

TREATISE ON THE ANGELS (QQ[50]-64)

[Q. 50. OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE ANGELS ABSOLUTELY CONSIDERED \(FIVE ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 51. OF THE ANGELS IN COMPARISON WITH BODIES \(THREE ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 52. OF THE ANGELS IN RELATION TO PLACE \(THREE ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 53. OF THE LOCAL MOVEMENT OF THE ANGELS \(THREE ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 54. OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE ANGELS \(FIVE ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 55. OF THE MEDIUM OF THE ANGELIC KNOWLEDGE \(THREE ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 56. OF THE ANGEL'S KNOWLEDGE OF IMMATERIAL THINGS \(THREE ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 57. OF THE ANGEL'S KNOWLEDGE OF MATERIAL THINGS \(FIVE ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 58. OF THE MODE OF ANGELIC KNOWLEDGE \(SEVEN ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 59. THE WILL OF THE ANGELS \(FOUR ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 60. OF THE LOVE OR DILECTION OF THE ANGELS \(FIVE ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 61. OF THE PRODUCTION OF THE ANGELS IN THE ORDER OF NATURAL BEING \(FOUR ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 62. OF THE PERFECTION OF THE ANGELS IN THE ORDER OF GRACE AND OF GLORY \(NINE ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 63. THE MALICE OF THE ANGELS WITH REGARD TO SIN \(NINE ARTICLES\)](#)

[Q. 64. THE PUNISHMENT OF THE DEMONS \(FOUR ARTICLES\)](#)

Q. 50. OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE ANGELS ABSOLUTELY CONSIDERED (FIVE ARTICLES)

Now we consider the distinction of corporeal and spiritual creatures: firstly, the purely spiritual creature which in Holy Scripture is called angel; secondly, the creature wholly corporeal; thirdly, the composite creature, corporeal and spiritual, which is man.

Concerning the angels, we consider first what belongs to their substance; secondly, what belongs to their intellect; thirdly, what belongs to their will; fourthly, what belongs to their creation.

Their substance we consider absolutely and in relation to corporeal things.

Concerning their substance absolutely considered, there are five points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Whether there is any entirely spiritual creature, altogether incorporeal?](#)

[\(2\) Supposing that an angel is such, we ask whether it is composed of matter and form?](#)

[\(3\) We ask concerning their number.](#)

[\(4\) Of their difference from each other.](#)

[\(5\) Of their immortality or incorruptibility.](#)

Q. 50. A. 1. Whether an angel is altogether incorporeal?

Objection 1: It would seem that an angel is not entirely incorporeal. For what is incorporeal only as regards ourselves, and not in relation to God, is not absolutely incorporeal. But Damascene says (De Fide Orth. ii) that "an angel is said to be incorporeal and immaterial as regards us; but compared to God it is corporeal and material. Therefore he is not simply incorporeal."

Objection 2: Further, nothing is moved except a body, as the Philosopher says (Phys. vi, text 32). But Damascene says (De Fide Orth. ii) that "an angel is an ever movable intellectual substance." Therefore an angel is a corporeal substance.

[30551] I^a q. 50 pr. Post haec considerandum est de distinctione corporalis et spiritualis creaturae. Et primo, de creatura pure spirituali, quae in Scriptura sacra Angelus nominatur; secundo, de creatura pure corporali; tertio, de creatura composita ex corporali et spirituali, quae est homo. Circa vero Angelos, considerandum est primo de his quae pertinent ad eorum substantiam; secundo, de his quae pertinent ad eorum intellectum; tertio, de his quae pertinent ad eorum voluntatem; quarto, de his quae pertinent ad eorum creationem. De substantia autem eorum considerandum est et absolute, et per comparationem ad corporalia. Circa substantiam vero eorum absolute, quinque quaeruntur. Primo, utrum sit aliqua creatura omnino spiritualis, et penitus incorporea. Secundo, supposito quod Angelus sit talis, quaeritur utrum Angelus sit compositus ex materia et forma. Tertio, quaeritur de multitudine eorum. Quarto, de differentia ipsorum ab invicem. Quinto, de immortalitate, seu incorruptibilitate ipsorum.

[30552] I^a q. 50 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus non sit omnino incorporeus. Illud enim quod est incorporeum solum quoad nos, et non quoad Deum, non est incorporeum simpliciter. Sed Damascenus dicit, in libro II, quod *Angelus incorporeus et immaterialis dicitur quantum ad nos, sed comparatus ad Deum, corporeus et materialis invenitur*. Non ergo est incorporeus simpliciter.

[30553] I^a q. 50 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, nihil movetur nisi corpus, ut probatur in VI Physic. Sed Damascenus dicit ibidem quod Angelus est substantia intellectualis semper mobilis. Angelus ergo est substantia corporea.

Objection 3: Further, Ambrose says (De Spir. Sanct. i, 7): "Every creature is limited within its own nature." But to be limited belongs to bodies. Therefore, every creature is corporeal. Now angels are God's creatures, as appears from [Ps. 148:2](#): "Praise ye" the Lord, "all His angels"; and, farther on (verse 4), "For He spoke, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created." Therefore angels are corporeal.

On the contrary, It is said ([Ps. 103:4](#)): "Who makes His angels spirits."

I answer that, There must be some incorporeal creatures. For what is principally intended by God in creatures is good, and this consists in assimilation to God Himself. And the perfect assimilation of an effect to a cause is accomplished when the effect imitates the cause according to that whereby the cause produces the effect; as heat makes heat. Now, God produces the creature by His intellect and will ([Q\[14\], A\[8\]](#); [Q\[19\], A\[4\]](#)). Hence the perfection of the universe requires that there should be intellectual creatures. Now intelligence cannot be the action of a body, nor of any corporeal faculty; for every body is limited to "here" and "now." Hence the perfection of the universe requires the existence of an incorporeal creature.

The ancients, however, not properly realizing the force of intelligence, and failing to make a proper distinction between sense and intellect, thought that nothing existed in the world but what could be apprehended by sense and imagination. And because bodies alone fall under imagination, they supposed that no being existed except bodies, as the Philosopher observes (Phys. iv, text 52,57). Thence came the error of the Sadducees, who said there was no spirit ([Acts 23:8](#)).

But the very fact that intellect is above sense is a reasonable proof that there are some incorporeal things comprehensible by the intellect alone.

Reply to Objection 1: Incorporeal substances rank between God and corporeal creatures. Now the medium compared to one extreme appears to

[30554] I^a q. 50 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, Ambrosius dicit, in libro de spiritu sancto, *omnis creatura certis suae naturae circumscripta est limitibus*. Circumscribi autem proprium est corporum. Ergo omnis creatura est corporea. Angeli autem sunt Dei creaturae, ut patet in Psalmo CXLVIII, *laudate dominum, omnes Angeli eius; et postea subditur, quoniam ipse dixit, et facta sunt, ipse mandavit, et creata sunt*. Ergo Angeli sunt corporei.

[30555] I^a q. 50 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur in Psalmo CIII, *qui facit Angelos suos spiritus*.

[30556] I^a q. 50 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod necesse est ponere aliquas creaturas incorporeas. Id enim quod praecipue in rebus creatis Deus intendit est bonum quod consistit in assimilatione ad Deum. Perfecta autem assimilatio effectus ad causam attenditur, quando effectus imitatur causam secundum illud per quod causa producit effectum; sicut calidum facit calidum. Deus autem creaturam producit per intellectum et voluntatem, ut supra ostensum est. Unde ad perfectionem universi requiritur quod sint aliquae creaturae intellectuales. Intelligere autem non potest esse actus corporis, nec alicuius virtutis corporeae, quia omne corpus determinatur ad hic et nunc. Unde necesse est ponere, ad hoc quod universum sit perfectum, quod sit aliqua incorporea creatura. Antiqui autem, ignorantes vim intelligendi, et non distinguentes inter sensum et intellectum, nihil esse existimaverunt in mundo, nisi quod sensu et imaginatione apprehendi potest. Et quia sub imaginatione non cadit nisi corpus, existimaverunt quod nullum ens esset nisi corpus; ut philosophus dicit in IV Physic. Et ex his processit Sadducaeorum error, dicentium non esse spiritum. Sed hoc ipsum quod intellectus est altior sensu, rationabiliter ostendit esse aliquas res incorporeas, a solo intellectu comprehensibiles.

[30557] I^a q. 50 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod substantiae incorporeae medium sunt inter Deum et creaturas corporeas. Medium

be the other extreme, as what is tepid compared to heat seems to be cold; and thus it is said that angels, compared to God, are material and corporeal, not, however, as if anything corporeal existed in them.

Reply to Objection 2: Movement is there taken in the sense in which it is applied to intelligence and will. Therefore an angel is called an ever mobile substance, because he is ever actually intelligent, and not as if he were sometimes actually and sometimes potentially, as we are. Hence it is clear that the objection rests on an equivocation.

Reply to Objection 3: To be circumscribed by local limits belongs to bodies only; whereas to be circumscribed by essential limits belongs to all creatures, both corporeal and spiritual. Hence Ambrose says (De Spir. Sanct. i, 7) that "although some things are not contained in corporeal place, still they are none the less circumscribed by their substance."

Q. 50. A. 2. Whether an angel is composed of matter and form?

Objection 1: It would seem that an angel is composed of matter and form. For everything which is contained under any genus is composed of the genus, and of the difference which added to the genus makes the species. But the genus comes from the matter, and the difference from the form (Metaph. xiii, text 6). Therefore everything which is in a genus is composed of matter and form. But an angel is in the genus of substance. Therefore he is composed of matter and form.

Objection 2: Further, wherever the properties of matter exist, there is matter. Now the properties of matter are to receive and to substand; whence Boethius says (De Trin.) that "a simple form cannot be a subject": and the above properties are found in the angel. Therefore an angel is composed of matter and form.

Objection 3: Further, form is act. So what is form

autem comparatum ad unum extremum, videtur alterum extremum; sicut tepidum comparatum calido, videtur frigidum. Et hac ratione dicitur quod Angeli, Deo comparati, sunt materiales et corporei, non quod in eis sit aliquid de natura corporea.

[30558] I^a q. 50 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod motus ibi accipitur prout intelligere et velle motus quidam dicuntur. Dicitur ergo Angelus substantia semper mobilis, quia semper est actu intelligens, non quandoque actu et quandoque potentia, sicut nos. Unde patet quod ratio procedit ex aequivoco.

[30559] I^a q. 50 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod circumscribi terminis localibus est proprium corporum, sed circumscribi terminis essentialibus est commune cuilibet creaturae, tam corporali quam spirituali. Unde dicit Ambrosius, in libro de Spir. Sanct., quod licet quaedam locis corporalibus non contineantur, circumscriptione tamen substantiae non carent.

[30560] I^a q. 50 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus sit compositus ex materia et forma. Omne enim quod continetur sub aliquo genere, est compositum ex genere et differentia, quae, adveniens generi, constituit speciem. Sed genus sumitur ex materia, differentia vero ex forma, ut patet in VIII Metaphys. Ergo omne quod est in genere, est compositum ex materia et forma. Sed Angelus est in genere substantiae. Ergo est compositus ex materia et forma.

[30561] I^a q. 50 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, in quocumque inveniuntur proprietates materiae, ibi invenitur materia. Proprietates autem materiae sunt recipere et substand; unde dicit Boetius, in libro de Trin., quod *forma simplex subiectum esse non potest*. Haec autem inveniuntur in Angelo. Ergo Angelus est compositus ex materia et forma.

[30562] I^a q. 50 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, forma est

only is pure act. But an angel is not pure act, for this belongs to God alone. Therefore an angel is not form only, but has a form in matter.

Objection 4: Further, form is properly limited and perfected by matter. So the form which is not in matter is an infinite form. But the form of an angel is not infinite, for every creature is finite. Therefore the form of an angel is in matter.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv): "The first creatures are understood to be as immaterial as they are incorporeal."

I answer that, Some assert that the angels are composed of matter and form; which opinion Avicbron endeavored to establish in his book of the Fount of Life. For he supposes that whatever things are distinguished by the intellect are really distinct. Now as regards incorporeal substance, the intellect apprehends that which distinguishes it from corporeal substance, and that which it has in common with it. Hence he concludes that what distinguishes incorporeal from corporeal substance is a kind of form to it, and whatever is subject to this distinguishing form, as it were something common, is its matter. Therefore, he asserts the universal matter of spiritual and corporeal things is the same; so that it must be understood that the form of incorporeal substance is impressed in the matter of spiritual things, in the same way as the form of quantity is impressed in the matter of corporeal things.

But one glance is enough to show that there cannot be one matter of spiritual and of corporeal things. For it is not possible that a spiritual and a corporeal form should be received into the same part of matter, otherwise one and the same thing would be corporeal and spiritual. Hence it would follow that one part of matter receives the corporeal form, and another receives the spiritual form. Matter, however, is not divisible into parts except as regarded under quantity; and without quantity substance is indivisible, as Aristotle says (Phys. i, text 15). Therefore it would follow that the matter of spiritual things is subject to quantity;

actus. Quod ergo est forma tantum, est actus purus. Sed Angelus non est actus purus, hoc enim solius Dei est. Ergo non est forma tantum, sed habet formam in materia.

[30563] I^a q. 50 a. 2 arg. 4 Praeterea, forma proprie limitatur et finitur per materiam. Forma ergo quae non est in materia, est forma infinita. Sed forma Angeli non est infinita, quia omnis creatura finita est. Ergo forma Angeli est in materia.

[30564] I^a q. 50 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod Dionysius dicit, IV cap. de Div. Nom., quod *primae creaturae sicut incorporeales et immateriales intelliguntur.*

[30565] I^a q. 50 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod quidam ponunt Angelos esse compositos ex materia et forma. Et hanc opinionem astruere nititur Avicbron in libro fontis vitae. Supponit enim quod quaecumque distinguuntur secundum intellectum, sint etiam in rebus distincta. In substantia autem incorporea intellectus apprehendit aliquid per quod distinguitur a substantia corporea, et aliquid per quod cum ea convenit. Unde ex hoc vult concludere quod illud per quod differt substantia incorporea a corporea, sit ei quasi forma, et illud quod subiicitur huic formae distinguenti quasi commune, sit materia eius. Et propter hoc ponit quod eadem est materia universalis spiritualium et corporalium, ut intelligatur quod forma incorporeae substantiae sic sit impressa in materia spiritualium, sicut forma quantitatis est impressa in materia corporalium. Sed primo aspectu apparet esse impossibile unam esse materiam spiritualium et corporalium. Non enim est possibile quod forma spiritualis et corporalis recipiatur in una parte materiae, quia sic una et eadem res numero esset corporalis et spiritualis. Unde relinquitur quod alia pars materiae sit quae recipit formam corporalem, et alia quae recipit formam spiritualem. Materiam autem dividi in partes non contingit nisi secundum quod intelligitur sub quantitate, qua remota, remanet substantia indivisibilis, ut dicitur in I Physic. Sic igitur relinquitur quod materia spiritualium sit subiecta quantitati, quod est impossibile. Impossibile est ergo quod una sit materia corporalium et

which cannot be. Therefore it is impossible that corporeal and spiritual things should have the same matter.

It is, further, impossible for an intellectual substance to have any kind of matter. For the operation belonging to anything is according to the mode of its substance. Now to understand is an altogether immaterial operation, as appears from its object, whence any act receives its species and nature. For a thing is understood according to its degree of immateriality; because forms that exist in matter are individual forms which the intellect cannot apprehend as such. Hence it must be that every individual substance is altogether immaterial.

But things distinguished by the intellect are not necessarily distinguished in reality; because the intellect does not apprehend things according to their mode, but according to its own mode. Hence material things which are below our intellect exist in our intellect in a simpler mode than they exist in themselves. Angelic substances, on the other hand, are above our intellect; and hence our intellect cannot attain to apprehend them, as they are in themselves, but by its own mode, according as it apprehends composite things; and in this way also it apprehends God ([Q\[3\]](#)).

Reply to Objection 1: It is difference which constitutes the species. Now everything is constituted in a species according as it is determined to some special grade of being because "the species of things are like numbers," which differ by addition and subtraction of unity, as the Philosopher says (Metaph. viii, text 10). But in material things there is one thing which determines to a special grade, and that is the form; and another thing which is determined, and this is the matter; and hence from the latter the "genus" is derived, and from the former the "difference." Whereas in immaterial things there is no separate determinator and thing determined; each thing by its own self holds a determinate grade in being; and therefore in them "genus" and "difference" are not derived from different things, but from one and the same. Nevertheless, this differs in our mode of conception; for, inasmuch as our intellect considers it as indeterminate, it derives the idea of their "genus"; and inasmuch as it considers it

spiritualium. Sed adhuc ulterius impossibile est quod substantia intellectualis habeat qualemcumque materiam. Operatio enim cuiuslibet rei est secundum modum substantiae eius. Intelligere autem est operatio penitus immaterialis. Quod ex eius obiecto apparet, a quo actus quilibet recipit speciem et rationem, sic enim unumquodque intelligitur, inquantum a materia abstrahitur; quia formae in materia sunt individuales formae, quas intellectus non apprehendit secundum quod huiusmodi. Unde relinquitur quod omnis substantia intellectualis est omnino immaterialis. Non est autem necessarium quod ea quae distinguuntur secundum intellectum, sint distincta in rebus, quia intellectus non apprehendit res secundum modum rerum, sed secundum modum suum. Unde res materiales, quae sunt infra intellectum nostrum, simpliciori modo sunt in intellectu nostro, quam sint in seipsis. Substantiae autem angelicae sunt supra intellectum nostrum. Unde intellectus noster non potest attingere ad apprehendendum eas secundum quod sunt in seipsis; sed per modum suum, secundum quod apprehendit res compositas. Et sic etiam apprehendit Deum, ut supra dictum est.

[30566] I^a q. 50 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod differentia est quae constituit speciem. Unumquodque autem constituitur in specie, secundum quod determinatur ad aliquem specialem gradum in entibus, quia species rerum sunt sicut numeri, qui differunt per additionem et subtractionem unitatis, ut dicitur in VIII Metaphys. In rebus autem materialibus aliud est quod determinat ad specialem gradum, scilicet forma, et aliud quod determinatur, scilicet materia, unde ab alio sumitur genus, et ab alio differentia. Sed in rebus immaterialibus non est aliud determinans et determinatum, sed unaquaeque earum secundum seipsam tenet determinatum gradum in entibus. Et ideo genus et differentia in eis non accipitur secundum aliud et aliud, sed secundum unum et idem. Quod tamen differt secundum considerationem nostram, inquantum enim intellectus noster considerat illam rem ut indeterminate, accipitur in eis ratio generis; inquantum vero considerat ut

determinately, it derives the idea of their "difference."

Reply to Objection 2: This reason is given in the book on the Fount of Life, and it would be cogent, supposing that the receptive mode of the intellect and of matter were the same. But this is clearly false. For matter receives the form, that thereby it may be constituted in some species, either of air, or of fire, or of something else. But the intellect does not receive the form in the same way; otherwise the opinion of Empedocles (*De Anima* i, 5, text 26) would be true, to the effect that we know earth by earth, and fire by fire. But the intelligible form is in the intellect according to the very nature of a form; for as such is it so known by the intellect. Hence such a way of receiving is not that of matter, but of an immaterial substance.

Reply to Objection 3: Although there is no composition of matter and form in an angel, yet there is act and potentiality. And this can be made evident if we consider the nature of material things which contain a twofold composition. The first is that of form and matter, whereby the nature is constituted. Such a composite nature is not its own existence but existence is its act. Hence the nature itself is related to its own existence as potentiality to act. Therefore if there be no matter, and supposing that the form itself subsists without matter, there nevertheless still remains the relation of the form to its very existence, as of potentiality to act. And such a kind of composition is understood to be in the angels; and this is what some say, that an angel is composed of, "whereby he is," and "what is," or "existence," and "what is," as Boethius says. For "what is," is the form itself subsisting; and the existence itself is whereby the substance is; as the running is whereby the runner runs. But in God "existence" and "what is" are not different as was explained above ([Q\[3\], A\[4\]](#)). Hence God alone is pure act.

Reply to Objection 4: Every creature is simply finite, inasmuch as its existence is not absolutely subsisting, but is limited to some nature to which it belongs. But there is nothing against a creature being considered relatively infinite. Material creatures are infinite on the part of matter, but finite in their form, which is limited by the matter

determinate, accipitur ratio differentiae.

[30567] I^a q. 50 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod ratio illa ponitur in libro fontis vitae. Et esset necessaria, si idem esset modus quo recipit intellectus, et quo recipit materia. Sed hoc patet esse falsum. Materia enim recipit formam, ut secundum ipsam constituatur in esse alicuius speciei, vel aeris, vel ignis, vel cuiuscumque alterius. Sic autem intellectus non recipit formam, alioquin verificaretur opinio Empedoclis, qui posuit quod terram terra cognoscimus, et ignem igne. Sed forma intelligibilis est in intellectu secundum ipsam rationem formae, sic enim cognoscitur ab intellectu. Unde talis receptio non est receptio materiae, sed est receptio substantiae immaterialis.

[30568] I^a q. 50 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, licet in Angelo non sit compositio formae et materiae, est tamen in eo actus et potentia. Quod quidem manifestum potest esse ex consideratione rerum materialium, in quibus invenitur duplex compositio. Prima quidem formae et materiae, ex quibus constituitur natura aliqua. Natura autem sic composita non est suum esse, sed esse est actus eius. Unde ipsa natura comparatur ad suum esse sicut potentia ad actum. Subtracta ergo materia, et posito quod ipsa forma subsistat non in materia, adhuc remanet comparatio formae ad ipsum esse ut potentiae ad actum. Et talis compositio intelligenda est in Angelis. Et hoc est quod a quibusdam dicitur, quod Angelus est compositus ex quo est et quod est, vel ex esse et quod est, ut Boetius dicit, nam quod est est ipsa forma subsistens; ipsum autem esse est quo substantia est, sicut cursus est quo currens currit. Sed in Deo non est aliud esse et quod est, ut supra ostensum est. Unde solus Deus est actus purus.

[30569] I^a q. 50 a. 2 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod omnis creatura est finita simpliciter, inquantum esse eius non est absolutum subsistens, sed limitatur ad naturam aliquam cui advenit. Sed nihil prohibet aliquam creaturam esse secundum quid infinitam. Creaturae autem materiales habent infinitatem ex parte materiae, sed finitatem ex

which receives it. But immaterial created substances are finite in their being; whereas they are infinite in the sense that their forms are not received in anything else; as if we were to say, for example, that whiteness existing separate is infinite as regards the nature of whiteness, forasmuch as it is not contracted to any one subject; while its "being" is finite as determined to some one special nature.

Whence it is said (De Causis, prop. 16) that "intelligence is finite from above," as receiving its being from above itself, and is "infinite from below," as not received in any matter.

Q. 50. A. 3. Whether the angels exist in any great number?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels are not in great numbers. For number is a species of quantity, and follows the division of a continuous body. But this cannot be in the angels, since they are incorporeal, as was shown above ([A\[1\]](#)). Therefore the angels cannot exist in any great number.

Objection 2: Further, the more a thing approaches to unity, so much the less is it multiplied, as is evident in numbers. But among other created natures the angelic nature approaches nearest to God. Therefore since God is supremely one, it seems that there is the least possible number in the angelic nature.

Objection 3: Further, the proper effect of the separate substances seems to be the movements of the heavenly bodies. But the movements of the heavenly bodies fall within some small determined number, which we can apprehend. Therefore the angels are not in greater number than the movements of the heavenly bodies.

Objection 4: Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that "all intelligible and intellectual substances subsist because of the rays of the divine goodness." But a ray is only multiplied according to the different things that receive it. Now it cannot be said that their matter is receptive of an intelligible ray, since intellectual substances are immaterial, as was shown above ([A\[2\]](#)). Therefore it seems that

parte formae, quae limitatur per materiam in qua recipitur. Substantiae autem immateriales creatae sunt finitae secundum suum esse, sed infinitae secundum quod eorum formae non sunt receptae in alio. Sicut si diceremus albedinem separatam existentem esse infinitam quantum ad rationem albedinis, quia non contrahitur ad aliquod subiectum; esse tamen eius esset finitum, quia determinatur ad aliquam naturam specialem. Et propter hoc dicitur in libro de causis, quod intelligentia est finita superius, inquantum scilicet recipit esse a suo superiori; sed est infinita inferius, inquantum non recipitur in aliqua materia.

[30570] I^a q. 50 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli non sint in aliquo magno numero. Numerus enim species quantitatis est, et sequitur divisionem continui. Hoc autem non potest esse in Angelis cum sint incorporei, ut supra ostensum est. Ergo Angeli non possunt esse in aliquo magno numero.

[30571] I^a q. 50 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, quanto aliquid est magis propinquum uni, tanto minus est multiplicatum, ut in numeris apparet. Natura autem angelica inter alias naturas creatas est Deo propinquior. Cum ergo Deus sit maxime unus, videtur quod in natura angelica inveniatur minimum de multitudine.

[30572] I^a q. 50 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, proprius effectus separatarum substantiarum videtur esse motus corporum caelestium. Sed motus corporum caelestium sunt secundum aliquem determinatum numerum paucum, qui a nobis comprehendi potest. Ergo Angeli non sunt in maiori multitudine, quam motus corporum caelestium.

[30573] I^a q. 50 a. 3 arg. 4 Praeterea, Dionysius dicit, IV cap. de Div. Nom., quod *propter radios divinae bonitatis subsistunt intelligibiles et intellectuales omnes substantiae*. Sed radius non multiplicatur nisi secundum diversitatem recipientium. Non autem potest dici quod materia sit receptiva intelligibilis radii, cum substantiae intellectuales sint immateriales, ut supra ostensum

the multiplication of intellectual substances can only be according to the requirements of the first bodies---that is, of the heavenly ones, so that in some way the shedding form of the aforesaid rays may be terminated in them; and hence the same conclusion is to be drawn as before.

On the contrary, It is said ([Dan. 7:10](#)): "Thousands of thousands ministered to Him, and ten thousands times a hundred thousand stood before Him."

I answer that, There have been various opinions with regard to the number of the separate substances. Plato contended that the separate substances are the species of sensible things; as if we were to maintain that human nature is a separate substance of itself: and according to this view it would have to be maintained that the number of the separate substances is the number of the species of sensible things. Aristotle, however, rejects this view (Metaph. i, text 31) because matter is of the very nature of the species of sensible things. Consequently the separate substances cannot be the exemplar species of these sensible things; but have their own fixed natures, which are higher than the natures of sensible things. Nevertheless Aristotle held (Metaph. xi, text 43) that those more perfect natures bear relation to these sensible things, as that of mover and end; and therefore he strove to find out the number of the separate substances according to the number of the first movements.

But since this appears to militate against the teachings of Sacred Scripture, Rabbi Moses the Jew, wishing to bring both into harmony, held that the angels, in so far as they are styled immaterial substances, are multiplied according to the number of heavenly movements or bodies, as Aristotle held (Metaph. xi, text 43); while he contended that in the Scriptures even men bearing a divine message are styled angels; and again, even the powers of natural things, which manifest God's almighty power. It is, however, quite foreign to the custom of the Scriptures for the powers of irrational things to be designated as angels.

Hence it must be said that the angels, even inasmuch as they are immaterial substances, exist

est. Ergo videtur quod multiplicatio substantiarum intellectualium non possit esse nisi secundum exigentiam primorum corporum, scilicet caelestium, ut ad ea quodammodo processus praedictorum radiorum terminetur. Et sic idem quod prius.

[30574] I^a q. 50 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur Dan. VII, *millia millium ministrabant ei, et decies millies centena millia assistebant ei.*

[30575] I^a q. 50 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod circa numerum substantiarum separatarum, diversi diversis viis processerunt. Plato enim posuit substantias separatas esse species rerum sensibilium, utpote si poneremus ipsam naturam humanam esse separatam. Et secundum hoc oportebat dicere quod substantiae separatae sint secundum numerum specierum sensibilium. Sed hanc positionem improbat Aristoteles, ex eo quod materia est de ratione speciei horum sensibilium. Unde substantiae separatae non possunt esse species exemplares horum sensibilium, sed habent quasdam naturas altiores naturis rerum sensibilium. Posuit tamen Aristoteles quod illae naturae perfectiores habent ordinem ad sensibilia ista, secundum rationem moventis et finis. Et ideo secundum numerum primorum motuum, conatus est adinvenire numerum substantiarum separatarum. Sed quia hoc videtur repugnare documentis sacrae Scripturae, Rabbi Moyses, Iudaeus, volens utrumque concordare, posuit quod Angeli, secundum quod dicuntur substantiae immateriales, multiplicantur secundum numerum motuum vel corporum caelestium, secundum Aristotelem. Sed posuit quod Angeli in Scriptura dicuntur etiam homines divina annuntiantes; et iterum virtutes rerum naturalium, quae Dei omnipotentiam manifestant. Sed hoc est alienum a consuetudine Scripturae, quod virtutes rerum irrationabilium Angeli nominentur. Unde dicendum est quod etiam Angeli secundum quod sunt immateriales substantiae, in quadam multitudine maxima sunt, omnem materiale multitudinem excedentes. Et hoc est quod dicit Dionysius, XIV cap. Caelest. Hierarch., *multi sunt beati exercitus supernarum mentium, infirmam et constrictam excedentes nostrorum materialium numerorum commensurationem.* Et huius ratio est

in exceeding great number, far beyond all material multitude. This is what Dionysius says (Coel. Hier. xiv): "There are many blessed armies of the heavenly intelligences, surpassing the weak and limited reckoning of our material numbers." The reason whereof is this, because, since it is the perfection of the universe that God chiefly intends in the creation of things, the more perfect some things are, in so much greater an excess are they created by God. Now, as in bodies such excess is observed in regard to their magnitude, so in things incorporeal is it observed in regard to their multitude. We see, in fact, that incorruptible bodies, exceed corruptible bodies almost incomparably in magnitude; for the entire sphere of things active and passive is something very small in comparison with the heavenly bodies. Hence it is reasonable to conclude that the immaterial substances as it were incomparably exceed material substances as to multitude.

Reply to Objection 1: In the angels number is not that of discrete quantity, brought about by division of what is continuous, but that which is caused by distinction of forms; according as multitude is reckoned among the transcendentals, as was said above ([Q\[30\]](#), [A\[3\]](#); [Q\[11\]](#)).

Reply to Objection 2: From the angelic nature being the highest unto God, it must needs have least of multitude in its composition, but not so as to be found in few subjects.

Reply to Objection 3: This is Aristotle's argument (Metaph. xii, text 44), and it would conclude necessarily if the separate substances were made for corporeal substances. For thus the immaterial substances would exist to no purpose, unless some movement from them were to appear in corporeal things. But it is not true that the immaterial substances exist on account of the corporeal, because the end is nobler than the means to the end. Hence Aristotle says (Metaph. xii, text 44) that this is not a necessary argument, but a probable one. He was forced to make use of this argument, since only through sensible things can we come to know intelligible ones.

quia, cum perfectio universi sit illud quod praecipue Deus intendit in creatione rerum, quanto aliqua sunt magis perfecta tanto in maiori excessu sunt creata a Deo. Sicut autem in corporibus attenditur excessus secundum magnitudinem, ita in rebus incorporeis potest attendi excessus secundum multitudinem. Videmus autem quod corpora incorruptibilia, quae sunt perfectiora inter corpora, excedunt quasi incomparabiliter secundum magnitudinem corpora corruptibilia, nam tota sphaera activorum et passivorum est aliquid modicum respectu corporum caelestium. Unde rationabile est quod substantiae immateriales excedant secundum multitudinem substantias materiales, quasi incomparabiliter.

[30576] I^a q. 50 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod in Angelis non est numerus qui est quantitas discreta, causatus ex divisione continui, sed causatus ex distinctione formarum, prout multitudo est de transcendentibus, ut supra dictum est.

[30577] I^a q. 50 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod ex hoc quod natura angelica est Deo propinqua, oportet quod habeat minimum de multitudine in sui compositione, non autem ita quod in paucis salvetur.

[30578] I^a q. 50 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod ratio illa est Aristotelis in XII Metaphys. Et ex necessitate concluderet, si substantiae separatae essent propter substantias corporales, sic enim frustra essent immateriales substantiae, nisi ex eis aliquis motus in rebus corporalibus appareret. Non est autem hoc verum, quod substantiae immateriales sint propter corporales, quia finis nobilior est his quae sunt ad finem. Unde etiam Aristoteles dicit ibidem quod haec ratio non est necessaria, sed probabilis. Coactus autem fuit hac ratione uti, quia ad cognoscendum intelligibilia non possumus pervenire nisi per sensibilia.

Reply to Objection 4: This argument comes from the opinion of such as hold that matter is the cause of the distinction of things; but this was refuted above ([Q\[47\]](#), [A\[1\]](#)). Accordingly, the multiplication of the angels is not to be taken according to matter, nor according to bodies, but according to the divine wisdom devising the various orders of immaterial substances.

Q. 50. A. 4. Whether the angels differ in species?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels do not differ in species. For since the "difference" is nobler than the 'genus,' all things which agree in what is noblest in them, agree likewise in their ultimate constitutive difference; and so they are the same according to species. But all angels agree in what is noblest in them---that is to say, in intellectuality. Therefore all the angels are of one species.

Objection 2: Further, more and less do not change a species. But the angels seem to differ only from one another according to more and less---namely, as one is simpler than another, and of keener intellect. Therefore the angels do not differ specifically.

Objection 3: Further, soul and angel are contra-distinguished mutually from each other. But all souls are of the one species. So therefore are the angels.

Objection 4: Further, the more perfect a thing is in nature, the more ought it to be multiplied. But this would not be so if there were but one individual under one species. Therefore there are many angels of one species.

On the contrary, In things of one species there is no such thing as "first" and "second" [prius et posterius], as the Philosopher says (Metaph. iii, text 2). But in the angels even of the one order there are first, middle, and last, as Dionysius says (Hier. Ang. x). Therefore the angels are not of the same species.

[30579] I^a q. 50 a. 3 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod ratio illa procedit secundum opinionem eorum qui causam distinctionis rerum ponebant esse materiam. Hoc autem improbatum est. Unde multiplicatio Angelorum neque secundum materiam, neque secundum corpora est accipienda, sed secundum divinam sapientiam, diversos ordines immaterialium substantiarum excogitantem.

[30580] I^a q. 50 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli non differant specie. Cum enim differentia sit nobilior genere, quaecumque conveniunt secundum id quod est nobilissimum in eis, conveniunt in ultima differentia constitutiva; et ita sunt eadem secundum speciem. Sed omnes Angeli conveniunt in eo quod est nobilissimum in eis, scilicet in intellectualitate. Ergo omnes Angeli sunt unius speciei.

[30581] I^a q. 50 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, magis et minus non diversificant speciem. Sed Angeli non videntur differre ad invicem nisi secundum magis et minus; prout scilicet unus alio est simplicior, et perspicacioris intellectus. Ergo Angeli non differunt specie.

[30582] I^a q. 50 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, anima et Angelus ex opposito dividuntur. Sed omnes animae sunt unius speciei. Ergo et Angeli.

[30583] I^a q. 50 a. 4 arg. 4 Praeterea, quanto aliquid est perfectius in natura, tanto magis debet multiplicari. Hoc autem non esset, si in una specie esset unum tantum individuum. Ergo multi Angeli sunt unius speciei.

[30584] I^a q. 50 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra est quod in his quae sunt unius speciei, non est invenire prius et posterius, ut dicitur in III Metaphys. Sed in Angelis, etiam unius ordinis, sunt primi et medii et ultimi, ut dicit Dionysius, X cap. Ang. Hier. Ergo Angeli non sunt eiusdem speciei.

I answer that, Some have said that all spiritual substances, even souls, are of the one species. Others, again, that all the angels are of the one species, but not souls; while others allege that all the angels of one hierarchy, or even of one order, are of the one species.

But this is impossible. For such things as agree in species but differ in number, agree in form, but are distinguished materially. If, therefore, the angels be not composed of matter and form, as was said above ([A\[2\]](#)), it follows that it is impossible for two angels to be of one species; just as it would be impossible for there to be several whitenesses apart, or several humanities, since whitenesses are not several, except in so far as they are in several substances. And if the angels had matter, not even then could there be several angels of one species. For it would be necessary for matter to be the principle of distinction of one from the other, not, indeed, according to the division of quantity, since they are incorporeal, but according to the diversity of their powers; and such diversity of matter causes diversity not merely of species, but of genus.

Reply to Objection 1: "Difference" is nobler than "genus," as the determined is more noble than the undetermined, and the proper than the common, but not as one nature is nobler than another; otherwise it would be necessary that all irrational animals be of the same species; or that there should be in them some form which is higher than the sensible soul. Therefore irrational animals differ in species according to the various determined degrees of sensitive nature; and in like manner all the angels differ in species according to the diverse degrees of intellectual nature.

Reply to Objection 2: More and less change the species, not according as they are caused by the intensity or remissness of one form, but according as they are caused by forms of diverse degrees; for instance, if we say that fire is more perfect than air: and in this way the angels are diversified according to more or less.

Reply to Objection 3: The good of the species preponderates over the good of the individual.

[30585] I^a q. 50 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod quidam dixerunt omnes substantias spirituales esse unius speciei, etiam animas. Alii vero quod omnes Angeli sunt unius speciei, sed non animae. Quidam vero quod omnes Angeli unius hierarchiae, aut etiam unius ordinis. Sed hoc est impossibile. Ea enim quae conveniunt specie et differunt numero, conveniunt in forma, et distinguuntur materialiter. Si ergo Angeli non sunt compositi ex materia et forma, ut dictum est supra, sequitur quod impossibile sit esse duos Angelos unius speciei. Sicut etiam impossibile esset dicere quod essent plures albedines separatae, aut plures humanitates; cum albedines non sint plures nisi secundum quod sunt in pluribus substantiis. Si tamen Angeli haberent materiam, nec sic possent esse plures Angeli unius speciei. Sic enim oporteret quod principium distinctionis unius ab alio esset materia, non quidem secundum divisionem quantitatis, cum sint incorporei, sed secundum diversitatem potentiarum. Quae quidem diversitas materiae causat diversitatem non solum speciei, sed generis.

[30586] I^a q. 50 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod differentia est nobilior genere, sicut determinatum indeterminato et proprium communi; non autem sicut alia et alia natura. Alioquin oporteret quod omnia animalia irrationalia essent unius speciei; vel quod esset in eis aliqua alia perfectior forma quam anima sensibilis. Differunt ergo specie animalia irrationalia secundum diversos gradus determinatos naturae sensitivae. Et similiter omnes Angeli differunt specie secundum diversos gradus naturae intellectivae.

[30587] I^a q. 50 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod magis et minus, secundum quod causantur ex intensione et remissione unius formae, non diversificant speciem. Sed secundum quod causantur ex formis diversorum graduum, sic diversificant speciem, sicut si dicamus quod ignis est perfectior aere. Et hoc modo Angeli diversificantur secundum magis et minus.

[30588] I^a q. 50 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod bonum speciei praeponderat bono individui.

Hence it is much better for the species to be multiplied in the angels than for individuals to be multiplied in the one species.

Reply to Objection 4: Numerical multiplication, since it can be drawn out infinitely, is not intended by the agent, but only specific multiplication, as was said above ([Q\[47\]](#), [A\[3\]](#)). Hence the perfection of the angelic nature calls for the multiplying of species, but not for the multiplying of individuals in one species.

Q. 50. A. 5. Whether the angels are incorruptible?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels are not incorruptible; for Damascene, speaking of the angel, says (De Fide Orth. ii, 3) that he is "an intellectual substance, partaking of immortality by favor, and not by nature."

Objection 2: Further, Plato says in the Timaeus: "O gods of gods, whose maker and father am I: You are indeed my works, dissoluble by nature, yet indissoluble because I so will it." But gods such as these can only be understood to be the angels. Therefore the angels are corruptible by their nature

Objection 3: Further, according to Gregory (Moral. xvi), "all things would tend towards nothing, unless the hand of the Almighty preserved them." But what can be brought to nothing is corruptible. Therefore, since the angels were made by God, it would appear that they are corruptible of their own nature.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that the intellectual substances "have unfailing life, being free from all corruption, death, matter, and generation."

I answer that, It must necessarily be maintained that the angels are incorruptible of their own nature. The reason for this is, that nothing is corrupted except by its form being separated from the matter. Hence, since an angel is a subsisting

Unde multo melius est quod multiplicentur species in Angelis, quam quod multiplicentur individua in una specie.

[30589] I^a q. 50 a. 4 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod multiplicatio secundum numerum, cum in infinitum protendi possit, non intenditur ab agente, sed sola multiplicatio secundum speciem, ut supra dictum est. Unde perfectio naturae angelicae requirit multiplicationem specierum, non autem multiplicationem individuorum in una specie.

[30590] I^a q. 50 a. 5 arg. 1 Ad quintum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli non sint incorruptibiles. Dicit enim Damascenus de Angelo, quod *est substantia intellectualis, gratia et non natura immortalitatem suscipiens*.

[30591] I^a q. 50 a. 5 arg. 2 Praeterea, Plato dicit, in Timaeo, *o dii deorum, quorum opifex idem paterque ego, opera siquidem vos mea, dissolubilia natura, me tamen ita volente indissolubilia*. Hos autem deos non aliud quam Angelos intelligere potest. Ergo Angeli natura sua sunt corruptibiles.

[30592] I^a q. 50 a. 5 arg. 3 Praeterea, secundum Gregorium, *omnia in nihilum deciderent, nisi ea manus omnipotentis conservaret*. Sed quod in nihilum redigi potest, est corruptibile. Ergo, cum Angeli sint a Deo facti, videtur quod sint corruptibiles secundum suam naturam.

[30593] I^a q. 50 a. 5 s. c. Sed contra est quod Dionysius dicit, IV cap. de Div. Nom., quod intellectuales substantiae *vitam habent indeficientem, ab universa corruptione, morte et materia et generatione munda existentes*.

[30594] I^a q. 50 a. 5 co. Respondeo dicendum quod necesse est dicere Angelos secundum suam naturam esse incorruptibiles. Cuius ratio est, quia nihil corrumpitur nisi per hoc, quod forma eius a materia separatur, unde, cum Angelus sit ipsa

form, as is clear from what was said above ([A\[2\]](#)), it is impossible for its substance to be corruptible. For what belongs to anything considered in itself can never be separated from it; but what belongs to a thing, considered in relation to something else, can be separated, when that something else is taken away, in view of which it belonged to it. Roundness can never be taken from the circle, because it belongs to it of itself; but a bronze circle can lose roundness, if the bronze be deprived of its circular shape. Now to be belongs to a form considered in itself; for everything is an actual being according to its form: whereas matter is an actual being by the form. Consequently a subject composed of matter and form ceases to be actually when the form is separated from the matter. But if the form subsists in its own being, as happens in the angels, as was said above ([A\[2\]](#)), it cannot lose its being. Therefore, the angel's immateriality is the cause why it is incorruptible by its own nature.

A token of this incorruptibility can be gathered from its intellectual operation; for since everything acts according as it is actual, the operation of a thing indicates its mode of being. Now the species and nature of the operation is understood from the object. But an intelligible object, being above time, is everlasting. Hence every intellectual substance is incorruptible of its own nature.

Reply to Objection 1: Damascene is dealing with perfect immortality, which includes complete immutability; since "every change is a kind of death," as Augustine says (*Contra Maxim.* iii). The angels obtain perfect immutability only by favor, as will appear later ([Q\[62\]](#)).

Reply to Objection 2: By the expression 'gods' Plato understands the heavenly bodies, which he supposed to be made up of elements, and therefore dissoluble of their own nature; yet they are for ever preserved in existence by the Divine will.

Reply to Objection 3: As was observed above ([Q\[44\]](#), [A\[1\]](#)) there is a kind of necessary thing which has a cause of its necessity. Hence it is not

forma subsistens, ut ex dictis patet, impossibile est quod eius substantia sit corruptibilis. Quod enim convenit alicui secundum se, nunquam ab eo separari potest, ab eo autem cui convenit per aliud, potest separari, separato eo secundum quod ei conveniebat. Rotunditas enim a circulo separari non potest, quia convenit ei secundum seipsum, sed aeneus circulus potest amittere rotunditatem per hoc, quod circularis figura separatur ab aere. Esse autem secundum se competit formae, unumquodque enim est ens actu secundum quod habet formam. Materia vero est ens actu per formam. Compositum igitur ex materia et forma desinit esse actu per hoc, quod forma separatur a materia. Sed si ipsa forma subsistat in suo esse, sicut est in Angelis, ut dictum est, non potest amittere esse. Ipsa igitur immaterialitas Angeli est ratio quare Angelus est incorruptibilis secundum suam naturam. Et huius incorruptibilitatis signum accipi potest ex eius intellectuali operatione, quia enim unumquodque operatur secundum quod est actu, operatio rei indicat modum esse ipsius. Species autem et ratio operationis ex obiecto comprehenditur. Obiectum autem intelligibile, cum sit supra tempus, est sempiternum. Unde omnis substantia intellectualis est incorruptibilis secundum suam naturam.

[30595] I^a q. 50 a. 5 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Damascenus accipit immortalitatem perfectam, quae includit omnimodam immutabilitatem, quia omnis mutatio est quaedam mors, ut Augustinus dicit. Perfectam autem immutabilitatem Angeli non nisi per gratiam assequuntur, ut infra patebit.

[30596] I^a q. 50 a. 5 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod Plato per deos intelligit corpora caelestia, quae existimabat esse ex elementis composita, et ideo secundum suam naturam dissolubilia, sed voluntate divina semper conservantur in esse.

[30597] I^a q. 50 a. 5 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, sicut supra dictum est, quoddam necessarium est quod habet causam suae

repugnant to a necessary or incorruptible being to depend for its existence on another as its cause. Therefore, when it is said that all things, even the angels, would lapse into nothing, unless preserved by God, it is not to be gathered therefrom that there is any principle of corruption in the angels; but that the nature of the angels is dependent upon God as its cause. For a thing is said to be corruptible not merely because God can reduce it to non-existence, by withdrawing His act of preservation; but also because it has some principle of corruption within itself, or some contrariety, or at least the potentiality of matter.

necessitatis. Unde non repugnat necessario nec incorruptibili, quod esse eius dependeat ab alio sicut a causa. Per hoc ergo quod dicitur quod omnia deciderent in nihilum nisi continerentur a Deo, et etiam Angeli, non datur intelligi quod in Angelis sit aliquod corruptionis principium, sed quod esse Angeli dependeat a Deo sicut a causa. Non autem dicitur aliquid esse corruptibile, per hoc quod Deus possit illud in non esse redigere, subtrahendo suam conservationem, sed per hoc quod in seipso aliquod principium corruptionis habet, vel contrarietatem vel saltem potentiam materiae.

Q. 51. OF THE ANGELS IN COMPARISON WITH BODIES (THREE ARTICLES)

We next inquire about the angels in comparison with corporeal things; and in the first place about their comparison with bodies; secondly, of the angels in comparison with corporeal places; and, thirdly, of their comparison with local movement.

Under the first heading there are three points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Whether angels have bodies naturally united to them?](#)

[\(2\) Whether they assume bodies?](#)

[\(3\) Whether they exercise functions of life in the bodies assumed?](#)

Q. 51. A. 1. Whether the angels have bodies naturally united to them?

Objection 1: It would seem that angels have bodies naturally united to them. For Origen says (Peri Archon i): "It is God's attribute alone---that is, it belongs to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as a property of nature, that He is understood to exist without any material substance and without any companionship of corporeal addition." Bernard likewise says (Hom. vi. super Cant.): "Let us assign incorporeity to God alone even as we do immortality, whose nature alone, neither for its own sake nor on account of anything else, needs the help of any corporeal organ. But it is clear that every created spirit needs corporeal substance." Augustine also says (Gen. ad lit. iii): "The demons are called animals of the atmosphere because their nature is akin to that of aerial bodies." But the nature of demons and angels is the same. Therefore angels have bodies naturally united to them.

Objection 2: Further, Gregory (Hom. x in Ev.) calls an angel a rational animal. But every animal is composed of body and soul. Therefore angels have bodies naturally united to them.

Objection 3: Further, life is more perfect in the angels than in souls. But the soul not only lives, but gives life to the body. Therefore the angels animate bodies which are naturally united to

[30598] I^a q. 51 pr. Deinde quaeritur de Angelis per comparationem ad corporalia. Et primo, de comparatione Angelorum ad corpora; secundo, de comparatione Angelorum ad loca corporalia; tertio, de comparatione Angelorum ad motum localem. Circa primum quaeruntur tria. Primo, utrum Angeli habeant corpora naturaliter sibi unita. Secundo, utrum assumant corpora. Tertio, utrum in corporibus assumptis exerceant opera vitae.

[30599] I^a q. 51 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli habeant corpora naturaliter sibi unita. Dicit enim Origenes, in libro peri archon, *solius Dei, idest patris et filii et spiritus sancti, naturae illud proprium est, ut sine materiali substantia et absque ulla corporeae adiectionis societate, intelligatur existere.* Bernardus etiam dicit, in VI homilia super Cant., *demus Deo soli, sicut immortalitatem sic incorporeitatem, cuius natura sola neque propter se neque propter alium, solatio indiget instrumenti corporei. Liqueat autem omnem spiritum creatum corporeo indigere solatio.* Augustinus etiam dicit, super Gen. ad Litt., *Daemones aerea dicuntur animalia, quia corporum aereorum natura vigent.* Eadem autem est natura Daemonis et Angeli. Ergo Angeli habent corpora naturaliter sibi unita.

[30600] I^a q. 51 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, Gregorius, in homilia Epiphaniae, nominat Angelum rationale animal. Omne autem animal componitur ex corpore et anima. Ergo Angeli habent corpora naturaliter sibi unita.

[30601] I^a q. 51 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, perfectior est vita in Angelis quam in animabus. Sed anima non solum vivit, sed etiam vivificat corpus. Ergo Angeli vivificant corpora naturaliter sibi unita.

them.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that "the angels are understood to be incorporeal."

I answer that, The angels have not bodies naturally united to them. For whatever belongs to any nature as an accident is not found universally in that nature; thus, for instance, to have wings, because it is not of the essence of an animal, does not belong to every animal. Now since to understand is not the act of a body, nor of any corporeal energy, as will be shown later ([Q\[75\], A\[2\]](#)), it follows that to have a body united to it is not of the nature of an intellectual substance, as such; but it is accidental to some intellectual substance on account of something else. Even so it belongs to the human soul to be united to a body, because it is imperfect and exists potentially in the genus of intellectual substances, not having the fulness of knowledge in its own nature, but acquiring it from sensible things through the bodily senses, as will be explained later on ([Q\[84\], A\[6\]](#); [Q\[89\], A\[1\]](#)). Now whenever we find something imperfect in any genus we must presuppose something perfect in that genus. Therefore in the intellectual nature there are some perfectly intellectual substances, which do not need to acquire knowledge from sensible things. Consequently not all intellectual substances are united to bodies; but some are quite separated from bodies, and these we call angels.

Reply to Objection 1: As was said above ([Q\[50\], A\[1\]](#)) it was the opinion of some that every being is a body; and consequently some seem to have thought that there were no incorporeal substances existing except as united to bodies; so much so that some even held that God was the soul of the world, as Augustine tells us (De Civ. Dei vii). As this is contrary to Catholic Faith, which asserts that God is exalted above all things, according to [Ps. 8:2](#) : "Thy magnificence is exalted beyond the heavens"; Origen, while refusing to say such a thing of God, followed the above opinion of others regarding the other substances; being deceived here as he was also in many other points, by following the opinions of the ancient philosophers. Bernard's expression can

[30602] I^a q. 51 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicit Dionysius, IV cap. de Div. Nom., quod *Angeli sicut incorporeales intelliguntur*.

[30603] I^a q. 51 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Angeli non habent corpora sibi naturaliter unita. Quod enim accidit alicui naturae, non invenitur universaliter in natura illa, sicut habere alas, quia non est de ratione animalis, non convenit omni animali. Cum autem intelligere non sit actus corporis nec alicuius virtutis corporeae, ut infra patebit, habere corpus unitum non est de ratione substantiae intellectualis inquantum huiusmodi, sed accidit alicui substantiae intellectuali propter aliquid aliud; sicut humanae animae competit uniri corpori, quia est imperfecta et in potentia existens in genere intellectualium substantiarum, non habens in sui natura plenitudinem scientiae, sed acquirens eam per sensus corporeos a sensibilibus rebus, ut infra dicetur. In quocumque autem genere invenitur aliquid imperfectum, oportet praeexistere aliquid perfectum in genere illo. Sunt igitur aliquae substantiae perfectae intellectuales in natura intellectuali, non indigentes acquirere scientiam a sensibilibus rebus. Non igitur omnes substantiae intellectuales sunt unitae corporibus; sed aliquae sunt a corporibus separatae. Et has dicimus Angelos.

[30604] I^a q. 51 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod, sicut supra dictum est, quorundam opinio fuit quod omne ens esset corpus. Et ex hac existimatione derivatum videtur, quod aliqui existimaverunt nullas substantias incorporeas esse nisi corporibus unitas; adeo quod quidam etiam posuerunt Deum esse animam mundi, ut Augustinus narrat in VII de Civ. Dei. Sed quia hoc fidei Catholicae repugnat, quae ponit Deum super omnia exaltatum, secundum illud Psalmi VIII, *elevata est magnificentia tua super caelos*, Origenes, hoc de Deo dicere recusans, de aliis secutus est aliorum opinionem; sicut et in multis aliis deceptus fuit, sequens antiquorum philosophorum opiniones. Verbum autem Bernardi potest exponi, quod spiritus creati

be explained, that the created spirit needs some bodily instrument, which is not naturally united to it, but assumed for some purpose, as will be explained ([A\[2\]](#)). Augustine speaks, not as asserting the fact, but merely using the opinion of the Platonists, who maintained that there are some aerial animals, which they termed demons.

Reply to Objection 2: Gregory calls the angel a rational animal metaphorically, on account of the likeness to the rational nature.

Reply to Objection 3: To give life effectively is a perfection simply speaking; hence it belongs to God, as is said ([1 Kings 2:6](#)): "The Lord killeth, and maketh alive." But to give life formally belongs to a substance which is part of some nature, and which has not within itself the full nature of the species. Hence an intellectual substance which is not united to a body is more perfect than one which is united to a body.

Q. 51. A. 2. Whether angels assume bodies?

Objection 1: It would seem that angels do not assume bodies. For there is nothing superfluous in the work of an angel, as there is nothing of the kind in the work of nature. But it would be superfluous for the angels to assume bodies, because an angel has no need for a body, since his own power exceeds all bodily power. Therefore an angel does not assume a body.

Objection 2: Further, every assumption is terminated in some union; because to assume implies a taking to oneself [ad se sumere]. But a body is not united to an angel as to a form, as stated ([A\[1\]](#)); while in so far as it is united to the angel as to a mover, it is not said to be assumed, otherwise it would follow that all bodies moved by the angels are assumed by them. Therefore the angels do not assume bodies.

Objection 3: Further, angels do not assume bodies from the earth or water, or they could not suddenly disappear; nor again from fire, otherwise they would burn whatever things they touched;

indigeant corporali instrumento, non naturaliter unito, sed ad aliquid assumpto, ut infra dicitur. Augustinus autem loquitur non asserendo, sed opinione Platoniorum utens, qui ponebant esse quaedam animalia aerea, quae Daemones nominabant.

[30605] I^a q. 51 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod Gregorius nominat Angelum rationale animal metaphorice, propter similitudinem rationis.

[30606] I^a q. 51 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod vivificare effective simpliciter perfectionis est. Unde et Deo convenit secundum illud I Reg. II, *dominus mortificat et vivificat*. Sed vivificare formaliter est substantiae quae est pars alicuius naturae, et non habentis in se integram naturam speciei. Unde substantia intellectualis quae non est unita corpori, est perfectior quam ea quae est corpori unita.

[30607] I^a q. 51 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli non assumant corpora. In opere enim Angeli nihil est superfluum; sicut neque in opere naturae. Sed superfluum esset quod Angeli corpora assumerent, Angelus enim non indiget corpore, cum eius virtus omnem virtutem corporis excedat. Ergo Angelus non assumit corpus.

[30608] I^a q. 51 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, omnis assumptio ad aliquam unionem terminatur, quia assumere dicitur quasi ad se sumere. Sed corpus non unitur Angelo ut formae, sicut dictum est. Ex eo autem quod unitur sibi ut motori, non dicitur assumi, alioquin sequeretur quod omnia corpora mota ab Angelis, essent ab eis assumpta. Ergo Angeli non assumunt corpora.

[30609] I^a q. 51 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, Angeli non assumunt corpora de terra vel aqua, quia non subito disparerent; neque iterum de igne, quia comburerent ea quae contingerent; neque iterum

nor again from air, because air is without shape or color. Therefore the angels do not assume bodies.

On the contrary, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xvi) that angels appeared to Abraham under assumed bodies.

I answer that, Some have maintained that the angels never assume bodies, but that all that we read in Scripture of apparitions of angels happened in prophetic vision---that is, according to imagination. But this is contrary to the intent of Scripture; for whatever is beheld in imaginary vision is only in the beholder's imagination, and consequently is not seen by everybody. Yet Divine Scripture from time to time introduces angels so apparent as to be seen commonly by all; just as the angels who appeared to Abraham were seen by him and by his whole family, by Lot, and by the citizens of Sodom; in like manner the angel who appeared to Tobias was seen by all present. From all this it is clearly shown that such apparitions were beheld by bodily vision, whereby the object seen exists outside the person beholding it, and can accordingly be seen by all. Now by such a vision only a body can be beheld. Consequently, since the angels are not bodies, nor have they bodies naturally united with them, as is clear from what has been said ([A\[1\]; Q\[50\], A\[1\]](#)), it follows that they sometimes assume bodies.

Reply to Objection 1: Angels need an assumed body, not for themselves, but on our account; that by conversing familiarly with men they may give evidence of that intellectual companionship which men expect to have with them in the life to come. Moreover that angels assumed bodies under the Old Law was a figurative indication that the Word of God would take a human body; because all the apparitions in the Old Testament were ordained to that one whereby the Son of God appeared in the flesh.

Reply to Objection 2: The body assumed is united to the angel not as its form, nor merely as its mover, but as its mover represented by the assumed movable body. For as in the Sacred

ex aere, quia aer infigurabilis est et incolorabilis. Ergo Angeli corpora non assumunt.

[30610] I^a q. 51 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod Augustinus dicit, XVI de Civ. Dei, quod Angeli in assumptis corporibus Abrahae apparuerunt.

[30611] I^a q. 51 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod quidam dixerunt Angelos nunquam corpora assumere, sed omnia quae in Scripturis divinis leguntur de apparitionibus Angelorum, contigisse in visione prophetiae, hoc est secundum imaginationem. Sed hoc repugnat intentioni Scripturae. Illud enim quod imaginaria visione videtur, est in sola imaginatione videntis, unde non videtur indifferenter ab omnibus. Scriptura autem divina sic introducit interdum Angelos apparentes, ut communiter ab omnibus viderentur; sicut Angeli apparentes Abrahae, visi sunt ab eo et tota familia eius, et a Loth, et a civibus Sodomorum. Similiter Angelus qui apparuit Tobiae, ab omnibus videbatur. Ex quo manifestum fit huiusmodi contigisse secundum corpoream visionem, qua videtur id quod positum est extra videntem, unde ab omnibus videri potest. Tali autem visione non videtur nisi corpus. Cum igitur Angeli neque corpora sint, neque habeant corpora naturaliter sibi unita, ut ex dictis patet, relinquitur quod interdum corpora assumant.

[30612] I^a q. 51 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Angeli non indigent corpore assumpto propter seipsos, sed propter nos; ut familiariter cum hominibus conversando, demonstrent intelligibilem societatem quam homines expectant cum eis habendam in futura vita. Hoc etiam quod Angeli corpora assumpserunt in veteri testamento, fuit quoddam figurale indicium quod verbum Dei assumpturum esset corpus humanum, omnes enim apparitiones veteris testamenti ad illam apparitionem ordinatae fuerunt, qua filius Dei apparuit in carne.

[30613] I^a q. 51 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod corpus assumptum unitur Angelo, non quidem ut formae, neque solum ut motori; sed sicut motori repraesentato per corpus mobile

Scripture the properties of intelligible things are set forth by the likenesses of things sensible, in the same way by Divine power sensible bodies are so fashioned by angels as fittingly to represent the intelligible properties of an angel. And this is what we mean by an angel assuming a body.

Reply to Objection 3: Although air as long as it is in a state of rarefaction has neither shape nor color, yet when condensed it can both be shaped and colored as appears in the clouds. Even so the angels assume bodies of air, condensing it by the Divine power in so far as is needful for forming the assumed body.

Q. 51. A. 3. Whether the angels exercise functions of life in the bodies assumed?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels exercise functions of life in assumed bodies. For pretence is unbecoming in angels of truth. But it would be pretence if the body assumed by them, which seems to live and to exercise vital functions, did not possess these functions. Therefore the angels exercise functions of life in the assumed body.

Objection 2: Further, in the works of the angels there is nothing without a purpose. But eyes, nostrils, and the other instruments of the senses, would be fashioned without a purpose in the body assumed by the angel, if he perceived nothing by their means. Consequently, the angel perceives by the assumed body; and this is the most special function of life.

Objection 3: Further, to move hither and thither is one of the functions of life, as the Philosopher says (*De Anima* ii). But the angels are manifestly seen to move in their assumed bodies. For it was said ([Gn. 18:16](#)) that "Abraham walked with" the angels, who had appeared to him, "bringing them on the way"; and when Tobias said to the angel ([Tob. 5:7,8](#)): "Knowest thou the way that leadeth to the city of Medes?" he answered: "I know it; and I have often walked through all the ways thereof." Therefore the angels often exercise functions of life in assumed bodies.

assumptum. Sicut enim in sacra Scriptura proprietates rerum intelligibilium sub similitudinibus rerum sensibilium describuntur, ita corpora sensibilia divina virtute sic formantur ab Angelis, ut congruant ad repraesentandum Angeli intelligibiles proprietates. Et hoc est Angelum assumere corpus.

[30614] I^a q. 51 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, licet aer, in sua raritate manens, non retineat figuram neque colorem; quando tamen condensatur, et figurari et colorari potest, sicut patet in nubibus. Et sic Angeli assumunt corpora ex aere, condensando ipsum virtute divina, quantum necesse est ad corporis assumendi formationem.

[30615] I^a q. 51 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli in corporibus assumptis opera vitae exercent. Angelos enim veritatis non decet aliqua fictio. Esset autem fictio, si corpus ab eis assumptum, quod vivum videtur et opera vitae habens, non haberet huiusmodi. Ergo Angeli in assumpto corpore opera vitae exercent.

[30616] I^a q. 51 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, in operibus Angeli non sunt aliqua frustra. Frustra autem in corpore assumpto per Angelum formarentur oculi et nares et alia sensuum instrumenta, nisi per ea Angelus sentiret. Ergo Angelus sentit per corpus assumptum. Quod est propriissimum opus vitae.

[30617] I^a q. 51 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, moveri motu processivo est unum de operibus vitae, ut patet in II de anima. Manifeste autem Angeli apparent in assumptis corporibus moveri. Dicitur enim Gen. XVIII, quod Abraham simul gradiebatur, deducens Angelos qui ei apparuerant. Et Angelus Tobiae quaerenti, nosti viam quae ducit in civitatem Medorum? Respondit, *novi, et omnia itinera eius frequenter ambulavi*. Ergo Angeli in corporibus assumptis frequenter exercent opera vitae.

Objection 4: Further, speech is the function of a living subject, for it is produced by the voice, while the voice itself is a sound conveyed from the mouth. But it is evident from many passages of Sacred Scripture that angels spoke in assumed bodies. Therefore in their assumed bodies they exercise functions of life.

Objection 5: Further, eating is a purely animal function. Hence the Lord after His Resurrection ate with His disciples in proof of having resumed life ([Lk. 24](#)). Now when angels appeared in their assumed bodies they ate, and Abraham offered them food, after having previously adored them as God ([Gn. 18](#)). Therefore the angels exercise functions of life in assumed bodies.

Objection 6: Further, to beget offspring is a vital act. But this has befallen the angels in their assumed bodies; for it is related: "After the sons of God went in to the daughters of men, and they brought forth children, these are the mighty men of old, men of renown" ([Gn. 6:4](#)). Consequently the angels exercised vital functions in their assumed bodies.

On the contrary, The bodies assumed by angels have no life, as was stated in the previous article (ad 3). Therefore they cannot exercise functions of life through assumed bodies.

I answer that, Some functions of living subjects have something in common with other operations; just as speech, which is the function of a living creature, agrees with other sounds of inanimate things, in so far as it is sound; and walking agrees with other movements, in so far as it is movement. Consequently vital functions can be performed in assumed bodies by the angels, as to that which is common in such operations; but not as to that which is special to living subjects; because, according to the Philosopher (De Somn. et Vig. i), "that which has the faculty has the action." Hence nothing can have a function of life except what has life, which is the potential principle of such action.

[30618] I^a q. 51 a. 3 arg. 4 Praeterea, locutio est opus viventis, fit enim per vocem, quae est sonus ab ore animalis prolatus ut dicitur in II de anima. Manifestum est autem ex multis locis Scripturae, Angelos in assumptis corporibus locutos fuisse. Ergo in corporibus assumptis exercent opera vitae.

[30619] I^a q. 51 a. 3 arg. 5 Praeterea, comedere est proprium opus animalis, unde dominus post resurrectionem, in argumentum resumptae vitae, cum discipulis manducavit, ut habetur Lucae ultimo. Sed Angeli in assumptis corporibus apparentes comederunt, et Abraham eis cibos obtulit, quos tamen prius adoraverat, ut habetur Gen. XVIII. Ergo Angeli in assumptis corporibus exercent opera vitae.

[30620] I^a q. 51 a. 3 arg. 6 Praeterea, generare hominem est actus vitae. Sed hoc competit Angelis in assumptis corporibus dicitur enim Gen. VI, *postquam ingressi sunt filii Dei ad filias hominum, illaeque genuerunt, isti sunt potentes a saeculo viri famosi*. Ergo Angeli exercent opera vitae in corporibus assumptis.

[30621] I^a q. 51 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra, corpora assumpta ab Angelis non vivunt, ut supra dictum est. Ergo nec opera vitae per ea exerceri possunt.

[30622] I^a q. 51 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod quaedam opera viventium habent aliquid commune cum aliis operibus, ut locutio, quae est opus viventis, convenit cum aliis sonis inanimatorum, inquantum est sonus; et progressio cum aliis motibus, inquantum est motus. Quantum ergo ad id quod est commune utrisque operibus, possunt opera vitae fieri ab Angelis per corpora assumpta. Non autem quantum ad id quod est proprium viventium, quia secundum philosophum, in libro de Somn. et Vig., cuius est potentia, eius est actio; unde nihil potest habere opus vitae, quod non habet vitam, quae est potentiale principium talis actionis.

Reply to Objection 1: As it is in no wise contrary to truth for intelligible things to be set forth in Scripture under sensible figures, since it is not said for the purpose of maintaining that intelligible things are sensible, but in order that properties of intelligible things may be understood according to similitude through sensible figures; so it is not contrary to the truth of the holy angels that through their assumed bodies they appear to be living men, although they are really not. For the bodies are assumed merely for this purpose, that the spiritual properties and works of the angels may be manifested by the properties of man and of his works. This could not so fittingly be done if they were to assume true men; because the properties of such men would lead us to men, and not to angels.

Reply to Objection 2: Sensation is entirely a vital function. Consequently it can in no way be said that the angels perceive through the organs of their assumed bodies. Yet such bodies are not fashioned in vain; for they are not fashioned for the purpose of sensation through them, but to this end, that by such bodily organs the spiritual powers of the angels may be made manifest; just as by the eye the power of the angel's knowledge is pointed out, and other powers by the other members, as Dionysius teaches (Coel. Hier.).

Reply to Objection 3: Movement coming from a united mover is a proper function of life; but the bodies assumed by the angels are not thus moved, since the angels are not their forms. Yet the angels are moved accidentally, when such bodies are moved, since they are in them as movers are in the moved; and they are here in such a way as not to be elsewhere which cannot be said of God. Accordingly, although God is not moved when the things are moved in which He exists, since He is everywhere; yet the angels are moved accidentally according to the movement of the bodies assumed. But they are not moved according to the movement of the heavenly bodies, even though they be in them as the movers in the thing moved, because the heavenly bodies do not change place in their entirety; nor for the spirit which moves the world is there any fixed locality according to any restricted part of

[30623] I^a q. 51 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod, sicut non est contra veritatem quod in Scriptura intelligibilia sub figuris sensibilibus describuntur, quia hoc non dicitur ad adstruendum quod intelligibilia sint sensibilia, sed per figuras sensibilibus proprietates intelligibilium secundum similitudinem quandam dantur intelligi; ita non repugnat veritati sanctorum Angelorum quod corpora ab eis assumpta videntur homines viventes, licet non sint. Non enim assumuntur nisi ut per proprietates hominis et operum hominis. Spirituales proprietates Angelorum et eorum spiritualia opera designentur. Quod non ita congrue fieret, si veros homines assumerent, quia proprietates eorum ducerent in ipsos homines, non in Angelos.

[30624] I^a q. 51 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod sentire est totaliter opus vitae, unde nullo modo est dicendum quod Angeli per organa assumptorum corporum sentiant. Nec tamen superflue sunt formata. Non enim ad hoc sunt formata, ut per ea sentiatur, sed ad hoc ut per huiusmodi organa virtutes spirituales Angelorum designentur; sicut per oculum designatur virtus cognitiva Angeli, et per alia membra aliae eius virtutes, ut Dionysius docet, ult. cap. Cael. Hier.

[30625] I^a q. 51 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod motus qui est a motore coniuncto, est proprium opus vitae. Sic autem non moventur corpora assumpta ab eis, quia Angeli non sunt eorum formae. Moventur tamen Angeli per accidens, motis huiusmodi corporibus, cum sint in eis sicut motores in mobilibus, et ita sunt hic quod non alibi, quod de Deo dici non potest. Unde licet Deus non moveatur, motis his in quibus est, quia ubique est; Angeli tamen moventur per accidens ad motum corporum assumptorum. Non autem ad motum corporum caelestium, etiamsi sint in eis sicut motores in mobilibus, quia corpora caelestia non recedunt de loco secundum totum; nec determinatur spiritui moventi orbem locum secundum aliquam determinatam partem substantiae orbis, quae nunc est in oriente, nunc in occidente; sed secundum determinatum situm, quia semper est in oriente virtus movens, ut

the world's substance, which now is in the east, and now in the west, but according to a fixed quarter; because "the moving energy is always in the east," as stated in Phys. viii, text 84.

Reply to Objection 4: Properly speaking, the angels do not talk through their assumed bodies; yet there is a semblance of speech, in so far as they fashion sounds in the air like to human voices.

Reply to Objection 5: Properly speaking, the angels cannot be said to eat, because eating involves the taking of food convertible into the substance of the eater.

Although after the Resurrection food was not converted into the substance of Christ's body, but resolved into pre-existing matter; nevertheless Christ had a body of such a true nature that food could be changed into it; hence it was a true eating. But the food taken by angels was neither changed into the assumed body, nor was the body of such a nature that food could be changed into it; consequently, it was not a true eating, but figurative of spiritual eating. This is what the angel said to Tobias: "When I was with you, I seemed indeed to eat and to drink; but I use an invisible meat and drink" ([Tob. 12:19](#)).

Abraham offered them food, deeming them to be men, in whom, nevertheless, he worshipped God, as God is wont to be in the prophets, as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xvi).

Reply to Objection 6: As Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xv): "Many persons affirm that they have had the experience, or have heard from such as have experienced it, that the Satyrs and Fauns, whom the common folk call incubi, have often presented themselves before women, and have sought and procured intercourse with them. Hence it is folly to deny it. But God's holy angels could not fall in such fashion before the deluge. Hence by the sons of God are to be understood the sons of Seth, who were good; while by the daughters of men the Scripture designates those who sprang from the race of Cain. Nor is it to be wondered at that giants should be born of them; for they were not all giants, albeit there were many more before

dicitur in VIII Physic.

[30626] I^a q. 51 a. 3 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod Angeli proprie non loquuntur per corpora assumpta, sed est aliquid simile locutioni, inquantum formant sonos in aere similes vocibus humanis.

[30627] I^a q. 51 a. 3 ad 5 Ad quintum dicendum quod nec etiam comedere, proprie loquendo, Angelis convenit, quia comestio importat sumptionem cibi convertibilis in substantiam comedentis. Et quamvis in corpus Christi post resurrectionem cibus non converteretur, sed resolveretur in praeiacentem materiam, tamen Christus habebat corpus talis naturae in quod posset cibus converti, unde fuit vera comestio. Sed cibus assumptus ab Angelis neque convertebatur in corpus assumptum, neque corpus illud talis erat naturae in quod posset alimentum converti, unde non fuit vera comestio, sed figurativa spiritualis comestionis. Et hoc est quod Angelus dixit, Tob. XII, *cum essem vobiscum, videbar quidem manducare et bibere, sed ego potu invisibili et cibo utor*. Abraham autem obtulit eis cibos, existimans eos homines esse; in quibus tamen Deum venerabatur, sicut solet Deus esse in prophetis, ut Augustinus dicit, XVI de Civ. Dei.

[30628] I^a q. 51 a. 3 ad 6 Ad sextum dicendum quod, sicut Augustinus dicit, XV de Civ. Dei, *multi se expertos, vel ab expertis audisse confirmant, Silvanos et Faunos, quos vulgus incubos vocat, improbos saepe extitisse mulieribus et earum expetisse atque peregissee concubitus. Unde hoc negare impudentiae videtur. Sed Angeli Dei sancti nullo modo sic labi ante diluvium potuerunt. Unde per filios Dei intelliguntur filii Seth, qui boni erant, filias autem hominum nominat Scriptura eas quae natae erant de stirpe Cain. Neque mirandum est quod de eis gigantes nasci potuerunt, neque enim omnes gigantes fuerunt, sed multo plures ante diluvium quam post. Si tamen ex coitu Daemonum aliqui*

than after the deluge." Still if some are occasionally begotten from demons, it is not from the seed of such demons, nor from their assumed bodies, but from the seed of men taken for the purpose; as when the demon assumes first the form of a woman, and afterwards of a man; just as they take the seed of other things for other generating purposes, as Augustine says (*De Trin.* iii), so that the person born is not the child of a demon, but of a man.

interdum nascuntur, hoc non est per semen ab eis decisum, aut a corporibus assumptis, sed per semen alicuius hominis ad hoc acceptum, utpote quod idem Daemon qui est succubus ad virum, fiat incubus ad mulierem; sicut et aliarum rerum semina assumunt ad aliquarum rerum generationem, ut Augustinus dicit, *III de Trin.*; ut sic ille qui nascitur non sit filius Daemonis, sed illius hominis cuius est semen acceptum.

Q. 52. OF THE ANGELS IN RELATION TO PLACE (THREE ARTICLES)

We now inquire into the place of the angels.
Touching this there are three subjects of inquiry:

[\(1\) Is the angel in a place?](#)

[\(2\) Can he be in several places at once?](#)

[\(3\) Can several angels be in the same place?](#)

Q. 52. A. 1. Whether an angel is in a place?

Objection 1: It would seem that an angel is not in a place. For Boethius says (De Hebdom.): "The common opinion of the learned is that things incorporeal are not in a place." And again, Aristotle observes (Phys. iv, text 48,57) that "it is not everything existing which is in a place, but only a movable body." But an angel is not a body, as was shown above [\(Q\[50\]\)](#). Therefore an angel is not in a place.

Objection 2: Further, place is a "quantity having position." But everything which is in a place has some position. Now to have a position cannot benefit an angel, since his substance is devoid of quantity, the proper difference of which is to have a position. Therefore an angel is not in a place.

Objection 3: Further, to be in a place is to be measured and to be contained by such place, as is evident from the Philosopher (Phys. iv, text 14,119). But an angel can neither be measured nor contained by a place, because the container is more formal than the contained; as air with regard to water (Phys. iv, text 35,49). Therefore an angel is not in a place.

On the contrary, It is said in the Collect [*Prayer at Compline, Dominican Breviary]: "Let Thy holy angels who dwell herein, keep us in peace."

I answer that, It is befitting an angel to be in a place; yet an angel and a body are said to be in a place in quite a different sense. A body is said to be in a place in such a way that it is applied to such place according to the contact of dimensive

[30629] I^a q. 52 pr. Deinde quaeritur de loco Angeli. Et circa hoc quaeruntur tria. Primo, utrum Angelus sit in loco. Secundo, utrum possit esse in pluribus locis simul. Tertio, utrum plures Angeli possint esse in eodem loco.

[30630] I^a q. 52 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus non sit in loco. Dicit enim Boetius, in libro de Hebdom., *communis animi conceptio apud sapientes est, incorporalia in loco non esse*. Et Aristoteles, in IV Physic., dicit quod *non omne quod est, est in loco, sed mobile corpus*. Sed Angelus non est corpus, ut supra ostensum est. Ergo Angelus non est in loco.

[30631] I^a q. 52 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, locus est quantitas positionem habens. Omne ergo quod est in loco, habet aliquem situm. Sed habere situm non potest convenire Angelo, cum substantia sua sit immunis a quantitate, cuius propria differentia est positionem habere. Ergo Angelus non est in loco.

[30632] I^a q. 52 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, esse in loco est mensurari loco et contineri a loco, ut patet per philosophum in IV Physic. Sed Angelus non potest mensurari neque contineri a loco, quia continens est formaliter contento, sicut aer aqua, ut dicitur in IV Physic. Ergo Angelus non est in loco.

[30633] I^a q. 52 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod in collecta dicitur, *Angeli tui sancti, habitantes in ea, nos in pace custodiant*.

[30634] I^a q. 52 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Angelo convenit esse in loco, aequivoce tamen dicitur Angelus esse in loco, et corpus. Corpus enim est in loco per hoc, quod applicatur loco secundum contactum dimensivae quantitatis.

quantity; but there is no such quantity in the angels, for theirs is a virtual one. Consequently an angel is said to be in a corporeal place by application of the angelic power in any manner whatever to any place.

Accordingly there is no need for saying that an angel can be deemed commensurate with a place, or that he occupies a space in the continuous; for this is proper to a located body which is endowed with dimensive quantity. In similar fashion it is not necessary on this account for the angel to be contained by a place; because an incorporeal substance virtually contains the thing with which it comes into contact, and is not contained by it: for the soul is in the body as containing it, not as contained by it. In the same way an angel is said to be in a place which is corporeal, not as the thing contained, but as somehow containing it.

Reply to Objection 1: And hereby we have the answers to the objections.

Q. 52. A. 2. Whether an angel can be in several places at once?

Objection 1: It would seem that an angel can be in several places at once. For an angel is not less endowed with power than the soul. But the soul is in several places at once, for it is entirely in every part of the body, as Augustine says (De Trin. vi). Therefore an angel can be in several places at once.

Objection 2: Further, an angel is in the body which he assumes; and, since the body which he assumes is continuous, it would appear that he is in every part thereof. But according to the various parts there are various places. Therefore the angel is at one time in various places.

Objection 3: Further, Damascene says (De Fide Orth. ii) that "where the angel operates, there he is." But occasionally he operates in several places at one time, as is evident from the angel destroying Sodom ([Gn. 19:25](#)). Therefore an angel can be in several places at the one time.

On the contrary, Damascene says (De Fide Orth.

Quae quidem in Angelis non est; sed est in eis quantitas virtualis. Per applicationem igitur virtutis angelicae ad aliquem locum qualitercumque, dicitur Angelus esse in loco corporeo. Et secundum hoc patet quod non oportet dicere quod Angelus commensuretur loco; vel quod habeat situm in continuo. Haec enim conveniunt corpori locato, prout est quantum quantitate dimensiva. Similiter etiam non oportet propter hoc, quod contineatur a loco. Nam substantia incorporea sua virtute contingens rem corpoream, continet ipsam, et non continetur ab ea, anima enim est in corpore ut continens, et non ut contenta. Et similiter Angelus dicitur esse in loco corporeo, non ut contentum, sed ut continens aliquo modo.

[30635] I^a q. 52 a. 1 ad arg. Et per hoc patet responsio ad obiecta.

[30636] I^a q. 52 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus possit esse in pluribus locis simul. Angelus enim non est minoris virtutis quam anima. Sed anima est simul in pluribus locis, quia est tota in qualibet parte corporis, ut Augustinus dicit. Ergo Angelus potest esse in pluribus locis simul.

[30637] I^a q. 52 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, Angelus est in corpore assumpto; et cum assumat corpus continuum, videtur quod sit in qualibet eius parte. Sed secundum partes eius considerantur diversa loca. Ergo Angelus est simul in pluribus locis.

[30638] I^a q. 52 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, Damascenus dicit quod ubi Angelus operatur, ibi est. Sed aliquando operatur simul in pluribus locis, ut patet de Angelo subvertente Sodomam, Gen. XIX. Ergo Angelus potest esse in pluribus locis simul.

[30639] I^a q. 52 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod

ii) that "while the angels are in heaven, they are not on earth."

I answer that, An angel's power and nature are finite, whereas the Divine power and essence, which is the universal cause of all things, is infinite: consequently God through His power touches all things, and is not merely present in some places, but is everywhere. Now since the angel's power is finite, it does not extend to all things, but to one determined thing. For whatever is compared with one power must be compared therewith as one determined thing. Consequently since all being is compared as one thing to God's universal power, so is one particular being compared as one with the angelic power. Hence, since the angel is in a place by the application of his power to the place, it follows that he is not everywhere, nor in several places, but in only one place.

Some, however, have been deceived in this matter. For some who were unable to go beyond the reach of their imaginations supposed the indivisibility of the angel to be like that of a point; consequently they thought that an angel could be only in a place which is a point. But they were manifestly deceived, because a point is something indivisible, yet having its situation; whereas the angel is indivisible, and beyond the genus of quantity and situation. Consequently there is no occasion for determining in his regard one indivisible place as to situation: any place which is either divisible or indivisible, great or small suffices, according as to his own free-will he applies his power to a great or to a small body. So the entire body to which he is applied by his power, corresponds as one place to him.

Neither, if any angel moves the heavens, is it necessary for him to be everywhere. First of all, because his power is applied only to what is first moved by him. Now there is one part of the heavens in which there is movement first of all, namely, the part to the east: hence the Philosopher (Phys. vii, text 84) attributes the power of the heavenly mover to the part which is in the east. Secondly, because philosophers do not hold that one separate substance moves all the spheres immediately. Hence it need not be everywhere.

Damascenus dicit, quod *Angeli, dum sunt in caelo, non sunt in terra.*

[30640] I^a q. 52 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Angelus est virtutis et essentiae finitae. Divina autem virtus et essentia infinita est, et est universalis causa omnium, et ideo sua virtute omnia contingit, et non solum in pluribus locis est, sed ubique. Virtus autem Angeli, quia finita est, non se extendit ad omnia, sed ad aliquid unum determinatum. Oportet enim quidquid comparatur ad unam virtutem, ut unum aliquid comparari ad ipsam. Sicut igitur universum ens comparatur ut unum aliquid ad universalem Dei virtutem, ita et aliquod particulare ens comparatur ut aliquid unum ad Angeli virtutem. Unde cum Angelus sit in loco per applicationem virtutis suae ad locum, sequitur quod non sit ubique, nec in pluribus locis, sed in uno loco tantum. Circa hoc tamen aliqui decepti sunt. Quidam enim, imaginationem transcendere non valentes, cogitaverunt indivisibilitatem Angeli ad modum indivisibilitatis puncti, et inde crediderunt quod Angelus non posset esse nisi in loco punctali. Sed manifeste decepti sunt. Nam punctum est indivisibile habens situm, sed Angelus est indivisibile extra genus quantitatis et situs existens. Unde non est necesse quod determinetur ei unus locus indivisibilis secundum situm; sed vel divisibilis vel indivisibilis, vel maior vel minor, secundum quod voluntarie applicat suam virtutem ad corpus maius vel minus. Et sic totum corpus cui per suam virtutem applicatur, correspondet ei ut unus locus. Nec tamen oportet quod si aliquis Angelus movet caelum, quod sit ubique. Primo quidem, quia non applicatur virtus eius nisi ad id quod primo ab ipso movetur, una autem pars caeli est in qua primo est motus, scilicet pars orientis, unde etiam philosophus, in VIII Physic., virtutem motoris caelorum attribuit parti orientis. Secundo, quia non ponitur a philosophis quod una substantia separata moveat omnes orbes immediate. Unde non oportet quod sit ubique. Sic igitur patet quod diversimode esse in loco convenit corpori, et Angelo, et Deo. Nam corpus est in loco circumscriptive, quia commensuratur loco. Angelus autem non circumscriptive, cum non commensuretur loco, sed definitive, quia ita est in uno loco, quod non in alio. Deus autem neque circumscriptive neque definitive, quia est ubique.

So, then, it is evident that to be in a place appertains quite differently to a body, to an angel, and to God. For a body is in a place in a circumscribed fashion, since it is measured by the place. An angel, however, is not there in a circumscribed fashion, since he is not measured by the place, but definitively, because he is in a place in such a manner that he is not in another. But God is neither circumscriptively nor definitively there, because He is everywhere.

Reply to Objections: From this we can easily gather an answer to the objections: because the entire subject to which the angelic power is immediately applied, is reputed as one place, even though it be continuous.

Q. 52. A. 3. Whether several angels can be at the same time in the same place?

Objection 1: It would seem that several angels can be at the same time in the same place. For several bodies cannot be at the same time in the same place, because they fill the place. But the angels do not fill a place, because only a body fills a place, so that it be not empty, as appears from the Philosopher (Phys. iv, text 52,58). Therefore several angels can be in the one place.

Objection 2: Further, there is a greater difference between an angel and a body than there is between two angels. But an angel and a body are at the one time in the one place: because there is no place which is not filled with a sensible body, as we find proved in Phys. iv, text. 58. Much more, then, can two angels be in the same place.

Objection 3: Further, the soul is in every part of the body, according to Augustine (De Trin. vi). But demons, although they do not obsess souls, do obsess bodies occasionally; and thus the soul and the demon are at the one time in the same place; and consequently for the same reason all other spiritual substances.

On the contrary, There are not two souls in the same body. Therefore for a like reason there are not two angels in the same place.

[30641] I^a q. 52 a. 2 ad 1 Et per hoc patet de facili responsio ad obiecta, quia totum illud cui immediate applicatur virtus Angeli, reputatur ut unus locus eius, licet sit continuum.

[30642] I^a q. 52 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod plures Angeli possint simul esse in eodem loco. Plura enim corpora non possunt esse simul in eodem loco, quia replent locum. Sed Angeli non replent locum, quia solum corpus replet locum, ut non sit vacuum, ut patet per philosophum, in IV Physic. Ergo plures Angeli possunt esse in uno loco.

[30643] I^a q. 52 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, plus differt Angelus et corpus quam duo Angeli. Sed Angelus et corpus sunt simul in eodem loco, quia nullus locus est qui non sit plenus sensibili corpore, ut probatur in IV Physic. Ergo multo magis duo Angeli possunt esse in eodem loco.

[30644] I^a q. 52 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, anima est in qualibet parte corporis, secundum Augustinum. Sed Daemones, licet non illabantur mentibus, illabuntur tamen interdum corporibus, et sic anima et Daemon sunt simul in eodem loco. Ergo, eadem ratione, quaecumque aliae spirituales substantiae.

[30645] I^a q. 52 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra, duae animae non sunt in eodem corpore. Ergo, pari ratione, neque duo Angeli in eodem loco.

I answer that, There are not two angels in the same place. The reason of this is because it is impossible for two complete causes to be the causes immediately of one and the same thing. This is evident in every class of causes: for there is one proximate form of one thing, and there is one proximate mover, although there may be several remote movers. Nor can it be objected that several individuals may row a boat, since no one of them is a perfect mover, because no one man's strength is sufficient for moving the boat; while all together are as one mover, in so far as their united strengths all combine in producing the one movement. Hence, since the angel is said to be in one place by the fact that his power touches the place immediately by way of a perfect container, as was said ([A\[1\]](#)), there can be but one angel in one place.

Reply to Objection 1: Several angels are not hindered from being in the same place because of their filling the place; but for another reason, as has been said.

Reply to Objection 2: An angel and a body are not in a place in the same way; hence the conclusion does not follow.

Reply to Objection 3: Not even a demon and a soul are compared to a body according to the same relation of causality; since the soul is its form, while the demon is not. Hence the inference does not follow.

[30646] I^a q. 52 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod duo Angeli non sunt simul in eodem loco. Et ratio huius est, quia impossibile est quod duae causae completae sint immediatae unius et eiusdem rei. Quod patet in omni genere causarum, una enim est forma proxima unius rei, et unum est proximum movens, licet possint esse plures motores remoti. Nec habet instantiam de pluribus trahentibus navem, quia nullus eorum est perfectus motor, cum virtus uniuscuiusque sit insufficiens ad movendum; sed omnes simul sunt in loco unius motoris, inquantum omnes virtutes eorum aggregantur ad unum motum faciendum. Unde cum Angelus dicatur esse in loco per hoc quod virtus eius immediate contingit locum per modum continentis perfecti, ut dictum est, non potest esse nisi unus Angelus in uno loco.

[30647] I^a q. 52 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod plures Angelos esse in uno loco non impeditur propter impletionem loci, sed propter aliam causam, ut dictum est.

[30648] I^a q. 52 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod Angelus et corpus non eodem modo sunt in loco, unde ratio non sequitur.

[30649] I^a q. 52 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod nec etiam Daemon et anima comparantur ad corpus secundum eandem habitudinem causae; cum anima sit forma, non autem Daemon. Unde ratio non sequitur.

Q. 53. OF THE LOCAL MOVEMENT OF THE ANGELS (THREE ARTICLES)

We must next consider the local movement of the angels; under which heading there are three points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Whether an angel can be moved locally.](#)

[\(2\) Whether in passing from place to place he passes through intervening space?](#)

[\(3\) Whether the angel's movement is in time or instantaneous?](#)

Q. 53. A. 1. Whether an angel can be moved locally?

Objection 1: It seems that an angel cannot be moved locally. For, as the Philosopher proves (Phys. vi, text 32,86) "nothing which is devoid of parts is moved"; because, while it is in the term "wherefrom," it is not moved; nor while it is in the term "whereeto," for it is then already moved; consequently it remains that everything which is moved, while it is being moved, is partly in the term "wherefrom" and partly in the term "whereeto." But an angel is without parts. Therefore an angel cannot be moved locally.

Objection 2: Further, movement is "the act of an imperfect being," as the Philosopher says (Phys. iii, text 14). But a beatified angel is not imperfect. Consequently a beatified angel is not moved locally.

Objection 3: Further, movement is simply because of want. But the holy angels have no want. Therefore the holy angels are not moved locally.

On the contrary, It is the same thing for a beatified angel to be moved as for a beatified soul to be moved. But it must necessarily be said that a blessed soul is moved locally, because it is an article of faith that Christ's soul descended into Hell. Therefore a beatified angel is moved locally.

I answer that, A beatified angel can be moved locally. As, however, to be in a place belongs equivocally to a body and to an angel, so likewise

[30650] I^a q. 53 pr. Consequenter considerandum est de motu locali Angelorum. Et circa hoc quaeruntur tria. Primo, utrum Angelus possit moveri localiter. Secundo, utrum moveatur de loco ad locum, pertranseundo medium. Tertio, utrum motus Angeli sit in tempore vel in instanti.

[30651] I^a q. 53 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus non possit moveri localiter. Ut enim probat philosophus in VI Physic., nullum impartibile movetur, quia dum aliquid est in termino a quo, non movetur; nec etiam dum est in termino ad quem, sed tunc mutatum est, unde relinquitur quod omne quod movetur, dum movetur, partim est in termino a quo, et partim in termino ad quem. Sed Angelus est impartibilis. Ergo Angelus non potest moveri localiter.

[30652] I^a q. 53 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, motus est actus imperfecti, ut dicitur in III Physic. Sed Angelus beatus non est imperfectus. Ergo Angelus beatus non movetur localiter.

[30653] I^a q. 53 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, motus non est nisi propter indigentiam. Sed sanctorum Angelorum nulla est indigentia. Ergo sancti Angeli localiter non moventur.

[30654] I^a q. 53 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra, eiusdem rationis est Angelum beatum moveri, et animam beatam moveri. Sed necesse est dicere animam beatam localiter moveri, cum sit articulus fidei quod Christus secundum animam, descendit ad Inferos. Ergo Angelus beatus movetur localiter.

[30655] I^a q. 53 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Angelus beatus potest moveri localiter. Sed sicut esse in loco aequivoce convenit corpori et

does local movement. For a body is in a place in so far as it is contained under the place, and is commensurate with the place. Hence it is necessary for local movement of a body to be commensurate with the place, and according to its exigency. Hence it is that the continuity of movement is according to the continuity of magnitude; and according to priority and posteriority of local movement, as the Philosopher says (Phys. iv, text 99). But an angel is not in a place as commensurate and contained, but rather as containing it. Hence it is not necessary for the local movement of an angel to be commensurate with the place, nor for it to be according to the exigency of the place, so as to have continuity therefrom; but it is a non-continuous movement. For since the angel is in a place only by virtual contact, as was said above ([Q\[52\], A\[1\]](#)), it follows necessarily that the movement of an angel in a place is nothing else than the various contacts of various places successively, and not at once; because an angel cannot be in several places at one time, as was said above ([Q\[52\], A\[2\]](#)). Nor is it necessary for these contacts to be continuous. Nevertheless a certain kind of continuity can be found in such contacts. Because, as was said above ([Q\[52\], A\[1\]](#)), there is nothing to hinder us from assigning a divisible place to an angel according to virtual contact; just as a divisible place is assigned to a body by contact of magnitude. Hence as a body successively, and not all at once, quits the place in which it was before, and thence arises continuity in its local movement; so likewise an angel can successively quit the divisible place in which he was before, and so his movement will be continuous. And he can all at once quit the whole place, and in the same instant apply himself to the whole of another place, and thus his movement will not be continuous.

Reply to Objection 1: This argument fails of its purpose for a twofold reason. First of all, because Aristotle's demonstration deals with what is indivisible according to quantity, to which responds a place necessarily indivisible. And this cannot be said of an angel.

Secondly, because Aristotle's demonstration deals with movement which is continuous. For if the movement were not continuous, it might be said

Angelo, ita etiam et moveri secundum locum. Corpus enim est in loco, inquantum continetur sub loco, et commensuratur loco. Unde oportet quod etiam motus corporis secundum locum, commensuretur loco, et sit secundum exigentiam eius. Et inde est quod secundum continuitatem magnitudinis est continuus motus; et secundum prius et posterius in magnitudine, est prius et posterius in motu locali corporis, ut dicitur in IV Physic. Sed Angelus non est in loco ut commensuratus et contentus, sed magis ut continens. Unde motus Angeli in loco, non oportet quod commensuretur loco, nec quod sit secundum exigentiam eius, ut habeat continuitatem ex loco; sed est motus non continuus. Quia enim Angelus non est in loco nisi secundum contactum virtutis, ut dictum est, necesse est quod motus Angeli in loco nihil aliud sit quam diversi contactus diversorum locorum successive et non simul, quia Angelus non potest simul esse in pluribus locis, ut supra dictum est. Huiusmodi autem contactus non est necessarium esse continuos. Potest tamen in huiusmodi contactibus continuus quaedam inveniri. Quia, ut dictum est, nihil prohibet Angelo assignare locum divisibilem, per contactum suae virtutis; sicut corpori assignatur locus divisibilis, per contactum suae magnitudinis. Unde sicut corpus successive, et non simul, dimittit locum in quo prius erat, et ex hoc causatur continuus in motu locali eius; ita etiam Angelus potest dimittere successive locum divisibilem in quo prius erat, et sic motus eius erit continuus. Et potest etiam totum locum simul dimittere, et toti alteri loco simul se applicare, et sic motus eius non erit continuus.

[30656] I^a q. 53 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod illa ratio dupliciter deficit in proposito. Primo quidem, quia demonstratio Aristotelis procedit de indivisibili secundum quantitatem, cui respondet locus de necessitate indivisibilis. Quod non potest dici de Angelo. Secundo, quia demonstratio Aristotelis procedit de motu continuo. Si enim motus non esset continuus, posset dici quod aliquid movetur dum est in termino a quo, et dum est in termino ad

that a thing is moved where it is in the term "wherefrom," and while it is in the term "whereto": because the very succession of "wheres," regarding the same thing, would be called movement: hence, in whichever of those "wheres" the thing might be, it could be said to be moved. But the continuity of movement prevents this; because nothing which is continuous is in its term, as is clear, because the line is not in the point. Therefore it is necessary for the thing moved to be not totally in either of the terms while it is being moved; but partly in the one, and partly in the other. Therefore, according as the angel's movement is not continuous, Aristotle's demonstration does not hold good. But according as the angel's movement is held to be continuous, it can be so granted, that, while an angel is in movement, he is partly in the term "wherefrom," and partly in the term "whereto" (yet so that such partiality be not referred to the angel's substance, but to the place); because at the outset of his continuous movement the angel is in the whole divisible place from which he begins to be moved; but while he is actually in movement, he is in part of the first place which he quits, and in part of the second place which he occupies. This very fact that he can occupy the parts of two places appertains to the angel from this, that he can occupy a divisible place by applying his power; as a body does by application of magnitude. Hence it follows regarding a body which is movable according to place, that it is divisible according to magnitude; but regarding an angel, that his power can be applied to something which is divisible.

Reply to Objection 2: The movement of that which is in potentiality is the act of an imperfect agent. But the movement which is by application of energy is the act of one in act: because energy implies actuality.

Reply to Objection 3: The movement of that which is in potentiality is the act of an imperfect but the movement of what is in act is not for any need of its own, but for another's need. In this way, because of our need, the angel is moved locally, according to [Heb. 1:14](#): "They are all [*Vulg.: 'Are they not all . . . ?'] ministering spirits, sent to minister for them who receive the

quem, quia ipsa successio diversorum ubi circa eandem rem, motus diceretur; unde in quolibet illorum ubi res esset, illa posset dici moveri. Sed continuitas motus hoc impedit, quia nullum continuum est in termino suo, ut patet, quia linea non est in puncto. Et ideo oportet quod illud quod movetur, non sit totaliter in altero terminorum, dum movetur; sed partim in uno, et partim in altero. Secundum ergo quod motus Angeli non est continuus, demonstratio Aristotelis non procedit in proposito. Sed secundum quod motus Angeli ponitur continuus, sic concedi potest quod Angelus, dum movetur, partim est in termino a quo, et partim in termino ad quem (ut tamen partialitas non referatur ad substantiam Angeli, sed ad locum), quia in principio sui motus continui, Angelus est in toto loco divisibili a quo incipit moveri; sed dum est in ipso moveri, est in parte primi loci quem deserit, et in parte secundi loci quem occupat. Et hoc quidem quod possit occupare partes duorum locorum, competit Angelo ex hoc quod potest occupare locum divisibilem per applicationem suae virtutis sicut corpus per applicationem magnitudinis. Unde sequitur de corpore mobili secundum locum, quod sit divisibile secundum magnitudinem de Angelo autem, quod virtus eius possit applicari alicui divisibili.

[30657] I^a q. 53 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod motus existentis in potentia, est actus imperfecti. Sed motus qui est secundum applicationem virtutis, est existentis in actu, quia virtus rei est secundum quod actu est.

[30658] I^a q. 53 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod motus existentis in potentia, est propter indigentiam suam, sed motus existentis in actu, non est propter indigentiam suam, sed propter indigentiam alterius. Et hoc modo Angelus, propter indigentiam nostram, localiter movetur, secundum illud Heb. I, *omnes sunt administratorii spiritus, in ministerium missi propter eos qui*

inheritance of salvation."

haereditatem capiunt salutis.

Q. 53. A. 2. Whether an angel passes through intermediate space?

Objection 1: It would seem that an angel does not pass through intermediate space. For everything that passes through a middle space first travels along a place of its own dimensions, before passing through a greater. But the place responding to an angel, who is indivisible, is confined to a point. Therefore if the angel passes through middle space, he must reckon infinite points in his movement: which is not possible.

Objection 2: Further, an angel is of simpler substance than the soul. But our soul by taking thought can pass from one extreme to another without going through the middle: for I can think of France and afterwards of Syria, without ever thinking of Italy, which stands between them. Therefore much more can an angel pass from one extreme to another without going through the middle.

On the contrary, If the angel be moved from one place to another, then, when he is in the term "whither," he is no longer in motion, but is changed. But a process of changing precedes every actual change: consequently he was being moved while existing in some place. But he was not moved so long as he was in the term "whence." Therefore, he was moved while he was in mid-space: and so it was necessary for him to pass through intervening space.

I answer that, As was observed above in the preceding article, the local motion of an angel can be continuous, and non-continuous. If it be continuous, the angel cannot pass from one extreme to another without passing through the mid-space; because, as is said by the Philosopher (Phys. v, text 22; vi, text 77), "The middle is that into which a thing which is continually moved comes, before arriving at the last into which it is moved"; because the order of first and last in continuous movement, is according to the order of the first and last in magnitude, as he says (Phys. iv, text 99).

[30659] I^a q. 53 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus non transeat per medium. Omne enim quod pertransit medium, prius pertransit locum sibi aequalem, quam maiorem. Locus autem aequalis Angeli, qui est indivisibilis, est locus punctalis. Si ergo Angelus in suo motu pertransit medium, oportet quod numeret puncta infinita suo motu, quod est impossibile.

[30660] I^a q. 53 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, Angelus est simplicioris substantiae quam anima nostra. Sed anima nostra sua cogitatione potest transire de uno extremo in aliud, non pertranseundo medium, possum enim cogitare Galliam et postea Syriam, nihil cogitando de Italia, quae est in medio. Ergo multo magis Angelus potest de uno extremo transire ad aliud, non per medium.

[30661] I^a q. 53 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra, si Angelus movetur de uno loco ad alium, quando est in termino ad quem, non movetur, sed mutatus est. Sed ante omne mutatum esse praecedit mutari, ergo alicubi existens movebatur. Sed non movebatur dum erat in termino a quo. Movebatur ergo dum erat in medio. Et ita oportet quod pertranseat medium.

[30662] I^a q. 53 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut supra dictum est, motus localis Angeli potest esse continuus, et non continuus. Si ergo sit continuus, non potest Angelus moveri de uno extremo in alterum, quin transeat per medium, quia, ut dicitur in V Physic., medium est in quod prius venit quod continue mutatur, quam in quod mutatur ultimum; ordo enim prioris et posterioris in motu continuo, est secundum ordinem prioris et posterioris in magnitudine, ut dicitur in IV Physic. Si autem motus Angeli non sit continuus, possibile est quod pertranseat de aliquo extremo in aliud, non pertransito medio. Quod sic patet. Inter quaelibet enim duo extrema loca sunt

But if an angel's movement be not continuous, it is possible for him to pass from one extreme to another without going through the middle: which is evident thus. Between the two extreme limits there are infinite intermediate places; whether the places be taken as divisible or as indivisible. This is clearly evident with regard to places which are indivisible; because between every two points that are infinite intermediate points, since no two points follow one another without a middle, as is proved in Phys. vi, text. 1. And the same must of necessity be said of divisible places: and this is shown from the continuous movement of a body. For a body is not moved from place to place except in time. But in the whole time which measures the movement of a body, there are not two "nows" in which the body moved is not in one place and in another; for if it were in one and the same place in two "nows," it would follow that it would be at rest there; since to be at rest is nothing else than to be in the same place now and previously. Therefore since there are infinite "nows" between the first and the last "now" of the time which measures the movement, there must be infinite places between the first from which the movement begins, and the last where the movement ceases. This again is made evident from sensible experience. Let there be a body of a palm's length, and let there be a plane measuring two palms, along which it travels; it is evident that the first place from which the movement starts is that of the one palm; and the place wherein the movement ends is that of the other palm. Now it is clear that when it begins to move, it gradually quits the first palm and enters the second. According, then, as the magnitude of the palm is divided, even so are the intermediate places multiplied; because every distinct point in the magnitude of the first palm is the beginning of a place, and a distinct point in the magnitude of the other palm is the limit of the same. Accordingly, since magnitude is infinitely divisible and the points in every magnitude are likewise infinite in potentiality, it follows that between every two places there are infinite intermediate places.

Now a movable body only exhausts the infinity of the intermediate places by the continuity of its movement; because, as the intermediate places are infinite in potentiality, so likewise must there be reckoned some infinities in movement which is

infinita loca media; sive accipiantur loca divisibilia, sive indivisibilia. Et de indivisibilibus quidem manifestum est, quia inter quaelibet duo puncta sunt infinita puncta media, cum nulla duo puncta consequantur se invicem sine medio, ut in VI Physic. probatur. De locis autem divisibilibus necesse est etiam hoc dicere. Et hoc demonstratur ex motu continuo alicuius corporis. Corpus enim non movetur de loco ad locum nisi in tempore. In toto autem tempore mensurante motum corporis, non est accipere duo nunc, in quibus corpus quod movetur non sit in alio et alio loco, quia si in uno et eodem loco esset in duobus nunc, sequeretur quod ibi quiesceret; cum nihil aliud sit quiescere quam in loco eodem esse nunc et prius. Cum igitur inter primum nunc et ultimum temporis mensurantis motum, sint infinita nunc, oportet quod inter primum locum, a quo incipit moveri, et ultimum locum, ad quem terminatur motus, sint infinita loca. Et hoc sic etiam sensibiliter apparet. Sit enim unum corpus unius palmi, et sit via per quam transit, duorum palmorum, manifestum est quod locus primus, a quo incipit motus, est unius palmi; et locus, ad quem terminatur motus, est alterius palmi. Manifestum est autem quod, quando incipit moveri, paulatim deserit primum palmum, et subintrat secundum. Secundum ergo quod dividitur magnitudo palmi, secundum hoc multiplicantur loca media, quia quodlibet punctum signatum in magnitudine primi palmi, est principium unius loci; et punctum signatum in magnitudine alterius palmi, est terminus eiusdem. Unde cum magnitudo sit divisibilis in infinitum, et puncta sint etiam infinita in potentia in qualibet magnitudine; sequitur quod inter quaelibet duo loca sint infinita loca media. Mobile autem infinitatem mediorum locorum non consumit nisi per continuitatem motus, quia sicut loca media sunt infinita in potentia, ita et in motu continuo est accipere infinita quaedam in potentia. Si ergo motus non sit continuus, omnes partes motus erunt numeratae in actu. Si ergo mobile quodcumque moveatur motu non continuo, sequitur quod vel non transeat omnia media, vel quod actu numeret media infinita, quod est impossibile. Sic igitur secundum quod motus Angeli non est continuus, non pertransit omnia media. Hoc autem, scilicet moveri de extremo in extremum et non per medium, potest convenire Angelo sed non corpori. Quia corpus mensuratur et continetur sub loco, unde oportet quod sequatur leges loci in suo motu. Sed substantia Angeli non

continuous. Consequently, if the movement be not continuous, then all the parts of the movement will be actually numbered. If, therefore, any movable body be moved, but not by continuous movement, it follows, either that it does not pass through all the intermediate places, or else that it actually numbers infinite places: which is not possible. Accordingly, then, as the angel's movement is not continuous, he does not pass through all intermediate places.

Now, the actual passing from one extreme to the other, without going through the mid-space, is quite in keeping with an angel's nature; but not with that of a body, because a body is measured by and contained under a place; hence it is bound to follow the laws of place in its movement. But an angel's substance is not subject to place as contained thereby, but is above it as containing it: hence it is under his control to apply himself to a place just as he wills, either through or without the intervening place.

Reply to Objection 1: The place of an angel is not taken as equal to him according to magnitude, but according to contact of power: and so the angel's place can be divisible, and is not always a mere point. Yet even the intermediate divisible places are infinite, as was said above: but they are consumed by the continuity of the movement, as is evident from the foregoing.

Reply to Objection 2: While an angel is moved locally, his essence is applied to various places: but the soul's essence is not applied to the things thought of, but rather the things thought of are in it. So there is no comparison.

Reply to Objection 3: In continuous movement the actual change is not a part of the movement, but its conclusion; hence movement must precede change. Accordingly such movement is through the mid-space. But in movement which is not continuous, the change is a part, as a unit is a part of number: hence the succession of the various places, even without the mid-space, constitutes such movement.

est subdita loco ut contenta, sed est superior eo ut continens, unde in potestate eius est applicare se loco prout vult, vel per medium vel sine medio.

[30663] I^a q. 53 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod locus Angeli non accipitur ei aequalis secundum magnitudinem, sed secundum contactum virtutis, et sic locus Angeli potest esse divisibilis, et non semper punctalis. Sed tamen loca media etiam divisibilia, sunt infinita, ut dictum est, sed consumuntur per continuitatem motus, ut patet ex praedictis.

[30664] I^a q. 53 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod Angelus dum movetur localiter, applicatur eius essentia diversis locis, animae autem essentia non applicatur rebus quas cogitat, sed potius res cogitatae sunt in ipsa. Et ideo non est simile.

[30665] I^a q. 53 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod in motu continuo mutatum esse non est pars moveri, sed terminus unde oportet quod moveri sit ante mutatum esse. Et ideo oportet quod talis motus sit per medium. Sed in motu non continuo mutatum esse est pars, sicut unitas est pars numeri, unde successio diversorum locorum, etiam sine medio, constituit talem motum.

Q. 53. A. 3. Whether the movement of an angel is instantaneous?

Objection 1: It would seem that an angel's movement is instantaneous. For the greater the power of the mover, and the less the moved resist the mover, the more rapid is the movement. But the power of an angel moving himself exceeds beyond all proportion the power which moves a body. Now the proportion of velocities is reckoned according to the lessening of the time. But between one length of time and any other length of time there is proportion. If therefore a body is moved in time, an angel is moved in an instant.

Objection 2: Further, the angel's movement is simpler than any bodily change. But some bodily change is effected in an instant, such as illumination; both because the subject is not illuminated successively, as it gets hot successively; and because a ray does not reach sooner what is near than what is remote. Much more therefore is the angel's movement instantaneous.

Objection 3: Further, if an angel be moved from place to place in time, it is manifest that in the last instant of such time he is in the term "whereto": but in the whole of the preceding time, he is either in the place immediately preceding, which is taken as the term "wherefrom"; or else he is partly in the one, and partly in the other, it follows that he is divisible; which is impossible. Therefore during the whole of the preceding time he is in the term "wherefrom." Therefore he rests there: since to be at rest is to be in the same place now and previously, as was said ([A\[2\]](#)). Therefore it follows that he is not moved except in the last instant of time.

On the contrary, In every change there is a before and after. Now the before and after of movement is reckoned by time. Consequently every movement, even of an angel, is in time, since there is a before and after in it.

I answer that, Some have maintained that the local movement of an angel is instantaneous. They said that when an angel is moved from place

[30666] I^a q. 53 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod motus Angeli sit in instanti. Quanto enim virtus motoris fuerit fortior, et mobile minus resistens motori, tanto motus est velocior. Sed virtus Angeli moventis seipsum, impropotionabiliter excedit virtutem moventem aliquod corpus. Proportio autem velocitatum est secundum minorationem temporis. Omne autem tempus omni tempori proportionabile est. Si igitur aliquod corpus movetur in tempore, Angelus movetur in instanti.

[30667] I^a q. 53 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, motus Angeli simplicior est quam aliqua mutatio corporalis. Sed aliqua mutatio corporalis est in instanti, ut illuminatio, tum quia non illuminatur aliquid successive, sicut calefit successive; tum quia radius non prius pertingit ad propinquum quam ad remotum. Ergo multo magis motus Angeli est in instanti.

[30668] I^a q. 53 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, si Angelus movetur in tempore de loco ad locum, manifestum est quod in ultimo instanti illius temporis est in termino ad quem, in toto autem tempore praecedenti, aut est in loco immediate praecedenti, qui accipitur ut terminus a quo; aut partim in uno et partim in alio. Si autem partim in uno et partim in alio, sequitur quod sit partibilis, quod est impossibile. Ergo in toto tempore praecedenti est in termino a quo. Ergo quiescit ibi, cum quiescere sit in eodem esse nunc et prius, ut dictum est. Et sic sequitur quod non moveatur nisi in ultimo instanti temporis.

[30669] I^a q. 53 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra, in omni mutatione est prius et posterius. Sed prius et posterius motus numeratur secundum tempus. Ergo omnis motus est in tempore, etiam motus Angeli; cum in eo sit prius et posterius.

[30670] I^a q. 53 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod quidam dixerunt motum localem Angeli esse in instanti. Dicebant enim quod, cum

to place, during the whole of the preceding time he is in the term "wherefrom"; but in the last instant of such time he is in the term "whereto." Nor is there any need for a medium between the terms, just as there is no medium between time and the limit of time. But there is a mid-time between two "nows" of time: hence they say that a last "now" cannot be assigned in which it was in the term "wherefrom," just as in illumination, and in the substantial generation of fire, there is no last instant to be assigned in which the air was dark, or in which the matter was under the privation of the form of fire: but a last time can be assigned, so that in the last instant of such time there is light in the air, or the form of fire in the matter. And so illumination and substantial generation are called instantaneous movements.

But this does not hold good in the present case; and it is shown thus. It is of the nature of rest that the subject in repose be not otherwise disposed now than it was before: and therefore in every "now" of time which measures rest, the subject reposing is in the same "where" in the first, in the middle, and in the last "now." On the other hand, it is of the very nature of movement for the subject moved to be otherwise now than it was before: and therefore in every "now" of time which measures movement, the movable subject is in various dispositions; hence in the last "now" it must have a different form from what it had before. So it is evident that to rest during the whole time in some (disposition), for instance, in whiteness, is to be in it in every instant of such time. Hence it is not possible for anything to rest in one term during the whole of the preceding time, and afterwards in the last instant of that time to be in the other term. But this is possible in movement: because to be moved in any whole time, is not to be in the same disposition in every instant of that time. Therefore all instantaneous changes of the kind are terms of a continuous movement: just as generation is the term of the alteration of matter, and illumination is the term of the local movement of the illuminating body. Now the local movement of an angel is not the term of any other continuous movement, but is of itself, depending upon no other movement. Consequently it is impossible to say that he is in any place during the whole time, and that in the last "now" he is in another place: but some "now" must be assigned in which he was last in the

Angelus movetur de uno loco ad alium, in toto tempore praecedenti Angelus est in termino a quo in ultimo autem instanti illius temporis est in termino ad quem. Nec oportet esse aliquod medium inter duos terminos; sicut non est aliquod medium inter tempus et terminum temporis. Inter duo autem nunc temporis, est tempus medium, unde dicunt quod non est dare ultimum nunc in quo fuit in termino a quo. Sicut in illuminatione, et in generatione substantiali ignis, non est dare ultimum instans in quo aer fuit tenebrosus, vel in quo materia fuit sub privatione formae ignis, sed est dare ultimum tempus, ita quod in ultimo illius temporis est vel lumen in aere, vel forma ignis in materia. Et sic illuminatio et generatio substantialis dicuntur motus instantanei. Sed hoc non habet locum in proposito. Quod sic ostenditur. De ratione enim quietis est quod quiescens non aliter se habeat nunc et prius, et ideo in quolibet nunc temporis mensurantis quietem, quiescens est in eodem et in primo, et in medio, et in ultimo. Sed de ratione motus est quod id quod movetur, aliter se habeat nunc et prius, et ideo in quolibet nunc temporis mensurantis motum, mobile se habet in alia et alia dispositione, unde oportet quod in ultimo nunc habeat formam quam prius non habebat. Et sic patet quod quiescere in toto tempore in aliquo, puta in albedine, est esse in illo in quolibet instanti illius temporis, unde non est possibile ut aliquid in toto tempore praecedenti quiescat in uno termino et postea in ultimo instanti illius temporis sit in alio termino. Sed hoc est possibile in motu, quia moveri in toto aliquo tempore, non est esse in eadem dispositione in quolibet instanti illius temporis. Igitur omnes huiusmodi mutationes instantaneae sunt termini motus continui, sicut generatio est terminus alterationis materiae, et illuminatio terminus motus localis corporis illuminantis. Motus autem localis Angeli non est terminus alicuius alterius motus continui, sed est per se ipsum, a nullo alio motu dependens. Unde impossibile est dicere quod in toto tempore sit in aliquo loco, et in ultimo nunc sit in alio loco. Sed oportet assignare nunc in quo ultimo fuit in loco praecedenti. Ubi autem sunt multa nunc sibi succedentia, ibi de necessitate est tempus, cum tempus nihil aliud sit quam numeratio prioris et posterioris in motu. Unde relinquitur quod motus Angeli sit in tempore. In continuo quidem tempore, si sit motus eius continuus; in non continuo autem, si motus sit non continuus

preceding place. But where there are many "nows" succeeding one another, there is necessarily time; since time is nothing else than the reckoning of before and after in movement. It remains, then, that the movement of an angel is in time. It is in continuous time if his movement be continuous, and in non-continuous time if his movement is non-continuous for, as was said [\(A\[1\]\)](#), his movement can be of either kind, since the continuity of time comes of the continuity of movement, as the Philosopher says (Phys. iv, text 99).

But that time, whether it be continuous or not, is not the same as the time which measures the movement of the heavens, and whereby all corporeal things are measured, which have their changeableness from the movement of the heavens; because the angel's movement does not depend upon the movement of the heavens.

Reply to Objection 1: If the time of the angel's movement be not continuous, but a kind of succession of 'nows,' it will have no proportion to the time which measures the movement of corporeal things, which is continuous; since it is not of the same nature. If, however, it be continuous, it is indeed proportionable, not, indeed, because of the proportion of the mover and the movable, but on account of the proportion of the magnitudes in which the movement exists. Besides, the swiftness of the angel's movement is not measured by the quantity of his power, but according to the determination of his will.

Reply to Objection 2: Illumination is the term of a movement; and is an alteration, not a local movement, as though the light were understood to be moved to what is near, before being moved to what is remote. But the angel's movement is local, and, besides, it is not the term of movement; hence there is no comparison.

Reply to Objection 3: This objection is based on continuous time. But the same time of an angel's movement can be non-continuous. So an angel can be in one place in one instant, and in another place in the next instant, without any time intervening. If the time of the angel's movement be continuous, he is changed through infinite

(utroque enim modo contingit esse motum Angeli, ut dictum est), continuitas enim temporis est ex continuitate motus, ut dicitur in IV Physic. Sed istud tempus, sive sit tempus continuum sive non, non est idem cum tempore quod mensurat motum caeli, et quo mensurantur omnia corporalia, quae habent mutabilitatem ex motu caeli. Motus enim Angeli non dependet ex motu caeli.

[30671] I^a q. 53 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod, si tempus motus Angeli non sit continuum, sed successio quaedam ipsorum nunc, non habebit proportionem ad tempus quod mensurat motum corporalium, quod est continuum, cum non sit eiusdem rationis. Si vero sit continuum, est quidem proportionabile, non quidem propter proportionem moventis et mobilis sed propter proportionem magnitudinum in quibus est motus. Et praeterea, velocitas motus Angeli non est secundum quantitatem suae virtutis; sed secundum determinationem suae voluntatis.

[30672] I^a q. 53 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod illuminatio est terminus motus; et est alteratio, non motus localis ut intelligatur lumen moveri prius ad propinquum, quam ad remotum. Motus autem Angeli est localis, et non est terminus motus. Unde non est simile.

[30673] I^a q. 53 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod obiectio illa procedit de tempore continuo. Tempus autem motus Angeli potest esse non continuum. Et sic Angelus in uno instanti potest esse in uno loco, et in alio instanti in alio loco, nullo tempore intermedio existente. Si autem tempus motus Angeli sit continuum, Angelus in

places throughout the whole time which precedes the last 'now'; as was already shown ([A\[2\]](#)). Nevertheless he is partly in one of the continuous places, and partly in another, not because his substance is susceptible of parts, but because his power is applied to a part of the first place and to a part of the second, as was said above ([A\[2\]](#)).

toto tempore praecedenti ultimum nunc, variatur per infinita loca, ut prius expositum est. Est tamen partim in uno locorum continuorum et partim in alio, non quod substantia illius sit partibilis; sed quia virtus sua applicatur ad partem primi loci et ad partem secundi, ut etiam supra dictum est.

Q. 54. OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE ANGELS (FIVE ARTICLES)

After considering what belongs to the angel's substance, we now proceed to his knowledge. This investigation will be fourfold. In the first place inquiry must be made into his power of knowledge: secondly, into his medium of knowledge: thirdly, into the objects known: and fourthly, into the manner whereby he knows them.

Under the first heading there are five points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Is the angel's understanding his substance?](#)

[\(2\) Is his being his understanding?](#)

[\(3\) Is his substance his power of intelligence?](#)

[\(4\) Is there in the angels an active and a passive intellect?](#)

[\(5\) Is there in them any other power of knowledge besides the intellect?](#)

Q. 54. A. 1. Whether an angel's act of understanding is his substance?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angel's act of understanding is his substance. For the angel is both higher and simpler than the active intellect of a soul. But the substance of the active intellect is its own action; as is evident from Aristotle (*De Anima* iii) and from his Commentator [*Averroes, A.D. 1126-1198]. Therefore much more is the angel's substance his action---that is, his act of understanding.

Objection 2: Further, the Philosopher says (*Metaph.* xii, text 39) that "the action of the intellect is life." But "since in living things to live is to be," as he says (*De Anima* ii, text 37), it seems that life is essence. Therefore the action of the intellect is the essence of an angel who understands.

Objection 3: Further, if the extremes be one, then the middle does not differ from them; because extreme is farther from extreme than the middle is. But in an angel the intellect and the object understood are the same, at least in so far as he understands his own essence. Therefore the act of

[30674] I^a q. 54 pr. Consideratis his quae ad substantiam Angeli pertinent, procedendum est ad cognitionem ipsius. Haec autem consideratio erit quadripartita, nam primo considerandum est de his quae pertinent ad virtutem cognoscitivam Angeli; secundo, de his quae pertinent ad medium cognoscendi ipsius; tertio, de his quae ab eo cognoscuntur; quarto, de modo cognitionis ipsorum. Circa primum quaeruntur quinque. Primo, utrum intelligere Angeli sit sua substantia. Secundo, utrum eius esse sit suum intelligere. Tertio, utrum eius substantia sit sua virtus intellectiva. Quarto, utrum in Angelis sit intellectus agens et possibilis. Quinto, utrum in eis sit aliqua alia potentia cognoscitiva quam intellectus.

[30675] I^a q. 54 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod intelligere Angeli sit eius substantia. Angelus enim est sublimior et simplicior quam intellectus agens animae. Sed substantia intellectus agentis est sua actio; ut patet in III de anima per Aristotelem, et eius Commentatorem. Ergo, multo fortius, substantia Angeli est sua actio, quae est intelligere.

[30676] I^a q. 54 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, philosophus dicit, in XII *Metaphys.*, quod actio intellectus est vita. Sed cum vivere sit esse viventibus, ut dicitur in II de anima, videtur quod vita sit essentia. Ergo actio intellectus est essentia intelligentis Angeli.

[30677] I^a q. 54 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, si extrema sunt unum, medium non differt ab eis, quia extremum magis distat ab extremo, quam medium. Sed in Angelo idem est intellectus et intellectum, ad minus inquantum intelligit essentiam suam. Ergo intelligere, quod cadit

understanding, which is between the intellect and the thing understood, is one with the substance of the angel who understands.

On the contrary, The action of anything differs more from its substance than does its existence. But no creature's existence is its substance, for this belongs to God only, as is evident from what was said above ([Q\[3\]](#), [A\[4\]](#)). Therefore neither the action of an angel, nor of any other creature, is its substance.

I answer that, It is impossible for the action of an angel, or of any creature, to be its own substance. For an action is properly the actuality of a power; just as existence is the actuality of a substance or of an essence. Now it is impossible for anything which is not a pure act, but which has some admixture of potentiality, to be its own actuality: because actuality is opposed to potentiality. But God alone is pure act. Hence only in God is His substance the same as His existence and His action.

Besides, if an angel's act of understanding were his substance, it would be necessary for it to be subsisting. Now a subsisting act of intelligence can be but one; just as an abstract thing that subsists. Consequently an angel's substance would neither be distinguished from God's substance, which is His very act of understanding subsisting in itself, nor from the substance of another angel.

Also, if the angel were his own act of understanding, there could then be no degrees of understanding more or less perfectly; for this comes about through the diverse participation of the act of understanding.

Reply to Objection 1: When the active intellect is said to be its own action, such predication is not essential, but concomitant, because, since its very nature consists in act, instantly, so far as lies in itself, action accompanies it: which cannot be said of the passive intellect, for this has no actions until after it has been reduced to act.

Reply to Objection 2: The relation between

medium inter intellectum et rem intellectam, est idem cum substantia Angeli intelligentis.

[30678] I^a q. 54 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra, plus differt actio rei a substantia eius, quam ipsum esse eius. Sed nullius creati suum esse est sua substantia, hoc enim solius Dei proprium est, ut ex superioribus patet. Ergo neque Angeli, neque alterius creaturae, sua actio est eius substantia.

[30679] I^a q. 54 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod impossibile est quod actio Angeli, vel cuiuscumque alterius creaturae, sit eius substantia. Actio enim est proprie actualitas virtutis; sicut esse est actualitas substantiae vel essentiae. Impossibile est autem quod aliquid quod non est purus actus, sed aliquid habet de potentia admixtum, sit sua actualitas, quia actualitas potentialitati repugnat. Solus autem Deus est actus purus. Unde in solo Deo sua substantia est suum esse et suum agere. Praeterea, si intelligere Angeli esset sua substantia, oporteret quod intelligere Angeli esset subsistens. Intelligere autem subsistens non potest esse nisi unum; sicut nec aliquod abstractum subsistens. Unde unius Angeli substantia non distingueretur neque a substantia Dei, quae est ipsum intelligere subsistens; neque a substantia alterius Angeli. Si etiam Angelus ipse esset suum intelligere, non possent esse gradus in intelligendo perfectius et minus perfecte, cum hoc contingat propter diversam participationem ipsius intelligere.

[30680] I^a q. 54 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod, cum dicitur quod intellectus agens est sua actio, est praedicatio non per essentiam, sed per concomitantiam, quia cum sit in actu eius substantia, statim quantum est in se, concomitatur ipsam actio. Quod non est de intellectu possibili, qui non habet actiones nisi postquam fuerit factus in actu.

[30681] I^a q. 54 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum

"life" and "to live" is not the same as that between "essence" and "to be"; but rather as that between "a race" and "to run," one of which signifies the act in the abstract, and the other in the concrete. Hence it does not follow, if "to live" is "to be," that "life" is "essence." Although life is sometimes put for the essence, as Augustine says (De Trin. x), "Memory and understanding and will are one essence, one life": yet it is not taken in this sense by the Philosopher, when he says that "the act of the intellect is life."

Reply to Objection 3: The action which is transient, passing to some extrinsic object, is really a medium between the agent and the subject receiving the action. The action which remains within the agent, is not really a medium between the agent and the object, but only according to the manner of expression; for it really follows the union of the object with the agent. For the act of understanding is brought about by the union of the object understood with the one who understands it, as an effect which differs from both.

Q. 54. A. 2. Whether in the angel to understand is to exist?

Objection 1: It would seem that in the angel to understand is to exist. For in living things to live is to be, as the Philosopher says (De Anima ii, text. 37). But to "understand is in a sense to live" (De Anima ii, text. 37). Therefore in the angel to understand is to exist.

Objection 2: Further, cause bears the same relation to cause, as effect to effect. But the form whereby the angel exists is the same as the form by which he understands at least himself. Therefore in the angel to understand is to exist.

On the contrary, The angel's act of understanding is his movement, as is clear from Dionysius (Div. Nom. iv). But to exist is not movement. Therefore in the angel to be is not to understand.

I answer that, The action of the angel, as also the action of any creature, is not his existence. For as

quod vita non hoc modo se habet ad vivere, sicut essentia ad esse; sed sicut cursus ad currere, quorum unum significat actum in abstracto, aliud in concreto. Unde non sequitur si vivere sit esse, quod vita sit essentia. Quamvis etiam quandoque vita pro essentia ponatur; secundum quod Augustinus dicit, in libro de Trin., quod *memoria et intelligentia et voluntas sunt una essentia, una vita*. Sed sic non accipitur a philosopho cum dicit quod *actio intellectus est vita*.

[30682] I^a q. 54 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod actio quae transit in aliquid extrinsecum, est realiter media inter agens et subiectum recipiens actionem. Sed actio quae manet in agente, non est realiter medium inter agens et obiectum, sed secundum modum significandi tantum, realiter vero consequitur unionem obiecti cum agente. Ex hoc enim quod intellectum fit unum cum intelligente, consequitur intelligere, quasi quidam effectus differens ab utroque.

[30683] I^a q. 54 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod intelligere Angeli sit eius esse. Vivere enim viventibus est esse, ut dicitur in II de anima. Sed intelligere est quoddam vivere, ut in eodem dicitur. Ergo intelligere Angeli est eius esse.

[30684] I^a q. 54 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, sicut se habet causa ad causam, ita effectus ad effectum. Sed forma per quam Angelus est, est eadem cum forma per quam intelligit ad minus seipsum. Ergo eius intelligere est idem cum suo esse.

[30685] I^a q. 54 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra, intelligere Angeli est motus eius; ut patet per Dionysium, IV cap. de Div. Nom. Sed esse non est motus. Ergo esse Angeli non est intelligere eius.

[30686] I^a q. 54 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod actio Angeli non est eius esse, neque actio

it is said (Metaph. ix, text. 16), there is a twofold class of action; one which passes out to something beyond, and causes passion in it, as burning and cutting; and another which does not pass outwards, but which remains within the agent, as to feel, to understand, to will; by such actions nothing outside is changed, but the whole action takes place within the agent. It is quite clear regarding the first kind of action that it cannot be the agent's very existence: because the agent's existence is signified as within him, while such an action denotes something as issuing from the agent into the thing done. But the second action of its own nature has infinity, either simple or relative. As an example of simple infinity, we have the act "to understand," of which the object is "the true"; and the act "to will," of which the object is "the good"; each of which is convertible with being; and so, to understand and to will, of themselves, bear relation to all things, and each receives its species from its object. But the act of sensation is relatively infinite, for it bears relation to all sensible things; as sight does to all things visible. Now the being of every creature is restricted to one in genus and species; God's being alone is simply infinite, comprehending all things in itself, as Dionysius says (Div. Nom. v). Hence the Divine nature alone is its own act of understanding and its own act of will.

Reply to Objection 1: Life is sometimes taken for the existence of the living subject: sometimes also for a vital operation, that is, for one whereby something is shown to be living. In this way the Philosopher says that to understand is, in a sense, to live: for there he distinguishes the various grades of living things according to the various functions of life.

Reply to Objection 2: The essence of an angel is the reason of his entire existence, but not the reason of his whole act of understanding, since he cannot understand everything by his essence. Consequently in its own specific nature as such an essence, it is compared to the existence of the angel, whereas to his act of understanding it is compared as included in the idea of a more universal object, namely, truth and being. Thus it is evident, that, although the form is the same, yet it is not the principle of existence and of

alicuius creaturae. Duplex enim est actionis genus, ut dicitur IX Metaphys. Una scilicet actio est quae transit in aliquid exterius, inferens ei passionem, sicut urere et secare. Alia vero actio est quae non transit in rem exteriorem, sed manet in ipso agente, sicut sentire, intelligere et velle, per huiusmodi enim actionem non immutatur aliquid extrinsecum, sed totum in ipso agente agitur. De prima ergo actione manifestum est quod non potest esse ipsum esse agentis, nam esse agentis significatur intra ipsum, actio autem talis est effluxus in actum ab agente. Secunda autem actio de sui ratione habet infinitatem, vel simpliciter, vel secundum quid. Simpliciter quidem, sicut intelligere, cuius obiectum est verum, et velle, cuius obiectum est bonum, quorum utrumque convertitur cum ente; et ita intelligere et velle, quantum est de se, habent se ad omnia; et utrumque recipit speciem ab obiecto. Secundum quid autem infinitum est sentire, quod se habet ad omnia sensibilia, sicut visus ad omnia visibilia. Esse autem cuiuslibet creaturae est determinatum ad unum secundum genus et speciem, esse autem solius Dei est simpliciter infinitum, in se omnia comprehendens, ut dicit Dionysius, V cap. de Div. Nom. Unde solum esse divinum est suum intelligere et suum velle.

[30687] I^a q. 54 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod vivere quandoque sumitur pro ipso esse viventis, quandoque vero pro operatione vitae, idest per quam demonstratur aliquid esse vivens. Et hoc modo philosophus dicit quod intelligere est vivere quoddam, ibi enim distinguit diversos gradus viventium secundum diversa opera vitae.

[30688] I^a q. 54 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod ipsa essentia Angeli est ratio totius sui esse, non autem est ratio totius sui intelligere, quia non omnia intelligere potest per suam essentiam. Et ideo secundum propriam rationem, inquantum est talis essentia, comparatur ad ipsum esse Angeli. Sed ad eius intelligere comparatur secundum rationem universalioris obiecti, scilicet veri vel entis. Et sic patet quod, licet sit eadem forma, non tamen secundum eandem rationem est principium essendi et intelligendi. Et propter hoc non sequitur

understanding according to the same formality. On this account it does not follow that in the angel "to be" is the same as 'to understand.'

Q. 54. A. 3. Whether an angel's power of intelligence is his essence?

Objection 1: It would seem that in an angel the power or faculty of understanding is not different from his essence. For, "mind" and "intellect" express the power of understanding. But in many passages of his writings, Dionysius styles angels "intellects" and "minds." Therefore the angel is his own power of intelligence.

Objection 2: Further, if the angel's power of intelligence be anything besides his essence, then it must needs be an accident; for that which is besides the essence of anything, we call it accident. But "a simple form cannot be a subject," as Boethius states (De Trin. 1). Thus an angel would not be a simple form, which is contrary to what has been previously said ([Q\[50\], A\[2\]](#)).

Objection 3: Further, Augustine (Confess. xii) says, that God made the angelic nature "nigh unto Himself," while He made primary matter "nigh unto nothing"; from this it would seem that the angel is of a simpler nature than primary matter, as being closer to God. But primary matter is its own power. Therefore much more is an angel his own power of intelligence.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Coel. Hier. xi) that "the angels are divided into substance, power, and operation." Therefore substance, power, and operation, are all distinct in them.

I answer that, Neither in an angel nor in any creature, is the power or operative faculty the same as its essence: which is made evident thus. Since every power is ordained to an act, then according to the diversity of acts must be the diversity of powers; and on this account it is said that each proper act responds to its proper power. But in every creature the essence differs from the existence, and is compared to it as potentiality is

quod in Angelo sit idem esse et intelligere.

[30689] I^a q. 54 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod virtus vel potentia intellectiva in Angelo non sit aliud quam sua essentia. Mens enim et intellectus nominant potentiam intellectivam. Sed Dionysius in pluribus locis suorum librorum, nominat ipsos Angelos intellectus et mentes. Ergo Angelus est sua potentia intellectiva.

[30690] I^a q. 54 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, si potentia intellectiva in Angelo est aliquid praeter eius essentiam, oportet quod sit accidens, hoc enim dicimus esse accidens alicuius, quod est praeter eius essentiam. *Sed forma simplex subiectum esse non potest*, ut Boetius dicit, in libro de Trin. Ergo Angelus non esset forma simplex, quod est contra praemissa.

[30691] I^a q. 54 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, Augustinus dicit, XII Confess., quod Deus fecit angelicam naturam prope se, materiam autem primam prope nihil, ex quo videtur quod Angelus sit simplicior quam materia prima, utpote Deo propinquior. Sed materia prima est sua potentia. Ergo multo magis Angelus est sua potentia intellectiva.

[30692] I^a q. 54 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod Dionysius dicit, XI cap. Angel. Hier., quod *Angeli dividuntur in substantiam, virtutem et operationem*. Ergo aliud est in eis substantia, et aliud virtus, et aliud operatio.

[30693] I^a q. 54 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod nec in Angelo nec in aliqua creatura, virtus vel potentia operativa est idem quod sua essentia. Quod sic patet. Cum enim potentia dicatur ad actum, oportet quod secundum diversitatem actuum sit diversitas potentiarum, propter quod dicitur quod proprius actus respondet propriae potentiae. In omni autem creato essentia differt a suo esse, et comparatur ad ipsum sicut potentia ad

to act, as is evident from what has been already said ([Q\[44\]](#), [A\[1\]](#)). Now the act to which the operative power is compared is operation. But in the angel to understand is not the same as to exist, nor is any operation in him, nor in any other created thing, the same as his existence. Hence the angel's essence is not his power of intelligence: nor is the essence of any creature its power of operation.

Reply to Objection 1: An angel is called "intellect" and "mind," because all his knowledge is intellectual: whereas the knowledge of a soul is partly intellectual and partly sensitive.

Reply to Objection 2: A simple form which is pure act cannot be the subject of accident, because subject is compared to accident as potentiality is to act. God alone is such a form: and of such is Boethius speaking there. But a simple form which is not its own existence, but is compared to it as potentiality is to act, can be the subject of accident; and especially of such accident as follows the species: for such accident belongs to the form---whereas an accident which belongs to the individual, and which does not belong to the whole species, results from the matter, which is the principle of individuation. And such a simple form is an angel.

Reply to Objection 3: The power of matter is a potentiality in regard to substantial being itself, whereas the power of operation regards accidental being. Hence there is no comparison.

Q. 54. A. 4. Whether there is an active and a passive intellect in an angel?

Objection 1: It would seem that there is both an active and a passive intellect in an angel. The Philosopher says (*De Anima* iii, text. 17) that, "in the soul, just as in every nature, there is something whereby it can become all things, and there is something whereby it can make all things." But an angel is a kind of nature. Therefore there is an active and a passive intellect in an angel.

actum, ut ex supra dictis patet. Actus autem ad quem comparatur potentia operativa, est operatio. In Angelo autem non est idem intelligere et esse, nec aliqua alia operatio aut in ipso aut in quocumque alio creato, est idem quod eius esse. Unde essentia Angeli non est eius potentia intellectiva, nec alicuius creati essentia est eius operativa potentia.

[30694] I^a q. 54 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Angelus dicitur intellectus et mens, quia tota eius cognitio est intellectualis. Cognitio autem animae partim est intellectualis, et partim sensitiva.

[30695] I^a q. 54 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod forma simplex quae est actus purus, nullius accidentis potest esse subiectum, quia subiectum comparatur ad accidens ut potentia ad actum. Et huiusmodi est solus Deus. Et de tali forma loquitur ibi Boetius. Forma autem simplex quae non est suum esse, sed comparatur ad ipsum ut potentia ad actum, potest esse subiectum accidentis, et praecipue eius quod consequitur speciem, huiusmodi enim accidens pertinet ad formam (accidens vero quod est individui, non consequens totam speciem, consequitur materiam, quae est individuationis principium). Et talis forma simplex est Angelus.

[30696] I^a q. 54 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod potentia materiae est ad ipsum esse substantiale, et non potentia operativa, sed ad esse accidentale. Unde non est simile.

[30697] I^a q. 54 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod in Angelo sit intellectus agens et possibilis. Dicit enim philosophus, in III de anima, quod *sicut in omni natura est aliquid quo est omnia fieri, et aliquid quo est omnia facere, ita etiam in anima*. Sed Angelus est natura quaedam. Ergo in eo est intellectus agens et possibilis.

Objection 2: Further, the proper function of the passive intellect is to receive; whereas to enlighten is the proper function of the active intellect, as is made clear in *De Anima* iii, text. 2,3,18. But an angel receives enlightenment from a higher angel, and enlightens a lower one. Therefore there is in him an active and a passive intellect.

On the contrary, The distinction of active and passive intellect in us is in relation to the phantasms, which are compared to the passive intellect as colors to the sight; but to the active intellect as colors to the light, as is clear from *De Anima* iii, text. 18. But this is not so in the angel. Therefore there is no active and passive intellect in the angel.

I answer that, The necessity for admitting a passive intellect in us is derived from the fact that we understand sometimes only in potentiality, and not actually. Hence there must exist some power, which, previous to the act of understanding, is in potentiality to intelligible things, but which becomes actuated in their regard when it apprehends them, and still more when it reflects upon them. This is the power which is denominated the passive intellect. The necessity for admitting an active intellect is due to this--- that the natures of the material things which we understand do not exist outside the soul, as immaterial and actually intelligible, but are only intelligible in potentiality so long as they are outside the soul. Consequently it is necessary that there should be some power capable of rendering such natures actually intelligible: and this power in us is called the active intellect.

But each of these necessities is absent from the angels. They are neither sometimes understanding only in potentiality, with regard to such things as they naturally apprehend; nor, again, are their intelligible in potentiality, but they are actually such; for they first and principally understand immaterial things, as will appear later ([Q\[84\], A\[7\]](#); [Q\[85\], A\[1\]](#)). Therefore there cannot be an active and a passive intellect in them, except equivocally.

Reply to Objection 1: As the words themselves

[30698] I^a q. 54 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, recipere est proprium intellectus possibilis, illuminare autem est proprium intellectus agentis, ut patet in III de anima. Sed Angelus recipit illuminationem a superiori, et illuminat inferiorem. Ergo in eo est intellectus agens et possibilis.

[30699] I^a q. 54 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra est quod in nobis intellectus agens et possibilis est per comparationem ad phantasmata; quae quidem comparantur ad intellectum possibilem ut colores ad visum, ad intellectum autem agentem ut colores ad lumen, ut patet ex III de anima. Sed hoc non est in Angelo. Ergo in Angelo non est intellectus agens et possibilis.

[30700] I^a q. 54 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod necessitas ponendi intellectum possibilem in nobis, fuit propter hoc, quod nos invenimur quandoque intelligentes in potentia et non in actu, unde oportet esse quandam virtutem, quae sit in potentia ad intelligibilia ante ipsum intelligere, sed reducitur in actum eorum cum fit sciens, et ulterius cum fit considerans. Et haec virtus vocatur intellectus possibilis. Necessitas autem ponendi intellectum agentem fuit, quia naturae rerum materialium, quas nos intelligimus, non subsistunt extra animam immateriales et intelligibiles in actu, sed sunt solum intelligibiles in potentia, extra animam existentes, et ideo oportuit esse aliquam virtutem, quae faceret illas naturas intelligibiles actu. Et haec virtus dicitur intellectus agens in nobis. Utraque autem necessitas deest in Angelis. Quia neque sunt quandoque intelligentes in potentia tantum, respectu eorum quae naturaliter intelligunt, neque intelligibilia eorum sunt intelligibilia in potentia, sed in actu; intelligunt enim primo et principaliter res immateriales, ut infra patebit. Et ideo non potest in eis esse intellectus agens et possibilis, nisi aequivoce.

[30701] I^a q. 54 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo

show, the Philosopher understands those two things to be in every nature in which there chances to be generation or making. Knowledge, however, is not generated in the angels, but is present naturally. Hence there is not need for admitting an active and a passive intellect in them.

Reply to Objection 2: It is the function of the active intellect to enlighten, not another intellect, but things which are intelligible in potentiality, in so far as by abstraction it makes them to be actually intelligible. It belongs to the passive intellect to be in potentiality with regard to things which are naturally capable of being known, and sometimes to apprehend them actually. Hence for one angel to enlighten another does not belong to the notion of an active intellect: neither does it belong to the passive intellect for the angel to be enlightened with regard to supernatural mysteries, to the knowledge of which he is sometimes in potentiality. But if anyone wishes to call these by the names of active and passive intellect, he will then be speaking equivocally; and it is not about names that we need trouble.

Q. 54. A. 5. Whether there is only intellectual knowledge in the angels?

Objection 1: It would seem that the knowledge of the angels is not exclusively intellectual. For Augustine says (*De Civ. Dei* viii) that in the angels there is "life which understands and feels." Therefore there is a sensitive faculty in them as well.

Objection 2: Further, Isidore says (*De Summo Bono*) that the angels have learnt many things by experience. But experience comes of many remembrances, as stated in *Metaph.* i, 1. Consequently they have likewise a power of memory.

Objection 3: Further, Dionysius says (*Div. Nom.* iv) that there is a sort of "perverted phantasy" in the demons. But phantasy belongs to the imaginative faculty. Therefore the power of the imagination is in the demons; and for the same reason it is in the angels, since they are of the same nature.

dicendum quod philosophus intelligit ista duo esse in omni natura in qua contingit esse generari vel fieri, ut ipsa verba demonstrant. In Angelo autem non generatur scientia, sed naturaliter adest. Unde non oportet ponere in eis agens et possibile.

[30702] I^a q. 54 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod intellectus agentis est illuminare non quidem alium intelligentem, sed intelligibilia in potentia, inquantum per abstractionem facit ea intelligibilia actu. Ad intellectum autem possibilem pertinet esse in potentia respectu naturalium cognoscibilium, et quandoque fieri actu. Unde quod Angelus illuminat Angelum, non pertinet ad rationem intellectus agentis. Neque ad rationem intellectus possibilis pertinet, quod illuminatur de supernaturalibus mysteriis, ad quae cognoscenda quandoque est in potentia. Si quis autem velit haec vocare intellectum agentem et possibilem, aequivoce dicet, nec de nominibus est curandum.

[30703] I^a q. 54 a. 5 arg. 1 Ad quintum sic proceditur. Videtur quod in Angelis non sit sola intellectiva cognitio. Dicit enim Augustinus, VIII de Civ. Dei, quod in Angelis est vita quae intelligit et sentit. Ergo in eis est potentia sensitiva.

[30704] I^a q. 54 a. 5 arg. 2 Praeterea, Isidorus dicit quod Angeli multa noverunt per experientiam. Experientia autem fit ex multis memoriis, ut dicitur in I *Metaphys.* Ergo in eis est etiam memorativa potentia.

[30705] I^a q. 54 a. 5 arg. 3 Praeterea, Dionysius dicit, IV cap. de Div. Nom., quod in Daemonibus est phantasia proterva. Phantasia autem ad vim imaginativam pertinet. Ergo in Daemonibus est vis imaginativa. Et eadem ratione in Angelis, quia sunt eiusdem naturae.

On the contrary, Gregory says (Hom. 29 in Ev.), that "man senses in common with the brutes, and understands with the angels."

I answer that, In our soul there are certain powers whose operations are exercised by corporeal organs; such powers are acts of sundry parts of the body, as sight of the eye, and hearing of the ear. There are some other powers of the soul whose operations are not performed through bodily organs, as intellect and will: these are not acts of any parts of the body. Now the angels have no bodies naturally joined to them, as is manifest from what has been said already ([Q\[51\], A\[1\]](#)). Hence of the soul's powers only intellect and will can belong to them.

The Commentator (Metaph. xii) says the same thing, namely, that the separated substances are divided into intellect and will. And it is in keeping with the order of the universe for the highest intellectual creature to be entirely intelligent; and not in part, as is our soul. For this reason the angels are called "intellects" and "minds," as was said above ([A\[3\]](#), ad 1).

Reply to Objections A twofold answer can be returned to the contrary objections. First, it may be replied that those authorities are speaking according to the opinion of such men as contended that angels and demons have bodies naturally united to them. Augustine often makes use of this opinion in his books, although he does not mean to assert it; hence he says (De Civ. Dei xxi) that "such an inquiry does not call for much labor." Secondly, it may be said that such authorities and the like are to be understood by way of similitude. Because, since sense has a sure apprehension of its proper sensible object, it is a common usage of speech, when he understands something for certain, to say that we "sense it." And hence it is that we use the word "sentence." Experience can be attributed to the angels according to the likeness of the things known, although not by likeness of the faculty knowing them. We have experience when we know single objects through the senses: the angels likewise know single objects, as we shall show ([Q\[57\], A\[2\]](#)), yet not through the senses. But memory

[30706] I^a q. 54 a. 5 s. c. Sed contra est quod Gregorius dicit, in homilia de ascensione, quod *homo sentit cum pecoribus, et intelligit cum Angelis*.

[30707] I^a q. 54 a. 5 co. Respondeo dicendum quod in anima nostra sunt quaedam vires, quarum operationes per organa corporea exercentur, et huiusmodi vires sunt actus quarundam partium corporis, sicut est visus in oculo, et auditus in aure. Quaedam vero vires animae nostrae sunt, quarum operationes per organa corporea non exercentur, ut intellectus et voluntas, et huiusmodi non sunt actus aliquarum partium corporis. Angeli autem non habent corpora sibi naturaliter unita, ut ex supra dictis patet. Unde de viribus animae non possunt eis competere nisi intellectus et voluntas. Et hoc etiam Commentator dicit, XII Metaphys., quod substantiae separatae dividuntur in intellectum et voluntatem. Et hoc convenit ordini universi, ut suprema creatura intellectualis sit totaliter intellectiva; et non secundum partem, ut anima nostra. Et propter hoc etiam Angeli vocantur intellectus et mentes, ut supra dictum est.

[30708] I^a q. 54 a. 5 ad 1 Ad ea vero quae in contrarium obiiciuntur, potest dupliciter responderi. Uno modo, quod auctoritates illae loquuntur secundum opinionem illorum qui posuerunt Angelos et Daemones habere corpora naturaliter sibi unita. Qua opinione frequenter Augustinus in libris suis utitur, licet eam asserere non intendat, unde dicit, XXI de Civ. Dei, quod *super hac inquisitione non est multum laborandum*. Alio modo potest dici, quod auctoritates illae, et consimiles, sunt intelligendae per quandam similitudinem. Quia cum sensus certam apprehensionem habeat de proprio sensibili, est in usu loquentium ut etiam secundum certam apprehensionem intellectus aliquid sentire dicamur. Unde etiam sententia nominatur. Experientia vero Angelis attribui potest per similitudinem cognitorum, etsi non per similitudinem virtutis cognoscitivae. Est enim in nobis experientia, dum singularia per sensum cognoscimus, Angeli autem singularia cognoscunt, ut infra patebit, sed non per sensum. Sed tamen memoria in Angelis potest poni,

can be allowed in the angels, according as Augustine (De Trin. x) puts it in the mind; although it cannot belong to them in so far as it is a part of the sensitive soul. In like fashion 'a perverted phantasy' is attributed to demons, since they have a false practical estimate of what is the true good; while deception in us comes properly from the phantasy, whereby we sometimes hold fast to images of things as to the things themselves, as is manifest in sleepers and lunatics.

secundum quod ab Augustino ponitur in mente; licet non possit eis competere secundum quod ponitur pars animae sensitivae. Similiter dicendum quod phantasia proterva attribuitur Daemonibus, ex eo quod habent falsam practicam existimationem de vero bono, deceptio autem in nobis proprie fit secundum phantasiam, per quam interdum similitudinibus rerum inhaeremus sicut rebus ipsis, ut patet in dormientibus et amentibus.

Q. 55. OF THE MEDIUM OF THE ANGELIC KNOWLEDGE (THREE ARTICLES)

Next in order, the question arises as to the medium of the angelic knowledge. Under this heading there are three points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Do the angels know everything by their substance, or by some species?](#)

[\(2\) If by species, is it by connatural species, or is it by such as they have derived from things?](#)

[\(3\) Do the higher angels know by more universal species than the lower angels?](#)

[30709] I^a q. 55 pr. Consequenter quaeritur de medio cognitionis angelicae. Et circa hoc quaeruntur tria. Primo, utrum Angeli cognoscant omnia per suam substantiam, vel per aliquas species. Secundo, si per species, utrum per species connaturales, vel per species a rebus acceptas. Tertio, utrum Angeli superiores cognoscant per species magis universales, quam inferiores.

Q. 55. A. 1. Whether the angels know all things by their substance?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels know all things by their substance. For Dionysius says (Div. Nom. vii) that "the angels, according to the proper nature of a mind, know the things which are happening upon earth." But the angel's nature is his essence. Therefore the angel knows things by his essence.

[30710] I^a q. 55 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli cognoscant omnia per suam substantiam. Dicit enim Dionysius, VII cap. de Div. Nom., quod *Angeli sciunt ea quae sunt in terra, secundum propriam naturam mentis*. Sed natura Angeli est eius essentia. Ergo Angelus per suam essentiam res cognoscit.

Objection 2: Further, according to the Philosopher (Metaph. xii, text. 51; De Anima iii, text. 15), "in things which are without matter, the intellect is the same as the object understood." But the object understood is the same as the one who understands it, as regards that whereby it is understood. Therefore in things without matter, such as the angels, the medium whereby the object is understood is the very substance of the one understanding it.

[30711] I^a q. 55 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, secundum philosophum, in XII Metaphys., et in III de anima, *in his quae sunt sine materia, idem est intellectus et quod intelligitur*. Id autem quod intelligitur est idem intelligenti ratione eius quo intelligitur. Ergo in his quae sunt sine materia, sicut sunt Angeli, id quo intelligitur est ipsa substantia intelligentis.

Objection 3: Further, everything which is contained in another is there according to the mode of the container. But an angel has an intellectual nature. Therefore whatever is in him is there in an intelligible mode. But all things are in him: because the lower orders of beings are essentially in the higher, while the higher are in the lower participatively: and therefore Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that God "enfolds the whole in the whole," i.e. all in all. Therefore the angel knows all things in his substance.

[30712] I^a q. 55 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, omne quod est in altero, est in eo per modum eius in quo est. Sed Angelus habet naturam intellectualem. Ergo quidquid est in ipso, est in eo per modum intelligibilem. Sed omnia sunt in eo, quia inferiora in entibus sunt in superioribus essentialiter, superiora vero sunt in inferioribus participative; et ideo dicit Dionysius, IV cap. de Div. Nom., quod Deus tota in totis congregat, idest omnia in omnibus. Ergo Angelus omnia in sua substantia cognoscit.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv)

[30713] I^a q. 55 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod

that "the angels are enlightened by the forms of things." Therefore they know by the forms of things, and not by their own substance.

I answer that, The medium through which the intellect understands, is compared to the intellect understanding it as its form, because it is by the form that the agent acts. Now in order that the faculty may be perfectly completed by the form, it is necessary for all things to which the faculty extends to be contained under the form. Hence it is that in things which are corruptible, the form does not perfectly complete the potentiality of the matter: because the potentiality of the matter extends to more things than are contained under this or that form. But the intellective power of the angel extends to understanding all things: because the object of the intellect is universal being or universal truth. The angel's essence, however, does not comprise all things in itself, since it is an essence restricted to a genus and species. This is proper to the Divine essence, which is infinite, simply and perfectly to comprise all things in Itself. Therefore God alone knows all things by His essence. But an angel cannot know all things by his essence; and his intellect must be perfected by some species in order to know things.

Reply to Objection 1: When it is said that the angel knows things according to his own nature, the words "according to" do not determine the medium of such knowledge, since the medium is the similitude of the thing known; but they denote the knowing power, which belongs to the angel of his own nature.

Reply to Objection 2: As the sense in act is the sensible in act, as stated in *De Anima* ii, text. 53, not so that the sensitive power is the sensible object's likeness contained in the sense, but because one thing is made from both as from act and potentiality: so likewise the intellect in act is said to be the thing understood in act, not that the substance of the intellect is itself the similitude by which it understands, but because that similitude is its form. Now, it is precisely the same thing to say "in things which are without matter, the intellect is the same thing as the object understood," as to say that "the intellect in act is

Dionysius dicit, in eodem capite, quod Angeli illuminantur rationibus rerum. Ergo cognoscunt per rationes rerum, et non per propriam substantiam.

[30714] I^a q. 55 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod illud quo intellectus intelligit, comparatur ad intellectum intelligentem ut forma eius, quia forma est quo agens agit. Oportet autem, ad hoc quod potentia perfecte compleatur per formam, quod omnia contineantur sub forma, ad quae potentia se extendit. Et inde est quod in rebus corruptibilibus forma non perfecte complet potentiam materiae, quia potentia materiae ad plura se extendit quam sit continentia formae huius vel illius. Potentia autem intellectiva Angeli se extendit ad intelligendum omnia, quia obiectum intellectus est ens vel verum commune. Ipsa autem essentia Angeli non comprehendit in se omnia, cum sit essentia determinata ad genus et ad speciem. Hoc autem proprium est essentiae divinae, quae infinita est, ut in se simpliciter omnia comprehendat perfecte. Et ideo solus Deus cognoscit omnia per suam essentiam. Angelus autem per suam essentiam non potest omnia cognoscere; sed oportet intellectum eius aliquibus speciebus perfici ad res cognoscendas.

[30715] I^a q. 55 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod, cum dicitur Angelum secundum suam naturam res cognoscere, ly secundum non determinat medium cognitionis, quod est similitudo cogniti; sed virtutem cognoscitivam, quae convenit Angelo secundum suam naturam.

[30716] I^a q. 55 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod, sicut sensus in actu est sensibile in actu, ut dicitur in III de anima, non ita quod ipsa vis sensitiva sit ipsa similitudo sensibilis quae est in sensu, sed quia ex utroque fit unum sicut ex actu et potentia; ita et intellectus in actu dicitur esse intellectum in actu, non quod substantia intellectus sit ipsa similitudo per quam intelligit, sed quia illa similitudo est forma eius. Idem est autem quod dicitur, in his quae sunt sine materia, idem est intellectus et quod intelligitur, ac si diceretur quod intellectus in actu est intellectum in actu, ex hoc enim aliquid est intellectum in actu

the thing understood in act"; for a thing is actually understood, precisely because it is immaterial.

Reply to Objection 3: The things which are beneath the angel, and those which are above him, are in a measure in his substance, not indeed perfectly, nor according to their own proper formality---because the angel's essence, as being finite, is distinguished by its own formality from other things---but according to some common formality. Yet all things are perfectly and according to their own formality in God's essence, as in the first and universal operative power, from which proceeds whatever is proper or common to anything. Therefore God has a proper knowledge of all things by His own essence: and this the angel has not, but only a common knowledge.

Q. 55. A. 2. Whether the angels understand by species drawn from things?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels understand by species drawn from things. For everything understood is apprehended by some likeness within him who understands it. But the likeness of the thing existing in another is there either by way of an exemplar, so that the likeness is the cause of the thing; or else by way of an image, so that it is caused by such thing. All knowledge, then, of the person understanding must either be the cause of the object understood, or else caused by it. Now the angel's knowledge is not the cause of existing things; that belongs to the Divine knowledge alone. Therefore it is necessary for the species, by which the angelic mind understands, to be derived from things.

Objection 2: Further, the angelic light is stronger than the light of the active intellect of the soul. But the light of the active intellect abstracts intelligible species from phantasms. Therefore the light of the angelic mind can also abstract species from sensible things. So there is nothing to hinder us from saying that the angel understands through species drawn from things.

Objection 3: Further, the species in the intellect are indifferent to what is present or distant, except in so far as they are taken from sensible objects. Therefore, if the angel does not understand by

quod est immateriale.

[30717] I^a q. 55 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod ea quae sunt infra Angelum, et ea quae sunt supra ipsum, sunt quodammodo in substantia eius, non quidem perfecte, neque secundum propriam rationem, cum Angeli essentia, finita existens, secundum propriam rationem ab aliis distinguatur; sed secundum quandam rationem communem. In essentia autem Dei sunt omnia perfecte et secundum propriam rationem, sicut in prima et universali virtute operativa, a qua procedit quidquid est in quacumque re vel proprium vel commune. Et ideo Deus per essentiam suam habet propriam cognitionem de rebus omnibus, non autem Angelus, sed solam communem.

[30718] I^a q. 55 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli intelligant per species a rebus acceptas. Omne enim quod intelligitur, per aliquam sui similitudinem in intelligente intelligitur. Similitudo autem alicuius in altero existens, aut est ibi per modum exemplaris, ita quod illa similitudo sit causa rei, aut est ibi per modum imaginis, ita quod sit causata a re. Oportet igitur quod omnis scientia intelligentis vel sit causa rei intellectae, vel causata a re. Sed scientia Angeli non est causa rerum existentium in natura, sed sola divina scientia. Ergo oportet quod species per quas intelligit intellectus angelicus, sint a rebus acceptae.

[30719] I^a q. 55 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, lumen angelicum est fortius quam lumen intellectus agentis in anima. Sed lumen intellectus agentis abstrahit species intelligibiles a phantasmatis. Ergo lumen intellectus angelici potest abstrahere species etiam ab ipsis rebus sensibilibus. Et ita nihil prohibet dicere quod Angelus intelligat per species a rebus acceptas.

[30720] I^a q. 55 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, species quae sunt in intellectu, indifferenter se habent ad praesens et distans, nisi quatenus a rebus sensibilibus accipiuntur. Si ergo Angelus non

species drawn from things, his knowledge would be indifferent as to things present and distant; and so he would be moved locally to no purpose.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. vii) that the "angels do not gather their Divine knowledge from things divisible or sensible."

I answer that, The species whereby the angels understand are not drawn from things, but are connatural to them. For we must observe that there is a similarity between the distinction and order of spiritual substances and the distinction and order of corporeal substances. The highest bodies have in their nature a potentiality which is fully perfected by the form; whereas in the lower bodies the potentiality of matter is not entirely perfected by the form, but receives from some agent, now one form, now another. In like fashion also the lower intellectual substances ---that is to say, human souls---have a power of understanding which is not naturally complete, but is successively completed in them by their drawing intelligible species from things. But in the higher spiritual substances---that is, the angels---the power of understanding is naturally complete by intelligible species, in so far as they have such species connatural to them, so as to understand all things which they can know naturally.

The same is evident from the manner of existence of such substances. The lower spiritual substances---that is, souls---have a nature akin to a body, in so far as they are the forms of bodies: and consequently from their very mode of existence it behooves them to seek their intelligible perfection from bodies, and through bodies; otherwise they would be united with bodies to no purpose. On the other hand, the higher substances---that is, the angels---are utterly free from bodies, and subsist immaterially and in their own intelligible nature; consequently they attain their intelligible perfection through an intelligible outpouring, whereby they received from God the species of things known, together with their intellectual nature. Hence Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. ii, 8): "The other things which are lower than the angels are so created that they

intelligit per species a rebus acceptas, eius cognitio indifferenter se haberet ad propinqua et distantia, et ita frustra secundum locum moveretur.

[30721] I^a q. 55 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod Dionysius dicit, VII cap. de Div. Nom., quod *Angeli non congregant divinam cognitionem a rebus divisibilibus, aut a sensibilibus.*

[30722] I^a q. 55 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod species per quas Angeli intelligunt, non sunt a rebus acceptae, sed eis connaturales. Sic enim oportet intelligere distinctionem et ordinem spiritualium substantiarum, sicut est distinctio et ordo corporalium. Suprema autem corpora habent potentiam in sui natura totaliter perfectam per formam, in corporibus autem inferioribus potentia materiae non totaliter perficitur per formam, sed accipit nunc unam, nunc aliam formam, ab aliquo agente. Similiter et inferiores substantiae intellectivae, scilicet animae humanae, habent potentiam intellectivam non completam naturaliter; sed completur in eis successive, per hoc quod accipiunt species intelligibiles a rebus. Potentia vero intellectiva in substantiis spiritualibus superioribus, idest in Angelis, naturaliter completa est per species intelligibiles, inquantum habent species intelligibiles connaturales ad omnia intelligenda quae naturaliter cognoscere possunt. Et hoc etiam ex ipso modo essendi huiusmodi substantiarum apparet. Substantiae enim spirituales inferiores, scilicet animae, habent esse affine corpori, inquantum sunt corporum formae, et ideo ex ipso modo essendi competit eis ut a corporibus, et per corpora suam perfectionem intelligibilem consequantur, alioquin frustra corporibus unirentur. Substantiae vero superiores, idest Angeli, sunt a corporibus totaliter absolutae, immaterialiter et in esse intelligibili subsistentes, et ideo suam perfectionem intelligibilem consequuntur per intelligibilem effluxum, quo a Deo species rerum cognitarum acceperunt simul cum intellectuali natura. Unde Augustinus dicit, II super Gen. ad Litt., quod *cetera, quae infra Angelos sunt, ita creantur, ut prius fiant in cognitione rationalis creaturae, ac deinde in genere suo.*

first receive existence in the knowledge of the rational creature, and then in their own nature."

Reply to Objection 1: There are images of creatures in the angel's mind, not, indeed derived from creatures, but from God, Who is the cause of creatures, and in Whom the likenesses of creatures first exist. Hence Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. ii, 8) that, "As the type, according to which the creature is fashioned, is in the Word of God before the creature which is fashioned, so the knowledge of the same type exists first in the intellectual creature, and is afterwards the very fashioning of the creature."

Reply to Objection 2: To go from one extreme to the other it is necessary to pass through the middle. Now the nature of a form in the imagination, which form is without matter but not without material conditions, stands midway between the nature of a form which is in matter, and the nature of a form which is in the intellect by abstraction from matter and from material conditions. Consequently, however powerful the angelic mind might be, it could not reduce material forms to an intelligible condition, except it were first to reduce them to the nature of imagined forms; which is impossible, since the angel has no imagination, as was said above ([Q\[54\], A\[5\]](#)). Even granted that he could abstract intelligible species from material things, yet he would not do so; because he would not need them, for he has connatural intelligible species.

Reply to Objection 3: The angel's knowledge is quite indifferent as to what is near or distant. Nevertheless his local movement is not purposeless on that account: for he is not moved to a place for the purpose of acquiring knowledge, but for the purpose of operation.

Q. 55. A. 3. Whether the higher angels understand by more universal species than the lower angels?

Objection 1: It would seem that the higher angels do not understand by more universal species than the lower angels. For the universal, seemingly, is what is abstracted from particulars. But angels do not understand by species abstracted from things. Therefore it cannot be said that the species of the

[30723] I^a q. 55 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod in mente Angeli sunt similitudines creaturarum, non quidem ab ipsis creaturis acceptae, sed a Deo, qui est creaturarum causa, et in quo primo similitudines rerum existunt. Unde Augustinus dicit, in eodem libro, quod *sicut ratio qua creatura conditur, prius est in verbo Dei quam ipsa creatura quae conditur, sic et eiusdem rationis cognitio prius fit in creatura intellectuali, ac deinde est ipsa conditio creaturae.*

[30724] I^a q. 55 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod de extremo ad extremum non pervenitur nisi per medium. Esse autem formae in imaginatione, quod est quidem sine materia, non tamen sine materialibus conditionibus, medium est inter esse formae quae est in materia, et esse formae quae est in intellectu per abstractionem a materia et a conditionibus materialibus. Unde quantumcumque sit potens intellectus angelicus, non posset formas materiales reducere ad esse intelligibile, nisi prius reduceret eas ad esse formarum imaginatarum. Quod est impossibile, cum careat imaginatione, ut dictum est. Dato etiam quod posset abstrahere species intelligibiles a rebus materialibus, non tamen abstraheret, quia non indigeret eis, cum habeat species intelligibiles connaturales.

[30725] I^a q. 55 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod cognitio Angeli indifferenter se habet ad distans et propinquum secundum locum. Non tamen propter hoc motus eius localis est frustra, non enim movetur localiter ad cognitionem accipiendam, sed ad operandum aliquid in loco.

[30726] I^a q. 55 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod superiores Angeli non intelligant per species magis universales quam inferiores. Universale enim esse videtur quod a particularibus abstrahitur. Sed Angeli non intelligunt per species a rebus abstractas. Ergo

angelic intellect are more or less universal.

Objection 2: Further, whatever is known in detail is more perfectly known than what is known generically; because to know anything generically is, in a fashion, midway between potentiality and act. If, therefore, the higher angels know by more universal species than the lower, it follows that the higher have a more imperfect knowledge than the lower; which is not befitting.

Objection 3: Further, the same cannot be the proper type of many. But if the higher angel knows various things by one universal form, which the lower angel knows by several special forms, it follows that the higher angel uses one universal form for knowing various things. Therefore he will not be able to have a proper knowledge of each; which seems unbecoming.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Coel. Hier. xii) that the higher angels have a more universal knowledge than the lower. And in De Causis it is said that the higher angels have more universal forms.

I answer that, For this reason are some things of a more exalted nature, because they are nearer to and more like unto the first, which is God. Now in God the whole plenitude of intellectual knowledge is contained in one thing, that is to say, in the Divine essence, by which God knows all things. This plenitude of knowledge is found in created intellects in a lower manner, and less simply. Consequently it is necessary for the lower intelligences to know by many forms what God knows by one, and by so many forms the more according as the intellect is lower.

Thus the higher the angel is, by so much the fewer species will he be able to apprehend the whole mass of intelligible objects. Therefore his forms must be more universal; each one of them, as it were, extending to more things. An example of this can in some measure be observed in

non potest dici quod species intellectus angelici sint magis vel minus universales.

[30727] I^a q. 55 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, quod cognoscitur in speciali, perfectius cognoscitur quam quod cognoscitur in universali, quia cognoscere aliquid in universali est quodammodo medium inter potentiam et actum. Si ergo Angeli superiores cognoscunt per formas magis universales quam inferiores, sequitur quod Angeli superiores habeant scientiam magis imperfectam quam inferiores. Quod est inconueniens.

[30728] I^a q. 55 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, idem non potest esse propria ratio multorum. Sed si Angelus superior cognoscat per unam formam universalem diversa, quae inferior Angelus cognoscit per plures formas speciales, sequitur quod Angelus superior utitur una forma universali ad cognoscendum diversa. Ergo non poterit habere propriam cognitionem de utroque. Quod videtur inconueniens.

[30729] I^a q. 55 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicit Dionysius, XII cap. Angel. Hier., quod superiores Angeli participant scientiam magis in universali quam inferiores. Et in libro de causis dicitur quod Angeli superiores habent formas magis universales.

[30730] I^a q. 55 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod ex hoc sunt in rebus aliqua superiora, quod sunt uni primo, quod est Deus, propinquiora et similia. In Deo autem tota plenitudo intellectualis cognitionis continetur in uno, scilicet in essentia divina, per quam Deus omnia cognoscit. Quae quidem intelligibilis plenitudo in intellectibus creatis inferiori modo et minus simpliciter invenitur. Unde oportet quod ea quae Deus cognoscit per unum, inferiores intellectus cognoscant per multa, et tanto amplius per plura, quanto amplius intellectus inferior fuerit. Sic igitur quanto Angelus fuerit superior, tanto per pauciores species universitatem intelligibilium apprehendere poterit. Et ideo oportet quod eius formae sint universales, quasi ad plura se extendentes unaquaeque earum. Et de hoc exemplum aliquo modo in nobis perspicitur. Sunt enim quidam, qui veritatem intelligibilem

ourselves. For some people there are who cannot grasp an intelligible truth, unless it be explained to them in every part and detail; this comes of their weakness of intellect: while there are others of stronger intellect, who can grasp many things from few.

Reply to Objection 1: It is accidental to the universal to be abstracted from particulars, in so far as the intellect knowing it derives its knowledge from things. But if there be an intellect which does not derive its knowledge from things, the universal which it knows will not be abstracted from things, but in a measure will be pre-existing to them; either according to the order of causality, as the universal ideas of things are in the Word of God; or at least in the order of nature, as the universal ideas of things are in the angelic mind.

Reply to Objection 2: To know anything universally can be taken in two senses. In one way, on the part of the thing known, namely, that only the universal nature of the thing is known. To know a thing thus is something less perfect: for he would have but an imperfect knowledge of a man who only knew him to be an animal. In another way, on the part of the medium of such knowledge. In this way it is more perfect to know a thing in the universal; for the intellect, which by one universal medium can know each of the things which are properly contained in it, is more perfect than one which cannot.

Reply to Objection 3: The same cannot be the proper and adequate type of several things. But if it be eminent, then it can be taken as the proper type and likeness of many. Just as in man, there is a universal prudence with respect to all the acts of the virtues; which can be taken as the proper type and likeness of that prudence which in the lion leads to acts of magnanimity, and in the fox to acts of wariness; and so on of the rest. The Divine essence, on account of Its eminence, is in like fashion taken as the proper type of each thing contained therein: hence each one is likened to It according to its proper type. The same applies to the universal form which is in the mind of the angel, so that, on account of its excellence, many things can be known through it with a proper

capere non possunt, nisi eis particulatim per singula explicetur, et hoc quidem ex debilitate intellectus eorum contingit. Alii vero, qui sunt fortioris intellectus, ex paucis multa capere possunt.

[30731] I^a q. 55 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod accidit universali ut a singularibus abstrahatur, inquantum intellectus illud cognoscens a rebus cognitionem accipit. Si vero sit aliquis intellectus a rebus cognitionem non accipiens, universale ab eo cognitum non erit abstractum a rebus, sed quodammodo ante res praeexistens, vel secundum ordinem causae, sicut universales rerum rationes sunt in verbo Dei; vel saltem ordine naturae, sicut universales rerum rationes sunt in intellectu angelico.

[30732] I^a q. 55 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod cognoscere aliquid in universali, dicitur dupliciter. Uno modo, ex parte rei cognitae, ut scilicet cognoscatur solum universalis natura rei. Et sic cognoscere aliquid in universali est imperfectius, imperfecte enim cognosceret hominem, qui cognosceret de eo solum quod est animal. Alio modo, ex parte medii cognoscendi. Et sic perfectius est cognoscere aliquid in universali, perfectior enim est intellectus qui per unum universale medium potest singula propria cognoscere, quam qui non potest.

[30733] I^a q. 55 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod idem non potest esse plurium propria ratio adaequata. Sed si sit excellens, potest idem accipi ut propria ratio et similitudo diversorum. Sicut in homine est universalis prudentia quantum ad omnes actus virtutum; et potest accipi ut propria ratio et similitudo particularis prudentiae quae est in leone ad actus magnanimitatis, et eius quae est in vulpe ad actus cautela, et sic de aliis. Similiter essentia divina accipitur, propter sui excellentiam, ut propria ratio singulorum, quia est in ea unde sibi singula simulentur secundum proprias rationes. Et eodem modo dicendum est de ratione universali quae est in mente Angeli, quod per eam, propter eius excellentiam, multa cognosci possunt propria cognitione.

knowledge.

Q. 56. OF THE ANGEL'S KNOWLEDGE OF IMMATERIAL THINGS (THREE ARTICLES)

We now inquire into the knowledge of the angels with regard to the objects known by them. We shall treat of their knowledge, first, of immaterial things, secondly of things material. Under the first heading there are three points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Does an angel know himself?](#)

[\(2\) Does one angel know another?](#)

[\(3\) Does the angel know God by his own natural principles?](#)

Q. 56. A. 1. Whether an angel knows himself?

Objection 1: It would seem that an angel does not know himself. For Dionysius says that "the angels do not know their own powers" (Coel. Hier. vi). But, when the substance is known, the power is known. Therefore an angel does not know his own essence.

Objection 2: Further, an angel is a single substance, otherwise he would not act, since acts belong to single subsistences. But nothing single is intelligible. Therefore, since the angel possesses only knowledge which is intellectual, no angel can know himself.

Objection 3: Further, the intellect is moved by the intelligible object: because, as stated in De Anima iii, 4 understanding is a kind of passion. But nothing is moved by or is passive to itself; as appears in corporeal things. Therefore the angel cannot understand himself.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. ii) that "the angel knew himself when he was established, that is, enlightened by truth."

I answer that, As is evident from what has been previously said ([Q\[14\], A\[2\]](#); [Q\[54\], A\[2\]](#)), the object is on a different footing in an immanent, and in a transient, action. In a transient action the

[30734] I^a q. 56 pr. Deinde quaeritur de cognitione Angelorum ex parte rerum quas cognoscunt. Et primo, de cognitione rerum immaterialium; secundo, de cognitione rerum materialium. Circa primum quaeruntur tria. Primo, utrum Angelus cognoscat seipsum. Secundo, utrum unus cognoscat alium. Tertio, utrum Angelus per sua naturalia cognoscat Deum.

[30735] I^a q. 56 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus seipsum non cognoscat. Dicit enim Dionysius, VI cap. Angel. Hier., quod Angeli ignorant proprias virtutes. Cognita autem substantia, cognoscitur virtus. Ergo Angelus non cognoscit suam essentiam.

[30736] I^a q. 56 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, Angelus est quaedam substantia singularis, alioquin non ageret, cum actus sint singularium subsistentium. Sed nullum singulare est intelligibile. Ergo non potest intelligi. Et ita, cum Angelo non adsit nisi intellectiva cognitio, non poterit aliquis Angelus cognoscere seipsum.

[30737] I^a q. 56 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, intellectus movetur ab intelligibili, quia intelligere est quoddam pati, ut dicitur in III de anima. Sed nihil movetur aut patitur a seipso; ut in rebus corporalibus apparet. Ergo Angelus non potest intelligere seipsum.

[30738] I^a q. 56 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod Augustinus dicit, II super Gen. ad Litt., quod *Angelus in ipsa sua conformatione, hoc est illustratione veritatis, cognovit seipsum.*

[30739] I^a q. 56 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut ex supra dictis patet, obiectum aliter se habet in actione quae manet in agente, et in actione quae transit in aliquid exterius. Nam in

object or matter into which the action passes is something separate from the agent, as the thing heated is from what gave it heat, and the building from the builder; whereas in an immanent action, for the action to proceed, the object must be united with the agent; just as the sensible object must be in contact with sense, in order that sense may actually perceive. And the object which is united to a faculty bears the same relation to actions of this kind as does the form which is the principle of action in other agents: for, as heat is the formal principle of heating in the fire, so is the species of the thing seen the formal principle of sight to the eye.

It must, however, be borne in mind that this image of the object exists sometimes only potentially in the knowing faculty; and then there is only knowledge in potentiality; and in order that there may be actual knowledge, it is required that the faculty of knowledge be actuated by the species. But if it always actually possesses the species, it can thereby have actual knowledge without any preceding change or reception. From this it is evident that it is not of the nature of knower, as knowing, to be moved by the object, but as knowing in potentiality. Now, for the form to be the principle of the action, it makes no difference whether it be inherent in something else, or self-subsisting; because heat would give forth heat none the less if it were self-subsisting, than it does by inhering in something else. So therefore, if in the order of intelligible beings there be any subsisting intelligible form, it will understand itself. And since an angel is immaterial, he is a subsisting form; and, consequently, he is actually intelligible. Hence it follows that he understands himself by his form, which is his substance.

Reply to Objection 1: That is the text of the old translation, which is amended in the new one, and runs thus: "furthermore they," that is to say the angels, "knew their own powers": instead of which the old translation read---"and furthermore they do not know their own powers." Although even the letter of the old translation might be kept in this respect, that the angels do not know their own power perfectly; according as it proceeds from the order of the Divine Wisdom, Which to the angels is incomprehensible.

actione quae transit in aliquid exterius, obiectum sive materia in quam transit actus, est separata ab agente, sicut calefactum a calefaciente, et aedificatum ab aedificante. Sed in actione quae manet in agente, oportet ad hoc quod procedat actio, quod obiectum uniatur agenti, sicut oportet quod sensibile uniatur sensui, ad hoc quod sentiat actu. Et ita se habet obiectum unitum potentiae ad huiusmodi actionem, sicut forma quae est principium actionis in aliis agentibus, sicut enim calor est principium formale calefactionis in igne, ita species rei visae est principium formale visionis in oculo. Sed considerandum est quod huiusmodi species obiecti quandoque est in potentia tantum in cognoscitiva virtute, et tunc est cognoscens in potentia tantum; et ad hoc quod actu cognoscat, requiritur quod potentia cognoscitiva reducatur in actum speciei. Si autem semper eam actu habeat, nihilominus per eam cognoscere potest absque aliqua mutatione vel receptione praecedenti. Ex quo patet quod moveri ab obiecto non est de ratione cognoscentis inquantum est cognoscens, sed inquantum est potentia cognoscens. Nihil autem differt, ad hoc quod forma sit principium actionis, quod ipsa forma sit alii inhaerens, et quod sit per se subsistens, non enim minus calor calefaceret si esset per se subsistens, quam calefacit inhaerens. Sic igitur et si aliquid in genere intelligibilium se habeat ut forma intelligibilis subsistens, intelliget seipsum. Angelus autem, cum sit immaterialis, est quaedam forma subsistens, et per hoc intelligibilis actu. Unde sequitur quod per suam formam, quae est sua substantia, seipsum intelligat.

[30740] I^a q. 56 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod littera illa est antiquae translationis, quae corrigitur per novam, in qua dicitur, praeterea et ipsos, scilicet Angelos, cognovisse proprias virtutes; loco cuius habebatur in alia translatione, et adhuc et eos ignorare proprias virtutes. Quamvis etiam littera antiquae translationis salvari possit quantum ad hoc, quod Angeli non perfecte cognoscunt suam virtutem, secundum quod procedit ab ordine divinae sapientiae, quae est Angelis incomprehensibilis.

Reply to Objection 2: We have no knowledge of single corporeal things, not because of their particularity, but on account of the matter, which is their principle of individuation. Accordingly, if there be any single things subsisting without matter, as the angels are, there is nothing to prevent them from being actually intelligible.

Reply to Objection 3: It belongs to the intellect, in so far as it is in potentiality, to be moved and to be passive. Hence this does not happen in the angelic intellect, especially as regards the fact that he understands himself. Besides the action of the intellect is not of the same nature as the action found in corporeal things, which passes into some other matter.

Q. 56. A. 2. Whether one angel knows another?

Objection 1: It would seem that one angel does not know another. For the Philosopher says (De Anima iii, text. 4), that if the human intellect were to have in itself any one of the sensible things, then such a nature existing within it would prevent it from apprehending external things; as likewise, if the pupil of the eye were colored with some particular color, it could not see every color. But as the human intellect is disposed for understanding corporeal things, so is the angelic mind for understanding immaterial things. Therefore, since the angelic intellect has within itself some one determinate nature from the number of such natures, it would seem that it cannot understand other natures.

Objection 2: Further, it is stated in De Causis that "every intelligence knows what is above it, in so far as it is caused by it; and what is beneath it, in so far as it is its cause." But one angel is not the cause of another. Therefore one angel does not know another.

Objection 3: Further, one angel cannot be known to another angel by the essence of the one knowing; because all knowledge is effected by way of a likeness. But the essence of the angel knowing is not like the essence of the angel known, except generically; as is clear from what has been said before ([Q\[50\], A\[4\]](#); [Q\[55\], A\[1\]](#),

[30741] I^a q. 56 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod singularium quae sunt in rebus corporalibus, non est intellectus, apud nos, non ratione singularitatis, sed ratione materiae, quae est in eis individuationis principium. Unde si aliqua singularia sunt sine materia subsistentia, sicut sunt Angeli, illa nihil prohibet intelligibilia esse actu.

[30742] I^a q. 56 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod moveri et pati convenit intellectui secundum quod est in potentia. Unde non habet locum in intellectu angelico; maxime quantum ad hoc quod intelligit seipsum. Actio etiam intellectus non est eiusdem rationis cum actione quae in corporalibus invenitur, in aliam materiam transeunte.

[30743] I^a q. 56 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod unus Angelus alium non cognoscat. Dicit enim philosophus, in III de anima, quod si intellectus humanus haberet in se aliquam naturam de numero naturarum rerum sensibilium, illa natura interius existens prohiberet apparere extranea, sicut etiam si pupilla esset colorata aliquo colore, non posset videre omnem colorem. Sed sicut se habet intellectus humanus ad cognoscendas res corporeas, ita se habet intellectus angelicus ad cognoscendas res immateriales. Cum igitur intellectus angelicus habeat in se aliquam naturam determinatam de numero illarum naturarum, videtur quod alias cognoscere non possit.

[30744] I^a q. 56 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, in libro de causis dicitur quod *omnis intelligentia sit quod est supra se, inquantum est causata ab eo; et quod est sub se, inquantum est causa eius*. Sed unus Angelus non est causa alterius. Ergo unus Angelus non cognoscit alium.

[30745] I^a q. 56 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, unus Angelus non potest cognoscere alium per essentiam ipsius Angeli cognoscentis, cum omnis cognitio sit secundum rationem similitudinis, essentia autem Angeli cognoscentis non est similis essentiae Angeli cogniti nisi in genere, ut ex supra dictis patet; unde sequeretur quod unus

ad 3). Hence, it follows that one angel would not have a particular knowledge of another, but only a general knowledge. In like manner it cannot be said that one angel knows another by the essence of the angel known; because that whereby the intellect understands is something within the intellect; whereas the Trinity alone can penetrate the mind. Again, it cannot be said that one angel knows the other by a species; because that species would not differ from the angel understood, since each is immaterial. Therefore in no way does it appear that one angel can understand another.

Objection 4: Further, if one angel did understand another, this would be either by an innate species; and so it would follow that, if God were now to create another angel, such an angel could not be known by the existing angels; or else he would have to be known by a species drawn from things; and so it would follow that the higher angels could not know the lower, from whom they receive nothing. Therefore in no way does it seem that one angel knows another.

On the contrary, We read in De Causis that "every intelligence knows the things which are not corrupted."

I answer that, As Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. lit. ii), such things as pre-existed from eternity in the Word of God, came forth from Him in two ways: first, into the angelic mind; and secondly, so as to subsist in their own natures. They proceeded into the angelic mind in such a way, that God impressed upon the angelic mind the images of the things which He produced in their own natural being. Now in the Word of God from eternity there existed not only the forms of corporeal things, but likewise the forms of all spiritual creatures. So in every one of these spiritual creatures, the forms of all things, both corporeal and spiritual, were impressed by the Word of God; yet so that in every angel there was impressed the form of his own species according to both its natural and its intelligible condition, so that he should subsist in the nature of his species, and understand himself by it; while the forms of other spiritual and corporeal natures were impressed in him only according to their intelligible natures, so that by such impressed

Angelus non haberet de alio cognitionem propriam, sed generalem tantum. Similiter etiam non potest dici quod unus Angelus cognoscat alium per essentiam Angeli cogniti, quia illud quo intellectus intelligit, est intrinsecum intellectui; sola autem Trinitas illabitur menti. Similiter etiam dici non potest quod unus cognoscat alium per speciem, quia illa species non differret ab Angelo intellecto, cum utrumque sit immateriale. Nullo igitur modo videtur quod unus Angelus possit intelligere alium.

[30746] I^a q. 56 a. 2 arg. 4 Praeterea, si unus Angelus intelligit alium, aut hoc esset per speciem innatam, et sic sequeretur quod, si Deus nunc de novo crearet aliquem Angelum, quod non posset cognosci ab his qui nunc sunt. Aut per speciem acquisitam a rebus, et sic sequeretur quod Angeli superiores non possent cognoscere inferiores, a quibus nihil accipiunt. Nullo igitur modo videtur quod unus Angelus alium cognoscat.

[30747] I^a q. 56 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur in libro de causis, quod *omnis intelligentia scit res quae non corrumpuntur*.

[30748] I^a q. 56 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut Augustinus dicit, II super Gen. ad Litt., ea quae in verbo Dei ab aeterno praeexisterunt, dupliciter ab eo effluerunt, uno modo, in intellectum angelicum; alio modo, ut subsisterent in propriis naturis. In intellectum autem angelicum processerunt per hoc, quod Deus menti angelicae impressit rerum similitudines, quas in esse naturali produxit. In verbo autem Dei ab aeterno extiterunt non solum rationes rerum corporalium, sed etiam rationes omnium spiritualium creaturarum. Sic igitur unicuique spiritualium creaturarum a verbo Dei impressae sunt omnes rationes rerum omnium, tam corporalium quam spiritualium. Ita tamen quod unicuique Angelo impressa est ratio suae speciei secundum esse naturale et intelligibile simul, ita scilicet quod in natura suae speciei subsisteret, et per eam se intelligeret, aliarum vero naturarum, tam spiritualium quam corporalium, rationes sunt ei impressae secundum esse intelligibile tantum, ut videlicet per huiusmodi species impressas, tam

species he might know corporeal and spiritual creatures.

Reply to Objection 1: The spiritual natures of the angels are distinguished from one another in a certain order, as was already observed ([Q\[50\], A\[4\]](#), ad 1,2). So the nature of an angel does not hinder him from knowing the other angelic natures, since both the higher and lower bear affinity to his nature, the only difference being according to their various degrees of perfection.

Reply to Objection 2: The nature of cause and effect does not lead one angel to know another, except on account of likeness, so far as cause and effect are alike. Therefore if likeness without causality be admitted in the angels, this will suffice for one to know another.

Reply to Objection 3: One angel knows another by the species of such angel existing in his intellect, which differs from the angel whose image it is, not according to material and immaterial nature, but according to natural and intentional existence. The angel is himself a subsisting form in his natural being; but his species in the intellect of another angel is not so, for there it possesses only an intelligible existence. As the form of color on the wall has a natural existence; but, in the deferent medium, it has only intentional existence.

Reply to Objection 4: God made every creature proportionate to the universe which He determined to make. Therefore had God resolved to make more angels or more natures of things, He would have impressed more intelligible species in the angelic minds; as a builder who, if he had intended to build a larger house, would have made larger foundations. Hence, for God to add a new creature to the universe, means that He would add a new intelligible species to an angel.

creaturas corporales quam spirituales cognosceret.

[30749] I^a q. 56 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod naturae spirituales Angelorum ab invicem distinguuntur ordine quodam, sicut supra dictum est. Et sic natura unius Angeli non prohibet intellectum ipsius a cognoscendis aliis naturis Angelorum, cum tam superiores quam inferiores habeant affinitatem cum natura eius, differentia existente tantum secundum diversos gradus perfectionis.

[30750] I^a q. 56 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod ratio causae et causati non facit ad hoc quod unus Angelus alium cognoscat, nisi ratione similitudinis, inquantum causa et causatum sunt similia. Et ideo, si inter Angelos ponatur similitudo absque causalitate, remanebit in uno cognitio alterius.

[30751] I^a q. 56 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod unus Angelus cognoscit alium per speciem eius in intellectu suo existentem, quae differt ab Angelo cuius similitudo est, non secundum esse materiale et immateriale, sed secundum esse naturale et intentionale. Nam ipse Angelus est forma subsistens in esse naturali, non autem species eius quae est in intellectu alterius Angeli, sed habet ibi esse intelligibile tantum. Sicut etiam et forma coloris in pariete habet esse naturale, in medio autem deferente habet esse intentionale tantum.

[30752] I^a q. 56 a. 2 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod Deus unamquamque creaturam fecit proportionatam universo quod facere disposuit. Et ideo, si Deus instituisset facere plures Angelos vel plures naturas rerum, plures species intelligibiles mentibus angelicis impressisset. Sicut si aedificator voluisset facere maiorem domum, fecisset maius fundamentum. Unde eiusdem rationis est quod Deus adderet aliquam creaturam universo, et aliquam speciem intelligibilem Angelo.

Q. 56. A. 3. Whether an angel knows God by his own natural principles?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels cannot know God by their natural principles. For Dionysius says (Div. Nom. i) that God "by His incomprehensible might is placed above all heavenly minds." Afterwards he adds that, "since He is above all substances, He is remote from all knowledge."

Objection 2: Further, God is infinitely above the intellect of an angel. But what is infinitely beyond cannot be reached. Therefore it appears that an angel cannot know God by his natural principles.

Objection 3: Further, it is written ([1 Cor. 13:12](#)): "We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face." From this it appears that there is a twofold knowledge of God; the one, whereby He is seen in His essence, according to which He is said to be seen face to face; the other whereby He is seen in the mirror of creatures. As was already shown ([Q\[12\], A\[4\]](#)), an angel cannot have the former knowledge by his natural principles. Nor does vision through a mirror belong to the angels, since they do not derive their knowledge of God from sensible things, as Dionysius observes (Div. Nom. vii). Therefore the angels cannot know God by their natural powers.

On the contrary, The angels are mightier in knowledge than men. Yet men can know God through their natural principles; according to [Rom. 1:19](#): "what is known of God is manifest in them." Therefore much more so can the angels.

I answer that, The angels can have some knowledge of God by their own principles. In evidence whereof it must be borne in mind that a thing is known in three ways: first, by the presence of its essence in the knower, as light can be seen in the eye; and so we have said that an angel knows himself---secondly, by the presence of its similitude in the power which knows it, as a stone is seen by the eye from its image being in the eye---thirdly, when the image of the object

[30753] I^a q. 56 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli per sua naturalia Deum cognoscere non possint. Dicit enim Dionysius, I cap. de Div. Nom., quod *Deus est super omnes caelestes mentes incomprehensibili virtute collocatus*. Et postea subdit quod, *quia est supra omnem substantiam, ab omni cognitione est segregatus*.

[30754] I^a q. 56 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, Deus in infinitum distat ab intellectu Angeli. Sed in infinitum distantia non possunt attingi. Ergo videtur quod Angelus per sua naturalia non possit Deum cognoscere.

[30755] I^a q. 56 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, I Cor. XIII dicitur, *videmus nunc per speculum in aenigmate, tunc autem facie ad faciem*. Ex quo videtur quod sit duplex Dei cognitio, una, qua videtur per sui essentiam, secundum quam dicitur videri facie ad faciem; alia, secundum quod videtur in speculo creaturarum. Sed primam Dei cognitionem Angelus habere non potuit per sua naturalia, ut supra ostensum est. Visio autem specularis Angelis non convenit, quia non accipiunt divinam cognitionem e rebus sensibilibus, ut dicit Dionysius, VII cap. de Div. Nom. Ergo Angeli per sua naturalia Deum cognoscere non possunt.

[30756] I^a q. 56 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra, Angeli sunt potentiores in cognoscendo quam homines. Sed homines per sua naturalia Deum cognoscere possunt; secundum illud Rom. I, *quod notum est Dei, manifestum est in illis*. Ergo multo magis Angeli.

[30757] I^a q. 56 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Angeli aliquam cognitionem de Deo habere possunt per sua naturalia. Ad cuius evidentiam, considerandum est quod aliquid tripliciter cognoscitur. Uno modo, per praesentiam suae essentiae in cognoscente, sicut si lux videatur in oculo, et sic dictum est quod Angelus intelligit seipsum. Alio modo, per praesentiam suae similitudinis in potentia cognoscitiva, sicut lapis videtur ab oculo per hoc quod similitudo eius

known is not drawn directly from the object itself, but from something else in which it is made to appear, as when we behold a man in a mirror.

To the first-named class that knowledge of God is likened by which He is seen through His essence; and knowledge such as this cannot accrue to any creature from its natural principles, as was said above ([Q\[12\], A\[4\]](#)). The third class comprises the knowledge whereby we know God while we are on earth, by His likeness reflected in creatures, according to [Rom. 1:20](#): "The invisible things of God are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." Hence, too, we are said to see God in a mirror. But the knowledge, whereby according to his natural principles the angel knows God, stands midway between these two; and is likened to that knowledge whereby a thing is seen through the species abstracted from it. For since God's image is impressed on the very nature of the angel in his essence, the angel knows God in as much as he is the image of God. Yet he does not behold God's essence; because no created likeness is sufficient to represent the Divine essence. Such knowledge then approaches rather to the specular kind; because the angelic nature is itself a kind of mirror representing the Divine image.

Reply to Objection 1: Dionysius is speaking of the knowledge of comprehension, as his words expressly state. In this way God is not known by any created intellect.

Reply to Objection 2: Since an angel's intellect and essence are infinitely remote from God, it follows that he cannot comprehend Him; nor can he see God's essence through his own nature. Yet it does not follow on that account that he can have no knowledge of Him at all: because, as God is infinitely remote from the angel, so the knowledge which God has of Himself is infinitely above the knowledge which an angel has of Him.

Reply to Objection 3: The knowledge which an angel has of God is midway between these two kinds of knowledge; nevertheless it approaches more to one of them, as was said above.

resultat in oculo. Tertio modo, per hoc quod similitudo rei cognitae non accipitur immediate ab ipsa re cognita, sed a re alia, in qua resultat, sicut cum videmus hominem in speculo. Primae igitur cognitioni assimilatur divina cognitio, qua per essentiam suam videtur. Et haec cognitio Dei non potest adesse creaturae alicui per sua naturalia, ut supra dictum est. Tertiae autem cognitioni assimilatur cognitio qua nos cognoscimus Deum in via, per similitudinem eius in creaturis resultantem; secundum illud Rom. I, *invisibilia Dei per ea quae facta sunt, intellecta, conspiciuntur*. Unde et dicimur Deum videre in speculo. Cognitio autem qua Angelus per sua naturalia cognoscit Deum, media est inter has duas; et similatur illi cognitioni qua videtur res per speciem ab ea acceptam. Quia enim imago Dei est in ipsa natura Angeli impressa per suam essentiam, Angelus Deum cognoscit, inquantum est similitudo Dei. Non tamen ipsam essentiam Dei videt, quia nulla similitudo creata est sufficiens ad repraesentandam divinam essentiam. Unde magis ista cognitio tenet se cum speculari, quia et ipsa natura angelica est quoddam speculum divinam similitudinem repraesentans.

[30758] I^a q. 56 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Dionysius loquitur de cognitione comprehensionis, ut expresse eius verba ostendunt. Et sic a nullo intellectu creato cognoscitur.

[30759] I^a q. 56 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod propter hoc quod intellectus et essentia Angeli in infinitum distant a Deo, sequitur quod non possit ipsum comprehendere, nec per suam naturam eius essentiam videre. Non tamen sequitur propter hoc, quod nullam eius cognitionem habere possit, quia sicut Deus in infinitum distat ab Angelo, ita cognitio quam Deus habet de seipso, in infinitum distat a cognitione quam Angelus habet de eo.

[30760] I^a q. 56 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod cognitio quam naturaliter Angelus habet de Deo, est media inter utramque cognitionem, et tamen magis se tenet cum una, ut supra dictum

est.

Q. 57. OF THE ANGEL'S KNOWLEDGE OF MATERIAL THINGS (FIVE ARTICLES)

We next investigate the material objects which are known by the angels. Under this heading there are five points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Whether the angels know the natures of material things?](#)

[\(2\) Whether they know single things?](#)

[\(3\) Whether they know the future?](#)

[\(4\) Whether they know secret thoughts?](#)

[\(5\) Whether they know all mysteries of grace?](#)

Q. 57. A. 1. Whether the angels know material things?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels do not know material things. For the object understood is the perfection of him who understands it. But material things cannot be the perfections of angels, since they are beneath them. Therefore the angels do not know material things.

Objection 2: Further, intellectual vision is only of such things as exist within the soul by their essence, as is said in the gloss [**On 2 Cor. 12:2*, taken from Augustine (Gen. ad lit. xii. 28)]. But the material things cannot enter by their essence into man's soul, nor into the angel's mind. Therefore they cannot be known by intellectual vision, but only by imaginary vision, whereby the images of bodies are apprehended, and by sensible vision, which regards bodies in themselves. Now there is neither imaginary nor sensible vision in the angels, but only intellectual. Therefore the angels cannot know material things.

Objection 3: Further, material things are not actually intelligible, but are knowable by apprehension of sense and of imagination, which does not exist in angels. Therefore angels do not know material things.

On the contrary, Whatever the lower power can do, the higher can do likewise. But man's intellect, which in the order of nature is inferior to the angel's, can know material things. Therefore

[30761] I^a q. 57 pr. Deinde quaeritur de his materialibus quae ab Angelis cognoscuntur. Et circa hoc quaeruntur quinque. Primo, utrum Angeli cognoscant naturas rerum materialium. Secundo, utrum cognoscant singularia. Tertio, utrum cognoscant futura. Quarto, utrum cognoscant cogitationes cordium. Quinto, utrum cognoscant omnia mysteria gratiae.

[30762] I^a q. 57 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli non cognoscant res materiales. Intellectum enim est perfectio intelligentis. Res autem materiales non possunt esse perfectiones Angelorum, cum sint infra ipsos. Ergo Angeli non cognoscunt res materiales.

[30763] I^a q. 57 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, visio intellectualis est eorum quae sunt in anima per sui essentiam, ut dicitur in Glossa, II ad Cor. XII. Sed res materiales non possunt esse in anima hominis, vel in mente Angeli, per suas essentias. Ergo non possunt intellectuali visione cognosci, sed solum imaginaria, qua apprehenduntur similitudines corporum; et sensibili, quae est de ipsis corporibus. In Angelis autem non est visio imaginaria et sensibilis, sed solum intellectualis. Ergo Angeli materialia cognoscere non possunt.

[30764] I^a q. 57 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, res materiales non sunt intelligibiles in actu, sed sunt cognoscibiles apprehensione sensus et imaginationis; quae non est in Angelis. Ergo Angeli materialia non cognoscunt.

[30765] I^a q. 57 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra, quidquid potest inferior virtus, potest virtus superior. Sed intellectus hominis, qui est ordine naturae infra intellectum Angeli, potest cognoscere res

much more can the mind of an angel.

I answer that, The established order of things is for the higher beings to be more perfect than the lower; and for whatever is contained deficiently, partially, and in manifold manner in the lower beings, to be contained in the higher eminently, and in a certain degree of fulness and simplicity. Therefore, in God, as in the highest source of things, all things pre-exist supersubstantially in respect of His simple Being itself, as Dionysius says (Div. Nom. 1). But among other creatures the angels are nearest to God, and resemble Him most; hence they share more fully and more perfectly in the Divine goodness, as Dionysius says (Coel. Hier. iv). Consequently, all material things pre-exist in the angels more simply and less materially even than in themselves, yet in a more manifold manner and less perfectly than in God.

Now whatever exists in any subject, is contained in it after the manner of such subject. But the angels are intellectual beings of their own nature. Therefore, as God knows material things by His essence, so do the angels know them, forasmuch as they are in the angels by their intelligible species.

Reply to Objection 1: The thing understood is the perfection of the one who understands, by reason of the intelligible species which he has in his intellect. And thus the intelligible species which are in the intellect of an angel are perfections and acts in regard to that intellect.

Reply to Objection 2: Sense does not apprehend the essences of things, but only their outward accidents. In like manner neither does the imagination; for it apprehends only the images of bodies. The intellect alone apprehends the essences of things. Hence it is said (De Anima iii, text. 26) that the object of the intellect is "what a thing is," regarding which it does not err; as neither does sense regarding its proper sensible object. So therefore the essences of material things are in the intellect of man and angels, as the thing understood is in him who understands, and not according to their real natures. But some things are in an intellect or in the soul according

material. Ergo multo fortius intellectus Angeli.

[30766] I^a q. 57 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod talis est ordo in rebus, quod superiora in entibus sunt perfectiora inferioribus, et quod in inferioribus continetur deficienter et partialiter et multipliciter, in superioribus continetur eminenter et per quamdam totalitatem et simplicitatem. Et ideo in Deo, sicut in summo rerum vertice, omnia supersubstantialiter praeexistunt secundum ipsum suum simplex esse, ut Dionysius dicit, in libro de Div. Nom. Angeli autem inter ceteras creaturas sunt Deo propinquiores et similiores, unde et plura participant ex bonitate divina, et perfectius, ut Dionysius dicit, IV cap. Cael. Hier. Sic igitur omnia materialia in ipsis Angelis praeexistunt, simplicius quidem et immaterialius quam in ipsis rebus; multiplicius autem et imperfectius quam in Deo. Omne autem quod est in aliquo; est in eo per modum eius in quo est. Angeli autem secundum suam naturam sunt intellectuales. Et ideo, sicut Deus per suam essentiam materialia cognoscit, ita Angeli ea cognoscunt per hoc quod sunt in eis per suas intelligibiles species.

[30767] I^a q. 57 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod intellectum est perfectio intelligentis secundum speciem intelligibilem quam habet in intellectu. Et sic species intelligibiles quae sunt in intellectu Angeli, sunt perfectiones et actus intellectus angelici.

[30768] I^a q. 57 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod sensus non apprehendit essentias rerum, sed exteriora accidentia tantum. Similiter neque imaginatio, sed apprehendit solas similitudines corporum. Intellectus autem solus apprehendit essentias rerum. Unde in III de anima dicitur quod obiectum intellectus est quod quid est, circa quod non errat, sicut neque sensus circa proprium sensibile. Sic ergo essentiae rerum materialium sunt in intellectu hominis vel Angeli, ut intellectum est in intelligente, et non secundum esse suum reale. Quaedam vero sunt quae sunt in intellectu vel in anima secundum utrumque esse. Et utrorumque est visio intellectualis.

to both natures; and in either case there is intellectual vision.

Reply to Objection 3: If an angel were to draw his knowledge of material things from the material things themselves, he would require to make them actually intelligible by a process of abstraction. But he does not derive his knowledge of them from the material things themselves; he has knowledge of material things by actually intelligible species of things, which species are connatural to him; just as our intellect has, by species which it makes intelligible by abstraction.

Q. 57. A. 2. Whether an angel knows singulars?

Objection 1: It would seem that angels do not know singulars. For the Philosopher says (Poster. i, text. 22): "The sense has for its object singulars, but the intellect, universals." Now, in the angels there is no power of understanding save the intellectual power, as is evident from what was said above ([Q\[54\], A\[5\]](#)). Consequently they do not know singulars.

Objection 2: Further, all knowledge comes about by some assimilation of the knower to the object known. But it is not possible for any assimilation to exist between an angel and a singular object, in so far as it is singular; because, as was observed above ([Q\[50\], A\[2\]](#)), an angel is immaterial, while matter is the principle of singularity. Therefore the angel cannot know singulars.

Objection 3: Further, if an angel does know singulars, it is either by singular or by universal species. It is not by singular species; because in this way he would require to have an infinite number of species. Nor is it by universal species; since the universal is not the sufficient principle for knowing the singular as such, because singular things are not known in the universal except potentially. Therefore the angel does not know singulars.

On the contrary, No one can guard what he does not know. But angels guard individual men, according to [Ps. 90:11](#): "He hath given His angels

[30769] I^a q. 57 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, si Angelus acciperet cognitionem rerum materialium ab ipsis rebus materialibus, oporteret quod faceret eas intelligibiles actu, abstrahendo eas. Non autem accipit cognitionem earum a rebus materialibus, sed per species actu intelligibiles rerum sibi connaturales, rerum materialium notitiam habet; sicut intellectus noster secundum species quas intelligibiles facit abstrahendo.

[30770] I^a q. 57 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus singularia non cognoscat. Dicit enim philosophus, in I Physic., quod sensus est singularium, ratio vero (vel intellectus) universalium. In Angelis autem non est vis cognoscitiva nisi intellectiva, ut ex superioribus patet. Ergo singularia non cognoscunt.

[30771] I^a q. 57 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, omnis cognitio est per assimilationem aliquam cognoscentis ad cognitum. Sed non videtur quod possit esse aliqua assimilatio Angeli ad singulare inquantum est singulare, cum Angelus sit immaterialis, ut supra dictum est, singularitatis vero principium sit materia. Ergo Angelus non potest cognoscere singularia.

[30772] I^a q. 57 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, si Angelus scit singularia, aut per species singulares, aut per species universales. Non per singulares, quia sic oporteret quod haberet species infinitas. Neque per universales, quia universale non est sufficiens principium cognoscendi singulare inquantum est singulare, cum in universali singularia non cognoscantur nisi in potentia. Ergo Angelus non cognoscit singularia.

[30773] I^a q. 57 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra, nullus potest custodire quod non cognoscit. Sed Angeli custodiunt homines singulares, secundum illud

charge over Thee." Consequently the angels know singulars.

I answer that, Some have denied to the angels all knowledge of singulars. In the first place this derogates from the Catholic faith, which asserts that these lower things are administered by angels, according to [Heb. 1:14](#): "They are all ministering spirits." Now, if they had no knowledge of singulars, they could exercise no provision over what is going on in this world; since acts belong to individuals: and this is against the text of [Eccles. 5:5](#): "Say not before the angel: There is no providence." Secondly, it is also contrary to the teachings of philosophy, according to which the angels are stated to be the movers of the heavenly spheres, and to move them according to their knowledge and will.

Consequently others have said that the angel possesses knowledge of singulars, but in their universal causes, to which all particular effects are reduced; as if the astronomer were to foretell a coming eclipse from the dispositions of the movements of the heavens. This opinion does not escape the aforesaid implications; because, to know a singular, merely in its universal causes, is not to know it as singular, that is, as it exists here and now. The astronomer, knowing from computation of the heavenly movements that an eclipse is about to happen, knows it in the universal; yet he does not know it as taking place now, except by the senses. But administration, providence and movement are of singulars, as they are here and now existing.

Therefore, it must be said differently, that, as man by his various powers of knowledge knows all classes of things, apprehending universals and immaterial things by his intellect, and things singular and corporeal by the senses, so an angel knows both by his one mental power. For the order of things runs in this way, that the higher a thing is, so much the more is its power united and far-reaching: thus in man himself it is manifest that the common sense which is higher than the proper sense, although it is but one faculty, knows everything apprehended by the five outward senses, and some other things which no outer sense knows; for example, the difference between white and sweet. The same is to be observed in

Psalmi XC, *Angelis suis mandavit de te*, et cetera. Ergo Angeli cognoscunt singularia.

[30774] I^a q. 57 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod quidam totaliter subtraxerunt Angelis singularium cognitionem. Sed hoc primo quidem derogat Catholicae fidei, quae ponit haec inferiora administrari per Angelos, secundum illud Heb. I, *omnes sunt administratorii spiritus*. Si autem singularium notitiam non haberent, nullam providentiam habere possent de his quae in hoc mundo aguntur; cum actus singularium sint. Et hoc est contra illud quod dicitur Eccle. V, *ne dicas coram Angelo, non est providentia*. Secundo, etiam derogat philosophiae documentis, secundum quae ponuntur Angeli motores caelestium orbium, et quod eos moveant secundum intellectum et voluntatem. Et ideo alii dixerunt quod Angelus habet quidem cognitionem singularium, sed in causis universalibus, ad quas reducuntur particulares omnes effectus, sicut si astrologus iudicet de aliqua eclipsi futura, per dispositiones caelestium motuum. Sed haec positio praedicta inconvenientia non evadit, quia sic cognoscere singulare in causis universalibus, non est cognoscere ipsum ut est singulare, hoc est ut est hic et nunc. Astrologus enim cognoscens eclipsim futuram per computationem caelestium motuum, scit eam in universali; et non prout est hic et nunc, nisi per sensum accipiat. Administratio autem et providentia et motus sunt singularium, prout sunt hic et nunc. Et ideo aliter dicendum est quod, sicut homo cognoscit diversis viribus cognitivis omnia rerum genera, intellectu quidem universalialia et immaterialia, sensu autem singularia et corporalia; ita Angelus per unam intellectivam virtutem utraque cognoscit. Hoc enim rerum ordo habet, quod quanto aliquid est superius, tanto habeat virtutem magis unitam et ad plura se extendentem, sicut in ipso homine patet quod sensus communis, qui est superior quam sensus proprius, licet sit unica potentia, omnia cognoscit quae quinque sensibus exterioribus cognoscuntur, et quaedam alia quae nullus sensus exterior cognoscit, scilicet differentiam albi et dulcis. Et simile etiam est in aliis considerare. Unde cum Angelus naturae ordine sit supra hominem, inconveniens est dicere quod homo quacumque sua potentia cognoscat aliquid, quod Angelus per unam vim suam cognoscitivam, scilicet intellectum, non cognoscat. Unde

other cases. Accordingly, since an angel is above man in the order of nature, it is unreasonable to say that a man knows by any one of his powers something which an angel by his one faculty of knowledge, namely, the intellect, does not know. Hence Aristotle pronounces it ridiculous to say that a discord, which is known to us, should be unknown to God (De Anima i, text. 80; Metaph. text. 15).

The manner in which an angel knows singular things can be considered from this, that, as things proceed from God in order that they may subsist in their own natures, so likewise they proceed in order that they may exist in the angelic mind. Now it is clear that there comes forth from God not only whatever belongs to their universal nature, but likewise all that goes to make up their principles of individuation; since He is the cause of the entire substance of the thing, as to both its matter and its form. And for as much as He causes, does He know; for His knowledge is the cause of a thing, as was shown above ([Q\[14\]](#), [A\[8\]](#)). Therefore as by His essence, by which He causes all things, God is the likeness of all things, and knows all things, not only as to their universal natures, but also as to their singularity; so through the species imparted to them do the angels know things, not only as to their universal nature, but likewise in their individual conditions, in so far as they are the manifold representations of that one simple essence.

Reply to Objection 1: The Philosopher is speaking of our intellect, which apprehends only by a process of abstraction; and by such abstraction from material conditions the thing abstracted becomes a universal. Such a manner of understanding is not in keeping with the nature of the angels, as was said above ([Q\[55\]](#), [A\[2\]](#), [A\[3\]](#) ad 1), and consequently there is no comparison.

Reply to Objection 2: It is not according to their nature that the angels are likened to material things, as one thing resembles another by agreement in genus, species, or accident; but as the higher bears resemblance to the lower, as the sun does to fire. Even in this way there is in God a resemblance of all things, as to both matter and form, in so far as there pre-exists in Him as in its

Aristoteles pro inconvenienti habet ut litem, quam nos scimus, Deus ignoret; ut patet in I de anima, et in III Metaphys. Modus autem quo intellectus Angeli singularia cognoscit, ex hoc considerari potest quod, sicut a Deo effluunt res ut subsistant in propriis naturis, ita etiam ut sint in cognitione angelica. Manifestum est autem quod a Deo effluit in rebus non solum illud quod ad naturam universalem pertinet, sed etiam ea quae sunt individuationis principia, est enim causa totius substantiae rei, et quantum ad materiam et quantum ad formam. Et secundum quod causat, sic et cognoscit, quia scientia eius est causa rei, ut supra ostensum est. Sicut igitur Deus per essentiam suam, per quam omnia causat, est similitudo omnium, et per eam omnia cognoscit non solum quantum ad naturas universales, sed etiam quantum ad singularitatem; ita Angeli per species a Deo inditas, res cognoscunt non solum quantum ad naturam universalem, sed etiam secundum earum singularitatem, inquantum sunt quaedam repraesentationes multiplicatae illius unice et simplicis essentiae.

[30775] I^a q. 57 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod philosophus loquitur de intellectu nostro, qui non intelligit res nisi abstrahendo; et per ipsam abstractionem a materialibus conditionibus, id quod abstrahitur, fit universale. Hic autem modus intelligendi non convenit Angelis, ut supra dictum est, et ideo non est eadem ratio.

[30776] I^a q. 57 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod secundum suam naturam Angeli non assimilantur rebus materialibus sicut assimilatur aliquid alicui secundum convenientiam in genere vel in specie, aut in accidente; sed sicut superius habet similitudinem cum inferiori, ut sol cum igne. Et per hunc etiam modum in Deo est similitudo omnium, et quantum ad formam et

cause whatever is to be found in things. For the same reason, the species in the angel's intellect, which are images drawn from the Divine essence, are the images of things not only as to their form, but also as to their matter.

Reply to Objection 3: Angels know singulars by universal forms, which nevertheless are the images of things both as to their universal, and as to their individuating principles. How many things can be known by the same species, has been already stated above ([Q\[55\], A\[3\]](#), ad 3).

Q. 57. A. 3. Whether angels know the future?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels know future events. For angels are mightier in knowledge than men. But some men know many future events. Therefore much more do the angels.

Objection 2: Further, the present and the future are differences of time. But the angel's intellect is above time; because, as is said in De Causis, "an intelligence keeps pace with eternity," that is, aeternity. Therefore, to the angel's mind, past and future are not different, but he knows each indifferently.

Objection 3: Further, the angel does not understand by species derived from things, but by innate universal species. But universal species refer equally to present, past, and future. Therefore it appears that the angels know indifferently things past, present, and future.

Objection 4: Further, as a thing is spoken of as distant by reason of time, so is it by reason of place. But angels know things which are distant according to place. Therefore they likewise know things distant according to future time.

On the contrary, Whatever is the exclusive sign

quantum ad materiam, inquantum in ipso praeexistit ut in causa quidquid in rebus invenitur. Et eadem ratione species intellectus Angeli, quae sunt quaedam derivatae similitudines a divina essentia, sunt similitudines rerum non solum quantum ad formam, sed etiam quantum ad materiam.

[30777] I^a q. 57 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod Angeli cognoscunt singularia per formas universales, quae tamen sunt similitudines rerum et quantum ad principia universalia, et quantum ad individuationis principia. Quomodo autem per eandem speciem possint multa cognosci iam supra dictum est.

[30778] I^a q. 57 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli cognoscant futura. Angeli enim potentiores sunt in cognoscendo quam homines. Sed homines aliqui cognoscunt multa futura. Ergo multo fortius Angeli.

[30779] I^a q. 57 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, praesens et futurum sunt differentiae temporis. Sed intellectus Angeli est supra tempus, parificatur enim intelligentia aeternitati, idest aevo, ut dicitur in libro de causis. Ergo quantum ad intellectum Angeli, non differunt praeteritum et futurum; sed indifferenter cognoscit utrumque.

[30780] I^a q. 57 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, Angelus non cognoscit per species acceptas a rebus, sed per species innatas universales. Sed species universales aequaliter se habent ad praesens, praeteritum et futurum. Ergo videtur quod Angeli indifferenter cognoscant praeterita et praesentia et futura.

[30781] I^a q. 57 a. 3 arg. 4 Praeterea, sicut aliquid dicitur distans secundum tempus, ita secundum locum. Sed Angeli cognoscunt distantia secundum locum. Ergo etiam cognoscunt distantia secundum tempus futurum.

[30782] I^a q. 57 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra, id quod est

of the Divinity, does not belong to the angels. But to know future events is the exclusive sign of the Divinity, according to [Is. 41:23](#): "Show the things that are to come hereafter, and we shall know that ye are gods." Therefore the angels do not know future events.

I answer that, The future can be known in two ways. First, it can be known in its cause. And thus, future events which proceed necessarily from their causes, are known with sure knowledge; as that the sun will rise tomorrow. But events which proceed from their causes in the majority of cases, are not known for certain, but conjecturally; thus the doctor knows beforehand the health of the patient. This manner of knowing future events exists in the angels, and by so much the more than it does in us, as they understand the causes of things both more universally and more perfectly; thus doctors who penetrate more deeply into the causes of an ailment can pronounce a surer verdict on the future issue thereof. But events which proceed from their causes in the minority of cases are quite unknown; such as casual and chance events.

In another way future events are known in themselves. To know the future in this way belongs to God alone; and not merely to know those events which happen of necessity, or in the majority of cases, but even casual and chance events; for God sees all things in His eternity, which, being simple, is present to all time, and embraces all time. And therefore God's one glance is cast over all things which happen in all time as present before Him; and He beholds all things as they are in themselves, as was said before when dealing with God's knowledge ([Q\[14\], A\[13\]](#)). But the mind of an angel, and every created intellect, fall far short of God's eternity; hence the future as it is in itself cannot be known by any created intellect.

Reply to Objection 1: Men cannot know future things except in their causes, or by God's revelation. The angels know the future in the same way, but much more distinctly.

Reply to Objection 2: Although the angel's intellect is above that time according to which

proprium signum divinitatis, non convenit Angelis. Sed cognoscere futura est proprium signum divinitatis; secundum illud Isaiae XLI, *annuntiate quae ventura sunt in futurum, et sciemus quod dii estis vos*. Ergo Angeli non cognoscunt futura.

[30783] I^a q. 57 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod futurum dupliciter potest cognosci. Uno modo, in causa sua. Et sic futura quae ex necessitate ex causis suis proveniunt, per certam scientiam cognoscuntur, ut solem oriri cras. Quae vero ex suis causis proveniunt ut in pluribus, cognoscuntur non per certitudinem, sed per coniecturam; sicut medicus praecognoscit sanitatem infirmi. Et iste modus cognoscendi futura adest Angelis; et tanto magis quam nobis, quanto magis rerum causas et universalius et perfectius cognoscunt; sicut medici qui acutius vident causas, melius de futuro statu aegritudinis prognosticantur. Quae vero proveniunt ex causis suis ut in paucioribus, penitus sunt ignota, sicut casualia et fortuita. Alio modo cognoscuntur futura in seipsis. Et sic solius Dei est futura cognoscere, non solum quae ex necessitate proveniunt, vel ut in pluribus, sed etiam casualia et fortuita, quia Deus videt omnia in sua aeternitate, quae, cum sit simplex, toti tempori adest, et ipsum concludit. Et ideo unus Dei intuitus fertur in omnia quae aguntur per totum tempus sicut in praesentia, et videt omnia ut in seipsis sunt; sicut supra dictum est cum de Dei scientia ageretur. Angelicus autem intellectus, et quilibet intellectus creatus, deficit ab aeternitate divina. Unde non potest ab aliquo intellectu creato cognosci futurum, ut est in suo esse.

[30784] I^a q. 57 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod homines non cognoscunt futura nisi in causis suis, vel Deo revelante. Et sic Angeli multo subtilius futura cognoscunt.

[30785] I^a q. 57 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod, licet intellectus Angeli sit supra tempus quo

corporeal movements are reckoned, yet there is a time in his mind according to the succession of intelligible concepts; of which Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. viii) that "God moves the spiritual creature according to time." And thus, since there is succession in the angel's intellect, not all things that happen through all time, are present to the angelic mind.

Reply to Objection 3: Although the species in the intellect of an angel, in so far as they are species, refer equally to things present, past, and future; nevertheless the present, past, and future; nevertheless the present, past, and future do not bear the same relations to the species. Present things have a nature according to which they resemble the species in the mind of an angel: and so they can be known thereby. Things which are yet to come have not yet a nature whereby they are likened to such species; consequently, they cannot be known by those species.

Reply to Objection 4: Things distant according to place are already existing in nature; and share in some species, whose image is in the angel; whereas this is not true of future things, as has been stated. Consequently there is no comparison.

Q. 57. A. 4. Whether angels know secret thoughts?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels know secret thoughts. For Gregory (Moral. xviii), explaining [Job 28:17](#): "Gold or crystal cannot equal it," says that "then," namely in the bliss of those rising from the dead, "one shall be as evident to another as he is to himself, and when once the mind of each is seen, his conscience will at the same time be penetrated." But those who rise shall be like the angels, as is stated ([Mat. 22:30](#)). Therefore an angel can see what is in another's conscience.

Objection 2: Further, intelligible species bear the same relation to the intellect as shapes do to bodies. But when the body is seen its shape is seen. Therefore, when an intellectual substance is seen, the intelligible species within it is also seen. Consequently, when one angel beholds another, or

mensurantur corporales motus, est tamen in intellectu Angeli tempus secundum successionem intelligibilium conceptionum; secundum quod dicit Augustinus, VIII super Gen. ad Litt., quod *Deus movet spiritualem creaturam per tempus*. Et ita, cum sit successio in intellectu Angeli, non omnia quae aguntur per totum tempus, sunt ei praesentia.

[30786] I^a q. 57 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, licet species quae sunt in intellectu Angeli, quantum est de se, aequaliter se habeant ad praesentia, praeterita et futura; tamen praesentia, praeterita et futura non aequaliter se habent ad rationes. Quia ea quae praesentia sunt, habent naturam per quam assimilantur speciebus quae sunt in mente Angeli, et sic per eas cognosci possunt. Sed quae futura sunt, nondum habent naturam per quam illis assilientur, unde per eas cognosci non possunt.

[30787] I^a q. 57 a. 3 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod distantia secundum locum sunt iam in rerum natura, et participant aliquam speciem, cuius similitudo est in Angelo, quod non est verum de futuris, ut dictum est. Et ideo non est simile.

[30788] I^a q. 57 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli cognoscant cogitationes cordium. Dicit enim Gregorius, in moralibus, super illud Iob XXVIII, *non aequabitur ei aurum vel vitrum*, quod tunc, scilicet in beatitudine resurgentium, unus erit *perspicabilis alteri sicut ipse sibi, et cum uniuscuiusque intellectus attenditur, simul conscientia penetratur*. Sed resurgentes erunt similes Angelis, sicut habetur Matth. XXII. Ergo unus Angelus potest videre id quod est in conscientia alterius.

[30789] I^a q. 57 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, sicut se habent figurae ad corpora, ita se habent species intelligibiles ad intellectum. Sed viso corpore, videtur eius figura. Ergo visa substantia intellectuali, videtur species intelligibilis quae est in ipsa. Ergo, cum Angelus videat alium

even a soul, it seems that he can see the thoughts of both.

Objection 3: Further, the ideas of our intellect resemble the angel more than do the images in our imagination; because the former are actually understood, while the latter are understood only potentially. But the images in our imagination can be known by an angel as corporeal things are known: because the imagination is a corporeal faculty. Therefore it seems that an angel can know the thoughts of the intellect.

On the contrary, What is proper to God does not belong to the angels. But it is proper to God to read the secrets of hearts, according to [Jer. 17:9](#): "The heart is perverse above all things, and unsearchable; who can know it? I am the Lord, Who search the heart." Therefore angels do not know the secrets of hearts.

I answer that, A secret thought can be known in two ways: first, in its effect. In this way it can be known not only by an angel, but also by man; and with so much the greater subtlety according as the effect is the more hidden. For thought is sometimes discovered not merely by outward act, but also by change of countenance; and doctors can tell some passions of the soul by the mere pulse. Much more then can angels, or even demons, the more deeply they penetrate those occult bodily modifications. Hence Augustine says (*De divin. daemon.*) that demons "sometimes with the greatest faculty learn man's dispositions, not only when expressed by speech, but even when conceived in thought, when the soul expresses them by certain signs in the body"; although (*Retract. ii, 30*) he says "it cannot be asserted how this is done."

In another way thoughts can be known as they are in the mind, and affections as they are in the will: and thus God alone can know the thoughts of hearts and affections of wills. The reason of this is, because the rational creature is subject to God only, and He alone can work in it Who is its principal object and last end: this will be developed later ([Q\[63\], A\[1\]](#); [Q\[105\], A\[5\]](#)). Consequently all that is in the will, and all things that depend only on the will, are known to God

Angelum, et etiam animam, videtur quod possit videre cogitationem utriusque.

[30790] I^a q. 57 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, ea quae sunt in intellectu nostro, sunt similia Angelo quam ea quae sunt in phantasia, cum haec sint intellecta in actu, illa vero in potentia tantum. Sed ea quae sunt in phantasia, possunt cognosci ab Angelo sicut corporalia, cum phantasia sit virtus corporis. Ergo videtur quod Angelus possit cognoscere cogitationes intellectus.

[30791] I^a q. 57 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra, quod est proprium Dei, non convenit Angelis. Sed cognoscere cogitationes cordium est proprium Dei, secundum illud Ierem. XVII, *pravum est cor hominis et inscrutabile, quis cognoscet illud? Ego, dominus, scrutans corda*. Ergo Angeli non cognoscunt secreta cordium.

[30792] I^a q. 57 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod cogitatio cordis dupliciter potest cognosci. Uno modo, in suo effectu. Et sic non solum ab Angelo, sed etiam ab homine cognosci potest; et tanto subtilius, quanto effectus huiusmodi fuerit magis occultus. Cognoscitur enim cogitatio interdum non solum per actum exteriorem, sed etiam per immutationem vultus, et etiam medici aliquas affectiones animi per pulsum cognoscere possunt. Et multo magis Angeli, vel etiam Daemones, quanto subtilius huiusmodi immutationes occultas corporales perpendunt. Unde Augustinus dicit, in libro de divinatione Daemonum, quod *aliquando hominum dispositiones, non solum voce prolatas, verum etiam cogitatione conceptas, cum signa quaedam in corpore exprimuntur ex animo, tota facilitate perdiscunt*, quamvis in libro *Retract.* hoc dicat non esse asserendum quomodo fiat. Alio modo possunt cognosci cogitationes, prout sunt in intellectu; et affectiones, prout sunt in voluntate. Et sic solus Deus cogitationes cordium et affectiones voluntatum cognoscere potest. Cuius ratio est, quia voluntas rationalis creaturae soli Deo subiacet; et ipse solus in eam operari potest, qui est principale eius obiectum, ut ultimus finis; et hoc magis infra patebit. Et ideo ea quae in voluntate sunt, vel quae ex voluntate sola dependent, soli Deo sunt nota. Manifestum est

alone. Now it is evident that it depends entirely on the will for anyone actually to consider anything; because a man who has a habit of knowledge, or any intelligible species, uses them at will. Hence the Apostle says ([1 Cor. 2:11](#)): "For what man knoweth the things of a man, but the spirit of a man that is in him?"

Reply to Objection 1: In the present life one man's thought is not known by another owing to a twofold hindrance; namely, on account of the grossness of the body, and because the will shuts up its secrets. The first obstacle will be removed at the Resurrection, and does not exist at all in the angels; while the second will remain, and is in the angels now. Nevertheless the brightness of the body will show forth the quality of the soul; as to its amount of grace and of glory. In this way one will be able to see the mind of another.

Reply to Objection 2: Although one angel sees the intelligible species of another, by the fact that the species are proportioned to the rank of these substances according to greater or lesser universality, yet it does not follow that one knows how far another makes use of them by actual consideration.

Reply to Objection 3: The appetite of the brute does not control its act, but follows the impression of some other corporeal or spiritual cause. Since, therefore, the angels know corporeal things and their dispositions, they can thereby know what is passing in the appetite or in the imaginative apprehension of the brute beasts, and even of man, in so far as the sensitive appetite sometimes, through following some bodily impression, influences his conduct, as always happens in brutes. Yet the angels do not necessarily know the movement of the sensitive appetite and the imaginative apprehension of man in so far as these are moved by the will and reason; because, even the lower part of the soul has some share of reason, as obeying its ruler, as is said in Ethics iii, 12. But it does not follow that, if the angel knows what is passing through man's sensitive appetite or imagination, he knows what is in the thought or will: because the intellect or will is not subject to

autem quod ex sola voluntate dependet quod aliquis actu aliqua consideret, quia cum aliquis habet habitum scientiae, vel species intelligibiles in eo existentes, utitur eis cum vult. Et ideo dicit apostolus, I Cor. II, quod *quae sunt hominis, nemo novit nisi spiritus hominis, qui in ipso est.*

[30793] I^a q. 57 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod modo cogitatio unius hominis non cognoscitur ab alio, propter duplex impedimentum, scilicet propter grossitiam corporis, et propter voluntatem claudentem sua secreta. Primum autem obstaculum tolletur in resurrectione, nec est in Angelis. Sed secundum impedimentum manebit post resurrectionem, et est modo in Angelis. Et tamen qualitatem mentis, quantum ad quantitatem gratiae et gloriae, repraesentabit claritas corporis. Et sic unus mentem alterius videre poterit.

[30794] I^a q. 57 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod, etsi unus Angelus, species intelligibiles alterius videat, per hoc quod modus intelligibilium specierum, secundum maiorem et minorem universalitatem, proportionatur nobilitati substantiarum; non tamen sequitur quod unus cognoscat quomodo alius illis intelligibilibus speciebus utitur actualiter considerando.

[30795] I^a q. 57 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod appetitus brutalis non est dominus sui actus, sed sequitur impressionem alterius causae corporalis vel spiritualis. Quia igitur Angeli cognoscunt res corporales et dispositiones earum, possunt per haec cognoscere quod est in appetitu et in apprehensione phantastica brutorum animalium; et etiam hominum, secundum quod in eis quandoque appetitus sensitivus procedit in actum, sequens aliquam impressionem corporalem, sicut in brutis semper est. Non tamen oportet quod Angeli cognoscant motum appetitus sensitivi et apprehensionem phantasticam hominis, secundum quod moventur a voluntate et ratione, quia etiam inferior pars animae participat aliquantulum rationem, sicut obediens imperanti, ut dicitur in I Ethic. Nec tamen sequitur quod, si Angelus cognoscit quod est in appetitu sensitivo vel phantasia hominis, quod cognoscat id quod est in cogitatione vel voluntate, quia intellectus vel

the sensitive appetite or the imagination, but can make various uses of them.

voluntas non subiacet appetitui sensitivo et phantasiae, sed potest eis diversimode uti.

Q. 57. A. 5. Whether the angels know the mysteries of grace?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels know mysteries of grace. For, the mystery of the Incarnation is the most excellent of all mysteries. But the angels knew of it from the beginning; for Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. v, 19): "This mystery was hidden in God through the ages, yet so that it was known to the princes and powers in heavenly places." And the Apostle says ([1 Tim. 3:16](#)): "That great mystery of godliness appeared unto angels*." [*Vulg.: 'Great is the mystery of godliness, which . . . appeared unto angels.'] Therefore the angels know the mysteries of grace.

Objection 2: Further, the reasons of all mysteries of grace are contained in the Divine wisdom. But the angels behold God's wisdom, which is His essence. Therefore they know the mysteries of grace.

Objection 3: Further, the prophets are enlightened by the angels, as is clear from Dionysius (Coel. Hier. iv). But the prophets knew mysteries of grace; for it is said ([Amos 3:7](#)): "For the Lord God doth nothing without revealing His secret to His servants the prophets." Therefore angels know the mysteries of grace.

On the contrary, No one learns what he knows already. Yet even the highest angels seek out and learn mysteries of grace. For it is stated (Coel. Hier. vii) that "Sacred Scripture describes some heavenly essences as questioning Jesus, and learning from Him the knowledge of His Divine work for us; and Jesus as teaching them directly": as is evident in [Is. 63:1](#), where, on the angels asking, "Who is he who cometh up from Edom?" Jesus answered, "It is I, Who speak justice." Therefore the angels do not know mysteries of grace.

I answer that, There is a twofold knowledge in the angel. The first is his natural knowledge, according to which he knows things both by his

[30796] I^a q. 57 a. 5 arg. 1 Ad quantum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli mysteria gratiae cognoscant. Quia inter omnia mysteria excellentius est mysterium incarnationis Christi. Sed hoc Angeli cognoverunt a principio, dicit enim Augustinus, V super Gen. ad Litt., quod *sic fuit hoc mysterium absconditum a saeculis in Deo, ut tamen innotesceret principibus et potestatibus in caelestibus*. Et dicit apostolus, I ad Tim. III, quod *apparuit Angelis illud magnum sacramentum pietatis*. Ergo Angeli mysteria gratiae cognoscunt.

[30797] I^a q. 57 a. 5 arg. 2 Praeterea, rationes omnium mysteriorum gratiae in divina sapientia continentur. Sed Angeli vident ipsam Dei sapientiam, quae est eius essentia. Ergo Angeli mysteria gratiae cognoscunt.

[30798] I^a q. 57 a. 5 arg. 3 Praeterea, prophetae per Angelos instruuntur, ut patet per Dionysium, IV cap. Angel. Hier. Sed prophetae mysteria gratiae cognoverunt, dicitur enim Amos III, *non faciet dominus verbum, nisi revelaverit secretum ad servos suos, prophetas*. Ergo Angeli mysteria gratiae cognoscunt.

[30799] I^a q. 57 a. 5 s. c. Sed contra est quod nullus discit illud quod cognoscit. Sed Angeli, etiam supremi, quaerunt de divinis mysteriis gratiae, et ea discunt, dicitur enim VII cap. Cael. Hier., quod *sacra Scriptura inducit quasdam caelestes essentias ad ipsum Iesum quaestionem facientes, et addiscentes scientiam divinae eius operationis pro nobis, et Iesum eas sine medio docentem*; ut patet Isaiae LXIII, ubi quaerentibus Angelis, quis est iste qui venit de Edom? Respondit Iesus, ego, qui loquor iustitiam. Ergo Angeli non cognoscunt mysteria gratiae.

[30800] I^a q. 57 a. 5 co. Respondeo dicendum quod in Angelis est cognitio duplex. Una quidem naturalis, secundum quam cognoscunt res tum per

essence, and by innate species. By such knowledge the angels cannot know mysteries of grace. For these mysteries depend upon the pure will of God: and if an angel cannot learn the thoughts of another angel, which depend upon the will of such angel, much less can he ascertain what depends entirely upon God's will. The Apostle reasons in this fashion ([1 Cor. 2:11](#)): "No one knoweth the things of a man [*Vulg.: 'What man knoweth the things of a man, but . . . ?'], but the spirit of a man that is in him." So, "the things also that are of God no man knoweth but the Spirit of God."

There is another knowledge of the angels, which renders them happy; it is the knowledge whereby they see the Word, and things in the Word. By such vision they know mysteries of grace, but not all mysteries: nor do they all know them equally; but just as God wills them to learn by revelation; as the Apostle says ([1 Cor. 2:10](#)): "But to us God hath revealed them through His Spirit"; yet so that the higher angels beholding the Divine wisdom more clearly, learn more and deeper mysteries in the vision of God, which mysteries they communicate to the lower angels by enlightening them. Some of these mysteries they knew from the very beginning of their creation; others they are taught afterwards, as befits their ministrations.

Reply to Objection 1: One can speak in two ways of the mystery of the Incarnation. First of all, in general; and in this way it was revealed to all from the commencement of their beatitude. The reason of this is, that this is a kind of general principle to which all their duties are ordered. For "all are [*Vulg.: 'Are they not all.'] ministering spirits, sent to minister for them who shall receive the inheritance of salvation ([Heb. 1:14](#))"; and this is brought by the mystery of the Incarnation. Hence it was necessary for all of them to be instructed in this mystery from the very beginning.

We can speak of the mystery of the Incarnation in another way, as to its special conditions. Thus not all the angels were instructed on all points from the beginning; even the higher angels learned these afterwards, as appears from the passage of Dionysius already quoted.

essentiam suam, tum etiam per species innatas. Et hac cognitione mysteria gratiae Angeli cognoscere non possunt. Haec enim mysteria ex pura Dei voluntate dependent, si autem unus Angelus non potest cognoscere cogitationes alterius ex voluntate eius dependentes, multo minus potest cognoscere ea quae ex sola Dei voluntate dependent. Et sic argumentatur apostolus, I Cor. II, *quae sunt hominis, nemo novit nisi spiritus hominis, qui in ipso est. Ita et quae sunt Dei, nemo novit nisi spiritus Dei*. Est autem alia Angelorum cognitio, quae eos beatos facit, qua vident verbum et res in verbo. Et hac quidem visione cognoscunt mysteria gratiae, non quidem omnia, nec aequaliter omnes sed secundum quod Deus voluerit eis revelare; secundum illud apostoli, I Cor. II, *nobis autem revelavit Deus per spiritum suum*. Ita tamen quod superiores Angeli, perspicacius divinam sapientiam contemplantes, plura mysteria et altiora in ipsa Dei visione cognoscunt, quae inferioribus manifestant, eos illuminando. Et horum etiam mysteriorum quaedam a principio suae creationis cognoverunt; quaedam vero postmodum, secundum quod eorum officiis congruit, edocentur.

[30801] I^a q. 57 a. 5 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod de mysterio incarnationis Christi dupliciter contingit loqui. Uno modo, in generali, et sic omnibus revelatum est a principio suae beatitudinis. Cuius ratio est, quia hoc est quoddam generale principium, ad quod omnia eorum officia ordinantur, *omnes enim sunt administratorii spiritus*, ut dicitur Heb. I, *in ministerium missi propter eos qui haereditatem capiunt salutis*; quod quidem fit per incarnationis mysterium. Unde oportuit de hoc mysterio omnes a principio communiter edoceri. Alio modo possumus loqui de mysterio incarnationis quantum ad speciales condiciones. Et sic non omnes Angeli a principio de omnibus sunt edocti, immo quidam, etiam superiores Angeli, postmodum didicerunt, ut patet per auctoritatem Dionysii inductam.

Reply to Objection 2: Although the angels in bliss behold the Divine wisdom, yet they do not comprehend it. So it is not necessary for them to know everything hidden in it.

Reply to Objection 3: Whatever the prophets knew by revelation of the mysteries of grace, was revealed in a more excellent way to the angels. And although God revealed in general to the prophets what He was one day to do regarding the salvation of the human race, still the apostles knew some particulars of the same, which the prophets did not know. Thus we read ([Eph. 3:4,5](#)): "As you reading, may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ, which in other generations was not known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed to His holy apostles." Among the prophets also, the later ones knew what the former did not know; according to [Ps. 118:100](#): "I have had understanding above ancients," and Gregory says: "The knowledge of Divine things increased as time went on" (Hom. xvi in Ezech.).

[30802] I^a q. 57 a. 5 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod, licet Angeli beati divinam sapientiam contemplentur, non tamen eam comprehendunt. Et ideo non oportet quod cognoscant quidquid in ea latet.

[30803] I^a q. 57 a. 5 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod quidquid prophetae cognoverunt de mysteriis gratiae per revelationem divinam, multo excellentius est Angelis revelatum. Et licet prophetis ea quae Deus facturus erat circa salutem humani generis, in generali revelaverit; quaedam tamen specialia apostoli circa hoc cognoverunt, quae prophetae non cognoverant; secundum illud Ephes. III, *potestis, legentes, intelligere prudentiam meam in mysterio Christi, quod aliis generationibus non est agnitus, sicut nunc revelatum est sanctis apostolis eius*. Inter ipsos etiam prophetas, posteriores cognoverunt quod priores non cognoverant; secundum illud Psalmi CXVIII, *super senes intellexi*. Et Gregorius dicit quod per successiones temporum, crevit divinae cognitionis augmentum.

Q. 58. OF THE MODE OF ANGELIC KNOWLEDGE (SEVEN ARTICLES)

After the foregoing we have now to treat of the mode of the angelic knowledge, concerning which there are seven points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Whether the angel's intellect be sometimes in potentiality, and sometimes in act?](#)

[\(2\) Whether the angel can understand many things at the same time?](#)

[\(3\) Whether the angel's knowledge is discursive?](#)

[\(4\) Whether he understands by composing and dividing?](#)

[\(5\) Whether there can be error in the angel's intellect?](#)

[\(6\) Whether his knowledge can be styled as morning and evening?](#)

[\(7\) Whether the morning and evening knowledge are the same, or do they differ?](#)

Q. 58. A. 1. Whether the angel's intellect is sometimes in potentiality, sometimes in act?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angel's intellect is sometimes in potentiality and sometimes in act. For movement is the act of what is in potentiality, as stated in Phys. iii, 6. But the angels' minds are moved by understanding, as Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv). Therefore the angelic minds are sometimes in potentiality.

Objection 2: Further, since desire is of a thing not possessed but possible to have, whoever desires to know anything is in potentiality thereto. But it is said ([1 Pet. 1:12](#)): "On Whom the angels desire to look." Therefore the angel's intellect is sometimes in potentiality.

Objection 3: Further, in the book De Causis it is stated that "an intelligence understands according to the mode of its substance." But the angel's intelligence has some admixture of potentiality. Therefore it sometimes understands potentially.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. ii):

[30804] I^a q. 58 pr. Post haec considerandum est de modo angelicae cognitionis. Et circa hoc quaeruntur septem. Primo, utrum intellectus Angeli quandoque sit in potentia, quandoque in actu. Secundo, utrum Angelus possit simul intelligere multa. Tertio, utrum intelligat discurrendo. Quarto, utrum intelligat componendo et dividendo. Quinto, utrum in intellectu Angeli possit esse falsitas. Sexto, utrum cognitio Angeli possit dici matutina et vespertina. Septimo, utrum sit eadem cognitio matutina et vespertina, vel diversae.

[30805] I^a q. 58 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod intellectus Angeli quandoque sit in potentia. Motus enim est actus existentis in potentia, ut dicitur III Physic. Sed mentes angelicae intelligendo moventur, ut dicit Dionysius, IV cap. de Div. Nom. Ergo mentes angelicae quandoque sunt in potentia.

[30806] I^a q. 58 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, cum desiderium sit rei non habitae, possibilis tamen haberi, quicumque desiderat aliquid intelligere, est in potentia ad illud. Sed I Petri I, dicitur, *in quem desiderant Angeli prospicere*. Ergo intellectus Angeli quandoque est in potentia.

[30807] I^a q. 58 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, in libro de causis dicitur quod intelligentia intelligit secundum modum suae substantiae. Sed substantia Angeli habet aliquid de potentia permixtum. Ergo quandoque intelligit in potentia.

[30808] I^a q. 58 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod

"Since the angels were created, in the eternity of the Word, they enjoy holy and devout contemplation." Now a contemplating intellect is not in potentiality, but in act. Therefore the intellect of an angel is not in potentiality.

I answer that, As the Philosopher states (De Anima iii, text. 8; Phys. viii, 32), the intellect is in potentiality in two ways; first, "as before learning or discovering," that is, before it has the habit of knowledge; secondly, as "when it possesses the habit of knowledge, but does not actually consider." In the first way an angel's intellect is never in potentiality with regard to the things to which his natural knowledge extends. For, as the higher, namely, the heavenly, bodies have no potentiality to existence, which is not fully actuated, in the same way the heavenly intellects, the angels, have no intelligible potentiality which is not fully completed by connatural intelligible species. But with regard to things divinely revealed to them, there is nothing to hinder them from being in potentiality: because even the heavenly bodies are at times in potentiality to being enlightened by the sun.

In the second way an angel's intellect can be in potentiality with regard to things learnt by natural knowledge; for he is not always actually considering everything that he knows by natural knowledge. But as to the knowledge of the Word, and of the things he beholds in the Word, he is never in this way in potentiality; because he is always actually beholding the Word, and the things he sees in the Word. For the bliss of the angels consists in such vision; and beatitude does not consist in habit, but in act, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. i, 8).

Reply to Objection 1: Movement is taken there not as the act of something imperfect, that is, of something existing in potentiality, but as the act of something perfect, that is, of one actually existing. In this way understanding and feeling are termed movements, as stated in De Anima iii, text. 28.

Reply to Objection 2: Such desire on the part of the angels does not exclude the object desired, but weariness thereof. Or they are said to desire the

Augustinus dicit, II super Gen. ad Litt., quod *Angeli, ex quo creati sunt, ipsa verbi aeternitate, sancta et pia contemplatione perfruuntur*. Sed intellectus contemplanus non est in potentia, sed in actu. Ergo intellectus Angeli non est in potentia.

[30809] I^a q. 58 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut philosophus dicit, in III de anima et in VIII Physic., intellectus dupliciter est in potentia, uno modo, sicut ante addiscere vel invenire, idest antequam habeat habitum scientiae; alio modo dicitur esse in potentia, sicut cum iam habet habitum scientiae, sed non considerat. Primo igitur modo, intellectus Angeli nunquam est in potentia respectu eorum ad quae eius cognitio naturalis se extendere potest. Sicut enim corpora superiora, scilicet caelestia, non habent potentiam ad esse, quae non sit completa per actum; ita caelestes intellectus, scilicet Angeli, non habent aliquam intelligibilem potentiam, quae non sit totaliter completa per species intelligibiles connaturales eis. Sed quantum ad ea quae eis divinitus revelantur, nihil prohibet intellectus eorum esse in potentia, quia sic etiam corpora caelestia sunt in potentia quandoque ut illuminentur a sole. Secundo vero modo, intellectus Angeli potest esse in potentia ad ea quae cognoscit naturali cognitione, non enim omnia quae naturali cognitione cognoscit, semper actu considerat. Sed ad cognitionem verbi, et eorum quae in verbo videt, nunquam hoc modo est in potentia, quia semper actu intuetur verbum, et ea quae in verbo videt. In hac enim visione eorum beatitudo consistit, beatitudo autem non consistit in habitu, sed in actu, ut dicit philosophus, in I Ethic.

[30810] I^a q. 58 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod motus ibi non sumitur secundum quod est actus imperfecti, idest existentis in potentia; sed secundum quod est actus perfecti, idest existentis in actu. Sic enim intelligere et sentire dicuntur motus, ut dicitur in III de anima.

[30811] I^a q. 58 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod desiderium illud Angelorum non excludit rem desideratam, sed eius fastidium. Vel dicuntur

vision of God with regard to fresh revelations, which they receive from God to fit them for the tasks which they have to perform.

Reply to Objection 3: In the angel's substance there is no potentiality divested of act. In the same way, the angel's intellect is never so in potentiality as to be without act.

Q. 58. A. 2. Whether an angel can understand many things at the same time?

Objection 1: It would seem that an angel cannot understand many things at the same time. For the Philosopher says (Topic. ii, 4) that "it may happen that we know many things, but understand only one."

Objection 2: Further, nothing is understood unless the intellect be informed by an intelligible species; just as the body is formed by shape. But one body cannot be formed into many shapes. Therefore neither can one intellect simultaneously understand various intelligible things.

Objection 3: Further, to understand is a kind of movement. But no movement terminates in various terms. Therefore many things cannot be understood altogether.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. iv, 32): "The spiritual faculty of the angelic mind comprehends most easily at the same time all things that it wills."

I answer that, As unity of term is requisite for unity of movement, so is unity of object required for unity of operation. Now it happens that several things may be taken as several or as one; like the parts of a continuous whole. For if each of the parts be considered severally they are many: consequently neither by sense nor by intellect are they grasped by one operation, nor all at once. In another way they are taken as forming one in the whole; and so they are grasped both by sense and intellect all at once and by one operation; as long as the entire continuous whole is considered, as is stated in De Anima iii, text. 23. In this way our

desiderare Dei visionem, quantum ad novas revelationes, quas pro opportunitate negotiorum a Deo recipiunt.

[30812] I^a q. 58 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod in substantia Angeli non est aliqua potentia denudata ab actu. Et similiter nec intellectus Angeli sic est in potentia, quod sit absque actu.

[30813] I^a q. 58 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus non possit simul multa intelligere. Dicit enim philosophus, II Topic., quod *contingit multa scire, sed unum tantum intelligere*.

[30814] I^a q. 58 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, nihil intelligitur nisi secundum quod intellectus formatur per speciem intelligibilem, sicut corpus formatur per figuram. Sed unum corpus non potest formari diversis figuris. Ergo unus intellectus non potest simul intelligere diversa intelligibilia.

[30815] I^a q. 58 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, intelligere est motus quidam. Nullus autem motus terminatur ad diversos terminos. Ergo non contingit simul multa intelligere.

[30816] I^a q. 58 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicit Augustinus, IV Sup. Gen. ad Litt., *potentia spiritualis mentis angelicae cuncta quae voluerit, facillime simul comprehendit*.

[30817] I^a q. 58 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut ad unitatem motus requiritur unitas termini, ita ad unitatem operationis requiritur unitas obiecti. Contingit autem aliqua accipi ut plura, et ut unum; sicut partes alicuius continui. Si enim unaquaeque per se accipiat, plures sunt, unde et non una operatione, nec simul accipiuntur per sensum et intellectum. Alio modo accipiuntur secundum quod sunt unum in toto, et sic simul et una operatione cognoscuntur tam per sensum quam per intellectum, dum totum continuum consideratur, ut dicitur in III de anima. Et sic etiam intellectus noster simul intelligit subiectum

intellect understands together both the subject and the predicate, as forming parts of one proposition; and also two things compared together, according as they agree in one point of comparison. From this it is evident that many things, in so far as they are distinct, cannot be understood at once; but in so far as they are comprised under one intelligible concept, they can be understood together. Now everything is actually intelligible according as its image is in the intellect. All things, then, which can be known by one intelligible species, are known as one intelligible object, and therefore are understood simultaneously. But things known by various intelligible species, are apprehended as different intelligible objects.

Consequently, by such knowledge as the angels have of things through the Word, they know all things under one intelligible species, which is the Divine essence. Therefore, as regards such knowledge, they know all things at once: just as in heaven "our thoughts will not be fleeting, going and returning from one thing to another, but we shall survey all our knowledge at the same time by one glance," as Augustine says (De Trin. xv, 16). But by that knowledge wherewith the angels know things by innate species, they can at one time know all things which can be comprised under one species; but not such as are under various species.

Reply to Objection 1: To understand many things as one, is, so to speak, to understand one thing.

Reply to Objection 2: The intellect is informed by the intelligible species which it has within it. So it can behold at the same time many intelligible objects under one species; as one body can by one shape be likened to many bodies.

Reply to Objection 3: To the third objection the answer is the same as the first.

Q. 58. A. 3. Whether an angel's knowledge is discursive?

Objection 1: It would seem that the knowledge of an angel is discursive. For the discursive

et praedicatum, prout sunt partes unius propositionis; et duo comparata, secundum quod conveniunt in una comparatione. Ex quo patet quod multa, secundum quod sunt distincta, non possunt simul intelligi; sed secundum quod uniuntur in uno intelligibili, sic simul intelliguntur. Unumquodque autem est intelligibile in actu, secundum quod eius similitudo est in intellectu. Quaecumque igitur per unam speciem intelligibilem cognosci possunt, cognoscuntur ut unum intelligibile; et ideo simul cognoscuntur. Quae vero per diversas species intelligibiles cognoscuntur, ut diversa intelligibilia capiuntur. Angeli igitur ea cognitione qua cognoscunt res per verbum, omnia cognoscunt una intelligibili specie, quae est essentia divina. Et ideo quantum ad talem cognitionem, omnia simul cognoscunt, sicut et in patria *non erunt volubiles nostrae cogitationes, ab aliis in alia euntes atque redeuntes, sed omnem scientiam nostram simul uno conspectu videbimus*, ut Augustinus dicit in XV de Trin. Ea vero cognitione qua cognoscunt res per species innatas, omnia illa simul possunt intelligere, quae una specie cognoscuntur; non autem illa quae diversis.

[30818] I^a q. 58 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod intelligere multa ut unum, est quodammodo unum intelligere.

[30819] I^a q. 58 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod intellectus formatur per intelligibilem speciem quam apud se habet. Et ideo sic potest una specie intelligibili multa simul intelligibilia intueri, sicut unum corpus per unam figuram potest simul multis corporibus assimilari.

[30820] I^a q. 58 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum sicut ad primum.

[30821] I^a q. 58 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus cognoscat

movement of the mind comes from one thing being known through another. But the angels know one thing through another; for they know creatures through the Word. Therefore the intellect of an angel knows by discursive method.

Objection 2: Further, whatever a lower power can do, the higher can do. But the human intellect can syllogize, and know causes in effects; all of which is the discursive method. Therefore the intellect of the angel, which is higher in the order of nature, can with greater reason do this.

Objection 3: Further, Isidore (De sum. bono i, 10) says that "demons learn more things by experience." But experimental knowledge is discursive: for, "one experience comes of many remembrances, and one universal from many experiences," as Aristotle observes (Poster. ii; Metaph. vii). Therefore an angel's knowledge is discursive.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. vii) that the "angels do not acquire Divine knowledge from separate discourses, nor are they led to something particular from something common."

I answer that, As has often been stated ([A\[1\]; Q\[55\], A\[1\]](#)), the angels hold that grade among spiritual substances which the heavenly bodies hold among corporeal substances: for Dionysius calls them "heavenly minds" ([A\[1\]; Q\[55\], A\[1\]](#)). Now, the difference between heavenly and earthly bodies is this, that earthly bodies obtain their last perfection by chance and movement: while the heavenly bodies have their last perfection at once from their very nature. So, likewise, the lower, namely, the human, intellects obtain their perfection in the knowledge of truth by a kind of movement and discursive intellectual operation; that is to say, as they advance from one known thing to another. But, if from the knowledge of a known principle they were straightway to perceive as known all its consequent conclusions, then there would be no discursive process at all. Such is the condition of the angels, because in the truths which they know naturally, they at once

discurrendo. Discursus enim intellectus attenditur secundum hoc, quod unum per aliud cognoscitur. Sed Angeli cognoscunt unum per aliud, cognoscunt enim creaturas per verbum. Ergo intellectus Angeli cognoscit discurrendo.

[30822] I^a q. 58 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, quidquid potest virtus inferior, potest et virtus superior. Sed intellectus humanus potest syllogizare, et in effectibus causas cognoscere, secundum quae discursus attenditur. Ergo intellectus Angeli, qui superior est ordine naturae, multo magis hoc potest.

[30823] I^a q. 58 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, Isidorus dicit quod Daemones per experientiam multa cognoscunt. Sed experimentalis cognitio est discursiva, *ex multis enim memoriis fit unum experimentum, et ex multis experimentis fit unum universale*, ut dicitur in fine Poster., et in principio Metaphys. Ergo cognitio Angelorum est discursiva.

[30824] I^a q. 58 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod Dionysius dicit, VII cap. de Div. Nom., quod *Angeli non congregant divinam cognitionem a sermonibus diffusis, neque ab aliquo communi ad ista specialia simul aguntur*.

[30825] I^a q. 58 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut saepius dictum est, Angeli illum gradum tenent in substantiis spiritualibus, quem corpora caelestia in substantiis corporeis, nam et caelestes mentes a Dionysio dicuntur. Est autem haec differentia inter caelestia et terrena corpora, quod corpora terrena per mutationem et motum adipiscuntur suam ultimam perfectionem, corpora vero caelestia statim, ex ipsa sua natura, suam ultimam perfectionem habent. Sic igitur et inferiores intellectus, scilicet hominum, per quendam motum et discursum intellectualis operationis perfectionem in cognitione veritatis adipiscuntur; dum scilicet ex uno cognito in aliud cognitum procedunt. Si autem statim in ipsa cognitione principii noti, inspicerent quasi notas omnes conclusiones consequentes, in eis discursus locum non haberet. Et hoc est in Angelis, quia statim in illis quae primo naturaliter cognoscunt, inspicunt omnia quaecumque in eis

behold all things whatsoever that can be known in them.

Therefore they are called "intellectual beings": because even with ourselves the things which are instantly grasped by the mind are said to be understood [intelligi]; hence "intellect" is defined as the habit of first principles. But human souls which acquire knowledge of truth by the discursive method are called "rational"; and this comes of the feebleness of their intellectual light. For if they possessed the fulness of intellectual light, like the angels, then in the first aspect of principles they would at once comprehend their whole range, by perceiving whatever could be reasoned out from them.

Reply to Objection 1: Discursion expresses movement of a kind. Now all movement is from something before to something after. Hence discursive knowledge comes about according as from something previously known one attains to the knowledge of what is afterwards known, and which was previously unknown. But if in the thing perceived something else be seen at the same time, as an object and its image are seen simultaneously in a mirror, it is not discursive knowledge. And in this way the angels know things in the Word.

Reply to Objection 2: The angels can syllogize, in the sense of knowing a syllogism; and they see effects in causes, and causes in effects: yet they do not acquire knowledge of an unknown truth in this way, by syllogizing from causes to effect, or from effect to cause.

Reply to Objection 3: Experience is affirmed of angels and demons simply by way of similitude, forasmuch as they know sensible things which are present, yet without any discursion withal.

Q. 58. A. 4. Whether the angels understand by composing and dividing?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels understand by composing and dividing. For, where there is multiplicity of things understood,

cognosci possunt. Et ideo dicuntur intellectuales, quia etiam apud nos, ea quae statim naturaliter apprehenduntur, intelligi dicuntur; unde intellectus dicitur habitus primorum principiorum. Animae vero humanae, quae veritatis notitiam per quendam discursum acquirunt, rationales vocantur. Quod quidem contingit ex debilitate intellectualis luminis in eis. Si enim haberent plenitudinem intellectualis luminis, sicut Angeli, statim in primo aspectu principiorum totam virtutem eorum comprehenderent, intuendo quidquid ex eis syllogizari posset.

[30826] I^a q. 58 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod discursus quendam motum nominat. Omnis autem motus est de uno priori in aliud posterius. Unde discursiva cognitio attenditur secundum quod ex aliquo prius noto devenitur in cognitionem alterius posterius noti, quod prius erat ignotum. Si autem in uno inspecto simul aliud inspiciatur, sicut in speculo inspicitur simul imago rei et res; non est propter hoc cognitio discursiva. Et hoc modo cognoscunt Angeli res in verbo.

[30827] I^a q. 58 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod Angeli syllogizare possunt, tanquam syllogismum cognoscentes; et in causis effectus vident, et in effectibus causas, non tamen ita quod cognitionem veritatis ignotae acquirant syllogizando ex causis in causata, et ex causatis in causas.

[30828] I^a q. 58 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod experientia in Angelis et Daemonibus dicitur secundum quandam similitudinem, prout scilicet cognoscunt sensibilia praesentia; tamen absque omni discursu.

[30829] I^a q. 58 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli intelligant componendo et dividendo. Ubi enim est multitudo

there is composition of the same, as is said in De Anima iii, text. 21. But there is a multitude of things understood in the angelic mind; because angels apprehend different things by various species, and not all at one time. Therefore there is composition and division in the angel's mind.

Objection 2: Further, negation is far more remote from affirmation than any two opposite natures are; because the first of distinctions is that of affirmation and negation. But the angel knows certain distant natures not by one, but by diverse species, as is evident from what was said ([A\[2\]](#)). Therefore he must know affirmation and negation by diverse species. And so it seems that he understands by composing and dividing.

Objection 3: Further, speech is a sign of the intellect. But in speaking to men, angels use affirmative and negative expressions, which are signs of composition and of division in the intellect; as is manifest from many passages of Sacred Scripture. Therefore it seems that the angel understands by composing and dividing.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. vii) that "the intellectual power of the angel shines forth with the clear simplicity of divine concepts." But a simple intelligence is without composition and division. Therefore the angel understands without composition or division.

I answer that, As in the intellect, when reasoning, the conclusion is compared with the principle, so in the intellect composing and dividing, the predicate is compared with the subject. For if our intellect were to see at once the truth of the conclusion in the principle, it would never understand by discursion and reasoning. In like manner, if the intellect in apprehending the quiddity of the subject were at once to have knowledge of all that can be attributed to, or removed from, the subject, it would never understand by composing and dividing, but only by understanding the essence. Thus it is evident that for the self-same reason our intellect understands by discursion, and by composing and dividing, namely, that in the first apprehension of

intellectum, ibi est compositio intellectum, ut dicitur in III de anima. Sed in intellectu Angeli est multitudo intellectum, cum per diversas species diversa intelligat, et non omnia simul. Ergo in intellectu Angeli est compositio et divisio.

[30830] I^a q. 58 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, plus distat negatio ab affirmatione, quam quaecumque duae naturae oppositae, quia prima distinctio est per affirmationem et negationem. Sed aliquas naturas distantes Angelus non cognoscit per unum, sed per diversas species, ut ex dictis patet. Ergo oportet quod affirmationem et negationem cognoscat per diversa. Et ita videtur quod Angelus intelligat componendo et dividendo.

[30831] I^a q. 58 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, locutio est signum intellectus. Sed Angeli hominibus loquentes, proferunt affirmativas et negativas enuntiationes, quae sunt signa compositionis et divisionis in intellectu; ut ex multis locis sacrae Scripturae apparet. Ergo videtur quod Angelus intelligat componendo et dividendo.

[30832] I^a q. 58 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra est quod Dionysius dicit, VII cap. de Div. Nom., quod *virtus intellectualis Angelorum resplendet conspicaci divinorum intellectuum simplicitate*. Sed simplex intelligentia est sine compositione et divisione, ut dicitur in III de anima. Ergo Angelus intelligit sine compositione et divisione.

[30833] I^a q. 58 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut in intellectu ratiocinante comparatur conclusio ad principium, ita in intellectu componente et dividente comparatur praedicatum ad subiectum. Si enim intellectus statim in ipso principio videret conclusionis veritatem, nunquam intelligeret discurrendo vel ratiocinando. Similiter si intellectus statim in apprehensione quidditatis subiecti, haberet notitiam de omnibus quae possunt attribui subiecto vel removeri ab eo, nunquam intelligeret componendo et dividendo, sed solum intelligendo quod quid est. Sic igitur patet quod ex eodem provenit quod intellectus noster intelligit discurrendo, et componendo et dividendo, ex hoc scilicet, quod non statim in prima apprehensione alicuius primi apprehensi,

anything newly apprehended it does not at once grasp all that is virtually contained in it. And this comes from the weakness of the intellectual light within us, as has been said (A[3]). Hence, since the intellectual light is perfect in the angel, for he is a pure and most clear mirror, as Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv), it follows that as the angel does not understand by reasoning, so neither does he by composing and dividing.

Nevertheless, he understands the composition and the division of enunciations, just as he apprehends the reasoning of syllogisms: for he understands simply, such things as are composite, things movable immovably, and material things immaterially.

Reply to Objection 1: Not every multitude of things understood causes composition, but a multitude of such things understood that one of them is attributed to, or denied of, another. When an angel apprehends the nature of anything, he at the same time understands whatever can be either attributed to it, or denied of it. Hence, in apprehending a nature, he by one simple perception grasps all that we can learn by composing and dividing.

Reply to Objection 2: The various natures of things differ less as to their mode of existing than do affirmation and negation. Yet, as to the way in which they are known, affirmation and negation have something more in common; because directly the truth of an affirmation is known, the falsehood of the opposite negation is known also.

Reply to Objection 3: The fact that angels use affirmative and negative forms of speech, shows that they know both composition and division: yet not that they know by composing and dividing, but by knowing simply the nature of a thing.

Q. 58. A. 5. Whether there can be falsehood in the intellect of an angel?

Objection 1: It would seem that there can be

potest inspicere quidquid in eo virtute continetur. Quod contingit ex debilitate luminis intellectualis in nobis, sicut dictum est. Unde cum in Angelo sit lumen intellectuale perfectum, cum sit speculum purum et clarissimum, ut dicit Dionysius, IV cap. de Div. Nom.; relinquitur quod Angelus, sicut non intelligit ratiocinando, ita non intelligit componendo et dividendo. Nihilominus tamen compositionem et divisionem enuntiationum intelligit, sicut et ratiocinationem syllogismorum, intelligit enim composita simpliciter, et mobilia immobiliter, et materialia immaterialiter.

[30834] I^a q. 58 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod non qualiscumque multitudo intellectuum compositionem causat, sed multitudo illorum intellectuum quorum unum attribuitur alteri, vel removetur ab altero. Angelus autem, intelligendo quidditatem alicuius rei, simul intelligit quidquid ei attribui potest vel removeri ab ea. Unde intelligendo quod quid est, intelligit quidquid nos intelligere possumus et componendo et dividendo, per unum suum simplicem intellectum.

[30835] I^a q. 58 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod diversae quidditates rerum minus differunt, quantum ad rationem existendi, quam affirmatio et negatio. Tamen quantum ad rationem cognoscendi, affirmatio et negatio magis conveniunt, quia statim per hoc quod cognoscitur veritas affirmationis, cognoscitur falsitas negationis oppositae.

[30836] I^a q. 58 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod hoc quod Angeli loquuntur enuntiationes affirmativas et negativas, manifestat quod Angeli cognoscunt compositionem et divisionem, non autem quod cognoscant componendo et dividendo, sed simpliciter cognoscendo quod quid est.

[30837] I^a q. 58 a. 5 arg. 1 Ad quintum sic

falsehood in the angel's intellect. For perversity appertains to falsehood. But, as Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv), there is "a perverted fancy" in the demons. Therefore it seems that there can be falsehood in the intellect of the angels.

Objection 2: Further, nescience is the cause of estimating falsely. But, as Dionysius says (Eccl. Hier. vi), there can be nescience in the angels. Therefore it seems there can be falsehood in them.

Objection 3: Further, everything which falls short of the truth of wisdom, and which has a depraved reason, has falsehood or error in its intellect. But Dionysius (Div. Nom. vii) affirms this of the demons. Therefore it seems that there can be error in the minds of the angels.

On the contrary, The Philosopher says (De Anima iii, text. 41) that "the intelligence is always true." Augustine likewise says (QQ. 83, qu. 32) that "nothing but what is true can be the object of intelligence" Therefore there can be neither deception nor falsehood in the angel's knowledge.

I answer that, The truth of this question depends partly upon what has gone before. For it has been said ([A\[4\]](#)) that an angel understands not by composing and dividing, but by understanding what a thing is. Now the intellect is always true as regards what a thing is, just as the sense regarding its proper object, as is said in De Anima iii, text. 26. But by accident, deception and falsehood creep in, when we understand the essence of a thing by some kind of composition, and this happens either when we take the definition of one thing for another, or when the parts of a definition do not hang together, as if we were to accept as the definition of some creature, "a four-footed flying beast," for there is no such animal. And this comes about in things composite, the definition of which is drawn from diverse elements, one of which is as matter to the other. But there is no room for error in understanding simple quiddities, as is stated in Metaph. ix, text. 22; for either they are not grasped at all, and so we know nothing

proceditur. Videtur quod in intellectu Angeli possit esse falsitas. Protervitas enim ad falsitatem pertinet. Sed in Daemonibus est phantasia proterva, ut dicit Dionysius, IV cap. de Div. Nom. Ergo videtur quod in Angelorum intellectu possit esse falsitas.

[30838] I^a q. 58 a. 5 arg. 2 Praeterea, nescientia est causa falsae aestimationis. Sed in Angelis potest esse nescientia, ut Dionysius dicit, VI cap. Eccles. Hier. Ergo videtur quod in eis possit esse falsitas.

[30839] I^a q. 58 a. 5 arg. 3 Praeterea, omne quod cadit a veritate sapientiae, et habet rationem depravatam, habet falsitatem vel errorem in suo intellectu. Sed hoc Dionysius dicit de Daemonibus, VII cap. de Div. Nom. Ergo videtur quod in intellectu Angelorum possit esse falsitas.

[30840] I^a q. 58 a. 5 s. c. Sed contra, philosophus dicit, III de anima, quod *intellectus semper verus est*. Augustinus etiam dicit, in libro octoginta trium quaest., quod *nihil intelligitur nisi verum*. Sed Angeli non cognoscunt aliquid nisi intelligendo. Ergo in Angeli cognitione non potest esse deceptio et falsitas.

[30841] I^a q. 58 a. 5 co. Respondeo dicendum quod huius quaestionis veritas aliquatenus ex praemissa dependet. Dictum est enim quod Angelus non intelligit componendo et dividendo, sed intelligendo quod quid est. Intellectus autem circa quod quid est semper verus est, sicut et sensus circa proprium obiectum, ut dicitur in III de anima. Sed per accidens in nobis accidit deceptio et falsitas intelligendo quod quid est, scilicet secundum rationem alicuius compositionis, vel cum definitionem unius rei accipimus ut definitionem alterius; vel cum partes definitionis sibi non cohaerent, sicut si accipiatur pro definitione alicuius rei, animal quadrupes volatile (nullum enim animal tale est); et hoc quidem accidit in compositis, quorum definitio ex diversis sumitur, quorum unum est materiale ad aliud. Sed intelligendo quidditates simplices, ut dicitur in IX Metaphys., non est falsitas, quia vel totaliter non attinguntur, et nihil intelligimus de eis; vel cognoscuntur ut sunt. Sic igitur per se non

respecting them; or else they are known precisely as they exist.

So therefore, no falsehood, error, or deception can exist of itself in the mind of any angel; yet it does so happen accidentally; but very differently from the way it befalls us. For we sometimes get at the quiddity of a thing by a composing and dividing process, as when, by division and demonstration, we seek out the truth of a definition. Such is not the method of the angels; but through the (knowledge of the) essence of a thing they know everything that can be said regarding it. Now it is quite evident that the quiddity of a thing can be a source of knowledge with regard to everything belonging to such thing, or excluded from it; but not of what may be dependent on God's supernatural ordinance. Consequently, owing to their upright will, from their knowing the nature of every creature, the good angels form no judgments as to the nature of the qualities therein, save under the Divine ordinance; hence there can be no error or falsehood in them. But since the minds of demons are utterly perverted from the Divine wisdom, they at times form their opinions of things simply according to the natural conditions of the same. Nor are they ever deceived as to the natural properties of anything; but they can be misled with regard to supernatural matters; for example, on seeing a dead man, they may suppose that he will not rise again, or, on beholding Christ, they may judge Him not to be God.

Reply to Objections From all this the answers to the objections of both sides of the question are evident. For the perversity of the demons comes of their not being subject to the Divine wisdom; while nescience is in the angels as regards things knowable, not naturally but supernaturally. It is, furthermore, evident that their understanding of what a thing is, is always true, save accidentally, according as it is, in an undue manner, referred to some composition or division.

Q. 58. A. 6. Whether there is a "morning" and an "evening" knowledge in the angels?

Objection 1: It would seem that there is neither an evening nor a morning knowledge in the angels; because evening and morning have an admixture of darkness. But there is no darkness in

potest esse falsitas aut error aut deceptio in intellectu alicuius Angeli; sed per accidens contingit. Alio tamen modo quam in nobis. Nam nos componendo et dividendo quandoque ad intellectum quidditatis pervenimus, sicut cum dividendo vel demonstrando definitionem investigamus. Quod quidem in Angelis non contingit; sed per quod quid est rei cognoscunt omnes enuntiationes ad illam rem pertinentes. Manifestum est autem quod quidditas rei potest esse principium cognoscendi respectu eorum quae naturaliter conveniunt rei vel ab ea removentur, non autem eorum quae a supernaturali Dei ordinatione dependent. Angeli igitur boni, habentes rectam voluntatem, per cognitionem quidditatis rei non iudicant de his quae naturaliter ad rem pertinent, nisi salva ordinatione divina. Unde in eis non potest esse falsitas aut error. Daemones vero, per voluntatem perversam subducentes intellectum a divina sapientia, absolute interdum de rebus iudicant secundum naturalem conditionem. Et in his quae naturaliter ad rem pertinent, non decipiuntur. Sed decipi possunt quantum ad ea quae supernaturalia sunt, sicut si considerans hominem mortuum, iudicet eum non resurrecturum; et si videns hominem Christum, iudicet eum non esse Deum.

[30842] I^a q. 58 a. 5 ad 1 Et per hoc patet responsio ad ea quae utrinque obiiciuntur. Nam protervitas Daemonum est secundum quod non subduntur divinae sapientiae. Nescientia autem est in Angelis, non respectu naturalium cognoscibilium, sed supernaturalium. Patet etiam quod intellectus eius quod quid est semper est verus, nisi per accidens, secundum quod indebite ordinatur ad aliquam compositionem vel divisionem.

[30843] I^a q. 58 a. 6 arg. 1 Ad sextum sic proceditur. Videtur quod in Angelis non sit vespertina neque matutina cognitio. Vespere enim et mane admixtionem tenebrarum habent. Sed in

the knowledge of an angel; since there is no error nor falsehood. Therefore the angelic knowledge ought not to be termed morning and evening knowledge.

Objection 2: Further, between evening and morning the night intervenes; while noonday falls between morning and evening. Consequently, if there be a morning and an evening knowledge in the angels, for the same reason it appears that there ought to be a noonday and a night knowledge.

Objection 3: Further, knowledge is diversified according to the difference of the objects known: hence the Philosopher says (*De Anima* iii, text. 38), "The sciences are divided just as things are." But there is a threefold existence of things: to wit, in the Word; in their own natures; and in the angelic knowledge, as Augustine observes (*Gen. ad lit.* ii, 8). If, therefore, a morning and an evening knowledge be admitted in the angels, because of the existence of things in the Word, and in their own nature, then there ought to be admitted a third class of knowledge, on account of the existence of things in the angelic mind.

On the contrary, Augustine (*Gen. ad lit.* iv, 22,31; *De Civ. Dei* xii, 7,20) divides the knowledge of the angels into morning and evening knowledge.

I answer that, The expression "morning" and "evening" knowledge was devised by Augustine; who interprets the six days wherein God made all things, not as ordinary days measured by the solar circuit, since the sun was only made on the fourth day, but as one day, namely, the day of angelic knowledge as directed to six classes of things. As in the ordinary day, morning is the beginning, and evening the close of day, so, their knowledge of the primordial being of things is called morning knowledge; and this is according as things exist in the Word. But their knowledge of the very being of the thing created, as it stands in its own nature, is termed evening knowledge; because the being of things flows from the Word, as from a kind of primordial principle; and this flow is terminated in the being which they have in themselves.

cognitione Angeli non est aliqua tenebrositas; cum non sit ibi error vel falsitas. Ergo cognitio Angeli non debet dici matutina vel vespertina.

[30844] I^a q. 58 a. 6 arg. 2 Praeterea, inter vespere et mane cadit nox; et inter mane et vespere cadit meridies. Si igitur in Angelis cadit cognitio matutina et vespertina, pari ratione videtur quod in eis debeat esse meridiana et nocturna cognitio.

[30845] I^a q. 58 a. 6 arg. 3 Praeterea, cognitio distinguitur secundum differentiam cognitorum, unde in III de anima dicit philosophus quod *scientiae secantur quemadmodum et res*. Triplex autem est esse rerum, scilicet in verbo, in propria natura, et in intelligentia angelica, ut Augustinus dicit, II super *Gen. ad Litt.* Ergo, si ponatur cognitio matutina in Angelis et vespertina, propter esse rerum in verbo et in propria natura; debet etiam in eis poni tertia cognitio, propter esse rerum in intelligentia angelica.

[30846] I^a q. 58 a. 6 s. c. Sed contra est quod Augustinus, IV super *Gen. ad Litt.*, et XI de *Civ. Dei*, distinguit cognitionem Angelorum per matutinam et vespertinam.

[30847] I^a q. 58 a. 6 co. Respondeo dicendum quod hoc quod dicitur de cognitione matutina et vespertina in Angelis, introductum est ab Augustino, qui sex dies in quibus Deus legitur fecisse cuncta, *Gen. I*, intelligi vult non hos usitatos dies qui solis circuitu peraguntur, cum sol quarto die factus legatur; sed unum diem, scilicet cognitionem angelicam sex rerum generibus praesentatam. Sicut autem in die consueto mane est principium diei, vespere autem terminus, ita cognitio ipsius primordialis esse rerum, dicitur cognitio matutina, et haec est secundum quod res sunt in verbo. Cognitio autem ipsius esse rei creatae secundum quod in propria natura consistit, dicitur cognitio vespertina, nam esse rerum fluit a verbo sicut a quodam primordiali principio, et hic effluxus terminatur ad esse rerum quod in propria

natura habent.

Reply to Objection 1: Evening and morning knowledge in the angelic knowledge are not taken as compared to an admixture of darkness, but as compared to beginning and end. Or else it can be said, as Augustine puts it (Gen. ad lit. iv, 23), that there is nothing to prevent us from calling something light in comparison with one thing, and darkness with respect to another. In the same way the life of the faithful and the just is called light in comparison with the wicked, according to [Eph. 5:8](#): "You were heretofore darkness; but now, light in the Lord": yet this very life of the faithful, when set in contrast to the life of glory, is termed darkness, according to [2 Pet. 1:19](#): "You have the firm prophetic word, whereunto you do well to attend, as to a light that shineth in a dark place." So the angel's knowledge by which he knows things in their own nature, is day in comparison with ignorance or error; yet it is dark in comparison with the vision of the Word.

Reply to Objection 2: The morning and evening knowledge belong to the day, that is, to the enlightened angels, who are quite apart from the darkness, that is, from the evil spirits. The good angels, while knowing the creature, do not adhere to it, for that would be to turn to darkness and to night; but they refer this back to the praise of God, in Whom, as in their principle, they know all things. Consequently after "evening" there is no night, but "morning"; so that morning is the end of the preceding day, and the beginning of the following, in so far as the angels refer to God's praise their knowledge of the preceding work. Noonday is comprised under the name of day, as the middle between the two extremes. Or else the noon can be referred to their knowledge of God Himself, Who has neither beginning nor end.

Reply to Objection 3: The angels themselves are also creatures. Accordingly the existence of things in the angelic knowledge is comprised under evening knowledge, as also the existence of things in their own nature.

[30848] I^a q. 58 a. 6 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod vespere et mane non accipiuntur in cognitione angelica secundum similitudinem ad admixtionem tenebrarum; sed secundum similitudinem principii et termini. Vel dicendum quod nihil prohibet, ut dicit Augustinus IV super Gen. ad Litt., aliquid in comparatione ad unum dici lux, et in comparatione ad aliud dici tenebra. Sicut vita fidelium et iustorum, in comparatione ad impios, dicitur lux, secundum illud Ephes. V, *fuistis aliquando tenebrae, nunc autem lux in domino*; quae tamen vita fidelium, in comparatione ad vitam gloriae, tenebrosa dicitur, secundum illud II Petri I, *habetis propheticum sermonem, cui bene facitis attendentes quasi lucernae lucenti in caliginoso loco*. Sic igitur cognitio Angeli qua cognoscit res in propria natura, dies est per comparationem ad ignorantiam vel errorem, sed obscura est per comparationem ad visionem verbi.

[30849] I^a q. 58 a. 6 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod matutina et vespertina cognitio ad diem pertinet, idest ad Angelos illuminatos, qui sunt distincti a tenebris, idest a malis Angelis. Angeli autem boni, cognoscentes creaturam, non in ea figuntur, quod esset tenebrescere et noctem fieri; sed hoc ipsum referunt ad laudem Dei, in quo sicut in principio omnia cognoscunt. Et ideo post vesperam non ponitur nox, sed mane, ita quod mane sit finis praecedentis diei et principium sequentis, inquantum Angeli cognitionem praecedentis operis ad laudem Dei referunt. Meridies autem sub nomine diei comprehenditur, quasi medium inter duo extrema. Vel potest meridies referri ad cognitionem ipsius Dei, qui non habet principium nec finem.

[30850] I^a q. 58 a. 6 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod etiam ipsi Angeli creaturae sunt. Unde esse rerum in intelligentia angelica comprehenditur sub vespertina cognitione, sicut et esse rerum in propria natura.

Q. 58. A. 7. Whether the morning and evening knowledge are one?

Objection 1: It would seem that the morning and the evening knowledge are one. For it is said ([Gn. 1:5](#)): "There was evening and morning, one day." But by the expression "day" the knowledge of the angels is to be understood, as Augustine says (*Gen. ad lit. iv, 23*). Therefore the morning and evening knowledge of the angels are one and the same.

Objection 2: Further, it is impossible for one faculty to have two operations at the same time. But the angels are always using their morning knowledge; because they are always beholding God and things in God, according to [Mat. 18:10](#). Therefore, if the evening knowledge were different from the morning, the angel could never exercise his evening knowledge.

Objection 3: Further, the Apostle says ([1 Cor. 13:10](#)): "When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." But, if the evening knowledge be different from the morning, it is compared to it as the less perfect to the perfect. Therefore the evening knowledge cannot exist together with the morning knowledge.

On the contrary, Augustine says (*Gen. ad lit. iv, 24*): "There is a vast difference between knowing anything as it is in the Word of God, and as it is in its own nature; so that the former belongs to the day, and the latter to the evening."

I answer that, As was observed ([A\[6\]](#)), the evening knowledge is that by which the angels know things in their proper nature. This cannot be understood as if they drew their knowledge from the proper nature of things, so that the preposition "in" denotes the form of a principle; because, as has been already stated ([Q\[55\], A\[2\]](#)), the angels do not draw their knowledge from things. It follows, then, that when we say "in their proper nature" we refer to the aspect of the thing known in so far as it is an object of knowledge; that is to say, that the evening knowledge is in the angels in

[30851] I^a q. 58 a. 7 arg. 1 Ad septimum sic proceditur. Videtur quod una sit cognitio vespertina et matutina. Dicitur enim *Gen. I, factum est vespere et mane dies unus*. Sed per diem intelligitur cognitio angelica, ut Augustinus dicit. Ergo una et eadem est cognitio in Angelis matutina et vespertina.

[30852] I^a q. 58 a. 7 arg. 2 Praeterea, impossibile est unam potentiam simul duas operationes habere. Sed Angeli semper sunt in actu cognitionis matutinae, quia semper vident Deum et res in Deo, secundum illud *Matth. XVIII, Angeli eorum semper vident faciem patris mei* et cetera. Ergo, si cognitio vespertina esset alia a matutina, nullo modo Angelus posset esse in actu cognitionis vespertinae.

[30853] I^a q. 58 a. 7 arg. 3 Praeterea, apostolus dicit, *I Cor. XIII, cum venerit quod perfectum est, evacuabitur quod ex parte est*. Sed si cognitio vespertina sit alia a matutina, comparatur ad ipsam sicut imperfectum ad perfectum. Ergo non poterit simul vespertina cognitio esse cum matutina.

[30854] I^a q. 58 a. 7 s. c. In contrarium est quod dicit Augustinus, *IV super Gen. ad Litt., quod multum interest inter cognitionem rei cuiuscumque in verbo Dei, et cognitionem eius in natura eius, ut illud merito pertineat ad diem, hoc ad vesperam*.

[30855] I^a q. 58 a. 7 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut dictum est, cognitio vespertina dicitur, qua Angeli cognoscunt res in propria natura. Quod non potest ita intelligi quasi ex propria rerum natura cognitionem accipiant, ut haec praepositio in indicet habitudinem principii, quia non accipiunt Angeli cognitionem a rebus, ut supra habitum est. Relinquitur igitur quod hoc quod dicitur in propria natura, accipiatur secundum rationem cogniti, secundum quod subest cognitioni; ut scilicet cognitio vespertina in Angelis dicatur secundum quod cognoscunt esse

so far as they know the being of things which those things have in their own nature.

Now they know this through a twofold medium, namely, by innate ideas, or by the forms of things existing in the Word. For by beholding the Word, they know not merely the being of things as existing in the Word, but the being as possessed by the things themselves; as God by contemplating Himself sees that being which things have in their own nature. It, therefore, is called evening knowledge, in so far as when the angels behold the Word, they know the being which things have in their proper nature, then the morning and the evening knowledge are essentially one and the same, and only differ as to the things known. If it is called evening knowledge, in so far as through innate ideas they know the being which things have in their own natures, then the morning and the evening knowledge differ. Thus Augustine seems to understand it when he assigns one as inferior to the other.

Reply to Objection 1: The six days, as Augustine understands them, are taken as the six classes of things known by the angels; so that the day's unit is taken according to the unit of the thing understood; which, nevertheless, can be apprehended by various ways of knowing it.

Reply to Objection 2: There can be two operations of the same faculty at the one time, one of which is referred to the other; as is evident when the will at the same time wills the end and the means to the end; and the intellect at the same instant perceives principles and conclusions through those principles, when it has already acquired knowledge. As Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. iv, 24), the evening knowledge is referred to the morning knowledge in the angels; hence there is nothing to hinder both from being at the same time in the angels.

Reply to Objection 3: On the coming of what is perfect, the opposite imperfect is done away: just as faith, which is of the things that are not seen, is made void when vision succeeds. But the imperfection of the evening knowledge is not

rerum quod habent res in propria natura. Quod quidem per duplex medium cognoscunt, scilicet per species innatas, et per rationes rerum in verbo existentes. Non enim, videndo verbum, cognoscunt solum illud esse rerum quod habent in verbo; sed illud esse quod habent in propria natura; sicut Deus per hoc quod videt se, cognoscit esse rerum quod habent in propria natura. Si ergo dicatur cognitio vespertina secundum quod cognoscunt esse rerum quod habent in propria natura, videndo verbum; sic una et eadem secundum essentiam est cognitio vespertina et matutina, differens solum secundum cognita. Si vero cognitio vespertina dicatur secundum quod Angeli cognoscunt esse rerum quod habent in propria natura, per formas innatas; sic alia est cognitio vespertina et matutina. Et ita videtur intelligere Augustinus, cum unam ponat imperfectam respectu alterius.

[30856] I^a q. 58 a. 7 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod, sicut numerus sex dierum, secundum intellectum Augustini, accipitur secundum sex genera rerum quae cognoscuntur ab Angelis; ita unitas diei accipitur secundum unitatem rei cognitae, quae tamen diversis cognitionibus cognosci potest.

[30857] I^a q. 58 a. 7 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod duae operationes possunt simul esse unius potentiae, quarum una ad aliam refertur; ut patet cum voluntas simul vult et finem et ea quae sunt ad finem, et intellectus simul intelligit principia et conclusiones per principia, quando iam scientiam acquisivit. Cognitio autem vespertina in Angelis refertur ad matutinam, ut Augustinus dicit. Unde nihil prohibet utramque simul esse in Angelis.

[30858] I^a q. 58 a. 7 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, veniente perfecto, evacuatur imperfectum quod ei opponitur, sicut fides, quae est eorum quae non videntur, evacuatur visione veniente. Sed imperfectio vespertinae cognitionis non

opposed to the perfection of the morning knowledge. For that a thing be known in itself, is not opposite to its being known in its cause. Nor, again, is there any inconsistency in knowing a thing through two mediums, one of which is more perfect and the other less perfect; just as we can have a demonstrative and a probable medium for reaching the same conclusion. In like manner a thing can be known by the angel through the uncreated Word, and through an innate idea.

opponitur perfectioni matutinae. Quod enim cognoscatur aliquid in seipso, non est oppositum ei quod cognoscatur in sua causa. Nec iterum quod aliquid cognoscatur per duo media, quorum unum est perfectius et aliud imperfectius, aliquid repugnans habet, sicut ad eandem conclusionem habere possumus et medium demonstrativum et dialecticum. Et similiter eadem res potest sciri ab Angelo per verbum increatum, et per speciem innatam.

Q. 59. THE WILL OF THE ANGELS (FOUR ARTICLES)

In the next place we must treat of things concerning the will of the angels. In the first place we shall treat of the will itself; secondly, of its movement, which is love. Under the first heading there are four points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Whether there is will in the angels?](#)

[\(2\) Whether the will of the angel is his nature, or his intellect?](#)

[\(3\) Is there free-will in the angels?](#)

[\(4\) Is there an irascible and a concupiscible appetite in them?](#)

Q. 59. A. 1. Whether there is will in the angels?

Objection 1: It would seem that there is no will in the angels. For as the Philosopher says (De Anima iii, text. 42), "The will is in the reason." But there is no reason in the angels, but something higher than reason. Therefore there is no will in the angels, but something higher than the will.

Objection 2: Further, the will is comprised under the appetite, as is evident from the Philosopher (De Anima iii, text. 42). But the appetite argues something imperfect; because it is a desire of something not as yet possessed. Therefore, since there is no imperfection in the angels, especially in the blessed ones, it seems that there is no will in them.

Objection 3: Further, the Philosopher says (De Anima ii, text. 54) that the will is a mover which is moved; for it is moved by the appetible object understood. Now the angels are immovable, since they are incorporeal. Therefore there is no will in the angels.

On the contrary, Augustine says (De Trin. x, 11,12) that the image of the Trinity is found in the soul according to memory, understanding, and will. But God's image is found not only in the soul of man, but also in the angelic mind, since it also is capable of knowing God. Therefore there

[30859] I^a q. 59 pr. Consequenter considerandum est de his quae pertinent ad voluntatem Angelorum. Et primo considerabimus de ipsa voluntate secundo, de motu eius, qui est amor sive dilectio. Circa primum quaeruntur quatuor. Primo, utrum in Angelis sit voluntas. Secundo, utrum voluntas Angeli sit ipsa natura eorum, vel etiam ipse intellectus eorum. Tertio, utrum in Angelis sit liberum arbitrium. Quarto, utrum in eis sit irascibilis et concupiscibilis.

[30860] I^a q. 59 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod in Angelis non sit voluntas. Quia, ut dicit philosophus, in III de anima, *voluntas in ratione est*. Sed in Angelis non est ratio, sed aliquid superius ratione. Ergo in Angelis non est voluntas, sed aliquid superius voluntate.

[30861] I^a q. 59 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, voluntas sub appetitu continetur, ut patet per philosophum, in III de anima. Sed appetitus est imperfecti, est enim eius quod nondum habetur. Cum igitur in Angelis, maxime in beatis, non sit aliqua imperfectio, videtur quod non sit in eis voluntas.

[30862] I^a q. 59 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, philosophus dicit, in III de anima, quod voluntas est movens motum, movetur enim ab appetibili intellectu. Sed Angeli sunt immobiles; cum sint incorporei. Ergo in Angelis non est voluntas.

[30863] I^a q. 59 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod Augustinus dicit, X Lib. de Trin., quod imago Trinitatis invenitur in mente secundum memoriam, intelligentiam et voluntatem. Imago autem Dei invenitur non solum in mente humana, sed etiam in mente angelica; cum etiam mens

is will in the angels.

I answer that, We must necessarily place a will in the angels. In evidence thereof, it must be borne in mind that, since all things flow from the Divine will, all things in their own way are inclined by appetite towards good, but in different ways. Some are inclined to good by their natural inclination, without knowledge, as plants and inanimate bodies. Such inclination towards good is called "a natural appetite." Others, again, are inclined towards good, but with some knowledge; not that they know the aspect of goodness, but that they apprehend some particular good; as in the sense, which knows the sweet, the white, and so on. The inclination which follows this apprehension is called "a sensitive appetite." Other things, again, have an inclination towards good, but with a knowledge whereby they perceive the aspect of goodness; this belongs to the intellect. This is most perfectly inclined towards what is good; not, indeed, as if it were merely guided by another towards some particular good only, like things devoid of knowledge, nor towards some particular good only, as things which have only sensitive knowledge, but as inclined towards good in general. Such inclination is termed "will." Accordingly, since the angels by their intellect know the universal aspect of goodness, it is manifest that there is a will in them.

Reply to Objection 1: Reason surpasses sense in a different way from that in which intellect surpasses reason. Reason surpasses sense according to the diversity of the objects known; for sense judges of particular objects, while reason judges of universals. Therefore there must be one appetite tending towards good in the abstract, which appetite belongs to reason; and another with a tendency towards particular good, which appetite belongs to sense. But intellect and reason differ as to their manner of knowing; because the intellect knows by simple intuition, while reason knows by a process of discursion from one thing to another. Nevertheless by such discursion reason comes to know what intellect learns without it, namely, the universal. Consequently the object presented to the

angelica sit capax Dei. Ergo in Angelis est voluntas.

[30864] I^a q. 59 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod necesse est ponere in Angelis voluntatem. Ad cuius evidentiam, considerandum est quod, cum omnia procedant ex voluntate divina, omnia suo modo per appetitum inclinantur in bonum, sed diversimode. Quaedam enim inclinantur in bonum, per solam naturalem habitudinem, absque cognitione, sicut plantae et corpora inanimata. Et talis inclinatio ad bonum vocatur appetitus naturalis. Quaedam vero ad bonum inclinantur cum aliqua cognitione; non quidem sic quod cognoscant ipsam rationem boni, sed cognoscunt aliquod bonum particulare; sicut sensus, qui cognoscit dulce et album et aliquid huiusmodi. Inclinatio autem hanc cognitionem sequens, dicitur appetitus sensitivus. Quaedam vero inclinantur ad bonum cum cognitione qua cognoscunt ipsam boni rationem; quod est proprium intellectus. Et haec perfectissime inclinantur in bonum; non quidem quasi ab alio solummodo directa in bonum, sicut ea quae cognitione carent; neque in bonum particulariter tantum, sicut ea in quibus est sola sensitiva cognitio; sed quasi inclinata in ipsum universale bonum. Et haec inclinatio dicitur voluntas. Unde cum Angeli per intellectum cognoscant ipsam universalem rationem boni, manifestum est quod in eis sit voluntas.

[30865] I^a q. 59 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod aliter ratio transcendit sensum, et aliter intellectus rationem. Ratio enim transcendit sensum, secundum diversitatem cognitorum, nam sensus est particularium, ratio vero universalium. Et ideo oportet quod sit alius appetitus tendens in bonum universale, qui debetur rationi; et alius tendens in bonum particulare, qui debetur sensui. Sed intellectus et ratio differunt quantum ad modum cognoscendi, quia scilicet intellectus cognoscit simplici intuitu, ratio vero discurrendo de uno in aliud. Sed tamen ratio per discursum pervenit ad cognoscendum illud, quod intellectus sine discursu cognoscit, scilicet universale. Idem est ergo obiectum quod appetitivae proponitur et ex parte rationis, et ex parte intellectus. Unde in Angelis, qui sunt intellectuales tantum, non est

appetitive faculty on the part of reason and on the part of intellect is the same. Therefore in the angels, who are purely intellectual, there is no appetite higher than the will.

Reply to Objection 2: Although the name of the appetitive part is derived from seeking things not yet possessed, yet the appetitive part reaches out not to these things only, but also to many other things; thus the name of a stone [lapis] is derived from injuring the foot [laesione pedis], though not this alone belongs to a stone. In the same way the irascible faculty is so denominated from anger [ira]; though at the same time there are several other passions in it, as hope, daring, and the rest.

Reply to Objection 3: The will is called a mover which is moved, according as to will and to understand are termed movements of a kind; and there is nothing to prevent movement of this kind from existing in the angels, since such movement is the act of a perfect agent, as stated in *De Anima* iii, text. 28.

Q. 59. A. 2. Whether in the angels the will differs from the intellect?

Objection 1: It would seem that in the angel the will does not differ from the intellect and from the nature. For an angel is more simple than a natural body. But a natural body is inclined through its form towards its end, which is its good. Therefore much more so is the angel. Now the angel's form is either the nature in which he subsists, or else it is some species within his intellect. Therefore the angel inclines towards the good through his own nature, or through an intelligible species. But such inclination towards the good belongs to the will. Therefore the will of the angel does not differ from his nature or his intellect.

Objection 2: Further, the object of the intellect is the true, while the object of the will is the good. Now the good and the true differ, not really but only logically [*Cf. [Q\[16\], A\[4\]](#)]. Therefore will and intellect are not really different.

Objection 3: Further, the distinction of common and proper does not differentiate the faculties; for

appetitus superior voluntate.

[30866] I^a q. 59 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod, licet nomen appetitivae partis sit sumptum ab appetendo ea quae non habentur, tamen appetitiva pars non solum ad haec se extendit, sed etiam ad multa alia. Sicut et nomen lapidis sumptum est a laesione pedis, cum tamen lapidi non hoc solum conveniat. Similiter irascibilis potentia denominatur ab ira; cum tamen in ea sint plures aliae passioness, ut spes et audacia et huiusmodi.

[30867] I^a q. 59 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod voluntas dicitur movens motum, secundum quod velle est motus quidam, et intelligere; cuiusmodi motum nihil prohibet in Angelis esse, quia talis motus est actus perfecti, ut dicitur in III de anima.

[30868] I^a q. 59 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod in Angelis non differat voluntas ab intellectu et natura. Angelus enim est simplicior quam corpus naturale. Sed corpus naturale per suam formam inclinatur in suum finem, qui est eius bonum. Ergo multo magis Angelus. Forma autem Angeli est vel natura ipsa in qua subsistit, vel species quae est in intellectu eius. Ergo Angelus inclinatur in bonum per naturam suam, et per speciem intelligibilem. Haec autem inclinatio ad bonum pertinet ad voluntatem. Voluntas igitur Angeli non est aliud quam eius natura vel intellectus.

[30869] I^a q. 59 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, obiectum intellectus est verum, voluntatis autem bonum. Bonum autem et verum non differunt realiter, sed secundum rationem tantum. Ergo voluntas et intellectus non differunt realiter.

[30870] I^a q. 59 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, distinctio communis et proprii non diversificat potentias,

the same power of sight perceives color and whiteness. But the good and the true seem to be mutually related as common to particular; for the true is a particular good, to wit, of the intellect. Therefore the will, whose object is the good, does not differ from the intellect, whose object is the true.

On the contrary, The will in the angels regards good things only, while their intellect regards both good and bad things, for they know both. Therefore the will of the angels is distinct from their intellect.

I answer that, In the angels the will is a special faculty or power, which is neither their nature nor their intellect. That it is not their nature is manifest from this, that the nature or essence of a thing is completely comprised within it: whatever, then, extends to anything beyond it, is not its essence. Hence we see in natural bodies that the inclination to being does not come from anything superadded to the essence, but from the matter which desires being before possessing it, and from the form which keeps it in such being when once it exists. But the inclination towards something extrinsic comes from something superadded to the essence; as tendency to a place comes from gravity or lightness, while the inclination to make something like itself comes from the active qualities.

Now the will has a natural tendency towards good. Consequently there alone are essence and will identified where all good is contained within the essence of him who wills; that is to say, in God, Who wills nothing beyond Himself except on account of His goodness. This cannot be said of any creature, because infinite goodness is quite foreign to the nature of any created thing. Accordingly, neither the will of the angel, nor that of any creature, can be the same thing as its essence.

In like manner neither can the will be the same thing as the intellect of angel or man. Because knowledge comes about in so far as the object known is within the knower; consequently the intellect extends itself to what is outside it, according as what, in its essence, is outside it is disposed to be somehow within it. On the other

eadem enim potentia visiva est coloris et albedinis. Sed bonum et verum videntur se habere sicut commune et proprium, nam verum est quoddam bonum, scilicet intellectus. Ergo voluntas, cuius obiectum est bonum, non differt ab intellectu, cuius obiectum est verum.

[30871] I^a q. 59 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra, voluntas in Angelis est bonorum tantum. Intellectus autem est bonorum et malorum, cognoscunt enim utrumque. Ergo voluntas in Angelis est aliud quam eius intellectus.

[30872] I^a q. 59 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod voluntas in Angelis est quaedam virtus vel potentia, quae nec est ipsa eorum natura, nec eorum intellectus. Et quod non sit eorum natura, apparet ex hoc, quod natura vel essentia alicuius rei intra ipsam rem comprehenditur, quidquid ergo se extendit ad id quod est extra rem, non est rei essentia. Unde videmus in corporibus naturalibus, quod inclinatio quae est ad esse rei, non est per aliquid superadditum essentiae; sed per materiam, quae appetit esse antequam illud habeat, et per formam, quae tenet rem in esse postquam fuerit. Sed inclinatio ad aliquid extrinsecum, est per aliquid essentiae superadditum, sicut inclinatio ad locum est per gravitatem vel levitatem, inclinatio autem ad faciendum sibi simile est per qualitates activas. Voluntas autem habet inclinationem in bonum naturaliter. Unde ibi solum est idem essentia et voluntas, ubi totaliter bonum continetur in essentia volentis; scilicet in Deo, qui nihil vult extra se nisi ratione suae bonitatis. Quod de nulla creatura potest dici; cum bonum infinitum sit extra essentiam cuiuslibet creati. Unde nec voluntas Angeli, nec alterius creaturae, potest esse idem quod eius essentia. Similiter nec potest esse idem quod intellectus Angeli vel hominis. Nam cognitio fit per hoc quod cognitum est in cognoscente, unde ea ratione se extendit eius intellectus in id quod est extra se, secundum quod illud quod extra ipsum est per essentiam, natum est aliquo modo in eo esse. Voluntas vero se extendit in id quod extra se est, secundum quod quadam inclinatione quodammodo tendit in rem exterioriorem. Alterius autem virtutis est, quod aliquid habeat in se quod est extra se, et quod ipsum tendat in rem exterioriorem. Et ideo oportet

hand, the will goes out to what is beyond it, according as by a kind of inclination it tends, in a manner, to what is outside it. Now it belongs to one faculty to have within itself something which is outside it, and to another faculty to tend to what is outside it. Consequently intellect and will must necessarily be different powers in every creature. It is not so with God, for He has within Himself universal being, and the universal good. Therefore both intellect and will are His nature.

Reply to Objection 1: A natural body is moved to its own being by its substantial form: while it is inclined to something outside by something additional, as has been said.

Reply to Objection 2: Faculties are not differentiated by any material difference of their objects, but according to their formal distinction, which is taken from the nature of the object as such. Consequently the diversity derived from the notion of good and true suffices for the difference of intellect from will.

Reply to Objection 3: Because the good and the true are really convertible, it follows that the good is apprehended by the intellect as something true; while the true is desired by the will as something good. Nevertheless, the diversity of their aspects is sufficient for diversifying the faculties, as was said above (ad 2).

Q. 59. A. 3. Whether there is free-will in the angels?

Objection 1: It would seem that there is no free-will in the angels. For the act of free-will is to choose. But there can be no choice with the angels, because choice is "the desire of something after taking counsel," while counsel is "a kind of inquiry," as stated in *Ethic. iii, 3*. But the angels' knowledge is not the result of inquiring, for this belongs to the discursiveness of reason. Therefore it appears that there is no free-will in the angels.

Objection 2: Further, free-will implies indifference to alternatives. But in the angels on the part of their intellect there is no such

quod in qualibet creatura sit aliud intellectus et voluntas. Non autem in Deo, qui habet et ens universale et bonum universale in seipso. Unde tam voluntas quam intellectus est eius essentia.

[30873] I^a q. 59 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod corpus naturale per formam substantialem inclinatur in esse suum, sed in exterius inclinatur per aliquid additum, ut dictum est.

[30874] I^a q. 59 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod potentiae non diversificantur secundum materialem distinctionem obiectorum, sed secundum formalem distinctionem, quae attenditur secundum rationem obiecti. Et ideo diversitas secundum rationem boni et veri, sufficit ad diversitatem intellectus et voluntatis.

[30875] I^a q. 59 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, quia bonum et verum convertuntur secundum rem, inde est quod et bonum ab intellectu intelligitur sub ratione veri, et verum a voluntate appetitur sub ratione boni. Sed tamen diversitas rationum ad diversificandum potentias sufficit, ut dictum est.

[30876] I^a q. 59 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod in Angelis non sit liberum arbitrium. Actus enim liberi arbitrii est eligere. Sed electio non potest esse in Angelis, cum electio sit appetitus praeconsiliati, consilium autem est inquisitio quaedam ut dicitur in III *Ethic.*; Angeli autem non cognoscunt inquirendo, quia hoc pertinet ad discursum rationis. Ergo videtur quod in Angelis non sit liberum arbitrium.

[30877] I^a q. 59 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, liberum arbitrium se habet ad utrumlibet. Sed ex parte intellectus non est aliquid se habens ad utrumlibet

indifference; because, as was observed already ([Q\[58\], A\[5\]](#)), their intellect is not deceived as to things which are naturally intelligible to them. Therefore neither on the part of their appetitive faculty can there be free-will.

Objection 3: Further, the natural endowments of the angels belong to them according to degrees of more or less; because in the higher angels the intellectual nature is more perfect than in the lower. But the free-will does not admit of degrees. Therefore there is no free-will in them.

On the contrary, Free-will is part of man's dignity. But the angels' dignity surpasses that of men. Therefore, since free-will is in men, with much more reason is it in the angels.

I answer that, Some things there are which act, not from any previous judgment, but, as it were, moved and made to act by others; just as the arrow is directed to the target by the archer. Others act from some kind of judgment; but not from free-will, such as irrational animals; for the sheep flies from the wolf by a kind of judgment whereby it esteems it to be hurtful to itself: such a judgment is not a free one, but implanted by nature. Only an agent endowed with an intellect can act with a judgment which is free, in so far as it apprehends the common note of goodness; from which it can judge this or the other thing to be good. Consequently, wherever there is intellect, there is free-will. It is therefore manifest that just as there is intellect, so is there free-will in the angels, and in a higher degree of perfection than in man.

Reply to Objection 1: The Philosopher is speaking of choice, as it is in man. As a man's estimate in speculative matters differs from an angel's in this, that the one needs not to inquire, while the other does so need; so is it in practical matters. Hence there is choice in the angels, yet not with the inquisitive deliberation of counsel, but by the sudden acceptance of truth.

in Angelis, quia intellectus eorum non fallitur in naturalibus intelligibilibus, ut dictum est. Ergo nec ex parte appetitus liberum arbitrium in eis esse potest.

[30878] I^a q. 59 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, ea quae sunt naturalia in Angelis, conveniunt eis secundum magis et minus, quia in superioribus Angelis natura intellectualis est perfectior quam in inferioribus. Liberum autem arbitrium non recipit magis et minus. Ergo in Angelis non est liberum arbitrium.

[30879] I^a q. 59 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra, libertas arbitrii ad dignitatem hominis pertinet. Sed Angeli digniores sunt hominibus. Ergo libertas arbitrii, cum sit in hominibus, multo magis est in Angelis.

[30880] I^a q. 59 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod quaedam sunt quae non agunt ex aliquo arbitrio, sed quasi ab aliis acta et mota, sicut sagitta a sagittante movetur ad finem. Quaedam vero agunt quodam arbitrio, sed non libero, sicut animalia irrationalia, ovis enim fugit lupum ex quodam iudicio, quo existimat eum sibi noxium; sed hoc iudicium non est sibi liberum, sed a natura inditum. Sed solum id quod habet intellectum, potest agere iudicio libero, inquantum cognoscit universalem rationem boni, ex qua potest iudicare hoc vel illud esse bonum. Unde ubicumque est intellectus, est liberum arbitrium. Et sic patet liberum arbitrium esse in Angelis etiam excellentius quam in hominibus, sicut et intellectum.

[30881] I^a q. 59 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod philosophus loquitur de electione secundum quod est hominis. Sicut autem aestimatio hominis in speculativis differt ab aestimatione Angeli in hoc, quod una est absque inquisitione, alia vero per inquisitionem; ita et in operativis. Unde in Angelis est electio; non tamen cum inquisitiva deliberatione consilii, sed per subitam acceptionem veritatis.

Reply to Objection 2: As was observed already [\(A\[2\]\)](#), knowledge is effected by the presence of the known within the knower. Now it is a mark of imperfection in anything not to have within it what it should naturally have. Consequently an angel would not be perfect in his nature, if his intellect were not determined to every truth which he can know naturally. But the act of the appetitive faculty comes of this, that the affection is directed to something outside. Yet the perfection of a thing does not come from everything to which it is inclined, but only from something which is higher than it. Therefore it does not argue imperfection in an angel if his will be not determined with regard to things beneath him; but it would argue imperfection in him, with he to be indeterminate to what is above him.

Reply to Objection 3: Free-will exists in a nobler manner in the higher angels than it does in the lower, as also does the judgment of the intellect. Yet it is true that liberty, in so far as the removal of compulsion is considered, is not susceptible of greater and less degree; because privations and negations are not lessened nor increased directly of themselves; but only by their cause, or through the addition of some qualification.

Q. 59. A. 4. Whether there is an irascible and a concupiscible appetite in the angels?

Objection 1: It would seem that there is an irascible and a concupiscible appetite in the angels. For Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that in the demons there is "unreasonable fury and wild concupiscence." But demons are of the same nature as angels; for sin has not altered their nature. Therefore there is an irascible and a concupiscible appetite in the angels.

Objection 2: Further, love and joy are in the concupiscible; while anger, hope, and fear are in the irascible appetite. But in the Sacred Scriptures these things are attributed both to the good and to the wicked angels. Therefore there is an irascible and a concupiscible appetite in the angels.

Objection 3: Further, some virtues are said to reside in the irascible appetite and some in the

[30882] I^a q. 59 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod, sicut dictum est, cognitio fit per hoc quod cognita sunt in cognoscente. Ad imperfectionem autem alicuius rei pertinet, si non sit in ea id quod natum est in ea esse. Unde Angelus non esset perfectus in sua natura, si intellectus eius non esset determinatus ad omnem veritatem quam naturaliter cognoscere potest. Sed actus appetitivae virtutis est per hoc quod affectus inclinatur ad rem exteriorem. Non autem dependet perfectio rei ex omni re ad quam inclinatur, sed solum ex superiori. Et ideo non pertinet ad imperfectionem Angeli, si non habet voluntatem determinatam respectu eorum quae infra ipsum sunt. Pertineret autem ad imperfectionem eius, si indeterminate se haberet ad illud quod supra ipsum est.

[30883] I^a q. 59 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod liberum arbitrium nobiliori modo est in superioribus Angelis, quam in inferioribus, sicut et iudicium intellectus. Tamen verum est quod ipsa libertas, secundum quod in ea consideratur quaedam remotio coactionis, non suscipit magis et minus, quia privationes et negationes non remittuntur nec intenduntur per se, sed solum per suam causam, vel secundum aliquam affirmationem adiunctam.

[30884] I^a q. 59 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod in Angelis sit irascibilis et concupiscibilis. Dicit enim Dionysius, IV cap. de Div. Nom., quod in Daemonibus est furor irrationabilis et concupiscentia amens. Sed Daemones eiusdem naturae sunt cum Angelis, quia peccatum non mutavit in eis naturam. Ergo in Angelis est irascibilis et concupiscibilis.

[30885] I^a q. 59 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, amor et gaudium in concupiscibili sunt; ira vero, spes et timor in irascibili. Sed haec attribuuntur Angelis bonis et malis in Scripturis. Ergo in Angelis est irascibilis et concupiscibilis.

[30886] I^a q. 59 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, virtutes quaedam dicuntur esse in irascibili et

concupiscible: thus charity and temperance appear to be in the concupiscible, while hope and fortitude are in the irascible. But these virtues are in the angels. Therefore there is both a concupiscible and an irascible appetite in the angels.

On the contrary, The Philosopher says (De Anima iii, text. 42) that the irascible and concupiscible are in the sensitive part, which does not exist in angels. Consequently there is no irascible or concupiscible appetite in the angels.

I answer that, The intellectual appetite is not divided into irascible and concupiscible; only the sensitive appetite is so divided. The reason of this is because, since the faculties are distinguished from one another not according to the material but only by the formal distinction of objects, if to any faculty there respond an object according to some common idea, there will be no distinction of faculties according to the diversity of the particular things contained under that common idea. Just as if the proper object of the power of sight be color as such, then there are not several powers of sight distinguished according to the difference of black and white: whereas if the proper object of any faculty were white, as white, then the faculty of seeing white would be distinguished from the faculty of seeing black.

Now it is quite evident from what has been said ([A\[1\]; Q\[16\], A\[1\]](#)), that the object of the intellectual appetite, otherwise known as the will, is good according to the common aspect of goodness; nor can there be any appetite except of what is good. Hence, in the intellectual part, the appetite is not divided according to the distinction of some particular good things, as the sensitive appetite is divided, which does not crave for what is good according to its common aspect, but for some particular good object. Accordingly, since there exists in the angels only an intellectual appetite, their appetite is not distinguished into irascible and concupiscible, but remains undivided; and it is called the will.

Reply to Objection 1: Fury and concupiscence are metaphorically said to be in the demons, as anger is sometimes attributed to God;---on

concupiscibili; sicut caritas et temperantia videntur esse in concupiscibili, spes autem et fortitudo in irascibili. Sed virtutes hae sunt in Angelis. Ergo in Angelis est concupiscibilis et irascibilis.

[30887] I^a q. 59 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra est quod philosophus dicit, in III de anima, quod irascibilis et concupiscibilis sunt in parte sensitiva; quae non est in Angelis. Ergo in eis non est irascibilis et concupiscibilis.

[30888] I^a q. 59 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod intellectivus appetitus non dividitur per irascibilem et concupiscibilem, sed solum appetitus sensitivus. Cuius ratio est quia cum potentiae non distinguantur secundum distinctionem materialem obiectorum, sed solum secundum rationem formalem obiecti; si alicui potentiae respondeat aliquod obiectum secundum rationem communem, non erit distinctio potentiarum secundum diversitatem propriorum quae sub illo communi continentur. Sicut si proprium obiectum potentiae visivae est color secundum rationem coloris, non distinguuntur plures potentiae visivae secundum differentiam albi et nigri, sed si proprium obiectum alicuius potentiae esset album inquantum album, distingueretur potentia visiva albi a potentia visiva nigri. Manifestum est autem ex dictis quod obiectum appetitus intellectivi, qui voluntas dicitur, est bonum secundum communem boni rationem, nec potest esse aliquis appetitus nisi boni. Unde in parte intellectiva appetitus non dividitur secundum distinctionem aliquorum particularium bonorum; sicut dividitur appetitus sensitivus, qui non respicit bonum secundum communem rationem, sed quoddam particulare bonum. Unde, cum in Angelis non sit nisi appetitus intellectivus, eorum appetitus non distinguitur per irascibilem et concupiscibilem, sed remanet indivisus; et vocatur voluntas.

[30889] I^a q. 59 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod furor et concupiscentia metaphorice dicuntur esse in Daemonibus, sicut et

account of the resemblance in the effect.

Reply to Objection 2: Love and joy, in so far as they are passions, are in the concupiscible appetite, but in so far as they express a simple act of the will, they are in the intellective part: in this sense to love is to wish well to anyone; and to be glad is for the will to repose in some good possessed. Universally speaking, none of these things is said of the angels, as by way of passions; as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei ix).

Reply to Objection 3: Charity, as a virtue, is not in the concupiscible appetite, but in the will; because the object of the concupiscible appetite is the good as delectable to the senses. But the Divine goodness, which is the object of charity, is not of any such kind. For the same reason it must be said that hope does not exist in the irascible appetite; because the object of the irascible appetite is something arduous belonging to the sensible order, which the virtue of hope does not regard; since the object of hope is arduous and divine. Temperance, however, considered as a human virtue, deals with the desires of sensible pleasures, which belong to the concupiscible faculty. Similarly, fortitude regulates daring and fear, which reside in the irascible part. Consequently temperance, in so far as it is a human virtue, resides in the concupiscible part, and fortitude in the irascible. But they do not exist in the angels in this manner. For in them there are no passions of concupiscence, nor of fear and daring, to be regulated by temperance and fortitude. But temperance is predicated of them according as in moderation they display their will in conformity with the Divine will. Fortitude is likewise attributed to them, in so far as they firmly carry out the Divine will. All of this is done by their will, and not by the irascible or concupiscible appetite.

ira quandoque Deo attribuitur, propter similitudinem effectus.

[30890] I^a q. 59 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod amor et gaudium, secundum quod sunt passiones, sunt in concupiscibili, sed secundum quod nominant simplicem voluntatis actum, sic sunt in intellectiva parte; prout amare est velle bonum alicui, et gaudere est quiescere voluntatem in aliquo bono habito. Et universaliter nihil horum dicitur de Angelis secundum passionem, ut Augustinus dicit, IX de Civ. Dei.

[30891] I^a q. 59 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod caritas, secundum quod est virtus, non est in concupiscibili, sed in voluntate. Nam obiectum concupiscibilis est bonum delectabile secundum sensum, huiusmodi autem non est bonum divinum, quod est obiectum caritatis. Et eadem ratione dicendum est quod spes non est in irascibili, quia obiectum irascibilis est quoddam arduum quod est sensibile, circa quod non est spes quae est virtus, sed circa arduum divinum. Temperantia autem, secundum quod est virtus humana, est circa concupiscentias delectabilium sensibilium, quae pertinent ad vim concupiscibilem. Et similiter fortitudo est circa audacias et timores quae sunt in irascibili. Et ideo temperantia, secundum quod est virtus humana, est in concupiscibili, et fortitudo in irascibili. Sed hoc modo non sunt in Angelis. Non enim in eis sunt passiones concupiscentiarum, vel timoris et audaciae, quas oporteat per temperantiam et fortitudinem regulare. Sed temperantia in eis dicitur, secundum quod moderate suam voluntatem exhibent secundum regulam divinae voluntatis. Et fortitudo in eis dicitur, secundum quod voluntatem divinam firmiter exequuntur. Quod totum fit per voluntatem; et non per irascibilem et concupiscibilem.

Q. 60. OF THE LOVE OR DILECTION OF THE ANGELS (FIVE ARTICLES)

The next subject for our consideration is that act of the will which is love or dilection; because every act of the appetitive faculty comes of love.

Under this heading there are five points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Whether there is natural love in the angels?](#)

[\(2\) Whether there is in them love of choice?](#)

[\(3\) Whether the angel loves himself with natural love or with love of choice?](#)

[\(4\) Whether one angel loves another with natural love as he loves himself?](#)

[\(5\) Whether the angel loves God more than self with natural love?](#)

Q. 60. A. 1. Whether there is natural love or dilection in an angel?

Objection 1: It would seem that there is no natural love or dilection in the angels. For, natural love is contradistinguished from intellectual love, as stated by Dionysius (Div. Nom. iv). But an angel's love is intellectual. Therefore it is not natural.

Objection 2: Further, those who love with natural love are more acted upon than active in themselves; for nothing has control over its own nature. Now the angels are not acted upon, but act of themselves; because they possess free-will, as was shown above ([Q\[59\], A\[3\]](#)). Consequently there is no natural love in them.

Objection 3: Further, every love is either ordinate or inordinate. Now ordinate love belongs to charity; while inordinate love belongs to wickedness. But neither of these belongs to nature; because charity is above nature, while wickedness is against nature. Therefore there is no natural love in the angels.

On the contrary, Love results from knowledge; for, nothing is loved except it be first known, as Augustine says (De Trin. x, 1,2). But there is

[30892] I^a q. 60 pr. Deinde considerandum est de actu voluntatis, qui est amor sive dilectio, nam omnis actus appetitivae virtutis ex amore seu dilectione derivatur. Et circa hoc quaeruntur quinque. Primo, utrum in Angelis sit dilectio naturalis. Secundo, utrum in eis sit dilectio electiva. Tertio, utrum Angelus diligat seipsum dilectione naturali an electiva. Quarto, utrum unus Angelus diligat alium dilectione naturali sicut seipsum. Quinto, utrum Angelus naturali dilectione diligat Deum plus quam seipsum.

[30893] I^a q. 60 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod in Angelis non sit amor vel dilectio naturalis. Amor enim naturalis dividitur contra intellectualem; ut patet per Dionysium, IV cap. de Div. Nom. Sed amor Angeli est intellectualis. Ergo non est naturalis.

[30894] I^a q. 60 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, ea quae amant amore naturali, magis aguntur quam agant, nihil enim habet dominium suae naturae. Sed Angeli non aguntur, sed agunt; cum sint liberi arbitrii, ut ostensum est. Ergo in Angelis non est amor seu dilectio naturalis.

[30895] I^a q. 60 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, omnis dilectio aut est recta, aut non recta. Dilectio autem recta pertinet ad caritatem, dilectio autem non recta pertinet ad iniquitatem. Neutrum autem horum pertinet ad naturam, quia caritas est supra naturam, iniquitas autem est contra naturam. Ergo nulla dilectio naturalis est in Angelis.

[30896] I^a q. 60 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod dilectio sequitur cognitionem, nihil enim amatur nisi cognitum, ut Augustinus dicit, X de Trin. Sed

natural knowledge in the angels. Therefore there is also natural love.

I answer that, We must necessarily place natural love in the angels. In evidence of this we must bear in mind that what comes first is always sustained in what comes after it. Now nature comes before intellect, because the nature of every subject is its essence. Consequently whatever belongs to nature must be preserved likewise in such subjects as have intellect. But it is common to every nature to have some inclination; and this is its natural appetite or love. This inclination is found to exist differently in different natures; but in each according to its mode. Consequently, in the intellectual nature there is to be found a natural inclination coming from the will; in the sensitive nature, according to the sensitive appetite; but in a nature devoid of knowledge, only according to the tendency of the nature to something. Therefore, since an angel is an intellectual nature, there must be a natural love in his will.

Reply to Objection 1: Intellectual love is contradistinguished from that natural love, which is merely natural, in so far as it belongs to a nature which has not likewise the perfection of either sense or intellect.

Reply to Objection 2: All things in the world are moved to act by something else except the First Agent, Who acts in such a manner that He is in no way moved to act by another; and in Whom nature and will are the same. So there is nothing unfitting in an angel being moved to act in so far as such natural inclination is implanted in him by the Author of his nature. Yet he is not so moved to act that he does not act himself, because he has free-will.

Reply to Objection 3: As natural knowledge is always true, so is natural love well regulated; because natural love is nothing else than the inclination implanted in nature by its Author. To say that a natural inclination is not well regulated, is to derogate from the Author of nature. Yet the rectitude of natural love is different from the

in Angelis est cognitio naturalis. Ergo et dilectio naturalis.

[30897] I^a q. 60 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod necesse est in Angelis ponere dilectionem naturalem. Ad cuius evidentiam, considerandum est quod semper prius salvatur in posteriori. Natura autem prior est quam intellectus, quia natura cuiuscumque rei est essentia eius. Unde id quod est naturae, oportet salvari etiam in habentibus intellectum. Est autem hoc commune omni naturae, ut habeat aliquam inclinationem, quae est appetitus naturalis vel amor. Quae tamen inclinatio diversimode invenitur in diversis naturis, in unaquaque secundum modum eius. Unde in natura intellectuali invenitur inclinatio naturalis secundum voluntatem; in natura autem sensitiva, secundum appetitum sensitivum, in natura vero carente cognitione, secundum solum ordinem naturae in aliquid. Unde cum Angelus sit natura intellectualis, oportet quod in voluntate eius sit naturalis dilectio.

[30898] I^a q. 60 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod intellectualis amor dividitur contra naturalem qui est solum naturalis, inquantum est naturae quae non addit supra rationem naturae perfectionem sensus aut intellectus.

[30899] I^a q. 60 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod omnia quae sunt in toto mundo, aguntur ab aliquo, praeter primum agens, quod ita agit quod nullo modo ab alio agitur, in quo est idem natura et voluntas. Et ideo non est inconveniens si Angelus agatur, inquantum inclinatio naturalis est sibi indita ab auctore suae naturae. Non tamen sic agitur quod non agat; cum habeat liberam voluntatem.

[30900] I^a q. 60 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, sicut cognitio naturalis semper est vera ita dilectio naturalis semper est recta, cum amor naturalis nihil aliud sit quam inclinatio naturae indita ab auctore naturae. Dicere ergo quod inclinatio naturalis non sit recta, est derogare auctori naturae. Alia tamen est rectitudo naturalis

rectitude of charity and virtue: because the one rectitude perfects the other; even so the truth of natural knowledge is of one kind, and the truth of infused or acquired knowledge is of another.

Q. 60. A. 2. Whether there is love of choice in the angels?

Objection 1: It would seem that there is no love of choice in the angels. For love of choice appears to be rational love; since choice follows counsel, which lies in inquiry, as stated in *Ethic.* iii, 3. Now rational love is contrasted with intellectual, which is proper to angels, as is said (*Div. Nom.* iv). Therefore there is no love of choice in the angels.

Objection 2: Further, the angels have only natural knowledge besides such as is infused: since they do not proceed from principles to acquire the knowledge of conclusions. Hence they are disposed to everything they can know, as our intellect is disposed towards first principles, which it can know naturally. Now love follows knowledge, as has been already stated ([A\[1\]; Q\[16\], A\[1\]](#)). Consequently, besides their infused love, there is only natural love in the angels. Therefore there is no love of choice in them.

On the contrary, We neither merit nor demerit by our natural acts. But by their love the angels merit or demerit. Therefore there is love of choice in them.

I answer that, There exists in the angels a natural love, and a love of choice. Their natural love is the principle of their love of choice; because, what belongs to that which precedes, has always the nature of a principle. Wherefore, since nature is first in everything, what belongs to nature must be a principle in everything.

This is clearly evident in man, with respect to both his intellect and his will. For the intellect knows principles naturally; and from such knowledge in man comes the knowledge of conclusions, which are known by him not naturally, but by discovery, or by teaching. In like manner, the end acts in the will in the same way

dilectionis, et alia est rectitudo caritatis et virtutis, quia una rectitudo est perfectiva alterius. Sicut etiam alia est veritas naturalis cognitionis; et alia est veritas cognitionis infusae vel acquisitae.

[30901] I^a q. 60 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod in Angelis non sit dilectio electiva. Dilectio enim electiva videtur esse amor rationalis, cum electio sequatur consilium, quod in inquisitione consistit, ut dicitur in III *Ethic.* Sed rationalis amor dividitur contra intellectualem (qui est proprius Angelorum); ut dicitur IV cap. de *Div. Nom.* Ergo in Angelis non est dilectio electiva.

[30902] I^a q. 60 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, in Angelis non est nisi cognitio naturalis, praeter cognitionem infusam, quia non discurrunt de principiis ad acquirendum conclusiones. Et sic ad omnia quae naturaliter cognoscere possunt, sic se habent sicut intellectus noster ad prima principia quae naturaliter cognoscere potest. Sed dilectio sequitur cognitionem, ut dictum est. Ergo in Angelis, praeter dilectionem gratuitam, non est nisi dilectio naturalis. Non ergo electiva.

[30903] I^a q. 60 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra, naturalibus neque meremur neque demeremur. Sed Angeli sua dilectione aliqua merentur, vel demerentur. Ergo in eis est aliqua dilectio electiva.

[30904] I^a q. 60 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod in Angelis est quaedam dilectio naturalis et quaedam electiva. Et naturalis dilectio in eis est principium electivae, quia semper id quod pertinet ad prius, habet rationem principii; unde, cum natura sit primum quod est in unoquoque, oportet quod id quod ad naturam pertinet, sit principium in quolibet. Et hoc apparet in homine et quantum ad intellectum, et quantum ad voluntatem. Intellectus enim cognoscit principia naturaliter, et ex hac cognitione causatur in homine scientia conclusionum, quae non cognoscuntur naturaliter ab homine, sed per inventionem vel doctrinam. Similiter in voluntate finis hoc modo se habet, sicut principium in intellectu, ut dicitur in II

as the principle does in the intellect, as is laid down in Phys. ii, text. 89. Consequently the will tends naturally to its last end; for every man naturally wills happiness: and all other desires are caused by this natural desire; since whatever a man wills he wills on account of the end. Therefore the love of that good, which a man naturally wills as an end, is his natural love; but the love which comes of this, which is of something loved for the end's sake, is the love of choice.

There is however a difference on the part of the intellect and on the part of the will. Because, as was stated already ([Q\[59\], A\[2\]](#)), the mind's knowledge is brought about by the inward presence of the known within the knower. It comes of the imperfection of man's intellectual nature that his mind does not simultaneously possess all things capable of being understood, but only a few things from which he is moved in a measure to grasp other things. The act of the appetitive faculty, on the contrary, follows the inclination of man towards things; some of which are good in themselves, and consequently are appetible in themselves; others being good only in relation to something else, and being appetible on account of something else. Consequently it does not argue imperfection in the person desiring, for him to seek one thing naturally as his end, and something else from choice as ordained to such end. Therefore, since the intellectual nature of the angels is perfect, only natural and not deductive knowledge is to be found in them, but there is to be found in them both natural love and love of choice.

In saying all this, we are passing over all that regards things which are above nature, since nature is not the sufficient principle thereof: but we shall speak of them later on ([Q\[62\]](#)).

Reply to Objection 1: Not all love of choice is rational love, according as rational is distinguished from intellectual love. For rational love is so called which follows deductive knowledge: but, as was said above ([Q\[59\], A\[3\]](#), ad 1), when treating of free-will, every choice does not follow a discursive act of the reason; but only human choice. Consequently the conclusion does not follow.

Physic. Unde voluntas naturaliter tendit in suum finem ultimum, omnis enim homo naturaliter vult beatitudinem. Et ex hac naturali voluntate causantur omnes aliae voluntates, cum quidquid homo vult, velit propter finem. Dilectio igitur boni quod homo naturaliter vult sicut finem, est dilectio naturalis, dilectio autem ab hac derivata, quae est boni quod diligitur propter finem, est dilectio electiva. Hoc tamen differenter se habet ex parte intellectus, et voluntatis. Quia, sicut supra dictum est, cognitio intellectus fit secundum quod res cognitae sunt in cognoscente. Est autem ex imperfectione intellectualis naturae in homine, quod non statim eius intellectus naturaliter habet omnia intelligibilia, sed quaedam, a quibus in alia quodammodo movetur. Sed actus appetitivae virtutis est, e converso, secundum ordinem appetentis ad res. Quarum quaedam sunt secundum se bona, et ideo secundum se appetibilia, quaedam vero habent rationem bonitatis ex ordine ad aliud, et sunt appetibilia propter aliud. Unde non est ex imperfectione appetentis, quod aliquid appetat naturaliter ut finem, et aliquid per electionem, ut ordinatur in finem. Quia igitur natura intellectualis in Angelis perfecta est, invenitur in eis sola cognitio naturalis, non autem ratiocinativa, sed invenitur in eis dilectio et naturalis et electiva. Haec autem dicta sunt, praetermissis his quae supra naturam sunt, horum enim natura non est principium sufficiens. De his autem infra dicetur.

[30905] I^a q. 60 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod non omnis dilectio electiva est amor rationalis, secundum quod rationalis amor dividitur contra intellectualem. Dicitur enim sic amor rationalis, qui sequitur cognitionem ratiocinativam, non omnis autem electio consequitur discursum rationis, ut supra dictum est, cum de libero arbitrio ageretur; sed solum electio hominis. Unde ratio non sequitur.

Reply to Objection 2: The reply to the second objection follows from what has been said.

[30906] I^a q. 60 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum patet responsio ex dictis.

Q. 60. A. 3. Whether the angel loves himself with both natural love, and love of choice?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angel does not love himself both with natural love and a love of choice. For, as was said ([A\[2\]](#)), natural love regards the end itself; while love of choice regards the means to the end. But the same thing, with regard to the same, cannot be both the end and a means to the end. Therefore natural love and the love of choice cannot have the same object.

[30907] I^a q. 60 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus non diligat seipsum dilectione naturali et electiva. Dilectio enim naturalis est ipsius finis, sicut dictum est; dilectio autem electiva, eorum quae sunt ad finem. Sed idem non potest esse finis et ad finem, respectu eiusdem. Ergo non potest esse eiusdem dilectio naturalis et electiva.

Objection 2: Further, as Dionysius observes (Div. Nom. iv): "Love is a uniting and a binding power." But uniting and binding imply various things brought together. Therefore the angel cannot love himself.

[30908] I^a q. 60 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, amor est virtus unitiva et concretiva, ut Dionysius dicit, IV cap. de Div. Nom. Sed unitio et concretio est diversorum in unum reductorum. Ergo non potest Angelus diligere seipsum.

Objection 3: Further, love is a kind of movement. But every movement tends towards something else. Therefore it seems that an angel cannot love himself with either natural or elective love.

[30909] I^a q. 60 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, dilectio est quidam motus. Sed omnis motus in alterum tendit. Ergo videtur quod Angelus non possit amare seipsum dilectione naturali, nec electiva.

On the contrary, The Philosopher says (Ethic. ix, 8): "Love for others comes of love for oneself."

[30910] I^a q. 60 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod philosophus dicit, IX Ethic., quod *amicabilia quae sunt ad alterum, veniunt ex amicabilibus quae sunt ad seipsum.*

I answer that, Since the object of love is good, and good is to be found both in substance and in accident, as is clear from Ethic. i, 6, a thing may be loved in two ways; first of all as a subsisting good; and secondly as an accidental or inherent good. That is loved as a subsisting good, which is so loved that we wish well to it. But that which we wish unto another, is loved as an accidental or inherent good: thus knowledge is loved, not that any good may come to it but that it may be possessed. This kind of love has been called by the name "concupiscence" while the first is called "friendship."

Now it is manifest that in things devoid of knowledge, everything naturally seeks to procure what is good for itself; as fire seeks to mount

[30911] I^a q. 60 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, cum amor sit boni, bonum autem sit et in substantia et in accidente, ut patet I Ethic., dupliciter aliquid amatur, uno modo, ut bonum subsistens; alio modo, ut bonum accidentale sive inhaerens. Illud quidem amatur ut bonum subsistens, quod sic amatur ut ei aliquis velit bonum. Ut bonum vero accidentale seu inhaerens amatur id quod desideratur alteri, sicut amatur scientia, non ut ipsa sit bona, sed ut habeatur. Et hunc modum amoris quidam nominaverunt concupiscentiam, primum vero amicitiam. Manifestum est autem quod in rebus cognitione carentibus, unumquodque naturaliter appetit consequi id quod est sibi bonum; sicut ignis locum sursum. Unde et Angelus et homo naturaliter appetunt suum bonum et suam

upwards. Consequently both angel and man naturally seek their own good and perfection. This is to love self. Hence angel and man naturally love self, in so far as by natural appetite each desires what is good for self. On the other hand, each loves self with the love of choice, in so far as from choice he wishes for something which will benefit himself.

Reply to Objection 1: It is not under the same but under quite different aspects that an angel or a man loves self with natural and with elective love, as was observed above.

Reply to Objection 2: As to be one is better than to be united, so there is more oneness in love which is directed to self than in love which unites one to others. Dionysius used the terms "uniting" and "binding" in order to show the derivation of love from self to things outside self; as uniting is derived from unity.

Reply to Objection 3: As love is an action which remains within the agent, so also is it a movement which abides within the lover, but does not of necessity tend towards something else; yet it can be reflected back upon the lover so that he loves himself; just as knowledge is reflected back upon the knower, in such a way that he knows himself.

Q. 60. A. 4. Whether an angel loves another with natural love as he loves himself?

Objection 1: It would seem that an angel does not love another with natural love as he loves himself. For love follows knowledge. But an angel does not know another as he knows himself: because he knows himself by his essence, while he knows another by his similitude, as was said above ([Q\[56\].AA\[1\].2](#)). Therefore it seems that one angel does not love another with natural love as he loves himself.

Objection 2: Further, the cause is more powerful than the effect; and the principle than what is derived from it. But love for another comes of love for self, as the Philosopher says (*Ethic. ix, 8*). Therefore one angel does not love another as himself, but loves himself more.

perfectionem. Et hoc est amare seipsum. Unde naturaliter tam Angelus quam homo diligit seipsum, inquantum aliquod bonum naturali appetitu sibi desiderat. Inquantum vero sibi desiderat aliquod bonum per electionem, intantum amat seipsum dilectione electiva.

[30912] I^a q. 60 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Angelus aut homo non diligit se dilectione naturali et electiva secundum idem; sed secundum diversa, ut dictum est.

[30913] I^a q. 60 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod, sicut plus est esse unum quam uniri, ita amor magis est unus ad seipsum, quam ad diversa quae ei uniuntur. Sed ideo Dionysius usus fuit nomine unitiois et concretionis, ut ostenderet derivationem amoris a se in alia, sicut ab uno derivatur unitio.

[30914] I^a q. 60 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, sicut amor est actio manens in agente, ita est motus manens in amante, non autem tendens in aliquid aliud ex necessitate; sed potest reflecti super amantem, ut amet seipsum, sicut et cognitio reflectitur in cognoscentem, ut cognoscat seipsum.

[30915] I^a q. 60 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod unus Angelus non diligit naturali dilectione alium sicut seipsum. Dilectio enim sequitur cognitionem. Sed unus Angelus non cognoscit alium sicut seipsum, quia seipsum cognoscit per suam essentiam, alium vero per eius similitudinem, ut supra dictum est. Ergo videtur quod unus Angelus non diligit alium sicut seipsum.

[30916] I^a q. 60 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, causa est potior causato, et principium eo quod ex principio derivatur. Sed dilectio quae est ad alium, derivatur ab ea quae est ad seipsum; sicut dicit philosophus, IX *Ethic*. Ergo Angelus non diligit alium sicut seipsum, sed seipsum magis.

Objection 3: Further, natural love is of something as an end, and is unremovable. But no angel is the end of another; and again, such love can be severed from him, as is the case with the demons, who have no love for the good angels. Therefore an angel does not love another with natural love as he loves himself.

On the contrary, That seems to be a natural property which is found in all, even in such as devoid of reason. But, "every beast loves its like," as is said, [Ecclus. 13:19](#). Therefore an angel naturally loves another as he loves himself.

I answer that, As was observed ([A\[3\]](#)), both angel and man naturally love self. Now what is one with a thing, is that thing itself: consequently every thing loves what is one with itself. So, if this be one with it by natural union, it loves it with natural love; but if it be one with it by non-natural union, then it loves it with non-natural love. Thus a man loves his fellow townsman with a social love, while he loves a blood relation with natural affection, in so far as he is one with him in the principle of natural generation.

Now it is evident that what is generically or specifically one with another, is the one according to nature. And so everything loves another which is one with it in species, with a natural affection, in so far as it loves its own species. This is manifest even in things devoid of knowledge: for fire has a natural inclination to communicate its form to another thing, wherein consists this other thing's good; as it is naturally inclined to seek its own good, namely, to be borne upwards.

So then, it must be said that one angel loves another with natural affection, in so far as he is one with him in nature. But so far as an angel has something else in common with another angel, or differs from him in other respects, he does not love him with natural love.

Reply to Objection 1: The expression 'as himself' can in one way qualify the knowledge and the love on the part of the one known and loved: and thus one angel knows another as himself, because he knows the other to be even as he knows himself to be. In another way the expression can

[30917] I^a q. 60 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, dilectio naturalis est alicuius tanquam finis; et non potest removeri. Sed unus Angelus non est finis alterius; et iterum haec dilectio potest removeri, ut patet in Daemonibus, qui non diligunt bonos Angelos. Ergo unus Angelus non diligit alium naturali dilectione sicut seipsum.

[30918] I^a q. 60 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra est, quia illud quod invenitur in omnibus, etiam ratione carentibus, videtur esse naturale. Sed sicut dicitur Eccli. XIII, omne animal diligit sibi simile. Ergo Angelus diligit naturaliter alium sicut seipsum.

[30919] I^a q. 60 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut dictum est, Angelus et homo naturaliter seipsum diligit. Illud autem quod est unum cum aliquo, est ipsummet, unde unumquodque diligit id quod est unum sibi. Et si quidem sit unum sibi unione naturali, diligit illud dilectione naturali, si vero sit unum secum unione non naturali, diligit ipsum dilectione non naturali. Sicut homo diligit civem suum dilectione politicae virtutis; consanguineum autem suum dilectione naturali, inquantum est unum cum eo in principio generationis naturalis. Manifestum est autem quod id quod est unum cum aliquo, genere vel specie, est unum per naturam. Et ideo dilectione naturali quaelibet res diligit id quod est secum unum secundum speciem, inquantum diligit speciem suam. Et hoc etiam apparet in his quae cognitione carent, nam ignis naturalem inclinationem habet ut communicet alteri suam formam, quod est bonum eius; sicut naturaliter inclinatur ad hoc quod quaerat bonum suum, ut esse sursum. Sic ergo dicendum est quod unus Angelus diligit alium naturali dilectione, inquantum convenit cum eo in natura. Sed inquantum convenit cum eo in aliquibus aliis vel etiam inquantum differt ab eo secundum quaedam alia, non diligit eum naturali dilectione.

[30920] I^a q. 60 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod hoc quod dico sicut seipsum, potest uno modo determinare cognitionem seu dilectionem ex parte cogniti et dilecti. Et sic cognoscit alium sicut seipsum, quia cognoscit alium esse, sicut cognoscit seipsum esse. Alio

qualify the knowledge and the love on the part of the knower and lover. And thus one angel does not know another as himself, because he knows himself by his essence, and the other not by the other's essence. In like manner he does not love another as he loves himself, because he loves himself by his own will; but he does not love another by the other's will.

Reply to Objection 2: The expression "as" does not denote equality, but likeness. For since natural affection rests upon natural unity, the angel naturally loves less what is less one with him. Consequently he loves more what is numerically one with himself, than what is one only generically or specifically. But it is natural for him to have a like love for another as for himself, in this respect, that as he loves self in wishing well to self, so he loves another in wishing well to him.

Reply to Objection 3: Natural love is said to be of the end, not as of that end to which good is willed, but rather as of that good which one wills for oneself, and in consequence for another, as united to oneself. Nor can such natural love be stripped from the wicked angels, without their still retaining a natural affection towards the good angels, in so far as they share the same nature with them. But they hate them, in so far as they are unlike them according to righteousness and unrighteousness.

Q. 60. A. 5. Whether an angel by natural love loves God more than he loves himself?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angel does not love God by natural love more than he loves himself. For, as was stated ([A\[4\]](#)), natural love rests upon natural union. Now the Divine nature is far above the angelic nature. Therefore, according to natural love, the angel loves God less than self, or even than another angel.

Objection 2: Further, "That on account of which a thing is such, is yet more so." But every one loves another with natural love for his own sake: because one thing loves another as good for itself. Therefore the angel does not love God more than

modo potest determinare cognitionem et dilectionem ex parte diligentis et cognoscentis. Et sic non cognoscit alium sicut seipsum, quia se cognoscit per suam essentiam, alium autem non per eius essentiam. Et similiter non diligit alium sicut seipsum, quia seipsum diligit per suam voluntatem, alium autem non diligit per eius voluntatem.

[30921] I^a q. 60 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod ly sicut non designat aequalitatem, sed similitudinem. Cum enim dilectio naturalis super unitatem naturalem fundetur, illud quod est minus unum cum eo, naturaliter minus diligit. Unde naturaliter plus diligit quod est unum numero, quam quod est unum specie vel genere. Sed naturale est quod similem dilectionem habeat ad alium sicut ad seipsum, quantum ad hoc, quod sicut seipsum diligit inquantum vult sibi bonum, ita alium diligit inquantum vult eius bonum.

[30922] I^a q. 60 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod dilectio naturalis dicitur esse ipsius finis, non tanquam cui aliquis velit bonum; sed tanquam bonum quod quis vult sibi, et per consequens alii, inquantum est unum sibi. Nec ista dilectio naturalis removeri potest etiam ab Angelis malis, quin dilectionem naturalem habeant ad alios Angelos, inquantum cum eis communicant in natura. Sed odiunt eos, inquantum diversificantur secundum iustitiam et iniustitiam.

[30923] I^a q. 60 a. 5 arg. 1 Ad quintum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus naturali dilectione non diligit Deum plus quam seipsum. Quia, ut dictum est, dilectio naturalis fundatur super unione naturali. Sed natura divina maxime distat a natura Angeli. Ergo naturali dilectione Angelus minus diligit Deum quam se, vel etiam alium Angelum.

[30924] I^a q. 60 a. 5 arg. 2 Praeterea, propter quod unumquodque, et illud magis. Sed naturali dilectione quilibet diligit alium propter se, unumquodque enim diligit aliquid inquantum est bonum sibi. Ergo dilectione naturali Angelus non

self with natural love.

Objection 3: Further, nature is self-centered in its operation; for we behold every agent acting naturally for its own preservation. But nature's operation would not be self-centered were it to tend towards anything else more than to nature itself. Therefore the angel does not love God more than himself from natural love.

Objection 4: Further, it is proper to charity to love God more than self. But to love from charity is not natural to the angels; for "it is poured out upon their hearts by the Holy Spirit Who is given to them," as Augustine says (*De Civ. Dei* xii, 9). Therefore the angels do not love God more than themselves by natural love.

Objection 5: Further, natural love lasts while nature endures. But the love of God more than self does not remain in the angel or man who sins; for Augustine says (*De Civ. Dei* xiv), "Two loves have made two cities; namely love of self unto the contempt of God has made the earthly city; while love of God unto the contempt of self has made the heavenly city." Therefore it is not natural to love God more than self.

On the contrary, All the moral precepts of the law come of the law of nature. But the precept of loving God more than self is a moral precept of the law. Therefore, it is of the law of nature. Consequently from natural love the angel loves God more than himself.

I answer that, There have been some who maintained that an angel loves God more than himself with natural love, both as to the love of concupiscence, through his seeking the Divine good for himself rather than his own good; and, in a fashion, as to the love of friendship, in so far as he naturally desires a greater good to God than to himself; because he naturally wishes God to be God, while as for himself, he wills to have his own nature. But absolutely speaking, out of the natural love he loves himself more than he does God, because he naturally loves himself before

diligit Deum plus quam seipsum.

[30925] I^a q. 60 a. 5 arg. 3 Praeterea, natura reflectitur in seipsam, videmus enim quod omne agens naturaliter agit ad conservationem sui. Non autem reflecteretur in seipsam natura, si tenderet in aliud plus quam in seipsam. Non ergo naturali dilectione diligit Angelus Deum plus quam se.

[30926] I^a q. 60 a. 5 arg. 4 Praeterea, hoc videtur esse proprium caritatis, ut aliquis Deum plus quam seipsum diligat. Sed dilectio caritatis non est naturalis in Angelis, sed diffunditur in cordibus eorum per spiritum sanctum, qui datus est eis, ut dicit Augustinus, XII de Civ. Dei. Ergo non diligunt Deum Angeli dilectione naturali plus quam seipsos.

[30927] I^a q. 60 a. 5 arg. 5 Praeterea, dilectio naturalis semper manet, manente natura. Sed diligere Deum plus quam seipsum non manet in peccante Angelo vel homine, quia, ut Augustinus dicit, XIV de Civ. Dei, *fecerunt civitates duas amores duo, terrenam scilicet amor sui usque ad Dei contemptum, caelestem vero amor Dei usque ad contemptum sui*. Ergo diligere Deum supra seipsum non est naturale.

[30928] I^a q. 60 a. 5 s. c. Sed contra, omnia moralia legis praecepta sunt de lege naturae. Sed praeceptum de diligendo Deum supra seipsum, est praeceptum morale legis. Ergo est de lege naturae. Ergo dilectione naturali Angelus diligit Deum supra seipsum.

[30929] I^a q. 60 a. 5 co. Respondeo dicendum quod quidam dixerunt quod Angelus naturali dilectione diligit Deum plus quam se, amore concupiscentiae, quia scilicet plus appetit sibi bonum divinum quam bonum suum. Et quodammodo amore amicitiae, inquantum scilicet Deo vult naturaliter Angelus maius bonum quam sibi, vult enim naturaliter Deum esse Deum, se autem vult habere naturam propriam. Sed simpliciter loquendo, naturali dilectione plus diligit se quam Deum, quia intensius et principalius naturaliter diligit se quam Deum. Sed

God, and with greater intensity.

The falsity of such an opinion stands in evidence, if one but consider whither natural movement tends in the natural order of things; because the natural tendency of things devoid of reason shows the nature of the natural inclination residing in the will of an intellectual nature. Now, in natural things, everything which, as such, naturally belongs to another, is principally, and more strongly inclined to that other to which it belongs, than towards itself. Such a natural tendency is evidenced from things which are moved according to nature: because "according as a thing is moved naturally, it has an inborn aptitude to be thus moved," as stated in Phys. ii, text. 78. For we observe that the part naturally exposes itself in order to safeguard the whole; as, for instance, the hand is without deliberation exposed to the blow for the whole body's safety. And since reason copies nature, we find the same inclination among the social virtues; for it behooves the virtuous citizen to expose himself to the danger of death for the public weal of the state; and if man were a natural part of the city, then such inclination would be natural to him.

Consequently, since God is the universal good, and under this good both man and angel and all creatures are comprised, because every creature in regard to its entire being naturally belongs to God, it follows that from natural love angel and man alike love God before themselves and with a greater love. Otherwise, if either of them loved self more than God, it would follow that natural love would be perverse, and that it would not be perfected but destroyed by charity.

Reply to Objection 1: Such reasoning holds good of things adequately divided whereof one is not the cause of the existence and goodness of the other; for in such natures each loves itself naturally more than it does the other, inasmuch as it is more one with itself than it is with the other. But where one is the whole cause of the existence and goodness of the other, that one is naturally more loved than self; because, as we said above, each part naturally loves the whole more than itself: and each individual naturally loves the good of the species more than its own individual good. Now God is not only the good of one

falsitas huius opinionis manifeste apparet, si quis in rebus naturalibus consideret ad quid res naturaliter moveatur, inclinatio enim naturalis in his quae sunt sine ratione, demonstrat inclinationem naturalem in voluntate intellectualis naturae. Unumquodque autem in rebus naturalibus, quod secundum naturam hoc ipsum quod est, alterius est, principalius et magis inclinatur in id cuius est, quam in seipsum. Et haec inclinatio naturalis demonstratur ex his quae naturaliter aguntur, quia *unumquodque, sicut agitur naturaliter, sic aptum natum est agi*, ut dicitur in II Physic. Videmus enim quod naturaliter pars se exponit, ad conservationem totius, sicut manus exponitur ictui, absque deliberatione, ad conservationem totius corporis. Et quia ratio imitatur naturam, huiusmodi inclinationem invenimus in virtutibus politicis, est enim virtuosus civis, ut se exponat mortis periculo pro totius reipublicae conservatione; et si homo esset naturalis pars huius civitatis, haec inclinatio esset ei naturalis. Quia igitur bonum universale est ipse Deus, et sub hoc bono continetur etiam Angelus et homo et omnis creatura, quia omnis creatura naturaliter, secundum id quod est, Dei est; sequitur quod naturali dilectione etiam Angelus et homo plus et principalius diligit Deum quam seipsum. Alioquin, si naturaliter plus seipsum diligeret quam Deum, sequeretur quod naturalis dilectio esset perversa; et quod non perficeretur per caritatem, sed destrueretur.

[30930] I^a q. 60 a. 5 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod ratio illa procedit in his quae ex aequo dividuntur, quorum unum non est alteri ratio existendi et bonitatis, in talibus enim unumquodque diligit naturaliter magis seipsum quam alterum, inquantum est magis sibi ipsi unum quam alteri. Sed in illis quorum unum est tota ratio existendi et bonitatis alii, magis diligitur naturaliter tale alterum quam ipsum; sicut dictum est quod unaquaeque pars diligit naturaliter totum plus quam se. Et quodlibet singulare naturaliter diligit plus bonum suae speciei, quam bonum suum singulare. Deus autem non solum est bonum

species, but is absolutely the universal good; hence everything in its own way naturally loves God more than itself.

Reply to Objection 2: When it is said that God is loved by an angel "in so far" as He is good to the angel, if the expression "in so far" denotes an end, then it is false; for he does not naturally love God for his own good, but for God's sake. If it denotes the nature of love on the lover's part, then it is true; for it would not be in the nature of anyone to love God, except from this---that everything is dependent on that good which is God.

Reply to Objection 3: Nature's operation is self-centered not merely as to certain particular details, but much more as to what is common; for everything is inclined to preserve not merely its individuality, but likewise its species. And much more has everything a natural inclination towards what is the absolutely universal good.

Reply to Objection 4: God, in so far as He is the universal good, from Whom every natural good depends, is loved by everything with natural love. So far as He is the good which of its very nature beatifies all with supernatural beatitude, He is love with the love of charity.

Reply to Objection 5: Since God's substance and universal goodness are one and the same, all who behold God's essence are by the same movement of love moved towards the Divine essence as it is distinct from other things, and according as it is the universal good. And because He is naturally loved by all so far as He is the universal good, it is impossible that whoever sees Him in His essence should not love Him. But such as do not behold His essence, know Him by some particular effects, which are sometimes opposed to their will. So in this way they are said to hate God; yet nevertheless, so far as He is the universal good of all, every thing naturally loves God more than itself.

unius speciei, sed est ipsum universale bonum simpliciter. Unde unumquodque suo modo naturaliter diligit Deum plus quam seipsum.

[30931] I^a q. 60 a. 5 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod, cum dicitur quod Deus diligitur ab Angelo inquantum est ei bonus, si ly inquantum dicat finem, sic falsum est, non enim diligit naturaliter Deum propter bonum suum, sed propter ipsum Deum. Si vero dicat rationem amoris ex parte amantis, sic verum est, non enim esset in natura alicuius quod amaret Deum, nisi ex eo quod unumquodque dependet a bono quod est Deus.

[30932] I^a q. 60 a. 5 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod natura reflectitur in seipsam non solum quantum ad id quod est ei singulare, sed multo magis quantum ad commune, inclinatur enim unumquodque ad conservandum non solum suum individuum, sed etiam suam speciem. Et multo magis habet naturalem inclinationem unumquodque in id quod est bonum universale simpliciter.

[30933] I^a q. 60 a. 5 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod Deus, secundum quod est universale bonum, a quo dependet omne bonum naturale, diligitur naturali dilectione ab unoquoque. Inquantum vero est bonum beatificans naturaliter omnes supernaturali beatitudine, sic diligitur dilectione caritatis.

[30934] I^a q. 60 a. 5 ad 5 Ad quintum dicendum quod, cum in Deo sit unum et idem eius substantia et bonum commune, omnes qui vident ipsam Dei essentiam, eodem motu dilectionis moventur in ipsam Dei essentiam prout est ab aliis distincta, et secundum quod est quoddam bonum commune. Et quia inquantum est bonum commune, naturaliter amatur ab omnibus; quicumque videt eum per essentiam, impossibile est quin diligit ipsum. Sed illi qui non vident essentiam eius, cognoscunt eum per aliquos particulares effectus, qui interdum eorum voluntati contrariantur. Et sic hoc modo dicuntur odio habere Deum, cum tamen, inquantum est bonum commune omnium, unumquodque naturaliter diligit plus Deum quam seipsum.

Q. 61. OF THE PRODUCTION OF THE ANGELS IN THE ORDER OF NATURAL BEING (FOUR ARTICLES)

After dealing with the nature of the angels, their knowledge and will, it now remains for us to treat of their creation, or, speaking in a general way, of their origin. Such consideration is threefold. In the first place we must see how they were brought into natural existence; secondly, how they were made perfect in grace or glory; and thirdly, how some of them became wicked.

Under the first heading there are four points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Whether the angel has a cause of his existence?](#)

[\(2\) Whether he has existed from eternity?](#)

[\(3\) Whether he was created before corporeal creatures?](#)

[\(4\) Whether the angels were created in the empyrean heaven?](#)

Q. 61. A. 1. Whether the angels have a cause of their existence?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels have no cause of their existence. For the first chapter of Genesis treats of things created by God. But there is no mention of angels. Therefore the angels were not created by God.

Objection 2: Further, the Philosopher says (Metaph. viii, text. 16) that if any substance be a form without matter, "straightway it has being and unity of itself, and has no cause of its being and unity." But the angels are immaterial forms, as was shown above ([Q\[50\], A\[2\]](#)). Therefore they have no cause of their being.

Objection 3: Further, whatever is produced by any agent, from the very fact of its being produced, receives form from it. But since the angels are forms, they do not derive their form from any agent. Therefore the angels have no active cause.

On the contrary, It is said ([Ps. 148:2](#)): "Praise ye

[30935] I^a q. 61 pr. Post ea quae praemissa sunt de natura Angelorum, et cognitione et voluntate eorum, restat considerandum de eorum creatione, sive universaliter de eorum exordio. Et haec consideratio est tripartita. Nam primo considerabimus quomodo producti sunt in esse naturae; secundo, quomodo perfecti sunt in gratia vel gloria; tertio, quomodo aliqui ex eis facti sunt mali. Circa primum quaeruntur quatuor. Primo, utrum Angelus habeat causam sui esse. Secundo, utrum Angelus sit ab aeterno. Tertio, utrum Angelus sit creatus ante corporalem creaturam. Quarto, utrum Angeli fuerint creati in caelo Empyreo.

[30936] I^a q. 61 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli non habeant causam sui esse. De his enim quae sunt a Deo creata, agitur Genesis I. Sed nulla mentio fit ibi de Angelis. Ergo Angeli non sunt creati a Deo.

[30937] I^a q. 61 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, philosophus dicit, in VIII Metaphys., quod si aliqua substantia sit forma sine materia, *statim per seipsam est ens et unum, et non habet causam quae faciat eam ens et unum*. Sed Angeli sunt formae immateriales, ut supra ostensum est. Ergo non habent causam sui esse.

[30938] I^a q. 61 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, omne quod fit ab aliquo agente, per hoc quod fit, accipit formam ab eo. Sed Angeli, cum sint formae, non accipiunt formam ab aliquo agente. Ergo Angeli non habent causam agentem.

[30939] I^a q. 61 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod

Him, all His angels"; and further on, verse 5: "For He spoke and they were made."

I answer that, It must be affirmed that angels and everything existing, except God, were made by God. God alone is His own existence; while in everything else the essence differs from the existence, as was shown above ([Q\[3\], A\[4\]](#)). From this it is clear that God alone exists of His own essence: while all other things have their existence by participation. Now whatever exists by participation is caused by what exists essentially; as everything ignited is caused by fire. Consequently the angels, of necessity, were made by God.

Reply to Objection 1: Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xi, 50) that the angels were not passed over in that account of the first creation of things, but are designated by the name "heavens" or of "light." And they were either passed over, or else designated by the names of corporeal things, because Moses was addressing an uncultured people, as yet incapable of understanding an incorporeal nature; and if it had been divulged that there were creatures existing beyond corporeal nature, it would have proved to them an occasion of idolatry, to which they were inclined, and from which Moses especially meant to safeguard them.

Reply to Objection 2: Substances that are subsisting forms have no 'formal' cause of their existence and unity, nor such active cause as produces its effect by changing the matter from a state of potentiality to actuality; but they have a cause productive of their entire substance.

From this the solution of the third difficulty is manifest.

Q. 61. A. 2. Whether the angel was produced by God from eternity?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angel was produced by God from eternity. For God is the cause of the angel by His being: for He does not

dicatur in Psalmo CXLVIII, laudate eum, omnes Angeli eius. Et postea subdit, quoniam ipse dixit, et facta sunt.

[30940] I^a q. 61 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod necesse est dicere et Angelos, et omne id quod praeter Deum est, a Deo factum esse. Solus enim Deus est suum esse, in omnibus autem aliis differt essentia rei et esse eius, ut ex superioribus patet. Et ex hoc manifestum est quod solus Deus est ens per suam essentiam, omnia vero alia sunt entia per participationem. Omne autem quod est per participationem causatur ab eo quod est per essentiam, sicut omne ignitum causatur ab igne. Unde necesse est Angelos a Deo creatos esse.

[30941] I^a q. 61 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Augustinus dicit, in XI de Civ. Dei, quod Angeli non sunt praetermissi in illa prima rerum creatione, sed significantur nomine caeli, aut etiam lucis. Ideo autem vel praetermissi sunt, vel nominibus rerum corporalium significati, quia Moyses rudi populo loquebatur, qui nondum capere poterat incorpoream naturam; et si eis fuisset expressum aliquas res esse super omnem naturam corpoream, fuisset eis occasio idololatriae, ad quam proni erant, et a qua Moyses eos praecipue revocare intendebat.

[30942] I^a q. 61 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod substantiae quae sunt formae subsistentes, non habent causam aliquam formalem sui esse et suae unitatis, nec causam agentem per transmutationem materiae de potentia in actum, sed habent causam producentem totam substantiam.

[30943] I^a q. 61 a. 1 ad 3 Et per hoc patet solutio ad tertium.

[30944] I^a q. 61 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus sit productus a Deo ab aeterno. Deus enim est causa Angeli per

act through something besides His essence. But His being is eternal. Therefore He produced the angels from eternity.

Objection 2: Further, everything which exists at one period and not at another, is subject to time. But the angel is above time, as is laid down in the book *De Causis*. Therefore the angel is not at one time existing and at another non-existing, but exists always.

Objection 3: Further, Augustine (*De Trin.* xiii) proves the soul's incorruptibility by the fact that the mind is capable of truth. But as truth is incorruptible, so is it eternal. Therefore the intellectual nature of the soul and of the angel is not only incorruptible, but likewise eternal.

On the contrary, It is said ([Prov. 8:22](#)), in the person of begotten Wisdom: "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His ways, before He made anything from the beginning." But, as was shown above ([A\[1\]](#)), the angels were made by God. Therefore at one time the angels were not.

I answer that, God alone, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is from eternity. Catholic Faith holds this without doubt; and everything to the contrary must be rejected as heretical. For God so produced creatures that He made them "from nothing"; that is, after they had not been.

Reply to Objection 1: God's being is His will. So the fact that God produced the angels and other creatures by His being does not exclude that He made them also by His will. But, as was shown above ([Q\[19\], A\[3\]](#); [Q\[46\], A\[1\]](#)), God's will does not act by necessity in producing creatures. Therefore He produced such as He willed, and when He willed.

Reply to Objection 2: An angel is above that time which is the measure of the movement of the heavens; because he is above every movement of a corporeal nature. Nevertheless he is not above time which is the measure of the succession of his

suum esse, non enim agit per aliquid additum suae essentiae. Sed esse eius est aeternum. Ergo ab aeterno Angelos produxit.

[30945] I^a q. 61 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, omne quod quandoque est et quandoque non est, subiacet tempori. Sed Angelus est supra tempus, ut dicitur in libro de causis. Ergo Angelus non quandoque est, et quandoque non est, sed semper.

[30946] I^a q. 61 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, Augustinus probat incorruptibilitatem animae per hoc, quod per intellectum est capax veritatis. Sed sicut veritas est incorruptibilis, ita est aeterna. Ergo natura intellectualis et animae et Angeli, non solum est incorruptibilis, sed etiam aeterna.

[30947] I^a q. 61 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur Prov. VIII, ex persona sapientiae genitae, *dominus possedit me ab initio viarum suarum, antequam quidquam faceret a principio*. Sed Angeli sunt facti a Deo, ut ostensum est. Ergo Angeli aliquando non fuerunt.

[30948] I^a q. 61 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod solus Deus, pater et filius et spiritus sanctus, est ab aeterno. Hoc enim fides Catholica indubitanter tenet; et omne contrarium est sicut haereticum refutandum. Sic enim Deus creaturas produxit, quod eas ex nihilo fecit, idest postquam nihil fuerat.

[30949] I^a q. 61 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod esse Dei est ipsum eius velle. Per hoc ergo quod Deus produxit Angelos et alias creaturas per suum esse, non excluditur quin eas produxerit per suam voluntatem. Voluntas autem Dei non de necessitate se habet ad productionem creaturarum, ut supra dictum est. Et ideo produxit et quae voluit, et quando voluit.

[30950] I^a q. 61 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod Angelus est supra tempus quod est numerus motus caeli, quia est supra omnem motum corporalis naturae. Non tamen est supra tempus quod est numerus successionis esse eius post non

existence after his non-existence, and which is also the measure of the succession which is in his operations. Hence Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. viii, 20,21) that "God moves the spiritual creature according to time."

Reply to Objection 3: Angels and intelligent souls are incorruptible by the very fact of their having a nature whereby they are capable of truth. But they did not possess this nature from eternity; it was bestowed upon them when God Himself willed it. Consequently it does not follow that the angels existed from eternity.

Q. 61. A. 3. Whether the angels were created before the corporeal world?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels were created before the corporeal world. For Jerome says (In Ep. ad Tit. i, 2): "Six thousand years of our time have not yet elapsed; yet how shall we measure the time, how shall we count the ages, in which the Angels, Thrones, Dominations, and the other orders served God?" Damascene also says (De Fide Orth. ii): "Some say that the angels were begotten before all creation; as Gregory the Theologian declares, He first of all devised the angelic and heavenly powers, and the devising was the making thereof."

Objection 2: Further, the angelic nature stands midway between the Divine and the corporeal natures. But the Divine nature is from eternity; while corporeal nature is from time. Therefore the angelic nature was produced ere time was made, and after eternity.

Objection 3: Further, the angelic nature is more remote from the corporeal nature than one corporeal nature is from another. But one corporeal nature was made before another; hence the six days of the production of things are set forth in the opening of Genesis. Much more, therefore, was the angelic nature made before every corporeal nature.

On the contrary, It is said ([Gn. 1:1](#)): "In the beginning God created heaven and earth." Now,

esse, et etiam quod est numerus successionis quae est in operationibus eius. Unde Augustinus dicit, VIII super Gen. ad Litt., quod *Deus movet creaturam spiritualem per tempus*.

[30951] I^a q. 61 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod Angeli et animae intellectivae, ex hoc ipso quod habent naturam per quam sunt capaces veritatis, sunt incorruptibiles. Sed hanc naturam non habuerunt ab aeterno; sed data fuit eis a Deo quando ipse voluit. Unde non sequitur quod Angeli sint ab aeterno.

[30952] I^a q. 61 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli fuerint creati ante mundum corporeum. Dicit enim Hieronymus, super epistolam ad Titum, *sex millia nondum nostri temporis complentur annorum; et quanta tempora, quantasque saeculorum origines fuisse arbitrandum est, in quibus Angeli, throni, dominationes, ceterique ordines Deo servierunt?* Damascenus etiam dicit, in II libro, *quidam dicunt quod ante omnem creationem geniti sunt Angeli; ut theologus dicit Gregorius, primum quidem excogitavit angelicas virtutes et caelestes, et excogitatio opus eius fuit.*

[30953] I^a q. 61 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, angelica natura est media inter naturam divinam et naturam corpoream. Sed natura divina est ab aeterno, natura autem corporea ex tempore. Ergo natura angelica facta est ante creationem temporis, et post aeternitatem.

[30954] I^a q. 61 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, plus distat natura angelica a natura corporali, quam una natura corporalis ab alia. Sed una natura corporalis fuit facta ante aliam, unde et sex dies productionis rerum in principio Genesis describuntur. Ergo multo magis natura angelica facta est ante omnem naturam corporealem.

[30955] I^a q. 61 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur Gen. I, *in principio creavit Deus caelum et*

this would not be true if anything had been created previously. Consequently the angels were not created before corporeal nature.

I answer that, There is a twofold opinion on this point to be found in the writings of the Fathers. The more probable one holds that the angels were created at the same time as corporeal creatures. For the angels are part of the universe: they do not constitute a universe of themselves; but both they and corporeal natures unite in constituting one universe. This stands in evidence from the relationship of creature to creature; because the mutual relationship of creatures makes up the good of the universe. But no part is perfect if separate from the whole. Consequently it is improbable that God, Whose "works are perfect," as it is said [Dt. 32:4](#), should have created the angelic creature before other creatures. At the same time the contrary is not to be deemed erroneous; especially on account of the opinion of Gregory Nazianzen, "whose authority in Christian doctrine is of such weight that no one has ever raised objection to his teaching, as is also the case with the doctrine of Athanasius," as Jerome says.

Reply to Objection 1: Jerome is speaking according to the teaching of the Greek Fathers; all of whom hold the creation of the angels to have taken place previously to that of the corporeal world.

Reply to Objection 2: God is not a part of, but far above, the whole universe, possessing within Himself the entire perfection of the universe in a more eminent way. But an angel is a part of the universe. Hence the comparison does not hold.

Reply to Objection 3: All corporeal creatures are one in matter; while the angels do not agree with them in matter. Consequently the creation of the matter of the corporeal creature involves in a manner the creation of all things; but the creation of the angels does not involve creation of the universe.

If the contrary view be held, then in the text of [Gn. 1](#), "In the beginning God created heaven and

terram. Non autem hoc esset verum, si aliquid creasset antea. Ergo Angeli non sunt ante naturam corpoream creati.

[30956] I^a q. 61 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod circa hoc invenitur duplex sanctorum doctorum sententia, illa tamen probabilior videtur, quod Angeli simul cum creatura corporea sunt creati. Angeli enim sunt quaedam pars universi, non enim constituunt per se unum universum, sed tam ipsi quam creatura corporea in constitutionem unius universi conveniunt. Quod apparet ex ordine unius creaturae ad aliam, ordo enim rerum ad invicem est bonum universi. Nulla autem pars perfecta est a suo toto separata. Non est igitur probabile ut Deus, cuius perfecta sunt opera, ut dicitur Deut. XXXII, creaturam angelicam seorsum ante alias creaturas creaverit. Quamvis contrarium non sit reputandum erroneum; praecipue propter sententiam Gregorii Nazianzeni, cuius tanta est in doctrina Christiana auctoritas, ut nullus unquam eius dictis calumniam inferre praesumpserit, sicut nec Athanasii documentis, ut Hieronymus dicit.

[30957] I^a q. 61 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Hieronymus loquitur secundum sententiam doctorum Graecorum, qui omnes hoc concorditer sentiunt, quod Angeli sunt ante mundum corporeum creati.

[30958] I^a q. 61 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod Deus non est aliqua pars universi, sed est supra totum universum, praehabens in se eminentiori modo totam universi perfectionem. Angelus autem est pars universi. Unde non est eadem ratio.

[30959] I^a q. 61 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod creaturae corporeae omnes sunt unum in materia, sed Angeli non conveniunt in materia cum creatura corporea. Unde, creata materia corporalis creaturae, omnia quodammodo sunt creata, non autem, creatis Angelis, esset ipsum universum creatum. Si vero contrarium teneatur, quod dicitur Gen. I, *in principio creavit Deus caelum et terram* exponendum est, in principio, idest in filio, vel in principio temporis, non autem

earth," the words, "In the beginning," must be interpreted, "In the Son," or "In the beginning of time": but not, "In the beginning, before which there was nothing," unless we say "Before which there was nothing of the nature of corporeal creatures."

Q. 61. A. 4. Whether the angels were created in the empyrean heaven?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels were not created in the empyrean heaven. For the angels are incorporeal substances. Now a substance which is incorporeal is not dependent upon a body for its existence; and as a consequence, neither is it for its creation. Therefore the angels were not created in any corporeal place.

Objection 2: Further, Augustine remarks (Gen. ad lit. iii, 10), that the angels were created in the upper atmosphere: therefore not in the empyrean heaven.

Objection 3: Further, the empyrean heaven is said to be the highest heaven. If therefore the angels were created in the empyrean heaven, it would not beseem them to mount up to a still higher heaven. And this is contrary to what is said in Isaias, speaking in the person of the sinning angel: "I will ascend into heaven" ([Is. 14:13](#)).

On the contrary, Strabus, commenting on the text "In the beginning God created heaven and earth," says: "By heaven he does not mean the visible firmament, but the empyrean, that is, the fiery or intellectual firmament, which is not so styled from its heat, but from its splendor; and which was filled with angels directly it was made."

I answer that, As was observed ([A\[3\]](#)), the universe is made up of corporeal and spiritual creatures. Consequently spiritual creatures were so created as to bear some relationship to the corporeal creature, and to rule over every corporeal creature. Hence it was fitting for the angels to be created in the highest corporeal place, as presiding over all corporeal nature; whether it

in principio, idest ante quod nihil, nisi dicatur, ante quod nihil in genere corporalium creaturarum.

[30960] I^a q. 61 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quantum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli non sint creati in caelo Empyreo. Angeli enim sunt substantiae incorporeae. Sed substantia incorporea non dependet a corpore secundum suum esse, et per consequens neque secundum suum fieri. Ergo Angeli non sunt creati in loco corporeo.

[30961] I^a q. 61 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, Augustinus dicit, III super Gen. ad Litt., quod Angeli fuerunt creati in superiori parte aeris. Non ergo in caelo Empyreo.

[30962] I^a q. 61 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, caelum Empyreum dicitur esse caelum supremum. Si igitur Angeli creati fuissent in caelo Empyreo, non convenisset eis in superius caelum ascendere. Quod est contra id quod ex persona Angeli peccantis dicitur Isaias XIV, *ascendam in caelum*.

[30963] I^a q. 61 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra est quod Strabus dicit, super illud, *in principio creavit Deus caelum et terram, caelum non visibile firmamentum hic appellat, sed Empyreum, idest igneum vel intellectuale, quod non ab ardore, sed a splendore dicitur, quod statim factum, Angelis est repletum*.

[30964] I^a q. 61 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut dictum est, ex creaturis corporalibus et spiritualibus unum universum constituitur. Unde sic creatae sunt spirituales creaturae, quod ad creaturam corporalem aliquem ordinem habent, et toti creaturae corporali praesident. Unde conveniens fuit quod Angeli in supremo corpore crearentur, tanquam toti naturae corporeae

be styled the empyrean heaven, or whatever else it be called. So Isidore says that the highest heaven is the heaven of the angels, explaining the passage of [Dt. 10:14](#): "Behold heaven is the Lord's thy God, and the heaven of heaven."

Reply to Objection 1: The angels were created in a corporeal place, not as if depending upon a body either as to their existence or as to their being made; because God could have created them before all corporeal creation, as many holy Doctors hold. They were made in a corporeal place in order to show their relationship to corporeal nature, and that they are by their power in touch with bodies.

Reply to Objection 2: By the uppermost atmosphere Augustine possibly means the highest part of heaven, to which the atmosphere has a kind of affinity owing to its subtlety and transparency. Or else he is not speaking of all the angels; but only of such as sinned, who, in the opinion of some, belonged to the inferior orders. But there is nothing to hinder us from saying that the higher angels, as having an exalted and universal power over all corporeal things, were created in the highest place of the corporeal creature; while the other angels, as having more restricted powers, were created among the inferior bodies.

Reply to Objection 3: Isaias is not speaking there of any corporeal heaven, but of the heaven of the Blessed Trinity; unto which the sinning angel wished to ascend, when he desired to be equal in some manner to God, as will appear later on ([Q\[63\], A\[3\]](#)).

praesidentes; sive id dicatur caelum Empyreum, sive qualitercumque nominetur. Unde Isidorus dicit quod supremum caelum est caelum Angelorum, super illud Deut. X, *domini Dei tui est caelum, et caelum caeli*.

[30965] I^a q. 61 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Angeli non sunt creati in loco corporeo, quasi dependentes a corpore secundum suum esse vel secundum suum fieri, potuisset enim Deus Angelos ante totam creaturam corpoream creasse, ut multi sancti doctores tenent. Sed facti sunt in loco corporeo, ad ostendendum ordinem eorum ad naturam corpoream, et quod sua virtute corpora contingunt.

[30966] I^a q. 61 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod Augustinus forte per supremam partem aeris intelligit supremam partem caeli, cum quo aer quandam convenientiam habet propter suam subtilitatem et diaphaneitatem. Vel loquitur non de omnibus Angelis, sed de illis qui peccaverunt, qui secundum quosdam fuerunt de inferioribus ordinibus. Nihil autem prohibet dicere quod superiores Angeli, habentes virtutem elevatam et universalem supra omnia corpora, sint in supremo creaturae corporeae creati; alii vero, habentes virtutes magis particulares, sint creati in inferioribus corporibus.

[30967] I^a q. 61 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod loquitur ibi non de caelo aliquo corporeo, sed de caelo sanctae Trinitatis, in quod Angelus peccans ascendere voluit, dum voluit aliquo modo Deo aequiparari, ut infra patebit.

Q. 62. OF THE PERFECTION OF THE ANGELS IN THE ORDER OF GRACE AND OF GLORY (NINE ARTICLES)

In due sequence we have to inquire how the angels were made in the order of grace and of glory; under which heading there are nine points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Were the angels created in beatitude?](#)

[\(2\) Did they need grace in order to turn to God?](#)

[\(3\) Were they created in grace?](#)

[\(4\) Did they merit their beatitude?](#)

[\(5\) Did they at once enter into beatitude after merit?](#)

[\(6\) Did they receive grace and glory according to their natural capacities?](#)

[\(7\) After entering glory, did their natural love and knowledge remain?](#)

[\(8\) Could they have sinned afterwards?](#)

[\(9\) After entering into glory, could they advance farther?](#)

[30968] I^a q. 62 pr. Consequenter investigandum est quomodo Angeli facti sunt in esse gratiae vel gloriae. Et circa hoc quaeruntur novem. Primo, utrum Angeli fuerint in sua creatione beati. Secundo, utrum indiguerint gratia ad hoc quod ad Deum converterentur. Tertio, utrum fuerint creati in gratia. Quarto, utrum suam beatitudinem meruerint. Quinto, utrum statim post meritum beatitudinem adepti fuerint. Sexto, utrum gratiam et gloriam secundum capacitatem suorum naturalium receperint. Septimo, utrum post consecutionem gloriae remanserit in eis dilectio et cognitio naturalis. Octavo, utrum postmodum potuerint peccare. Nono, utrum post adeptionem gloriae potuerint proficere.

Q. 62. A. 1. Whether the angels were created in beatitude?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels were created in beatitude. For it is stated (De Eccl. Dogm. xxix) that "the angels who continue in the beatitude wherein they were created, do not of their nature possess the excellence they have." Therefore the angels were created in beatitude.

[30969] I^a q. 62 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli fuerint creati beati. Dicitur enim in libro de ecclesiasticis dogmatibus, quod *Angeli qui in illa in qua creati sunt beatitudine perseverant, non natura possident bonum quod habent*. Sunt ergo Angeli creati in beatitudine.

Objection 2: Further, the angelic nature is nobler than the corporeal creature. But the corporeal creature straightway from its creation was made perfect and complete; nor did its lack of form take precedence in time, but only in nature, as Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. i, 15). Therefore neither did God create the angelic nature imperfect and incomplete. But its formation and perfection are derived from its beatitude, whereby it enjoys God. Therefore it was created in beatitude.

[30970] I^a q. 62 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, natura angelica est nobilior quam creatura corporalis. Sed creatura corporalis statim in principio suae creationis fuit creata formata et perfecta; nec informitas praecessit in ea formationem tempore, sed natura tantum, ut Augustinus dicit, I super Gen. ad Litt. Ergo nec naturam angelicam creavit Deus informem et imperfectam. Sed eius formatio et perfectio est per beatitudinem, secundum quod fruitur Deo. Ergo fuit creata beata.

Objection 3: Further, according to Augustine (Gen. ad lit. iv, 34; v, 5), the things which we read of as being made in the works of the six days, were made together at one time; and so all the six days must have existed instantly from the beginning of creation. But, according to his exposition, in those six days, "the morning" was the angelic knowledge, according to which they knew the Word and things in the Word. Therefore straightway from their creation they knew the Word, and things in the Word. But the bliss of the angels comes of seeing the Word. Consequently the angels were in beatitude straightway from the very beginning of their creation.

On the contrary, To be established or confirmed in good is of the nature of beatitude. But the angels were not confirmed in good as soon as they were created; the fall of some of them shows this. Therefore the angels were not in beatitude from their creation.

I answer that, By the name of beatitude is understood the ultimate perfection of rational or of intellectual nature; and hence it is that it is naturally desired, since everything naturally desires its ultimate perfection. Now there is a twofold ultimate perfection of rational or of intellectual nature. The first is one which it can procure of its own natural power; and this is in a measure called beatitude or happiness. Hence Aristotle (Ethic. x) says that man's ultimate happiness consists in his most perfect contemplation, whereby in this life he can behold the best intelligible object; and that is God. Above this happiness there is still another, which we look forward to in the future, whereby "we shall see God as He is." This is beyond the nature of every created intellect, as was shown above ([Q\[12\]](#), [A\[4\]](#)).

So, then, it remains to be said, that, as regards this first beatitude, which the angel could procure by his natural power, he was created already blessed. Because the angel does not acquire such beatitude by any progressive action, as man does, but, as was observed above ([Q\[58\]](#), [AA\[3\]](#) ,4), is straightway in possession thereof, owing to his natural dignity. But the angels did not have from the beginning of their creation that ultimate

[30971] I^a q. 62 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, secundum Augustinum, super Gen. ad Litt., ea quae leguntur facta in operibus sex dierum, simul facta fuerunt, et sic oportet quod statim a principio creationis rerum fuerint omnes illi sex dies. Sed in illis sex diebus, secundum eius expositionem, mane fuit cognitio angelica secundum quam cognoverunt verbum et res in verbo. Ergo statim a principio creationis cognoverunt verbum et res in verbo. Sed Angeli beati sunt per hoc quod verbum vident. Ergo statim a principio suae creationis Angeli fuerunt beati.

[30972] I^a q. 62 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra, de ratione beatitudinis est stabilitas sive confirmatio in bono. Sed Angeli non statim ut creati sunt, fuerunt confirmati in bono, quod casus quorundam ostendit. Non ergo Angeli in sua creatione fuerunt beati.

[30973] I^a q. 62 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod nomine beatitudinis intelligitur ultima perfectio rationalis seu intellectualis naturae, et inde est quod naturaliter desideratur, quia unumquodque naturaliter desiderat suam ultimam perfectionem. Ultima autem perfectio rationalis seu intellectualis naturae est duplex. Una quidem, quam potest assequi virtute suae naturae, et haec quodammodo beatitudo vel felicitas dicitur. Unde et Aristoteles perfectissimam hominis contemplationem, qua optimum intelligibile, quod est Deus, contemplari potest in hac vita, dicit esse ultimam hominis felicitatem. Sed super hanc felicitatem est alia felicitas, quam in futuro expectamus, qua videbimus Deum sicuti est. Quod quidem est supra cuiuslibet intellectus creati naturam, ut supra ostensum est. Sic igitur dicendum est quod, quantum ad primam beatitudinem, quam Angelus assequi virtute suae naturae potuit, fuit creatus beatus. Quia perfectionem huiusmodi Angelus non acquirit per aliquem motum discursivum, sicut homo, sed statim ei adest propter suae naturae dignitatem, ut supra dictum est. Sed ultimam beatitudinem, quae facultatem naturae excedit, Angeli non statim in principio suae creationis habuerunt, quia haec beatitudo non est aliquid naturae, sed naturae finis; et ideo non statim eam a principio debuerunt

beatitude which is beyond the power of nature; because such beatitude is no part of their nature, but its end; and consequently they ought not to have it immediately from the beginning.

Reply to Objection 1: Beatitude is there taken for that natural perfection which the angel had in the state of innocence.

Reply to Objection 2: The corporeal creature instantly in the beginning of its creation could not have the perfection to which it is brought by its operation; consequently, according to Augustine (Gen. ad. lit. v, 4,23; viii, 3), the growing of plants from the earth did not take place at once among the first works, in which only the germinating power of the plants was bestowed upon the earth. In the same way, the angelic creature in the beginning of its existence had the perfection of its nature; but it did not have the perfection to which it had to come by its operation.

Reply to Objection 3: The angel has a twofold knowledge of the Word; the one which is natural, and the other according to glory. He has a natural knowledge whereby he knows the Word through a similitude thereof shining in his nature; and he has a knowledge of glory whereby he knows the Word through His essence. By both kinds of knowledge the angel knows things in the Word; imperfectly by his natural knowledge, and perfectly by his knowledge of glory. Therefore the first knowledge of things in the Word was present to the angel from the outset of his creation; while the second was not, but only when the angels became blessed by turning to the good. And this is properly termed their morning knowledge.

Q. 62. A. 2. Whether an angel needs grace in order to turn to God?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angel had no need of grace in order to turn to God. For, we have no need of grace for what we can accomplish naturally. But the angel naturally turns to God: because he loves God naturally, as is clear from what has been said ([Q\[60\], A\[5\]](#)). Therefore an angel did not need grace in order to turn to God.

habere.

[30974] I^a q. 62 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod beatitudo ibi accipitur pro illa perfectione naturali quam Angelus habuit in statu innocentiae.

[30975] I^a q. 62 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod creatura corporalis statim in principio suae creationis habere non potuit perfectionem ad quam per suam operationem perducitur, unde, secundum Augustinum, germinatio plantarum ex terra non statim fuit in primis operibus, in quibus virtus sola germinativa plantarum data est terrae. Et similiter creatura angelica in principio suae creationis habuit perfectionem suae naturae; non autem perfectionem ad quam per suam operationem pervenire debebat.

[30976] I^a q. 62 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod Angelus duplicem habet verbi cognitionem, unam naturalem, et aliam gloriae, naturalem quidem, qua cognoscit verbum per eius similitudinem in sua natura relucentem; cognitionem vero gloriae, qua cognoscit verbum per suam essentiam. Et utraque cognoscit Angelus res in verbo, sed naturali quidem cognitione imperfecte, cognitione vero gloriae perfecte. Prima ergo cognitio rerum in verbo affuit Angelo a principio suae creationis, secunda vero non, sed quando facti sunt beati per conversionem ad bonum. Et haec proprie dicitur cognitio matutina.

[30977] I^a q. 62 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus non indiguerit gratia ad hoc quod converteretur in Deum. Ad ea enim quae naturaliter possumus, gratia non indigemus. Sed naturaliter Angelus convertitur in Deum, quia naturaliter Deum diligit, ut ex supra dictis patet. Ergo Angelus non indiguit gratia ad hoc quod converteretur in Deum.

Objection 2: Further, seemingly we need help only for difficult tasks. Now it was not a difficult task for the angel to turn to God; because there was no obstacle in him to such turning. Therefore the angel had no need of grace in order to turn to God.

Objection 3: Further, to turn oneself to God is to dispose oneself for grace; hence it is said ([Zech. 1:3](#)): "Turn ye to Me, and I will turn to you." But we do not stand in need of grace in order to prepare ourselves for grace: for thus we should go on to infinity. Therefore the angel did not need grace to turn to God.

On the contrary, It was by turning to God that the angel reached to beatitude. If, then, he had needed no grace in order to turn to God, it would follow that he did not require grace in order to possess everlasting life. But this is contrary to the saying of the Apostle ([Rom. 6:23](#)): "The grace of God is life everlasting."

I answer that, The angels stood in need of grace in order to turn to God, as the object of beatitude. For, as was observed above ([Q\[60\], A\[2\]](#)) the natural movement of the will is the principle of all things that we will. But the will's natural inclination is directed towards what is in keeping with its nature. Therefore, if there is anything which is above nature, the will cannot be inclined towards it, unless helped by some other supernatural principle. Thus it is clear that fire has a natural tendency to give forth heat, and to generate fire; whereas to generate flesh is beyond the natural power of fire; consequently, fire has no tendency thereto, except in so far as it is moved instrumentally by the nutritive soul.

Now it was shown above ([Q\[12\], AA\[4\], 5](#)), when we were treating of God's knowledge, that to see God in His essence, wherein the ultimate beatitude of the rational creature consists, is beyond the nature of every created intellect. Consequently no rational creature can have the movement of the will directed towards such beatitude, except it be moved thereto by a supernatural agent. This is what we call the help of grace. Therefore it must be said that an angel could not of his own will be turned to such

[30978] I^a q. 62 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, ad ea tantum videmur indigere auxilio, quae sunt difficilia. Sed converti ad Deum non erat difficile Angelo; cum nihil esset in eo quod huic conversioni repugnaret. Ergo Angelus non indiguit auxilio gratiae ad hoc quod converteretur in Deum.

[30979] I^a q. 62 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, converti ad Deum est se ad gratiam praeparare, unde Zach. I, dicitur, *convertimini ad me, et ego convertar ad vos*. Sed nos non indigemus gratia ad hoc quod nos ad gratiam praeparemus, quia sic esset abire in infinitum. Ergo non indiguit gratia Angelus ad hoc quod converteretur in Deum.

[30980] I^a q. 62 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra, per conversionem ad Deum Angelus pervenit ad beatitudinem. Si igitur non indiguisset gratia ad hoc quod converteretur in Deum, sequeretur quod non indigeret gratia ad habendam vitam aeternam. Quod est contra illud apostoli, Rom. VI, *gratia Dei vita aeterna*.

[30981] I^a q. 62 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Angeli indiguerunt gratia ad hoc quod converterentur in Deum, prout est obiectum beatitudinis. Sicut enim superius dictum est, naturalis motus voluntatis est principium omnium eorum quae volumus. Naturalis autem inclinatio voluntatis est ad id quod est conveniens secundum naturam. Et ideo, si aliquid sit supra naturam, voluntas in id ferri non potest, nisi ab aliquo alio supernaturali principio adiuta. Sicut patet quod ignis habet naturalem inclinationem ad calefaciendum, et ad generandum ignem, sed generare carnem est supra naturalem virtutem ignis, unde ignis ad hoc nullam inclinationem habet, nisi secundum quod movetur ut instrumentum ab anima nutritiva. Ostensum est autem supra, cum de Dei cognitione ageretur, quod videre Deum per essentiam, in quo ultima beatitudo rationalis creaturae consistit, est supra naturam cuiuslibet intellectus creati. Unde nulla creatura rationalis potest habere motum voluntatis ordinatum ad illam beatitudinem, nisi mota a supernaturali agente. Et hoc dicimus auxilium gratiae. Et ideo dicendum est quod Angelus in illam beatitudinem voluntate converti non potuit, nisi per auxilium gratiae.

beatitude, except by the help of grace.

Reply to Objection 1: The angel loves God naturally, so far as God is the author of his natural being. But here we are speaking of turning to God, so far as God bestows beatitude by the vision of His essence.

Reply to Objection 2: A thing is "difficult" which is beyond a power; and this happens in two ways. First of all, because it is beyond the natural capacity of the power. Thus, if it can be attained by some help, it is said to be "difficult"; but if it can in no way be attained, then it is "impossible"; thus it is impossible for a man to fly. In another way a thing may be beyond the power, not according to the natural order of such power, but owing to some intervening hindrance; as to mount upwards is not contrary to the natural order of the motive power of the soul; because the soul, considered in itself, can be moved in any direction; but is hindered from so doing by the weight of the body; consequently it is difficult for a man to mount upwards. To be turned to his ultimate beatitude is difficult for man, both because it is beyond his nature, and because he has a hindrance from the corruption of the body and infection of sin. But it is difficult for an angel, only because it is supernatural.

Reply to Objection 3: Every movement of the will towards God can be termed a conversion to God. And so there is a threefold turning to God. The first is by the perfect love of God; this belongs to the creature enjoying the possession of God; and for such conversion, consummate grace is required. The next turning to God is that which merits beatitude; and for this there is required habitual grace, which is the principle of merit. The third conversion is that whereby a man disposes himself so that he may have grace; for this no habitual grace is required; but the operation of God, Who draws the soul towards Himself, according to [Lam 5:21](#): "Convert us, O Lord, to Thee, and we shall be converted." Hence it is clear that there is no need to go on to infinity.

[30982] I^a q. 62 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Angelus naturaliter diligit Deum, inquantum est principium naturalis esse. Hic autem loquimur de conversione ad Deum, inquantum est beatificans per suae essentiae visionem.

[30983] I^a q. 62 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod difficile est quod transcendit potentiam. Sed hoc contingit esse dupliciter. Uno modo, quia transcendit potentiam secundum suum naturalem ordinem. Et tunc, si ad hoc possit pervenire aliquo auxilio, dicitur difficile; si autem nullo modo, dicitur impossibile, sicut impossibile est hominem volare. Alio modo transcendit aliquid potentiam, non secundum ordinem naturalem potentiae, sed propter aliquod impedimentum potentiae adiunctum. Sicut ascendere non est contra naturalem ordinem potentiae animae motivae, quia anima, quantum est de se, nata est movere in quamlibet partem, sed impeditur ab hoc propter corporis gravitatem; unde difficile est homini ascendere. Converti autem ad beatitudinem ultimam, homini quidem est difficile et quia est supra naturam, et quia habet impedimentum ex corruptione corporis et infectione peccati. Sed Angelo est difficile propter hoc solum quod est supernaturale.

[30984] I^a q. 62 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod quilibet motus voluntatis in Deum, potest dici conversio in ipsum. Et ideo triplex est conversio in Deum. Una quidem per dilectionem perfectam, quae est creaturae iam Deo fruientis. Et ad hanc conversionem requiritur gratia consummata. Alia conversio est, quae est meritum beatitudinis. Et ad hanc requiritur habitualis gratia, quae est merendi principium. Tertia conversio est, per quam aliquis praeparat se ad gratiam habendam. Et ad hanc non exigitur aliqua habitualis gratia, sed operatio Dei ad se animam convertentis, secundum illud Thren. ult., *converte nos, domine, ad te, et convertemur*. Unde patet quod non est procedere in infinitum.

Q. 62. A. 3. Whether the angels were created in grace?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels were not created in grace. For Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. ii, 8) that the angelic nature was first made without form, and was called "heaven": but afterwards it received its form, and was then called "light." But such formation comes from grace. Therefore they were not created in grace.

Objection 2: Further, grace turns the rational creature towards God. If, therefore, the angel had been created in grace, no angel would ever have turned away from God.

Objection 3: Further, grace comes midway between nature and glory. But the angels were not beatified in their creation. Therefore it seems that they were not created in grace; but that they were first created in nature only, and then received grace, and that last of all they were beatified.

On the contrary, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xii, 9), "Who wrought the good will of the angels? Who, save Him Who created them with His will, that is, with the pure love wherewith they cling to Him; at the same time building up their nature and bestowing grace on them?"

I answer that, Although there are conflicting opinions on this point, some holding that the angels were created only in a natural state, while others maintain that they were created in grace; yet it seems more probable, and more in keeping with the sayings of holy men, that they were created in sanctifying grace. For we see that all things which, in the process of time, being created by the work of Divine Providence, were produced by the operation of God, were created in the first fashioning of things according to seedlike forms, as Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. viii, 3), such as trees, animals, and the rest. Now it is evident that sanctifying grace bears the same relation to beatitude as the seedlike form in nature does to the natural effect; hence ([1 Jn. 3:9](#)) grace is called the "seed" of God. As, then, in Augustine's opinion it is contended that the seedlike forms of all natural effects were implanted in the creature when corporeally created, so straightway from the

[30985] I^a q. 62 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli non sint creati in gratia. Dicit enim Augustinus, II super Gen. ad Litt., quod angelica natura primo erat informiter creata, et caelum dicta, postmodum vero formata est, et lux appellata. Sed haec formatio est per gratiam. Ergo non sunt creati in gratia.

[30986] I^a q. 62 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, gratia inclinat creaturam rationalem in Deum. Si igitur Angelus in gratia creatus fuisset nullus Angelus fuisset a Deo aversus.

[30987] I^a q. 62 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, gratia medium est inter naturam et gloriam. Sed Angeli non fuerunt beati in sua creatione. Ergo videtur quod nec etiam creati sint in gratia, sed primo in natura tantum; postea autem adepti sunt gratiam; et ultimo facti sunt beati.

[30988] I^a q. 62 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod Augustinus dicit, XII de Civ. Dei, *bonam voluntatem quis fecit in Angelis, nisi ille qui eos cum sua voluntate, idest cum amore casto quo illi adhaerent, creavit, simul in eis condens naturam et largiens gratiam?*

[30989] I^a q. 62 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, quamvis super hoc sint diversae opiniones, quibusdam dicentibus quod creati sunt Angeli in naturalibus tantum, aliis vero quod sunt creati in gratia; hoc tamen probabilius videtur tenendum, et magis dictis sanctorum consonum est, quod fuerunt creati in gratia gratum faciente. Sic enim videmus quod omnia quae processu temporis per opus divinae providentiae, creatura sub Deo operante, sunt producta, in prima rerum conditione producta sunt secundum quasdam seminales rationes, ut Augustinus dicit, super Gen. ad Litt.; sicut arbores et animalia et alia huiusmodi. Manifestum est autem quod gratia gratum faciens hoc modo comparatur ad beatitudinem, sicut ratio seminalis in natura ad effectum naturalem, unde I Ioan. III, gratia semen Dei nominatur. Sicut igitur, secundum opinionem Augustini, ponitur quod statim in prima creatione corporalis creaturae inditae sunt ei seminales

beginning the angels were created in grace.

Reply to Objection 1: Such absence of form in the angels can be understood either by comparison with their formation in glory; and so the absence of formation preceded formation by priority of time. Or else it can be understood of the formation according to grace: and so it did not precede in the order of time, but in the order of nature; as Augustine holds with regard to the formation of corporeal things (Gen. ad lit. i, 15).

Reply to Objection 2: Every form inclines the subject after the mode of the subject's nature. Now it is the mode of an intellectual nature to be inclined freely towards the objects it desires. Consequently the movement of grace does not impose necessity; but he who has grace can fail to make use of it, and can sin.

Reply to Objection 3: Although in the order of nature grace comes midway between nature and glory, nevertheless, in the order of time, in created nature, glory is not simultaneous with nature; because glory is the end of the operation of nature helped by grace. But grace stands not as the end of operation, because it is not of works, but as the principle of right operation. Therefore it was fitting for grace to be given straightway with nature.

Q. 62. A. 4. Whether an angel merits his beatitude?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angel did not merit his beatitude. For merit arises from the difficulty of the meritorious act. But the angel experienced no difficulty in acting rightly. Therefore righteous action was not meritorious for him.

Objection 2: Further, we do not merit by merely natural operations. But it was quite natural for the angel to turn to God. Therefore he did not thereby merit beatitude.

Objection 3: Further, if a beatified angel merited his beatitude, he did so either before he had it, or

rationes omnium naturalium effectuum, ita statim a principio sunt Angeli creati in gratia.

[30990] I^a q. 62 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod informitas illa Angeli potest intelligi vel per comparisonem ad formationem gloriae, et sic praecessit tempore informitas formationem. Vel per comparisonem ad formationem gratiae, et sic non praecessit ordine temporis, sed ordine naturae; sicut etiam de formatione corporali Augustinus ponit.

[30991] I^a q. 62 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod omnis forma inclinatur suum subiectum secundum modum naturae eius. Modus autem naturalis intellectualis naturae est, ut libere feratur in ea quae vult. Et ideo inclinatio gratiae non imponit necessitatem, sed habens gratiam potest ea non uti, et peccare.

[30992] I^a q. 62 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, quamvis gratia sit medium inter naturam et gloriam ordine naturae tamen ordine temporis in natura creata non debuit simul esse gloria cum natura, quia est finis operationis ipsius naturae per gratiam adiutae. Gratia autem non se habet ut finis operationis, quia non est ex operibus; sed ut principium bene operandi. Et ideo statim cum natura gratiam dare conveniens fuit.

[30993] I^a q. 62 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus beatus suam beatitudinem non meruerit. Meritum enim est ex difficultate actus meritorii. Sed nullam difficultatem Angelus habuit ad bene operandum. Ergo bona operatio non fuit ei meritoria.

[30994] I^a q. 62 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, naturalibus non meremur. Sed naturale fuit Angelo quod converteretur ad Deum. Ergo per hoc non meruit beatitudinem.

[30995] I^a q. 62 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, si Angelus beatus beatitudinem suam meruit, aut ergo

else afterwards. But it was not before; because, in the opinion of many, he had no grace before whereby to merit it. Nor did he merit it afterwards, because thus he would be meriting it now; which is clearly false, because in that case a lower angel could by meriting rise up to the rank of a higher, and the distinct degrees of grace would not be permanent; which is not admissible. Consequently the angel did not merit his beatitude.

On the contrary, It is stated ([Apoc. 21:17](#)) that the "measure of the angel" in that heavenly Jerusalem is "the measure of a man." Therefore the same is the case with the angel.

I answer that, Perfect beatitude is natural only to God, because existence and beatitude are one and the same thing in Him. Beatitude, however, is not of the nature of the creature, but is its end. Now everything attains its last end by its operation. Such operation leading to the end is either productive of the end, when such end is not beyond the power of the agent working for the end, as the healing art is productive of health; or else it is deserving of the end, when such end is beyond the capacity of the agent striving to attain it; wherefore it is looked for from another's bestowing. Now it is evident from what has gone before ([AA\[1\],2](#); [Q\[12\], AA\[4\],5](#)), ultimate beatitude exceeds both the angelic and the human nature. It remains, then, that both man and angel merited their beatitude.

And if the angel was created in grace, without which there is no merit, there would be no difficulty in saying that he merited beatitude: as also, if one were to say that he had grace in any way before he had glory.

But if he had no grace before entering upon beatitude, it would then have to be said that he had beatitude without merit, even as we have grace. This, however, is quite foreign to the idea of beatitude; which conveys the notion of an end, and is the reward of virtue, as even the Philosopher says (*Ethic. i, 9*). Or else it will have to be said, as some others have maintained, that the angels merit beatitude by their present ministrations, while in beatitude. This is quite

antequam eam haberet, aut post. Sed non ante, quia, ut multis videtur, ante non habuit gratiam, sine qua nullum est meritum. Nec etiam post, quia sic etiam modo mereretur, quod videtur esse falsum, quia sic minor Angelus merendo ad superioris Angeli gradum posset pertingere, et non essent stabiles distinctiones graduum gratiae; quod est inconueniens. Non ergo Angelus beatus suam beatitudinem meruit.

[30996] I^a q. 62 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra, Apoc. XXI, dicitur quod mensura Angeli, in illa caelesti Ierusalem, est mensura hominis. Sed homo ad beatitudinem pertingere non potest nisi per meritum. Ergo neque Angelus.

[30997] I^a q. 62 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod soli Deo beatitudo perfecta est naturalis quia idem est sibi esse et beatum esse. Cuiuslibet autem creaturae esse beatum non est natura, sed ultimus finis. Quaelibet autem res ad ultimum finem per suam operationem pertingit. Quae quidem operatio in finem ducens, vel est factiva finis, quando finis non excedit virtutem eius quod operatur propter finem, sicut medicatio est factiva sanitatis, vel est meritoria finis, quando finis excedit virtutem operantis propter finem, unde expectatur finis ex dono alterius. Beatitudo autem ultima excedit et naturam angelicam et humanam, ut ex dictis patet. Unde relinquitur quod tam homo quam Angelus suam beatitudinem meruerit. Et si quidem Angelus in gratia creatus fuit, sine qua nullum est meritum, absque difficultate dicere possumus quod suam beatitudinem meruerit. Et similiter si quis diceret quod qualitercumque gratiam habuerit antequam gloriam. Si vero gratiam non habuit antequam esset beatus, sic oportet dicere quod beatitudinem absque merito habuit, sicut nos gratiam. Quod tamen est contra rationem beatitudinis, quae habet rationem finis, et est praemium virtutis, ut etiam philosophus dicit, in I *Ethic*. Vel oportet dicere quod Angeli merentur beatitudinem per ea quae iam beati operantur in divinis ministeriis, ut alii dixerunt. Quod tamen est contra rationem meriti, nam meritum habet rationem viae ad finem, ei autem qui iam est in termino, non convenit moveri ad terminum; et sic nullus meretur quod iam habet. Vel oportet dicere quod unus et idem actus

contrary, again, to the notion of merit: since merit conveys the idea of a means to an end; while what is already in its end cannot, properly speaking, be moved towards such end; and so no one merits to produce what he already enjoys. Or else it will have to be said that one and the same act of turning to God, so far as it comes of free-will, is meritorious; and so far as it attains the end, is the fruition of beatitude. Even this view will not stand, because free-will is not the sufficient cause of merit; and, consequently, an act cannot be meritorious as coming from free-will, except in so far as it is informed by grace; but it cannot at the same time be informed by imperfect grace, which is the principle of meriting, and by perfect grace, which is the principle of enjoying. Hence it does not appear to be possible for anyone to enjoy beatitude, and at the same time to merit it.

Consequently it is better to say that the angel had grace ere he was admitted to beatitude, and that by such grace he merited beatitude.

Reply to Objection 1: The angel's difficulty of working righteously does not come from any contrariety or hindrance of natural powers; but from the fact that the good work is beyond his natural capacity.

Reply to Objection 2: An angel did not merit beatitude by natural movement towards God; but by the movement of charity, which comes of grace.

Reply to Objection 3: The answer to the Third Objection is evident from what we have said.

Q. 62. A. 5. Whether the angel obtained beatitude immediately after one act of merit?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angel did not possess beatitude instantly after one act of merit. For it is more difficult for a man to do well than for an angel. But man is not rewarded at once after one act of merit. Therefore neither was the angel.

Objection 2: Further, an angel could act at once, and in an instant, from the very outset of his

conversionis in Deum, inquantum est ex libero arbitrio, est meritorius; et inquantum pertingit ad finem, est fruitio beata. Sed nec hoc etiam videtur esse conveniens, quia liberum arbitrium non est sufficiens causa meriti unde actus non potest esse meritorius secundum quod est ex libero arbitrio, nisi inquantum est gratia informatus; non autem simul potest informari gratia imperfecta, quae est principium merendi, et gratia perfecta, quae est principium fruendi. Unde non videtur esse possibile quod simul fruatur, et suam fruitionem mereatur. Et ideo melius dicendum est quod gratiam habuit Angelus antequam esset beatus, per quam beatitudinem meruit.

[30998] I^a q. 62 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod difficultas bene operandi non est in Angelis ex aliqua contrarietate, vel impedimento naturalis virtutis; sed ex hoc quod opus aliquod bonum est supra virtutem naturae.

[30999] I^a q. 62 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod conversione naturali Angelus non meruit beatitudinem, sed conversione caritatis, quae est per gratiam.

[31000] I^a q. 62 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium patet responsio ex dictis.

[31001] I^a q. 62 a. 5 arg. 1 Ad quintum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus non statim post unum actum meritorium beatitudinem habuerit. Difficilius enim est homini bene operari quam Angelo. Sed homo non praemiatur statim post unum actum. Ergo neque Angelus.

[31002] I^a q. 62 a. 5 arg. 2 Praeterea, Angelus statim in principio suae creationis, et in instanti,

creation, for even natural bodies begin to be moved in the very instant of their creation; and if the movement of a body could be instantaneous, like operations of mind and will, it would have movement in the first instant of its generation. Consequently, if the angel merited beatitude by one act of his will, he merited it in the first instant of his creation; and so, if their beatitude was not retarded, then the angels were in beatitude in the first instant.

Objection 3: Further, there must be many intervals between things which are far apart. But the beatific state of the angels is very far remote from their natural condition: while merit comes midway between. Therefore the angel would have to pass through many stages of merit in order to reach beatitude.

On the contrary, Man's soul and an angel are ordained alike for beatitude: consequently equality with angels is promised to the saints. Now the soul separated from the body, if it has merit deserving beatitude, enters at once into beatitude, unless there be some obstacle. Therefore so does an angel. Now an angel instantly, in his first act of charity, had the merit of beatitude. Therefore, since there was no obstacle within him, he passed at once into beatitude by only one meritorious act.

I answer that, The angel was beatified instantly after the first act of charity, whereby he merited beatitude. The reason whereof is because grace perfects nature according to the manner of the nature; as every perfection is received in the subject capable of perfection, according to its mode. Now it is proper to the angelic nature to receive its natural perfection not by passing from one stage to another; but to have it at once naturally, as was shown above ([A\[1\]; Q\[58\], AA\[3\],4](#)). But as the angel is of his nature inclined to natural perfection, so is he by merit inclined to glory. Hence instantly after merit the angel secured beatitude. Now the merit of beatitude in angel and man alike can be from merely one act; because man merits beatitude by every act informed by charity. Hence it remains that an angel was beatified straightway after one act of charity.

actum aliquem habere potuit, cum etiam corpora naturalia in ipso instanti suae creationis moveri incipiant, et si motus corporis in instanti esse posset, sicut opera intellectus et voluntatis, in primo instanti suae generationis motum haberent. Si ergo Angelus per unum motum suae voluntatis beatitudinem meruit, in primo instanti suae creationis meruit beatitudinem. Si ergo eorum beatitudo non retardatur, statim in primo instanti fuerunt beati.

[31003] I^a q. 62 a. 5 arg. 3 Praeterea, inter multum distantia oportet esse multa media. Sed status beatitudinis Angelorum multum distat a statu naturae eorum, medium autem inter utrumque est meritum. Oportuit igitur quod per multa media Angelus ad beatitudinem perveniret.

[31004] I^a q. 62 a. 5 s. c. Sed contra, anima hominis et Angelus similiter ad beatitudinem ordinantur, unde sanctis promittitur aequalitas Angelorum Luc. XX. Sed anima a corpore separata, si habeat meritum beatitudinis, statim beatitudinem consequitur, nisi aliud sit impedimentum. Ergo pari ratione et Angelus. Sed statim in primo actu caritatis habuit meritum beatitudinis. Ergo, cum in eo non esset aliquod impedimentum, statim ad beatitudinem pervenit per solum unum actum meritorium.

[31005] I^a q. 62 a. 5 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Angelus post primum actum caritatis quo beatitudinem meruit, statim beatus fuit. Cuius ratio est, quia gratia perficit naturam secundum modum naturae, sicut et omnis perfectio recipitur in perfectibili secundum modum eius. Est autem hoc proprium naturae angelicae, quod naturalem perfectionem non per discursum acquirat, sed statim per naturam habeat, sicut supra ostensum est. Sicut autem ex sua natura Angelus habet ordinem ad perfectionem naturalem, ita ex merito habet ordinem ad gloriam. Et ita statim post meritum in Angelo fuit beatitudo consecuta. Meritum autem beatitudinis, non solum in Angelo, sed etiam in homine esse potest per unicum actum, quia quolibet actu caritate informato homo beatitudinem meretur. Unde relinquitur quod statim post unum actum caritate informatum, Angelus beatus fuit.

Reply to Objection 1: Man was not intended to secure his ultimate perfection at once, like the angel. Hence a longer way was assigned to man than to the angel for securing beatitude.

Reply to Objection 2: The angel is above the time of corporeal things; hence the various instants regarding the angels are not to be taken except as reckoning the succession of their acts. Now their act which merited beatitude could not be in them simultaneously with the act of beatitude, which is fruition; since the one belongs to imperfect grace, and the other to consummate grace. Consequently, it remains for different instants to be conceived, in one of which the angel merited beatitude, and in another was beatified.

Reply to Objection 3: It is of the nature of an angel instantly to attain the perfection unto which he is ordained. Consequently, only one meritorious act is required; which act can so far be called an interval as through it the angel is brought to beatitude.

Q. 62. A. 6. Whether the angels receive grace and glory according to the degree of their natural gifts?

Objection 1: It would seem that the angels did not receive grace and glory according to the degree of their natural gifts. For grace is bestowed of God's absolute will. Therefore the degree of grace depends on God's will, and not on the degree of their natural gifts.

Objection 2: Further, a moral act seems to be more closely allied with grace than nature is; because a moral act is preparatory to grace. But grace does not come "of works," as is said [Rom. 11:6](#). Therefore much less does the degree of grace depend upon the degree of their natural gifts.

Objection 3: Further, man and angel are alike ordained for beatitude or grace. But man does not receive more grace according to the degree of his

[31006] I^a q. 62 a. 5 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod homo secundum suam naturam non statim natus est ultimam perfectionem adipisci, sicut Angelus. Et ideo homini longior via data est ad merendum beatitudinem, quam Angelo.

[31007] I^a q. 62 a. 5 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod Angelus est supra tempus rerum corporalium, unde instantia diversa in his quae ad Angelos pertinent, non accipiuntur nisi secundum successionem in ipsorum actibus. Non autem potuit simul in eis esse actus meritorius beatitudinis, et actus beatitudinis, qui est fruitio; cum unus sit gratiae imperfectae, et alius gratiae consummatae. Unde relinquitur quod oportet diversa instantia accipi, in quorum uno meruerit beatitudinem, et in alio fuerit beatus.

[31008] I^a q. 62 a. 5 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod de natura Angeli est, quod statim suam perfectionem consequatur ad quam ordinatur. Et ideo non requiritur nisi unus actus meritorius; qui ea ratione medium dici potest, quia secundum ipsum Angelus ad beatitudinem ordinatur.

[31009] I^a q. 62 a. 6 arg. 1 Ad sextum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli non sint consecuti gratiam et gloriam secundum quantitatem suorum naturalium. Gratia enim ex mera Dei voluntate datur. Ergo et quantitas gratiae dependet ex voluntate Dei, et non ex quantitate naturalium.

[31010] I^a q. 62 a. 6 arg. 2 Praeterea, magis propinquum videtur ad gratiam actus humanus quam natura, quia actus humanus praeparatorius est ad gratiam. Sed gratia non est ex operibus, ut dicitur Rom. XI. Multo igitur minus quantitas gratiae in Angelis est secundum quantitatem naturalium.

[31011] I^a q. 62 a. 6 arg. 3 Praeterea, homo et Angelus pariter ordinantur ad beatitudinem vel gratiam. Sed homini non datur plus de gratia

natural gifts. Therefore neither does the angel.

On the contrary, Is the saying of the Master of the Sentences (Sent. ii, D, 3) that "those angels who were created with more subtle natures and of keener intelligence in wisdom, were likewise endowed with greater gifts of grace."

I answer that, It is reasonable to suppose that gifts of graces and perfection of beatitude were bestowed on the angels according to the degree of their natural gifts. The reason for this can be drawn from two sources. First of all, on the part of God, Who, in the order of His wisdom, established various degrees in the angelic nature. Now as the angelic nature was made by God for attaining grace and beatitude, so likewise the grades of the angelic nature seem to be ordained for the various degrees of grace and glory; just as when, for example, the builder chisels the stones for building a house, from the fact that he prepares some more artistically and more fittingly than others, it is clear that he is setting them apart for the more ornate part of the house. So it seems that God destined those angels for greater gifts of grace and fuller beatitude, whom He made of a higher nature.

Secondly, the same is evident on the part of the angel. The angel is not a compound of different natures, so that the inclination of the one thwarts or retards the tendency of the other; as happens in man, in whom the movement of his intellective part is either retarded or thwarted by the inclination of his sensitive part. But when there is nothing to retard or thwart it, nature is moved with its whole energy. So it is reasonable to suppose that the angels who had a higher nature, were turned to God more mightily and efficaciously. The same thing happens in men, since greater grace and glory are bestowed according to the greater earnestness of their turning to God. Hence it appears that the angels who had the greater natural powers, had the more grace and glory.

Reply to Objection 1: As grace comes of God's will alone, so likewise does the nature of the angel: and as God's will ordained nature for grace, so did it ordain the various degrees of nature to

secundum gradum naturalium. Ergo nec Angelo.

[31012] I^a q. 62 a. 6 s. c. Sed contra est quod Magister dicit, III dist. II Sent., quod *Angeli qui natura magis subtiles, et sapientia amplius perspicaces creati sunt, hi etiam maioribus gratiae muneribus praediti sunt.*

[31013] I^a q. 62 a. 6 co. Respondeo dicendum quod rationabile est quod secundum gradum naturalium Angelis data sint dona gratiarum et perfectio beatitudinis. Cuius quidem ratio ex duobus accipi potest. Primo quidem ex parte ipsius Dei, qui per ordinem suae sapientiae diversos gradus in angelica natura constituit. Sicut autem natura angelica facta est a Deo ad gratiam et beatitudinem consequendam, ita etiam gradus naturae angelicae ad diversos gradus gratiae et gloriae ordinari videntur, ut puta, si aedificator lapides polit ad construendam domum, ex hoc ipso quod aliquos pulchrius et decentius aptat, videtur eos ad honoratiorem partem domus ordinare. Sic igitur videtur quod Deus Angelos quos altioris naturae fecit, ad maiora gratiarum dona et ampliorem beatitudinem ordinaverit. Secundo apparet idem ex parte ipsius Angeli. Non enim Angelus est compositus ex diversis naturis, ut inclinatio unius naturae impetum alterius impediat aut retardet; sicut in homine accidit, in quo motus intellectivae partis aut retardatur aut impeditur ex inclinatione partis sensitivae. Quando autem non est aliquid quod retardet aut impediat, natura secundum totam suam virtutem movetur. Et ideo rationabile est quod Angeli qui meliorem naturam habuerunt, etiam fortius et efficacius ad Deum sint conversi. Hoc autem etiam in hominibus contingit, quod secundum intensionem conversionis in Deum datur maior gratia et gloria. Unde videtur quod Angeli qui habuerunt meliora naturalia, habuerunt plus de gratia et gloria.

[31014] I^a q. 62 a. 6 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod, sicut gratia est ex mera Dei voluntate, ita etiam et natura Angeli. Et sicut naturam Dei voluntas ordinavit ad gratiam ita et

the various degrees of grace.

Reply to Objection 2: The acts of the rational creature are from the creature itself; whereas nature is immediately from God. Accordingly it seems rather that grace is bestowed according to degree of nature than according to works.

Reply to Objection 3: Diversity of natural gifts is in one way in the angels, who are themselves different specifically; and in quite another way in men, who differ only numerically. For specific difference is on account of the end; while numerical difference is because of the matter. Furthermore, there is something in man which can thwart or impede the movement of his intellective nature; but not in the angels. Consequently the argument is not the same for both.

in the beatified angels?

Objection 1: It would seem that natural knowledge and love do not remain in the beatified angels. For it is said ([1 Cor. 13:10](#)): "When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." But natural love and knowledge are imperfect in comparison with beatified knowledge and love. Therefore, in beatitude, natural knowledge and love cease.

Objection 2: Further, where one suffices, another is superfluous. But the knowledge and love of glory suffice for the beatified angels. Therefore it would be superfluous for their natural knowledge and love to remain.

Objection 3: Further, the same faculty has not two simultaneous acts, as the same line cannot, at the same end, be terminated in two points. But the beatified angels are always exercising their beatified knowledge and love; for, as is said *Ethic. i, 8*, happiness consists not in habit, but in act. Therefore there can never be natural knowledge and love in the angels.

On the contrary, So long as a nature endures, its operation remains. But beatitude does not destroy

gradus naturae ad gradus gratiae.

[31015] I^a q. 62 a. 6 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod actus rationalis creaturae sunt ab ipsa; sed natura est immediate a Deo. Unde magis videtur quod gratia detur secundum gradum naturae, quam ex operibus.

[31016] I^a q. 62 a. 6 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod diversitas naturalium aliter est in Angelis, qui differunt specie; et aliter in hominibus, qui differunt solo numero. Differentia enim secundum speciem est propter finem, sed differentia secundum numerum est propter materiam. In homine etiam est aliquid quod potest impedire vel retardare motum intellectivae naturae, non autem in Angelis. Unde non est eadem ratio de utroque.

Q. 62. A. 7. Whether natural knowledge and love remain

[31017] I^a q. 62 a. 7 arg. 1 Ad septimum sic proceditur. Videtur quod in Angelis beatis non remaneat cognitio et dilectio naturalis. Quia, ut dicitur I Cor. XIII, *cum venerit quod perfectum est, evacuabitur quod ex parte est*. Sed dilectio et cognitio naturalis est imperfecta respectu cognitionis et dilectionis beatae. Ergo adveniente beatitudine, naturalis cognitio et dilectio cessat.

[31018] I^a q. 62 a. 7 arg. 2 Praeterea, ubi unum sufficit, aliud superflue existit. Sed sufficit in Angelis beatis cognitio et dilectio gloriae. Superfluum ergo esset quod remaneret in eis cognitio et dilectio naturalis.

[31019] I^a q. 62 a. 7 arg. 3 Praeterea, eadem potentia non habet simul duos actus; sicut nec una linea terminatur ex eadem parte ad duo puncta. Sed Angeli beati sunt semper in actu cognitionis et dilectionis beatae, felicitas enim non est secundum habitum, sed secundum actum, ut dicitur in I *Ethic*. Ergo nunquam in Angelis potest esse cognitio et dilectio naturalis.

[31020] I^a q. 62 a. 7 s. c. Sed contra, quandiu manet natura aliqua, manet operatio eius. Sed

nature, since it is its perfection. Therefore it does not take away natural knowledge and love.

I answer that, Natural knowledge and love remain in the angels. For as principles of operations are mutually related, so are the operations themselves. Now it is manifest that nature is to beatitude as first to second; because beatitude is superadded to nature. But the first must ever be preserved in the second. Consequently nature must be preserved in beatitude: and in like manner the act of nature must be preserved in the act of beatitude.

Reply to Objection 1: The advent of a perfection removes the opposite imperfection. Now the imperfection of nature is not opposed to the perfection of beatitude, but underlies it; as the imperfection of the power underlies the perfection of the form, and the power is not taken away by the form, but the privation which is opposed to the form. In the same way, the imperfection of natural knowledge is not opposed to the perfection of the knowledge in glory; for nothing hinders us from knowing a thing through various mediums, as a thing may be known at the one time through a probable medium and through a demonstrative one. In like manner, an angel can know God by His essence, and this appertains to his knowledge of glory; and at the same time he can know God by his own essence, which belongs to his natural knowledge.

Reply to Objection 2: All things which make up beatitude are sufficient of themselves. But in order for them to exist, they presuppose the natural gifts; because no beatitude is self-subsisting, except the uncreated beatitude.

Reply to Objection 3: There cannot be two operations of the one faculty at the one time, except the one be ordained to the other. But natural knowledge and love are ordained to the knowledge and love of glory. Accordingly there is nothing to hinder natural knowledge and love from existing in the angel conjointly with those of glory.

beatitudo non tollit naturam; cum sit perfectio eius. Ergo non tollit naturalem cognitionem et dilectionem.

[31021] I^a q. 62 a. 7 co. Respondeo dicendum quod in Angelis beatis remanet cognitio et dilectio naturalis. Sicut enim se habent principia operationum ad invicem, ita se habent et operationes ipsae. Manifestum est autem quod natura ad beatitudinem comparatur sicut primum ad secundum, quia beatitudo naturae additur. Semper autem oportet salvari primum in secundo. Unde oportet quod natura salvetur in beatitudine. Et similiter oportet quod in actu beatitudinis salvetur actus naturae.

[31022] I^a q. 62 a. 7 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod perfectio adveniēns tollit imperfectionem sibi oppositam. Imperfectio autem naturae non opponitur perfectioni beatitudinis, sed substernitur ei, sicut imperfectio potentiae substernitur perfectioni formae, et non tollitur potentia per formam, sed tollitur privatio, quae opponitur formae. Et similiter etiam imperfectio cognitionis naturalis non opponitur perfectioni cognitionis gloriae, nihil enim prohibet simul aliquid cognoscere per diversa media, sicut simul potest aliquid cognosci per medium probabile, et demonstrativum. Et similiter potest Angelus simul Deum cognoscere per essentiam Dei, quod pertinet ad cognitionem gloriae, et per essentiam propriam, quod pertinet ad cognitionem naturae.

[31023] I^a q. 62 a. 7 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod ea quae sunt beatitudinis, per se sufficiunt. Sed ad hoc quod sint, praeexigunt ea quae sunt naturae, quia nulla beatitudo est per se subsistens, nisi beatitudo increata.

[31024] I^a q. 62 a. 7 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod duae operationes non possunt esse simul unius potentiae, nisi una ad aliam ordinetur. Cognitio autem et dilectio naturalis ordinantur ad cognitionem et dilectionem gloriae. Unde nihil prohibet in Angelo simul esse et cognitionem et dilectionem naturalem, et cognitionem et dilectionem gloriae.

Q. 62. A. 8. Whether a beatified angel can sin?

Objection 1: It would seem that a beatified angel can sin. For, as was said above ([A\[7\]](#)), beatitude does not do away with nature. But it is of the very notion of created nature, that it can fail. Therefore a beatified angel can sin.

Objection 2: Further, the rational powers are referred to opposites, as the Philosopher observes (Metaph. iv, text. 3). But the will of the angel in beatitude does not cease to be rational. Therefore it is inclined towards good and evil.

Objection 3: Further, it belongs to the liberty of free-will for man to be able to choose good or evil. But the freedom of will is not lessened in the beatified angels. Therefore they can sin.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. xi) that "there is in the holy angels that nature which cannot sin." Therefore the holy angels cannot sin.

I answer that, The beatified angels cannot sin. The reason for this is, because their beatitude consists in seeing God through His essence. Now, God's essence is the very essence of goodness. Consequently the angel beholding God is disposed towards God in the same way as anyone else not seeing God is to the common form of goodness. Now it is impossible for any man either to will or to do anything except aiming at what is good; or for him to wish to turn away from good precisely as such. Therefore the beatified angel can neither will nor act, except as aiming towards God. Now whoever wills or acts in this manner cannot sin. Consequently the beatified angel cannot sin.

Reply to Objection 1: Created good, considered in itself, can fail. But from its perfect union with the uncreated good, such as is the union of beatitude, it is rendered unable to sin, for the reason already alleged.

[31025] I^a q. 62 a. 8 arg. 1 Ad octavum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angelus beatus peccare possit. Beatitudo enim non tollit naturam, ut dictum est. Sed de ratione naturae creatae est quod possit deficere. Ergo Angelus beatus potest peccare.

[31026] I^a q. 62 a. 8 arg. 2 Praeterea, potestates rationales sunt ad opposita, ut philosophus dicit. Sed voluntas Angeli beati non desinit esse rationalis. Ergo se habet ad bonum et malum.

[31027] I^a q. 62 a. 8 arg. 3 Praeterea, ad libertatem arbitrii pertinet quod homo possit eligere bonum et malum. Sed libertas arbitrii non minuitur in Angelis beatis. Ergo possunt peccare.

[31028] I^a q. 62 a. 8 s. c. Sed contra est quod Augustinus dicit, XI super Gen. ad Litt., quod illa natura quae peccare non potest in sanctis Angelis est. Ergo sancti Angeli peccare non possunt.

[31029] I^a q. 62 a. 8 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Angeli beati peccare non possunt. Cuius ratio est, quia eorum beatitudo in hoc consistit, quod per essentiam Deum vident. Essentia autem Dei est ipsa essentia bonitatis. Unde hoc modo se habet Angelus videns Deum ad ipsum Deum, sicut se habet quicumque non videns Deum ad communem rationem boni. Impossibile est autem quod aliquis quidquam velit vel operetur, nisi attendens ad bonum; vel quod velit divertere a bono, inquantum huiusmodi. Angelus igitur beatus non potest velle vel agere, nisi attendens ad Deum. Sic autem volens vel agens non potest peccare. Unde Angelus beatus nullo modo peccare potest.

[31030] I^a q. 62 a. 8 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod bonum creatum, in se consideratum, deficere potest. Sed ex coniunctione perfecta ad bonum increatum, qualis est coniunctio beatitudinis, adipiscitur quod peccare non possit, ratione iam dicta.

Reply to Objection 2: The rational powers are referred to opposites in the things to which they are not inclined naturally; but as to the things whereunto they have a natural tendency, they are not referred to opposites. For the intellect cannot but assent to naturally known principles; in the same way, the will cannot help clinging to good, formally as good; because the will is naturally ordained to good as to its proper object. Consequently the will of the angels is referred to opposites, as to doing many things, or not doing them. But they have no tendency to opposites with regard to God Himself, Whom they see to be the very nature of goodness; but in all things their aim is towards God, which ever alternative they choose, that is not sinful.

Reply to Objection 3: Free-will in its choice of means to an end is disposed just as the intellect is to conclusions. Now it is evident that it belongs to the power of the intellect to be able to proceed to different conclusions, according to given principles; but for it to proceed to some conclusion by passing out of the order of the principles, comes of its own defect. Hence it belongs to the perfection of its liberty for the free-will to be able to choose between opposite things, keeping the order of the end in view; but it comes of the defect of liberty for it to choose anything by turning away from the order of the end; and this is to sin. Hence there is greater liberty of will in the angels, who cannot sin, than there is in ourselves, who can sin.

Q. 62. A. 9. Whether the beatified angels advance in beatitude?

Objection 1: It would seem that the beatified angels can advance in beatitude. For charity is the principle of merit. But there is perfect charity in the angels. Therefore the beatified angels can merit. Now, as merit increases, the reward of beatitude increases. Therefore the beatified angels can progress in beatitude.

Objection 2: Further, Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. i) that "God makes use of us for our own gain, and for His own goodness. The same thing happens to the angels, whom He uses for spiritual ministrations"; since "they are all [*Vulg.: 'Are

[31031] I^a q. 62 a. 8 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod virtutes rationales se habent ad opposita in illis ad quae non ordinantur naturaliter, sed quantum ad illa ad quae naturaliter ordinantur, non se habent ad opposita. Intellectus enim non potest non assentire principiis naturaliter notis, et similiter voluntas non potest non adhaerere bono inquantum est bonum, quia in bonum naturaliter ordinatur sicut in suum obiectum. Voluntas igitur Angeli se habet ad opposita, quantum ad multa facienda vel non facienda. Sed quantum ad ipsum Deum, quem vident esse ipsam essentiam bonitatis, non se habent ad opposita; sed secundum ipsum ad omnia diriguntur, quodcumque oppositorum eligant. Quod sine peccato est.

[31032] I^a q. 62 a. 8 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod liberum arbitrium sic se habet ad eligendum ea quae sunt ad finem, sicut se habet intellectus ad conclusiones. Manifestum est autem quod ad virtutem intellectus pertinet, ut in diversas conclusiones procedere possit secundum principia data, sed quod in aliquam conclusionem procedat praetermittendo ordinem principiorum, hoc est ex defectu ipsius. Unde quod liberum arbitrium diversa eligere possit servato ordine finis, hoc pertinet ad perfectionem libertatis eius, sed quod eligat aliquid divertendo ab ordine finis, quod est peccare, hoc pertinet ad defectum libertatis. Unde maior libertas arbitrii est in Angelis, qui peccare non possunt, quam in nobis, qui peccare possumus.

[31033] I^a q. 62 a. 9 arg. 1 Ad nonum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Angeli beati in beatitudine proficere possint. Caritas enim est principium merendi. Sed in Angelis est perfecta caritas. Ergo Angeli beati possunt mereri. Crescente autem merito, et praemium beatitudinis crescit. Ergo Angeli beati in beatitudine proficere possunt.

[31034] I^a q. 62 a. 9 arg. 2 Praeterea, Augustinus dicit, in libro de Doctr. Christ., quod *Deus utitur nobis ad nostram utilitatem, et ad suam bonitatem*. Et similiter Angelis, quibus utitur in ministeriis spiritualibus; *cum sint administratorii*

they not all . . . ?] ministering spirits, sent to minister for them who shall receive the inheritance of salvation" ([Heb. 1:14](#)). This would not be for their profit were they not to merit thereby, nor to advance to beatitude. It remains, then, that the beatified angels can merit, and can advance in beatitude.

Objection 3: Further, it argues imperfection for anyone not occupying the foremost place not to be able to advance. But the angels are not in the highest degree of beatitude. Therefore if unable to ascend higher, it would appear that there is imperfection and defect in them; which is not admissible.

On the contrary, Merit and progress belong to this present condition of life. But angels are not wayfarers travelling towards beatitude, they are already in possession of beatitude. Consequently the beatified angels can neither merit nor advance in beatitude.

I answer that, In every movement the mover's intention is centered upon one determined end, to which he intends to lead the movable subject; because intention looks to the end, to which infinite progress is repugnant. Now it is evident, since the rational creature cannot of its own power attain to its beatitude, which consists in the vision of God, as is clear from what has gone before ([Q\[12\], A\[4\]](#)), that it needs to be moved by God towards its beatitude. Therefore there must be some one determined thing to which every rational creature is directed as to its last end.

Now this one determinate object cannot, in the vision of God, consist precisely in that which is seen; for the Supreme Truth is seen by all the blessed in various degrees: but it is on the part of the mode of vision, that diverse terms are fixed beforehand by the intention of Him Who directs towards the end. For it is impossible that as the rational creature is led on to the vision of the Supreme Essence, it should be led on in the same way to the supreme mode of vision, which is comprehension, for this belongs to God only; as is evident from what was said above ([Q\[12\], A\[7\]](#); [Q\[14\], A\[3\]](#)). But since infinite efficacy is

spiritus, in ministerium missi propter eos qui haereditatem capiunt salutis, ut dicitur Heb. I. Non autem hoc esset ad eorum utilitatem, si per hoc non mererentur nec in beatitudine proficerent. Relinquitur ergo quod Angeli beati et mereri, et in beatitudine proficere possunt.

[31035] I^a q. 62 a. 9 arg. 3 Praeterea, ad imperfectionem pertinet quod ille qui non est in summo, non possit proficere. Sed Angeli non sunt in summo. Si ergo ad maius proficere non possunt, videtur quod in eis sit imperfectio et defectus. Quod est inconveniens.

[31036] I^a q. 62 a. 9 s. c. Sed contra est quod mereri et proficere pertinent ad statum viae. Sed Angeli non sunt viatores, sed comprehensores. Ergo Angeli beati non possunt mereri, nec in beatitudine proficere.

[31037] I^a q. 62 a. 9 co. Respondeo dicendum quod in unoquoque motu motoris intentio fertur in aliquid determinatum, ad quod mobile perducere intendit, intentio enim est de fine cui repugnat infinitum. Manifestum est autem quod, cum creatura rationalis per suam virtutem consequi non possit suam beatitudinem, quae in visione Dei consistit, ut ex superioribus patet; indiget ut ad beatitudinem a Deo moveatur. Oportet igitur quod sit aliquid determinatum, ad quod quaelibet creatura rationalis dirigatur sicut in ultimum finem. Et hoc quidem determinatum non potest esse, in divina visione, quantum ad ipsum quod videtur, quia summa veritas ab omnibus beatis secundum diversos gradus conspicitur. Sed quantum ad modum visionis, praefigitur diversimode terminus ex intentione dirigentis in finem. Non enim possibile est quod, sicut rationalis creatura producit ad videndum summam essentiam, ita producat ad summum modum visionis, qui est comprehensio, hic enim modus soli Deo competere potest, ut ex supra dictis patet. Sed cum infinita efficacia requiratur ad Deum comprehendendum, creaturae vero efficacia in videndo non possit esse nisi finita; ab infinito autem finitum quodlibet infinitis gradibus distet; infinitis modis contingit creaturam

required for comprehending God, while the creature's efficacy in beholding is only finite; and since every finite being is in infinite degrees removed from the infinite; it comes to pass that the rational creature understands God more or less clearly according to infinite degrees. And as beatitude consists in vision, so the degree of vision lies in a determinate mode of the vision.

Therefore every rational creature is so led by God to the end of its beatitude, that from God's predestination it is brought even to a determinate degree of beatitude. Consequently, when that degree is once secured, it cannot pass to a higher degree.

Reply to Objection 1: Merit belongs to a subject which is moving towards its end. Now the rational creature is moved towards its end, not merely passively, but also by working actively. If the end is within the power of the rational creature, then its action is said to procure the end; as man acquires knowledge by reflection: but if the end be beyond its power, and is looked for from another, then the action will be meritorious of such end. But what is already in the ultimate term is not said to be moved, but to have been moved. Consequently, to merit belongs to the imperfect charity of this life; whereas perfect charity does not merit but rather enjoys the reward. Even as in acquired habits, the operation preceding the habit is productive of the habit; but the operation from an acquired habit is both perfect and enjoyable. In the same way the act of perfect charity has no quality of merit, but belongs rather to the perfection of the reward.

Reply to Objection 2: A thing can be termed useful in two ways. First of all, as being on the way to an end; and so the merit of beatitude is useful. Secondly, as the part is useful for the whole; as the wall for a house. In this way the angelic ministrings are useful for the beatified angels, inasmuch as they are a part of their beatitude; for to pour out acquired perfection upon others is of the nature of what is perfect, considered as perfect.

Reply to Objection 3: Although a beatified angel is not absolutely in the highest degree of

rationalem intelligere Deum vel clarius vel minus clare. Et sicut beatitudo consistit in ipsa visione, ita gradus beatitudinis in certo modo visionis. Sic igitur unaquaeque creatura rationalis a Deo perducitur ad finem beatitudinis, ut etiam ad determinatum gradum beatitudinis perducatur ex praedestinatione Dei. Unde consecuto illo gradu, ad altiorem transire non potest.

[31038] I^a q. 62 a. 9 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod mereri est eius quod movetur ad finem. Movetur autem ad finem creatura rationalis, non solum patiando, sed etiam operando. Et si quidem finis ille subsit virtuti rationalis creaturae, operatio illa dicitur acquisitiva illius finis, sicut homo meditando acquirit scientiam, si vero finis non sit in potestate eius, sed ab alio expectetur, operatio, erit meritoria finis. Ei autem quod est in ultimo termino, non convenit moveri, sed mutatum esse. Unde caritatis imperfectae, quae est viae, est mereri, caritatis autem perfectae non est mereri, sed potius praemio frui. Sicut et in habitibus acquisitis, operatio praecedens habitum est acquisitiva habitus, quae vero est ex habitu iam acquisito, est operatio iam perfecta cum delectatione. Et similiter actus caritatis perfectae non habet rationem meriti, sed magis est de perfectione praemii.

[31039] I^a q. 62 a. 9 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod aliquid dicitur utile dupliciter. Uno modo, sicut quod est in via ad finem, et sic utile est meritum beatitudinis. Alio modo, sicut pars est utilis ad totum, ut paries ad domum. Et hoc modo ministeria Angelorum sunt utilia Angelis beatis, inquantum sunt quaedam pars beatitudinis ipsorum, diffundere enim perfectionem habitam in alia, hoc est de ratione perfecti inquantum est perfectum.

[31040] I^a q. 62 a. 9 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, licet Angelus beatus non sit in summo

beatitude, yet, in his own regard he is in the highest degree, according to Divine predestination. Nevertheless the joy of the angels can be increased with regard to the salvation of such as are saved by their ministrations, according to [Lk. 15:10](#): "There is [Vulg. 'shall be'] joy before the angels of God upon one sinner doing penance." Such joy belongs to their accidental reward, which can be increased unto judgment day. Hence some writers say that they can merit as to their accidental reward. But it is better to say that the Blessed can in no wise merit without being at the same time a wayfarer and a comprehensor; like Christ, Who alone was such. For the Blessed acquire such joy from the virtue of their beatitude, rather than merit it.

gradu beatitudinis simpliciter, est tamen in ultimo quantum ad seipsum, secundum praedestinationem divinam. Potest tamen augeri Angelorum gaudium de salute eorum qui per ipsorum ministerium salvantur; secundum illud Luc. XV, *gaudium est Angelis Dei super uno peccatore poenitentiam agente*. Sed hoc gaudium ad praemium accidentale pertinet, quod quidem augeri potest usque ad diem iudicii. Unde quidam dicunt quod, quantum ad praemium accidentale, etiam mereri possunt. Sed melius est ut dicatur quod nullo modo aliquis beatus mereri potest, nisi sit simul viator et comprehensor, ut Christus, qui solus fuit viator et comprehensor. Praedictum enim gaudium magis acquirunt ex virtute beatitudinis, quam illud mereantur.

Q. 63. THE MALICE OF THE ANGELS WITH REGARD TO SIN (NINE ARTICLES)

In the next place we must consider how angels became evil: first of all with regard to the evil of fault; and secondly, as to the evil of punishment. Under the first heading there are nine points for consideration:

- [\(1\) Can there be evil of fault in the angels?](#)
- [\(2\) What kind of sins can be in them?](#)
- [\(3\) What did the angel seek in sinning?](#)
- [\(4\) Supposing that some became evil by a sin of their own choosing, are any of them naturally evil?](#)
- [\(5\) Supposing that it is not so, could any one of them become evil in the first instant of his creation by an act of his own will?](#)
- [\(6\) Supposing that he did not, was there any interval between his creation and fall?](#)
- [\(7\) Was the highest of them who fell, absolutely the highest among the angels?](#)
- [\(8\) Was the sin of the foremost angel the cause of the others sinning?](#)
- [\(9\) Did as many sin as remained steadfast?](#)

Q. 63. A. 1. Whether the evil of fault can be in the angels?

Objection 1: It would seem that there can be no evil of fault in the angels. For there can be no evil except in things which are in potentiality, as is said by the Philosopher (Metaph. ix, text. 19), because the subject of privation is a being in potentiality. But the angels have not being in potentiality, since they are subsisting forms. Therefore there can be no evil in them.

Objection 2: Further, the angels are higher than the heavenly bodies. But philosophers say that there cannot be evil in the heavenly bodies. Therefore neither can there be in the angels.

Objection 3: Further, what is natural to a thing is always in it. But it is natural for the angels to be

[31041] I^a q. 63 pr. Deinde considerandum est quomodo Angeli facti sunt mali. Et primo, quantum ad malum culpae; secundo, quantum ad malum poenae. Circa primum quaeruntur novem. Primo, utrum malum culpae in Angelo esse possit. Secundo, cuiusmodi peccata in eis esse possunt. Tertio, quid appetendo Angelus peccavit. Quarto, supposito quod aliqui peccato propriae voluntatis facti sunt mali, utrum aliqui naturaliter sint mali. Quinto, supposito quod non, utrum aliquis eorum in primo instanti suae creationis potuerit esse malus per actum propriae voluntatis. Sexto, supposito quod non, utrum aliqua mora fuerit inter creationem et lapsum. Septimo, utrum supremus inter cadentes, fuerit simpliciter inter omnes Angelos summus. Octavo, utrum peccatum primi Angeli fuerit aliis aliqua causa peccandi. Nono, utrum tot ceciderint, quot remanserunt.

[31042] I^a q. 63 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod malum culpae in Angelis esse non possit. Quia malum non potest esse nisi in his quae sunt in potentia, ut dicitur in IX Metaphys., subiectum enim privationis est ens in potentia. Sed Angeli, cum sint formae subsistentes, non habent esse in potentia. Ergo in eis non potest esse malum.

[31043] I^a q. 63 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, Angeli sunt digniores quam corpora caelestia. Sed in corporibus caelestibus non potest esse malum, ut philosophi dicunt. Ergo neque in Angelis.

[31044] I^a q. 63 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, id quod est naturale, semper inest. Sed naturale est Angelis

moved by the movement of love towards God. Therefore such love cannot be withdrawn from them. But in loving God they do not sin. Consequently the angels cannot sin.

Objection 4: Further, desire is only of what is good or apparently good. Now for the angels there can be no apparent good which is not a true good; because in them either there can be no error at all, or at least not before guilt. Therefore the angels can desire only what is truly good. But no one sins by desiring what is truly good. Consequently the angel does not sin by desire.

On the contrary, It is said ([Job 4:18](#)): "In His angels He found wickedness."

I answer that, An angel or any other rational creature considered in his own nature, can sin; and to whatever creature it belongs not to sin, such creature has it as a gift of grace, and not from the condition of nature. The reason of this is, because sinning is nothing else than a deviation from that rectitude which an act ought to have; whether we speak of sin in nature, art, or morals. That act alone, the rule of which is the very virtue of the agent, can never fall short of rectitude. Were the craftsman's hand the rule itself engraving, he could not engrave the wood otherwise than rightly; but if the rightness of engraving be judged by another rule, then the engraving may be right or faulty. Now the Divine will is the sole rule of God's act, because it is not referred to any higher end. But every created will has rectitude of act so far only as it is regulated according to the Divine will, to which the last end is to be referred: as every desire of a subordinate ought to be regulated by the will of his superior; for instance, the soldier's will, according to the will of his commanding officer. Thus only in the Divine will can there be no sin; whereas there can be sin in the will of every creature; considering the condition of its nature.

Reply to Objection 1: In the angels there is no potentiality to natural existence. Yet there is

quod moveantur motu dilectionis in Deum. Ergo hoc ab eis removeri non potest. Sed diligendo Deum non peccant. Ergo Angeli peccare non possunt.

[31045] I^a q. 63 a. 1 arg. 4 Praeterea, appetitus non est nisi boni, vel apparentis boni. Sed in Angelis non potest esse apparens bonum, quod non sit verum bonum, quia in eis vel omnino error esse non potest, vel saltem non potest praecedere culpam. Ergo Angeli non possunt appetere nisi id quod est vere bonum. Sed nullus, appetendo id quod est vere bonum, peccat. Ergo Angelus appetendo non peccat.

[31046] I^a q. 63 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur Iob IV, *in Angelis suis reperit pravitatem*.

[31047] I^a q. 63 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod tam Angelus quam quaecumque creatura rationalis, si in sua sola natura consideretur, potest peccare, et cuicumque creaturae hoc convenit ut peccare non possit, hoc habet ex dono gratiae, non ex conditione naturae. Cuius ratio est, quia peccare nihil est aliud quam declinare a rectitudine actus quam debet habere; sive accipiatur peccatum in naturalibus, sive in artificialibus, sive in moralibus. Solum autem illum actum a rectitudine declinare non contingit, cuius regula est ipsa virtus agentis. Si enim manus artificis esset ipsa regula incisionis, nunquam posset artifex nisi recte lignum incidere, sed si rectitudo incisionis sit ab alia regula, contingit incisionem esse rectam et non rectam. Divina autem voluntas sola est regula sui actus, quia non ad superiorem finem ordinatur. Omnis autem voluntas cuiuslibet creaturae rectitudinem in suo actu non habet, nisi secundum quod regulatur a voluntate divina, ad quam pertinet ultimus finis, sicut quaelibet voluntas inferioris debet regulari secundum voluntatem superioris, ut voluntas militis secundum voluntatem ducis exercitus. Sic igitur in sola voluntate divina peccatum esse non potest, in qualibet autem voluntate creaturae potest esse peccatum, secundum conditionem suae naturae.

[31048] I^a q. 63 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod in Angelis non est potentia ad

potentiality in their intellectual part, as regards their being inclined to this or the other object. In this respect there can be evil in them.

Reply to Objection 2: The heavenly bodies have none but a natural operation. Therefore as there can be no evil of corruption in their nature; so neither can there be evil of disorder in their natural action. But besides their natural action there is the action of free-will in the angels, by reason of which evil may be in them.

Reply to Objection 3: It is natural for the angel to turn to God by the movement of love, according as God is the principle of his natural being. But for him to turn to God as the object of supernatural beatitude, comes of infused love, from which he could be turned away by sinning.

Reply to Objection 4: Mortal sin occurs in two ways in the act of free-will. First, when something evil is chosen; as man sins by choosing adultery, which is evil of itself. Such sin always comes of ignorance or error; otherwise what is evil would never be chosen as good. The adulterer errs in the particular, choosing this delight of an inordinate act as something good to be performed now, from the inclination of passion or of habit; even though he does not err in his universal judgment, but retains a right opinion in this respect. In this way there can be no sin in the angel; because there are no passions in the angels to fetter reason or intellect, as is manifest from what has been said above ([Q\[59\], A\[4\]](#)); nor, again, could any habit inclining to sin precede their first sin. In another way sin comes of free-will by choosing something good in itself, but not according to proper measure or rule; so that the defect which induces sin is only on the part of the choice which is not properly regulated, but not on the part of the thing chosen; as if one were to pray, without heeding the order established by the Church. Such a sin does not presuppose ignorance, but merely absence of consideration of the things which ought to be considered. In this way the angel sinned, by seeking his own good, from his own free-will, insubordinately to the rule of the Divine

esse naturale. Est tamen in eis potentia secundum intellectivam partem, ad hoc quod convertantur in hoc vel in illud. Et quantum ad hoc, potest in eis esse malum.

[31049] I^a q. 63 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod corpora caelestia non habent operationem nisi naturalem. Et ideo sicut in natura eorum non potest esse corruptionis malum, ita nec in actione naturali eorum potest esse malum inordinationis. Sed supra actionem naturalem in Angelis est actio liberi arbitrii, secundum quam contingit in eis esse malum.

[31050] I^a q. 63 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod naturale est Angelo quod convertatur motu dilectionis in Deum, secundum quod est principium naturalis esse. Sed quod convertatur in ipsum secundum quod est obiectum beatitudinis supernaturalis, hoc est ex amore gratuito, a quo averti potuit peccando.

[31051] I^a q. 63 a. 1 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod peccatum in actu liberi arbitrii contingit esse dupliciter. Uno modo, ex hoc quod aliquod malum eligitur, sicut homo peccat eligendo adulterium, quod secundum se est malum. Et tale peccatum semper procedit ex aliqua ignorantia vel errore, alioquin id quod est malum, non eligeretur ut bonum. Errat quidem adulter in particulari, eligens hanc delectationem inordinati actus quasi aliquod bonum ad nunc agendum, propter inclinationem passionis aut habitus; etiam si in universali non erret, sed veram de hoc sententiam teneat. Hoc autem modo in Angelo peccatum esse non potuit, quia nec in Angelis sunt passiones, quibus ratio aut intellectus ligetur, ut ex supra dictis patet; nec iterum primum peccatum habitus praecedere potuit ad peccatum inclinans. Alio modo contingit peccare per liberum arbitrium, eligendo aliquid quod secundum se est bonum, sed non cum ordine debitae mensurae aut regulae; ita quod defectus inducens peccatum sit solum ex parte electionis, quae non habet debitum ordinem, non ex parte rei electae; sicut si aliquis eligeret orare, non attendens ad ordinem ab Ecclesia institutum. Et huiusmodi peccatum non praeequit ignorantiam, sed absentiam solum considerationis eorum quae considerari debent. Et hoc modo Angelus peccavit, convertendo se per liberum

will.

arbitrium ad proprium bonum, absque ordine ad regulam divinae voluntatis.

Q. 63. A. 2. Whether only the sin of pride and envy can exist in an angel?

Objection 1: It would seem that there can be other sins in the angels besides those of pride and envy. Because whosoever can delight in any kind of sin, can fall into the sin itself. But the demons delight even in the obscenities of carnal sins; as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xiv, 3). Therefore there can also be carnal sins in the demons.

[31052] I^a q. 63 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod in Angelis non possit esse solum peccatum superbiae et invidiae. In quemcumque enim cadit delectatio alicuius peccati, potest cadere peccatum illud. Sed Daemones delectantur etiam in obscenitatibus carnalium peccatorum, ut Augustinus dicit, II de Civ. Dei. Ergo in Daemonibus etiam peccata carnalia possunt esse.

Objection 2: Further, as pride and envy are spiritual sins, so are sloth, avarice, and anger. But spiritual sins are concerned with the spirit, just as carnal sins are with the flesh. Therefore not only can there be pride and envy in the angels; but likewise sloth and avarice.

[31053] I^a q. 63 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, sicut superbia et invidia sunt peccata spiritualia, ita acedia et avaritia et ira. Sed spiritui conveniunt peccata spiritualia, sicut et carni peccata carnalia. Ergo non solum superbia et invidia in Angelis esse possunt, sed etiam acedia et avaritia.

Objection 3: Further, according to Gregory (Moral. xxxi), many vices spring from pride; and in like manner from envy. But, if the cause is granted, the effect follows. If, therefore, there can be pride and envy in the angels, for the same reason there can likewise be other vices in them.

[31054] I^a q. 63 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, secundum Gregorium, in moralibus, ex superbia nascuntur plura vitia, et similiter ex invidia. Posita autem causa, ponitur effectus. Si ergo superbia et invidia in Angelis esse possunt, pari ratione et alia vitia in eis esse possunt.

On the contrary, Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xiv, 3) that the devil "is not a fornicator nor a drunkard, nor anything of the like sort; yet he is proud and envious."

[31055] I^a q. 63 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod Augustinus dicit, XIV libro de Civ. Dei, quod *Diabolus non est fornicator aut ebriosus, neque aliquid huiusmodi, est tamen superbus et invidus.*

I answer that, Sin can exist in a subject in two ways: first of all by actual guilt, and secondly by affection. As to guilt, all sins are in the demons; since by leading men to sin they incur the guilt of all sins. But as to affection only those sins can be in the demons which can belong to a spiritual nature. Now a spiritual nature cannot be affected by such pleasures as appertain to bodies, but only by such as are in keeping with spiritual things; because nothing is affected except with regard to something which is in some way suited to its nature. But there can be no sin when anyone is incited to good of the spiritual order; unless in such affection the rule of the superior be not kept.

[31056] I^a q. 63 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod peccatum aliquod in aliquo esse potest dupliciter, uno modo, secundum reatum; alio modo, secundum affectum. Secundum reatum quidem omnia peccata in Daemonibus esse contingit, quia dum homines ad omnia peccata inducunt, omnium peccatorum reatum incurrunt. Secundum affectum vero illa solum peccata in malis Angelis esse possunt, ad quae contingit affici spiritualem naturam. Spiritualem autem naturam affici non contingit ad bona quae sunt propria corpori, sed ad ea quae in rebus spiritualibus inveniri possunt, nihil enim afficitur nisi ad id quod suae naturae potest esse quodam

Such is precisely the sin of pride---not to be subject to a superior when subjection is due. Consequently the first sin of the angel can be none other than pride.

Yet, as a consequence, it was possible for envy also to be in them, since for the appetite to tend to the desire of something involves on its part resistance to anything contrary. Now the envious man repines over the good possessed by another, inasmuch as he deems his neighbor's good to be a hindrance to his own. But another's good could not be deemed a hindrance to the good coveted by the wicked angel, except inasmuch as he coveted a singular excellence, which would cease to be singular because of the excellence of some other. So, after the sin of pride, there followed the evil of envy in the sinning angel, whereby he grieved over man's good, and also over the Divine excellence, according as against the devil's will God makes use of man for the Divine glory.

Reply to Objection 1: The demons do not delight in the obscenities of the sins of the flesh, as if they themselves were disposed to carnal pleasures: it is wholly through envy that they take pleasure in all sorts of human sins, so far as these are hindrances to a man's good.

Reply to Objection 2: Avarice, considered as a special kind of sin, is the immoderate greed of temporal possessions which serve the use of human life, and which can be estimated in value of money; to these demons are not at all inclined, any more than they are to carnal pleasures. Consequently avarice properly so called cannot be in them. But if every immoderate greed of possessing any created good be termed avarice, in this way avarice is contained under the pride which is in the demons. Anger implies passion, and so does concupiscence; consequently they can only exist metaphorically in the demons. Sloth is a kind of sadness, whereby a man becomes sluggish in spiritual exercises because they weary the body; which does not apply to the demons. So it is evident that pride and envy are the only spiritual sins which can be found in demons; yet so that envy is not to be taken for a passion, but

modo conveniens. In spiritualibus autem bonis non potest esse peccatum dum aliquis ad ea afficitur, nisi per hoc quod in tali affectu superioris regula non servatur. Et hoc est peccatum superbiae, non subdi superiori in eo quo debet. Unde peccatum primum Angeli non potest esse aliud quam superbia. Sed consequenter potuit in eis esse etiam invidia. Eiusdem enim rationis est quod affectus tendat in aliquid appetendum, et quod renitatur opposito. Invidus autem ex hoc de bono alterius dolet, inquantum bonum alterius aestimat sui boni impedimentum. Non autem bonum alterius poterat aestimari impedimentum boni affectati per Angelum malum, nisi inquantum affectavit excellentiam singularem, quae quidem singularitas per alterius excellentiam cessat. Et ideo post peccatum superbiae consecutum est in Angelo peccante malum invidiae, secundum quod de bono hominis doluit; et etiam de excellentia divina, secundum quod eo Deus contra voluntatem ipsius Diaboli utitur in gloriam divinam.

[31057] I^a q. 63 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Daemones non delectantur in obscenitatibus carnalium peccatorum; quasi ipsi afficiantur ad delectationes carnales, sed hoc totum ex invidia procedit, quod in peccatis hominum quibuscumque delectantur, inquantum sunt impedimenta humani boni.

[31058] I^a q. 63 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod avaritia, secundum quod est speciale peccatum, est immoderatus appetitus rerum temporalium quae veniunt in usum vitae humanae, quaecumque pecunia aestimari possunt, et ad ista non afficiuntur Daemones, sicut nec ad delectationes carnales. Unde avaritia proprie sumpta in eis esse non potest. Sed si avaritia dicatur omnis immoderata cupiditas habendi quodcumque bonum creatum, sic avaritia continetur in superbia quae est in Daemonibus. Ira vero cum quadam passione est, sicut et concupiscentia. Unde ipsa in Daemonibus esse non potest nisi metaphorice. Acedia vero est quaedam tristitia, qua homo redditur tardus ad spirituales actus propter corporalem laborem; qui Daemonibus non competit. Et sic patet quod sola superbia et invidia sunt pure spiritualia peccata, quae Daemonibus competere possunt, ita tamen

for a will resisting the good of another.

Reply to Objection 3: Under envy and pride, as found in the demons, are comprised all other sins derived from them.

Q. 63. A. 3. Whether the devil desired to be as God?

Objection 1: It would seem that the devil did not desire to be as God. For what does not fall under apprehension, does not fall under desire; because the good which is apprehended moves the appetite, whether sensible, rational, or intellectual; and sin consists only in such desire. But for any creature to be God's equal does not fall under apprehension, because it implies a contradiction; for ~~it~~ the finite equals the infinite, then it would itself be infinite. Therefore an angel could not desire to be as God.

Objection 2: Further, the natural end can always be desired without sin. But to be likened unto God is the end to which every creature naturally tends. If, therefore, the angel desired to be as God, not by equality, but by likeness, it would seem that he did not thereby sin.

Objection 3: Further, the angel was created with greater fulness of wisdom than man. But no man, save a fool, ever makes choice of being the equal of an angel, still less of God; because choice regards only things which are possible, regarding which one takes deliberation. Therefore much less did the angel sin by desiring to be as God.

On the contrary, It is said, in the person of the devil ([Is. 14:13,14](#)), "I will ascend into heaven . . . I will be like the Most High." And Augustine (De Qu. Vet. Test. cxiii) says that being "inflated with pride, he wished to be called God."

I answer that, Without doubt the angel sinned by seeking to be as God. But this can be understood in two ways: first, by equality; secondly, by

quod invidia non sumatur pro passione, sed pro voluntate renitente bono alterius.

[31059] I^a q. 63 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod sub invidia et superbia, prout in Daemonibus ponuntur, comprehenduntur omnia peccata quae ab illis derivantur.

[31060] I^a q. 63 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod Diabolus non appetierit esse ut Deus. Illud enim quod non cadit in apprehensione, non cadit in appetitu, cum bonum apprehensum moveat appetitum vel sensibilem vel rationalem, vel intellectualem (in solo enim huiusmodi appetitu contingit esse peccatum). Sed creaturam aliquam esse aequalem Deo, non cadit in apprehensione, implicat enim contradictionem, quia necesse est finitum esse infinitum, si aequatur infinito. Ergo Angelus non potuit appetere esse ut Deus.

[31061] I^a q. 63 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, illud quod est finis naturae, absque peccato appeti potest. Sed assimilari Deo est finis in quem tendit naturaliter quaelibet creatura. Si ergo Angelus appetiit esse ut Deus, non per aequalitatem, sed per similitudinem, videtur quod in hoc non peccaverit.

[31062] I^a q. 63 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, Angelus in maiori plenitudine sapientiae conditus est quam homo. Sed nullus homo, nisi omnino amens, eligit esse aequalis Angelo, nedum Deo, quia electio non est nisi possibilium, de quibus est consilium. Ergo multo minus peccavit Angelus appetendo esse ut Deus.

[31063] I^a q. 63 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur Isaiae XIV, ex persona Diaboli, *ascendam in caelum, et ero similis altissimo*. Et Augustinus dicit in libro de quaestionibus Vet. Test., quod elatione inflatus, voluit dici Deus.

[31064] I^a q. 63 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Angelus, absque omni dubio, peccavit appetendo esse ut Deus. Sed hoc potest intelligi

likeness. He could not seek to be as God in the first way; because by natural knowledge he knew that this was impossible: and there was no habit preceding his first sinful act, nor any passion fettering his mind, so as to lead him to choose what was impossible by failing in some particular; as sometimes happens in ourselves. And even supposing it were possible, it would be against the natural desire; because there exists in everything the natural desire of preserving its own nature; which would not be preserved were it to be changed into another nature. Consequently, no creature of a lower order can ever covet the grade of a higher nature; just as an ass does not desire to be a horse: for were it to be so upraised, it would cease to be itself. But herein the imagination plays us false; for one is liable to think that, because a man seeks to occupy a higher grade as to accidentals, which can increase without the destruction of the subject, he can also seek a higher grade of nature, to which he could not attain without ceasing to exist. Now it is quite evident that God surpasses the angels, not merely in accidentals, but also in degree of nature; and one angel, another. Consequently it is impossible for one angel of lower degree to desire equality with a higher; and still more to covet equality with God.

To desire to be as God according to likeness can happen in two ways. In one way, as to that likeness whereby everything is made to be likened unto God. And so, if anyone desire in this way to be Godlike, he commits no sin; provided that he desires such likeness in proper order, that is to say, that he may obtain it of God. But he would sin were he to desire to be like unto God even in the right way, as of his own, and not of God's power. In another way one may desire to be like unto God in some respect which is not natural to one; as if one were to desire to create heaven and earth, which is proper to God; in which desire there would be sin. It was in this way that the devil desired to be as God. Not that he desired to resemble God by being subject to no one else absolutely; for so he would be desiring his own 'not-being'; since no creature can exist except by holding its existence under God. But he desired resemblance with God in this respect---by desiring, as his last end of beatitude, something which he could attain by the virtue of his own nature, turning his appetite away from

dupliciter, uno modo, per aequiparantiam; alio modo, per similitudinem. Primo quidem modo, non potuit appetere esse ut Deus, quia scivit hoc esse impossibile, naturali cognitione; nec primum actum peccandi in ipso praecessit vel habitus vel passio ligans cognoscitivam ipsius virtutem, ut in particulari deficiens eligeret impossibile, sicut in nobis interdum accidit. Et tamen, dato quod esset possibile, hoc esset contra naturale desiderium. Inest enim unicuique naturale desiderium ad conservandum suum esse, quod non conservaretur, si transmutaretur in alteram naturam. Unde nulla res quae est in inferiori gradu naturae, potest appetere superioris naturae gradum, sicut asinus non appetit esse equus, quia si transferretur in gradum superioris naturae, iam ipsum non esset. Sed in hoc imaginatio decipitur, quia enim homo appetit esse in altiori gradu quantum ad aliqua accidentalia, quae possunt crescere absque corruptione subiecti, aestimatur quod possit appetere altiozem gradum naturae, in quem pervenire non posset nisi esse desineret. Manifestum est autem quod Deus excedit Angelum, non secundum aliqua accidentalia, sed secundum gradum naturae, et etiam unus Angelus alium. Unde impossibile est quod Angelus inferior appetat esse aequalis superiori; nedum quod appetat esse aequalis Deo. Appetere autem esse ut Deus per similitudinem, contingit dupliciter. Uno modo, quantum ad id in quo aliquid natum est Deo assimilari. Et sic, si aliquis quantum ad hoc appetat esse Deo similis, non peccat, dummodo similitudinem Dei debito ordine appetat adipisci, ut scilicet eam a Deo habeat. Peccaret vero si quis etiam appeteret secundum iustitiam esse similis Deo, quasi propria virtute, et non ex virtute Dei. Alio vero modo potest aliquis appetere similis esse Deo, quantum ad hoc in quo non natus est assimilari; sicut si quis appeteret creare caelum et terram, quod est proprium Dei; in quo appetitu esset peccatum. Et hoc modo Diabolus appetiit esse ut Deus. Non ut ei assimilaretur quantum ad hoc quod est nulli subesse simpliciter, quia sic etiam suum non esse appeteret, cum nulla creatura esse possit nisi per hoc quod sub Deo esse participat. Sed in hoc appetiit esse similis Deo, quia appetiit ut finem ultimum beatitudinis id ad quod virtute suae naturae poterat pervenire, avertens suum appetitum a beatitudine supernaturali, quae est ex gratia Dei. Vel si appetiit ut ultimum finem illam Dei similitudinem quae datur ex gratia, voluit hoc

supernatural beatitude, which is attained by God's grace. Or, if he desired as his last end that likeness of God which is bestowed by grace, he sought to have it by the power of his own nature; and not from Divine assistance according to God's ordering. This harmonizes with Anselm's opinion, who says [*De casu diaboli, iv.] that "he sought that to which he would have come had he stood fast." These two views in a manner coincide; because according to both, he sought to have final beatitude of his own power, whereas this is proper to God alone.

Since, then, what exists of itself is the cause of what exists of another, it follows from this furthermore that he sought to have dominion over others; wherein he also perversely wished to be like unto God.

Reply to Objections From this we have the answer to all the objections.

Q. 63. A. 4. Whether any demons are naturally wicked?

Objection 1: It would seem that some demons are naturally wicked. For Porphyry says, as quoted by Augustine (De Civ. Dei x, 11): "There is a class of demons of crafty nature, pretending that they are gods and the souls of the dead." But to be deceitful is to be evil. Therefore some demons are naturally wicked.

Objection 2: Further, as the angels are created by God, so are men. But some men are naturally wicked, of whom it is said ([Wis. 12:10](#)): "Their malice is natural." Therefore some angels may be naturally wicked.

Objection 3: Further, some irrational animals have wicked dispositions by nature: thus the fox is naturally sly, and the wolf naturally rapacious; yet they are God's creatures. Therefore, although the demons are God's creatures, they may be naturally wicked.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that "the demons are not naturally wicked."

habere per virtutem suae naturae, non ex divino auxilio secundum Dei dispositionem. Et hoc consonat dictis Anselmi, qui dicit quod appetiit illud ad quod pervenisset si stetisset. Et haec duo quodammodo in idem redeunt, quia secundum utrumque appetiit finalem beatitudinem per suam virtutem habere, quod est proprium Dei. Quia vero quod est per se, est principium et causa eius quod est per aliud, ex hoc etiam consecutum est quod appetiit aliquem principatum super alia habere. In quo etiam perverse voluit Deo assimilari.

[31065] I^a q. 63 a. 3 ad arg. Et per hoc patet responsio ad omnia obiecta.

[31066] I^a q. 63 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod aliqui Daemones sint naturaliter mali. Dicit enim Porphyrius, ut Augustinus introducit X de Civ. Dei, quod *est quoddam genus Daemonum natura fallax, simulans deos et animas defunctorum*. Sed esse fallacem est esse malum. Ergo aliqui Daemones sunt naturaliter mali.

[31067] I^a q. 63 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, sicut Angeli sunt creati a Deo, ita et homines. Sed aliqui homines sunt naturaliter mali, de quibus dicitur Sap. XII, *erat eorum malitia naturalis*. Ergo et Angeli aliqui possunt esse naturaliter mali.

[31068] I^a q. 63 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, aliqua animalia irrationalia habent quasdam naturales malitias, sicut vulpes naturaliter est subdola, et lupus naturaliter est rapax, et tamen sunt creaturae Dei. Ergo et Daemones, licet sint creaturae Dei, possunt esse naturaliter mali.

[31069] I^a q. 63 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra est quod Dionysius dicit, IV cap. de Div. Nom., quod

I answer that, Everything which exists, so far as it exists and has a particular nature, tends naturally towards some good; since it comes from a good principle; because the effect always reverts to its principle. Now a particular good may happen to have some evil connected with it; thus fire has this evil connected with it that it consumes other things: but with the universal good no evil can be connected. If, then, there be anything whose nature is inclined towards some particular good, it can tend naturally to some evil; not as evil, but accidentally, as connected with some good. But if anything of its nature be inclined to good in general, then of its own nature it cannot be inclined to evil. Now it is manifest that every intellectual nature is inclined towards good in general, which it can apprehend and which is the object of the will. Hence, since the demons are intellectual substances, they can in no wise have a natural inclination towards any evil whatsoever; consequently they cannot be naturally evil.

Reply to Objection 1: Augustine rebukes Porphyry for saying that the demons are naturally deceitful; himself maintaining that they are not naturally so, but of their own will. Now the reason why Porphyry held that they are naturally deceitful was that, as he contended, demons are animals with a sensitive nature. Now the sensitive nature is inclined towards some particular good, with which evil may be connected. In this way, then, it can have a natural inclination to evil; yet only accidentally, inasmuch as evil is connected with good.

Reply to Objection 2: The malice of some men can be called natural, either because of custom which is a second nature; or on account of the natural proclivity on the part of the sensitive nature to some inordinate passion, as some people are said to be naturally wrathful or lustful; but not on the part of the intellectual nature.

[31070] I^a q. 63 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod omne quod est, inquantum est et naturam habet aliquam, in bonum aliquod naturaliter tendit, utpote ex principio bono existens, quia semper effectus convertitur in suum principium. Contingit autem alicui bono particulari aliquod malum esse adiunctum, sicut igni coniungitur hoc malum quod est esse consumptivum aliorum, sed bono universali nullum malum potest esse adiunctum. Si ergo aliquid sit cuius natura ordinetur in aliquod bonum particulare, potest naturaliter tendere in aliquod malum, non inquantum malum, sed per accidens, inquantum est coniunctum cuidam bono. Si vero aliquid sit cuius natura ordinetur in aliquod bonum secundum communem boni rationem hoc secundum suam naturam non potest tendere in aliquod malum. Manifestum est autem quod quaelibet natura intellectualis habet ordinem in bonum universale, quod potest apprehendere, et quod est obiectum voluntatis. Unde cum Daemones sint substantiae intellectuales, nullo modo possunt habere inclinationem naturalem in aliquod quodcumque malum. Et ideo non possunt esse naturaliter mali.

[31071] I^a q. 63 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Augustinus ibidem reprehendit Porphyrium de hoc quod dixit quod Daemones erant naturaliter fallaces, dicens eos non esse naturaliter fallaces, sed propria voluntate. Porphyrius autem hac ratione posuit Daemones esse natura fallaces, quia ponebat Daemones esse animalia habentia naturam sensitivam. Natura autem sensitiva ordinatur ad aliquod bonum particulare, cui potest esse coniunctum malum. Et secundum hoc, aliquam inclinationem naturalem habere possunt ad malum; per accidens tamen, inquantum malum est coniunctum bono.

[31072] I^a q. 63 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod malitia aliquorum hominum potest dici naturalis, vel propter consuetudinem, quae est altera natura; vel propter naturalem inclinationem ex parte naturae sensitivae, ad aliquam inordinatam passionem, sicut quidam dicuntur naturaliter iracundi vel concupiscentes; non autem ex parte naturae intellectualis.

Reply to Objection 3: Brute beasts have a natural inclination in their sensitive nature towards certain particular goods, with which certain evils are connected; thus the fox in seeking its food has a natural inclination to do so with a certain skill coupled with deceit. Wherefore it is not evil in the fox to be sly, since it is natural to him; as it is not evil in the dog to be fierce, as Dionysius observes (De Div. Nom. iv).

[31073] I^a q. 63 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod animalia bruta secundum naturam sensitivam habent naturalem inclinationem ad quaedam particularia bona, quibus coniuncta sunt aliqua mala; sicut vulpes ad quaerendum victum sagaciter, cui adiungitur dolositas. Unde esse dolosum non est malum vulpi, cum sit ei naturale; sicut nec esse furiosum est malum cani, sicut Dionysius dicit, IV cap. de Div. Nom.

Q. 63. A. 5. Whether the devil was wicked by the fault of his own will in the first instant of his creation?

Objection 1: It would seem that the devil was wicked by the fault of his own will in the first instant of his creation. For it is said of the devil ([Jn. 8:44](#)): "He was a murderer from the beginning."

[31074] I^a q. 63 a. 5 arg. 1 Ad quintum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Diabolus in primo instanti suae creationis fuerit malus per culpam propriae voluntatis. Dicitur enim Ioan. VIII, de Diabolo, *ille homicida erat ab initio*.

Objection 2: Further, according to Augustine (Gen. ad lit. i, 15), the lack of form in the creature did not precede its formation in order of time, but merely in order of nature. Now according to him (Gen. ad lit. ii, 8), the "heaven," which is said to have been created in the beginning, signifies the angelic nature while as yet not fully formed: and when it is said that God said: "Be light made: and light was made," we are to understand the full formation of the angel by turning to the Word. Consequently, the nature of the angel was created, and light was made, in the one instant. But at the same moment that light was made, it was made distinct from "darkness," whereby the angels who sinned are denoted. Therefore in the first instant of their creation some of the angels were made blessed, and some sinned.

[31075] I^a q. 63 a. 5 arg. 2 Praeterea, secundum Augustinum, I super Gen. ad Litt., informitas creaturae non praecessit formationem tempore, sed origine tantum. Per caelum autem quod legitur primo creatum, ut ipse dicit in II libro, intelligitur natura angelica informis; per hoc autem quod dicitur quod Deus dixit, fiat lux, et facta est lux, intelligitur formatio eius per conversionem ad verbum; simul ergo natura Angeli creata est, et facta est lux. Sed simul dum facta est lux, distincta est a tenebris, per quas intelliguntur Angeli peccantes. Ergo in primo instanti suae creationis quidam Angeli fuerunt beati, et quidam peccaverunt.

Objection 3: Further, sin is opposed to merit. But some intellectual nature can merit in the first instant of its creation; as the soul of Christ, or also the good angels. Therefore the demons likewise could sin in the first instant of their creation.

[31076] I^a q. 63 a. 5 arg. 3 Praeterea, peccatum opponitur merito. Sed in primo instanti suae creationis aliqua natura intellectualis potest mereri; sicut anima Christi, vel etiam ipsi boni Angeli. Ergo et Daemones in primo instanti suae creationis potuerunt peccare.

Objection 4: Further, the angelic nature is more powerful than the corporeal nature. But a corporeal thing begins to have its operation in the first instant of its creation; as fire begins to move upwards in the first instant it is produced. Therefore the angel could also have his operation

[31077] I^a q. 63 a. 5 arg. 4 Praeterea, natura angelica virtuosior est quam natura corporea. Sed res corporalis statim in primo instanti suae creationis incipit habere suam operationem; sicut ignis in primo instanti quo generatus est, incipit moveri sursum. Ergo et Angelus in primo instanti

in the first instant of his creation. Now this operation was either ordinate or inordinate. It ordinate, then, since he had grace, he thereby merited beatitude. But with the angels the reward follows immediately upon merit; as was said above ([Q\[62\], A\[5\]](#)). Consequently they would have become blessed at once; and so would never have sinned, which is false. It remains, then, that they sinned by inordinate action in their first instant.

On the contrary, It is written ([Gn. 1:31](#)): "God saw all the things that He had made, and they were very good." But among them were also the demons. Therefore the demons were at some time good.

I answer that, Some have maintained that the demons were wicked straightway in the first instant of their creation; not by their nature, but by the sin of their own will; because, as soon as he was made, the devil refused righteousness. To this opinion, as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xi, 13), if anyone subscribes, he does not agree with those Manichean heretics who say that the devil's nature is evil of itself. Since this opinion, however, is in contradiction with the authority of Scripture---for it is said of the devil under the figure of the prince of Babylon ([Is. 14:12](#)): "How art thou fallen . . . O Lucifer, who didst rise in the morning!" and it is said of the devil in the person of the King of Tyre ([Ezech. 28:13](#)): "Thou wast in the pleasures of the paradise of God," --- consequently, this opinion was reasonably rejected by the masters as erroneous.

Hence others say that the angels, in the first instant of their creation, could have sinned, but did not. Yet this view also is repudiated by some, because, when two operations follow one upon the other, it seems impossible for each operation to terminate in the one instant. Now it is clear that the angel's sin was an act subsequent to his creation. But the term of the creative act is the angel's very being, while the term of the sinful act is the being wicked. It seems, then, an impossibility for the angel to have been wicked in the first instant of his existence.

This argument, however, does not satisfy. For it holds good only in such movements as are

suae creationis potuit operari. Aut ergo habuit operationem rectam, aut non rectam. Si rectam, cum gratiam habuerint, per eam meruerunt beatitudinem. In Angelis autem statim ad meritum sequitur praemium, ut supra dictum est. Ergo fuissent statim beati, et ita nunquam peccassent, quod est falsum. Relinquitur ergo quod in primo instanti, non recte operando, peccaverunt.

[31078] I^a q. 63 a. 5 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur Gen. I, *vidit Deus cuncta quae fecerat, et erant valde bona*. Inter ea autem erant etiam Daemones. Ergo et Daemones aliquando fuerunt boni.

[31079] I^a q. 63 a. 5 co. Respondeo dicendum quod quidam posuerunt quod statim Daemones in primo instanti suae creationis mali fuerunt, non quidem per naturam, sed per peccatum propriae voluntatis, quia *ex quo est factus Diabolus, iustitiam recusavit. Cui sententiae*, ut Augustinus dicit, XI de Civ. Dei, *quisquis acquiescit, non cum illis haereticis sapit, idest Manichaeis, qui dicunt quod Diabolus habet naturam mali*. Sed quia haec opinio auctoritati Scripturae contradicit (dicitur enim, sub figura principis Babylonis, de Diabolo, Isaiae XIV, *quomodo cecidisti, Lucifer, qui mane oriebaris?* Et Ezech. XXVIII, *in deliciis Paradisi Dei fuisti* dicitur ad Diabolum sub persona regis Tyri), ideo a magistris haec opinio tanquam erronea rationabiliter reprobata est. Unde aliqui dixerunt quod Angeli in primo instanti suae creationis peccare potuerunt, sed non peccaverunt. Sed haec opinio etiam a quibusdam improbatur ea ratione quia, cum duae operationes se consequuntur, impossibile videtur quod in eodem nunc utraque operatio terminetur. Manifestum est autem quod peccatum Angeli fuit operatio creatione posterior. Terminus autem creationis est ipsum esse Angeli; terminus vero operationis peccati est quod sunt mali. Impossibile ergo videtur quod in primo instanti quo Angelus esse coepit, fuerit malus. Sed haec ratio non videtur sufficiens. Habet enim solum locum in motibus temporalibus, qui successive aguntur; sicut si motus localis sequitur ad alterationem, non potest in eodem instanti terminari alteratio et localis motus. Sed si sunt mutationes instantaneae, simul

measured by time, and take place successively; thus, if local movement follows a change, then the change and the local movement cannot be terminated in the same instant. But if the changes are instantaneous, then all at once and in the same instant there can be a term to the first and the second change; thus in the same instant in which the moon is lit up by the sun, the atmosphere is lit up by the moon. Now, it is manifest that creation is instantaneous; so also is the movement of free-will in the angels; for, as has been already stated, they have no occasion for comparison or discursive reasoning ([Q\[58\], A\[3\]](#)).

Consequently, there is nothing to hinder the term of creation and of free-will from existing in the same instant.

We must therefore reply that, on the contrary, it was impossible for the angel to sin in the first instant by an inordinate act of free-will. For although a thing can begin to act in the first instant of its existence, nevertheless, that operation which begins with the existence comes of the agent from which it drew its nature; just as upward movement in fire comes of its productive cause. Therefore, if there be anything which derives its nature from a defective cause, which can be the cause of a defective action, it can in the first instant of its existence have a defective operation; just as the leg, which is defective from birth, through a defect in the principle of generation, begins at once to limp. But the agent which brought the angels into existence, namely, God, cannot be the cause of sin. Consequently it cannot be said that the devil was wicked in the first instant of his creation.

Reply to Objection 1: As Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xi, 15), when it is stated that "the devil sins from the beginning," "he is not to be thought of as sinning from the beginning wherein he was created, but from the beginning of sin": that is to say, because he never went back from his sin.

Reply to Objection 2: That distinction of light and darkness, whereby the sins of the demons are understood by the term darkness, must be taken as according to God's foreknowledge. Hence Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xi, 15), that "He alone could discern light and darkness, Who also

et in eodem instanti potest esse terminus primae et secundae mutationis; sicut in eodem instanti in quo illuminatur luna a sole, illuminatur aer a luna. Manifestum est autem quod creatio est instantanea; et similiter motus liberi arbitrii in Angelis; non enim indigent collatione et discursu rationis, ut ex supra dictis patet. Unde nihil prohibet simul et in eodem instanti esse terminum creationis, et terminum liberi arbitrii. Et ideo aliter dicendum est, quod impossibile fuit Angelum in primo instanti peccasse per inordinatum actum liberi arbitrii. Quamvis enim res aliqua in primo instanti quo esse incipit, simul incipere possit operari; tamen illa operatio quae simul incipit cum esse rei, est ei ab agente a quo habet esse; sicut moveri sursum inest igni a generante. Unde si aliqua res habeat esse ab agente deficiente, quod possit esse causa defectivae actionis, poterit in primo instanti in quo incipit esse, habere defectivam operationem; sicut si tibia quae nascitur clauda ex debilitate seminis, statim incipiat claudicare. Agens autem quod Angelos in esse produxit, scilicet Deus, non potest esse causa peccati. Unde non potest dici quod Diabolus in primo instanti suae creationis fuerit malus.

[31080] I^a q. 63 a. 5 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod, sicut Augustinus dicit, XI de Civ. Dei, *cum dicitur quod Diabolus ab initio peccat non ab initio ex quo creatus est, peccare putandus est, sed ab initio peccati*; scilicet quia nunquam a peccato suo recessit.

[31081] I^a q. 63 a. 5 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod illa distinctio lucis et tenebrarum, secundum quod per tenebras peccata Daemonum intelliguntur, accipienda est secundum Dei praescientiam. Unde Augustinus dicit, XI de Civ. Dei, *quod solus lucem ac tenebras discernere*

could foreknow, before they fell, those who would fall."

Reply to Objection 3: All that is in merit is from God; and consequently an angel could merit in the first instant of his creation. The same reason does not hold good of sin; as has been said.

Reply to Objection 4: God did not distinguish between the angels before the turning away of some of them, and the turning of others to Himself, as Augustine says (*De Civ. Dei* xi, 15). Therefore, as all were created in grace, all merited in their first instant. But some of them at once placed an impediment to their beatitude, thereby destroying their preceding merit; and consequently they were deprived of the beatitude which they had merited.

Q. 63. A. 6. Whether there was any interval between the creation and the fall of the angel?

Objection 1: It would seem that there was some interval between the angel's creation and his fall. For, it is said ([Ezech. 28:15](#)): "Thou didst walk perfect [*Vulg.: 'Thou hast walked in the midst of the stones of fire; thou wast perfect . . .'] in thy ways from the day of thy creation until iniquity was found in thee." But since walking is continuous movement, it requires an interval. Therefore there was some interval between the devil's creation and his fall.

Objection 2: Further, Origen says (*Hom. i in Ezech.*) that "the serpent of old did not from the first walk upon his breast and belly"; which refers to his sin. Therefore the devil did not sin at once after the first instant of his creation.

Objection 3: Further, capability of sinning is common alike to man and angel. But there was some delay between man's formation and his sin. Therefore, for the like reason there was some interval between the devil's formation and his sin.

Objection 4: Further, the instant wherein the devil sinned was distinct from the instant wherein

potuit, qui potuit etiam, priusquam caderent, praescire casuros.

[31082] I^a q. 63 a. 5 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod quidquid est in merito, est a Deo, et ideo in primo instanti suae creationis Angelus mereri potuit. Sed non est similis ratio de peccato, ut dictum est.

[31083] I^a q. 63 a. 5 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod Deus non discrevit inter Angelos ante aversionem quorundam et conversionem aliorum, ut Augustinus dicit, *XI de Civ. Dei*, et ideo omnes, in gratia creati in primo instanti meruerunt. Sed quidam eorum statim impedimentum praestiterunt suae beatitudinis, praecedens meritum mortificantes. Et ideo beatitudine quam meruerunt, sunt privati.

[31084] I^a q. 63 a. 6 arg. 1 Ad sextum sic proceditur. Videtur quod aliqua mora fuerit inter creationem et lapsum Angeli. Dicitur enim *Ezech. XXVIII, ambulasti perfectus in viis tuis a die conceptionis tuae, donec inventa est iniquitas in te*. Sed ambulatio, cum sit motus continuus, requirit aliquam moram. Ergo aliqua mora fuit inter creationem Diaboli et eius lapsum.

[31085] I^a q. 63 a. 6 arg. 2 Praeterea, Origenes dicit quod *serpens antiquus non statim supra pectus et ventrem suum ambulavit*; per quod intelligitur eius peccatum. Ergo Diabolus non statim post primum instans suae creationis peccavit.

[31086] I^a q. 63 a. 6 arg. 3 Praeterea, posse peccare commune est homini et Angelo. Fuit autem aliqua mora inter formationem hominis et eius peccatum. Ergo, pari ratione, fuit aliqua mora inter formationem Diaboli et eius peccatum.

[31087] I^a q. 63 a. 6 arg. 4 Praeterea, aliud instans fuit in quo Diabolus peccavit, ab instanti in quo

he was created. But there is a middle time between every two instants. Therefore there was an interval between his creation and his fall.

On the contrary, It is said of the devil ([Jn. 8:44](#)): "He stood not in the truth": and, as Augustine says (*De Civ. Dei* xi, 15), "we must understand this in the sense, that he was in the truth, but did not remain in it."

I answer that, There is a twofold opinion on this point. But the more probable one, which is also more in harmony with the teachings of the Saints, is that the devil sinned at once after the first instant of his creation. This must be maintained if it be held that he elicited an act of free-will in the first instant of his creation, and that he was created in grace; as we have said ([Q\[62\], A\[3\]](#)). For since the angels attain beatitude by one meritorious act, as was said above ([Q\[62\], A\[5\]](#)), if the devil, created in grace, merited in the first instant, he would at once have received beatitude after that first instant, if he had not placed an impediment by sinning.

If, however, it be contended that the angel was not created in grace, or that he could not elicit an act of free-will in the first instant, then there is nothing to prevent some interval being interposed between his creation and fall.

Reply to Objection 1: Sometimes in Holy Scripture spiritual instantaneous movements are represented by corporeal movements which are measured by time. In this way by "walking" we are to understand the movement of free-will tending towards good.

Reply to Objection 2: Origen says, "The serpent of old did not from the first walk upon his breast and belly," because of the first instant in which he was not wicked.

Reply to Objection 3: An angel has an inflexible free-will after once choosing; consequently, if after the first instant, in which he had a natural movement to good, he had not at once placed a

creatus fuit. Sed inter quaelibet duo instantia cadit tempus medium. Ergo aliqua mora fuit inter creationem eius et lapsum.

[31088] I^a q. 63 a. 6 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur Ioan. VIII, de Diabolo, quod *in veritate non stetit*. Et sicut Augustinus dicit, XI de Civ. Dei, *oportet ut hoc sic accipiamus, quod in veritate fuerit, sed non permanserit*.

[31089] I^a q. 63 a. 6 co. Respondeo dicendum quod circa hoc est duplex opinio. Sed probabilior, et sanctorum dictis magis consona est, quod statim post primum instans suae creationis Diabolus peccaverit. Et hoc necesse est dicere, si ponatur quod in primo instanti suae creationis in actum liberi arbitrii proruperit, et cum gratia fuerit creatus, ut supra diximus. Cum enim Angeli per unum actum meritorium ad beatitudinem perveniant, ut supra dictum est; si Diabolus in primo instanti, in gratia creatus, meruit, statim post primum instans beatitudinem accepisset, nisi statim impedimentum praestitisset peccando. Si vero ponatur quod Angelus in gratia creatus non fuerit; vel quod in primo instanti actum liberi arbitrii non potuerit habere; nihil prohibet aliquam moram fuisse inter creationem et lapsum.

[31090] I^a q. 63 a. 6 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod per motus corporales, qui per tempus mensurantur, quandoque in sacra Scriptura intelliguntur metaphorice motus spirituales instantanei. Et sic per ambulationem intelligitur motus liberi arbitrii tendentis in bonum.

[31091] I^a q. 63 a. 6 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod Origenes dicit quod *serpens antiquus non a principio, nec statim supra pectus ambulavit*, propter primum instans, in quo malus non fuit.

[31092] I^a q. 63 a. 6 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod Angelus habet liberum arbitrium inflexibile post electionem, et ideo nisi statim post primum instans, in quo naturalem motum habuit ad

barrier to beatitude, he would have been confirmed in good. It is not so with man; and therefore the argument does not hold good.

Reply to Objection 4: It is true to say that there is a middle time between every two instants, so far as time is continuous, as it is proved Phys. vi, text. 2. But in the angels, who are not subject to the heavenly movement, which is primarily measured by continuous time, time is taken to mean the succession of their mental acts, or of their affections. So the first instant in the angels is understood to respond to the operation of the angelic mind, whereby it introspects itself by its evening knowledge because on the first day evening is mentioned, but not morning. This operation was good in them all. From such operation some of them were converted to the praise of the Word by their morning knowledge while others, absorbed in themselves, became night, "swelling up with pride," as Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. iv, 24). Hence the first act was common to them all; but in their second they were separated. Consequently they were all of them good in the first instant; but in the second the good were set apart from the wicked.

Q. 63. A. 7. Whether the highest angel among those who sinned was the highest of all?

Objection 1: It would seem that the highest among the angels who sinned was not the highest of all. For it is stated ([Ezech. 28:14](#)): "Thou wast a cherub stretched out, and protecting, and I set thee in the holy mountain of God." Now the order of the Cherubim is under the order of the Seraphim, as Dionysius says (Coel. Hier. vi, vii). Therefore, the highest angel among those who sinned was not the highest of all.

Objection 2: Further, God made intellectual nature in order that it might attain to beatitude. If therefore the highest of the angels sinned, it follows that the Divine ordinance was frustrated in the noblest creature which is unfitting.

Objection 3: Further, the more a subject is inclined towards anything, so much the less can it fall away from it. But the higher an angel is, so

bonum, impedimentum beatitudini praestitisset, fuisset firmatus in bono. Sed non est simile de homine. Et ideo ratio non sequitur.

[31093] I^a q. 63 a. 6 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod inter quaelibet duo instantia esse tempus medium, habet veritatem inquantum tempus est continuum, ut probatur in VI Physic. Sed in Angelis, qui non sunt subiecti caelesti motui, qui primo per tempus continuum mensuratur, tempus accipitur pro ipsa successione operationum intellectus, vel etiam affectus. Sic igitur instans primum in Angelis intelligitur respondere operationi mentis angelicae, qua se in seipsam convertit per vespertinam cognitionem, quia in primo die commemoratur vespere, sed non mane. Et haec quidem operatio in omnibus bona fuit. Sed ab hac operatione quidam per matutinam cognitionem ad laudem verbi sunt conversi, quidam vero, in seipsis remanentes, facti sunt nox, per superbiam intumescens, ut Augustinus dicit, IV super Gen. ad Litt. Et sic prima operatio fuit omnibus communis; sed in secunda sunt discreti. Et ideo in primo instanti omnes fuerunt boni; sed in secundo fuerunt boni a malis distincti.

[31094] I^a q. 63 a. 7 arg. 1 Ad septimum sic proceditur. Videtur quod ille Angelus qui fuit supremus inter peccantes, non fuerit supremus inter omnes. Dicitur enim de eo Ezech. XXVIII, *tu Cherub extentus et protegens, posui te in monte sancto Dei*. Sed ordo Cherubim est sub ordine Seraphim, ut Dionysius dicit, VII cap. Ang. Hier. Ergo Angelus qui fuit supremus inter peccantes, non fuit supremus inter omnes.

[31095] I^a q. 63 a. 7 arg. 2 Praeterea, Deus fecit naturam intellectualem propter beatitudinem consequendam. Si igitur Angelus qui fuit supremus inter omnes, peccavit, sequitur quod ordinatio divina fuerit frustrata in nobilissima creatura. Quod est inconveniens.

[31096] I^a q. 63 a. 7 arg. 3 Praeterea, quanto aliquid magis inclinatur in aliquid, tanto minus potest ab illo deficere. Sed Angelus quanto est

much the more is he inclined towards God. Therefore so much the less can he turn away from God by sinning. And so it seems that the angel who sinned was not the highest of all, but one of the lower angels.

On the contrary, Gregory (Hom. xxxiv in Ev.) says that the chief angel who sinned, "being set over all the hosts of angels, surpassed them in brightness, and was by comparison the most illustrious among them."

I answer that, Two things have to be considered in sin, namely, the proneness to sin, and the motive for sinning. If, then, in the angels we consider the proneness to sin, it seems that the higher angels were less likely to sin than the lower. On this account Damascene says (De Fide Orth. ii), that the highest of those who sinned was set over the terrestrial order. This opinion seems to agree with the view of the Platonists, which Augustine quotes (De Civ. Dei vii, 6,7; x, 9,10,11). For they said that all the gods were good; whereas some of the demons were good, and some bad; naming as 'gods' the intellectual substances which are above the lunar sphere, and calling by the name of "demons" the intellectual substances which are beneath it, yet higher than men in the order of nature. Nor is this opinion to be rejected as contrary to faith; because the whole corporeal creation is governed by God through the angels, as Augustine says (De Trin. iii, 4,5). Consequently there is nothing to prevent us from saying that the lower angels were divinely set aside for presiding over the lower bodies, the higher over the higher bodies; and the highest to stand before God. And in this sense Damascene says (De Fide Orth. ii) that they who fell were of the lower grade of angels; yet in that order some of them remained good.

But if the motive for sinning be considered, we find that it existed in the higher angels more than in the lower. For, as has been said ([A\[2\]](#)), the demons' sin was pride; and the motive of pride is excellence, which was greater in the higher spirits. Hence Gregory says that he who sinned was the very highest of all. This seems to be the more probable view: because the angels' sin did

superior, tanto magis inclinatur in Deum. Ergo minus potest a Deo peccando deficere. Et sic videtur quod Angelus qui peccavit, non fuerit supremus inter omnes, sed de inferioribus.

[31097] I^a q. 63 a. 7 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicit Gregorius, in homilia de centum ovibus, *quod primus Angelus qui peccavit, dum cunctis agminibus Angelorum praelatus, eorum claritatem transcenderet, ex eorum comparatione clarior fuit.*

[31098] I^a q. 63 a. 7 co. Respondeo dicendum quod in peccato est duo considerare, scilicet pronitatem ad peccandum; et motivum ad peccandum. Si ergo consideremus in Angelis pronitatem ad peccandum, minus videtur quod peccaverint superiores Angeli, quam inferiores. Et propter hoc Damascenus dicit quod maior eorum qui peccaverunt, fuit terrestri ordini praelatus. Et videtur haec opinio consonare positioni Platoniorum, quam Augustinus recitat in Lib. de Civ. Dei VIII et X. Dicebant enim quod omnes dii erant boni, sed Daemonum quidam boni, quidam mali; deos nominantes substantias intellectuales quae sunt a globo lunari superius, Daemones vero substantias intellectuales quae sunt a globo lunari inferius, superiores hominibus ordine naturae. Nec est abiicienda haec opinio tanquam a fide aliena, quia tota creatura corporalis administratur a Deo per Angelos, ut Augustinus dicit, III de Trin.; unde nihil prohibet dicere inferiores Angelos divinitus distributos esse ad administrandum inferiora corpora, superiores vero ad administrandum corpora superiora, supremos vero ad assistendum Deo. Et secundum hoc Damascenus dicit quod illi qui ceciderunt, fuerunt de inferioribus, in quorum etiam ordine aliqui boni Angeli permanserunt. Si vero consideretur motivum ad peccandum, maius invenitur in superioribus quam in inferioribus. Fuit enim Daemonum peccatum superbia, ut supra dictum est; cuius motivum est excellentia, quae fuit maior in superioribus. Et ideo Gregorius dicit quod ille qui peccavit, fuit superior inter omnes. Et hoc videtur probabilius. Quia peccatum Angeli non processit ex aliqua pronitate, sed ex solo libero arbitrio, unde magis videtur considerata esse ratio quae sumitur a motivo ad peccandum. Non

not come of any proneness, but of free choice alone. Consequently that argument seems to have the more weight which is drawn from the motive in sinning. Yet this must not be prejudicial to the other view; because there might be some motive for sinning in him also who was the chief of the lower angels.

Reply to Objection 1: Cherubim is interpreted "fulness of knowledge," while "Seraphim" means "those who are on fire," or "who set on fire." Consequently Cherubim is derived from knowledge; which is compatible with mortal sin; but Seraphim is derived from the heat of charity, which is incompatible with mortal sin. Therefore the first angel who sinned is called, not a Seraph, but a Cherub.

Reply to Objection 2: The Divine intention is not frustrated either in those who sin, or in those who are saved; for God knows beforehand the end of both; and He procures glory from both, saving these of His goodness, and punishing those of His justice. But the intellectual creature, when it sins, falls away from its due end. Nor is this unfitting in any exalted creature; because the intellectual creature was so made by God, that it lies within its own will to act for its end.

Reply to Objection 3: However great was the inclination towards good in the highest angel, there was no necessity imposed upon him: consequently it was in his power not to follow it.

Q. 63. A. 8. Whether the sin of the highest angel was the cause of the others sinning?

Objection 1: It would seem that the sin of the highest angel was not the cause of the others sinning. For the cause precedes the effect. But, as Damascene observes (De Fide Orth. ii), they all sinned at one time. Therefore the sin of one was not the cause of the others' sinning.

Objection 2: Further, an angel's first sin can only be pride, as was shown above ([A\[2\]](#)). But pride seeks excellence. Now it is more contrary to

est tamen inde alii opinioni praeiudicandum, quia etiam in principe inferiorum Angelorum potuit esse aliquod motivum ad peccandum.

[31099] I^a q. 63 a. 7 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Cherubim interpretatur plenitudo scientiae; Seraphim autem interpretatur ardentes sive incedentes. Et sic patet quod Cherubim denominatur a scientia, quae potest esse cum mortali peccato; Seraphim vero denominatur ab ardore caritatis, quae cum peccato mortali esse non potest. Et ideo primus Angelus peccans non est denominatus Seraphim, sed Cherubim.

[31100] I^a q. 63 a. 7 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod divina intentio non frustratur nec in his qui peccant, nec in his qui salvantur, utrorumque enim eventum Deus praecognoscit, et ex utroque habet gloriam, dum hos ex sua bonitate salvat, illos ex sua iustitia punit. Ipsa vero creatura intellectualis, dum peccat, a fine debito deficit. Nec hoc est inconveniens in quacumque creatura sublimi, sic enim creatura intellectualis instituta est a Deo, ut in eius arbitrio positum sit agere propter finem.

[31101] I^a q. 63 a. 7 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod quantacumque inclinatio ad bonum fuerit in supremo Angelo, tamen ei necessitatem non inducebat. Unde potuit per liberum arbitrium eam non sequi.

[31102] I^a q. 63 a. 8 arg. 1 Ad octavum sic proceditur. Videtur quod peccatum primi Angeli peccantis non fuit aliis causa peccandi. Causa enim prior est causato. Sed omnes simul peccaverunt, ut Damascenus dicit. Ergo peccatum unius non fuit aliis causa peccandi.

[31103] I^a q. 63 a. 8 arg. 2 Praeterea, primum peccatum Angeli non potest esse nisi superbia, ut supra dictum est. Sed superbia excellentiam

excellence for anyone to be subject to an inferior than to a superior; and so it does not appear that the angels sinned by desiring to be subject to a higher angel rather than to God. Yet the sin of one angel would have been the cause of the others sinning, if he had induced them to be his subjects. Therefore it does not appear that the sin of the highest angel was the cause of the others sinning.

Objection 3: Further, it is a greater sin to wish to be subject to another against God, than to wish to be over another against God; because there is less motive for sinning. If, therefore, the sin of the foremost angel was the cause of the others sinning, in that he induced them to subject themselves to him, then the lower angels would have sinned more deeply than the highest one; which is contrary to a gloss on [Ps. 103:26](#): "This dragon which Thou hast formed---He who was the more excellent than the rest in nature, became the greater in malice." Therefore the sin of the highest angel was not the cause of the others sinning.

On the contrary, It is said ([Apoc. 12:4](#)) that the dragon "drew" with him "the third part of the stars of heaven."

I answer that, The sin of the highest angel was the cause of the others sinning; not as compelling them, but as inducing them by a kind of exhortation. A token thereof appears in this, that all the demons are subjects of that highest one; as is evident from our Lord's words: "Go [Vulg. 'Depart from Me'], you cursed, into everlasting fire, which was prepared for the devil and his angels" ([Mat. 25:41](#)). For the order of Divine justice exacts that whosoever consents to another's evil suggestion, shall be subjected to him in his punishment; according to ([2 Pet. 2:19](#)): "By whom a man is overcome, of the same also he is the slave."

Reply to Objection 1: Although the demons all sinned in the one instant, yet the sin of one could be the cause of the rest sinning. For the angel needs no delay of time for choice, exhortation, or consent, as man, who requires deliberation in

quaerit. Magis autem excellentiae repugnat quod aliquis inferiori subdatur, quam superiori, et sic non videtur quod Daemones peccaverint per hoc quod voluerunt subesse alicui superiorum Angelorum, potius quam Deo. Sic autem peccatum unius Angeli fuisset aliis causa peccandi, si eos ad hoc induxisset ut sibi subiicerentur. Non ergo videtur quod peccatum primi Angeli fuerit causa peccandi aliis.

[31104] I^a q. 63 a. 8 arg. 3 Praeterea, maius peccatum est velle subesse alteri contra Deum, quam contra Deum alteri velle praeesse, quia minus habet de motivo ad peccandum. Si ergo peccatum primi Angeli fuit aliis causa peccandi in hoc, quod eos ut sibi subiicerentur induxit, gravius peccassent inferiores Angeli quam supremus, quod est contra hoc quod super illud Psalmi CIII, *draco iste quem formasti*, dicit Glossa, *qui ceteris in esse erat excellentior, factus est in malitia maior*. Non ergo peccatum primi Angeli fuit aliis causa peccandi.

[31105] I^a q. 63 a. 8 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur Apoc. XII, quod draco traxit secum tertiam partem stellarum.

[31106] I^a q. 63 a. 8 co. Respondeo dicendum quod peccatum primi Angeli fuit aliis causa peccandi, non quidem cogens, sed quadam quasi exhortatione inducens. Cuius signum ex hoc apparet, quod omnes Daemones illi supremo subduntur; ut manifeste apparet per illud quod dicit dominus, Matth. XXV, *ite, maledicti, in ignem aeternum, qui paratus est Diabolo et Angelis eius*. Habet enim hoc ordo divinae iustitiae, ut cuius suggestioni aliquis consentit in culpa, eius potestati subdatur in poena; secundum illud II Petr. II, a quo quis superatus est, huic servus addictus est.

[31107] I^a q. 63 a. 8 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod, licet simul Daemones peccaverint, tamen peccatum unius potuit esse aliis causa peccandi. Angelus enim non indiget ad eligendum vel exhortandum vel etiam

order to choose and consent, and vocal speech in order to exhort; both of which are the work of time. And it is evident that even man begins to speak in the very instant when he takes thought; and in the last instant of speech, another who catches his meaning can assent to what is said; as is especially evident with regard to primary concepts, "which everyone accepts directly they are heard" [*Boethius, De Hebdom.].

Taking away, then, the time for speech and deliberation which is required in us; in the same instant in which the highest angel expressed his affection by intelligible speech, it was possible for the others to consent thereto.

Reply to Objection 2: Other things being equal, the proud would rather be subject to a superior than to an inferior. Yet he chooses rather to be subject to an inferior than to a superior, if he can procure an advantage under an inferior which he cannot under a superior. Consequently it was not against the demons' pride for them to wish to serve an inferior by yielding to his rule; for they wanted to have him as their prince and leader, so that they might attain their ultimate beatitude of their own natural powers; especially because in the order of nature they were even then subject to the highest angel.

Reply to Objection 3: As was observed above ([Q\[62\], A\[6\]](#)), an angel has nothing in him to retard his action, and with his whole might he is moved to whatsoever he is moved, be it good or bad. Consequently since the highest angel had greater natural energy than the lower angels, he fell into sin with intenser energy, and therefore he became the greater in malice.

Q. 63. A. 9. Whether those who sinned were as many as those who remained firm?

Objection 1: It would seem that more angels sinned than stood firm. For, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 6): "Evil is in many, but good is in few."

Objection 2: Further, justice and sin are to be

consentiendum, temporis mora; sicut homo, qui deliberatione indiget ad eligendum et ad consentiendum, et locutione vocali ad exhortandum, quorum utrumque tempore agitur. Manifestum est autem quod etiam homo simul dum aliquid iam corde concepit, in eodem instanti incipit loqui. Et in ultimo instanti locutionis, in quo aliquis sensum loquentis capit, potest assentire ei quod dicitur, ut patet maxime in primis conceptionibus, quas quisque probat auditas. Sublato ergo tempore locutionis et deliberationis quod in nobis requiritur, in eodem instanti in quo primus Angelus suam affectionem intelligibili locutione expressit, possibile fuit aliis in eam consentire.

[31108] I^a q. 63 a. 8 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod superbus, ceteris paribus, magis vult subesse superiori quam inferiori. Sed si aliquam excellentiam consequatur sub inferiori, quam sub superiori consequi non possit, magis eligit inferiori subesse quam superiori. Sic igitur non fuit contra superbiam Daemonum quod subesse inferiori voluerunt, in eius principatum consentientes; ad hoc eum principem et ducem habere volentes, ut virtute naturali suam ultimam beatitudinem consequerentur; praesertim quia supremo Angelo naturae ordine etiam tunc subiecti erant.

[31109] I^a q. 63 a. 8 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, sicut supra dictum est, Angelus non habet aliquid retardans, sed secundum suam totam virtutem movetur in illud ad quod movetur, sive in bonum sive in malum. Quia igitur supremus Angelus maiorem habuit naturalem virtutem quam inferiores, intensiori motu in peccatum prolapsus est. Et ideo factus est etiam in malitia maior.

[31110] I^a q. 63 a. 9 arg. 1 Ad nonum sic proceditur. Videtur quod plures peccaverunt de Angelis, quam permanserunt. Quia, ut dicit philosophus, *malum est ut in pluribus, bonum ut in paucioribus*.

[31111] I^a q. 63 a. 9 arg. 2 Praeterea, iustitia et

found in the same way in men and in angels. But there are more wicked men to be found than good; according to [Eccles. 1:15](#): "The number of fools is infinite." Therefore for the same reason it is so with the angels.

Objection 3: Further, the angels are distinguished according to persons and orders. Therefore if more angelic persons stood firm, it would appear that those who sinned were not from all the orders.

On the contrary, It is said ([4 Kings 6:16](#)): "There are more with us than with them": which is expounded of the good angels who are with us to aid us, and the wicked spirits who are our foes.

I answer that, More angels stood firm than sinned. Because sin is contrary to the natural inclination; while that which is against the natural order happens with less frequency; for nature procures its effects either always, or more often than not.

Reply to Objection 1: The Philosopher is speaking with regard to men, in whom evil comes to pass from seeking after sensible pleasures, which are known to most men, and from forsaking the good dictated by reason, which good is known to the few. In the angels there is only an intellectual nature; hence the argument does not hold.

And from this we have the answer to the second difficulty.

Reply to Objection 3: According to those who hold that the chief devil belonged to the lower order of the angels, who are set over earthly affairs, it is evident that some of every order did not fall, but only those of the lowest order. According to those who maintain that the chief devil was of the highest order, it is probable that some fell of every order; just as men are taken up into every order to supply for the angelic ruin. In

peccatum eadem ratione inveniuntur in Angelis et hominibus. Sed in hominibus plures inveniuntur mali quam boni; secundum illud Eccle. I, *stultorum infinitus est numerus*. Ergo pari ratione in Angelis.

[31112] I^a q. 63 a. 9 arg. 3 Praeterea, Angeli distinguuntur secundum personas, et secundum ordines. Si igitur plures personae angelicae remanserunt, videtur etiam quod non de omnibus ordinibus aliqui peccaverunt.

[31113] I^a q. 63 a. 9 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur IV Reg. VI, *plures nobiscum sunt quam cum illis*; quod exponitur de bonis Angelis qui sunt nobiscum in auxilium, et de malis qui nobis adversantur.

[31114] I^a q. 63 a. 9 co. Respondeo dicendum quod plures Angeli permanserunt quam peccaverunt. Quia peccatum est contra naturalem inclinationem, ea vero quae contra naturam fiunt, ut in paucioribus accidunt; natura enim consequitur suum effectum vel semper, vel ut in pluribus.

[31115] I^a q. 63 a. 9 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod philosophus loquitur quantum ad homines, in quibus malum contingit ex hoc quod sequuntur bona sensibilia, quae sunt pluribus nota, deserto bono rationis, quod paucioribus notum est. In Angelis autem non est nisi natura intellectualis. Unde non est similis ratio.

[31116] I^a q. 63 a. 9 ad 2 Et per hoc patet responsio ad secundum.

[31117] I^a q. 63 a. 9 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod secundum illos qui dicunt quod Diabolus maior fuit de inferiori ordine Angelorum, qui praesunt terrestribus, manifestum est quod non de quolibet ordine ceciderunt, sed de infimo tantum. Secundum vero illos qui ponunt maiorem Diabolum de supremo fuisse ordine, probabile est quod de quolibet ordine aliqui ceciderunt; sicut et in quemlibet ordinem homines assumuntur in

this view the liberty of free-will is more established; which in every degree of creature can be turned to evil. In the Sacred Scripture, however, the names of some orders, as of Seraphim and Thrones, are not attributed to demons; since they are derived from the ardor of love and from God's indwelling, which are not consistent with mortal sin. Yet the names of Cherubim, Powers, and Principalities are attributed to them; because these names are derived from knowledge and from power, which can be common to both good and bad.

supplementum ruinae angelicae. In quo etiam magis comprobatur libertas liberi arbitrii, quae secundum quemlibet gradum creaturae in malum flecti potest. In sacra Scriptura tamen nomina quorundam ordinum, ut Seraphim et thronorum, Daemonibus non attribuuntur; quia haec nomina sumuntur ab ardore caritatis et ab inhabitatione Dei, quae non possunt esse cum peccato mortali. Attribuuntur autem eis nomina Cherubim, potestatum et principatum, quia haec nomina sumuntur a scientia et potentia, quae bonis malisque possunt esse communia.

Q. 64. THE PUNISHMENT OF THE DEMONS (FOUR ARTICLES)

It now remains as a sequel to deal with the punishment of the demons; under which heading there are four points of inquiry:

[\(1\) Of their darkness of intellect;](#)

[\(2\) Of their obstinacy of will;](#)

[\(3\) Of their grief;](#)

[\(4\) Of their place of punishment.](#)

[31118] I^a q. 64 pr. Consequenter quaeritur de poena Daemonum. Et circa hoc quaeruntur quatuor. Primo, de obtenebratione intellectus. Secundo, de obstinatione voluntatis. Tertio, de dolore ipsorum. Quarto, de loco poenali ipsorum.

Q. 64. A. 1. Whether the demons' intellect is darkened by privation of the knowledge of all truth?

Objection 1: It would seem that the demons' intellect is darkened by being deprived of the knowledge of all truth. For it they knew any truth at all, they would most of all know themselves; which is to know separated substances. But this is not in keeping with their unhappiness: for this seems to belong to great happiness, insomuch as that some writers have assigned as man's last happiness the knowledge of the separated substances. Therefore the demons are deprived of all knowledge of truth.

[31119] I^a q. 64 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod intellectus Daemonis sit obtenebratus per privationem cognitionis omnis veritatis. Si enim aliquam veritatem cognoscerent, maxime cognoscerent seipsos, quod est cognoscere substantias separatas. Hoc autem eorum miseriae non convenit, cum ad magnam beatitudinem pertinere videatur, intantum quod quidam ultimam beatitudinem hominis posuerunt in cognoscendo substantias separatas. Ergo Daemones privantur omni cognitione veritatis.

Objection 2: Further, what is most manifest in its nature, seems to be specially manifest to the angels, whether good or bad. That the same is not manifest with regard to ourselves, comes from the weakness of our intellect which draws its knowledge from phantasms; as it comes from the weakness of its eye that the owl cannot behold the light of the sun. But the demons cannot know God, Who is most manifest of Himself, because He is the sovereign truth; and this is because they are not clean of heart, whereby alone can God be seen. Therefore neither can they know other things.

[31120] I^a q. 64 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, id quod est manifestissimum in natura, videtur esse maxime manifestum Angelis, sive bonis sive malis. Quod enim non sit nobis maxime manifestum, contingit ex debilitate intellectus nostri a phantasmatis accipientis, sicut ex debilitate oculi noctuae contingit quod non possit videre lumen solis. Sed Daemones non possunt cognoscere Deum, qui est secundum se manifestissimus, cum sit in summo veritatis, eo quod non habent mundum cor, quo solo videtur Deus. Ergo nec alia cognoscere possunt.

Objection 3: Further, according to Augustine (Gen. ad lit. iv, 22), the proper knowledge of the angels is twofold; namely, morning and evening. But the demons have no morning knowledge, because they do not see things in the Word; nor have they the evening knowledge, because this evening knowledge refers the things known to the Creator's praise (hence, after "evening" comes "morning" [[Gn. 1](#)]). Therefore the demons can

[31121] I^a q. 64 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, cognitio rerum Angelis conveniens est duplex, secundum Augustinum, scilicet matutina, et vespertina. Sed cognitio matutina non competit Daemonibus, quia non vident res in verbo, nec etiam cognitio vespertina, quia cognitio vespertina refert res cognitae ad laudem creatoris (unde post vespere fit mane, ut dicitur Gen. I). Ergo Daemones non possunt cognitionem de rebus habere.

have no knowledge of things.

Objection 4: Further, the angels at their creation knew the mystery of the kingdom of God, as Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. v, 19; De Civ. Dei xi). But the demons are deprived of such knowledge: "for if they had known it, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory," as is said [1 Cor. 2:8](#). Therefore, for the same reason, they are deprived of all other knowledge of truth.

Objection 5: Further, whatever truth anyone knows is known either naturally, as we know first principles; or by deriving it from someone else, as we know by learning; or by long experience, as the things we learn by discovery. Now, the demons cannot know the truth by their own nature, because, as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xi, 33), the good angels are separated from them as light is from darkness; and every manifestation is made through light, as is said [Eph. 5:13](#). In like manner they cannot learn by revelation, nor by learning from the good angels: because "there is no fellowship of light with darkness [*Vulg.: 'What fellowship hath . . . ?']" ([2 Cor. 6:14](#)). Nor can they learn by long experience: because experience comes of the senses. Consequently there is no knowledge of truth in them.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that, "certain gifts were bestowed upon the demons which, we say, have not been changed at all, but remain entire and most brilliant." Now, the knowledge of truth stands among those natural gifts. Consequently there is some knowledge of truth in them.

I answer that, The knowledge of truth is twofold: one which comes of nature, and one which comes of grace. The knowledge which comes of grace is likewise twofold: the first is purely speculative, as when Divine secrets are imparted to an individual; the other is effective, and produces love for God; which knowledge properly belongs to the gift of wisdom.

Of these three kinds of knowledge the first was neither taken away nor lessened in the demons. For it follows from the very nature of the angel,

[31122] I^a q. 64 a. 1 arg. 4 Praeterea, Angeli in sua conditione cognoverunt mysterium regni Dei, ut Augustinus dicit, V super Gen. ad Litt. Sed Daemones hac cognitione privati sunt, quia *si cognovissent, nequaquam dominum gloriae crucifixissent*, ut dicitur I Cor. II. Ergo, pari ratione, omni alia cognitione veritatis sunt privati.

[31123] I^a q. 64 a. 1 arg. 5 Praeterea, quamcumque veritatem aliquis scit, aut cognoscit eam naturaliter, sicut nos cognoscimus prima principia; aut accipiendo ab alio, sicut quae scimus addiscendo; aut per experientiam longi temporis, sicut quae scimus inveniando. Sed Daemones non possunt cognoscere veritatem per suam naturam, quia ab eis divisi sunt boni Angeli sicut lux a tenebris, ut Augustinus dicit; omnis autem manifestatio fit per lumen, ut dicitur Ephes. V. Similiter etiam neque per revelationem, neque addiscendo a bonis Angelis, quia non est conventio lucis ad tenebras, ut dicitur II Cor. VI. Neque etiam per experientiam longi temporis, quia experientia a sensu oritur. Ergo nulla in eis est cognitio veritatis.

[31124] I^a q. 64 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod Dionysius dicit, IV cap. de Div. Nom., quod *data Daemonibus angelica dona nequaquam mutata esse dicimus, sed sunt integra et splendidissima*. Inter ista autem naturalia dona est cognitio veritatis. Ergo in eis est aliqua veritatis cognitio.

[31125] I^a q. 64 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod duplex est cognitio veritatis, una quidem quae habetur per gratiam; alia vero quae habetur per naturam. Et ista quae habetur per gratiam, est duplex, una quae est speculativa tantum, sicut cum alicui aliqua secreta divinorum revelantur; alia vero quae est affectiva, producens amorem Dei; et haec proprie pertinet ad donum sapientiae. Harum autem trium cognitionum prima in Daemonibus nec est ablata, nec diminuta. Consequitur enim ipsam naturam Angeli, qui secundum suam naturam est quidam intellectus

who, according to his nature, is an intellect or mind: since on account of the simplicity of his substance, nothing can be withdrawn from his nature, so as to punish him by subtracting from his natural powers, as a man is punished by being deprived of a hand or a foot or of something else. Therefore Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that the natural gifts remain entire in them. Consequently their natural knowledge was not diminished. The second kind of knowledge, however, which comes of grace, and consists in speculation, has not been utterly taken away from them, but lessened; because, of these Divine secrets only so much is revealed to them as is necessary; and that is done either by means of the angels, or "through some temporal workings of Divine power," as Augustine says (De Civ. Dei ix, 21); but not in the same degree as to the holy angels, to whom many more things are revealed, and more fully, in the Word Himself. But of the third knowledge, as likewise of charity, they are utterly deprived.

Reply to Objection 1: Happiness consists in self-application to something higher. The separated substances are above us in the order of nature; hence man can have happiness of a kind by knowing the separated substances, although his perfect happiness consists in knowing the first substance, namely, God. But it is quite natural for one separate substance to know another; as it is natural for us to know sensible natures. Hence, as man's happiness does not consist in knowing sensible natures; so neither does the angel's happiness consist in knowing separated substances.

Reply to Objection 2: What is most manifest in its nature is hidden from us by its surpassing the bounds of our intellect; and not merely because our intellect draws knowledge from phantasms. Now the Divine substance surpasses the proportion not only of the human intellect, but even of the angelic. Consequently, not even an angel can of his own nature know God's substance. Yet on account of the perfection of his intellect he can of his nature have a higher knowledge of God than man can have. Such knowledge of God remains also in the demons. Although they do not possess the purity which

vel mens, propter simplicitatem autem suae substantiae, a natura eius aliquid subtrahi non potest, ut sic per subtractionem naturalium puniatur, sicut homo punitur per subtractionem manus aut pedis aut alicuius huiusmodi. Et ideo dicit Dionysius quod dona naturalia in eis integra manent. Unde naturalis cognitio in eis non est diminuta. Secunda autem cognitio, quae est per gratiam, in speculatione consistens, non est in eis totaliter ablata, sed diminuta, quia de huiusmodi secretis divinis tantum revelatur eis quantum oportet, vel mediantibus Angelis, vel per aliqua temporalia divinae virtutis effecta, ut dicit Augustinus, IX de Civ. Dei; non autem sicut ipsis sanctis Angelis, quibus plura et clarius revelantur in ipso verbo. A tertia vero cognitione sunt totaliter privati, sicut et a caritate.

[31126] I^a q. 64 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod felicitas consistit in applicatione ad id quod superius est. Substantiae autem separatae sunt ordine naturae supra nos, unde aequalis ratio felicitatis esse potest homini si cognoscat substantias separatas; licet perfecta eius felicitas sit in cognoscendo primam substantiam, scilicet Deum. Sed substantiae separatae cognoscere substantiam separatam est connaturale, sicut et nobis cognoscere naturas sensibiles. Unde sicut in hoc non est felicitas hominis, quod cognoscat naturas sensibiles; ita non est felicitas Angeli in hoc, quod cognoscat substantias separatas.

[31127] I^a q. 64 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod illud quod est manifestissimum in natura, est nobis occultum propter hoc quod excedit proportionem intellectus nostri; et non solum propter hoc quod intellectus noster accipit a phantasmatis. Excedit autem divina substantia non solum proportionem intellectus humani, sed etiam intellectus angelici. Unde nec ipse Angelus secundum suam naturam, potest cognoscere Dei substantiam. Potest tamen altiore cognitionem de Deo habere per suam naturam quam homo, propter perfectionem sui intellectus. Et talis cognitio Dei remanet etiam in Daemonibus. Licet

comes with grace, nevertheless they have purity of nature; and this suffices for the knowledge of God which belongs to them from their nature.

Reply to Objection 3: The creature is darkness in comparison with the excellence of the Divine light; and therefore the creature's knowledge in its own nature is called "evening" knowledge. For the evening is akin to darkness, yet it possesses some light: but when the light fails utterly, then it is night. So then the knowledge of things in their own nature, when referred to the praise of the Creator, as it is in the good angels, has something of the Divine light, and can be called evening knowledge; but if it be not referred to God, as is the case with the demons, it is not called evening, but "nocturnal" knowledge. Accordingly we read in [Gn. 1:5](#) that the darkness, which God separated from the light, "He called night."

Reply to Objection 4: All the angels had some knowledge from the very beginning respecting the mystery of God's kingdom, which found its completion in Christ; and most of all from the moment when they were beatified by the vision of the Word, which vision the demons never had. Yet all the angels did not fully and equally apprehend it; hence the demons much less fully understood the mystery of the Incarnation, when Christ was in the world. For, as Augustine observes (*De Civ. Dei* ix, 21), "It was not manifested to them as it was to the holy angels, who enjoy a participated eternity of the Word; but it was made known by some temporal effects, so as to strike terror into them." For had they fully and certainly known that He was the Son of God and the effect of His passion, they would never have procured the crucifixion of the Lord of glory.

Reply to Objection 5: The demons know a truth in three ways: first of all by the subtlety of their nature; for although they are darkened by privation of the light of grace, yet they are enlightened by the light of their intellectual nature: secondly, by revelation from the holy angels; for while not agreeing with them in conformity of will, they do agree, nevertheless, by their likeness of intellectual nature, according to which they can accept what is manifested by others: thirdly, they know by long experience; not

enim non habeant puritatem quae est per gratiam, habent tamen puritatem naturae, quae sufficit ad cognitionem Dei quae eis competit ex natura.

[31128] I^a q. 64 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod creatura tenebra est, comparata excellentiae divini luminis, et ideo cognitio creaturae in propria natura, vespertina dicitur. Vespere enim est tenebris adiunctum, habet tamen aliquid de luce, cum autem totaliter deficit lux, est nox. Sic igitur et cognitio rerum in propria natura, quando refertur ad laudem creatoris, ut in bonis Angelis, habet aliquid de luce divina, et potest dici vespertina, si autem non referatur in Deum, sicut in Daemonibus, non dicitur vespertina, sed nocturna. Unde et in Genesi I, legitur quod tenebras quas Deus a luce separavit, vocavit noctem.

[31129] I^a q. 64 a. 1 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod mysterium regni Dei, quod est impletum per Christum, omnes quidem Angeli a principio aliquo modo cognoverunt; maxime ex quo beatificati sunt visione verbi, quam Daemones nunquam habuerunt. Non tamen omnes Angeli cognoverunt perfecte, neque aequaliter. Unde Daemones multo minus, Christo existente in mundo, perfecte mysterium incarnationis cognoverunt. Non enim innotuit eis, ut Augustinus dicit sicut Angelis sanctis, qui verbi participata aeternitate perfruuntur, sed sicut eis terrendis innotescendum fuit per quaedam temporalia effecta. Si autem perfecte et per certitudinem cognovissent ipsum esse filium Dei, et effectum passionis eius, nunquam dominum gloriae crucifigi procurassent.

[31130] I^a q. 64 a. 1 ad 5 Ad quintum dicendum quod Daemones tribus modis cognoscunt veritatem aliquam. Uno modo, subtilitate suae naturae, quia licet sint obtenebrati per privationem luminis gratiae, sunt tamen lucidi lumine intellectualis naturae. Secundo, per revelationem a sanctis Angelis; cum quibus non conveniunt quidem per conformitatem voluntatis; conveniunt autem similitudine intellectualis naturae, secundum quam possunt accipere quod ab aliis manifestatur. Tertio modo cognoscunt per

as deriving it from the senses; but when the similitude of their innate intelligible species is completed in individual things, they know some things as present, which they previously did not know would come to pass, as we said when dealing with the knowledge of the angels ([Q\[57\], A\[3\]](#), ad 3).

Q. 64. A. 2. Whether the will of the demons is obstinate in evil?

Objection 1: It would seem that the will of the demons is not obstinate in evil. For liberty of will belongs to the nature of an intellectual being, which nature remains in the demons, as we said above ([A\[1\]](#)). But liberty of will is directly and firstly ordained to good rather than to evil. Therefore the demons' will is not so obstinate in evil as not to be able to return to what is good.

Objection 2: Further, since God's mercy is infinite, it is greater than the demons' malice, which is finite. But no one returns from the malice of sin to the goodness of justice save through God's mercy. Therefore the demons can likewise return from their state of malice to the state of justice.

Objection 3: Further, if the demons have a will obstinate in evil, then their will would be especially obstinate in the sin whereby they fell. But that sin, namely, pride, is in them no longer; because the motive for the sin no longer endures, namely, excellence. Therefore the demon is not obstinate in malice.

Objection 4: Further, Gregory says (Moral. iv) that man can be reinstated by another, since he fell through another. But, as was observed already ([Q\[63\], A\[8\]](#)), the lower demons fell through the highest one. Therefore their fall can be repaired by another. Consequently they are not obstinate in malice.

Objection 5: Further, whoever is obstinate in malice, never performs any good work. But the demon performs some good works: for he confesses the truth, saying to Christ: "I know Who Thou art, the holy one of God" ([Mk. 1:24](#)).

experientiam longi temporis; non quasi a sensu accipientes; sed dum in rebus singularibus completur similitudo eius speciei intelligibilis quam sibi naturaliter habent inditam, aliqua cognoscunt praesentia, quae non praecognoverunt futura, ut supra de cognitione Angelorum dictum est.

[31131] I^a q. 64 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod voluntas Daemonum non sit obstinata in malo. Libertas enim arbitrii ad naturam intellectualis naturae pertinet, quae manet in Daemonibus, ut dictum est. Sed libertas arbitrii per se et prius ordinatur ad bonum quam ad malum. Ergo voluntas Daemonis non est ita obstinata in malo, quin possit redire ad bonum.

[31132] I^a q. 64 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, maior est misericordia Dei, quae est infinita, quam Daemonis malitia, quae est finita. A malitia autem culpa ad bonitatem iustitiae nullus redit nisi per Dei misericordiam. Ergo etiam Daemones a statu malitiae possunt redire ad statum iustitiae.

[31133] I^a q. 64 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, si Daemones habent voluntatem obstinatam in malo, maxime haberent eam obstinatam in peccato quo peccaverunt. Sed illud peccatum in eis nunc non manet, scilicet superbia quia nec motivum manet, scilicet excellentia. Ergo Daemon non est obstinatus in malitia.

[31134] I^a q. 64 a. 2 arg. 4 Praeterea, Gregorius dicit quod homo per alium reparari potuit, quia per alium cecidit. Sed Daemones inferiores per primum ceciderunt, ut supra dictum est. Ergo eorum casus per alium reparari potest. Ergo non sunt in malitia obstinati.

[31135] I^a q. 64 a. 2 arg. 5 Praeterea, quicumque est in malitia obstinatus, nunquam aliquod bonum opus operatur. Sed Daemon aliqua bona opera facit, confitetur enim veritatem, dicens Christo, scio quia sis sanctus Dei, Marc. I, Daemones

"The demons" also "believe and tremble" ([Jam. 2:19](#)). And Dionysius observes (Div. Nom. iv), that "they desire what is good and best, which is, to be, to live, to understand." Therefore they are not obstinate in malice.

On the contrary, It is said ([Ps. 73:23](#)): "The pride of them that hate Thee, ascendeth continually"; and this is understood of the demons. Therefore they remain ever obstinate in their malice.

I answer that, It was Origen's opinion [*Peri Archon i. 6] that every will of the creature can by reason of free-will be inclined to good and evil; with the exception of the soul of Christ on account of the union of the Word. Such a statement deprives angels and saints of true beatitude, because everlasting stability is of the very nature of true beatitude; hence it is termed "life everlasting." It is also contrary to the authority of Sacred Scripture, which declares that demons and wicked men shall be sent "into everlasting punishment," and the good brought "into everlasting life." Consequently such an opinion must be considered erroneous; while according to Catholic Faith, it must be held firmly both that the will of the good angels is confirmed in good, and that the will of the demons is obstinate in evil.

We must seek for the cause of this obstinacy, not in the gravity of the sin, but in the condition of their nature or state. For as Damascene says (De Fide Orth. ii), "death is to men, what the fall is to the angels." Now it is clear that all the mortal sins of men, grave or less grave, are pardonable before death; whereas after death they are without remission and endure for ever.

To find the cause, then, of this obstinacy, it must be borne in mind that the appetitive power is in all things proportioned to the apprehensive, whereby it is moved, as the movable by its mover. For the sensitive appetite seeks a particular good; while the will seeks the universal good, as was said above ([Q\[59\], A\[1\]](#)); as also the sense apprehends particular objects, while the intellect considers universals. **Now the angel's apprehension differs from man's in this respect, that the angel by his intellect apprehends**

etiam credunt et contremiscunt, ut dicitur Iacob. II; Dionysius etiam dicit, IV cap. de Div. Nom., quod *bonum et optimum concupiscunt, esse, vivere et intelligere*. Ergo non sunt obstinati in malitia.

[31136] I^a q. 64 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur in Psalmo LXXIII, *superbia eorum qui te oderunt, ascendit semper*; quod de Daemonibus exponitur. Ergo semper obstinati in malitia perseverant.

[31137] I^a q. 64 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Origenis positio fuit quod omnis voluntas creaturae, propter libertatem arbitrii, potest flecti et in bonum et in malum, excepta anima Christi propter unionem verbi. Sed haec positio tollit veritatem beatitudinis a sanctis Angelis et hominibus, quia stabilitas sempiterna est de ratione verae beatitudinis; unde et vita aeterna nominatur. Repugnat etiam auctoritati Scripturae sacrae, quae Daemones et homines malos in supplicium aeternum mittendos, bonos autem in vitam aeternam transferendos pronuntiat, Matth. XXV. Unde haec positio est tanquam erronea reputanda; et tenendum est firmiter, secundum fidem Catholicam, quod et voluntas bonorum Angelorum confirmata est in bono, et voluntas Daemonum obstinata est in malo. Causam autem huius obstinationis oportet accipere, non ex gravitate culpae, sed ex conditione naturae status. *Hoc enim est hominibus mors, quod Angelis casus*, ut Damascenus dicit. Manifestum est autem quod omnia mortalia peccata hominum, sive sint magna sive sint parva, ante mortem sunt remissibilia; post mortem vero, irremissibilia, et perpetuo manentia. Ad inquirendum ergo causam huiusmodi obstinationis, considerandum est quod vis appetitiva in omnibus proportionatur apprehensivae a qua movetur, sicut mobile motori. Appetitus enim sensitivus est boni particularis, voluntas vero universalis, ut supra dictum est; sicut etiam sensus apprehensivus est singularium, intellectus vero universalium. Differt autem apprehensio Angeli ab apprehensione hominis in hoc, quod Angelus apprehendit immobiliter per intellectum, sicut et nos immobiliter apprehendimus prima principia, quorum est intellectus, homo vero per rationem apprehendit mobiliter, discurrendo de uno ad

immovably, as we apprehend immovably first principles which are the object of the habit of "intelligence"; whereas man by his reason apprehends movably, passing from one consideration to another; and having the way open by which he may proceed to either of two opposites. Consequently man's will adheres to a thing movably, and with the power of forsaking it and of clinging to the opposite; whereas the angel's will adheres fixedly and immovably.

Therefore, if his will be considered before its adhesion, it can freely adhere either to this or to its opposite (namely, in such things as he does not will naturally); but after he has once adhered, he clings immovably. So it is customary to say that man's free-will is flexible to the opposite both before and after choice; but the angel's free-will is flexible either opposite before the choice, but not after. Therefore the good angels who adhered to justice, were confirmed therein; whereas the wicked ones, sinning, are obstinate in sin. Later on we shall treat of the obstinacy of men who are damned (SP, [Q\[98\]](#), [AA\[1\]](#), 2).

Reply to Objection 1: The good and wicked angels have free-will, but according to the manner and condition of their state, as has been said.

Reply to Objection 2: God's mercy delivers from sin those who repent. But such as are not capable of repenting, cling immovably to sin, and are not delivered by the Divine mercy.

Reply to Objection 3: The devil's first sin still remains in him according to desire; although not as to his believing that he can obtain what he desired. Even so, if a man were to believe that he can commit murder, and wills to commit it, and afterwards the power is taken from him; nevertheless, the will to murder can stay with him, so that he would he had done it, or still would do it if he could.

Reply to Objection 4: The fact that man sinned from another's suggestion, is not the whole cause of man's sin being pardonable. Consequently the argument does not hold good.

aliud, habens viam procedendi ad utrumque oppositorum. Unde et voluntas hominis adhaeret alicui mobiliter, quasi potens etiam ab eo discedere et contrario adhaerere, voluntas autem Angeli adhaeret fixe et immobiliter. Et ideo, si consideretur ante adhaesionem, potest libere adhaerere et huic et opposito (in his scilicet quae non naturaliter vult), sed postquam iam adhaesit, immobiliter adhaeret. Et ideo consuevit dici quod liberum arbitrium hominis flexibile est ad oppositum et ante electionem, et post; liberum autem arbitrium Angeli est flexibile ad utrumque oppositum ante electionem, sed non post. Sic igitur et boni Angeli, semper adhaerentes iustitiae, sunt in illa confirmati, mali vero, peccantes, sunt in peccato obstinati. De obstinatione vero hominum damnatorum infra dicetur.

[31138] I^a q. 64 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod boni et mali Angeli habent liberum arbitrium, sed secundum modum et conditionem suae naturae, ut dictum est.

[31139] I^a q. 64 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod misericordia Dei liberat a peccato poenitentes. Illi vero qui poenitentiae capaces non sunt, immobiliter malo adhaerentes per divinam misericordiam non liberantur.

[31140] I^a q. 64 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod adhuc manet in Diabolo peccatum quo primo peccavit, quantum ad appetitum; licet non quantum ad hoc quod credat se posse obtinere. Sicut si aliquis credat se posse facere homicidium, et velit facere, et postea adimatur ei potestas; nihilominus voluntas homicidii in eo manere potest, ut velit fecisse, vel velit facere si posset.

[31141] I^a q. 64 a. 2 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod non est tota causa quare peccatum hominis sit remissibile, quia alio suggerente peccavit. Et ideo ratio non sequitur.

Reply to Objection 5: A demon's act is twofold. One comes of deliberate will; and this is properly called his own act. Such an act on the demon's part is always wicked; because, although at times he does something good, yet he does not do it well; as when he tells the truth in order to deceive; and when he believes and confesses, yet not willingly, but compelled by the evidence of things. Another kind of act is natural to the demon; this can be good and bears witness to the goodness of nature. Yet he abuses even such good acts to evil purpose.

Q. 64. A. 3. Whether there is sorrow in the demons?

Objection 1: It would seem that there is no sorrow in the demons. For since sorrow and joy are opposites, they cannot be together in the same subject. But there is joy in the demons: for Augustine writing against the Maniches (*De Gen. Contra Manich. ii, 17*) says: "The devil has power over them who despise God's commandments, and he rejoices over this sinister power." Therefore there is no sorrow in the demons.

Objection 2: Further, sorrow is the cause of fear, for those things cause fear while they are future, which cause sorrow when they are present. But there is no fear in the demons, according to [Job 41:24](#), "Who was made to fear no one." Therefore there is no grief in the demons.

Objection 3: Further, it is a good thing to be sorry for evil. But the demons can do no good action. Therefore they cannot be sorry, at least for the evil of sin; which applies to the worm of conscience.

On the contrary, The demon's sin is greater than man's sin. But man is punished with sorrow on account of the pleasure taken in sin, according to [Apoc. 18:7](#), "As much as she hath glorified herself, and lived in delicacies, so much torment and sorrow give ye to her." Consequently much more is the devil punished with the grief of sorrow, because he especially glorified himself.

I answer that, Fear, sorrow, joy, and the like, so

[31142] I^a q. 64 a. 2 ad 5 Ad quintum dicendum quod actus Daemonis est duplex. Quidam scilicet ex voluntate deliberata procedens, et hic proprie potest dici actus eius. Et talis actus Daemonis semper est malus, quia etsi aliquando aliquod bonum faciat, non tamen bene facit; sicut dum veritatem dicit ut decipiat, et dum non voluntarie credit et confitetur, sed rerum evidentia coactus. Alius autem actus Daemonis est naturalis; qui bonus esse potest, et attestatur bonitati naturae. Et tamen etiam tali bono actu abutuntur ad malum.

[31143] I^a q. 64 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod dolor non sit in Daemonibus. Cum enim dolor et gaudium opponantur, non possunt esse simul in eodem. Sed in Daemonibus est gaudium, dicit enim Augustinus, contra Manichaeos, *Diabolus potestatem habet in eos qui Dei praecepta contemnunt, et de hac tam infelici potestate laetatur*. Ergo in Daemonibus non est dolor.

[31144] I^a q. 64 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, dolor est causa timoris, de his enim timemus dum futura sunt, de quibus dolemus dum praesentia sunt. Sed in Daemonibus non est timor; secundum illud Iob XLI, *factus est ut nullum timeret*. Ergo in Daemonibus non est dolor.

[31145] I^a q. 64 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, dolere de malo est bonum. Sed Daemones non possunt bene facere. Ergo non possunt dolere, ad minus de malo culpa; quod pertinet ad vermem conscientiae.

[31146] I^a q. 64 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod peccatum Daemonis est gravius quam peccatum hominis. Sed homo punitur dolore pro delectatione peccati; secundum illud Apoc. XVIII, *quantum glorificavit se et in deliciis fuit, tantum date ei tormentum et luctum*. Ergo multo magis Diabolus, qui maximo se glorificavit, punitur doloris luctu.

[31147] I^a q. 64 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum

far as they are passions, cannot exist in the demons; for thus they are proper to the sensitive appetite, which is a power in a corporeal organ. According, however, as they denote simple acts of the will, they can be in the demons. And it must be said that there is sorrow in them; because sorrow, as denoting a simple act of the will, is nothing else than the resistance of the will to what is, or to what is not. Now it is evident that the demons would wish many things not to be, which are, and others to be, which are not: for, out of envy, they would wish others to be damned, who are saved. Consequently, sorrow must be said to exist in them: and especially because it is of the very notion of punishment for it to be repugnant to the will. Moreover, they are deprived of happiness, which they desire naturally; and their wicked will is curbed in many respects.

Reply to Objection 1: Joy and sorrow about the same thing are opposites, but not about different things. Hence there is nothing to hinder a man from being sorry for one thing, and joyful for another; especially so far as sorrow and joy imply simple acts of the will; because, not merely in different things, but even in one and the same thing, there can be something that we will, and something that we will not.

Reply to Objection 2: As there is sorrow in the demons over present evil, so also there is fear of future evil. Now when it is said, "He was made to fear no one," this is to be understood of the fear of God which restrains from sin. For it is written elsewhere that "the devils believe and tremble" ([James 2:19](#)).

Reply to Objection 3: To be sorry for the evil of sin on account of the sin bears witness to the goodness of the will, to which the evil of sin is opposed. But to be sorry for the evil of punishment, for the evil of sin on account of the punishment, bears witness to the goodness of nature, to which the evil of punishment is opposed. Hence Augustine says (De Civ. Dei xix, 13), that "sorrow for good lost by punishment, is the witness to a good nature." Consequently, since the demon has a perverse and obstinate will, he is not sorry for the evil of sin.

quod timor, dolor, gaudium, et huiusmodi, secundum quod sunt passionēs, in Daemonibus esse non possunt, sic enim sunt propriae appetitus sensitivi, qui est virtus in organo corporali. Sed secundum quod nominant simplices actus voluntatis, sic possunt esse in Daemonibus. Et necesse est dicere quod in eis sit dolor. Quia dolor, secundum quod significat simplicem actum voluntatis, nihil est aliud quam renisus voluntatis ad id quod est vel non est. Patet autem quod Daemones multa vellent non esse quae sunt, et esse quae non sunt, vellent enim, cum sint invidi, damnari eos qui salvantur. Unde oportet dicere quod in eis sit dolor, et praecipue quia de ratione poenae est, quod voluntati repugnet. Privantur etiam beatitudine quam naturaliter appetunt; et in multis eorum iniqua voluntas cohibetur.

[31148] I^a q. 64 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod gaudium et dolor de eodem sunt opposita, non autem de diversis. Unde nihil prohibet unum simul dolere de uno, et gaudere de alio; et maxime secundum quod dolor et gaudium important simplices voluntatis actus; quia non solum in diversis, sed etiam in una et eadem re potest esse aliquid quod volumus, et aliquid quod nolumus.

[31149] I^a q. 64 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod sicut in Daemonibus est dolor de praesenti, ita et timor de futuro. Quod autem dicitur, factus est ut nullum timeret, intelligitur de timore Dei cohibente a peccato. Alibi, namque scriptum est quod Daemones credunt et contremiscunt.

[31150] I^a q. 64 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod dolere de malo culpae propter se attestatur voluntatis bonitati, cui malum culpae opponitur. Dolere autem de malo poenae, vel de malo culpae propter poenam, attestatur bonitati naturae, cui malum poenae opponitur. Unde Augustinus dicit, XIX de Civ. Dei, quod *dolor amissi boni in supplicio, testis est naturae bonae*. Daemon ergo, cum perversae sit voluntatis et obstinatae, de malo culpae non dolet.

Q. 64. A. 4. Whether our atmosphere is the demons' place of punishment?

Objection 1: It would seem that this atmosphere is not the demons' place of punishment. For a demon is a spiritual nature. But a spiritual nature is not affected by place. Therefore there is no place of punishment for demons.

Objection 2: Further, man's sin is not graver than the demons'. But man's place of punishment is hell. Much more, therefore, is it the demons' place of punishment; and consequently not the darksome atmosphere.

Objection 3: Further, the demons are punished with the pain of fire. But there is no fire in the darksome atmosphere. Therefore the darksome atmosphere is not the place of punishment for the demons.

On the contrary, Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. iii, 10), that "the darksome atmosphere is as a prison to the demons until the judgment day."

I answer that, The angels in their own nature stand midway between God and men. Now the order of Divine providence so disposes, that it procures the welfare of the inferior orders through the superior. But man's welfare is disposed by Divine providence in two ways: first of all, directly, when a man is brought unto good and withheld from evil; and this is fittingly done through the good angels. In another way, indirectly, as when anyone assailed is exercised by fighting against opposition. It was fitting for this procuring of man's welfare to be brought about through the wicked spirits, lest they should cease to be of service in the natural order. Consequently a twofold place of punishment is due to the demons: one, by reason of their sin, and this is hell; and another, in order that they may tempt men, and thus the darksome atmosphere is their due place of punishment.

Now the procuring of men's salvation is prolonged even to the judgment day: consequently, the ministry of the angels and wrestling with demons endure until then. Hence

[31151] I^a q. 64 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quantum sic proceditur. Videtur quod aer iste non sit locus poenalis Daemonum. Daemon enim est natura spiritualis. Natura autem spiritualis non afficitur loco. Ergo nullus locus est Daemonibus poenalis.

[31152] I^a q. 64 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, peccatum hominis non est gravius quam peccatum Daemonis. Sed locus poenalis hominis est Infernus. Ergo multo magis Daemonis. Ergo non aer caliginosus.

[31153] I^a q. 64 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, Daemones puniuntur poena ignis. Sed in aere caliginoso non est ignis. Ergo aer caliginosus non est locus poenae Daemonum.

[31154] I^a q. 64 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra est quod Augustinus dicit, III super Gen. ad Litt., quod *aer caliginosus est quasi carcer Daemonibus usque ad tempus iudicii*.

[31155] I^a q. 64 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Angeli, secundum suam naturam, medii sunt inter Deum et homines. Habet autem hoc divinae providentiae ratio, quod inferiorum bonum per superiora procuret. Bonum autem hominis dupliciter procuratur per divinam providentiam. Uno modo directe, dum scilicet aliquis inducitur ad bonum et retrahitur a malo, et hoc decenter fit per Angelos bonos. Alio modo indirecte, dum scilicet aliquis exercetur, impugnatus, per impugnationem contrarii. Et hanc procuracionem boni humani conveniens fuit per malos Angelos fieri, ne totaliter post peccatum ab utilitate naturalis ordinis exciderent. Sic ergo Daemonibus duplex locus poenalis debetur. Unus quidem ratione suae culpa, et hic est Infernus. Alius autem ratione exercitationis humanae, et sic debetur eis caliginosus aer. Procuratio autem salutis humanae protenditur usque ad diem iudicii, unde et usque tunc durat ministerium Angelorum et exercitatio Daemonum. Unde et usque tunc et boni Angeli ad nos huc mittuntur, et Daemones in hoc aere caliginoso sunt ad nostrum exercitium, licet eorum aliqui etiam nunc in Inferno sint, ad

until then the good angels are sent to us here; and the demons are in this dark atmosphere for our trial: although some of them are even now in hell, to torment those whom they have led astray; just as some of the good angels are with the holy souls in heaven. But after the judgment day all the wicked, both men and angels, will be in hell, and the good in heaven.

Reply to Objection 1: A place is not penal to angel or soul as if affecting the nature by changing it, but as affecting the will by saddening it: because the angel or the soul apprehends that it is in a place not agreeable to its will.

Reply to Objection 2: One soul is not set over another in the order of nature, as the demons are over men in the order of nature; consequently there is no parallel.

Reply to Objection 3: Some have maintained that the pain of sense for demons and souls is postponed until the judgment day: and that the beatitude of the saints is likewise postponed until the judgment day. But this is erroneous, and contrary to the teaching of the Apostle ([2 Cor. 5:1](#)): "If our earthly house of this habitation be dissolved, we have a house in heaven." Others, again, while not admitting the same of souls, admit it as to demons. But it is better to say that the same judgment is passed upon wicked souls and wicked angels, even as on good souls and good angels.

Consequently, it must be said that, although a heavenly place belongs to the glory of the angels, yet their glory is not lessened by their coming to us, for they consider that place to be their own; in the same way as we say that the bishop's honor is not lessened while he is not actually sitting on his throne. In like manner it must be said, that although the demons are not actually bound within the fire of hell while they are in this dark atmosphere, nevertheless their punishment is none the less; because they know that such confinement is their due. Hence it is said in a gloss upon [James 3:6](#): "They carry fire of hell with them wherever they go." Nor is this contrary to what is said ([Lk.](#)

torquendum eos quos ad malum induxerunt; sicut et aliquis boni Angeli sunt cum animabus sanctis in caelo. Sed post diem iudicii omnes mali, tam homines quam Angeli, in Inferno erunt; boni vero in caelo.

[31156] I^a q. 64 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod locus non est poenalis Angelo aut animae, quasi afficiens alterando naturam; sed quasi afficiens voluntatem contristando, dum Angelus vel anima apprehendit se esse in loco non convenienti suae voluntati.

[31157] I^a q. 64 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod anima secundum ordinem naturae non praefertur alteri animae, sicut Daemones ordine naturae praeferuntur hominibus. Unde non est similis ratio.

[31158] I^a q. 64 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod aliqui dixerunt usque ad diem iudicii differri poenam sensibilem tam Daemonum quam animarum, et similiter beatitudinem sanctorum differri usque ad diem iudicii; quod est erroneum, et repugnans apostoli sententiae, qui dicit, II Cor. V, *si terrestris domus nostra huius habitationis dissolvatur, domum habemus in caelo*. Alii vero, licet hoc non concedant de animabus, concedunt tamen de Daemonibus. Sed melius est dicendum quod idem iudicium sit de malis animabus et malis Angelis; sicut idem iudicium est de bonis animabus et bonis Angelis. Unde dicendum est quod, sicut locus caelestis pertinet ad gloriam Angelorum, tamen gloria eorum non minuitur cum ad nos veniunt, quia considerant illum locum esse suum (eo modo quo dicimus honorem episcopi non minui dum actu non sedet in cathedra); similiter dicendum est quod Daemones licet non actu alligentur gehennali igni, dum sunt in aere isto caliginoso, tamen ex hoc ipso quod sciunt illam alligationem sibi deberi, eorum poena non diminuitur. Unde dicitur in quadam Glossa Iacobi III, quod *portant secum ignem Gehennae quocumque vadant*. Nec est contra hoc, quod rogaverunt dominum ut non mitteret eos in abyssum, ut dicitur Lucae VIII, quia hoc petierunt reputantes sibi poenam, si excluderentur a loco in

[8:31](#)), "They besought the Lord not to cast them into the abyss"; for they asked for this, deeming it to be a punishment for them to be cast out of a place where they could injure men. Hence it is stated, "They [Vulg. 'He'] besought Him that He would not expel them [Vulg. 'him'] out of the country" ([Mk. 5:10](#)).

quo possunt hominibus nocere. Unde Marci V, dicitur quod *deprecabantur eum ne expelleret eos extra regionem*.