

Summa of the Summa

Summary

Chapter One-

(1) Whether Sacred Doctrine is necessary: For Salvation? Yes

Why is revealed Scripture important to know God?

(2) Whether Sacred Doctrine is a science: Physical or Metaphysical? Both are built upon presuppositions.

(3) Whether Sacred Doctrine is one or many: Yes, one science. All revealed for one purpose by one God.

(4) Whether the Sacred is speculative or practical: It is both- Contemplative and Practical. More practical in St. Thomas' day and more contemplative now. It is more contemplative than practical because more concerned with divine things than humans alone.

(5) Sacred Doctrine compared to other sciences: It is not completely knowable- Can't be proved from philosophical view. Does not depend on philosophical science, but on God alone by transcending all other science. Sacred science makes physical science clear.

(6) Whether Sacred Doctrine is the same as wisdom: Sacred Doctrine is wisdom from God.

(7) Whether the Sacred Doctrine has God as its subject matter: It is above all human reason. It treats God as the highest cause.

(8) Sacred Doctrine is a matter of argument: Obj. 2 only From authority or Reason with authority being the weaker argument of the two. If the opponent admits at least some truth of the presuppositions of Sacred Doctrine, an argument can be made from reason. If not, then no way. * The Church is our authority on Truth. (I Tim 3:15). However, this is bolstered and made known to each Catholic personally through Sacred Doctrine. This is how it becomes personally applicable to each life. "Authority is the weakest form of truth."

(9) Whether Holy Scripture rightly employs metaphors : Material things can be used for understanding Sacred Doctrine i.e. pictures, music, art, beauty, nature, etc. (Figures or symbols) All knowledge originates from sense.

(10) Whether in Holy Scripture a Word may have several senses? (Literal and Spiritual) The presupposition of the spiritual sense is the literal sense. The spiritual senses are three and fall under the literal sense: 1, Allegorical, 2, Moral and 3, Anagogical

Chapter two

Intro: Aim of Sacred Doctrine 1. Teach us knowledge of God

- A. As He is in Himself
- B. As He is in the beginning of things and at last things
- C. And especially of rational creatures

This chapter shall treat three things:

- 1. Of God
- 2. Of the rational creature's advance to words of God
- 3. Of Christ, Who as man, is our way to God

In this treating of the above three things there will be a threefold division:

- 1. Whether God exists?
- 2. The manner of His existence, or what is not His existence.
- 3. Whatever concerns His operations-namely His
 - A. Knowledge
 - B. Will
 - C. Power

Concerning the first, there are three articles of inquiry:

1. Whether the proposition, "God exists" is self evident?
2. Whether it is demonstrable?
3. Whether God exists or not?

(1) Whether the Existence of God is Self-Evident?

Objection 1. It seems that the existence of God is self-evident. That is this knowledge is already implanted in us. This is obvious, because of knowledge which is naturally implanted in us. We know basic elementary principles. Damascene says: Knowledge of God is naturally implanted in all and therefore, God's evidence is self-evident.

Objection 2. Those things, that is, propositions are said to be self-evident which are known (to be true) as soon as the terms are known (understood), which the Philosopher, 1 Poster says is true of the first principles of demonstration. In nature, when the whole is known along with the part it is seen that the whole is greater than the part. When the word, "God" is seen and understood, then God exists. The word includes that nothing greater could exist. Since to exist by word and actually is greater than just by word only. Therefore, since the word exists, it is self-evident that God exists.

Objection 3. The existence of truth is self-evident. If truth does not exist, then the proposition that truth does not exist declares that the opposite is true and therefore, God exists. Jesus said, "I am the Truth, the Life and the Way." Therefore, God's existence is self-evident.

Objection 3. On the contrary: No one can truthfully admit the opposite of what is self-evident as the Philosopher states the opposite of the proposition "God" can be mentally admitted that the fool has said in his heart there is no God. Therefore, that God exists is not self-evident.

I answer that: A thing can be self-evident in either of two ways: Self-evident in itself, though not to us, and the other is self-evident to itself, and also to us.

According to the Author's note:

A proposition that is “self-evident in itself” is one whose predicate is logically identical with or contained in the meaning of its subject. An example is, “The water is good.” In order for the proposition, “God Exists” to be self-evident the terms for both the subject and the predicate will need to be understood. Now because we don’t fully know the Essence of God, because He is His own existence, as will be shown in (Q, 3, A.4) the proposition is not self-evident to us. But this must be demonstrated by other things more known to us, perhaps only by effects.

Reply Obj 1 We know God exists only by nature in a general and confused manner, in that God is man’s beatitude. For if man is drawn to God, as he is drawn to happiness, therefore, what is naturally desired by man must be naturally known to him. However, we do not know God exists absolutely in a similar way that we might be aware that someone is approaching us and this is not the same as knowing Peter is that man who is approaching us, even though it is Peter approaching us. For many imagine that man’s perfect good which is happiness consists in riches, and others in pleasures, and in others something else.

Reply to Obj 2 This is Anselm’s argument, but appears to beg the question: Not everyone who perceives God when hearing the Word, “God” recognizes that it signifies something in which nothing greater can be thought, seeing that some have believed God to be a body. We cannot be assured that everyone does not follow and understand what the word, “God” signifies and that it actually exists, unless of course, if admitted so that there actually exists something that which nothing greater can be thought, and this is definitely not admitted by those who hold that God does not exist. The word can only be rightly argued that the existence of God is known mentally.

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

1. Concerning understanding>term ->clear or unclear
2. Judging-> Declarative sentence->>true or false-> If true ->evident or not evident->If evident then true through other premises or propositions or self-evident

3. Reasoning-→argument which is either logically valid or invalid (see examples of a valid and invalid syllogism:

Valid Example

All men are animals

All animals have a backbone

Therefore, all men have a backbone

Invalid Example

All people are omnivores

Animals are omnivores too

Therefore, all animals and men are omnivores

Second Article: Whether it can be demonstrated that God Exists

Obj 1 Since it is an article of faith that God exists, it cannot be known scientifically that God exists since faith is of the unseen. (Hebrews 11:1)

Reply Obj 1 God's existence and other similar truths about God can be known by natural reason and are not articles of faith, but opening summary statements or preambles to the articles, for faith is not based in any thought vacuum, but has a context based on information, sound reasoning and natural knowledge, just as grace presupposes nature and perfection supposes something that can be perfected. However, it is acceptable to us as a matter of faith goes with something which is capable of being scientifically known and understood, even though proof is just out of reach at this time. (PM) p. 59

Continuation of Second Article: Whether it can be demonstrated that God exists?

Obj 2 A true "demonstration" is not merely any deductive argument, but a proof that a certain property necessarily follows from the essence. "The beginning, middle and final terms of the syllogism: Rational animals are mortal, Socrates is a rational animal and therefore, Socrates is mortal." Rational animal is the middle term. The essence is the middle term of demonstration. But we cannot know in what God's essence consists, but solely in what it does not consist as Damascene says, "Therefore we cannot demonstrate that God exists.

Reply to Obj 2 Accepting the middle term in the syllogism is crucial to answering the question of its essence, which follows on the question of its existence, because the existence of a cause is demonstrated from an effect. This effect takes the place of the definition of the cause in proof of the cause's existence. Names given to God are derived from His effects; consequently, in demonstrating the existence of God from His effects, we may take for the middle term the meaning of the word, "God."

Continuation Second Article: Whether it can be demonstrated that God exists.

Obj 3 Since the effect of God is not sufficient enough to include all of God's being, since God is infinite and His effects are finite, and there is no proportion here able to be related. Therefore, the existence of God cannot be demonstrated.

p. 58 On the contrary: The Apostle says: Romans 1:23 "The invisible things of Him are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." This is so because the existence of God is demonstrated through things that are made. This is general revelation.

I answer that: There exist two ways to demonstrate: a priori and a posteriori. (Basically, by cause and effect). When the effect is better known we proceed to the knowledge of the cause. From every effect the existence of its proper cause can be demonstrated, so long as its effects are better known to us; because since every effect depends upon its cause, if the effect exists, then the cause must pre-exist. Therefore, God's existence can be demonstrated from His effects.

Continuation 3 Sacred Article: Whether it can be demonstrated that God exists

Reply to obj 1 and p. 59 No problem with someone accepting a truth as a matter of faith even if it is scientifically unable to be known and demonstrated. Grace presupposes nature and perfection presupposes something that can be perfected.

Reply to objection 2 In order to prove the existence of anything, it is necessary to accept as a middle term the meaning of the word, and not its essence. We do not need to know the essence of footprints for the demonstration to be valid, but we do need to know the meaning of the word.

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

Third Article: Whether God Exists?

Obj 1 Since evil is in the world God cannot exist.

Obj 2 No need to suppose God because all material things can be reduced to nature and all voluntary things can be reduced to human reason, or will.

On the Contrary: It is said in the person of God: I am who I am. God said it so, therefore, it is!

I answer that: There are five ways to prove the existence of God:

- 1) Motion—Motion has to be put into effect by something.
- 2) The nature of the efficient cause-- To take the cause away is to take away the effect.
- 3) The possibility and necessity-- Every necessary thing either has its necessity caused by another or not. Only from the existence of its own necessity can we state its existence is not dependent upon anything for its own existence. That one is God.
- 4) This greatest good and every other perfection leads us to God.
- 5) The Governor of the world—Some intelligent being exists by whom all natural things are directed to that ends and this being we call God.

Continued Third Article: Whether God Exists?

Reply to Obj 1: Augustine says, "Since God is the Highest Good, He would not allow any evil to exist in His works, unless, His omnipotence and goodness were such as to bring good even out of evil. Question Three—Of the Simplicity of God

Some questions:

1. Why do we study the manner of God's existence? P. 73 To know the essence of God.
2. According to Peter Kreeft, essence is equal to what? The manner of existence. (See note 1 on p. 73)
3. Only in God are essence and existence identical. So why try to understand the essence of God? To identify God's interaction with His creation as opposed or in addition to all others. To be rightly informed is to be rightly peaceful about life. Or to say it in another way: To know and appreciate God and who He has revealed Himself to be is to know and experience a just and peaceful co-existence on earth and in our space and time.
4. Why can we only know God by analogy and what He is not? Because God cannot be known fully by his creation in this fallen world.
5. What are the three questions we must consider regarding the simplicity of God? (1) How He is not; (2) How He is known by us; and 3) How He is named.
6. What does Peter Kreeft have to say about the above three questions in note # 3 on p. 73? The three questions correspond to the three meanings of the Greek word: "logos" 'That is: Trying to identify God, know God and communicate God is what it is about.
7. According to Thomas A., Why must we study or discuss God's simplicity? To understand more of what God is not and what He is like.
8. How many points in Chapter three are given? Eight

The First Article: Whether God has a body or not? Thomas Aquinas provides "two objections", "one On the contrary" "one I answer that", and "a reply to objection 1 & 2.

The first objection gives the indication that God has a body because the Scripture attributes a three dimensional measurement to Him in Job 11: 8-9. The second objection references Genesis 1-3 indicating that God created

man in His image which, of course, has figure. Thus, God created man in His own image and therefore God has a body.

The “on the contrary” brings up that “God is spirit”. (John 4:24)

Thomas comes back with his “I answer that,” to say three points which are:

1. God is not a body because He is the first mover as shown in (Q.2.A.3).

Since He Himself is unmoved for it is evident that a body is in motion only because it is put into motion. Therefore, by induction, God doesn’t need a body and has no body because He is the first mover which is not put into motion. His second point is that the first being, by necessity must be in act and in no way potentiality. There is no potentiality in God. God is the first being, and therefore, is pure actuality. The third point is that God is perfect and the most noble of beings. Bodies are either animate or inanimate. Animate is nobler than inanimate. Animate bodies are dependent on another thing. The thing that animates the soul must be nobler than the thing animated. Therefore, since God is not animated by another, it is impossible that He should be a body.

Reply to Objection one: Dionysius says, “by the depth of God is meant the incomprehensibility of His essence; by length, the procession of His all-pervading power; by breadth, His over spreading of all things, in as much as all things lie under His perfection. Describing God on these terms does not mean He has a body. Corporeal things refer to God’s attributes, such as how depth can signify God’s power in knowing hidden things; by height, the transcendence of His excelling power; by length, the duration of His existence; and His breadth, His excelling love for all.

Reply to Obj 2; By referring to God making man in His own image He means to speak in terms of exceeding the quality of the animals. In that they are not compared to the way God looks so much as the way in which God communicates through reason and intelligence.

The Second Article: Whether God is Composed of Matter and Form? This is comprised of Obj. 1, Obj. 2, Obj. 3, I answer that 1,2,3 points, reply to obj.

1, 2 and 3.

The second article Ob. 1. Since the Bible references God as having a soul in Heb. 10:8 ...please my soul, then God has a body because the body houses the soul, "for whatever has a soul is composed of matter and form; since the soul is the form of the body." P. 76.

Obj. 2. Since God has attributes as recorded in Scripture, such as anger, joy and the like which passions of the (matter-form) composite, therefore, God has a body.

Obj. 3. Because God is an individual and matter is the principle of individualization, therefore, God is composed of matter and form.

Thomas answers that with three points: 1. Since God is pure act without potentiality (Q.2.A.3), hence it is impossible that God be composed of matter and form. 2. Matter and form owes its perfection and goodness to its form, therefore, the goodness is participated as matter participates the form. The first good is best. God is not a participated good, because the essential good is before the participated good. No way then, can God be matter and form. 3. God is an essence and composed of form which is like and the same as the matter and form of that which He created. God is the first agent and cause and not bound to what He created for whatever is "primarily and essentially an agent must be primarily and essentially form."

Reply to obj. 1. A soul is attributed to God because of similarity of the acts of the soul. When we will anything it is an act of the soul... "What pleases God is also pleasing the His soul."

Reply to Obj. 2. Anger is a quality of God only righteously expressed in Ps. 105:40 . When God is angry with His people this is only a metaphorical expression.

Reply to obj. 3. God is a form that cannot be received in matter, but is self-subsisting and is individualized without being received in a subject.

Third Article: Whether God is the same as His essence or nature?

On the contrary: There is no difference between God and the Godhead.

"God is His very Godhead." P. 78. God is more than a living thing. He is life itself. Jesus said, "I am the way, the truth and the life." John 14:6

Fourth Article: Whether Essence and Existence are the same in God? We can know whether God exists for it was said in (Q. 2. A. 2.), but exactly what He is cannot be fully grasped by His creatures. His existence is not His nature. (Quiddity)

On the contrary: Hilary says that there is no accidental quality in God's essence, but subsisting forth. Therefore what subsists in God is His essence.

I answer that: Three points. One is that it is impossible that in God His existence should differ from His essence because God is the first efficient cause. A thing whose existence differs from its essence must have its existence caused by another. Therefore God's existence does not differ from His essence.

Thomas' second point is that existence is that which makes every form or nature actual. God's essence is His because in God there is no potentiality, but only actuality and from that God exists actually.

Thomas' third point is that God is His own existence. If He is not His own existence, He would not be essential, but a participated being. And then He could not be the first being. Therefore, God must be His own existence and not merely His own essence.

Reply to Obj. 2: To be can mean two things: One is the act of essence or; Two: "The composition of a proposition effected by the mind in joining a predicate to a subject." p. 81. We can only know that this proposition which we form about God when we say that God is, is true. We only know something by what we can perceive by its action in our world. (Q. 2. A. 2)

The Fifth Article: Whether God is contained in a Genus? No, Thomas answers with three points: One: Since in God actuality is not added to potentiality it is impossible that He should be in any genus as a species. Second: The existence of God is His essence. "Since genus is predicated as an essential it refers to the essence of a thing. But the Philosopher has shown (*Metaph. Iii*) that being cannot be a genus, for every genus has differences distinct from its generic essence. Now no difference can exist distinct from being; for non-being cannot be a difference." (See Peter Kreeft's note 21. "Being is not a genus because there is nothing outside it.")

Continue Article five with Thomas' third point: Though differences within a genus may be found in its existence, in the "whatness or quiddity", but in God there can be no difference In His existence as shown in the preceding article. "Therefore it is plain that God is not in a genus as if He were a species."

Sixth Article: Whether in God There Are Any Accidents? This article contains obj. 1, I answer that, and Reply to obj. 1

Obj. 1: Since accidents like wisdom, virtue and the like are also in us it must be concluded that accidents are in God since He is described as having like attributes.

I answer that: No potentiality is in God, as shown in (Q. 2. A. 3) Because a subject is compared to its accidents for the subject is made actual by its accidents.

Reply to Obj. 1: Accidents such as virtue and wisdom are not predicated on God—God has no accidents in Him.

Seventh Article: Whether God is altogether simple: This article contains Obj. 2, I answer that with four points and a reply to obj. 2.

Obj. 2: "Whatever is best must be attributed to God." But is that which is better always the determination regarding the simple state of something? Is an element greater than the compound made up of the element? Which is best? This depends on a few things. God is not simple because the more simple state is not always best. Are the parts better than the whole? The best can be a composite of the simple. But God is always best. So God is not simple.

I answer that with four points: One: God is not comprised of parts, therefore it is clear that God is simple. God is one. Two: God is the first being (Q. 2. A. 3) God is simple because every composite has something a priori. God has no a prior to Himself. Three: God is simple because every composite has a cause. God is the first cause and without a cause. He is His own cause. Four: Every composite has potentiality and actuality. God has no potentiality. God is pure actuality. Reply to obj. 2. Perfection is found in composites with created things, but with God in His divine

goodness, is perfect in simple state. He needs no complexity to be perfect. God is perfect within His simple state.

Eighth Article: Whether God Enters Into the Composition of other things? (Contains an obj. 3, I answer that with two points, a reply to obj. 1, 2 and 3)

Obj. 3: God and primary matter do not differ from each other. They are absolutely the same. Hegels argument is noted in note 25 on pg. 84 which concludes they cannot differ from one another.

I answer that: There are three errors this obj. 3 is based upon: 1. Is that God is a world-soul or the soul of the highest heaven. Others have said that God is the formal principle of all things and there is the theory of the Almaricans. The third error is that of David of Dinant, who most absurdly taught that God was primary matter. These are all untruths for it is not possible for God to enter the composition of anything as a formal or material principle. God is the first efficient cause. The efficient cause is not equal to the form of the thing created. Primary matter and God are the same to David of Dinant. This is ludicrous. "It is not possible for God to enter into the composition of anything." Two reason: 1. Because God is the first efficient cause. This is because the form is potential and efficient cause is actual...For primary can be neither numerically nor specifically identical with the efficient cause, p. 84. "Secondly, since God is the first efficient cause, to act belongs to God primarily and essentially, but rather the composite so acts; for the hand does not act, but the man by his hand; and, fire warms by its heat. Hence God cannot be part of a compound..."

Reply to Obj. 1: "The Godhead is called the being of all things; as their efficient and exemplar cause, but not as being their essence."

Reply to Obj. 2: "The Word is an exemplar form, but not a form that is part of a compound."

Reply to Obj. 3: It is safe to say that simple things do not differ by added differences. Rational and irrational are not so much as opposites as they are diverse. According to the Philosopher (*Metaph X*) "Things which are diverse are absolutely distinct, but things which are different differ by something. Strictly speaking primary matter and God do not differ, but are by their very being diverse." P. 85 So they cannot be the same!