

Truth • QUESTION FIVE: ARTICLE 2

similar agents, we cannot give any reason why things happen in a good and orderly way.

Moreover, whatever does not have a determinate cause happens by accident. Consequently, if the position mentioned above were true, all the harmony and usefulness found in things would be the result of chance. This was actually what Empedocles held.¹⁷ He asserted that it was by accident that the parts of animals came together in this way through friendship—and this was his explanation of an animal and of a frequent occurrence! This explanation, of course, is absurd, for those things that happen by chance, happen only rarely; we know from experience, however, that harmony and usefulness are found in nature either at all times or at least for the most part. This cannot be the result of mere chance; it must be because an end is intended. What lacks intellect or knowledge, however, cannot tend directly toward an end. It can do this only if someone else's knowledge has established an end for it, and directs it to that end. Consequently, since natural things have no knowledge, there must be some previously existing intelligence directing them to an end, like an archer who gives a definite motion to an arrow so that it will wing its way to a determined end. Now, the hit made by the arrow is said to be the work not of the arrow alone but also of the person who shot it. Similarly, philosophers¹⁸ call every work of nature the work of intelligence.

Consequently, the world is ruled by the providence of that intellect which gave this order to nature; and we may compare the providence by which God rules the world to the domestic foresight by which a man rules his family, or to the political foresight by which a ruler governs a city or a kingdom, and directs the acts of others to a definite end. There is no providence, however, in God with respect to Himself, since whatever is in Him is an end, not a means to it.

Answers to Difficulties:

1. The metaphor used by Dionysius notes merely that, like the sun which, on its own part, keeps no body from sharing its light, the divine goodness keeps no creature from participating in itself. The metaphor does not mean that providence acts without choice or knowledge.

2. A principle can be said to be multiform in two senses. First, the multiformity can refer to the very essence of the principle—that is, the principle is composite. A principle that is multiform in this sense must be posterior to a principle having but one form. Second, the multiformity may refer to the principle's relation to its effects, so that a principle is said to be multiform because it extends its influence to many things. A principle that is multiform in this sense precedes one

3-28

Truth • QUESTION FIVE: ARTICLE 2

that has but a single form, because the more simple a principle is, the more extensive is its influence. It is in this sense, moreover, that the will is said to be a multiform, and nature, a uniform principle.

3. The argument given is based on the uniformity of a principle according to its essence.

4. God is the cause of things by His essence. Consequently, any plurality in things can be reduced to one simple principle. His essence, however, is the cause of things only in so far as it is known, and consequently, only in so far as it wills to be communicated to a creature by the creature's being made in its likeness. Hence, things proceed from the divine essence through the ordering of knowledge and will, and so through providence.

5. That determination by which a natural thing is restricted to one course of action belongs to it, not because of itself, but because of something else. Consequently, the very determination for bringing about the suitable effect is, as has been said,^{*} a proof of divine providence.

6. Generation and corruption can be understood in two senses. First, generation and corruption can arise from a contrary being and terminate in a contrary. In this sense, the potency to generation and corruption exists in a thing because its matter is in potency to contrary forms; and in this respect celestial bodies and spiritual substances have no potency to generation or corruption. Second, these terms are commonly used to indicate any coming into or passing out of existence that is found in things. Consequently, even creation, by which a thing is drawn from nothingness into existence, is called generation; and the annihilation of a thing is called corruption.

Moreover, a thing is said to be in potency to generation in this sense if an agent has the power to produce it; and it is said to be in potency to corruption if an agent has the power to reduce it to nothingness. In this way of speaking, every creature is in potency to corruption; for all that God has brought into existence He can also reduce to nothingness. For, as Augustine says,¹⁹ for creatures to subsist God must constantly work in them. This action of God, however, must not be compared to the action of a craftsman building a house, for, when his action ceases, the house still remains; it should rather be compared to the sun's lighting up the air. Consequently, when God no longer gives existence to a creature, whose very existence depends on His will, then this creature is reduced to nothingness.

7. The necessity of the principles mentioned depends upon God's providence and disposition, because the fact that created things have a particular nature and, in this nature, a determined act of existence,

Truth • QUESTION SIX: ARTICLE 2

knowledge does this but only knowledge of an end; and an end is an object moving the will. Consequently, it is because of His knowledge of His own goodness that God loves it; and, from this love, He wills to pour out His goodness upon others. But it does not therefore follow that knowledge of merits is the cause of His will in so far as it is included in predestination.

4. Although the different formal characters of God's attributes are drawn from the differences in their effects, it does not follow from this that these effects are the cause of His attributes. For the different formal characteristics of His attributes are not derived from our qualities as though our qualities caused them; rather, our qualities are seen that the attributes themselves are causes. Consequently, it does not follow that that which comes from us is the reason why one man is reprobated and another predestined.

5. We can consider God's relation to things in two ways. We can consider it only with respect to the first disposition of things that took place according to His divine wisdom, which established different grades of things. If only this is considered, then God is not related to all things in the same way. We can, however, consider His relation to things also according to the way in which He provides for them as already disposed. If His relation to them is considered in this manner, then He is related to all things in the same way, because He gives equally to all, according to the proportion He has made. Now, all that has been said to proceed from God, according to His will taken simply, belongs to the first disposition of things, of which preparation for grace is a part.

6. It belongs to the divine goodness as infinite to give from its perfections whatever the nature of each thing requires and is capable of receiving. But this is not required for superabundant perfections such as grace and glory. Hence, the argument proves nothing.

7. God's foreknowledge of what lay in the heart of Jacob was not the reason for His willing to give grace to him. Instead, the intention in Jacob's heart was a good for which God ordained the grace to be given to him. It is for this reason that God is said to have loved him "because his heart's intention was known by Him." For God loved him in order that he might have such an intention in his heart or because He foresaw that his heart's intention was a disposition for the acceptance of grace.

8. It would be contrary to the nature of distributive justice if things that were due to persons and were to be distributed to them were given out unequally to those that had equal rights. But things given out of liberality do not come under any form of justice. I may freely choose

Truth • QUESTION SIX: ARTICLE 3

to give them to one person and not to another. Now, grace belongs to this class of things. Consequently, it is not contrary to the nature of distributive justice if God intends to give grace to one person and not to another, and does not consider their unequal merits.

9. The election by which God chooses one man and reprobates another is reasonable. There is no reason why merit must be the reason for His choice, however, since the reason for this is the divine goodness. As Augustine says,¹⁸ moreover, a justifying reason for reprobation [in the present] is the fact of original sin in man—for reprobation in the future, the fact that mere existence gives man no claim to grace. For I can reasonably deny something to a person if it is not due to him.

10. Peter Lombard says¹⁹ that Augustine retracted that statement in a similar passage. But, if it must be sustained, then it should be taken as referring to the effect of reprobation and of predestination, which has a meritorious or disposing cause.

11. God's foreknowledge of this abuse of grace was not the reason why Judas was reprobated, unless we are considering only the consequences of this abuse—though it is true that God denies grace to no one who is willing to accept it. Now, the very fact that we are willing to accept grace comes to us through God's predestination. Hence, our willingness cannot be a cause of predestination.

12. Although merit can be the cause of the effect of predestination, it cannot be the cause of predestination itself.

13. Although that with which the consequent cannot be interchanged is prior in some way, it does not always follow that it is prior as a cause is said to be prior; for, if this were true, then to be colored would be the cause of being a man. Consequently, it does not follow that foreknowledge is the cause of predestination.

14. The answer to this difficulty is clear from our last response.

ARTICLE III

In the Third Article We Ask: IS PREDESTINATION CERTAIN?

Difficulties:

It seems that it has no certitude, for

1. No cause whose effects can vary can be certain of its effects. But

Parallel readings: *S. T.*, I, 23, aa. 6-7; *I Sent.*, 40, 3; *Quodl.*, XI, 3, 3; XII, 3, 3; *De rationibus fidei*, c. 10 (P. 16:962); *C. G.*, III, cc. 94, 162-63. See also readings given for q. 5, a. 5.

the effects of predestination can vary, for one who is predestined may not attain the effect of his predestination. This is clear from the commentary of Augustine on the words of the Apocalypse (3: 11), "Hold fast that which thou hast, that no man take . . .," in which he says: "If one person will not receive glory unless another loses it, then the number of the elect is certain."¹ Now, from this it seems that one could lose and another receive the crown of glory, which is the effect of predestination.

2. Human affairs fall under God's providence as things in nature do. But, according to the ordering of God's providence, only those natural effects that are produced necessarily by their causes proceed from them with certainty. Now, since the effect of predestination, man's salvation, arises not necessarily but contingently from its proximate causes, it seems that the ordering of predestination is not certain.

3. If a cause has certitude with respect to some effect, that effect will necessarily follow unless there is something that can resist the power of the agent. For example, dispositions in bodies here below are sometimes found to resist the action of celestial bodies; and, as a consequence, these celestial bodies do not produce their characteristic effects, which they would produce were there not something resisting them. But nothing can resist divine predestination, because, as we read in the Epistle to the Romans (9: 19): "Who resisteth his will?" Therefore, if divine predestination is ordered with certitude to its effect, its effect will necessarily be produced.

4. The answer was given that the certitude which predestination has of its effect presupposes the second cause.—On the contrary, any certitude based on the supposition of something is not absolute but conditional certitude. For example, it is not certain that the sun will cause a plant to bear fruit unless the generative power of the plant is in a favorable condition; and, because of this, the certitude of the sun's producing this effect presupposes the power of the plant as though the latter were a second cause. Consequently, if the certitude of divine predestination includes the presupposition of a second cause, that certitude will not be absolute but merely conditional—like the certitude I have that Socrates is moving if he runs, and that he will be saved if he prepares himself. Therefore, God will have no more certitude about those who are to be saved than I have. But this is absurd.

5. We read in Job (34: 24): "He shall break in pieces many and innumerable, and shall make others to stand in their stead." In explanation of this passage, Gregory writes: "Some fall from the place of life

while others are given it."² Now, the place of life is that place to which men are ordained by predestination. Hence, one who is predestined can fall short of the effect of predestination; therefore, predestination is not certain.

6. According to Anselm,³ predestination has the same kind of truth that a proposition about the future has. But a proposition about the future does not have certain and determinate truth. Such a proposition is open to correction—as is clear from that passage in Aristotle where he says: "One about to walk may not walk."⁴ Similarly, therefore, the truth that predestination has does not possess certitude.

7. Sometimes one who is predestined is in mortal sin. This was clearly true of Paul when he was persecuting the Church. Now, he can stay in mortal sin until death or be killed immediately. If either happens, predestination will not obtain its effect. Therefore, it is possible for predestination not to obtain its effect.

8. But it was said that, when it is stated that one predestined may possibly die in the state of sin, the proposition is taken compositely and so is false; for its subject is taken as simultaneously having the determination *predestined*. But if its subject is taken without this determination, then the proposition is taken in a divided sense and is true.—On the contrary, with those forms which cannot be removed from the subject, it does not matter whether a thing is attributed to the subject with those qualifying determinations or without them. For example, taken either way, the following proposition is false: "A black crow can be white." Now, predestination is the kind of form that cannot be removed from the one predestined. In the matter at hand, therefore, there is no room for the afore-mentioned distinction.

9. If what is eternal be joined to what is temporal and contingent, then the whole is temporal and contingent. Thus, it is clear that creation is temporal, even though its notion includes God's eternal essence as well as a temporal effect. The same is true of a divine mission, which implies an eternal procession and a temporal effect. Now, even though predestination implies something eternal, it also implies a temporal effect. Therefore, predestination as a whole is temporal and contingent and, consequently, does not seem to have certitude.

10. What can be or not be cannot have any certitude. But the fact that God predestines to salvation can be or not be. For just as He can, from all eternity, predestine and not predestine, so even now He can predestine and not predestine, since present, past, and future do not differ in eternity. Consequently, predestination cannot have any certitude.

To the Contrary:

1'. In explanation of that verse in the Epistle to the Romans (8:29), "Whom he foreknew, he also predestined," the *Gloss* says: "Predestination is the foreknowledge and preparation of the benefits of God by which whoever are freed are most certainly freed."⁵

2'. If the truth of a thing is unshakable, it must be certain. But, as Augustine says: "The truth of predestination is unshakable."⁶ Therefore, predestination is certain.

3'. Whoever is predestined has this predestination from all eternity. But what exists from all eternity cannot be changed. Predestination, therefore, is unchangeable and, consequently, certain.

4'. As is clear from the *Gloss* mentioned above,⁷ predestination includes foreknowledge. But, as Boethius has proved,⁸ foreknowledge is certain. Therefore, predestination is also certain.

REPLY:

There are two kinds of certitude: certitude of knowledge and certitude of ordination. Now, certitude of knowledge is had when one's knowledge does not deviate in any way from reality, and, consequently, when it judges about a thing as it is. But because a judgment which will be certain about a thing is had especially from its causes, the word *certitude* has been transferred to the relation that a cause has to its effect; therefore, the relation of a cause to an effect is said to be certain when the cause infallibly produces its effect. Consequently, since God's foreknowledge does not imply, in all cases, a relation of a cause to all the things which are its objects, it is considered to have only the certitude of knowledge. But His predestination adds another element, because it includes not only His foreknowledge but also the relation of a cause to its objects, since predestination is a kind of direction or preparation. Thus, not only the certitude of knowledge, but also the certitude of ordination is contained in predestination. Now we are concerned only with the certitude of predestination; the certitude of knowledge, found also in predestination, has been explained in our investigation of God's knowledge.⁹

It should be known that, since predestination is a particular type of providence, not only its notion adds something to providence, but also its certitude adds something to the certitude of providence. Now, the ordering of providence is found to be certain in two respects. First, it is certain with relation to a particular thing, when God's providence ordains things to some particular end, and they attain that

end without failure. This is evident in the motions of celestial spheres and in all things in nature that act necessarily. Second, providence is certain in relation to things in general, but not in particular. For example, we see that the power of beings capable of generation and corruption sometimes falls short of the proper effects to which it has been ordered as its proper ends. Thus, the power that shapes bodies sometimes falls short of forming members completely. Yet, as we saw above when treating providence,¹⁰ these very defects are directed by God to some end. Consequently, nothing can fail to attain the general end of providence, even though it may at times fall short of a particular end.

The ordering of predestination, however, is certain, not only with respect to its general end, but also with respect to a particular and determinate end. For one who is ordained to salvation by predestination never fails to obtain it. Moreover, the ordering of predestination is not certain with reference to a particular end in the way in which the ordering of providence is; for, in providence, the ordering is not certain with respect to a particular end unless the proximate cause necessarily produces its effect. In predestination, however, there is certitude with respect to an individual end even though the proximate cause, free choice, does not produce that effect except in a contingent manner.

Hence, it seems difficult to reconcile the infallibility of predestination with freedom of choice; for we cannot say that predestination adds nothing to the certitude of providence except the certitude of foreknowledge, because this would be to say that God orders one who is predestined to his salvation as He orders any other person, with this difference, that, in the case of the predestined, God knows he will not fail to be saved. According to this position, one predestined would not differ in ordination from one not predestined; he would differ only with respect to [God's] foreknowledge of the outcome. Consequently, foreknowledge would be the cause of predestination, and predestination would not take place by the choice of Him who predestines. This, however, is contrary to the authority of the Scriptures¹¹ and the sayings of the saints.¹² Thus, the ordering of predestination has an infallible certitude of its own—over and above the certitude of foreknowledge. Nevertheless, the proximate cause of salvation, free choice, is related to predestination contingently, not necessarily.

This can be considered in the following manner. We find that an ordering is infallible in regard to something in two ways. First, an individual cause necessarily brings about its own effect because of the

Truth • QUESTION SIX: ARTICLE 3

ordering of divine providence. Secondly, a single effect may be attained only as the result of the convergence of many contingent causes individually capable of failure; but each one of these causes has been ordained by God either to bring about that effect itself if another cause should fail or to prevent that other cause from failing. We see, for example, that all the individual members of a species are corruptible. Yet, from the fact that one succeeds another, the nature of the species can be kept in existence; and this is how God keeps the species from extinction, despite the fact that the individual perishes.

A similar case is had in predestination; for, even though free choice can fail with respect to salvation, God prepares so many other helps for one who is predestined that he either does not fall at all or, if he does fall, he rises again. The helps that God gives a man to enable him to gain salvation are exhortations, the support of prayer, the gift of grace, and all similar things. Consequently, if we were to consider salvation only in relation to its proximate cause, free choice, salvation would not be certain but contingent; however, in relation to the first cause, namely, predestination, salvation is certain.

Answers to Difficulties:

1. The word *crown* as used in the Apocalypse (3:11) may mean either the crown of present justice or the crown of future glory. No matter which meaning is taken, however, one person is said to receive the crown of another when that other person falls in the sense that the goods of one person help another, either by aiding him to merit or even by increasing his glory. The reason for this is that all the members of the Church are connected by charity in such a way that their goods are common. Consequently, one receives the crown of another when that other falls through sin and does not achieve the reward of his merits; and another person receives the fruits of the sinner's merits, just as he would have benefited from the sinner's merits had the latter persevered. From this, however, it does not follow that predestination is ever in vain.

Or it can be answered that one is said to receive the crown of another, not because the other lost a crown that was predestined for him, but because whenever a person loses the crown that was due to him because of the justice he possessed, another person is substituted in his place to make up the number of the elect—just as men have been substituted to take the place of the fallen angels.

2. A natural effect issuing infallibly from God's providence takes place because of one proximate cause necessarily ordered to the effect.

Truth • QUESTION SIX: ARTICLE 3

The ordering of predestination, however, is not made certain in this manner but in the manner described above.*

3. A celestial body, taken in itself, imposes a kind of determinism in its action on bodies here below. Consequently, its effect necessarily takes place, unless something resists it. But God does not act on the will in the manner of one necessitating; for He does not force the will but merely moves it, without taking away its own proper mode, which consists in being free with respect to opposites. Consequently, even though nothing can resist the divine will, our will, like everything else, carries out the divine will according to its own proper mode. Indeed, the divine will has given things their mode of being in order that His will be fulfilled. Therefore, some things fulfill the divine will necessarily, other things, contingently; but that which God wills always takes place.

4. The second cause, which we must suppose as prerequisite for obtaining the effect of predestination, lies also under the ordering of predestination. The relationship between lower powers and the power of a superior agent is not one of predestination. Consequently, even though the ordering of God's predestination includes the supposition of a human will, it nevertheless has absolute certitude, despite the fact that the example given points to the contrary.

5. Those words of Job and Gregory should be referred to the state of present justice. If some fall from it, others are chosen in their place. From this, therefore, we cannot conclude to any uncertainty with reference to predestination; for those who fall from grace at the end were never predestined at all.

6. The comparison Anselm makes holds good in this respect, that just as the truth of a proposition about the future does not remove contingency from a future event, so also the truth of predestination [does not take away the contingency of predestination]. But, in another respect, the comparison is weak. For a proposition about the future is related to the future in so far as it is future, and, under this aspect, it cannot be certain. As we pointed out previously,¹³ however, the truth of predestination and foreknowledge is related to the future as present, and, consequently, is certain.

7. A thing can be said to be possible in two ways. First, we may consider the potency that exists in the thing itself, as when we say that a stone can be moved downwards. Or we may consider the potency that exists in another thing, as when we say that a stone can be moved upwards, not by a potency existing in the stone, but by a potency existing in the one who hurls it.

Truth • QUESTION SIX: ARTICLE 3

Consequently, when we say: "That predestined person can possibly die in sin," the statement is true if we consider only the potency that exists in him. But, if we are speaking of this predestined person according to the ordering which he has to another, namely, to God, who is predestining him, that event is incompatible with this ordering, even though it is compatible with the person's own power. Hence, we can use the distinction given above;¹⁴ that is, we can consider the subject with this form or without it.

8. Blackness and whiteness are, in a sense, examples of forms that exist in a subject said to be white or black. Consequently, nothing can be attributed to the subject, either according to potency or according to act, as long as blackness remains, if it is repugnant to this form of blackness. Predestination, however, is a form that exists, not in the person predestined, but in the one predestining, just as the *known* gets its name from knowledge in the knower. Consequently, no matter how fixed predestination may remain in the order of knowledge, yet, if we consider only the nature [of the predestined], we can attribute something to it which is repugnant to the ordering of predestination. For, considered this way, predestination is something other than the man who is said to be predestined, just as blackness is something other than the essence of a crow, even though it is not something outside the crow, but, by considering only the essence of a crow, one can attribute to it something that is repugnant to its blackness. For this reason, as Porphyry says,¹⁵ one can think of a white crow. Similarly, in the problem being discussed, one can attribute something to a predestined person taken in himself which cannot be attributed to him in so far as he is predestined.

9. Creation and mission imply the production of a temporal effect. Consequently, they affirm the existence of a temporal effect, and so must be temporal themselves, even though they include something eternal. Predestination, however, does not imply the production of a temporal effect—as the word itself shows—but only an ordering to something temporal, such as will, power, and all such attributes also imply. Since it does not affirm the actual existence of a temporal effect, which is also contingent, predestination is not necessarily temporal and contingent itself, because from eternity something can be unchangeably ordained to a temporal and contingent effect.

10. Absolutely speaking, it is possible for God to predestine or not to predestine each and every person, and it is possible for Him to have predestined or not to have predestined. For, since the act of predestination is measured by eternity, it never is past and never is fu-

Truth • QUESTION SIX: ARTICLE 4

ture. Consequently, it is always considered as issuing from His will as something free. Because of the supposition, however, certain things are impossible: He cannot predestine if He has predestined, and He cannot predestine if He has already not predestined—for God does not change. Hence, it does not follow that predestination can change.

ARTICLE IV

In the Fourth Article We Ask: IS THE NUMBER OF
PREDESTINED CERTAIN?

Difficulties:

It seems not, for

1. No number is certain if something can be added to it. But something can be added to the number of the predestined, because Moses' petition for such an increase is described in Deuteronomy (1:11) where he says: "The Lord God of your fathers add to this number many thousands." And the *Gloss* comments: "This number is fixed by God, who knows who belong to Him."¹ Now, unless such an addition were possible, Moses would have asked in vain. Consequently, the number of the predestined is not certain.

2. As we are prepared for grace through the disposition of natural perfections, so are we prepared through grace for the attainment of glory. Now, grace is found in whomsoever there is sufficient preparation of natural gifts. Similarly, then, glory will be found wherever grace is found. But one not predestined may, at one time, possess grace. Therefore, he will possess glory and so be predestined. Consequently, one not predestined may become predestined. In this way, the number of the predestined can be increased; hence, it is not certain.

3. If one who has grace is not to have glory, his loss of glory will be due to a failure either on the part of grace or on the part of the one giving glory. However, this loss cannot be due to a failure on the part of grace, for, in itself, it sufficiently disposes for glory; nor can it be due to a failure on the part of the one giving glory, for, on His part, He is ready to give it to all. Consequently, whoever has grace will necessarily have glory. Thus, one who is foreknown [as lost] will have glory and be predestined. Accordingly, our original argument stands.

Parallel readings: See readings given for preceding article.

ARTICLE VIII

In the Eighth Article We Ask: CAN GOD
FORCE THE WILL?

Difficulties:

It seems that He can, for

1. Whoever turns something whithersoever he wishes can force it. But, as is said in Proverbs (21:1), "The heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord: whithersoever he will he shall turn it." God can therefore force the will.

2. Quoting Augustine¹ on Romans (1:24): "Wherefore, God gave them up to the desires of their heart . . .," the *Gloss*² says: "It is evident that God works in the hearts of men to incline their wills to whatever He wishes, whether to good, according to His mercy, or to evil, according to their deserts." God can accordingly force the will.

3. If a finite being acts finitely, an infinite being will act infinitely. But a finite creature attracts the will in a finite way, because, as Cicero says,³ the honorable is what attracts us by its own vigor and entices us by its own excellence. Therefore God, who has infinite efficacy in acting, can altogether force the will.

4. He is properly said to be forced to something who is unable not to do it whether he wants to or not. But the will is unable not to will what God by His will of good pleasure wants it to will; otherwise the will of God would be inefficacious in regard to our will. God can therefore force the will.

5. In any creature there is perfect obedience to the Creator. But the will is a creature. Hence there is in it a perfect obedience to the Creator. God can therefore force it to what He wills.

To the Contrary:

1'. To be free from force is natural to the will. But what is natural to anything cannot be removed from it. The will therefore cannot be forced by God.

2'. God cannot make opposites to be true at the same time. But what is voluntary and what is violent are opposites, because the violent is

Parallel readings: C.G., III, 88, 89, 91; S.T., I, 105, 4; 111, 2; I-II, 9, 6; *De malo*, 3, 3; *Comp. theol.*, I, 129.

a species of the involuntary, as is made clear in the *Ethics*.⁴ God therefore cannot make the will do anything by force; and so He cannot force the will.

REPLY:

God can change the will with necessity but nevertheless cannot force it. For however much the will is moved toward something, it is not said to be forced to it. The reason for this is that to will something is to be inclined to it. But force or violence is contrary to the inclination of the thing forced. When God moves the will, then, He causes an inclination to succeed a previous inclination so that the first disappears and the second remains. Accordingly, that to which He induces the will is not contrary to an inclination still extant but merely to one that was previously there. This is not, then, violence or force.

The case is parallel to that of a stone, in which by reason of its heaviness there is an inclination downward. While this inclination remains, if the stone is thrown upward, violence is done it. But if God were to subtract from the stone the inclination of its heaviness and give it an inclination of lightness, then it would not be violent for the stone to be borne upward. Thus a change of motion can be had without violence.

It is in this way that God's changing of the will without forcing it is to be understood. God can change the will because He works within it just as He works in nature. Now, just as every natural action is from God, so too every action of the will, in so far as it is an action, not only is from the will as its immediate agent but also is from God as its first agent, who influences it more forcefully. Then, just as the will can change its act to something else, as is apparent from the explanation above,⁵ so too and much more can God.

God changes the will in two ways. (1) He does it merely by moving it. This occurs, for instance, when He moves the will to want something without introducing any form into the will. Thus He sometimes without the addition of any habit causes a man to want what he did not want before. (2) He does it by introducing some form into the will itself. By the very nature which God gave the will He inclines it to will something, as is clear from what has been said.⁶ Now in like fashion by something additional, such as grace or a virtue, the soul is inclined to will something to which it was not previously determined by a natural inclination.

This additional inclination is sometimes perfect, sometimes imperfect. When it is perfect it causes a necessary inclination to the thing

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-TWO: ARTICLE 9

to which it determines the will, in the same way as the will is inclined by nature necessarily to desire the end. This happens among the blessed, whom perfect charity sufficiently inclines to good not only as regards the last end but also as regards the means to this end. Sometimes, however, the additional form is not in all respects perfect, as among the wayfarers on earth. Then the will is indeed inclined by reason of the additional form, but not necessarily.

Answers to Difficulties:

From what has just been said the answers are clear. For the first set of arguments go to prove that God can change the will; the second, that He cannot force it. Both of these are true, as is evident from the explanation above.*

It should, however, be noted that, when it is said in the *Gloss* as cited⁷ that God works in the hearts of men to incline their wills to evil, this is not to be understood (as the *Gloss* itself says in the same place) as if God bestowed wickedness, but in the sense that, just as He confers grace by which men's wills are inclined to good, He also withdraws it from some; and when it is thus withdrawn, their wills are bent to evil.

ARTICLE IX

In the Ninth Article We Ask: CAN ANY CREATURE
CHANGE THE WILL OR INFLUENCE IT?

Difficulties:

It seems that it can, for

1. The will is a creature. But the will changes its own act as it wishes. It therefore seems that some creature can change the will and force it.

2. It is harder to change a whole thing than a part of it. But according to some philosophers¹ the heavenly bodies change a whole crowd to will something. With all the more reason, then, does it seem that they can force the will of a single man.

3. Whoever is bound by something is forced by it. But according

Parallel readings: *II Sent.*, 8, 2, 5; *C.G.*, III, 88 & 92; *S.T.*, I, 106, 2; I-II, 80, 1; *De malo*, 3, 3 & 4; *In Joan.*, c. 13, lect. 1, § 3 (P 10: 526b-527a).

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-TWO: ARTICLE 9

to the Philosopher² incontinent people are bound by their passions. Passions therefore change and force the will of an incontinent person.

4. According to Augustine³ both among spirits and among bodies the higher move the lower with a certain natural order. But not only the intellect but also the will of the blessed angels is higher and more perfect than ours. Therefore, just as they can influence our intellect by theirs by enlightening it, according to the teaching of Dionysius,⁴ so also it seems that by their will they can influence our will by changing it in some way.

5. According to Dionysius⁵ the higher angels enlighten, cleanse, and perfect the lower. But just as enlightenment applies to the intellect, so cleansing seems to apply to the affections. Angels can accordingly influence the will as they can the intellect.

6. A thing is naturally more disposed to be changed by a higher nature than by a lower. But just as sense appetite is inferior to our will, the will of angels is superior. Therefore, since sense appetite sometimes changes our will, with all the more reason will the angelic will be able to change ours.

7. In Luke (14:23) the master says to his servant, "Compel them to come in." Now it is by their will that they enter that banquet hall. Our will can therefore be forced by an angel, the servant of God.

To the Contrary:

1'. Bernard says⁶ that free choice is the most powerful thing this side of God. But nothing is changed except by something stronger. Then nothing can change the will.

2'. Merit and demerit are in some sense situated in the will. If, then, any creature could change the will, a person could be justified or even made a sinner by some creature. But that is false, because no one becomes a sinner except by himself; nor does anyone become just except by the operation of God and his own cooperation.

REPLY:

The will can be understood to be changed by something in two ways. (1) This is referred to its object. In this sense the will is changed by the appetible thing. But nothing which changes the will in this way is in question here; for that was treated above,⁷ where it was shown that a certain good does move the will with necessity (in the way in which the object moves it), though the will is not forced. (2) The will can be taken to be moved by something in the manner of an efficient cause. In this sense we say that not only can no creature

ARTICLE VIII

In the Eighth Article We Ask: CAN GOD
FORCE THE WILL?

Difficulties:

It seems that He can, for

1. Whoever turns something whithersoever he wishes can force it. But, as is said in Proverbs (21:1), "The heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord: whithersoever he will he shall turn it." God can therefore force the will.

2. Quoting Augustine¹ on Romans (1:24): "Wherefore, God gave them up to the desires of their heart . . .," the Gloss² says: "It is evident that God works in the hearts of men to incline their wills to whatever He wishes, whether to good, according to His mercy, or to evil, according to their deserts." God can accordingly force the will.

3. If a finite being acts finitely, an infinite being will act infinitely. But a finite creature attracts the will in a finite way, because, as Cicero says,³ the honorable is what attracts us by its own vigor and entices us by its own excellence. Therefore God, who has infinite efficacy in acting, can altogether force the will.

4. He is properly said to be forced to something who is unable not to do it whether he wants to or not. But the will is unable not to will what God by His will of good pleasure wants it to will; otherwise the will of God would be inefficacious in regard to our will. God can therefore force the will.

5. In any creature there is perfect obedience to the Creator. But the will is a creature. Hence there is in it a perfect obedience to the Creator. God can therefore force it to what He wills.

To the Contrary:

1'. To be free from force is natural to the will. But what is natural to anything cannot be removed from it. The will therefore cannot be forced by God.

2'. God cannot make opposites to be true at the same time. But what is voluntary and what is violent are opposites, because the violent is

Parallel readings: C.G., III, 88, 89, 91; S.T., I, 105, 4; 111, 2; I-II, 9, 6; *De malo*, 3, 3; *Comp. theol.*, I, 129.

a species of the involuntary, as is made clear in the *Ethics*.⁴ God therefore cannot make the will do anything by force; and so He cannot force the will.

REPLY:

God can change the will with necessity but nevertheless cannot force it. For however much the will is moved toward something, it is not said to be forced to it. The reason for this is that to will something is to be inclined to it. But force or violence is contrary to the inclination of the thing forced. When God moves the will, then, He causes an inclination to succeed a previous inclination so that the first disappears and the second remains. Accordingly, that to which He induces the will is not contrary to an inclination still extant but merely to one that was previously there. This is not, then, violence or force.

The case is parallel to that of a stone, in which by reason of its heaviness there is an inclination downward. While this inclination remains, if the stone is thrown upward, violence is done it. But if God were to subtract from the stone the inclination of its heaviness and give it an inclination of lightness, then it would not be violent for the stone to be borne upward. Thus a change of motion can be had without violence.

It is in this way that God's changing of the will without forcing it is to be understood. God can change the will because He works within it just as He works in nature. Now, just as every natural action is from God, so too every action of the will, in so far as it is an action, not only is from the will as its immediate agent but also is from God as its first agent, who influences it more forcefully. Then, just as the will can change its act to something else, as is apparent from the explanation above,⁵ so too and much more can God.

God changes the will in two ways. (1) He does it merely by moving it. This occurs, for instance, when He moves the will to want something without introducing any form into the will. Thus He sometimes without the addition of any habit causes a man to want what he did not want before. (2) He does it by introducing some form into the will itself. By the very nature which God gave the will He inclines it to will something, as is clear from what has been said.⁶ Now in like fashion by something additional, such as grace or a virtue, the soul is inclined to will something to which it was not previously determined by a natural inclination.

This additional inclination is sometimes perfect, sometimes imperfect. When it is perfect it causes a necessary inclination to the thing

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-TWO: ARTICLE 9

to which it determines the will, in the same way as the will is inclined by nature necessarily to desire the end. This happens among the blessed, whom perfect charity sufficiently inclines to good not only as regards the last end but also as regards the means to this end. Sometimes, however, the additional form is not in all respects perfect, as among the wayfarers on earth. Then the will is indeed inclined by reason of the additional form, but not necessarily.

Answers to Difficulties:

From what has just been said the answers are clear. For the first set of arguments go to prove that God can change the will; the second, that He cannot force it. Both of these are true, as is evident from the explanation above.*

It should, however, be noted that, when it is said in the *Gloss* as cited⁷ that God works in the hearts of men to incline their wills to evil, this is not to be understood (as the *Gloss* itself says in the same place) as if God bestowed wickedness, but in the sense that, just as He confers grace by which men's wills are inclined to good, He also withdraws it from some; and when it is thus withdrawn, their wills are bent to evil.

ARTICLE IX

In the Ninth Article We Ask: CAN ANY CREATURE
CHANGE THE WILL OR INFLUENCE IT?

Difficulties:

It seems that it can, for

1. The will is a creature. But the will changes its own act as it wishes. It therefore seems that some creature can change the will and force it.

2. It is harder to change a whole thing than a part of it. But according to some philosophers¹ the heavenly bodies change a whole crowd to will something. With all the more reason, then, does it seem that they can force the will of a single man.

3. Whoever is bound by something is forced by it. But according

Parallel readings: *II Sent.*, 8, a. 5; *C.G.*, III, 88 & 92; *S.T.*, I, 106, 2; I-II, 80, 1; *De malo*, 3, 3 & 4; *In Joan.*, c. 13, lect. 1, § 3 (*P* 10: 526b-527a).

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-TWO: ARTICLE 9

to the Philosopher² incontinent people are bound by their passions. Passions therefore change and force the will of an incontinent person.

4. According to Augustine³ both among spirits and among bodies the higher move the lower with a certain natural order. But not only the intellect but also the will of the blessed angels is higher and more perfect than ours. Therefore, just as they can influence our intellect by theirs by enlightening it, according to the teaching of Dionysius,⁴ so also it seems that by their will they can influence our will by changing it in some way.

5. According to Dionysius⁵ the higher angels enlighten, cleanse, and perfect the lower. But just as enlightenment applies to the intellect, so cleansing seems to apply to the affections. Angels can accordingly influence the will as they can the intellect.

6. A thing is naturally more disposed to be changed by a higher nature than by a lower. But just as sense appetite is inferior to our will, the will of angels is superior. Therefore, since sense appetite sometimes changes our will, with all the more reason will the angelic will be able to change ours.

7. In Luke (14:23) the master says to his servant, "Compel them to come in." Now it is by their will that they enter that banquet hall. Our will can therefore be forced by an angel, the servant of God.

To the Contrary:

1¹. Bernard says⁶ that free choice is the most powerful thing this side of God. But nothing is changed except by something stronger. Then nothing can change the will.

2¹. Merit and demerit are in some sense situated in the will. If, then, any creature could change the will, a person could be justified or even made a sinner by some creature. But that is false, because no one becomes a sinner except by himself; nor does anyone become just except by the operation of God and his own cooperation.

REPLY:

The will can be understood to be changed by something in two ways. (1) This is referred to its object. In this sense the will is changed by the appetible thing. But nothing which changes the will in this way is in question here; for that was treated above,⁷ where it was shown that a certain good does move the will with necessity (in the way in which the object moves it), though the will is not forced. (2) The will can be taken to be moved by something in the manner of an efficient cause. In this sense we say that not only can no creature

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-SEVEN: ARTICLE 5

powerful, seeing that the passion of Christ works in them. The sacraments of the Old Law, however, which preceded the passion of Christ, are called weak, as appears in the Epistle to the Galatians (4:9): "You have turned to the weak and needy elements."²⁵

15. Creation does not presuppose anything in which the action of an instrumental agent could terminate, but re-creation does. There is accordingly no parallel.

16. It is not because of His own need but for the meetness of the effects that God uses instruments or intervening causes in His action. For it is meet that the divine remedies should be presented to us conformably to our condition, that is, through sensible things, as Dionysius says.²⁶

17. The natural action of a material instrument helps toward the effect of the sacrament in so far as the sacrament is applied by it to the recipient and in so far as the signification of the sacrament is completed by the said action, as the signification of baptism by washing.

18. There are some sacraments in which a definite minister is not required, as in baptism. In these the power of the sacrament is not situated in the minister at all. But there are some sacraments in which a definite minister is required. The power of these is partially situated in the minister as well as in the matter and the form. And yet the minister is not said to justify except by way of the ministry, inasmuch as he cooperates in justification by conferring a sacrament.

19. The Holy Spirit is given only by him who causes grace as the principal agent; and this is the business of God alone. Thus only God gives the Holy Spirit.

ARTICLE V

In the Fifth Article We Ask: IN ONE MAN IS THERE ONLY ONE INGRATIATORY GRACE?

Difficulties:

It seems that there is not, for

1. Nothing is distinguished from itself. But grace is distinguished into operating and cooperating grace. Operating and cooperating grace are therefore different kinds, and in one man there is not just one ingratiatory grace.

Parallel readings: *II Sent.*, 26, a. 6; *IV Sent.*, 1, 1, 4 sol. 5.

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-SEVEN: ARTICLE 5

2. It was said in answer that operating and cooperating grace are one and the same from the viewpoint of the habit, but the distinction is made from the viewpoint of the distinct acts.—On the contrary, habits are distinguished by their acts. If, then, the acts are distinct, the two kinds of grace cannot be a single habit.

3. No one has to ask for what he already has. But a person who has antecedent grace has to ask for subsequent grace, according to Augustine.¹ Antecedent grace and subsequent grace are therefore not one and the same.

4. It was said that a person having antecedent grace does not ask for subsequent grace as a distinct grace but as the preservation of the same one.—On the contrary, grace is stronger than nature. But man in the state of uncorrupted nature was able by himself to remain in possession of what he had received, as is said in the *Sentences*.² Consequently one who has received antecedent grace is able to remain in it, and so he does not have to ask for this.

5. Form is distinguished in the same way as the things to be perfected. But grace is the form of virtues. Since there are many virtues, grace therefore cannot be one.

6. Antecedent grace refers to this present life, but subsequent grace refers to glory. Thus Augustine says: "It precedes in order that we may live piously, and it follows in order that we may always live with God; it precedes that we may be called, and it follows that we may be glorified."³ Now the grace of this present life is different from that of our heavenly home, since nature as created and nature as glorified do not have the same perfection, as the Master says.⁴ Antecedent grace and subsequent grace are therefore not the same.

7. Operating grace pertains to the internal act, whereas cooperating grace pertains to the external act. Augustine thus says: "It precedes in order that we may will, and it follows lest we will in vain."⁵ But the principle of the internal act and that of the external act are not the same. In regard to the virtues, for instance, it is evident that charity is given for the internal act, but fortitude, justice, and the like for external acts. Consequently operating and cooperating grace or antecedent and subsequent grace are not the same.

8. Ignorance is a defect in the soul on the part of the intellect like guilt on the part of the will. But no one habit drives all ignorance out of the intellect. Consequently there cannot be a single habit which would drive all guilt out of the will. But grace drives out all guilt. Then grace is not a single habit.

9. Grace and guilt are contraries. But a single guilt does not infect

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-SEVEN: ARTICLE 5

all the powers of the soul. Then neither can a single grace perfect all.

10. On the words of Exodus (33:13): "If therefore I have found favor . . ." the *Gloss* comments: "A single grace is not sufficient for the saints; there is one which precedes in order that they may know and love God; and there is another which follows in order that they may keep themselves clean and inviolate and make progress."⁶ There is accordingly not merely one grace in one man.

11. A different manner of acting having a special difficulty requires a different habit. In regard to the granting of large gifts, for example, which cause difficulty because of their magnitude, there is required a special virtue, magnificence, over and above liberality, which is concerned with ordinary gifts. But to persevere in willing rightly has a special difficulty over and above that of simply willing. But simply to will rightly is a matter of antecedent grace, whereas perseverance in willing rightly is a matter of subsequent grace. Thus Augustine says⁷ that grace precedes in order that man may will, and follows in order that he may fulfill and persist. Subsequent grace is therefore a different habit from antecedent grace.

12. The sacraments of the New Law are the cause of grace, as has been said.⁸ But different sacraments are not ordained to the same effect. Consequently there are different graces in man which are conferred by the different sacraments.

13. It was answered that later sacraments are not conferred in order to introduce grace but to increase it.—On the contrary, the increase of grace does not change its species. If, then, causes are proportioned to their effects, it will follow from the answer given that the sacraments do not differ in species.

14. It was said that the sacraments differ specifically in accordance with the different gratuitous graces which are conferred in the different sacraments and are the distinctive effects of the sacraments.—On the contrary, gratuitous grace is not opposed to guilt. Now since the sacraments are especially directed against guilt, it therefore seems that the distinctive effects of the sacraments, in accordance with which the sacraments are distinguished, are not gratuitous graces.

15. Different wounds are inflicted upon the soul by different sins, but all are healed by grace. Since different medicines correspond to different wounds, because (in the words of Jerome) "what heals a heel will not heal an eye,"⁹ it therefore seems that there are distinct graces.

16. The same thing cannot at the same time be had and not had by the same thing. But some people who do not have cooperating grace

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-SEVEN: ARTICLE 5

do have operating grace—baptized infants, for instance. Operating grace and cooperating grace are therefore not the same.

17. Grace is proportioned to nature as a perfection to a perfectible thing. But in human nature it so happens that being and operation are not immediately from the same principle; for the soul is the principle of being on the basis of its essence, but that of operation on the basis of its power. Now since on the supernatural plane operating or antecedent grace is the principle from which spiritual existence is had, but cooperating grace is the principle of spiritual operation, it therefore seems that operating and cooperating grace are not the same.

18. One habit cannot produce two acts at one and the same time. But the act of operating grace, which is to justify or heal the soul, and the act of cooperating or subsequent grace, which is to act justly, are in the soul at the same time. Operating grace and cooperating grace are therefore not identical; and so there is not just one grace in man.

To the Contrary:

1'. Where one thing suffices it is superfluous to posit many. But one grace suffices for man's salvation, as is said in the second Epistle to the Corinthians (12:9): "My grace is sufficient for thee." Then there is only one grace in man.

2'. A relation does not multiply the essence of a thing. But cooperating grace does not add anything to operating grace except a relation. Cooperating grace is therefore essentially the same as operating grace.

REPLY:

As is clear from what has been said,¹⁰ grace is so called either because it is gratuitously given or because it puts us in God's good graces. Now it is evident that there are different graces gratuitously given. For there are different gifts which are conferred upon man by God gratuitously and above the merit and capability of human nature, such as prophecy, the working of miracles, and the like, of which the Apostle says in the first Epistle to the Corinthians (12:4): "Now there are diversities of graces." But our present inquiry is not concerned with these. But as can be gathered from what has been said,¹¹ the grace that puts us in God's good graces, or ingratiatory grace, is taken in two ways: (1) for the divine acceptance itself, which is the gratuitous will of God, and (2) for a created gift which formally perfects a man and makes him worthy of eternal life.

Now if we take grace in this second sense, it is impossible for more

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-SEVEN: ARTICLE 5

than one grace to be in one man. The reason for this is that grace is spoken of inasmuch as by it man is destined for eternal life, and adequately. For to have grace means to be accepted by God with a view to having eternal life. Now anything held to direct things adequately to one term must itself be only one, because if there were many such, either no one of them would be adequate or every other would be superfluous.

But it is not necessary on this account for grace to be one simple thing. For it is possible that no one thing would sufficiently make a man worthy of eternal life, but that man would be made worthy of it by many things, as by many virtues. But if that were the case, no one of those many things would be called grace, but all taken together would be called one grace, because from all of them there would arise in the man only one worthiness with regard to eternal life. Grace is, however, not one in this way, but rather as one simple habit. This is so because habits in the soul are differentiated in relation to different acts. The acts themselves, however, are not the reason for the divine acceptance; but first the man is accepted by God and then his acts, as is indicated in Genesis (4:4): "And the Lord had respect to Abel, and to his offerings."

That gift, then, which God grants to those whom He accepts into His kingdom and glory is presupposed to the perfections or habits by which human acts are perfected so as to be worthy of acceptance by God. Thus the habit of grace must remain undivided, as preceding the things by which the differentiation of habits takes place in the soul.

If, on the other hand, grace is taken in the first sense, namely, for God's gratuitous will, then it is evident that from the viewpoint of God who does the accepting there is only one grace of God, not only in regard to one man, but also in regard to all, because whatever is in Him cannot be distinct. But from the viewpoint of its effects it can be multiple. As a result we say that every effect which God works in us by His gratuitous will accepting us into His kingdom, pertains to ingratulatory grace, such as giving us good thoughts and holy affections.

In so far, then, as grace is a habitual gift within us, it is only one; but in so far as it refers to an effect of God within us destined for our salvation, there can be said to be many graces in us.

Answers to Difficulties:

1. Operating and cooperating grace can be distinguished from the

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-SEVEN: ARTICLE 5

point of view of God's gratuitous will and from that of the gift conferred upon us. Grace is called operating in regard to an effect which the will of God brings about in us, whereas grace is called cooperating in regard to an effect which God's will does not produce alone, but with the cooperation of our free choice.

From the point of view of God's gratuitous will, therefore, the very justification of a sinner, which is brought about by means of the infusion of a gratuitous gift, will be called operating grace. For only God's gratuitous will causes this gift in us, and free choice is in no way its cause except as a disposition, and that is inadequate. From the same point of view grace will be called cooperating inasmuch as it works in our free choice, causing its movement, removing the obstacles to the execution of the external act, and giving perseverance, in all of which our free choice plays a part. Thus it is clear that operating grace is distinct from cooperating grace.

From the point of view of the gratuitous gift essentially the same grace will be called operating and cooperating. It will be called operating grace in so far as it informs the soul, so that the term *operating* will be understood *formally*, in the way in which we speak of whiteness making a wall white. For this information it is nowise the act of our free choice. It will be called cooperating, however, in so far as it inclines us to the internal and the external act and supplies the ability to persevere to the end.

2. The different effects which are attributed to operating and to cooperating grace cannot differentiate the habit. For the effects which are attributed to operating grace are the causes of the effects which are attributed to cooperating grace. As a consequence of being informed by a habit, the will passes into the act of willing, and from the act of willing the external act is caused. Moreover the resistance which we offer to sin is caused by the firmness of the habit. Thus it is one and the same habit which informs the soul, elicits the internal and the external act, and in a sense accounts for perseverance inasmuch as it resists temptations.

3. However much a man has the habit of grace, he still has need of the divine operation working in us in the ways mentioned above.¹² This is because of the infirmity of our nature and the multiplicity of impediments, which were of course not found in the state of nature as it was created. Man was accordingly better able to stand by himself than even those who have grace can now, not because of any deficiency in the grace but because of the infirmity of our nature, though even then men needed divine providence to guide and help

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-SEVEN: ARTICLE 5

them. One who has grace therefore has the necessity of asking for divine help, which is a form of cooperating grace.

4. The answer is clear from what has just been said.

5. Grace is not called the form of the virtues as being an essential part of the virtues. Were that the case, when the virtues are multiplied, grace would have to be multiplied. But it is called the form of the virtues as formally completing the act of virtue.

Now an act of virtue is given form in three ways. This is done first of all in so far as the due conditions for the substance of the act are placed, setting limits to the act and establishing it in the mean of virtue. The act of virtue has this from prudence; for the mean of virtue is determined by a correct norm, as is said in the *Ethics*.¹³ In this sense prudence is called the form of all the moral virtues. But the act of virtue thus established in the mean is, as it were, material in regard to the ordination to the last end. This order is conferred upon the act of virtue by the command of charity. In this sense charity is said to be the form of all the other virtues. And furthermore grace contributes efficacy for meriting. For no value on the part of our works would be held to be deserving of eternal glory unless divine acceptance were presupposed. In this sense grace is said to be the form both of charity and of the other virtues.

6. Antecedent and subsequent grace are distinguished on the basis of the sequence of factors found in gratuitous existence. The first of these is the information of the subject by grace or the justification of a sinner (which is the same thing). The second is the act of the will. The third is the external act. The fourth is spiritual progress and perseverance in good. The fifth is the obtaining of one's reward.

Antecedent and subsequent grace are therefore distinguished in the following ways: (1) The grace by which sinners are justified is called antecedent; that by which those already justified operate is called subsequent. (2) That by which a person wills correctly is called antecedent; that by which he carries out his correct will in the external act is called subsequent. (3) Antecedent grace is referred to all of these; subsequent grace, to perseverance in the foregoing. (4) Antecedent grace is referred to the whole state of merit; subsequent grace, to reward.

In the first three distinctions it is clear from what was said¹⁴ about operating grace and cooperating grace, in what sense antecedent grace and subsequent grace are the same or different, because in these ways antecedent and subsequent grace seem to be the same as operating and cooperating grace. According to the fourth distinction too, if

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-SEVEN: ARTICLE 5

the gratuitous gift which is called grace is taken in itself, antecedent grace and subsequent grace are found to be the same thing. For just as the charity of this present life is not taken away but remains and is increased in our heavenly home because it involves no defect in its essence; in the same way grace too, involving no defect in its essence, when increased becomes glory. Nor is the perfection of nature in the present life and in heaven said to be different in point of grace because of any difference in the perfecting form but because of a difference in the measure of perfection. But if we take grace along with all the virtues to which it gives form, then grace and glory are not the same thing, because some virtues, such as faith and hope, are voided in heaven.

7. Although the external act and the internal act are distinct subjects of perfection, they are nevertheless subordinated, because one is the cause of the other, as has been explained.¹⁵

8. There are two aspects to be taken into account in sin: turning towards creatures and turning away from God. As regards turning toward creatures sins are distinguished from one another, but as regards turning away from God they are linked, inasmuch as by any mortal sin a man is turned away from the unchangeable good. Virtues are therefore opposed to sins from the standpoint of turning toward creatures, and in this sense different sins are driven out by different virtues, as different types of ignorance by different sciences. From the standpoint of turning away from God, however, all sins are forgiven by one and the same thing, grace. But different types of ignorance are not linked in any one thing; and so the case is not the same.

9. One type of guilt is not found to be the formal completion of all types of guilt as one habit of virtue or of grace completes all the virtues. For this reason one type of guilt does not infect all the powers as one grace perfects them—not, of course, in such a way that it is in all as its subject, but as giving form to the acts of all the powers.

10. The grace which follows means either another effect of the divine gratuitous will or the same habit of grace referred to another effect, as is clear from what has been said above.¹⁶

11. To have the habit and the operation firmly and unchangeably is a condition which is required for every virtue, as is made clear by the Philosopher.¹⁷ That manner, then, does not require a special habit.

12. Just as different virtues and different gifts of the Holy Spirit are directed to different actions, so too the different effects of the sacraments are like different medicines for sin and different shares in

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-SEVEN: ARTICLE 5

the efficacy of our Lord's passion, which depend upon sanctifying grace, as do the virtues and gifts.

The virtues and gifts have a special name, however, because the acts to which they are directed are evident. They are accordingly distinguished from grace in name also. But the defects of sin, against which the sacraments are instituted, are hidden. Hence the effects of the sacraments do not have a proper name but go by the name of grace; for they are called sacramental graces, and the sacraments are distinguished on the basis of these graces as their proper effects. Those effects, moreover, belong to ingratiatory grace, which also is joined to those effects. Thus along with their proper effects they have a common effect, ingratiatory grace, which is given by means of the sacraments to one who does not have it and increased by them in one who does.

13-14. The answer is clear from the above.

15. From the point of view of turning away from God all sins inflict a single wound, as has been said,¹⁸ and so are healed by a single gift of grace. But from the point of view of turning towards creatures they inflict different wounds, which are healed by different virtues and by the different effects of the sacraments.

16. Even though there is no cooperating grace in infants actually, there is nonetheless virtually; for the operating grace which they have received will be sufficient to cooperate with free choice when they have its use.

17. Just as the essence of the soul is immediately the principle of being but, through the mediation of the powers, the principle of acting; in the same way the immediate effect of grace is to confer spiritual existence. This concerns the information of the subject or the justification of sinners and is the effect of operating grace. But the effect of grace through the mediation of the virtues and gifts is to elicit meritorious acts, and this has reference to cooperating grace.

18. Two acts which are distinct operations not subordinated to one another cannot be caused at one and the same time by one habit. But two acts of which one is an operation and the other the information of a subject, or even two operations of which one is the cause of the other, as an internal act is the cause of an external, can be caused by one habit. It is in this way that operating and cooperating grace are related, as appears from what has been said.¹⁹

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-SEVEN: ARTICLE 6

ARTICLE VI

In the Sixth Article We Ask: IS GRACE IN THE
ESSENCE OF THE SOUL?

Difficulties:

It seems that it is not, for

1. A habit or perfection which is in the essence of the soul has the same relation to the effect of the essence as a habit which is in a power has to the effect of the power. But a habit which is in a power perfects the power for its act, as charity perfects the will for willing. But the proper effect of the essence is to be, which the soul confers upon the body, because the soul in its essence is the form of the body. Now since grace does not perfect the soul with regard to the natural act of being which the soul confers upon the body, it will not be in the essence of the soul as its subject.

2. Opposites are by their nature concerned with the same thing. Now grace and guilt are opposed. But guilt is not in the essence of the soul, as is evident from the fact that the essence of the soul suffers no privation, though according to Augustine sin or guilt is "the privation of measure, species, and order."¹ It therefore seems that grace is not in the essence of the soul as its subject.

3. Gratuitous gifts presuppose natural ones. But the powers are natural properties of the soul according to Avicenna.² Grace is therefore not in the essence of the soul unless a power is presupposed. Thus it is immediately in the power as its subject.

4. A habit or form is there where its effect is found. But any effect of grace, whether operating or cooperating, is found in the powers, as can be seen from an enumeration of the effects. Grace therefore has the powers of the soul as its subject.

5. "The image of re-creation" corresponds to "the image of creation." These two sorts of image are distinguished in the *Gloss*³ in its comment upon the words of the Psalm (4:7): "The light of thy countenance, O Lord, is signed upon us." But the image of creation is taken with reference to the powers, memory, intelligence, and will, which are three faculties of the soul, as the Master says.⁴ Then grace also refers to the powers of the soul.

6. Acquired habits are distinguished from infused habits. But all

Parallel readings: *II Sent.*, 26, a. 3; *IV Sent.*, 4, 1, 3 sol. 1; sol. 3 ad 1; *S.T.*, I-II, 110, 4.

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-EIGHT: ARTICLE 8

8. There is need of the same distinction in natural forms and in the matter at hand.

9. Leaving the starting point is prior in the line of coming to be and of motion. These are reduced to the order of matter, for motion is the act of a being that is in potency. The arrival at the terminus, however, is prior in the line of formal causality.

10. In God's operations a disposition is needed, not because of the impotence of the agent, but because of the condition of the effect; and especially such a disposition—the removal of the contrary—because contraries cannot exist together.

11. Even a form which is wholly from without requires the right disposition in the subject, either one pre-existing, as light requires transparency in the air, or one inserted by the same agent at the same time, as heat in its fullness is introduced along with the form of fire. In the same way guilt is driven out by God simultaneously with the infusion of grace.

12. The same distinction is to be applied to the sequence of cleansing and enlightenment as is applied in the matter at hand.

13. If God effected justification successively, the driving out of guilt would be prior in time but posterior in nature; for the order of time follows that of motion and matter. In agreement with this distinction the Philosopher says⁵ that in the same being act is posterior to potency in time but prior in nature, because what is prior in the line of final causality is prior in nature without qualification, as has been said.*

ARTICLE VIII

In the Eighth Article We Ask: IN THE JUSTIFICATION
OF SINNERS DOES THE MOTION OF FREE CHOICE
NATURALLY PRECEDE THE INFUSION
OF GRACE?

Difficulties:

It seems that it does, for

1. A cause naturally precedes its effect. But contrition is the cause

Parallel readings: *IV Sent.*, 17, 1, 4 sol. 2 & 3; *S.T.*, I-II, 113, 8.

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-EIGHT: ARTICLE 8

of the forgiveness of guilt. It therefore naturally precedes it; and consequently it also precedes the infusion of grace, because forgiveness and the infusion of grace are concomitant.

2. The answer was given that contrition is not the cause of the forgiveness of guilt except as a material disposition.—On the contrary, contrition is the sacramental cause of the forgiveness of guilt and of the infusion of grace. Since penance is a sacrament of the New Law, it causes grace, and therefore also the forgiveness of guilt; and it does not do this by reason of its other parts, confession and satisfaction, which presuppose grace and the forgiveness of guilt. We are thus left with the conclusion that contrition itself is the sacramental cause of the forgiveness of guilt and of the infusion of grace. But a sacramental cause is an instrumental cause, as is evident from the preceding question.¹ Since an instrument is reduced to the genus of efficient cause, contrition will not be the cause of the forgiveness of guilt as a material disposition but rather in the genus of efficient cause.

3. Attrition precedes the infusion of grace and the forgiveness of guilt. But contrition differs from attrition only in the intensity of sorrow, and that does not change its species. Then contrition also at least naturally precedes the infusion of grace and the forgiveness of guilt.

4. It is written in the Psalm (88:15): "Justice and judgment are the preparation of thy throne." Now the soul is made the throne of God by the infusion of grace and the forgiveness of guilt. Consequently, since a man works justice and judgment by being contrite for his sin, it seems that contrition is a preparation for the infusion of grace; and so it is naturally prior.

5. Motion to a term naturally precedes the term. But contrition is a kind of motion tending to the destruction of sin. It therefore naturally precedes the forgiveness of sin.

6. Augustine says: "He who created you without you will not justify you without you."² Thus the motion of free choice, which is from us, is required for justification and naturally precedes it. But justification terminates in the forgiveness of guilt. The motion of free choice therefore naturally precedes the forgiveness of guilt.

7. In carnal marriage mutual consent naturally precedes the marriage bond. But through the infusion of grace a certain spiritual marriage of the soul with God is contracted, according to the words of Osee (2:19): "I will espouse thee to me for ever." Consequently the motion of free choice, by which the consent of the soul to God is given, naturally precedes the infusion of grace.

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-EIGHT: ARTICLE 8

8. The relation between the imparting of motion by the mover and its reception by the thing moved is the same in things moved by another and in those which are moved by themselves. But the motion imparted by an external agent, whether it acts as a principal agent or only as a helper, naturally precedes its reception by the thing moved. Now, since in the justification of sinners the soul is not moved wholly from without, but in a certain sense it moves itself as a helper, according to the words of the first Epistle to the Corinthians (3:9): "We are God's coadjutors," it therefore seems that the operation of the soul, that is, the motion of free choice, naturally precedes the forgiveness of guilt, in which the soul is moved from vice to virtue.

To the Contrary:

1'. Contrition is a meritorious act. But a meritorious act comes only from grace. Then grace is the cause of contrition. But the cause naturally precedes the effect. The infusion of grace therefore naturally precedes contrition.

2'. In its comment upon the words of the Epistle to the Romans (5:1): "Being justified therefore by faith . . .," the *Gloss* says: "No meritorious act of man precedes the grace of God."³ But contrition is a meritorious act of man. It therefore does not precede the infusion of grace.

3'. It was said in answer that it precedes as a kind of disposition.—On the contrary, a disposition is less perfect than the form for which it disposes. But contrition is something more perfect than grace. Contrition is therefore not a disposition for grace. Proof of the minor: A second act has greater perfection than a first act. But grace is a first act since it is like a habit; but contrition is a second act since it is the operation of grace, just as considering is the operation of science. Then contrition is more perfect than grace, just as considering is more perfect than science.

4'. The effect of an efficient cause is never a disposition for that efficient cause, because in the line of motion it follows the efficient cause, though in the same line a disposition precedes that for which it disposes. But contrition is related to grace as the effect of an efficient cause is related to that cause. Contrition is therefore not a disposition for grace; and so the conclusion is the same as above. Proof of the minor: Habit and power are reduced to the same genus of causes, since the habit supplies what is lacking to the power. But a power is the cause of its act in the line of efficient causality. Then so is a habit. But the relation of grace to contrition is that of a habit to its act. The

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-EIGHT: ARTICLE 8

relation of contrition to grace is therefore that of an effect to an efficient cause.

5'. Whatever has no influence upon the introduction of a form is not a disposition for the form. But contrition has no influence upon the infusion of grace, because apart from contrition the infusion of grace can take place. Examples are had in Christ, in the angels, and in the first man in the state of innocence. Contrition is therefore not a disposition for grace; and so we must conclude the same as before.

6'. Bernard says⁴ that there are two requisites for the work of our salvation: God to give it, and free choice to receive it. But giving is naturally prior to receiving. Consequently grace, which in our justification is from God who gives it, naturally precedes contrition, which is from our free choice which receives it.

7'. Contrition cannot coexist with sin. The forgiveness of sin therefore naturally precedes contrition.

REPLY:

On this matter there are three opinions.

Some⁵ say that the motion of free choice naturally precedes without qualification the infusion of grace and the forgiveness of guilt. For they say that that motion of free choice is not contrition but attrition, and that it is an act not of formed but of unformed faith. But this does not seem to be to the point. For all sorrow for sin in one who has grace is contrition; and similarly every act of faith joined to grace is an act of formed faith. Accordingly the act of unformed faith and the attrition of which these men speak precede in time the infusion of grace. Of such motions of free choice we are not at present speaking, but rather of those which are accompanied by the infusion of grace and without which there cannot be any justification in adults; for it can take place without any preceding acts, as is clear from what was said above.⁶

For this reason others⁷ say that those motions are meritorious and informed by grace, and hence naturally follow grace; but they naturally precede the forgiveness of guilt, because through those acts grace brings about that forgiveness. Now this cannot be true. For anything that causes an effect by its operation causes it as an efficient cause. If, then, grace causes the forgiveness of guilt through an act of contrition and of faith that is formed, it will cause it as an efficient cause. But that is impossible; for a cause which effectively destroys something is placed in existence before the thing destroyed is reduced to non-existence, because it would not work for the destruction of

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-EIGHT: ARTICLE 8

something which already does not exist. It would accordingly follow that grace would be in the soul before guilt is forgiven. But that is impossible. It is therefore clear that grace is not the cause of the forgiveness of sin through any operation, but through the information of its subject implied in the infusion of grace. Nothing intervenes, then, between the infusion of grace and the forgiveness of guilt.

We must therefore hold, as another opinion⁸ has it, that the motions in question are so related in the same order to both forgiveness and grace that in one sense they precede and in another they follow by the order of nature. For if we view the order of nature in the line of material causality, the motion of free choice naturally precedes the infusion of grace as a material disposition precedes the form. If, on the other hand, we view them in the line of formal causality, the sequence is reversed. The same situation obtains in natural things as regards a disposition that is an exigency for a form, which in some sense precedes the substantial form, namely, in the line of material causality; for a material disposition attaches to the matter. In the other line of causality—formal—however, the substantial form is prior inasmuch as it perfects both the matter and the material accidents.

Answers to Difficulties:

1. Contrition is the cause of the forgiveness of guilt in so far as it is a disposition for grace.

2. The sacrament of penance has the ability to confer grace from the power of the keys, to which the penitent submits. If contrition is considered in itself, then, it is related to grace only as a material disposition; but if it is considered in so far as it has the power of the keys in desire, then it works sacramentally in virtue of the sacrament of penance, as also in virtue of baptism, as is clear in the case of an adult who has the sacrament of baptism only in desire. We do not conclude from this, then, that contrition is itself directly the efficient cause of the forgiveness of guilt, but rather that the power of the keys or baptism is.

Or the answer may be given that with reference to the debt of temporal punishment contrition stands as an efficient cause, but with reference to the stain and the debt of eternal punishment it stands only as a disposition.

3. Contrition does not differ from previous attrition merely in the intensity of the sorrow but also in information by grace. Thus contrition has a certain relation of posteriority to grace which attrition does not have.

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-EIGHT: ARTICLE 8

4. That preparation is by way of a material disposition.

5. Contrition is a motion to the forgiveness of guilt, not as if the contrition were distant from the forgiveness but as joined to it. Hence it is considered as being in the condition of having been moved rather than in that of being moved. And yet the motion precedes the term in the line of material causality, because motion is the act of a being that is in potency.

6. The words "He will not justify you without you" are to be understood as meaning "not without you in some way disposing yourself for grace." So the motion of free choice does not have to precede except as a disposition.

7. Consent is the efficient cause of carnal marriage; but the motion of free choice is not the efficient cause of the infusion of grace; and so there is no parallel.

8. In the justification of sinners man is not God's helper in the sense of producing grace along with Him, but only in the sense that he prepares himself for grace.

Answers to Contrary Difficulties:

1'. Contrition is from grace as from that which informs it. It accordingly follows that in the line of formal causality grace is prior.

2'. The meritorious act of man does not precede grace in the line of meriting so that grace becomes subordinate to the meritorious act. Yet the human act can precede grace as a material disposition.

3'. Contrition is from free choice and from grace. Inasmuch as it proceeds from free choice it is a disposition for grace that arrives simultaneously with grace, just as a disposition that is an exigency exists simultaneously with the form; but inasmuch as it is from grace it is related to grace as a second act.

4'. Just as a habit perfects a power formally, in the same way the remnant of the habit left in the act is formal as regards the substance of the act which the power furnishes. Thus the habit is a formal principle of the formed act, although in regard to the formation it has the character of an efficient cause.

5'. A disposition does not have any influence upon the form effectively but only materially, inasmuch as through the disposition the matter is made suitable for the reception of the form. Contrition accordingly has an influence upon the infusion of grace in one who has guilt, though it is not required in an innocent person. For there are more dispositive requisites for the removal of a contrary form

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-EIGHT: ARTICLE 9

and the simultaneous introduction of a form than for the introduction of a form alone.

6'. The contribution of the giver is prior formally, but that of the receiver is prior materially.

7'. It does not follow from that argument that the removal of guilt precedes contrition, because guilt is in some sense forgiven through contrition itself, just as the form of water is driven out by means of heat in the highest degree and therefore the two forms are not simultaneous. In the same way, neither are guilt and contrition.

ARTICLE IX

In the Ninth Article We Ask: IS THE JUSTIFICATION
OF SINNERS INSTANTANEOUS?

Difficulties:

It seems that it is not, for

1. It is impossible for the same power to have several motions at one and the same time, just as a single matter is not under different distinct forms at one and the same time. But in the justification of sinners two different motions of free choice are required, as is clear from what has been said.¹ The justification of sinners therefore cannot be instantaneous.

2. The answer was given that those two motions belong to different powers; for the motion of free choice toward God belongs to the concupiscible power, and that toward sin, being a sort of detestation of sin, is in the irascible.—On the contrary, to detest is the same as to hate. But hatred, like love, is in the concupiscible power, as the Philosopher teaches.² To detest is therefore not in the irascible power.

3. According to Damascene³ the irascible and concupiscible powers are parts of sense appetite. But sense appetite extends only to a good suited to it or to the contrary of this. But objects of this kind are not God Himself and sin under the aspect of being detestable. The motions in question therefore do not pertain to the concupiscible and

Parallel readings: *De ver.*, 28, 2 ad 10; *IV Sent.*, 17, 1, 5 sol. 2 & 3; *S.T.*, I-II, 113, 7.

Truth • QUESTION TWENTY-EIGHT: ARTICLE 9

irascible powers but to the will; and so they belong to the same power.

4. It was said in answer that the motion of free choice toward God is the motion of faith, which belongs to the intellect, whereas contrition belongs to the will, whose business it is to sorrow for sin; and thus they are not motions of a single power.—On the contrary, according to Augustine "man cannot believe, unless he so wills."⁴ Consequently, even though an act of the intellect is required in believing, there is nevertheless required in it an act of the will. We are accordingly left with the conclusion that two motions of the same power are required for the justification of sinners.

5. To be moved from one term to another belongs to the same being. But to detest sin is to be moved from a term, and to be moved toward God is to be moved to a term. Consequently contrition, which is detestation for sin, is an act of the same power to which motion toward God belongs; and so they cannot coexist.

6. Nothing is moved at the same time to distinct and contrary terms. But God and sin are distinct and contrary terms. The soul therefore cannot at the same time be moved toward God and toward sin; and so we must conclude as before.

7. Grace is given only to one who is worthy. But as long as a person is subjected to guilt he is not worthy of grace. Guilt must therefore be driven out before grace is infused. Then justification, which includes the two, is not instantaneous.

8. A form susceptible of more or less must, it seems, come to be in a subject successively, just as a form not susceptible of more or less comes to be in the subject all at once, as is clear of substantial forms. But grace is intensified in its subject. It therefore seems to be introduced successively; and so the infusion of grace is not instantaneous, and consequently neither is the justification of sinners.

9. In the justification of sinners, as in any change, two terms must be set down, a starting point and a finish. But the two terms of any change are incompatible; that is, they cannot coexist. In the justification of sinners, then, two things are included which are related as prior and posterior; and so the justification of sinners is successive and not instantaneous.

10. Nothing which is in the process of becoming before it is in the state of having become, comes into being instantaneously. But grace is in the process of becoming before it is in the state of having become. The infusion of grace is therefore not instantaneous. Thus the conclusion is the same as above. Proof of the minor: In permanent beings