor good, and his act good likewise,” wherefore we must needs say that every good act belongs to a virtue. Now it is evident that to render anyone his due has the aspect of good, since by rendering a person his due, one becomes suitably proportioned to him, through being ordered to him in a becoming manner. But order comes under the aspect of good, just as mode and species, according to Augustine (De Nat. Boni iii). Since then it belongs to religion

to pay due honor to someone, namely, to God, it is evident that religion is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(2)-RO(1) — To pay reverence to God is an act of the gift of fear. Now it belongs to religion to do certain things through reverence for God. Hence it follows, not that religion is the same as the gift of fear, but that it is referred thereto as to something more excellent; for the gifts are more excellent than the moral virtues, as stated above (**Q(9)**, **A(1)**, ad 3; **P(2a)**, **Q(68)**, **A(8)**).

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(2)-RO(2) — Even a slave can voluntarily do his duty by his master, and so “he makes a virtue of necessity” [*Jerome, Ep. liv, ad Furiam.], by doing his duty voluntarily. In like manner, to render due service to God may be an act of virtue, in so far as man does so voluntarily.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(2)-RO(3) — It belongs to the dictate of natural reason that man should do something through reverence for God. But that he should do this or that determinate thing does not belong to the dictate of natural reason, but is established by Divine or human law.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(3)

Whether religion is one virtue?

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that religion is not one virtue. Religion directs us to God, as stated above (**A(1)**). Now in God there are three Persons; and also many attributes, which differ at least logically from one another. Now a logical difference in the object suffices for a difference of virtue, as stated above (**Q(50)**, **A(2)**, ad 2). Therefore religion is not one virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, of one virtue there is seemingly one act, since habits are distinguished by their acts. Now there are many acts of religion, for instance to worship, to serve, to vow, to pray, to sacrifice and many such like. Therefore religion is not one virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, adoration belongs to religion. Now adoration is paid to images under one aspect, and under another aspect to

God Himself. Since, then, a difference of aspect distinguishes virtues, it would seem that religion is not one virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~1~~¹ Ephesians 4:5): “One God [Vulg.: ‘Lord’], one faith.” Now true religion professes faith in one God. Therefore religion is one virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(54), A(2),** ad 1), habits are differentiated according to a different aspect of the object. Now it belongs to religion to show reverence to one God under one aspect, namely, as the first principle of the creation and government of things. Wherefore He Himself says (Malach. 1:6): “If... I be a father, where is My honor?” For it belongs to a father to beget and to govern. Therefore it is evident that religion is one virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(3)-RO(1) — The three Divine Persons are the one principle of the creation and government of things, wherefore they are served by one religion. The different aspects of the attributes concur under the aspect of first principle, because God produces all things, and governs them by the wisdom, will and power of His goodness. Wherefore religion is one virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(3)-RO(2) — By the one same act man both serves and worships God, for worship regards the excellence of God, to Whom reverence is due: while service regards the subjection of man who, by his condition, is under an obligation of showing reverence to God. To these two belong all acts ascribed to religion, because, by them all, man bears witness to the Divine excellence and to his own subjection to God, either by offering something to God, or by assuming something Divine.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(3)-RO(3) — The worship of religion is paid to images, not as considered in themselves, nor as things, but as images leading us to God incarnate. Now movement to an image as image does not stop at the image, but goes on to the thing it represents. Hence neither “latria” nor the virtue of religion is differentiated by the fact that religious worship is paid to the images of Christ.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(4)

Whether religion is a special virtue, distinct from the others?

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that religion is not a special virtue distinct from the others. Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x, 6): “Any action whereby we are united to God in holy fellowship, is a true sacrifice.” But sacrifice belongs to religion. Therefore every virtuous deed belongs to religion; and consequently religion is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the Apostle says (~~408~~ 1 Corinthians 10:31): “Do all to the glory of God.” Now it belongs to religion to do anything in reverence of God, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 2; **A(2)**). Therefore religion is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the charity whereby we love God is not distinct from the charity whereby we love our neighbor. But according to Ethic. viii, 8 “to be honored is almost to be loved.” Therefore the religion whereby we honor God is not a special virtue distinct from observance, or “dulia,” or piety whereby we honor our neighbor. Therefore religion is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is reckoned a part of justice, distinct from the other parts.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Since virtue is directed to the good, wherever there is a special aspect of good, there must be a special virtue. Now the good to which religion is directed, is to give due honor to God. Again, honor is due to someone under the aspect of excellence: and to God a singular excellence is competent, since He infinitely surpasses all things and exceeds them in every way. Wherefore to Him is special honor due: even as in human affairs we see that different honor is due to different personal excellences, one kind of honor to a father, another to the king, and so on. Hence it is evident that religion is a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(4)-RO(1) — Every virtuous deed is said to be a sacrifice, in so far as it is done out of reverence of God. Hence this does not prove that religion is a general virtue, but that it commands all other virtues, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 1).

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(4)-RO(2) — Every deed, in so far as it is done in God's honor, belongs to religion, not as eliciting but as commanding: those belong to religion as eliciting which pertain to the reverence of God by reason of their specific character.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(4)-RO(3) — The object of love is the good, but the object of honor and reverence is something excellent. Now God's goodness is communicated to the creature, but the excellence of His goodness is not. Hence the charity whereby God is loved is not distinct from the charity whereby our neighbor is loved; whereas the religion whereby God is honored, is distinct from the virtues whereby we honor our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(5)

Whether religion is a theological virtue?

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that religion is a theological virtue. Augustine says (Enchiridion iii) that "God is worshiped by faith, hope and charity," which are theological virtues. Now it belongs to religion to pay worship to God. Therefore religion is a theological virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, a theological virtue is one that has God for its object. Now religion has God for its object, since it directs us to God alone, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore religion is a theological virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, every virtue is either theological, or intellectual, or moral, as is clear from what has been said (**P(2a), QQ(57),58,62**). Now it is evident that religion is not an intellectual virtue, because its perfection does not depend on the consideration of truth: nor is it a moral virtue, which consists properly in observing the mean between too much and too little. for one cannot worship God too much, according to Ecclus. 43:33, "Blessing the Lord, exalt Him as much as you can; for He is above all praise." Therefore it remains that it is a theological virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, It is reckoned a part of justice which is a moral virtue.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(4)**) religion pays due worship to God. Hence two things are to be considered in religion: first that which it offers to God, viz. worship, and this is by way of matter and object in religion; secondly, that to which something is offered, viz. God, to Whom worship is paid. And yet the acts whereby God is worshiped do not reach out to God himself, as when we believe God we reach out to Him by believing; for which reason it was stated (**Q(1), AA(1),2,4**) that God is the object of faith, not only because we believe in a God, but because we believe God.

Now due worship is paid to God, in so far as certain acts whereby God is worshiped, such as the offering of sacrifices and so forth, are done out of reverence for God. Hence it is evident that God is related to religion not as matter or object, but as end: and consequently religion is not a theological virtue whose object is the last end, but a moral virtue which is properly about things referred to the end.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(5)-RO(1) — The power or virtue whose action deals with an end, moves by its command the power or virtue whose action deals with matters directed to that end. Now the theological virtues, faith, hope and charity have an act in reference to God as their proper object: wherefore, by their command, they cause the act of religion, which performs certain deeds directed to God: and so Augustine says that God is worshiped by faith, hope and charity.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(5)-RO(2) — Religion directs man to God not as its object but as its end.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(5)-RO(3) — Religion is neither a theological nor an intellectual, but a moral virtue, since it is a part of justice, and observes a mean, not in the passions, but in actions directed to God, by establishing a kind of equality in them. And when I say “equality,” I do not mean absolute equality, because it is not possible to pay God as much as we owe Him, but equality in consideration of man’s ability and God’s acceptance.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(5)-RO(3)

And it is possible to have too much in matters pertaining to the Divine worship, not as regards the circumstance of quantity, but as regards other

circumstances, as when Divine worship is paid to whom it is not due, or when it is not due, or unduly in respect of some other circumstance.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(6)

Whether religion should be preferred to the other moral virtues?

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that religion should not be preferred to the other moral virtues. The perfection of a moral virtue consists in its observing the mean, as stated in Ethic. ii, 6. But religion fails to observe the mean of justice, since it does not render an absolute equal to God. Therefore religion is not more excellent than the other moral virtues.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, what is offered by one man to another is the more praiseworthy, according as the person it is offered to is in greater need: wherefore it is written (²⁵⁰Isaiah 57:7): “Deal thy bread to the hungry.” But God needs nothing that we can offer Him, according to ^{415D}Psalm 15:2,

“I have said: Thou art my God,
for Thou hast no need of my goods.”

Therefore religion would seem less praiseworthy than the other virtues whereby man’s needs are relieved.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, the greater the obligation to do a thing, the less praise does it deserve, according to ^{419G}1 Corinthians 9:16, “If I preach the Gospel, it is no glory to me: a necessity lieth upon me.” Now the more a thing is due, the greater the obligation of paying it. Since, then, what is paid to God by man is in the highest degree due to Him, it would seem that religion is less praiseworthy than the other human virtues.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(6) — On the contrary, The precepts pertaining to religion are given precedence (^{420H}Exodus 20) as being of greatest importance. Now the order of precepts is proportionate to the order of virtues, since the precepts of the Law prescribe acts of virtue. Therefore religion is the chief of the moral virtues.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(6) — *I answer that*, Whatever is directed to an end takes its goodness from being ordered to that end; so that the nearer it is to the end the better it is. Now moral virtues, as stated above (**A(5); Q(4), A(7)**), are about matters that are ordered to God as their end. And religion approaches nearer to God than the other moral virtues, in so far as its actions are directly and immediately ordered to the honor of God. Hence religion excels among the moral virtues.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(6)-RO(1) — Virtue is praised because of the will, not because of the ability: and therefore if a man fall short of equality which is the mean of justice, through lack of ability, his virtue deserves no less praise, provided there be no failing on the part of his will.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(6)-RO(2) — In offering a thing to a man on account of its usefulness to him, the more needy the man the more praiseworthy the offering, because it is more useful: whereas we offer a thing to God not on account of its usefulness to Him, but for the sake of His glory, and on account of its usefulness to us.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(6)-RO(3) — Where there is an obligation to do a thing it loses the luster of supererogation, but not the merit of virtue, provided it be done voluntarily. Hence the argument proves nothing.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(7)

Whether religion has an external act?

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that religion has not an external act. It is written (^{Gen}John 4:24):

“God is a spirit, and they that adore Him,
must adore Him in spirit and in truth.”

Now external acts pertain, not to the spirit but to the body. Therefore religion, to which adoration belongs, has acts that are not external but internal.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, the end of religion is to pay God reverence and honor. Now it would savor of irreverence towards a superior, if one were to offer him that which properly belongs to his

inferior. Since then whatever man offers by bodily actions, seems to be directed properly to the relief of human needs, or to the reverence of inferior creatures, it would seem unbecoming to employ them in showing reverence to God.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, Augustine (De Civ. Dei vi, 10) commends Seneca for finding fault with those who offered to idols those things that are wont to be offered to men, because, to wit, that which befits mortals is unbecoming to immortals. But such things are much less becoming to the true God, Who is “exalted above all gods” [~~490B~~ Psalm 94:3]. Therefore it would seem wrong to worship God with bodily actions. Therefore religion has no bodily actions.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~488B~~ Psalm 83:3): “My heart and my flesh have rejoiced in the living God.” Now just as internal actions belong to the heart, so do external actions belong to the members of the flesh. Therefore it seems that God ought to be worshiped not only by internal but also by external actions.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(7) — *I answer that*, We pay God honor and reverence, not for His sake (because He is of Himself full of glory to which no creature can add anything), but for our own sake, because by the very fact that we revere and honor God, our mind is subjected to Him; wherein its perfection consists, since a thing is perfected by being subjected to its superior, for instance the body is perfected by being quickened by the soul, and the air by being enlightened by the sun. Now the human mind, in order to be united to God, needs to be guided by the sensible world, since “invisible things... are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made,” as the Apostle says (~~481B~~ Romans 1:20). Wherefore in the Divine worship it is necessary to make use of corporeal things, that man’s mind may be aroused thereby, as by signs, to the spiritual acts by means of which he is united to God. Therefore the internal acts of religion take precedence of the others and belong to religion essentially, while its external acts are secondary, and subordinate to the internal acts.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(7)-RO(1) — Our Lord is speaking of that which is most important and directly intended in the worship of God.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(7)-RO(2) — These external things are offered to God, not as though He stood in need of them, according to ^{<94B>}Psalm 49:13, “Shall I eat the flesh of bullocks? or shall I drink the blood of goats?” but as signs of the internal and spiritual works, which are of themselves acceptable to God. Hence Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x, 5): “The visible sacrifice is the sacrament or sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice.”

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(7)-RO(3) — Idolaters are ridiculed for offering to idols things pertaining to men, not as signs arousing them to certain spiritual things, but as though they were of themselves acceptable to the idols; and still more because they were foolish and wicked.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(8)

Whether religion is the same as sanctity?

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that religion is not the same as sanctity. Religion is a special virtue, as stated above (**A(4)**): whereas sanctity is a general virtue, because it makes us faithful, and fulfil our just obligations to God, according to Andronicus [*De Affectibus]. Therefore sanctity is not the same as religion.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, sanctity seems to denote a kind of purity. For Dionysius says (Div. Nom. xii) that “sanctity is free from all uncleanness, and is perfect and altogether unspotted purity.” Now purity would seem above all to pertain to temperance which repels bodily uncleanness. Since then religion belongs to justice, it would seem that sanctity is not the same as religion.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, things that are opposite members of a division are not identified with one another. But in an enumeration given above (**Q(80)**, ad 4) of the parts of justice, sanctity is reckoned as distinct from religion. Therefore sanctity is not the same as religion.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(8) — On the contrary, It is written (^{<94A>}Luke 1:74,75): “That... we may serve Him... in holiness and justice.” Now, “to serve God” belongs to religion, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 3; **A(3)**, ad 2). Therefore religion is the same as sanctity.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(8) — *I answer that*, The word “sanctity” seems to have two significations. In one way it denotes purity; and this signification fits in with the Greek, for {hagios} means “unsoiled.” In another way it denotes firmness, wherefore in olden times the term “sancta” was applied to such things as were upheld by law and were not to be violated. Hence a thing is said to be sacred [sancitum] when it is ratified by law. Again, in Latin, this word “sanctus” may be connected with purity, if it be resolved into “sanguine tinctus, since, in olden times, those who wished to be purified were sprinkled with the victim’s blood,” according to Isidore (Etym. x). In either case the signification requires sanctity to be ascribed to those things that are applied to the Divine worship; so that not only men, but also the temple, vessels and such like things are said to be sanctified through being applied to the worship of God. For purity is necessary in order that the mind be applied to God, since the human mind is soiled by contact with inferior things, even as all things depreciate by admixture with baser things, for instance, silver by being mixed with lead. Now in order for the mind to be united to the Supreme Being it must be withdrawn from inferior things: and hence it is that without purity the mind cannot be applied to God. Wherefore it is written (^{<8124>} Hebrews 12:14):

“Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see God.”

Again, firmness is required for the mind to be applied to God, for it is applied to Him as its last end and first beginning, and such things must needs be most immovable. Hence the Apostle said (^{<8138>} Romans 8:38,39):

“I am sure that neither death, nor life... shall separate me [*Vulg.: ‘shall be able to separate us’] from the love of God.”

Accordingly, it is by sanctity that the human mind applies itself and its acts to God: so that it differs from religion not essentially but only logically. For it takes the name of religion according as it gives God due service in matters pertaining specially to the Divine worship, such as sacrifices, oblations, and so forth; while it is called sanctity, according as man refers to God not only these but also the works of the other virtues, or according as man by means of certain good works disposes himself to the worship of God

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(8)-RO(1) — Sanctity is a special virtue according to its essence; and in this respect it is in a way identified with religion. But it has a certain generality, in so far as by its command it directs the acts of all the virtues to the Divine good, even as legal justice is said to be a general virtue, in so far as it directs the acts of all the virtues to the common good.

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(8)-RO(2) — Temperance practices purity, yet not so as to have the character of sanctity unless it be referred to God. Hence of virginity itself Augustine says (*De Virgin.* viii) that “it is honored not for what it is, but for being consecrated to God.”

P(2b)-Q(81)-A(8)-RO(3) — Sanctity differs from religion as explained above, not really but logically.

INTERIOR ACTS OF RELIGION

QUESTIONS 82-83

QUESTION 82

OF DEVOTION

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the acts of religion. First, we shall consider the interior acts, which, as stated above, are its principal acts; secondly, we shall consider its exterior acts, which are secondary. The interior acts of religion are seemingly devotion and prayer. Accordingly we shall treat first of devotion, and afterwards of prayer.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether devotion is a special act?
- (2) Whether it is an act of religion?
- (3) Of the cause of devotion?
- (4) Of its effect?

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(1)

Whether devotion is a special act?

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that devotion is not a special act. That which qualifies other acts is seemingly not a special act. Now devotion seems to qualify other acts, for it is written (2 Paralip 29:31): “All the multitude offered victims, and praises, and holocausts with a devout mind.” Therefore devotion is not a special act.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, no special kind of act is common to various genera of acts. But devotion is common to various genera of acts, namely, corporal and spiritual acts: for a person is said to meditate devoutly and to genuflect devoutly. Therefore devotion is not a special act.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, every special act belongs either to an appetitive or to a cognitive virtue or power. But devotion belongs to neither, as may be seen by going through the various species of acts of either faculty, as enumerated above (**P(1)**, **QQ(78)**, seqq.; **P(2a)**, **Q(23)**, **A(4)**). Therefore devotion is not a special act.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Merits are acquired by acts as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(21)**, **AA(34)**). But devotion has a special reason for merit. Therefore devotion is a special act.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Devotion is derived from “devote” [*The Latin ‘devovere’ means ‘to vow’]; wherefore those persons are said to be “devout” who, in a way, devote themselves to God, so as to subject themselves wholly to Him. Hence in olden times among the heathens a devotee was one who vowed to his idols to suffer death for the safety of his army, as Livy relates of the two Decii (Decad. I, viii, 9; x, 28). Hence devotion is apparently nothing else but the will to give oneself readily to things concerning the service of God. Wherefore it is written (⁽¹²⁵¹⁾Exodus 35:20,21) that “the multitude of the children of Israel... offered first-fruits to the Lord with a most ready and devout mind.” Now it is evident that the will to do readily what concerns the service of God is a special kind of act. Therefore devotion is a special act of the will.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(1)-RO(1) — The mover prescribes the mode of the movement of the thing moved. Now the will moves the other powers of the soul to their acts, and the will, in so far as it regards the end, moves both itself and whatever is directed to the end, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(9)**, **A(3)**). Wherefore, since devotion is an act of the will whereby a man offers himself for the service of God Who is the last end, it follows that devotion prescribes the mode to human acts, whether they be acts of the will itself about things directed to the end, or acts of the other powers that are moved by the will.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(1)-RO(2) — Devotion is to be found in various genera of acts, not as a species of those genera, but as the motion of the mover is found virtually in the movements of the things moved.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(1)-RO(3) — Devotion is an act of the appetitive part of the soul, and is a movement of the will, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(2)

Whether devotion is an act of religion?

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that devotion is not an act of religion. Devotion, as stated above (**A(1)**), consists in giving oneself up to God. But this is done chiefly by charity, since according to Dionysius (Div. Nom. iv) “the Divine love produces ecstasy, for it takes the lover away from himself and gives him to the beloved.” Therefore devotion is an act of charity rather than of religion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, charity precedes religion; and devotion seems to precede charity; since, in the Scriptures, charity is represented by fire, while devotion is signified by fatness which is the material of fire [*Cant. 8:6; ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 52:6]. Therefore devotion is not an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, by religion man is directed to God alone, as stated above (**Q(81)**, **A(1)**). But devotion is directed also to men; for we speak of people being devout to certain holy men, and subjects are said to be devoted to their masters; thus Pope Leo says [*Serm. viii, De Pass. Dom.] that the Jews “out of devotion to the Roman laws,” said: “We have no king but Caesar.” Therefore devotion is not an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Devotion is derived from “devovere,” as stated (**A(1)**). But a vow is an act of religion. Therefore devotion is also an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(2) — *I answer that*, It belongs to the same virtue, to will to do something, and to have the will ready to do it, because both acts have the same object. For this reason the Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 1): “It is justice whereby men both will end do just actions.” Now it is evident that to do what pertains to the worship or service of God, belongs properly to

religion, as stated above (**Q(81)**). Wherefore it belongs to that virtue to have the will ready to do such things, and this is to be devout. Hence it is evident that devotion is an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(2)-RO(1) — It belongs immediately to charity that man should give himself to God, adhering to Him by a union of the spirit; but it belongs immediately to religion, and, through the medium of religion, to charity which is the principle of religion, that man should give himself to God for certain works of Divine worship.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(2)-RO(2) — Bodily fatness is produced by the natural heat in the process of digestion, and at the same time the natural heat thrives, as it were, on this fatness. In like manner charity both causes devotion (inasmuch as love makes one ready to serve one's friend) and feeds on devotion. Even so all friendship is safeguarded and increased by the practice and consideration of friendly deeds.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(2)-RO(3) — Devotion to God's holy ones, dead or living, does not terminate in them, but passes on to God, in so far as we honor God in His servants. But the devotion of subjects to their temporal masters is of another kind, just as service of a temporal master differs from the service of God.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(3)

***Whether contemplation or meditation
is the cause of devotion?***

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that contemplation or meditation is not the cause of devotion. No cause hinders its effect. But subtle considerations about abstract matters are often a hindrance to devotion. Therefore contemplation or meditation is not the cause of devotion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, if contemplation were the proper and essential cause of devotion, the higher objects of contemplation would arouse greater devotion. But the contrary is the case: since frequently we are urged to greater devotion by considering Christ's Passion and other

mysteries of His humanity than by considering the greatness of His Godhead. Therefore contemplation is not the proper cause of devotion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, if contemplation were the proper cause of devotion, it would follow that those who are most apt for contemplation, are also most apt for devotion. Yet the contrary is to be noticed, for devotion is frequently found in men of simplicity and members of the female sex, who are defective in contemplation. Therefore contemplation is not the proper cause of devotion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~1884~~ Psalm 38:4): “In my meditation a fire shall flame out.” But spiritual fire causes devotion. Therefore meditation is the cause of devotion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(3) — *I answer that*, The extrinsic and chief cause of devotion is God, of Whom Ambrose, commenting on ~~4155~~ Luke 9:55, says that “God calls whom He deigns to call, and whom He wills He makes religious: the profane Samaritans, had He so willed, He would have made devout.” But the intrinsic cause on our part must needs be meditation or contemplation. For it was stated above (**A(1)**) that devotion is an act of the will to the effect that man surrenders himself readily to the service of God. Now every act of the will proceeds from some consideration, since the object of the will is a good understood. Wherefore Augustine says (De Trin. ix, 12; xv, 23) that “the will arises from the intelligence.” Consequently meditation must needs be the cause of devotion, in so far as through meditation man conceives the thought of surrendering himself to God’s service. Indeed a twofold consideration leads him thereto. The one is the consideration of God’s goodness and loving kindness, according to ~~4710~~ Psalm 72:28, “It is good for me to adhere to my God, to put my hope in the Lord God”: and this consideration wakens love [**Dilectio*, the interior act of charity; cf. **Q(27)**] which is the proximate cause of devotion. The other consideration is that of man’s own shortcomings, on account of which he needs to lean on God, according to ~~4800~~ Psalm 120:1,2,

“I have lifted up my eyes to the mountains, from whence help shall come to me: my help is from the Lord, Who made heaven and earth”;

and this consideration shuts out presumption whereby man is hindered from submitting to God, because he leans on His strength.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(3)-RO(1) — The consideration of such things as are of a nature to awaken our love [*‘Dilectio,’ the interior act of charity; cf. **Q(27)**] of God, causes devotion; whereas the consideration of foreign matters that distract the mind from such things is a hindrance to devotion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(3)-RO(2) — Matters concerning the Godhead are, in themselves, the strongest incentive to love [‘dilectio,’ the interior act of charity; cf. **Q(27)**] and consequently to devotion, because God is supremely lovable. Yet such is the weakness of the human mind that it needs a guiding hand, not only to the knowledge, but also to the love of Divine things by means of certain sensible objects known to us. Chief among these is the humanity of Christ, according to the words of the Preface [*Preface for Christmastide], “that through knowing God visibly, we may be caught up to the love of things invisible.” Wherefore matters relating to Christ’s humanity are the chief incentive to devotion, leading us thither as a guiding hand, although devotion itself has for its object matters concerning the Godhead.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(3)-RO(3) — Science and anything else conducive to greatness, is to man an occasion of self-confidence, so that he does not wholly surrender himself to God. The result is that such like things sometimes occasion a hindrance to devotion; while in simple souls and women devotion abounds by repressing pride. If, however, a man perfectly submits to God his science or any other perfection, by this very fact his devotion is increased.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(4)

Whether joy is an effect of devotion?

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that joy is not an effect of devotion. As stated above (**A(3)**, ad 2), Christ’s Passion is the chief incentive to devotion. But the consideration thereof causes an affliction of the soul, according to ^{<289>}Lamentations 3:19, “Remember my poverty... the wormwood and the gall,” which refers to the Passion, and afterwards

(~~281~~Lamentations 3:20) it is said: “I will be mindful and remember, and my soul shall languish within me.” Therefore delight or joy is not the effect of devotion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, devotion consists chiefly in an interior sacrifice of the spirit. But it is written (~~489~~Psalm 50:19): “A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit.” Therefore affliction is the effect of devotion rather than gladness or joy.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, Gregory of Nyssa says (De Homine xii) [*Orat. funebr. de Placilla Imp.] that “just as laughter proceeds from joy, so tears and groans are signs of sorrow.” But devotion makes some people shed tears. Therefore gladness or joy is not the effect of devotion.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, We say in the Collect [*Thursday after fourth Sunday of Lent]: “That we who are punished by fasting may be comforted by a holy devotion.”

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(4) — *I answer that*, The direct and principal effect of devotion is the spiritual joy of the mind, though sorrow is its secondary and indirect effect. For it has been stated (**A(3)**) that devotion is caused by a twofold consideration: chiefly by the consideration of God’s goodness, because this consideration belongs to the term, as it were, of the movement of the will in surrendering itself to God, and the direct result of this consideration is joy, according to ~~470~~Psalm 76:4, “I remembered God, and was delighted”; but accidentally this consideration causes a certain sorrow in those who do not yet enjoy God fully, according to ~~490~~Psalm 41:3, “My soul hath thirsted after the strong living God,” and afterwards it is said (~~490~~Psalm 41:4): “My tears have been my bread,” etc. Secondarily devotion is caused as stated (**A(3)**), by the consideration of one’s own failings; for this consideration regards the term from which man withdraws by the movement of his devout will, in that he trusts not in himself, but subjects himself to God. This consideration has an opposite tendency to the first: for it is of a nature to cause sorrow directly (when one thinks over one’s own failings), and joy accidentally, namely, through hope of the Divine assistance. It is accordingly evident that the first and direct effect of devotion is joy, while the secondary and accidental effect is that “sorrow which is according to God” [*~~401~~2 Corinthians 7:10].

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(4)-RO(1) — In the consideration of Christ's Passion there is something that causes sorrow, namely, the human defect, the removal of which made it necessary for Christ to suffer [* ~~Q25~~ Luke 24:25]; and there is something that causes joy, namely, God's loving-kindness to us in giving us such a deliverance.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(4)-RO(2) — The spirit which on the one hand is afflicted on account of the defects of the present life, on the other hand is rejoiced, by the consideration of God's goodness, and by the hope of the Divine help.

P(2b)-Q(82)-A(4)-RO(3) — Tears are caused not only through sorrow, but also through a certain tenderness of the affections, especially when one considers something that gives joy mixed with pain. Thus men are wont to shed tears through a sentiment of piety, when they recover their children or dear friends, whom they thought to have lost. In this way tears arise from devotion.

QUESTION 83

OF PRAYER

(SEVENTEEN ARTICLES)

We must now consider prayer, under which head there are seventeen points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether prayer is an act of the appetitive or of the cognitive power?
- (2) Whether it is fitting to pray to God?
- (3) Whether prayer is an act of religion?
- (4) Whether we ought to pray to God alone?
- (5) Whether we ought to ask for something definite when we pray?
- (6) Whether we ought to ask for temporal things when we pray?
- (7) Whether we ought to pray for others?
- (8) Whether we ought to pray for our enemies?
- (9) Of the seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer;
- (10) Whether prayer is proper to the rational creature?
- (11) Whether the saints in heaven pray for us?
- (12) Whether prayer should be vocal?
- (13) Whether attention is requisite in prayer?
- (14) Whether prayer should last a long time?
- (15) Whether prayer is meritorious? [*Art. 16]
- (16) Whether sinners impetrate anything from God by praying? [*Art. 15]
- (17) of the different kinds of prayer.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(1)

Whether prayer is an act of the appetitive power?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that prayer is an act of the appetitive power. It belongs to prayer to be heard. Now it is the desire that is heard by God, according to ^{<190B>}Psalm 9:38, “The Lord hath heard the desire of the poor.” Therefore prayer is desire. But desire is an act of the appetitive power: and therefore prayer is also.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iii): “It is useful to begin everything with prayer, because thereby we surrender ourselves to God and unite ourselves to Him.” Now union with God is effected by love which belongs to the appetitive power. Therefore prayer belongs to the appetitive power.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the Philosopher states (De Anima iii, 6) that there are two operations of the intellective part. Of these the first is “the understanding of indivisibles,” by which operation we apprehend what a thing is: while the second is “synthesis” and “analysis,” whereby we apprehend that a thing is or is not. To these a third may be added, namely, “reasoning,” whereby we proceed from the known to the unknown. Now prayer is not reducible to any of these operations. Therefore it is an operation, not of the intellective, but of the appetitive power.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Isidore says (Etym. x) that “to pray is to speak.” Now speech belongs to the intellect. Therefore prayer is an act, not of the appetitive, but of the intellective power.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(1) — *I answer that*, According to Cassiodorus [*Comment. in ^{<198B>}Psalm 38:13] “prayer [oratio] is spoken reason [oris ratio].” Now the speculative and practical reason differ in this, that the speculative merely apprehends its object, whereas the practical reason not only apprehends but causes. Now one thing is the cause of another in two ways: first perfectly, when it necessitates its effect, and this happens when the effect is wholly subject to the power of the cause; secondly imperfectly, by merely disposing to the effect, for the reason that the effect is not wholly subject to the power of the cause. Accordingly in this

way the reason is cause of certain things in two ways: first, by imposing necessity; and in this way it belongs to reason, to command not only the lower powers and the members of the body, but also human subjects, which indeed is done by commanding; secondly, by leading up to the effect, and, in a way, disposing to it, and in this sense the reason asks for something to be done by things not subject to it, whether they be its equals or its superiors. Now both of these, namely, to command and to ask or beseech, imply a certain ordering, seeing that man proposes something to be effected by something else, wherefore they pertain to the reason to which it belongs to set in order. For this reason the Philosopher says (Ethic. i, 13) that the “reason exhorts us to do what is best.”

Now in the present instance we are speaking of prayer [*This last paragraph refers to the Latin word ‘oratio’ [prayer] which originally signified a speech, being derived in the first instance from ‘os,’ ‘oris’ (the mouth).] as signifying a beseeching or petition, in which sense Augustine [*Rabanus, De Univ. vi, 14]: says (De Verb. Dom.) that “prayer is a petition,” and Damascene states (De Fide Orth. iii, 24) that “to pray is to ask becoming things of God.” Accordingly it is evident that prayer, as we speak of it now, is an act of reason.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(1)-RO(1) — The Lord is said to hear the desire of the poor, either because desire is the cause of their petition, since a petition is like the interpreter of a desire, or in order to show how speedily they are heard, since no sooner do the poor desire something than God hears them before they put up a prayer, according to the saying of ~~2561~~ Isaiah 65:24,

“And it shall come to pass, that before they call, I will hear.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(1)-RO(2) — As stated above (**P(1), Q(82), A(4); P(2a), Q(9), A(1)**, ad 3), the will moves the reason to its end: wherefore nothing hinders the act of reason, under the motion of the will, from tending to an end such as charity which is union with God. Now prayer tends to God through being moved by the will of charity, as it were, and this in two ways. First, on the part of the object of our petition, because when we pray we ought principally to ask to be united to God, according to ~~1920~~ Psalm 26:4, “One thing I have asked of the Lord, this will I seek after, that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life.” Secondly, on the part of the petitioner, who ought to approach the person

whom he petitions, either locally, as when he petitions a man, or mentally, as when he petitions God. Hence Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iii) that “when we call upon God in our prayers, we unveil our mind in His presence”: and in the same sense Damascene says (De Fide Orth. iii, 24) that “prayer is the raising up of the mind to God.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(1)-RO(3) — These three acts belong to the speculative reason, but to the practical reason it belongs in addition to cause something by way of command or of petition, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(2)

Whether it is becoming to pray?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that it is unbecoming to pray. Prayer seems to be necessary in order that we may make our needs known to the person to whom we pray. But according to ^{<116>}Matthew 6:32, “Your Father knoweth that you have need of all these things.” Therefore it is not becoming to pray to God.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, by prayer we bend the mind of the person to whom we pray, so that he may do what is asked of him. But God’s mind is unchangeable and inflexible, according to ^{<115>}1 Kings 15:29,

“But the Triumpher in Israel will not spare, and will
not be moved to repentance.”

Therefore it is not fitting that we should pray to God.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it is more liberal to give to one that asks not, than to one who asks because, according to Seneca (De Benefic. ii, 1), “nothing is bought more dearly than what is bought with prayers.” But God is supremely liberal. Therefore it would seem unbecoming to pray to God.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<117>}Luke 18:1):

“We ought always to pray, and not to faint.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Among the ancients there was a threefold error concerning prayer. Some held that human affairs are not

ruled by Divine providence; whence it would follow that it is useless to pray and to worship God at all: of these it is written (~~Malachi~~ Malachi 3:14): “You have said: He laboreth in vain that serveth God.” Another opinion held that all things, even in human affairs, happen of necessity, whether by reason of the unchangeableness of Divine providence, or through the compelling influence of the stars, or on account of the connection of causes: and this opinion also excluded the utility of prayer. There was a third opinion of those who held that human affairs are indeed ruled by Divine providence, and that they do not happen of necessity; yet they deemed the disposition of Divine providence to be changeable, and that it is changed by prayers and other things pertaining to the worship of God. All these opinions were disproved in the **P(1), Q(19), AA(7),8; P(1), Q(22), AA(2),4; P(1), Q(115), A(6); P(1), Q(116)**. Wherefore it behooves us so to account for the utility of prayer as neither to impose necessity on human affairs subject to Divine providence, nor to imply changeableness on the part of the Divine disposition.

In order to throw light on this question we must consider that Divine providence disposes not only what effects shall take place, but also from what causes and in what order these effects shall proceed. Now among other causes human acts are the causes of certain effects. Wherefore it must be that men do certain actions, not that thereby they may change the Divine disposition, but that by those actions they may achieve certain effects according to the order of the Divine disposition: and the same is to be said of natural causes. And so is it with regard to prayer. For we pray not that we may change the Divine disposition, but that we may impetrate that which God has disposed to be fulfilled by our prayers in other words “that by asking, men may deserve to receive what Almighty God from eternity has disposed to give,” as Gregory says (Dial. i, 8)

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(2)-RO(1) — We need to pray to God, not in order to make known to Him our needs or desires but that we ourselves may be reminded of the necessity of having recourse to God’s help in these matters.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(2)-RO(2) — As stated above, our motive in praying is, not Divine disposition, we may change the Divine disposition, but that, by our prayers, we may obtain what God has appointed.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(2)-RO(3) — God bestows many things on us out of His liberality, even without our asking for them: but that He wishes to bestow certain things on us at our asking, is for the sake of our good, namely, that we may acquire confidence in having recourse to God, and that we may recognize in Him the Author of our goods. Hence Chrysostom says [*Implicitly [Hom. ii, de Orat.: Hom. xxx in Genes.]; Cf. Caten. Aur. on Luke 18]: “Think what happiness is granted thee, what honor bestowed on thee, when thou conversest with God in prayer, when thou talkest with Christ, when thou askest what thou wilt, whatever thou desirest.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(3)

Whether prayer is an act of religion?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that prayer is not an act of religion. Since religion is a part of justice, it resides in the will as in its subject. But prayer belongs to the intellective part, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore prayer seems to be an act, not of religion, but of the gift of understanding whereby the mind ascends to God.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, the act of “latria” falls under a necessity of precept. But prayer does not seem to come under a necessity of precept, but to come from the mere will, since it is nothing else than a petition for what we will. Therefore prayer seemingly is not an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, it seems to belong to religion that one “offers worship end ceremonial rites to the Godhead” [*Cicero, Rhet. ii, 53]. But prayer seems not to offer anything to God, but to. ask to obtain something from Him. Therefore prayer is not an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~CHD~~ Psalm 140:2): “Let my prayer be directed as incense in Thy sight”: and a gloss on the passage says that “it was to signify this that under the old Law incense was said to be offered for a sweet smell to the Lord.” Now this belongs to religion. Therefore prayer is an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(81)**, **AA(2),4**), it belongs properly to religion to show honor to God, wherefore all those

things through which reverence is shown to God, belong to religion. Now man shows reverence to God by means of prayer, in so far as he subjects himself to Him, and by praying confesses that he needs Him as the Author of his goods. Hence it is evident that prayer is properly an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(3)-RO(1) — The will moves the other powers of the soul to its end, as stated above (**Q(82)**, **A(1)**, ad 1), and therefore religion, which is in the will, directs the acts of the other powers to the reverence of God. Now among the other powers of the soul the intellect is the highest, and the nearest to the will; and consequently after devotion which belongs to the will, prayer which belongs to the intellective part is the chief of the acts of religion, since by it religion directs man's intellect to God.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(3)-RO(2) — It is a matter of precept not only that we should ask for what we desire, but also that we should desire aright. But to desire comes under a precept of charity, whereas to ask comes under a precept of religion, which precept is expressed in ~~400~~ Matthew 7:7, where it is said: "Ask and ye shall receive" [*Vulg.: 'Ask and it shall be given you.'].]

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(3)-RO(3) — By praying man surrenders his mind to God, since he subjects it to Him with reverence and, so to speak, presents it to Him, as appears from the words of Dionysius quoted above (**A(1)**, **O(2)**). Wherefore just as the human mind excels exterior things, whether bodily members, or those external things that are employed for God's service, so too, prayer surpasses other acts of religion.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(4)

Whether we ought to pray to God alone?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that we ought to pray to God alone. Prayer is an act of religion, as stated above (**A(3)**). But God alone is to be worshiped by religion. Therefore we should pray to God alone.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, it is useless to pray to one who is ignorant of the prayer. But it belongs to God alone to know one's prayer, both because frequently prayer is uttered by an interior act which God alone knows, rather than by words, according to the saying of the Apostle

(~~4445~~ 1 Corinthians 14:15), “I will pray with the spirit, I will pray also with the understanding”: and again because, as Augustine says (De Cura pro mortuis xiii) the “dead, even the saints, know not what the living, even their own children, are doing.” Therefore we ought to pray to God alone.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, if we pray to any of the saints, this is only because they are united to God. Now some yet living in this world, or even some who are in Purgatory, are closely united to God by grace, and yet we do not pray to them. Therefore neither should we pray to the saints who are in Paradise.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~8881~~ Job 5:1),

“Call... if there be any that will answer thee,
and turn to some of the saints.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Prayer is offered to a person in two ways: first, as to be fulfilled by him, secondly, as to be obtained through him. In the first way we offer prayer to God alone, since all our prayers ought to be directed to the acquisition of grace and glory, which God alone gives, according to ~~4982~~ Psalm 83:12, “The Lord will give grace and glory.” But in the second way we pray to the saints, whether angels or men, not that God may through them know our petitions, but that our prayers may be effective through their prayers and merits. Hence it is written (Apoc. 8:4) that “the smoke of the incense,” namely “the prayers of the saints ascended up before God.” This is also clear from the very style employed by the Church in praying: since we beseech the Blessed Trinity “to have mercy on us,” while we ask any of the saints “to pray for us.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(4)-RO(1) — To Him alone do we offer religious worship when praying, from Whom we seek to obtain what we pray for, because by so doing we confess that He is the Author of our goods: but not to those whom we call upon as our advocates in God’s presence.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(4)-RO(2) — The dead, if we consider their natural condition, do not know what takes place in this world, especially the interior movements of the heart. Nevertheless, according to Gregory (Moral. xii, 21), whatever it is fitting the blessed should know about what happens to us, even as regards the interior movements of the heart, is made known to them in the Word: and it is most becoming to their exalted

position that they should know the petitions we make to them by word or thought; and consequently the petitions which we raise to them are known to them through Divine manifestation.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(4)-RO(3) — Those who are in this world or in Purgatory, do not yet enjoy the vision of the Word, so as to be able to know what we think or say. Wherefore we do not seek their assistance by praying to them, but ask it of the living by speaking to them.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(5)

*Whether we ought to ask for something
definite when we pray?*

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that we ought not to ask for anything definite when we pray to God. According to Damascene (De Fide Orth. iii, 24), “to pray is to ask becoming things of God”; wherefore it is useless to pray for what is inexpedient, according to ~~SCOT~~ James 4:3, “You ask, and receive not: because you ask amiss.” Now according to ~~SCOT~~ Romans 8:26, “we know not what we should pray for as we ought.” Therefore we ought not to ask for anything definite when we pray.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, those who ask another person for something definite strive to incline his will to do what they wish themselves. But we ought not to endeavor to make God will what we will; *on the contrary*, we ought to strive to will what He wills, according to a gloss on ~~SCOT~~ Psalm 32:1, “Rejoice in the Lord, O ye just.” Therefore we ought not to ask God for anything definite when we pray.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, evil things are not to be sought from God; and as to good things, God Himself invites us to take them. Now it is useless to ask a person to give you what he invites you to take. Therefore we ought not to ask God for anything definite in our prayers.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, our Lord (Matthew 6 and Luke 11) taught His disciples to ask definitely for those things which are contained in the petitions of the Lord’s Prayer.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(5) — *I answer that*, According to Valerius Maximus [*Fact. et Dict. Memor. vii, 2], “Socrates deemed that we should ask the immortal gods for nothing else but that they should grant us good things, because they at any rate know what is good for each one whereas when we pray we frequently ask for what it had been better for us not to obtain.” This opinion is true to a certain extent, as to those things which may have an evil result, and which man may use ill or well, such as “riches, by which,” as stated by the same authority (Fact. et Dict. Memor. vii, 2), “many have come to an evil end; honors, which have ruined many; power, of which we frequently witness the unhappy results; splendid marriages, which sometimes bring about the total wreck of a family.” Nevertheless there are certain goods which man cannot ill use, because they cannot have an evil result. Such are those which are the object of beatitude and whereby we merit it: and these the saints seek absolutely when they pray, as in ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 79:4, “Show us Thy face, and we shall be saved,” and again in ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 118:35, “Lead me into the path of Thy commandments.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(5)-RO(1) — Although man cannot by himself know what he ought to pray for, “the Spirit,” as stated in the same passage, “helpeth our infirmity,” since by inspiring us with holy desires, He makes us ask for what is right. Hence our Lord said (~~John~~ John 4:24) that true adorers “must adore... in spirit and in truth.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(5)-RO(2) — When in our prayers we ask for things concerning our salvation, we conform our will to God’s, of Whom it is written (~~1 Timothy~~ 1 Timothy 2:4) that “He will have all men to be saved.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(5)-RO(3) — God so invites us to take good things, that we may approach to them not by the steps of the body, but by pious desires and devout prayers.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(6)

***Whether man ought to ask God
for temporal things when he prays?***

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that man ought not to ask God for temporal things when he prays. We seek what we ask for in prayer.

But we should not seek for temporal things, for it is written (⁴¹⁶⁵ Matthew 6:33):

“Seek ye... first the kingdom of God, and His justice: and all these things shall be added unto you,”

that is to say, temporal things, which, says He, we are not to seek, but they will be added to what we seek. Therefore temporal things are not to be asked of God in prayer.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, no one asks save for that which he is solicitous about. Now we ought not to have solicitude for temporal things, according to the saying of ⁴¹⁶⁵ Matthew 6:25, “Be not solicitous for your life, what you shall eat.” Therefore we ought not to ask for temporal things when we pray.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, by prayer our mind should be raised up to God. But by asking for temporal things, it descends to things beneath it, against the saying of the Apostle (⁴¹⁶⁸ 2 Corinthians 4:18),

“While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen. For the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal.”

Therefore man ought not to ask God for temporal things when he prays.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(6)-O(4) — Further, man ought not to ask of God other than good and useful things. But sometimes temporal things, when we have them, are harmful, not only in a spiritual sense, but also in a material sense. Therefore we should not ask God for them in our prayers.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, It is written (⁴¹⁶⁹ Proverbs 30:8): “Give me only the necessities of life.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(6) — *I answer that*, As Augustine says (ad Probam, de orando Deum, Ep. cxxx, 12): “It is lawful to pray for what it is lawful to desire.” Now it is lawful to desire temporal things, not indeed principally, by placing our end therein, but as helps whereby we are assisted in tending towards beatitude, in so far, to wit, as they are the means of supporting the life of the body, and are of service to us as instruments in performing acts of virtue, as also the Philosopher states (Ethic. i, 8). Augustine too

says the same to Proba (ad Probam, de orando Deum, Ep. cxxx, 6,7) when he states that “it is not unbecoming for anyone to desire enough for a livelihood, and no more; for this sufficiency is desired, not for its own sake, but for the welfare of the body, or that we should desire to be clothed in a way befitting one’s station, so as not to be out of keeping with those among whom we have to live. Accordingly we ought to pray that we may keep these things if we have them, and if we have them not, that we may gain possession of them.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(6)-RO(1) — We should seek temporal things not in the first but in the second place. Hence Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 16): “When He says that this” (i.e. the kingdom of God) “is to be sought first, He implies that the other” (i.e. temporal goods) “is to be sought afterwards, not in time but in importance, this as being our good, the other as our need.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(6)-RO(2) — Not all solicitude about temporal things is forbidden, but that which is superfluous and inordinate, as stated above (**Q(55), A(6)**).

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(6)-RO(3) — When our mind is intent on temporal things in order that it may rest in them, it remains immersed therein; but when it is intent on them in relation to the acquisition of beatitude, it is not lowered by them, but raises them to a higher level.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(6)-RO(4) — From the very fact that we ask for temporal things not as the principal object of our petition, but as subordinate to something else, we ask God for them in the sense that they may be granted to us in so far as they are expedient for salvation.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(7)

Whether we ought to pray for others?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that we ought not to pray for others. In praying we ought to conform to the pattern given by our Lord. Now in the Lord’s Prayer we make petitions for ourselves, not for others; thus we say: “Give us this day our daily bread,” etc. Therefore we should not pray for others.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, prayer is offered that it may be heard. Now one of the conditions required for prayer that it may be heard is that one pray for oneself, wherefore Augustine in commenting on ⁴¹⁶³John 16:23, “If you ask the Father anything in My name He will give it you,” says (Tract. cii): “Everyone is heard when he prays for himself, not when he prays for all; wherefore He does not say simply ‘He will give it,’ but ‘He will give it you.’ “Therefore it would seem that we ought not to pray for others, but only for ourselves.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, we are forbidden to pray for others, if they are wicked, according to ³¹⁷⁶Jeremiah 7:16,

“Therefore do not then pray for this people... and do not
withstand Me, for I will not hear thee.”

On the other hand we are not bound to pray for the good, since they are heard when they pray for themselves. Therefore it would seem that we ought not to pray for others.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written (⁵¹⁵⁶James 5:16):

“Pray one for another, that you may be saved.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(7) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(6)**), when we pray we ought to ask for what we ought to desire. Now we ought to desire good things not only for ourselves, but also for others: for this is essential to the love which we owe to our neighbor, as stated above (**Q(25)**, **AA(1),12**; **Q(27)**, **A(2)**; **Q(31)**, **A(1)**). Therefore charity requires us to pray for others. Hence Chrysostom says (Hom. xiv in Matth.) [^{*}Opus Imperfectum, falsely ascribed to St. John Chrysostom]: “Necessity binds us to pray for ourselves, fraternal charity urges us to pray for others: and the prayer that fraternal charity proffers is sweeter to God than that which is the outcome of necessity.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(7)-RO(1) — As Cyprian says (De orat. Dom.), “We say ‘Our Father’ and not ‘My Father,’ ‘Give us’ and not ‘Give me,’ because the Master of unity did not wish us to pray privately, that is for ourselves alone, for He wished each one to pray for all, even as He Himself bore all in one.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(7)-RO(2) — It is a condition of prayer that one pray for oneself: not as though it were necessary in order that prayer be meritorious, but as being necessary in order that prayer may not fail in its effect of impetration. For it sometimes happens that we pray for another with piety and perseverance, and ask for things relating to his salvation, and yet it is not granted on account of some obstacle on the part of the person we are praying for, according to ^{<1841>}Jeremiah 15:1,

“If Moses and Samuel shall stand before Me, My soul is not
towards this people.”

And yet the prayer will be meritorious for the person who prays thus out of charity, according to ^{<1843>}Psalms 34:13,

“My prayer shall be turned into my bosom, i.e. though it profit
them not, I am not deprived of my reward,”

as the gloss expounds it.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(7)-RO(3) — We ought to pray even for sinners, that they may be converted, and for the just that they may persevere and advance in holiness. Yet those who pray are heard not for all sinners but for some: since they are heard for the predestined, but not for those who are foreknown to death; even as the correction whereby we correct the brethren, has an effect in the predestined but not in the reprobate, according to ^{<2074>}Ecclesiastes 7:14, “No man can correct whom God hath despised.” Hence it is written (^{<1516>}1 John 5:16):

“He that knoweth his brother to sin a sin which is not to death, let
him ask, and life shall be given to him, who sinneth not to death.”

Now just as the benefit of correction must not be refused to any man so long as he lives here below, because we cannot distinguish the predestined from the reprobate, as Augustine says (*De Correp. et Grat.* xv), so too no man should be denied the help of prayer.

We ought also to pray for the just for three reasons: First, because the prayers of a multitude are more easily heard, wherefore a gloss on ^{<1815>}Romans 15:30, “Help me in your prayers,” says: “The Apostle rightly tells the lesser brethren to pray for him, for many lesser ones, if they be united together in one mind, become great, and it is impossible for the

prayers of a multitude not to obtain” that which is possible to be obtained by prayer. Secondly, that many may thank God for the graces conferred on the just, which graces conduce to the profit of many, according to the Apostle (^{<4011>}2 Corinthians 1:11). Thirdly, that the more perfect may not wax proud, seeing that they find that they need the prayers of the less perfect.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(8)

Whether we ought to pray for our enemies?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that we ought not to pray for our enemies. According to ^{<5124>}Romans 15:4, “what things soever were written, were written for our learning.” Now Holy Writ contains many imprecations against enemies; thus it is written (^{<4061>}Psalm 6:11):

“Let all my enemies be ashamed and be... troubled, let them be ashamed and be troubled very speedily [*Vulg.: ‘Let them be turned back and be ashamed.’].”

Therefore we too should pray against rather than for our enemies.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, to be revenged on one’s enemies is harmful to them. But holy men seek vengeance of their enemies according to Apoc. 6:10, “How long... dost Thou not... revenge our blood on them that dwell on earth?” Wherefore they rejoice in being revenged on their enemies, according to ^{<4571>}Psalm 57:11, “The just shall rejoice when he shall see the revenge.” Therefore we should not pray for our enemies, but against them.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, man’s deed should not be contrary to his prayer. Now sometimes men lawfully attack their enemies, else all wars would be unlawful, which is opposed to what we have said above (**Q(40), A(1)**). Therefore we should not pray for our enemies.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<4154>}Matthew 5:44):

“Pray for them that persecute and calumniate you.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(8) — *I answer that*, To pray for another is an act of charity, as stated above (**A(7)**). Wherefore we are bound to pray for our enemies in the same manner as we are bound to love them. Now it was explained above in the treatise on charity (**Q(25)**, **AA(8),9**), how we are bound to love our enemies, namely, that we must love in them their nature, not their sin. and that to love our enemies in general is a matter of precept, while to love them in the individual is not a matter of precept, except in the preparedness of the mind, so that a man must be prepared to love his enemy even in the individual and to help him in a case of necessity, or if his enemy should beg his forgiveness. But to love one's enemies absolutely in the individual, and to assist them, is an act of perfection.

In like manner it is a matter of obligation that we should not exclude our enemies from the general prayers which we offer up for others: but it is a matter of perfection, and not of obligation, to pray for them individually, except in certain special cases.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(8)-RO(1) — The imprecations contained in Holy Writ may be understood in four ways. First, according to the custom of the prophets “to foretell the future under the veil of an imprecation,” as Augustine states [**De Serm. Dom. in Monte i*, 21]. Secondly, in the sense that certain temporal evils are sometimes inflicted by God on the wicked for their correction. Thirdly, because they are understood to be pronounced, not against the men themselves, but against the kingdom of sin, with the purpose, to wit, of destroying sin by the correction of men. Fourthly, by way of conformity of our will to the Divine justice with regard to the damnation of those who are obstinate in sin.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(8)-RO(2) — As Augustine states in the same book (*De Serm. Dom. in Monte i*, 22), “the martyrs’ vengeance is the overthrow of the kingdom of sin, because they suffered so much while it reigned”: or as he says again (*QQ. Vet. et Nov. Test. lxxviii*), “their prayer for vengeance is expressed not in words but in their minds, even as the blood of Abel cried from the earth.” They rejoice in vengeance not for its own sake, but for the sake of Divine justice.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(8)-RO(3) — It is lawful to attack one's enemies, that they may be restrained from sin: and this is for their own good and for the good of others. Consequently it is even lawful in praying to ask that temporal

evils be inflicted on our enemies in order that they may mend their ways. Thus prayer and deed will not be contrary to one another.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9)

Whether the seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer are fittingly assigned?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that the seven petitions of the Lord's Prayer are not fittingly assigned. It is useless to ask for that to be hallowed which is always holy. But the name of God is always holy, according to ^{<114>}Luke 1:49, "Holy is His name." Again, His kingdom is everlasting, according to ^{<114>}Psalm 144:13, "Thy kingdom is a kingdom of all ages." Again, God's will is always fulfilled, according to ^{<240>}Isaiah 46:10, "All My will shall be done." Therefore it is useless to ask for "the name of God to be hallowed," for "His kingdom to come," and for "His will to be done."

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, one must withdraw from evil before attaining good. Therefore it seems unfitting for the petitions relating to the attainment of good to be set forth before those relating to the removal of evil.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, one asks for a thing that it may be given to one. Now the chief gift of God is the Holy Ghost, and those gifts that we receive through Him. Therefore the petitions seem to be unfittingly assigned, since they do not correspond to the gifts of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9)-O(4) — Further, according to Luke, only five petitions are mentioned in the Lord's Prayer, as appears from the eleventh chapter. Therefore it was superfluous for Matthew to mention seven.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9)-O(5) — Further, it seems useless to seek to win the benevolence of one who forestalls us by his benevolence. Now God forestalls us by His benevolence, since "He first hath loved us" (^{<114>}1 John 4:19). Therefore it is useless to preface the petitions with the words our "Father Who art in heaven," which seem to indicate a desire to win God's benevolence.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, The authority of Christ, who composed this prayer, suffices.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9) — *I answer that*, The Lord's Prayer is most perfect, because, as Augustine says (ad Probam Ep. cxxx, 12), "if we pray rightly and fittingly, we can say nothing else but what is contained in this prayer of our Lord." For since prayer interprets our desires, as it were, before God, then alone is it right to ask for something in our prayers when it is right that we should desire it. Now in the Lord's Prayer not only do we ask for all that we may rightly desire, but also in the order wherein we ought to desire them, so that this prayer not only teaches us to ask, but also directs all our affections. Thus it is evident that the first thing to be the object of our desire is the end, and afterwards whatever is directed to the end. Now our end is God towards Whom our affections tend in two ways: first, by our willing the glory of God, secondly, by willing to enjoy His glory. The first belongs to the love whereby we love God in Himself, while the second belongs to the love whereby we love ourselves in God. Wherefore the first petition is expressed thus: "Hallowed be Thy name," and the second thus: "Thy kingdom come," by which we ask to come to the glory of His kingdom.

To this same end a thing directs us in two ways: in one way, by its very nature, in another way, accidentally. Of its very nature the good which is useful for an end directs us to that end. Now a thing is useful in two ways to that end which is beatitude: in one way, directly and principally, according to the merit whereby we merit beatitude by obeying God, and in this respect we ask: "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven"; in another way instrumentally, and as it were helping us to merit, and in this respect we say: "Give us this day our daily bread," whether we understand this of the sacramental Bread, the daily use of which is profitable to man, and in which all the other sacraments are contained, or of the bread of the body, so that it denotes all sufficiency of food, as Augustine says (ad Probam, Ep. cxxx, 11), since the Eucharist is the chief sacrament, and bread is the chief food: thus in the Gospel of Matthew we read, "supersubstantial," i.e. "principal," as Jerome expounds it.

We are directed to beatitude accidentally by the removal of obstacles. Now there are three obstacles to our attainment of beatitude. First, there is sin,

which directly excludes a man from the kingdom, according to ~~4103~~1 Corinthians 6:9,10, “Neither fornicators, nor idolaters, etc., shall possess the kingdom of God”; and to this refer the words, “Forgive us our trespasses.” Secondly, there is temptation which hinders us from keeping God’s will, and to this we refer when we say: “And lead us not into temptation,” whereby we do not ask not to be tempted, but not to be conquered by temptation, which is to be led into temptation. Thirdly, there is the present penal state which is a kind of obstacle to a sufficiency of life, and to this we refer in the words, “Deliver us from evil.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9)-RO(1) — As Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 5), when we say, “Hallowed be Thy name, we do not mean that God’s name is not holy, but we ask that men may treat it as a holy thing,” and this pertains to the diffusion of God’s glory among men. When we say, “Thy kingdom come, we do not imply that God is not reigning now,” but “we excite in ourselves the desire for that kingdom, that it may come to us, and that we may reign therein,” as Augustine says (ad Probam, Ep. cxxx, 11). The words, “Thy will be done rightly signify, ‘May Thy commandments be obeyed’ on earth as in heaven, i.e. by men as well as by angels” (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 6). Hence these three petitions will be perfectly fulfilled in the life to come; while the other four, according to Augustine (Enchiridion cxv), belong to the needs of the present life

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9)-RO(2) — Since prayer is the interpreter of desire, the order of the petitions corresponds with the order, not of execution, but of desire or intention, where the end precedes the things that are directed to the end, and attainment of good precedes removal of evil.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9)-RO(3) — Augustine (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 11) adapts the seven petitions to the gifts and beatitudes. He says: “If it is fear God whereby blessed are the poor in spirit, let us ask that God’s name be hallowed among men with a chaste fear. If it is piety whereby blessed are the meek, let us ask that His kingdom may come, so that we become meek and no longer resist Him. If it is knowledge whereby blessed are they that mourn, let us pray that His will be done, for thus we shall mourn no more. If it is fortitude whereby blessed are they that hunger, let us pray that our daily bread be given to us. If it is counsel whereby blessed are the merciful, let us forgive the trespasses of others that our own may be forgiven. If it is

understanding whereby blessed are the pure in heart, let us pray lest we have a double heart by seeking after worldly things which ere the occasion of our temptations. If it is wisdom whereby blessed are the peacemakers for they shall be called the children of God, let us pray to be delivered from evil: for if we be delivered we shall by that very fact become the free children of God.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9)-RO(4) — According to Augustine (Enchiridion cxvi), “Luke included not seven but five petitions in the Lord’s Prayer, for by omitting it, he shows that the third petition is a kind of repetition of the two that precede, and thus helps us to understand it”; because, to wit, the will of God tends chiefly to this — that we come to the knowledge of His holiness and to reign together with Him. Again the last petition mentioned by Matthew, “Deliver us from evil,” is omitted by Luke, so that each one may know himself to be delivered from evil if he be not led into temptation.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(9)-RO(5) — Prayer is offered up to God, not that we may bend Him, but that we may excite in ourselves the confidence to ask: which confidence is excited in us chiefly by the consideration of His charity in our regard, whereby he wills our good — wherefore we say: “Our Father”; and of His excellence, whereby He is able to fulfil it — wherefore we say: “Who art in heaven.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(10)

Whether prayer is proper to the rational creature?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that prayer is not proper to the rational creature. Asking and receiving apparently belong to the same subject. But receiving is becoming also to uncreated Persons, viz. the Son and Holy Ghost. Therefore it is competent to them to pray: for the Son said (⁴¹⁴⁶ John 14:16): “I will ask My [Vulg.: ‘the’] Father,” and the Apostle says of the Holy Ghost (⁴¹⁸⁵ Romans 8:26): “The Spirit... asketh for us.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(10)-O(2) — Angels are above rational creatures, since they are intellectual substances. Now prayer is becoming to the angels,

wherefore we read in the ~~99th~~ Psalm 96:7: “Adore Him, all you His angels.” Therefore prayer is not proper to the rational creature.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, the same subject is fitted to pray as is fitted to call upon God, since this consists chiefly in prayer. But dumb animals are fitted to call upon God, according to ~~99th~~ Psalm 146:9,

“Who giveth to beasts their food and to the
young ravens that call upon Him.”

Therefore prayer is not proper to the rational creatures.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, Prayer is an act of reason, as stated above (**A(1)**). But the rational creature is so called from his reason. Therefore prayer is proper to the rational creature.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(10) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**) prayer is an act of reason, and consists in beseeching a superior; just as command is an act of reason, whereby an inferior is directed to something. Accordingly prayer is properly competent to one to whom it is competent to have reason, and a superior whom he may beseech. Now nothing is above the Divine Persons; and dumb animals are devoid of reason. Therefore prayer is unbecoming both the Divine Persons and dumb animals, and it is proper to the rational creature.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(10)-RO(1) — Receiving belongs to the Divine Persons in respect of their nature, whereas prayer belongs to one who receives through grace. The Son is said to ask or pray in respect of His assumed, i.e. His human, nature and not in respect of His Godhead: and the Holy Ghost is said to ask, because He makes us ask.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(10)-RO(2) — As stated in the **P(1)**, **Q(79)**, **A(8)**, intellect and reason are not distinct powers in us: but they differ as the perfect from the imperfect. Hence intellectual creatures which are the angels are distinct from rational creatures, and sometimes are included under them. In this sense prayer is said to be proper to the rational creature.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(10)-RO(3) — The young ravens are said to call upon God, on account of the natural desire whereby all things, each in its own way, desire to attain the Divine goodness. Thus too dumb animals are said to

obey God, on account of the natural instinct whereby they are moved by God.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11)

Whether the saints in heaven pray for us?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11)-O(1) — It would seem that the saints in heaven do not pray for us. A man's action is more meritorious for himself than for others. But the saints in heaven do not merit for themselves, neither do they pray for themselves, since they are already established in the term. Neither therefore do they pray for us.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11)-O(2) — Further, the saints conform their will to God perfectly, so that they will only what God wills. Now what God wills is always fulfilled. Therefore it would be useless for the saints to pray for us.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11)-O(3) — Further, just as the saints in heaven are above, so are those in Purgatory, for they can no longer sin. Now those in Purgatory do not pray for us, on the contrary we pray for them. Therefore neither do the saints in heaven pray for us.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11)-O(4) — Further, if the saints in heaven pray for us, the prayers of the higher saints would be more efficacious; and so we ought not to implore the help of the lower saints' prayers but only of those of the higher saints.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11)-O(5) — Further, the soul of Peter is not Peter. If therefore the souls of the saints pray for us, so long as they are separated from their bodies, we ought not to call upon Saint Peter, but on his soul, to pray for us: yet the Church does the contrary. The saints therefore do not pray for us, at least before the resurrection.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11) — *On the contrary*, It is written (2 Macc. 15:14): "This is... he that prayeth much for the people, and for all the holy city, Jeremias the prophet of God."

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11) — *I answer that*, As Jerome says (Cont. Vigilant. 6), the error of Vigilantius consisted in saying that "while we live, we can pray one for another; but that after we are dead, none of our prayers for

others can be heard, seeing that not even the martyrs' prayers are granted when they pray for their blood to be avenged." But this is absolutely false, because, since prayers offered for others proceed from charity, as stated above (**AA(7),8**), the greater the charity of the saints in heaven, the more they pray for wayfarers, since the latter can be helped by prayers: and the more closely they are united to God, the more are their prayers efficacious: for the Divine order is such that lower beings receive an overflow of the excellence of the higher, even as the air receives the brightness of the sun. Wherefore it is said of Christ (³⁰⁷²Hebrews 7:25): "Going to God by His own power... to make intercession for us" [*Vulg.: 'He is able to save for ever them that come to God by Him, always living to make intercession for us.']. Hence Jerome says (Cont. Vigilant. 6): "If the apostles and martyrs while yet in the body and having to be solicitous for themselves, can pray for others, how much more now that they have the crown of victory and triumph."

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11)-RO(1) — The saints in heaven, since they are blessed, have no lack of bliss, save that of the body's glory, and for this they pray. But they pray for us who lack the ultimate perfection of bliss: and their prayers are efficacious in impetrating through their previous merits and through God's acceptance.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11)-RO(2) — The saints impetrate what ever God wishes to take place through their prayers: and they pray for that which they deem will be granted through their prayers according to God's will.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11)-RO(3) — Those who are in Purgatory though they are above us on account of their impeccability, yet they are below us as to the pains which they suffer: and in this respect they are not in a condition to pray, but rather in a condition that requires us to pray for them.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11)-RO(4) — It is God's will that inferior beings should be helped by all those that are above them, wherefore we ought to pray not only to the higher but also to the lower saints; else we should have to implore the mercy of God alone. Nevertheless it happens sometime that prayers addressed to a saint of lower degree are more efficacious, either because he is implored with greater devotion, or because God wishes to make known his sanctity.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(11)-RO(5) — It is because the saints while living merited to pray for us, that we invoke them under the names by which they were known in this life, and by which they are better known to us: and also in order to indicate our belief in the resurrection, according to the saying of ~~Exo~~ Exodus 3:6, “I am the God of Abraham,” etc.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(12)

Whether prayer should be vocal?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(12)-O(1) — It would seem that prayer ought not to be vocal. As stated above (**A(4)**), prayer is addressed chiefly to God. Now God knows the language of the heart. Therefore it is useless to employ vocal prayer.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(12)-O(2) — Further, prayer should lift man’s mind to God, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 2). But words, like other sensible objects, prevent man from ascending to God by contemplation. Therefore we should not use words in our prayers.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(12)-O(3) — Further, prayer should be offered to God in secret, according to ~~Mat~~ Matthew 6:6,

“But thou, when thou shalt pray, enter into thy chamber, and having shut the door, pray to thy Father in secret.

But prayer loses its secrecy by being expressed vocally. Therefore prayer should not be vocal.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(12) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~Psa~~ Psalm 141:2):

“I cried to the Lord with my voice, with my voice I made supplication to the Lord.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(12) — *I answer that*, Prayer is twofold, common and individual. Common prayer is that which is offered to God by the ministers of the Church representing the body of the faithful: wherefore such like prayer should come to the knowledge of the whole people for whom it is offered: and this would not be possible unless it were vocal prayer. Therefore it is reasonably ordained that the ministers of the

Church should say these prayers even in a loud voice, so that they may come to the knowledge of all.

On the other hand individual prayer is that which is offered by any single person, whether he pray for himself or for others; and it is not essential to such a prayer as this that it be vocal. And yet the voice is employed in such like prayers for three reasons. First, in order to excite interior devotion, whereby the mind of the person praying is raised to God, because by means of external signs, whether of words or of deeds, the human mind is moved as regards apprehension, and consequently also as regards the affections. Hence Augustine says (ad Probam. Ep. cxxx, 9) that “by means of words and other signs we arouse ourselves more effectively to an increase of holy desires.” Hence then alone should we use words and such like signs when they help to excite the mind internally. But if they distract or in any way impede the mind we should abstain from them; and this happens chiefly to those whose mind is sufficiently prepared for devotion without having recourse to those signs. Wherefore the Psalmist (^{<2016>}Psalm 26:8) said: “My heart hath said to Thee: ‘My face hath sought Thee,’“ and we read of Anna (^{<1013>}1 Kings 1:13) that “she spoke in her heart.” Secondly, the voice is used in praying as though to pay a debt, so that man may serve God with all that he has from God, that is to say, not only with his mind, but also with his body: and this applies to prayer considered especially as satisfactory. Hence it is written (^{<2340>}Hosea 14:3): “Take away all iniquity, and receive the good: and we will render the calves of our lips.” Thirdly, we have recourse to vocal prayer, through a certain overflow from the soul into the body, through excess of feeling, according to ^{<2150>}Psalm 15:9, “My heart hath been glad, and my tongue hath rejoiced.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(12)-RO(1) — Vocal prayer is employed, not in order to tell God something He does not know, but in order to lift up the mind of the person praying or of other persons to God.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(12)-RO(2) — Words about other matters distract the mind and hinder the devotion of those who pray: but words signifying some object of devotion lift up the mind, especially one that is less devout.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(12)-RO(3) — As Chrysostom says [*Hom. xiii in the Opus Imperfectum falsely ascribed to St. John Chrysostom], “Our Lord

forbids one to pray in presence of others in order that one may be seen by others. Hence when you pray, do nothing strange to draw men's attention, either by shouting so as to be heard by others, or by openly striking the heart, or extending the hands, so as to be seen by many. And yet, "according to Augustine (De Serm. Dom. in Monte ii, 3), "it is not wrong to be seen by men, but to do this or that in order to be seen by men."

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(13)

Whether attention is a necessary condition of prayer?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(13)-O(1) — It would seem that attention is a necessary condition of prayer. It is written (^{<1901>}John 4:24): "God is a spirit, and they that adore Him must adore Him in spirit and in truth." But prayer is not in spirit unless it be attentive. Therefore attention is a necessary condition of prayer.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(13)-O(2) — Further, prayer is "the ascent of the mind to God" [*Damascene, De Fide Orth. iii, 24]. But the mind does not ascend to God if the prayer is inattentive. Therefore attention is a necessary condition of prayer.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(13)-O(3) — Further, it is a necessary condition of prayer that it should be altogether sinless. Now if a man allows his mind to wander while praying he is not free of sin, for he seems to make light of God; even as if he were to speak to another man without attending to what he was saying. Hence Basil says [*De Constit. Monach. i] that the "Divine assistance is to be implored, not lightly, nor with a mind wandering hither and thither: because he that prays thus not only will not obtain what he asks, nay rather will he provoke God to anger." Therefore it would seem a necessary condition of prayer that it should be attentive.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(13) — *On the contrary*, Even holy men sometimes suffer from a wandering of the mind when they pray, according to ^{<1901>}Psalms 39:13, "My heart hath forsaken me."

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(13) — *I answer that*, This question applies chiefly to vocal prayer. Accordingly we must observe that a thing is necessary in two ways. First, a thing is necessary because thereby the end is better

obtained: and thus attention is absolutely necessary for prayer. Secondly, a thing is said to be necessary when without it something cannot obtain its effect. Now the effect of prayer is threefold. The first is an effect which is common to all acts quickened by charity, and this is merit. In order to realize this effect, it is not necessary that prayer should be attentive throughout; because the force of the original intention with which one sets about praying renders the whole prayer meritorious, as is the case with other meritorious acts. The second effect of prayer is proper thereto, and consists in impetration: and again the original intention, to which God looks chiefly, suffices to obtain this effect. But if the original intention is lacking, prayer lacks both merit and impetration: because, as Gregory [*Hugh St. Victor, *Expos. in Reg. S. Aug.* iii] says, “God hears not the prayer of those who pay no attention to their prayer.” The third effect of prayer is that which it produces at once; this is the spiritual refreshment of the mind, and for this effect attention is a necessary condition: wherefore it is written (~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 14:14):

“If I pray in a tongue... my understanding is without fruit.”

It must be observed, however, that there are three kinds of attention that can be brought to vocal prayer: one which attends to the words, lest we say them wrong, another which attends to the sense of the words, and a third, which attends to the end of prayer, namely, God, and to the thing we are praying for. That last kind of attention is most necessary, and even idiots are capable of it. Moreover this attention, whereby the mind is fixed on God, is sometimes so strong that the mind forgets all other things, as Hugh of St. Victor states [**De Modo Orandi* ii].

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(13)-RO(1) — To pray in spirit and in truth is to set about praying through the instigation of the Spirit, even though afterwards the mind wander through weakness.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(13)-RO(2) — The human mind is unable to remain aloft for long on account of the weakness of nature, because human weakness weighs down the soul to the level of inferior things: and hence it is that when, while praying, the mind ascends to God by contemplation, of a sudden it wanders off through weakness.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(13)-RO(3) — Purposely to allow one's mind to wander in prayer is sinful and hinders the prayer from having fruit. It is against this that Augustine says in his Rule (Ep. ccxi): "When you pray God with psalms and hymns, let your mind attend to that which your lips pronounce." But to wander in mind unintentionally does not deprive prayer of its fruit. Hence Basil says (De Constit. Monach. i): "If you are so truly weakened by sin that you are unable to pray attentively, strive as much as you can to curb yourself, and God will pardon you, seeing that you are unable to stand in His presence in a becoming manner, not through negligence but through frailty."

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(14)

Whether prayer should last a long time?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(14)-O(1) — It would seem that prayer should not be continual. It is written (^{<408>}Matthew 6:7): "When you are praying, speak not much." Now one who prays a long time needs to speak much, especially if his be vocal prayer. Therefore prayer should not last a long time.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(14)-O(2) — Further, prayer expresses the desire. Now a desire is all the holier according as it is centered on one thing, according to ^{<409>}Psalms 26:4, "One thing I have asked of the Lord, this will I seek after." Therefore the shorter prayer is, the more is it acceptable to God.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(14)-O(3) — Further, it seems to be wrong to transgress the limits fixed by God, especially in matters concerning Divine worship, according to ^{<410>}Exodus 19:21:

"Charge the people, lest they should have a mind to pass the limits to see the Lord, and a very great multitude of them should perish."

But God has fixed for us the limits of prayer by instituting the Lord's Prayer (^{<411>}Matthew 6). Therefore it is not right to prolong our prayer beyond its limits.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(14)-O(4) — *On the contrary*, It would seem that we ought to pray continually. For our Lord said (^{<412>}Luke 18:1): "We ought always

to pray, and not to faint”: and it is written (~~1~~¹ 1 Thessalonians 5:17):
 “Pray without ceasing.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(14) — *I answer that*, We may speak about prayer in two ways: first, by considering it in itself; secondly, by considering it in its cause. The not cause of prayer is the desire of charity, from which prayer ought to arise: and this desire ought to be in us continually, either actually or virtually, for the virtue of this desire remains in whatever we do out of charity; and we ought to “do all things to the glory of God” (~~1~~¹ 1 Corinthians 10:31). From this point of view prayer ought to be continual: wherefore Augustine says (ad Probam, Ep. cxxx, 9): “Faith, hope and charity are by themselves a prayer of continual longing.” But prayer, considered in itself, cannot be continual, because we have to be busy about other works, and, as Augustine says (ad Probam. Ep. cxxx, 9), “we pray to God with our lips at certain intervals and seasons, in order to admonish ourselves by means of such like signs, to take note of the amount of our progress in that desire, and to arouse ourselves more eagerly to an increase thereof.” Now the quantity of a thing should be commensurate with its end, for instance the quantity of the dose should be commensurate with health. And so it is becoming that prayer should last long enough to arouse the fervor of the interior desire: and when it exceeds this measure, so that it cannot be continued any longer without causing weariness, it should be discontinued. Wherefore Augustine says (ad Probam. Ep. cxxx): “It is said that the brethren in Egypt make frequent but very short prayers, rapid ejaculations, as it were, lest that vigilant and erect attention which is so necessary in prayer slacken and languish, through the strain being prolonged. By so doing they make it sufficiently clear not only that this attention must not be forced if we are unable to keep it up, but also that if we are able to continue, it should not be broken off too soon.” And just as we must judge of this in private prayers by considering the attention of the person praying, so too, in public prayers we must judge of it by considering the devotion of the people.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(14)-RO(1) — As Augustine says (ad Probam. Ep. cxxx), “to pray with many words is not the same as to pray long; to speak long is one thing, to be devout long is another. For it is written that our Lord passed the whole night in prayer, and that He ‘prayed the longer’ in order to set us an example.” Further on he says: “When praying say little, yet

pray much so long as your attention is fervent. For to say much in prayer is to discuss your need in too many words: whereas to pray much is to knock at the door of Him we pray, by the continuous and devout clamor of the heart. Indeed this business is frequently done with groans rather than with words, with tears rather than with speech.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(14)-RO(2) — Length of prayer consists, not in praying for many things, but in the affections persisting in the desire of one thing.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(14)-RO(3) — Our Lord instituted this prayer, not that we might use no other words when we pray, but that in our prayers we might have none but these things in view, no matter how we express them or think of them.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(14)-RO(4) — One may pray continually, either through having a continual desire, as stated above; or through praying at certain fixed times, though interruptedly; or by reason of the effect, whether in the person who prays — because he remains more devout even after praying, or in some other person — as when by his kindness a man incites another to pray for him, even after he himself has ceased praying.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(15)

Whether prayer is meritorious?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(15)-O(1) — It would seem that prayer is not meritorious. All merit proceeds from grace. But prayer precedes grace, since even grace is obtained by means of prayer according to ^{<4113>}Luke 11:13, “(How much more) will your Father from heaven give the good Spirit to them that ask Him!” Therefore prayer is not a meritorious act.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(15)-O(2) — Further, if prayer merits anything, this would seem to be chiefly that which is besought in prayer. Yet it does not always merit this, because even the saints’ prayers are frequently not heard; thus Paul was not heard when he besought the sting of the flesh to be removed from him. Therefore prayer is not a meritorious act.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(15)-O(3) — Further, prayer is based chiefly on faith, according to ^{<3006>}James 1:6, “But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering.”

Now faith is not sufficient for merit, as instanced in those who have lifeless faith. Therefore prayer is not a meritorious act.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(15) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on the words of ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 34:13, “My prayer shall be turned into my bosom,” explains them as meaning, “if my prayer does not profit them, yet shall not I be deprived of my reward.” Now reward is not due save to merit. Therefore prayer is meritorious.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(15) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(13)**) prayer, besides causing spiritual consolation at the time of praying, has a twofold efficacy in respect of a future effect, namely, efficacy in meriting and efficacy in impetrating. Now prayer, like any other virtuous act, is efficacious in meriting, because it proceeds from charity as its root, the proper object of which is the eternal good that we merit to enjoy. Yet prayer proceeds from charity through the medium of religion, of which prayer is an act, as stated above (**A(3)**), and with the concurrence of other virtues requisite for the goodness of prayer, viz. humility and faith. For the offering of prayer itself to God belongs to religion, while the desire for the thing. that we pray to be accomplished belongs to charity. Faith is necessary in reference to God to Whom we pray; that is, we need to believe that we can obtain from Him what we seek. Humility is necessary on the part of the person praying, because he recognizes his neediness. Devotion too is necessary: but this belongs to religion, for it is its first act and a necessary condition of all its secondary acts, as stated above (**Q(82), AA(1),2**).

As to its efficacy in impetrating, prayer derives this from the grace of God to Whom we pray, and Who instigates us to pray. Wherefore Augustine says (De Verb. Dom., Sermon. cv, 1): “He would not urge us to ask, unless He were willing to give”; and Chrysostom [*Cf. Catena Aurea of St. Thomas on Luke 18. The words as quoted are not to be found in the words of Chrysostom] says: “He never refuses to grant our prayers, since in His loving-kindness He urged us not to faint in praying.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(15)-RO(1) — Neither prayer nor any other virtuous act is meritorious without sanctifying grace. And yet even that prayer which impetrates sanctifying grace proceeds from some grace, as from a

gratuitous gift, since the very act of praying is “a gift of God,” as Augustine states (*De Persever.* xxiii).

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(15)-RO(2) — Sometimes the merit of prayer regards chiefly something distinct from the object of one’s petition. For the chief object of merit is beatitude, whereas the direct object of the petition of prayer extends sometimes to certain other things, as stated above (**AA(6),7**). Accordingly if this other thing that we ask for ourselves be not useful for our beatitude, we do not merit it; and sometimes by asking for and desiring such things we lose merit for instance if we ask of God the accomplishment of some sin, which would be an impious prayer. And sometimes it is not necessary for salvation, nor yet manifestly contrary thereto; and then although he who prays may merit eternal life by praying, yet he does not merit to obtain what he asks for. Hence Augustine says (*Liber. Sentent. Prosperi sent. ccxii*): “He who faithfully prays God for the necessities of this life, is both mercifully heard, and mercifully not heard. For the physician knows better than the sick man what is good for the disease.” For this reason, too, Paul was not heard when he prayed for the removal of the sting in his flesh, because this was not expedient. If, however, we pray for something that is useful for our beatitude, through being conducive to salvation, we merit it not only by praying, but also by doing other good deeds: therefore without any doubt we receive what we ask for, yet when we ought to receive it: “since certain things are not denied us, but are deferred that they may be granted at a suitable time,” according to Augustine (*Tract. cii in Joan.*): and again this may be hindered if we persevere not in asking for it. Wherefore Basil says (*De Constit. Monast. i*): “The reason why sometimes thou hast asked and not received, is because thou hast asked amiss, either inconsistently, or lightly, or because thou hast asked for what was not good for thee, or because thou hast ceased asking.” Since, however, a man cannot condignly merit eternal life for another, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(114), A(6)**), it follows that sometimes one cannot condignly merit for another things that pertain to eternal life. For this reason we are not always heard when we pray for others, as stated above (**A(7)**, ad 2,3). Hence it is that four conditions are laid down; namely, to ask — “for ourselves — things necessary for salvation — piously — perseveringly”; when all these four concur, we always obtain what we ask for.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(15)-RO(3) — Prayer depends chiefly on faith, not for its efficacy in meriting, because thus it depends chiefly on charity, but for its efficacy in impetrating, because it is through faith that man comes to know of God's omnipotence and mercy, which are the source whence prayer impetrates what it asks for.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(16)

Whether sinners impetrate anything from God by their prayers?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(16)-O(1) — It would seem that sinners impetrate nothing from God by their prayers. It is written (^{<1828}John 9:31): "We know that God doth not hear sinners"; and this agrees with the saying of ^{<1829}Proverbs 28:9,

"He that turneth away his ears from hearing the law, his prayer
shall be an abomination."

Now an abominable prayer impetrates nothing from God. Therefore sinners impetrate nothing from God.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(16)-O(2) — Further, the just impetrate from God what they merit, as stated above (**A(15)**, ad 2). But sinners cannot merit anything since they lack grace and charity which is the "power of godliness," according to a gloss on ^{<1825}2 Timothy 3:5, "Having an appearance indeed of godliness, but denying the power thereof." and so their prayer is impious, and yet piety it required in order that prayer may be impetrative, as stated above (**A(15)**, ad 2). Therefore sinners impetrate nothing by their prayers.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(16)-O(3) — Further, Chrysostom [*Hom. xiv in the Opus Imperfectum falsely ascribed to St. John Chrysostom] says: "The Father is unwilling to hear the prayer which the Son has not inspired." Now in the prayer inspired by Christ we say: "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us": and sinners do not fulfil this. Therefore either they lie in saying this, and so are unworthy to be heard, or, if they do not say it, they are not heard, because they do not observe the form of prayer instituted by Christ.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(16) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (Tract. xlv, super Joan.): “If God were not to hear sinners, the publican would have vainly said: Lord, be merciful to me a sinner”; and Chrysostom [*Hom. xviii of the same Opus Imperfectum] says: “Everyone that asketh shall receive, that is to say whether he be righteous or sinful.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(16) — *I answer that*, In the sinner, two things are to be considered: his nature which God loves, and the sin which He hates. Accordingly when a sinner prays for something as sinner, i.e. in accordance with a sinful desire, God hears him not through mercy but sometimes through vengeance when He allows the sinner to fall yet deeper into sin. For “God refuses in mercy what He grants in anger,” as Augustine declares (Tract. lxxiii in Joan.). On the other hand God hears the sinner’s prayer if it proceed from a good natural desire, not out of justice, because the sinner does not merit to be heard, but out of pure mercy [*Cf. **A(15)**, ad 1], provided however he fulfil the four conditions given above, namely, that he beseech for himself things necessary for salvation, piously and perseveringly.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(16)-RO(1) — As Augustine states (Tract. xlv super Joan.), these words were spoken by the blind man before being anointed, i.e. perfectly enlightened, and consequently lack authority. And yet there is truth in the saying if it refers to a sinner as such, in which sense also the sinner’s prayer is said to be an abomination.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(16)-RO(2) — There can be no godliness in the sinner’s prayer as though his prayer were quickened by a habit of virtue: and yet his prayer may be godly in so far as he asks for something pertaining to godliness. Even so a man who has not the habit of justice is able to will something just, as stated above (**Q(59)**, **A(2)**). And though his prayer is not meritorious, it can be impetrative, because merit depends on justice, whereas impetration rests on grace.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(16)-RO(3) — As stated above (**A(7)**, ad 1) the Lord’s Prayer is pronounced in the common person of the whole Church: and so if anyone say the Lord’s Prayer while unwilling to forgive his neighbor’s trespasses, he lies not, although his words do not apply to him personally: for they are true as referred to the person of the Church, from which he is excluded by merit, and consequently he is deprived of the fruit of his

prayer. Sometimes, however, a sinner is prepared to forgive those who have trespassed against him, wherefore his prayers are heard, according to Eccus. 28:2, “Forgive thy neighbor if he hath hurt thee, and then shall thy sins be forgiven to thee when thou prayest.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(17)

Whether the parts of prayer are fittingly described as supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings?

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(17)-O(1) — It would seem that the parts of prayer are unfittingly described as supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings. Supplication would seem to be a kind of adjuration. Yet, according to Origen (Super Matth. Tract. xxxv), “a man who wishes to live according to the gospel need not adjure another, for if it be unlawful to swear, it is also unlawful to adjure.” Therefore supplication is unfittingly reckoned a part of prayer.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(17)-O(2) — Further, according to Damascene (De Fide Orth. iii, 24), “to pray is to ask becoming things of God.” Therefore it is unfitting to distinguish “prayers” from “intercessions.”

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(17)-O(3) — Further, thanksgivings regard the past, while the others regard the future. But the past precedes the future. Therefore thanksgivings are unfittingly placed after the others.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(17) — *On the contrary*, suffices the authority of the Apostle (^{scrip}1 Timothy 2:1).

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(17) — *I answer that*, Three conditions are requisite for prayer. First, that the person who prays should approach God Whom he prays: this is signified in the word “prayer,” because prayer is “the raising up of one’s mind to God.” The second is that there should be a petition, and this is signified in the word “intercession.” In this case sometimes one asks for something definite, and then some say it is “intercession” properly so called, or we may ask for some thing indefinitely, for instance to be helped by God, or we may simply indicate a fact, as in ^{scrip}John 11:3, “Behold, he whom Thou lovest is sick,” and then they call it “insinuation.” The third condition is the reason for impetrating what we ask for: and this

either on the part of God, or on the part of the person who asks. The reason of impetration on the part of God is His sanctity, on account of which we ask to be heard, according to ~~2007~~ Daniel 9:17,18, “For Thy own sake, incline, O God, Thy ear”; and to this pertains “supplication” [obsecratio] which means a pleading through sacred things, as when we say, “Through Thy nativity, deliver us, O Lord.” The reason for impetration on the part of the person who asks is “thanksgiving”; since “through giving thanks for benefits received we merit to receive yet greater benefits,” as we say in the collect [*Ember Friday in September and Postcommunion of the common of a Confessor Bishop]. Hence a gloss on ~~2001~~ 1 Timothy 2:1 says that “in the Mass, the consecration is preceded by supplication,” in which certain sacred things are called to mind; that “prayers are in the consecration itself,” in which especially the mind should be raised up to God; and that “intercessions are in the petitions that follow, and thanksgivings at the end.”

We may notice these four things in several of the Church’s collects. Thus in the collect of Trinity Sunday the words, “Almighty eternal God” belong to the offering up of prayer to God; the words, “Who hast given to Thy servants,” etc. belong to thanksgiving; the words, “grant, we beseech Thee,” belong to intercession; and the words at the end, “Through Our Lord,” etc. belong to supplication.

In the “Conferences of the Fathers” (ix, cap. 11, seqq.) we read: “Supplication is bewailing one’s sins; prayer is vowing something to God; intercession is praying for others; thanksgiving is offered by the mind to God in ineffable ecstasy.” The first explanation, however, is the better.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(17)-RO(1) — “Supplication” is an adjuration not for the purpose of compelling, for this is forbidden, but in order to implore mercy.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(17)-RO(2) — “Prayer” in the general sense includes all the things mentioned here; but when distinguished from the others it denotes properly the ascent to God.

P(2b)-Q(83)-A(17)-RO(3) — Among things that are diverse the past precedes the future; but the one and same thing is future before it is past. Hence thanksgiving for other benefits precedes intercession: but one and the same benefit is first sought, and finally, when it has been received, we

give thanks for it. Intercession is preceded by prayer whereby we approach Him of Whom we ask: and prayer is preceded by supplication, whereby through the consideration of God's goodness we dare approach Him.

EXTERIOR ACTS OF RELIGION

QUESTIONS 84-91

THE SERVICE OF THE BODY

QUESTION 84

OF ADORATION

(THREE ARTICLES)

In due sequence we must consider the external acts of latria, and in the first place, adoration whereby one uses one's body to reverence God; secondly, those acts whereby some external thing is offered to God; thirdly, those acts whereby something belonging to God is assumed.

Under the first head there are three points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether adoration is an act of latria?
- (2) Whether adoration denotes an internal or an external act?
- (3) Whether adoration requires a definite place?

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(1)

Whether adoration is an act of latria or religion?

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that adoration is not an act of latria or religion. The worship of religion is due to God alone. But adoration is not due to God alone: since we read (^{<118P>}Genesis 18:2) that Abraham adored the angels; and (^{<1102>}1 Kings 1:23) that the prophet Nathan, when he was come in to king David, “worshiped him bowing down to the ground.” Therefore adoration is not an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the worship of religion is due to God as the object of beatitude, according to Augustine (De Civ. Dei x, 3): whereas adoration is due to Him by reason of His majesty, since a gloss on ~~Exod~~ Psalm 28:2, “Adore ye the Lord in His holy court,” says: “We pass from these courts into the court where we adore His majesty.” Therefore adoration is not an act of latria.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the worship of one same religion is due to the three Persons. But we do not adore the three Persons with one adoration, for we genuflect at each separate invocation of Them [*At the adoration of the Cross, on Good Friday]. Therefore adoration is not an act of latria.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, are the words quoted ~~Exod~~ Matthew 4:10:

“The Lord thy God shalt thou adore and Him
only shalt thou serve.”

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Adoration is directed to the reverence of the person adored. Now it is evident from what we have said (**Q(81)**, **AA(2),4**) that it is proper to religion to show reverence to God. Hence the adoration whereby we adore God is an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(1)-RO(1) — Reverence is due to God on account of His excellence, which is communicated to certain creatures not in equal measure, but according to a measure of proportion; and so the reverence which we pay to God, and which belongs to latria, differs from the reverence which we pay to certain excellent creatures; this belongs to dulia, and we shall speak of it further on (**Q(103)**). And since external actions are signs of internal reverence, certain external tokens significative of reverence are offered to creatures of excellence, and among these tokens the chief is adoration: yet there is one thing which is offered to God alone, and that is sacrifice. Hence Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x, 4): “Many tokens of Divine worship are employed in doing honor to men, either through excessive humility, or through pernicious flattery; yet so that those to whom these honors are given are recognized as being men to whom we owe esteem and reverence and even adoration if they be far above us. But who ever thought it his duty to sacrifice to any other than one whom he either

knew or deemed or pretended to be a God?” Accordingly it was with the reverence due to an excellent creature that Nathan adored David; while it was the reverence due to God with which Mardochai refused to adore Aman fearing “lest he should transfer the honor of his God to a man” (Esther 13:14).

Again with the reverence due to an excellent creature Abraham adored the angels, as did also Josue (^{<0685>}Joshua 5:15): though we may understand them to have adored, with the adoration of latria, God Who appeared and spoke to them in the guise of an angel. It was with the reverence due to God that John was forbidden to adore the angel (^{<629>}Revelation 22:9), both to indicate the dignity which he had acquired through Christ, whereby man is made equal to an angel: wherefore the same text goes on: “I am thy fellow-servant and of thy brethren”; as also to exclude any occasion of idolatry, wherefore the text continues: “Adore God.”

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(1)-RO(2) — Every Divine excellency is included in His majesty: to which it pertains that we should be made happy in Him as in the sovereign good.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(1)-RO(3) — Since there is one excellence of the three Divine Persons, one honor and reverence is due to them and consequently one adoration. It is to represent this that where it is related (^{<0182>}Genesis 18:2) that three men appeared to Abraham, we are told that he addressed one, saying: “Lord, if I have found favor in thy sight,” etc. The triple genuflection represents the Trinity of Persons, not a difference of adoration.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(2)

Whether adoration denotes an action of the body?

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that adoration does not denote an act of the body. It is written (^{<0023>}John 4:23): “The true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth.” Now what is done in spirit has nothing to do with an act of the body. Therefore adoration does not denote an act of the body.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the word adoration is taken from “oratio” [prayer]. But prayer consists chiefly in an interior act, according to ⁴⁴⁵1 Corinthians 14:15, “I will pray with the spirit, I will pray also with the understanding.” Therefore adoration denotes chiefly a spiritual act.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, acts of the body pertain to sensible knowledge: whereas we approach God not by bodily but by spiritual sense. Therefore adoration does not denote an act of the body.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on ¹²¹⁵Exodus 20:5, “Thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them,” says: “Thou shalt neither worship them in mind, nor adore them outwardly.”

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As Damascene says (De Fide Orth. iv, 12), since we are composed of a twofold nature, intellectual and sensible, we offer God a twofold adoration; namely, a spiritual adoration, consisting in the internal devotion of the mind; and a bodily adoration, which consists in an exterior humbling of the body. And since in all acts of latria that which is without is referred to that which is within as being of greater import, it follows that exterior adoration is offered on account of interior adoration, in other words we exhibit signs of humility in our bodies in order to incite our affections to submit to God, since it is connatural to us to proceed from the sensible to the intelligible.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(2)-RO(1) — Even bodily adoration is done in spirit, in so far as it proceeds from and is directed to spiritual devotion.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(2)-RO(2) — Just as prayer is primarily in the mind, and secondarily expressed in words, as stated above (**Q(83), A(12)**), so too adoration consists chiefly in an interior reverence of God, but secondarily in certain bodily signs of humility; thus when we genuflect we signify our weakness in comparison with God, and when we prostrate ourselves we profess that we are nothing of ourselves.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(2)-RO(3) — Though we cannot reach God with the senses, our mind is urged by sensible signs to approach God.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(3)

Whether adoration requires a definite place?

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that adoration does not require a definite place. It is written (^{<400>}John 4:21):

“The hour cometh, when you shall neither on this mountain, nor in
Jerusalem, adore the Father”;

and the same reason seems to apply to other places. Therefore a definite place is not necessary for adoration.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, exterior adoration is directed to interior adoration. But interior adoration is shown to God as existing everywhere. Therefore exterior adoration does not require a definite place.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the same God is adored in the New as in the Old Testament. Now in the Old Testament they adored towards the west, because the door of the Tabernacle looked to the east (^{<123>}Exodus 26:18 seqq.). Therefore for the same reason we ought now to adore towards the west, if any definite place be requisite for adoration.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<251>}Isaiah 56:7): “My house shall be called the house of prayer,” which words are also quoted (^{<416>}John 2:16).

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (A(2)), the chief part of adoration is the internal devotion of the mind, while the secondary part is something external pertaining to bodily signs. Now the mind internally apprehends God as not comprised in a place; while bodily signs must of necessity be in some definite place and position. Hence a definite place is required for adoration, not chiefly, as though it were essential thereto, but by reason of a certain fittingness, like other bodily signs.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(3)-RO(1) — By these words our Lord foretold the cessation of adoration, both according to the rite of the Jews who adored in Jerusalem, and according to the rite of the Samaritans who adored on Mount Garizim. For both these rites ceased with the advent of the

spiritual truth of the Gospel, according to which “a sacrifice is offered to God in every place,” as stated in ^{<3011>}Malachi 1:11.

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(3)-RO(2) — A definite place is chosen for adoration, not on account of God Who is adored, as though He were enclosed in a place, but on account of the adorers; and this for three reasons. First, because the place is consecrated, so that those who pray there conceive a greater devotion and are more likely to be heard, as may be seen in the prayer of Solomon (^{<1001>}1 Kings 8). Secondly, on account of the sacred mysteries and other signs of holiness contained therein. Thirdly, on account of the concourse of many adorers, by reason of which their prayer is more likely to be heard, according to ^{<1001>}Matthew 18:20, “Where there are two or three gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.”

P(2b)-Q(84)-A(3)-RO(3) — There is a certain fittingness in adoring towards the east. First, because the Divine majesty is indicated in the movement of the heavens which is from the east. Secondly, because Paradise was situated in the east according to the Septuagint version of ^{<1001>}Genesis 2:8, and so we signify our desire to return to Paradise. Thirdly, on account of Christ Who is “the light of the world” [^{<1001>}*^{<1001>}John 8:12; ^{<1001>}9:5], and is called “the Orient” (^{<1001>}Zechariah 6:12). Who mounteth above the heaven of heavens to the east (^{<1001>}Psalm 67:34), and is expected to come from the east, according to ^{<1001>}Matthew 24:27, “As lightning cometh out of the east, and appeareth even into the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be.”

SERVICE BY GIFT

QUESTIONS 85-87

QUESTION 85

OF SACRIFICE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

In due sequence we must consider those acts whereby external things are offered to God. These give rise to a twofold consideration:

- (1) Of things given to God by the faithful;
- (2) Of vows, whereby something is promised to Him.

Under the first head we shall consider sacrifices, oblations, first-fruits, and tithes. About sacrifices there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether offering a sacrifice to God is of the law of nature?
- (2) Whether sacrifice should be offered to God alone?
- (3) Whether the offering of a sacrifice is a special act of virtue?
- (4) Whether all are bound to offer sacrifice?

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(1)

Whether offering a sacrifice to God is of the law of nature?

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that offering a sacrifice to God is not of the natural law. Things that are of the natural law are common among all men. Yet this is not the case with sacrifices: for we read of some, e.g. Melchisedech (^{CHRS}Genesis 14:18), offering bread and wine in sacrifice, and of certain animals being offered by some, and others by others. Therefore the offering of sacrifices is not of the natural law.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, things that are of the natural law were observed by all just men. Yet we do not read that Isaac offered sacrifice; nor that Adam did so, of whom nevertheless it is written (Wis. 10:2) that wisdom “brought him out of his sin.” Therefore the offering of sacrifice is not of the natural law.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x, 5,19) that sacrifices are offered in signification of something. Now words which are chief among signs, as he again says (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 3), “signify, not by nature but by convention,” according to the Philosopher (Peri Herm. i, 2). Therefore sacrifices are not of the natural law.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, At all times and among all nations there has always been the offering of sacrifices. Now that which is observed by all is seemingly natural. Therefore the offering of sacrifices is of the natural law.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Natural reason tells man that he is subject to a higher being, on account of the defects which he perceives in himself, and in which he needs help and direction from someone above him: and whatever this superior being may be, it is known to all under the name of God. Now just as in natural things the lower are naturally subject to the higher, so too it is a dictate of natural reason in accordance with man’s natural inclination that he should tender submission and honor, according to his mode, to that which is above man. Now the mode befitting to man is that he should employ sensible signs in order to signify anything, because he derives his knowledge from sensibles. Hence it is a dictate of natural reason that man should use certain sensibles, by offering them to God in sign of the subjection and honor due to Him, like those who make certain offerings to their lord in recognition of his authority. Now this is what we mean by a sacrifice, and consequently the offering of sacrifice is of the natural law.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(1)-RO(1) — As stated above (**P(2a), Q(95), A(2)**), certain things belong generically to the natural law, while their determination belongs to the positive law; thus the natural law requires that evildoers should be punished; but that this or that punishment should be inflicted on them is a matter determined by God or by man. In like manner the offering of sacrifice belongs generically to the natural law, and consequently all are

agreed on this point, but the determination of sacrifices is established by God or by man, and this is the reason for their difference.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(1)-RO(2) — Adam, Isaac and other just men offered sacrifice to God in a manner befitting the times in which they lived, according to Gregory, who says (Moral. iv, 3) that in olden times original sin was remitted through the offering of sacrifices. Nor does Scripture mention all the sacrifices of the just, but only those that have something special connected with them. Perhaps the reason why we read of no sacrifice being offered by Adam may be that, as the origin of sin is ascribed to him, the origin of sanctification ought not to be represented as typified in him. Isaac was a type of Christ, being himself offered in sacrifice; and so there was no need that he should be represented as offering a sacrifice.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(1)-RO(3) — It is natural to man to express his ideas by signs, but the determination of those signs depends on man's pleasure.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(2)

Whether sacrifice should be offered to God alone?

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that sacrifice should not be offered to the most high God alone. Since sacrifice ought to be offered to God, it would seem that it ought to be offered to all such as are partakers of the Godhead. Now holy men are made "partakers of the Divine nature," according to ~~800b~~ 2 Peter 1:4; wherefore of them is it written (~~890b~~ Psalm 81:6): "I have said, You are gods": and angels too are called "sons of God," according to ~~800b~~ Job 1:6. Thus sacrifice should be offered to all these.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the greater a person is the greater the honor due to him from man. Now the angels and saints are far greater than any earthly princes: and yet the subjects of the latter pay them much greater honor, by prostrating before them, and offering them gifts, than is implied by offering an animal or any other thing in sacrifice. Much more therefore may one offer sacrifice to the angels and saints.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, temples and altars are raised for the offering of sacrifices. Yet temples and altars are raised to angels and saints. Therefore sacrifices also may be offered to them.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (¹²²¹Exodus 22:20):

“He that sacrificeth to gods shall be put to death,
save only to the Lord.”

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), a sacrifice is offered in order that something may be represented. Now the sacrifice that is offered outwardly represents the inward spiritual sacrifice, whereby the soul offers itself to God according to ¹²⁰⁹Psalm 50:19, “A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit,” since, as stated above (**Q(81)**, **A(7)**; **Q(84)**, **A(2)**), the outward acts of religion are directed to the inward acts. Again the soul offers itself in sacrifice to God as its beginning by creation, and its end by beatification: and according to the true faith God alone is the creator of our souls, as stated in the **P(1)**, **Q(90)**, **A(3)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(118)**, **A(2)**, while in Him alone the beatitude of our soul consists, as stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(1)**, **A(8)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(2)**, **A(8)**; **P(2a)**, **Q(3)**, **AA(1),7,8**). Wherefore just as to God alone ought we to offer spiritual sacrifice, so too ought we to offer outward sacrifices to Him alone: even so “in our prayers and praises we proffer significant words to Him to Whom in our hearts we offer the things which we designate thereby,” as Augustine states (De Civ. Dei x, 19). Moreover we find that in every country the people are wont to show the sovereign ruler some special sign of honor, and that if this be shown to anyone else, it is a crime of high-treason. Therefore, in the Divine law, the death punishment is assigned to those who offer Divine honor to another than God.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(2)-RO(1) — The name of the Godhead is communicated to certain ones, not equally with God, but by participation; hence neither is equal honor due to them.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(2)-RO(2) — The offering of a sacrifice is measured not by the value of the animal killed, but by its signification, for it is done in honor of the sovereign Ruler of the whole universe. Wherefore, as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x, 19), “the demons rejoice, not in the stench of corpses, but in receiving divine honors.”

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(2)-RO(3) — As Augustine says (De Civ. Dei viii, 19), “we do not raise temples and priesthoods to the martyrs, because not they but their God is our God. Wherefore the priest says not: I offer sacrifice to

thee, Peter or Paul. But we give thanks to God for their triumphs, and urge ourselves to imitate them.”

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(3)

Whether the offering of sacrifice is a special act of virtue?

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that the offering of sacrifice is not a special act of virtue. Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x, 6): “A true sacrifice is any work done that we may cleave to God in holy fellowship.” But not every good work is a special act of some definite virtue. Therefore the offering of sacrifice is not a special act of a definite virtue.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, the mortification of the body by fasting belongs to abstinence, by continence belongs to chastity, by martyrdom belongs to fortitude. Now all these things seem to be comprised in the offering of sacrifice, according to ~~611~~ Romans 12:1, “Present your bodies a living sacrifice.” Again the Apostle says (~~583~~ Hebrews 13:16):

“Do not forget to do good and to impart, for by such sacrifices
God’s favor is obtained.”

Now it belongs to charity, mercy and liberality to do good and to impart. Therefore the offering of sacrifice is not a special act of a definite virtue.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, a sacrifice is apparently anything offered to God. Now many things are offered to God, such as devotion, prayer, tithes, first-fruits, oblations, and holocausts. Therefore sacrifice does not appear to be a special act of a definite virtue.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, The law contains special precepts about sacrifices, as appears from the beginning of Leviticus.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(2a), Q(18), AA(6),7**), where an act of one virtue is directed to the end of another virtue it partakes somewhat of its species; thus when a man thieves in order to commit fornication, his theft assumes, in a sense, the deformity of fornication, so that even though it were not a sin otherwise, it would be a sin from the very fact that it was directed to fornication. Accordingly,

sacrifice is a special act deserving of praise in that it is done out of reverence for God; and for this reason it belongs to a definite virtue, viz. religion. But it happens that the acts of the other virtues are directed to the reverence of God, as when a man gives alms of his own things for God's sake, or when a man subjects his own body to some affliction out of reverence for God; and in this way the acts also of other virtues may be called sacrifices. On the other hand there are acts that are not deserving of praise save through being done out of reverence for God: such acts are properly called sacrifices, and belong to the virtue of religion.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(3)-RO(1) — The very fact that we wish to cling to God in a spiritual fellowship pertains to reverence for God: and consequently the act of any virtue assumes the character of a sacrifice through being done in order that we may cling to God in holy fellowship.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(3)-RO(2) — Man's good is threefold. There is first his soul's good which is offered to God in a certain inward sacrifice by devotion, prayer and other like interior acts: and this is the principal sacrifice. The second is his body's good, which is, so to speak, offered to God in martyrdom, and abstinence or continency. The third is the good which consists of external things: and of these we offer a sacrifice to God, directly when we offer our possession to God immediately, and indirectly when we share them with our neighbor for God's sake.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(3)-RO(3) — A "sacrifice," properly speaking, requires that something be done to the thing which is offered to God, for instance animals were slain and burnt, the bread is broken, eaten, blessed. The very word signifies this, since "sacrifice" is so called because a man does something sacred [facit sacrum]. On the other hand an "oblation" is properly the offering of something to God even if nothing be done thereto, thus we speak of offering money or bread at the altar, and yet nothing is done to them. Hence every sacrifice is an oblation, but not conversely. "First-fruits" are oblations, because they were offered to God, according to ~~Deuteronomy~~ Deuteronomy 26, but they are not a sacrifice, because nothing sacred was done to them. "Tithes," however, are neither a sacrifice nor an oblation, properly speaking, because they are not offered immediately to God, but to the ministers of Divine worship.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(4)

Whether all are bound to offer sacrifices?

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that all are not bound to offer sacrifices. The Apostle says (~~cf.~~ Romans 3:19): “What things soever the Law speaketh, it speaketh to them that are in the Law.” Now the law of sacrifices was not given to all, but only to the Hebrew people. Therefore all are not bound to offer sacrifices.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, sacrifices are offered to God in order to signify something. But not everyone is capable of understanding these significations. Therefore not all are bound to offer sacrifices.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, priests [^{*}Sacerdotes]: Those who give or administer sacred things (sacra dantes): cf. ~~cf.~~ 1 Corinthians 4:1] are so called because they offer sacrifice to God. But all are not priests. Therefore not all are bound to offer sacrifices.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The offering of sacrifices of is of the natural law, as stated above (A(1)). Now all are bound to do that which is of the natural law. Therefore all are bound to offer sacrifice to God.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Sacrifice is twofold, as stated above (A(2)). The first and principal is the inward sacrifice, which all are bound to offer, since all are obliged to offer to God a devout mind. The other is the outward sacrifice, and this again is twofold. There is a sacrifice which is deserving of praise merely through being offered to God in protestation of our subjection to God: and the obligation of offering this sacrifice was not the same for those under the New or the Old Law, as for those who were not under the Law. For those who are under the Law are bound to offer certain definite sacrifices according to the precepts of the Law, whereas those who were not under the Law were bound to perform certain outward actions in God’s honor, as became those among whom they dwelt, but not definitely to this or that action. The other outward sacrifice is when the outward actions of the other virtues are performed out of reverence for God; some of which are a matter of precept; and to these all are bound, while others are works of supererogation, and to these all are not bound.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(4)-RO(1) — All were not bound to offer those particular sacrifices which were prescribed in the Law: but they were bound to some sacrifices inward or outward, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(4)-RO(2) — Though all do not know explicitly the power of the sacrifices, they know it implicitly, even as they have implicit faith, as stated above (**Q(2), AA 6,7**).

P(2b)-Q(85)-A(4)-RO(3) — The priests offer those sacrifices which are specially directed to the Divine worship, not only for themselves but also for others. But there are other sacrifices, which anyone can offer to God for himself as explained above (**AA(2),3**).

QUESTION 86

OF OBLATIONS AND FIRST-FRUITS

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must next consider oblations and first-fruits. Under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether any oblations are necessary as a matter of precept?
- (2) To whom are oblations due?
- (3) of what things they should be made?
- (4) In particular, as to first-fruits, whether men are bound to offer them?

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(1)

Whether men are under a necessity of precept to make oblations?

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that men are not bound by precept to make oblations. Men are not bound, at the time of the Gospel, to observe the ceremonial precepts of the Old Law, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(103), AA(3),4**). Now the offering of oblations is one of the ceremonial precepts of the Old Law, since it is written (¹²³⁴Exodus 23:14): “Three times every year you shall celebrate feasts with Me,” and further on (¹²³⁵Exodus 23:15): “Thou shalt not appear empty before Me.” Therefore men are not now under a necessity of precept to make oblations.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, before they are made, oblations depend on man’s will, as appears from our Lord’s saying (⁴¹⁵³Matthew 5:23), “If... thou offer thy gift at the altar,” as though this were left to the choice of the offerer: and when once oblations have been made, there is no way of offering them again. Therefore in no way is a man under a necessity of precept to make oblations.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, if anyone is bound to give a certain thing to the Church, and fails to give it, he can be compelled to do so by being deprived of the Church's sacraments. But it would seem unlawful to refuse the sacraments of the Church to those who refuse to make oblations according to a decree of the sixth council [**Can. Trullan, xxiii*], quoted I, qu. i, can. Nullus: "Let none who dispense Holy Communion exact anything of the recipient, and if they exact anything let them be deposed." Therefore it is not necessary that men should make oblations.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Gregory says [**Gregory VII; Concil. Roman. v, can. xii*]: "Let every Christian take care that he offer something to God at the celebration of Mass."

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(85), A(3)**, ad 3), the term "oblation" is common to all things offered for the Divine worship, so that if a thing be offered to be destroyed in worship of God, as though it were being made into something holy, it is both an oblation and a sacrifice. Wherefore it is written (~~Exod~~ Exodus 29:18):

"Thou shalt offer the whole ram for a burnt-offering upon the altar; it is an oblation to the Lord, a most sweet savor of the victim of the Lord";

and (~~Lev~~ Leviticus 2:1):

"When anyone shall offer an oblation of sacrifice to the Lord, his offering shall be of fine flour."

If, on the other hand, it be offered with a view to its remaining entire and being deputed to the worship of God or to the use of His ministers, it will be an oblation and not a sacrifice. Accordingly it is essential to oblations of this kind that they be offered voluntarily, according to ~~Exod~~ Exodus 25:2, of "every man that offereth of his own accord you shall take them."

Nevertheless it may happen in four ways that one is bound to make oblations. First, on account of a previous agreement: as when a person is granted a portion of Church land, that he may make certain oblations at fixed times, although this has the character of rent. Secondly, by reason of a previous assignment or promise; as when a man offers a gift among the living, or by will bequeaths to the Church something whether movable or immovable to be delivered at some future time. Thirdly, on account of the

need of the Church, for instance if her ministers were without means of support. Fourthly, on account of custom; for the faithful are bound at certain solemn feasts to make certain customary oblations. In the last two cases, however, the oblation remains voluntary, as regards, to wit, the quantity or kind of the thing offered.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(1)-RO(1) — Under the New Law men are not bound to make oblations on account of legal solemnities, as stated in Exodus, but on account of certain other reasons, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(1)-RO(2) — Some are bound to make oblations, both before making them, as in the first, third, and fourth cases, and after they have made them by assignment or promise: for they are bound to offer in reality that which has been already offered to the Church by way of assignment.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(1)-RO(3) — Those who do not make the oblations they are bound to make may be punished by being deprived of the sacraments, not by the priest himself to whom the oblations should be made, lest he seem to exact, something for bestowing the sacraments, but by someone superior to him.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(2)

Whether oblations are due to priests alone?

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that oblations are not due to priests alone. For chief among oblations would seem to be those that are deputed to the sacrifices of victims. Now whatever is given to the poor is called a “victim in Scripture according to ~~Scripture~~ Hebrews 13:16, “Do not forget to do good and to impart, for by such victims [Douay: ‘sacrifices’] God’s favor is obtained. Much more therefore are oblations due to the poor.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, in many parishes monks have a share in the oblations. Now “the case of clerics is distinct from the case of monks,” as Jerome states [*Ep. xiv, ad Heliody]. Therefore oblations are not due to priests alone.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, lay people with the consent of the Church buy oblations such as loaves and so forth, and they do so for no other reason than that they may make use thereof themselves. Therefore oblations may have reference to the laity.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, A canon of Pope Damasus [*Damasus I] quoted X, qu. i [*Can. Hanc consuetudinem], says:

“None but the priests whom day by day we see serving the Lord may eat and drink of the oblations which are offered within the precincts of the Holy Church: because in the Old Testament the Lord forbade the children of Israel to eat the sacred loaves, with the exception of Aaron and his sons” (^{491B}Leviticus 24:8,9).

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(2) — *I answer that*, The priest is appointed mediator and stands, so to speak, “between” the people and God, as we read of Moses (^{491B}Deuteronomy 5:5), wherefore it belongs to him to set forth the Divine teachings and sacraments before the people; and besides to offer to the Lord things appertaining to the people, their prayers, for instance, their sacrifices and oblations. Thus the Apostle says (^{491B}Hebrews 5:1):

“Every high priest taken from among men is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins.”

Hence the oblations which the people offer to God concern the priests, not only as regards their turning them to their own use, but also as regards the faithful dispensation thereof, by spending them partly on things appertaining to the Divine worship, partly on things touching their own livelihood (since they that serve the altar partake with the altar, according to ^{491B}1 Corinthians 9:13), and partly for the good of the poor, who, as far as possible, should be supported from the possessions of the Church: for our Lord had a purse for the use of the poor, as Jerome observes on ^{491B}Matthew 17:26, “That we may not scandalize them.”

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(2)-RO(1) — Whatever is given to the poor is not a sacrifice properly speaking; yet it is called a sacrifice in so far as it is given to them for God’s sake. In like manner, and for the same reason, it can be called an oblation, though not properly speaking, since it is not given immediately to God. Oblations properly so called fall to the use of the

poor, not by the dispensation of the offerers, but by the dispensation of the priests.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(2)-RO(2) — Monks or other religious may receive oblations under three counts. First, as poor, either by the dispensation of the priests, or by ordination of the Church; secondly, through being ministers of the altar, and then they can accept oblations that are freely offered; thirdly, if the parishes belong to them, and they can accept oblations, having a right to them as rectors of the Church.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(2)-RO(3) — Oblations when once they are consecrated, such as sacred vessels and vestments, cannot be granted to the use of the laity: and this is the meaning of the words of Pope Damasus. But those which are unconsecrated may be allowed to the use of layfolk by permission of the priests, whether by way of gift or by way of sale.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(3)

Whether a man may make oblations of whatever he lawfully possesses?

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that a man may not make oblations of whatever he lawfully possesses. According to human law [*Dig. xii, v, de Conduct. ob. turp. vel iniust. caus. 4] “the whore’s is a shameful trade in what she does but not in what she takes,” and consequently what she takes she possesses lawfully. Yet it is not lawful for her to make an oblation with her gains, according to ⁽⁶²⁸⁾Deuteronomy 23:18,

“Thou shalt not offer the hire of a strumpet...
in the house of the Lord thy God.”

Therefore it is not lawful to make an oblation of whatever one possesses lawfully.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, in the same passage it is forbidden to offer “the price of a dog” in the house of God. But it is evident that a man possesses lawfully the price of a dog he has lawfully sold. Therefore it is not lawful to make an oblation of whatever we possess lawfully.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, it is written (^{<3018>}Malachi 1:8): “If you offer the lame and the sick, is it not evil?” Yet an animal though lame or sick is a lawful possession. Therefore it would seem that not of every lawful possession may one make an oblation.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<3018>}Proverbs 3:9): “Honor the Lord with thy substance.” Now whatever a man possesses lawfully belongs to his substance. Therefore he may make oblations of whatever he possesses lawfully.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As Augustine says (De Verb. Dom. Sermon. cxiii), “shouldst thou plunder one weaker than thyself and give some of the spoil to the judge, if he should pronounce in thy favor, such is the force of justice that even thou wouldst not be pleased with him: and if this should not please thee, neither does it please thy God.” Hence it is written (Ecclus. 34:21): “The offering of him that sacrificeth of a thing wrongfully gotten is stained.” Therefore it is evident that an oblation must not be made of things unjustly acquired or possessed. In the Old Law, however, wherein the figure was predominant, certain things were reckoned unclean on account of their signification, and it was forbidden to offer them. But in the New Law all God’s creatures are looked upon as clean, as stated in ^{<3015>}Titus 1:15: and consequently anything that is lawfully possessed, considered in itself, may be offered in oblation. But it may happen accidentally that one may not make an oblation of what one possesses lawfully; for instance if it be detrimental to another person, as in the case of a son who offers to God the means of supporting his father (which our Lord condemns, ^{<3015>}Matthew 15:5), or if it give rise to scandal or contempt, or the like.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(3)-RO(1) — In the Old Law it was forbidden to make an offering of the hire of a strumpet on account of its uncleanness, and in the New Law, on account of scandal, lest the Church seem to favor sin if she accept oblations from the profits of sin.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(3)-RO(2) — According to the Law, a dog was deemed an unclean animal. Yet other unclean animals were redeemed and their price could be offered, according to ^{<3022>}Leviticus 27:27, “If it be an unclean animal, he that offereth it shall redeem it.” But a dog was neither offered nor redeemed, both because idolaters used dogs in sacrifices to their idols,

and because they signify robbery, the proceeds of which cannot be offered in oblation. However, this prohibition ceased under the New Law.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(3)-RO(3) — The oblation of a blind or lame animal was declared unlawful for three reasons. First, on account of the purpose for which it was offered, wherefore it is written (^{<3008>}Malachi 1:8): “If you offer the blind in sacrifice, is it not evil?” and it behooved sacrifices to be without blemish. Secondly, on account of contempt, wherefore the same text goes on (^{<3012>}Malachi 1:12): “You have profaned” My name, “in that you say: The table of the Lord is defiled and that which is laid thereupon is contemptible.” Thirdly, on account of a previous vow, whereby a man has bound himself to offer without blemish whatever he has vowed: hence the same text says further on (^{<3014>}Malachi 1:14):

“Cursed is the deceitful man that hath in his flock a male, and making a vow offereth in sacrifice that which is feeble to the Lord.”

The same reasons avail still in the New Law, but when they do not apply the unlawfulness ceases.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(4)

Whether men are bound to pay first-fruits?

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that men are not bound to pay first-fruits. After giving the law of the first-born the text continues (^{<0139>}Exodus 13:9): “It shall be as a sign in thy hand,” so that, apparently, it is a ceremonial precept. But ceremonial precepts are not to be observed in the New Law. Neither therefore ought first-fruits to be paid.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, first-fruits were offered to the Lord for a special favor conferred on that people, wherefore it is written (^{<0262>}Deuteronomy 26:2,3):

“Thou shalt take the first of all thy fruits... and thou shalt go to the priest that shall be in those days, and say to him: I profess this day before the Lord thy God, that I am come into the land, for which He swore to our fathers, that He would give it us.”

Therefore other nations are not bound to pay first-fruits.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(4)-O(3) — That which one is bound to do should be something definite. But neither in the New Law nor in the Old do we find mention of a definite amount of first-fruits. Therefore one is not bound of necessity to pay them.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is laid down (16, qu. vii, can. Decimas): “We confirm the right of priests to tithes and first-fruits, and everybody must pay them.”

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(4) — *I answer that*, First-fruits are a kind of oblation, because they are offered to God with a certain profession (~~from~~ Deuteronomy 26); where the same passage continues:

“The priest taking the basket containing the first-fruits from the hand of him that bringeth the first-fruits, shall set it before the altar of the Lord thy God,”

and further on (~~from~~ Deuteronomy 26:10) he is commanded to say: “Therefore now I offer the first-fruits of the land, which the Lord hath given me.” Now the first-fruits were offered for a special reason, namely, in recognition of the divine favor, as though man acknowledged that he had received the fruits of the earth from God, and that he ought to offer something to God in return, according to 1 Paral 29:14, “We have given Thee what we received of Thy hand.” And since what we offer God ought to be something special, hence it is that man was commanded to offer God his first-fruits, as being a special part of the fruits of the earth: and since a priest is “ordained for the people “in the things that appertain to God” (~~from~~ Hebrews 5:1), the first-fruits offered by the people were granted to the priest’s use.” Wherefore it is written (~~from~~ Numbers 18:8): “The Lord said to Aaron: Behold I have given thee the charge of My first-fruits.” Now it is a point of natural law that man should make an offering in God’s honor out of the things he has received from God, but that the offering should be made to any particular person, or out of his first-fruits, or in such or such a quantity, was indeed determined in the Old Law by divine command; but in the New Law it is fixed by the declaration of the Church, in virtue of which men are bound to pay first-fruits according to the custom of their country and the needs of the Church’s ministers.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(4)-RO(1) — The ceremonial observances were properly speaking signs of the future, and consequently they ceased when the foreshadowed truth was actually present. But the offering of first-fruits was for a sign of a past favor, whence arises the duty of acknowledgment in accordance with the dictate of natural reason. Hence taken in a general sense this obligation remains.

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(4)-RO(2) — First-fruits were offered in the Old Law, not only on account of the favor of the promised land given by God, but also on account of the favor of the fruits of the earth, which were given by God. Hence it is written (~~GEN~~ Deuteronomy 26:10): “I offer the first-fruits of the land which the Lord hath given me,” which second motive is common among all people. We may also reply that just as God granted the land of promise to the Jews by a special favor, so by a general favor He bestowed the lordship of the earth on the whole of mankind, according to ~~PS~~ Psalm 113:24,

“The earth He has given to the children of men.”

P(2b)-Q(86)-A(4)-RO(3) — As Jerome says [*Comment. in Ezekiel 45:13,14; cf. Cap. Decimam, de Decim. Primit. et Oblat.]: “According to the tradition of the ancients the custom arose for those who had most to give the priests a fortieth part, and those who had least, one sixtieth, in lieu of first-fruits.” Hence it would seem that first-fruits should vary between these limits according to the custom of one’s country. And it was reasonable that the amount of first-fruits should not be fixed by law, since, as stated above, first-fruits are offered by way of oblation, a condition of which is that it should be voluntary.

QUESTION 87

OF TITHES

(FOUR ARTICLES)

Next we must consider tithes, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether men are bound by precept to pay tithes?
- (2) Of what things ought tithes to be paid?
- (3) To whom ought they to be paid?
- (4) Who ought to pay tithes?

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1)

Whether men are bound to pay tithes under a necessity of precept?

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that men are not bound by precept to pay tithes. The commandment to pay tithes is contained in the Old Law (^{<1273>}Leviticus 27:30), “All tithes of the land, whether of corn or of the fruits of trees, are the Lord’s,” and further on (^{<1273>}Leviticus 27:32):

“Of all the tithes of oxen and sheep and goats, that pass under the shepherd’s rod, every tenth that cometh shall be sanctified to the Lord.”

This cannot be reckoned among the moral precepts, because natural reason does not dictate that one ought to give a tenth part, rather than a ninth or eleventh. Therefore it is either a judicial or a ceremonial precept. Now, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(103), A(3); P(2a), Q(104), A(3)**), during the time of grace men are bound neither to the ceremonial nor to the judicial precepts of the Old Law. Therefore men are not bound now to pay tithes.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, during the time of grace men are bound only to those things which were commanded by Christ through the Apostles, according to ⁽⁴¹⁸⁾Matthew 28:20, “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you”; and Paul says (⁽⁴¹⁷⁾Acts 20:27): “I have not spared to declare unto you all the counsel of God.” Now neither in the teaching of Christ nor in that of the apostles is there any mention of the paying of tithes: for the saying of our Lord about tithes (⁽⁴²³⁾Matthew 23:23), “These things you ought to have done” seems to refer to the past time of legal observance: thus Hilary says (Super Matth. can. xxiv): “The tithing of herbs, which was useful in foreshadowing the future, was not to be omitted.” Therefore during the time of grace men are not bound to pay tithes.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, during the time of grace, men are not more bound to the legal observances than before the Law. But before the Law tithes were given, by reason not of a precept but of a vow. For we read (⁽⁴²⁹⁾Genesis 28:20,22) that Jacob “made a vow” saying: “If God shall be with me, and shall keep me in the way by which I walk... of all the things that Thou shalt give to me, I will offer tithes to Thee.” Neither, therefore, during the time of grace are men bound to pay tithes.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, in the Old Law men were bound to pay three kinds of tithe. For it is written (⁽⁴¹²⁾Numbers 18:23,24):

“The sons of Levi... shall... be content with the oblation of tithes, which I have separated for their uses and necessities.”

Again, there were other tithes of which we read (⁽⁴¹²⁾Deuteronomy 14:22,23):

“Every year thou shalt set aside the tithes of all thy fruits, that the earth bringeth forth year by year; and thou shalt eat before the Lord thy God in the place which He shall choose.”

And there were yet other tithes, of which it is written (⁽⁴¹⁴⁾Deuteronomy 14:28):

“The third year thou shalt separate another tithe of all things that grow to thee at that time, and shalt lay it up within thy gates. And the Levite that hath no other part nor possession with thee, and the

stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are within thy gates, shall... eat and be filled.”

Now during the time of grace men are not bound to pay the second and third tithes. Neither therefore are they bound to pay the first.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, a debt that is due without any time being fixed for its payment, must be paid at once under pain of sin. Accordingly if during the time of grace men are bound, under necessity of precept, to pay tithes in those countries where tithes are not paid, they would all be in a state of mortal sin, and so would also be the ministers of the Church for dissembling. But this seems unreasonable. Therefore during the time of grace men are not bound under necessity of precept to pay tithes.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine [*Append. Serm. cclxxcii], whose words are quoted 16, qu. i [*Can. Decimae], says: “It is a duty to pay tithes, and whoever refuses to pay them takes what belongs to another.”

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1) — *I answer that*, In the Old Law tithes were paid for the sustenance of the ministers of God. Hence it is written (~~2ND~~ Malachi 3:10):

“Bring all the tithes into My [Vulg.: ‘the’] store-house that there may be meat in My house.”

Hence the precept about the paying of tithes was partly moral and instilled in the natural reason; and partly judicial, deriving its force from its divine institution. Because natural reason dictates that the people should administer the necessities of life to those who minister the divine worship for the welfare of the whole people even as it is the people’s duty to provide a livelihood for their rulers and soldiers and so forth. Hence the Apostle proves this from human custom, saying (~~4TH~~ 1 Corinthians 9:7):

“Who serveth as a soldier at any time at his own charge? Who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof?”

But the fixing of the proportion to be offered to the ministers of divine worship does not belong to the natural law, but was determined by divine institution, in accordance with the condition of that people to whom the

law was being given. For they were divided into twelve tribes, and the twelfth tribe, namely that of Levi, was engaged exclusively in the divine ministry and had no possessions whence to derive a livelihood: and so it was becomingly ordained that the remaining eleven tribes should give one-tenth part of their revenues to the Levites [*^{CH22}Numbers 18:21] that the latter might live respectably; and also because some, through negligence, would disregard this precept. Hence, so far as the tenth part was fixed, the precept was judicial, since all institutions established among this people for the special purpose of preserving equality among men, in accordance with this people's condition, are called "judicial precepts." Nevertheless by way of consequence these institutions foreshadowed something in the future, even as everything else connected with them, according to ^{CH11}1 Corinthians 12, "All these things happened to them in figure." In this respect they had something in common with the "ceremonial precepts," which were instituted chiefly that they might be signs of the future. Hence the precept about paying tithes foreshadowed something in the future. For ten is, in a way, the perfect number (being the first numerical limit, since the figures do not go beyond ten but begin over again from one), and therefore he that gave a tenth, which is the sign of perfection, reserving the nine other parts for himself, acknowledged by a sign that imperfection was his part, and that the perfection which was to come through Christ was to be hoped for from God. Yet this proves it to be, not a ceremonial but a judicial precept, as stated above.

There is this difference between the ceremonial and judicial precepts of the Law, as we stated above (**P(2a)**, **Q(104)**, **A(3)**), that it is unlawful to observe the ceremonial precepts at the time of the New Law, whereas there is no sin in keeping the judicial precepts during the time of grace although they are not binding. Indeed they are bound to be observed by some, if they be ordained by the authority of those who have power to make laws. Thus it was a judicial precept of the Old Law that he who stole a sheep should restore four sheep (^{CH22}Exodus 22:1), and if any king were to order this to be done his subjects would be bound to obey. In like manner during the time of the New Law the authority of the Church has established the payment of tithe; thus showing a certain kindness, lest the people of the New Law should give less to the ministers of the New Testament than did the people of the Old Law to the ministers of the Old

Testament; for the people of the New Law are under greater obligations, according to ~~(100)~~ Matthew 5:20,

“Unless your justice abound more than that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven,”

and, moreover, the ministers of the New Testament are of greater dignity than the ministers of the Old Testament, as the Apostle shows (~~(200)~~ 2 Corinthians 3:7,8).

Accordingly it is evident that man’s obligation to pay tithes arises partly from natural law, partly from the institution of the Church; who, nevertheless, in consideration of the requirements of time and persons might ordain the payment of some other proportion.

This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1)-RO(2) — The precept about paying tithes, in so far as it was a moral precept, was given in the Gospel by our Lord when He said (~~(100)~~ Matthew 10:10) [*The words as quoted are from ~~(200)~~ Luke 10:7: Matthew has ‘meat’ instead of ‘hire’]: “The workman is worthy of his hire,” and the Apostle says the same (~~(100)~~ 1 Corinthians 9:4 seq.). But the fixing of the particular proportion is left to the ordinance of the Church.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1)-RO(3) — Before the time of the Old Law the ministry of the divine worship was not entrusted to any particular person; although it is stated that the first-born were priests, and that they received a double portion. For this very reason no particular portion was directed to be given to the ministers of the divine worship: but when they met with one, each man of his own accord gave him what he deemed right. Thus Abraham by a kind of prophetic instinct gave tithes to Melchisedech, the priest of the Most High God, according to ~~(100)~~ Genesis 14:20, and again Jacob made a vow to give tithes [* ~~(100)~~ Genesis 28:20], although he appears to have vowed to do so, not by paying them to ministers, but for the purpose of the divine worship, for instance for the fulfilling of sacrifices, hence he said significantly: “I will offer tithes to Thee.”

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1)-RO(4) — The second kind of tithe, which was reserved for the offering of sacrifices, has no place in the New Law, since the legal victims had ceased. But the third kind of tithe which they had to eat with

the poor, is increased in the New Law, for our Lord commanded us to give to the poor not merely the tenth part, but all our surplus, according to ~~Q(14)~~ Luke 11:41: “That which remaineth, give alms.” Moreover the tithes that are given to the ministers of the Church should be dispensed by them for the use of the poor.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(1)-RO(5) — The ministers of the Church ought to be more solicitous for the increase of spiritual goods in the people, than for the amassing of temporal goods: and hence the Apostle was unwilling to make use of the right given him by the Lord of receiving his livelihood from those to whom he preached the Gospel, lest he should occasion a hindrance to the Gospel of Christ [~~Q(12)~~* 1 Corinthians 9:12]. Nor did they sin who did not contribute to his upkeep, else the Apostle would not have omitted to reprove them. In like manner the ministers of the Church rightly refrain from demanding the Church’s tithes, when they could not demand them without scandal, on account of their having fallen into desuetude, or for some other reason. Nevertheless those who do not give tithes in places where the Church does not demand them are not in a state of damnation, unless they be obstinate, and unwilling to pay even if tithes were demanded of them.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(2)

Whether men are bound to pay tithes of all things?

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that men are not bound to give tithes of all things. The paying of tithes seems to be an institution of the Old Law. Now the Old Law contains no precept about personal tithes, viz. those that are payable on property acquired by one’s own act, for instance by commerce or soldiering. Therefore no man is bound to pay tithes on such things.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, it is not right to make oblations of that which is ill-gotten, as stated above (**Q(86), A(3)**). Now oblations, being offered to God immediately, seem to be more closely connected with the divine worship than tithes which are offered to the ministers. Therefore neither should tithes be paid on ill-gotten goods.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, in the last chapter of ^(~~1801~~)Leviticus (30,32) the precept of paying tithes refers only to “corn, fruits of trees” and animals “that pass under the shepherd’s rod.” But man derives a revenue from other smaller things, such as the herbs that grow in his garden and so forth. Therefore neither on these things is a man bound to pay tithes.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, man cannot pay except what is in his power. Now a man does not always remain in possession of all his profit from land and stock, since sometimes he loses them by theft or robbery; sometimes they are transferred to another person by sale; sometimes they are due to some other person, thus taxes are due to princes, and wages due to workmen. Therefore one ought not to pay tithes on such like things.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^(~~1802~~)Genesis 28:22):

“Of all things that Thou shalt give to me, I will offer tithes to Thee.”

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(2) — *I answer that*, In judging about a thing we should look to its principle. Now the principle of the payment of tithes is the debt whereby carnal things are due to those who sow spiritual things, according to the saying of the Apostle (^(~~1801~~)1 Corinthians 9:11),

“If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we reap your carnal things?”

[thus implying that on the contrary “it is no great matter if we reap your carnal things”] [*The phrase in the brackets is omitted in the Leonine edition]. For this debt is the principle on which is based the commandment of the Church about the payment of tithes. Now whatever man possesses comes under the designation of carnal things. Therefore tithes must be paid on whatever one possesses.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(2)-RO(1) — In accordance with the condition of that people there was a special reason why the Old Law did not include a precept about personal tithes; because, to wit, all the other tribes had certain possessions wherewith they were able to provide a sufficient livelihood for the Levites who had no possessions, but were not forbidden to make a profit out of other lawful occupations as the other Jews did. On

the other hand the people of the New Law are spread abroad throughout the world, and many of them have no possessions, but live by trade, and these would contribute nothing to the support of God's ministers if they did not pay tithes on their trade profits. Moreover the ministers of the New Law are more strictly forbidden to occupy themselves in money-making trades, according to ~~2~~ Timothy 2:4, "No man being a soldier to God, entangleth himself with secular business." Wherefore in the New Law men are bound to pay personal tithes, according to the custom of their country and the needs of the ministers: hence Augustine, whose words are quoted 16, qu. 1, cap. Decimae, says [*Append. Serm. cclxxvii]: "Tithes must be paid on the profits of soldiering, trade or craft."

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(2)-RO(2) — Things are ill-gotten in two ways. First, because the getting itself was unjust: such, for instance, are things gotten by robbery, theft or usury: and these a man is bound to restore, and not to pay tithes on them. If, however, a field be bought with the profits of usury, the usurer is bound to pay tithes on the produce, because the latter is not gotten usuriously but given by God. On the other hand certain things are said to be ill-gotten, because they are gotten of a shameful cause, for instance of whoredom or stage-playing, and the like. Such things a man is not bound to restore, and consequently he is bound to pay tithes on them in the same way as other personal tithes. Nevertheless the Church must not accept the tithe so long as those persons remain in sin, lest she appear to have a share in their sins: but when they have done penance, tithes may be accepted from them on these things.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(2)-RO(3) — Things directed to an end must be judged according to their fittingness to the end. Now the payment of tithes is due not for its own sake, but for the sake of the ministers, to whose dignity it is unbecoming that they should demand minute things with careful exactitude, for this is reckoned sinful according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 2). Hence the Old Law did not order the payment of tithes on such like minute things, but left it to the judgment of those who are willing to pay, because minute things are counted as nothing. Wherefore the Pharisees who claimed for themselves the perfect justice of the Law, paid tithes even on these minute things: nor are they reproved by our Lord on that account, but only because they despised greater, i.e. spiritual, precepts; and rather did He show them to be deserving of praise in this particular, when He

said (⁴¹²³Matthew 23:23): “These things you ought to have done,” i.e. during the time of the Law, according to Chrysostom’s [*Hom. xlv in the Opus Imperfectum falsely ascribed to St. John Chrysostom] commentary. This also seems to denote fittingness rather than obligation. Therefore now too men are not bound to pay tithes on such minute things, except perhaps by reason of the custom of one’s country.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(2)-RO(4) — A man is not bound to pay tithes on what he has lost by theft or robbery, before he recovers his property: unless he has incurred the loss through his own fault or neglect, because the Church ought not to be the loser on that account. If he sell wheat that has not been tithed, the Church can command the tithes due to her, both from the buyer who has a thing due to the Church, and from the seller, because so far as he is concerned he has defrauded the Church: yet if one pays, the other is not bound. Tithes are due on the fruits of the earth, in so far as these fruits are the gift of God. Wherefore tithes do not come under a tax, nor are they subject to workmen’s wages. Hence it is not right to deduct one’s taxes and the wages paid to workmen, before paying tithes: but tithes must be paid before anything else on one’s entire produce.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(3)

Whether tithes should be paid to the clergy?

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that tithes should not be paid to the clergy. Tithes were paid to the Levites in the Old Testament, because they had no portion in the people’s possessions, according to ⁴¹²³Numbers 18:23,24. But in the New Testament the clergy have possessions not only ecclesiastical, but sometimes also patrimonial: moreover they receive first-fruits, and oblations for the living and the dead. Therefore it is unnecessary to pay tithes to them.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it sometimes happens that a man dwells in one parish, and farms in another; or a shepherd may take his flock within the bounds of one parish during one part of the year, and within the bounds of another parish during the other part of the year; or he may have his sheepfold in one parish, and graze the sheep in another. Now in all

these and similar cases it seems impossible to decide to which clergy the tithes ought to be paid. Therefore it would seem that no fixed tithe ought to be paid to the clergy.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, it is the general custom in certain countries for the soldiers to hold the tithes from the Church in fee; and certain religious receive tithes. Therefore seemingly tithes are not due only to those of the clergy who have care of souls.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~Gen~~ Numbers 18:21):

“I have given to the sons of Levi all the tithes of Israel for a possession, for the ministry wherewith they serve Me in the Tabernacle.”

Now the clergy are the successors of the sons of Levi in the New Testament. Therefore tithes are due to the clergy alone.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Two things have to be considered with regard to tithes: namely, the right to receive tithes, and the things given in the name of tithes. The right to receive tithes is a spiritual thing, for it arises from the debt in virtue of which the ministers of the altar have a right to the expenses of their ministry, and temporal things are due to those who sow spiritual things. This debt concerns none but the clergy who have care of souls, and so they alone are competent to have this right.

On the other hand the things given in the name of tithes are material, wherefore they may come to be used by anyone, and thus it is that they fall into the hands of the laity.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(3)-RO(1) — In the Old Law, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 4), special tithes were earmarked for the assistance of the poor. But in the New Law the tithes are given to the clergy, not only for their own support, but also that the clergy may use them in assisting the poor. Hence they are not unnecessary; indeed Church property, oblations and first-fruits as well as tithes are all necessary for this same purpose.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(3)-RO(2) — Personal tithes are due to the church in whose parish a man dwells, while predial tithes seem more reasonably to belong to the church within whose bounds the land is situated. The law, however, prescribes that in this matter a custom that has obtained for a

long time must be observed [*Cap. Cum sint, and Cap. Ad apostolicae, de Decimis, etc.]. The shepherd who grazes his flock at different seasons in two parishes, should pay tithe proportionately to both churches. And since the fruit of the flock is derived from the pasture, the tithe of the flock is due to the church in whose lands the flock grazes, rather than to the church on whose land the fold is situated.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(3)-RO(3) — Just as the Church can hand over to a layman the things she receives under the title of tithe, so too can she allow him to receive tithes that are yet to be paid, the right of receiving being reserved to the ministers of the Church. The motive may be either the need of the Church, as when tithes are due to certain soldiers through being granted to them in fee by the Church, or it may be the succoring of the poor; thus certain tithes have been granted by way of alms to certain lay religious, or to those that have no care of souls. Some religious, however, are competent to receive tithes, because they have care of souls.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(4)

Whether the clergy also are bound to pay tithes?

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that clerics also are bound to pay tithes. By common law [*Cap. Cum homines, de Decimis, etc.] the parish church should receive the tithes on the lands which are in its territory. Now it happens sometimes that the clergy have certain lands of their own on the territory of some parish church, or that one church has ecclesiastical property on the territory of another. Therefore it would seem that the clergy are bound to pay predial tithes.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, some religious are clerics; and yet they are bound to pay tithes to churches on account of the lands which they cultivate even with their own hands [*Cap. Ex parte, and Cap. Nuper.]. Therefore it would seem that the clergy are not immune from the payment of tithes.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, in the ¹⁸⁹⁶~~1895~~ eighteenth chapter of Numbers (26,28), it is prescribed not only that the Levites should receive tithes from the people, but also that they should themselves pay tithes to

the high-priest. Therefore the clergy are bound to pay tithes to the Sovereign Pontiff, no less than the laity are bound to pay tithes to the clergy.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(4)-O(4) — Further, tithes should serve not only for the support of the clergy, but also for the assistance of the poor. Therefore, if the clergy are exempt from paying tithes, so too are the poor. Yet the latter is not true. Therefore the former is false.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, A decretal of Pope Paschal [*Paschal II] says: “It is a new form of exaction when the clergy demand tithes from the clergy” [*Cap. Novum genus, de Decimis, etc.].

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(4) — *I answer that*, The cause of giving cannot be the cause of receiving, as neither can the cause of action be the cause of passion; yet it happens that one and the same person is giver and receiver, even as agent and patient, on account of different causes and from different points of view. Now tithes are due to the clergy as being ministers of the altar and sowers of spiritual things among the people. Wherefore those members of the clergy as such, i.e. as having ecclesiastical property, are not bound to pay tithes; whereas from some other cause through holding property in their own right, either by inheriting it from their kindred, or by purchase, or in any other similar manner, they are bound to the payment of tithes.

Hence the Reply to the First Objection is clear, because the clergy like anyone else are bound to pay tithes on their own lands to the parish church, even though they be the clergy of that same church, because to possess a thing as one’s private property is not the same as possessing it in common. But church lands are not tithable, even though they be within the boundaries of another parish.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(4)-RO(2) — Religious who are clerics, if they have care of souls, and dispense spiritual things to the people, are not bound to pay tithes, but they may receive them. Another reason applies to other religious, who though clerics do not dispense spiritual things to the people; for according to the ordinary law they are bound to pay tithes, but they are somewhat exempt by reason of various concessions granted by the

Apostolic See [*Cap. Ex multiplici, Ex parte, and Ad audientiam, de Decimis, etc.].

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(4)-RO(3) — In the Old Law first-fruits were due to the priests, and tithes to the Levites; and since the Levites were below the priests, the Lord commanded that the former should pay the high-priest “the tenth part of the tenth” [*~~Q83~~ Numbers 18:26] instead of first-fruits: wherefore for the same reason the clergy are bound now to pay tithes to the Sovereign Pontiff, if he demanded them. For natural reason dictates that he who has charge of the common estate of a multitude should be provided with all goods, so that he may be able to carry out whatever is necessary for the common welfare.

P(2b)-Q(87)-A(4)-RO(4) — Tithes should be employed for the assistance of the poor, through the dispensation of the clergy. Hence the poor have no reason for accepting tithes, but they are bound to pay them.

SERVICE BY PROMISE

QUESTION 88

OF VOWS

(TWELVE ARTICLES)

We must now consider vows, whereby something is promised to God. Under this head there are twelve points of inquiry:

- (1) What is a vow?
- (2) What is the matter of a vow?
- (3) Of the obligation of vows;
- (4) Of the use of taking vows;
- (5) Of what virtue is it an act?
- (6) Whether it is more meritorious to do a thing from a vow, than without a vow?
- (7) Of the solemnizing of a vow;
- (8) Whether those who are under another's power can take vows?
- (9) Whether children may be bound by vow to enter religion?
- (10) Whether a vow is subject to dispensation or commutation?
- (11) Whether a dispensation can be granted in a solemn vow of continence?
- (12) Whether the authority of a superior is required in a dispensation from a vow?

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(1)

Whether a vow consists in a mere purpose of the will?

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that a vow consists in nothing but a purpose of the will. According to some [*William of Auxerre, Sum. Aur. III, xxviii, qu. 1; Albertus Magnus, Sent. iv, D, 38], “a vow is a conception of a good purpose after a firm deliberation of the mind, whereby a man binds himself before God to do or not to do a certain thing.” But the conception of a good purpose and so forth, may consist in a mere movement of the will. Therefore a vow consists in a mere purpose of the will.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the very word vow seems to be derived from “voluntas” [will], for one is said to do a thing “proprio voto” [by one’s own vow] when one does it voluntarily. Now to “purpose” is an act of the will, while to “promise” is an act of the reason. Therefore a vow consists in a mere act of the will.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, our Lord said (²⁰⁰⁹ Luke 9:62):

“No man putting his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.”

Now from the very fact that a man has a purpose of doing good, he puts his hand to the plough. Consequently, if he look back by desisting from his good purpose, he is not fit for the kingdom of God. Therefore by a mere good purpose a man is bound before God, even without making a promise; and consequently it would seem that a vow consists in a mere purpose of the will.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (²⁰¹⁰ Ecclesiastes 5:3):

“If thou hast vowed anything to God, defer not to pay it, for an unfaithful and foolish promise displeaseth Him.”

Therefore to vow is to promise, and a vow is a promise.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(1) — *I answer that*, A vow denotes a binding to do or omit some particular thing. Now one man binds himself to another by means of a promise, which is an act of the reason to which faculty it belongs to

direct. For just as a man by commanding or praying, directs, in a fashion, what others are to do for him, so by promising he directs what he himself is to do for another. Now a promise between man and man can only be expressed in words or any other outward signs; whereas a promise can be made to God by the mere inward thought, since according to ^{<1167>}1 Kings 16:7, “Man seeth those things that appear, but the Lord beholdeth the heart.” Yet we express words outwardly sometimes, either to arouse ourselves, as was stated above with regard to prayer (**Q(83), A(12)**), or to call others to witness, so that one may refrain from breaking the vow, not only through fear of God, but also through respect of men. Now a promise is the outcome from a purpose of doing something: and a purpose presupposes deliberation, since it is the act of a deliberate will.

Accordingly three things are essential to a vow: the first is deliberation. the second is a purpose of the will; and the third is a promise, wherein is completed the nature of a vow. Sometimes, however, two other things are added as a sort of confirmation of the vow, namely, pronouncement by word of mouth, according to ^{<1168>}Psalm 65:13, “I will pay Thee my vows which my lips have uttered”; and the witnessing of others. Hence the Master says (Sent. iv, D, 38) that a vow is “the witnessing of a spontaneous promise and ought to be made to God and about things relating to God”: although the “witnessing” may strictly refer to the inward protestation.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(1)-RO(1) — The conceiving of a good purpose is not confirmed by the deliberation of the mind, unless the deliberation lead to a promise.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(1)-RO(2) — Man’s will moves the reason to promise something relating to things subject to his will, and a vow takes its name from the will forasmuch as it proceeds from the will as first mover.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(1)-RO(3) — He that puts his hand to the plough does something already; while he that merely purposes to do something does nothing so far. When, however, he promises, he already sets about doing, although he does not yet fulfil his promise: even so, he that puts his hand to the plough does not plough yet, nevertheless he stretches out his hand for the purpose of ploughing.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(2)

Whether a vow should always be about a better good?

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that a vow need not be always about a better good. A greater good is one that pertains to supererogation. But vows are not only about matters of supererogation, but also about matters of salvation: thus in Baptism men vow to renounce the devil and his pomps, and to keep the faith, as a gloss observes on ^(~~1981~~)Psalm 75:12, “Vow ye, and pay to the Lord your God”; and Jacob vowed (^(~~1920~~)Genesis 28:21) that the Lord should be his God. Now this above all is necessary for salvation. Therefore vows are not only about a better good.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, Jephthe is included among the saints (^(~~9813~~)Hebrews 11:32). Yet he killed his innocent daughter on account of his vow (Judges 11). Since, then, the slaying of an innocent person is not a better good, but is in itself unlawful, it seems that a vow may be made not only about a better good, but also about something unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, things that tend to be harmful to the person, or that are quite useless, do not come under the head of a better good. Yet sometimes vows are made about immoderate vigils or fasts which tend to injure the person: and sometimes vows are about indifferent matters and such as are useful to no purpose. Therefore a vow is not always about a better good.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^(~~1920~~)Deuteronomy 23:22):

“If thou wilt not promise thou shalt be without sin.”

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), a vow is a promise made to God. Now a promise is about something that one does voluntarily for someone else: since it would be not a promise but a threat to say that one would do something against someone. In like manner it would be futile to promise anyone something unacceptable to him. Wherefore, as every sin is against God, and since no work is acceptable to God unless it be virtuous, it follows that nothing unlawful or indifferent, but only some act of virtue, should be the matter of a vow. But as a vow

denotes a voluntary promise, while necessity excludes voluntariness, whatever is absolutely necessary, whether to be or not to be, can nowise be the matter of a vow. For it would be foolish to vow that one would die or that one would not fly.

On the other hand, if a thing be necessary. not absolutely but on the supposition of an end — for instance if salvation be unattainable without it — it may be the matter of a vow in so far as it is done voluntarily, but not in so far as there is a necessity for doing it. But that which is not necessary, neither absolutely, nor on the supposition of an end, is altogether voluntary, and therefore is most properly the matter of a vow. And this is said to be a greater good in comparison with that which is universally necessary for salvation. Therefore, properly speaking, a vow is said to be about a better good.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(2)-RO(1) — Renouncing the devil's pomps and keeping the faith of Christ are the matter of baptismal vows, in so far as these things are done voluntarily, although they are necessary for salvation. The same answer applies to Jacob's vow: although it may also be explained that Jacob vowed that he would have the Lord for his God, by giving Him a special form of worship to which he was not bound, for instance by offering tithes and so forth as mentioned further on in the same passage.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(2)-RO(2) — Certain things are good, whatever be their result; such are acts of virtue, and these can be, absolutely speaking, the matter of a vow: some are evil, whatever their result may be; as those things which are sins in themselves, and these can nowise be the matter of a vow: while some, considered in themselves, are good, and as such may be the matter of a vow, yet they may have an evil result, in which case the vow must not be kept. It was thus with the vow of Jephthe, who as related in ~~the~~ Judges 11:30,31,

“made a vow to the Lord, saying: If Thou wilt deliver the children of Ammon into my hands, whosoever shall first come forth out of the doors of my house, and shall meet me when I return in peace... the same will I offer a holocaust to the Lord.”

For this could have an evil result if, as indeed happened, he were to be met by some animal which it would be unlawful to sacrifice, such as an ass or a

human being. Hence Jerome says [**Implicitly 1 Contra Jovin.: Comment. in Micheam vi, viii: Comment. in Jerem. 7:*The quotation is from Peter Comestor, *Hist. Scholast.*]: “In vowing he was foolish, through lack of discretion, and in keeping his vow he was wicked.” Yet it is premised (^{<712>}Judges 11:29) that “the Spirit of the Lord came upon him,” because his faith and devotion, which moved him to make that vow, were from the Holy Ghost; and for this reason he is reckoned among the saints, as also by reason of the victory which he obtained, and because it is probable that he repented of his sinful deed, which nevertheless foreshadowed something good.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(2)-RO(3) — The mortification of one’s own body, for instance by vigils and fasting, is not acceptable to God except in so far as it is an act of virtue; and this depends on its being done with due discretion, namely, that concupiscence be curbed without overburdening nature. on this condition such things may be the matter of a vow. Hence the Apostle after saying (^{<611>}Romans 12:1), “Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing to God,” adds, “your reasonable service.” Since, however, man is easily mistaken in judging of matters concerning himself, such vows as these are more fittingly kept or disregarded according to the judgment of a superior, yet so that, should a man find that without doubt he is seriously burdened by keeping such a vow, and should he be unable to appeal to his superior, he ought not to keep it. As to vows about vain and useless things they should be ridiculed rather than kept.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(3)

Whether all vows are binding?

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that vows are not all binding. For man needs things that are done by another, more than God does, since He has no need for our goods (^{<610>}Psalms 15:2). Now according to the prescription of human laws [**Dig. L. xii, de pollicitat., i*] a simple promise made to a man is not binding; and this seems to be prescribed on account of the changeableness of the human will. Much less binding therefore is a simple promise made to God, which we call a vow.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, no one is bound to do what is impossible. Now sometimes that which a man has vowed becomes impossible to him, either because it depends on another's decision, as when, for instance, a man vows to enter a monastery, the monks of which refuse to receive him: or on account of some defect arising, for instance when a woman vows virginity, and afterwards is deflowered; or when a man vows to give a sum of money, and afterwards loses it. Therefore a vow is not always binding.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, if a man is bound to pay something, he must do so at once. But a man is not bound to pay his vow at once, especially if it be taken under a condition to be fulfilled in the future. Therefore a vow is not always binding.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (²¹⁸Ecclesiastes 5:3,4):

“Whatsoever thou hast vowed, pay it; and it is much better not to vow, than after a vow not to perform the things promised.”

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(3) — *I answer that*, For one to be accounted faithful one must keep one's promises. Wherefore, according to Augustine [*Ep. xxxii, 2: De Mendac. xx] faith takes its name “from a man's deed agreeing with his word” [*'Fides... fiunt dicta' Cicero gives the same etymology (De Offic. i, 7)]. Now man ought to be faithful to God above all, both on account of God's sovereignty, and on account of the favors he has received from God. Hence man is obliged before all to fulfill the vows he has made to God, since this is part of the fidelity he owes to God. On the other hand, the breaking of a vow is a kind of infidelity. Wherefore Solomon gives the reason why vows should be paid to God, because “an unfaithful... promise displeaseth Him” [*²¹⁸Ecclesiastes 5:3].

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(3)-RO(1) — Honesty demands that a man should keep any promise he makes to another man, and this obligation is based on the natural law. But for a man to be under a civil obligation through a promise he has made, other conditions are requisite. And although God needs not our goods, we are under a very great obligation to Him: so that a vow made to Him is most binding.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(3)-RO(2) — If that which a man has vowed becomes impossible to him through any cause whatsoever, he must do what he can,

so that he have at least a will ready to do what he can. Hence if a man has vowed to enter a monastery, he must endeavor to the best of his power to be received there. And if his intention was chiefly to bind himself to enter the religious life, so that, in consequence, he chose this particular form of religious life, or this place, as being most agreeable to him, he is bound, should he be unable to be received there, to enter the religious life elsewhere. But if his principal intention is to bind himself to this particular kind of religious life, or to this particular place, because the one or the other pleases him in some special way, he is not bound to enter another religious house, if they are unwilling to receive him into this particular one. on the other hand, if he be rendered incapable of fulfilling his vow through his own fault, he is bound over and above to do penance for his past fault: thus if a woman has vowed virginity and is afterwards violated, she is bound not only to observe what is in her power, namely, perpetual continency, but also to repent of what she has lost by sinning.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(3)-RO(3) — The obligation of a vow is caused by our own will and intention, wherefore it is written (⁴⁹²⁹Deuteronomy 23:23):

“That which is once gone out of thy lips, thou shalt observe, and shalt do as thou hast promised to the Lord thy God, and hast spoken with thy own will and with thy own mouth.”

Wherefore if in taking a vow, it is one's intention and will to bind oneself to fulfil it at once, one is bound to fulfil it immediately. But if one intend to fulfil it at a certain time, or under a certain condition, one is not bound to immediate fulfilment. And yet one ought not to delay longer than one intended to bind oneself, for it is written (⁴⁹³⁰Deuteronomy 23:21):

“When thou hast made a vow to the Lord thy God thou shalt not delay to pay it: because the Lord thy God will require it; and if thou delay, it shall be imputed to thee for a sin.”

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(4)

Whether it is expedient to take vows?

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not expedient to take vows. It is not expedient to anyone to deprive himself of the good that

God has given him. Now one of the greatest goods that God has given man is liberty whereof he seems to be deprived by the necessity implicated in a vow. Therefore it would seem inexpedient for man to take vows.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, no one should expose himself to danger. But whoever takes a vow exposes himself to danger, since that which, before taking a vow, he could omit without danger, becomes a source of danger to him if he should not fulfil it after taking the vow. Hence Augustine says (Ep. cxxvii, ad Arment. et Paulin.): “Since thou hast vowed, thou hast bound thyself, thou canst not do otherwise. If thou dost not what thou hast vowed thou wilt not be as thou wouldst have been hadst thou not vowed. For then thou wouldst have been less great, not less good: whereas now if thou breakest faith with God (which God forbid) thou art the more unhappy, as thou wouldst have been happier, hadst thou kept thy vow.” Therefore it is not expedient to take vows.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the Apostle says (~~1~~¹ 1 Corinthians 4:16): “Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ.” But we do not read that either Christ or the Apostles took any vows. Therefore it would seem inexpedient to take vows.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~1~~¹ Psalm 75:12): “Vow ye and pay to the Lord your God.”

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**AA(1),2**), a vow is a promise made to God. Now one makes a promise to a man under one aspect, and to God under another. Because we promise something to a man for his own profit; since it profits him that we should be of service to him, and that we should at first assure him of the future fulfilment of that service: whereas we make promises to God not for His but for our own profit. Hence Augustine says (Ep. cxxvii, ad Arment. et Paulin.): “He is a kind and not a needy exactor, for he does not grow rich on our payments, but makes those who pay Him grow rich in Him.” And just as what we give God is useful not to Him but to us, since “what is given Him is added to the giver,” as Augustine says (Ep. cxxvii, ad Arment. et Paulin.), so also a promise whereby we vow something to God, does not conduce to His profit, nor does He need to be assured by us, but it conduces to our profit, in so far as by vowing we fix our wills immovably on that which it is expedient to do. Hence it is expedient to take vows.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(4)-RO(1) — Even as one's liberty is not lessened by one being unable to sin, so, too, the necessity resulting from a will firmly fixed to good does not lessen the liberty, as instanced in God and the blessed. Such is the necessity implied by a vow, bearing a certain resemblance to the confirmation of the blessed. Hence, Augustine says (Ep. cxxvii, ad Arment. et Paulin.) that “happy is the necessity that compels us to do the better things.”

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(4)-RO(2) — When danger arises from the deed itself, this deed is not expedient, for instance that one cross a river by a tottering bridge: but if the danger arise through man's failure in the deed, the latter does not cease to be expedient: thus it is expedient to mount on horseback, though there be the danger of a fall from the horse: else it would behoove one to desist from all good things, that may become dangerous accidentally. Wherefore it is written (²¹¹⁰Ecclesiastes 11:4):

“He that observeth the wind shall not sow, and he that considereth
the clouds shall never reap.”

Now a man incurs danger, not from the vow itself, but from his fault, when he changes his mind by breaking his vow. Hence, Augustine says (Ep. cxxvii, ad Arment. et Paulin.): “Repent not of thy vow: thou shouldst rather rejoice that thou canst no longer do what thou mightest lawfully have done to thy detriment.”

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(4)-RO(3) — It was incompetent for Christ, by His very nature, to take a vow, both because He was God, and because, as man, His will was firmly fixed on the good, since He was a “comprehensor.” By a kind of similitude, however, He is represented as saying (⁴²⁰¹Psalm 21:26): “I will pay my vows in the sight of them that fear Him,” when He is speaking of His body, which is the Church.

The apostles are understood to have vowed things pertaining to the state of perfection when “they left all things and followed Christ.”

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(5)***Whether a vow is an act of latria or religion?***

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that a vow is not an act of latria or religion. Every act of virtue is matter for a vow. Now it would seem to pertain to the same virtue to promise a thing and to do it. Therefore a vow pertains to any virtue and not to religion especially.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, according to Tully (De Invent. ii, 53) it belongs to religion to offer God worship and ceremonial rites. But he who takes a vow does not yet offer something to God, but only promises it. Therefore, a vow is not an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, religious worship should be offered to none but God. But a vow is made not only to God, but also to the saints and to one's superiors, to whom religious vow obedience when they make their profession. Therefore, a vow is not an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~2809~~ Isaiah 19:21):

“(The Egyptians) shall worship Him with sacrifices and offerings
and they shall make vows to the Lord, and perform them.”

Now, the worship of God is properly the act of religion or latria.
Therefore, a vow is an act of latria or religion.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(81), A(1)**, ad 1), every act of virtue belongs to religion or latria by way of command, in so far as it is directed to the reverence of God which is the proper end of latria. Now the direction of other actions to their end belongs to the commanding virtue, not to those which are commanded. Therefore the direction of the acts of any virtue to the service of God is the proper act of latria.

Now, it is evident from what has been said above (**AA(1),2**) that a vow is a promise made to God, and that a promise is nothing else than a directing of the thing promised to the person to whom the promise is made. Hence a vow is a directing of the thing vowed to the worship or service of God.

And thus it is clear that to take a vow is properly an act of latria or religion.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(5)-RO(1) — The matter of a vow is sometimes the act of another virtue, as, for instance, keeping the fast or observing continency; while sometimes it is an act of religion, as offering a sacrifice or praying. But promising either of them to God belongs to religion, for the reason given above. Hence it is evident that some vows belong to religion by reason only of the promise made to God, which is the essence of a vow, while others belong thereto by reason also of the thing promised, which is the matter of the vow.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(5)-RO(2) — He who promises something gives it already in as far as he binds himself to give it: even as a thing is said to be made when its cause is made, because the effect is contained virtually in its cause. This is why we thank not only a giver, but also one who promises to give.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(5)-RO(3) — A vow is made to God alone, whereas a promise may be made to a man also: and this very promise of good, which is fore made to a man, may be the matter of a vow, and in so far as it is a virtuous act. This is how we are to understand vows whereby we vow something to the saints or to one's superiors: so that the promise made to the saints or to one's superiors is the matter of the vow, in so far as one vows to God to fulfil what one has promised to the saints or one's superiors.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(6)

Whether it is more praiseworthy and meritorious to do something in fulfilment of a vow, than without a vow?

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that it is more praiseworthy and meritorious to do a thing without a vow than in fulfilment of a vow. Prosper says (De Vita Contempl. ii): "We should abstain or fast without putting ourselves under the necessity of fasting, lest that which we are free to do be done without devotion and unwillingly." Now he who vows to

fast puts himself under the necessity of fasting. Therefore it would be better for him to fast without taking the vow.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, the Apostle says (~~1~~ 2 Corinthians 9:7):

“Everyone as he hath determined in his heart, not with sadness, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver.”

Now some fulfil sorrowfully what they have vowed: and this seems to be due to the necessity arising from the vow, for necessity is a cause of sorrow according to Metaph. v [*Ed. Did. iv, 5]. Therefore, it is better to do something without a vow, than in fulfilment of a vow.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, a vow is necessary for the purpose of fixing the will on that which is vowed, as stated above (**A(4)**). But the will cannot be more fixed on a thing than when it actually does that thing. Therefore it is no better to do a thing in fulfilment of a vow than without a vow.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on the words of ~~1571~~ Psalm 75:12, “Vow ye and pay,” says: “Vows are counseled to the will.” But a counsel is about none but a better good. Therefore it is better to do a deed in fulfilment of a vow than without a vow: since he that does it without a vow fulfils only one counsel, viz. the counsel to do it, whereas he that does it with a vow, fulfils two counsels, viz. the counsel to vow and the counsel to do it.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(6) — *I answer that*, For three reasons it is better and more meritorious to do one and the same deed with a vow than without. First, because to vow, as stated above (**A(5)**) is an act of religion which is the chief of the moral virtues. Now the more excellent the virtue the better and more meritorious the deed. Wherefore the act of an inferior virtue is the better the more meritorious for being commanded by a superior virtue, whose act it becomes through being commanded by it, just as the act of faith or hope is better if it be commanded by charity. Hence the works of the other moral virtues (for instance, fasting, which is an act of abstinence; and being continent, which is an act of chastity) are better and more meritorious, if they be done in fulfilment of a vow, since thus they belong to the divine worship, being like sacrifices to God. Wherefore Augustine

says (De Virg. viii) that “not even is virginity honorable as such, but only when it is consecrated to God, and cherished by godly continence.”

Secondly, because he that vows something and does it, subjects himself to God more than he that only does it; for he subjects himself to God not only as to the act, but also as to the power, since in future he cannot do something else. Even so he gives more who gives the tree with its fruit, than he that gives the fruit only, as Anselm [*Eadmer] observes (De Simil. viii). For this reason, we thank even those who promise, as stated above (**A(5)**, ad 2).

Thirdly, because a vow fixes the will on the good immovably and to do anything of a will that is fixed on the good belongs to the perfection of virtue, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. ii, 4), just as to sin with an obstinate mind aggravates the sin, and is called a sin against the Holy Ghost, as stated above (**Q(14)**, **A(2)**).

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(6)-RO(1) — The passage quoted should be understood as referring to necessity of coercion which causes an act to be involuntary and excludes devotion. Hence he says pointedly: “Lest that which we are free to do be done without devotion and unwillingly.” On the other hand the necessity resulting from a vow is caused by the immobility of the will, wherefore it strengthens the will and increases devotion. Hence the argument does not conclude.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(6)-RO(2) — According to the Philosopher, necessity of coercion, in so far as it is opposed to the will, causes sorrow. But the necessity resulting from a vow, in those who are well disposed, in so far as it strengthens the will, causes not sorrow but joy. Hence Augustine says (Ep. ad Arment. et Paulin. cxxcii): “Repent not of thy vow: thou shouldst rather rejoice that thou canst no longer do what thou mightest lawfully have done to thy detriment.” If, however, the very deed, considered in itself, were to become disagreeable and involuntary after one has taken the vow, the will to fulfil it remaining withal, it is still more meritorious than if it were done without the vow, since the fulfilment of a vow is an act of religion which is a greater virtue than abstinence, of which fasting is an act.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(6)-RO(3) — He who does something without having vowed it has an immovable will as regards the individual deed which he

does and at the time when he does it; but his will does not remain altogether fixed for the time to come, as does the will of one who makes a vow: for the latter has bound his will to do something, both before he did that particular deed, and perchance to do it many times.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(7)

Whether a vow is solemnized by the reception of holy orders, and by the profession of a certain rule?

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that a vow is not solemnized by the reception of holy orders and by the profession of a certain rule. As stated above (**A(1)**), a vow is a promise made to God. Now external actions pertaining to solemnity seem to be directed, not to God, but to men. Therefore they are related to vows accidentally: and consequently a solemnization of this kind is not a proper circumstance of a vow.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, whatever belongs to the condition of a thing, would seem to be applicable to all in which that thing is found. Now many things may be the subject of a vow, which have no connection either with holy orders, or to any particular rule: as when a man vows a pilgrimage, or something of the kind. Therefore the solemnization that takes place in the reception of holy orders or in the profession of a certain rule does not belong to the condition of a vow.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, a solemn vow seems to be the same as a public vow. Now many other vows may be made in public besides that which is pronounced in receiving holy orders or in professing a certain rule; which latter, moreover, may be made in private. Therefore not only these vows are solemn.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, These vows alone are an impediment to the contract of marriage, and annul marriage if it be contracted, which is the effect of a solemn vow, as we shall state further on in the Third Part of this work [***XP**, **Q(53)**, **A(2)**].

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(7) — *I answer that*, The manner in which a thing is solemnized depends on its nature [conditio]: thus when a man takes up arms he solemnizes the fact in one way, namely, with a certain display of

horses and arms and a concourse of soldiers, while a marriage is solemnized in another way, namely, the array of the bridegroom and bride and the gathering of their kindred. Now a vow is a promise made to God: wherefore, the solemnization of a vow consists in something spiritual pertaining to God; i.e. in some spiritual blessing or consecration which, in accordance with the institution of the apostles, is given when a man makes profession of observing a certain rule, in the second degree after the reception of holy orders, as Dionysius states (Eccl. Hier. vi). The reason of this is that solemnization is not wont to be employed, save when a man gives himself up entirely to some particular thing. For the nuptial solemnization takes place only when the marriage is celebrated, and when the bride and bridegroom mutually deliver the power over their bodies to one another. In like manner a vow is solemnized when a man devotes himself to the divine ministry by receiving holy orders, or embraces the state of perfection by renouncing the world and his own will by the profession of a certain rule.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(7)-RO(1) — This kind of solemnization regards not only men but also God in so far as it is accompanied by a spiritual consecration or blessing, of which God is the author, though man is the minister, according to ~~Gen~~ Numbers 6:27, “They shall invoke My name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them.” Hence a solemn vow is more binding with God than a simple vow, and he who breaks a solemn vow sins more grievously. When it is said that a simple vow is no less binding than a solemn vow, this refers to the fact that the transgressor of either commits a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(7)-RO(2) — It is not customary to solemnize particular acts, but the embracing of a new state, as we have said above. Hence when a man vows particular deeds, such as a pilgrimage, or some special fast, such a vow is not competent to be solemnized, but only such as the vow whereby a man entirely devotes himself to the divine ministry or service: and yet many particular works are included under this vow as under a universal.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(7)-RO(3) — Through being pronounced in public vows may have a certain human solemnity, but not a spiritual and divine solemnity, as the aforesaid vows have, even when they are pronounced

before a few persons. Hence the publicity of a vow differs from its solemnization.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(8)

Whether those who are subject to another's power are hindered from taking vows?

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that those who are subject to another's power are not hindered from taking vows. The lesser bond is surpassed by the greater. Now the obligation of one man subject to another is a lesser bond than a vow whereby one is under an obligation to God. Therefore those who are subject to another's power are not hindered from taking vows.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, children are under their parents' power. Yet children may make religious profession even without the consent of their parents. Therefore one is not hindered from taking vows, through being subject to another's power.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, to do is more than to promise. But religious who are under the power of their superiors can do certain things such as to say some psalms, or abstain from certain things. Much more therefore seemingly can they promise such things to God by means of vows.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(8)-O(4) — Further, whoever does what he cannot do lawfully sins. But subjects do not sin by taking vows, since nowhere do we find this forbidden. Therefore it would seem that they can lawfully take vows.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, It is commanded (^{ORD}Numbers 30:4-6) that "if a woman vow any thing... being in her father's house, and yet but a girl in age," she is not bound by the vow, unless her father consent: and the same is said there (^{ORD}Numbers 30:7-9) of the woman that has a husband. Therefore in like manner other persons that are subject to another's power cannot bind themselves by vow.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(8) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), a vow is a promise made to God. Now no man can firmly bind himself by a promise to do what is in another's power, but only to that which is entirely in his own power. Now whoever is subject to another, as to the matter wherein he is subject to him, it does not lie in his power to do as he will, but it depends on the will of the other. And therefore without the consent of his superior he cannot bind himself firmly by a vow in those matters wherein he is subject to another.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(8)-RO(1) — Nothing but what is virtuous can be the subject of a promise made to God, as stated above (**A(2)**). Now it is contrary to virtue for a man to offer to God that which belongs to another, as stated above (**Q(86)**, **A(3)**). Hence the conditions necessary for a vow are not altogether ensured, when a man who is under another's power vows that which is in that other's power, except under the condition that he whose power it concerns does not gainsay it.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(8)-RO(2) — As soon as a man comes of age, if he be a freeman he is in his own power in all matters concerning his person, for instance with regard to binding himself by vow to enter religion, or with regard to contracting marriage. But he is not in his own power as regards the arrangements of the household, so that in these matters he cannot vow anything that shall be valid without the consent of his father.

A slave, through being in his master's power, even as regards his personal deeds, cannot bind himself by vow to enter religion, since this would withdraw him from his master's service.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(8)-RO(3) — A religious is subject to his superior as to his actions connected with his profession of his rule. Wherefore even though one may be able to do something now and then, when one is not being occupied with other things by one's superior, yet since there is no time when his superior cannot occupy him with something, no vow of a religious stands without the consent of his superior, as neither does the vow of a girl while in (her father's) house without his consent; nor of a wife, without the consent of her husband.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(8)-RO(4) — Although the vow of one who is subject to another's power does not stand without the consent of the one to whom

he is subject, he does not sin by vowing; because his vow is understood to contain the requisite condition, providing, namely, that his superior approve or do not gainsay it.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(9)

Whether children can bind themselves by vow to enter religion?

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that children cannot bind themselves by vow to enter religion. Since a vow requires deliberation of the mind, it is fitting that those alone should vow who have the use of reason. But this is lacking in children just as in imbeciles and madmen. Therefore just as imbeciles and madmen cannot bind themselves to anything by vow, so neither, seemingly, can children bind themselves by vow to enter religion.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, that which can be validly done by one cannot be annulled by another. Now a vow to enter religion made by a boy or girl before the age of puberty can be revoked by the parents or guardian (20, qu. ii, cap. Puella). Therefore it seems that a boy or girl cannot validly make a vow before the age of fourteen.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, according to the rule of Blessed Benedict [*Ch. 58] and a statute of Innocent IV, a year's probation is granted to those who enter religion, so that probation may precede the obligation of the vow. Therefore it seems unlawful, before the year of probation, for children to be bound by vow to enter religion.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, That which is not done aright is invalid without being annulled by anyone. But the vow pronounced by a maiden, even before attaining the age of puberty, is valid, unless it be annulled by her parents within a year (20, qu. ii, cap. Puella). Therefore even before attaining to puberty children can lawfully and validly be bound by a vow to enter religion.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(9) — *I answer that*, As may be gathered from what has been said above (**A(7)**), vows are of two kinds, simple and solemn. And since, as stated in the same article, the solemnization of a vow consists in a

spiritual blessing and consecration bestowed through the ministry of the Church, it follows that it comes under the Church's dispensation. Now a simple vow takes its efficacy from the deliberation of the mind, whereby one intends to put oneself under an obligation. That such an obligation be of no force may happen in two ways. First, through defect of reason, as in madmen and imbeciles, who cannot bind themselves by vow so long as they remain in a state of madness or imbecility. Secondly, through the maker of a vow being subject to another's power, as stated above (**A(8)**). Now these two circumstances concur in children before the age of puberty, because in most instances they are lacking in reason, and besides are naturally under the care of their parents, or guardians in place of their parents: wherefore in both events their vows are without force. It happens, however, through a natural disposition which is not subject to human laws, that the use of reason is accelerated in some, albeit few, who on this account are said to be capable of guile: and yet they are not, for this reason, exempt in any way from the care of their parents; for this care is subject to human law, which takes into account that which is of most frequent occurrence.

Accordingly we must say that boys or girls who have not reached the years of puberty and have not attained the use of reason can nowise bind themselves to anything by vow. If, however, they attain the use of reason, before reaching the years of puberty, they can for their own part, bind themselves by vow; but their vows can be annulled by their parents, under whose care they are still subject.

Yet no matter how much they be capable of guile before the years of puberty, they cannot be bound by a solemn religious vow, on account of the Church's decree [**Sext. Decret. cap. Is qui, de Reg. et transeunt. ad Relig.*] which considers the majority of cases. But after the years of puberty have been reached, they can bind themselves by religious vows, simple or solemn, without the consent of their parents.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(9)-RO(1) — This argument avails in the case of children who have not yet reached the use of reason: for their vows then are invalid, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(9)-RO(2) — The vows of persons subject to another's power contain an implied condition, namely, that they be not annulled by

the superior. This condition renders them licit and valid if it be fulfilled, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(9)-RO(3) — This argument avails in the case of solemn vows which are taken in profession.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(10)

Whether vows admit of dispensation?

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that vows are not subject to dispensation. It is less to have a vow commuted than to be dispensed from keeping it. But a vow cannot be commuted, according to ⁽⁸⁷⁰⁾Leviticus 27:9,10, “A beast that may be sacrificed to the Lord, if anyone shall vow, shall be holy, and cannot be changed, neither a better for a worse, nor a worse for a better.” Much less, therefore, do vows admit of dispensation.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, no man can grant a dispensation in matters concerning the natural law and in the Divine precepts, especially those of the First Table, since these aim directly at the love of God, which is the last end of the precepts. Now the fulfilment of a vow is a matter of the natural law, and is commanded by the Divine law, as shown above (**A(3)**), and belongs to the precepts of the First Table since it is an act of religion. Therefore vows do not admit of dispensation.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, the obligation of a vow is based on the fidelity which a man owes to God, as stated above (**A(3)**). But no man can dispense in such a matter as this. Neither, therefore, can any one grant a dispensation from a vow.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, That which proceeds from the common will of many has apparently greater stability than that which proceeds from the individual will of some one person. Now the law which derives its force from the common will admits of dispensation by a man. Therefore it seems that vows also admit of dispensation by a man.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(10) — *I answer that*, The dispensation from a vow is to be taken in the same sense as a dispensation given in the observance of a law because, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(96), A(6); P(2a), Q(97), A(4)**), a law is made with an eye to that which is good in the majority of instances. But since, in certain cases this is not good, there is need for someone to decide that in that particular case the law is not to be observed. This is properly

speaking to dispense in the law: for a dispensation would seem to denote a commensurate distribution or application of some common thing to those that are contained under it, in the same way as a person is said to dispense food to a household.

In like manner a person who takes a vow makes a law for himself as it were, and binds himself to do something which in itself and in the majority of cases is a good. But it may happen that in some particular case this is simply evil, or useless, or a hindrance to a greater good: and this is essentially contrary to that which is the matter of a vow, as is clear from what has been said above (**A(2)**). Therefore it is necessary, in such a case, to decide that the vow is not to be observed. And if it be decided absolutely that a particular vow is not to be observed, this is called a “dispensation” from that vow; but if some other obligation be imposed in lieu of that which was to have been observed, the vow is said to be “commuted.” Hence it is less to commute a vow than to dispense from a vow: both, however, are in the power of the Church.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(10)-RO(1) — An animal that could be lawfully sacrificed was deemed holy from the very moment that it was the subject of a vow, being, as it were, dedicated to the worship of God: and for this reason it could not be changed: even so neither may one now exchange for something better, or worse, that which one has vowed, if it be already consecrated, e.g. a chalice or a house. On the other hand, an animal that could not be sacrificed, through not being the lawful matter of a sacrifice, could and had to be bought back, as the law requires. Even so, vows can be commuted now, if no consecration has intervened.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(10)-RO(2) — Even as man is bound by natural law and Divine precept to fulfil his vow, so, too, is he bound under the same heads to obey the law or commands of his superiors. And yet when he is dispensed from keeping a human law, this does not involve disobedience to that human law, for this would be contrary to the natural law and the Divine command; but it amounts to this — that what was law is not law in this particular case. Even so, when a superior grants a dispensation, that which was contained under a vow is by his authority no longer so contained, in so far as he decides that in this case such and such a thing is not fitting matter for a vow. Consequently when an ecclesiastical superior dispenses someone from a vow, he does not dispense him from keeping a

precept of the natural or of the Divine law, but he pronounces a decision on a matter to which a man had bound himself of his own accord, and of which he was unable to consider every circumstance.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(10)-RO(3) — The fidelity we owe to God does not require that we fulfil that which it would be wrong or useless to vow, or which would be an obstacle to the greater good whereunto the dispensation from that vow would conduce. Hence the dispensation from a vow is not contrary to the fidelity due to God.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11)

***Whether it is possible to be dispensed from
a solemn vow of continency?***

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11)-O(1) — It would seem that it is possible to be dispensed from a solemn vow of continency. As stated above, one reason for granting a dispensation from a vow is if it be an obstacle to a greater good. But a vow of continency, even though it be solemn, may be an obstacle to a greater good, since the common good is more God-like than the good of an individual. Now one man's continency may be an obstacle to the good of the whole community, for instance, in the case where, if certain persons who have vowed continency were to marry, the peace of their country might be procured. Therefore it seems that it is possible to be dispensed even from a solemn vow of continency.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11)-O(2) — Further, religion is a more excellent virtue than chastity. Now if a man vows an act of religion, e.g. to offer sacrifice to God he can be dispensed from that vow. Much more, therefore, can he be dispensed from the vow of continency which is about an act of chastity.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11)-O(3) — Further, just as the observance of a vow of abstinence may be a source of danger to the person, so too may be the observance of a vow of continency. Now one who takes a vow of abstinence can be dispensed from that vow if it prove a source of danger to his body. Therefore for the same reason one may be dispensed from a vow of continency.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11)-O(4) — Further, just as the vow of continency is part of the religious profession, whereby the vow is solemnized, so also are the

vows of poverty and obedience. But it is possible to be dispensed from the vows of poverty and obedience, as in the case of those who are appointed bishops after making profession. Therefore it seems that it is possible to be dispensed from a solemn vow of continency.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11) — *On the contrary*, It is written (Ecclus. 26:20): “No price is worthy of a continent soul.”

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11) — Further, (Extra, De Statu Monach.) at the end of the Decretal, Cum ad Monasterium it is stated that the “renouncing of property, like the keeping of chastity, is so bound up with the monastic rule, that not even the Sovereign Pontiff can disperse from its observance.”

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11) — *I answer that*, Three things may be considered in a solemn vow of continency: first, the matter of the vow, namely, continency; secondly, the perpetuity of the vow, namely, when a person binds himself by vow to the perpetual observance of chastity: thirdly, the solemnity of the vow. Accordingly, some [*William of Auxerre, Sum. Aur. III. 7:1, qu. 5] say that the solemn vow cannot be a matter of dispensation, on account of the continency itself for which no worthy price can be found, as is stated by the authority quoted above. The reason for this is assigned by some to the fact that by continency man overcomes a foe within himself, or to the fact that by continency man is perfectly conformed to Christ in respect of purity of both body and soul. But this reason does not seem to be cogent since the goods of the soul, such as contemplation and prayer, far surpass the goods of the body and still more conform us to God, and yet one may be dispensed from a vow of prayer or contemplation. Therefore, continency itself absolutely considered seems no reason why the solemn vow thereof cannot be a matter of dispensation; especially seeing that the Apostle (~~1~~² Corinthians 7:34) exhorts us to be continent on account of contemplation, when he says that the unmarried woman... “thinketh on the things of God [Vulg.: ‘the Lord’],” and since the end is of more account than the means.

Consequently others [*Albertus Magnus, Sent. iv, D, 38] find the reason for this in the perpetuity and universality of this vow. For they assert that the vow of continency cannot be canceled, save by something altogether contrary thereto, which is never lawful in any vow. But this is evidently false, because just as the practice of carnal intercourse is contrary to

continency, so is eating flesh or drinking wine contrary to abstinence from such things, and yet these latter vows may be a matter for dispensation.

For this reason others [*Innocent IV, on the above decretal] maintain that one may be dispensed even from a solemn vow of continency, for the sake of some common good or common need, as in the case of the example given above (**O(1)**), of a country being restored to peace through a certain marriage to be contracted. Yet since the Decretal quoted says explicitly that “not even the Sovereign Pontiff can dispense a monk from keeping chastity,” it follows seemingly, that we must maintain that, as stated above (**A(10)**, ad 1; cf. ^{<774>}Leviticus 27:9,10,28), whatsoever has once been sanctified to the Lord cannot be put to any other use. For no ecclesiastical prelate can make that which is sanctified to lose its consecration, not even though it be something inanimate, for instance a consecrated chalice to be not consecrated, so long as it remains entire. Much less, therefore, can a prelate make a man that is consecrated to God cease to be consecrated, so long as he lives. Now the solemnity of a vow consists in a kind of consecration or blessing of the person who takes the vow, as stated above (**A(7)**). Hence no prelate of the Church can make a man, who has pronounced a solemn vow, to be quit of that to which he was consecrated, e.g. one who is a priest, to be a priest no more, although a prelate may, for some particular reason, inhibit him from exercising his order. In like manner the Pope cannot make a man who has made his religious profession cease to be a religious, although certain jurists have ignorantly held the contrary.

We must therefore consider whether continency is essentially bound up with the purpose for which the vow is solemnized. because if not, the solemnity of the consecration can remain without the obligation of continency, but not if continency is essentially bound up with that for which the vow is solemnized. Now the obligation of observing continency is connected with Holy orders, not essentially but by the institution of the Church; wherefore it seems that the Church can grant a dispensation from the vow of continency solemnized by the reception of Holy Orders. on the other hand the obligation of observing; continency is an essential condition of the religious state, whereby a man renounces the world and binds himself wholly to God’s service, for this is incompatible with matrimony, in which state a man is under the obligation of taking to himself a wife, of begetting children, of looking after his household, and of procuring

whatever is necessary for these purposes. Wherefore the Apostle says (~~403~~ 1 Corinthians 7:33) that

“he that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world,
how he may please his wife; and he is divided.”

Hence the “monk” takes his name from “unity” [*The Greek {monos}] in contrast with this division. For this reason the Church cannot dispense from a vow solemnized by the religious profession; and the reason assigned by the Decretal is because “chastity is bound up with the monastic rule.”

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11)-RO(1) — Perils occasioned by human affairs should be obviated by human means, not by turning divine things to a human use. Now a professed religious is dead to the world and lives to God, and so he must not be called back to the human life on the pretext of any human contingency.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11)-RO(2) — A vow of temporal continency can be a matter of dispensation, as also a vow of temporal prayer or of temporal abstinence. But the fact that no dispensation can be granted from a vow of continency solemnized by profession is due, not to its being an act of chastity, but because through the religious profession it is already an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11)-RO(3) — Food is directly ordered to the upkeep of the person, therefore abstinence from food may be a direct source of danger to the person: and so on this count a vow of abstinence is a matter of dispensation. On the other hand sexual intercourse is directly ordered to the upkeep not of the person but of the species, wherefore to abstain from such intercourse by continency does not endanger the person. And if indeed accidentally it prove a source of danger to the person, this danger may be obviated by some other means, for instance by abstinence, or other corporal remedies.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11)-RO(4) — A religious who is made a bishop is no more absolved from his vow of poverty than from his vow of continency, since he must have nothing of his own and must hold himself as being the dispenser of the common goods of the Church. In like manner neither is he dispensed from his vow of obedience; it is an accident that he is not bound

to obey if he have no superior; just as the abbot of a monastery, who nevertheless is not dispensed from his vow of obedience.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(11)-RO(4)

The passage of Ecclesiasticus, which is put forward in the contrary sense, should be taken as meaning that neither fruitfulness of the of the flesh nor any bodily good is to be compared with continency, which is reckoned one of the goods of the soul, as Augustine declares (De Sanct. Virg. viii). Wherefore it is said pointedly “of a continent soul,” not “of a continent body.”

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(12)

*Whether the authority of a prelate is required for
commutation or the dispensation of a vow?*

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(12)-O(1) — It would seem that the authority of a prelate is not required for the commutation or dispensation of a vow. A person may enter religion without the authority of a superior prelate. Now by entering religion one is absolved from the vows he made in the world, even from the vow of making a pilgrimage to the Holy Land [*Cap. Scripturae, de Voto et Voti redempt.]. Therefore the commutation or dispensation of a vow is possible without the authority of a superior prelate.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(12)-O(2) — Further, to dispense anyone from a vow seems to consist in deciding in what circumstances he need not keep that vow. But if the prelate is at fault in his decision, the person who took the vow does not seem to be absolved from his vow, since no prelate can grant a dispensation contrary to the divine precept about keeping one’s vows, as stated above (**A(10)**, ad 2; **A(11)**). Likewise, when anyone rightly determines of his own authority that in his case a vow is not to be kept, he would seem not to be bound; since a vow need not be kept if it have an evil result (**A(2)**, ad 2). Therefore the Authority of a prelate is not required that one may be dispensed from a vow.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(12)-O(3) — Further, if it belongs to a prelate’s power to grant dispensations from vows, on the same count it is competent to all prelates, but it does not belong to all to dispense from every vow. Therefore it does not belong to the power of a prelate to dispense from vows.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(12) — *On the contrary*, A vow binds one to do something, even as a law does. Now the superior's authority is requisite for a dispensation from a precept of the law, as stated above (**P(2a), Q(96), A(6); P(2a), Q(97), A(4)**). Therefore it is likewise required in a dispensation from a vow.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(12) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**AA(1),2**), a vow is a promise made to God about something acceptable to Him. Now if you promise something to anyone it depends on his decision whether he accept what you promise. Again in the Church a prelate stands in God's place. Therefore a commutation or dispensation of vows requires the authority of a prelate who in God's stead declares what is acceptable to God, according to ~~2~~ 2 Corinthians 2:10: "For... have pardoned... for your sakes... in the person of Christ." And he says significantly "for your sakes," since whenever we ask a prelate for a dispensation we should do so to honor Christ in Whose person he dispenses, or to promote the interests of the Church which is His Body.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(12)-RO(1) — All other vows are about some particular works, whereas by the religious life a man consecrates his whole life to God's service. Now the particular is included in the universal, wherefore a Decretal [*Cap. Scripturae, de Voto et Voti redempt.] says that "a man is not deemed a vow-breaker if he exchange a temporal service for the perpetual service of religion." And yet a man who enters religion is not bound to fulfil the vows, whether of fasting or of praying or the like, which he made when in the world, because by entering religion he dies to his former life, and it is unsuitable to the religious life that each one should have his own observances, and because the burden of religion is onerous enough without requiring the addition of other burdens.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(12)-RO(2) — Some have held that prelates can dispense from vows at their will, for the reason that every vow supposes as a condition that the superior prelate be willing; thus it was stated above (**A(8)**) that the vow of a subject, e.g. of a slave or a son, supposes this condition, if "the father or master consent," or "does not dissent." And thus a subject might break his vow without any remorse of conscience, whenever his superior tells him to.

But this opinion is based on a false supposition: because a spiritual prelate being, not a master, but a dispenser, his power is given “unto edification, not for destruction” (~~408~~ 2 Corinthians 10:8), and consequently, just as he cannot command that which is in itself displeasing to God, namely, sin, so neither can he forbid what is in itself pleasing to God, namely, works of virtue. Therefore absolutely speaking man can vow them. But it does belong to a prelate to decide what is the more virtuous and the more acceptable to God. Consequently in matters presenting no difficulty, the prelate’s dispensation would not excuse one from sin: for instance, if a prelate were to dispense a person from a vow to enter the religious life, without any apparent cause to prevent him from fulfilling his vow. But if some cause were to appear, giving rise, at least, to doubt, he could hold to the prelate’s decision whether of commutation or of dispensation. He could not, however, follow his own judgment in the matter, because he does not stand in the place of God; except perhaps in the case when the thing he has vowed is clearly unlawful, and he is unable to have recourse to the prelate.

P(2b)-Q(88)-A(12)-RO(3) — Since the Sovereign Pontiff holds the place of Christ throughout the whole Church, he exercises absolute power of dispensing from all vows that admit of dispensation. To other and inferior prelates is the power committed of dispensing from those vows that are commonly made and frequently require dispensation, in order that men may easily have recourse to someone; such are the vows of pilgrimage (Cap. de Peregrin., de Voto et Voti redempt.), fasting and the like, and of pilgrimage to the Holy Land, are reserved to the Sovereign Pontiff [*Cap. Ex multa].

BY TAKING THE NAME OF GOD

QUESTIONS 89-91

QUESTION 89

OF OATHS

(TEN ARTICLES)

We must now consider those external acts of religion, whereby something Divine is taken by man: and this is either a sacrament or the Name of God. The place for treating of the taking of a sacrament will be in the Third Part of this work: of the taking of God's Name we shall treat now. The Name of God is taken by man in three ways. First, by way of oath in order to confirm one's own assertion: secondly, by way of adjuration as an inducement to others: thirdly, by way of invocation for the purpose of prayer or praise. Accordingly we must first treat of oaths: and under this head there are ten points of inquiry:

- (1) What is an oath?
- (2) Whether it is lawful?
- (3) What are the accompanying conditions of an oath?
- (4) Of what virtue is it an act?
- (5) Whether oaths are desirable, and to be employed frequently as something useful and good?
- (6) Whether it is lawful to swear by a creature?
- (7) Whether an oath is binding?
- (8) Which is more binding, an oath or a vow?
- (9) Whether an oath is subject to dispensation?
- (10) Who may lawfully swear, and when?

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(1)

Whether to swear is to call God to witness?

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that to swear is not to call God to witness. Whoever invokes the authority of Holy Writ calls God to witness, since it is His word that Holy Writ contains. Therefore, if to swear is to call God to witness, whoever invoked the authority of Holy Writ would swear. But this is false Therefore the antecedent is false also.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, one does not pay anything to a person by calling him to witness. But he who swears by God pays something to Him for it is written (^{<4053>}Matthew 5:33): “Thou shall pay [Douay: ‘perform’] thy oaths to the Lord”; and Augustine says [*Serm. clxxx] that to swear [jurare] is “to pay the right [jus reddere] of truth to God.” Therefore to swear is not to call God to witness.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the duties of a judge differ from the duties of a witness, as shown above (QQ(67),70). Now sometimes a man, by swearing, implores the Divine judgment, according to ^{<4016>}Psalm 7:5, “If I have rendered to them that repaid me evils, let me deservedly fall empty before my enemies.” Therefore to swear is not to call God to witness.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says in a sermon on perjury (Serm. clxxx): “When a man says: ‘By God,’ what else does he mean but that God is his witness?”

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As the Apostle says (^{<3016>}Hebrews 6:16), oaths are taken for the purpose of confirmation. Now speculative propositions receive confirmation from reason, which proceeds from principles known naturally and infallibly true. But particular contingent facts regarding man cannot be confirmed by a necessary reason, wherefore propositions regarding such things are wont to be confirmed by witnesses. Now a human witness does not suffice to confirm such matters for two reasons. First, on account of man’s lack of truth, for many give way to lying, according to ^{<5030>}Psalm 16:10, “Their mouth hath spoken lies [Vulg.: ‘proudly’].” Secondly, on account of this lack of knowledge, since he can know neither the future, nor secret thoughts, nor distant things: and yet men speak about such things, and our everyday life requires that we

should have some certitude about them. Hence the need to have recourse to a Divine witness, for neither can God lie, nor is anything hidden from Him. Now to call God to witness is named “jurare” [to swear] because it is established as though it were a principle of law [jure] that what a man asserts under the invocation of God as His witness should be accepted as true. Now sometimes God is called to witness when we assert present or past events, and this is termed a “declaratory oath”; while sometimes God is called to witness in confirmation of something future, and this is termed a “promissory oath.” But oaths are not employed in order to substantiate necessary matters, and such as come under the investigation of reason; for it would seem absurd in a scientific discussion to wish to prove one’s point by an oath.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(1)-RO(1) — It is one thing to employ a Divine witness already given, as when one adduces the authority of Holy Scripture; and another to implore God to bear witness, as in an oath.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(1)-RO(2) — A man is said to pay his oaths to God because he performs what he swears to do, or because, from the very fact that he calls upon God to witness, he recognizes Him as possessing universal knowledge and unerring truth.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(1)-RO(3) — A person is called to give witness, in order that he may make known the truth about what is alleged. Now there are two ways in which God makes known whether the alleged facts are true or not. In one way He reveals the truth simply, either by inward inspiration, or by unveiling the facts, namely, by making public what was hitherto secret: in another way by punishing the lying witness, and then He is at once judge and witness, since by punishing the liar He makes known his lie. Hence oaths are of two kinds: one is a simple contestation of God, as when a man says “God is my witness,” or, “I speak before God,” or, “By God,” which has the same meaning, as Augustine states [*See argument On the contrary]; the other is by cursing, and consists in a man binding himself or something of his to punishment if what is alleged be not true.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(2)

Whether it is lawful to swear?

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not lawful to swear. Nothing forbidden in the Divine Law is lawful. Now swearing is forbidden (^{<405>}Matthew 5:34), “But I say to you not to swear at all”; and (^{<382>}James 5:12), “Above all things, my brethren, swear not.” Therefore swearing is unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, whatever comes from an evil seems to be unlawful, because according to (^{<407>}Matthew 7:18, “neither can an evil tree bring forth good fruit.” Now swearing comes from an evil, for it is written (^{<415>}Matthew 5:37):

“But let your speech be: Yea, yea: No, no. And that which is over
and above these is of evil.”

Therefore swearing is apparently unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, to seek a sign of Divine Providence is to tempt God, and this is altogether unlawful, according to (^{<416>}Deuteronomy 6:16, “Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.” Now he that swears seems to seek a sign of Divine Providence, since he asks God to bear witness, and this must be by some evident effect. Therefore it seems that swearing is altogether unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<413>}Deuteronomy 6:13):

“Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God... and shalt swear by His
name.”

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Nothing prevents a thing being good in itself, and yet becoming a source of evil to one who makes use thereof unbecomingly: thus to receive the Eucharist is good, and yet he that receives it “unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself” (^{<412>}1 Corinthians 11:29). Accordingly in answer to the question in point it must be stated that an oath is in itself lawful and commendable. This is proved from its origin and from its end. From its origin, because swearing owes its

introduction to the faith whereby man believes that God possesses unerring truth and universal knowledge and foresight of all things: and from its end, since oaths are employed in order to justify men, and to put an end to controversy (~~389~~ Hebrews 6:16).

Yet an oath becomes a source of evil to him that makes evil use of it, that is who employs it without necessity and due caution. For if a man calls God as witness, for some trifling reason, it would seemingly prove him to have but little reverence for God, since he would not treat even a good man in this manner. Moreover, he is in danger of committing perjury, because man easily offends in words, according to ~~389~~ James 3:2, “If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man.” Wherefore it is written (Ecclus. 23:9): “Let not thy mouth be accustomed to swearing, for in it there are many falls.”

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(2)-RO(1) — Jerome, commenting on ~~415~~ Matthew 5:34, says: “Observe that our Saviour forbade us to swear, not by God, but by heaven and earth. For it is known that the Jews have this most evil custom of swearing by the elements.” Yet this answer does not suffice, because James adds, “nor by any other oath.” Wherefore we must reply that, as Augustine states (De Mendacio xv), “when the Apostle employs an oath in his epistles, he shows how we are to understand the saying, ‘I say to you, not to swear at all’; lest, to wit, swearing lead us to swear easily and from swearing easily, we contract the habit, and, from swearing habitually, we fall into perjury. Hence we find that he swore only when writing, because thought brings caution and avoids hasty words.”

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(2)-RO(2) — According to Augustine (De Serm. Dom. in Monte 1:17): “If you have to swear, note that the necessity arises from the infirmity of those whom you convince, which infirmity is indeed an evil. Accordingly He did not say: ‘That which is over and above is evil,’ but ‘is of evil.’ For you do no evil; since you make good use of swearing, by persuading another to a useful purpose: yet it ‘comes of the evil’ of the person by whose infirmity you are forced to swear.”

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(2)-RO(3) — He who swears tempts not God, because it is not without usefulness and necessity that he implores the Divine assistance. Moreover, he does not expose himself to danger, if God be unwilling to bear witness there and then: for He certainly will bear witness

at some future time, when He “will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of hearts” (~~4045~~ 1 Corinthians 4:5). And this witness will be lacking to none who swears, neither for nor against him.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(3)

Whether three accompanying conditions of an oath are suitably assigned, namely, justice, judgment, and truth?

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that justice, judgment and truth are unsuitably assigned as the conditions accompanying an oath. Things should not be enumerated as diverse, if one of them includes the other. Now of these three, one includes another, since truth is a part of justice, according to Tully (De Invent. Rhet. ii, 53): and judgment is an act of justice, as stated above (**Q(60)**, **A(1)**). Therefore the three accompanying conditions of an oath are unsuitably assigned.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, many other things are required for an oath, namely, devotion, and faith whereby we believe that God knows all things and cannot lie. Therefore the accompanying conditions of an oath are insufficiently enumerated.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, these three are requisite in man’s every deed: since he ought to do nothing contrary to justice and truth, or without judgment, according to ~~5091~~ 1 Timothy 5:21, “Do nothing without prejudice,” i.e. without previous judgment [*Vulg.: ‘Observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by declining to either side.’]. Therefore these three should not be associated with an oath any more than with other human actions.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~2402~~ Jeremiah 4:2):

“Thou shalt swear: As the Lord liveth, in truth,
and in judgment, and in justice”:

which words Jerome expounds, saying: “Observe that an oath must be accompanied by these conditions, truth, judgment and justice.”

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(2)**), an oath is not good except for one who makes good use of it. Now two conditions are required for the good use of an oath. First, that one swear, not for frivolous, but for urgent reasons, and with discretion; and this requires judgment or discretion on the part of the person who swears. Secondly, as regards the point to be confirmed by oath, that it be neither false, nor unlawful, and this requires both truth, so that one employ an oath in order to confirm what is true, and justice, so that one confirm what is lawful. A rash oath lacks judgment, a false oath lacks truth, and a wicked or unlawful oath lacks justice.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(3)-RO(1) — Judgment does not signify here the execution of justice, but the judgment of discretion, as stated above. Nor is truth here to be taken for the part of justice, but for a condition of speech.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(3)-RO(2) — Devotion, faith and like conditions requisite for the right manner of swearing are implied by judgment: for the other two regard the things sworn to as stated above. We might also reply that justice regards the reason for swearing.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(3)-RO(3) — There is great danger in swearing, both on account of the greatness of God Who is called upon to bear witness, and on account of the frailty of the human tongue, the words of which are confirmed by oath. Hence these conditions are more requisite for an oath than for other human actions.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(4)

Whether an oath is an act of religion or latria?

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that an oath is not an act of religion, or latria. Acts of religion are about holy and divine things. But oaths are employed in connection with human disputes, as the Apostle declares (³¹⁹Hebrews 6:16). Therefore swearing is not an act of religion or latria.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, it belongs to religion to give worship to God, as Tully says (De Invent. Rhet. ii, 53). But he who swears offers

nothing to God, but calls God to be his witness. Therefore swearing is not an act of religion or latria.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the end of religion or latria is to show reverence to God. But the end of an oath is not this, but rather the confirmation of some assertion. Therefore swearing is not an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<1883>}Deuteronomy 6:13):

“Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and shalt serve Him only, and
thou shalt swear by His name.”

Now he speaks there of the servitude of religion. Therefore swearing is an act of religion.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As appears from what has been said above (**A(1)**), he that swears calls God to witness in confirmation of what he says. Now nothing is confirmed save by what is more certain and more powerful. Therefore in the very fact that a man swears by God, he acknowledges God to be more powerful, by reason of His unfailing truth and His universal knowledge; and thus in a way he shows reverence to God. For this reason the Apostle says (^{<1883>}Hebrews 6:16) that “men swear by one greater than themselves,” and Jerome commenting on ^{<1883>}Matthew 5:34, says that “he who swears either reveres or loves the person by whom he swears.” The Philosopher, too, states (Metaph. i, 3) that “to swear is to give very great honor.” Now to show reverence to God belongs to religion or latria. wherefore it is evident that an oath is an act of religion or latria.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(4)-RO(1) — Two things may be observed in an oath. The witness adduced, and this is Divine: and the thing witnessed to, or that which makes it necessary to call the witness, and this is human. Accordingly an oath belongs to religion by reason of the former, and not of the latter.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(4)-RO(2) — In the very fact that a man takes God as witness by way of an oath, he acknowledges Him to be greater: and this

pertains to the reverence and honor of God, so that he offers something to God, namely, reverence and honor.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(4)-RO(3) — Whatsoever we do, we should do it in honor of God: wherefore there is no hindrance, if by intending to assure a man, we show reverence to God. For we ought so to perform our actions in God's honor that they may conduce to our neighbor's good, since God also works for His own glory and for our good.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(5)

Whether oaths are desirable and to be used frequently as something useful and good?

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that oaths are desirable and to be used frequently as something useful and good. Just as a vow is an act of religion, so is an oath. Now it is commendable and more meritorious to do a thing by vow, because a vow is an act of religion, as stated above (**Q(88)**, **A(5)**). Therefore for the same reason, to do or say a thing with an oath is more commendable, and consequently oaths are desirable as being good essentially.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, Jerome, commenting on ^{408a}Matthew 5:34, says that "he who swears either reveres or loves the person by whom he swears." Now reverence and love of God are desirable as something good essentially. Therefore swearing is also.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, swearing is directed to the purpose of confirming or assuring. But it is a good thing for a man to confirm his assertion. Therefore an oath is desirable as a good thing.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, It is written (Ecclus. 23:12): "A man that sweareth much shall be filled with iniquity": and Augustine says (De Mendacio xv) that "the Lord forbade swearing, in order that for your own part you might not be fond of it, and take pleasure in seeking occasions of swearing, as though it were a good thing."

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Whatever is required merely as a remedy for an infirmity or a defect, is not reckoned among those things

that are desirable for their own sake, but among those that are necessary: this is clear in the case of medicine which is required as a remedy for sickness. Now an oath is required as a remedy to a defect, namely, some man's lack of belief in another man. Wherefore an oath is not to be reckoned among those things that are desirable for their own sake, but among those that are necessary for this life; and such things are used unduly whenever they are used outside the bounds of necessity. For this reason Augustine says (*De Serm. Dom. in Monte i*, 17): "He who understands that swearing is not to be held as a good thing," i.e. desirable for its own sake, "restrains himself as far as he can from uttering oaths, unless there be urgent need."

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(5)-RO(1) — There is no parity between a vow and an oath: because by a vow we direct something to the honor of God, so that for this very reason a vow is an act of religion. On the other hand, in an oath reverence for the name of God is taken in confirmation of a promise. Hence what is confirmed by oath does not, for this reason, become an act of religion, since moral acts take their species from the end.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(5)-RO(2) — He who swears does indeed make use of his reverence or love for the person by whom he swears: he does not, however, direct his oath to the reverence or love of that person, but to something else that is necessary for the present life.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(5)-RO(3) — Even as a medicine is useful for healing, and yet, the stronger it is, the greater harm it does if it be taken unduly, so too an oath is useful indeed as a means of confirmation, yet the greater the reverence it demands the more dangerous it is, unless it be employed aright; for, as it is written (*Ecclus. 23:13*), "if he make it void," i.e. if he deceive his brother, "his sin shall be upon him: and if he dissemble it," by swearing falsely, and with dissimulation, "he offendeth double," [because, to wit, "pretended equity is a twofold iniquity," as Augustine [**Enarr. in Psalm lxxiii*, 7] declares]: "and if he swear in vain," i.e. without due cause and necessity, "he shall not be justified."

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(6)

Whether it is lawful to swear by creatures?

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not lawful to swear by creatures. It is written (^{<405>}Matthew 5:34-36): “I say to you not to swear at all, neither by heaven... nor by the earth... nor by Jerusalem... nor by thy head”: and Jerome, expounding these words, says: “Observe that the Saviour does not forbid swearing by God, but by heaven and earth,” etc.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, punishment is not due save for a fault. Now a punishment is appointed for one who swears by creatures: for it is written (22, qu. i, can. Clericum): “If a cleric swears by creatures he must be very severely rebuked: and if he shall persist in this vicious habit we wish that he be excommunicated.” Therefore it is unlawful to swear by creatures.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, an oath is an act of religion, as stated above (A(4)). But religious worship is not due to any creature, according to ^{<402>}Romans 1:23,25. Therefore it is not lawful to swear by a creature.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Joseph swore “by the health of Pharaoh” (^{<426>}Genesis 42:16). Moreover it is customary to swear by the Gospel, by relics, and by the saints.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(6) — *I answer that*, As stated above (A(1), ad 3), there are two kinds of oath. One is uttered a simple contestation or calling God as witness: and this kind of oath, like faith, is based on God’s truth. Now faith is essentially and chiefly about God Who is the very truth, and secondarily about creatures in which God’s truth is reflected, as stated above (Q(1), A(1)). In like manner an oath is chiefly referred to God Whose testimony is invoked; and secondarily an appeal by oath is made to certain creatures considered, not in themselves, but as reflecting the Divine truth. Thus we swear by the Gospel, i.e. by God Whose truth is made known in the Gospel; and by the saints who believed this truth and kept it.

The other way of swearing is by cursing and in this kind of oath a creature is adduced that the judgment of God may be wrought therein. Thus a man

is wont to swear by his head, or by his son, or by some other thing that he loves, even as the Apostle swore (^{¶1022}2 Corinthians 1:23), saying: “I call God to witness upon my soul.”

As to Joseph’s oath by the health of Pharaoh this may be understood in both ways: either by way of a curse, as though he pledged Pharaoh’s health to God; or by way of contestation, as though he appealed to the truth of God’s justice which the princes of the earth are appointed to execute.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(6)-RO(1) — Our Lord forbade us to swear by creatures so as to give them the reverence due to God. Hence Jerome adds that “the Jews, through swearing by the angels and the like, worshipped creatures with a Divine honor.”

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(6)-RO(1)

In the same sense a cleric is punished, according to the canons (22, qu. i, can. Clericum, **O(2)**), for swearing by a creature, for this savors of the blasphemy of unbelief. Hence in the next chapter, it is said: “If any one swears by God’s hair or head, or otherwise utter blasphemy against God, and he be in ecclesiastical orders, let him be degraded.”

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(6)-RO(1)

This suffices for the Reply to the Second Objection.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(6)-RO(3) — Religious worship is shown to one whose testimony is invoked by oath: hence the prohibition (^{¶1023}Exodus 23:13): “By the name of strange gods you shall not swear.” But religious worship is not given to creatures employed in an oath in the ways mentioned above.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(7)

Whether an oath has a binding force?

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that an oath has no binding force. An oath is employed in order to confirm the truth of an assertion. But when a person makes an assertion about the future his assertion is true, though it may not be verified. Thus Paul lied not (^{¶1015}2 Corinthians

1:15, seqq.) though he went not to Corinth, as he had said he would (~~¶~~1 Corinthians 16:5). Therefore it seems that an oath is not binding.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, virtue is not contrary to virtue (Categ. viii, 22). Now an oath is an act of virtue, as stated above (**A(4)**). But it would sometimes be contrary to virtue, or an obstacle thereto, if one were to fulfil what one has sworn to do: for instance, if one were to swear to commit a sin, or to desist from some virtuous action. Therefore an oath is not always binding.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, sometimes a man is compelled against his will to promise something under oath. Now, “such a person is loosed by the Roman Pontiffs from the bond of his oath” (Extra, De Jurejur., cap. Verum in ea quaest., etc.). Therefore an oath is not always binding.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(7)-O(4) — Further, no person can be under two opposite obligations. Yet sometimes the person who swears and the person to whom he swears have opposite intentions. Therefore an oath cannot always be binding.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~¶~~Matthew 5:33):

“Thou shalt perform thy oaths to the Lord.”

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(7) — *I answer that*, An obligation implies something to be done or omitted; so that apparently it regards neither the declaratory oath (which is about something present or past), nor such oaths as are about something to be effected by some other cause (as, for example, if one were to swear that it would rain tomorrow), but only such as are about things to be done by the person who swears.

Now just as a declaratory oath, which is about the future or the present, should contain the truth, so too ought the oath which is about something to be done by us in the future. Yet there is a difference: since, in the oath that is about the past or present, this obligation affects, not the thing that already has been or is, but the action of the swearer, in the point of his swearing to what is or was already true; whereas, *on the contrary*, in the oath that is made about something to be done by us, the obligation falls on the thing guaranteed by oath. For a man is bound to make true what he has sworn, else his oath lacks truth.

Now if this thing be such as not to be in his power, his oath is lacking in judgment of discretion: unless perchance what was possible when he swore become impossible to him through some mishap. as when a man swore to pay a sum of money, which is subsequently taken from him by force or theft. For then he would seem to be excused from fulfilling his oath, although he is bound to do what he can, as, in fact, we have already stated with regard to the obligation of a vow (**Q(88), A(3)**, ad 2). If, on the other hand, it be something that he can do, but ought not to, either because it is essentially evil, or because it is a hindrance to a good, then his oath is lacking in justice: wherefore an oath must not be kept when it involves a sin or a hindrance to good. For in either case “its result is evil” [*Cf. Bede, Homil. xix, in Decoll. S. Joan. Bapt.]

Accordingly we must conclude that whoever swears to do something is bound to do what he can for the fulfilment of truth; provided always that the other two accompanying conditions be present, namely, judgment and justice.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(7)-RO(1) — It is not the same with a simple assertion, and with an oath wherein God is called to witness: because it suffices for the truth of an assertion, that a person say what he proposes to do, since it is already true in its cause, namely, the purpose of the doer. But an oath should not be employed, save in a matter about which one is firmly certain: and, consequently, if a man employ an oath, he is bound, as far as he can, to make true what he has sworn, through reverence of the Divine witness invoked, unless it leads to an evil result, as stated.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(7)-RO(2) — An oath may lead to an evil result in two ways. First, because from the very outset it has an evil result, either through being evil of its very nature (as, if a man were to swear to commit adultery), or through being a hindrance to a greater good, as if a man were to swear not to enter religion, or not to become a cleric, or that he would not accept a prelacy, supposing it would be expedient for him to accept, or in similar cases. For oaths of this kind are unlawful from the outset: yet with a difference: because if a man swear to commit a sin, he sinned in swearing, and sins in keeping his oath: whereas if a man swear not to perform a greater good, which he is not bound to do withal, he sins indeed in swearing (through placing an obstacle to the Holy Ghost, Who is the

inspirer of good purposes), yet he does not sin in keeping his oath, though he does much better if he does not keep it.

Secondly, an oath leads to an evil result through some new and unforeseen emergency. An instance is the oath of Herod, who swore to the damsel, who danced before him, that he would give her what she would ask of him. For this oath could be lawful from the outset, supposing it to have the requisite conditions, namely, that the damsel asked what it was right to grant. but the fulfilment of the oath was unlawful. Hence Ambrose says (*De Officiis* i, 50): “Sometimes it is wrong to fulfil a promise, and to keep an oath; as Herod, who granted the slaying of John, rather than refuse what he had promised.”

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(7)-RO(3) — There is a twofold obligation in the oath which a man takes under compulsion: one, whereby he is beholden to the person to whom he promises something; and this obligation is cancelled by the compulsion, because he that used force deserves that the promise made to him should not be kept. The other is an obligation whereby a man is beholden to God, in virtue of which he is bound to fulfil what he has promised in His name. This obligation is not removed in the tribunal of conscience, because that man ought rather to suffer temporal loss, than violate his oath. He can, however, seek in a court of justice to recover what he has paid, or denounce the matter to his superior even if he has sworn to the contrary, because such an oath would lead to evil results since it would be contrary to public justice. The Roman Pontiffs, in absolving men from oaths of this kind, did not pronounce such oaths to be unbinding, but relaxed the obligation for some just cause.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(7)-RO(4) — When the intention of the swearer is not the same as the intention of the person to whom he swears, if this be due to the swearer’s guile, he must keep his oath in accordance with the sound understanding of the person to whom the oath is made. Hence Isidore says (*De Summo Bono* ii, 31): “However artful a man may be in wording his oath, God Who witnesses his conscience accepts his oath as understood by the person to whom it is made.” And that this refers to the deceitful oath is clear from what follows: “He is doubly guilty who both takes God’s name in vain, and tricks his neighbor by guile.” If, however, the swearer uses no guile, he is bound in accordance with his own intention.

Wherefore Gregory says (Moral. xxvi, 7): “The human ear takes such like words in their natural outward sense, but the Divine judgment interprets them according to our inward intention.”

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(8)

Whether an oath is more binding than a vow?

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that an oath is more binding than a vow. A vow is a simple promise: whereas an oath includes, besides a promise, an appeal to God as witness. Therefore an oath is more binding than a vow.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, the weaker is wont to be confirmed by the stronger. Now a vow is sometimes confirmed by an oath. Therefore an oath is stronger than a vow.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, the obligation of a vow arises from the deliberation of the mind, as stated above (**Q(88)**, **A(1)**); while the obligation of an oath results from the truth of God Whose testimony is invoked. Since therefore God’s truth is something greater than human deliberation, it seems that the obligation of an oath is greater than that of a vow.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, A vow binds one to God while an oath sometimes binds one to man. Now one is more bound to God than to man. Therefore a vow is more binding than an oath.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(8) — *I answer that*, The obligation both of vow and of an oath arises from something Divine; but in different ways. For the obligation of a vow arises from the fidelity we owe God, which binds us to fulfil our promises to Him. On the other hand, the obligation of an oath arises from the reverence we owe Him which binds us to make true what we promise in His name. Now every act of infidelity includes an irreverence, but not conversely, because the infidelity of a subject to his lord would seem to be the greatest irreverence. Hence a vow by its very nature is more binding than an oath.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(8)-RO(1) — A vow is not any kind of promise, but a promise made to God; and to be unfaithful to God is most grievous.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(8)-RO(2) — An oath is added to a vow not because it is more stable, but because greater stability results from “two immutable things” [*³¹⁶⁸Hebrews 6:18].

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(8)-RO(3) — Deliberation of the mind gives a vow its stability, on the part of the person who takes the vow: but it has a greater cause of stability on the part of God, to Whom the vow is offered.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(9)

Whether anyone can dispense from an oath?

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(9)-O(1) — It would seem that no one can dispense from an oath. Just as truth is required for a declaratory oath, which is about the past or the present, so too is it required for a promissory oath, which is about the future. Now no one can dispense a man from swearing to the truth about present or past things. Therefore neither can anyone dispense a man from making truth that which he has promised by oath to do in the future.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(9)-O(2) — Further, a promissory oath is used for the benefit of the person to whom the promise is made. But, apparently, he cannot release the other from his oath, since it would be contrary to the reverence of God. Much less therefore can a dispensation from this oath be granted by anyone.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(9)-O(3) — Further, any bishop can grant a dispensation from a vow, except certain vows reserved to the Pope alone, as stated above (**Q(88)**, **A(12)**, ad 3). Therefore in like manner, if an oath admits of dispensation, any bishop can dispense from an oath. And yet seemingly this is to be against the law [*Caus. XV, qu. 6, can. Auctoritatem, seqq.: Cap. Si vero, de Jurejurando]. Therefore it would seem that an oath does not admit of dispensation.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(9) — *On the contrary*, A vow is more binding than an oath, as stated above (**A(8)**). But a vow admits of dispensation and therefore an oath does also.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(9) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(88), A(10)**), the necessity of a dispensation both from the law and from a vow arises from the fact that something which is useful and morally good in itself and considered in general, may be morally evil and hurtful in respect of some particular emergency: and such a case comes under neither law nor vow. Now anything morally evil or hurtful is incompatible with the matter of an oath: for if it be morally evil it is opposed to justice, and if it be hurtful it is contrary to judgment. Therefore an oath likewise admits of dispensation.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(9)-RO(1) — A dispensation from an oath does not imply a permission to do anything against the oath: for this is impossible, since the keeping of an oath comes under a Divine precept, which does not admit of dispensation: but it implies that what hitherto came under an oath no longer comes under it, as not being due matter for an oath, just as we have said with regard to vows (**Q(88), A(10)**, ad 2). Now the matter of a declaratory oath, which is about something past or present, has already acquired a certain necessity, and has become unchangeable, wherefore the dispensation will regard not the matter but the act itself of the oath: so that such a dispensation would be directly contrary to the Divine precept. On the other hand, the matter of a promissory oath is something future, which admits of change, so that, to wit, in certain emergencies, it may be unlawful or hurtful, and consequently undue matter for an oath. Therefore a promissory oath admits of dispensation, since such dispensation regards the matter of an oath, and is not contrary to the Divine precept about the keeping of oaths.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(9)-RO(2) — One man may promise something under oath to another in two ways. First, when he promises something for his benefit: for instance, if he promise to serve him, or to give him money: and from such a promise he can be released by the person to whom he made it: for he is understood to have already kept his promise to him when he acts towards him according to his will. Secondly, one man promises another something pertaining to God's honor or to the benefit of others: for instance, if a man promise another under oath that he will enter religion, or perform some act of kindness. In this case the person to whom the promise is made cannot release him that made the promise, because it was made principally not to him but to God: unless perchance it included some

condition, for instance, “provided he give his consent” or some such like condition.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(9)-RO(3) — Sometimes that which is made the matter of a promissory oath is manifestly opposed to justice, either because it is a sin, as when a man swears to commit a murder, or because it is an obstacle to a greater good, as when a man swears not to enter a religion: and such an oath requires no dispensation. But in the former case a man is bound not to keep such an oath, while in the latter it is lawful for him to keep or not to keep the oath, as stated above (**A(7)**, ad 2). Sometimes what is promised on oath is doubtfully right or wrong, useful or harmful, either in itself or under the circumstance. In this case any bishop can dispense. Sometimes, however, that which is promised under oath is manifestly lawful and beneficial. An oath of this kind seemingly admits not of dispensation but of commutation, when there occurs something better to be done for the common good, in which case the matter would seem to belong chiefly to the power of the Pope, who has charge over the whole Church; and even of absolute relaxation, for this too belongs in general to the Pope in all matters regarding the administration of things ecclesiastical. Thus it is competent to any man to cancel an oath made by one of his subjects in matters that come under his authority: for instance, a father may annul his daughter’s oath, and a husband his wife’s (^{89b}Numbers 30:6, seqq.), as stated above with regard to vows (**Q(88)**, **AA(8,9)**).

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(10)

Whether an oath is voided by a condition of person or time?

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(10)-O(1) — It would seem that an oath is not voided by a condition of person or time. An oath, according to the Apostle (^{89b}Hebrews 6:16), is employed for the purpose of confirmation. Now it is competent to anyone to confirm his assertion, and at any time. Therefore it would seem that an oath is not voided by a condition of person or time.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(10)-O(2) — Further, to swear by God is more than to swear by the Gospels: wherefore Chrysostom [*Hom. xlv in the Opus Imperfectum falsely ascribed to St. John Chrysostom] says: “If there is a reason for swearing, it seems a small thing to swear by God, but a great

thing to swear by the Gospels. To those who think thus, it must be said: Nonsense! the Scriptures were made for God's sake, not God for the sake of the Scriptures." Now men of all conditions and at all times are wont to swear by God. Much more, therefore, is it lawful to swear by the Gospels.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(10)-O(3) — Further, the same effect does not proceed from contrary causes, since contrary causes produce contrary effects. Now some are debarred from swearing on account of some personal defect; children, for instance, before the age of fourteen, and persons who have already committed perjury. Therefore it would seem that a person ought not to be debarred from swearing either on account of his dignity, as clerics, or on account of the solemnity of the time.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(10)-O(4) — Further, in this world no living man is equal in dignity to an angel: for it is written (^{<III>}Matthew 11:11) that "he that is the lesser in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he," namely than John the Baptist, while yet living. Now an angel is competent to swear, for it is written (Apoc. 10:6) that the angel "swore by Him that liveth for ever and ever." Therefore no man ought to be excused from swearing, on account of his dignity.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(10) — *On the contrary*, It is stated (II, qu. v, can. Si quis presbyter): "Let a priest be examined 'by his sacred consecration,' instead of being put on his oath": and (22, qu. v, can. Nullus): "Let no one in ecclesiastical orders dare to swear on the Holy Gospels to a layman."

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(10) — *I answer that*, Two things are to be considered in an oath. One is on the part of God, whose testimony is invoked, and in this respect we should hold an oath in the greatest reverence. For this reason children before the age of puberty are debarred from taking oaths [*Caus. XXII, qu. 5, can. Parvuli], and are not called upon to swear, because they have not yet attained the perfect use of reason, so as to be able to take a oath with due reverence. Perjurers also are debarred from taking an oath, because it is presumed from their antecedents that they will not treat an oath with the reverence due to it. For this same reason, in order that oaths might be treated with due reverence the law says (22, qu. v, can. Honestum): "It is becoming that he who ventures to swear on holy things should do so fasting, with all propriety and fear of God."

The other thing to be considered is on the part of the man, whose assertion is confirmed by oath. For a man's assertion needs no confirmation save because there is a doubt about it. Now it derogates from a person's dignity that one should doubt about the truth of what he says, wherefore "it becomes not persons of great dignity to swear." For this reason the law says (II, qu. v, can. *Si quis presbyter*) that "priests should not swear for trifling reasons." Nevertheless it is lawful for them to swear if there be need for it, or if great good may result therefrom. Especially is this the case in spiritual affairs, when moreover it is becoming that they should take oath on days of solemnity, since they ought then to devote themselves to spiritual matters. Nor should they on such occasions take oaths temporal matters, except perhaps in cases grave necessity.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(10)-RO(1) — Some are unable to confirm their own assertions on account of their own defect: and some there are whose words should be so certain that they need no confirmation.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(10)-RO(2) — The greater the thing sworn by, the holier and the more binding is the oath, considered in itself, as Augustine states (*Ad Public.*, Ep. xlvii): and accordingly is a graver matter to swear by God than the Gospels. Yet the contrary may be the case on account of the manner of swearing for instance, an oath by the Gospels might be taken with deliberation and solemnity, and an oath by God frivolously and without deliberation.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(10)-RO(3) — Nothing prevents the same thing from arising out of contrary causes, by way of superabundance and defect. It is in this way that some are debarred from swearing, through being of so great authority that it is unbecoming for them to swear; while others are of such little authority that their oaths have no standing.

P(2b)-Q(89)-A(10)-RO(4) — The angel's oath is adduced not on account of any defect in the angel, as though one ought not to credit his mere word, but in order to show that the statement made issues from God's infallible disposition. Thus too God is sometimes spoken of by Scripture as swearing, in order to express the immutability of His word, as the Apostle declares (³⁸⁶⁷ Hebrews 6:17).

QUESTION 90

OF THE TAKING OF GOD'S NAME BY WAY OF ADJURATION

(THREE ARTICLES)

We must now consider the taking of God's name by way of adjuration: under which head there are three points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether it is lawful to adjure a man?
- (2) Whether it is lawful to adjure the demons?
- (3) Whether it is lawful to adjure irrational creatures?

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(1)

Whether it is lawful to adjure a man?

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not lawful to adjure a man. Origen says (Tract. xxxv super Matth.): “I deem that a man who wishes to live according to the Gospel should not adjure another man. For if, according to the Gospel mandate of Christ, it be unlawful to swear, it is evident that neither is it lawful to adjure: and consequently it is manifest that the high-priest unlawfully adjured Jesus by the living God.”

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, whoever adjures a man, compels him after a fashion. But it is unlawful to compel a man against his will. Therefore seemingly it is also unlawful to adjure a man.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, to adjure is to induce a person to swear. Now it belongs to man's superior to induce him to swear, for the superior imposes an oath on his subject. Therefore subjects cannot adjure their superiors.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Even when we pray God we implore Him by certain holy things: and the Apostle too besought the

faithful “by the mercy of God” (^{<611>}Romans 12:1): and this seems to be a kind of adjuration. Therefore it is lawful to adjure.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(1) — *I answer that,* A man who utters a promissory oath, swearing by his reverence for the Divine name, which he invokes in confirmation of his promise, binds himself to do what he has undertaken, and so orders himself unchangeably to do a certain thing. Now just as a man can order himself to do a certain thing, so too can he order others, by beseeching his superiors, or by commanding his inferiors, as stated above (**Q(83), A(1)**). Accordingly when either of these orderings is confirmed by something Divine it is an adjuration. Yet there is this difference between them, that man is master of his own actions but not of those of others; wherefore he can put himself under an obligation by invoking the Divine name, whereas he cannot put others under such an obligation unless they be his subjects, whom he can compel on the strength of the oath they have taken.

Therefore, if a man by invoking the name of God, or any holy thing, intends by this adjuration to put one who is not his subject under an obligation to do a certain thing, in the same way as he would bind himself by oath, such an adjuration is unlawful, because he usurps over another a power which he has not. But superiors may bind their inferiors by this kind of adjuration, if there be need for it.

If, however, he merely intend, through reverence of the Divine name or of some holy thing, to obtain something from the other man without putting him under any obligation, such an adjuration may be lawfully employed in respect of anyone.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(1)-RO(1) — Origen is speaking of an adjuration whereby a man intends to put another under an obligation, in the same way as he would bind himself by oath: for thus did the high-priest presume to adjure our Lord Jesus Christ [^{*<166>}Matthew 26:63].

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(1)-RO(2) — This argument considers the adjuration which imposes an obligation.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(1)-RO(3) — To adjure is not to induce a man to swear, but to employ terms resembling an oath in order to provoke another to do a certain thing.

Moreover, we adjure God in one way and man in another; because when we adjure a man we intend to alter his will by appealing to his reverence for a holy thing; and we cannot have such an intention in respect of God Whose will is immutable. If we obtain something from God through His eternal will, it is due, not to our merits, but to His goodness.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(2)

Whether it is lawful to adjure the demons?


P(2b)-Q(90)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful to adjure the demons. Origen says (Tract. xxxv, super Matth.): “To adjure the demons is not accordance with the power given by our Saviour: for this is a Jewish practice.” Now rather than imitate the rites of the Jews, we should use the power given by Christ. Therefore it is not lawful to adjure the demons.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, many make use of necromantic incantations when invoking the demons by something Divine: and this is an adjuration. Therefore, if it be lawful to adjure the demons, it is lawful to make use of necromantic incantations, which is evidently false. Therefore the antecedent is false also.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, whoever adjures a person, by that very fact associates himself with him. Now it is not lawful to have fellowship with the demons, according to ^{<410>}1 Corinthians 10:20, “I would not that you should be made partakers with devils.” Therefore it is not lawful to adjure the demons.


P(2b)-Q(90)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<416>}Mark 16:17): “In My name they shall cast out devils.” Now to induce anyone to do a certain thing for the sake of God’s name is to adjure. Therefore it is lawful to adjure the demons.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated in the preceding article, there are two ways of adjuring: one by way of prayer or inducement through reverence of some holy thing: the other by way of compulsion. In the first way it is not lawful to adjure the demons because such a way seems to savor of benevolence or friendship, which it is unlawful to bear towards the demons. As to the second kind of adjuration, which is by

compulsion, we may lawfully use it for some purposes, and not for others. For during the course of this life the demons are our adversaries: and their actions are not subject to our disposal but to that of God and the holy angels, because, as Augustine says (De Trin. iii, 4), “the rebel spirit is ruled by the just spirit.” Accordingly we may repulse the demons, as being our enemies, by adjuring them through the power of God’s name, lest they do us harm of soul or body, in accord with the Divine power given by Christ, as recorded by  Luke 10:19: “Behold, I have given you power to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and upon all the power of the enemy: and nothing shall hurt you.”

It is not, however, lawful to adjure them for the purpose of learning something from them, or of obtaining something through them, for this would amount to holding fellowship with them: except perhaps when certain holy men, by special instinct or Divine revelation, make use of the demons’ actions in order to obtain certain results: thus we read of the Blessed James [*the Greater; cf. Apocrypha, N.T., Hist. Certam. Apost. vi, 19] that he caused Hermogenes to be brought to him, by the instrumentality of the demons.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(2)-RO(1) — Origen is speaking of adjuration made, not authoritatively by way of compulsion, but rather by way of a friendly appeal.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(2)-RO(2) — Necromancers adjure and invoke the demons in order to obtain or learn something from them: and this is unlawful, as stated above. Wherefore Chrysostom, commenting on our Lord’s words to the unclean spirit ( Mark 1:25), “Speak no more, and go out of the man,” says: “A salutary teaching is given us here, lest we believe the demons, however much they speak the truth.”

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(2)-RO(3) — This argument considers the adjuration whereby the demon’s help is besought in doing or learning something: for this savors of fellowship with them. On the other hand, to repulse the demons by adjuring them, is to sever oneself from their fellowship.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(3)

Whether it is lawful to adjure an irrational creature?

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem unlawful to adjure an irrational creature. An adjuration consists of spoken words. But it is useless to speak to one that understands not, such as an irrational creature. Therefore it is vain and unlawful to adjure an irrational creature.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, seemingly wherever adjuration is admissible, swearing is also admissible. But swearing is not consistent with an irrational creature. Therefore it would seem unlawful to employ adjuration towards one.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, there are two ways of adjuring, as explained above (**AA(1),2**). One is by way of appeal; and this cannot be employed towards irrational creatures, since they are not masters of their own actions. The other kind of adjuration is by way of compulsion: and, seemingly, neither is it lawful to use this towards them, because we have not the power to command irrational creatures, but only He of Whom it was said (⁴¹⁸²Matthew 8:27): “For the winds and the sea obey Him.” Therefore in no way, apparently, is it lawful to adjure irrational creatures.

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Simon and Jude are related to have adjured dragons and to have commanded them to withdraw into the desert. [*From the apocryphal *Historiae Certam*. Apost. 6:19.]

P(2b)-Q(90)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Irrational creatures are directed to their own actions by some other agent. Now the action of what is directed and moved is also the action of the director and mover: thus the movement of the arrow is an operation of the archer. Wherefore the operation of the irrational creature is ascribed not only to it, but also and chiefly to God, Who disposes the movements of all things. It is also ascribed to the devil, who, by God’s permission, makes use of irrational creatures in order to inflict harm on man.

Accordingly the adjuration of an irrational creature may be of two kinds. First, so that the adjuration is referred to the irrational creature in itself: and in this way it would be vain to adjure an irrational creature. Secondly,

so that it be referred to the director and mover of the irrational creature, and in this sense a creature of this kind may be adjured in two ways. First, by way of appeal made to God, and this relates to those who work miracles by calling on God: secondly, by way of compulsion, which relates to the devil, who uses the irrational creature for our harm. This is the kind of adjuration used in the exorcisms of the Church, whereby the power of the demons is expelled from an irrational creature. But it is not lawful to adjure the demons by beseeching them to help us.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

QUESTION 91

OF TAKING THE DIVINE NAME FOR THE PURPOSE OF INVOKING IT BY MEANS OF PRAISE

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the taking of the Divine name for the purpose of invoking it by prayer or praise. Of prayer we have already spoken (**Q(83)**). Wherefore we must speak now of praise. Under this head there are two points of inquiry:

(1) Whether God should be praised with the lips?

(2) Whether God should be praised with song?

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(1)

Whether God should be praised with the lips?

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that God should not be praised with the lips. The Philosopher says (Ethic. 1,12): “The best of men are accorded not praise, but something greater.” But God transcends the very best of all things. Therefore God ought to be given, not praise, but something greater than praise: wherefore He is said (Ecclus. 43:33) to be “above all praise.”

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, divine praise is part of divine worship, for it is an act of religion. Now God is worshiped with the mind rather than with the lips: wherefore our Lord quoted against certain ones the words of ²³⁹⁶Isaiah 29:13, “This people... honors [Vulg.: ‘glorifies’] Me with their lips, but their heart is far from Me.” Therefore the praise of God lies in the heart rather than on the lips.

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, men are praised with the lips that they may be encouraged to do better: since just as being praised makes the

wicked proud, so does it incite the good to better things. Wherefore it is written (¹⁰⁷²Proverbs 27:21):

“As silver is tried in the fining-pot... so a man is tried by the mouth
of him that praiseth.”

But God is not incited to better things by man's words, both because He is unchangeable, and because He is supremely good, and it is not possible for Him to grow better. Therefore God should not be praised with the lips.

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (¹⁰⁸¹Psalms 62:6):

“My mouth shall praise Thee with joyful lips.”

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(1) — *I answer that*, We use words, in speaking to God, for one reason, and in speaking to man, for another reason. For when speaking to man we use words in order to tell him our thoughts which are unknown to him. Wherefore we praise a man with our lips, in order that he or others may learn that we have a good opinion of him: so that in consequence we may incite him to yet better things; and that we may induce others, who hear him praised, to think well of him, to reverence him, and to imitate him. On the other hand we employ words, in speaking to God, not indeed to make known our thoughts to Him Who is the searcher of hearts, but that we may bring ourselves and our hearers to reverence Him.

Consequently we need to praise God with our lips, not indeed for His sake, but for our own sake; since by praising Him our devotion is aroused towards Him, according to (¹⁰⁸¹Psalms 49:23):

“The sacrifice of praise shall glorify Me, and there is the way by
which I will show him the salvation of God.”

And forasmuch as man, by praising God, ascends in his affections to God, by so much is he withdrawn from things opposed to God, according to (²⁴⁸¹Isaiah 48:9, “For My praise I will bridle thee lest thou shouldst perish.” The praise of the lips is also profitable to others by inciting their affections towards God, wherefore it is written (¹⁰⁸¹Psalms 33:2): “His praise shall always be in my mouth,” and farther on: “Let the meek hear and rejoice. O magnify the Lord with me.”

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(1)-RO(1) — We may speak of God in two ways. First, with regard to His essence; and thus, since He is incomprehensible and ineffable, He is above all praise. In this respect we owe Him reverence and the honor of latria; wherefore ^{<1641>}Psalm 64:2 is rendered by Jerome in his Psalter [*Translated from the Hebrew]: “Praise to Thee is speechless, O God,” as regards the first, and as to the second, “A vow shall be paid to Thee.” Secondly, we may speak of God as to His effects which are ordained for our good. In this respect we owe Him praise; wherefore it is written (^{<2311>}Isaiah 63:7):

“I will remember the tender mercies of the Lord, the praise of the Lord for all the things that the Lord hath bestowed upon us.”

Again, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. 1): “Thou wilt find that all the sacred hymns,” i.e. divine praises “of the sacred writers, are directed respectively to the Blessed Processions of the Thearchy,” i.e. of the Godhead, “showing forth and praising the names of God.”

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(1)-RO(2) — It profits one nothing to praise with the lips if one praise not with the heart. For the heart speaks God’s praises when it fervently recalls “the glorious things of His works” [*Cf. Ecclus. 17:7,8]. Yet the outward praise of the lips avails to arouse the inward fervor of those who praise, and to incite others to praise God, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(1)-RO(3) — We praise God, not for His benefit, but for ours as stated.

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2)

Whether God should be praised with song?

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that God should not be praised with song. For the Apostle says (^{<1616>}Colossians 3:16):

“Teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual canticles.”

Now we should employ nothing in the divine worship, save what is delivered to us on the authority of Scripture. Therefore it would seem that, in praising God, we should employ, not corporal but spiritual canticles.

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, Jerome in his commentary on ^{<H99}Ephesians 5:19, “Singing and making melody in your hearts to the Lord,” says: “Listen, young men whose duty it is to recite the office in church: God is to be sung not with the voice but with the heart. Nor should you, like play-actors, ease your throat and jaws with medicaments, and make the church resound with theatrical measures and airs.” Therefore God should not be praised with song.

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the praise of God is competent to little and great, according to Apoc. 14, “Give praise to our God, all ye His servants; and you that fear Him, little and great.” But the great, who are in the church, ought not to sing: for Gregory says (Regist. iv, ep. 44): “I hereby ordain that in this See the ministers of the sacred altar must not sing” (Cf. Decret., dist. xcii., cap. In sancta Romana Ecclesia). Therefore singing is unsuitable to the divine praises.

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, in the Old Law God was praised with musical instruments and human song, according to ^{<H99}Psalms 32:2,3:

“Give praise to the Lord on the harp, sing to Him with the psalter, the instrument of ten strings. Sing to Him a new canticle.”

But the Church does not make use of musical instruments such as harps and psalteries, in the divine praises, for fear of seeming to imitate the Jews. Therefore in like manner neither should song be used in the divine praises.

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2)-O(5) — Further, the praise of the heart is more important than the praise of the lips. But the praise of the heart is hindered by singing, both because the attention of the singers is distracted from the consideration of what they are singing, so long as they give all their attention to the chant, and because others are less able to understand the thing that are sung than if they were recited without chant. Therefore chants should not be employed in the divine praises.

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Blessed Ambrose established singing in the Church of Milan, a Augustine relates (Confess. ix).

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), the praise of the voice is necessary in order to arouse man’s devotion towards God. Wherefore whatever is useful in conducing to this result is becomingly

adopted in the divine praises. Now it is evident that the human soul is moved in various ways according to various melodies of sound, as the Philosophers state (Polit. viii, 5), and also Boethius (De Musica, prologue). Hence the use of music in the divine praises is a salutary institution, that the souls of the faint-hearted may be the more incited to devotion. Wherefore Augustine says (Confess. x, 33): “I am inclined to approve of the usage of singing in the church, that so by the delight of the ears the faint-hearted may rise to the feeling of devotion”: and he says of himself (Confess. ix, 6): “I wept in Thy hymns and canticles, touched to the quick by the voices of Thy sweet-attuned Church.”

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2)-RO(1) — The name of spiritual canticle may be given not only to those that are sung inwardly in spirit, but also to those that are sung outwardly with the lips, inasmuch as such like canticles arouse spiritual devotion.

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2)-RO(2) — Jerome does not absolutely condemn singing, but reproves those who sing theatrically in church not in order to arouse devotion, but in order to show off, or to provoke pleasure. Hence Augustine says (Confess. x, 33): “When it befalls me to be more moved by the voice than by the words sung, I confess to have sinned penally, and then had rather not hear the singer.”

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2)-RO(3) — To arouse men to devotion by teaching and preaching is a more excellent way than by singing. Wherefore deacons and prelates, whom it becomes to incite men’s minds towards God by means of preaching and teaching, ought not to be instant in singing, lest thereby they be withdrawn from greater things. Hence Gregory says (Regist. iv, ep. 44): “It is a most discreditable custom for those who have been raised to the diaconate to serve as choristers, for it behooves them to give their whole time to the duty of preaching and to taking charge of the alms.”

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2)-RO(4) — As the Philosopher says (Polit. viii, 6), “Teaching should not be accompanied with a flute or any artificial instrument such as the harp or anything else of this kind: but only with such things as make good hearers.” For such like musical instruments move the soul to pleasure rather than create a good disposition within it. In the Old Testament instruments of this description were employed, both because the people were more coarse and carnal — so that they needed to

be aroused by such instruments as also by earthly promises — and because these material instruments were figures of something else.

P(2b)-Q(91)-A(2)-RO(5) — The soul is distracted from that which is sung by a chant that is employed for the purpose of giving pleasure. But if the singer chant for the sake of devotion, he pays more attention to what he says, both because he lingers more thereon, and because, as Augustine remarks (Confess. x, 33), “each affection of our spirit, according to its variety, has its own appropriate measure in the voice, and singing, by some hidden correspondence wherewith it is stirred.” The same applies to the hearers, for even if some of them understand not what is sung, yet they understand why it is sung, namely, for God’s glory: and this is enough to arouse their devotion.

VICES OPPOSED TO RELIGION

QUESTIONS 92-114

SUPERSTITION, I.E. BY WAY OF EXCESS

QUESTIONS 92-96

QUESTION 92

OF SUPERSTITION

(TWO ARTICLES)

In due sequence we must consider the vices that are opposed to religion. First we shall consider those which agree with religion in giving worship to God; secondly, we shall treat of those vices which are manifestly contrary to religion, through showing contempt of those things that pertain to the worship of God. The former come under the head of superstition, the latter under that of irreligion. Accordingly we must consider in the first place, superstition and its parts, and afterwards irreligion and its parts.

Under the first head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether superstition is a vice opposed to religion?
- (2) Whether it has several parts or species?

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(1)

Whether superstition is a vice contrary to religion?

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that superstition is not a vice contrary to religion. One contrary is not included in the definition of the other. But religion is included in the definition of superstition: for the latter

is defined as being “immoderate observance of religion,” according to a gloss on ³⁰²Colossians 2:23, “Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in superstition.” Therefore superstition is not a vice contrary to religion.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Isidore says (Etym. x): “Cicero [*De Natura Deorum ii, 28] states that the superstitious were so called because they spent the day in praying and offering sacrifices that their children might survive [superstites] them.” But this may be done even in accordance with true religious worship. Therefore superstition is not a vice opposed to religion.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, superstition seems to denote an excess. But religion admits of no excess, since, as stated above (**Q(81)**, **A(5)**, ad 3), there is no possibility of rendering to God, by religion, the equal of what we owe Him. Therefore superstition is not a vice contrary to religion.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Decem Chord. Sermon. ix): “Thou strikest the first chord in the worship of one God, and the beast of superstition hath fallen.” Now the worship of one God belongs to religion. Therefore superstition is contrary to religion.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(81)**, **A(5)**), religion is a moral virtue. Now every moral virtue observes a mean, as stated above (**P(1)**, **Q(64)**, **A(1)**). Therefore a twofold vice is opposed to a moral virtue. One by way of excess, the other by way of deficiency. Again, the mean of virtue may be exceeded, not only with regard to the circumstance called “how much,” but also with regard to other circumstances: so that, in certain virtues such as magnanimity and magnificence; vice exceeds the mean of virtue, not through tending to something greater than the virtue, but possibly to something less, and yet it goes beyond the mean of virtue, through doing something to whom it ought not, or when it ought not, and in like manner as regards other circumstances, as the Philosopher shows (Ethic. iv, 1,2,3).

Accordingly superstition is a vice contrary to religion by excess, not that it offers more to the divine worship than true religion, but because it offers divine worship either to whom it ought not, or in a manner it ought not.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(1)-RO(1) — Just as we speak metaphorically of good among evil things — thus we speak of a good thief — so too sometimes the names of the virtues are employed by transposition in an evil sense. Thus prudence is sometimes used instead of cunning, according to ~~2b1~~ Luke 16:8,

“The children of this world are more prudent [Douay: ‘wiser’] in their generation than the children of light.”

It is in this way that superstition is described as religion.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(1)-RO(2) — The etymology of a word differs from its meaning. For its etymology depends on what it is taken from for the purpose of signification: whereas its meaning depends on the thing to which it is applied for the purpose of signifying it. Now these things differ sometimes: for “lapis” [a stone] takes its name from hurting the foot [laedere pedem], but this is not its meaning, else iron, since it hurts the foot, would be a stone. In like manner it does not follow that “superstition” means that from which the word is derived.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(1)-RO(3) — Religion does not admit of excess, in respect of absolute quantity, but it does admit of excess in respect of proportionate quantity, in so far, to wit, as something may be done in divine worship that ought not to be done.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(2)

Whether there are various species of superstition?

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that there are not various species of superstition. According to the Philosopher (Topic. i, 13), “if one contrary includes many kinds, so does the other.” Now religion, to which superstition is contrary, does not include various species; but all its acts belong to the one species. Therefore neither has superstition various species.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, opposites relate to one same thing. But religion, to which superstition is opposed, relates to those things whereby we are directed to God, as stated above (**Q(81), A(1)**). Therefore

superstition, which is opposed to religion, is not specified according to divinations of human occurrences, or by the observances of certain human actions.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, a gloss on ^{<5123}Colossians 2:23, “Which things have... a show of wisdom in superstition,” adds: “that is to say in a hypocritical religion.” Therefore hypocrisy should be reckoned a species of superstition.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine assigns the various species of superstition (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 20).

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above, sins against religion consist in going beyond the mean of virtue in respect of certain circumstances (**A(1)**). For as we have stated (**P(1), Q(72), A(9)**), not every diversity of corrupt circumstances differentiates the species of a sin, but only that which is referred to diverse objects, for diverse ends: since it is in this respect that moral acts are diversified specifically, as stated above (**P(1), Q(1), A(3); P(1), Q(18), AA(2),6**).

Accordingly the species of superstition are differentiated, first on the part of the mode, secondly on the part of the object. For the divine worship may be given either to whom it ought to be given, namely, to the true God, but “in an undue mode,” and this is the first species of superstition; or to whom it ought not to be given, namely, to any creature whatsoever, and this is another genus of superstition, divided into many species in respect of the various ends of divine worship. For the end of divine worship is in the first place to give reverence to God, and in this respect the first species of this genus is “idolatry,” which unduly gives divine honor to a creature. The second end of religion is that man may be taught by God Whom he worships; and to this must be referred “divinatory” superstition, which consults the demons through compacts made with them, whether tacit or explicit. Thirdly, the end of divine worship is a certain direction of human acts according to the precepts of God the object of that worship: and to this must be referred the superstition of certain “observances.”

Augustine alludes to these three (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 20), where he says that “anything invented by man for making and worshipping idols is superstitious,” and this refers to the first species. Then he goes on to say,

“or any agreement or covenant made with the demons for the purpose of consultation and of compact by tokens,” which refers to the second species; and a little further on he adds: “To this kind belong all sorts of amulets and such like,” and this refers to the third species.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(2)-RO(1) — As Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv), “good results from a cause that is one and entire, whereas evil arises from each single defect.” Wherefore several vices are opposed to one virtue, as stated above (**A(1); Q(10), A(5)**). The saying of the Philosopher is true of opposites wherein there is the same reason of multiplicity.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(2)-RO(2) — Divinations and certain observances come under the head of superstition, in so far as they depend on certain actions of the demons: and thus they pertain to compacts made with them.

P(2b)-Q(92)-A(2)-RO(3) — Hypocritical religion is taken here for “religion as applied to human observances,” as the gloss goes on to explain. Wherefore this hypocritical religion is nothing else than worship given to God in an undue mode: as, for instance, if a man were, in the time of grace, to wish to worship God according to the rite of the Old Law. It is of religion taken in this sense that the gloss speaks literally.

QUESTION 93

OF SUPERSTITION CONSISTING IN UNDUE WORSHIP OF THE TRUE GOD

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the species of superstition. We shall treat

- (1) Of the superstition which consists in giving undue worship to the true God;
- (2) Of the superstition of idolatry;
- (3) of divinatory superstition;
- (4) of the superstition of observances.

Under the first head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether there can be anything pernicious in the worship of the true God?
- (2) Whether there can be anything superfluous therein?

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(1)

Whether there can be anything pernicious in the worship of the true God?

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that there cannot be anything pernicious in the worship of the true God. It is written (²⁰²³ Joel 2:32): “Everyone that shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.” Now whoever worships God calls upon His name. Therefore all worship of God is conducive to salvation, and consequently none is pernicious.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, it is the same God that is worshiped by the just in any age of the world. Now before the giving of the Law the just worshiped God in whatever manner they pleased, without committing

mortal sin: wherefore Jacob bound himself by his own vow to a special kind of worship, as related in ^{}Genesis 28. Therefore now also no worship of God is pernicious.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, nothing pernicious is tolerated in the Church. Yet the Church tolerates various rites of divine worship: wherefore Gregory, replying to Augustine, bishop of the English (Regist. xi, ep. 64), who stated that there existed in the churches various customs in the celebration of Mass, wrote: “I wish you to choose carefully whatever you find likely to be most pleasing to God, whether in the Roman territory, or in the land of the Gauls, or in any part of the Church.” Therefore no way of worshipping God is pernicious.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine [*Jerome (Ep. lxxv, ad Aug.) See Opp. August. Ep. lxxxii] in a letter to Jerome (and the words are quoted in a gloss on ^{}Galatians 2:14) says that “after the Gospel truth had been preached the legal observances became deadly,” and yet these observances belonged to the worship of God. Therefore there can be something deadly in the divine worship.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As Augustine states (Cont. Mendac. xiv), “a most pernicious lie is that which is uttered in matters pertaining to Christian religion.” Now it is a lie if one signify outwardly that which is contrary to the truth. But just as a thing is signified by word, so it is by deed: and it is in this signification by deed that the outward worship of religion consists, as shown above (**Q(81), A(7)**). Consequently, if anything false is signified by outward worship, this worship will be pernicious.

Now this happens in two ways. In the first place, it happens on the part of the thing signified, through the worship signifying something discordant therefrom: and in this way, at the time of the New Law, the mysteries of Christ being already accomplished, it is pernicious to make use of the ceremonies of the Old Law whereby the mysteries of Christ were foreshadowed as things to come: just as it would be pernicious for anyone to declare that Christ has yet to suffer. In the second place, falsehood in outward worship occurs on the part of the worshiper, and especially in common worship which is offered by ministers impersonating the whole Church. For even as he would be guilty of falsehood who would, in the name of another person, proffer things that are not committed to him, so

too does a man incur the guilt of falsehood who, on the part of the Church, gives worship to God contrary to the manner established by the Church or divine authority, and according to ecclesiastical custom. Hence Ambrose [*Comment. in 1 ad Cor. 11:27, quoted in the gloss of Peter Lombard] says: “He is unworthy who celebrates the mystery otherwise than Christ delivered it.” For this reason, too, a gloss on <sup>¹⁰²²Colossians 2:23 says that superstition is “the use of human observances under the name of religion.”

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(1)-RO(1) — Since God is truth, to invoke God is to worship Him in spirit and truth, according to <sup>¹⁰²³John 4:23. Hence a worship that contains falsehood, is inconsistent with a salutary calling upon God.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(1)-RO(2) — Before the time of the Law the just were instructed by an inward instinct as to the way of worshipping God, and others followed them. But afterwards men were instructed by outward precepts about this matter, and it is wicked to disobey them.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(1)-RO(3) — The various customs of the Church in the divine worship are in no way contrary to the truth: wherefore we must observe them, and to disregard them is unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(2)

Whether there can be any excess in the worship of God?

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that there cannot be excess in the worship of God. It is written (Ecclus. 43:32): “Glorify the Lord as much as ever you can, for He will yet far exceed.” Now the divine worship is directed to the glorification of God. Therefore there can be no excess in it.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, outward worship is a profession of inward worship, “whereby God is worshiped with faith, hope, and charity,” as Augustine says (Enchiridion iii). Now there can be no excess in faith, hope, and charity. Neither, therefore, can there be in the worship of God.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, to worship God consists in offering to Him what we have received from Him. But we have received all our goods from God. Therefore if we do all that we possibly can for God’s honor, there will be no excess in the divine worship.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 18) “that the good and true Christian rejects also superstitious fancies, from Holy Writ.” But Holy Writ teaches us to worship God. Therefore there can be superstition by reason of excess even in the worship of God.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(2) — *I answer that*, A thing is said to be in excess in two ways. First, with regard to absolute quantity, and in this way there cannot be excess in the worship of God, because whatever man does is less than he owes God. Secondly, a thing is in excess with regard to quantity of proportion, through not being proportionate to its end. Now the end of divine worship is that man may give glory to God, and submit to Him in mind and body. Consequently, whatever a man may do conducing to God’s glory, and subjecting his mind to God, and his body, too, by a moderate curbing of the concupiscences, is not excessive in the divine worship, provided it be in accordance with the commandments of God and of the Church, and in keeping with the customs of those among whom he lives.

On the other hand if that which is done be, in itself, not conducive to God’s glory, nor raise man’s mind to God, nor curb inordinate concupiscence, or again if it be not in accordance with the commandments of God and of the Church, or if it be contrary to the general custom — which, according to Augustine [*Ad Casulan. Ep. xxxvi], “has the force of law” — all this must be reckoned excessive and superstitious, because consisting, as it does, of mere externals, it has no connection with the internal worship of God. Hence Augustine (De Vera Relig. iii) quotes the words of ⁴⁰⁷²Luke 17:21, “The kingdom of God is within you,” against the “superstitious,” those, to wit, who pay more attention to externals.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(2)-RO(1) — The glorification of God implies that what is done is done for God’s glory: and this excludes the excess denoted by superstition.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(2)-RO(2) — Faith, hope and charity subject the mind to God, so that there can be nothing excessive in them. It is different with external acts, which sometimes have no connection with these virtues.

P(2b)-Q(93)-A(2)-RO(3) — This argument considers excess by way of absolute quantity.

QUESTION 94

OF IDOLATRY

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider idolatry: under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether idolatry is a species of superstition?
- (2) Whether it is a sin?
- (3) Whether it is the gravest sin?
- (4) Of the cause of this sin.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(1)

Whether idolatry is rightly reckoned a species of superstition?

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that idolatry is not rightly reckoned a species of superstition. Just as heretics are unbelievers, so are idolaters. But heresy is a species of unbelief, as stated above (**Q(11), A(1)**). Therefore idolatry is also a species of unbelief and not of superstition.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, latria pertains to the virtue of religion to which superstition is opposed. But latria, apparently, is univocally applied to idolatry and to that which belongs to the true religion. For just as we speak univocally of the desire of false happiness, and of the desire of true happiness, so too, seemingly, we speak univocally of the worship of false gods, which is called idolatry, and of the worship of the true God, which is the latria of true religion. Therefore idolatry is not a species of superstition.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, that which is nothing cannot be the species of any genus. But idolatry, apparently, is nothing: for the Apostle

says (~~4006~~ 1 Corinthians 8:4): “We know that an idol is nothing in the world,” and further on (~~4019~~ 1 Corinthians 10:19):

“What then? Do I say that what is offered in sacrifice to idols is anything? Or that the idol is anything?”

implying an answer in the negative. Now offering things to idols belongs properly to idolatry. Therefore since idolatry is like to nothing, it cannot be a species of superstition.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, it belongs to superstition to give divine honor to whom that honor is not due. Now divine honor is undue to idols, just as it is undue to other creatures, wherefore certain people are reproached (~~4012~~ Romans 1:25) for that they “worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator.” Therefore this species of superstition is unfittingly called idolatry, and should rather be named “worship of creatures.”

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is related (~~4076~~ Acts 17:16) that when Paul awaited Silas and Timothy at Athens, “his spirit was stirred within him seeing the whole city given to idolatry,” and further on (~~4072~~ Acts 17:22) he says: “Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things you are too superstitious.” Therefore idolatry belongs to superstition.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(92), A(2)**), it belongs to superstition to exceed the due mode of divine worship, and this is done chiefly when divine worship is given to whom it should not be given. Now it should be given to the most high uncreated God alone, as stated above (**Q(81), A(1)**) when we were treating of religion. Therefore it is superstition to give worship to any creature whatsoever.

Now just as this divine worship was given to sensible creatures by means of sensible signs, such as sacrifices, games, and the like, so too was it given to a creature represented by some sensible form or shape, which is called an “idol.” Yet divine worship was given to idols in various ways. For some, by means of a nefarious art, constructed images which produced certain effects by the power of the demons: wherefore they deemed that the images themselves contained something God-like, and consequently that divine worship was due to them. This was the opinion of Hermes Trismegistus [*De Natura Deorum, ad Asclep], as Augustine states (De

Civ. Dei viii, 23): while others gave divine worship not to the images, but to the creatures represented thereby. The Apostle alludes to both of these (Romans 1:23,25). For, as regards the former, he says: “They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds, and of four-footed beasts, and of creeping things,” and of the latter he says: “Who worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator.”

These latter were of three ways of thinking. For some deemed certain men to have been gods, whom they worshipped in the images of those men: for instance, Jupiter, Mercury, and so forth. Others again deemed the whole world to be one god, not by reason of its material substance, but by reason of its soul, which they believed to be God, for they held God to be nothing else than a soul governing the world by movement and reason: even as a man is said to be wise in respect not of his body but of his soul. Hence they thought that divine worship ought to be given to the whole world and to all its parts, heaven, air, water, and to all such things: and to these they referred the names of their gods, as Varro asserted, and Augustine relates (De Civ. Dei vii, 5). Lastly, others, namely, the Platonists, said that there is one supreme god, the cause of all things. After him they placed certain spiritual substances created by the supreme god. These they called “gods,” on account of their having a share of the godhead; but we call them “angels.” After these they placed the souls of the heavenly bodies, and beneath these the demons which they stated to be certain animal denizens of the air, and beneath these again they placed human souls, which they believed to be taken up into the fellowship of the gods or of the demons by reason of the merit of their virtue. To all these they gave divine worship, as Augustine relates (De Civ. . . Dei xviii, 14).

The last two opinions were held to belong to “natural theology” which the philosophers gathered from their study of the world and taught in the schools: while the other, relating to the worship of men, was said to belong to “mythical theology” which was wont to be represented on the stage according to the fancies of poets. The remaining opinion relating to images was held to belong to “civil theology,” which was celebrated by the pontiffs in the temples [*De Civ. Dei vi, 5].

Now all these come under the head of the superstition of idolatry. Wherefore Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 20): “Anything invented by man for making and worshipping idols, or for giving Divine worship to a creature or any part of a creature, is superstitious.”

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(1)-RO(1) — Just as religion is not faith, but a confession of faith by outward signs, so superstition is a confession of unbelief by external worship. Such a confession is signified by the term idolatry, but not by the term heresy, which only means a false opinion. Therefore heresy is a species of unbelief, but idolatry is a species of superstition.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(1)-RO(2) — The term latria may be taken in two senses. In one sense it may denote a human act pertaining to the worship of God: and then its signification remains the same, to whomsoever it be shown, because, in this sense, the thing to which it is shown is not included in its definition. Taken thus latria is applied univocally, whether to true religion or to idolatry, just as the payment of a tax is univocally the same, whether it is paid to the true or to a false king. In another sense latria denotes the same as religion, and then, since it is a virtue, it is essential thereto that divine worship be given to whom it ought to be given; and in this way latria is applied equivocally to the latria of true religion, and to idolatry: just as prudence is applied equivocally to the prudence that is a virtue, and to that which is carnal.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(1)-RO(3) — The saying of the Apostle that “an idol is nothing in the world” means that those images which were called idols, were not animated, or possessed of a divine power, as Hermes maintained, as though they were composed of spirit and body. In the same sense we must understand the saying that “what is offered in sacrifice to idols is not anything,” because by being thus sacrificed the sacrificial flesh acquired neither sanctification, as the Gentiles thought, nor uncleanness, as the Jews held.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(1)-RO(4) — It was owing to the general custom among the Gentiles of worshipping any kind of creature under the form of images that the term “idolatry” was used to signify any worship of a creature, even without the use of images.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(2)

Whether idolatry is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that idolatry is not a sin. Nothing is a sin that the true faith employs in worshipping God. Now the true faith employs images for the divine worship: since both in the Tabernacle were there images of the cherubim, as related in ^{<P2b>}Exodus 25, and in the Church are images set up which the faithful worship. Therefore idolatry, whereby idols are worshipped, is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, reverence should be paid to every superior. But the angels and the souls of the blessed are our superiors. Therefore it will be no sin to pay them reverence by worship, of sacrifices or the like.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the most high God should be honored with an inward worship, according to ^{<P2b>}John 4:24, “God... they must adore... in spirit and in truth”: and Augustine says (Enchiridion iii), that “God is worshipped by faith, hope and charity.” Now a man may happen to worship idols outwardly, and yet not wander from the true faith inwardly. Therefore it seems that we may worship idols outwardly without prejudice to the divine worship.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<P2b>}Exodus 20:5): “Thou shalt not adore them,” i.e. outwardly, “nor serve them,” i.e. inwardly, as a gloss explains it: and it is a question of graven things and images. Therefore it is a sin to worship idols whether outwardly or inwardly.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(2) — *I answer that*, There has been a twofold error in this matter. For some [*The School of Plato] have thought that to offer sacrifices and other things pertaining to latria, not only to God but also to the others aforesaid, is due and good in itself, since they held that divine honor should be paid to every superior nature, as being nearer to God. But this is unreasonable. For though we ought to revere all superiors, yet the same reverence is not due to them all: and something special is due to the most high God Who excels all in a singular manner: and this is the worship of latria.

Nor can it be said, as some have maintained, that “these visible sacrifices are fitting with regard to other gods, and that to the most high God, as being better than those others, better sacrifices, namely, the service of a pure mind, should be offered” [*Augustine, as quoted below]. The reason is that, as Augustine says (*De Civ. Dei* x, 19), “external sacrifices are signs of internal, just as audible words are signs of things. Wherefore, just as by prayer and praise we utter significant words to Him, and offer to Him in our hearts the things they signify, so too in our sacrifices we ought to realize that we should offer a visible sacrifice to no other than to Him Whose invisible sacrifice we ourselves should be in our hearts.”

Others held that the outward worship of latria should be given to idols, not as though it were something good or fitting in itself, but as being in harmony with the general custom. Thus Augustine (*De Civ. Dei* vi, 10) quotes Seneca as saying: “We shall adore,” says he, “in such a way as to remember that our worship is in accordance with custom rather than with the reality”: and (*De Vera Relig.* v) Augustine says that “we must not seek religion from the philosophers, who accepted the same things for sacred, as did the people; and gave utterance in the schools to various and contrary opinions about the nature of their gods, and the sovereign good.” This error was embraced also by certain heretics [*The Helcesaitae], who affirmed that it is not wrong for one who is seized in time of persecution to worship idols outwardly so long as he keeps the faith in his heart.

But this is evidently false. For since outward worship is a sign of the inward worship, just as it is a wicked lie to affirm the contrary of what one holds inwardly of the true faith so too is it a wicked falsehood to pay outward worship to anything counter to the sentiments of one’s heart. Wherefore Augustine condemns Seneca (*De Civ. Dei* vi, 10) in that “his worship of idols was so much the more infamous forasmuch as the things he did dishonestly were so done by him that the people believed him to act honestly.”

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(2)-RO(1) — Neither in the Tabernacle or Temple of the Old Law, nor again now in the Church are images set up that the worship of latria may be paid to them, but for the purpose of signification, in order that belief in the excellence of angels and saints may be impressed and confirmed in the mind of man. It is different with the image of Christ, to

which latria is due on account of His Divinity, as we shall state in the **P(3), Q(25), A(3)**.

The Replies to the Second and Third Objections are evident from what has been said above.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3)

Whether idolatry is the gravest of sins?

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that idolatry is not the gravest of sins. The worst is opposed to the best (Ethic. viii, 10). But interior worship, which consists of faith, hope and charity, is better than external worship. Therefore unbelief, despair and hatred of God, which are opposed to internal worship, are graver sins than idolatry, which is opposed to external worship.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, the more a sin is against God the more grievous it is. Now, seemingly, a man acts more directly against God by blaspheming, or denying the faith, than by giving God's worship to another, which pertains to idolatry. Therefore blasphemy and denial of the faith are more grievous sins than idolatry.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, it seems that lesser evils are punished with greater evils. But the sin of idolatry was punished with the sin against nature, as stated in ~~812~~ Romans 1:26. Therefore the sin against nature is a graver sin than idolatry.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3)-O(4) — Further, Augustine says (Contra Faust. xx, 5): "Neither do we say that you," viz. the Manichees, "are pagans, or a sect of pagans, but that you bear a certain likeness to them since you worship many gods: and yet you are much worse than they are, for they worship things that exist, but should not be worshipped as gods, whereas you worship things that exist not at all." Therefore the vice of heretical depravity is more grievous than idolatry.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3)-O(5) — Further, a gloss of Jerome on ~~809~~ Galatians 4:9, "How turn you again to the weak and needy elements?" says: "The observance of the Law, to which they were then addicted, was a sin almost

equal to the worship of idols, to which they had been given before their conversion.” Therefore idolatry is not the most grievous sin.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on the saying of ^{<CR>}Leviticus 15:25, about the uncleanness of a woman suffering from an issue of blood, says: “Every sin is an uncleanness of the soul, but especially idolatry.”

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3) — *I answer that*, The gravity of a sin may be considered in two ways. First, on the part of the sin itself, and thus idolatry is the most grievous sin. For just as the most heinous crime in an earthly commonwealth would seem to be for a man to give royal honor to another than the true king, since, so far as he is concerned, he disturbs the whole order of the commonwealth, so, in sins that are committed against God, which indeed are the greater sins, the greatest of all seems to be for a man to give God’s honor to a creature, since, so far as he is concerned, he sets up another God in the world, and lessens the divine sovereignty. Secondly, the gravity of a sin may be considered on the part of the sinner. Thus the sin of one that sins knowingly is said to be graver than the sin of one that sins through ignorance: and in this way nothing hinders heretics, if they knowingly corrupt the faith which they have received, from sinning more grievously than idolaters who sin through ignorance. Furthermore other sins may be more grievous on account of greater contempt on the part of the sinner.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3)-RO(1) — Idolatry presupposes internal unbelief, and to this it adds undue worship. But in a case of external idolatry without internal unbelief, there is an additional sin of falsehood, as stated above (**A(2)**).

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3)-RO(2) — Idolatry includes a grievous blasphemy, inasmuch as it deprives God of the singleness of His dominion and denies the faith by deeds.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3)-RO(3) — Since it is essential to punishment that it be against the will, a sin whereby another sin is punished needs to be more manifest, in order that it may make the man more hateful to himself and to others; but it need not be a more grievous sin: and in this way the sin against nature is less grievous than the sin of idolatry. But since it is more

manifest, it is assigned as a fitting punishment of the sin of idolatry, in order that, as by idolatry man abuses the order of the divine honor, so by the sin against nature he may suffer confusion from the abuse of his own nature.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3)-RO(4) — Even as to the genus of the sin, the Manichean heresy is more grievous than the sin of other idolaters, because it is more derogatory to the divine honor, since they set up two gods in opposition to one another, and hold many vain and fabulous fancies about God. It is different with other heretics, who confess their belief in one God and worship Him alone.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(3)-RO(5) — The observance of the Law during the time of grace is not quite equal to idolatry as to the genus of the sin, but almost equal, because both are species of pestiferous superstition.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(4)

Whether the cause of idolatry was on the part of man?

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the cause of idolatry was not on the part of man. In man there is nothing but either nature, virtue, or guilt. But the cause of idolatry could not be on the part of man's nature, since rather does man's natural reason dictate that there is one God, and that divine worship should not be paid to the dead or to inanimate beings. Likewise, neither could idolatry have its cause in man on the part of virtue, since "a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit," according to ⁴¹⁷⁸Matthew 7:18: nor again could it be on the part of guilt, because, according to Wis. 14:27, "the worship of abominable idols is the cause and the beginning and end of all evil." Therefore idolatry has no cause on the part of man.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, those things which have a cause in man are found among men at all times. Now idolatry was not always, but is stated [*Peter Comestor, Hist. Genes. xxxvii, xl] to have been originated either by Nimrod, who is related to have forced men to worship fire, or by Ninus, who caused the statue of his father Bel to be worshiped. Among the Greeks, as related by Isidore (Etym. viii, 11), Prometheus was the first to set up statues of men: and the Jews say that Ismael was the first to

make idols of clay. Moreover, idolatry ceased to a great extent in the sixth age. Therefore idolatry had no cause on the part of man.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xxi, 6): “It was not possible to learn, for the first time, except from their” (i.e. the demons’) “teaching, what each of them desired or disliked, and by what name to invite or compel him: so as to give birth to the magic arts and their professors”: and the same observation seems to apply to idolatry. Therefore idolatry had no cause on the part of man.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (Wis. 14:14): “By the vanity of men they,” i.e. idols, “came into the world.”

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Idolatry had a twofold cause. One was a dispositive cause; this was on the part of man, and in three ways. First, on account of his inordinate affections, forasmuch as he gave other men divine honor, through either loving or revering them too much. This cause is assigned (Wis. 14:15): “A father being afflicted with bitter grief, made to himself the image of his son, who was quickly taken away: and him who then had died as a man he began to worship as a god.” The same passage goes on to say (Wis. 14:21) that “men serving either their affection, or their kings, gave the incommunicable name [Vulg.: ‘names’],” i.e. of the Godhead, “to stones and wood.” Secondly, because man takes a natural pleasure in representations, as the Philosopher observes (Poet. iv), wherefore as soon as the uncultured man saw human images skillfully fashioned by the diligence of the craftsman, he gave them divine worship; hence it is written (Wis. 13:11-17): “If an artist, a carpenter, hath cut down a tree, proper for his use, in the wood... and by the skill of his art fashioneth it, and maketh it like the image of a man... and then maketh prayer to it, inquiring concerning his substance, and his children, or his marriage.” Thirdly, on account of their ignorance of the true God, inasmuch as through failing to consider His excellence men gave divine worship to certain creatures, on account of their beauty or power, wherefore it is written (Wis. 13:1,2): “All men... neither by attending to the works have acknowledged who was the workman, but have imagined either the fire, or the wind, or the swift air, or the circle of the stars, or the great water, or the sun and the moon, to be the gods that rule the world.”

The other cause of idolatry was completive, and this was on the part of the demons, who offered themselves to be worshipped by men, by giving answers in the idols, and doing things which to men seemed marvelous. Hence it is written (~~1985~~ Psalm 95:5): “All the gods of the Gentiles are devils.”

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(4)-RO(1) — The dispositive cause of idolatry was, on the part of man, a defect of nature, either through ignorance in his intellect, or disorder in his affections, as stated above; and this pertains to guilt. Again, idolatry is stated to be the cause, beginning and end of all sin, because there is no kind of sin that idolatry does not produce at some time, either through leading expressly to that sin by causing it, or through being an occasion thereof, either as a beginning or as an end, in so far as certain sins were employed in the worship of idols; such as homicides, mutilations, and so forth. Nevertheless certain sins may precede idolatry and dispose man thereto.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(4)-RO(2) — There was no idolatry in the first age, owing to the recent remembrance of the creation of the world, so that man still retained in his mind the knowledge of one God. In the sixth age idolatry was banished by the doctrine and power of Christ, who triumphed over the devil.

P(2b)-Q(94)-A(4)-RO(3) — This argument considers the consummative cause of idolatry.

QUESTION 95

OF SUPERSTITION IN DIVINATIONS

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

We must now consider superstition in divinations, under which head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether divination is a sin?
- (2) Whether it is a species of superstition?
- (3) Of the species of divination;
- (4) Of divination by means of demons;
- (5) Of divination by the stars;
- (6) Of divination by dreams;
- (7) Of divination by auguries and like observances;
- (8) Of divination by lots.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(1)

Whether divination is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that divination is not a sin. Divination is derived from something “divine”: and things that are divine pertain to holiness rather than to sin. Therefore it seems that divination is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Augustine says (De Lib. Arb. i, 1): “Who dares to say that learning is an evil?” and again: “I could nowise admit that intelligence can be an evil.” But some arts are divinatory, as the Philosopher states (De Memor. i): and divination itself would seem to pertain to a certain intelligence of the truth. Therefore it seems that divination is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, there is no natural inclination to evil; because nature inclines only to its like. But men by natural inclination seek to foreknow future events; and this belongs to divination. Therefore divination is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (⁶⁸⁸Deuteronomy 18:10,11):

“Neither let there be found among you... any one that consulteth
pythonic spirits, or fortune tellers”:

and it is stated in the Decretals (26, qu. v, can. Qui divinationes): “Those who seek for divinations shall be liable to a penance of five years’ duration, according to the fixed grades of penance.”

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Divination denotes a foretelling of the future. The future may be foreknown in two ways: first in its causes, secondly in itself. Now the causes of the future are threefold: for some produce their effects, of necessity and always; and such like future effects can be foreknown and foretold with certainty, from considering their causes, even as astrologers foretell a coming eclipse. Other causes produce their effects, not of necessity and always, but for the most part, yet they rarely fail: and from such like causes their future effects can be foreknown, not indeed with certainty, but by a kind of conjecture, even as astrologers by considering the stars can foreknow and foretell things concerning rains and droughts, and physicians, concerning health and death. Again, other causes, considered in themselves, are indifferent; and this is chiefly the case in the rational powers, which stand in relation to opposites, according to the Philosopher [*Metaph. viii, 2,5,8]. Such like effects, as also those which ensue from natural causes by chance and in the minority of instances, cannot be foreknown from a consideration of their causes, because these causes have no determinate inclination to produce these effects. Consequently such like effects cannot be foreknown unless they be considered in themselves. Now man cannot consider these effects in themselves except when they are present, as when he sees Socrates running or walking: the consideration of such things in themselves before they occur is proper to God, Who alone in His eternity sees the future as though it were present, as stated in the **P(1), Q(14), A(13); P(1), Q(57), A(3); P(1), Q(86), A(4)**. Hence it is written (²⁸¹²Isaiah 41:23): “Show the

things that are to come hereafter, and we shall know that ye are gods.” Therefore if anyone presume to foreknow or foretell such like future things by any means whatever, except by divine revelation, he manifestly usurps what belongs to God. It is for this reason that certain men are called divines: wherefore Isidore says (Etym. viii, 9): “They are called divines, as though they were full of God. For they pretend to be filled with the Godhead, and by a deceitful fraud they forecast the future to men.”

Accordingly it is not called divination, if a man foretells things that happen of necessity, or in the majority of instances, for the like can be foreknown by human reason: nor again if anyone knows other contingent future things, through divine revelation: for then he does not divine, i.e. cause something divine, but rather receives something divine. Then only is a man said to divine, when he usurps to himself, in an undue manner, the foretelling of future events: and this is manifestly a sin. Consequently divination is always a sin; and for this reason Jerome says in his commentary on Mich. 3:9, seqq. that “divination is always taken in an evil sense.”

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(1)-RO(1) — Divination takes its name not from a rightly ordered share of something divine, but from an undue usurpation thereof, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(1)-RO(2) — There are certain arts for the foreknowledge of future events that occur of necessity or frequently, and these do not pertain to divination. But there are no true arts or sciences for the knowledge of other future events, but only vain inventions of the devil’s deceit, as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xxi, 8).

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(1)-RO(3) — Man has a natural inclination to know the future by human means, but not by the undue means of divination.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(2)

Whether divination is a species of superstition?

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that divination is not a species of superstition. The same thing cannot be a species of diverse genera. Now divination is apparently a species of curiosity, according to Augustine (De

Vera Relig. xxxviii) [*Cf. De Doctr. Christ. ii, 23,24; De Divin. Daem. 3]. Therefore it is not, seemingly, a species of superstition.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, just as religion is due worship, so is superstition undue worship. But divination does not seem to pertain to undue worship. Therefore it does not pertain to superstition.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, superstition is opposed to religion. But in true religion nothing is to be found corresponding as a contrary to divination. Therefore divination is not a species of superstition.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Origen says in his Peri Archon [*The quotation is from his sixteenth homily on the Book of Numbers]: “There is an operation of the demons in the administering of foreknowledge, comprised, seemingly, under the head of certain arts exercised by those who have enslaved themselves to the demons, by means of lots, omens, or the observance of shadows. I doubt not that all these things are done by the operation of the demons.” Now, according to Augustine (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 20,23), “whatever results from fellowship between demons and men is superstitious.” Therefore divination is a species of superstition.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1); QQ(92),94**), superstition denotes undue divine worship. Now a thing pertains to the worship of God in two ways: in one way, it is something offered to God; as a sacrifice, an oblation, or something of the kind: in another way, it is something divine that is assumed, as stated above with regard to an oath (**Q(89), A(4)**, ad 2). Wherefore superstition includes not only idolatrous sacrifices offered to demons, but also recourse to the help of the demons for the purpose of doing or knowing something. But all divination results from the demons’ operation, either because the demons are expressly invoked that the future may be made known, or because the demons thrust themselves into futile searchings of the future, in order to entangle men’s minds with vain conceits. Of this kind of vanity it is written (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 39:5): “Who hath not regard to vanities and lying follies.” Now it is vain to seek knowledge of the future, when one tries to get it from a source whence it cannot be foreknown. Therefore it is manifest that divination is a species of superstition.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(2)-RO(1) — Divination is a kind of curiosity with regard to the end in view, which is foreknowledge of the future; but it is a kind of superstition as regards the mode of operation.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(2)-RO(2) — This kind of divination pertains to the worship of the demons, inasmuch as one enters into a compact, tacit or express with the demons.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(2)-RO(3) — In the New Law man's mind is restrained from solicitude about temporal things: wherefore the New Law contains no institution for the foreknowledge of future events in temporal matters. On the other hand in the Old Law, which contained earthly promises, there were consultations about the future in connection with religious matters. Hence where it is written (²⁸⁸ Isaiah 8:19):

“And when they shall say to you: Seek of pythons and of diviners,
who mutter in their enchantments,”

it is added by way of answer: “Should not the people seek of their God, a vision for the living and the dead? [*Vulg.: ‘seek of their God, for the living of the dead?']”

In the New Testament, however, there were some possessed of the spirit of prophecy, who foretold many things about future events.

In the New Testament, however, there were some possessed of the spirit of prophecy, who foretold many things about future events.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(3)

Whether we ought to distinguish several species of divination?

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that we should not distinguish several species of divination. Where the formality of sin is the same, there are not seemingly several species of sin. Now there is one formality of sin in all divinations, since they consist in entering into compact with the demons in order to know the future. Therefore there are not several species of divination.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, a human act takes its species from its end, as stated above (**P(1), Q(1), A(3); P(1), Q(18), A(6)**). But all divination is directed to one end, namely, the foretelling of the future. Therefore all divinations are of one species.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, signs do not vary the species of a sin, for whether one detracts by word writing or gestures, it is the same species of sin. Now divinations seem to differ merely according to the various signs whence the foreknowledge of the future is derived. Therefore there are not several species of divination.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Isidore enumerates various species of divination (Etym. viii, 9).

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(2)**), all divinations seek to acquire foreknowledge of future events, by means of some counsel and help of a demon, who is either expressly called upon to give his help, or else thrusts himself in secretly, in order to foretell certain future things unknown to men, but known to him in such manners as have been explained in the **P(1), Q(57), A(3)**. When demons are expressly invoked, they are wont to foretell the future in many ways. Sometimes they offer themselves to human sight and hearing by mock apparitions in order to foretell the future: and this species is called “prestigation” because man’s eyes are blindfolded [praestringuntur]. Sometimes they make use of dreams, and this is called “divination by dreams”: sometimes they employ apparitions or utterances of the dead, and this species is called “necromancy,” for as Isidore observes (Etym. viii) in Greek, {nekron} “means dead and {manteia} divination, because after certain incantations and the sprinkling of blood, the dead seem to come to life, to divine and to answer questions.” Sometimes they foretell the future through living men, as in the case of those who are possessed: this is divination by “pythons,” of whom Isidore says that “pythons are so called from Pythius Apollo, who was said to be the inventor of divination.” Sometimes they foretell the future by means of shapes or signs which appear in inanimate beings. If these signs appear in some earthly body such as wood, iron or polished stone, it is called “geomancy,” if in water “hydromancy,” if in the air “aeromancy,” if in fire “pyromancy,” if in the entrails of animals sacrificed on the altars of demons, “aruspicy.”

The divination which is practiced without express invocation of the demons is of two kinds. The first is when, with a view to obtain knowledge of the future, we take observations in the disposition of certain things. If one endeavor to know the future by observing the position and movements of the stars, this belongs to “astrologers,” who are also called “genethliacs,” because they take note of the days on which people are born. If one observe the movements and cries of birds or of any animals, or the sneezing of men, or the sudden movements of limbs, this belongs in general to “augury,” which is so called from the chattering of birds [avium garritu], just as “auspice” is derived from watching birds [avium inspectione]. These are chiefly wont to be observed in birds, the former by the ear, the latter by the eye. If, however, these observations have for their object men’s words uttered unintentionally, which someone twist so as to apply to the future that he wishes to foreknow, then it is called an “omen”: and as Valerius Maximus [*De Dict. Fact. Memor. i, 5] remarks, “the observing of omens has a touch of religion mingled with it, for it is believed to be founded not on a chance movement, but on divine providence. It was thus that when the Romans were deliberating whether they would change their position, a centurion happened to exclaim at the time: ‘Standard-bearer, fix the banner, we had best stand here’: and on hearing these words they took them as an omen, and abandoned their intention of advancing further.” If, however, the observation regards the dispositions, that occur to the eye, of figures in certain bodies, there will be another species of divination: for the divination that is taken from observing the lines of the hand is called “chiromancy,” i.e. divination of the hand (because {cheir} is the Greek for hand): while the divination which is taken from signs appearing in the shoulder-blades of an animal is called “spatulamancy.”

To this second species of divination, which is without express invocation of the demons, belongs that which is practiced by observing certain things done seriously by men in the research of the occult, whether by drawing lots, which is called “geomancy”; or by observing the shapes resulting from molten lead poured into water; or by observing which of several sheets of paper, with or without writing upon them, a person may happen to draw; or by holding out several unequal sticks and noting who takes the greater or the lesser. or by throwing dice, and observing who throws the

highest score; or by observing what catches the eye when one opens a book, all of which are named “sortilege.”

Accordingly it is clear that there are three kinds of divination. The first is when the demons are invoked openly, this comes under the head of “necromancy”; the second is merely an observation of the disposition or movement of some other being, and this belongs to “augury”; while the third consists in doing something in order to discover the occult; and this belongs to “sortilege.” Under each of these many others are contained, as explained above.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(3)-RO(1) — In all the aforesaid there is the same general, but not the same special, character of sin: for it is much more grievous to invoke the demons than to do things that deserve the demons’ interference.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(3)-RO(2) — Knowledge of the future or of the occult is the ultimate end whence divination takes its general formality. But the various species are distinguished by their proper objects or matters, according as the knowledge of the occult is sought in various things.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(3)-RO(3) — The things observed by diviners are considered by them, not as signs expressing what they already know, as happens in detraction, but as principles of knowledge. Now it is evident that diversity of principles diversifies the species, even in demonstrative sciences.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(4)

Whether divination practiced by invoking the demons is unlawful?

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that divination practiced by invoking the demons is not unlawful. Christ did nothing unlawful, according to ⁽¹⁰²²⁾1 Peter 2:22, “Who did no sin.” Yet our Lord asked the demon: “What is thy name?” and the latter replied: “My name is Legion, for we are many” (⁽¹¹⁸¹⁾Mark 5:9). Therefore it seems lawful to question the demons about the occult.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the souls of the saints do not encourage those who ask unlawfully. Yet Samuel appeared to Saul when the latter inquired of the woman that had a divining spirit, concerning the issue of the coming war (^{<1088>}1 Samuel 28:8, sqq.). Therefore the divination that consists in questioning demons is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, it seems lawful to seek the truth from one who knows, if it be useful to know it. But it is sometimes useful to know what is hidden from us, and can be known through the demons, as in the discovery of thefts. Therefore divination by questioning demons is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<1089>}Deuteronomy 18:10,11): “Neither let there be found among you... anyone that consulteth soothsayers... nor... that consulteth pythonic spirits.”

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(4) — *I answer that*, All divination by invoking demons is unlawful for two reasons. The first is gathered from the principle of divination, which is a compact made expressly with a demon by the very fact of invoking him. This is altogether unlawful; wherefore it is written against certain persons (^{<1090>}Isaiah 28:15):

“You have said: We have entered into a league with death, and we
have made a covenant with hell.”

And still more grievous would it be if sacrifice were offered or reverence paid to the demon invoked. The second reason is gathered from the result. For the demon who intends man’s perdition endeavors, by his answers, even though he sometimes tells the truth, to accustom men to believe him, and so to lead him on to something prejudicial to the salvation of mankind. Hence Athanasius, commenting on the words of ^{<1091>}Luke 4:35, “He rebuked him, saying: Hold thy peace,” says: “Although the demon confessed the truth, Christ put a stop to his speech, lest together with the truth he should publish his wickedness and accustom us to care little for such things, however much he may seem to speak the truth. For it is wicked, while we have the divine Scriptures, to seek knowledge from the demons.”

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(4)-RO(1) — According to Bede’s commentary on ^{<1092>}Luke 8:30, “Our Lord inquired, not through ignorance, but in order that the disease, which he tolerated, being made public, the power of the Healer

might shine forth more graciously.” Now it is one thing to question a demon who comes to us of his own accord (and it is lawful to do so at times for the good of others, especially when he can be compelled, by the power of God, to tell the truth) and another to invoke a demon in order to gain from him knowledge of things hidden from us.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(4)-RO(2) — According to Augustine (Ad Simplic. ii, 3), “there is nothing absurd in believing that the spirit of the just man, being about to smite the king with the divine sentence, was permitted to appear to him, not by the sway of magic art or power, but by some occult dispensation of which neither the witch nor Saul was aware. Or else the spirit of Samuel was not in reality aroused from his rest, but some phantom or mock apparition formed by the machinations of the devil, and styled by Scripture under the name of Samuel, just as the images of things are wont to be called by the names of those things.”

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(4)-RO(3) — No temporal utility can compare with the harm to spiritual health that results from the research of the unknown by invoking the demon.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(5)

Whether divination by the stars is unlawful?

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that divination by the stars is not unlawful. It is lawful to foretell effects by observing their causes: thus a physician foretells death from the disposition of the disease. Now the heavenly bodies are the cause of what takes place in the world, according to Dionysius (Div. Nom. iv). Therefore divination by the stars is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, human science originates from experiments, according to the Philosopher (Metaph. i, 1). Now it has been discovered through many experiments that the observation of the stars is a means whereby some future events may be known beforehand. Therefore it would seem not unlawful to make use of this kind of divination.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, divination is declared to be unlawful in so far as it is based on a compact made with the demons. But divination by

the stars contains nothing of the kind, but merely an observation of God's creatures. Therefore it would seem that this species of divination is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (Confess. iv, 3): “Those astrologers whom they call mathematicians, I consulted without scruple; because they seemed to use no sacrifice, nor to pray to any spirit for their divinations which art, however, Christian and true piety rejects and condemns.”

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**AA(1),2**), the operation of the demon thrusts itself into those divinations which are based on false and vain opinions, in order that man's mind may become entangled in vanity and falsehood. Now one makes use of a vain and false opinion if, by observing the stars, one desires to foreknow the future that cannot be forecast by their means. Wherefore we must consider what things can be foreknown by observing the stars: and it is evident that those things which happen of necessity can be foreknown by this mean,; even so astrologers forecast a future eclipse.

However, with regard to the foreknowledge of future events acquired by observing the stars there have been various opinions. For some have stated that the stars signify rather than cause the things foretold by means of their observation. But this is an unreasonable statement: since every corporeal sign is either the effect of that for which it stands (thus smoke signifies fire whereby it is caused), or it proceeds from the same cause, so that by signifying the cause, in consequence it signifies the effect (thus a rainbow is sometimes a sign of fair weather, in so far as its cause is the cause of fair weather). Now it cannot be said that the dispositions and movements of the heavenly bodies are the effect of future events; nor again can they be ascribed to some common higher cause of a corporeal nature, although they are referable to a common higher cause, which is divine providence. on the contrary the appointment of the movements and positions of the heavenly bodies by divine providence is on a different principle from the appointment of the occurrence of future contingencies, because the former are appointed on a principle of necessity, so that they always occur in the same way, whereas the latter are appointed on a principle of contingency, so that the manner of their occurrence is variable.

Consequently it is impossible to acquire foreknowledge of the future from an observation of the stars, except in so far as effects can be foreknown from their causes.

Now two kinds of effects escape the causality of heavenly bodies. In the first place all effects that occur accidentally, whether in human affairs or in the natural order, since, as it is proved in *Metaph.* vi [*Ed. Did. v, 3], an accidental being has no cause, least of all a natural cause, such as is the power of a heavenly body, because what occurs accidentally, neither is a “being” properly speaking, nor is “one” — for instance, that an earthquake occur when a stone falls, or that a treasure be discovered when a man digs a grave — for these and like occurrences are not one thing, but are simply several things. Whereas the operation of nature has always some one thing for its term, just as it proceeds from some one principle, which is the form of a natural thing.

In the second place, acts of the free-will, which is the faculty of will and reason, escape the causality of heavenly bodies. For the intellect or reason is not a body, nor the act of a bodily organ, and consequently neither is the will, since it is in the reason, as the Philosopher shows (*De Anima* iii, 4,9). Now no body can make an impression on an incorporeal body. Wherefore it is impossible for heavenly bodies to make a direct impression on the intellect and will: for this would be to deny the difference between intellect and sense, with which position Aristotle reproaches (*De Anima* iii, 3) those who held that “such is the will of man, as is the day which the father of men and of gods,” i.e. the sun or the heavens, “brings on” [**Odyssey* xviii, 135].

Hence the heavenly bodies cannot be the direct cause of the free-will’s operations. Nevertheless they can be a dispositive cause of an inclination to those operations, in so far as they make an impression on the human body, and consequently on the sensitive powers which are acts of bodily organs having an inclination for human acts. Since, however, the sensitive powers obey reason, as the Philosopher shows (*De Anima* iii, 11; *Ethic.* i, 13), this does not impose any necessity on the free-will, and man is able, by his reason, to act counter to the inclination of the heavenly bodies.

Accordingly if anyone take observation of the stars in order to foreknow casual or fortuitous future events, or to know with certitude future human

actions, his conduct is based on a false and vain opinion; and so the operation of the demon introduces itself therein, wherefore it will be a superstitious and unlawful divination. On the other hand if one were to apply the observation of the stars in order to foreknow those future things that are caused by heavenly bodies, for instance, drought or rain and so forth, it will be neither an unlawful nor a superstitious divination.

Wherefore the Reply to the First Objection is evident.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(5)-RO(2) — That astrologers not unfrequently forecast the truth by observing the stars may be explained in two ways. First, because a great number of men follow their bodily passions, so that their actions are for the most part disposed in accordance with the inclination of the heavenly bodies: while there are few, namely, the wise alone, who moderate these inclinations by their reason. The result is that astrologers in many cases foretell the truth, especially in public occurrences which depend on the multitude. Secondly, because of the interference of the demons. Hence Augustine says (Genesis ad lit. ii, 17): “When astrologers tell the truth, it must be allowed that this is due to an instinct that, unknown to man, lies hidden in his mind. And since this happens through the action of unclean and lying spirits who desire to deceive man for they are permitted to know certain things about temporal affairs.” Wherefore he concludes: “Thus a good Christian should beware of astrologers, and of all impious diviners, especially of those who tell the truth, lest his soul become the dupe of the demons and by making a compact of partnership with them enmesh itself in their fellowship.”

This suffices for the Reply to the Third Objection.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(6)

Whether divination by dreams is unlawful?

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that divination by dreams is not unlawful. It is not unlawful to make use of divine instruction. Now men are instructed by God in dreams, for it is written (~~1888~~ Job 33:15,16):

“By a dream in a vision by night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, and they are sleeping in their beds, then He,”

God to wit, “openeth the ears of men, and teaching instructeth them in what they are to learn.” Therefore it is not unlawful to make use of divination by dreams.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, those who interpret dreams, properly speaking, make use of divination by dreams. Now we read of holy men interpreting dreams: thus Joseph interpreted the dreams of Pharaoh’s butler and of his chief baker (⁽⁴⁰⁾Genesis 40), and Daniel interpreted the dream of the king of Babylon (⁽²⁾Daniel 2,4). Therefore divination by dreams is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, it is unreasonable to deny the common experiences of men. Now it is the experience of all that dreams are significative of the future. Therefore it is useless to deny the efficacy of dreams for the purpose of divination, and it is lawful to listen to them.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, It is written (⁽¹⁸⁾Deuteronomy 18:10):

“Neither let there be found among you any one that
... observeth dreams.”

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(6) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**AA(2),6**), divination is superstitious and unlawful when it is based on a false opinion. Wherefore we must consider what is true in the matter of foreknowing the future from dreams. Now dreams are sometimes the cause of future occurrences; for instance, when a person’s mind becomes anxious through what it has seen in a dream and is thereby led to do something or avoid something: while sometimes dreams are signs of future happenings, in so far as they are referable to some common cause of both dreams and future occurrences, and in this way the future is frequently known from dreams. We must, then, consider what is the cause of dreams, and whether it can be the cause of future occurrences, or be cognizant of them.

Accordingly it is to be observed that the cause of dreams is sometimes in us and sometimes outside us. The inward cause of dreams is twofold: one regards the soul, in so far as those things which have occupied a man’s thoughts and affections while awake recur to his imagination while asleep. A such like cause of dreams is not a cause of future occurrences, so that dreams of this kind are related accidentally to future occurrences, and if at

any time they concur it will be by chance. But sometimes the inward cause of dreams regards the body: because the inward disposition of the body leads to the formation of a movement in the imagination consistent with that disposition; thus a man in whom there is abundance of cold humors dreams that he is in the water or snow: and for this reason physicians say that we should take note of dreams in order to discover internal dispositions.

In like manner the outward cause of dreams is twofold, corporal and spiritual. It is corporal in so far as the sleeper's imagination is affected either by the surrounding air, or through an impression of a heavenly body, so that certain images appear to the sleeper, in keeping with the disposition of the heavenly bodies. The spiritual cause is sometimes referable to God, Who reveals certain things to men in their dreams by the ministry of the angels, according ~~to~~ Numbers 12:6,

“If there be among you a prophet of the Lord, I will appear to him
in a vision, or I will speak to him in a dream.”

Sometimes, however, it is due to the action of the demons that certain images appear to persons in their sleep, and by this means they, at times, reveal certain future things to those who have entered into an unlawful compact with them.

Accordingly we must say that there is no unlawful divination in making use of dreams for the foreknowledge of the future, so long as those dreams are due to divine revelation, or to some natural cause inward or outward, and so far as the efficacy of that cause extends. But it will be an unlawful and superstitious divination if it be caused by a revelation of the demons, with whom a compact has been made, whether explicit, through their being invoked for the purpose, or implicit, through the divination extending beyond its possible limits.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(7)***Whether divination by auguries, omens, and by like observations of external things is unlawful?***

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(7)-O(1) — It would seem that divination by auguries, omens, and by like observations of external things is not unlawful. If it were unlawful holy men would not make use thereof. Now we read of Joseph that he paid attention to auguries, for it is related (^{<0445}Genesis 44:5) that Joseph's steward said: "The cup which you have stolen is that in which my lord drinketh and in which he is wont to divine [augurari]": and he himself afterwards said to his brethren (^{<0445}Genesis 44:15): "Know you not that there is no one like me in the science of divining?" Therefore it is not unlawful to make use of this kind of divination.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, birds naturally know certain things regarding future occurrences of the seasons, according to (^{<0447}Jeremiah 8:7, "The kite in the air hath known her time; the turtle, the swallow, and the stork have observed the time of their coming." Now natural knowledge is infallible and comes from God. Therefore it seems not unlawful to make use of the birds' knowledge in order to know the future, and this is divination by augury.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, Gedeon is numbered among the saints (^{<0013}Hebrews 11:32). Yet Gedeon made use of an omen, when he listened to the relation and interpreting of a dream (^{<0075}Judges 7:15): and Eliezer, Abraham's servant, acted in like manner (^{<0241}Genesis 24). Therefore it seems that this kind of divination is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<0581}Deuteronomy 18:10):

"Neither let there be found among you anyone
... that observeth omens."

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(7) — *I answer that*, The movements or cries of birds, and whatever dispositions one may consider in such things, are manifestly not the cause of future events: wherefore the future cannot be known therefrom as from its cause. It follows therefore that if anything future can

be known from them, it will be because the causes from which they proceed are also the causes of future occurrences or are cognizant of them. Now the cause of dumb animals' actions is a certain instinct whereby they are inclined by a natural movement, for they are not masters of their actions. This instinct may proceed from a twofold cause. In the first place it may be due to a bodily cause. For since dumb animals have naught but a sensitive soul, every power of which is the act of a bodily organ, their soul is subject to the disposition of surrounding bodies, and primarily to that of the heavenly bodies. Hence nothing prevents some of their actions from being signs of the future, in so far as they are conformed to the dispositions of the heavenly bodies and of the surrounding air, to which certain future events are due. Yet in this matter we must observe two things: first, that such observations must not be applied to the foreknowledge of future things other than those which can be foreknown from the movements of heavenly bodies, as stated above (**AA(5),6**): secondly, that they be not applied to other matters than those which in some way may have reference to these animals (since they acquire through the heavenly bodies a certain natural knowledge and instinct about things necessary for their life — such as changes resulting from rain and wind and so forth).

In the second place, this instinct is produced by a spiritual cause, namely, either by God, as may be seen in the dove that descended upon Christ, the raven that fed Elias, and the whale that swallowed and vomited Jonas, or by demons, who make use of these actions of dumb animals in order to entangle our minds with vain opinions. This seems to be true of all such like things; except omens, because human words which are taken for an omen are not subject to the disposition of the stars, yet are they ordered according to divine providence and sometimes according to the action of the demons.

Accordingly we must say that all such like divinations are superstitious and unlawful, if they be extended beyond the limits set according to the order of nature or of divine providence.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(7)-RO(1) — According to Augustine [*QQ. in Genes., qu. cxlv], when Joseph said that there was no one like him in the science of

divining, he spoke in joke and not seriously, referring perhaps to the common opinion about him: in this sense also spoke his steward.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(7)-RO(2) — The passage quoted refers to the knowledge that birds have about things concerning them; and in order to know these things it is not unlawful to observe their cries and movements: thus from the frequent cawing of crows one might say that it will rain soon.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(7)-RO(3) — Gedeon listened to the recital and interpretation of a dream, seeing therein an omen, ordered by divine providence for his instruction. In like manner Eliezer listened to the damsel's words, having previously prayed to God.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(8)

Whether divination by drawing lots is unlawful?

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(8)-O(1) — It would seem that divination by drawing lots is not unlawful, because a gloss of Augustine on ^{<807>}Psalm 30:16, "My lots are in Thy hands," says: "It is not wrong to cast lots, for it is a means of ascertaining the divine will when a man is in doubt."

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(8)-O(2) — There is, seemingly, nothing unlawful in the observances which the Scriptures relate as being practiced by holy men. Now both in the Old and in the New Testament we find holy men practicing the casting of lots. For it is related (^{<807>}Joshua 7:14, sqq.) that Josue, at the Lord's command, pronounced sentence by lot on Achan who had stolen of the anathema. Again Saul, by drawing lots, found that his son Jonathan had eaten honey (^{<1148>}1 Kings 14:58, sqq.): Jonas, when fleeing from the face of the Lord, was discovered and thrown into the sea (Jonas 1:7, sqq.): Zacharias was chosen by lot to offer incense (^{<807>}Luke 1:9): and the apostles by drawing lots elected Matthias to the apostleship (^{<807>}Acts 1:26). Therefore it would seem that divination by lots is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, fighting with the fists, or "monomachy," i.e. single combat as it is called, and trial by fire and water, which are called "popular" trials, seem to come under the head of sortilege, because something unknown is sought by their means. Yet these practices seem to be lawful, because David is related to have engaged in single

combat with the Philistine (^{<1178>}1 Kings 17:32, sqq.). Therefore it would seem that divination by lot is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, It is written in the Decretals (XXVI, qu. v, can. Sortes): “We decree that the casting of lots, by which means you make up your mind in all your undertakings, and which the Fathers have condemned, is nothing but divination and witchcraft. For which reason we wish them to be condemned altogether, and henceforth not to be mentioned among Christians, and we forbid the practice thereof under pain of anathema.”

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(8) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(3)**), sortilege consists, properly speaking, in doing something, that by observing the result one may come to the knowledge of something unknown. If by casting lots one seeks to know what is to be given to whom, whether it be a possession, an honor, a dignity, a punishment, or some action or other, it is called “sortilege of allotment”; if one seeks to know what ought to be done, it is called “sortilege of consultation”; if one seeks to know what is going to happen, it is called “sortilege of divination.” Now the actions of man that are required for sortilege and their results are not subject to the dispositions of the stars. Wherefore if anyone practicing sortilege is so minded as though the human acts requisite for sortilege depended for their result on the dispositions of the stars, his opinion is vain and false, and consequently is not free from the interference of the demons, so that a divination of this kind is superstitious and unlawful.

Apart from this cause, however, the result of sortilegious acts must needs be ascribed to chance, or to some directing spiritual cause. If we ascribe it to chance, and this can only take place in “sortilege of allotment,” it does not seem to imply any vice other than vanity, as in the case of persons who, being unable to agree upon the division of something or other, are willing to draw lots for its division, thus leaving to chance what portion each is to receive.

If, on the other hand, the decision by lot be left to a spiritual cause, it is sometimes ascribed to demons. Thus we read (^{<3021>}Ezekiel 21:21) that

“the king of Babylon stood in the highway, at the head of two ways, seeking divination, shuffling arrows; he inquired of the idols, and consulted entrails”:

sortilege of this kind is unlawful, and forbidden by the canons.

Sometimes, however, the decision is left to God, according to ²¹⁶³Proverbs 16:33, “Lots are cast into the lap, but they are disposed of by the Lord”: sortilege of this kind is not wrong in itself, as Augustine declares [*Enarr. ii in Psalm xxx, serm. 2; cf. **O(1)**].

Yet this may happen to be sinful in four ways. First, if one have recourse to lots without any necessity: for this would seem to amount to tempting God. Hence Ambrose, commenting on the words of ²¹⁶⁸Luke 1:8, says: “He that is chosen by lot is not bound by the judgment of men.” Secondly, if even in a case of necessity one were to have recourse to lots without reverence. Hence, on the Acts of the Apostles, Bede says (Super Act. Apost. i): “But if anyone, compelled by necessity, thinks that he ought, after the apostles’ example, to consult God by casting lots, let him take note that the apostles themselves did not do so, except after calling together the assembly of the brethren and pouring forth prayer to God.” Thirdly, if the Divine oracles be misapplied to earthly business. Hence Augustine says (ad inquisit. Januar. ii; Ep. iv): “Those who tell fortunes from the Gospel pages, though it is to be hoped that they do so rather than have recourse to consulting the demons, yet does this custom also displease me, that anyone should wish to apply the Divine oracles to worldly matters and to the vain things of this life.” Fourthly, if anyone resort to the drawing of lots in ecclesiastical elections, which should be carried out by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Wherefore, as Bede says (Super Act. Apost. i): “Before Pentecost the ordination of Matthias was decided by lot,” because as yet the fulness of the Holy Ghost was not yet poured forth into the Church: “whereas the same deacons were ordained not by lot but by the choice of the disciples.” It is different with earthly honors, which are directed to the disposal of earthly things: in elections of this kind men frequently have recourse to lots, even as in the distribution of earthly possessions.

If, however, there be urgent necessity it is lawful to seek the divine judgment by casting lots, provided due reverence be observed. Hence

Augustine says (Ep. ad Honor. ccxxviii), “If, at a time of persecution, the ministers of God do not agree as to which of them is to remain at his post lest all should flee, and which of them is to flee, lest all die and the Church be forsaken, should there be no other means of coming to an agreement, so far as I can see, they must be chosen by lot.” Again he says (De Doctr. Christ. xxviii): “If thou aboundest in that which it behooves thee to give to him who hath not, and which cannot be given to two; should two come to you, neither of whom surpasses the other either in need or in some claim on thee, thou couldst not act more justly than in choosing by lot to whom thou shalt give that which thou canst not give to both.”

This suffices for the Reply to the First and Second Objections.

P(2b)-Q(95)-A(8)-RO(3) — The trial by hot iron or boiling water is directed to the investigation of someone’s hidden sin, by means of something done by a man, and in this it agrees with the drawing of lots. But in so far as a miraculous result is expected from God, it surpasses the common generality of sortilege. Hence this kind of trial is rendered unlawful, both because it is directed to the judgment of the occult, which is reserved to the divine judgment, and because such like trials are not sanctioned by divine authority. Hence we read in a decree of Pope Stephen V [*II, qu. v., can. Consuluist i]: “The sacred canons do not approve of extorting a confession from anyone by means of the trial by hot iron or boiling water, and no one must presume, by a superstitious innovation, to practice what is not sanctioned by the teaching of the holy fathers. For it is allowable that public crimes should be judged by our authority, after the culprit has made spontaneous confession, or when witnesses have been approved, with due regard to the fear of God; but hidden and unknown crimes must be left to Him Who alone knows the hearts of the children of men.” The same would seem to apply to the law concerning duels, save that it approaches nearer to the common kind of sortilege, since no miraculous effect is expected thereupon, unless the combatants be very unequal in strength or skill.

QUESTION 96

OF SUPERSTITION IN OBSERVANCES

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider superstition in observances, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Of observances for acquiring knowledge, which are prescribed by the magic art;
- (2) Of observances for causing alterations in certain bodies;
- (3) Of observances practiced in fortune-telling;
- (4) Of wearing sacred words at the neck.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(1)

Whether it be unlawful to practice the observances of the magic art?

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not unlawful to practice the observances of the magic art. A thing is said to be unlawful in two ways. First, by reason of the genus of the deed, as murder and theft: secondly, through being directed to an evil end, as when a person gives an alms for the sake of vainglory. Now the observances of the magic art are not evil as to the genus of the deed, for they consist in certain fasts and prayers to God; moreover, they are directed to a good end, namely, the acquisition of science. Therefore it is not unlawful to practice these observances.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, it is written (²⁰¹⁷Daniel 1:17) that “to the children” who abstained, “God gave knowledge, and understanding in every book, and wisdom.” Now the observances of the magic art consist in certain fasts and abstinences. Therefore it seems that this art achieves its results through God: and consequently it is not unlawful to practice it.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, seemingly, as stated above (**A(1)**), the reason why it is wrong to inquire of the demons concerning the future is because they have no knowledge of it, this knowledge being proper to God. Yet the demons know scientific truths: because sciences are about things necessary and invariable, and such things are subject to human knowledge, and much more to the knowledge of demons, who are of keener intellect, as Augustine says [*Genesis ad lit. ii, 17; De Divin. Daemon. 3,4]. Therefore it seems to be no sin to practice the magic art, even though it achieve its result through the demons.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~CRS~~ Deuteronomy 18:10,11):

“Neither let there be found among you... anyone... that seeketh the truth from the dead”:

which search relies on the demons’ help. Now through the observances of the magic art, knowledge of the truth is sought “by means of certain signs agreed upon by compact with the demons” [*Augustine, De Doctr. Christ. ii, 20; see above **Q(92)**, **A(2)**]. Therefore it is unlawful to practice the notary art.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(1) — *I answer that*, The magic art is both unlawful and futile. It is unlawful, because the means it employs for acquiring knowledge have not in themselves the power to cause science, consisting as they do in gazing certain shapes, and muttering certain strange words, and so forth. Wherefore this art does not make use of these things as causes, but as signs; not however as signs instituted by God, as are the sacramental signs. It follows, therefore, that they are empty signs, and consequently a kind of “agreement or covenant made with the demons for the purpose of consultation and of compact by tokens” [*Augustine, De Doctr. Christ. ii, 20; see above **Q(92)**, **A(2)**]. Wherefore the magic art is to be absolutely repudiated and avoided by Christian, even as other arts of vain and noxious superstition, as Augustine declares (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 23). This art is also useless for the acquisition of science. For since it is not intended by means of this art to acquire science in a manner connatural to man, namely, by discovery and instruction, the consequence is that this effect is expected either from God or from the demons. Now it is certain that some have received wisdom and science infused into them by God, as

related of Solomon (3 Kings 3 and 2 Paralip 1). Moreover, our Lord said to His disciples (^{<4215>}Luke 21:15):

“I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries
shall not be able to resist and gainsay.”

However, this gift is not granted to all, or in connection with any particular observance, but according to the will of the Holy Ghost, as stated in ^{<4218>}1 Corinthians 12:8,

“To one indeed by the Spirit is given the word of wisdom, to
another the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit,”

and afterwards it is said (^{<4211>}1 Corinthians 12:11):

“All these things one and the same Spirit worketh, dividing to
everyone according as He will.”

On the other hand it does not belong to the demons to enlighten the intellect, as stated in the **P(1), Q(109), A(3)**. Now the acquisition of knowledge and wisdom is effected by the enlightening of the intellect, wherefore never did anyone acquire knowledge by means of the demons. Hence Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x, 9): “Porphyry confesses that the intellectual soul is in no way cleansed by theurgic inventions,” i.e. the operations “of the demons, so as to be fitted to see its God, and discern what is true,” such as are all scientific conclusions. The demons may, however, be able by speaking to men to express in words certain teachings of the sciences, but this is not what is sought by means of magic.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(1)-RO(1) — It is a good thing to acquire knowledge, but it is not good to acquire it by undue means, and it is to this end that the magic art tends.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(1)-RO(2) — The abstinence of these children was not in accordance with a vain observance of the notary art, but according to the authority of the divine law, for they refused to be defiled by the meat of Gentiles. Hence as a reward for their obedience they received knowledge from God, according to ^{<4280>}Psalms 118:100,

“I have had understanding above the ancients, because I have
sought Thy commandments.”

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(1)-RO(3) — To seek knowledge of the future from the demons is a sin not only because they are ignorant of the future, but also on account of the fellowship entered into with them, which also applies to the case in point.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(2)

Whether observances directed to the alteration of bodies, as for the purpose of acquiring health or the like, are unlawful?

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that observances directed to the alteration of bodies, as for the purpose of acquiring health, or the like, are lawful. It is lawful to make use of the natural forces of bodies in order to produce their proper effects. Now in the physical order things have certain occult forces, the reason of which man is unable to assign; for instance that the magnet attracts iron, and many like instances, all of which Augustine enumerates (De Civ. Dei xxi, 5,7). Therefore it would seem lawful to employ such like forces for the alteration of bodies.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, artificial bodies are subject to the heavenly bodies, just as natural bodies are. Now natural bodies acquire certain occult forces resulting from their species through the influence of the heavenly bodies. Therefore artificial bodies, e.g. images, also acquire from the heavenly bodies a certain occult force for the production of certain effects. Therefore it is not unlawful to make use of them and of such like things.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the demons too are able to alter bodies in many ways, as Augustine states (De Trin. iii, 8,9). But their power is from God. Therefore it is lawful to make use of their power for the purpose of producing these alterations.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 20) that “to superstition belong the experiments of magic arts, amulets and nostrums condemned by the medical faculty, consisting either of incantations or of certain cyphers which they call characters, or of any kind of thing worn or fastened on.”

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(2) — *I answer that*, In things done for the purpose of producing some bodily effect we must consider whether they seem able to produce that effect naturally: for if so it will not be unlawful to do so, since it is lawful to employ natural causes in order to produce their proper effects. But, if they seem unable to produce those effects naturally, it follows that they are employed for the purpose of producing those effects, not as causes but only as signs, so that they come under the head of “compact by tokens entered into with the demons” [*Augustine, De Doctr. Christ.; see above **Q(92), A(2)**]. Wherefore Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xxi, 6): “The demons are allured by means of creatures, which were made, not by them, but by God. They are enticed by various objects differing according to the various things in which they delight, not as animals by meat, but as spirits by signs, such as are to each one’s liking, by means of various kinds of stones, herbs, trees, animals, songs and rites.”

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(2)-RO(1) — There is nothing superstitious or unlawful in employing natural things simply for the purpose of causing certain effects such as they are thought to have the natural power of producing. But if in addition there be employed certain characters, words, or any other vain observances which clearly have no efficacy by nature, it will be superstitious and unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(2)-RO(2) — The natural forces of natural bodies result from their substantial forms which they acquire through the influence of heavenly bodies; wherefore through this same influence they acquire certain active forces. On the other hand the forms of artificial bodies result from the conception of the craftsman; and since they are nothing else but composition, order and shape, as stated in Phys. i, 5, they cannot have a natural active force. Consequently, no force accrues to them from the influence of heavenly bodies, in so far as they are artificial, but only in respect of their natural matter. Hence it is false, what Porphyry held, according to Augustine (De Civ. Dei x, 11), that “by herbs, stones, animals, certain particular sounds, words, shapes and devices, or again by certain movements of the stars observed in the course of the heavens it is possible for men to fashion on earth forces capable of carrying into effect the various dispositions of the stars,” as though the results of the magic arts were to be ascribed to the power of the heavenly bodies. In fact as

Augustine adds (De Civ. Dei x, 11), “all these things are to be ascribed to the demons, who delude the souls that are subject to them.”

Wherefore those images called astronomical also derive their efficacy from the actions of the demons: a sign of this is that it is requisite to inscribe certain characters on them which do not conduce to any effect naturally, since shape is not a principle of natural action. Yet astronomical images differ from necromantic images in this, that the latter include certain explicit invocations and trickery, wherefore they come under the head of explicit agreements made with the demons: whereas in the other images there are tacit agreements by means of tokens in certain shapes or characters.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(2)-RO(3) — It belongs to the domain of the divine majesty, to Whom the demons are subject, that God should employ them to whatever purpose He will. But man has not been entrusted with power over the demons, to employ them to whatsoever purpose he will; *on the contrary*, it is appointed that he should wage war against the demons. Hence in no way is it lawful for man to make use of the demons’ help by compacts either tacit or express.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(3)

Whether observances directed to the purpose of fortune-telling are unlawful?

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that observances directed to the purpose of fortune-telling are not unlawful. Sickness is one of the misfortunes that occur to man. Now sickness in man is preceded by certain symptoms, which the physician observes. Therefore it seems not unlawful to observe such like signs.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it is unreasonable to deny that which nearly everybody experiences. Now nearly everyone experiences that certain times, or places, hearing of certain words meetings of men or animals, uncanny or ungainly actions, are presages of good or evil to come. Therefore it seems not unlawful to observe these things.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, human actions and occurrences are disposed by divine providence in a certain order: and this order seems to require that precedent events should be signs of subsequent occurrences: wherefore, according to the Apostle (~~4306~~ 1 Corinthians 10:6), the things that happened to the fathers of old are signs of those that take place in our time. Now it is not unlawful to observe the order that proceeds from divine providence. Therefore it is seemingly not unlawful to observe these presages.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 20) that “a thousand vain observances are comprised under the head of compacts entered into with the demons: for instance, the twitching of a limb; a stone, a dog, or a boy coming between friends walking together; kicking the door-post when anyone passes in front of one’s house; to go back to bed if you happen to sneeze while putting on your shoes; to return home if you trip when going forth; when the rats have gnawed a hole in your clothes, to fear superstitiously a future evil rather than to regret the actual damage.”

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Men attend to all these observances, not as causes but as signs of future events, good or evil. Nor do they observe them as signs given by God, since these signs are brought forward, not on divine authority, but rather by human vanity with the cooperation of the malice of the demons, who strive to entangle men’s minds with such like trifles. Accordingly it is evident that all these observances are superstitious and unlawful: they are apparently remains of idolatry, which authorized the observance of auguries, of lucky and unlucky days which is allied to divination by the stars, in respect of which one day differentiated from another: except that these observances are devoid of reason and art, wherefore they are yet more vain and superstitious.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(3)-RO(1) — The causes of sickness are seated in us, and they produce certain signs of sickness to come, which physicians lawfully observe. Wherefore it is not unlawful to consider a presage of future events as proceeding from its cause; as when a slave fears a flogging when he sees his master’s anger. Possibly the same might be said if one were to fear for child lest it take harm from the evil eye, of which we have spoken in the

P(1), Q(117), A(3), ad 2. But this does not apply to this kind of observances.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(3)-RO(2) — That men have at first experienced a certain degree of truth in these observances is due to chance. But afterwards when a man begins to entangle his mind with observances of this kind, many things occur in connection with them through the trickery of the demons, “so that men, through being entangled in these observances, become yet more curious, and more and more embroiled in the manifold snares of a pernicious error,” as Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. ii, 23).

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(3)-RO(3) — Among the Jewish people of whom Christ was to be born, not only words but also deeds were prophetic, as Augustine states (Contra Faust. iv, 2; xxii, 24). Wherefore it is lawful to apply those deeds to our instruction, as signs given by God. Not all things, however, that occur through divine providence are ordered so as to be signs of the future. Hence the argument does not prove.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(4)

Whether it is unlawful to wear divine words at the neck?

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not unlawful to wear divine words at the neck. Divine words are no less efficacious when written than when uttered. But it is lawful to utter sacred words for the purpose of producing certain effects; (for instance, in order to heal the sick), such as the “Our Father” or the “Hail Mary,” or in any way whatever to call on the Lord’s name, according to ^{<4167>}Mark 16:17,18, “In My name they shall cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents.” Therefore it seems to be lawful to wear sacred words at one’s neck, as a remedy for sickness or for any kind of distress.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, sacred words are no less efficacious on the human body than on the bodies of serpents and other animals. Now certain incantations are efficacious in checking serpents, or in healing certain other animals: wherefore it is written (^{<4505>}Psalm 57:5):

“Their madness is according to the likeness of a serpent, like the deaf asp that stoppeth her ears, which will not hear the voice of the charmers, nor of the wizard that charmeth wisely.”

Therefore it is lawful to wear sacred words as a remedy for men.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, God’s word is no less holy than the relics of the saints; wherefore Augustine says (Lib. L. Hom. xxvi) that “God’s word is of no less account than the Body of Christ.” Now it is lawful for one to wear the relics of the saints at one’s neck, or to carry them about one in any way for the purpose of self-protection. Therefore it is equally lawful to have recourse to the words of Holy Writ, whether uttered or written, for one’s protection.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(4)-O(4) — On the other hand, Chrysostom says (Hom. xliii in Matth.) [*Cf. the Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum, among St. Chrysostom’s works, and falsely ascribed to him]: “Some wear round their necks a passage in writing from the Gospel. Yet is not the Gospel read in church and heard by all every day? How then, if it does a man no good to have the Gospels in his ears, will he find salvation by wearing them round his neck? Moreover, where is the power of the Gospel? In the shapes of the letters or in the understanding of the sense? If in the shapes, you do well to wear them round your neck; if in the understanding, you will then do better to bear them in your heart than to wear them round your neck.”

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(4) — *I answer that*, In every incantation or wearing of written words, two points seem to demand caution. The first is the thing said or written, because if it is connected with invocation of the demons it is clearly superstitious and unlawful. In like manner it seems that one should beware lest it contain strange words, for fear that they conceal something unlawful. Hence Chrysostom says [*Cf. the Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum, among St. Chrysostom’s works, falsely ascribed to him] that “many now after the example of the Pharisees who enlarged their fringes, invent and write Hebrew names of angels, and fasten them to their persons. Such things seem fearsome to those who do not understand them.” Again, one should take care lest it contain anything false, because in that case also the effect could not be ascribed to God, Who does not bear witness to a falsehood.

In the second place, one should beware lest besides the sacred words it contain something vain, for instance certain written characters, except the sign of the Cross; or if hope be placed in the manner of writing or fastening, or in any like vanity, having no connection with reverence for God, because this would be pronounced superstitious: otherwise, however, it is lawful. Hence it is written in the Decretals (XXVI, qu. v, cap. Non liceat Christianis): “In blending together medicinal herbs, it is not lawful to make use of observances or incantations, other than the divine symbol, or the Lord’s Prayer, so as to give honor to none but God the Creator of all.”

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(4)-RO(1) — It is indeed lawful to pronounce divine words, or to invoke the divine name, if one do so with a mind to honor God alone, from Whom the result is expected: but it is unlawful if it be done in connection with any vain observance.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(4)-RO(2) — Even in the case of incantations of serpents or any animals whatever, if the mind attend exclusively to the sacred words and to the divine power, it will not be unlawful. Such like incantations, however, often include unlawful observances, and rely on the demons for their result, especially in the case of serpents, because the serpent was the first instrument employed by the devil in order to deceive man. Hence a gloss on the passage quoted says: “Note that Scripture does not commend everything whence it draws its comparisons, as in the case of the unjust judge who scarcely heard the widow’s request.”

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(4)-RO(3) — The same applies to the wearing of relics, for if they be worn out of confidence in God, and in the saints whose relics they are, it will not be unlawful. But if account were taken in this matter of some vain circumstance (for instance that the casket be three-cornered, or the like, having no bearing on the reverence due to God and the saints), it would be superstitious and unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(96)-A(4)-RO(4) — Chrysostom is speaking the case in which more attention is paid the written characters than to the understanding of the words.

IRRELIGION, I.E. BY WAY OF DEFICIENCY

QUESTIONS 97-102

QUESTION 97

OF THE TEMPTATION OF GOD

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the vices that are opposed to religion, through lack of religion, and which are manifestly contrary thereto, so that they come under the head of irreligion. Such are the vices which pertain to contempt or irreverence for God and holy things. Accordingly we shall consider:

- (1) Vices pertaining directly to irreverence for God;
- (2) Vices pertaining to irreverence for holy things.

With regard to the first we shall consider the temptation whereby God is tempted, and perjury, whereby God's name is taken with irreverence. Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) In what the temptation of God consists;
- (2) Whether it is a sin?
- (3) To what virtue it is opposed;
- (4) Of its comparison with other vices.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(1)

***Whether the temptation of God
consists in certain deeds, wherein the expected result
is ascribed to the power of God alone?***

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that the temptation of God does not consist in certain deeds wherein the result is expected from the power of God alone. Just as God is tempted by man so is man tempted by God, man, and demons. But when man is tempted the result is not always expected from his power. Therefore neither is God tempted when the result is expected from His power alone.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, all those who work miracles by invoking the divine name look for an effect due to God's power alone. Therefore, if the temptation of God consisted in such like deeds, all who work miracles would tempt God.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, it seems to belong to man's perfection that he should put aside human aids and put his hope in God alone. Hence Ambrose, commenting on ⁴⁹⁹Luke 9:3, "Take nothing for your journey," etc. says: "The Gospel precept points out what is required of him that announces the kingdom of God, namely, that he should not depend on worldly assistance, and that, taking assurance from his faith, he should hold himself to be the more able to provide for himself, the less he seeks these things." And the Blessed Agatha said: "I have never treated my body with bodily medicine, I have my Lord Jesus Christ, Who restores all things by His mere word." [*Office of St. Agatha, eighth Responsory (Dominican Breviary).] But the temptation of God does not consist in anything pertaining to perfection. Therefore the temptation of God does not consist in such like deeds, wherein the help of God alone is expected.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (Contra Faust. xxii, 36): "Christ who gave proof of God's power by teaching and reproof openly, yet not allowing the rage of His enemies to prevail against Him, nevertheless by fleeing and hiding, instructed human weakness, lest it should dare to tempt God when it has to strive to escape from that which it needs to avoid." From this it would seem that the temptation of God consists in omitting to do what one can in order to escape from danger, and relying on the assistance of God alone.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Properly speaking, to tempt is to test the person tempted. Now we put a person to the test by words or by deeds. By words, that we may find out whether he knows what we ask, or whether he can and will grant it: by deeds, when, by what we do, we probe another's prudence, will or power. Either of these may happen in two ways. First, openly, as when one declares oneself a tempter: thus Samson (^{<7412}Judges 14:12) proposed a riddle to the Philistines in order to tempt them. In the second place it may be done with cunning and by stealth, as the Pharisees tempted Christ, as we read in ^{<1215}Matthew 22:15, sqq. Again this is sometimes done explicitly, as when anyone intends, by word or deed, to put some person to the test; and sometimes implicitly, when, to wit, though he does not intend to test a person, yet that which he does or says can seemingly have no other purpose than putting him to a test.

Accordingly, man tempts God sometimes by words, sometimes by deeds. Now we speak with God in words when we pray. Hence a man tempts God explicitly in his prayers when he asks something of God with the intention of probing God's knowledge, power or will. He tempts God explicitly by deeds when he intends, by whatever he does, to experiment on God's power, good will or wisdom. But He will tempt God implicitly, if, though he does not intend to make an experiment on God, yet he asks for or does something which has no other use than to prove God's power, goodness or knowledge. Thus when a man wishes his horse to gallop in order to escape from the enemy, this is not giving the horse a trial: but if he make the horse gallop with out any useful purpose, it seems to be nothing else than a trial of the horse's speed; and the same applies to all other things. Accordingly when a man in his prayers or deeds entrusts himself to the divine assistance for some urgent or useful motive, this is not to tempt God: for it is written (2 Paralip 20:12): "As we know not what to do, we can only turn our eyes to Thee." But if this be done without any useful or urgent motive, this is to tempt God implicitly. Wherefore a gloss on ^{<1110}Deuteronomy 6:16, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," says: "A man tempts God, if having the means at hand, without reason he chooses a dangerous course, trying whether he can be delivered by God."

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(1)-RO(1) — Man also is sometimes tempted by means of deeds, to test his ability or knowledge or will to uphold or oppose those same deeds.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(1)-RO(2) — When saints work miracles by their prayers, they are moved by a motive of necessity or usefulness to ask for that which is an effect of the divine power.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(1)-RO(3) — The preachers of God's kingdom dispense with temporal aids, so as to be freer to give their time to the word of God: wherefore if they depend on God alone, it does not follow that they tempt God. But if they were to neglect human assistance without any useful or urgent motive, they would be tempting God. Hence Augustine (*Contra Faust.* xxii, 36) says that "Paul fled, not through ceasing to believe in God, but lest he should tempt God, were he not to flee when he had the means of flight." The Blessed Agatha had experience of God's kindness towards her, so that either she did not suffer such sickness as required bodily medicine, or else she felt herself suddenly cured by God.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(2)

Whether it is a sin to tempt God?

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not a sin to tempt God. For God has not commanded sin. Yet He has commanded men to try, which is the same as to tempt, Him: for it is written (³⁹⁸⁰Malachi 3:10):

"Bring all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in My house; and try Me in this, saith the Lord, if I open not unto you the flood-gates of heaven."

Therefore it seems not to be a sin to tempt God.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, a man is tempted not only in order to test his knowledge and his power, but also to try his goodness or his will. Now it is lawful to test the divine goodness or will, for it is written (⁴³⁹³Psalms 33:9): "O taste and see that the Lord is sweet," and (⁴⁵¹¹Romans 12:2):

"That you may prove what is the good, and the acceptable, and the perfect will of God."

Therefore it is not a sin to tempt God.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, Scripture never blames a man for ceasing from sin, but rather for committing a sin. Now Achaz is blamed because when the Lord said: “Ask thee a sign of the Lord thy God,” he replied: “I will not ask, and I will not tempt the Lord,” and then it was said to him:

“Is it a small thing for you to be grievous to men, that you are grievous to my God also?” (^{<2371>}Isaiah 7:11-13).

And we read of Abraham (^{<0158>}Genesis 15:8) that he said to the Lord: “Whereby may I know that I shall possess it?” namely, the land which God had promised him. Again Gedeon asked God for a sign of the victory promised to him (^{<0086>}Judges 6:36, sqq.). Yet they were not blamed for so doing. Therefore it is not a sin to tempt God.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is forbidden in God’s Law, for it is written (^{<0060>}Deuteronomy 6:10): “Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.”

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), to tempt a person is to put him to a test. Now one never tests that of which one is certain. Wherefore all temptation proceeds from some ignorance or doubt, either in the tempter (as when one tests a thing in order to know its qualities), or in others (as when one tests a thing in order to prove it to others), and in this latter way God is said to tempt us. Now it is a sin to be ignorant of or to doubt that which pertains to God’s perfection. Wherefore it is evident that it is a sin to tempt God in order that the tempter himself may know God’s power.

On the other hand, if one were to test that which pertains to the divine perfection, not in order to know it oneself, but to prove it to others: this is not tempting God, provided there be just motive of urgency, or a pious motive of usefulness, and other requisite conditions. For thus did the apostles ask the Lord that signs might be wrought in the name of Jesus Christ, as related in (^{<0083>}Acts 4:30, in order, to wit, that Christ’s power might be made manifest to unbelievers.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(2)-RO(1) — The paying of tithes was prescribed in the Law, as stated above (**Q(87)**, **A(1)**). Hence there was a motive of urgency to pay it, through the obligation of the Law, and also a motive of

usefulness, as stated in the text quoted — “that there may be meat in God’s house”: wherefore they did not tempt God by paying tithes. The words that follow, “and try Me,” are not to be understood causally, as though they had to pay tithes in order to try if “God would open the flood-gates of heaven,” but consecutively, because, to wit, if they paid tithes, they would prove by experience the favors which God would shower upon them.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(2)-RO(2) — There is a twofold knowledge of God’s goodness or will. One is speculative and as to this it is not lawful to doubt or to prove whether God’s will be good, or whether God is sweet. The other knowledge of God’s will or goodness is effective or experimental and thereby a man experiences in himself the taste of God’s sweetness, and complacency in God’s will, as Dionysius says of Hierotheos (Div. Nom. ii) that “he learnt divine thing through experience of them.” It is in this way that we are told to prove God’s will, and to taste His sweetness.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(2)-RO(3) — God wished to give a sign to Achaz, not for him alone, but for the instruction of the whole people. Hence he was reproved because, by refusing to ask a sign, he was an obstacle to the common welfare. Nor would he have tempted God by asking, both because he would have asked through God commanding him to do so, and because it was a matter relating to the common good. Abraham asked for a sign through the divine instinct, and so he did not sin. Gedeon seems to have asked a sign through weakness of faith, wherefore he is not to be excused from sin, as a gloss observes: just as Zachary sinned in saying to the angel (~~Q18~~ Luke 1:18): “Whereby shall I know this?” so that he was punished for his unbelief.

It must be observed, however, that there are two ways of asking God for a sign: first in order to test God’s power or the truth of His word, and this of its very nature pertains to the temptation of God. Secondly, in order to be instructed as to what is God’s pleasure in some particular matter; and this nowise comes under the head of temptation of God.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(3)

Whether temptation of God is opposed to the virtue of religion?

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that the temptation of God is not opposed to the virtue of religion. The temptation of God is sinful, because a man doubts God, as stated above (A(2)). Now doubt about God comes under the head of unbelief, which is opposed to faith. Therefore temptation of God is opposed to faith rather than to religion.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it is written (Ecclus. 18:23): “Before prayer prepare thy soul, and be not as a man that tempteth God. Such a man,” that is, who tempts God, says the interlinear gloss, “prays for what God taught him to pray for, yet does not what God has commanded him to do.” Now this pertains to imprudence which is opposed to hope. Therefore it seems that temptation of God is a sin opposed to hope.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, a gloss on ^{<5718>}Psalm 77:18, “And they tempted God in their hearts,” says that “to tempt God is to pray to Him deceitfully, with simplicity in our words and wickedness in our hearts.” Now deceit is opposed to the virtue of truth. Therefore temptation of God is opposed, not to religion, but to truth.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, According to the gloss quoted above “to tempt God is to pray to Him inordinately.” Now to pray to God becomingly is an act of religion as stated above (Q(83), A(15)). Therefore to tempt God is a sin opposed to religion.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As clearly shown above (Q(81), A(5)), the end of religion is to pay reverence to God. Wherefore whatever pertains directly to irreverence for God is opposed to religion. Now it is evident that to tempt a person pertains to irreverence for him: since no one presumes to tempt one of whose excellence he is sure. Hence it is manifest that to tempt God is a sin opposed to religion.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(3)-RO(1) — As stated above (Q(81), A(7)), it belongs to religion to declare one’s faith by certain signs indicative of reverence towards God. Consequently it belongs to irreligion that, through doubtful

faith, a man does things indicative of irreverence towards God. To tempt God is one of these; wherefore it is a species of irreligion.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(3)-RO(2) — He that prepares not his soul before prayer by forgiving those against whom he has anything, or in some other way disposing himself to devotion, does not do what he can to be heard by God, wherefore he tempts God implicitly as it were. And though this implicit temptation would seem to arise from presumption or indiscretion, yet the very fact that a man behaves presumptuously and without due care in matters relating to God implies irreverence towards Him. For it is written (¹⁸⁸⁶1 Peter 5:6): “Be you humbled... under the mighty hand of God,” and (¹⁸⁸⁵2 Timothy 2:15): “Carefully study to present thyself approved unto God.” Therefore also this kind of temptation is a species of irreligion.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(3)-RO(3) — A man is said to pray deceitfully, not in relation to God, Who knows the secrets of the heart, but in relation to man. Wherefore deceit is accidental to the temptation of God, and consequently it does not follow that to tempt God is directly opposed to the truth.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(4)

*Whether the temptation of God
is a graver sin than superstition?*

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the temptation of God is a graver sin than superstition. The greater sin receives the greater punishment. Now the sin of tempting God was more severely punished in the Jews than was the sin of idolatry; and yet the latter is the chief form of superstition: since for the sin of idolatry three thousand men of their number were slain, as related in (¹⁸²⁸Exodus 32:28 [*Septuagint version. The Vulgate has “twenty-three thousand.”]), whereas for the sin of temptation they all without exception perished in the desert, and entered not into the land of promise, according to (¹⁹¹⁰Psalm 94:9, “Your fathers tempted Me,” and further on, “so I swore in My wrath that they should not enter into My rest.” Therefore to tempt God is a graver sin than superstition.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the more a sin is opposed to virtue the graver it would seem to be. Now irreligion, of which the temptation of God is a species, is more opposed to the virtue of religion, than superstition which bears some likeness to religion. Therefore to tempt God is a graver sin than superstition.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, it seems to be a greater sin to behave disrespectfully to one's parents, than to pay others the respect we owe to our parents. Now God should be honored by us as the Father of all (^{300B}Malachi 1:6). Therefore. temptation of God whereby we behave irreverently to God, seems to be a greater sin than idolatry, whereby we give to a creature the honor we owe to God.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on ^{657D}Deuteronomy 17:2, “When there shall be found among you,” etc. says: “The Law detests error and idolatry above all: for it is a very great sin to give to a creature the honor that belongs to the Creator.”

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Among sins opposed to religion, the more grievous is that which is the more opposed to the reverence due to God. Now it is less opposed to this reverence that one should doubt the divine excellence than that one should hold the contrary for certain. For just as a man is more of an unbeliever if he be confirmed in his error, than if he doubt the truth of faith, so, too, a man acts more against the reverence due to God, if by his deeds he professes an error contrary to the divine excellence, than if he expresses a doubt. Now the superstitious man professes an error, as shown above (**Q(94), A(1)**, ad 1), whereas he who tempts God by words or deeds expresses a doubt of the divine excellence, as stated above (**A(2)**). Therefore the sin of superstition is graver than the sin of tempting God.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(4)-RO(1) — The sin of idolatry was not punished in the above manner, as though it were a sufficient punishment; because a more severe punishment was reserved in the future for that sin, for it is written (^{023A}Exodus 32:34): “And I, in the day of revenge, will visit this sin also of theirs.”

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(4)-RO(2) — Superstition bears a likeness to religion, as regards the material act which it pays just as religion does. But, as regards

the end, it is more contrary to religion than the temptation of God, since it implies greater irreverence for God, as stated.

P(2b)-Q(97)-A(4)-RO(3) — It belongs essentially to the divine excellence that it is singular and incommunicable. Consequently to give divine reverence to another is the same as to do a thing opposed to the divine excellence. There is no comparison with the honor due to our parents, which can without sin be given to others.

QUESTION 98

OF PERJURY

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider perjury: under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether falsehood is necessary for perjury?
- (2) Whether perjury is always a sin?
- (3) Whether it is always a mortal sin?
- (4) Whether it is a sin to enjoin an oath on a perjurer?

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(1)

Whether it is necessary for perjury that the statement confirmed on oath be false?

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not necessary for perjury that the statement confirmed on oath be false. As stated above (**Q(89), A(3)**), an oath should be accompanied by judgment and justice no less than by truth. Since therefore perjury is incurred through lack of truth, it is incurred likewise through lack of judgment, as when one swears indiscreetly, and through lack of justice, as when one swears to something unjust.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, that which confirms is more weighty than the thing confirmed thereby: thus in a syllogism the premises are more weighty than the conclusion. Now in an oath a man's statement is confirmed by calling on the name of God. Therefore perjury seems to consist in swearing by false gods rather than in a lack of truth in the human statement which is confirmed on oath.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, Augustine says (De Verb. Apost. Jacobi; Serm. clxxx): "Men swear falsely both in deceiving others and when

they are deceived themselves”; and he gives three examples. The first is: “Supposing a man to swear, thinking that what he swears to is true, whereas it is false”; the second is: “Take the instance of another who knows the statement to be false, and swears to it as though it were true”; and the third is: “Take another, who thinks his statement false, and swears to its being true, while perhaps it is true,” of whom he says afterwards that he is a perjurer. Therefore one may be a perjurer while swearing to the truth. Therefore falsehood is not necessary for perjury.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Perjury is defined “a falsehood confirmed by oath” [*Hugh of St. Victor, Sum. Sent. iv, 5].

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(92), A(2)**), moral acts take their species from their end. Now the end of an oath is the confirmation of a human assertion. To this confirmation falsehood is opposed: since an assertion is confirmed by being firmly shown to be true; and this cannot happen to that which is false. Hence falsehood directly annuls the end of an oath: and for this reason, that perversity in swearing, which is called perjury, takes its species chiefly from falsehood. Consequently falsehood is essential to perjury.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(1)-RO(1) — As Jerome says on ²⁰⁰Jeremiah 4:2, “whichever of these three be lacking, there is perjury,” but in different order. For first and chiefly perjury consists in a lack of truth, for the reason stated in the Article. Secondly, there is perjury when justice is lacking, for in whatever way a man swears to that which is unlawful, for this very reason he is guilty of falsehood, since he is under an obligation to do the contrary. Thirdly, there is perjury when judgment is lacking, since by the very fact that a man swears indiscreetly, he incurs the danger of lapsing into falsehood.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(1)-RO(2) — In syllogisms the premises are of greater weight, since they are in the position of active principle, as stated in Phys. ii, 3: whereas in moral matters the end is of greater importance than the active principle. Hence though it is a perverse oath when a man swears to the truth by false gods, yet perjury takes its name from that kind of perversity in an oath, that deprives the oath of its end, by swearing what is false.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(1)-RO(3) — Moral acts proceed from the will, whose object is the apprehended good. Wherefore if the false be apprehended as true, it will be materially false, but formally true, as related to the will. If something false be apprehended as false, it will be false both materially and formally. If that which is true be apprehended as false, it will be materially true, and formally false. Hence in each of these cases the conditions required for perjury are to be found in some way, on account of some measure of falsehood. Since, however, that which is formal in anything is of greater importance than that which is material, he that swears to a falsehood thinking it true is not so much of a perjurer as he that swears to the truth thinking it false. For Augustine says (De Verb. Apost. Jacobi; Sermon. clxxx): “It depends how the assertion proceeds from the mind, for the tongue is not guilty except the mind be guilty.”

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(2)

Whether all perjury is sinful?

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that not all perjury is sinful. Whoever does not fulfil what he has confirmed on oath is seemingly a perjurer. Yet sometimes a man swears he will do something unlawful (adultery, for instance, or murder): and if he does it, he commits a sin. If therefore he would commit a sin even if he did it not, it would follow that he is perplexed.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, no man sins by doing what is best. Yet sometimes by committing a perjury one does what is best: as when a man swears not to enter religion, or not to do some kind of virtuous deed. Therefore not all perjury is sinful.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, he that swears to do another's will would seem to be guilty of perjury unless he do it. Yet it may happen sometimes that he sins not, if he do not the man's will: for instance, if the latter order him to do something too hard and unbearable. Therefore seemingly not all perjury is sinful.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, a promissory oath extends to future, just as a declaratory oath extends to past and present things. Now the

obligation of an oath may be removed by some future occurrence: thus a state may swear to fulfil some obligation, and afterwards other citizens come on the scene who did not take the oath; or a canon may swear to keep the statutes of a certain church, and afterwards new statutes are made. Therefore seemingly he that breaks an oath does not sin.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Verb. Apost. Jacobi; Serm. cxxx), in speaking of perjury: “See how you should detest this horrible beast and exterminate it from all human business.”

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(89), A(1)**), to swear is to call God as witness. Now it is an irreverence to God to call Him to witness to a falsehood, because by so doing one implies either that God ignores the truth or that He is willing to bear witness to a falsehood. Therefore perjury is manifestly a sin opposed to religion, to which it belongs to show reverence to God.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(2)-RO(1) — He that swears to do what is unlawful is thereby guilty of perjury through lack of justice: though, if he fails to keep his oath, he is not guilty of perjury in this respect, since that which he swore to do was not a fit matter of an oath.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(2)-RO(2) — A person who swears not to enter religion, or not to give an alms, or the like, is guilty of perjury through lack of judgment. Hence when he does that which is best it is not an act of perjury, but contrary thereto: for the contrary of that which he is doing could not be a matter of an oath.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(2)-RO(3) — When one man swears or promises to do another’s will, there is to be understood this requisite condition — that the thing commanded be lawful and virtuous, and not unbearable or immoderate.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(2)-RO(4) — An oath is a personal act, and so when a man becomes a citizen of a state, he is not bound, as by oath, to fulfil whatever the state has sworn to do. Yet he is bound by a kind of fidelity, the nature of which obligation is that he should take his share of the state’s burdens if he takes a share of its goods.

The canon who swears to keep the statutes that have force in some particular “college” is not bound by his oath to keep any that may be made in the future, unless he intends to bind himself to keep all, past and future. Nevertheless he is bound to keep them by virtue of the statutes themselves, since they are possessed of coercive force, as stated above (P(1), Q(96), A(4)).

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(3)

Whether all perjury is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that not all perjury is a mortal sin. It is laid down (Extra, De Jurejur, cap. Verum): “Referring to the question whether an oath is binding on those who have taken one in order to safeguard their life and possessions, we have no other mind than that which our predecessors the Roman Pontiffs are known to have had, and who absolved such persons from the obligations of their oath. Henceforth, that discretion may be observed, and in order to avoid occasions of perjury, let them not be told expressly not to keep their oath: but if they should not keep it, they are not for this reason to be punished as for a mortal sin.” Therefore not all perjury is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, as Chrysostom [*Hom. xliv in the Opus Imperfectum on St. Matthew, falsely ascribed to St. John Chrysostom] says, “it is a greater thing to swear by God than by the Gospels.” Now it is not always a mortal sin to swear by God to something false; for instance, if we were to employ such an oath in fun or by a slip of the tongue in the course of an ordinary conversation. Therefore neither is it always a mortal sin to break an oath that has been taken solemnly on the Gospels.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, according to the Law a man incurs infamy through committing perjury (VI, qu. i, cap. Infames). Now it would seem that infamy is not incurred through any kind of perjury, as it is prescribed in the case of a declaratory oath violated by perjury [*Cap. Cum dilectus, de Ord. Cognit.]. Therefore, seemingly, not all perjury is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Every sin that is contrary to a divine precept is a mortal sin. Now perjury is contrary to a divine precept, for it is written (^{CRSD} Leviticus 19:12): “Thou shalt not swear falsely by My name.” Therefore it is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(3) — *I answer that*, According to the teaching of the Philosopher (Poster. i, 2), “that which causes a thing to be such is yet more so.” Now we know that an action which is, by reason of its very nature, a venial sin, or even a good action, is a mortal sin if it be done out of contempt of God. Wherefore any action that of its nature, implies contempt of God is a mortal sin. Now perjury, of its very nature implies contempt of God, since, as stated above (**A(2)**), the reason why it is sinful is because it is an act of irreverence towards God. Therefore it is manifest that perjury, of its very nature, is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(3)-RO(1) — As stated above (**Q(89)**, **A(7)**, ad 3), coercion does not deprive a promissory oath of its binding force, as regards that which can be done lawfully. Wherefore he who fails to fulfil an oath which he took under coercion is guilty of perjury and sins mortally. Nevertheless the Sovereign Pontiff can, by his authority, absolve a man from an obligation even of an oath, especially if the latter should have been coerced into taking the oath through such fear as may overcome a high-principled man.

When, however, it is said that these persons are not to be punished as for a mortal sin, this does not mean that they are not guilty of mortal sin, but that a lesser punishment is to be inflicted on them.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(3)-RO(2) — He that swears falsely in fun is nonetheless irreverent to God, indeed, in a way, he is more so, and consequently is not excused from mortal sin. He that swears falsely by a slip of tongue, if he adverts to the fact that he is swearing, and that he is swearing to something false, is not excused from mortal sin, as neither is he excused from contempt of God. If, however, he does not advert to this, he would seem to have no intention of swearing, and consequently is excused from the sin of perjury.

It is, however, a more grievous sin to swear solemnly by the Gospels, than to swear by God in ordinary conversation, both on account of scandal and

on account of the greater deliberation. But if we consider them equally in comparison with one another, it is more grievous to commit perjury in swearing by God than in swearing by the Gospels.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(3)-RO(3) — Not every sin makes a man infamous in the eye of the law. Wherefore, if a man who has sworn falsely in a declaratory oath be not infamous in the eye of the law, but only when he has been so declared by sentence in a court of law, it does not follow that he has not sinned mortally. The reason why the law attaches infamy rather to one who breaks a promissory oath taken solemnly is that he still has it in his power after he has sworn to substantiate his oath, which is not the case in a declaratory oath.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(4)

Whether he sins who demands an oath of a perjurer?

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that he who demands an oath of a perjurer commits a sin. Either he knows that he swears truly, or he knows that he swears falsely. If he knows him to swear truly, it is useless for him to demand an oath: and if he believes him to swear falsely, for his own part he leads him into sin. Therefore nowise seemingly should one enjoin an oath on another person.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, to receive an oath from a person is less than to impose an oath on him. Now it would seem unlawful to receive an oath from a person, especially if he swear falsely, because he would then seem to consent in his sin. Much less therefore would it seem lawful to impose an oath on one who swears falsely.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, it is written (^{CR1}Leviticus 5:1):

“If anyone sin, and hear the voice of one swearing falsely
[*’Falsely’ is not in the Vulgate’], and is a witness either because he himself hath seen, or is privy to it: if he do not utter it, he shall bear his iniquity.”

Hence it would seem that when a man knows another to be swearing falsely, he is bound to denounce him. Therefore it is not lawful to demand an oath of such a man.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(4)-O(4) — On the other hand, Just as it is a sin to swear falsely so is it to swear by false gods. Yet it is lawful to take advantage of an oath of one who has sworn by false gods, as Augustine says (ad Public. Ep. xlvii). Therefore it is lawful to demand an oath from one who swears falsely.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As regards a person who demands an oath from another, a distinction would seem to be necessary. For either he demands the oath on his own account and of his own accord, or he demands it on account of the exigencies of a duty imposed on him. If a man demands an oath on his own account as a private individual, we must make a distinction, as does Augustine (de Perjuriis. serm. clxxx): “For if he knows not that the man will swear falsely, and says to him accordingly: ‘Swear to me’ in order that he may be credited, there is no sin: yet it is a human temptation” (because, to wit, it proceeds from his weakness in doubting whether the man will speak the truth). “This is the evil whereof Our Lord says (⁴⁰⁵³ Matthew 5:37): That which is over and above these, is of evil. But if he knows the man to have done so,” i.e. the contrary of what he swears to, “and yet forces him to swear, he is a murderer: for the other destroys himself by his perjury, but it is he who urged the hand of the slayer.”

If, on the other hand, a man demands an oath as a public person, in accordance with the requirements of the law, on the requisition of a third person: he does not seem to be at fault, if he demands an oath of a person, whether he knows that he will swear falsely or truly, because seemingly it is not he that exacts the oath but the person at whose instance he demands it.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(4)-RO(1) — This argument avails in the case of one who demands an oath on his own account. Yet he does not always know that the other will swear truly or falsely, for at times he has doubts about the fact, and believes he will swear truly. In such a case he exacts an oath in order that he may be more certain.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(4)-RO(2) — As Augustine says (ad Public. serm. xlvii), “though we are forbidden to swear, I do not remember ever to have read in the Holy Scriptures that we must not accept oaths from others.” Hence he that accepts an oath does not sin, except perchance when of his own accord he forces another to swear, knowing that he will swear falsely.

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(4)-RO(3) — As Augustine says (QQ. Super Lev, qu. i), Moses in the passage quoted did not state to whom one man had to denounce another’s perjury: wherefore it must be understood that the matter had to be denounced “to those who would do the perjurer good rather than harm.” Again, neither did he state in what order the denunciation was to be made: wherefore seemingly the Gospel order should be followed, if the sin of perjury should be hidden, especially when it does not tend to another person’s injury: because if it did, the Gospel order would not apply to the case, as stated above (**Q(33), A(7); Q(68), A(1)**).

P(2b)-Q(98)-A(4)-RO(4) — It is lawful to make use of an evil for the sake of good, as God does, but it is not lawful to lead anyone to do evil. Consequently it is lawful to accept the oath of one who is ready to swear by false gods, but it is not lawful to induce him to swear by false gods. Yet it seems to be different in the case of one who swears falsely by the true God, because an oath of this kind lacks the good of faith, which a man makes use of in the oath of one who swears truly by false gods, as Augustine says (ad Public. Ep. xlvii). Hence when a man swears falsely by the true God his oath seems to lack any good that one may use lawfully.

QUESTION 99

OF SACRILEGE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the vices which pertain to irreligion, whereby sacred things are treated with irreverence. We shall consider

(1) Sacrilege;

(2) Simony [i.e., the buying and selling of positions in the Church].

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

(1) What is sacrilege?

(2) Whether it is a special sin?

(3) Of the species of sacrilege;

(4) Of the punishment of sacrilege.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(1)

Whether sacrilege is the violation of a sacred thing?

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that sacrilege is not the violation of a sacred thing. It is stated (XVII, qu. iv [*Append. Gratian, on can. Si quis suadente]): “They are guilty of sacrilege who disagree about the sovereign’s decision, and doubt whether the person chosen by the sovereign be worthy of honor.” Now this seems to have no connection with anything sacred. Therefore sacrilege does not denote the violation of something sacred.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, it is stated further on [*Append. Gratian, on can. Constituit.] that if any man shall allow the Jews to hold public offices, “he must be excommunicated as being guilty of sacrilege.” Yet public offices have nothing to do with anything sacred. Therefore it seems that sacrilege does not denote the violation of a sacred thing.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, God's power is greater than man's. Now sacred things receive their sacred character from God. Therefore they cannot be violated by man: and so a sacrilege would not seem to be the violation of a sacred thing.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Isidore says (Etym. x) that "a man is said to be sacrilegious because he selects," i.e. steals, "sacred things."

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(81), A(5); P(1), Q(101), A(4)**), a thing is called "sacred" through being deputed to the divine worship. Now just as a thing acquires an aspect of good through being deputed to a good end, so does a thing assume a divine character through being deputed to the divine worship, and thus a certain reverence is due to it, which reverence is referred to God. Therefore whatever pertains to irreverence for sacred things is an injury to God, and comes under the head of sacrilege.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(1)-RO(1) — According to the Philosopher (Ethic. i, 2) the common good of the nation is a divine thing, wherefore in olden times the rulers of a commonwealth were called divines, as being the ministers of divine providence, according to Wis. 6:5, "Being ministers of His kingdom, you have not judged rightly." Hence by an extension of the term, whatever savors of irreverence for the sovereign, such as disputing his judgment, and questioning whether one ought to follow it, is called sacrilege by a kind of likeness.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(1)-RO(2) — Christians are sanctified by faith and the sacraments of Christ, according to ~~1~~1 Corinthians 6:11, "But you are washed, but you are sanctified." Wherefore it is written (~~1~~1 Peter 2:9):

"You are a chosen generation, a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people."

Therefore any injury inflicted on the Christian people, for instance that unbelievers should be put in authority over it, is an irreverence for a sacred thing, and is reasonably called a sacrilege.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(1)-RO(3) — Violation here means any kind of irreverence or dishonor. Now as "honor is in the person who honors and not in the one who is honored" (Ethic. i, 5), so again irreverence is in the person who

behaves irreverently even though he do no harm to the object of his irreverence. Hence, so far he is concerned, he violates the sacred thing, though the latter be not violated in itself.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(2)

Whether sacrilege is a special sin?

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that sacrilege not a special sin. It is stated (XVII, qu. iv) “They are guilty of sacrilege who through ignorance sin against the sanctity of the law, violate and defile it by their negligence.” But this is done in every sin, because sin is “a word, deed or desire contrary to the law of God,” according to Augustine (Contra Faust. xxi, 27). Therefore sacrilege is a general sin.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, no special sin is comprised under different kinds of sin. Now sacrilege comprised under different kinds of sin, for instance under murder, if one kill a priest under lust, as the violation of a consecrate virgin, or of any woman in a sacred place under theft, if one steal a sacred thing. Therefore sacrilege is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, every special sin is to found apart from other sins as the Philosopher states, in speaking of special justice (Ethic. v, 11). But, seemingly, sacrilege is not to be found apart from other sins; for it is sometimes united to theft, sometimes to murder, as stated in the preceding objection. Therefore it is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, That which is opposed to a special virtue is a special sin. But sacrilege is opposed to a special virtue, namely religion, to which it belongs to reverence God and divine things. Therefore sacrilege is a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Wherever we find a special aspect of deformity, there must needs be a special sin; because the species of a thing is derived chiefly from its formal aspect, and not from its matter or subject. Now in sacrilege we find a special aspect of deformity, namely, the violation of a sacred thing by treating it irreverently. Hence it is a special sin.

Moreover, it is opposed to religion. For according to Damascene (De Fide Orth. iv, 3), “When the purple has been made into a royal robe, we pay it honor and homage, and if anyone dishonor it he is condemned to death,” as acting against the king: and in the same way if a man violate a sacred thing, by so doing his behavior is contrary to the reverence due to God and consequently he is guilty of irreligion.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(2)-RO(1) — Those are said to sin against the sanctity of the divine law who assail God’s law, as heretics and blasphemers do. These are guilty of unbelief, through not believing in God; and of sacrilege, through perverting the words of the divine law.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(2)-RO(2) — Nothing prevents one specific kind of sin being found in various generic kinds of sin, inasmuch as various sins are directed to the end of one sin, just as happens in the case of virtues commanded by one virtue. In this way, by whatever kind of sin a man acts counter to reverence due to sacred things, he commits a sacrilege formally; although his act contains various kinds of sin materially.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(2)-RO(3) — Sacrilege is sometimes found apart from other sins, through its act having no other deformity than the violation of a sacred thing: for instance, if a judge were to take a person from a sacred place for he might lawfully have taken him from elsewhere.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(3)

***Whether the species of sacrilege
are distinguished according to the sacred things?***

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(3)-O(1) — It would seem that the species of sacrilege are not distinguished according to the sacred things. Material diversity does not differentiate species, if the formal aspect remains the same. Now there would seem to be the same formal aspect of sin in all violations of sacred things, and that the only difference is one of matter. Therefore the species of sacrilege are not distinguished thereby.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it does not seem possible that things belonging to the same species should at the same time differ specifically. Now murder, theft, and unlawful intercourse, are different species of sin.

Therefore they cannot belong to the one same species of sacrilege: and consequently it seems that the species of sacrilege are distinguished in accordance with the species of other sins, and not according to the various sacred things.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, among sacred things sacred persons are reckoned. If, therefore, one species of sacrilege arises from the violation of a sacred person, it would follow that every sin committed by a sacred person is a sacrilege, since every sin violates the person of the sinner. Therefore the species of sacrilege are not reckoned according to the sacred things.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Acts and habits are distinguished by their objects. Now the sacred thing is the object of sacrilege, as stated above (**A(1)**). Therefore the species of sacrilege are distinguished according to the sacred things.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), the sin of sacrilege consists in the irreverent treatment of a sacred thing. Now reverence is due to a sacred thing by reason of its holiness: and consequently the species of sacrilege must needs be distinguished according to the different aspects of sanctity in the sacred things which are treated irreverently: for the greater the holiness ascribed to the sacred thing that is sinned against, the more grievous the sacrilege.

Now holiness is ascribed, not only to sacred persons, namely, those who are consecrated to the divine worship, but also to sacred places and to certain other sacred things. And the holiness of a place is directed to the holiness of man, who worships God in a holy place. For it is written (2 Macc. 5:19): “God did not choose the people for the place’s sake, but the place for the people’s sake.” Hence sacrilege committed against a sacred person is a graver sin than that which is committed against a sacred place. Yet in either species there are various degrees of sacrilege, according to differences of sacred persons and places.

In like manner the third species of sacrilege, which is committed against other sacred things, has various degrees, according to the differences of sacred things. Among these the highest place belongs to the sacraments whereby man is sanctified: chief of which is the sacrament of the

Eucharist, for it contains Christ Himself. Wherefore the sacrilege that is committed against this sacrament is the gravest of all. The second place, after the sacraments, belongs to the vessels consecrated for the administration of the sacraments; also sacred images, and the relics of the saints, wherein the very persons of the saints, so to speak, are revered and honored. After these come things connected with the apparel of the Church and its ministers; and those things, whether movable or immovable, that are deputed to the upkeep of the ministers. And whoever sins against any one of the aforesaid incurs the crime of sacrilege.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(3)-RO(1) — There is not the same aspect of holiness in all the aforesaid: wherefore the diversity of sacred things is not only a material, but also a formal difference.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(3)-RO(2) — Nothing hinders two things from belonging to one species in one respect, and to different species in another respect. Thus Socrates and Plato belong to the one species, “animal,” but differ in the species “colored thing,” if one be white and the other black. In like manner it is possible for two sins to differ specifically as to their material acts, and to belong to the same species as regards the one formal aspect of sacrilege: for instance, the violation of a nun by blows or by copulation.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(3)-RO(3) — Every sin committed by a sacred person is a sacrilege materially and accidentally as it were. Hence Jerome [*The quotation is from St. Bernard, De Consideration, ii, 13] says that “a trifle on a priest’s lips is a sacrilege or a blasphemy.” But formally and properly speaking a sin committed by a sacred person is a sacrilege only when it is committed against his holiness, for instance if a virgin consecrated to God be guilty of fornication: and the same is to be said of other instances.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(4)

Whether the punishment of sacrilege should be pecuniary?

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem that the punishment of sacrilege should not be pecuniary. A pecuniary punishment is not wont to be inflicted for a criminal fault. But sacrilege is a criminal fault, wherefore it is punished by capital sentence according to civil law [*Dig. xlviii, 13; Cod. i,

3, de Episc. et Cleric.]. Therefore sacrilege should not be awarded a pecuniary punishment.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the same sin should not receive a double punishment, according to ^{<300>}Nahum 1:9, “There shall not rise a double affliction.” But sacrilege is punished with excommunication; major excommunication, for violating a sacred person, and for burning or destroying a church, and minor excommunication for other sacrileges. Therefore sacrilege should not be awarded a pecuniary punishment.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, the Apostle says (^{<300>}1 Thessalonians 2:5): “Neither have we taken an occasion of covetousness.” But it seems to involve an occasion of covetousness that a pecuniary punishment should be exacted for the violation of a sacred thing. Therefore this does not seem to be a fitting punishment of sacrilege.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written [*XVII, qu. iv, can. Si quis contumax]: “If anyone contumaciously or arrogantly take away by force an escaped slave from the confines of a church he shall pay nine hundred soldi”: and again further on (XVII, qu. iv, can. Quisquis inventus, can. 21): “Whoever is found guilty of sacrilege shall pay thirty pounds of tried purest silver.”

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(4) — *I answer that*, In the award of punishments two points must be considered. First equality, in order that the punishment may be just, and that “by what things a man sinneth by the same... he may be tormented” (Wis. 11:17). In this respect the fitting punishment of one guilty of sacrilege, since he has done an injury to a sacred thing, is excommunication [*Append. Gratian. on can. Si quis contumax, quoted above] whereby sacred things are withheld from him. The second point to be considered is utility. For punishments are inflicted as medicines, that men being deterred thereby may desist from sin. Now it would seem that the sacrilegious man, who reverences not sacred things, is not sufficiently deterred from sinning by sacred things being withheld from him, since he has no care for them. Wherefore according to human laws he is sentenced to capital punishment, and according to the statutes of the Church, which does not inflict the death of the body, a pecuniary punishment is inflicted, in order that men may be deterred from sacrilege, at least by temporal punishments.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(4)-RO(1) — The Church inflicts not the death of the body, but excommunication in its stead.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(4)-RO(2) — When one punishment is not sufficient to deter a man from sin, a double punishment must be inflicted. Wherefore it was necessary to inflict some kind of temporal punishment in addition to the punishment of excommunication, in order to coerce those who despise spiritual things.

P(2b)-Q(99)-A(4)-RO(3) — If money were exacted without a reasonable cause, this would seem to involve an occasion of covetousness. But when it is exacted for the purpose of man's correction, it has a manifest utility, and consequently involves no occasion of avarice.

QUESTION 100

ON SIMONY

(SIX ARTICLES)

We must now consider simony, under which head there are six points of inquiry:

- (1) What is simony?
- (2) Whether it is lawful to accept money for the sacraments?
- (3) Whether it is lawful to accept money for spiritual actions?
- (4) Whether it is lawful to sell things connected with spirituals?
- (5) Whether real remuneration alone makes a man guilty of simony, or also oral remuneration or remuneration by service?
- (6) Of the punishment of simony.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)

Whether simony is an intentional will to buy or sell something spiritual or connected with a spiritual thing?

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-O(1) — It would seem that simony is not “an express will to buy or sell something spiritual or connected with a spiritual thing.” Simony is heresy, since it is written (I, qu. i [*Can. Eos qui per pecunias.]): “The impious heresy of Macedonius and of those who with him impugned the Holy Ghost, is more endurable than that of those who are guilty of simony: since the former in their ravings maintained that the Holy Spirit of Father and Son is a creature and the slave of God, whereas the latter make the same Holy Spirit to be their own slave. For every master sells what he has just as he wills, whether it be his slave or any other of his possessions.” But unbelief, like faith, is an act not of the will but of the intellect, as shown above (**Q(10)**, **A(2)**). Therefore simony should not be defined as an act of the will.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, to sin intentionally is to sin through malice, and this is to sin against the Holy Ghost. Therefore, if simony is an intentional will to sin, it would seem that it is always a sin against the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, nothing is more spiritual than the kingdom of heaven. But it is lawful to buy the kingdom of heaven: for Gregory says in a homily (v, in Ev.): “The kingdom of heaven is worth as much as you possess.” Therefore simony does not consist in a will to buy something spiritual.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, simony takes its name from Simon the magician, of whom we read (~~4188~~ Acts 8:18,19) that “he offered the apostles money” that he might buy a spiritual power, in order, to wit, “that on whomsoever he imposed his hand they might receive the Holy Ghost.” But we do not read that he wished to sell anything. Therefore simony is not the will to sell a spiritual thing.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, there are many other voluntary commutations besides buying and selling, such as exchange and transaction [*A kind of legal compromise — Oxford Dictionary]. Therefore it would seem that simony is defined insufficiently.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-O(6) — Further, anything connected with spiritual things is itself spiritual. Therefore it is superfluous to add “or connected with spiritual things.”

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-O(7) — Further, according to some, the Pope cannot commit simony: yet he can buy or sell something spiritual. Therefore simony is not the will to buy or sell something spiritual or connected with a spiritual thing.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Gregory VII says (Regist. [*Caus. I, qu. i, can. Presbyter, qu. iii, can. Altare]): “None of the faithful is ignorant that buying or selling altars, tithes, or the Holy Ghost is the heresy of simony.”

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(1), Q(18), A(2)**) an act is evil generically when it bears on undue matter. Now a spiritual thing is undue matter for buying and selling for three reasons. First,

because a spiritual thing cannot be appraised at any earthly price, even as it is said concerning wisdom (~~4085~~ Proverbs 3:15),

“she is more precious than all riches, and all things that are desired,
are not to be compared with her”:

and for this reason Peter, in condemning the wickedness of Simon in its very source, said (~~4083~~ Acts 8:20):

“Keep thy money to thyself to perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money.”

Secondly, because a thing cannot be due matter for sale if the vendor is not the owner thereof, as appears from the authority quoted (**O(1)**) Now ecclesiastical superiors are not owners, but dispensers of spiritual things, according to ~~4081~~ 1 Corinthians 4:1,

“Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the ministers of God.”

Thirdly, because sale is opposed to the source of spiritual things, since they flow from the gratuitous will of God. Wherefore Our Lord said (~~4008~~ Matthew 10:8): “Freely have you received, freely give.”

Therefore by buying or selling a spiritual thing, a man treats God and divine things with irreverence, and consequently commits a sin of irreligion.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-RO(1) — Just as religion consists in a kind of protestation of faith, without, sometimes, faith being in one’s heart, so too the vices opposed to religion include a certain protestation of unbelief without, sometimes, unbelief being in the mind. Accordingly simony is said to be a “heresy,” as regards the outward protestation, since by selling a gift of the Holy Ghost a man declares, in a way, that he is the owner of a spiritual gift; and this is heretical. It must, however, be observed that Simon Magus, besides wishing the apostles to sell him a grace of the Holy Ghost for money, said that the world was not created by God, but by some heavenly power, as Isidore states (Etym. viii, 5): and so for this reason simoniacs are reckoned with other heretics, as appears from Augustine’s book on heretics.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-RO(2) — As stated above (**Q(58)**, **A(4)**), justice, with all its parts, and consequently all the opposite vices, is in the will as its subject. Hence simony is fittingly defined from its relation to the will. This act is furthermore described as “express,” in order to signify that it proceeds from choice, which takes the principal part in virtue and vice. Nor does everyone sin against the Holy Ghost that sins from choice, but only he who chooses sin through contempt of those things whereby man is wont to be withdrawn from sin, as stated above (**Q(14)**, **A(1)**).

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-RO(3) — The kingdom of heaven is said to be bought when a man gives what he has for God’s sake. But this is to employ the term “buying” in a wide sense, and as synonymous with merit: nor does it reach to the perfect signification of buying, both because neither “the sufferings of this time,” nor any gift or deed of ours, “are worthy to be compared with the glory to come, that shall be revealed in us” (~~cf.~~ Romans 8:18), and because merit consists chiefly, not in an outward gift, action or passion, but in an inward affection.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-RO(4) — Simon the magician wished to buy a spiritual power in order that afterwards he might sell it. For it is written (I. qu. iii [*Can. Salvator]), that “Simon the magician wished to buy the gift of the Holy Ghost, in order that he might make money by selling the signs to be wrought by him.” Hence those who sell spiritual things are likened in intention to Simon the magician: while those who wish to buy them are likened to him in act. Those who sell them imitate, in act, Giezi the disciple of Eliseus, of whom we read (~~cf.~~ 2 Kings 5:20-24) that he received money from the leper who was healed: wherefore the sellers of spiritual things may be called not only “simoniacs” but also “giezites.”

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-RO(5) — The terms “buying” and “selling” cover all kinds of non-gratuitous contracts. Wherefore it is impossible for the exchange or agency of prebends or ecclesiastical benefices to be made by authority of the parties concerned without danger of committing simony, as laid down by law [*Cap. Quaesitum, de rerum Permutat.; cap. Super, de Transact.]. Nevertheless the superior, in virtue of his office, can cause these exchanges to be made for useful or necessary reasons.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-RO(6) — Even as the soul lives by itself, while the body lives through being united to the soul; so, too, certain things are

spiritual by themselves, such as the sacraments and the like, while others are called spiritual, through adhering to those others. Hence (I, qu. iii, cap. Siquis objecerit) it is stated that “spiritual things do not progress without corporal things, even as the soul has no bodily life without the body.”

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(1)-RO(7) — The Pope can be guilty of the vice of simony, like any other man, since the higher a man’s position the more grievous is his sin. For although the possessions of the Church belong to him as dispenser in chief, they are not his as master and owner. Therefore, were he to accept money from the income of any church in exchange for a spiritual thing, he would not escape being guilty of the vice of simony. In like manner he might commit simony by accepting from a layman moneys not belonging to the goods of the Church.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)

Whether it is always unlawful to give money for the sacraments?

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-O(1) — It would seem that it is not always unlawful to give money for the sacraments. Baptism is the door of the sacraments, as we shall state in the **P(3), Q(68), A(6); P(3), Q(73), A(3)**. But seemingly it is lawful in certain cases to give money for Baptism, for instance if a priest were unwilling to baptize a dying child without being paid. Therefore it is not always unlawful to buy or sell the sacraments.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the greatest of the sacraments is the Eucharist, which is consecrated in the Mass. But some priests receive a prebend or money for singing masses. Much more therefore is it lawful to buy or sell the other sacraments.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the sacrament of Penance is a necessary sacrament consisting chiefly in the absolution. But some persons demand money when absolving from excommunication. Therefore it is not always unlawful to buy or sell a sacrament.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, custom makes that which otherwise were sinful to be not sinful; thus Augustine says (Contra Faust. xxii, 47) that “it was no crime to have several wives, so long as it was the custom.”

Now it is the custom in some places to give something in the consecration of bishops, blessings of abbots, ordinations of the clergy, in exchange for the chrism, holy oil, and so forth. Therefore it would seem that it is not unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-O(5) — Further, it happens sometimes that someone maliciously hinders a person from obtaining a bishopric or some like dignity. But it is lawful for a man to make good his grievance. Therefore it is lawful, seemingly, in such a case to give money for a bishopric or a like ecclesiastical dignity.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-O(6) — Further, marriage is a sacrament. But sometimes money is given for marriage. Therefore it is lawful to sell a sacrament.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (I, qu. i [*Can. Qui per pecunias]): “Whosoever shall consecrate anyone for money, let him be cut off from the priesthood.”

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2) — *I answer that*, The sacraments of the New Law are of all things most spiritual, inasmuch as they are the cause of spiritual grace, on which no price can be set, and which is essentially incompatible with a non-gratuitous giving. Now the sacraments are dispensed through the ministers of the Church, whom the people are bound to support, according to the words of the Apostle (^{<403>}1 Corinthians 9:13),

“Know you not, that they who work in the holy place, eat the things that are of the holy place; and they that serve the altar, partake with the altar?”

Accordingly we must answer that to receive money for the spiritual grace of the sacraments, is the sin of simony, which cannot be excused by any custom whatever, since “custom does not prevail over natural or divine law” [*Cap. Cum tanto, de Consuetud.; cf. **P(1), Q(97), A(3)**]. Now by money we are to understand anything that has a pecuniary value, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. iv, 1). On the other hand, to receive anything for the support of those who administer the sacraments, in accordance with the statutes of the Church and approved customs, is not simony, nor is it a sin. For it is received not as a price of goods, but as a payment for their need. Hence a gloss of Augustine on ^{<507>}1 Timothy 5:17,

“Let the priests that rule well,” says: “They should look to the people for a supply to their need, but to the Lord for the reward of their ministry.”

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-RO(1) — In a case of necessity anyone may baptize. And since nowise ought one to sin, if the priest be unwilling to baptize without being paid, one must act as though there were no priest available for the baptism. Hence the person who is in charge of the child can, in such a case, lawfully baptize it, or cause it to be baptized by anyone else. He could, however, lawfully buy the water from the priest, because it is merely a bodily element. But if it were an adult in danger of death that wished to be baptized, and the priest were unwilling to baptize him without being paid, he ought, if possible, to be baptized by someone else. And if he is unable to have recourse to another, he must by no means pay a price for Baptism, and should rather die without being baptized, because for him the baptism of desire would supply the lack of the sacrament.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-RO(2) — The priest receives money, not as the price for consecrating the Eucharist, or for singing the Mass (for this would be simoniacal), but as payment for his livelihood, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-RO(3) — The money exacted of the person absolved is not the price of his absolution (for this would be simoniacal), but a punishment of a past crime for which he was excommunicated.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-RO(4) — As stated above, “custom does not prevail over natural or divine law” whereby simony is forbidden. Wherefore the custom, if such there be, of demanding anything as the price of a spiritual thing, with the intention of buying or selling it, is manifestly simoniacal, especially when the demand is made of a person unwilling to pay. But if the demand be made in payment of a stipend recognized by custom it is not simoniacal, provided there be no intention of buying or selling, but only of doing what is customary, and especially if the demand be acceded to voluntarily. In all these cases, however, one must beware of anything having an appearance of simony or avarice, according to the saying of the Apostle (¹1 Thessalonians 5:22), “From all appearance of evil restrain yourselves.”

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-RO(5) — It would be simoniacal to buy off the opposition of one's rivals, before acquiring the right to a bishopric or any dignity or prebend, by election, appointment or presentation, since this would be to use money as a means of obtaining a spiritual thing. But it is lawful to use money as a means of removing unjust opposition, after one has already acquired that right.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(2)-RO(6) — Some [**Innocent IV on Cap. Cum in Ecclesia, de Simonia*] say that it is lawful to give money for Matrimony because no grace is conferred thereby. But this is not altogether true, as we shall state in the Third Part of the work [**XP, Q(42), A(3)*]. Wherefore we must reply that Matrimony is not only a sacrament of the Church, but also an office of nature. Consequently it is lawful to give money for Matrimony considered as an office of nature, but unlawful if it be considered as a sacrament of the Church. Hence, according to the law [**Cap. Cum in Ecclesia, de Simonia*], it is forbidden to demand anything for the Nuptial Blessing.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(3)

Whether it is lawful to give and receive money for spiritual actions?

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that it is lawful to give and receive money for spiritual actions. The use of prophecy is a spiritual action. But something used to be given of old for the use of prophecy, as appears from ^{<100>}1 Samuel 9:7,8, and ^{<114>}1 Kings 14:3. Therefore it would seem that it is lawful to give and receive money for a spiritual action.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, prayer, preaching, divine praise, are most spiritual actions. Now money is given to holy persons in order to obtain the assistance of their prayers, according to ^{<20>}Luke 16:9, "Make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity." To preachers also, who sow spiritual things, temporal things are due according to the Apostle (^{<104>}1 Corinthians 9:14). Moreover, something is given to those who celebrate the divine praises in the ecclesiastical office, and make processions: and sometimes an annual income is assigned to them. Therefore it is lawful to receive something for spiritual actions.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, science is no less spiritual than power. Now it is lawful to receive money for the use of science: thus a lawyer may sell his just advocacy, a physician his advice for health, and a master the exercise of his teaching. Therefore in like manner it would seem lawful for a prelate to receive something for the use of his spiritual power, for instance, for correction, dispensation, and so forth.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(3)-O(4) — Further, religion is the state of spiritual perfection. Now in certain monasteries something is demanded from those who are received there. Therefore it is lawful to demand something for spiritual things.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is stated (I, qu. i [*Can. Quidquid invisibilis]): “It is absolutely forbidden to make a charge for what is acquired by the consolation of invisible grace, whether by demanding a price or by seeking any kind of return whatever.” Now all these spiritual things are acquired through an invisible grace. Therefore it is not lawful to charge a price or return for them.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Just as the sacraments are called spiritual, because they confer a spiritual grace, so, too, certain other things are called spiritual, because they flow from spiritual grace and dispose thereto. And yet these things are obtainable through the ministry of men, according to ⁴⁰⁰1 Corinthians 9:7, “Who serveth as a soldier at any time at his own charges? Who feedeth the flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock?” Hence it is simoniacal to sell or buy that which is spiritual in such like actions; but to receive or give something for the support of those who minister spiritual things in accordance with the statutes of the Church and approved customs is lawful, yet in such wise that there be no intention of buying or selling, and that no pressure be brought to bear on those who are unwilling to give, by withholding spiritual things that ought to be administered, for then there would be an appearance of simony [i.e., the buying and selling of positions in the Church]. But after the spiritual things have been freely bestowed, then the statutory and customary offerings and other dues may be exacted from those who are unwilling but able to pay, if the superior authorize this to be done.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(3)-RO(1) — As Jerome says in his commentary on Micheas 3:9, certain gifts were freely offered to the good prophets, for

their livelihood, but not as a price for the exercise of their gift of prophecy. Wicked prophets, however, abused this exercise by demanding payment for it.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(3)-RO(2) — Those who give alms to the poor in order to obtain from them the assistance of their prayers do not give with the intent of buying their prayers; but by their gratuitous beneficence inspire the poor with the mind to pray for them freely and out of charity. Temporal things are due to the preacher as means for his support, not as a price of the words he preaches. Hence a gloss on ⁵⁰⁵¹1 Timothy 5:11, “Let the priests that rule well,” says: “Their need allows them to receive the wherewithal to live, charity demands that this should be given to them: yet the Gospel is not for sale, nor is a livelihood the object of preaching: for if they sell it for this purpose, they sell a great thing for a contemptible price.” In like manner temporal things are given to those who praise God by celebrating the divine office whether for the living or for the dead, not as a price but as a means of livelihood; and the same purpose is fulfilled when alms are received for making processions in funerals. Yet it is simoniacal to do such things by contract, or with the intention of buying or selling. Hence it would be an unlawful ordinance if it were decreed in any church that no procession would take place at a funeral unless a certain sum of money were paid, because such an ordinance would preclude the free granting of pious offices to any person. The ordinance would be more in keeping with the law, if it were decreed that this honor would be accorded to all who gave a certain alms, because this would not preclude its being granted to others. Moreover, the former ordinance has the appearance of an exaction, whereas the latter bears a likeness to a gratuitous remuneration.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(3)-RO(3) — A person to whom a spiritual power is entrusted is bound by virtue of his office to exercise the power entrusted to him in dispensing spiritual things. Moreover, he receives a statutory payment from the funds of the Church as a means of livelihood. Therefore, if he were to accept anything for the exercise of his spiritual power, this would imply, not a hiring of his labor (which he is bound to give, as a duty arising out of the office he has accepted), but a sale of the very use of a spiritual grace. For this reason it is unlawful for him to receive anything for any dispensing whatever, or for allowing someone else to take his duty, or

for correcting his subjects, or for omitting to correct them. On the other hand it is lawful for him to receive “procurations,” when he visits his subjects, not as a price for correcting them, but as a means of livelihood. He that is possessed of science, without having taken upon himself the obligation of using it for the benefit of others can lawfully receive a price for his learning or advice, since this is not a sale of truth or science, but a hiring of labor. If, on the other hand, he be so bound by virtue of his office, this would amount to a sale of the truth, and consequently he would sin grievously. For instance, those who in certain churches are appointed to instruct the clerics of that church and other poor persons, and are in receipt of an ecclesiastical benefice for so doing, are not allowed to receive anything in return, either for teaching, or for celebrating or omitting any feasts.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(3)-RO(4) — It is unlawful to exact or receive anything as price for entering a monastery: but, in the case of small monasteries, that are unable to support so many persons, it is lawful, while entrance to the monastery is free, to accept something for the support of those who are about to be received into the monastery, if its revenues are insufficient. In like manner it is lawful to be easier in admitting to a monastery a person who has proved his regard for that monastery by the generosity of his alms: just as, on the other hand, it is lawful to incite a person’s regard for a monastery by means of temporal benefits, in order that he may thereby be induced to enter the monastery; although it is unlawful to agree to give or receive something for entrance into a monastery (I, qu. ii, cap. Quam pio).

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(4)

Whether it is lawful to receive money for things annexed to spiritual things?

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(4)-O(1) — It would seem lawful to receive money for things annexed to spiritual things. Seemingly all temporal things are annexed to spiritual things, since temporal things ought to be sought for the sake of spiritual things. If, therefore, it is unlawful to sell what is annexed to spiritual things, it will be unlawful to sell anything temporal, and this is clearly false.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, nothing would seem to be more annexed to spiritual things than consecrated vessels. Yet it is lawful to sell a chalice for the ransom of prisoners, according to Ambrose (De Offic. ii, 28). Therefore it is lawful to sell things annexed to spiritual things.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, things annexed to spiritual things include right of burial, right of patronage, and, according to ancient writers, right of the first-born (because before the Lord the first-born exercised the priestly office), and the right to receive tithes. Now Abraham bought from Ephron a double cave for a burying-place (⁽¹²³⁸⁾Genesis 23:8, sqq.), and Jacob bought from Esau the right of the first-born (⁽¹²⁵⁹⁾Genesis 25:31, sqq.). Again the right of patronage is transferred with the property sold, and is granted “in fee.” Tithes are granted to certain soldiers, and can be redeemed. Prelates also at times retain for themselves the revenues of prebends of which they have the presentation, although a prebend is something annexed to a spiritual thing. Therefore it is lawful to sell things annexed to spiritual things.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Pope Paschal [*Paschal II] says (cf. I, qu. iii, cap. Si quis objecerit): “Whoever sells one of two such things, that the one is unproductive without the other, leaves neither unsold. Wherefore let no person sell a church, or a prebend, or anything ecclesiastical.”

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(4) — *I answer that*, A thing may be annexed to spiritual things in two ways. First, as being dependent on spiritual things. Thus to have to spiritual things, because it is not competent save to those who hold a clerical office. Hence such things can by no means exist apart from spiritual things. Consequently it is altogether unlawful to sell such things, because the sale thereof implies the sale of things spiritual. Other things are annexed to spiritual things through being directed thereto, for instance the right of patronage, which is directed to the presentation of clerics to ecclesiastical benefices; and sacred vessels, which are directed to the use of the sacraments. Wherefore such things as these do not presuppose spiritual things, but precede them in the order of time. Hence in a way they can be sold, but not as annexed to spiritual things.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(4)-RO(1) — All things temporal are annexed to spiritual things, as to their end, wherefore it is lawful to sell temporal things, but their relation to spiritual things cannot be the matter of a lawful sale.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(4)-RO(2) — Sacred vessels also are annexed to spiritual things as to their end, wherefore their consecration cannot be sold. Yet their material can be sold for the needs of the Church or of the poor provided they first be broken, after prayer has been said over them, since when once broken, they are considered to be no longer sacred vessels but mere metal: so that if like vessels were to be made out of the same material they would have to be consecrated again.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(4)-RO(3) — We have no authority for supposing that the double cave which Abraham bought for a burial place was consecrated for that purpose: wherefore Abraham could lawfully buy that site to be used for burial, in order to turn it into a sepulchre: even so it would be lawful now to buy an ordinary field as a site for a cemetery or even a church. Nevertheless because even among the Gentiles burial places are looked upon as religious, if Ephron intended to accept the price as payment for a burial place, he sinned in selling, though Abraham did not sin in buying, because he intended merely to buy an ordinary plot of ground. Even now, it is lawful in a case of necessity to sell or buy land on which there has previously been a church, as we have also said with regard to sacred vessels (**RO(2)**). Or again, Abraham is to be excused because he thus freed himself of a grievance. For although Ephron offered him the burial place for nothing, Abraham deemed that he could not accept it gratis without prejudice to himself.

The right of the first-born was due to Jacob by reason of God's choice, according to ³⁰⁰Malachi 1:2,3, "I have loved Jacob, but have hated Esau." Wherefore Esau sinned by selling his birthright, yet Jacob sinned not in buying, because he is understood to have freed himself of his grievance.

The right of patronage cannot be the matter of a direct sale, nor can it be granted "in fee," but is transferred with the property sold or granted.

The spiritual right of receiving tithes is not granted to layfolk, but merely the temporal commodities which are granted in the name of tithe, as stated above (**Q(87), A(3)**).

With regard to the granting of benefices it must, however, be observed, that it is not unlawful for a bishop, before presenting a person to a benefice, to decide, for some reason, to retain part of the revenues of the benefice in question, and to spend it on some pious object. But, on the other hand, if he were to require part of the revenues of that benefice to be given to him by the beneficiary, it would be the same as though he demanded payment from him, and he would not escape the guilt of simony.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(5)

Whether it is lawful to grant spiritual things in return for an equivalent of service, or for an oral remuneration?

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(5)-O(1) — It would seem that it is lawful to grant spiritual things in return for an equivalent of service, or an oral remuneration. Gregory says (Regist. iii, ep. 18): “It is right that those who serve the interests of the Church should be rewarded.” Now an equivalent of service denotes serving the interests of the Church. Therefore it seems lawful to confer ecclesiastical benefices for services received.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, to confer an ecclesiastical benefice for service received seems to indicate a carnal intention, no less than to do so on account of kinship. Yet the latter seemingly is not simoniacal since it implies no buying or selling. Therefore neither is the former simoniacal.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, that which is done only at another’s request would seem to be done gratis: so that apparently it does not involve simony, which consists in buying or selling. Now oral remuneration denotes the conferring of an ecclesiastical benefice at some person’s request. Therefore this is not simoniacal.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(5)-O(4) — Further, hypocrites perform spiritual deeds in order that they may receive human praise, which seems to imply oral remuneration: and yet hypocrites are not said to be guilty of simony. Therefore oral remuneration does not entail simony.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Pope Urban [*Urban II, Ep. xvii ad Lucium] says: “Whoever grants or acquires ecclesiastical things, not for the purpose for which they were instituted but for his own profit, in

consideration of an oral remuneration or of an equivalent in service rendered or money received, is guilty of simony.”

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(2)**), the term “money” denotes “anything that can have a pecuniary value.” Now it is evident that a man’s service is directed to some kind of usefulness, which has a pecuniary value, wherefore servants are hired for a money wage. Therefore to grant a spiritual thing for a service rendered or to be rendered is the same as to grant it for the money, received or promised, at which that service could be valued. If likewise, to grant a person’s request for the bestowal of a temporary favor is directed to some kind of usefulness which has a pecuniary value. Wherefore just as a man contracts the guilt of simony by accepting money or any eternal thing which comes under the head of “real remuneration,” so too does he contract it, by receiving “oral remuneration” or an “equivalent in service rendered.”

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(5)-RO(1) — If a cleric renders a prelate a lawful service, directed to spiritual things (e.g. to the good of the Church, or benefit of her ministers), he becomes worthy of an ecclesiastical benefice by reason of the devotion that led him to render the service, as he would by reason of any other good deed. Hence this is not a case of remuneration for service rendered, such as Gregory has in mind. But if the service be unlawful, or directed to carnal things (e.g. a service rendered to the prelate for the profit of his kindred, or the increase of his patrimony, or the like), it will be a case of remuneration for service rendered, and this will be simony.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(5)-RO(2) — The bestowal of a spiritual thing gratis on a person by reason of kinship or of any carnal affection is unlawful and carnal, but not simoniacal: since nothing is received in return, wherefore it does not imply a contract of buying and selling, on which simony is based. But to present a person to an ecclesiastical benefice with the understanding or intention that he provide for one’s kindred from the revenue is manifest simony.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(5)-RO(3) — Oral remuneration denotes either praise that pertains to human favor, which has its price, or a request whereby man’s favor is obtained or the contrary avoided. Hence if one intend this chiefly one commits simony. Now to grant a request made for an unworthy person implies, seemingly, that this is one’s chief intention wherefore the

deed itself is simoniacal. But if the request be made for a worthy person, the deed itself is not simoniacal, because it is based on a worthy cause, on account of which a spiritual thing is granted to the person for whom the request is made. Nevertheless there may be simony in the intention, if one look, not to the worthiness of the person, but to human favor. If, however, a person asks for himself, that he may obtain the cure of souls, his very presumption renders him unworthy, and so his request is made for an unworthy person. But, if one be in need, one may lawfully seek for oneself an ecclesiastical benefice without the cure of souls.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(5)-RO(4) — A hypocrite does not give a spiritual thing for the sake of praise, he only makes a show of it, and under false pretenses stealthily purloins rather than buys human praise: so that seemingly the hypocrite is not guilty of simony.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)

*Whether those who are guilty of simony
are fittingly punished by being deprived of
what they have acquired by simony?*

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-O(1) — It would seem that those who are guilty of simony are not fittingly punished by being deprived of what they have acquired by simony. Simony is committed by acquiring spiritual things in return for a remuneration. Now certain spiritual things cannot be lost when once acquired, such as all characters that are imprinted by a consecration. Therefore it is not a fitting punishment for a person to be deprived of what he has acquired simoniacally.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, it sometimes happens that one who has obtained the episcopate by simony commands a subject of his to receive orders from him: and apparently the subject should obey, so long as the Church tolerates him. Yet no one ought to receive from him that has not the power to give. Therefore a bishop does not lose his episcopal power, if he has acquired it by simony.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, no one should be punished for what was done without his knowledge and consent, since punishment is due for sin which is voluntary, as was shown above (**P(1), Q(74), AA(1),2; P(1), Q(77), A(7)**). Now it happens sometimes that a person acquires something

spiritual, which others have procured for him without his knowledge and consent. Therefore he should not be punished by being deprived of what has been bestowed on him.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-O(4) — Further, no one should profit by his own sin. Yet, if a person who has acquired an ecclesiastical benefice by simony, were to restore what he has received, this would sometimes turn to the profit of those who had a share in his simony; for instance, when a prelate and his entire chapter have consented to the simony. Therefore that which has been acquired by simony ought not always to be restored.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-O(5) — Further, sometimes a person obtains admission to a monastery by simony, and there takes the solemn vow of profession. But no one should be freed from the obligation of a vow on account of a fault he has committed. Therefore he should not be expelled from the monastic state which he has acquired by simony.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-O(6) — Further, in this world external punishment is not inflicted for the internal movements of the heart, whereof God alone is the judge. Now simony is committed in the mere intention or will, wherefore it is defined in reference to the will, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 2). Therefore a person should not always be deprived of what he has acquired by simony.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-O(7) — Further, to be promoted to greater dignity is much less than to retain that which one has already received. Now sometimes those who are guilty of simony are, by dispensation, promoted to greater dignity. Therefore they should not always be deprived of what they have received.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, It is written (I, qu. i, cap. Si quis Episcopus): “He that has been ordained shall profit nothing from his ordination or promotion that he has acquired by the bargain, but shall forfeit the dignity or cure that he has acquired with his money.”

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6) — *I answer that*, No one can lawfully retain that which he has acquired against the owner’s will. For instance, if a steward were to give some of his lord’s property to a person, against his lord’s will and orders, the recipient could not lawfully retain what he received. Now Our Lord, Whose stewards and ministers are the prelates of churches,

ordered spiritual things to be given gratis, according to ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 10:8, “Freely have you received, freely give.” Wherefore whosoever acquires spiritual things in return for a remuneration cannot lawfully retain them. Moreover, those who are guilty of simony, by either selling or buying spiritual things, as well as those who act as go-between, are sentenced to other punishments, namely, infamy and deposition, if they be clerics, and excommunication if they be laymen, as stated qu. i, cap. Si quis Episcopus [*Qu. iii, can. Si quis praebendas].

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-RO(1) — He that has received a sacred Order simoniacally, receives the character of the Order on account of the efficacy of the sacrament: but he does not receive the grace nor the exercise of the Order, because he has received the character by stealth as it were, and against the will of the Supreme Lord. Wherefore he is suspended, by virtue of the law, both as regards himself, namely, that he should not busy himself about exercising his Order, and as regards others, namely, that no one may communicate with him in the exercise of his Order, whether his sin be public or secret. Nor may he reclaim the money which he basely gave, although the other party unjustly retains it.

Again, a man who is guilty of simony, through having conferred Orders simoniacally, or through having simoniacally granted or received a benefice, or through having been a go-between in a simoniacal transaction, if he has done so publicly, is suspended by virtue of the law, as regards both himself and others; but if he has acted in secret he is suspended by virtue of the law, as regards himself alone, and not as regards others.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-RO(2) — One ought not to receive Orders from a bishop one knows to have been promoted simoniacally, either on account of his command or for fear of his excommunication: and such as receive Orders from him do not receive the exercise of their Orders, even though they are ignorant of his being guilty of simony; and they need to receive a dispensation. Some, however, maintain that one ought to receive Orders in obedience to his command unless one can prove him to be guilty of simony, but that one ought not to exercise the Order without a dispensation. But this is an unreasonable statement, because no one should obey a man to the extent of communicating with him in an unlawful action. Now he that is, by virtue of the law, suspended as regards both himself and others, confers Orders unlawfully: wherefore no one should

communicate with him, by receiving Orders from him for any cause whatever. If, however, one be not certain on the point, one ought not to give credence to another's sin, and so one ought with a good conscience to receive Orders from him. And if the bishop has been guilty of simony otherwise than by a simoniacal promotion, and the fact be a secret, one can receive Orders from him because he is not suspended as regards others, but only as regards himself, as stated above (ad 1).

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-RO(3) — To be deprived of what one has received is not only the punishment of a sin, but is also sometimes the effect of acquiring unjustly, as when one buys a thing of a person who cannot sell it. Wherefore if a man, knowingly and spontaneously, receives Orders or an ecclesiastical benefice simoniacally, not only is he deprived of what he has received, by forfeiting the exercise of his order, and resigning the benefice and the fruits acquired therefrom, but also in addition to this he is punished by being marked with infamy. Moreover, he is bound to restore not only the fruit actually acquired, but also such as could have been acquired by a careful possessor (which, however, is to be understood of the net fruits, allowance being made for expenses incurred on account of the fruits), excepting those fruits that have been expended for the good of the Church.

On the other hand, if a man's promotion be procured simoniacally by others, without his knowledge and consent, he forfeits the exercise of his Order, and is bound to resign the benefice obtained together with fruits still extant; but he is not bound to restore the fruits which he has consumed, since he possessed them in good faith. Exception must be made in the case when his promotion has been deceitfully procured by an enemy of his; or when he expressly opposes the transaction, for then he is not bound to resign, unless subsequently he agree to the transaction, by paying what was promised.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-RO(4) — Money, property, or fruits simoniacally received, must be restored to the Church that has incurred loss by their transfer, notwithstanding the fact that the prelate or a member of the chapter of that church was at fault, since others ought not to be the losers by his sin: in suchwise, however, that, as far as possible, the guilty parties be not the gainers. But if the prelate and the entire chapter be at fault,

restitution must be made, with the consent of superior authority, either to the poor or to some other church.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-RO(5) — If there are any persons who have been simoniacally admitted into a monastery, they must quit: and if the simony was committed with their knowledge since the holding of the General Council [*Fourth Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, held by Innocent III], they must be expelled from their monastery without hope of return, and do perpetual penance under a stricter rule, or in some house of the same order, if a stricter one be not found. If, however, this took place before the Council, they must be placed in other houses of the same order. If this cannot be done, they must be received into monasteries of the same order, by way of compensation, lest they wander about the world, but they must not be admitted to their former rank, and must be assigned a lower place.

On the other hand, if they were received simoniacally, without their knowledge, whether before or after the Council, then after quitting they may be received again, their rank being changed as stated.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-RO(6) — In God's sight the mere will makes a man guilty of simony; but as regards the external ecclesiastical punishment he is not punished as a simoniac, by being obliged to resign, but is bound to repent of his evil intention.

P(2b)-Q(100)-A(6)-RO(7) — The Pope alone can grant a dispensation to one who has knowingly received a benefice (simoniacally). In other cases the bishop also can dispense, provided the beneficiary first of all renounce what he has received simoniacally, so that he will receive either the lesser dispensation allowing him to communicate with the laity, or a greater dispensation, allowing him after doing penance to retain his order in some other Church; or again a greater dispensation, allowing him to remain in the same Church, but in minor orders; or a full dispensation allowing him to exercise even the major orders in the same Church, but not to accept a prelacy.

QUESTION 101

OF PIETY

(FOUR ARTICLES)

After religion we must consider piety, the consideration of which will render the opposite vices manifest. Accordingly four points of inquiry arise with regard to piety:

- (1) To whom does piety extend?
- (2) What does piety make one offer a person?
- (3) Whether piety is a special virtue?
- (4) Whether the duties of piety should be omitted for the sake of religion?

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(1)

Whether piety extends to particular human individuals?

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that piety does not extend to particular human individuals. For Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x) that piety denotes, properly speaking, the worship of God, which the Greeks designate by the term {eusebeia}. But the worship of God does not denote relation to man, but only to God. Therefore piety does not extend definitely to certain human individuals.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. i): “Piety, on her day, provides a banquet, because she fills the inmost recesses of the heart with works of mercy.” Now the works of mercy are to be done to all, according to Augustine (De Doctr. Christ. i). Therefore piety does not extend definitely to certain special persons.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, in human affairs there are many other mutual relations besides those of kindred and citizenship, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. viii, 11,12), and on each of them is founded a

kind of friendship, which would seem to be the virtue of piety, according to a gloss on ~~2~~ Timothy 3:5, “Having an appearance indeed of piety [Douay: ‘godliness’].” Therefore piety extends not only to one’s kindred and fellow-citizens.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Tully says (De Invent. Rhet. ii) that “it is by piety that we do our duty towards our kindred and well-wishers of our country and render them faithful service.”

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Man becomes a debtor to other men in various ways, according to their various excellence and the various benefits received from them. on both counts God holds first place, for He is supremely excellent, and is for us the first principle of being and government. In the second place, the principles of our being and government are our parents and our country, that have given us birth and nourishment. Consequently man is debtor chiefly to his parents and his country, after God. Wherefore just as it belongs to religion to give worship to God, so does it belong to piety, in the second place, to give worship to one’s parents and one’s country.

The worship due to our parents includes the worship given to all our kindred, since our kinsfolk are those who descend from the same parents, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. viii, 12). The worship given to our country includes homage to all our fellow-citizens and to all the friends of our country. Therefore piety extends chiefly to these.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(1)-RO(1) — The greater includes the lesser: wherefore the worship due to God includes the worship due to our parents as a particular. Hence it is written (~~300~~ Malachi 1:6): “If I be a father, where is My honor?” Consequently the term piety extends also to the divine worship.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(1)-RO(2) — As Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x), “the term piety is often used in connection with works of mercy, in the language of the common people; the reason for which I consider to be the fact that God Himself has declared that these works are more pleasing to Him than sacrifices. This custom has led to the application of the word ‘pious’ to God Himself.”

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(1)-RO(3) — The relations of a man with his kindred and fellow-citizens are more referable to the principles of his being than other relations: wherefore the term piety is more applicable to them.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(2)

Whether piety provides support for our parents?

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that piety does not provide support for our parents. For, seemingly, the precept of the decalogue, “Honor thy father and mother,” belongs to piety. But this prescribes only the giving of honor. Therefore it does not belong to piety to provide support for one’s parents.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, a man is bound to lay up for those whom he is bound to support. Now according to the Apostle (⁴⁰²⁴2 Corinthians 12:14), “neither ought the children to lay up for the parents.” Therefore piety does not oblige them to support their parents.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, piety extends not only to one’s parents, but also to other kinsmen and to one’s fellow-citizens, as stated above (**A(1)**). But one is not bound to support all one’s kindred and fellow-citizens. Therefore neither is one bound to support one’s parents.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, our Lord (⁴⁰³⁸Matthew 15:3-6) reproved the Pharisees for hindering children from supporting their parents.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(2) — *I answer that*, We owe something to our parents in two ways: that is to say, both essentially, and accidentally. We owe them essentially that which is due to a father as such: and since he is his son’s superior through being the principle of his being, the latter owes him reverence and service. Accidentally, that is due to a father, which it befits him to receive in respect of something accidental to him, for instance, if he be ill, it is fitting that his children should visit him and see to his cure; if he be poor, it is fitting that they should support him; and so on in like instance, all of which come under the head of service due. Hence Tully says (De Invent. Rhet. ii) that “piety gives both duty and homage”: “duty” referring to service, and “homage” to reverence or honor, because,

as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x), “we are said to give homage to those whose memory or presence we honor.”

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(2)-RO(1) — According to our Lord’s interpretation (^{415B}Matthew 15:3-6) the honor due to our parents includes whatever support we owe them; and the reason for this is that support is given to one’s father because it is due to him as to one greater.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(2)-RO(2) — Since a father stands in the relation of principle, and his son in the relation of that which is from a principle, it is essentially fitting for a father to support his son: and consequently he is bound to support him not only for a time, but for all his life, and this is to lay by. On the other hand, for the son to bestow something on his father is accidental, arising from some momentary necessity, wherein he is bound to support him, but not to lay by as for a long time beforehand, because naturally parents are not the successors of their children, but children of their parents.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(2)-RO(3) — As Tully says (De Invent. Rhet. ii), “we offer homage and duty to all our kindred and to the well-wishers of our country”; not, however, equally to all, but chiefly to our parents, and to others according to our means and their personal claims.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(3)

Whether piety is a special virtue distinct from other virtues?

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that piety is not a special virtue distinct from other virtues. For the giving of service and homage to anyone proceeds from love. But it belongs to piety. Therefore piety is not a distinct virtue from charity.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it is proper to religion to give worship to God. But piety also gives worship to God, according to Augustine (De Civ. Dei x). Therefore piety is not distinct from religion.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, piety, whereby we give our country worship and duty, seems to be the same as legal justice, which looks to the

common good. But legal justice is a general virtue, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 1,2). Therefore piety is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is accounted by Tully (De Invent. Rhet. ii) as a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(3) — *I answer that*, A special virtue is one that regards an object under a special aspect. Since, then, the nature of justice consists in rendering another person his due, wherever there is a special aspect of something due to a person, there is a special virtue. Now a thing is indebted in a special way to that which is its connatural principle of being and government. And piety regards this principle, inasmuch as it pays duty and homage to our parents and country, and to those who are related thereto. Therefore piety is a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(3)-RO(1) — Just as religion is a protestation of faith, hope and charity, whereby man is primarily directed to God, so again piety is a protestation of the charity we bear towards our parents and country.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(3)-RO(2) — God is the principle of our being and government in a far more excellent manner than one's father or country. Hence religion, which gives worship to God, is a distinct virtue from piety, which pays homage to our parents and country. But things relating to creatures are transferred to God as the summit of excellence and causality, as Dionysius says (Div. Nom. i): wherefore, by way of excellence, piety designates the worship of God, even as God, by way of excellence, is called "Our Father."

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(3)-RO(3) — Piety extends to our country in so far as the latter is for us a principle of being: but legal justice regards the good of our country, considered as the common good: wherefore legal justice has more of the character of a general virtue than piety has.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(4)***Whether the duties of piety towards one's parents should be omitted for the sake of religion?***

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that the duties of piety towards one's parents should be omitted for the sake of religion. For Our Lord said (~~A14~~ Luke 14:26):

“If any man come to Me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple.”

Hence it is said in praise of James and John (~~A102~~ Matthew 4:22) that they left “their nets and father, and followed” Christ. Again it is said in praise of the Levites (~~A510~~ Deuteronomy 33:9):

“Who hath said to his father, and to his mother: I do not know you; and to his brethren: I know you not; and their own children they have not known. These have kept Thy word.”

Now a man who knows not his parents and other kinsmen, or who even hates them, must needs omit the duties of piety. Therefore the duties of piety should be omitted for the sake of religion.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, it is written (~~A105~~ Luke 9:59,60) that in answer to him who said: “Suffer me first to go and bury my father,” Our Lord replied: “Let the dead bury their dead: but go thou, and preach the kingdom of God.” Now the latter pertains to religion, while it is a duty of piety to bury one's father. Therefore a duty of piety should be omitted for the sake of religion.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, God is called “Our Father” by excellence. Now just as we worship our parents by paying them the duties of piety so do we worship God by religion. Therefore the duties of piety should be omitted for the sake of the worship of religion.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(4)-O(4) — Further, religious are bound by a vow which they may not break to fulfil the observances of religion. Now in accordance with those observances they are hindered from supporting their parents,

both on the score of poverty, since they have nothing of their own, and on the score of obedience, since they may not leave the cloister without the permission of their superior. Therefore the duties of piety towards one's parents should be omitted for the sake of religion.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Our Lord reproved the Pharisees (^{415B}Matthew 15:3-6) who taught that for the sake of religion one ought to refrain from paying one's parents the honor we owe them.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Religion and piety are two virtues. Now no virtue is opposed to another virtue, since according to the Philosopher, in his book on the Categories (Cap. De oppos.), "good is not opposed to good." Therefore it is impossible that religion and piety mutually hinder one another, so that the act of one be excluded by the act of the other. Now, as stated above (**P(1), Q(7), A(2); P(1), Q(18), A(3)**), the act of every virtue is limited by the circumstances due thereto, and if it overstep them it will be an act no longer of virtue but of vice. Hence it belongs to piety to pay duty and homage to one's parents according to the due mode. But it is not the due mode that man should tend to worship his father rather than God, but, as Ambrose says on ^{415C}Luke 12:52, "the piety of divine religion takes precedence of the claims of kindred."

Accordingly, if the worship of one's parents take one away from the worship of God it would no longer be an act of piety to pay worship to one's parents to the prejudice of God. Hence Jerome says (Ep. ad Heliod.): "Though thou trample upon thy father, though thou spurn thy mother, turn not aside, but with dry eyes hasten to the standard of the cross; it is the highest degree of piety to be cruel in this matter." Therefore in such a case the duties of piety towards one's parents should be omitted for the sake of the worship religion gives to God. If, however, by paying the services due to our parents, we are not withdrawn from the service of God, then will it be an act of piety, and there will be no need to set piety aside for the sake of religion.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(4)-RO(1) — Gregory expounding this saying of our Lord says (Hom. xxxvii in Ev.) that "when we find our parents to be a hindrance in our way to God, we must ignore them by hating and fleeing from them." For if our parents incite us to sin, and withdraw us from the service of God, we must, as regards this point, abandon and hate them. It is in this

sense that the Levites are said to have not known their kindred, because they obeyed the Lord's command, and spared not the idolaters (^{Exodus} 32). James and John are praised for leaving their parents and following our Lord, not that their father incited them to evil, but because they deemed it possible for him to find another means of livelihood, if they followed Christ.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(4)-RO(2) — Our Lord forbade the disciple to bury his father because, according to Chrysostom (Hom. xxviii in Matth.), "Our Lord by so doing saved him from many evils, such as the sorrows and worries and other things that one anticipates under these circumstances. For after the burial the will had to be read, the estate had to be divided, and so forth: but chiefly, because there were others who could see to the funeral." Or, according to Cyril's commentary on ^{Luke} Luke 9, "this disciple's request was, not that he might bury a dead father, but that he might support a yet living father in the latter's old age, until at length he should bury him. This is what Our Lord did not grant, because there were others, bound by the duties of kindred, to take care of him."

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(4)-RO(3) — Whatever we give our parents out of piety is referred by us to God; just as other works of mercy which we perform with regard to any of our neighbors are offered to God, according to ^{Matthew} Matthew 25:40: "As long as you did it to one of... My least... you did it to Me." Accordingly, if our carnal parents stand in need of our assistance, so that they have no other means of support, provided they incite us to nothing against God, we must not abandon them for the sake of religion. But if we cannot devote ourselves to their service without sin, or if they can be supported without our assistance, it is lawful to forego their service, so as to give more time to religion.

P(2b)-Q(101)-A(4)-RO(4) — We must speak differently of one who is yet in the world, and of one who has made his profession in religion. For he that is in the world, if he has parents unable to find support without him, he must not leave them and enter religion, because he would be breaking the commandment prescribing the honoring of parents. Some say, however, that even then he might abandon them, and leave them in God's care. But this, considered aright, would be to tempt God: since, while having human means at hand, he would be exposing his parents to danger,

in the hope of God's assistance. on the other hand, if the parents can find means of livelihood without him, it is lawful for him to abandon them and enter religion, because children are not bound to support their parents except in cases of necessity, as stated above. He that has already made his profession in religion is deemed to be already dead to the world: wherefore he ought not, under pretext of supporting his parents, to leave the cloister where he is buried with Christ, and busy himself once more with worldly affairs. Nevertheless he is bound, saving his obedience to his superiors, and his religious state withal, to make points efforts for his parents' support.

QUESTION 102

OF OBSERVANCE, CONSIDERED IN ITSELF, AND OF ITS PARTS

(THREE ARTICLES)

We must now consider observance and its parts, the considerations of which will manifest the contrary vices.

Under the head of observance there are three points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether observance is a special virtue, distinct from other virtues?
- (2) What does observance offer?
- (3) Of its comparison with piety.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(1)

Whether observance is a special virtue, distinct from other virtues?

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that observance is not a special virtue, distinct from other virtues. For virtues are distinguished by their objects. But the object of observance is not distinct from the object of piety: for Tully says (De Invent. Rhet. ii) that “it is by observance that we pay worship and honor to those who excel in some kind of dignity.” But worship and honor are paid also by piety to our parents, who excel in dignity. Therefore observance is not a distinct virtue from piety.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, just as honor and worship are due to those that are in a position of dignity, so also are they due to those who excel in science and virtue. But there is no special virtue whereby we pay honor and worship to those who excel in science and virtue. Therefore observance, whereby we pay worship and honor to those who excel in dignity, is not a special virtue distinct from other virtues.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, we have many duties towards those who are in a position of dignity, the fulfilment of which is required by law, according to ⁶¹¹Romans 13:7, “Render... to all men their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due,” etc. Now the fulfilment of the requirements of the law belongs to legal justice, or even to special justice. Therefore observance is not by itself a special virtue distinct from other virtues.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Tully (De Invent. Rhet. ii) reckons observance along with the other parts of justice, which are special virtues.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As explained above (**Q(101), AA(1),3; Q(80)**), according to the various excellences of those persons to whom something is due, there must needs be a corresponding distinction of virtues in a descending order. Now just as a carnal father partakes of the character of principle in a particular way, which character is found in God in a universal way, so too a person who, in some way, exercises providence in one respect, partakes of the character of father in a particular way, since a father is the principle of generation, of education, of learning and of whatever pertains to the perfection of human life: while a person who is in a position of dignity is as a principle of government with regard to certain things: for instance, the governor of a state in civil matters, the commander of an army in matters of warfare, a professor in matters of learning, and so forth. Hence it is that all such persons are designated as “fathers,” on account of their being charged with like cares: thus the servants of Naaman said to him (⁶¹²2 Kings 5:13): “Father, if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing,” etc.

Therefore, just as, in a manner, religion, whereby worship is given to find piety, whereby we worship our so under piety we find observance, whereby worship and honor are paid to persons in positions of dignity.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(1)-RO(1) — As stated above (**Q(101), A(3)**, ad 2), religion goes by the name of piety by way of supereminence, although piety properly so called is distinct from religion; and in the same way piety can be called observance by way of excellence, although observance properly speaking is distinct from piety.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(1)-RO(2) — By the very fact of being in a position of dignity a man not only excels as regards his position, but also has a certain power of governing subjects, wherefore it is fitting that he should be considered as a principle inasmuch as he is the governor of others. On the other hand, the fact that a man has perfection of science and virtue does not give him the character of a principle in relation to others, but merely a certain excellence in himself. Wherefore a special virtue is appointed for the payment of worship and honor to persons in positions of dignity. Yet, forasmuch as science, virtue and all like things render a man fit for positions of dignity, the respect which is paid to anyone on account of any excellence whatever belongs to the same virtue.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(1)-RO(3) — It belongs to special justice, properly speaking, to pay the equivalent to those to whom we owe anything. Now this cannot be done to the virtuous, and to those who make good use of their position of dignity, as neither can it be done to God, nor to our parents. Consequently these matters belong to an annexed virtue, and not to special justice, which is a principal virtue.

Legal justice extends to the acts of all the virtues, as stated above (**Q(58), A(6)**).

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(2)

Whether it belongs to observance to pay worship and honor to those who are in positions of dignity?

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that it does not belong to observance to pay worship and honor to persons in positions of dignity. For according to Augustine (De Civ. Dei x), we are said to worship those persons whom we hold in honor, so that worship and honor would seem to be the same. Therefore it is unfitting to define observance as paying worship and honor to persons in positions of dignity.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, it belongs to justice that we pay what we owe: wherefore this belongs to observance also, since it is a part of justice. Now we do not owe worship and honor to all persons in

positions of dignity, but only to those who are placed over us. Therefore observance is unfittingly defined as giving worship and honor to all.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, not only do we owe honor to persons of dignity who are placed over us; we owe them also fear and a certain payment of remuneration, according to ^{<817>}Romans 13:7,

“Render... to all men their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.”

Moreover, we owe them reverence and subjection, according to ^{<817>}Hebrews 13:17, “Obey your prelates, and be subject to them.” Therefore observance is not fittingly defined as paying worship and honor.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Tully says (De Invent. Rhet. ii) that “it is by observance that we pay worship and honor to those who excel in some kind of dignity.”

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(2) — *I answer that*, It belongs to persons in positions of dignity to govern subjects. Now to govern is to move certain ones to their due end: thus a sailor governs his ship by steering it to port. But every mover has a certain excellence and power over that which is moved. Wherefore, a person in a position of dignity is an object of twofold consideration: first, in so far as he obtains excellence of position, together with a certain power over subjects: secondly, as regards the exercise of his government. In respect of his excellence there is due to him honor, which is the recognition of some kind of excellence; and in respect of the exercise of his government, there is due to him worship, consisting in rendering him service, by obeying his commands, and by repaying him, according to one’s faculty, for the benefits we received from him.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(2)-RO(1) — Worship includes not only honor, but also whatever other suitable actions are connected with the relations between man and man.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(2)-RO(2) — As stated above (**Q(80)**), debt is twofold. One is legal debt, to pay which man is compelled by law; and thus man owes honor and worship to those persons in positions of dignity who are placed over him. The other is moral debt, which is due by reason of a

certain honesty: it is in this way that we owe worship and honor to persons in positions of dignity even though we be not their subjects.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(2)-RO(3) — Honor is due to the excellence of persons in positions of dignity, on account of their higher rank: while fear is due to them on account of their power to use compulsion: and to the exercise of their government there is due both obedience, whereby subjects are moved at the command of their superiors, and tributes, which are a repayment of their labor.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(3)

Whether observance is a greater virtue than piety?

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that observance is a greater virtue than piety. For the prince to whom worship is paid by observance is compared to a father who is worshiped by piety, as a universal to a particular governor; because the household which a father governs is part of the state which is governed by the prince. Now a universal power is greater, and inferiors are more subject thereto. Therefore observance is a greater virtue than piety.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, persons in positions of dignity take care of the common good. Now our kindred pertain to the private good, which we ought to set aside for the common good: wherefore it is praiseworthy to expose oneself to the danger of death for the sake of the common good. Therefore observance, whereby worship is paid to persons in positions of dignity, is a greater virtue than piety, which pays worship to one's kindred.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(3)-O(3) — Further honor and reverence are due to the virtuous in the first place after God. Now honor and reverence are paid to the virtuous by the virtue of observance, as stated above (**A(1)**, ad 3). Therefore observance takes the first place after religion.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, The precepts of the Law prescribe acts of virtue. Now, immediately after the precepts of religion, which belong to the first table, follows the precept of honoring our parents which

refers to piety. Therefore piety follows immediately after religion in the order of excellence.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Something may be paid to persons in positions of dignity in two ways. First, in relation to the common good, as when one serves them in the administration of the affairs of the state. This no longer belongs to observance, but to piety, which pays worship not only to one's father but also to one's fatherland. Secondly, that which is paid to persons in positions of dignity refers specially to their personal usefulness or renown, and this belongs properly to observance, as distinct from piety. Therefore in comparing observance with piety we must needs take into consideration the different relations in which other persons stand to ourselves, which relations both virtues regard. Now it is evident that the persons of our parents and of our kindred are more substantially akin to us than persons in positions of dignity, since birth and education, which originate in the father, belong more to one's substance than external government, the principle of which is seated in those who are in positions of dignity. For this reason piety takes precedence of observance, inasmuch as it pays worship to persons more akin to us, and to whom we are more strictly bound.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(3)-RO(1) — The prince is compared to the father as a universal to a particular power, as regards external government, but not as regards the father being a principle of generation: for in this way the father should be compared with the divine power from which all things derive their being.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(3)-RO(2) — In so far as persons in positions of dignity are related to the common good, their worship does not pertain to observance, but to piety, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(102)-A(3)-RO(3) — The rendering of honor or worship should be proportionate to the person to whom it is paid not only as considered in himself, but also as compared to those who pay them. Wherefore, though virtuous persons, considered in themselves, are more worthy of honor than the persons of one's parents, yet children are under a greater obligation, on account of the benefits they have received from their parents and their natural kinship with them, to pay worship and honor to their parents than to virtuous persons who are not of their kindred.

PARTS OF OBSERVANCE AND ORDINARY VICE

QUESTIONS 103-109

QUESTION 103

OF DULIA

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the parts of observance. We shall consider

- (1) *dulia*, whereby we pay honor and other things pertaining thereto to those who are in a higher position;
- (2) obedience, whereby we obey their commands.

Under the first head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether honor is a spiritual or a corporal thing?
- (2) Whether honor is due to those only who are in a higher position?
- (3) Whether *dulia*, which pays honor and worship to those who are above us, is a special virtue, distinct from *latria*?
- (4) Whether it contains several species?

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(1)

Whether honor denotes something corporal?

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that honor does not denote something corporal. For honor is showing reverence in acknowledgment of virtue, as may be gathered from the Philosopher (*Ethic. i, 5*). Now showing

reverence is something spiritual, since to revere is an act of fear, as stated above (**Q(81), A(2)**, ad 1). Therefore honor is something spiritual.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 3), “honor is the reward of virtue.” Now, since virtue consists chiefly of spiritual things, its reward is not something corporal, for the reward is more excellent than the merit. Therefore honor does not consist of corporal things.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, honor is distinct from praise, as also from glory. Now praise and glory consist of external things. Therefore honor consists of things internal and spiritual.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Jerome in his exposition of <sup><SUB>1</sup> Timothy 5:3, “Honor widows that are widows indeed,” and (<sup><SUB>1</sup> Timothy 5:17), “let the priests that rule well be esteemed worthy of double honor” etc. says (Ep. ad Ageruch.): “Honor here stands either for almsgiving or for remuneration.” Now both of these pertain to spiritual things. Therefore honor consists of corporal things.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Honor denotes a witnessing to a person’s excellence. Therefore men who wish to be honored seek a witnessing to their excellence, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. i, 5; viii, 8). Now witness is borne either before God or before man. Before God, Who is the searcher of hearts, the witness of one’s conscience suffices. wherefore honor, so far as God is concerned, may consist of the mere internal movement of the heart, for instance when a man acknowledges either God’s excellence or another man’s excellence before God. But, as regards men, one cannot bear witness, save by means of signs, either by words, as when one proclaims another’s excellence by word of mouth, or by deeds, for instance by bowing, saluting, and so forth, or by external things, as by offering gifts, erecting statues, and the like. Accordingly honor consists of signs, external and corporal.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(1)-RO(1) — Reverence is not the same as honor: but on the one hand it is the primary motive for showing honor, in so far as one man honors another out of the reverence he has for him; and on the other hand, it is the end of honor, in so far as a person is honored in order that he may be held in reverence by others.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(1)-RO(2) — According to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 3), honor is not a sufficient reward of virtue: yet nothing in human and corporal things can be greater than honor, since these corporal things themselves are employed as signs in acknowledgment of excelling virtue. It is, however, due to the good and the beautiful, that they may be made known, according to ⁴¹⁵⁵Matthew 5:15, “Neither do men light a candle, and put it under a bushel, but upon a candlestick, that it may shine to all that are in the house.” In this sense honor is said to be the reward of virtue.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(1)-RO(3) — Praise is distinguished from honor in two ways. First, because praise consists only of verbal signs, whereas honor consists of any external signs, so that praise is included in honor. Secondly, because by paying honor to a person we bear witness to a person’s excelling goodness absolutely, whereas by praising him we bear witness to his goodness in reference to an end: thus we praise one that works well for an end. On the other hand, honor is given even to the best, which is not referred to an end, but has already arrived at the end, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. i, 5).

Glory is the effect of honor and praise, since the result of our bearing witness to a person’s goodness is that his goodness becomes clear to the knowledge of many. The word “glory” signifies this, for “glory” is the same as {kleria}, wherefore a gloss of Augustine on ⁶¹²⁷Romans 16:27 observes that glory is “clear knowledge together with praise.”

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(2)

Whether honor is properly due to those who are above us?

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that honor is not properly due to those who are above us. For an angel is above any human wayfarer, according to ⁴¹¹¹Matthew 11:11, “He that is lesser in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John the Baptist.” Yet an angel forbade John when the latter wished to honor him (⁶²⁹¹Revelation 22:10). Therefore honor is not due to those who are above us.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, honor is due to a person in acknowledgment of his virtue, as stated above (**A(1); Q(63), A(3)**). But

sometimes those who are above us are not virtuous. Therefore honor is not due to them, as neither is it due to the demons, who nevertheless are above us in the order of nature.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the Apostle says (⁶²¹Romans 12:10): “With honor preventing one another,” and we read (⁶¹⁷1 Peter 2:17): “Honor all men.” But this would not be so if honor were due to those alone who are above us. Therefore honor is not due properly to those who are above us.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, it is written (Tob. 1:16) that Tobias “had ten talents of silver of that which he had been honored by the king”: and we read (⁶¹⁸Esther 6:11) that Assuerus honored Mardochaeus, and ordered it to be proclaimed in his presence: “This honor is he worthy of whom the king hath a mind to honor.” Therefore honor is paid to those also who are beneath us, and it seems, in consequence, that honor is not due properly to those who are above us.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. i, 12) that “honor is due to the best.”

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), honor is nothing but an acknowledgment of a person’s excelling goodness. Now a person’s excellence may be considered, not only in relation to those who honor him, in the point of his being more excellent than they, but also in itself, or in relation to other persons, and in this way honor is always due to a person, on account of some excellence or superiority.

For the person honored has no need to be more excellent than those who honor him; it may suffice for him to be more excellent than some others, or again he may be more excellent than those who honor him in some respect and not simply.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(2)-RO(1) — The angel forbade John to pay him, not any kind of honor, but the honor of adoration and latria, which is due to God. Or again, he forbade him to pay the honor of dulia, in order to indicate the dignity of John himself, for which Christ equaled him to the angels “according to the hope of glory of the children of God”: wherefore he refused to be honored by him as though he were superior to him.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(2)-RO(2) — A wicked superior is honored for the excellence, not of his virtue but of his dignity, as being God’s minister, and because the honor paid to him is paid to the whole community over which he presides. As for the demons, they are wicked beyond recall, and should be looked upon as enemies, rather than treated with honor.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(2)-RO(3) — In every man is to be found something that makes it possible to deem him better than ourselves, according to ^{<103>}Philippians 2:3, “In humility, let each esteem others better than themselves,” and thus, too, we should all be on the alert to do honor to one another.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(2)-RO(4) — Private individuals are sometimes honored by kings, not that they are above them in the order of dignity but on account of some excellence of their virtue: and in this way Tobias and Mardocheaus were honored by kings.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(3)

Whether dulia is a special virtue distinct from latria?

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that dulia is not a special virtue distinct from latria. For a gloss on ^{<103>}Psalm 7:1, “O Lord my God, in Thee have I put my trust,” says: “Lord of all by His power, to Whom dulia is due; God by creation, to Whom we owe latria.” Now the virtue directed to God as Lord is not distinct from that which is directed to Him as God. Therefore dulia is not a distinct virtue from latria.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. viii, 8), “to be loved is like being honored.” Now the charity with which we love God is the same as that whereby we love our neighbor. Therefore dulia whereby we honor our neighbor is not a distinct virtue from latria with which we honor God.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the movement whereby one is moved towards an image is the same as the movement whereby one is moved towards the thing represented by the image. Now by dulia we honor a man as being made to the image of God. For it is written of the wicked (Wis.

2:22,23) that “they esteemed not the honor of holy souls, for God created man incorruptible, and to the image of His own likeness He made him.” Therefore *dulia* is not a distinct virtue from *latria* whereby God is honored.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei x), that “the homage due to man, of which the Apostle spoke when he commanded servants to obey their masters and which in Greek is called *dulia*, is distinct from *latria* which denotes the homage that consists in the worship of God.”

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(3) — *I answer that*, According to what has been stated above (Q(101), A(3)), where there are different aspects of that which is due, there must needs be different virtues to render those dues. Now servitude is due to God and to man under different aspects: even as lordship is competent to God and to man under different aspects. For God has absolute and paramount lordship over the creature wholly and singly, which is entirely subject to His power: whereas man partakes of a certain likeness to the divine lordship, forasmuch as he exercises a particular power over some man or creature. Wherefore *dulia*, which pays due service to a human lord, is a distinct virtue from *latria*, which pays due service to the lordship of God. It is, moreover, a species of observance, because by observance we honor all those who excel in dignity, while *dulia* properly speaking is the reverence of servants for their master, *dulia* being the Greek for servitude.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(3)-RO(1) — Just as religion is called piety by way of excellence, inasmuch as God is our Father by way of excellence, so again *latria* is called *dulia* by way of excellence, inasmuch as God is our Lord by way of excellence. Now the creature does not partake of the power to create by reason of which *latria* is due to God: and so this gloss drew a distinction, by ascribing *latria* to God in respect of creation, which is not communicated to a creature, but *dulia* in respect of lordship, which is communicated to a creature.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(3)-RO(2) — The reason why we love our neighbor is God, since that which we love in our neighbor through charity is God alone. Wherefore the charity with which we love God is the same as that with which we love our neighbor. Yet there are other friendships distinct from charity, in respect of the other reasons for which a man is loved. In

like manner, since there is one reason for serving God and another for serving man, and for honoring the one or the other, latria and dulia are not the same virtue.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(3)-RO(3) — Movement towards an image as such is referred to the thing represented by the image: yet not every movement towards an image is referred to the image as such, and consequently sometimes the movement to the image differs specifically from the movement to the thing. Accordingly we must reply that the honor or subjection of dulia regards some dignity of a man absolutely. For though, in respect of that dignity, man is made to the image or likeness of God, yet in showing reverence to a person, one does not always refer this to God actually.

Or we may reply that the movement towards an image is, after a fashion, towards the thing, yet the movement towards the thing need not be towards its image. Wherefore reverence paid to a person as the image of God redounds somewhat to God: and yet this differs from the reverence that is paid to God Himself, for this in no way refers to His image.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(4)

Whether dulia has various species?

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that dulia has various species. For by dulia we show honor to our neighbor. Now different neighbors are honored under different aspects, for instance king, father and master, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. ix, 2). Since this difference of aspect in the object differentiates the species of virtue, it seems that dulia is divided into specifically different virtues.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the mean differs specifically from the extremes, as pale differs from white and black. Now hyperdulia is apparently a mean between latria and dulia: for it is shown towards creatures having a special affinity to God, for instance to the Blessed Virgin as being the mother of God. Therefore it seems that there are different species of dulia, one being simply dulia, the other hyperdulia.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, just as in the rational creature we find the image of God, for which reason it is honored, so too in the irrational creature we find the trace of God. Now the aspect of likeness denoted by an image differs from the aspect conveyed by a trace. Therefore we must distinguish a corresponding difference of *dulia*: and all the more since honor is shown to certain irrational creatures, as, for instance, to the wood of the Holy Cross.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, *Dulia* is condivided with *latria*. But *latria* is not divided into different species. Neither therefore is *dulia*.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(4) — *I answer that*, *Dulia* may be taken in two ways. In one way it may be taken in a wide sense as denoting reverence paid to anyone on account of any kind of excellence, and thus it comprises piety and observance, and any similar virtue whereby reverence is shown towards a man. Taken in this sense it will have parts differing specifically from one another. In another way it may be taken in a strict sense as denoting the reverence of a servant for his lord, for *dulia* signifies servitude, as stated above (**A(3)**). Taken in this sense it is not divided into different species, but is one of the species of observance, mentioned by Tully (*De Invent. Rhet.* ii), for the reason that a servant reveres his lord under one aspect, a soldier his commanding officer under another, the disciple his master under another, and so on in similar cases.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(4)-RO(1) — This argument takes *dulia* in a wide sense.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(4)-RO(2) — *Hyperdulia* is the highest species of *dulia* taken in a wide sense, since the greatest reverence is that which is due to a man by reason of his having an affinity to God.

P(2b)-Q(103)-A(4)-RO(3) — Man owes neither subjection nor honor to an irrational creature considered in itself, indeed all such creatures are naturally subject to man. As to the Cross of Christ, the honor we pay to it is the same as that which we pay to Christ, just as the king's robe receives the same honor as the king himself, according to Damascene (*De Fide Orth.* iv).

QUESTION 104

OF OBEDIENCE

(SIX ARTICLES)

We must now consider obedience, under which head there are six points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether one man is bound to obey another?
- (2) Whether obedience is a special virtue?
- (3) Of its comparison with other virtues;
- (4) Whether God must be obeyed in all things?
- (5) Whether subjects are bound to obey their superiors in all things?
- (6) Whether the faithful are bound to obey the secular power?

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(1)

Whether one man is bound to obey another?

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that one man is not bound to obey another. For nothing should be done contrary to the divine ordinance. Now God has so ordered that man is ruled by his own counsel, according to Eccles. 15:14, “God made man from the beginning, and left him in the hand of his own counsel.” Therefore one man is not bound to obey another.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, if one man were bound to obey another, he would have to look upon the will of the person commanding him, as being his rule of conduct. Now God’s will alone, which is always right, is a rule of human conduct. Therefore man is bound to obey none but God.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the more gratuitous the service the more is it acceptable. Now what a man does out of duty is not gratuitous. Therefore if a man were bound in duty to obey others in doing good deeds,

for this very reason his good deeds would be rendered less acceptable through being done out of obedience. Therefore one man is not bound to obey another.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is prescribed (^{<8307>} Hebrews 13:17): “Obey your prelates and be subject to them.”

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Just as the actions of natural things proceed from natural powers, so do human actions proceed from the human will. In natural things it behooved the higher to move the lower to their actions by the excellence of the natural power bestowed on them by God: and so in human affairs also the higher must move the lower by their will in virtue of a divinely established authority. Now to move by reason and will is to command. Wherefore just as in virtue of the divinely established natural order the lower natural things need to be subject to the movement of the higher, so too in human affairs, in virtue of the order of natural and divine law, inferiors are bound to obey their superiors.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(1)-RO(1) — God left man in the hand of his own counsel, not as though it were lawful to him to do whatever he will, but because, unlike irrational creatures, he is not compelled by natural necessity to do what he ought to do, but is left the free choice proceeding from his own counsel. And just as he has to proceed on his own counsel in doing other things, so too has he in the point of obeying his superiors. For Gregory says (Moral. xxxv), “When we humbly give way to another’s voice, we overcome ourselves in our own hearts.”

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(1)-RO(2) — The will of God is the first rule whereby all rational wills are regulated: and to this rule one will approaches more than another, according to a divinely appointed order. Hence the will of the one man who issues a command may be as a second rule to the will of this other man who obeys him.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(1)-RO(3) — A thing may be deemed gratuitous in two ways. In one way on the part of the deed itself, because, to wit, one is not bound to do it; in another way, on the part of the doer, because he does it of his own free will. Now a deed is rendered virtuous, praiseworthy and meritorious, chiefly according as it proceeds from the will. Wherefore although obedience be a duty, if one obey with a prompt will, one’s merit

is not for that reason diminished, especially before God, Who sees not only the outward deed, but also the inward will.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(2)

Whether obedience is a special virtue?

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that obedience is not a special virtue. For disobedience is contrary to obedience. But disobedience is a general sin, because Ambrose says (De Parad. viii) that “sin is to disobey the divine law.” Therefore obedience is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, every special virtue is either theological or moral. But obedience is not a theological virtue, since it is not comprised under faith, hope or charity. Nor is it a moral virtue, since it does not hold the mean between excess and deficiency, for the more obedient one is the more is one praised. Therefore obedience is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. xxxv) that “obedience is the more meritorious and praiseworthy, the less it holds its own.” But every special virtue is the more to be praised the more it holds its own, since virtue requires a man to exercise his will and choice, as stated in Ethic. ii, 4. Therefore obedience is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, virtues differ in species according to their objects. Now the object of obedience would seem to be the command of a superior, of which, apparently, there are as many kinds as there are degrees of superiority. Therefore obedience is a general virtue, comprising many special virtues.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, obedience is reckoned by some to be a part of justice, as stated above (**Q(80)**).

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(2) — *I answer that*, A special virtue is assigned to all good deeds that have a special reason of praise: for it belongs properly to virtue to render a deed good. Now obedience to a superior is due in accordance with the divinely established order of things, as shown above (**A(1)**), and therefore it is a good, since good consists in mode, species and

order, as Augustine states (De Natura Boni iii) [*Cf. **P(1), Q(5), A(5)**]. Again, this act has a special aspect of praiseworthiness by reason of its object. For while subjects have many obligations towards their superiors, this one, that they are bound to obey their commands, stands out as special among the rest. Wherefore obedience is a special virtue, and its specific object is a command tacit or express, because the superior's will, however it become known, is a tacit precept, and a man's obedience seems to be all the more prompt, forasmuch as by obeying he forestalls the express command as soon as he understands his superior's will.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(2)-RO(1) — Nothing prevents the one same material object from admitting two special aspects to which two special virtues correspond: thus a soldier, by defending his king's fortress, fulfils both an act of fortitude, by facing the danger of death for a good end, and an act of justice, by rendering due service to his lord. Accordingly the aspect of precept, which obedience considers, occurs in acts of all virtues, but not in all acts of virtue, since not all acts of virtue are a matter of precept, as stated above (**P(1), Q(96), A(3)**). Moreover, certain things are sometimes a matter of precept, and pertain to no other virtue, such things for instance as are not evil except because they are forbidden. Wherefore, if obedience be taken in its proper sense, as considering formally and intentionally the aspect of precept, it will be a special virtue, and disobedience a special sin: because in this way it is requisite for obedience that one perform an act of justice or of some other virtue with the intention of fulfilling a precept; and for disobedience that one treat the precept with actual contempt. On the other hand, if obedience be taken in a wide sense for the performance of any action that may be a matter of precept, and disobedience for the omission of that action through any intention whatever, then obedience will be a general virtue, and disobedience a general sin.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(2)-RO(2) — Obedience is not a theological virtue, for its direct object is not God, but the precept of any superior, whether expressed or inferred, namely, a simple word of the superior, indicating his will, and which the obedient subject obeys promptly, according to ^{<300>}Titus 3:1, "Admonish them to be subject to princes, and to obey at a word," etc.

It is, however, a moral virtue, since it is a part of justice, and it observes the mean between excess and deficiency. Excess thereof is measured in

respect, not of quantity, but of other circumstances, in so far as a man obeys either whom he ought not, or in matters wherein he ought not to obey, as we have stated above regarding religion (**Q(92), A(2)**). We may also reply that as in justice, excess is in the person who retains another's property, and deficiency in the person who does not receive his due, according to the Philosopher (*Ethic. v, 4*), so too obedience observes the mean between excess on the part of him who fails to pay due obedience to his superior, since he exceeds in fulfilling his own will, and deficiency on the part of the superior, who does not receive obedience. Wherefore in this way obedience will be a mean between two forms of wickedness, as was stated above concerning justice (**Q(58), A(10)**).

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(2)-RO(3) — Obedience, like every virtue requires the will to be prompt towards its proper object, but not towards that which is repugnant to it. Now the proper object of obedience is a precept, and this proceeds from another's will. Wherefore obedience make a man's will prompt in fulfilling the will of another, the maker, namely, of the precept. If that which is prescribed to him is willed by him for its own sake apart from its being prescribed, as happens in agreeable matters, he tends towards it at once by his own will and seems to comply, not on account of the precept, but on account of his own will. But if that which is prescribed is nowise willed for its own sake, but, considered in itself, repugnant to his own will, as happens in disagreeable matters, then it is quite evident that it is not fulfilled except on account of the precept. Hence Gregory says (*Moral. xxxv*) that "obedience perishes or diminishes when it holds its own in agreeable matters," because, to wit, one's own will seems to tend principally, not to the accomplishment of the precept, but to the fulfilment of one's own desire; but that "it increases in disagreeable or difficult matters," because there one's own will tends to nothing beside the precept. Yet this must be understood as regards outward appearances: for, on the other hand, according to the judgment of God, Who searches the heart, it may happen that even in agreeable matters obedience, while holding its own, is nonetheless praiseworthy, provided the will of him that obeys tend no less devotedly [**Cf. Q(82), A(2)*] to the fulfilment of the precept.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(2)-RO(4) — Reverence regards directly the person that excels: wherefore it admits a various species according to the various

aspects of excellence. Obedience, on the other hand, regards the precept of the person that excels, and therefore admits of only one aspect. And since obedience is due to a person's precept on account of reverence to him, it follows that obedience to a man is of one species, though the causes from which it proceeds differ specifically.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(3)

Whether obedience is the greatest of the virtues?

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that obedience is the greatest of the virtues. For it is written (⁴¹⁵²1 Kings 15:22): "Obedience is better than sacrifices." Now the offering of sacrifices belongs to religion, which is the greatest of all moral virtues, as shown above (**Q(81), A(6)**). Therefore obedience is the greatest of all virtues.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. xxxv) that "obedience is the only virtue that ingrafts virtues in the soul and protects them when ingrafted." Now the cause is greater than the effect. Therefore obedience is greater than all the virtues.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. xxxv) that "evil should never be done out of obedience: yet sometimes for the sake of obedience we should lay aside the good we are doing." Now one does not lay aside a thing except for something better. Therefore obedience, for whose sake the good of other virtues is set aside, is better than other virtues.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, obedience deserves praise because it proceeds from charity: for Gregory says (Moral. xxxv) that "obedience should be practiced, not out of servile fear, but from a sense of charity, not through fear of punishment, but through love of justice." Therefore charity is a greater virtue than obedience.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Just as sin consists in man contemning God and adhering to mutable things, so the merit of a virtuous act consists in man contemning created goods and adhering to God as his end. Now the end is greater than that which is directed to the end. Therefore if a man contemns created goods in order that he may adhere to

God, his virtue derives greater praise from his adhering to God than from his contemning earthly things. And so those, namely the theological, virtues whereby he adheres to God in Himself, are greater than the moral virtues, whereby he holds in contempt some earthly thing in order to adhere to God.

Among the moral virtues, the greater the thing which a man contemns that he may adhere to God, the greater the virtue. Now there are three kinds of human goods that man may condemn for God's sake. The lowest of these are external goods, the goods of the body take the middle place, and the highest are the goods of the soul; and among these the chief, in a way, is the will, in so far as, by his will, man makes use of all other goods. Therefore, properly speaking, the virtue of obedience, whereby we condemn our own will for God's sake, is more praiseworthy than the other moral virtues, which condemn other goods for the sake of God.

Hence Gregory says (Moral. xxxv) that "obedience is rightly preferred to sacrifices, because by sacrifices another's body is slain whereas by obedience we slay our own will." Wherefore even any other acts of virtue are meritorious before God through being performed out of obedience to God's will. For were one to suffer even martyrdom, or to give all one's goods to the poor, unless one directed these things to the fulfilment of the divine will, which pertains directly to obedience, they could not be meritorious: as neither would they be if they were done without charity, which cannot exist apart from obedience. For it is written (~~Gen~~ 1 John 2:4,5):

“He who saith that he knoweth God, and keepeth not His commandments, is a liar... but he that keepeth His word, in him in very deed the charity of God is perfected”:

and this because friends have the same likes and dislikes.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(3)-RO(1) — Obedience proceeds from reverence, which pays worship and honor to a superior, and in this respect it is contained under different virtues, although considered in itself, as regarding the aspect of precept, it is one special virtue. Accordingly, in so far as it proceeds from reverence for a superior, it is contained, in a way, under observance; while in so far as it proceeds from reverence for one's parents, it is contained under piety; and in so far as it proceeds from reverence for

God, it comes under religion, and pertains to devotion, which is the principal act of religion. Wherefore from this point of view it is more praiseworthy to obey God than to offer sacrifice, as well as because, “in a sacrifice we slay another’s body, whereas by obedience we slay our own will,” as Gregory says (Moral. xxxv). As to the special case in which Samuel spoke, it would have been better for Saul to obey God than to offer in sacrifice the fat animals of the Amalekites against the commandment of God.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(3)-RO(2) — All acts of virtue, in so far as they come under a precept, belong to obedience. Wherefore according as acts of virtue act causally or dispositively towards their generation and preservation, obedience is said to ingraft and protect all virtues. And yet it does not follow that obedience takes precedence of all virtues absolutely, for two reasons. First, because though an act of virtue come under a precept, one may nevertheless perform that act of virtue without considering the aspect of precept. Consequently, if there be any virtue, whose object is naturally prior to the precept, that virtue is said to be naturally prior to obedience. Such a virtue is faith, whereby we come to know the sublime nature of divine authority, by reason of which the power to command is competent to God. Secondly, because infusion of grace and virtues may precede, even in point of time, all virtuous acts: and in this way obedience is not prior to all virtues, neither in point of time nor by nature.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(3)-RO(3) — There are two kinds of good. There is that to which we are bound of necessity, for instance to love God, and so forth: and by no means may such a good be set aside on account of obedience. But there is another good to which man is not bound of necessity, and this good we ought sometimes to set aside for the sake of obedience to which we are bound of necessity, since we ought not to do good by falling into sin. Yet as Gregory remarks (Moral. xxxv), “he who forbids his subjects any single good, must needs allow them many others, lest the souls of those who obey perish utterly from starvation, through being deprived of every good.” Thus the loss of one good may be compensated by obedience and other goods.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(4)

Whether God ought to be obeyed in all things?

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that God need not be obeyed in all things. For it is written (^{<108>}Matthew 9:30,31) that our Lord after healing the two blind men commanded them, saying:

“See that no man know this. But they going out spread His fame abroad in all that country.”

Yet they are not blamed for so doing. Therefore it seems that we are not bound to obey God in all things.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, no one is bound to do anything contrary to virtue. Now we find that God commanded certain things contrary to virtue: thus He commanded Abraham to slay his innocent son (^{<121>}Genesis 22); and the Jews to steal the property of the Egyptians (^{<1010>}Exodus 11), which things are contrary to justice; and Osee to take to himself a woman who was an adulteress (^{<380>}Hosea 3), and this is contrary to chastity. Therefore God is not to be obeyed in all things.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, whoever obeys God conforms his will to the divine will even as to the thing willed. But we are not bound in all things to conform our will to the divine will as to the thing willed, as stated above (**P(1), Q(19), A(10)**). Therefore man is not bound to obey God in all things.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(4) — *On the contrary,* It is written (^{<1241>}Exodus 24:7):

“All things that the Lord hath spoken we will do,
and we will be obedient.”

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(4) — *I answer that,* As stated above (**A(1)**), he who obeys is moved by the command of the person he obeys, just as natural things are moved by their motive causes. Now just a God is the first mover of all things that are moved naturally, so too is He the first mover of all wills, as shown above (**P(1), Q(9), A(6)**). Therefore just as all natural things are subject to the divine motion by a natural necessity so too all

wills, by a kind of necessity of justice, are bound to obey the divine command.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(4)-RO(1) — Our Lord in telling the blind men to conceal the miracle had no intention of binding them with the force of a divine precept, but, as Gregory says (Moral. xix), “gave an example to His servants who follow Him that they might wish to hide their virtue and yet that it should be proclaimed against their will, in order that others might profit by their example.”

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(4)-RO(2) — Even as God does nothing contrary to nature (since “the nature of a thing is what God does therein,” according to a gloss on ~~5111~~ Romans 11), and yet does certain things contrary to the wonted course of nature; so to God can command nothing contrary to virtue since virtue and rectitude of human will consist chiefly in conformity with God’s will and obedience to His command, although it be contrary to the wonted mode of virtue. Accordingly, then, the command given to Abraham to slay his innocent son was not contrary to justice, since God is the author of life and death. Nor again was it contrary to justice that He commanded the Jews to take things belonging to the Egyptians, because all things are His, and He gives them to whom He will. Nor was it contrary to chastity that Osee was commanded to take an adulteress, because God Himself is the ordainer of human generation, and the right manner of intercourse with woman is that which He appoints. Hence it is evident that the persons aforesaid did not sin, either by obeying God or by willing to obey Him.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(4)-RO(3) — Though man is not always bound to will what God wills, yet he is always bound to will what God wills him to will. This comes to man’s knowledge chiefly through God’s command, wherefore man is bound to obey God’s commands in all things.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(5)***Whether subjects are bound to obey
their superiors in all things?***

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(5)-O(1) — It seems that subjects are bound to obey their superiors in all things. For the Apostle says (^{<SR1>}Colossians 3:20): “Children, obey your parents in all things,” and farther on (^{<SR2>}Colossians 3:22): “Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh.” Therefore in like manner other subjects are bound to obey their superiors in all things.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, superiors stand between God and their subjects, according to (^{<RRF>}Deuteronomy 5:5, “I was the mediator and stood between the Lord and you at that time, to show you His words.” Now there is no going from extreme to extreme, except through that which stands between. Therefore the commands of a superior must be esteemed the commands of God, wherefore the Apostle says (^{<RM4>}Galatians 4:14): “You... received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus” and (^{<SR3>}1 Thessalonians 2:13):

“When you had received of us the word of the hearing of God, you received it, not as the word of men, but, as it is indeed, the word of God.”

Therefore as man is bound to obey God in all things, so is he bound to obey his superiors.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, just as religious in making their profession take vows of chastity and poverty, so do they also vow obedience. Now a religious is bound to observe chastity and poverty in all things. Therefore he is also bound to obey in all things.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<MR3>}Acts 5:29): “We ought to obey God rather than men.” Now sometimes the things commanded by a superior are against God. Therefore superiors are not to be obeyed in all things.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(5) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**AA(1),4**), he who obeys is moved at the bidding of the person who commands him, by a

certain necessity of justice, even as a natural thing is moved through the power of its mover by a natural necessity. That a natural thing be not moved by its mover, may happen in two ways. First, on account of a hindrance arising from the stronger power of some other mover; thus wood is not burnt by fire if a stronger force of water intervene. Secondly, through lack of order in the movable with regard to its mover, since, though it is subject to the latter's action in one respect, yet it is not subject thereto in every respect. Thus, a humor is sometimes subject to the action of heat, as regards being heated, but not as regards being dried up or consumed. In like manner there are two reasons, for which a subject may not be bound to obey his superior in all things. First on account of the command of a higher power. For as a gloss says on ^{811D}Romans 13:2, "They that resist [Vulg.: 'He that resisteth'] the power, resist the ordinance of God" (cf. St. Augustine, *De Verb. Dom.* viii). "If a commissioner issue an order, are you to comply, if it is contrary to the bidding of the proconsul? Again if the proconsul command one thing, and the emperor another, will you hesitate, to disregard the former and serve the latter? Therefore if the emperor commands one thing and God another, you must disregard the former and obey God." Secondly, a subject is not bound to obey his superior if the latter command him to do something wherein he is not subject to him. For Seneca says (*De Beneficiis* iii): "It is wrong to suppose that slavery falls upon the whole man: for the better part of him is excepted." His body is subjected and assigned to his master but his soul is his own. Consequently in matters touching the internal movement of the will man is not bound to obey his fellow-man, but God alone.

Nevertheless man is bound to obey his fellow-man in things that have to be done externally by means of the body: and yet, since by nature all men are equal, he is not bound to obey another man in matters touching the nature of the body, for instance in those relating to the support of his body or the begetting of his children. Wherefore servants are not bound to obey their masters, nor children their parents, in the question of contracting marriage or of remaining in the state of virginity or the like. But in matters concerning the disposal of actions and human affairs, a subject is bound to obey his superior within the sphere of his authority; for instance a soldier must obey his general in matters relating to war, a servant his master in matters touching the execution of the duties of his service, a son

his father in matters relating to the conduct of his life and the care of the household; and so forth.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(5)-RO(1) — When the Apostle says “in all things,” he refers to matters within the sphere of a father’s or master’s authority.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(5)-RO(2) — Man is subject to God simply as regards all things, both internal and external, wherefore he is bound to obey Him in all things. On the other hand, inferiors are not subject to their superiors in all things, but only in certain things and in a particular way, in respect of which the superior stands between God and his subjects, whereas in respect of other matters the subject is immediately under God, by Whom he is taught either by the natural or by the written law.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(5)-RO(3) — Religious profess obedience as to the regular mode of life, in respect of which they are subject to their superiors: wherefore they are bound to obey in those matters only which may belong to the regular mode of life, and this obedience suffices for salvation. If they be willing to obey even in other matters, this will belong to the superabundance of perfection; provided, however, such things be not contrary to God or to the rule they profess, for obedience in this case would be unlawful.

Accordingly we may distinguish a threefold obedience; one, sufficient for salvation, and consisting in obeying when one is bound to obey: secondly, perfect obedience, which obeys in all things lawful: thirdly, indiscreet obedience, which obeys even in matters unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(6)

Whether Christians are bound to obey the secular powers?

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(6)-O(1) — It seems that Christians are not bound to obey the secular power. For a gloss on ⁴¹⁷⁵Matthew 17:25, “Then the children are free,” says: “If in every kingdom the children of the king who holds sway over that kingdom are free, then the children of that King, under Whose sway are all kingdoms, should be free in every kingdom.” Now Christians, by their faith in Christ, are made children of God, according to ⁴¹⁷⁶John 1:12: “He gave them power to be made the sons of

God, to them that believe in His name.” Therefore they are not bound to obey the secular power.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, it is written (^{<610>}Romans 7:4): “You... are become dead to the law by the body of Christ,” and the law mentioned here is the divine law of the Old Testament. Now human law whereby men are subject to the secular power is of less account than the divine law of the Old Testament. Much more, therefore, since they have become members of Christ’s body, are men freed from the law of subjection, whereby they were under the power of secular princes.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, men are not bound to obey robbers, who oppress them with violence. Now, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei iv): “Without justice, what else is a kingdom but a huge robbery?” Since therefore the authority of secular princes is frequently exercised with injustice, or owes its origin to some unjust usurpation, it seems that Christians ought not to obey secular princes.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, It is written (^{<618>}Titus 3:1): “Admonish them to be subject to princes and powers,” and (^{<6123>}1 Peter 2:13,14):

“Be ye subject... to every human creature for God’s sake: whether it be to the king as excelling, or to governors as sent by him.”

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(6) — *I answer that*, Faith in Christ is the origin and cause of justice, according to (^{<6122>}Romans 3:22, “The justice of God by faith of Jesus Christ:” wherefore faith in Christ does not void the order of justice, but strengthens it.” Now the order of justice requires that subjects obey their superiors, else the stability of human affairs would cease. Hence faith in Christ does not excuse the faithful from the obligation of obeying secular princes.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(6)-RO(1) — As stated above (**A(5)**), subjection whereby one man is bound to another regards the body; not the soul, which retains its liberty. Now, in this state of life we are freed by the grace of Christ from defects of the soul, but not from defects of the body, as the Apostle declares by saying of himself (^{<6123>}Romans 7:23) that in his mind he served the law of God, but in his flesh the law of sin. Wherefore those that are made children of God by grace are free from the spiritual bondage of sin,

but not from the bodily bondage, whereby they are held bound to earthly masters, as a gloss observes on ~~scilicet~~ 1 Timothy 6:1, “Whosoever are servants under the yoke,” etc.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(6)-RO(2) — The Old Law was a figure of the New Testament, and therefore it had to cease on the advent of truth. And the comparison with human law does not stand because thereby one man is subject to another. Yet man is bound by divine law to obey his fellow-man.

P(2b)-Q(104)-A(6)-RO(3) — Man is bound to obey secular princes in so far as this is required by order of justice. Wherefore if the prince’s authority is not just but usurped, or if he commands what is unjust, his subjects are not bound to obey him, except perhaps accidentally, in order to avoid scandal or danger.

QUESTION 105

OF DISOBEDIENCE

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider disobedience, under which head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether it is a mortal sin?
- (2) Whether it is the most grievous of sins?

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(1)*Whether disobedience is a mortal sin?*

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that disobedience is not a mortal sin. For every sin is a disobedience, as appears from Ambrose's definition given above (**Q(104), A(2), O(1)**). Therefore if disobedience were a mortal sin, every sin would be mortal.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. xxxi) that disobedience is born of vainglory. But vainglory is not a mortal sin. Neither therefore is disobedience.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, a person is said to be disobedient when he does not fulfil a superior's command. But superiors often issue so many commands that it is seldom, if ever, possible to fulfil them. Therefore if disobedience were a mortal sin, it would follow that man cannot avoid mortal sin, which is absurd. Wherefore disobedience is not a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The sin of disobedience to parents is reckoned (~~613~~ Romans 1:30; ~~613~~ 2 Timothy 3:2) among other mortal sins.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(24), A(12); P(1), Q(72), A(5); P(1), Q(88), A(1)**), a mortal sin is one that is contrary to charity which is the cause of spiritual life. Now by charity we love God

and our neighbor. The charity of God requires that we obey His commandments, as stated above (**Q(24), A(12)**). Therefore to be disobedient to the commandments of God is a mortal sin, because it is contrary to the love of God.

Again, the commandments of God contain the precept of obedience to superiors. Wherefore also disobedience to the commands of a superior is a mortal sin, as being contrary to the love of God, according to ~~681D~~ Romans 13:2, “He that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God.” It is also contrary to the love of our neighbor, as it withdraws from the superior who is our neighbor the obedience that is his due.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(1)-RO(1) — The definition given by Ambrose refers to mortal sin, which has the character of perfect sin. Venial sin is not disobedience, because it is not contrary to a precept, but beside it. Nor again is every mortal sin disobedience, properly and essentially, but only when one contemns a precept, since moral acts take their species from the end. And when a thing is done contrary to a precept, not in contempt of the precept, but with some other purpose, it is not a sin of disobedience except materially, and belongs formally to another species of sin.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(1)-RO(2) — Vainglory desires display of excellence. And since it seems to point to a certain excellence that one be not subject to another’s command, it follows that disobedience arises from vainglory. But there is nothing to hinder mortal sin from arising out of venial sin, since venial sin is a disposition to mortal.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(1)-RO(3) — No one is bound to do the impossible: wherefore if a superior makes a heap of precepts and lays them upon his subjects, so that they are unable to fulfil them, they are excused from sin. Wherefore superiors should refrain from making a multitude of precepts.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(2)

Whether disobedience is the most grievous of sins?

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that disobedience is the most grievous of sins. For it is written (~~11523~~ 1 Kings 15:23):

“It is like the sin of witchcraft to rebel, and like the crime of idolatry to refuse to obey.

But idolatry is the most grievous of sins, as stated above (**Q(94), A(3)**). Therefore disobedience is the most grievous of sins.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the sin against the Holy Ghost is one that removes the obstacles of sin, as stated above (**Q(14), A(2)**). Now disobedience makes a man condemn a precept which, more than anything, prevents a man from sinning. Therefore disobedience is a sin against the Holy Ghost, and consequently is the most grievous of sins.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the Apostle says (~~818~~ Romans 5:19) that “by the disobedience of one man, many were made sinners.” Now the cause is seemingly greater than its effect. Therefore disobedience seems to be a more grievous sin than the others that are caused thereby.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Contempt of the commander is a more grievous sin than contempt of his command. Now some sins are against the very person of the commander, such as blasphemy and murder. Therefore disobedience is not the most grievous of sins.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Not every disobedience is equally a sin: for one disobedience may be greater than another, in two ways. First, on the part of the superior commanding, since, although a man should take every care to obey each superior, yet it is a greater duty to obey a higher than a lower authority, in sign of which the command of a lower authority is set aside if it be contrary to the command of a higher authority. Consequently the higher the person who commands, the more grievous is it to disobey him: so that it is more grievous to disobey God than man. Secondly, on the part of the things commanded. For the person commanding does not equally desire the fulfilment of all his commands: since every such person desires above all the end, and that which is nearest to the end. Wherefore disobedience is the more grievous, according as the unfulfilled commandment is more in the intention of the person commanding. As to the commandments of God, it is evident that the greater the good commanded, the more grievous the disobedience of that commandment, because since God’s will is essentially directed to the good, the greater the good the more does God wish it to be fulfilled.

Consequently he that disobeys the commandment of the love of God sins more grievously than one who disobeys the commandment of the love of our neighbor. On the other hand, man's will is not always directed to the greater good: hence, when we are bound by a mere precept of man, a sin is more grievous, not through setting aside a greater good, but through setting aside that which is more in the intention of the person commanding.

Accordingly the various degrees of disobedience must correspond with the various degrees of precepts: because the disobedience in which there is contempt of God's precept, from the very nature of disobedience is more grievous than a sin committed against a man, apart from the latter being a disobedience to God. And I say this because whoever sins against his neighbor acts also against God's commandment. And if the divine precept be contemned in a yet graver matter, the sin is still more grievous. The disobedience that contains contempt of a man's precept is less grievous than the sin which contemns the man who made the precept, because reverence for the person commanding should give rise to reverence for his command. In like manner a sin that directly involves contempt of God, such as blasphemy, or the like, is more grievous (even if we mentally separate the disobedience from the sin) than would be a sin involving contempt of God's commandment alone.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(2)-RO(1) — This comparison of Samuel is one, not of equality but of likeness, because disobedience redounds to the contempt of God just as idolatry does, though the latter does so more.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(2)-RO(2) — Not every disobedience is sin against the Holy Ghost, but only that which obstinacy is added: for it is not the contempt of any obstacle to sin that constitutes sin against the Holy Ghost, else the contempt of any good would be a sin against the Holy Ghost, since any good may hinder a man from committing sin. The sin against the Holy Ghost consists in the contempt of those goods which lead directly to repentance and the remission of sins.

P(2b)-Q(105)-A(2)-RO(3) — The first sin of our first parent, from which sin was transmitted to a men, was not disobedience considered as a special sin, but pride, from which then man proceeded to disobey. Hence the Apostle in these words seems to take disobedience in its relation to every sin.

QUESTION 106

OF THANKFULNESS OR GRATITUDE

(SIX ARTICLES)

We must now consider thankfulness or gratitude, and ingratitude. Concerning thankfulness there are six points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether thankfulness is a special virtue distinct from other virtues?
- (2) Who owes more thanks to God, the innocent or the penitent?
- (3) Whether man is always bound to give thanks for human favors?
- (4) Whether thanksgiving should be deferred?
- (5) Whether thanksgiving should be measured according to the favor received or the disposition of the giver?
- (6) Whether one ought to pay back more than one has received?

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(1)

***Whether thankfulness is a special virtue,
distinct from other virtues?***

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that thankfulness is not a special virtue, distinct from other virtue. For we have received the greatest benefits from God, and from our parents. Now the honor which we pay to God in return belongs to the virtue of religion, and the honor with which we repay our parents belongs to the virtue of piety. Therefore thankfulness or gratitude is not distinct from the other virtues.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, proportionate repayment belongs to commutative justice, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 4). Now the purpose of giving thanks is repayment (Ethic. 5,4). Therefore thanksgiving, which belongs to gratitude, is an act of justice. Therefore gratitude is not a special virtue, distinct from other virtues.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, acknowledgment of favor received is requisite for the preservation of friendship, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. viii, 13; ix, 1). Now friendship is associated with all the virtues, since they are the reason for which man is loved. Therefore thankfulness or gratitude, to which it belongs to repay favors received, is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Tully reckons thankfulness a special part of justice (De Invent. Rhet. ii).

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(1), Q(60), A(3)**), the nature of the debt to be paid must needs vary according to various causes giving rise to the debt, yet so that the greater always includes the lesser. Now the cause of debt is found primarily and chiefly in God, in that He is the first principle of all our goods: secondarily it is found in our father, because he is the proximate principle of our begetting and upbringing: thirdly it is found in the person that excels in dignity, from whom general favors proceed; fourthly it is found in a benefactor, from whom we have received particular and private favors, on account of which we are under particular obligation to him.

Accordingly, since what we owe God, or our father, or a person excelling in dignity, is not the same as what we owe a benefactor from whom we have received some particular favor, it follows that after religion, whereby we pay God due worship, and piety, whereby we worship our parents, and observance, whereby we worship persons excelling in dignity, there is thankfulness or gratitude, whereby we give thanks to our benefactors. And it is distinct from the foregoing virtues, just as each of these is distinct from the one that precedes, as falling short thereof.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(1)-RO(1) — Just as religion is superexcelling piety, so is it excelling thankfulness or gratitude: wherefore giving thanks to God was reckoned above (**Q(83), A(17)**) among things pertaining to religion.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(1)-RO(2) — Proportionate repayment belongs to commutative justice, when it answers to the legal due; for instance when it is contracted that so much be paid for so much. But the repayment that belongs to the virtue of thankfulness or gratitude answers to the moral

debt, and is paid spontaneously. Hence thanksgiving is less thankful when compelled, as Seneca observes (De Beneficiis iii).

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(1)-RO(3) — Since true friendship is based on virtue, whatever there is contrary to virtue in a friend is an obstacle to friendship, and whatever in him is virtuous is an incentive to friendship. In this way friendship is preserved by repayment of favors, although repayment of favors belongs specially to the virtue of gratitude.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(2)

*Whether the innocent is more bound
to give thanks to God than the penitent?*

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that the innocent is more bound to give thanks to God than the penitent. For the greater the gift one has received from God, the more one is bound to give Him thanks. Now the gift of innocence is greater than that of justice restored. Therefore it seems that the innocent is more bound to give thanks to God than the penitent.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, a man owes love to his benefactor just as he owes him gratitude. Now Augustine says (Confess. ii): “What man, weighing his own infirmity, would dare to ascribe his purity and innocence to his own strength; that so he should love Thee the less, as if he had less needed Thy mercy, whereby Thou remittest sins to those that turn to Thee?” And farther on he says: “And for this let him love Thee as much, yea and more, since by Whom he sees me to have been recovered from such deep torpor of sin, by Him he sees himself to have been from the like torpor of sin preserved.” Therefore the innocent is also more bound to give thanks than the penitent.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the more a gratuitous favor is continuous, the greater the thanksgiving due for it. Now the favor of divine grace is more continuous in the innocent than in the penitent. For Augustine says (Confess. iii): “To Thy grace I ascribe it, and to Thy mercy, that Thou hast melted away my sins as it were ice. To Thy grace I ascribe also whatsoever I have not done of evil; for what might I not have done?... Yea, all I confess to have been forgiven me, both what evils I

committed by my own wilfulness, and what by Thy guidance committed not.” Therefore the innocent is more bound to give thanks than the penitent.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is written (¹⁰⁷ Luke 7:43): “To whom more is forgiven, he loveth more [*Vulg.: ‘To whom less is forgiven, he loveth less’ ¹⁰⁸ Luke 7:47].” Therefore for the same reason he is bound to greater thanksgiving.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Thanksgiving [gratiarum actio] in the recipient corresponds to the favor [gratia] of the giver: so that when there is greater favor on the part of the giver, greater thanks are due on the part of the recipient. Now a favor is something bestowed “gratis”: wherefore on the part of the giver the favor may be greater on two counts. First, owing to the quantity of the thing given: and in this way the innocent owes greater thanksgiving, because he receives a greater gift from God, also, absolutely speaking, a more continuous gift, other things being equal. Secondly, a favor may be said to be greater, because it is given more gratuitously; and in this sense the penitent is more bound to give thanks than the innocent, because what he receives from God is more gratuitously given: since, whereas he was deserving of punishment, he has received grace. Wherefore, although the gift bestowed on the innocent is, considered absolutely, greater, yet the gift bestowed on the penitent is greater in relation to him: even as a small gift bestowed on a poor man is greater to him than a great gift is to a rich man. And since actions are about singulars, in matters of action, we have to take note of what is such here and now, rather than of what is such absolutely, as the Philosopher observes (Ethic. iii) in treating of the voluntary and the involuntary.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)

Whether a man is bound to give thanks to every benefactor?

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that the a man is not bound to give thanks to every benefactor. For a man may benefit himself just as he may harm himself, according to Eccclus. 14:5, “He that is evil to himself, to

whom will he be good?" But a man cannot thank himself, since thanksgiving seems to pass from one person to another. Therefore thanksgiving is not due to every benefactor.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, gratitude is a repayment of an act of grace. But some favors are granted without grace, and are rudely, slowly and grudgingly given. Therefore gratitude is not always due to a benefactor.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, no thanks are due to one who works for his own profit. But sometimes people bestow favors for their own profit. Therefore thanks are not due to them.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-O(4) — Further, no thanks are due to a slave, for all that he is belongs to his master. Yet sometimes a slave does a good turn to his master. Therefore gratitude is not due to every benefactor .

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-O(5) — Further, no one is bound to do what he cannot do equitably and advantageously. Now it happens at times that the benefactor is very well off, and it would be of no advantage to him to be repaid for a favor he has bestowed. Again it happens sometimes that the benefactor from being virtuous has become wicked, so that it would not seem equitable to repay him. Also the recipient of a favor may be a poor man, and is quite unable to repay. Therefore seemingly a man is not always bound to repayment for favors received.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-O(6) — Further, no one is bound to do for another what is inexpedient and hurtful to him. Now sometimes it happens that repayment of a favor would be hurtful or useless to the person repaid. Therefore favors are not always to be repaid by gratitude.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~5:18~~ 1 Thessalonians 5:18): "In all things give thanks."

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Every effect turns naturally to its cause; wherefore Dionysius says (Div. Nom. i) that "God turns all things to Himself because He is the cause of all": for the effect must needs always be directed to the end of the agent. Now it is evident that a benefactor, as such, is cause of the beneficiary. Hence the natural order requires that he who has received a favor should, by repaying the favor, turn to his benefactor according to the mode of each. And, as stated above with regard

to a father (**Q(31)**, **A(3)**; **Q(101)**, **A(2)**), a man owes his benefactor, as such, honor and reverence, since the latter stands to him in the relation of principle; but accidentally he owes him assistance or support, if he need it.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-RO(1) — In the words of Seneca (1 Benef. v), “just as a man is liberal who gives not to himself but to others, and gracious who forgives not himself but others, and merciful who is moved, not by his own misfortunes but by another’s, so too, no man confers a favor on himself, he is but following the bent of his nature, which moves him to resist what hurts him, and to seek what is profitable.” Wherefore in things that one does for oneself, there is no place for gratitude or ingratitude, since a man cannot deny himself a thing except by keeping it. Nevertheless things which are properly spoken of in relation to others are spoken of metaphorically in relation to oneself, as the Philosopher states regarding justice (Ethic. v, 11), in so far, to wit, as the various parts of man are considered as though they were various persons.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-RO(2) — It is the mark of a happy disposition to see good rather than evil. Wherefore if someone has conferred a favor, not as he ought to have conferred it, the recipient should not for that reason withhold his thanks. Yet he owes less thanks, than if the favor had been conferred duly, since in fact the favor is less, for, as Seneca remarks (De Benef. ii.) “promptness enhances, delay discounts a favor.”

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-RO(3) — As Seneca observes (De Benef. vi), “it matters much whether a person does a kindness to us for his own sake, or for ours, or for both his and ours. He that considers himself only, and benefits because cannot otherwise benefit himself, seems to me like a man who seeks fodder for his cattle.” And farther on: “If he has done it for me in common with himself, having both of us in his mind, I am ungrateful and not merely unjust, unless I rejoice that what was profitable to him is profitable to me also. It is the height of malevolence to refuse to recognize a kindness, unless the giver has been the loser thereby.”

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-RO(4) — As Seneca observes (De Benef. iii), “when a slave does what is wont to be demanded of a slave, it is part of his service: when he does more than a slave is bound to do, it is a favor: for as soon as he does anything from a motive of friendship, if indeed that be his motive,

it is no longer called service.” Wherefore gratitude is due even to a slave, when he does more than his duty.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-RO(5) — A poor man is certainly not ungrateful if he does what he can. For since kindness depends on the heart rather than on the deed, so too gratitude depends chiefly the heart. Hence Seneca says (De Benef. ii): “Who receives a favor gratefully, has already begun to pay it back: and that we are grateful for favors received should be shown by the outpourings of the heart, not only in his hearing but everywhere.” From this it is evident that however well off a man may be, it is possible to thank him for his kindness by showing him reverence and honor. Wherefore the Philosopher says (Ethic. viii, 14): “He that abounds should be repaid with honor, he that is in want should be repaid with money”: and Seneca writes (De Benef. vi): “There are many ways of repaying those who are well off, whatever we happen to owe them; such as good advice, frequent fellowship, affable and pleasant conversation without flattery.” Therefore there is no need for a man to desire neediness or distress in his benefactor before repaying his kindness, because, as Seneca says (De Benef. vi), “it were inhuman to desire this in one from whom you have received no favor; how much more so to desire it in one whose kindness has made you his debtor!”

If, however, the benefactor has lapsed from virtue, nevertheless he should be repaid according to his state, that he may return to virtue if possible. But if he be so wicked as to be incurable, then his heart has changed, and consequently no repayment is due for his kindness, as heretofore. And yet, as far as it possible without sin, the kindness he has shown should be held in memory, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. ix, 3).

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(3)-RO(6) — As stated in the preceding reply, repayment of a favor depends chiefly on the affection of the heart: wherefore repayment should be made in such a way as to prove most beneficial. If, however, through the benefactor’s carelessness it prove detrimental to him, this is not imputed to the person who repays him, as Seneca observes (De Benef. vii): “It is my duty to repay, and not to keep back and safeguard my repayment.”

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(4)***Whether a man is bound to repay a favor at once?***

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that a man is bound to repay a favor at once. For we are bound to restore at once what we owe, unless the term be fixed. Now there is no term prescribed for the repayment of favors, and yet this repayment is a duty, as stated above (**A(3)**). Therefore a man is bound to repay a favor at once.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, a good action would seem to be all the more praiseworthy according as it is done with greater earnestness. Now earnestness seems to make a man do his duty without any delay. Therefore it is apparently more praiseworthy to repay a favor at once.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, Seneca says (De Benef. ii) that “it is proper to a benefactor to act freely and quickly.” Now repayment ought to equal the favor received. Therefore it should be done at once.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Seneca says (De Benef. iv): “He that hastens to repay, is animated with a sense, not of gratitude but of indebtedness.”

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Just as in conferring a favor two things are to be considered, namely, the affection of the heart and the gift, so also must these things be considered in repaying the favor. As regards the affection of the heart, repayment should be made at once, wherefore Seneca says (De Benef. ii): “Do you wish to repay a favor? Receive it graciously.” As regards the gift, one ought to wait until such a time as will be convenient to the benefactor. In fact, if instead of choosing a convenient time, one wished to repay at once, favor for favor, it would not seem to be a virtuous, but a constrained repayment. For, as Seneca observes (De Benef. iv), “he that wishes to repay too soon, is an unwilling debtor, and an unwilling debtor is ungrateful.”

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(4)-RO(1) — A legal debt must be paid at once, else the equality of justice would not be preserved, if one kept another’s property without his consent. But a moral debt depends on the equity of the debtor:

and therefore it should be repaid in due time according as the rectitude of virtue demands.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(4)-RO(2) — Earnestness of the will is not virtuous unless it be regulated by reason; wherefore it is not praiseworthy to forestall the proper time through earnestness.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(4)-RO(3) — Favors also should be conferred at a convenient time and one should no longer delay when the convenient time comes; and the same is to be observed in repaying favors.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(5)

Whether in giving thanks we should look at the benefactor's disposition or at the deed?

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(5)-O(1) — It seems that in repaying favors we should not look at the benefactor's disposition but at the deed. For repayment is due to beneficence, and beneficence consists in deeds, as the word itself denotes. Therefore in repaying favors we should look at the deed.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, thanksgiving, whereby we repay favors, is a part of justice. But justice considers equality between giving and taking. Therefore also in repaying favors we should consider the deed rather than the disposition of the benefactor.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, no one can consider what he does not know. Now God alone knows the interior disposition. Therefore it is impossible to repay a favor according to the benefactor's disposition.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Seneca says (De Benef. i): "We are sometimes under a greater obligation to one who has given little with a large heart, and has bestowed a small favor, yet willingly."

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(5) — *I answer that*, The repayment of a favor may belong to three virtues, namely, justice, gratitude and friendship. It belongs to justice when the repayment has the character of a legal debt, as in a loan and the like: and in such cases repayment must be made according to the quantity received.

On the other hand, repayment of a favor belongs, though in different ways, to friendship and likewise to the virtue of gratitude when it has the character of a moral debt. For in the repayment of friendship we have to consider the cause of friendship; so that in the friendship that is based on the useful, repayment should be made according to the usefulness accruing from the favor conferred, and in the friendship based on virtue repayment should be made with regard for the choice or disposition of the giver, since this is the chief requisite of virtue, as stated in *Ethic.* viii, 13. And likewise, since gratitude regards the favor inasmuch as it is bestowed gratis, and this regards the disposition of the giver, it follows again that repayment of a favor depends more on the disposition of the giver than on the effect.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(5)-RO(1) — Every moral act depends on the will. Hence a kindly action, in so far as it is praiseworthy and is deserving of gratitude, consists materially in the thing done, but formally and chiefly in the will. Hence Seneca says (*De Benef.* i): “A kindly action consists not in deed or gift, but in the disposition of the giver or doer.”

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(5)-RO(2) — Gratitude is a part of justice, not indeed as a species is part of a genus, but by a kind of reduction to the genus of justice, as stated above (**Q(80)**). Hence it does not follow that we shall find the same kind of debt in both virtues.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(5)-RO(3) — God alone sees man’s disposition in itself: but in so far as it is shown by certain signs, man also can know it. It is thus that a benefactor’s disposition is known by the way in which he does the kindly action, for instance through his doing it joyfully and readily.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(6)

***Whether the repayment of gratitude
should surpass the favor received?***

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(6)-O(1) — It seems that there is no need for the repayment of gratitude to surpass the favor received. For it is not possible to make even equal repayment to some, for instance, one’s parents, as the Philosopher states (*Ethic.* viii, 14). Now virtue does not attempt the

impossible. Therefore gratitude for a favor does not tend to something yet greater.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, if one person repays another more than he has received by his favor, by that very fact he gives him something his turn, as it were. But the latter owes him repayment for the favor which in his turn the former has conferred on him. Therefore he that first conferred a favor will be bound to a yet greater repayment, and so on indefinitely. Now virtue does not strive at the indefinite, since “the indefinite removes the nature of good” (Metaph. ii, text. 8). Therefore repayment of gratitude should not surpass the favor received.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, justice consists in equality. But “more” is excess of equality. Since therefore excess is sinful in every virtue, it seems that to repay more than the favor received is sinful and opposed to justice.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. v, 5): “We should repay those who are gracious to us, by being gracious to them return,” and this is done by repaying more than we have received. Therefore gratitude should incline to do something greater.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(6) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(5)**), gratitude regards the favor received according the intention of the benefactor; who seems be deserving of praise, chiefly for having conferred the favor gratis without being bound to do so. Wherefore the beneficiary is under a moral obligation to bestow something gratis in return. Now he does not seem to bestow something gratis, unless he exceeds the quantity of the favor received: because so long as he repays less or an equivalent, he would seem to do nothing gratis, but only to return what he has received. Therefore gratitude always inclines, as far as possible, to pay back something more.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(6)-RO(1) — As stated above (**A(3)**, ad 5; **A(5)**), in repaying favors we must consider the disposition rather than the deed. Accordingly, if we consider the effect of beneficence, which a son receives from his parents namely, to be and to live, the son cannot make an equal repayment, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. viii, 14). But if we consider the will of the giver and of the repayer, then it is possible for the son to pay back something greater to his father, as Seneca declares (De Benef. iii).

If, however, he were unable to do so, the will to pay back would be sufficient for gratitude.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(6)-RO(2) — The debt of gratitude flows from charity, which the more it is paid the more it is due, according to ~~618~~ Romans 13:8, “Owe no man anything, but to love one another.” Wherefore it is not unreasonable if the obligation of gratitude has no limit.

P(2b)-Q(106)-A(6)-RO(3) — As in injustice, which is a cardinal virtue, we consider equality of things, so in gratitude we consider equality of wills. For while on the one hand the benefactor of his own free-will gave something he was not bound to give, so on the other hand the beneficiary repays something over and above what he has received.

QUESTION 107

OF INGRATITUDE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider ingratitude, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether ingratitude is always a sin?
- (2) Whether ingratitude is a special sin?
- (3) Whether every act of ingratitude is a mortal sin?
- (4) Whether favors should be withdrawn from the ungrateful?

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(1)

Whether ingratitude is always a sin?

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that ingratitude is not always a sin. For Seneca says (De Benef. iii) that “he who does not repay a favor is ungrateful.” But sometimes it is impossible to repay a favor without sinning, for instance if one man has helped another to commit a sin. Therefore, since it is not a sin to refrain from sinning, it seems that ingratitude is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, every sin is in the power of the person who commits it: because, according to Augustine (De Lib. Arb. iii; Retract. i), “no man sins in what he cannot avoid.” Now sometimes it is not in the power of the sinner to avoid ingratitude, for instance when he has not the means of repaying. Again forgetfulness is not in our power, and yet Seneca declares (De Benef. iii) that “to forget a kindness is the height of ingratitude.” Therefore ingratitude is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, there would seem to be no repayment in being unwilling to owe anything, according to the Apostle (Romans 13:8), “Owe no man anything.” Yet “an unwilling debtor is

ungrateful,” as Seneca declares (De Benef. iv). Therefore ingratitude is not always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Ingratitude is reckoned among other sins (² Timothy 3:2), where it is written: “Disobedient to parents, ungrateful, wicked.” etc.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(106), A(4)**, ad 1, **A(6)**) a debt of gratitude is a moral debt required by virtue. Now a thing is a sin from the fact of its being contrary to virtue. Wherefore it is evident that every ingratitude is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(1)-RO(1) — Gratitude regards a favor received: and he that helps another to commit a sin does him not a favor but an injury: and so no thanks are due to him, except perhaps on account of his good will, supposing him to have been deceived, and to have thought to help him in doing good, whereas he helped him to sin. In such a case the repayment due to him is not that he should be helped to commit a sin, because this would be repaying not good but evil, and this is contrary to gratitude.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(1)-RO(2) — No man is excused from ingratitude through inability to repay, for the very reason that the mere will suffices for the repayment of the debt of gratitude, as stated above (**Q(106), A(6)**, ad 1).

Forgetfulness of a favor received amounts to ingratitude, not indeed the forgetfulness that arises from a natural defect, that is not subject to the will, but that which arises from negligence. For, as Seneca observes (De Benef. iii), “when forgetfulness of favors lays hold of a man, he has apparently given little thought to their repayment.”

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(1)-RO(3) — The debt of gratitude flows from the debt of love, and from the latter no man should wish to be free. Hence that anyone should owe this debt unwillingly seems to arise from lack of love for his benefactor.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(2)

Whether ingratitude is a special sin?

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that ingratitude is not a special sin. For whoever sins acts against God his sovereign benefactor. But this pertains to ingratitude. Therefore ingratitude is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, no special sin is contained under different kinds of sin. But one can be ungrateful by committing different kinds of sin, for instance by calumny, theft, or something similar committed against a benefactor. Therefore ingratitude is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, Seneca writes (De Benef. iii): “It is ungrateful to take no notice of a kindness, it is ungrateful not to repay one, but it is the height of ingratitude to forget it.” Now these do not seem to belong to the same species of sin. Therefore ingratitude is not a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Ingratitude is opposed to gratitude or thankfulness, which is a special virtue. Therefore it is a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Every vice is denominated from a deficiency of virtue, because deficiency is more opposed to virtue: thus illiberality is more opposed to liberality than prodigality is. Now a vice may be opposed to the virtue of gratitude by way of excess, for instance if one were to show gratitude for things for which gratitude is not due, or sooner than it is due, as stated above (**Q(106), A(4)**). But still more opposed to gratitude is the vice denoting deficiency of gratitude, because the virtue of gratitude, as stated above (**Q(106), A(6)**), inclines to return something more. Wherefore ingratitude is properly denominated from being a deficiency of gratitude. Now every deficiency or privation takes its species from the opposite habit: for blindness and deafness differ according to the difference of sight and hearing. Therefore just as gratitude or thankfulness is one special virtue, so also is ingratitude one special sin.

It has, however, various degrees corresponding in their order to the things required for gratitude. The first of these is to recognize the favor received, the second to express one’s appreciation and thanks, and the third to repay the favor at a suitable place and time according to one’s means. And

since what is last in the order of generation is first in the order of destruction, it follows that the first degree of ingratitude is when a man fails to repay a favor, the second when he declines to notice or indicate that he has received a favor, while the third and supreme degree is when a man fails to recognize the reception of a favor, whether by forgetting it or in any other way. Moreover, since opposite affirmation includes negation, it follows that it belongs to the first degree of ingratitude to return evil for good, to the second to find fault with a favor received, and to the third to esteem kindness as though it were unkindness.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(2)-RO(1) — In every sin there is material ingratitude to God, inasmuch as a man does something that may pertain to ingratitude. But formal ingratitude is when a favor is actually contemned, and this is a special sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(2)-RO(2) — Nothing hinders the formal aspect of some special sin from being found materially in several kinds of sin, and in this way the aspect of ingratitude is to be found in many kinds of sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(2)-RO(3) — These three are not different species but different degrees of one special sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(3)

Whether ingratitude is always a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that ingratitude is always a mortal sin. For one ought to be grateful to God above all. But one is not ungrateful to God by committing a venial sin: else every man would be guilty of ingratitude. Therefore no ingratitude is a venial sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, a sin is mortal through being contrary to charity, as stated above (**Q(24)**, **A(12)**). But ingratitude is contrary to charity, since the debt of gratitude proceeds from that virtue, as stated above (**Q(106)**, **A(1)**, ad 3; **A(6)**, ad 2). Therefore ingratitude is always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, Seneca says (De Benef. ii): “Between the giver and the receiver of a favor there is this law, that the former should

forthwith forget having given, and the latter should never forget having received.” Now, seemingly, the reason why the giver should forget is that he may be unaware of the sin of the recipient, should the latter prove ungrateful; and there would be no necessity for that if ingratitude were a slight sin. Therefore ingratitude is always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(3)-O(4) — *On the contrary*, No one should be put in the way of committing a mortal sin. Yet, according to Seneca (De Benef. ii), “sometimes it is necessary to deceive the person who receives assistance, in order that he may receive without knowing from whom he has received.” But this would seem to put the recipient in the way of ingratitude. Therefore ingratitude is not always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As appears from what we have said above (**A(2)**), a man may be ungrateful in two ways: first, by mere omission, for instance by failing to recognize the favor received, or to express his appreciation of it or to pay something in return, and this is not always a mortal sin, because, as stated above (**Q(106)**, **A(6)**), the debt of gratitude requires a man to make a liberal return, which, however, he is not bound to do; wherefore if he fail to do so, he does not sin mortally. It is nevertheless a venial sin, because it arises either from some kind of negligence or from some disinclination to virtue in him. And yet ingratitude of this kind may happen to be a mortal sin, by reason either of inward contempt, or of the kind of thing withheld, this being needful to the benefactor, either simply, or in some case of necessity.

Secondly, a man may be ungrateful, because he not only omits to pay the debt of gratitude, but does the contrary. This again is sometimes mortal and sometimes a venial sin, according to the kind of thing that is done.

It must be observed, however, that when ingratitude arises from a mortal sin, it has the perfect character of ingratitude, and when it arises from venial sin, it has the imperfect character.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(3)-RO(1) — By committing a venial sin one is not ungrateful to God to the extent of incurring the guilt of perfect ingratitude: but there is something of ingratitude in a venial sin, in so far as it removes a virtuous act of obedience to God.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(3)-RO(2) — When ingratitude is a venial sin it is not contrary to, but beside charity: since it does not destroy the habit of charity, but excludes some act thereof.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(3)-RO(3) — Seneca also says (De Benef. vii): “When we say that a man after conferring a favor should forget about it, it is a mistake to suppose that we mean him to shake off the recollection of a thing so very praiseworthy. When we say: He must not remember it, we mean that he must not publish it abroad and boast about it.”

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(3)-RO(4) — He that is unaware of a favor conferred on him is not ungrateful, if he fails to repay it, provided he be prepared to do so if he knew. It is nevertheless commendable at times that the object of a favor should remain in ignorance of it, both in order to avoid vainglory, as when Blessed Nicolas threw gold into a house secretly, wishing to avoid popularity: and because the kindness is all the greater through the benefactor wishing not to shame the person on whom he is conferring the favor.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(4)

Whether favors should be withheld from the ungrateful?

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that favors should be withheld from the ungrateful. For it is written (Wis. 16:29): “The hope of the unthankful shall melt away as the winter’s ice.” But this hope would not melt away unless favors were withheld from him. Therefore favors should be withheld from the ungrateful.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, no one should afford another an occasion of committing sin. But the ungrateful in receiving a favor is given an occasion of ingratitude. Therefore favors should not be bestowed on the ungrateful.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, “By what things a man sinneth, by the same also he is tormented” (Wis. 11:17). Now he that is ungrateful when he receives a favor sins against the favor. Therefore he should be deprived of the favor.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~and~~ Luke 6:35) that “the Highest... is kind to the unthankful, and to the evil.” Now we should prove ourselves His children by imitating Him (~~and~~ Luke 6:36). Therefore we should not withhold favors from the ungrateful.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(4) — *I answer that*, There are two points to be considered with regard to an ungrateful person. The first is what he deserves to suffer and thus it is certain that he deserves to be deprived of our favor. The second is, what ought his benefactor to do? For in the first place he should not easily judge him to be ungrateful, since, as Seneca remarks (De Benef. iii), “a man is often grateful although he repays not,” because perhaps he has not the means or the opportunity of repaying. Secondly, he should be inclined to turn his ungratefulness into gratitude, and if he does not achieve this by being kind to him once, he may by being so a second time. If, however, the more he repeats his favors, the more ungrateful and evil the other becomes, he should cease from bestowing his favors upon him.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(4)-RO(1) — The passage quoted speaks of what the ungrateful man deserves to suffer.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(4)-RO(2) — He that bestows a favor on an ungrateful person affords him an occasion not of sin but of gratitude and love. And if the recipient takes therefrom an occasion of ingratitude, this is not to be imputed to the bestower.

P(2b)-Q(107)-A(4)-RO(3) — He that bestows a favor must not at once act the part of a punisher of ingratitude, but rather that of a kindly physician, by healing the ingratitude with repeated favors.

QUESTION 108

OF VENGEANCE

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider vengeance, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether vengeance is lawful?
- (2) Whether it is a special virtue?
- (3) Of the manner of taking vengeance;
- (4) On whom should vengeance be taken?

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1)

Whether vengeance is lawful?

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that vengeance is not lawful. For whoever usurps what is God's sins. But vengeance belongs to God, for it is written (^{<622b>}Deuteronomy 32:35, ^{<622b>}Romans 12:19): "Revenge to Me, and I will repay." Therefore all vengeance is unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, he that takes vengeance on a man does not bear with him. But we ought to bear with the wicked, for a gloss on Cant 2:2, "As the lily among the thorns," says: "He is not a good man that cannot bear with a wicked one." Therefore we should not take vengeance on the wicked.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, vengeance is taken by inflicting punishment, which is the cause of servile fear. But the New Law is not a law of fear, but of love, as Augustine states (Contra Adamant. xvii). Therefore at least in the New Testament all vengeance is unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, a man is said to avenge himself when he takes revenge for wrongs inflicted on himself. But, seemingly, it is

unlawful even for a judge to punish those who have wronged him: for Chrysostom [*Cf. Opus Imperfectum, Hom. v in Matth., falsely ascribed to St. Chrysostom] says: “Let us learn after Christ’s example to bear our own wrongs with magnanimity, yet not to suffer God’s wrongs, not even by listening to them.” Therefore vengeance seems to be unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1)-O(5) — Further, the sin of a multitude is more harmful than the sin of only one: for it is written (Ecclus. 26:5-7): “Of three things my heart hath been afraid... the accusation of a city, and the gathering together of the people, and a false calumny.” But vengeance should not be taken on the sin of a multitude, for a gloss on ⁴¹³⁹Matthew 13:29,30, “Lest perhaps... you root up the wheat... suffer both to grow,” says that “a multitude should not be excommunicated, nor should the sovereign.” Neither therefore is any other vengeance lawful.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, We should look to God for nothing save what is good and lawful. But we are to look to God for vengeance on His enemies: for it is written (⁴¹⁴⁰Luke 18:7): “Will not God revenge His elect who cry to Him day and night?” as if to say: “He will indeed.” Therefore vengeance is not essentially evil and unlawful.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Vengeance consists in the infliction of a penal evil on one who has sinned. Accordingly, in the matter of vengeance, we must consider the mind of the avenger. For if his intention is directed chiefly to the evil of the person on whom he takes vengeance and rests there, then his vengeance is altogether unlawful: because to take pleasure in another’s evil belongs to hatred, which is contrary to the charity whereby we are bound to love all men. Nor is it an excuse that he intends the evil of one who has unjustly inflicted evil on him, as neither is a man excused for hating one that hates him: for a man may not sin against another just because the latter has already sinned against him, since this is to be overcome by evil, which was forbidden by the Apostle, who says (⁴¹⁴¹Romans 12:21):

“Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil by good.”

If, however, the avenger’s intention be directed chiefly to some good, to be obtained by means of the punishment of the person who has sinned (for instance that the sinner may amend, or at least that he may be restrained

and others be not disturbed, that justice may be upheld, and God honored), then vengeance may be lawful, provided other due circumstances be observed.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1)-RO(1) — He who takes vengeance on the wicked in keeping with his rank and position does not usurp what belongs to God but makes use of the power granted him by God. For it is written (^{<130>}Romans 13:4) of the earthly prince that “he is God’s minister, an avenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.” If, however, a man takes vengeance outside the order of divine appointment, he usurps what is God’s and therefore sins.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1)-RO(2) — The good bear with the wicked by enduring patiently, and in due manner, the wrongs they themselves receive from them: but they do not bear with them as to endure the wrongs they inflict on God and their neighbor. For Chrysostom [*Cf. *Opus Imperfectum*, Hom. v in Matth., falsely ascribed to St. Chrysostom] says: “It is praiseworthy to be patient under our own wrongs, but to overlook God’s wrongs is most wicked.”

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1)-RO(3) — The law of the Gospel is the law of love, and therefore those who do good out of love, and who alone properly belong to the Gospel, ought not to be terrorized by means of punishment, but only those who are not moved by love to do good, and who, though they belong to the Church outwardly, do not belong to it in merit.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1)-RO(4) — Sometimes a wrong done to a person reflects on God and the Church: and then it is the duty of that person to avenge the wrong. For example, Elias made fire descend on those who were come to seize him (^{<100>}2 Kings 1); likewise Eliseus cursed the boys that mocked him (^{<100>}2 Kings 2); and Pope Sylverius excommunicated those who sent him into exile (XXIII, Q. iv, Cap. Guilisarius). But in so far as the wrong inflicted on a man affects his person, he should bear it patiently if this be expedient. For these precepts of patience are to be understood as referring to preparedness of the mind, as Augustine states (De Serm. Dom. in Monte i).

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(1)-RO(5) — When the whole multitude sins, vengeance must be taken on them, either in respect of the whole multitude — thus

the Egyptians were drowned in the Red Sea while they were pursuing the children of Israel (⁽¹⁹⁾Exodus 14), and the people of Sodom were entirely destroyed (⁽¹⁹⁾Genesis 19) — or as regards part of the multitude, as may be seen in the punishment of those who worshipped the calf.

Sometimes, however, if there is hope of many making amends, the severity of vengeance should be brought to bear on a few of the principals, whose punishment fills the rest with fear; thus the Lord (⁽¹⁹⁾Numbers 25) commanded the princes of the people to be hanged for the sin of the multitude.

On the other hand, if it is not the whole but only a part of the multitude that has sinned, then if the guilty can be separated from the innocent, vengeance should be wrought on them: provided, however, that this can be done without scandal to others; else the multitude should be spared and severity foregone. The same applies to the sovereign, whom the multitude follow. For his sin should be borne with, if it cannot be punished without scandal to the multitude: unless indeed his sin were such, that it would do more harm to the multitude, either spiritually or temporally, than would the scandal that was feared to arise from his punishment.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(2)

Whether vengeance is a special virtue?

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that vengeance is not a special and distinct virtue. For just as the good are rewarded for their good deeds, so are the wicked punished for their evil deeds. Now the rewarding of the good does not belong to a special virtue, but is an act of commutative justice. Therefore in the same way vengeance should not be accounted a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, there is no need to appoint a special virtue for an act to which a man is sufficiently disposed by the other virtues. Now man is sufficiently disposed by the virtues of fortitude or zeal to avenge evil. Therefore vengeance should not be reckoned a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, there is a special vice opposed to every special virtue. But seemingly no special vice is opposed to vengeance. Therefore it is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Tully (De Invent. Rhet. ii) reckons it a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As the Philosopher states (Ethic. ii, 1), aptitude to virtue is in us by nature, but the complement of virtue is in us through habituation or some other cause. Hence it is evident that virtues perfect us so that we follow in due manner our natural inclinations, which belong to the natural right. Wherefore to every definite natural inclination there corresponds a special virtue. Now there is a special inclination of nature to remove harm, for which reason animals have the irascible power distinct from the concupiscible. Man resists harm by defending himself against wrongs, lest they be inflicted on him, or he avenges those which have already been inflicted on him, with the intention, not of harming, but of removing the harm done. And this belongs to vengeance, for Tully says (De Invent. Rhet. ii) that by “vengeance we resist force, or wrong, and in general whatever is obscure” [*‘Obscurum’ Cicero wrote ‘obfuturum’ but the sense is the same as St. Thomas gives in the parenthesis] “(i.e. derogatory), either by self-defense or by avenging it.” Therefore vengeance is a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(2)-RO(1) — Just as repayment of a legal debt belongs to commutative justice, and as repayment of a moral debt, arising from the bestowal of a particular favor, belongs to the virtue of gratitude, so too the punishment of sins, so far as it is the concern of public justice, is an act of commutative justice; while so far as it is concerned in defending the rights of the individual by whom a wrong is resisted, it belongs to the virtue of revenge.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(2)-RO(2) — Fortitude disposes to vengeance by removing an obstacle thereto, namely, fear of an imminent danger. Zeal, as denoting the fervor of love, signifies the primary root of vengeance, in so far as a man avenges the wrong done to God and his neighbor, because charity makes him regard them as his own. Now every act of virtue proceeds from charity as its root, since, according to Gregory (Hom. xxvii

in Ev.), “there are no green leaves on the bough of good works, unless charity be the root.”

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(2)-RO(3) — Two vices are opposed to vengeance: one by way of excess, namely, the sin of cruelty or brutality, which exceeds the measure in punishing: while the other is a vice by way of deficiency and consists in being remiss in punishing, wherefore it is written (⁴¹³⁹Proverbs 13:24): “He that spareth the rod hateth his son.” But the virtue of vengeance consists in observing the due measure of vengeance with regard to all the circumstances.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(3)

Whether vengeance should be wrought by means of punishments customary among men?

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that vengeance should not be wrought by means of punishments customary among men. For to put a man to death is to uproot him. But our Lord forbade (⁴¹³⁹Matthew 13:29) the uprooting of the cockle, whereby the children of the wicked one are signified. Therefore sinners should not be put to death.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, all who sin mortally seem to be deserving of the same punishment. Therefore if some who sin mortally are punished with death, it seems that all such persons should be punished with death: and this is evidently false.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, to punish a man publicly for his sin seems to publish his sin: and this would seem to have a harmful effect on the multitude, since the example of sin is taken by them as an occasion for sin. Therefore it seems that the punishment of death should not be inflicted for a sin.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, These punishments are fixed by the divine law as appears from what we have said above (**P(1), Q(105), A(2)**).

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Vengeance is lawful and virtuous so far as it tends to the prevention of evil. Now some who are not influenced

by motive of virtue are prevented from committing sin, through fear of losing those things which they love more than those they obtain by sinning, else fear would be no restraint to sin. Consequently vengeance for sin should be taken by depriving a man of what he loves most. Now the things which man loves most are life, bodily safety, his own freedom, and external goods such as riches, his country and his good name. Wherefore, according to Augustine's reckoning (De Civ. Dei xxi), "Tully writes that the laws recognize eight kinds of punishment": namely, "death," whereby man is deprived of life; "stripes," "retaliation," or the loss of eye for eye, whereby man forfeits his bodily safety; "slavery," and "imprisonment," whereby he is deprived of freedom; "exile" whereby he is banished from his country; "fines," whereby he is mulcted in his riches; "ignominy," whereby he loses his good name.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(3)-RO(1) — Our Lord forbids the uprooting of the cockle, when there is fear lest the wheat be uprooted together with it. But sometimes the wicked can be uprooted by death, not only without danger, but even with great profit, to the good. Wherefore in such a case the punishment of death may be inflicted on sinners.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(3)-RO(2) — All who sin mortally are deserving of eternal death, as regards future retribution, which is in accordance with the truth of the divine judgment. But the punishments of this life are more of a medicinal character; wherefore the punishment of death is inflicted on those sins alone which conduce to the grave undoing of others.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(3)-RO(3) — The very fact that the punishment, whether of death or of any kind that is fearsome to man, is made known at the same time as the sin, makes man's will avers to sin: because the fear of punishment is greater than the enticement of the example of sin.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4)

Whether vengeance should be taken on those who have sinned involuntarily?

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that vengeance should be taken on those who have sinned involuntarily. For the will of one man does not

follow from the will of another. Yet one man is punished for another, according to ^{<1215>}Exodus 20:5,

“I am... God... jealous, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation.”

Thus for the sin of Cham, his son Chanaan was curse (^{<0025>}Genesis 9:25) and for the sin of Giezi, his descendants were struck with leprosy (^{<1210>}2 Kings 5). Again the blood of Christ lays the descendants of the Jews under the ban of punishment, for they said (^{<1225>}Matthew 27:25): “His blood be upon us and upon our children.” Moreover we read (^{<0010>}Joshua 7) that the people of Israel were delivered into the hands of their enemies for the sin of Achan, and that the same people were overthrown by the Philistines on account of the sin of the sons of Heli (^{<0001>}1 Samuel 4). Therefore a person is to be punished without having deserved it voluntarily.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, nothing is voluntary except what is in a man’s power. But sometimes a man is punished for what is not in his power; thus a man is removed from the administration of the Church on account of being infected with leprosy; and a Church ceases to be an episcopal see on account of the depravity or evil of the people. Therefore vengeance is taken not only for voluntary sins.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, ignorance makes an act involuntary. Now vengeance is sometimes taken on the ignorant. Thus the children of the people of Sodom, though they were in invincible ignorance, perished with their parents (^{<0010>}Genesis 19). Again, for the sin of Dathan and Abiron their children were swallowed up together with them (^{<0010>}Numbers 16). Moreover, dumb animals, which are devoid of reason, were commanded to be slain on account of the sin of the Amalekites (^{<0001>}1 Samuel 15). Therefore vengeance is sometimes taken on those who have deserved it involuntarily.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4)-O(4) — Further, compulsion is most opposed to voluntariness. But a man does not escape the debt of punishment through being compelled by fear to commit a sin. Therefore vengeance is sometimes taken on those who have deserved it involuntarily.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4)-O(5) — Further Ambrose says on ^{<0010>}Luke 5 that “the ship in which Judas was, was in distress”; wherefore “Peter, who was

calm in the security of his own merits, was in distress about those of others.” But Peter did not will the sin of Judas. Therefore a person is sometimes punished without having voluntarily deserved it.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Punishment is due to sin. But every sin is voluntary according to Augustine (De Lib. Arb. iii; Retract. i). Therefore vengeance should be taken only on those who have deserved it voluntarily.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4) — *I answer that*, Punishment may be considered in two ways. First, under the aspect of punishment, and in this way punishment is not due save for sin, because by means of punishment the equality of justice is restored, in so far as he who by sinning has exceeded in following his own will suffers something that is contrary to this will. Wherefore, since every sin is voluntary, not excluding original sin, as stated above (**P(1), Q(81), A(1)**), it follows that no one is punished in this way, except for something done voluntarily. Secondly, punishment may be considered as a medicine, not only healing the past sin, but also preserving from future sin, or conducing to some good, and in this way a person is sometimes punished without any fault of his own, yet not without cause.

It must, however, be observed that a medicine never removes a greater good in order to promote a lesser; thus the medicine of the body never blinds the eye, in order to repair the heel: yet sometimes it is harmful in lesser things that it may be helpful in things of greater consequence. And since spiritual goods are of the greatest consequence, while temporal goods are least important, sometimes a person is punished in his temporal goods without any fault of his own. Such are many of the punishments inflicted by God in this present life for our humiliation or probation. But no one is punished in spiritual goods without any fault on his part, neither in this nor in the future life, because in the latter punishment is not medicinal, but a result of spiritual condemnation.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4)-RO(1) — A man is never condemned to a spiritual punishment for another man’s sin, because spiritual punishment affects the soul, in respect of which each man is master of himself. But sometimes a man is condemned to punishment in temporal matters for the sin of another, and this for three reasons. First, because one man may be the temporal goods of another, and so he may be punished in punishment of

the latter: thus children, as to the body, are a belonging of their father, and slaves are a possession of their master. Secondly, when one person's sin is transmitted to another, either by "imitation," as children copy the sins of their parents, and slaves the sins of their masters, so as to sin with greater daring; or by way of "merit," as the sinful subjects merit a sinful superior, according to ^{<3980>}Job 34:30, "Who maketh a man that is a hypocrite to reign for the sins of the people?" Hence the people of Israel were punished for David's sin in numbering the people (^{<1041>}2 Samuel 24). This may also happen through some kind of "consent" or "connivance": thus sometimes even the good are punished in temporal matters together with the wicked, for not having condemned their sins, as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei i, 9). Thirdly, in order to mark the unity of human fellowship, whereby one man is bound to be solicitous for another, lest he sin; and in order to inculcate horror of sin, seeing that the punishment of one affects all, as though all were one body, as Augustine says in speaking of the sin of Achan (QQ. sup. Josue viii). The saying of the Lord, "Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation," seems to belong to mercy rather than to severity, since He does not take vengeance forthwith, but waits for some future time, in order that the descendants at least may mend their ways; yet should the wickedness of the descendants increase, it becomes almost necessary to take vengeance on them.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4)-RO(2) — As Augustine states (QQ. sup. Josue viii), human judgment should conform to the divine judgment, when this is manifest, and God condemns men spiritually for their own sins. But human judgment cannot be conformed to God's hidden judgments, whereby He punishes certain persons in temporal matters without any fault of theirs, since man is unable to grasp the reasons of these judgments so as to know what is expedient for each individual. Wherefore according to human judgment a man should never be condemned without fault of his own to an inflictive punishment, such as death, mutilation or flogging. But a man may be condemned, even according to human judgment, to a punishment of forfeiture, even without any fault on his part, but not without cause: and this in three ways.

First, through a person becoming, without any fault of his, disqualified for having or acquiring a certain good: thus for being infected with leprosy a man is removed from the administration of the Church: and for bigamy, or

through pronouncing a death sentence a man is hindered from receiving sacred orders.

Secondly, because the particular good that he forfeits is not his own but common property: thus that an episcopal see be attached to a certain church belongs to the good of the whole city, and not only to the good of the clerics.

Thirdly, because the good of one person may depend on the good of another: thus in the crime of high treason a son loses his inheritance through the sin of his parent.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4)-RO(3) — By the judgment of God children are punished in temporal matters together with their parents, both because they are a possession of their parents, so that their parents are punished also in their person, and because this is for their good lest, should they be spared, they might imitate the sins of their parents, and thus deserve to be punished still more severely. Vengeance is wrought on dumb animals and any other irrational creatures, because in this way their owners are punished; and also in horror of sin.

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4)-RO(4) — An act done through compulsion of fear is not involuntary simply, but has an admixture of voluntariness, as stated above (**P(1), Q(6), AA(5),6**).

P(2b)-Q(108)-A(4)-RO(5) — The other apostles were distressed about the sin of Judas, in the same way as the multitude is punished for the sin of one, in commendation of unity, as state above (**RO(1,2)**).

QUESTION 109

OF TRUTH

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider truth and the vices opposed thereto. Concerning truth there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether truth is a virtue?
- (2) Whether it is a special virtue?
- (3) Whether it is a part of justice?
- (4) Whether it inclines to that which is less?

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(1)

Whether truth is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that truth is not a virtue. For the first of virtues is faith, whose object is truth. Since then the object precedes the habit and the act, it seems that truth is not a virtue, but something prior to virtue.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 7), it belongs to truth that a man should state things concerning himself to be neither more nor less than they are. But this is not always praiseworthy — neither in good things, since according to ³⁷⁰Proverbs 27:2, “Let another praise thee, and not thy own mouth” — nor even in evil things, because it is written in condemnation of certain people (²¹⁸Isaiah 3:9): “They have proclaimed abroad their sin as Sodom, and they have not hid it.” Therefore truth is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, every virtue is either theological, or intellectual, or moral. Now truth is not a theological virtue, because its object is not God but temporal things. For Tully says (De Invent. Rhet. ii) that by “truth we faithfully represent things as they are were, or will be.”

Likewise it is not one of the intellectual virtues, but their end. Nor again is it a moral virtue, since it is not a mean between excess and deficiency, for the more one tells the truth, the better it is. Therefore truth is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher both in the Second and in the Fourth Book of Ethics places truth among the other virtues.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Truth can be taken in two ways. First, for that by reason of which a thing is said to be true, and thus truth is not a virtue, but the object or end of a virtue: because, taken in this way, truth is not a habit, which is the genus containing virtue, but a certain equality between the understanding or sign and the thing understood or signified, or again between a thing and its rule, as stated in the **P(1), Q(16), A(1); P(1), Q(21), A(2)**. Secondly, truth may stand for that by which a person says what is true, in which sense one is said to be truthful. This truth or truthfulness must needs be a virtue, because to say what is true is a good act: and virtue is “that which makes its possessor good, and renders his action good.”

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(1)-RO(1) — This argument takes truth in the first sense.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(1)-RO(2) — To state that which concerns oneself, in so far as it is a statement of what is true, is good generically. Yet this does not suffice for it to be an act of virtue, since it is requisite for that purpose that it should also be clothed with the due circumstances, and if these be not observed, the act will be sinful. Accordingly it is sinful to praise oneself without due cause even for that which is true: and it is also sinful to publish one’s sin, by praising oneself on that account, or in any way proclaiming it uselessly.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(1)-RO(3) — A person who says what is true, utters certain signs which are in conformity with things; and such signs are either words, or external actions, or any external thing. Now such kinds of things are the subject-matter of the moral virtues alone, for the latter are concerned with the use of the external members, in so far as this use is put into effect at the command of the will. Wherefore truth is neither a theological, nor an intellectual, but a moral virtue. And it is a mean between excess and deficiency in two ways. First, on the part of the object,

secondly, on the part of the act. On the part of the object, because the true essentially denotes a kind of equality, and equal is a mean between more and less. Hence for the very reason that a man says what is true about himself, he observes the mean between one that says more than the truth about himself, and one that says less than the truth. On the part of the act, to observe the mean is to tell the truth, when one ought, and as one ought. Excess consists in making known one's own affairs out of season, and deficiency in hiding them when one ought to make them known.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(2)

Whether truth is a special virtue?

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that truth is not a special virtue. For the true and the good are convertible. Now goodness is not a special virtue, in fact every virtue is goodness, because “it makes its possessor good.” Therefore truth is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, to make known what belongs to oneself is an act of truth as we understand it here. But this belongs to every virtue, since every virtuous habit is made known by its own act. Therefore truth is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the truth of life is the truth whereby one lives aright, and of which it is written (~~280~~ Isaiah 38:3):

“I beseech Thee... remember how I have walked before Thee in
truth, and with a perfect heart.”

Now one lives aright by any virtue, as follows from the definition of virtue given above (**P(1), Q(55), A(4)**). Therefore truth is not a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(2)-O(4) — Further, truth seems to be the same as simplicity, since hypocrisy is opposed to both. But simplicity is not a special virtue, since it rectifies the intention, and that is required in every virtue. Therefore neither is truth a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, It is numbered together with other virtues (Ethic. ii, 7).

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(2) — *I answer that*, The nature of human virtue consists in making a man's deed good. Consequently whenever we find a special aspect of goodness in human acts, it is necessary that man be disposed thereto by a special virtue. And since according to Augustine (De Nat. Boni iii) good consists in order, it follows that a special aspect of good will be found where there is a special order. Now there is a special order whereby our externals, whether words or deeds, are duly ordered in relation to some thing, as sign to thing signified: and thereto man is perfected by the virtue of truth. Wherefore it is evident that truth is a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(2)-RO(1) — The true and the good are convertible as to subject, since every true thing is good, and every good thing is true. But considered logically, they exceed one another, even as the intellect and will exceed one another. For the intellect understands the will and many things besides, and the will desires things pertaining to the intellect, and many others. Wherefore the "true" considered in its proper aspect as a perfection of the intellect is a particular good, since it is something appetible: and in like manner the "good" considered in its proper aspect as the end of the appetite is something true, since it is something intelligible. Therefore since virtue includes the aspect of goodness, it is possible for truth to be a special virtue, just as the "true" is a special good; yet it is not possible for goodness to be a special virtue, since rather, considered logically, it is the genus of virtue.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(2)-RO(2) — The habits of virtue and vice take their species from what is directly intended, and not from that which is accidental and beside the intention. Now that a man states that which concerns himself, belongs to the virtue of truth, as something directly intended: although it may belong to other virtues consequently and beside his principal intention. For the brave man intends to act bravely: and that he shows his fortitude by acting bravely is a consequence beside his principal intention.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(2)-RO(3) — The truth of life is the truth whereby a thing is true, not whereby a person says what is true. Life like anything else is said to be true, from the fact that it attains its rule and measure, namely,

the divine law; since rectitude of life depends on conformity to that law. This truth or rectitude is common to every virtue.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(2)-RO(4) — Simplicity is so called from its opposition to duplicity, whereby, to wit, a man shows one thing outwardly while having another in his heart: so that simplicity pertains to this virtue. And it rectifies the intention, not indeed directly (since this belongs to every virtue), but by excluding duplicity, whereby a man pretends one thing and intends another.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(3)

Whether truth is a part of justice?

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that truth is not a part of justice. For it seems proper to justice to give another man his due. But, by telling the truth, one does not seem to give another man his due, as is the case in all the foregoing parts of justice. Therefore truth is not a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, truth pertains to the intellect: whereas justice is in the will, as stated above (**Q(58)**, **A(4)**). Therefore truth is not a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, according to Jerome truth is threefold, namely, “truth of life,” “truth of justice,” and “truth of doctrine.” But none of these is a part of justice. For truth of life comprises all virtues, as stated above (**A(2)**, ad 3): truth of justice is the same as justice, so that it is not one of its parts; and truth of doctrine belongs rather to the intellectual virtues. Therefore truth is nowise a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, Tully (De Invent. Rhet. ii) reckons truth among the parts of justice.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(3) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(80)**), a virtue is annexed to justice, as secondary to a principal virtue, through having something in common with justice, while falling short from the perfect virtue thereof. Now the virtue of truth has two things in common with justice. In the first place it is directed to another, since the manifestation, which we have stated to be an act of truth, is directed to another, inasmuch

as one person manifests to another the things that concern himself. In the second place, justice sets up a certain equality between things, and this the virtue of truth does also, for it equals signs to the things which concern man himself. Nevertheless it falls short of the proper aspect of justice, as to the notion of debt: for this virtue does not regard legal debt, which justice considers, but rather the moral debt, in so far as, out of equity, one man owes another a manifestation of the truth. Therefore truth is a part of justice, being annexed thereto as a secondary virtue to its principal.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(3)-RO(1) — Since man is a social animal, one man naturally owes another whatever is necessary for the preservation of human society. Now it would be impossible for men to live together, unless they believed one another, as declaring the truth one to another. Hence the virtue of truth does, in a manner, regard something as being due.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(3)-RO(2) — Truth, as known, belongs to the intellect. But man, by his own will, whereby he uses both habits and members, utters external signs in order to manifest the truth, and in this way the manifestation of the truth is an act of the will.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(3)-RO(3) — The truth of which we are speaking now differs from the truth of life, as stated in the preceding **A(2)**, ad 3.

We speak of the truth of justice in two ways. In one way we refer to the fact that justice itself is a certain rectitude regulated according to the rule of the divine law; and in this way the truth of justice differs from the truth of life, because by the truth of life a man lives aright in himself, whereas by the truth of justice a man observes the rectitude of the law in those judgments which refer to another man: and in this sense the truth of justice has nothing to do with the truth of which we speak now, as neither has the truth of life. In another way the truth of justice may be understood as referring to the fact that, out of justice, a man manifests the truth, as for instance when a man confesses the truth, or gives true evidence in a court of justice. This truth is a particular act of justice, and does not pertain directly to this truth of which we are now speaking, because, to wit, in this manifestation of the truth a man's chief intention is to give another man his due. Hence the Philosopher says (*Ethic. iv, 7*) in describing this virtue: "We are not speaking of one who is truthful in his agreements, nor does this apply to matters in which justice or injustice is questioned."

The truth of doctrine consists in a certain manifestation of truths relating to science wherefore neither does this truth directly pertain to this virtue, but only that truth whereby a man, both in life and in speech, shows himself to be such as he is, and the things that concern him, not other, and neither greater nor less, than they are. Nevertheless since truths of science, as known by us, are something concerning us, and pertain to this virtue, in this sense the truth of doctrine may pertain to this virtue, as well as any other kind of truth whereby a man manifests, by word or deed, what he knows.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(4)

Whether the virtue of truth inclines rather to that which is less?

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that the virtue of truth does not incline to that which is less. For as one incurs falsehood by saying more, so does one by saying less: thus it is no more false that four are five, than that four are three. But “every falsehood is in itself evil, and to be avoided,” as the Philosopher declares (Ethic. iv, 7). Therefore the virtue of truth does not incline to that which is less rather than to that which is greater.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, that a virtue inclines to the one extreme rather than to the other, is owing to the fact that the virtue’s mean is nearer to the one extreme than to the other: thus fortitude is nearer to daring than to timidity. But the mean of truth is not nearer to one extreme than to the other; because truth, since it is a kind of equality, holds to the exact mean. Therefore truth does not more incline to that which is less.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, to forsake the truth for that which is less seems to amount to a denial of the truth, since this is to subtract therefrom; and to forsake the truth for that which is greater seems to amount to an addition thereto. Now to deny the truth is more repugnant to truth than to add something to it, because truth is incompatible with the denial of truth, whereas it is compatible with addition. Therefore it seems that truth should incline to that which is greater rather than to that which is less.

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 7) that “by this virtue a man declines rather from the truth towards that which is less.”

P(2b)-Q(109)-A(4) — *I answer that*, There are two ways of declining from the truth to that which is less. First, by affirming, as when a man does not show the whole good that is in him, for instance science, holiness and so forth. This is done without prejudice to truth, since the lesser is contained in the greater: and in this way this virtue inclines to what is less. For, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 7), “this seems to be more prudent because exaggerations give annoyance.” For those who represent themselves as being greater than they are, are a source of annoyance to others, since they seem to wish to surpass others: whereas those who make less account of themselves are a source of pleasure, since they seem to defer to others by their moderation. Hence the Apostle says (1st 2 Corinthians 12:6):

“Though I should have a mind to glory, I shall not be foolish: for I will say the truth. But I forbear, lest any man should think of me above that which he seeth in me or anything he heareth from me.”

Secondly, one may incline to what is less by denying, so as to say that what is in us is not. In this way it does not belong to this virtue to incline to what is less, because this would imply falsehood. And yet this would be less repugnant to the truth, not indeed as regards the proper aspect of truth, but as regards the aspect of prudence, which should be safeguarded in all the virtues. For since it is fraught with greater danger and is more annoying to others, it is more repugnant to prudence to think or boast that one has what one has not, than to think or say that one has not what one has.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

VICES OPPOSED TO TRUTH

QUESTIONS 110-114

QUESTION 110

OF THE VICES OPPOSED TO TRUTH, AND FIRST OF LYING

(FOUR ARTICLES)

We must now consider the vices opposed to truth, and

- (1) lying:
- (2) dissimulation or hypocrisy:
- (3) boasting and the opposite vice.

Concerning lying there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether lying, as containing falsehood, is always opposed to truth?
- (2) Of the species of lying;
- (3) Whether lying is always a sin?
- (4) Whether it is always a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(1)

Whether lying is always opposed to truth?

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that lying is not always opposed to truth. For opposites are incompatible with one another. But lying is compatible with truth, since that speaks the truth, thinking it to be false,

lies, according to Augustine (Lib. De Mendac. iii). Therefore lying is not opposed to truth.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the virtue of truth applies not only to words but also to deeds, since according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 7) by this virtue one tells the truth both in one's speech and in one's life. But lying applies only to words, for Augustine says (Contra Mend. xii) that "a lie is a false signification by words." Accordingly, it seems that lying is not directly opposed to the virtue of truth.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, Augustine says (Lib. De Mendac. iii) that the "liar's sin is the desire to deceive." But this is not opposed to truth, but rather to benevolence or justice. Therefore lying is not opposed to truth.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (Contra Mend. x): "Let no one doubt that it is a lie to tell a falsehood in order to deceive. Wherefore a false statement uttered with intent to deceive is a manifest lie." But this is opposed to truth. Therefore lying is opposed to truth.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(1) — *I answer that*, A moral act takes its species from two things, its object, and its end: for the end is the object of the will, which is the first mover in moral acts. And the power moved by the will has its own object, which is the proximate object of the voluntary act, and stands in relation to the will's act towards the end, as material to formal, as stated above (**P(1), Q(18), AA(6),7**).

Now it has been said above (**Q(109), A(1)**, ad 3) that the virtue of truth — and consequently the opposite vices — regards a manifestation made by certain signs: and this manifestation or statement is an act of reason comparing sign with the thing signified; because every representation consists in comparison, which is the proper act of the reason. Wherefore though dumb animals manifest something, yet they do not intend to manifest anything: but they do something by natural instinct, and a manifestation is the result. But when this manifestation or statement is a moral act, it must needs be voluntary, and dependent on the intention of the will. Now the proper object of a manifestation or statement is the true or the false. And the intention of a bad will may bear on two things: one of

which is that a falsehood may be told; while the other is the proper effect of a false statement, namely, that someone may be deceived.

Accordingly if these three things concur, namely, falsehood of what is said, the will to tell a falsehood, and finally the intention to deceive, then there is falsehood — materially, since what is said is false, formally, on account of the will to tell an untruth, and effectively, on account of the will to impart a falsehood.

However, the essential notion of a lie is taken from formal falsehood, from the fact namely, that a person intends to say what is false; wherefore also the word “mendacium” [lie] is derived from its being in opposition to the “mind.” Consequently if one says what is false, thinking it to be true, it is false materially, but not formally, because the falseness is beside the intention of the speaker so that it is not a perfect lie, since what is beside the speaker’s intention is accidental for which reason it cannot be a specific difference. If, on the other hand, one utters’ falsehood formally, through having the will to deceive, even if what one says be true, yet inasmuch as this is a voluntary and moral act, it contains falseness essentially and truth accidentally, and attains the specific nature of a lie.

That a person intends to cause another to have a false opinion, by deceiving him, does not belong to the species of lying, but to perfection thereof, even as in the physical order, a thing acquires its species if it has its form, even though the form’s effect be lacking; for instance a heavy body which is held up aloft by force, lest it come down in accordance with the exigency of its form. Therefore it is evident that lying is directly an formally opposed to the virtue of truth.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(1)-RO(1) — We judge of a thing according to what is in it formally and essentially rather than according to what is in it materially and accidentally. Hence it is more in opposition to truth, considered as a moral virtue, to tell the truth with the intention of telling a falsehood than to tell a falsehood with the intention of telling the truth.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(1)-RO(2) — As Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. ii), words hold the chief place among other signs. And so when it is said that “a lie is a false signification by words,” the term “words” denotes every

kind of sign. Wherefore if a person intended to signify something false by means of signs, he would not be excused from lying.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(1)-RO(3) — The desire to deceive belongs to the perfection of lying, but not to its species, as neither does any effect belong to the species of its cause.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(2)

*Whether lies are sufficiently divided into
officious, jocose, and mischievous lies?*

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that lies are not sufficiently divided into “officious,” “jocose” and “mischievous” lies. For a division should be made according to that which pertains to a thing by reason of its nature, as the Philosopher states (Metaph. vii, text. 43; De Part. Animal i, 3). But seemingly the intention of the effect resulting from a moral act is something beside and accidental to the species of that act, so that an indefinite number of effects can result from one act. Now this division is made according to the intention of the effect: for a “jocose” lie is told in order to make fun, an “officious” lie for some useful purpose, and a “mischievous” lie in order to injure someone. Therefore lies are unfittingly divided in this way.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, Augustine (Contra Mendac. xiv) gives eight kinds of lies. The first is “in religious doctrine”; the second is “a lie that profits no one and injures someone”; the third “profits one party so as to injure another”; the fourth is “told out of mere lust of lying and deceiving”; the fifth is “told out of the desire to please”; the sixth “injures no one, and profits /someone in saving his money”; the seventh “injures no one and profits someone in saving him from death”; the eighth “injures no one, and profits someone in saving him from defilement of the body.” Therefore it seems that the first division of lies is insufficient.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 7) divides lying into “boasting,” which exceeds the truth in speech, and “irony,” which falls short of the truth by saying something less: and these two are

not contained under any one of the kinds mentioned above. Therefore it seems that the aforesaid division of lies is inadequate.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on ^{BR}Psalm 5:7, “Thou wilt destroy all that speak a lie,” says “that there are three kinds of lies; for some are told for the wellbeing and convenience of someone; and there is another kind of lie that is told in fun; but the third kind of lie is told out of malice.” The first of these is called an officious lie, the second a jocose lie, the third a mischievous lie. Therefore lies are divided into these three kinds.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(2) — *I answer that*, Lies may be divided in three ways. First, with respect to their nature as lies: and this is the proper and essential division of lying. In this way, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 7), lies are of two kinds, namely, the lie which goes beyond the truth, and this belongs to “boasting,” and the lie which stops short of the truth, and this belongs to “irony.” This division is an essential division of lying itself, because lying as such is opposed to truth, as stated in the preceding Article: and truth is a kind of equality, to which more and less are in essential opposition.

Secondly, lies may be divided with respect to their nature as sins, and with regard to those things that aggravate or diminish the sin of lying, on the part of the end intended. Now the sin of lying is aggravated, if by lying a person intends to injure another, and this is called a “mischievous” lie, while the sin of lying is diminished if it be directed to some good — either of pleasure and then it is a “jocose” lie, or of usefulness, and then we have the “officious” lie, whereby it is intended to help another person, or to save him from being injured. In this way lies are divided into the three kinds aforesaid.

Thirdly, lies are divided in a more general way, with respect to their relation to some end, whether or not this increase or diminish their gravity: and in this way the division comprises eight kinds, as stated in the Second Objection. Here the first three kinds are contained under “mischievous” lies, which are either against God, and then we have the lie “in religious doctrine,” or against man, and this either with the sole intention of injuring him, and then it is the second kind of lie, which “profits no one, and injures someone”; or with the intention of injuring one and at the same time

profiting another, and this is the third kind of lie, “which profits one, and injures another.” Of these the first is the most grievous, because sins against God are always more grievous, as stated above (**P(1), Q(73), A(3)**): and the second is more grievous than the third, since the latter’s gravity is diminished by the intention of profiting another.

After these three, which aggravate the sin of lying, we have a fourth, which has its own measure of gravity without addition or diminution; and this is the lie which is told “out of mere lust of lying and deceiving.” This proceeds from a habit, wherefore the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 7) that “the liar, when he lies from habit, delights in lying.”

The four kinds that follow lessen the gravity of the sin of lying. For the fifth kind is the jocose lie, which is told “with a desire to please”: and the remaining three are comprised under the officious lie, wherein something useful to another person is intended. This usefulness regards either external things, and then we have the sixth kind of lie, which “profits someone in saving his money”; or his body, and this is the seventh kind, which “saves a man from death”; or the morality of his virtue, and this is the eighth kind, which “saves him from unlawful defilement of his body.”

Now it is evident that the greater the good intended, the more is the sin of lying diminished in gravity. Wherefore a careful consideration of the matter will show that these various kinds of lies are enumerated in their order of gravity: since the useful good is better than the pleasurable good, and life of the body than money, and virtue than the life of the body.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)

Whether every lie is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that not every lie is a sin. For it is evident that the evangelists did not sin in the writing of the Gospel. Yet they seem to have told something false: since their accounts of the words of Christ and of others often differ from one another: wherefore seemingly one of them must have given an untrue account. Therefore not every lie is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, no one is rewarded by God for sin. But the midwives of Egypt were rewarded by God for a lie, for it is stated that “God built them houses” (⁽¹¹²⁾Exodus 1:21). Therefore a lie is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the deeds of holy men are related in Sacred Writ that they may be a model of human life. But we read of certain very holy men that they lied. Thus (⁽¹¹³⁾Genesis 12 and 20) we are told that Abraham said of his wife that she was his sister. Jacob also lied when he said that he was Esau, and yet he received a blessing (⁽¹²⁷⁾Genesis 27:27-29). Again, Judith is commended (Judith 15:10,11) although she lied to Holofernes. Therefore not every lie is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-O(4) — Further, one ought to choose the lesser evil in order to avoid the greater: even so a physician cuts off a limb, lest the whole body perish. Yet less harm is done by raising a false opinion in a person’s mind, than by someone slaying or being slain. Therefore a man may lawfully lie, to save another from committing murder, or another from being killed.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-O(5) — Further, it is a lie not to fulfill what one has promised. Yet one is not bound to keep all one’s promises: for Isidore says (Synonym. ii): “Break your faith when you have promised ill.” Therefore not every lie is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-O(6) — Further, apparently a lie is a sin because thereby we deceive our neighbor: wherefore Augustine says (Lib. De Mend. xxi): “Whoever thinks that there is any kind of lie that is not a sin deceives himself shamefully, since he deems himself an honest man when he deceives others.” Yet not every lie is a cause of deception, since no one is deceived by a jocose lie; seeing that lies of this kind are told, not with the intention of being believed, but merely for the sake of giving pleasure. Hence again we find hyperbolical expressions in Holy Writ. Therefore not every lie is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (Ecclus. 7:14): “Be not willing to make any manner of lie.”

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3) — *I answer that*, An action that is naturally evil in respect of its genus can by no means be good and lawful, since in order for an action to be good it must be right in every respect: because good results

from a complete cause, while evil results from any single defect, as Dionysius asserts (Div. Nom. iv). Now a lie is evil in respect of its genus, since it is an action bearing on undue matter. For as words are naturally signs of intellectual acts, it is unnatural and undue for anyone to signify by words something that is not in his mind. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 7) that “lying is in itself evil and to be shunned, while truthfulness is good and worthy of praise.” Therefore every lie is a sin, as also Augustine declares (Contra Mend. i).

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-RO(1) — It is unlawful to hold that any false assertion is contained either in the Gospel or in any canonical Scripture, or that the writers thereof have told untruths, because faith would be deprived of its certitude which is based on the authority of Holy Writ. That the words of certain people are variously reported in the Gospel and other sacred writings does not constitute a lie. Hence Augustine says (De Consens. Evang. ii): “He that has the wit to understand that in order to know the truth it is necessary to get at the sense, will conclude that he must not be the least troubled, no matter by what words that sense is expressed.” Hence it is evident, as he adds (De Consens. Evang. ii), that “we must not judge that someone is lying, if several persons fail to describe in the same way and in the same words a thing which they remember to have seen or heard.”

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-RO(2) — The midwives were rewarded, not for their lie, but for their fear of God, and for their good-will, which latter led them to tell a lie. Hence it is expressly stated (⁽¹¹²⁾Exodus 2:21): “And because the midwives feared God, He built them houses.” But the subsequent lie was not meritorious.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-RO(3) — In Holy Writ, as Augustine observes (Lib. De Mend. v), the deeds of certain persons are related as examples of perfect virtue: and we must not believe that such persons were liars. If, however, any of their statements appear to be untruthful, we must understand such statements to have been figurative and prophetic. Hence Augustine says (Lib. De Mend. v): “We must believe that whatever is related of those who, in prophetic times, are mentioned as being worthy of credit, was done and said by them prophetically.” As to Abraham “when he said that Sara was his sister, he wished to hide the truth, not to

tell a lie, for she is called his sister since she was the daughter of his father,” Augustine says (QQ. Super. Genesis xxvi; Contra Mend. x; Contra Faust. xxii). Wherefore Abraham himself said (~~Gen~~ Genesis 20:12): “She is truly my sister, the daughter of my father, and not the daughter of my mother,” being related to him on his father’s side. Jacob’s assertion that he was Esau, Isaac’s first-born, was spoken in a mystical sense, because, to wit, the latter’s birthright was due to him by right: and he made use of this mode of speech being moved by the spirit of prophecy, in order to signify a mystery, namely, that the younger people, i.e. the Gentiles, should supplant the first-born, i.e. the Jews.

Some, however, are commended in the Scriptures, not on account of perfect virtue, but for a certain virtuous disposition, seeing that it was owing to some praiseworthy sentiment that they were moved to do certain undue things. It is thus that Judith is praised, not for lying to Holofernes, but for her desire to save the people, to which end she exposed herself to danger. And yet one might also say that her words contain truth in some mystical sense.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-RO(4) — A lie is sinful not only because it injures one’s neighbor, but also on account of its inordinateness, as stated above in this Article. Now it is not allowed to make use of anything inordinate in order to ward off injury or defects from another: as neither is it lawful to steal in order to give an alms, except perhaps in a case of necessity when all things are common. Therefore it is not lawful to tell a lie in order to deliver another from any danger whatever. Nevertheless it is lawful to hide the truth prudently, by keeping it back, as Augustine says (Contra Mend. x).

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-RO(5) — A man does not lie, so long as he has a mind to do what he promises, because he does not speak contrary to what he has in mind: but if he does not keep his promise, he seems to act without faith in changing his mind. He may, however, be excused for two reasons. First, if he has promised something evidently unlawful, because he sinned in promise, and did well to change his mind. Secondly, if circumstances have changed with regard to persons and the business in hand. For, as Seneca states (De Benef. iv), for a man to be bound to keep a promise, it is necessary for everything to remain unchanged: otherwise neither did he lie

in promising — since he promised what he had in his mind, due circumstances being taken for granted — nor was he faithless in not keeping his promise, because circumstances are no longer the same. Hence the Apostle, though he did not go to Corinth, whither he had promised to go (²Corinthians 1), did not lie, because obstacles had arisen which prevented him.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(3)-RO(6) — An action may be considered in two ways. First, in itself, secondly, with regard to the agent. Accordingly a jocose lie, from the very genus of the action, is of a nature to deceive; although in the intention of the speaker it is not told to deceive, nor does it deceive by the way it is told. Nor is there any similarity in the hyperbolical or any kind of figurative expressions, with which we meet in Holy Writ: because, as Augustine says (Lib. De Mend. v), “it is not a lie to do or say a thing figuratively: because every statement must be referred to the thing stated: and when a thing is done or said figuratively, it states what those to whom it is tendered understand it to signify.”

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4)

Whether every lie is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that every lie is a mortal sin. For it is written (²Psalm 6:7): “Thou wilt destroy all that speak a lie,” and (Wis. 1:11): “The mouth that beliesth killeth the soul.” Now mortal sin alone causes destruction and death of the soul. Therefore every lie is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, whatever is against a precept of the decalogue is a mortal sin. Now lying is against this precept of the decalogue: “Thou shalt not bear false witness.” Therefore every lie is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i, 36): “Every liar breaks his faith in lying, since forsooth he wishes the person to whom he lies to have faith in him, and yet he does not keep faith with him, when he lies to him: and whoever breaks his faith is guilty of

iniquity.” Now no one is said to break his faith or “to be guilty of iniquity,” for a venial sin. Therefore no lie is a venial sin.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4)-O(4) — Further, the eternal reward is not lost save for a mortal sin. Now, for a lie the eternal reward was lost, being exchanged for a temporal meed. For Gregory says (Moral. xviii) that “we learn from the reward of the midwives what the sin of lying deserves: since the reward which they deserved for their kindness, and which they might have received in eternal life, dwindled into a temporal meed on account of the lie of which they were guilty.” Therefore even an officious lie, such as was that of the midwives, which seemingly is the least of lies, is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4)-O(5) — Further, Augustine says (Lib. De Mend. xvii) that “it is a precept of perfection, not only not to lie at all, but not even to wish to lie.” Now it is a mortal sin to act against a precept. Therefore every lie of the perfect is a mortal sin: and consequently so also is a lie told by anyone else, otherwise the perfect would be worse off than others.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says on ⁴⁹⁸⁰Psalm 5:7, “Thou wilt destroy,” etc.: “There are two kinds of lie, that are not grievously sinful yet are not devoid of sin, when we lie either in joking, or for the sake of our neighbor’s good.” But every mortal sin is grievous. Therefore jocular and officious lies are not mortal sins.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4) — *I answer that*, A mortal sin is, properly speaking, one that is contrary to charity whereby the soul lives in union with God, as stated above (**Q(24), A(12); Q(35), A(3)**). Now a lie may be contrary to charity in three ways: first, in itself; secondly, in respect of the evil intended; thirdly, accidentally.

A lie may be in itself contrary to charity by reason of its false signification. For if this be about divine things, it is contrary to the charity of God, whose truth one hides or corrupts by such a lie; so that a lie of this kind is opposed not only to the virtue of charity, but also to the virtues of faith and religion: wherefore it is a most grievous and a mortal sin. If, however, the false signification be about something the knowledge of which affects a man’s good, for instance if it pertain to the perfection of science or to moral conduct, a lie of this description inflicts an injury on one’s neighbor, since it causes him to have a false opinion, wherefore it is

contrary to charity, as regards the love of our neighbor, and consequently is a mortal sin. On the other hand, if the false opinion engendered by the lie be about some matter the knowledge of which is of no consequence, then the lie in question does no harm to one's neighbor; for instance, if a person be deceived as to some contingent particulars that do not concern him. Wherefore a lie of this kind, considered in itself, is not a mortal sin.

As regards the end in view, a lie may be contrary to charity, through being told with the purpose of injuring God, and this is always a mortal sin, for it is opposed to religion; or in order to injure one's neighbor, in his person, his possessions or his good name, and this also is a mortal sin, since it is a mortal sin to injure one's neighbor, and one sins mortally if one has merely the intention of committing a mortal sin. But if the end intended be not contrary to charity, neither will the lie, considered under this aspect, be a mortal sin, as in the case of a jocose lie, where some little pleasure is intended, or in an officious lie, where the good also of one's neighbor is intended. Accidentally a lie may be contrary to charity by reason of scandal or any other injury resulting therefrom: and thus again it will be a mortal sin, for instance if a man were not deterred through scandal from lying publicly.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4)-RO(1) — The passages quoted refer to the mischievous lie, as a gloss explains the words of ~~CHR~~ Psalm 5:7, "Thou wilt destroy all that speak a lie."

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4)-RO(2) — Since all the precepts of the decalogue are directed to the love of God and our neighbor, as stated above (**Q(44)**, **A(1)**, ad 3; **P(1)**, **Q(100)**, **A(5)**, ad 1), a lie is contrary to a precept of the decalogue, in so far as it is contrary to the love of God and our neighbor. Hence it is expressly forbidden to bear false witness against our neighbor.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4)-RO(3) — Even a venial sin can be called "iniquity" in a broad sense, in so far as it is beside the equity of justice; wherefore it is written (~~CHR~~ 1 John 3:4): "Every sin is iniquity [*Vulg.: 'And sin is iniquity.']. It is in this sense that Augustine is speaking.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4)-RO(4) — The lie of the midwives may be considered in two ways. First as regards their feeling of kindness towards the Jews, and their reverence and fear of God, for which their virtuous disposition is

commended. For this an eternal reward is due. Wherefore Jerome (in his exposition of ~~and~~ Isaiah 65:21, ‘And they shall build houses’) explains that God “built them spiritual houses.” Secondly, it may be considered with regard to the external act of lying. For thereby they could merit, not indeed eternal reward, but perhaps some temporal meed, the deserving of which was not inconsistent with the deformity of their lie, though this was inconsistent with their meriting an eternal reward. It is in this sense that we must understand the words of Gregory, and not that they merited by that lie to lose the eternal reward as though they had already merited it by their preceding kindliness, as the objection understands the words to mean.

P(2b)-Q(110)-A(4)-RO(5) — Some say that for the perfect every lie is a mortal sin. But this assertion is unreasonable. For no circumstance causes a sin to be infinitely more grievous unless it transfers it to another species. Now a circumstance of person does not transfer a sin to another species, except perhaps by reason of something annexed to that person, for instance if it be against his vow: and this cannot apply to an officious or jocose lie. Wherefore an officious or a jocose lie is not a mortal sin in perfect men, except perhaps accidentally on account of scandal. We may take in this sense the saying of Augustine that “it is a precept of perfection not only not to lie at all, but not even to wish to lie”: although Augustine says this not positively but dubiously, for he begins by saying: “Unless perhaps it is a precept,” etc. Nor does it matter that they are placed in a position to safeguard the truth: because they are bound to safeguard the truth by virtue of their office in judging or teaching, and if they lie in these matters their lie will be a mortal sin: but it does not follow that they sin mortally when they lie in other matters.

QUESTION 111

OF DISSIMULATION AND HYPOCRISY

(FOUR ARTICLES)

In due sequence we must consider dissimulation and hypocrisy. Under this head there are four points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether all dissimulation is a sin?
- (2) Whether hypocrisy is dissimulation?
- (3) Whether it is opposed to truth?
- (4) Whether it is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(1)

Whether all dissimulation is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that not all dissimulation is a sin. For it is written (^{<0208>}Luke 24:28) that our Lord “pretended [Douay: ‘made as though’] he would go farther”; and Ambrose in his book on the Patriarchs (De Abraham i) says of Abraham that he “spoke craftily to his servants, when he said” (^{<0025>}Genesis 22:5):

“I and the boy will go with speed as far as yonder, and after we have worshipped, will return to you.”

Now to pretend and to speak craftily savor of dissimulation: and yet it is not to be said that there was sin in Christ or Abraham. Therefore not all dissimulation is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, no sin is profitable. But according to Jerome, in his commentary on ^{<0021>}Galatians 2:11,

“When Peter [Vulg.: ‘Cephas’] was come to Antioch: — The example of Jehu, king of Israel, who slew the priest of Baal,

pretending that he desired to worship idols, should teach us that dissimulation is useful and sometimes to be employed”;

and David “changed his countenance before” Achis, king of Geth (¹²¹³1 Kings 21:13). Therefore not all dissimulation is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, good is contrary to evil. Therefore if it is evil to simulate good, it is good to simulate evil.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, it is written in condemnation of certain people (²¹⁸Isaiah 3:9):

“They have proclaimed abroad their sin as Sodom,
and they have not hid it.”

Now it pertains to dissimulation to hide one’s sin. Therefore it is reprehensible sometimes not to simulate. But it is never reprehensible to avoid sin. Therefore dissimulation is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on ²¹³⁴Isaiah 16:14, “In three years,” etc., says: “Of the two evils it is less to sin openly than to simulate holiness.” But to sin openly is always a sin. Therefore dissimulation is always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(109), A(3); Q(110), A(1)**), it belongs to the virtue of truth to show oneself outwardly by outward signs to be such as one is. Now outward signs are not only words, but also deeds. Accordingly just as it is contrary to truth to signify by words something different from that which is in one’s mind, so also is it contrary to truth to employ signs of deeds or things to signify the contrary of what is in oneself, and this is what is properly denoted by dissimulation. Consequently dissimulation is properly a lie told by the signs of outward deeds. Now it matters not whether one lie in word or in any other way, as stated above (**Q(110), A(1), O(2)**). Wherefore, since every lie is a sin, as stated above (**Q(110), A(3)**), it follows that also all dissimulation is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(1)-RO(1) — As Augustine says (De QQ. Evang. ii), “To pretend is not always a lie: but only when the pretense has no signification, then it is a lie. When, however, our pretense refers to some signification, there is no lie, but a representation of the truth.” And he cites

figures of speech as an example, where a thing is “pretended,” for we do not mean it to be taken literally but as a figure of something else that we wish to say. In this way our Lord “pretended He would go farther,” because He acted as if wishing to go farther; in order to signify something figuratively either because He was far from their faith, according to Gregory (Hom. xxiii in Ev.); or, as Augustine says (De QQ. Evang. ii), because, “as He was about to go farther away from them by ascending into heaven, He was, so to speak, held back on earth by their hospitality.”

Abraham also spoke figuratively. Wherefore Ambrose (De Abraham i) says that Abraham “foretold what he knew not”: for he intended to return alone after sacrificing his son: but by his mouth the Lord expressed what He was about to do. It is evident therefore that neither dissembled.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(1)-RO(2) — Jerome employs the term “simulation” in a broad sense for any kind of pretense. David’s change of countenance was a figurative pretense, as a gloss observes in commenting on the title of ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 33, “I will bless the Lord at all times.” There is no need to excuse Jehu’s dissimulation from sin or lie, because he was a wicked man, since he departed not from the idolatry of Jeroboam (~~2~~ 2 Kings 10:29,31). And yet he is praised withal and received an earthly reward from God, not for his dissimulation, but for his zeal in destroying the worship of Baal.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(1)-RO(3) — Some say that no one may pretend to be wicked, because no one pretends to be wicked by doing good deeds, and if he do evil deeds, he is evil. But this argument proves nothing. Because a man might pretend to be evil, by doing what is not evil in itself but has some appearance of evil: and nevertheless this dissimulation is evil, both because it is a lie, and because it gives scandal; and although he is wicked on this account, yet his wickedness is not the wickedness he simulates. And because dissimulation is evil in itself, its sinfulness is not derived from the thing simulated, whether this be good or evil.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(1)-RO(4) — Just as a man lies when he signifies by word that which he is not, yet lies not when he refrains from saying what he is, for this is sometimes lawful; so also does a man dissemble, when by outward signs of deeds or things he signifies that which he is not, yet he dissembles not if he omits to signify what he is. Hence one may hide one’s sin without being guilty of dissimulation. It is thus that we must

understand the saying of Jerome on the words of ^{<23B>}Isaiah 3:9, that the “second remedy after shipwreck is to hide one’s sin,” lest, to wit, others be scandalized thereby.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(2)

Whether hypocrisy is the same as dissimulation?

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that hypocrisy is not the same as dissimulation. For dissimulation consists in lying by deeds. But there may be hypocrisy in showing outwardly what one does inwardly, according to ^{<10B>}Matthew 6:2,

“When thou dost an alms-deed sound not a trumpet before thee, as
the hypocrites do.”

Therefore hypocrisy is not the same as dissimulation.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 7): “Some there are who wear the habit of holiness, yet are unable to attain the merit of perfection. We must by no means deem these to have joined the ranks of the hypocrites, since it is one thing to sin from weakness, and another to sin from malice.” Now those who wear the habit of holiness, without attaining the merit of perfection, are dissemblers, since the outward habit signifies works of perfection. Therefore dissimulation is not the same as hypocrisy.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, hypocrisy consists in the mere intention. For our Lord says of hypocrites (^{<10B>}Matthew 23:5) that “all their works they do for to be seen of men”: and Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 7) that “they never consider what it is that they do, but how by their every action they may please men.” But dissimulation consists, not in the mere intention, but in the outward action: wherefore a gloss on ^{<89B>}Job 36:13, “Dissemblers and crafty men prove the wrath of God,” says that “the dissembler simulates one thing and does another: he pretends chastity, and delights in lewdness, he makes a show of poverty and fills his purse.” Therefore hypocrisy is not the same as dissimulation.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Isidore says (Etym. x):

“‘Hypocrite’ is a Greek word corresponding to the Latin ‘simulator,’ for whereas he is evil within,” he “shows himself outwardly as being good; {hypo} denoting falsehood, and {krisis}, judgment.”

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As Isidore says (Etym. x), “the word hypocrite is derived from the appearance of those who come on to the stage with a disguised face, by changing the color of their complexion, so as to imitate the complexion of the person they simulate, at one time under the guise of a man, at another under the guise of a woman, so as to deceive the people in their acting.” Hence Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. ii) that “just as hypocrites by simulating other persons act the parts of those they are not (since he that acts the part of Agamemnon is not that man himself but pretends to be), so too in the Church and in every department of human life, whoever wishes to seem what he is not is a hypocrite: for he pretends to be just without being so in reality.”

We must conclude, therefore, that hypocrisy is dissimulation, not, however, any form of dissimulation, but only when one person simulates another, as when a sinner simulates the person of a just man.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(2)-RO(1) — The outward deed is a natural sign of the intention. Accordingly when a man does good works pertaining by their genus to the service of God, and seeks by their means to please, not God but man, he simulates a right intention which he has not. Wherefore Gregory says (Moral.) that “hypocrites make God’s interests subservient to worldly purposes, since by making a show of saintly conduct they seek, not to turn men to God, but to draw to themselves the applause of their approval:” and so they make a lying pretense of having a good intention, which they have not, although they do not pretend to do a good deed without doing it.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(2)-RO(2) — The habit of holiness, for instance the religious or the clerical habit, signifies a state whereby one is bound to perform works of perfection. And so when a man puts on the habit of holiness, with the intention of entering the state of perfection, if he fail through weakness, he is not a dissembler or a hypocrite, because he is not bound to disclose his sin by laying aside the habit of holiness. If, however,

he were to put on the habit of holiness in order to make a show of righteousness, he would be a hypocrite and a dissembler.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(2)-RO(3) — In dissimulation, as in a lie, there are two things: one by way of sign, the other by way of thing signified. Accordingly the evil intention in hypocrisy is considered as a thing signified, which does not tally with the sign: and the outward words, or deeds, or any sensible objects are considered in every dissimulation and lie as a sign.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(3)

Whether hypocrisy is contrary to the virtue of truth?

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that hypocrisy is not contrary to the virtue of truth. For in dissimulation or hypocrisy there is a sign and a thing signified. Now with regard to neither of these does it seem to be opposed to any special virtue: for a hypocrite simulates any virtue, and by means of any virtuous deeds, such as fasting, prayer and alms deeds, as stated in ~~4000~~ Matthew 6:1-18. Therefore hypocrisy is not specially opposed to the virtue of truth.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, all dissimulation seems to proceed from guile, wherefore it is opposed to simplicity. Now guile is opposed to prudence as above stated (**Q(55), A(4)**). Therefore, hypocrisy which is dissimulation is not opposed to truth, but rather to prudence or simplicity.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the species of moral acts is taken from their end. Now the end of hypocrisy is the acquisition of gain or vainglory: wherefore a gloss on ~~8708~~ Job 27:8, “What is the hope of the hypocrite, if through covetousness he take by violence,” says: “A hypocrite or, as the Latin has it, a dissimulator, is a covetous thief: for through desire of being honored for holiness, though guilty of wickedness, he steals praise for a life which is not his.” [*The quotation is from St. Gregory’s *Moralia*, Bk XVIII.] Therefore since covetousness or vainglory is not directly opposed to truth, it seems that neither is hypocrisy or dissimulation.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, All dissimulation is a lie, as stated above (**A(1)**). Now a lie is directly opposed to truth. Therefore dissimulation or hypocrisy is also.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(3) — *I answer that*, According to the Philosopher (Metaph. text. 13, 24, x), “contrariety is opposition as regards form,” i.e. the specific form. Accordingly we must reply that dissimulation or hypocrisy may be opposed to a virtue in two ways, in one way directly, in another way indirectly. Its direct opposition or contrariety is to be considered with regard to the very species of the act, and this species depends on that act’s proper object. Wherefore since hypocrisy is a kind of dissimulation, whereby a man simulates a character which is not his, as stated in the preceding article, it follows that it is directly opposed to truth whereby a man shows himself in life and speech to be what he is, as stated in Ethic. iv, 7.

The indirect opposition or contrariety of hypocrisy may be considered in relation to any accident, for instance a remote end, or an instrument of action, or anything else of that kind.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(3)-RO(1) — The hypocrite in simulating a virtue regards it as his end, not in respect of its existence, as though he wished to have it, but in respect of appearance, since he wishes to seem to have it. Hence his hypocrisy is not opposed to that virtue, but to truth, inasmuch as he wishes to deceive men with regard to that virtue. And he performs acts of that virtue, not as intending them for their own sake, but instrumentally, as signs of that virtue, wherefore his hypocrisy has not, on that account, a direct opposition to that virtue.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(3)-RO(2) — As stated above (**Q(55)**, **AA(3),4,5**), the vice directly opposed to prudence is cunning, to which it belongs to discover ways of achieving a purpose, that are apparent and not real: while it accomplishes that purpose, by guile in words, and by fraud in deeds: and it stands in relation to prudence, as guile and fraud to simplicity. Now guile and fraud are directed chiefly to deception, and sometimes secondarily to injury. Wherefore it belongs directly to simplicity to guard oneself from deception, and in this way the virtue of simplicity is the same as the virtue of truth as stated above (**Q(109)**, **A(2)**, ad 4). There is, however, a mere logical difference between them, because by truth we

mean the concordance between sign and thing signified, while simplicity indicates that one does not tend to different things, by intending one thing inwardly, and pretending another outwardly.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(3)-RO(3) — Gain or glory is the remote end of the dissembler as also of the liar. Hence it does not take its species from this end, but from the proximate end, which is to show oneself other than one is. Wherefore it sometimes happens to a man to pretend great things of himself, for no further purpose than the mere lust of hypocrisy, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 7), and as also we have said above with regard to lying (**Q(110), A(2)**).

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(4)

Whether hypocrisy is always a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that hypocrisy is always a mortal sin. For Jerome says on ^{<2364>}Isaiah 16:14: “Of the two evils it is less to sin openly than to simulate holiness”: and a gloss on ^{<812>}Job 1:21 [*St. Augustine on ^{<560>}Psalms 63:7], “As it hath pleased the Lord,” etc., says that “pretended justice is no justice, but a twofold sin”: and again a gloss on ^{<2406>}Lamentations 4:6, “The iniquity... of my people is made greater than the sin of Sodom,” says: “He deplores the sins of the soul that falls into hypocrisy, which is a greater iniquity than the sin of Sodom.” Now the sins of Sodom are mortal sin. Therefore hypocrisy is always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 8) that hypocrites sin out of malice. But this is most grievous, for it pertains to the sin against the Holy Ghost. Therefore a hypocrite always sins mortally.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, no one deserves the anger of God and exclusion from seeing God, save on account of mortal sin. Now the anger of God is deserved through hypocrisy according to ^{<893>}Job 36:13, “Dissemblers and crafty men prove the wrath of God”: and the hypocrite is excluded from seeing God, according to ^{<836>}Job 13:16, “No hypocrite shall come before His presence.” Therefore hypocrisy is always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, Hypocrisy is lying by deed since it is a kind of dissimulation. But it is not always a mortal sin to lie by deed. Neither therefore is all hypocrisy a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(4) — Further, the intention of a hypocrite is to appear to be good. But this is not contrary to charity. Therefore hypocrisy is not of itself a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(4) — Further, hypocrisy is born of vainglory, as Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 17). But vainglory is not always a mortal sin. Neither therefore is hypocrisy.

P(2b)-Q(111)-A(4) — *I answer that*, There are two things in hypocrisy, lack of holiness, and simulation thereof. Accordingly if by a hypocrite we mean a person whose intention is directed to both the above, one, namely, who cares not to be holy but only to appear so, in which sense Sacred Scripture is wont to use the term, it is evident that hypocrisy is a mortal sin: for no one is entirely deprived of holiness save through mortal sin. But if by a hypocrite we mean one who intends to simulate holiness, which he lacks through mortal sin, then, although he is in mortal sin, whereby he is deprived of holiness, yet, in his case, the dissimulation itself is not always a mortal sin, but sometimes a venial sin. This will depend on the end in view; for if this be contrary to the love of God or of his neighbor, it will be a mortal sin: for instance if he were to simulate holiness in order to disseminate false doctrine, or that he may obtain ecclesiastical preferment, though unworthy, or that he may obtain any temporal good in which he fixes his end. If, however, the end intended be not contrary to charity, it will be a venial sin, as for instance when a man takes pleasure in the pretense itself: of such a man it is said in Ethic. iv, 7 that “he would seem to be vain rather than evil”; for the same applies to simulation as to a lie.

It happens also sometimes that a man simulates the perfection of holiness which is not necessary for spiritual welfare. Simulation of this kind is neither a mortal sin always, nor is it always associated with mortal sin.

This suffices for the Replies to the Objections.

QUESTION 112

OF BOASTING

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider boasting and irony, which are parts of lying according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 7). Under the first head, namely, boasting, there are two points of inquiry:

(1) To which virtue is it opposed?

(2) Whether it is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(1)

Whether boasting is opposed to the virtue of truth?

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that boasting is not opposed to the virtue of truth. For lying is opposed to truth. But it is possible to boast even without lying, as when a man makes a show of his own excellence. Thus it is written (²⁴⁰⁸Esther 1:3,4) that Assuerus “made a great feast... that he might show the riches of the glory” and “of his kingdom, and the greatness and boasting of his power.” Therefore boasting is not opposed to the virtue of truth.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, boasting is reckoned by Gregory (Moral. xxiii, 4) to be one of the four species of pride, “when,” to wit, “a man boasts of having what he has not.” Hence it is written (²⁴⁰⁹Jeremiah 48:29,30): “We have heard the pride of Moab, he is exceeding proud: his haughtiness, and his arrogancy, and his pride, and the loftiness of his heart. I know, saith the Lord, his boasting, and that the strength thereof is not according to it.” Moreover, Gregory says (Moral. xxxi, 7) that boasting arises from vainglory. Now pride and vainglory are opposed to the virtue of humility. Therefore boasting is opposed, not to truth, but to humility.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, boasting seems to be occasioned by riches; wherefore it is written (Wis. 5:8): “What hath pride profited us? or

what advantage hath the boasting of riches brought us?" Now excess of riches seems to belong to the sin of covetousness, which is opposed to justice or liberality. Therefore boasting is not opposed to truth.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 7; iv, 7), that boasting is opposed to truth.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(1) — *I answer that*, "Jactantia" [boasting] seems properly to denote the uplifting of self by words: since if a man wishes to throw [jactare] a thing far away, he lifts it up high. And to uplift oneself, properly speaking, is to talk of oneself above oneself [*Or 'tall-talking' as we should say in English]. This happens in two ways. For sometimes a man speaks of himself, not above what he is in himself, but above that which he is esteemed by men to be: and this the Apostle declines to do when he says (~~1~~ 2 Corinthians 12:6):

"I forbear lest any man should think of me above that which he seeth in me, or anything he heareth of me."

In another way a man uplifts himself in words, by speaking of himself above that which he is in reality. And since we should judge of things as they are in themselves, rather than as others deem them to be, it follows that boasting denotes more properly the uplifting of self above what one is in oneself, than the uplifting of self above what others think of one: although in either case it may be called boasting. Hence boasting properly so called is opposed to truth by way of excess.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(1)-RO(1) — This argument takes boasting as exceeding men's opinion.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(1)-RO(2) — The sin of boasting may be considered in two ways. First, with regard to the species of the act, and thus it is opposed to truth; as stated (in the body of the article and **Q(110), A(2)**). Secondly, with regard to its cause, from which more frequently though not always it arises: and thus it proceeds from pride as its inwardly moving and impelling cause. For when a man is uplifted inwardly by arrogance, it often results that outwardly he boasts of great things about himself; though sometimes a man takes to boasting, not from arrogance, but from some kind of vanity, and delights therein, because he is a boaster by habit. Hence arrogance, which is an uplifting of self above oneself, is a kind of

pride; yet it is not the same as boasting, but is very often its cause. For this reason Gregory reckons boasting among the species of pride. Moreover, the boaster frequently aims at obtaining glory through his boasting, and so, according to Gregory, it arises from vainglory considered as its end.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(1)-RO(3) — Wealth also causes boasting, in two ways. First, as an occasional cause, inasmuch as a man prides himself on his riches. Hence (²⁰⁸⁸Proverbs 8:18) “riches” are significantly described as “proud” [Douay: ‘glorious’]. Secondly, as being the end of boasting, since according to Ethic. iv, 7, some boast, not only for the sake of glory, but also for the sake of gain. Such people invent stories about themselves, so as to make profit thereby; for instance, they pretend to be skilled in medicine, wisdom, or divination.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(2)

Whether boasting is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that boasting is a mortal sin. For it is written (²⁰⁸⁹Proverbs 28:25): “He that boasteth, and puffeth himself, stirreth up quarrels.” Now it is a mortal sin to stir up quarrels, since God hates those that sow discord, according to ²⁰⁸⁹Proverbs 6:19. Therefore boasting is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, whatever is forbidden in God’s law is a mortal sin. Now a gloss on Ecclus. 6:2, “Extol not thyself in the thoughts of thy soul,” says: “This is a prohibition of boasting and pride.” Therefore boasting is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, boasting is a kind of lie. But it is neither an officious nor a jocose lie. This is evident from the end of lying; for according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 7), “the boaster pretends to something greater than he is, sometimes for no further purpose, sometimes for the sake of glory or honor, sometimes for the sake of money.” Thus it is evident that it is neither an officious nor a jocose lie, and consequently it must be a mischievous lie. Therefore seemingly it is always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Boasting arises from vainglory, according to Gregory (Moral. xxxi, 17). Now vainglory is not always a mortal sin, but is sometimes a venial sin which only the very perfect avoid. For Gregory says (Moral. viii, 30) that “it belongs to the very perfect, by outward deeds so to seek the glory of their author, that they are not inwardly uplifted by the praise awarded them.” Therefore boasting is not always a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(110), A(4)**), a mortal sin is one that is contrary to charity. Accordingly boasting may be considered in two ways. First, in itself, as a lie, and thus it is sometimes a mortal, and sometimes a venial sin. It will be a mortal sin when a man boasts of that which is contrary to God’s glory — thus it is said in the person of the king of Tyre (^{238D}Ezekiel 28:2): “Thy heart is lifted up, and thou hast said: I am God” — or contrary to the love of our neighbor, as when a man while boasting of himself breaks out into invectives against others, as told of the Pharisee who said (^{238E}Luke 18:11):

“I am not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, as also is this publican.”

Sometimes it is a venial sin, when, to wit, a man boasts of things that are against neither God nor his neighbor. Secondly, it may be considered with regard to its cause, namely, pride, or the desire of gain or of vainglory: and then if it proceeds from pride or from such vainglory as is a mortal sin, then the boasting will also be a mortal sin: otherwise it will be a venial sin. Sometimes, however, a man breaks out into boasting through desire of gain, and for this very reason he would seem to be aiming at the deception and injury of his neighbor: wherefore boasting of this kind is more likely to be a mortal sin. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 7) that “a man who boasts for the sake of gain, is viler than one who boasts for the sake of glory or honor.” Yet it is not always a mortal sin because the gain may be such as not to injure another man.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(2)-RO(1) — To boast in order to stir quarrels is a mortal sin. But it happens sometimes that boasts are the cause of quarrels, not intentionally but accidentally: and consequently boasting will not be a mortal sin on that account.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(2)-RO(2) — This gloss speaks of boasting as arising from pride that is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(112)-A(2)-RO(3) — Boasting does not always involve a mischievous lie, but only where it is contrary to the love of God or our neighbor, either in itself or in its cause. That a man boast, through mere pleasure in boasting, is an inane thing to do, as the Philosopher remarks (Ethic. iv, 7): wherefore it amounts to a jocose lie. Unless perchance he were to prefer this to the love of God, so as to condemn God's commandments for the sake of boasting: for then it would be against the charity of God, in Whom alone ought our mind to rest as in its last end.

To boast for the sake of glory or gain seen to involve an officious lie: provided it be do without injury to others, for then it would once become a mischievous lie.

QUESTION 113

IRONY*

(TWO ARTICLES)

[*Irony here must be given the signification of the Greek {eironia}, whence it is derived: dissimulation of one's own good points.]

We must now consider irony, under which head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether irony is a sin?
- (2) Of its comparison with boasting.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(1)*Whether irony is a sin?*

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that irony, which consists in belittling oneself, is not a sin. For no sin arises from one's being strengthened by God: and yet this leads one to belittle oneself, according to ^{<3074>}Proverbs 30:1,2:

“The vision which the man spoke, with whom is God, and who being strengthened by God, abiding with him, said, I am the most foolish of men.”

Also it is written (^{<3074>}Amos 7:14): “Amos answered... I am not a prophet.” Therefore irony, whereby a man belittles himself in words, is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Gregory says in a letter to Augustine, bishop of the English (Regist. xii): “It is the mark of a well-disposed mind to acknowledge one's fault when one is not guilty.” But all sin is inconsistent with a well-disposed mind. Therefore irony is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, it is not a sin to shun pride. But “some belittle themselves in words, so as to avoid pride,” according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 7). Therefore irony is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Verb. Apost., Serm. xxix): “If thou liest on account of humility, if thou wert not a sinner before lying, thou hast become one by lying.”

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(1) — *I answer that*, To speak so as to belittle oneself may occur in two ways. First so as to safeguard truth, as when a man conceals the greater things in himself, but discovers and asserts lesser things of himself the presence of which in himself he perceives. To belittle oneself in this way does not belong to irony, nor is it a sin in respect of its genus, except through corruption of one of its circumstances. Secondly, a person belittles himself by forsaking the truth, for instance by ascribing to himself something the existence of which in himself he does not perceive, or by denying something great of himself, which nevertheless he perceives himself to possess: this pertains to irony, and is always a sin.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(1)-RO(1) — There is a twofold wisdom and a twofold folly. For there is a wisdom according to God, which has human or worldly folly annexed to it, according to ^{<418>}1 Corinthians 3:18,

“If any man among you seem to be wise in this world, let him
become a fool that he may be wise.”

But there is another wisdom that is worldly, which as the same text goes on to say, “is foolishness with God.” Accordingly, he that is strengthened by God acknowledges himself to be most foolish in the estimation of men, because, to wit, he despises human things, which human wisdom seeks. Hence the text quoted continues, “and the wisdom of men is not with me,” and farther on, “and I have known the science of the saints” [*Vulg.: ‘and I have not known the science of the saints’].

It may also be replied that “the wisdom of men” is that which is acquired by human reason, while the “wisdom of the saints” is that which is received by divine inspiration.

Amos denied that he was a prophet by birth, since, to wit, he was not of the race of prophets: hence the text goes on, “nor am I the son of a prophet.”

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(1)-RO(2) — It belongs to a well-disposed mind that a man tend to perfect righteousness, and consequently deem himself guilty, not only if he fall short of common righteousness, which is truly a sin, but

also if he fall short of perfect righteousness, which sometimes is not a sin. But he does not call sinful that which he does not acknowledge to be sinful: which would be a lie of irony.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(1)-RO(3) — A man should not commit one sin in order to avoid another: and so he ought not to lie in any way at all in order to avoid pride. Hence Augustine says (Tract. xliii in Joan.): “Shun not arrogance so as to forsake truth”: and Gregory says (Moral. xxvi, 3) that “it is a reckless humility that entangles itself with lies.”

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(2)

Whether irony is a less grievous sin than boasting?

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that irony is not a less grievous sin than boasting. For each of them is a sin through forsaking truth, which is a kind of equality. But one does not forsake truth by exceeding it any more than by diminishing it. Therefore irony is not a less grievous sin than boasting.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 7), irony sometimes is boasting. But boasting is not irony. Therefore irony is not a less grievous sin than boasting.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it is written (²¹⁶⁵Proverbs 26:25): “When he shall speak low, trust him not: because there are seven mischiefs in his heart.” Now it belongs to irony to speak low. Therefore it contains a manifold wickedness.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 7): “Those who speak with irony and belittle themselves are more gracious, seemingly, in their manners.”

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(110), AA(2),4**), one lie is more grievous than another, sometimes on account of the matter which it is about — thus a lie about a matter of religious doctrine is most grievous — and sometimes on account of the motive for sinning; thus a mischievous lie is more grievous than an officious or jocose lie. Now irony and boasting lie about the same matter, either by words, or by any other outward signs, namely, about matters affecting the person: so that in this respect they are equal.

But for the most part boasting proceeds from a viler motive, namely, the desire of gain or honor: whereas irony arises from a man's averseness, albeit inordinate, to be disagreeable to others by uplifting himself: and in this respect the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 7) that "boasting is a more grievous sin than irony."

Sometimes, however, it happens that a man belittles himself for some other motive, for instance that he may deceive cunningly: and then irony is more grievous.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(2)-RO(1) — This argument applies to irony and boasting, according as a lie is considered to be grievous in itself or on account of its matter: for it has been said that in this way they are equal.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(2)-RO(2) — Excellence is twofold: one is in temporal, the other in spiritual things. Now it happens at times that a person, by outward words or signs, pretends to be lacking in external things, for instance by wearing shabby clothes, or by doing something of the kind, and that he intends by so doing to make a show of some spiritual excellence. Thus our Lord said of certain men (~~am~~ Matthew 6:16) that "they disfigure their faces that they may appear unto men to fast." Wherefore such persons are guilty of both vices, irony and boasting, although in different respects, and for this reason they sin more grievously. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 7) that it is "the practice of boasters both to make overmuch of themselves, and to make very little of themselves": and for the same reason it is related of Augustine that he was unwilling to possess clothes that were either too costly or too shabby, because by both do men seek glory.

P(2b)-Q(113)-A(2)-RO(3) — According to the words of Ecclus. 19:23, "There is one that humbleth himself wickedly, and his interior is full of deceit," and it is in this sense that Solomon speaks of the man who, through deceitful humility, "speaks low" wickedly.

QUESTION 114

OF THE FRIENDLINESS WHICH IS CALLED AFFABILITY

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the friendliness which is called affability, and the opposite vices which are flattery and quarreling. Concerning friendliness or affability, there are two points of inquiry:

(1) Whether it is a special virtue?

(2) Whether it is a part of justice?

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(1)

Whether friendliness is a special virtue?

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that friendliness is not a special virtue. For the Philosopher says (Ethic. viii, 3) that “the perfect friendship is that which is on account of virtue.” Now any virtue is the cause of friendship: “since the good is lovable to all,” as Dionysius states (Div. Nom. iv). Therefore friendliness is not a special virtue, but a consequence of every virtue.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 6) of this kind of friend that he “takes everything in a right manner both from those he loves and from those who are not his friends.” Now it seems to pertain to simulation that a person should show signs of friendship to those whom he loves not, and this is incompatible with virtue. Therefore this kind of friendliness is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, virtue “observes the mean according as a wise man decides” (Ethic. ii, 6). Now it is written (~~2005~~ Ecclesiastes 7:5): “The heart of the wise is where there is mourning, and the heart of fools where there is mirth”: wherefore “it belongs to a virtuous man to be most wary of pleasure” (Ethic. ii, 9). Now this kind of friendship, according to

the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 6), “is essentially desirous of sharing pleasures, but fears to give pain.” Therefore this kind of friendliness is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The precepts of the law are about acts of virtue. Now it is written (Ecclus. 4:7): “Make thyself affable to the congregation of the poor.” Therefore affability, which is what we mean by friendship, is a special virtue.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(109), A(2); P(1), Q(55), A(3)**), since virtue is directed to good, wherever there is a special kind of good, there must needs be a special kind of virtue. Now good consists in order, as stated above (**Q(109), A(2)**). And it behooves man to be maintained in a becoming order towards other men as regards their mutual relations with one another, in point of both deeds and words, so that they behave towards one another in a becoming manner. Hence the need of a special virtue that maintains the becomingness of this order: and this virtue is called friendliness.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(1)-RO(1) — The Philosopher speaks of a twofold friendship in his Ethics. One consists chiefly in the affection whereby one man loves another and may result from any virtue. We have stated above, in treating of charity (**Q(23), A(1), A(3)**, ad 1; **QQ(25), 26**), what things belong to this kind of friendship. But he mentions another friendliness, which consists merely in outward words or deeds; this has not the perfect nature of friendship, but bears a certain likeness thereto, in so far as a man behaves in a becoming manner towards those with whom he is in contact.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(1)-RO(2) — Every man is naturally every man’s friend by a certain general love; even so it is written (Ecclus. 13:19) that “every beast loveth its like.” This love is signified by signs of friendship, which we show outwardly by words or deeds, even to those who are strangers or unknown to us. Hence there is no dissimulation in this: because we do not show them signs of perfect friendship, for we do not treat strangers with the same intimacy as those who are united to us by special friendship.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(1)-RO(3) — When it is said that “the heart of the wise is where there is mourning” it is not that he may bring sorrow to his neighbor, for the Apostle says (^{~5415} Romans 14:15):

“If, because of thy meat, thy brother be grieved, thou walkest not now according to charity”:

but that he may bring consolation to the sorrowful, according to Eccclus. 7:38, “Be not wanting in comforting them that weep, and walk with them that mourn.” Again, “the heart of fools is where there is mirth,” not that they may gladden others, but that they may enjoy others’ gladness. Accordingly, it belongs to the wise man to share his pleasures with those among whom he dwells, not lustful pleasures, which virtue shuns, but honest pleasures, according to ~~Eccl~~ Psalm 132:1, “Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.”

Nevertheless, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 6), for the sake of some good that will result, or in order to avoid some evil, the virtuous man will sometimes not shrink from bringing sorrow to those among whom he lives. Hence the Apostle says (~~2 Cor~~ 2 Corinthians 7:8): “Although I made you sorrowful by my epistle, I do not repent,” and further on (~~2 Cor~~ 2 Corinthians 7:9),

“I am glad; not because you were made sorrowful, but because you were made sorrowful unto repentance.”

For this reason we should not show a cheerful face to those who are given to sin, in order that we may please them, lest we seem to consent to their sin, and in a way encourage them to sin further. Hence it is written (Eccclus. 7:26):

“Hast thou daughters? Have a care of their body, and show not thy countenance gay towards them.”

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(2)

Whether this kind of friendship is a part of justice?

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that this kind of friendship is not a part of justice. For justice consists in giving another man his due. But this virtue does not consist in doing that, but in behaving agreeably towards those among whom we live. Therefore this virtue is not a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 6), this virtue is concerned about the joys and sorrows of those who dwell in fellowship. Now it belongs to temperance to moderate the greatest pleasures, as stated above (**P(1), Q(60), A(5); P(1), Q(61), A(3)**). Therefore this virtue is a part of temperance rather than of justice.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, to give equal things to those who are unequal is contrary to justice, as stated above (**Q(59), AA(1),2**). Now, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 6), this virtue “treats in like manner known and unknown, companions and strangers.” Therefore this virtue rather than being a part of justice is opposed thereto.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Macrobius (De Somno Scip. i) accounts friendship a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(2) — *I answer that*, This virtue is a part of justice, being annexed to it as to a principal virtue. Because in common with justice it is directed to another person, even as justice is: yet it falls short of the notion of justice, because it lacks the full aspect of debt, whereby one man is bound to another, either by legal debt, which the law binds him to pay, or by some debt arising out of a favor received. For it regards merely a certain debt of equity, namely, that we behave pleasantly to those among whom we dwell, unless at times, for some reason, it be necessary to displease them for some good purpose.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(2)-RO(1) — As we have said above (**Q(109), A(3)**, ad 1), because man is a social animal he owes his fellow-man, in equity, the manifestation of truth without which human society could not last. Now as man could not live in society without truth, so likewise, not without joy, because, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. viii), no one could abide a day with the sad nor with the joyless. Therefore, a certain natural equity obliges a man to live agreeably with his fellow-men; unless some reason should oblige him to sadden them for their good.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(2)-RO(2) — It belongs to temperance to curb pleasures of the senses. But this virtue regards the pleasures of fellowship, which have their origin in the reason, in so far as one man behaves becomingly towards another. Such pleasures need not to be curbed as though they were noisome.

P(2b)-Q(114)-A(2)-RO(3) — This saying of the Philosopher does not mean that one ought to converse and behave in the same way with acquaintances and strangers, since, as he says (Ethic. iv, 6), “it is not fitting to please and displease intimate friends and strangers in the same way.” This likeness consists in this, that we ought to behave towards all in a fitting manner.

VICES OPPOSED TO FRIENDLINESS

QUESTIONS 115-117

QUESTION 115

OF FLATTERY

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the vices opposed to the aforesaid virtue:

(1) Flattery, and

(2) Quarreling.

Concerning flattery there are two points of inquiry:

(1) Whether flattery is a sin?

(2) Whether it is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(1)

Whether flattery is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that flattery is not a sin. For flattery consists in words of praise offered to another in order to please him. But it is not a sin to praise a person, according to ^{<318>}Proverbs 31:28,

“Her children rose up and called her blessed:
her husband, and he praised her.”

Moreover, there is no evil in wishing to please others, according to ^{<403>}1 Corinthians 10:33, “I... in all things please all men.” Therefore flattery is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, evil is contrary to good, and blame to praise. But it is not a sin to blame evil. Neither, then, is it a sin to praise good, which seems to belong to flattery. Therefore flattery is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, detraction is contrary to flattery. Wherefore Gregory says (Moral. xxii, 5) that detraction is a remedy against flattery. “It must be observed,” says he, “that by the wonderful moderation of our Ruler, we are often allowed to be rent by detractions but are uplifted by immoderate praise, so that whom the voice of the flatterer upraises, the tongue of the detractor may humble.” But detraction is an evil, as stated above (**Q(73), AA(2),3**). Therefore flattery is a good.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on ^{Gen}Ezekiel 13:18, “Woe to them that sew cushions under every elbow,” says, “that is to say, sweet flattery.” Therefore flattery is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(114), A(1)**, ad 3), although the friendship of which we have been speaking, or affability, intends chiefly the pleasure of those among whom one lives, yet it does not fear to displease when it is a question of obtaining a certain good, or of avoiding a certain evil. Accordingly, if a man were to wish always to speak pleasantly to others, he would exceed the mode of pleasing, and would therefore sin by excess. If he do this with the mere intention of pleasing he is said to be “complaisant,” according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 6): whereas if he do it with the intention of making some gain out of it, he is called a “flatterer” or “adulator.” As a rule, however, the term “flattery” is wont to be applied to all who wish to exceed the mode of virtue in pleasing others by words or deeds in their ordinary behavior towards their fellows.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(1)-RO(1) — One may praise a person both well and ill, according as one observes or omits the due circumstances. For if while observing other due circumstances one were to wish to please a person by praising him, in order thereby to console him, or that he may strive to make progress in good, this will belong to the aforesaid virtue of friendship. But it would belong to flattery, if one wished to praise a person for things in which he ought not to be praised; since perhaps they are evil, according to ^{Psalm}Psalm 9:24, “The sinner is praised in the desires of his soul”; or they may be uncertain, according to Ecclus. 27:8, “Praise not a man before he speaketh,” and again (Ecclus. 11:2), “Praise not a man for

his beauty”; or because there may be fear lest human praise should incite him to vainglory, wherefore it is written, (Ecclus. 11:30), “Praise not any man before death.” Again, in like manner it is right to wish to please a man in order to foster charity, so that he may make spiritual progress therein. But it would be sinful to wish to please men for the sake of vainglory or gain, or to please them in something evil, according to ^{<1910>}Psalm 52:6, “God hath scattered the bones of them that please men,” and according to the words of the Apostle (^{<1910>}Galatians 1:10), “If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.”

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(1)-RO(2) — Even to blame evil is sinful, if due circumstances be not observed; and so too is it to praise good.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(1)-RO(3) — Nothing hinders two vices being contrary to one another. Wherefore even as detraction is evil, so is flattery, which is contrary thereto as regards what is said, but not directly as regards the end. Because flattery seeks to please the person flattered, whereas the detractor seeks not the displeasure of the person defamed, since at times he defames him in secret, but seeks rather his defamation.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(2)

Whether flattery is a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that flattery is a mortal sin. For, according to Augustine (Enchiridion xii), “a thing is evil because it is harmful.” But flattery is most harmful, according to ^{<1910>}Psalm 9:24,

“For the sinner is praised in the desires of his soul, and the unjust man is blessed. The sinner hath provoked the Lord.”

Wherefore Jerome says (Ep. ad Celant): “Nothing so easily corrupts the human mind as flattery”: and a gloss on ^{<1910>}Psalm 69:4, “Let them be presently turned away blushing for shame that say to me: ‘Tis well, ‘Tis well,” says: “The tongue of the flatterer harms more than the sword of the persecutor.” Therefore flattery is a most grievous sin.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, whoever does harm by words, harms himself no less than others: wherefore it is written (^{<1910>}Psalm 36:15): “Let

their sword enter into their own hearts.” Now he that flatters another induces him to sin mortally: hence a gloss on ~~CH15~~ Psalm 140:5, “Let not the oil of the sinner fatten my head,” says: “The false praise of the flatterer softens the mind by depriving it of the rigidity of truth and renders it susceptible of vice.” Much more, therefore, does the flatterer sin in himself.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it is written in the Decretals (D. XLVI, Cap. 3): “The cleric who shall be found to spend his time in flattery and treachery shall be degraded from his office.” Now such a punishment as this is not inflicted save for mortal sin. Therefore flattery is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine in a sermon on Purgatory (xli, de Sanctis) reckons among slight sins, “if one desire to flatter any person of higher standing, whether of one’s own choice, or out of necessity.”

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**Q(112), A(2)**), a mortal sin is one that is contrary to charity. Now flattery is sometimes contrary to charity and sometimes not. It is contrary to charity in three ways. First, by reason of the very matter, as when one man praises another’s sin: for this is contrary to the love of God, against Whose justice he speaks, and contrary to the love of his neighbor, whom he encourages to sin. Wherefore this is a mortal sin, according to ~~CH15~~ Isaiah 5:20. “Woe to you that call evil good.” Secondly, by reason of the intention, as when one man flatters another, so that by deceiving him he may injure him in body or in soul; this is also a mortal sin, and of this it is written (~~CH15~~ Proverbs 27:6): “Better are the wounds of a friend than the deceitful kisses of an enemy.” Thirdly, by way of occasion, as when the praise of a flatterer, even without his intending it, becomes to another an occasion of sin. In this case it is necessary to consider, whether the occasion were given or taken, and how grievous the consequent downfall, as may be understood from what has been said above concerning scandal (**Q(43), AA(3),4**). If, however, one man flatters another from the mere craving to please others, or again in order to avoid some evil, or to acquire something in a case of necessity, this is not contrary to charity. Consequently it is not a mortal but a venial sin.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(2)-RO(1) — The passages quoted speak of the flatterer who praises another’s sin. Flattery of this kind is said to harm more than

the sword of the persecutor, since it does harm to goods that are of greater consequence. namely, spiritual goods. Yet it does not harm so efficaciously, since the sword of the persecutor slays effectively, being a sufficient cause of death; whereas no one by flattering can be a sufficient cause of another's sinning, as was shown above (**Q(43), A(1)**, ad 3; **P(1), Q(73), A(8)**, ad 3; **P(1), Q(80), A(1)**).

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(2)-RO(2) — This argument applies to one that flatters with the intention of doing harm: for such a man harms himself more than others, since he harms himself, as the sufficient cause of sinning, whereas he is only the occasional cause of the harm he does to others.

P(2b)-Q(115)-A(2)-RO(3) — The passage quoted refers to the man who flatters another treacherously, in order to deceive him.

QUESTION 116

OF QUARRELING

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider quarreling; concerning which there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether it is opposed to the virtue of friendship?
- (2) Of its comparison with flattery?

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(1)

*Whether quarreling is opposed to
the virtue of friendship or affability?*

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that quarreling is not opposed to the virtue of friendship or affability. For quarreling seems to pertain to discord, just as contention does. But discord is opposed to charity, as stated above (**Q(37)**, **A(1)**). Therefore quarreling is also.

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, it is written (²¹⁶²Proverbs 26:21): “An angry man stirreth up strife.” Now anger is opposed to meekness. Therefore strife or quarreling is also.

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, it is written (⁵⁰⁰¹James 4:1):

“From whence are wars and quarrels [Douay: ‘contentions’] among you? Are they not hence, from your concupiscences which war in your members?”

Now it would seem contrary to temperance to follow one’s concupiscences. Therefore it seems that quarreling is opposed not to friendship but to temperance.

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(1) — On the contrary, The Philosopher opposes quarreling to friendship (Ethic. iv, 6).

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(1) — *I answer that*, Quarreling consists properly in words, when, namely, one person contradicts another's words. Now two things may be observed in this contradiction. For sometimes contradiction arises on account of the person who speaks, the contradictor refusing to consent with him from lack of that love which unites minds together, and this seems to pertain to discord, which is contrary to charity. Whereas at times contradiction arises by reason of the speaker being a person to whom someone does not fear to be disagreeable: whence arises quarreling, which is opposed to the aforesaid friendship or affability, to which it belongs to behave agreeably towards those among whom we dwell. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 6) that "those who are opposed to everything with the intent of being disagreeable, and care for nobody, are said to be peevish and quarrelsome."

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(1)-RO(1) — Contention pertains rather to the contradiction of discord, while quarreling belongs to the contradiction which has the intention of displeasing.

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(1)-RO(2) — The direct opposition of virtues to vices depends, not on their causes, since one vice may arise from many causes, but on the species of their acts. And although quarreling arises at times from anger, it may arise from many other causes, hence it does not follow that it is directly opposed to meekness.

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(1)-RO(3) — James speaks there of concupiscence considered as a general evil whence all vices arise. Thus, a gloss on ~~ROM~~Romans 7:7 says:

"The law is good, since by forbidding concupiscence,
it forbids all evil."

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(2)

Whether quarreling is a more grievous sin than flattery?

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that quarreling is a less grievous sin than the contrary vice, viz. adulation or flattery. For the more harm a sin does the more grievous it seems to be. Now flattery does more harm than quarreling, for it is written (~~ISA~~Isaiah 3:12):

“O My people, they that call thee blessed, the same deceive thee,
and destroy the way of thy steps.”

Therefore flattery is a more grievous sin than quarreling.

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, there appears to be a certain amount of deceit in flattery, since the flatterer says one thing, and thinks another: whereas the quarrelsome man is without deceit, for he contradicts openly. Now he that sins deceitfully is a viler man, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. vii, 6). Therefore flattery is a more grievous sin than quarreling.

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, shame is fear of what is vile, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 9). But a man is more ashamed to be a flatterer than a quarreler. Therefore quarreling is a less grievous sin than flattery.

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The more a sin is inconsistent with the spiritual state, the more it appears to be grievous. Now quarreling seems to be more inconsistent with the spiritual state: for it is written (~~SIN~~¹ Timothy 3:2,3) that it “behooveth a bishop to be... not quarrelsome”; and (~~SIN~~² Timothy 3:24): “The servant of the Lord must not wrangle.” Therefore quarreling seems to be a more grievous sin than flattery.

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(2) — *I answer that*, We can speak of each of these sins in two ways. In one way we may consider the species of either sin, and thus the more a vice is at variance with the opposite virtue the more grievous it is. Now the virtue of friendship has a greater tendency to please than to displease: and so the quarrelsome man, who exceeds in giving displeasure sins more grievously than the adulator or flatterer, who exceeds in giving pleasure. In another way we may consider them as regards certain external motives, and thus flattery sometimes more grievous, for instance when one intends by deception to acquire undue honor or gain: while sometimes quarreling is more grievous; for instance, when one intends either to deny the truth, or to hold up the speaker to contempt.

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(2)-RO(1) — Just as the flatterer may do harm by deceiving secretly, so the quarreler may do harm sometimes by assailing openly. Now, other things being equal, it is more grievous to harm a person openly, by violence as it were, than secretly. Wherefore robbery is a more grievous sin than theft, as stated above (**Q(66), A(9)**).

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(2)-RO(2) — In human acts, the more grievous is not always the more vile. For the comeliness of a man has its source in his reason: wherefore the sins of the flesh, whereby the flesh enslaves the reason, are viler, although spiritual sins are more grievous, since they proceed from greater contempt. In like manner, sins that are committed through deceit are viler, in so far as they seem to arise from a certain weakness, and from a certain falseness of the reason, although sins that are committed openly proceed sometimes from a greater contempt. Hence flattery, through being accompanied by deceit, seems to be a viler sin; while quarreling, through proceeding from greater contempt, is apparently more grievous.

P(2b)-Q(116)-A(2)-RO(3) — As stated in the objection, shame regards the vileness of a sin; wherefore a man is not always more ashamed of a more grievous sin, but of a viler sin. Hence it is that a man is more ashamed of flattery than of quarreling, although quarreling is more grievous.

QUESTION 117

OF LIBERALITY

(SIX ARTICLES)

We must now consider liberality and the opposite vices, namely, covetousness and prodigality.

Concerning liberality there are six points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether liberality is a virtue?
- (2) What is its matter?
- (3) Of its act;
- (4) Whether it pertains thereto to give rather than to take?
- (5) Whether liberality is a part of justice?
- (6) Of its comparison with other virtues.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(1)

Whether liberality is a virtue?

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that liberality is not a virtue. For no virtue is contrary to a natural inclination. Now it is a natural inclination for one to provide for oneself more than for others: and yet it pertains to the liberal man to do the contrary, since, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 1), “it is the mark of a liberal man not to look to himself, so that he leaves for himself the lesser things.” Therefore liberality is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, man sustains life by means of riches, and wealth contributes to happiness instrumentally, as stated in Ethic. i, 8. Since, then, every virtue is directed to happiness, it seems that the liberal man is not virtuous, for the Philosopher says of him (Ethic. iv, 1) that “he is inclined neither to receive nor to keep money, but to give it away.”

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the virtues are connected with one another. But liberality does not seem to be connected with the other virtues: since many are virtuous who cannot be liberal, for they have nothing to give; and many give or spend liberally who are not virtuous otherwise. Therefore liberality is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Ambrose says (De Offic. i) that “the Gospel contains many instances in which a just liberality is inculcated.” Now in the Gospel nothing is taught that does not pertain to virtue. Therefore liberality is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As Augustine says (De Lib. Arb. ii, 19), “it belongs to virtue to use well the things that we can use ill.” Now we may use both well and ill, not only the things that are within us, such as the powers and the passions of the soul, but also those that are without, such as the things of this world that are granted us for our livelihood. Wherefore since it belongs to liberality to use these things well, it follows that liberality is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(1)-RO(1) — According to Ambrose (Serm. lxiv de Temp.) and Basil (Hom. in Luc. xii, 18) excess of riches is granted by God to some, in order that they may obtain the merit of a good stewardship. But it suffices for one man to have few things. Wherefore the liberal man commendably spends more on others than on himself. Nevertheless we are bound to be more provident for ourselves in spiritual goods, in which each one is able to look after himself in the first place. And yet it does not belong to the liberal man even in temporal things to attend so much to others as to lose sight of himself and those belonging to him. Wherefore Ambrose says (De Offic. i): “It is a commendable liberality not to neglect your relatives if you know them to be in want.”

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(1)-RO(2) — It does not belong to a liberal man so to give away his riches that nothing is left for his own support, nor the wherewithal to perform those acts of virtue whereby happiness is acquired. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1) that “the liberal man does not neglect his own, wishing thus to be of help to certain people”; and Ambrose says (De Offic. i) that “Our Lord does not wish a man to pour out his riches all at once, but to dispense them: unless he do as Eliseus did, who slew his oxen and fed the poor, that he might not be

bound by any household cares.” For this belongs to the state of perfection, of which we shall speak farther on (**Q(184)**, **Q(186)**, **A(3)**).

It must be observed, however, that the very act of giving away one’s possessions liberally, in so far as it is an act of virtue, is directed to happiness.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(1)-RO(3) — As the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1), “those who spend much on intemperance are not liberal but prodigal”; and likewise whoever spends what he has for the sake of other sins. Hence Ambrose says (De Offic. i): “If you assist to rob others of their possessions, your honesty is not to be commended, nor is your liberality genuine if you give for the sake of boasting rather than of pity.” Wherefore those who lack other virtues, though they spend much on certain evil works, are not liberal.

Again, nothing hinders certain people from spending much on good uses, without having the habit of liberality: even as men perform works of other virtues, before having the habit of virtue, though not in the same way as virtuous people, as stated above (**P(1)**, **Q(65)**, **A(1)**). In like manner nothing prevents a virtuous man from being liberal, although he be poor. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1): “Liberality is proportionate to a man’s substance,” i.e. his means, “for it consists, not in the quantity given, but in the habit of the giver”: and Ambrose says (De Offic. i) that “it is the heart that makes a gift rich or poor, and gives things their value.”

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(2)

Whether liberality is about money?

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that liberality is not about money. For every moral virtue is about operations and passions. Now it is proper to justice to be about operations, as stated in Ethic. v, 1. Therefore, since liberality is a moral virtue, it seems that it is about passions and not about money.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, it belongs to a liberal man to make use of any kind of wealth. Now natural riches are more real than artificial

riches, according to the Philosopher (Polit. i, 5,6). Therefore liberality is not chiefly about money.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, different virtues have different matter, since habits are distinguished by their objects. But external things are the matter of distributive and commutative justice. Therefore they are not the matter of liberality.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1) that “liberality seems to be a mean in the matter of money.”

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(2) — *I answer that*, According to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 1) it belongs to the liberal man to part with things. Hence liberality is also called open-handedness [largitas], because that which is open does not withhold things but parts of them. The term “liberality” seems also to allude to this, since when a man quits hold of a thing he frees it [liberat], so to speak, from his keeping and ownership, and shows his mind to be free of attachment thereto. Now those things which are the subject of a man’s free-handedness towards others are the goods he possesses, which are denoted by the term “money.” Therefore the proper matter of liberality is money.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(2)-RO(1) — As stated above (**A(1)**, ad 3), liberality depends not on the quantity given, but on the heart of the giver. Now the heart of the giver is disposed according to the passions of love and desire, and consequently those of pleasure and sorrow, towards the things given. Hence the interior passions are the immediate matter of liberality, while exterior money is the object of those same passions.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(2)-RO(2) — As Augustine says in his book De Disciplina Christi (Tract. de divers, i), everything whatsoever man has on earth, and whatsoever he owns, goes by the name of “‘pecunia’ [money], because in olden times men’s possessions consisted entirely of ‘pecora’ [flocks].” And the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1): “We give the name of money to anything that can be valued in currency.”

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(2)-RO(3) — Justice establishes equality in external things, but has nothing to do, properly speaking, with the regulation of internal passions: wherefore money is in one way the matter of liberality, and in another way of justice.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(3)

Whether using money is the act of liberality?

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that using money is not the act of liberality. For different virtues have different acts. But using money is becoming to other virtues, such as justice and magnificence. Therefore it is not the proper act of liberality.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, it belongs to a liberal man, not only to give but also to receive and keep. But receiving and keeping do not seem to be connected with the use of money. Therefore using money seems to be unsuitably assigned as the proper act of liberality.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, the use of money consists not only in giving it but also in spending it. But the spending of money refers to the spender, and consequently is not an act of liberality: for Seneca says (De Benef. v): “A man is not liberal by giving to himself.” Therefore not every use of money belongs to liberality.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1): “In whatever matter a man is virtuous, he will make the best use of that matter: Therefore he that has the virtue with regard to money will make the best use of riches.” Now such is the liberal man. Therefore the good use of money is the act of liberality.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(3) — *I answer that*, The species of an act is taken from its object, as stated above (**P(1), Q(18), A(2)**). Now the object or matter of liberality is money and whatever has a money value, as stated in the foregoing Article (ad 2). And since every virtue is consistent with its object, it follows that, since liberality is a virtue, its act is consistent with money. Now money comes under the head of useful goods, since all external goods are directed to man’s use. Hence the proper act of liberality is making use of money or riches.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(3)-RO(1) — It belongs to liberality to make good use of riches as such, because riches are the proper matter of liberality. On the other hand it belongs to justice to make use of riches under another aspect, namely, that of debt, in so far as an external thing is due to another. And it

belongs to magnificence to make use of riches under a special aspect, in so far, to wit, as they are employed for the fulfilment of some great deed. Hence magnificence stands in relation to liberality as something in addition thereto, as we shall explain farther on (**Q(134)**).

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(3)-RO(2) — It belongs to a virtuous man not only to make good use of his matter or instrument, but also to provide opportunities for that good use. Thus it belongs to a soldier's fortitude not only to wield his sword against the foe, but also to sharpen his sword and keep it in its sheath. Thus, too, it belongs to liberality not only to use money, but also to keep it in preparation and safety in order to make fitting use of it.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(3)-RO(3) — As stated (**A(2)**, ad 1), the internal passions whereby man is affected towards money are the proximate matter of liberality. Hence it belongs to liberality before all that a man should not be prevented from making any due use of money through an inordinate affection for it. Now there is a twofold use of money: one consists in applying it to one's own use, and would seem to come under the designation of costs or expenditure; while the other consists in devoting it to the use of others, and comes under the head of gifts. Hence it belongs to liberality that one be not hindered by an immoderate love of money, either from spending it becomingly, or from making suitable gifts. Therefore liberality is concerned with giving and spending, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 1). The saying of Seneca refers to liberality as regards giving: for a man is not said to be liberal for the reason that he gives something to himself.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(4)

Whether it belongs to a liberal man chiefly to give?

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that it does not belong to a liberal man chiefly to give. For liberality, like all other moral virtues, is regulated by prudence. Now it seems to belong very much to prudence that a man should keep his riches. Wherefore the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1) that "those who have not earned money, but have received the money earned by others, spend it more liberally, because they have not experienced the

want of it.” Therefore it seems that giving does not chiefly belong to the liberal man.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, no man is sorry for what he intends chiefly to do, nor does he cease from doing it. But a liberal man is sometimes sorry for what he has given, nor does he give to all, as stated in Ethic. iv, 1. Therefore it does not belong chiefly to a liberal man to give.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, in order to accomplish what he intends chiefly, a man employs all the ways he can. Now a liberal man is not a beggar, as the Philosopher observes (Ethic. iv, 1); and yet by begging he might provide himself with the means of giving to others. Therefore it seems that he does not chiefly aim at giving.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(4)-O(4) — Further, man is bound to look after himself rather than others. But by spending he looks after himself, whereas by giving he looks after others. Therefore it belongs to a liberal man to spend rather than to give.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1) that “it belongs to a liberal man to surpass in giving.”

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(4) — *I answer that*, It is proper to a liberal man to use money. Now the use of money consists in parting with it. For the acquisition of money is like generation rather than use: while the keeping of money, in so far as it is directed to facilitate the use of money, is like a habit. Now in parting with a thing — for instance, when we throw something — the farther we put it away the greater the force [virtus] employed. Hence parting with money by giving it to others proceeds from a greater virtue than when we spend it on ourselves. But it is proper to a virtue as such to tend to what is more perfect, since “virtue is a kind of perfection” (Phys. vii, text. 17,18). Therefore a liberal man is praised chiefly for giving.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(4)-RO(1) — It belongs to prudence to keep money, lest it be stolen or spent uselessly. But to spend it usefully is not less but more prudent than to keep it usefully: since more things have to be considered in money’s use, which is likened to movement, than in its keeping, which is likened to rest. As to those who, having received money that others have earned, spend it more liberally, through not having

experienced the want of it, if their inexperience is the sole cause of their liberal expenditure they have not the virtue of liberality. Sometimes, however, this inexperience merely removes the impediment to liberality, so that it makes them all the more ready to act liberally, because, not unfrequently, the fear of want that results from the experience of want hinders those who have acquired money from using it up by acting with liberality; as does likewise the love they have for it as being their own effect, according to the Philosopher (*Ethic. iv, 1*).

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(4)-RO(2) — As stated in this and the preceding Article, it belongs to liberality to make fitting use of money, and consequently to give it in a fitting manner, since this is a use of money. Again, every virtue is grieved by whatever is contrary to its act, and avoids whatever hinders that act. Now two things are opposed to suitable giving; namely, not giving what ought suitably to be given, and giving something unsuitably. Wherefore the liberal man is grieved at both: but especially at the former, since it is more opposed to his proper act. For this reason, too, he does not give to all: since his act would be hindered were he to give to everyone: for he would not have the means of giving to those to whom it were fitting for him to give.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(4)-RO(3) — Giving and receiving are related to one another as action and passion. Now the same thing is not the principle of both action and passion. Hence, since liberality is a principle of giving, it does not belong to the liberal man to be ready to receive, and still less to beg. Hence the verse:

‘In this world he that wishes to be pleasing to many Should give often, take seldom, ask never.’ But he makes provision in order to give certain things according as liberality requires; such are the fruits of his own possessions, for he is careful about realizing them that he may make a liberal use thereof.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(4)-RO(4) — To spend on oneself is an inclination of nature; hence to spend money on others belongs properly to a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(5)***Whether liberality is a part of justice?***

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(5)-O(1) — It seems that liberality is not a part of justice. For justice regards that which is due. Now the more a thing is due the less liberally is it given. Therefore liberality is not a part of justice, but is incompatible with it.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, justice is about operation as stated above (**Q(58)**, **A(9)**; **P(1)**, **Q(60)**, **AA(2),3**): whereas liberality is chiefly about the love and desire of money, which are passions. Therefore liberality seems to belong to temperance rather than to justice.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, it belongs chiefly to liberality to give becomingly, as stated (**A(4)**). But giving becomingly belongs to beneficence and mercy, which pertain to charity, as state above (**QQ(30),31**). Therefore liberality is a part of charity rather than of justice.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Ambrose says (De Offic. i): “Justice has to do with the fellowship of mankind. For the notion of fellowship is divided into two parts, justice and beneficence, also called liberality or kind-heartedness.” Therefore liberality pertains to justice.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Liberality is not a species of justice, since justice pays another what is his whereas liberality gives another what is one’s own. There are, however, two points in which it agrees with justice: first, that it is directed chiefly to another, as justice is; secondly, that it is concerned with external things, and so is justice, albeit under a different aspect, as stated in this Article and above (**A(2)**, ad 3). Hence it is that liberality is reckoned by some to be a part of justice, being annexed thereto as to a principal virtue.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(5)-RO(1) — Although liberality does not consider the legal due that justice considers, it considers a certain moral due. This due is based on a certain fittingness and not on an obligation: so that it answers to the idea of due in the lowest degree.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(5)-RO(2) — Temperance is about concupiscence in pleasures of the body. But the concupiscence and delight in money is not

referable to the body but rather to the soul. Hence liberality does not properly pertain to temperance.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(5)-RO(3) — The giving of beneficence and mercy proceeds from the fact that a man has a certain affection towards the person to whom he gives: wherefore this giving belongs to charity or friendship. But the giving of liberality arises from a person being affected in a certain way towards money, in that he desires it not nor loves it: so that when it is fitting he gives it not only to his friends but also to those whom he knows not. Hence it belong not to charity, but to justice, which is about external things.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(6)

Whether liberality is the greatest of the virtues?

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(6)-O(1) — It seems that liberality is the greatest of the virtues. For every virtue of man is a likeness to the divine goodness. Now man is likened chiefly by liberality to God, “Who giveth to all men abundantly, and upbraideth not” (^{<5005>}James 1:5). Therefore liberality is the greatest of the virtues.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, according to Augustine (De Trin. vi, 8), “in things that are great, but not in bulk, to be greatest is to be best.” Now the nature of goodness seems to pertain mostly to liberality, since “the good is self-communicative,” according to Dionysius (Div. Nom. iv). Hence Ambrose says (De Offic. i) that “justice reclines to severity, liberality to goodness.” Therefore liberality is the greatest of virtues.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, men are honored and loved on account of virtue. Now Boethius says (De Consol. ii) that “bounty above all makes a man famous”: and the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1) that “among the virtuous the liberal are the most beloved.” Therefore liberality is the greatest of virtues.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Ambrose says (De Offic. i) that “justice seems to be more excellent than liberality, although liberality is more pleasing.” The Philosopher also says (Rhet. i, 9) that “brave and just men are honored chiefly and, after them, those who are liberal.”

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(6) — *I answer that,* Every virtue tends towards a good; wherefore the greater virtue is that which tends towards the greater good. Now liberality tends towards a good in two ways: in one way, primarily and of its own nature; in another way, consequently. Primarily and of its very nature it tends to set in order one's own affection towards the possession and use of money. In this way temperance, which moderates desires and pleasures relating to one's own body, takes precedence of liberality: and so do fortitude and justice, which, in a manner, are directed to the common good, one in time of peace, the other in time of war: while all these are preceded by those virtues which are directed to the Divine good. For the Divine good surpasses all manner of human good; and among human goods the public good surpasses the good of the individual; and of the last named the good of the body surpasses those goods that consist of external things. Again, liberality is ordained to a good consequently, and in this way it is directed to all the aforesaid goods. For by reason of his not being a lover of money, it follows that a man readily makes use of it, whether for himself. Or for the good of others, or for God's glory. Thus it derives a certain excellence from being useful in many ways. Since, however, we should judge of things according to that which is competent to them primarily and in respect of their nature, rather than according to that which pertains to them consequently, it remains to be said that liberality is not the greatest of virtues.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(6)-RO(1) — God's giving proceeds from His love for those to whom He gives, not from His affection towards the things He gives, wherefore it seems to pertain to charity, the greatest of virtues, rather than to liberality.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(6)-RO(2) — Every virtue shares the nature of goodness by giving forth its own act: and the acts of certain other virtues are better than money which liberality gives forth.

P(2b)-Q(117)-A(6)-RO(3) — The friendship whereby a liberal man is beloved is not that which is based on virtue, as though he were better than others, but that which is based on utility, because he is more useful in external goods, which as a rule men desire above all others. For the same reason he becomes famous.

VICES OPPOSED TO LIBERALITY

QUESTIONS 118-122

QUESTION 118

OF THE VICES OPPOSED TO LIBERALITY, AND IN THE FIRST PLACE, OF COVETOUSNESS

(EIGHT ARTICLES)

We must now consider the vices opposed to liberality: and

- (1) covetousness;
- (2) prodigality.

Under the first head there are eight points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether covetousness is a sin?
- (2) Whether it is a special sin?
- (3) To which virtue it is opposed;
- (4) Whether it is a mortal sin?
- (5) Whether it is the most grievous of sins?
- (6) Whether it is a sin of the flesh or a spiritual sin?
- (7) Whether it is a capital vice?
- (8) Of its daughters.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(1)

Whether covetousness is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that covetousness is not a sin. For covetousness [avaritia] denotes a certain greed for gold [aeris aviditas*], because, to wit, it consists in a desire for money, under which all external goods may be comprised. [*The Latin for covetousness “avaritia” is derived from “aveo” to desire; but the Greek {philargyria} signifies literally “love of money”: and it is to this that St. Thomas is alluding (cf. **A(2), O(2)**)] Now it is not a sin to desire external goods: since man desires them naturally, both because they are naturally subject to man, and because by their means man’s life is sustained (for which reason they are spoken of as his substance). Therefore covetousness is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, every sin is against either God, or one’s neighbor, or oneself, as stated above (**P(1), Q(72), A(4)**). But covetousness is not, properly speaking, a sin against God: since it is opposed neither to religion nor to the theological virtues, by which man is directed to God. Nor again is it a sin against oneself, for this pertains properly to gluttony and lust, of which the Apostle says (~~1~~¹ Corinthians 6:18): “He that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body.” In like manner neither is it apparently a sin against one’s neighbor, since a man harms no one by keeping what is his own. Therefore covetousness is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, things that occur naturally are not sins. Now covetousness comes naturally to old age and every kind of defect, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 1). Therefore covetousness is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is written (~~833~~⁸³³ Hebrews 13:5):

“Let your manners be without covetousness, contented with such things as you have.”

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(1) — *I answer that*, In whatever things good consists in a due measure, evil must of necessity ensue through excess or deficiency of that measure. Now in all things that are for an end, the good consists in a

certain measure: since whatever is directed to an end must needs be commensurate with the end, as, for instance, medicine is commensurate with health, as the Philosopher observes (Polit. i, 6). External goods come under the head of things useful for an end, as stated above (**Q(117), A(3); P(1), Q(2), A(1)**). Hence it must needs be that man's good in their respect consists in a certain measure, in other words, that man seeks, according to a certain measure, to have external riches, in so far as they are necessary for him to live in keeping with his condition of life. Wherefore it will be a sin for him to exceed this measure, by wishing to acquire or keep them immoderately. This is what is meant by covetousness, which is defined as "immoderate love of possessing." It is therefore evident that covetousness is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(1)-RO(1) — It is natural to man to desire external things as means to an end: wherefore this desire is devoid of sin, in so far as it is held in check by the rule taken from the nature of the end. But covetousness exceeds this rule, and therefore is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(1)-RO(2) — Covetousness may signify immoderation about external things in two ways. First, so as to regard immediately the acquisition and keeping of such things, when, to wit, a man acquires or keeps them more than is due. In this way it is a sin directly against one's neighbor, since one man cannot over-abound in external riches, without another man lacking them, for temporal goods cannot be possessed by many at the same time. Secondly, it may signify immoderation in the internal affection which a man has for riches when, for instance, a man loves them, desires them, or delights in them, immoderately. In this way by covetousness a man sins against himself, because it causes disorder in his affections, though not in his body as do the sins of the flesh.

As a consequence, however, it is a sin against God, just as all mortal sins, inasmuch as man contemns things eternal for the sake of temporal things.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(1)-RO(3) — Natural inclinations should be regulated according to reason, which is the governing power in human nature. Hence though old people seek more greedily the aid of external things, just as everyone that is in need seeks to have his need supplied, they are not excused from sin if they exceed this due measure of reason with regard to riches.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(2)

Whether covetousness is a special sin?

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that covetousness is not a special sin. For Augustine says (De Lib. Arb. iii): “Covetousness, which in Greek is called {philargyria}, applies not only to silver or money, but also to anything that is desired immoderately.” Now in every sin there is immoderate desire of something, because sin consists in turning away from the immutable good, and adhering to mutable goods, as state above (**P(1), Q(71), A(6), O(3)**). Therefore covetousness is a general sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, according to Isidore (Etym. x), “the covetous [avarus] man” is so called because he is “greedy for brass [avidus aeris],” i.e. money: wherefore in Greek covetousness is called {philargyria}, i.e. “love of silver.” Now silver, which stands for money, signifies all external goods the value of which can be measured by money, as stated above (**Q(117), A(2)**, ad 2). Therefore covetousness is a desire for any external thing: and consequently seems to be a general sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, a gloss on ^(~~611~~)Romans 7:7, “For I had not known concupiscence,” says: “The law is good, since by forbidding concupiscence, it forbids all evil.” Now the law seems to forbid especially the concupiscence of covetousness: hence it is written (^(~~611~~)Exodus 20:17): “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s goods.” Therefore the concupiscence of covetousness is all evil, and so covetousness is a general sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(2) — On the contrary, Covetousness is numbered together with other special sins (^(~~612~~)Romans 1:29), where it is written: “Being filled with all iniquity, malice, fornication, covetousness” [Douay: ‘avarice’], etc.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(2) — I answer that, Sins take their species from their objects, as stated above (**P(1), Q(72), A(1)**). Now the object of a sin is the good towards which an inordinate appetite tends. Hence where there is a special aspect of good inordinately desired, there is a special kind of sin. Now the useful good differs in aspect from the delightful good. And riches, as such, come under the head of useful good, since they are desired under the aspect of being useful to man. Consequently covetousness is a special

sin, forasmuch as it is an immoderate love of having possessions, which are comprised under the name of money, whence covetousness [avaritia] is denominated.

Since, however, the verb “to have,” which seems to have been originally employed in connection with possessions whereof we are absolute masters, is applied to many other things (thus a man is said to have health, a wife, clothes, and so forth, as stated in *De Praedicamentis*), consequently the term “covetousness” has been amplified to denote all immoderate desire for having anything whatever. Thus Gregory says in a homily (xvi in Ev.) that “covetousness is a desire not only for money, but also for knowledge and high places, when prominence is immoderately sought after.” In this way covetousness is not a special sin: and in this sense Augustine speaks of covetousness in the passage quoted in the First Objection. Wherefore this suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(2)-RO(2) — All those external things that are subject to the uses of human life are comprised under the term “money,” inasmuch as they have the aspect of useful good. But there are certain external goods that can be obtained by money, such as pleasures, honors, and so forth, which are desirable under another aspect. Wherefore the desire for such things is not properly called covetousness, in so far as it is a special vice.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(2)-RO(3) — This gloss speaks of the inordinate concupiscence for anything whatever. For it is easy to understand that if it is forbidden to covet another’s possessions it is also forbidden to covet those things that can be obtained by means of those possessions.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(3)

Whether covetousness is opposed to liberality?

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that covetousness is not opposed to liberality. For Chrysostom, commenting on ¹⁰⁸⁶Matthew 5:6, “Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice,” says, (Hom. xv in Matth.) that there are two kinds of justice, one general, and the other special, to which covetousness is opposed: and the Philosopher says the same (*Ethic.* v, 2). Therefore covetousness is not opposed to liberality.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, the sin of covetousness consists in a man's exceeding the measure in the things he possesses. But this measure is appointed by justice. Therefore covetousness is directly opposed to justice and not to liberality.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, liberality is a virtue that observes the mean between two contrary vices, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. i, 7; iv, 1). But covetousness has no contrary and opposite sin, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. v, 1,2). Therefore covetousness is not opposed to liberality.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, It is written (²¹⁸¹Ecclesiastes 5:9):

“A covetous man shall not be satisfied with money, and he that loveth riches shall have no fruits from them.”

Now not to be satisfied with money and to love it inordinately are opposed to liberality, which observes the mean in the desire of riches. Therefore covetousness is opposed to liberality.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Covetousness denotes immoderation with regard to riches in two ways. First, immediately in respect of the acquisition and keeping of riches. In this way a man obtains money beyond his due, by stealing or retaining another's property. This is opposed to justice, and in this sense covetousness is mentioned (³²²⁷Ezekiel 22:27):

“Her princes in the midst of her are like wolves ravening the prey to shed blood... and to run after gains through covetousness.”

Secondly, it denotes immoderation in the interior affections for riches; for instance, when a man loves or desires riches too much, or takes too much pleasure in them, even if he be unwilling to steal. In this way covetousness is opposed to liberality, which moderates these affections, as stated above (**Q(117), A(2)**, ad 3, **A(3)**, ad 3, **A(6)**). In this sense covetousness is spoken of (⁴⁹⁶2 Corinthians 9:5): “That they would... prepare this blessing before promised, to be ready, so as a blessing, not as covetousness,” where a gloss observes: “Lest they should regret what they had given, and give but little.”

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(3)-RO(1) — Chrysostom and the Philosopher are speaking of covetousness in the first sense: covetousness in the second sense is called illiberality [**{aneleutheria}*] by the Philosopher.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(3)-RO(2) — It belongs properly to justice to appoint the measure in the acquisition and keeping of riches from the point of view of legal due, so that a man should neither take nor retain another's property. But liberality appoints the measure of reason, principally in the interior affections, and consequently in the exterior taking and keeping of money, and in the spending of the same, in so far as these proceed from the interior affection, looking at the matter from the point of view not of the legal but of the moral debt, which latter depends on the rule of reason.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(3)-RO(3) — Covetousness as opposed to justice has no opposite vice: since it consists in having more than one ought according to justice, the contrary of which is to have less than one ought, and this is not a sin but a punishment. But covetousness as opposed to liberality has the vice of prodigality opposed to it.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(4)

Whether covetousness is always a mortal sin?

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that covetousness is always a mortal sin. For no one is worthy of death save for a mortal sin. But men are worthy of death on account of covetousness. For the Apostle after saying (^{¶113}Romans 1:29): “Being filled with all iniquity... fornication, covetousness [Douay: ‘avarice’],” etc. adds (^{¶113}Romans 1:32): “They who do such things are worthy of death.” Therefore covetousness is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the least degree of covetousness is to hold to one's own inordinately. But this seemingly is a mortal sin: for Basil says (Serm. super. Luc. xii, 18): “It is the hungry man's bread that thou keepest back, the naked man's cloak that thou hoardest, the needy man's money that thou possessest, hence thou despoilest as many as thou mightest succor.”

Now it is a mortal sin to do an injustice to another, since it is contrary to the love of our neighbor. Much more therefore is all covetousness a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, no one is struck with spiritual blindness save through a mortal sin, for this deprives a man of the light of grace. But, according to Chrysostom [*Hom. xv in the *Opus Imperfectum*, falsely ascribed to St. Chrysostom], “Lust for money brings darkness on the soul.” Therefore covetousness, which is lust for money, is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, A gloss on ~~1~~¹ Corinthians 3:12, “If any man build upon this foundation,” says (cf. St. Augustine, *De Fide et Oper.* xvi) that “he builds wood, hay, stubble, who thinks in the things of the world, how he may please the world,” which pertains to the sin of covetousness. Now he that builds wood, hay, stubble, sins not mortally but venially, for it is said of him that “he shall be saved, yet so as by fire.” Therefore covetousness is some times a venial sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(4) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(3)**) covetousness is twofold. In one way it is opposed to justice, and thus it is a mortal sin in respect of its genus. For in this sense covetousness consists in the unjust taking or retaining of another’s property, and this belongs to theft or robbery, which are mortal sins, as stated above (**Q(66), AA(6),8**). Yet venial sin may occur in this kind of covetousness by reason of imperfection of the act, as stated above (**Q(66), A(6)**, ad 3), when we were treating of theft.

In another way covetousness may be take as opposed to liberality: in which sense it denotes inordinate love of riches. Accordingly if the love of riches becomes so great as to be preferred to charity, in such wise that a man, through love of riches, fear not to act counter to the love of God and his neighbor, covetousness will then be a mortal sin. If, on the other hand, the inordinate nature of his love stops short of this, so that although he love riches too much, yet he does not prefer the love of them to the love of God, and is unwilling for the sake of riches to do anything in opposition to God or his neighbor, then covetousness is a venial sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(4)-RO(1) — Covetousness is numbered together with mortal sins, by reason of the aspect under which it is a mortal sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(4)-RO(2) — Basil is speaking of a case wherein a man is bound by a legal debt to give of his goods to the poor, either through fear of their want or on account of his having too much.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(4)-RO(3) — Lust for riches, properly speaking, brings darkness on the soul, when it puts out the light of charity, by preferring the love of riches to the love of God.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(5)

Whether covetousness is the greatest of sins?

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(5)-O(1) — It seems that covetousness is the greatest of sins. For it is written (Ecclus. 10:9): “Nothing is more wicked than a covetous man,” and the text continues: “There is not a more wicked thing than to love money: for such a one setteth even his own soul to sale.” Tully also says (De Offic. i, under the heading, ‘True magnanimity is based chiefly on two things’): “Nothing is so narrow or little minded as to love money.” But this pertains to covetousness. Therefore covetousness is the most grievous of sins.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, the more a sin is opposed to charity, the more grievous it is. Now covetousness is most opposed to charity: for Augustine says (**QQ(83)**, qu. 36) that “greed is the bane of charity.” Therefore covetousness is the greatest of sins.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, the gravity of a sin is indicated by its being incurable: wherefore the sin against the Holy Ghost is said to be most grievous, because it is irremissible. But covetousness is an incurable sin: hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1) that “old age and helplessness of any kind make men illiberal.” Therefore covetousness is the most grievous of sins.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(5)-O(4) — Further, the Apostle says (~~833~~ Ephesians 5:5) that covetousness is “a serving of idols.” Now idolatry is reckoned among the most grievous sins. Therefore covetousness is also.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, Adultery is a more grievous sin than theft, according to ^{2nd}Proverbs 6:30. But theft pertains to covetousness. Therefore covetousness is not the most grievous of sins.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(5) — *I answer that*, Every sin, from the very fact that it is an evil, consists in the corruption or privation of some good: while, in so far as it is voluntary, it consists in the desire of some good. Consequently the order of sins may be considered in two ways. First, on the part of the good that is despised or corrupted by sin, and then the greater the good the graver the sin. From this point of view a sin that is against God is most grievous; after this comes a sin that is committed against a man's person, and after this comes a sin against external things, which are deputed to man's use, and this seems to belong to covetousness. Secondly, the degrees of sin may be considered on the part of the good to which the human appetite is inordinately subjected; and then the lesser the good, the more deformed is the sin: for it is more shameful to be subject to a lower than to a higher good. Now the good of external things is the lowest of human goods: since it is less than the good of the body, and this is less than the good of the soul, which is less than the Divine good. From this point of view the sin of covetousness, whereby the human appetite is subjected even to external things, has in a way a greater deformity. Since, however, corruption or privation of good is the formal element in sin, while conversion to a mutable good is the material element, the gravity of the sin is to be judged from the point of view of the good corrupted, rather than from that of the good to which the appetite is subjected. Hence we must assert that covetousness is not simply the most grievous of sins.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(5)-RO(1) — These authorities speak of covetousness on the part of the good to which the appetite is subjected. Hence (Ecclus. 10:10) it is given as a reason that the covetous man "setteth his own soul to sale"; because, to wit, he exposes his soul — that is, his life — to danger for the sake of money. Hence the text continues: "Because while he liveth he hath cast away" — that is, despised — "his bowels," in order to make money. Tully also adds that it is the mark of a "narrow mind," namely, that one be willing to be subject to money.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(5)-RO(2) — Augustine is taking greed generally, in reference to any temporal good, not in its special acceptance for

covetousness: because greed for any temporal good is the bane of charity, inasmuch as a man turns away from the Divine good through cleaving to a temporal good.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(5)-RO(3) — The sin against the Holy Ghost is incurable in one way, covetousness in another. For the sin against the Holy Ghost is incurable by reason of contempt: for instance, because a man contemns God's mercy, or His justice, or some one of those things whereby man's sins are healed: wherefore incurability of this kind points to the greater gravity of the sin. on the other hand, covetousness is incurable on the part of a human defect; a thing which human nature ever seeks to remedy, since the more deficient one is the more one seeks relief from external things, and consequently the more one gives way to covetousness. Hence incurability of this kind is an indication not of the sin being more grievous, but of its being somewhat more dangerous.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(5)-RO(4) — Covetousness is compared to idolatry on account of a certain likeness that it bears to it: because the covetous man, like the idolater, subjects himself to an external creature, though not in the same way. For the idolater subjects himself to an external creature by paying it Divine honor, whereas the covetous man subjects himself to an external creature by desiring it immoderately for use, not for worship. Hence it does not follow that covetousness is as grievous a sin as idolatry.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(6)

Whether covetousness is a spiritual sin?

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(6)-O(1) — It seems that covetousness is not a spiritual sin. For spiritual sins seem to regard spiritual goods. But the matter of covetousness is bodily goods, namely, external riches. Therefore covetousness is not a spiritual sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, spiritual sin is condivided with sin of the flesh. Now covetousness is seemingly a sin of the flesh, for it results from the corruption of the flesh, as instanced in old people who, through corruption of carnal nature, fall into covetousness. Therefore covetousness is not a spiritual sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, a sin of the flesh is one by which man's body is disordered, according to the saying of the Apostle (⁴¹⁸⁸1 Corinthians 6:18), "He that committeth fornication sinneth against his own body." Now covetousness disturbs man even in his body; wherefore Chrysostom (Hom. xxix in Matth.) compares the covetous man to the man who was possessed by the devil (⁴¹⁸⁹Mark 5) and was troubled in body. Therefore covetousness seems not to be a spiritual sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, Gregory (Moral. xxxi) numbers covetousness among spiritual vices.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(6) — *I answer that*, Sins are seated chiefly in the affections: and all the affections or passions of the soul have their term in pleasure and sorrow, according to the Philosopher (Ethic. ii, 5). Now some pleasures are carnal and some spiritual. Carnal pleasures are those which are consummated in the carnal senses — for instance, the pleasures of the table and sexual pleasures: while spiritual pleasures are those which are consummated in the mere apprehension of the soul. Accordingly, sins of the flesh are those which are consummated in carnal pleasures, while spiritual sins are consummated in pleasures of the spirit without pleasure of the flesh. Such is covetousness: for the covetous man takes pleasure in the consideration of himself as a possessor of riches. Therefore covetousness is a spiritual sin.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(6)-RO(1) — Covetousness with regard to a bodily object seeks the pleasure, not of the body but only of the soul, forasmuch as a man takes pleasure in the fact that he possesses riches: wherefore it is not a sin of the flesh. Nevertheless by reason of its object it is a mean between purely spiritual sins, which seek spiritual pleasure in respect of spiritual objects (thus pride is about excellence), and purely carnal sins, which seek a purely bodily pleasure in respect of a bodily object.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(6)-RO(2) — Movement takes its species from the term "whereto" and not from the term "wherefrom." Hence a vice of the flesh is so called from its tending to a pleasure of the flesh, and not from its originating in some defect of the flesh.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(6)-RO(3) — Chrysostom compares a covetous man to the man who was possessed by the devil, not that the former is troubled in

the flesh in the same way as the latter, but by way of contrast, since while the possessed man, of whom we read in Mark 5, stripped himself, the covetous man loads himself with an excess of riches.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(7)

Whether covetousness is a capital vice?

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(7)-O(1) — It seems that covetousness is not a capital vice. For covetousness is opposed to liberality as the mean, and to prodigality as extreme. But neither is liberality a principal virtue, nor prodigality a capital vice. Therefore covetousness also should not be reckoned a capital vice.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(7)-O(2) — Further, as stated above (**P(1), Q(84), AA(3),4**), those vices are called capital which have principal ends, to which the ends of other vices are directed. But this does not apply to covetousness: since riches have the aspect, not of an end, but rather of something directed to an end, as stated in Ethic. i, 5. Therefore covetousness is not a capital vice.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(7)-O(3) — Further, Gregory says (Moral. xv), that “covetousness arises sometimes from pride, sometimes from fear. For there are those who, when they think that they lack the needful for their expenses, allow the mind to give way to covetousness. And there are others who, wishing to be thought more of, are incited to greed for other people’s property.” Therefore covetousness arises from other vices instead of being a capital vice in respect of other vices.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(7) — *On the contrary*, Gregory (Moral. xxxi) reckons covetousness among the capital vices.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(7) — *I answer that*, As stated in the Second Objection, a capital vice is one which under the aspect of end gives rise to other vices: because when an end is very desirable, the result is that through desire thereof man sets about doing many things either good or evil. Now the most desirable end is happiness or felicity, which is the last end of human life, as stated above (**P(1), Q(1), AA(4),7,8**): wherefore the more a thing is furnished with the conditions of happiness, the more desirable it is. Also

one of the conditions of happiness is that it be self-sufficing, else it would not set man's appetite at rest, as the last end does. Now riches give great promise of self-sufficiency, as Boethius says (*De Consol.* iii): the reason of which, according to the Philosopher (*Ethic.* v, 5), is that we "use money in token of taking possession of something," and again it is written (²¹⁰⁸*Ecclesiastes* 10:19): "All things obey money." Therefore covetousness, which is desire for money, is a capital vice.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(7)-RO(1) — Virtue is perfected in accordance with reason, but vice is perfected in accordance with the inclination of the sensitive appetite. Now reason and sensitive appetite do not belong chiefly to the same genus, and consequently it does not follow that principal vice is opposed to principal virtue. Wherefore, although liberality is not a principal virtue, since it does not regard the principal good of the reason, yet covetousness is a principal vice, because it regards money, which occupies a principal place among sensible goods, for the reason given in the Article.

On the other hand, prodigality is not directed to an end that is desirable principally, indeed it seems rather to result from a lack of reason. Hence the Philosopher says (*Ethic.* iv, 1) that "a prodigal man is a fool rather than a knave."

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(7)-RO(2) — It is true that money is directed to something else as its end: yet in so far as it is useful for obtaining all sensible things, it contains, in a way, all things virtually. Hence it has a certain likeness to happiness, as stated in the Article.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(7)-RO(3) — Nothing prevents a capital vice from arising sometimes out of other vices, as stated above (**Q(36), A(4)**, ad 1; **P(1), Q(84), A(4)**), provided that itself be frequently the source of others.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8)

Whether treachery, fraud, falsehood, perjury, restlessness, violence, and insensibility to mercy are daughters of covetousness?

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8)-O(1) — It seems that the daughters of covetousness are not as commonly stated, namely, “treachery, fraud, falsehood, perjury, restlessness, violence, and insensibility to mercy.” For covetousness is opposed to liberality, as stated above (**A(3)**). Now treachery, fraud, and falsehood are opposed to prudence, perjury to religion, restlessness to hope, or to charity which rests in the beloved object, violence to justice, insensibility to mercy. Therefore these vices have no connection with covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8)-O(2) — Further, treachery, fraud and falsehood seem to pertain to the same thing, namely, the deceiving of one’s neighbor. Therefore they should not be reckoned as different daughters of covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8)-O(3) — Further, Isidore (Comment. in Deut.) enumerates nine daughters of covetousness; which are “lying, fraud, theft, perjury, greed of filthy lucre, false witnessing, violence, inhumanity, rapacity.” Therefore the former reckoning of daughters is insufficient.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8)-O(4) — Further, the Philosopher (Ethic. iv, 1) mentions many kinds of vices as belonging to covetousness which he calls illiberality, for he speaks of those who are “sparing, tight-fisted, skinflints [*{kyminopristes}], misers [*{kimbikes}], who do illiberal deeds,” and of those who “batten on whoredom, usurers, gamblers, despoilers of the dead, and robbers.” Therefore it seems that the aforesaid enumeration is insufficient.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8)-O(5) — Further, tyrants use much violence against their subjects. But the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1) that “tyrants who destroy cities and despoil sacred places are not to be called illiberal,” i.e. covetous. Therefore violence should not be reckoned a daughter of covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8) — *On the contrary*, Gregory (Moral. xxxi) assigns to covetousness the daughters mentioned above.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8) — *I answer that*, The daughters of covetousness are the vices which arise therefrom, especially in respect of the desire of an end. Now since covetousness is excessive love of possessing riches, it exceeds in two things. For in the first place it exceeds in retaining, and in this respect covetousness gives rise to “insensibility to mercy,” because, to wit, a man’s heart is not softened by mercy to assist the needy with his riches [*See **Q(30), A(1)**]. In the second place it belongs to covetousness to exceed in receiving, and in this respect covetousness may be considered in two ways. First as in the thought [affectu]. In this way it gives rise to “restlessness,” by hindering man with excessive anxiety and care, for “a covetous man shall not be satisfied with money” (~~2~~ Ecclesiastes 5:9). Secondly, it may be considered in the execution [effectu]. In this way the covetous man, in acquiring other people’s goods, sometimes employs force, which pertains to “violence,” sometimes deceit, and then if he has recourse to words, it is “falsehood,” if it be mere words, “perjury” if he confirm his statement by oath; if he has recourse to deeds, and the deceit affects things, we have “fraud”; if persons, then we have “treachery,” as in the case of Judas, who betrayed Christ through covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8)-RO(1) — There is no need for the daughters of a capital sin to belong to that same kind of vice: because a sin of one kind allows of sins even of a different kind being directed to its end; seeing that it is one thing for a sin to have daughters, and another for it to have species.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8)-RO(2) — These three are distinguished as stated in the Article.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8)-RO(3) — These nine are reducible to the seven aforesaid. For lying and false witnessing are comprised under falsehood, since false witnessing is a special kind of lie, just as theft is a special kind of fraud, wherefore it is comprised under fraud; and greed of filthy lucre belongs to restlessness; rapacity is comprised under violence, since it is a species thereof; and inhumanity is the same as insensibility to mercy.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8)-RO(4) — The vices mentioned by Aristotle are species rather than daughters of illiberality or covetousness. For a man may be said to be illiberal or covetous through a defect in giving. If he gives but little he is said to be “sparing”; if nothing, he is “tightfisted”: if he gives with great reluctance, he is said to be {kymnopristes} [skinflint], a cumin-seller, as it were, because he makes a great fuss about things of little value. Sometimes a man is said to be illiberal or covetous, through an excess in receiving, and this in two ways. In one way, through making money by disgraceful means, whether in performing shameful and servile works by means of illiberal practices, or by acquiring more through sinful deeds, such as whoredom or the like, or by making a profit where one ought to have given gratis, as in the case of usury, or by laboring much to make little profit. In another way, in making money by unjust means, whether by using violence on the living, as robbers do, or by despoiling the dead, or by preying on one’s friends, as gamblers do.

P(2b)-Q(118)-A(8)-RO(5) — Just as liberality is about moderate sums of money, so is illiberality. Wherefore tyrants who take great things by violence, are said to be, not illiberal, but unjust.

QUESTION 119

OF PRODIGALITY

(THREE ARTICLES)

We must now consider prodigality, under which head there are three points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether prodigality is opposite to covetousness?
- (2) Whether prodigality is a sin?
- (3) Whether it is a graver sin than covetousness?

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(1)*Whether prodigality is opposite to covetousness?*

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that prodigality is not opposite to covetousness. For opposites cannot be together in the same subject. But some are at the same time prodigal and covetous. Therefore prodigality is not opposite to covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, opposites relate to one same thing. But covetousness, as opposed to liberality, relates to certain passions whereby man is affected towards money: whereas prodigality does not seem to relate to any passions of the soul, since it is not affected towards money, or to anything else of the kind. Therefore prodigality is not opposite to covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, sin takes its species chiefly from its end, as stated above (**P(1), Q(62), A(3)**). Now prodigality seems always to be directed to some unlawful end, for the sake of which the prodigal squanders his goods. Especially is it directed to pleasures, wherefore it is stated (^{<DIS>} Luke 15:13) of the prodigal son that he “wasted his substance living riotously.” Therefore it seems that prodigality is opposed to temperance and insensibility rather than to covetousness and liberality.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 7; iv, 1) that prodigality is opposed to liberality, and illiberality, to which we give here the name of covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(1) — *I answer that*, In morals vices are opposed to one another and to virtue in respect of excess and deficiency. Now covetousness and prodigality differ variously in respect of excess and deficiency. Thus, as regards affection for riches, the covetous man exceeds by loving them more than he ought, while the prodigal is deficient, by being less careful of them than he ought: and as regards external action, prodigality implies excess in giving, but deficiency in retaining and acquiring, while covetousness, *on the contrary*, denotes deficiency in giving, but excess in acquiring and retaining. Hence it is evident that prodigality is opposed to covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(1)-RO(1) — Nothing prevents opposites from being in the same subject in different respects. For a thing is denominated more from what is in it principally. Now just as in liberality, which observes the mean, the principal thing is giving, to which receiving and retaining are subordinate, so, too, covetousness and prodigality regard principally giving. Wherefore he who exceeds in giving is said to be “prodigal,” while he who is deficient in giving is said to be “covetous.” Now it happens sometimes that a man is deficient in giving, without exceeding in receiving, as the Philosopher observes (Ethic. iv, 1). And in like manner it happens sometimes that a man exceeds in giving, and therefore is prodigal, and yet at the same time exceeds in receiving. This may be due either to some kind of necessity, since while exceeding in giving he is lacking in goods of his own, so that he is driven to acquire unduly, and this pertains to covetousness; or it may be due to inordinateness of the mind, for he gives not for a good purpose, but, as though despising virtue, cares not whence or how he receives. Wherefore he is prodigal and covetous in different respects.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(1)-RO(2) — Prodigality regards passions in respect of money, not as exceeding, but as deficient in them.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(1)-RO(3) — The prodigal does not always exceed in giving for the sake of pleasures which are the matter of temperance, but sometimes through being so disposed as not to care about riches, and

sometimes on account of something else. More frequently, however, he inclines to intemperance, both because through spending too much on other things he becomes fearless of spending on objects of pleasure, to which the concupiscence of the flesh is more prone; and because through taking no pleasure in virtuous goods, he seeks for himself pleasures of the body. Hence the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1) “that many a prodigal ends in becoming intemperate.”

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(2)

Whether prodigality is a sin?

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that prodigality is not a sin. For the Apostle says (^{sc100}1 Timothy 6:10): “Covetousness [Douay: ‘desire of money’] is the root of all evils.” But it is not the root of prodigality, since this is opposed to it. Therefore prodigality is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the Apostle says (^{sc107}1 Timothy 6:17,18): “Charge the rich of this world... to give easily, to communicate to others.” Now this is especially what prodigal persons do. Therefore prodigality is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it belongs to prodigality to exceed in giving and to be deficient in solicitude about riches. But this is most becoming to the perfect, who fulfil the words of Our Lord (^{sc108}Matthew 6:34), “Be not... solicitous for tomorrow,” and (^{sc109}Matthew 19:21), “Sell all [Vulg.: ‘what’] thou hast, and give to the poor.” Therefore prodigality is not a sin.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, The prodigal son is held to blame for his prodigality.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(2) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**A(1)**), the opposition between prodigality and covetousness is one of excess and deficiency; either of which destroys the mean of virtue. Now a thing is vicious and sinful through corrupting the good of virtue. Hence it follows that prodigality is a sin.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(2)-RO(1) — Some expound this saying of the Apostle as referring, not to actual covetousness, but to a kind of habitual covetousness, which is the concupiscence of the “fomes” [*Cf. **P(1), Q(81), A(3)**, ad 2], whence all sins arise. Others say that he is speaking of a general covetousness with regard to any kind of good: and in this sense also it is evident that prodigality arises from covetousness; since the prodigal seeks to acquire some temporal good inordinately, namely, to give pleasure to others, or at least to satisfy his own will in giving. But to one that reviews the passage correctly, it is evident that the Apostle is speaking literally of the desire of riches, for he had said previously (^{500b}1 Timothy 6:9): “They that will become rich,” etc. In this sense covetousness is said to be “the root of all evils,” not that all evils always arise from covetousness, but because there is no evil that does not at some time arise from covetousness. Wherefore prodigality sometimes is born of covetousness, as when a man is prodigal in going to great expense in order to curry favor with certain persons from whom he may receive riches.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(2)-RO(2) — The Apostle bids the rich to be ready to give and communicate their riches, according as they ought. The prodigal does not do this: since, as the Philosopher remarks (Ethic. iv, 1), “his giving is neither good, nor for a good end, nor according as it ought to be. For sometimes they give much to those who ought to be poor, namely, to buffoons and flatterers, whereas to the good they give nothing.”

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(2)-RO(3) — The excess in prodigality consists chiefly, not in the total amount given, but in the amount over and above what ought to be given. Hence sometimes the liberal man gives more than the prodigal man, if it be necessary. Accordingly we must reply that those who give all their possessions with the intention of following Christ, and banish from their minds all solicitude for temporal things, are not prodigal but perfectly liberal.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(3)*Whether prodigality is
a more grievous sin than covetousness?*

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that prodigality is a more grievous sin than covetousness. For by covetousness a man injures his neighbor by not communicating his goods to him, whereas by prodigality a man injures himself, because the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 1) that “the wasting of riches, which are the means whereby a man lives, is an undoing of his very being.” Now he that injures himself sins more grievously, according to Eccles. 14:5, “He that is evil to himself, to whom will he be good?” Therefore prodigality is a more grievous sin than covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, a disorder that is accompanied by a laudable circumstance is less sinful. Now the disorder of covetousness is sometimes accompanied by a laudable circumstance, as in the case of those who are unwilling to spend their own, lest they be driven to accept from others: whereas the disorder of prodigality is accompanied by a circumstance that calls for blame, inasmuch as we ascribe prodigality to those who are intemperate, as the Philosopher observes (Ethic. iv, 1). Therefore prodigality is a more grievous sin than covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, prudence is chief among the moral virtues, as stated above (**Q(56)**, **A(1)**, ad 1; **P(1)**, **Q(61)**, **A(2)**, ad 1). Now prodigality is more opposed to prudence than covetousness is: for it is written (~~1Pr~~ Proverbs 21:20):

“There is a treasure to be desired, and oil in the dwelling of the just;
and the foolish man shall spend it”:

and the Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 6) that “it is the mark of a fool to give too much and receive nothing.” Therefore prodigality is a more grievous sin than covetousness.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher says (Ethic. iv, 6) that “the prodigal seems to be much better than the illiberal man.”

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(3) — *I answer that*, Prodigality considered in itself is a less grievous sin than covetousness, and this for three reasons. First,

because covetousness differs more from the opposite virtue: since giving, wherein the prodigal exceeds, belongs to liberality more than receiving or retaining, wherein the covetous man exceeds. Secondly, because the prodigal man is of use to the many to whom he gives, while the covetous man is of use to no one, not even to himself, as stated in Ethic. iv, 6. Thirdly, because prodigality is easily cured. For not only is the prodigal on the way to old age, which is opposed to prodigality, but he is easily reduced to a state of want, since much useless spending impoverishes him and makes him unable to exceed in giving. Moreover, prodigality is easily turned into virtue on account of its likeness thereto. On the other hand, the covetous man is not easily cured, for the reason given above (**Q(118), A(5)**, ad 3).

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(3)-RO(1) — The difference between the prodigal and the covetous man is not that the former sins against himself and the latter against another. For the prodigal sins against himself by spending that which is his, and his means of support, and against others by spending the wherewithal to help others. This applies chiefly to the clergy, who are the dispensers of the Church's goods, that belong to the poor whom they defraud by their prodigal expenditure. In like manner the covetous man sins against others, by being deficient in giving; and he sins against himself, through deficiency in spending: wherefore it is written (²⁰⁰⁰ Ecclesiastes 6:2):

“A man to whom God hath given riches... yet doth not give him the power to eat thereof.”

Nevertheless the prodigal man exceeds in this, that he injures both himself and others yet so as to profit some; whereas the covetous man profits neither others nor himself, since he does not even use his own goods for his own profit.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(3)-RO(2) — In speaking of vices in general, we judge of them according to their respective natures: thus, with regard to prodigality we note that it consumes riches to excess, and with regard to covetousness that it retains them to excess. That one spend too much for the sake of intemperance points already to several additional sins, wherefore the prodigal of this kind is worse, as stated in Ethic. iv, 1. That an illiberal or covetous man refrain from taking what belongs to others, although this

appears in itself to call for praise, yet on account of the motive for which he does so it calls for blame, since he is unwilling to accept from others lest he be forced to give to others.

P(2b)-Q(119)-A(3)-RO(3) — All vices are opposed to prudence, even as all virtues are directed by prudence: wherefore if a vice be opposed to prudence alone, for this very reason it is deemed less grievous.

QUESTION 120

OF “EPIKEIA” OR EQUITY

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider “epikeia,” under which head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether “epikeia” is a virtue?
- (2) Whether it is a part of justice?

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(1)*Whether “epikeia” (*{epieikeia}) is a virtue?*

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that “epikeia” is not a virtue. For no virtue does away with another virtue. Yet “epikeia” does away with another virtue, since it sets aside that which is just according to law, and seemingly is opposed to severity. Therefore “epikeia” is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, Augustine says (De Vera Relig. xxxi): “With regard to these earthly laws, although men pass judgment on them when they make them, yet, when once they are made and established, the judge must pronounce judgment not on them but according to them.” But seemingly “epikeia” pronounces judgment on the law, when it deems that the law should not be observed in some particular case. Therefore “epikeia” is a vice rather than a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, apparently it belongs to “epikeia” to consider the intention of the lawgiver, as the Philosopher states (Ethic. v, 10). But it belongs to the sovereign alone to interpret the intention of the lawgiver, wherefore the Emperor says in the Codex of Laws and Constitutions, under Law i: “It is fitting and lawful that We alone should interpret between equity and law.” Therefore the act of “epikeia” is unlawful: and consequently “epikeia” is not a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, The Philosopher (Ethic. v, 10) states it to be a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(1), Q(96), A(6)**), when we were treating of laws, since human actions, with which laws are concerned, are composed of contingent singulars and are innumerable in their diversity, it was not possible to lay down rules of law that would apply to every single case. Legislators in framing laws attend to what commonly happens: although if the law be applied to certain cases it will frustrate the equality of justice and be injurious to the common good, which the law has in view. Thus the law requires deposits to be restored, because in the majority of cases this is just. Yet it happens sometimes to be injurious — for instance, if a madman were to put his sword in deposit, and demand its delivery while in a state of madness, or if a man were to seek the return of his deposit in order to fight against his country. In these and like cases it is bad to follow the law, and it is good to set aside the letter of the law and to follow the dictates of justice and the common good. This is the object of “epikeia” which we call equity. Therefore it is evident that “epikeia” is a virtue.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(1)-RO(1) — “Epikeia” does not set aside that which is just in itself but that which is just as by law established. Nor is it opposed to severity, which follows the letter of the law when it ought to be followed. To follow the letter of the law when it ought not to be followed is sinful. Hence it is written in the Codex of Laws and Constitutions under Law v: “Without doubt he transgresses the law who by adhering to the letter of the law strives to defeat the intention of the lawgiver.”

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(1)-RO(2) — It would be passing judgment on a law to say that it was not well made; but to say that the letter of the law is not to be observed in some particular case is passing judgment not on the law, but on some particular contingency.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(1)-RO(3) — Interpretation is admissible in doubtful cases where it is not allowed to set aside the letter of the law without the interpretation of the sovereign. But when the case is manifest there is need, not of interpretation, but of execution.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(2)

Whether “epikeia” is a part of justice?

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that “epikeia” is not a part of justice. For, as stated above (**Q(58)**, **A(7)**), justice is twofold, particular and legal. Now “epikeia” is not a part of particular justice, since it extends to all virtues, even as legal justice does. In like manner, neither is it a part of legal justice, since its operation is beside that which is established by law. Therefore it seems that “epikeia” is not a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, a more principal virtue is not assigned as the part of a less principal virtue: for it is to the cardinal virtue, as being principal, that secondary virtues are assigned as parts. Now “epikeia” seems to be a more principal virtue than justice, as implied by its name: for it is derived from {epi}, i.e. “above,” and {dikaion}, i.e. “just.” Therefore “epikeia” is not a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, it seems that “epikeia” is the same as modesty. For where the Apostle says (³⁰¹⁵Philippians 4:5),

“Let your modesty be known to all men,”

the Greek has {epieikeia} [*{to epieikes}]. Now, according to Tully (*De Invent. Rhet.* ii), modesty is a part of temperance. Therefore “epikeia” is not a part of justice.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(2) — On the contrary, The Philosopher says (*Ethic.* v, 10) that “epikeia is a kind of justice.”

I answer that, As stated above (**Q(48)**), a virtue has three kinds of parts, subjective, integral, and potential. A subjective part is one of which the whole is predicated essentially, and it is less than the whole. This may happen in two ways. For sometimes one thing is predicated of many in one common ratio, as animal of horse and ox: and sometimes one thing is predicated of many according to priority and posteriority, as “being” of substance and accident.

Accordingly, “epikeia” is a part of justice taken in a general sense, for it is a kind of justice, as the Philosopher states (*Ethic.* v, 10). Wherefore it is

evident that “epikeia” is a subjective part of justice; and justice is predicated of it with priority to being predicated of legal justice, since legal justice is subject to the direction of “epikeia.” Hence “epikeia” is by way of being a higher rule of human actions.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(2)-RO(1) — Epikeia corresponds properly to legal justice, and in one way is contained under it, and in another way exceeds it. For if legal justice denotes that which complies with the law, whether as regards the letter of the law, or as regards the intention of the lawgiver, which is of more account, then “epikeia” is the more important part of legal justice. But if legal justice denote merely that which complies with the law with regard to the letter, then “epikeia” is a part not of legal justice but of justice in its general acceptation, and is condivided with legal justice, as exceeding it.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(2)-RO(2) — As the Philosopher states (Ethic. v, 10), “epikeia is better than a certain,” namely, legal, “justice,” which observes the letter of the law: yet since it is itself a kind of justice, it is not better than all justice.

P(2b)-Q(120)-A(2)-RO(3) — It belongs to “epikeia” to moderate something, namely, the observance of the letter of the law. But modesty, which is reckoned a part of temperance, moderates man’s outward life — for instance, in his deportment, dress or the like. Possibly also the term {epieikeia} is applied in Greek by a similitude to all kinds of moderation.

QUESTION 121

OF PIETY

(TWO ARTICLES)

We must now consider the gift that corresponds to justice; namely, piety. Under this head there are two points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether it is a gift of the Holy Ghost?
- (2) Which of the beatitudes and fruits corresponds to it?

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(1)

Whether piety is a gift?

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that piety is not a gift. For the gifts differ from the virtues, as stated above (**P(1), Q(68), A(1)**). But piety is a virtue, as stated above (**Q(101), A(3)**). Therefore piety is not a gift.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, the gifts are more excellent than the virtues, above all the moral virtues, as above (**P(1), Q(68), A(8)**). Now among the parts of justice religion is greater than piety. Therefore if any part of justice is to be accounted a gift, it seems that religion should be a gift rather than piety.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the gifts and their acts remain in heaven, as stated above (**P(1), Q(68), A(6)**). But the act of piety cannot remain in heaven: for Gregory says (Moral. i) that “piety fills the inmost recesses of the heart with works of mercy”: and so there will be no piety in heaven since there will be no unhappiness [*Cf. **Q(30), A(1)**]. Therefore piety is not a gift.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, It is reckoned among the gifts in the eleventh chapter of Isaias (verse 2) [Douay: ‘godliness’] [“Pietas,” whence our English word “pity,” which is the same as mercy.]

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(1) — *I answer that*, As stated above (**P(1), Q(68), A(1); P(1), Q(69), AA(1),3**), the gifts of the Holy Ghost are habitual dispositions of the soul, rendering it amenable to the motion of the Holy Ghost. Now the Holy Ghost moves us to this effect among others, of having a filial affection towards God, according to ~~ROM~~ Romans 8:15,

“You have received the spirit of adoption of sons,
whereby we cry: Abba (Father).”

And since it belongs properly to piety to pay duty and worship to one's father, it follows that piety, whereby, at the Holy Ghost's instigation, we pay worship and duty to God as our Father, is a gift of the Holy Ghost.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(1)-RO(1) — The piety that pays duty and worship to a father in the flesh is a virtue: but the piety that is a gift pays this to God as Father.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(1)-RO(2) — To pay worship to God as Creator, as religion does, is more excellent than to pay worship to one's father in the flesh, as the piety that is a virtue does. But to pay worship to God as Father is yet more excellent than to pay worship to God as Creator and Lord. Wherefore religion is greater than the virtue of piety: while the gift of piety is greater than religion.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(1)-RO(3) — As by the virtue of piety man pays duty and worship not only to his father in the flesh, but also to all his kindred on account of their being related to his father so by the gift of piety he pays worship and duty not only to God, but also to all men on account of their relationship to God. Hence it belongs to piety to honor the saints, and not to contradict the Scriptures whether one understands them or not, as Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. ii). Consequently it also assists those who are in a state of unhappiness. And although this act has no place in heaven, especially after the Day of Judgment, yet piety will exercise its principal act, which is to revere God with filial affection: for it is then above all that this act will be fulfilled, according to Wis. 5:5, “Behold how they are numbered among the children of God.” The saints will also mutually honor one another. Now, however, before the Judgment Day, the saints have pity on those also who are living in this unhappy state.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(2)***Whether the second beatitude, “Blessed are the meek,” corresponds to the gift of piety?***

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that the second beatitude, “Blessed are the meek,” does not correspond to the gift of piety. For piety is the gift corresponding to justice, to which rather belongs the fourth beatitude, “Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after justice,” or the fifth beatitude, “Blessed are the merciful,” since as stated above (**A(1), O(3)**), the works of mercy belong to piety. Therefore the second beatitude does not pertain to the gift of piety.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the gift of piety is directed by the gift of knowledge, which is united to it in the enumeration of the gifts (Isaiah 11). Now direction and execution extend to the same matter. Since, then, the third beatitude, “Blessed are they that mourn,” corresponds to the gift of knowledge, it seems that the second beatitude corresponds to piety.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, the fruits correspond to the beatitudes and gifts, as stated above (**P(1), Q(70), A(2)**). Now among the fruits, goodness and benignity seem to agree with piety rather than mildness, which pertains to meekness. Therefore the second beatitude does not correspond to the gift of piety.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, Augustine says (De Serm. Dom. in Monte i): “Piety is becoming to the meek.”

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(2) — *I answer that*, In adapting the beatitudes to the gifts a twofold congruity may be observed. One is according to the order in which they are given, and Augustine seems to have followed this: wherefore he assigns the first beatitude to the lowest gift, namely, fear, and the second beatitude, “Blessed are the meek,” to piety, and so on. Another congruity may be observed in keeping with the special nature of each gift and beatitude. In this way one must adapt the beatitudes to the gifts according to their objects and acts: and thus the fourth and fifth beatitudes would correspond to piety, rather than the second. Yet the second

beatitude has a certain congruity with piety, inasmuch as meekness removes the obstacles to acts of piety.

This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(2)-RO(2) — Taking the beatitudes and gifts according to their proper natures, the same beatitude must needs correspond to knowledge and piety: but taking them according to their order, different beatitudes correspond to them, although a certain congruity may be observed, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(121)-A(2)-RO(3) — In the fruits goodness and benignity may be directly ascribed to piety; and mildness indirectly in so far as it removes obstacles to acts of piety, as stated above.

QUESTION 122

OF THE PRECEPTS OF JUSTICE

(SIX ARTICLES)

We must now consider the precepts of justice, under which head there are six points of inquiry:

- (1) Whether the precepts of the decalogue are precepts of justice?
- (2) Of the first precept of the decalogue;
- (3) Of the second;
- (4) Of the third;
- (5) Of the fourth;
- (6) Of the other six.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(1)

Whether the precepts of the decalogue are precepts of justice?

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(1)-O(1) — It seems that the precepts of the decalogue are not precepts of justice. For the intention of a lawgiver is “to make the citizens virtuous in respect of every virtue,” as stated in Ethic. ii, 1. Wherefore, according to Ethic. v, 1, “the law prescribes about all acts of all virtues.” Now the precepts of the decalogue are the first principles of the whole Divine Law. Therefore the precepts of the decalogue do not pertain to justice alone.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(1)-O(2) — Further, it would seem that to justice belong especially the judicial precepts, which are condivided with the moral precepts, as stated above (**P(1), Q(99), A(4)**). But the precepts of the decalogue are moral precepts, as stated above (**P(1), Q(100), A(3)**). Therefore the precepts of the decalogue are not precepts of justice.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(1)-O(3) — Further, the Law contains chiefly precepts about acts of justice regarding the common good, for instance about public officers and the like. But there is no mention of these in the precepts of the decalogue. Therefore it seems that the precepts of the decalogue do not properly belong to justice.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(1)-O(4) — Further, the precepts of the decalogue are divided into two tables, corresponding to the love of God and the love of our neighbor, both of which regard the virtue of charity. Therefore the precepts of the decalogue belong to charity rather than to justice.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(1) — *On the contrary*, Seemingly justice is the sole virtue whereby we are directed to another. Now we are directed to another by all the precepts of the decalogue, as is evident if one consider each of them. Therefore all the precepts of the decalogue pertain to justice.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(1) — *I answer that*, The precepts of the decalogue are the first principles of the Law: and the natural reason assents to them at once, as to principles that are most evident. Now it is altogether evident that the notion of duty, which is essential to a precept, appears in justice, which is of one towards another. Because in those matters that relate to himself it would seem at a glance that man is master of himself, and that he may do as he likes: whereas in matters that refer to another it appears manifestly that a man is under obligation to render to another that which is his due. Hence the precepts of the decalogue must needs pertain to justice. Wherefore the first three precepts are about acts of religion, which is the chief part of justice; the fourth precept is about acts of piety, which is the second part of justice; and the six remaining are about justice commonly so called, which is observed among equals.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(1)-RO(1) — The intention of the law is to make all men virtuous, but in a certain order, namely, by first of all giving them precepts about those things where the notion of duty is most manifest, as stated above.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(1)-RO(2) — The judicial precepts are determinations of the moral precepts, in so far as these are directed to one's neighbor, just as the ceremonial precepts are determinations of the moral precepts in so far as these are directed to God. Hence neither precepts are contained in the

decatalogue: and yet they are determinations of the precepts of the decatalogue, and therefore pertain to justice.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(1)-RO(3) — Things that concern the common good must needs be administered in different ways according to the difference of men. Hence they were to be given a place not among the precepts of the decatalogue, but among the judicial precepts.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(1)-RO(4) — The precepts of the decatalogue pertain to charity as their end, according to ^{<5005>}1 Timothy 1:5, “The end of the commandment is charity”: but they belong to justice, inasmuch as they refer immediately to acts of justice.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(2)

Whether the first precept of the decatalogue is fittingly expressed?

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(2)-O(1) — It seems that the first precept of the decatalogue is unfittingly expressed. For man is more bound to God than to his father in the flesh, according to ^{<5005>}Hebrews 12:9,

“How much more shall we [Vulg.: ‘shall we not much more’] obey
the Father of spirits and live?”

Now the precept of piety, whereby man honors his father, is expressed affirmatively in these words: “Honor thy father and thy mother.” Much more, therefore, should the first precept of religion, whereby all honor God, be expressed affirmatively, especially as affirmation is naturally prior to negation.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(2)-O(2) — Further, the first precept of the decatalogue pertains to religion, as stated above (**A(1)**). Now religion, since it is one virtue, has one act. Yet in the first precept three acts are forbidden: since we read first: “Thou shalt not have strange gods before Me”; secondly, “Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing”; and thirdly, “Thou shalt not adore them nor serve them.” Therefore the first precept is unfittingly expressed.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(2)-O(3) — Further, Augustine says (De decem chord. ix) that “the first precept forbids the sin of superstition.” But there are many wicked superstitions besides idolatry, as stated above (**Q(92), A(2)**). Therefore it was insufficient to forbid idolatry alone.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(2) — *On the contrary*, stands the authority of Scripture.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(2) — *I answer that*, It pertains to law to make men good, wherefore it behooved the precepts of the Law to be set in order according to the order of generation, the order, to wit, of man’s becoming good. Now two things must be observed in the order of generation. The first is that the first part is the first thing to be established; thus in the generation of an animal the first thing to be formed is the heart, and in building a home the first thing to be set up is the foundation: and in the goodness of the soul the first part is goodness of the will, the result of which is that a man makes good use of every other goodness. Now the goodness of the will depends on its object, which is its end. Wherefore since man was to be directed to virtue by means of the Law, the first thing necessary was, as it were, to lay the foundation of religion, whereby man is duly directed to God, Who is the last end of man’s will.

The second thing to be observed in the order of generation is that in the first place contraries and obstacles have to be removed. Thus the farmer first purifies the soil, and afterwards sows his seed, according to ²⁰⁰⁸Jeremiah 4:3, “Break up anew your fallow ground, and sow not upon thorns.” Hence it behooved man, first of all to be instructed in religion, so as to remove the obstacles to true religion. Now the chief obstacle to religion is for man to adhere to a false god, according to ²⁰⁰⁸Matthew 6:24, “You cannot serve God and mammon.” Therefore in the first precept of the Law the worship of false gods is excluded.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(2)-RO(1) — In point of fact there is one affirmative precept about religion, namely: “Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath Day.” Still the negative precepts had to be given first, so that by their means the obstacles to religion might be removed. For though affirmation naturally precedes negation, yet in the process of generation, negation, whereby obstacles are removed, comes first, as stated in the Article. Especially is this true in matters concerning God, where negation

is preferable to affirmation, on account of our insufficiency, as Dionysius observes (Coel. Hier. ii).

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(2)-RO(2) — People worshiped strange gods in two ways. For some served certain creatures as gods without having recourse to images. Hence Varro says that for a long time the ancient Romans worshiped gods without using images: and this worship is first forbidden by the words, “Thou shalt not have strange gods.” Among others the worship of false gods was observed by using certain images: and so the very making of images was fittingly forbidden by the words, “Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing,” as also the worship of those same images, by the words, “Thou shalt not adore them,” etc.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(2)-RO(3) — All other kinds of superstition proceed from some compact, tacit or explicit, with the demons; hence all are understood to be forbidden by the words, “Thou shalt not have strange gods.”

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3)

*Whether the second precept
of the decalogue is fittingly expressed?*

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3)-O(1) — It seems that the second precept of the decalogue is unfittingly expressed. For this precept, “Thou shalt not take the name of thy God in vain” is thus explained by a gloss on ^{<122>}Exodus 20:7: “Thou shalt not deem the Son of God to be a creature,” so that it forbids an error against faith. Again, a gloss on the words of ^{<122>}Deuteronomy 5:11, “Thou shalt not take the name of... thy God in vain,” adds, i.e. “by giving the name of God to wood or stone,” as though they forbade a false confession of faith, which, like error, is an act of unbelief. Now unbelief precedes superstition, as faith precedes religion. Therefore this precept should have preceded the first, whereby superstition is forbidden.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3)-O(2) — Further, the name of God is taken for many purposes — for instance, those of praise, of working miracles, and generally speaking in conjunction with all we say or do, according to ^{<122>}Colossians 3:17, “All whatsoever you do in word or in work... do ye in

the name of the Lord.” Therefore the precept forbidding the taking of God’s name in vain seems to be more universal than the precept forbidding superstition, and thus should have preceded it.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3)-O(3) — Further, a gloss on ^{<1217>}Exodus 20:7 expounds the precept, “Thou shalt not take the name of... thy God in vain,” namely, by swearing to nothing. Hence this precept would seem to forbid useless swearing, that is to say, swearing without judgment. But false swearing, which is without truth, and unjust swearing, which is without justice, are much more grievous. Therefore this precept should rather have forbidden them.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3)-O(4) — Further, blasphemy or any word or deed that is an insult to God is much more grievous than perjury. Therefore blasphemy and other like sins should rather have been forbidden by this precept.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3)-O(5) — Further, God’s names are many. Therefore it should not have been said indefinitely: “Thou shalt not take the name of... thy God in vain.”

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3) — *On the contrary*, stands the authority of Scripture.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3) — *I answer that*, In one who is being instructed in virtue it is necessary to remove obstacles to true religion before establishing him in true religion. Now a thing is opposed to true religion in two ways. First, by excess, when, to wit, that which belongs to religion is given to others than to whom it is due, and this pertains to superstition. Secondly, by lack, as it were, of reverence, when, to wit, God is contemned, and this pertains to the vice of irreligion, as stated above (**Q(97)**, in the preamble, and in the Article that follows). Now superstition hinders religion by preventing man from acknowledging God so as to worship Him: and when a man’s mind is engrossed in some undue worship, he cannot at the same time give due worship to God, according to ^{<2310>}Isaiah 28:20, “The bed is straitened, so that one must fall out,” i.e. either the true God or a false god must fall out from man’s heart, “and a short covering cannot cover both.” On the other hand, irreligion hinders religion by preventing man from honoring God after he has acknowledged Him.

Now one must first of all acknowledge God with a view to worship, before honoring Him we have acknowledged.

For this reason the precept forbidding superstition is placed before the second precept, which forbids perjury that pertains to irreligion.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3)-RO(1) — These expositions are mystical. The literal explanation is that which is given ^(~~REB~~)Deuteronomy 5:11: “Thou shalt not take the name of... thy God in vain,” namely, “by swearing on that which is not [*Vulg.: ‘for he shall not be unpunished that taketh His name upon a vain thing’].”

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3)-RO(2) — This precept does not forbid all taking of the name of God, but properly the taking of God’s name in confirmation of a man’s word by way of an oath, because men are wont to take God’s name more frequently in this way. Nevertheless we may understand that in consequence all inordinate taking of the Divine name is forbidden by this precept: and it is in this sense that we are to take the explanation quoted in the First Objection.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3)-RO(3) — To swear to nothing means to swear to that which is not. This pertains to false swearing, which is chiefly called perjury, as stated above (**Q(98), A(1)**, ad 3). For when a man swears to that which is false, his swearing is vain in itself, since it is not supported by the truth. on the other hand, when a man swears without judgment, through levity, if he swear to the truth, there is no vanity on the part of the oath itself, but only on the part of the swearer.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3)-RO(4) — Just as when we instruct a man in some science, we begin by putting before him certain general maxims, even so the Law, which forms man to virtue by instructing him in the precepts of the decalogue, which are the first of all precepts, gave expression, by prohibition or by command, to those things which are of most common occurrence in the course of human life. Hence the precepts of the decalogue include the prohibition of perjury, which is of more frequent occurrence than blasphemy, since man does not fall so often into the latter sin.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(3)-RO(5) — Reverence is due to the Divine names on the part of the thing signified, which is one, and not on the part of the signifying words, which are many. Hence it is expressed in the singular:

“Thou shalt not take the name of... thy God in vain”: since it matters not in which of God’s names perjury is committed.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(4)

Whether the third precept of the decalogue, concerning the hallowing of the Sabbath, is fittingly expressed?

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(4)-O(1) — It seems that the third precept of the decalogue, concerning the hallowing of the Sabbath, is unfittingly expressed. For this, understood spiritually, is a general precept: since Bede in commenting on ^{<1314>}Luke 13:14, “The ruler of the synagogue being angry that He had healed on the Sabbath,” says (Comment. iv): “The Law forbids, not to heal man on the Sabbath, but to do servile works,” i.e. “to burden oneself with sin.” Taken literally it is a ceremonial precept, for it is written (^{<1315>}Exodus 31:13): “See that you keep My Sabbath: because it is a sign between Me and you in your generations.” Now the precepts of the decalogue are both spiritual and moral. Therefore it is unfittingly placed among the precepts of the decalogue.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(4)-O(2) — Further, the ceremonial precepts of the Law contain “sacred things, sacrifices, sacraments and observances,” as stated above (**P(1), Q(101), A(4)**). Now sacred things comprised not only sacred days, but also sacred places and sacred vessels, and so on. Moreover, there were many sacred days other than the Sabbath. Therefore it was unfitting to omit all other ceremonial observances and to mention only that of the Sabbath.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(4)-O(3) — Further, whoever breaks a precept of the decalogue, sins. But in the Old Law some who broke the observances of the Sabbath did not sin — for instance, those who circumcised their sons on the eighth day, and the priests who worked in the temple on the Sabbath. Also Elias (^{<1191>}1 Kings 19), who journeyed for forty days unto the mount of God, Horeb, must have traveled on a Sabbath: the priests also who carried the ark of the Lord for seven days, as related in ^{<1100>}Joshua 7, must be understood to have carried it on a Sabbath. Again it is written (^{<1315>}Luke 13:15):

“Doth not every one of you on the Sabbath day loose his ox or his
ass... and lead them to water?”

Therefore it is unfittingly placed among the precepts of the decalogue.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(4)-O(4) — Further, the precepts of the decalogue have to be observed also under the New Law. Yet in the New Law this precept is not observed, neither in the point of the Sabbath day, nor as to the Lord’s day, on which men cook their food, travel, fish, and do many like things. Therefore the precept of the observance of the Sabbath is unfittingly expressed.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(4) — *On the contrary*, stands the authority of Scripture.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(4) — *I answer that*, The obstacles to true religion being removed by the first and second precepts of the decalogue, as stated above (**AA(2),3**), it remained for the third precept to be given whereby man is established in true religion. Now it belongs to religion to give worship to God: and just as the Divine scriptures teach the interior worship under the guise of certain corporal similitudes, so is external worship given to God under the guise of sensible signs. And since for the most part man is induced to pay interior worship, consisting in prayer and devotion, by the interior prompting of the Holy Ghost, a precept of the Law as necessary respecting the exterior worship that consists in sensible signs. Now the precepts of the decalogue are, so to speak, first and common principles of the Law, and consequently the third precept of the decalogue describes the exterior worship of God as the sign of a universal boon that concerns all. This universal boon was the work of the Creation of the world, from which work God is stated to have rested on the seventh day: and sign of this we are commanded to keep holy seventh day — that is, to set it aside as a day to be given to God. Hence after the precept about the hallowing of the Sabbath the reason for it is given: “For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth... and rested on the seventh day.”

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(4)-RO(1) — The precept about hallowing the Sabbath, understood literally, is partly oral and partly ceremonial. It is a moral precept in the point of commanding man to aside a certain time to be given to Divine things. For there is in man a natural inclination to set aside a certain time for each necessary thing, such as refreshment of the body,

sleep, and so forth. Hence according to the dictate of reason, man sets aside a certain time for spiritual refreshment, by which man's mind is refreshed in God. And thus to have a certain time set aside for occupying oneself with Divine things is the matter of a moral precept. But, in so far as this precept specializes the time as a sign representing the Creation of the world, it is a ceremonial precept. Again, it is a ceremonial precept in its allegorical signification, as representative of Christ's rest in the tomb on the seventh day: also in its moral signification, as representing cessation from all sinful acts, and the mind's rest in God, in which sense, too, it is a general precept. Again, it is a ceremonial precept in its analogical signification, as foreshadowing the enjoyment of God in heaven. Hence the precept about hallowing the Sabbath is placed among the precepts of the decalogue, as a moral, but not as a ceremonial precept.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(4)-RO(2) — The other ceremonies of the Law are signs of certain particular Divine works: but the observance of the Sabbath is representative of a general boon, namely, the production of all creatures. Hence it was fitting that it should be placed among the general precepts of the decalogue, rather than any other ceremonial precept of the Law.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(4)-RO(3) — Two things are to be observed in the hallowing of the Sabbath. One of these is the end: and this is that man occupy himself with Divine things, and is signified in the words: "Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day." For in the Law those things are said to be holy which are applied to the Divine worship. The other thing is cessation from work, and is signified in the words (^{Q121}Exodus 20:11), "On the seventh day... thou shalt do no work." The kind of work meant appears from ^{Q122}Leviticus 23:3, "You shall do no servile work on that day [*Vulg.: 'You shall do no work on that day']." Now servile work is so called from servitude: and servitude is threefold. One, whereby man is the servant of sin, according to ^{Q123}John 8:34, "Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin," and in this sense all sinful acts are servile. Another servitude is whereby one man serves another. Now one man serves another not with his mind but with his body, as stated above (**Q(104), AA(5),6**, ad 1). Wherefore in this respect those works are called servile whereby one man serves another. The third is the servitude of God; and in this way the work of worship, which pertains to the service of God, may be called a servile work. In this sense servile work is not forbidden on the Sabbath

day, because that would be contrary to the end of the Sabbath observance: since man abstains from other works on the Sabbath day in order that he may occupy himself with works connected with God's service. For this reason, according to ^{<4123>}John 7:23, "a man [*Vulg.: 'If a man,' etc.] receives circumcision on the Sabbath day, that the law of Moses may not be broken": and for this reason too we read (^{<4125>}Matthew 12:5), that "on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple break the Sabbath," i.e. do corporal works on the Sabbath, "and are without blame." Accordingly, the priests in carrying the ark on the Sabbath did not break the precept of the Sabbath observance. In like manner it is not contrary to the observance of the Sabbath to exercise any spiritual act, such as teaching by word or writing. Wherefore a gloss on ^{<4031>}Numbers 28 says that "smiths and like craftsmen rest on the Sabbath day, but the reader or teacher of the Divine law does not cease from his work. Yet he profanes not the Sabbath, even as the priests in the temple break the Sabbath, and are without blame." On the other hand, those works that are called servile in the first or second way are contrary to the observance of the Sabbath, in so far as they hinder man from applying himself to Divine things. And since man is hindered from applying himself to Divine things rather by sinful than by lawful albeit corporal works, it follows that to sin on a feast day is more against this precept than to do some other but lawful bodily work. Hence Augustine says (*De decem chord.* iii): "It would be better if the Jew did some useful work on his farm than spent his time seditiously in the theatre: and their womenfolk would do better to be making linen on the Sabbath than to be dancing lewdly all day in their feasts of the new moon." It is not, however, against this precept to sin venially on the Sabbath, because venial sin does not destroy holiness.

Again, corporal works, not pertaining to the spiritual worship of God, are said to be servile in so far as they belong properly to servants; while they are not said to be servile, in so far as they are common to those who serve and those who are free. Moreover, everyone, be he servant or free, is bound to provide necessities both for himself and for his neighbor, chiefly in respect of things pertaining to the well-being of the body, according to ^{<4141>}Proverbs 24:11, "Deliver them that are led to death": secondarily as regards avoiding damage to one's property, according to ^{<4521>}Deuteronomy 22:1,

“Thou shalt not pass by if thou seest thy brother’s ox or his sheep go astray, but thou shalt bring them back to thy brother.”

Hence a corporal work pertaining to the preservation of one’s own bodily well-being does not profane the Sabbath: for it is not against the observance of the Sabbath to eat and do such things as preserve the health of the body. For this reason the Machabees did not profane the Sabbath when they fought in self-defense on the Sabbath day (1 Macc. 2), nor Elias when he fled from the face of Jezabel on the Sabbath. For this same reason our Lord (^{401b}Matthew 12:3) excused His disciples for plucking the ears of corn on account of the need which they suffered. In like manner a bodily work that is directed to the bodily well-being of another is not contrary to the observance of the Sabbath: wherefore it is written (^{402a}John 7:23):

“Are you angry at Me because I have healed the whole man on the Sabbath day?”

And again, a bodily work that is done to avoid an imminent damage to some external thing does not profane the Sabbath, wherefore our Lord says (^{402b}Matthew 12:11):

“What man shall there be among you, that hath one sheep, and if the same fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not take hold on it and lift it up?”

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(4)-RO(4) — In the New Law the observance of the Lord’s day took the place of the observance of the Sabbath, not by virtue of the precept but by the institution of the Church and the custom of Christian people. For this observance is not figurative, as was the observance of the Sabbath in the Old Law. Hence the prohibition to work on the Lord’s day is not so strict as on the Sabbath: and certain works are permitted on the Lord’s day which were forbidden on the Sabbath, such as the cooking of food and so forth. And again in the New Law, dispensation is more easily granted than in the Old, in the matter of certain forbidden works, on account of their necessity, because the figure pertains to the protestation of truth, which it is unlawful to omit even in small things; while works, considered in themselves, are changeable in point of place and time.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(5)

Whether the fourth precept, about honoring one's parents, is fittingly expressed?

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(5)-O(1) — It seems that the fourth precept, about honoring one's parents, is unfittingly expressed. For this is the precept pertaining to piety. Now, just as piety is a part of justice, so are observance, gratitude, and others of which we have spoken (**QQ(101),102**, seq.). Therefore it seems that there should not have been given a special precept of piety, as none is given regarding the others.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(5)-O(2) — Further, piety pays worship not only to one's parents, but also to one's country, and also to other blood kindred, and to the well-wishers of our country, as stated above (**Q(101), AA(1),2**). Therefore it was unfitting for this precept to mention only the honoring of one's father and mother.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(5)-O(3) — Further, we owe our parents not merely honor but also support. Therefore the mere honoring of one's parents is unfittingly prescribed.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(5)-O(4) — Further, sometimes those who honor their parents die young, and on the contrary those who honor them not live a long time. Therefore it was unfitting to supplement this precept with the promise, "That thou mayest be long-lived upon earth."

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(5) — *On the contrary*, stands the authority of Scripture.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(5) — *I answer that*, The precepts of the decalogue are directed to the love of God and of our neighbor. Now to our parents, of all our neighbors, we are under the greatest obligation. Hence, immediately after the precepts directing us to God, a place is given to the precept directing us to our parents, who are the particular principle of our being, just as God is the universal principle: so that this precept has a certain affinity to the precepts of the First Table.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(5)-RO(1) — As stated above (**Q(101), A(2)**), piety directs us to pay the debt due to our parents, a debt which is common to all. Hence, since the precepts of the decalogue are general precepts, they

ought to contain some reference to piety rather than to the other parts of justice, which regard some special debt.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(5)-RO(2) — The debt to one's parents precedes the debt to one's kindred and country since it is because we are born of our parents that our kindred and country belong to us. Hence, since the precepts of the decalogue are the first precepts of the Law, they direct man to his parents rather than to his country and other kindred. Nevertheless this precept of honoring our parents is understood to command whatever concerns the payment of debt to any person, as secondary matter included in the principal matter.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(5)-RO(3) — Reverential honor is due to one's parents as such, whereas support and so forth are due to them accidentally, for instance, because they are in want, in slavery, or the like, as stated above (**Q(101), A(2)**). And since that which belongs to a thing by nature precedes that which is accidental, it follows that among the first precepts of the Law, which are the precepts of the decalogue, there is a special precept of honoring our parents: and this honor, as a kind of principle, is understood to comprise support and whatever else is due to our parents.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(5)-RO(4) — A long life is promised to those who honor their parents not only as to the life to come, but also as to the present life, according to the saying of the Apostle (⁵⁰⁸1 Timothy 4:8):

“Piety [Douay: ‘godliness’] is profitable to all things, having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come.”

And with reason. Because the man who is grateful for a favor deserves, with a certain congruity, that the favor should be continued to him, and he who is ungrateful for a favor deserves to lose it. Now we owe the favor of bodily life to our parents after God: wherefore he that honors his parents deserves the prolongation of his life, because he is grateful for that favor: while he that honors not his parents deserves to be deprived of life because he is ungrateful for the favor. However, present goods or evils are not the subject of merit or demerit except in so far as they are directed to a future reward, as stated above (**P(1), Q(114), A(12)**). Wherefore sometimes in accordance with the hidden design of the Divine judgments, which regard chiefly the future reward, some, who are dutiful to their parents, are

sooner deprived of life, while others, who are undutiful to their parents, live longer.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(6)

Whether the other six precepts of the decalogue are fittingly expressed?

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(6)-O(1) — It seems that the other six precepts of the decalogue are unfittingly expressed. For it is not sufficient for salvation that one refrain from injuring one's neighbor; but it is required that one pay one's debts, according to ~~681~~ Romans 13:7, "Render... to all men their dues." Now the last six precepts merely forbid one to injure one's neighbor. Therefore these precepts are unfittingly expressed.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(6)-O(2) — Further, these precepts forbid murder, adultery, stealing and bearing false witness. But many other injuries can be inflicted on one's neighbor, as appears from those which have been specified above (**QQ(72)**, seq.). Therefore it seems that the aforesaid precepts are unfittingly expressed.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(6)-O(3) — Further, concupiscence may be taken in two ways. First as denoting an act of the will, as in Wis. 6:21, "The desire [concupiscentia] of wisdom bringeth to the everlasting kingdom": secondly, as denoting an act of the sensuality, as in ~~501~~ James 4:1,

"From whence are wars and contentions among you? Are they not... from your concupiscences which war in your members?"

Now the concupiscence of the sensuality is not forbidden by a precept of the decalogue, otherwise first movements would be mortal sins, as they would be against a precept of the decalogue. Nor is the concupiscence of the will forbidden, since it is included in every sin. Therefore it is unfitting for the precepts of the decalogue to include some that forbid concupiscence.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(6)-O(4) — Further, murder is a more grievous sin than adultery or theft. But there is no precept forbidding the desire of murder.

Therefore neither was it fitting to have precepts forbidding the desire of theft and of adultery.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(6) — *On the contrary*, stands the authority of Scripture.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(6) — *I answer that*, Just as by the parts of justice a man pays that which is due to certain definite persons, to whom he is bound for some special reason, so too by justice properly so called he pays that which is due to all in general. Hence, after the three precepts pertaining to religion, whereby man pays what is due God, and after the fourth precept pertaining to piety, whereby he pays what is due to his parents — which duty includes the paying of all that is due for any special reason — it was necessary in due sequence to give certain precepts pertaining to justice properly so called, which pays to all indifferently what is due to them.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(6)-RO(1) — Man is bound towards all persons in general to inflict injury on no one: hence the negative precepts, which forbid the doing of those injuries that can be inflicted on one's neighbor, had to be given a place, as general precepts, among the precepts of the decalogue. On the other hand, the duties we owe to our neighbor are paid in different ways to different people: hence it did not behoove to include affirmative precepts about those duties among the precepts of the decalogue.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(6)-RO(2) — All other injuries that are inflicted on our neighbor are reducible to those that are forbidden by these precepts, as taking precedence of others in point of generality and importance. For all injuries that are inflicted on the person of our neighbor are understood to be forbidden under the head of murder as being the principal of all. Those that are inflicted on a person connected with one's neighbor, especially by way of lust, are understood to be forbidden together with adultery: those that come under the head of damage done to property are understood to be forbidden together with theft: and those that are comprised under speech, such as detractions, insults, and so forth, are understood to be forbidden together with the bearing of false witness, which is more directly opposed to justice.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(6)-RO(3) — The precepts forbidding concupiscence do not include the prohibition of first movements of concupiscence, that do

not go farther than the bounds of sensuality. The direct object of their prohibition is the consent of the will, which is directed to deed or pleasure.

P(2b)-Q(122)-A(6)-RO(4) — Murder in itself is an object not of concupiscence but of horror, since it has not in itself the aspect of good. On the other hand, adultery has the aspect of a certain kind of good, i.e. of something pleasurable, and theft has an aspect of good, i.e. of something useful: and good of its very nature has the aspect of something concupiscible. Hence the concupiscence of theft and adultery had to be forbidden by special precepts, but not the concupiscence of murder.