TREATISE ON THE ONE GOD (QQ8--11)

Question 8. THE EXISTENCE OF GOD IN THINGS (FOUR ARTICLES)

Since it evidently belongs to the infinite to be present everywhere, and in all things, we now consider whether this belongs to God; and concerning this there arise four points of inquiry:

(1) Whether God is in all things?

(2) Whether God is everywhere?

(3) Whether God is everywhere by essence, power, and presence?

(4) Whether to be everywhere belongs to God alone?

[28528] Iª q. 8 pr. Quia vero infinito convenire videtur quod ubique et in omnibus sit, considerandum est utrum hoc Deo conveniat. Et circa hoc quaeruntur quatuor. Primo, utrum Deus sit in omnibus rebus. Secundo, utrum Deus sit ubique. Tertio, utrum Deus sit ubique per essentiam et potentiam et praesentiam. Quarto, utrum esse ubique sit proprium Dei.

Whether God is in all things?

Objection 1: It seems that God is not in all things. For what is above all things is not in all things. But God is above all, according to the Psalm (Ps. 112:4), "The Lord is high above all nations," etc. Therefore God is not in all things.

[28529] Iª q. 8 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Deus non sit in omnibus rebus. Quod enim est supra omnia, non est in omnibus rebus. Sed Deus est supra omnia, secundum illud Psalmi, *excelsus super omnes gentes dominus,* et cetera. Ergo Deus non est in omnibus rebus.

Objection 2: Further, what is in anything is thereby contained. Now God is not contained by things, but rather does He contain them. Therefore God is not in things but things are rather in Him. Hence Augustine says (Octog. Tri. Quaest. qu. 20), that "in Him things are, rather than He is in any place."

[28530] Iª q. 8 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, quod est in aliquo, continetur ab eo. Sed Deus non continetur a rebus, sed magis continet res. Ergo Deus non est in rebus, sed magis res sunt in eo. Unde Augustinus, in libro octoginta trium quaest., dicit quod *in ipso potius sunt omnia, quam ipse alicubi*.

Objection 3: Further, the more powerful an agent is, the more extended is its action. But God is the most powerful of all agents. Therefore His action can extend to things which are far removed from Him; nor is it necessary that He should be in all things.

[28531] Iª q. 8 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, quanto aliquod agens est virtuosius, tanto ad magis distans eius actio procedit. Sed Deus est virtuosissimum agens. Ergo eius actio pertingere potest ad ea etiam quae ab ipso distant, nec oportet quod sit in omnibus.

Objection 4: Further, the demons are beings. But God is not in the demons; for there is no fellowship between light and darkness (2 Cor. 6:14). Therefore God is not in all things.

[28532] Iª q. 8 a. 1 arg. 4 Praeterea, Daemones res aliquae sunt. Nec tamen Deus est in Daemonibus, non enim est conventio lucis ad tenebras, ut dicitur II ad Cor. VI. Ergo Deus non est in omnibus rebus.

On the contrary, A thing is wherever it operates. But God operates in all things, according to Is. 26:12, "Lord . . . Thou hast wrought all our works in [Vulg.: 'for'] us." Therefore God is in all things.

[28533] Iª q. 8 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra, ubicumque operatur aliquid, ibi est. Sed Deus operatur in omnibus, secundum illud Isaiae XXVI, *omnia opera nostra operatus es in nobis, domine*. Ergo Deus est in omnibus rebus.

I answer that, God is in all things; not, indeed, as part of their essence, nor as an accident, but as an agent is present to that upon which it works. For an agent must be joined to that wherein it acts immediately and touch it by its power; hence it is proved in Phys. vii that the thing moved and the mover must be joined together. Now since God is very being by His own essence, created being must be His proper effect; as to ignite is the proper effect of fire. Now God causes this effect in things not only when they first begin to be, but as long as they are preserved in being; as light is caused in the air by the sun as long as the air remains illuminated. Therefore as long as a thing has being, God must be present to it, according to its mode of being. But being is innermost in each thing and most fundamentally inherent in all things since it is formal in respect of everything found in a thing, as was shown above (Q[7], A[1]). Hence it must be that God is in all things, and innermostly.

[28534] Iª q. 8 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Deus est in omnibus rebus, non quidem sicut pars essentiae, vel sicut accidens, sed sicut agens adest ei in quod agit. Oportet enim omne agens coniungi ei in quod immediate agit, et sua virtute illud contingere, unde in VII Physic. probatur quod motum et movens oportet esse simul. Cum autem Deus sit ipsum esse per suam essentiam, oportet quod esse creatum sit proprius effectus eius; sicut ignire est proprius effectus ignis. Hunc autem effectum causat Deus in rebus, non solum quando primo esse incipiunt, sed quandiu in esse conservantur; sicut lumen causatur in aere a sole quandiu aer illuminatus manet. Quandiu igitur res habet esse, tandiu oportet quod Deus adsit ei, secundum modum quo esse habet. Esse autem est illud quod est magis intimum cuilibet, et quod profundius omnibus inest, cum sit formale respectu omnium quae in re sunt, ut ex supra dictis patet. Unde oportet quod Deus sit in omnibus rebus, et intime.

Reply to Objection 1: God is above all things by the excellence of His nature; nevertheless, He is in all things as the cause of the being of all things; as was shown above in this article.

[28535] Iª q. 8 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Deus est supra omnia per excellentiam suae naturae, et tamen est in omnibus rebus, ut causans omnium esse, ut supra dictum est.

Reply to Objection 2: Although corporeal things are said to be in another as in that which contains them, nevertheless, spiritual things contain those things in which they are; as the soul contains the body. Hence also God is in things containing them; nevertheless, by a certain similitude to corporeal things, it is said that all things are in God; inasmuch as they are contained by Him.

[28536] Iª q. 8 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod, licet corporalia dicantur esse in aliquo sicut in continente, tamen spiritualia continent ea in quibus sunt, sicut anima continet corpus. Unde et Deus est in rebus sicut continens res. Tamen, per quandam similitudinem corporalium, dicuntur omnia esse in Deo, inquantum continentur ab ipso.

Reply to Objection 3: No action of an agent, however powerful it may be, acts at a distance, except through a medium. But it belongs to the great power of God that He acts immediately in all things. Hence nothing is distant from Him, as if it could be without God in itself. But things are said to be distant from God by the unlikeness to Him in nature or grace; as also He is above all by the excellence of His own nature.

[28537] Iª q. 8 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod nullius agentis, quantumcumque virtuosi, actio procedit ad aliquid distans, nisi inquantum in illud per media agit. Hoc autem ad maximam virtutem Dei pertinet, quod immediate in omnibus agit. Unde nihil est distans ab eo, quasi in se illud Deum non habeat. Dicuntur tamen res distare a Deo per dissimilitudinem naturae vel gratiae, sicut et ipse est super omnia per excellentiam suae naturae.

Reply to Objection 4: In the demons there is their nature which is from God, and also the deformity of sin which is not from Him; therefore, it is not to be absolutely conceded that God is in the demons, except with the addition, "inasmuch as they are beings." But in things not deformed in their nature, we must say absolutely that God is.

[28538] Iª q. 8 a. 1 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod in Daemonibus intelligitur et natura, quae est a Deo, et deformitas culpae, quae non est ab ipso. Et ideo non est absolute concedendum quod Deus sit in Daemonibus, sed cum hac additione, inquantum sunt res quaedam. In rebus autem quae nominant naturam non deformatam, absolute dicendum est Deum esse.

Whether God is everywhere?

Objection 1: It seems that God is not everywhere. For to be everywhere means to be in every place. But to be in every place does not belong to God, to Whom it does not belong to be in place at all; for "incorporeal things," as Boethius says (De Hebdom.), "are not in a place." Therefore God is not everywhere.

[28539] Iª q. 8 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Deus non sit ubique. Esse enim ubique significat esse in omni loco. Sed esse in omni loco non convenit Deo, cui non convenit esse in loco, nam incorporalia, ut dicit Boetius, in libro de Hebdomad., non sunt in loco. Ergo Deus non est ubique.

Objection 2: Further, the relation of time to succession is the same as the relation of place to permanence. But one indivisible part of action or movement cannot exist in different times; therefore neither can one indivisible part in the genus of permanent things be in every place. Now the divine being is not successive but permanent. Therefore God is not in many places; and thus He is not everywhere.

[28540] Iª q. 8 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, sicut se habet tempus ad successiva, ita se habet locus ad permanentia. Sed unum indivisibile actionis vel motus, non potest esse in diversis temporibus. Ergo nec unum indivisibile in genere rerum permanentium, potest esse in omnibus locis. Esse autem divinum non est successivum, sed permanens. Ergo Deus non est in pluribus locis. Et ita non est ubique.

Objection 3: Further, what is wholly in any one place is not in part elsewhere. But if God is in any one place He is all there; for He has no parts. No part of Him then is elsewhere; and therefore God is not everywhere.

[28541] Iª q. 8 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, quod est totum alicubi, nihil eius est extra locum illum. Sed Deus, si est in aliquo loco, totus est ibi, non enim habet partes. Ergo nihil eius est extra locum illum. Ergo Deus non est ubique.

On the contrary, It is written, "I fill heaven and earth." (Jer. 23:24).

[28542] Iª q. 8 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur Ierem. XXIII, *caelum et terram ego impleo*.

I answer that, Since place is a thing, to be in place can be understood in a twofold sense; either by way of other things---i.e. as one thing is said to be in another no matter how; and thus the accidents of a place are in place; or by a way proper to place; and thus things placed are in a place. Now in both these senses, in some way God is in every place; and this is to be everywhere. First, as He is in all things giving them being, power and operation; so He is in every place as giving it existence and locative power. Again, things placed are in place, inasmuch as they fill place; and God fills every place; not, indeed, like a body, for a body is said to fill place inasmuch as it excludes the co-presence of another body; whereas by God being in a place, others are not thereby excluded from it; indeed, by the very fact that He gives being to the things that fill every place, He Himself fills every place.

[28543] Iª q. 8 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, cum locus sit res quaedam, esse aliquid in loco potest intelligi dupliciter, vel per modum aliarum rerum, idest sicut dicitur aliquid esse in aliis rebus quocumque modo, sicut accidentia loci sunt in loco; vel per modum proprium loci, sicut locata sunt in loco. Utroque autem modo, secundum aliquid, Deus est in omni loco, quod est esse ubique. Primo quidem, sicut est in omnibus rebus, ut dans eis esse et virtutem et operationem, sic enim est in omni loco, ut dans ei esse et virtutem locativam. Item, locata sunt in loco inquantum replent locum, et Deus omnem locum replet. Non sicut corpus, corpus enim dicitur replere locum, inquantum non compatitur secum aliud corpus; sed per hoc quod Deus est in aliquo loco, non excluditur quin alia sint ibi, imo per hoc replet omnia loca, quod dat esse omnibus locatis, quae replent omnia loca.

Reply to Objection 1: Incorporeal things are in place not by contact of dimensive quantity, as bodies are but by contact of power.

[28544] Iª q. 8 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod incorporalia non sunt in loco per contactum quantitatis dimensivae, sicut corpora, sed per contactum virtutis.

Reply to Objection 2: The indivisible is twofold. One is the term of the continuous; as a point in permanent things, and as a moment in succession; and this kind of the indivisible in permanent things, forasmuch as it has a determinate site, cannot be in many parts of place, or in many places; likewise the indivisible of action or movement, forasmuch as it has a determinate order in movement or action, cannot be in many parts of time. Another kind of the indivisible is outside of the whole genus of the continuous; and in this way incorporeal substances, like God, angel and soul, are called indivisible. Such a kind of indivisible does not belong to the continuous, as a part of it, but as touching it by its power; hence, according as its power can extend itself to one or to many, to a small thing, or to a great one, in this way it is in one or in many places, and in a small or large place.

[28545] Iª q. 8 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod indivisibile est duplex. Unum quod est terminus continui, ut punctus in permanentibus, et momentum in successivis. Et huiusmodi indivisibile, in permanentibus, quia habet determinatum situm, non potest esse in pluribus partibus loci, vel in pluribus locis, et similiter indivisibile actionis vel motus, quia habet determinatum ordinem in motu vel actione, non potest esse in pluribus partibus temporis. Aliud autem indivisibile est, quod est extra totum genus continui, et hoc modo substantiae incorporeae, ut Deus, Angelus et anima, dicuntur esse indivisibiles. Tale igitur indivisibile non applicatur ad continuum sicut aliquid eius, sed inquantum contingit illud sua virtute. Unde secundum quod virtus sua se potest extendere ad unum vel multa, ad parvum vel magnum, secundum hoc est in uno vel pluribus locis, et in loco parvo vel magno.

Reply to Objection 3: A whole is so called with reference to its parts. Now part is twofold: viz. a part of the essence, as the form and the matter are called parts of the composite, while genus and difference are called parts of species. There is also part of quantity into which any quantity is divided. What therefore is whole in any place by totality of quantity, cannot be outside of that place, because the quantity of anything placed is commensurate to the quantity of the place; and hence there is no totality of quantity without totality of place. But totality of essence is not commensurate to the totality of place. Hence it is not necessary for that which is whole by

[28546] Iª q. 8 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod totum dicitur respectu partium. Est autem duplex pars, scilicet pars essentiae, ut forma et materia dicuntur partes compositi, et genus et differentia partes speciei; et etiam pars quantitatis, in quam scilicet dividitur aliqua quantitas. Quod ergo est totum in aliquo loco totalitate quantitatis, non potest esse extra locum illum, quia quantitas locati commensuratur quantitati loci, unde non est totalitas quantitatis, si non sit totalitas loci. Sed totalitas essentiae non commensuratur totalitati loci. Unde non oportet quod illud quod est totum totalitate essentiae in aliquo, nullo modo sit extra illud. Sicut

totality of essence in a thing, not to be at all outside of it. This appears also in accidental forms which have accidental quantity; as an example, whiteness is whole in each part of the surface if we speak of its totality of essence; because according to the perfect idea of its species it is found to exist in every part of the surface. But if its totality be considered according to quantity which it has accidentally, then it is not whole in every part of the surface. On the other hand, incorporeal substances have no totality either of themselves or accidentally, except in reference to the perfect idea of their essence. Hence, as the soul is whole in every part of the body, so is God whole in all things and in each one.

apparet etiam in formis accidentalibus, quae secundum accidens quantitatem habent, albedo enim est tota in qualibet parte superficiei, si accipiatur totalitas essentiae, quia secundum perfectam rationem suae speciei invenitur in qualibet parte superficiei, si autem accipiatur totalitas secundum quantitatem, quam habet per accidens, sic non est tota in qualibet parte superficiei. In substantiis autem incorporeis non est totalitas, nec per se nec per accidens, nisi secundum perfectam rationem essentiae. Et ideo, sicut anima est tota in qualibet parte corporis, ita Deus totus est in omnibus et singulis.

Whether God is everywhere by essence, presence and power?

Objection 1: It seems that the mode of God's existence in all things is not properly described by way of essence, presence and power. For what is by essence in anything, is in it essentially. But God is not essentially in things; for He does not belong to the essence of anything. Therefore it ought not to be said that God is in things by essence, presence and power.

[28547] Iª q. 8 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod male assignentur modi existendi Deum in rebus, cum dicitur quod Deus est in omnibus rebus per essentiam, potentiam et praesentiam. Id enim per essentiam est in aliquo, quod essentialiter est in eo. Deus autem non est essentialiter in rebus, non enim est de essentia alicuius rei. Ergo non debet dici quod Deus sit in rebus per essentiam, praesentiam et potentiam.

Objection 2: Further, to be present in anything means not to be absent from it. Now this is the meaning of God being in things by His essence, that He is not absent from anything. Therefore the presence of God in all things by essence and presence means the same thing. Therefore it is superfluous to say that God is present in things by His essence, presence and power.

[28548] Iª q. 8 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, hoc est esse praesentem alicui rei, scilicet non deesse illi. Sed hoc est Deum esse per essentiam in rebus, scilicet non deesse alicui rei. Ergo idem est esse Deum in omnibus per essentiam et praesentiam. Superfluum ergo fuit dicere quod Deus sit in rebus per essentiam, praesentiam et potentiam.

Objection 3: Further, as God by His power is the principle of all things, so He is the same likewise by His knowledge and will. But it is not said

[28549] Iª q. 8 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, sicut Deus est principium omnium rerum per suam potentiam, ita per scientiam et voluntatem. Sed non

that He is in things by knowledge and will. Therefore neither is He present by His power.

dicitur Deus esse in rebus per scientiam et voluntatem. Ergo nec per potentiam.

Objection 4: Further, as grace is a perfection added to the substance of a thing, so many other perfections are likewise added. Therefore if God is said to be in certain persons in a special way by grace, it seems that according to every perfection there ought to be a special mode of God's existence in things.

[28550] Iª q. 8 a. 3 arg. 4 Praeterea, sicut gratia est quaedam perfectio superaddita substantiae rei, ita multae sunt aliae perfectiones superadditae. Si ergo Deus dicitur esse speciali modo in quibusdam per gratiam, videtur quod secundum quamlibet perfectionem debeat accipi specialis modus essendi Deum in rebus.

On the contrary, A gloss on the Canticle of Canticles (5) says that, "God by a common mode is in all things by His presence, power and substance; still He is said to be present more familiarly in some by grace" [*The quotation is from St. Gregory, (Hom. viii in Ezech.)].

[28551] Iª q. 8 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod Gregorius dicit, super Cant. Cantic., quod *Deus communi modo est in omnibus rebus praesentia, potentia et substantia, tamen familiari modo dicitur esse in aliquibus per gratiam*.

I answer that, God is said to be in a thing in two ways; in one way after the manner of an efficient cause; and thus He is in all things created by Him; in another way he is in things as the object of operation is in the operator; and this is proper to the operations of the soul, according as the thing known is in the one who knows; and the thing desired in the one desiring. In this second way God is especially in the rational creature which knows and loves Him actually or habitually. And because the rational creature possesses this prerogative by grace, as will be shown later (Q[12]). He is said to be thus in the saints by grace.

[28552] Iª q. 8 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Deus dicitur esse in re aliqua dupliciter. Uno modo, per modum causae agentis, et sic est in omnibus rebus creatis ab ipso. Alio modo, sicut obiectum operationis est in operante, quod proprium est in operationibus animae, secundum quod cognitum est in cognoscente, et desideratum in desiderante. Hoc igitur secundo modo, Deus specialiter est in rationali creatura, quae cognoscit et diligit illum actu vel habitu. Et quia hoc habet rationalis creatura per gratiam, ut infra patebit, dicitur esse hoc modo in sanctis per gratiam.

But how He is in other things created by Him, may be considered from human affairs. A king, for example, is said to be in the whole kingdom by his power, although he is not everywhere present. Again a thing is said to be by its presence in other things which are subject to its inspection; as things in a

In rebus vero aliis ab ipso creatis quomodo sit, considerandum est ex his quae in rebus humanis esse dicuntur. Rex enim dicitur esse in toto regno suo per suam potentiam, licet non sit ubique praesens. Per praesentiam vero suam, dicitur aliquid esse in omnibus quae in prospectu ipsius sunt; sicut

house are said to be present to anyone, who nevertheless may not be in substance in every part of the house. Lastly, a thing is said to be by way of substance or essence in that place in which its substance may be. Now there were some (the Manichees) who said that spiritual and incorporeal things were subject to the divine power; but that visible and corporeal things were subject to the power of a contrary principle. Therefore against these it is necessary to say that God is in all things by His power.

omnia quae sunt in aliqua domo, dicuntur esse praesentia alicui, qui tamen non est secundum substantiam suam in qualibet parte domus. Secundum vero substantiam vel essentiam, dicitur aliquid esse in loco in quo eius substantia habetur. Fuerunt ergo aliqui, scilicet Manichaei, qui dixerunt divinae potestati subiecta spiritualia esse et incorporalia, visibilia vero et corporalia subiecta esse dicebant potestati principii contrarii. Contra hos ergo oportet dicere quod Deus sit in omnibus per potentiam suam.

But others, though they believed that all things were subject to the divine power, still did not allow that divine providence extended to these inferior bodies, and in the person of these it is said, "He walketh about the poles of the heavens; and He doth not consider our things [*Vulg.: 'He doth not consider . . . and He walketh,' etc.]" (Job 22:14). Against these it is necessary to say that God is in all things by His presence.

Fuerunt vero alii, qui licet crederent omnia esse subiecta divinae potentiae, tamen providentiam divinam usque ad haec inferiora corpora non extendebant, ex quorum persona dicitur Iob XXII, *circa cardines caeli perambulat, nec nostra considerat*. Et contra hos oportuit dicere quod sit in omnibus per suam praesentiam.

Further, others said that, although all things are subject to God's providence, still all things are not immediately created by God; but that He immediately created the first creatures, and these created the others. Against these it is necessary to say that He is in all things by His essence.

Fuerunt vero alii, qui licet dicerent omnia ad Dei providentiam pertinere, tamen posuerunt omnia non immediate esse a Deo creata, sed quod immediate creavit primas creaturas, et illae creaverunt alias. Et contra hos oportet dicere quod sit in omnibus per essentiam.

Therefore, God is in all things by His power, inasmuch as all things are subject to His power; He is by His presence in all things, as all things are bare and open to His eyes; He is in all things by His essence, inasmuch as He is present to all as the cause of their being.

Sic ergo est in omnibus per potentiam, inquantum omnia eius potestati subduntur. Est per praesentiam in omnibus, inquantum omnia nuda sunt et aperta oculis eius. Est in omnibus per essentiam, inquantum adest omnibus ut causa essendi, sicut dictum est.

Reply to Objection 1: God is said to be in all things by essence, not indeed by the essence of the things themselves, as if He were of their essence; but by His own essence; because His substance is present to all things as the cause of their being.

[28553] Iª q. 8 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Deus dicitur esse in omnibus per essentiam, non quidem rerum, quasi sit de essentia earum, sed per essentiam suam, quia substantia sua adest omnibus ut causa essendi, sicut dictum est.

Reply to Objection 2: A thing can be said to be present to another, when in its sight, though the thing may be distant in substance, as was shown in this article; and therefore two modes of presence are necessary; viz. by essence and by presence.

[28554] Iª q. 8 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod aliquid potest dici praesens alicui, inquantum subiacet eius conspectui, quod tamen distat ab eo secundum suam substantiam, ut dictum est. Et ideo oportuit duos modos poni, scilicet per essentiam, et praesentiam.

Reply to Objection 3: Knowledge and will require that the thing known should be in the one who knows, and the thing willed in the one who wills. Hence by knowledge and will things are more truly in God than God in things. But power is the principle of acting on another; hence by power the agent is related and applied to an external thing; thus by power an agent may be said to be present to another.

[28555] Iª q. 8 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod de ratione scientiae et voluntatis est, quod scitum sit in sciente, et volitum in volente, unde secundum scientiam et voluntatem, magis res sunt in Deo, quam Deus in rebus. Sed de ratione potentiae est, quod sit principium agendi in aliud, unde secundum potentiam agens comparatur et applicatur rei exteriori. Et sic per potentiam potest dici agens esse in altero.

Reply to Objection 4: No other perfection, except grace, added to substance, renders God present in anything as the object known and loved; therefore only grace constitutes a special mode of God's existence in things. There is, however, another special mode of God's existence in man by union, which will be treated of in its own place (TP).

[28556] Iª q. 8 a. 3 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod nulla alia perfectio superaddita substantiae, facit Deum esse in aliquo sicut obiectum cognitum et amatum, nisi gratia, et ideo sola gratia facit singularem modum essendi Deum in rebus. Est autem alius singularis modus essendi Deum in homine per unionem, de quo modo suo loco agetur.

Whether to be everywhere belongs to God alone?

Objection 1: It seems that to be everywhere does not belong to God alone. For the universal, according to the Philosopher (Poster. i), is everywhere, and always; primary matter also, since it is in all bodies, is

[28557] Iª q. 8 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod esse ubique non sit proprium Dei. Universale enim, secundum philosophum, est ubique et semper, materia etiam prima, cum sit in

everywhere. But neither of these is God, as appears from what is said above (Q[3]). Therefore to be everywhere does not belong to God alone.

omnibus corporibus, est ubique. Neutrum autem horum est Deus, ut ex praemissis patet. Ergo esse ubique non est proprium Dei.

Objection 2: Further, number is in things numbered. But the whole universe is constituted in number, as appears from the Book of Wisdom (Wis. 11:21). Therefore there is some number which is in the whole universe, and is thus everywhere.

[28558] Iª q. 8 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, numerus est in numeratis. Sed totum universum est constitutum in numero, ut patet Sap. XI. Ergo aliquis numerus est, qui est in toto universo, et ita ubique.

Objection 3: Further, the universe is a kind of "whole perfect body" (Coel. et Mund. i). But the whole universe is everywhere, because there is no place outside it. Therefore to be everywhere does not belong to God alone.

[28559] Iª q. 8 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, totum universum est quoddam totum corpus perfectum, ut dicitur in I caeli et mundi. Sed totum universum est ubique, quia extra ipsum nullus locus est. Non ergo solus Deus est ubique.

Objection 4: Further, if any body were infinite, no place would exist outside of it, and so it would be everywhere. Therefore to be everywhere does not appear to belong to God alone.

[28560] Iª q. 8 a. 4 arg. 4 Praeterea, si aliquod corpus esset infinitum, nullus locus esset extra ipsum. Ergo esset ubique. Et sic, esse ubique non videtur proprium Dei.

Objection 5: Further, the soul, as Augustine says (De Trin. vi, 6), is "whole in the whole body, and whole in every one of its parts." Therefore if there was only one animal in the world, its soul would be everywhere; and thus to be everywhere does not belong to God alone.

[28561] Iª q. 8 a. 4 arg. 5 *Praeterea, anima*, ut dicit Augustinus, in VI de Trin., *est tota in toto corpore, et tota in qualibet eius parte*. Si ergo non esset in mundo nisi unum solum animal, anima eius esset ubique. Et sic, esse ubique non est proprium Dei.

Objection 6: Further, as Augustine says (Ep. 137), "The soul feels where it sees, and lives where it feels, and is where it lives." But the soul sees as it were everywhere: for in a succession of glances it comprehends the entire space of the heavens in its sight. Therefore the soul is everywhere.

[28562] Iª q. 8 a. 4 arg. 6 Praeterea, ut Augustinus dicit in epistola ad Volusianum, *anima ubi videt, ibi sentit; et ubi sentit, ibi vivit; et ubi vivit, ibi est*. Sed anima videt quasi ubique, quia successive videt etiam totum caelum. Ergo anima est ubique.

On the contrary, Ambrose says (De Spir. Sanct. i, 7): "Who dares to call the

[28563] Iª q. 8 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra est quod Ambrosius dicit, in libro de

Holy Ghost a creature, Who in all things, and everywhere, and always is, which assuredly belongs to the divinity alone?"

spiritu sancto, *quis audeat creaturam dicere spiritum sanctum, qui in omnibus et ubique et semper est; quod utique divinitatis est proprium?*

I answer that, To be everywhere primarily and absolutely, is proper to God. Now to be everywhere primarily is said of that which in its whole self is everywhere; for if a thing were everywhere according to its parts in different places, it would not be primarily everywhere, forasmuch as what belongs to anything according to part does not belong to it primarily; thus if a man has white teeth, whiteness belongs primarily not to the man but to his teeth. But a thing is everywhere absolutely when it does not belong to it to be everywhere accidentally, that is, merely on some supposition; as a grain of millet would be everywhere, supposing that no other body existed. It belongs therefore to a thing to be everywhere absolutely when, on any supposition, it must be everywhere; and this properly belongs to God alone. For whatever number of places be supposed, even if an infinite number be supposed besides what already exist, it would be necessary that God should be in all of them; for nothing can exist except by Him. Therefore to be everywhere primarily and absolutely belongs to God and is proper to Him: because whatever number of places be supposed to exist, God must be in all of them, not as to a part of Him, but as to His very self.

[28564] Iª q. 8 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod esse ubique primo et per se, est proprium Dei. Dico autem esse ubique primo, quod secundum se totum est ubique. Si quid enim esset ubique, secundum diversas partes in diversis locis existens, non esset primo ubique, quia quod convenit alicui ratione partis suae, non convenit ei primo; sicut si homo est albus dente, albedo non convenit primo homini, sed denti. Esse autem ubique per se dico id cui non convenit esse ubique per accidens, propter aliquam suppositionem factam, quia sic granum milii esset ubique, supposito quod nullum aliud corpus esset. Per se igitur convenit esse ubique alicui, quando tale est quod, qualibet positione facta, sequitur illud esse ubique. Et hoc proprie convenit Deo. Quia quotcumque loca ponantur, etiam si ponerentur infinita praeter ista quae sunt, oporteret in omnibus esse Deum, quia nihil potest esse nisi per ipsum. Sic igitur esse ubique primo et per se convenit Deo, et est proprium eius, quia quotcumque loca ponantur, oportet quod in quolibet sit Deus, non secundum partem, sed secundum seipsum.

Reply to Objection 1: The universal, and also primary matter are indeed everywhere; but not according to the same mode of existence.

[28565] Iª q. 8 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod universale et materia prima sunt quidem ubique, sed non secundum idem esse.

Reply to Objection 2: Number, since it is an accident, does not, of itself, exist in place, but accidentally; neither is the whole but only part of it in each of the things numbered; hence it does not follow that it is primarily and absolutely everywhere.

[28566] Iª q. 8 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod numerus, cum sit accidens, non est per se sed per accidens, in loco. Nec est totus in quolibet numeratorum, sed secundum partem. Et sic non sequitur quod sit primo et per se ubique.

Reply to Objection 3: The whole body of the universe is everywhere, but not primarily; forasmuch as it is not wholly in each place, but according to its parts; nor again is it everywhere absolutely, because, supposing that other places existed besides itself, it would not be in them.

[28567] Iª q. 8 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod totum corpus universi est ubique, sed non primo, quia non totum est in quolibet loco, sed secundum suas partes. Nec iterum per se, quia si ponerentur aliqua alia loca, non esset in eis.

Reply to Objection 4: If an infinite body existed, it would be everywhere; but according to its parts.

[28568] Iª q. 8 a. 4 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod, si esset corpus infinitum, esset ubique; sed secundum suas partes.

Reply to Objection 5: Were there one animal only, its soul would be everywhere primarily indeed, but only accidentally.

[28569] Iª q. 8 a. 4 ad 5 Ad quintum dicendum quod, si esset unum solum animal, anima eius esset ubique primo quidem, sed per accidens.

Reply to Objection 6: When it is said that the soul sees anywhere, this can be taken in two senses. In one sense the adverb "anywhere" determines the act of seeing on the part of the object; and in this sense it is true that while it sees the heavens, it sees in the heavens; and in the same way it feels in the heavens; but it does not follow that it lives or exists in the heavens, because to live and to exist do not import an act passing to an exterior object. In another sense it can be understood according as the adverb determines the act of the seer, as proceeding from the seer; and thus it is true that where the soul feels and sees, there it is, and there it lives according to this mode of speaking; and thus it does not follow that it is everywhere.

[28570] Iª q. 8 a. 4 ad 6 Ad sextum dicendum quod, cum dicitur anima alicubi videre, potest intelligi dupliciter. Uno modo, secundum quod hoc adverbium alicubi determinat actum videndi ex parte obiecti. Et sic verum est quod, dum caelum videt, in caelo videt, et eadem ratione in caelo sentit. Non tamen sequitur quod in caelo vivat vel sit, quia vivere et esse non important actum transeuntem in exterius obiectum. Alio modo potest intelligi secundum quod adverbium determinat actum videntis, secundum quod exit a vidente. Et sic verum est quod anima ubi sentit et videt, ibi est et vivit, secundum istum modum loquendi. Et ita non sequitur quod sit ubique.

Question 9. THE IMMUTABILITY OF GOD (TWO ARTICLES)

We next consider God's immutability, and His eternity following on His immutability. On the immutability of God there are two points of inquiry:

(1) Whether God is altogether immutable?

(2) Whether to be immutable belongs to God alone?

[28571] Iª q. 9 pr. Consequenter considerandum est de immutabilitate et aeternitate divina, quae immutabilitatem consequitur. Circa immutabilitatem vero quaeruntur duo. Primo, utrum Deus sit omnino immutabilis. Secundo, utrum esse immutabile sit proprium Dei.

Whether God is altogether immutable?

Objection 1: It seems that God is not altogether immutable. For whatever moves itself is in some way mutable. But, as Augustine says (Gen. ad lit viii, 20), "The Creator Spirit moves Himself neither by time, nor by place." Therefore God is in some way mutable.

[28572] Iª q. 9 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Deus non sit omnino immutabilis. Quidquid enim movet seipsum, est aliquo modo mutabile. Sed, sicut dicit Augustinus, VIII super Genesim ad litteram, *spiritus creator movet se nec per tempus nec per locum*. Ergo Deus est aliquo modo mutabilis.

Objection 2: Further, it is said of Wisdom, that "it is more mobile than all things active [Vulg.'mobilior']" (Wis. 7:24). But God is wisdom itself; therefore God is movable.

[28573] Iª q. 9 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, Sap. VII dicitur de sapientia quod est *mobilior omnibus mobilibus*. Sed Deus est ipsa sapientia. Ergo Deus est mobilis.

Objection 3: Further, to approach and to recede signify movement. But these are said of God in Scripture, "Draw nigh to God and He will draw nigh to you" (James 4:8). Therefore God is mutable.

[28574] Iª q. 9 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, appropinquari et elongari motum significant. Huiusmodi autem dicuntur de Deo in Scriptura, Iac. IV, *appropinquate Deo, et appropinquabit vobis*. Ergo Deus est mutabilis.

On the contrary, It is written, "I am the Lord, and I change not" (Malachi 3:6).

[28575] Iª q. 9 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur Malach. III, *ego Deus, et non mutor*.

I answer that, From what precedes, it is shown that God is altogether immutable. First, because it was shown above that there is some first being, whom we call God; and that this first being must be pure act, without the admixture of any potentiality, for the reason that, absolutely, potentiality is

[28576] Iª q. 9 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod ex praemissis ostenditur Deum esse omnino immutabilem. Primo quidem, quia supra ostensum est esse aliquod primum ens, quod Deum dicimus, et quod huiusmodi primum ens oportet esse purum actum absque permixtione

posterior to act. Now everything which is in any way changed, is in some way in potentiality. Hence it is evident that it is impossible for God to be in any way changeable. Secondly, because everything which is moved, remains as it was in part, and passes away in part; as what is moved from whiteness to blackness, remains the same as to substance; thus in everything which is moved, there is some kind of composition to be found. But it has been shown above (Q[3], A[7]) that in God there is no composition, for He is altogether simple. Hence it is manifest that God cannot be moved. Thirdly, because everything which is moved acquires something by its movement, and attains to what it had not attained previously. But since God is infinite, comprehending in Himself all the plenitude of perfection of all being, He cannot acquire anything new, nor extend Himself to anything whereto He was not extended previously. Hence movement in no way belongs to Him. So, some of the ancients, constrained, as it were, by the truth, decided that the first principle was immovable.

alicuius potentiae, eo quod potentia simpliciter est posterior actu. Omne autem quod quocumque modo mutatur, est aliquo modo in potentia. Ex quo patet quod impossibile est Deum aliquo modo mutari. Secundo, quia omne quod movetur, quantum ad aliquid manet, et quantum ad aliquid transit, sicut quod movetur de albedine in nigredinem, manet secundum substantiam. Et sic in omni eo quod movetur, attenditur aliqua compositio. Ostensum est autem supra quod in Deo nulla est compositio, sed est omnino simplex. Unde manifestum est quod Deus moveri non potest. Tertio, quia omne quod movetur, motu suo aliquid acquirit, et pertingit ad illud ad quod prius non pertingebat. Deus autem, cum sit infinitus, comprehendens in se omnem plenitudinem perfectionis totius esse, non potest aliquid acquirere, nec extendere se in aliquid ad quod prius non pertingebat. Unde nullo modo sibi competit motus. Et inde est quod quidam antiquorum, quasi ab ipsa veritate coacti, posuerunt primum principium esse immobile.

Reply to Objection 1: Augustine there speaks in a similar way to Plato, who said that the first mover moves Himself; calling every operation a movement, even as the acts of understanding, and willing, and loving, are called movements. Therefore because God understands and loves Himself, in that respect they said that God moves Himself, not, however, as movement and change belong to a thing existing in potentiality, as we now speak of change and movement.

[28577] Iª q. 9 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod Augustinus ibi loquitur secundum modum quo Plato dicebat primum movens movere seipsum, omnem operationem nominans motum; secundum quod etiam ipsum intelligere et velle et amare motus quidam dicuntur. Quia ergo Deus intelligit et amat seipsum, secundum hoc dixerunt quod Deus movet seipsum, non autem secundum quod motus et mutatio est existentis in potentia, ut nunc loquimur de mutatione et motu.

Reply to Objection 2: Wisdom is called mobile by way of similitude, according as it diffuses its likeness even to the outermost of things; for nothing can exist which does not

[28578] Iª q. 9 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod sapientia dicitur mobilis esse similitudinarie, secundum quod suam similitudinem diffundit usque ad ultima rerum. Nihil enim esse

proceed from the divine wisdom by way of some kind of imitation, as from the first effective and formal principle; as also works of art proceed from the wisdom of the artist. And so in the same way, inasmuch as the similitude of the divine wisdom proceeds in degrees from the highest things, which participate more fully of its likeness, to the lowest things which participate of it in a lesser degree, there is said to be a kind of procession and movement of the divine wisdom to things; as when we say that the sun proceeds to the earth, inasmuch as the ray of light touches the earth. In this way Dionysius (Coel. Hier. i) expounds the matter, that every procession of the divine manifestation comes to us from the movement of the Father of light.

potest, quod non procedat a divina sapientia per quandam imitationem, sicut a primo principio effectivo et formali; prout etiam artificiata procedunt a sapientia artificis. Sic igitur inquantum similitudo divinae sapientiae gradatim procedit a supremis, quae magis participant de eius similitudine, usque ad infima rerum, quae minus participant dicitur esse quidam processus et motus divinae sapientiae in res, sicut si dicamus solem procedere usque ad terram, inquantum radius luminis eius usque ad terram pertingit. Et hoc modo exponit Dionysius, cap. I Cael. Hier., dicens quod *omnis processus divinae manifestationis venit ad nos a patre luminum moto*.

Reply to Objection 3: These things are said of God in Scripture metaphorically. For as the sun is said to enter a house, or to go out, according as its rays reach the house, so God is said to approach to us, or to recede from us, when we receive the influx of His goodness, or decline from Him.

[28579] Iª q. 9 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod huiusmodi dicuntur de Deo in Scripturis metaphorice. Sicut enim dicitur sol intrare domum vel exire, inquantum radius eius pertingit ad domum; sic dicitur Deus appropinquare ad nos vel recedere a nobis, inquantum percipimus influentiam bonitatis ipsius, vel ab eo deficimus.

Whether to be immutable belongs to God alone?

Objection 1: It seems that to be immutable does not belong to God alone. For the Philosopher says (Metaph. ii) that "matter is in everything which is moved." But, according to some, certain created substances, as angels and souls, have not matter. Therefore to be immutable does not belong to God alone.

[28580] Iª q. 9 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod esse immutabile non sit proprium Dei. Dicit enim philosophus, in II Metaphys., quod materia est in omni eo quod movetur. Sed substantiae quaedam creatae, sicut Angeli et animae, non habent materiam, ut quibusdam videtur. Ergo esse immutabile non est proprium Dei.

Objection 2: Further, everything in motion moves to some end. What therefore has already attained its ultimate end, is not in motion. But some creatures have already attained

[28581] Iª q. 9 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, omne quod movetur, movetur propter aliquem finem, quod ergo iam pervenit ad ultimum finem, non movetur. Sed quaedam creaturae iam pervenerunt

to their ultimate end; as all the blessed in heaven. Therefore some creatures are immovable.

ad ultimum finem, sicut omnes beati. Ergo aliquae creaturae sunt immobiles.

Objection 3: Further, everything which is mutable is variable. But forms are invariable; for it is said (Sex Princip. i) that "form is essence consisting of the simple and invariable." Therefore it does not belong to God alone to be immutable.

[28582] Iª q. 9 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, omne quod est mutabile, est variabile. Sed formae sunt invariabiles, dicitur enim in libro sex principiorum, quod *forma est simplici et invariabili essentia consistens*. Ergo non est solius Dei proprium esse immutabile.

On the contrary, Augustine says (De Nat. Boni. i), "God alone is immutable; and whatever things He has made, being from nothing, are mutable."

[28583] Iª q. 9 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicit Augustinus, in libro de natura boni, *solus Deus immutabilis est; quae autem fecit, quia ex nihilo sunt, mutabilia sunt*.

I answer that, God alone is altogether immutable; whereas every creature is in some way mutable. Be it known therefore that a mutable thing can be called so in two ways: by a power in itself; and by a power possessed by another. For all creatures before they existed, were possible, not by any created power, since no creature is eternal, but by the divine power alone, inasmuch as God could produce them into existence. Thus, as the production of a thing into existence depends on the will of God, so likewise it depends on His will that things should be preserved; for He does not preserve them otherwise than by ever giving them existence; hence if He took away His action from them, all things would be reduced to nothing, as appears from Augustine (Gen. ad lit. iv, 12). Therefore as it was in the Creator's power to produce them before they existed in themselves, so likewise it is in the Creator's power when they exist in themselves to bring them to nothing. In this way therefore, by the power of another---namely, of God---they are mutable, inasmuch as they are producible from nothing by Him, and are by Him reducible from existence to non-existence.

[28584] Iª q. 9 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod solus Deus est omnino immutabilis, omnis autem creatura aliquo modo est mutabilis. Sciendum est enim quod mutabile potest aliquid dici dupliciter, uno modo, per potentiam quae in ipso est; alio modo, per potentiam quae in altero est. Omnes enim creaturae, antequam essent, non erant possibiles esse per aliquam potentiam creatam, cum nullum creatum sit aeternum, sed per solam potentiam divinam, inquantum Deus poterat eas in esse producere. Sicut autem ex voluntate Dei dependet quod res in esse producit, ita ex voluntate eius dependet quod res in esse conservat, non enim aliter eas in esse conservat, quam semper eis esse dando; unde si suam actionem eis subtraheret, omnia in nihilum redigerentur, ut patet per Augustinum, IV super Gen. ad Litt. Sicut igitur in potentia creatoris fuit ut res essent, antequam essent in seipsis, ita in potentia creatoris est, postquam sunt in seipsis, ut non sint. Sic igitur per potentiam quae est in altero, scilicet in Deo, sunt mutabiles, inquantum ab ipso ex nihilo potuerunt produci in esse, et de esse possunt reduci in non esse.

If, however, a thing is called mutable by a power in itself, thus also in some manner every creature is mutable. For every creature has a twofold power, active and passive; and I call that power passive which enables anything to attain its perfection either in being, or in attaining to its end. Now if the mutability of a thing be considered according to its power for being, in that way all creatures are not mutable, but those only in which what is potential in them is consistent with non-being. Hence, in the inferior bodies there is mutability both as regards substantial being, inasmuch as their matter can exist with privation of their substantial form, and also as regards their accidental being, supposing the subject to coexist with privation of accident; as, for example, this subject "man" can exist with "not-whiteness" and can therefore be changed from white to not-white. But supposing the accident to be such as to follow on the essential principles of the subject, then the privation of such an accident cannot coexist with the subject. Hence the subject cannot be changed as regards that kind of accident; as, for example, snow cannot be made black. Now in the celestial bodies matter is not consistent with privation of form, because the form perfects the whole potentiality of the matter; therefore these bodies are not mutable as to substantial being, but only as to locality, because the subject is consistent with privation of this or that place. On the other hand incorporeal substances, being subsistent forms which, although with respect to their own existence are as potentiality to act, are not consistent with the privation of this act; forasmuch as existence is consequent upon form, and nothing corrupts except it lose its form. Hence in the form itself there is no power to non-existence; and so these kinds of substances are immutable and invariable as regards their existence.

Si autem dicatur aliquid mutabile per potentiam in ipso existentem, sic etiam aliquo modo omnis creatura est mutabilis. Est enim in creatura duplex potentia, scilicet activa et passiva. Dico autem potentiam passivam, secundum quam aliquid assequi potest suam perfectionem, vel in essendo vel in consequendo finem. Si igitur attendatur mutabilitas rei secundum potentiam ad esse, sic non in omnibus creaturis est mutabilitas, sed in illis solum in quibus illud quod est possibile in eis, potest stare cum non esse. Unde in corporibus inferioribus est mutabilitas et secundum esse substantiale, quia materia eorum potest esse cum privatione formae substantialis ipsorum, et quantum ad esse accidentale, si subiectum compatiatur secum privationem accidentis; sicut hoc subiectum, homo, compatitur secum non album, et ideo potest mutari de albo in non album. Si vero sit tale accidens quod consequatur principia essentialia subiecti, privatio illius accidentis non potest stare cum subiecto, unde subiectum non potest mutari secundum illud accidens, sicut nix non potest fieri nigra. In corporibus vero caelestibus, materia non compatitur secum privationem formae, quia forma perficit totam potentialitatem materiae, et ideo non sunt mutabilia secundum esse substantiale; sed secundum esse locale, quia subiectum compatitur secum privationem huius loci vel illius. Substantiae vero incorporeae, quia sunt ipsae formae subsistentes, quae tamen se habent ad esse ipsarum sicut potentia ad actum, non compatiuntur secum privationem huius actus, quia esse consequitur formam, et nihil corrumpitur nisi per hoc quod amittit formam. Unde in ipsa forma non est potentia ad non esse, et ideo huiusmodi substantiae sunt immutabiles et invariabiles secundum esse. Et hoc est quod dicit Dionysius, IV cap. de Div. Nom., quod *substantiae intellectuales creatae mundae sunt a generatione et ab omni variatione,*

Wherefore Dionysius says (Div. Nom. iv) that "intellectual created substances are pure from generation and from every variation, as also are incorporeal and immaterial substances." Still, there remains in them a twofold mutability: one as regards their potentiality to their end; and in that way there is in them a mutability according to choice from good to evil, as Damascene says (De Fide ii, 3,4); the other as regards place, inasmuch as by their finite power they attain to certain fresh places---which cannot be said of God, who by His infinity fills all places, as was shown above (Q[8], A[2]).

sicut incorporales et immateriales. Sed tamen remanet in eis duplex mutabilitas. Una secundum quod sunt in potentia ad finem, et sic est in eis mutabilitas secundum electionem de bono in malum, ut Damascenus dicit. Alia secundum locum, inquantum virtute sua finita possunt attingere quaedam loca quae prius non attingebant, quod de Deo dici non potest, qui sua infinitate omnia loca replet, ut supra dictum est.

Thus in every creature there is a potentiality to change either as regards substantial being as in the case of things corruptible; or as regards locality only, as in the case of the celestial bodies; or as regards the order to their end, and the application of their powers to divers objects, as in the case with the angels; and universally all creatures generally are mutable by the power of the Creator, in Whose power is their existence and non-existence. Hence since God is in none of these ways mutable, it belongs to Him alone to be altogether immutable.

Sic igitur in omni creatura est potentia ad mutationem, vel secundum esse substantiale, sicut corpora corruptibilia; vel secundum esse locale tantum, sicut corpora caelestia, vel secundum ordinem ad finem et applicationem virtutis ad diversa, sicut in Angelis. Et universaliter omnes creaturae communiter sunt mutabiles secundum potentiam creantis, in cuius potestate est esse et non esse earum. Unde, cum Deus nullo istorum modorum sit mutabilis, proprium eius est omnino immutabilem esse.

Reply to Objection 1: This objection proceeds from mutability as regards substantial or accidental being; for philosophers treated of such movement.

[28585] Iª q. 9 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod obiectio illa procedit de eo quod est mutabile secundum esse substantiale vel accidentale, de tali enim motu philosophi tractaverunt.

Reply to Objection 2: The good angels, besides their natural endowment of immutability of being, have also immutability of election by divine power; nevertheless there remains in them mutability as regards place.

[28586] Iª q. 9 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod Angeli boni, supra immutabilitatem essendi, quae competit eis secundum naturam, habent immutabilitatem electionis ex divina virtute, tamen remanet in eis mutabilitas secundum locum.

Reply to Objection 3: Forms are called invariable, forasmuch as they cannot be subjects of variation; but they are subject to variation because by them their subject is variable. Hence it is clear that they vary in so far as they are; for they are not called beings as though they were the subject of being, but because through them something has being.

[28587] Iª q. 9 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod formae dicuntur invariabiles, quia non possunt esse subiectum variationis, subiiciuntur tamen variationi, inquantum subiectum secundum eas variatur. Unde patet quod secundum quod sunt, sic variantur, non enim dicuntur entia quasi sint subiectum essendi, sed quia eis aliquid est.

Question 10. THE ETERNITY OF GOD (SIX ARTICLES)

We must now consider the eternity of God, concerning which arise six points of inquiry:

(1) What is eternity?

(2) Whether God is eternal?

(3) Whether to be eternal belongs to God alone?

(4) Whether eternity differs from time?

(5) The difference of aeviternity, as there is one time, and one eternity?

[28588] Iª q. 10 pr. Deinde quaeritur de aeternitate. Et circa hoc quaeruntur sex. Primo, quid sit aeternitas. Secundo, utrum Deus sit aeternus. Tertio, utrum esse aeternum sit proprium Dei. Quarto, utrum aeternitas differat a tempore. Quinto, de differentia aevi et temporis. Sexto, utrum sit unum aevum tantum, sicut est unum tempus et una aeternitas.

Whether this is a good definition of eternity, "The simultaneously-whole and perfect possession of interminable life"?

Objection 1: It seems that the definition of eternity given by Boethius (De Consol. v) is not a good one: "Eternity is the simultaneously-whole and perfect possession of interminable life." For the word "interminable" is a negative one. But negation only belongs to what is defective, and this does not belong to eternity. Therefore in the definition of eternity the word "interminable" ought not to be found.

[28589] Iª q. 10 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod non sit conveniens definitio aeternitatis, quam Boetius ponit V de consolatione, dicens quod *aeternitas est interminabilis vitae tota simul et perfecta possessio*. Interminabile enim negative dicitur. Sed negatio non est de ratione nisi eorum quae sunt deficientia, quod aeternitati non competit. Ergo in definitione aeternitatis non debet poni interminabile.

Objection 2: Further, eternity signifies a certain kind of duration. But duration regards existence rather than life. Therefore the word "life" ought not to come into the definition of eternity; but rather the word "existence."

[28590] Iª q. 10 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, aeternitas durationem quandam significat. Duratio autem magis respicit esse quam vitam. Ergo non debuit poni in definitione aeternitatis vita, sed magis esse.

Objection 3: Further, a whole is what has parts. But this is alien to eternity which is simple. Therefore it is improperly said to be "whole."

[28591] Iª q. 10 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, totum dicitur quod habet partes. Hoc autem aeternitati non convenit, cum sit simplex. Ergo inconvenienter dicitur tota.

Objection 4: Many days cannot occur together, nor can many times exist all at once. But in eternity, days and times are in the plural, for it is said, "His going forth is from the beginning, from the days of eternity" (Micah 5:2); and also it is said, "According to the revelation of the mystery hidden from eternity" (Rom. 16:25). Therefore eternity is not omni-simultaneous.

[28592] Iª q. 10 a. 1 arg. 4 Praeterea, plures dies non possunt esse simul, nec plura tempora. Sed in aeternitate pluraliter dicuntur dies et tempora, dicitur enim Micheae V, *egressus eius ab initio, a diebus aeternitatis*; et ad Rom., XVI cap., *secundum revelationem mysterii temporibus aeternis taciti*. Ergo aeternitas non est tota simul.

Objection 5: Further, the whole and the perfect are the same thing. Supposing, therefore, that it is "whole," it is superfluously described as "perfect."

[28593] Iª q. 10 a. 1 arg. 5 Praeterea, totum et perfectum sunt idem. Posito igitur quod sit tota, superflue additur quod sit perfecta.

Objection 6: Further, duration does not imply "possession." But eternity is a kind of duration. Therefore eternity is not possession.

[28594] Iª q. 10 a. 1 arg. 6 Praeterea, possessio ad durationem non pertinet. Aeternitas autem quaedam duratio est. Ergo aeternitas non est possessio.

I answer that, As we attain to the knowledge of simple things by way of compound things, so must we reach to the knowledge of eternity by means of time, which is nothing but the numbering of movement by "before" and "after." For since succession occurs in every movement, and one part comes after another, the fact that we reckon before and after in movement, makes us apprehend time, which is nothing else but the measure of before and after in movement. Now in a thing bereft of movement, which is always the same, there is no before or after. As therefore the idea of time consists in the numbering of before and after in movement; so likewise in the apprehension of the uniformity of what is outside of movement, consists the idea of eternity.

[28595] Iª q. 10 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut in cognitionem simplicium oportet nos venire per composita, ita in cognitionem aeternitatis oportet nos venire per tempus; quod nihil aliud est quam numerus motus secundum prius et posterius. Cum enim in quolibet motu sit successio, et una pars post alteram, ex hoc quod numeramus prius et posterius in motu, apprehendimus tempus; quod nihil aliud est quam numerus prioris et posterioris in motu. In eo autem quod caret motu, et semper eodem modo se habet, non est accipere prius et posterius. Sicut igitur ratio temporis consistit in numeratione prioris et posterioris in motu, ita in apprehensione uniformitatis eius quod est omnino extra motum, consistit ratio aeternitatis.

Further, those things are said to be measured by time which have a beginning and an end in time, because in everything which is moved there is a beginning, and there is an end. But as whatever is wholly immutable can have no succession, so it has no beginning, and no end.

Item, ea dicuntur tempore mensurari, quae principium et finem habent in tempore, ut dicitur in IV Physic., et hoc ideo, quia in omni eo quod movetur est accipere aliquod principium et aliquem finem. Quod vero est omnino immutabile, sicut nec successionem, ita nec principium aut finem habere potest.

Thus eternity is known from two sources: first, because what is eternal is interminable---that is, has no beginning nor end (that is, no term either way); secondly, because eternity has no succession, being simultaneously whole.

Sic ergo ex duobus notificatur aeternitas. Primo, ex hoc quod id quod est in aeternitate, est interminabile, idest principio et fine carens (ut terminus ad utrumque referatur). Secundo, per hoc quod ipsa aeternitas successione caret, tota simul existens.

Reply to Objection 1: Simple things are usually defined by way of negation; as "a point is that which has no parts." Yet this is not to be taken as if the negation belonged to their essence, but because our intellect which first apprehends compound things, cannot attain to the knowledge of simple things except by removing the opposite.

[28596] Iª q. 10 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod simplicia consueverunt per negationem definiri, sicut punctus est cuius pars non est. Quod non ideo est, quod negatio sit de essentia eorum, sed quia intellectus noster, qui primo apprehendit composita, in cognitionem simplicium pervenire non potest, nisi per remotionem compositionis.

Reply to Objection 2: What is truly eternal, is not only being, but also living; and life extends to operation, which is not true of being. Now the protraction of duration seems to belong to operation rather than to being; hence time is the numbering of movement.

[28597] Iª q. 10 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod illud quod est vere aeternum, non solum est ens, sed vivens, et ipsum vivere se extendit quodammodo ad operationem, non autem esse. Protensio autem durationis videtur attendi secundum operationem, magis quam secundum esse, unde et tempus est numerus motus.

Reply to Objection 3: Eternity is called whole, not because it has parts, but because it is wanting in nothing.

[28598] Iª q. 10 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod aeternitas dicitur tota, non quia habet partes, sed inquantum nihil ei deest.

Reply to Objection 4: As God, although incorporeal, is named in Scripture metaphorically by corporeal names, so eternity though

[28599] Iª q. 10 a. 1 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod, sicut Deus, cum sit incorporeus, nominibus rerum corporalium metaphorice in Scripturis

simultaneously whole, is called by names implying time and succession.

nominatur, sic aeternitas, tota simul existens, nominibus temporalibus successivis.

Reply to Objection 5: Two things are to be considered in time: time itself, which is successive; and the "now" of time, which is imperfect. Hence the expression "simultaneously-whole" is used to remove the idea of time, and the word "perfect" is used to exclude the "now" of time.

[28600] Iª q. 10 a. 1 ad 5 Ad quintum dicendum quod in tempore est duo considerare, scilicet ipsum tempus, quod est successivum; et nunc temporis, quod est imperfectum. Dicit ergo tota simul, ad removendum tempus, et perfecta, ad excludendum nunc temporis.

Reply to Objection 6: Whatever is possessed, is held firmly and quietly; therefore to designate the immutability and permanence of eternity, we use the word "possession."

[28601] Iª q. 10 a. 1 ad 6 Ad sextum dicendum quod illud quod possidetur, firmiter et quiete habetur. Ad designandam ergo immutabilitatem et indeficientiam aeternitatis, usus est nomine possessionis.

Whether God is eternal?

Objection 1: It seems that God is not eternal. For nothing made can be predicated of God; for Boethius says (De Trin. iv) that, "The now that flows away makes time, the now that stands still makes eternity;" and Augustine says (Octog. Tri. Quaest. qu. 28) "that God is the author of eternity." Therefore God is not eternal.

[28602] Iª q. 10 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Deus non sit aeternus. Nihil enim factum potest dici de Deo. Sed aeternitas est aliquid factum, dicit enim Boetius quod *nunc fluens facit tempus, nunc stans facit aeternitatem*; et Augustinus dicit, in libro octoginta trium quaest., quod Deus est auctor aeternitatis. Ergo Deus non est aeternus.

Objection 2: Further, what is before eternity, and after eternity, is not measured by eternity. But, as Aristotle says (De Causis), "God is before eternity and He is after eternity": for it is written that "the Lord shall reign for eternity, and beyond [*Douay: 'for ever and ever']" (Ex. 15:18). Therefore to be eternal does not belong to God.

[28603] Iª q. 10 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, quod est ante aeternitatem et post aeternitatem, non mensuratur aeternitate. Sed Deus est ante aeternitatem, ut dicitur in libro de causis, et post aeternitatem; dicitur enim Exod. XV, quod *dominus regnabit in aeternum et ultra*. Ergo esse aeternum non convenit Deo.

Objection 3: Further, eternity is a kind of measure. But to be measured belongs not to God. Therefore it does not belong to Him to be eternal.

[28604] Iª q. 10 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, aeternitas mensura quaedam est. Sed Deo non convenit esse mensuratum. Ergo non competit ei esse aeternum.

Objection 4: Further, in eternity, there is no present, past or future, since it is simultaneously whole; as was said in the preceding article. But words denoting present, past and future time are applied to God in Scripture. Therefore God is not eternal.

[28605] Iª q. 10 a. 2 arg. 4 Praeterea, in aeternitate non est praesens, praeteritum vel futurum cum sit tota simul, ut dictum est. Sed de Deo dicuntur in Scripturis verba praesentis temporis, praeteriti vel futuri. Ergo Deus non est aeternus.

On the contrary, Athanasius says in his Creed: "The Father is eternal, the Son is eternal, the Holy Ghost is eternal."

[28606] Iª q. 10 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicit Athanasius, *aeternus pater, aeternus filius, aeternus spiritus sanctus*.

I answer that, The idea of eternity follows immutability, as the idea of time follows movement, as appears from the preceding article. Hence, as God is supremely immutable, it supremely belongs to Him to be eternal. Nor is He eternal only; but He is His own eternity; whereas, no other being is its own duration, as no other is its own being. Now God is His own uniform being; and hence as He is His own essence, so He is His own eternity.

[28607] Iª q. 10 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod ratio aeternitatis consequitur immutabilitatem, sicut ratio temporis consequitur motum, ut ex dictis patet. Unde, cum Deus sit maxime immutabilis, sibi maxime competit esse aeternum. Nec solum est aeternus, sed est sua aeternitas, cum tamen nulla alia res sit sua duratio, quia non est suum esse. Deus autem est suum esse uniforme, unde, sicut est sua essentia, ita est sua aeternitas.

Reply to Objection 1: The "now" that stands still, is said to make eternity according to our apprehension. As the apprehension of time is caused in us by the fact that we apprehend the flow of the "now," so the apprehension of eternity is caused in us by our apprehending the "now" standing still. When Augustine says that "God is the author of eternity," this is to be understood of participated eternity. For God communicates His eternity to some in the same way as He communicates His immutability.

[28608] Iª q. 10 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod nunc stans dicitur facere aeternitatem, secundum nostram apprehensionem. Sicut enim causatur in nobis apprehensio temporis, eo quod apprehendimus fluxum ipsius nunc, ita causatur in nobis apprehensio aeternitatis, inquantum apprehendimus nunc stans. Quod autem dicit Augustinus, quod *Deus est auctor aeternitatis*, intelligitur de aeternitate participata, eo enim modo communicat Deus suam aeternitatem aliquibus, quo et suam immutabilitatem.

Reply to Objection 2: From this appears the answer to the Second Objection. For God is said to be before eternity, according as it is shared by immaterial substances. Hence, also, in the same book, it is said that "intelligence is equal to eternity." In

[28609] Iª q. 10 a. 2 ad 2 Et per hoc patet solutio ad secundum. Nam Deus dicitur esse ante aeternitatem, prout participatur a substantiis immaterialibus. Unde et ibidem dicitur, quod *intelligentia parificatur aeternitati*. Quod autem dicitur in Exodo, *dominus regnabit*

the words of Exodus, "The Lord shall reign for eternity, and beyond," eternity stands for age, as another rendering has it. Thus it is said that the Lord will reign beyond eternity, inasmuch as He endures beyond every age, i.e. beyond every kind of duration. For age is nothing more than the period of each thing, as is said in the book De Coelo i. Or to reign beyond eternity can be taken to mean that if any other thing were conceived to exist for ever, as the movement of the heavens according to some philosophers, then God would still reign beyond, inasmuch as His reign is simultaneously whole.

in aeternum et ultra sciendum quod aeternum accipitur ibi pro saeculo, sicut habet alia translatio. Sic igitur dicitur quod regnabit ultra aeternum, quia durat ultra quodcumque saeculum, idest ultra quamcumque durationem datam, nihil est enim aliud saeculum quam periodus cuiuslibet rei, ut dicitur in libro I de caelo. Vel dicitur etiam ultra aeternum regnare, quia, si etiam aliquid aliud semper esset (ut motus caeli secundum quosdam philosophos), tamen Deus ultra regnat, inquantum eius regnum est totum simul.

Reply to Objection 3: Eternity is nothing else but God Himself. Hence God is not called eternal, as if He were in any way measured; but the idea of measurement is there taken according to the apprehension of our mind alone.

[28610] Iª q. 10 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod aeternitas non est aliud quam ipse Deus. Unde non dicitur Deus aeternus, quasi sit aliquo modo mensuratus, sed accipitur ibi ratio mensurae secundum apprehensionem nostram tantum.

Reply to Objection 4: Words denoting different times are applied to God, because His eternity includes all times; not as if He Himself were altered through present, past and future.

[28611] Iª q. 10 a. 2 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod verba diversorum temporum attribuuntur Deo, inquantum eius aeternitas omnia tempora includit, non quod ipse varietur per praesens, praeteritum et futurum.

Whether to be eternal belongs to God alone?

Objection 1: It seems that it does not belong to God alone to be eternal. For it is written that "those who instruct many to justice," shall be "as stars unto perpetual eternities [*Douay: 'for all eternity']" (Dan. 12:3). Now if God alone were eternal, there could not be many eternities. Therefore God alone is not the only eternal.

[28612] Iª q. 10 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod esse aeternum non sit soli Deo proprium. Dicitur enim Danielis XII, quod *qui ad iustitiam erudiunt plurimos, erunt quasi stellae in perpetuas aeternitates*. Non autem essent plures aeternitates, si solus Deus esset aeternus. Non igitur solus Deus est aeternus.

Objection 2: Further, it is written "Depart, ye cursed into eternal [Douay:

[28613] Iª q. 10 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, Matth. XXV dicitur, *ite, maledicti, in ignem*

'everlasting'] fire" (Mat. 25:41). Therefore God is not the only eternal.

aeternum. Non igitur solus Deus est aeternus.

Objection 3: Further, every necessary thing is eternal. But there are many necessary things; as, for instance, all principles of demonstration and all demonstrative propositions. Therefore God is not the only eternal.

[28614] Iª q. 10 a. 3 arg. 3 Praeterea, omne necessarium est aeternum. Sed multa sunt necessaria; sicut omnia principia demonstrationis, et omnes propositiones demonstrativae. Ergo non solus Deus est aeternus.

On the contrary, Jerome says (Ep. ad Damasum. xv) that "God is the only one who has no beginning." Now whatever has a beginning, is not eternal. Therefore God is the only one eternal.

[28615] Iª q. 10 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicit Hieronymus, ad Marcellam, *Deus solus est qui exordium non habet*. Quidquid autem exordium habet, non est aeternum. Solus ergo Deus est aeternus.

I answer that, Eternity truly and properly so called is in God alone, because eternity follows on immutability; as appears from the first article. But God alone is altogether immutable, as was shown above (Q[9], A[1]). Accordingly, however, as some receive immutability from Him, they share in His eternity. Thus some receive immutability from God in the way of never ceasing to exist; in that sense it is said of the earth, "it standeth for ever" (Eccles. 1:4). Again, some things are called eternal in Scripture because of the length of their duration, although they are in nature corruptible; thus (Ps. 75:5) the hills are called "eternal" and we read "of the fruits of the eternal hills." (Dt. 33:15). Some again, share more fully than others in the nature of eternity, inasmuch as they possess unchangeableness either in being or further still in operation; like the angels, and the blessed, who enjoy the Word, because "as regards that vision of the Word, no changing thoughts exist in the Saints," as Augustine says (De Trin. xv). Hence those who see God are said to have eternal life; according to that text, "This is eternal life, that they may know Thee the only true God," etc. (Jn. 17:3).

[28616] Iª q. 10 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod aeternitas vere et proprie in solo Deo est. Quia aeternitas immutabilitatem consequitur, ut ex dictis patet. Solus autem Deus est omnino immutabilis, ut est superius ostensum. Secundum tamen quod aliqua ab ipso immutabilitatem percipiunt, secundum hoc aliqua eius aeternitatem participant. Quaedam ergo quantum ad hoc immutabilitatem sortiuntur a Deo, quod nunquam esse desinunt, et secundum hoc dicitur Eccle. I de terra, quod in aeternum stat. Quaedam etiam aeterna in Scripturis dicuntur propter diuturnitatem durationis, licet corruptibilia sint, sicut in Psalmo dicuntur montes aeterni; et Deuter. XXXIII etiam dicitur, de pomis collium aeternorum. Quaedam autem amplius participant de ratione aeternitatis, inquantum habent intransmutabilitatem vel secundum esse, vel ulterius secundum operationem, sicut Angeli et beati, qui verbo fruuntur, quia quantum ad illam visionem verbi, non sunt in sanctis volubiles cogitationes, ut dicit Augustinus, XV de Trin. Unde et videntes Deum dicuntur habere vitam aeternam, secundum illud Ioann. XVII, *haec est vita aeterna, ut cognoscant* et cetera.

Reply to Objection 1: There are said to be many eternities, accordingly as many share in eternity, by the contemplation of God.

[28617] Iª q. 10 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod dicuntur multae aeternitates, secundum quod sunt multi participantes aeternitatem ex ipsa Dei contemplatione.

Reply to Objection 2: The fire of hell is called eternal, only because it never ends. Still, there is change in the pains of the lost, according to the words "To extreme heat they will pass from snowy waters" (Job 24:19). Hence in hell true eternity does not exist, but rather time; according to the text of the Psalm "Their time will be for ever" (Ps. 80:16).

[28618] Iª q. 10 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod ignis Inferni dicitur aeternus propter interminabilitatem tantum. Est tamen in poenis eorum transmutatio, secundum illud Iob XXIV, *ad nimium calorem transibunt ab aquis nivium*. Unde in Inferno non est vera aeternitas, sed magis tempus; secundum illud Psalmi, *erit tempus eorum in saecula*.

Reply to Objection 3: Necessary means a certain mode of truth; and truth, according to the Philosopher (Metaph. vi), is in the mind. Therefore in this sense the true and necessary are eternal, because they are in the eternal mind, which is the divine intellect alone; hence it does not follow that anything beside God is eternal.

[28619] Iª q. 10 a. 3 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod necessarium significat quendam modum veritatis. Verum autem, secundum philosophum, VI Metaphys., est in intellectu. Secundum hoc igitur vera et necessaria sunt aeterna, quia sunt in intellectu aeterno, qui est intellectus divinus solus. Unde non sequitur quod aliquid extra Deum sit aeternum.

Whether eternity differs from time?

Objection 1: It seems that eternity does not differ from time. For two measures of duration cannot exist together, unless one is part of the other; for instance two days or two hours cannot be together; nevertheless, we may say that a day or an hour are together, considering hour as part of a day. But eternity and time occur together, each of which imports a certain measure of duration. Since therefore eternity is not a part of time, forasmuch as eternity exceeds time, and includes it, it seems that time is a part of eternity, and is not a different thing from eternity.

[28620] Iª q. 10 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod aeternitas non sit aliud a tempore. Impossibile est enim duas esse mensuras durationis simul, nisi una sit pars alterius, non enim sunt simul duo dies vel duae horae; sed dies et hora sunt simul, quia hora est pars diei. Sed aeternitas et tempus sunt simul, quorum utrumque mensuram quandam durationis importat. Cum igitur aeternitas non sit pars temporis, quia aeternitas excedit tempus et includit ipsum; videtur quod tempus sit pars aeternitatis, et non aliud ab aeternitate.

Objection 2: Further, according to the Philosopher (Phys. iv), the "now" of

[28621] Iª q. 10 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, secundum philosophum in IV Physic.,

time remains the same in the whole of time. But the nature of eternity seems to be that it is the same indivisible thing in the whole space of time. Therefore eternity is the "now" of time. But the "now" of time is not substantially different from time. Therefore eternity is not substantially different from time.

nunc temporis manet idem in toto tempore. Sed hoc videtur constituere rationem aeternitatis, quod sit idem indivisibiliter se habens in toto decursu temporis. Ergo aeternitas est nunc temporis. Sed nunc temporis non est aliud secundum substantiam a tempore. Ergo aeternitas non est aliud secundum substantiam a tempore.

Objection 3: Further, as the measure of the first movement is the measure of every movement, as said in Phys. iv, it thus appears that the measure of the first being is that of every being. But eternity is the measure of the first being---that is, of the divine being. Therefore eternity is the measure of every being. But the being of things corruptible is measured by time. Time therefore is either eternity or is a part of eternity.

[28622] Iª q. 10 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, sicut mensura primi motus est mensura omnium motuum, ut dicitur in IV Physic., ita videtur quod mensura primi esse sit mensura omnis esse. Sed aeternitas est mensura primi esse, quod est esse divinum. Ergo aeternitas est mensura omnis esse. Sed esse rerum corruptibilium mensuratur tempore. Ergo tempus vel est aeternitas, vel aliquid aeternitatis.

On the contrary, Eternity is simultaneously whole. But time has a "before" and an "after." Therefore time and eternity are not the same thing.

[28623] Iª q. 10 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra est quod aeternitas est tota simul, in tempore autem est prius et posterius. Ergo tempus et aeternitas non sunt idem.

I answer that, It is manifest that time and eternity are not the same. Some have founded this difference on the fact that eternity has neither beginning nor an end; whereas time has a beginning and an end. This, however, makes a merely accidental, and not an absolute difference because, granted that time always was and always will be, according to the idea of those who think the movement of the heavens goes on for ever, there would yet remain a difference between eternity and time, as Boethius says (De Consol. v), arising from the fact that eternity is simultaneously whole; which cannot be applied to time: for eternity is the measure of a permanent being; while time is a measure of movement. Supposing, however, that the aforesaid difference be considered on the part of

[28624] Iª q. 10 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod manifestum est tempus et aeternitatem non esse idem. Sed huius diversitatis rationem quidam assignaverunt ex hoc quod aeternitas caret principio et fine, tempus autem habet principium et finem. Sed haec est differentia per accidens, et non per se. Quia dato quod tempus semper fuerit et semper futurum sit, secundum positionem eorum qui motum caeli ponunt sempiternum, adhuc remanebit differentia inter aeternitatem et tempus, ut dicit Boetius in libro de Consolat., ex hoc quod aeternitas est tota simul, quod tempori non convenit, quia aeternitas est mensura esse permanentis, tempus vero est mensura motus. Si tamen praedicta differentia attendatur quantum ad mensurata, et non quantum ad mensuras, sic habet

the things measured, and not as regards the measures, then there is some reason for it, inasmuch as that alone is measured by time which has beginning and end in time. Hence, if the movement of the heavens lasted always, time would not be of its measure as regards the whole of its duration, since the infinite is not measurable; but it would be the measure of that part of its revolution which has beginning and end in time.

aliquam rationem, quia solum illud mensuratur tempore, quod habet principium et finem in tempore, ut dicitur in IV Physic. Unde si motus caeli semper duraret, tempus non mensuraret ipsum secundum suam totam durationem, cum infinitum non sit mensurabile; sed mensuraret quamlibet circulationem, quae habet principium et finem in tempore.

Another reason for the same can be taken from these measures in themselves, if we consider the end and the beginning as potentialities; because, granted also that time always goes on, yet it is possible to note in time both the beginning and the end, by considering its parts: thus we speak of the beginning and the end of a day or of a year; which cannot be applied to eternity. Still these differences follow upon the essential and primary differences, that eternity is simultaneously whole, but that time is not so.

Potest tamen et aliam rationem habere ex parte istarum mensurarum, si accipiatur finis et principium in potentia. Quia etiam dato quod tempus semper duret, tamen possibile est signare in tempore et principium et finem, accipiendo aliquas partes ipsius, sicut dicimus principium et finem diei vel anni, quod non contingit in aeternitate. Sed tamen istae differentiae consequuntur eam quae est per se et primo, differentiam, per hoc quod aeternitas est tota simul, non autem tempus.

Reply to Objection 1: Such a reason would be a valid one if time and eternity were the same kind of measure; but this is seen not to be the case when we consider those things of which the respective measures are time and eternity.

[28625] Iª q. 10 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod ratio illa procederet, si tempus et aeternitas essent mensurae unius generis, quod patet esse falsum, ex his quorum est tempus et aeternitas mensura.

Reply to Objection 2: The "now" of time is the same as regards its subject in the whole course of time, but it differs in aspect; for inasmuch as time corresponds to movement, its "now" corresponds to what is movable; and the thing movable has the same one subject in all time, but differs in aspect a being here and there; and such alteration is movement. Likewise the flow of the "now" as alternating in aspect is time. But eternity remains the same according to both subject and

[28626] Iª q. 10 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod nunc temporis est idem subiecto in toto tempore, sed differens ratione, eo quod, sicut tempus respondet motui, ita nunc temporis respondet mobili; mobile autem est idem subiecto in toto decursu temporis, sed differens ratione, inquantum est hic et ibi. Et ista alternatio est motus. Similiter fluxus ipsius nunc, secundum quod alternatur ratione, est tempus. Aeternitas autem manet eadem et subiecto et ratione.

aspect; and hence eternity is not the same as the "now" of time.

Unde aeternitas non est idem quod nunc temporis.

Reply to Objection 3: As eternity is the proper measure of permanent being, so time is the proper measure of movement; and hence, according as any being recedes from permanence of being, and is subject to change, it recedes from eternity, and is subject to time. Therefore the being of things corruptible, because it is changeable, is not measured by eternity, but by time; for time measures not only things actually changed, but also things changeable; hence it not only measures movement but it also measures repose, which belongs to whatever is naturally movable, but is not actually in motion.

[28627] Iª q. 10 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, sicut aeternitas est propria mensura ipsius esse, ita tempus est propria mensura motus. Unde secundum quod aliquod esse recedit a permanentia essendi et subditur transmutationi, secundum hoc recedit ab aeternitate et subditur tempori. Esse ergo rerum corruptibilium, quia est transmutabile, non mensuratur aeternitate, sed tempore. Tempus enim mensurat non solum quae transmutantur in actu, sed quae sunt transmutabilia. Unde non solum mensurat motum, sed etiam quietem; quae est eius quod natum est moveri, et non movetur.

The difference of aeviternity and time

Objection 1: It seems that aeviternity is the same as time. For Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. viii, 20,22,23), that "God moves the spiritual through time." But aeviternity is said to be the measure of spiritual substances. Therefore time is the same as aeviternity.

[28628] Iª q. 10 a. 5 arg. 1 Ad quintum sic proceditur. Videtur quod aevum non sit aliud a tempore. Dicit enim Augustinus, VIII super Gen. ad Litt., quod *Deus movet creaturam spiritualem per tempus*. Sed aevum dicitur esse mensura spiritualium substantiarum. Ergo tempus non differt ab aevo.

Objection 2: Further, it is essential to time to have "before" and "after"; but it is essential to eternity to be simultaneously whole, as was shown above in the first article. Now aeviternity is not eternity; for it is written (Ecclus. 1:1) that eternal "Wisdom is before age." Therefore it is not simultaneously whole but has "before" and "after"; and thus it is the same as time.

[28629] Iª q. 10 a. 5 arg. 2 Praeterea, de ratione temporis est quod habeat prius et posterius, de ratione vero aeternitatis est quod sit tota simul, ut dictum est. Sed aevum non est aeternitas, dicitur enim Eccli. I, quod sapientia aeterna est ante aevum. Ergo non est totum simul, sed habet prius et posterius, et ita est tempus.

Objection 3: Further, if there is no "before" and "after" in aeviternity, it follows that in aeviternal things there is no difference between being, having been, or going to be. Since then it is

[28630] Iª q. 10 a. 5 arg. 3 Praeterea, si in aevo non est prius et posterius, sequitur quod in aeviternis non differat esse vel fuisse vel futurum esse. Cum igitur sit impossibile aeviterna non

impossible for aeviternal things not to have been, it follows that it is impossible for them not to be in the future; which is false, since God can reduce them to nothing.

fuisse, sequitur quod impossibile sit ea non futura esse. Quod falsum est, cum Deus possit ea reducere in nihilum.

Objection 4: Further, since the duration of aeviternal things is infinite as to subsequent duration, if aeviternity is simultaneously whole, it follows that some creature is actually infinite; which is impossible. Therefore aeviternity does not differ from time.

[28631] Iª q. 10 a. 5 arg. 4 Praeterea, cum duratio aeviternorum sit infinita ex parte post, si aevum sit totum simul, sequitur quod aliquod creatum sit infinitum in actu, quod est impossibile. Non igitur aevum differt a tempore.

On the contrary, Boethius says (De Consol. iii) "Who commandest time to be separate from aeviternity."

[28632] Iª q. 10 a. 5 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicit Boetius, *qui tempus ab aevo ire iubes*.

I answer that, Aeviternity differs from time, and from eternity, as the mean between them both. This difference is explained by some to consist in the fact that eternity has neither beginning nor end, aeviternity, a beginning but no end, and time both beginning and end. This difference, however, is but an accidental one, as was shown above, in the preceding article; because even if aeviternal things had always been, and would always be, as some think, and even if they might sometimes fail to be, which is possible to God to allow; even granted this, aeviternity would still be distinguished from eternity, and from time.

[28633] Iª q. 10 a. 5 co. Respondeo dicendum quod aevum differt a tempore et ab aeternitate, sicut medium existens inter illa. Sed horum differentiam aliqui sic assignant, dicentes quod aeternitas principio et fine caret; aevum habet principium, sed non finem; tempus autem habet principium et finem. Sed haec differentia est per accidens, sicut supra dictum est, quia si etiam semper aeviterna fuissent et semper futura essent, ut aliqui ponunt; vel etiam si quandoque deficerent, quod Deo possibile esset, adhuc aevum distingueretur ab aeternitate et tempore.

Others assign the difference between these three to consist in the fact that eternity has no "before" and "after"; but that time has both, together with innovation and veteration; and that aeviternity has "before" and "after" without innovation and veteration. This theory, however, involves a contradiction; which manifestly appears if innovation and veteration be referred to the measure itself. For since "before" and "after" of duration cannot exist together, if aeviternity has

Alii vero assignant differentiam inter haec tria, per hoc quod aeternitas non habet prius et posterius; tempus autem habet prius et posterius cum innovatione et veteratione; aevum habet prius et posterius sine innovatione et veteratione. Sed haec positio implicat contradictoria. Quod quidem manifeste apparet, si innovatio et veteratio referantur ad ipsam mensuram. Cum enim prius et posterius durationis non possint esse simul, si aevum habet prius et

"before" and "after," it must follow that with the receding of the first part of aeviternity, the after part of aeviternity must newly appear; and thus innovation would occur in aeviternity itself, as it does in time. And if they be referred to the things measured, even then an incongruity would follow. For a thing which exists in time grows old with time, because it has a changeable existence, and from the changeableness of a thing measured, there follows "before" and "after" in the measure, as is clear from Phys. iv. Therefore the fact that an aeviternal thing is neither inveterate, nor subject to innovation, comes from its changelessness; and consequently its measure does not contain "before" and "after." We say then that since eternity is the measure of a permanent being, in so far as anything recedes from permanence of being, it recedes from eternity. Now some things recede from permanence of being, so that their being is subject to change, or consists in change; and these things are measured by time, as are all movements, and also the being of all things corruptible. But others recede less from permanence of being, forasmuch as their being neither consists in change, nor is the subject of change; nevertheless they have change annexed to them either actually or potentially. This appears in the heavenly bodies, the substantial being of which is unchangeable; and yet with unchangeable being they have changeableness of place. The same applies to the angels, who have an unchangeable being as regards their nature with changeableness as regards choice; moreover they have changeableness of intelligence, of affections and of places in their own degree. Therefore these are measured by aeviternity which is a mean between eternity and time. But the being that is measured by eternity is not changeable, nor is it annexed to change. In this way time has "before"

posterius, oportet quod, priore parte aevi recedente, posterior de novo adveniat, et sic erit innovatio in ipso aevo, sicut in tempore. Si vero referantur ad mensurata, adhuc sequitur inconveniens. Ex hoc enim res temporalis inveteratur tempore, quod habet esse transmutabile, et ex transmutabilitate mensurati, est prius et posterius in mensura, ut patet ex IV Physic. Si igitur ipsum aeviternum non sit inveterabile nec innovabile, hoc erit quia esse eius est intransmutabile. Mensura ergo eius non habebit prius et posterius. Est ergo dicendum quod, cum aeternitas sit mensura esse permanentis, secundum quod aliquid recedit a permanentia essendi, secundum hoc recedit ab aeternitate. Quaedam autem sic recedunt a permanentia essendi, quod esse eorum est subiectum transmutationis, vel in transmutatione consistit, et huiusmodi mensurantur tempore; sicut omnis motus, et etiam esse omnium corruptibilium. Quaedam vero recedunt minus a permanentia essendi, quia esse eorum nec in transmutatione consistit, nec est subiectum transmutationis, tamen habent transmutationem adiunctam, vel in actu vel in potentia. Sicut patet in corporibus caelestibus, quorum esse substantiale est intransmutabile; tamen esse intransmutabile habent cum transmutabilitate secundum locum. Et similiter patet de Angelis, quod habent esse intransmutabile cum transmutabilitate secundum electionem, quantum ad eorum naturam pertinet; et cum transmutabilitate intelligentiarum et affectionum, et locorum suo modo. Et ideo huiusmodi mensurantur aevo, quod est medium inter aeternitatem et tempus. Esse autem quod mensurat aeternitas, nec est mutabile, nec mutabilitati adiunctum. Sic ergo tempus habet prius et posterius, aevum autem non habet in se prius et posterius, sed ei coniungi possunt,

and "after"; aeviternity in itself has no "before" and "after," which can, however, be annexed to it; while eternity has neither "before" nor "after," nor is it compatible with such at all.

aeternitas autem non habet prius neque posterius, neque ea compatitur.

Reply to Objection 1: Spiritual creatures as regards successive affections and intelligences are measured by time. Hence also Augustine says (Gen. ad lit. viii, 20,22,23) that to be moved through time, is to be moved by affections. But as regards their nature they are measured by aeviternity; whereas as regards the vision of glory, they have a share of eternity.

[28634] Iª q. 10 a. 5 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod creaturae spirituales, quantum ad affectiones et intelligentias, in quibus est successio, mensurantur tempore. Unde et Augustinus ibidem dicit quod per tempus moveri, est per affectiones moveri. Quantum vero ad eorum esse naturale, mensurantur aevo. Sed quantum ad visionem gloriae, participant aeternitatem.

Reply to Objection 2: Aeviternity is simultaneously whole; yet it is not eternity, because "before" and "after" are compatible with it.

[28635] Iª q. 10 a. 5 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod aevum est totum simul, non tamen est aeternitas, quia compatitur secum prius et posterius.

Reply to Objection 3: In the very being of an angel considered absolutely, there is no difference of past and future, but only as regards accidental change. Now to say that an angel was, or is, or will be, is to be taken in a different sense according to the acceptation of our intellect, which apprehends the angelic existence by comparison with different parts of time. But when we say that an angel is, or was, we suppose something, which being supposed, its opposite is not subject to the divine power. Whereas when we say he will be, we do not as yet suppose anything. Hence, since the existence and non-existence of an angel considered absolutely is subject to the divine power, God can make the existence of an angel not future; but He cannot cause him not to be while he is, or not to have been, after he has been.

[28636] Iª q. 10 a. 5 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod in ipso esse Angeli in se considerato, non est differentia praeteriti et futuri, sed solum secundum adiunctas mutationes. Sed quod dicimus Angelum esse vel fuisse vel futurum esse, differt secundum acceptionem intellectus nostri, qui accipit esse Angeli per comparationem ad diversas partes temporis. Et cum dicit Angelum esse vel fuisse, supponit aliquid cum quo eius oppositum non subditur divinae potentiae, cum vero dicit futurum esse, nondum supponit aliquid. Unde, cum esse et non esse Angeli subsit divinae potentiae, absolute considerando, potest Deus facere quod esse Angeli non sit futurum, tamen non potest facere quod non sit dum est, vel quod non fuerit postquam fuit.

Reply to Objection 4: The duration of aeviternity is infinite, forasmuch as it is not finished by time. Hence, there is no incongruity in saying that a creature is infinite, inasmuch as it is not ended by any other creature.

[28637] Iª q. 10 a. 5 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod duratio aevi est infinita, quia non finitur tempore. Sic autem esse aliquod creatum infinitum, quod non finiatur quodam alio, non est inconveniens.

Whether there is only one aeviternity?

Objection 1: It seems that there is not only one aeviternity; for it is written in the apocryphal books of Esdras: "Majesty and power of ages are with Thee, O Lord."

[28638] Iª q. 10 a. 6 arg. 1 Ad sextum sic proceditur. Videtur quod non sit tantum unum aevum. Dicitur enim in apocryphis Esdrae, *maiestas et potestas aevorum est apud te, domine*.

Objection 2: Further, different genera have different measures. But some aeviternal things belong to the corporeal genus, as the heavenly bodies; and others are spiritual substances, as are the angels. Therefore there is not only one aeviternity.

[28639] Iª q. 10 a. 6 arg. 2 Praeterea, diversorum generum diversae sunt mensurae. Sed quaedam aeviterna sunt in genere corporalium, scilicet corpora caelestia, quaedam vero sunt spirituales substantiae, scilicet Angeli. Non ergo est unum aevum tantum.

Objection 3: Further, since aeviternity is a term of duration, where there is one aeviternity, there is also one duration. But not all aeviternal things have one duration, for some begin to exist after others; as appears in the case especially of human souls. Therefore there is not only one aeviternity.

[28640] Iª q. 10 a. 6 arg. 3 Praeterea, cum aevum sit nomen durationis, quorum est unum aevum, est una duratio. Sed non omnium aeviternorum est una duratio, quia quaedam post alia esse incipiunt, ut maxime patet in animabus humanis. Non est ergo unum aevum tantum.

Objection 4: Further, things not dependent on each other do not seem to have one measure of duration; for there appears to be one time for all temporal things; since the first movement, measured by time, is in some way the cause of all movement. But aeviternal things do not depend on each other, for one angel is not the cause of another angel. Therefore there is not only one aeviternity.

[28641] Iª q. 10 a. 6 arg. 4 Praeterea, ea quae non dependent ab invicem, non videntur habere unam mensuram durationis, propter hoc enim omnium temporalium videtur esse unum tempus, quia omnium motuum quodammodo causa est primus motus, qui prius tempore mensuratur. Sed aeviterna non dependent ab invicem, quia unus Angelus non est causa alterius. Non ergo est unum aevum tantum.

On the contrary, Aeviternity is a more simple thing than time, and is nearer to eternity. But time is one only. Therefore much more is aeviternity one only.

[28642] Iª q. 10 a. 6 s. c. Sed contra, aevum est simplicius tempore, et propinquius se habens ad aeternitatem. Sed tempus est unum tantum. Ergo multo magis aevum.

I answer that, A twofold opinion exists on this subject. Some say there is only one aeviternity; others that there are many aeviternities. Which of these is true, may be considered from the cause why time is one; for we can rise from corporeal things to the knowledge of spiritual things.

[28643] Iª q. 10 a. 6 co. Respondeo dicendum quod circa hoc est duplex opinio, quidam enim dicunt quod est unum aevum tantum; quidam quod multa. Quid autem horum verius sit, oportet considerare ex causa unitatis temporis, in cognitionem enim spiritualium per corporalia devenimus.

Now some say that there is only one time for temporal things, forasmuch as one number exists for all things numbered; as time is a number, according to the Philosopher (Phys. iv). This, however, is not a sufficient reason; because time is not a number abstracted from the thing numbered, but existing in the thing numbered; otherwise it would not be continuous; for ten ells of cloth are continuous not by reason of the number, but by reason of the thing numbered. Now number as it exists in the thing numbered, is not the same for all; but it is different for different things. Hence, others assert that the unity of eternity as the principle of all duration is the cause of the unity of time. Thus all durations are one in that view, in the light of their principle, but are many in the light of the diversity of things receiving duration from the influx of the first principle. On the other hand others assign primary matter as the cause why time is one; as it is the first subject of movement, the measure of which is time. Neither of these reasons, however, is sufficient; forasmuch as things which are one in principle, or in subject, especially if distant, are not one absolutely, but accidentally. Therefore the true reason why time is one, is to be found in the oneness of the first movement by

Dicunt autem quidam esse unum tempus omnium temporalium, propter hoc quod est unus numerus omnium numeratorum, cum tempus sit numerus, secundum philosophum. Sed hoc non sufficit, quia tempus non est numerus ut abstractus extra numeratum, sed ut in numerato existens, alioquin non esset continuus; quia decem ulnae panni continuitatem habent, non ex numero, sed ex numerato. Numerus autem in numerato existens non est idem omnium, sed diversus diversorum. Unde alii assignant causam unitatis temporis ex unitate aeternitatis, quae est principium omnis durationis. Et sic, omnes durationes sunt unum, si consideretur earum principium, sunt vero multae, si consideretur diversitas eorum quae recipiunt durationem ex influxu primi principii. Alii vero assignant causam unitatis temporis ex parte materiae primae, quae est primum subiectum motus, cuius mensura est tempus. Sed neutra assignatio sufficiens videtur, quia ea quae sunt unum principio vel subiecto, et maxime remoto, non sunt unum simpliciter sed secundum quid. Est ergo ratio unitatis temporis, unitas primi motus, secundum quem, cum sit simplicissimus, omnes alii mensurantur, ut dicitur in X Metaphys. Sic ergo tempus ad illum motum

which, since it is most simple, all other movements are measured. Therefore time is referred to that movement, not only as a measure is to the thing measured, but also as accident is to subject; and thus receives unity from it. Whereas to other movements it is compared only as the measure is to the thing measured. Hence it is not multiplied by their multitude, because by one separate measure many things can be measured.

comparatur non solum ut mensura ad mensuratum, sed etiam ut accidens ad subiectum; et sic ab eo recipit unitatem. Ad alios autem motus comparatur solum ut mensura ad mensuratum. Unde secundum eorum multitudinem non multiplicatur, quia una mensura separata multa mensurari possunt.

This being established, we must observe that a twofold opinion existed concerning spiritual substances. Some said that all proceeded from God in a certain equality, as Origen said (Peri Archon. i); or at least many of them, as some others thought. Others said that all spiritual substances proceeded from God in a certain degree and order; and Dionysius (Coel. Hier. x) seems to have thought so, when he said that among spiritual substances there are the first, the middle and the last; even in one order of angels. Now according to the first opinion, it must be said that there are many aeviternities as there are many aeviternal things of first degree. But according to the second opinion, it would be necessary to say that there is one aeviternity only; because since each thing is measured by the most simple element of its genus, it must be that the existence of all aeviternal things should be measured by the existence of the first aeviternal thing, which is all the more simple the nearer it is to the first. Wherefore because the second opinion is truer, as will be shown later (Q[47], A[2]); we concede at present that there is only one aeviternity.

Hoc igitur habito, sciendum quod de substantiis spiritualibus duplex fuit opinio. Quidam enim dixerunt quod omnes processerunt a Deo in quadam aequalitate, ut Origenes dixit; vel etiam multae earum, ut quidam posuerunt. Alii vero dixerunt quod omnes substantiae spirituales processerunt a Deo quodam gradu et ordine et hoc videtur sentire Dionysius, qui dicit, cap. X Cael. Hier., quod inter substantias spirituales sunt primae, mediae et ultimae, etiam in uno ordine Angelorum. Secundum igitur primam opinionem, necesse est dicere quod sunt plura aeva, secundum quod sunt plura aeviterna prima aequalia. Secundum autem secundam opinionem, oportet dicere quod sit unum aevum tantum, quia, cum unumquodque mensuretur simplicissimo sui generis, ut dicitur in X Metaphys., oportet quod esse omnium aeviternorum mensuretur esse primi aeviterni, quod tanto est simplicius, quanto prius. Et quia secunda opinio verior est, ut infra ostendetur, concedimus ad praesens unum esse aevum tantum.

Reply to Objection 1: Aeviternity is sometimes taken for age, that is, a space of a thing's duration; and thus we say many aeviternities when we mean ages.

[28644] Iª q. 10 a. 6 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod aevum aliquando accipitur pro saeculo, quod est periodus durationis alicuius rei, et sic

dicuntur multa aeva, sicut multa saecula.

Reply to Objection 2: Although the heavenly bodies and spiritual things differ in the genus of their nature, still they agree in having a changeless being, and are thus measured by aeviternity.

[28645] Iª q. 10 a. 6 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod, licet corpora caelestia et spiritualia differant in genere naturae, tamen conveniunt in hoc, quod habent esse intransmutabile. Et sic mensurantur aevo.

Reply to Objection 3: All temporal things did not begin together; nevertheless there is one time for all of them, by reason of the first measured by time; and thus all aeviternal things have one aeviternity by reason of the first, though all did not begin together.

[28646] Iª q. 10 a. 6 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod nec omnia temporalia simul incipiunt, et tamen omnium est unum tempus, propter primum quod mensuratur tempore. Et sic omnia aeviterna habent unum aevum propter primum, etiam si non omnia simul incipiant.

Reply to Objection 4: For things to be measured by one, it is not necessary that the one should be the cause of all, but that it be more simple than the rest.

[28647] Iª q. 10 a. 6 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod ad hoc quod aliqua mensurentur per aliquod unum, non requiritur quod illud unum sit causa omnium eorum; sed quod sit simplicius.

Question 11. THE UNITY OF GOD (FOUR ARTICLES)

After the foregoing, we consider the divine unity; concerning which there are four points of inquiry:

(1) Whether "one" adds anything to "being"?

(2) Whether "one" and "many" are opposed to each other?

(3) Whether God is one?

(4) Whether He is in the highest degree one?

[28648] Iª q. 11 pr. Post praemissa, considerandum est de divina unitate. Et circa hoc quaeruntur quatuor. Primo, utrum unum addat aliquid supra ens. Secundo, utrum opponantur unum et multa. Tertio, utrum Deus sit unus. Quarto, utrum sit maxime unus.

Whether "one" adds anything to "being"?

Objection 1: It seems that "one" adds something to "being." For everything is in a determinate genus by addition to being, which penetrates all "genera."

[28649] Iª q. 11 a. 1 arg. 1 Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod unum addat aliquid supra ens. Omne enim quod est in aliquo genere determinato,

But "one" is a determinate genus, for it is the principle of number, which is a species of quantity. Therefore "one" adds something to "being."

se habet ex additione ad ens, quod circuit omnia genera. Sed unum est in genere determinato, est enim principium numeri, qui est species quantitatis. Ergo unum addit aliquid supra ens.

Objection 2: Further, what divides a thing common to all, is an addition to it. But "being" is divided by "one" and by "many." Therefore "one" is an addition to "being."

[28650] Iª q. 11 a. 1 arg. 2 Praeterea, quod dividit aliquod commune, se habet ex additione ad illud. Sed ens dividitur per unum et multa. Ergo unum addit aliquid supra ens.

Objection 3: Further, if "one" is not an addition to "being," "one" and "being" must have the same meaning. But it would be nugatory to call "being" by the name of "being"; therefore it would be equally so to call being "one." Now this is false. Therefore "one" is an addition to "being."

[28651] Iª q. 11 a. 1 arg. 3 Praeterea, si unum non addit supra ens, idem esset dicere unum et ens. Sed nugatorie dicitur ens ens. Ergo nugatio esset dicere ens unum, quod falsum est. Addit igitur unum supra ens.

On the contrary, Dionysius says (Div. Nom. 5, ult.): "Nothing which exists is not in some way one," which would be false if "one" were an addition to "being," in the sense of limiting it. Therefore "one" is not an addition to "being."

[28652] Iª q. 11 a. 1 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicit Dionysius, ult. cap. de Div. Nom., *nihil est existentium non participans uno*, quod non esset, si unum adderet supra ens quod contraheret ipsum. Ergo unum non habet se ex additione ad ens.

I answer that, "One" does not add any reality to "being"; but is only a negation of division; for "one" means undivided "being." This is the very reason why "one" is the same as "being." Now every being is either simple or compound. But what is simple is undivided, both actually and potentially. Whereas what is compound, has not being whilst its parts are divided, but after they make up and compose it. Hence it is manifest that the being of anything consists in undivision; and hence it is that everything guards its unity as it guards its being.

[28653] Iª q. 11 a. 1 co. Respondeo dicendum quod unum non addit supra ens rem aliquam, sed tantum negationem divisionis, unum enim nihil aliud significat quam ens indivisum. Et ex hoc ipso apparet quod unum convertitur cum ente. Nam omne ens aut est simplex, aut compositum. Quod autem est simplex, est indivisum et actu et potentia. Quod autem est compositum, non habet esse quandiu partes eius sunt divisae, sed postquam constituunt et componunt ipsum compositum. Unde manifestum est quod esse cuiuslibet rei consistit in indivisione. Et inde est quod unumquodque, sicut custodit suum esse, ita custodit suam unitatem.

Reply to Objection 1: Some, thinking that the "one" convertible with "being" is the same as the "one" which is the principle of number, were divided into contrary opinions. Pythagoras and Plato, seeing that the "one" convertible with "being" did not add any reality to "being," but signified the substance of "being" as undivided, thought that the same applied to the "one" which is the principle of number. And because number is composed of unities, they thought that numbers were the substances of all things. Avicenna, however, on the contrary, considering that "one" which is the principle of number, added a reality to the substance of "being" (otherwise number made of unities would not be a species of quantity), thought that the "one" convertible with "being" added a reality to the substance of beings; as "white" to "man." This, however, is manifestly false, inasmuch as each thing is "one" by its substance. For if a thing were "one" by anything else but by its substance, since this again would be "one," supposing it were again "one" by another thing, we should be driven on to infinity. Hence we must adhere to the former statement; therefore we must say that the "one" which is convertible with "being," does not add a reality to being; but that the "one" which is the principle of number, does add a reality to "being," belonging to the genus of quantity.

[28654] Iª q. 11 a. 1 ad 1 Ad primum igitur dicendum quod quidam, putantes idem esse unum quod convertitur cum ente, et quod est principium numeri, divisi sunt in contrarias positiones. Pythagoras enim et Plato, videntes quod unum quod convertitur cum ente, non addit aliquam rem supra ens, sed significat substantiam entis prout est indivisa, existimaverunt sic se habere de uno quod est principium numeri. Et quia numerus componitur ex unitatibus, crediderunt quod numeri essent substantiae omnium rerum. E contrario autem Avicenna, considerans quod unum quod est principium numeri, addit aliquam rem supra substantiam entis (alias numerus ex unitatibus compositus non esset species quantitatis), credidit quod unum quod convertitur cum ente, addat rem aliquam supra substantiam entis, sicut album supra hominem. Sed hoc manifeste falsum est, quia quaelibet res est una per suam substantiam. Si enim per aliquid aliud esset una quaelibet res, cum illud iterum sit unum, si esset iterum unum per aliquid aliud, esset abire in infinitum. Unde standum est in primo. Sic igitur dicendum est quod unum quod convertitur cum ente, non addit aliquam rem supra ens, sed unum quod est principium numeri, addit aliquid supra ens, ad genus quantitatis pertinens.

Reply to Objection 2: There is nothing to prevent a thing which in one way is divided, from being another way undivided; as what is divided in number, may be undivided in species; thus it may be that a thing is in one way "one," and in another way "many." Still, if it is absolutely undivided, either because it is so according to what belongs to its essence, though it may be divided as regards what is outside its essence, as what is one in subject may have many accidents; or because

it is undivided actually, and divided potentially, as what is "one" in the whole, and is "many" in parts; in such a case a thing will be "one" absolutely and "many" accidentally. On the other hand, if it be undivided accidentally, and divided absolutely, as if it were divided in essence and undivided in idea or in principle or cause, it will be "many" absolutely and "one" accidentally; as what are "many" in number and "one" in species or "one" in principle. Hence in that way, being is divided by "one" and by "many"; as it were by "one" absolutely and by "many" accidentally. For multitude itself would not be contained under "being," unless it were in some way contained under "one." Thus Dionysius says (Div. Nom. cap. ult.) that "there is no kind of multitude that is not in a way one. But what are many in their parts, are one in their whole; and what are many in accidents, are one in subject; and what are many in number, are one in species; and what are many in species, are one in genus; and what are many in processions, are one in principle."

[28655] Iª q. 11 a. 1 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod nihil prohibet id quod est uno modo divisum, esse alio modo indivisum; sicut quod est divisum numero, est indivisum secundum speciem, et sic contingit aliquid esse uno modo unum, alio modo multa. Sed tamen si sit indivisum simpliciter; vel quia est indivisum secundum id quod pertinet ad essentiam rei, licet sit divisum quantum ad ea quae sunt extra essentiam rei, sicut quod est unum subiecto et multa secundum accidentia; vel quia est indivisum in actu, et divisum in potentia, sicut quod est unum toto et multa secundum partes, huiusmodi erit unum simpliciter, et multa secundum quid. Si vero aliquid e converso sit indivisum secundum quid, et divisum simpliciter; utpote quia est divisum secundum essentiam, et indivisum secundum rationem, vel secundum principium sive causam, erit multa simpliciter, et unum secundum quid; ut quae sunt multa numero et unum specie, vel unum principio. Sic igitur ens dividitur per unum et multa, quasi per unum simpliciter, et multa secundum quid. Nam et ipsa multitudo non contineretur sub ente, nisi contineretur aliquo modo sub uno. Dicit enim Dionysius, ult. cap. de Div. Nom., quod *non est multitudo non participans uno, sed quae sunt multa partibus, sunt unum toto; et quae sunt multa accidentibus, sunt unum subiecto; et quae sunt multa numero, sunt unum specie; et quae sunt speciebus multa, sunt unum genere; et quae sunt multa processibus, sunt unum principio*.

Reply to Objection 3: It does not follow that it is nugatory to say "being" is "one"; forasmuch as "one" adds an idea to "being."

[28656] Iª q. 11 a. 1 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod ideo non est nugatio cum dicitur ens unum, quia unum addit aliquid secundum rationem supra ens.

Whether "one" and "many" are opposed to each other?

Objection 1: It seems that "one" and "many" are not mutually opposed. For no opposite thing is predicated of its opposite. But every "multitude" is in a

[28657] Iª q. 11 a. 2 arg. 1 Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod unum et multa non opponantur. Nullum enim oppositum praedicatur de

certain way "one," as appears from the preceding article. Therefore "one" is not opposed to "multitude."

suo opposito. Sed omnis multitudo est quodammodo unum, ut ex praedictis patet. Ergo unum non opponitur multitudini.

Objection 2: Further, no opposite thing is constituted by its opposite. But "multitude" is constituted by "one." Therefore it is not opposed to "multitude."

[28658] Iª q. 11 a. 2 arg. 2 Praeterea, nullum oppositum constituitur ex suo opposito. Sed unum constituit multitudinem. Ergo non opponitur multitudini.

Objection 3: Further, "one" is opposed to "one." But the idea of "few" is opposed to "many." Therefore "one" is not opposed to "many."

[28659] Iª q. 11 a. 2 arg. 3 Praeterea, unum uni est oppositum. Sed multo opponitur paucum. Ergo non opponitur ei unum.

Objection 4: Further, if "one" is opposed to "multitude," it is opposed as the undivided is to the divided; and is thus opposed to it as privation is to habit. But this appears to be incongruous; because it would follow that "one" comes after "multitude," and is defined by it; whereas, on the contrary, "multitude" is defined by "one." Hence there would be a vicious circle in the definition; which is inadmissible. Therefore "one" and "many" are not opposed.

[28660] Iª q. 11 a. 2 arg. 4 Praeterea, si unum opponitur multitudini, opponitur ei sicut indivisum diviso, et sic opponetur ei ut privatio habitui. Hoc autem videtur inconveniens, quia sequeretur quod unum sit posterius multitudine, et definiatur per eam; cum tamen multitudo definiatur per unum. Unde erit circulus in definitione, quod est inconveniens. Non ergo unum et multa sunt opposita.

On the contrary, Things which are opposed in idea, are themselves opposed to each other. But the idea of "one" consists in indivisibility; and the idea of "multitude" contains division. Therefore "one" and "many" are opposed to each other.

[28661] Iª q. 11 a. 2 s. c. Sed contra, quorum rationes sunt oppositae, ipsa sunt opposita. Sed ratio unius consistit in indivisibilitate, ratio vero multitudinis divisionem continet. Ergo unum et multa sunt opposita.

I answer that, "One" is opposed to "many," but in various ways. The "one" which is the principle of number is opposed to "multitude" which is number, as the measure is to the thing measured. For "one" implies the idea of a primary measure; and number is "multitude" measured by "one," as is clear from Metaph. x. But the "one" which convertible with "being" is

[28662] Iª q. 11 a. 2 co. Respondeo dicendum quod unum opponitur multis, sed diversimode. Nam unum quod est principium numeri, opponitur multitudini quae est numerus, ut mensura mensurato, unum enim habet rationem primae mensurae, et numerus est multitudo mensurata per unum, ut patet ex X Metaphys. Unum vero quod convertitur cum ente,

opposed to "multitude" by way of privation; as the undivided is to the thing divided.

opponitur multitudini per modum privationis, ut indivisum diviso.

Reply to Objection 1: No privation entirely takes away the being of a thing, inasmuch as privation means "negation in the subject," according to the Philosopher (Categor. viii). Nevertheless every privation takes away some being; and so in being, by reason of its universality, the privation of being has its foundation in being; which is not the case in privations of special forms, as of sight, or of whiteness and the like. And what applies to being applies also to one and to good, which are convertible with being, for the privation of good is founded in some good; likewise the removal of unity is founded in some one thing. Hence it happens that multitude is some one thing; and evil is some good thing, and non-being is some kind of being. Nevertheless, opposite is not predicated of opposite; forasmuch as one is absolute, and the other is relative; for what is relative being (as a potentiality) is non-being absolutely, i.e. actually; or what is absolute being in the genus of substance is non-being relatively as regards some accidental being. In the same way, what is relatively good is absolutely bad, or vice versa; likewise what is absolutely "one" is relatively "many," and vice versa.

[28663] Iª q. 11 a. 2 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod nulla privatio tollit totaliter esse, quia privatio est negatio in subiecto, secundum philosophum. Sed tamen omnis privatio tollit aliquod esse. Et ideo in ente, ratione suae communitatis, accidit quod privatio entis fundatur in ente, quod non accidit in privationibus formarum specialium, ut visus vel albedinis, vel alicuius huiusmodi. Et sicut est de ente, ita est de uno et bono, quae convertuntur cum ente, nam privatio boni fundatur in aliquo bono, et similiter remotio unitatis fundatur in aliquo uno. Et exinde contingit quod multitudo est quoddam unum, et malum est quoddam bonum, et non ens est quoddam ens. Non tamen oppositum praedicatur de opposito, quia alterum horum est simpliciter, et alterum secundum quid. Quod enim secundum quid est ens, ut in potentia, est non ens simpliciter, idest actu, vel quod est ens simpliciter in genere substantiae, est non ens secundum quid, quantum ad aliquod esse accidentale. Similiter ergo quod est bonum secundum quid, est malum simpliciter; vel e converso. Et similiter quod est unum simpliciter, est multa secundum quid; et e converso.

Reply to Objection 2: A "whole" is twofold. In one sense it is homogeneous, composed of like parts; in another sense it is heterogeneous, composed of dissimilar parts. Now in every homogeneous whole, the whole is made up of parts having the form of the whole; as, for instance, every part of water is water; and such is the constitution of a continuous thing made up of its parts. In every heterogeneous whole, however, every

[28664] Iª q. 11 a. 2 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod duplex est totum, quoddam homogeneum, quod componitur ex similibus partibus; quoddam vero heterogeneum, quod componitur ex dissimilibus partibus. In quolibet autem toto homogeneo, totum constituitur ex partibus habentibus formam totius, sicut quaelibet pars aquae est aqua, et talis est constitutio continui ex suis partibus. In quolibet autem toto heterogeneo, quaelibet pars

part is wanting in the form belonging to the whole; as, for instance, no part of a house is a house, nor is any part of a man a man. Now multitude is such a kind of a whole. Therefore inasmuch as its part has not the form of the multitude, the latter is composed of unities, as a house is composed of not houses; not, indeed, as if unities constituted multitude so far as they are undivided, in which way they are opposed to multitude; but so far as they have being, as also the parts of a house make up the house by the fact that they are beings, not by the fact that they are not houses.

caret forma totius, nulla enim pars domus est domus, nec aliqua pars hominis est homo. Et tale totum est multitudo. Inquantum ergo pars eius non habet formam multitudinis, componitur multitudo ex unitatibus, sicut domus ex non domibus, non quod unitates constituant multitudinem secundum id quod habent de ratione indivisionis, prout opponuntur multitudini; sed secundum hoc quod habent de entitate, sicut et partes domus constituunt domum per hoc quod sunt quaedam corpora, non per hoc quod sunt non domus.

Reply to Objection 3: "Many" is taken in two ways: absolutely, and in that sense it is opposed to "one"; in another way as importing some kind of excess, in which sense it is opposed to "few"; hence in the first sense two are many but not in the second sense.

[28665] Iª q. 11 a. 2 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod multum accipitur dupliciter. Uno modo, absolute, et sic opponitur uni. Alio modo, secundum quod importat excessum quendam, et sic opponitur pauco. Unde primo modo duo sunt multa; non autem secundo.

Reply to Objection 4: "One" is opposed to "many" privatively, inasmuch as the idea of "many" involves division. Hence division must be prior to unity, not absolutely in itself, but according to our way of apprehension. For we apprehend simple things by compound things; and hence we define a point to be, "what has no part," or "the beginning of a line." "Multitude" also, in idea, follows on "one"; because we do not understand divided things to convey the idea of multitude except by the fact that we attribute unity to every part. Hence "one" is placed in the definition of "multitude"; but "multitude" is not placed in the definition of "one." But division comes to be understood from the very negation of being: so what first comes to mind is being; secondly, that this being is not that being, and thus we apprehend division as a consequence; thirdly, comes the notion

[28666] Iª q. 11 a. 2 ad 4 Ad quartum dicendum quod unum opponitur privative multis, inquantum in ratione multorum est quod sint divisa. Unde oportet quod divisio sit prius unitate, non simpliciter, sed secundum rationem nostrae apprehensionis. Apprehendimus enim simplicia per composita, unde definimus punctum, cuius pars non est, vel principium lineae. Sed multitudo, etiam secundum rationem, consequenter se habet ad unum, quia divisa non intelligimus habere rationem multitudinis, nisi per hoc quod utrique divisorum attribuimus unitatem. Unde unum ponitur in definitione multitudinis, non autem multitudo in definitione unius. Sed divisio cadit in intellectu ex ipsa negatione entis. Ita quod primo cadit in intellectu ens; secundo, quod hoc ens non est illud ens, et sic secundo apprehendimus divisionem; tertio, unum; quarto, multitudinem.

of one; fourthly, the notion of multitude.

Whether God is one?

Objection 1: It seems that God is not one. For it is written "For there be many gods and many lords" (1 Cor. 8:5).

[28667] Iª q. 11 a. 3 arg. 1 Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod Deus non sit unus. Dicitur enim I ad Cor. VIII, *siquidem sunt dii multi et domini multi*.

Objection 2: Further, "One," as the principle of number, cannot be predicated of God, since quantity is not predicated of God; likewise, neither can "one" which is convertible with "being" be predicated of God, because it imports privation, and every privation is an imperfection, which cannot apply to God. Therefore God is not one.

[28668] Iª q. 11 a. 3 arg. 2 Praeterea, unum quod est principium numeri, non potest praedicari de Deo, cum nulla quantitas de Deo praedicetur. Similiter nec unum quod convertitur cum ente, quia importat privationem, et omnis privatio imperfectio est, quae Deo non competit. Non est igitur dicendum quod Deus sit unus.

On the contrary, It is written "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord" (Dt. 6:4).

[28669] Iª q. 11 a. 3 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicitur Deut. VI, *audi, Israel, dominus Deus tuus unus est*.

I answer that, It can be shown from these three sources that God is one. First from His simplicity. For it is manifest that the reason why any singular thing is "this particular thing" is because it cannot be communicated to many: since that whereby Socrates is a man, can be communicated to many; whereas, what makes him this particular man, is only communicable to one. Therefore, if Socrates were a man by what makes him to be this particular man, as there cannot be many Socrates, so there could not in that way be many men. Now this belongs to God alone; for God Himself is His own nature, as was shown above (Q[3], A[3]). Therefore, in the very same way God is God, and He is this God. Impossible is it therefore that many Gods should exist.

[28670] Iª q. 11 a. 3 co. Respondeo dicendum quod Deum esse unum, ex tribus demonstratur. Primo quidem ex eius simplicitate. Manifestum est enim quod illud unde aliquod singulare est hoc aliquid, nullo modo est multis communicabile. Illud enim unde Socrates est homo, multis communicari potest, sed id unde est hic homo, non potest communicari nisi uni tantum. Si ergo Socrates per id esset homo, per quod est hic homo, sicut non possunt esse plures Socrates, ita non possent esse plures homines. Hoc autem convenit Deo, nam ipse Deus est sua natura, ut supra ostensum est. Secundum igitur idem est Deus, et hic Deus. Impossibile est igitur esse plures deos.

Secondly, this is proved from the infinity of His perfection. For it was shown above (Q[4], A[2]) that God comprehends in Himself the whole perfection of being. If then many gods existed, they would necessarily differ from each other. Something therefore would belong to one which did not belong to another. And if this were a privation, one of them would not be absolutely perfect; but if a perfection, one of them would be without it. So it is impossible for many gods to exist. Hence also the ancient philosophers, constrained as it were by truth, when they asserted an infinite principle, asserted likewise that there was only one such principle.

Secundo vero, ex infinitate eius perfectionis. Ostensum est enim supra quod Deus comprehendit in se totam perfectionem essendi. Si ergo essent plures dii, oporteret eos differre. Aliquid ergo conveniret uni, quod non alteri. Et si hoc esset privatio, non esset simpliciter perfectus, si autem hoc esset perfectio, alteri eorum deesset. Impossibile est ergo esse plures deos. Unde et antiqui philosophi, quasi ab ipsa coacti veritate, ponentes principium infinitum, posuerunt unum tantum principium.

Thirdly, this is shown from the unity of the world. For all things that exist are seen to be ordered to each other since some serve others. But things that are diverse do not harmonize in the same order, unless they are ordered thereto by one. For many are reduced into one order by one better than by many: because one is the "per se" cause of one, and many are only the accidental cause of one, inasmuch as they are in some way one. Since therefore what is first is most perfect, and is so "per se" and not accidentally, it must be that the first which reduces all into one order should be only one. And this one is God.

Tertio, ab unitate mundi. Omnia enim quae sunt, inveniuntur esse ordinata ad invicem, dum quaedam quibusdam deserviunt. Quae autem diversa sunt, in unum ordinem non convenirent, nisi ab aliquo uno ordinarentur. Melius enim multa reducuntur in unum ordinem per unum, quam per multa, quia per se unius unum est causa, et multa non sunt causa unius nisi per accidens, inquantum scilicet sunt aliquo modo unum. Cum igitur illud quod est primum, sit perfectissimum et per se, non per accidens, oportet quod primum reducens omnia in unum ordinem, sit unum tantum. Et hoc est Deus.

Reply to Objection 1: Gods are called many by the error of some who worshipped many deities, thinking as they did that the planets and other stars were gods, and also the separate parts of the world. Hence the Apostle adds: "Our God is one," etc.

[28671] Iª q. 11 a. 3 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod dicuntur dii multi secundum errorem quorundam qui multos deos colebant, existimantes planetas et alias stellas esse deos, vel etiam singulas partes mundi. Unde subdit, *nobis autem unus Deus,* et cetera.

Reply to Objection 2: "One" which is the principle of number is not predicated of God, but only of material things. For "one" the principle of number belongs to the "genus" of

[28672] Iª q. 11 a. 3 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod unum secundum quod est principium numeri, non praedicatur de Deo; sed solum de his quae habent esse in materia. Unum enim quod est

mathematics, which are material in being, and abstracted from matter only in idea. But "one" which is convertible with being is a metaphysical entity and does not depend on matter in its being. And although in God there is no privation, still, according to the mode of our apprehension, He is known to us by way only of privation and remotion. Thus there is no reason why a certain kind of privation should not be predicated of God; for instance, that He is incorporeal and infinite; and in the same way it is said of God that He is one.

principium numeri, est de genere mathematicorum; quae habent esse in materia, sed sunt secundum rationem a materia abstracta. Unum vero quod convertitur cum ente, est quoddam metaphysicum, quod secundum esse non dependet a materia. Et licet in Deo non sit aliqua privatio, tamen, secundum modum apprehensionis nostrae, non cognoscitur a nobis nisi per modum privationis et remotionis. Et sic nihil prohibet aliqua privative dicta de Deo praedicari; sicut quod est incorporeus, infinitus. Et similiter de Deo dicitur quod sit unus.

Whether God is supremely one?

Objection 1: It seems that God is not supremely "one." For "one" is so called from the privation of division. But privation cannot be greater or less. Therefore God is not more "one" than other things which are called "one."

[28673] Iª q. 11 a. 4 arg. 1 Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod Deus non sit maxime unus. Unum enim dicitur secundum privationem divisionis. Sed privatio non recipit magis et minus. Ergo Deus non dicitur magis unus quam alia quae sunt unum.

Objection 2: Further, nothing seems to be more indivisible than what is actually and potentially indivisible; such as a point and unity. But a thing is said to be more "one" according as it is indivisible. Therefore God is not more "one" than unity is "one" and a point is "one."

[28674] Iª q. 11 a. 4 arg. 2 Praeterea, nihil videtur esse magis indivisibile quam id quod est indivisibile actu et potentia, cuiusmodi est punctus et unitas. Sed intantum dicitur aliquid magis unum, inquantum est indivisibile. Ergo Deus non est magis unum quam unitas et punctus.

Objection 3: Further, what is essentially good is supremely good. Therefore what is essentially "one" is supremely "one." But every being is essentially "one," as the Philosopher says (Metaph. iv). Therefore every being is supremely "one"; and therefore God is not "one" more than any other being is "one."

[28675] Iª q. 11 a. 4 arg. 3 Praeterea, quod est per essentiam bonum, est maxime bonum, ergo quod est per essentiam suam unum, est maxime unum. Sed omne ens est unum per suam essentiam, ut patet per philosophum in IV Metaphys. Ergo omne ens est maxime unum. Deus igitur non est magis unum quam alia entia.

On the contrary, Bernard says (De Consid. v): "Among all things called

[28676] Iª q. 11 a. 4 s. c. Sed contra est quod dicit Bernardus, quod *inter*

one, the unity of the Divine Trinity holds the first place."

omnia quae unum dicuntur, arcem tenet unitas divinae Trinitatis.

I answer that, Since "one" is an undivided being, if anything is supremely "one" it must be supremely being, and supremely undivided. Now both of these belong to God. For He is supremely being, inasmuch as His being is not determined by any nature to which it is adjoined; since He is being itself, subsistent, absolutely undetermined. But He is supremely undivided inasmuch as He is divided neither actually nor potentially, by any mode of division; since He is altogether simple, as was shown above (Q[3], A[7]). Hence it is manifest that God is "one" in the supreme degree.

[28677] Iª q. 11 a. 4 co. Respondeo dicendum quod, cum unum sit ens indivisum, ad hoc quod aliquid sit maxime unum, oportet quod sit et maxime ens et maxime indivisum. Utrumque autem competit Deo. Est enim maxime ens, inquantum est non habens aliquod esse determinatum per aliquam naturam cui adveniat, sed est ipsum esse subsistens, omnibus modis indeterminatum. Est autem maxime indivisum, inquantum neque dividitur actu neque potentia, secundum quemcunque modum divisionis, cum sit omnibus modis simplex, ut supra ostensum est. Unde manifestum est quod Deus est maxime unus.

Reply to Objection 1: Although privation considered in itself is not susceptive of more or less, still according as its opposite is subject to more or less, privation also can be considered itself in the light of more and less. Therefore according as a thing is more divided, or is divisible, either less or not at all, in the degree it is called more, or less, or supremely, "one."

[28678] Iª q. 11 a. 4 ad 1 Ad primum ergo dicendum quod, licet privatio secundum se non recipiat magis et minus, tamen secundum quod eius oppositum recipit magis et minus, etiam ipsa privativa dicuntur secundum magis et minus. Secundum igitur quod aliquid est magis divisum vel divisibile, vel minus, vel nullo modo, secundum hoc aliquid dicitur magis et minus vel maxime unum.

Reply to Objection 2: A point and unity which is the principle of number, are not supremely being, inasmuch as they have being only in some subject. Hence neither of them can be supremely "one." For as a subject cannot be supremely "one," because of the difference within it of accident and subject, so neither can an accident.

[28679] Iª q. 11 a. 4 ad 2 Ad secundum dicendum quod punctus et unitas quae est principium numeri, non sunt maxime entia, cum non habeant esse nisi in subiecto aliquo. Unde neutrum eorum est maxime unum. Sicut enim subiectum non est maxime unum, propter diversitatem accidentis et subiecti, ita nec accidens.

Reply to Objection 3: Although every being is "one" by its substance, still every such substance is not equally the cause of unity; for the substance of some things is compound and of others simple.

[28680] Iª q. 11 a. 4 ad 3 Ad tertium dicendum quod, licet omne ens sit unum per suam substantiam, non tamen se habet aequaliter substantia cuiuslibet ad causandam unitatem, quia substantia quorundam est ex

multis composita, quorundam vero non.