

## Questions 59-61

### The Will of the Angels

Article 1: Whether there is will in the angels?

Obj. 1: It appears that there is no will in the angels because according to the philosopher (De Anima iii, text. 42) the will is in the reason and in the angels there is no reason, but something higher than reason.

Obj. 2: Since the will indicates a desire or appetite for something it does not have, it portrays a sense of imperfection. And in the blessed angels there is no imperfection.

Obj. 3: The will implies movement and there is no movement in the angels. Therefore, there is no will in the angels.

On the Contrary: Augustine tells us that the will is contained in the image of God implanted within man and the angels. Therefore, the angels have a will put there by God Himself.

I answer that: TA says that it is necessary that we place will in the angels. Since all good things flow from the Divine will of God, all things in their own way are inclined by appetite towards good, but in various ways. Inanimate creation has innate tendencies toward the good. But the creatures with intellect there is the ability to know the aspects of goodness. Therefore, choosing the preferred choice involves exercising a will. "Accordingly, since the angels by their intellect know the universal aspect of goodness, it is manifest that there is a will in them."

Reply to Obj. 1: The intellect and reason differ as to their manner of knowing; because the intellect knows by simple intuition, while reason knows by a process of discursion from one thing to another. The will uses the reason and the intellect to determine the best option available influenced by appetite. The angels employ their intellect to distinguish the best from the good. There are many good choices, but only one best choice. (PM) "Therefore in the angels, who are purely intellectual, there is no appetite higher than the will."

Reply to Obj. 2: The appetite is greater and more than just seeking something that is not possessed yet. It is also characteristic of things that come along with it such as in the same way the name of a stone is derived from injuring the foot, though there are many other qualities of the stone. And in the case of emotions the irascible faculty is from anger, but also includes other emotions such a hope, daring, and others such as intensity and fervor, passion and desire.

Reply to Obj. 3: According to (De Anima iii, text. 28) there is no reason to prevent movement of a will to bring understanding, since angels do not know everything, but are inclined to such movement as an act of a perfect agent.

Article 2: Whether in the angels the will differs from the intellect?

Obj. 1: The angel's will does not differ from the intellect and from their nature. The angel is inclined toward the good much more than in the human. This inclination is through its own nature, or through

## Article 2 Obj. 1 cont.

the intelligible species. This inclination leaning toward the good belongs to the will. The conclusion is that the angel's will does not differ from the angel's intellect or nature.

Obj. 2: The angel's will does not differ from the angel's intellect really for the object of the intellect is the true and the object of the will is the good, even so they may differ logically.

Obj. 3: The will's object is the good and therefore, since the good and the true seem to be mutually related as common to particular; for the true is a particular good of the intellect. In this sense, the will does not differ from the intellect, whose object is the true.

On the contrary: The will of the angels does differ from their intellect for though the will in the angels regards good things only, but their intellect grasps the good and the bad for they know both and choose the good.

I answer that: "In the angels the will is a special faculty or power, which is neither their nature nor their intellect...the intellect extends itself to what is outside it, according as what, in its essence, is outside it is disposed to be somehow within it. On the other hand, the will goes out to what is beyond it, according as by a kind of inclination it tends, in a manner; to what is outside it. Now it belongs to one faculty to have within itself something which is outside it, and to another faculty to tend to what is outside it. " The conclusion is that the intellect and the will must be different powers in every creature. The same is true with God, for God has universal being and universal good. (PM)

Reply to obj. 1: The natural body is moved internally by its own being in substantial form, and also is inclined to something additional outside itself and therefore the angel's will does differ from its nature.

Reply to obj. 2: Internal faculties are not altered by the external object, but according to their formal distinction as determined from the nature of the object. Therefore, differences as observed in the notion of the good and true are sufficient for the difference of intellect from will.

Reply to obj. 3: The good and true are really convertible, it follows that the good is apprehended by the intellect as something true; while the true is desired by the will as something good. As was said in the reply to objection 2, the diversity of their aspects is sufficient for diversifying the faculties.

## Article 3: Whether there is free-will in the angels?

Obj. 1: Since the angel's knowledge is not the result of inquiring, for this belongs to the discursiveness of reason, there can be no free-will in angels. Inquiring implies a desire to take counsel and angels do not make choices by counsel and choice is not something angels seek. There is no option, but to choose the best, not just one of many good outcomes.

Obj. 2: There exists in free-will the implication that alternatives are not equal. The intellect of the angels is not deceived as to things which are naturally intelligible to them. Therefore, in their appetitive faculty there can be no free-will.

### Article 3, Obj. 3

Obj. 3: The free-will does not admit of degrees. Angels differ in intelligence from one level to the next. The higher angels have a higher degree of intellect than the lower angels because their intellectual nature is more perfect than in the lower. Therefore, there is not free-will in angels.

On the contrary: Just comparing angels superiority to the human implies if not verifies that angels have a free-will for God endowed humans with a free-will.

I answer that: Angels have to have a free-will for angels are not like animals that operate primarily by innate preconceived response mechanisms endowed by nature. Such as an animal may perceive as dangerous a set of circumstance and will respond similarly in like situations without intellectually discerning a non-dangerous situation. But the angels are of the intellect to exercise a free-will and are naturally endowed.

Reply to obj. 1: Angels have a free-will not negated by discursive counsel but by grasping completely the situation without need to inquire counsel, but by sudden acceptance of truth.

Reply to obj. 2: It is not rightly arguable that imperfection in an angel is found if his will is not determined with regard to things beneath him, but it would argue imperfection in him if he failed to determine outcomes without considering those of higher intellect.

Reply to obj. 3: Outcomes of decisions are the result of higher and lower degrees of intellect. It is true that liberty, in so far as the removal of compulsion is considered, is not susceptible of greater and less degree; because privations and negations are not lessened nor increased directly of themselves; but only by their cause, or through the addition of some qualification.

Article 4: Whether there is an irascible and a concupiscible appetite in the angels?

Obj. 1: According to Dionysius, if the demons have the capacity to be irascible and concupiscible, then the angels with the same nature have this potential as well.

Obj. 2: The Sacred Scripture attributes these qualities to the good and to the wicked angels. Therefore, there is an irascible and a concupiscible appetite in the angels.

Obj. 3: In viewing the qualities of angels from a virtue view it would seem that the concupiscible and an irascible appetite is in the angels. This is determined for every virtue has a good and an opposite potential.

On the contrary: "The Philosopher says (De Anima iii, text, 42) that the irascible and concupiscible are in the sensitive part, which does not exist in angels. Consequently, there is not irascible or concupiscible appetite in the angels."

I answer that: TA concludes that since there exists in the angels only an intellective appetite, their appetite is not distinguished into irascible and concupiscible, but remains undivided, and it is called the will. These qualities are not found in the intellectual appetite, but only in the sensitive appetite. (PM)

## Article 4 Reply to Obj. 1

Reply to Obj. 1: Because of similar effects fury is associated to the concupiscent desire as anger is attributed to God, but it doesn't meet that an irascible and a concupiscible appetite is in the angels.

Reply to Obj. 2: Angels possess passions of love and joy, but not in the sense of the sensitive appetite. For love and joy can be found in the intellectual appetite as well.

Reply to Obj. 3: "Charity, as a virtue, is not in the concupiscible appetite, but in the will; because the object of the concupiscible appetite is the good as delectable to the senses. " There is no passion of concupiscence, nor of fear and daring, to be regulated by temperance and fortitude. But temperance is predicated of them according as in moderation they display their will in conformity with the Divine will. Fortitude is likewise attributed to them, in so far as they firmly carry out the Divine will. All of this is done by their will, and not by the irascible or concupiscible appetite."

## 59 Q & A

1. Is there will in the angels? TA says that it is necessary that we place will in the angels. Since all good things flow from the Divine will of God, all things in their own way are inclined by appetite towards good, but in various ways. Inanimate creation has innate tendencies toward the good. But the creatures with intellect there is the ability to know the aspects of goodness. Therefore, choosing the preferred choice involves exercising a will. "Accordingly, since the angels by their intellect know the universal aspect of goodness, it is manifest that there is a will in them."

2. Is the will of the angel his nature or his intellect? "In the angels the will is a special faculty or power, which is neither their nature nor their intellect...the intellect extends itself to what is outside it, according as what, in its essence, is outside it is disposed to be somehow within it. On the other hand, the will goes out to what is beyond it, according as by a kind of inclination it tends, in a manner; to what is outside it. Now it belongs to one faculty to have within itself something which is outside it, and to another faculty to tend to what is outside it. " The conclusion is that the intellect and the will must be different powers in every creature. The same is true with God, for God has universal being and universal good. (PM)

3. Is there free-will in the angels? Angels have to have a free-will for angels are not like animals that operate primarily by innate preconceived response mechanisms endowed by nature. Such as an animal may perceive as dangerous a set of circumstance and will respond similarly in like situations without intellectually discerning a non-dangerous situation. But the angels are of the intellect to exercise a free-will and are naturally endowed.

4. Is there an irascible and a concupiscible appetite in the angels? TA concludes that since there exists in the angels only an intellective appetite, their appetite is not distinguished into irascible and concupiscible, but remains undivided, and it is called the will. These qualities are not found in the intellectual appetite, but only in the sensitive appetite. (PM)

## Question 60

### Of the Love or Dilection of the Angels

Article 1: Whether there is natural love or dilection in an angel?

Obj. 1: According to Dionysius (Div. Nom. iv) there is no natural love or dilection in the angels. Natural and intellectual love are distinguished here and angels only have intellectual love and therefore, they do not operate by natural love.

Obj. 2: There is no natural love in angels for natural love is acted upon and angels are not acted upon, but they are active themselves for nothing has control over their natures.

Obj. 3: There is no natural love in angels because love is either ordinate or inordinate. Charity is above inordinate love for inordinate love involves wickedness. Charity belongs to ordinate love. But neither of these belongs to nature. Consequently, there is no natural love in angels. (PM)

On the contrary: August tells us that there is no love without knowledge and that there is natural love in the angels.

I answer that: "Natural love is rightly placed in the angels because whatever comes first is sustained in what comes after it regarding evidential thinking. Common to every nature is to have some inclination or natural appetite or love. This inclination is found to exist differently in different nature; but according to its mode. Consequently, in the intellectual nature there is to be found a natural inclination coming from the will, in the sensitive nature, according to the sensitive appetite; but in a nature devoid of knowledge, only according to the tendency of the nature to something. Therefore, since an angel is an intellectual nature, there must be a natural love in this will."

Reply to Obj. 1: The distinguishing factor here regarding the intellectual and natural love is not to be confused with the perfection of either sense or intellect.

Reply to Obj. 2: Movement to act is not the issue here. All things in the world are moved to act by something other than itself. Of course, the exception is the First Agent. Natural inclination is implanted in the angel by the Author of the angels' nature. "Yet the angel is not so moved to act that does not act himself, because he has free-will." (PM)

Reply to Obj. 3: "As natural knowledge is always true, so is natural love well regulated; because natural love is nothing else than the inclination implanted in nature by its Author. The truth of natural knowledge is of one kind, and the truth of infused or acquired knowledge is of another." (PM)

Article 2: Whether there is love of choice in the angels?

Obj. 1: There is no love of choice in the angels for rational love is contrasted with intellectual, which is proper to angels, as is said (Div Nom, ir). Love of choice follows counsel, which lies in inquiry, as stated in Ethic. lii, 3)

Q 60 Art. 2 Obj. 2

Obj. 2: There is no love of choice in the angels. Angels do not proceed from principles to acquire the knowledge of conclusions. Angels already know what they are disposed to know as our intellect is disposed towards first principles, which it can know naturally. Love follows knowledge as already indicated. Therefore, besides their infused love, there is only natural love in the angels.

On the contrary: "The love of choice is in the angels because by their love the angels merit or do not merit. Angels do not merit or demerit by our natural acts." (PM)

I answer that: "There exists in the angels natural love, and a love of choice. Their natural love is the principle of their love of choice; because, what belongs to that which precedes, has always the nature of a principle. Wherefore, since nature is first in everything, what belongs to nature must be principle in everything...There is however a difference on the part of the intellect and on the part of the will. Because, as was stated already (Q[59], A [A2]), the mind's knowledge is brought about by the inward presence of the known within the knower. It comes of the imperfection of man's intellectual nature that his mind does not simultaneously possess all things capable of being understood, but only a few things from which he is moved in a measure to grasp other things...The argument is not imperfection in the person desiring, for him to seek one thing naturally as his end, and something else from choice as ordained to such end. Therefore, since the intellectual nature of the angels is perfect, only natural and not deductive knowledge is to be found in them, but there is to be found in them both natural love and love of choice."

Reply to Obj. 1: "The conclusion does not follow because not all love of choice is rational love. Rational love is distinguished from intellectual love. Rational love is obtained from the deductive approach to knowledge, but in the treating of free-will, every choice does not follow a discursive act of the reason, but only in human choice. (See Q[59], A[3], ad 1)" (PM)

Reply to Obj. 2: (See Reply to Obj. 1)

Article 3: Whether the angel loves himself with both natural love, and love of choice?

Obj. 1: An angel does not and cannot love himself with both natural love and love of choice. This is because natural love regards the end itself, while love of choice regards the means to the end. They cannot be both the end and a means to the end.

Obj. 2: According to Dionysius, (Div. Num. iv): "Love is uniting and a binding power." Binding and uniting imply various things brought together and therefore an angel cannot love himself with both natural love and love of choice?

Obj. 3: Love is a kind of movement and angels are not moving toward something. Therefore it seems that an angel cannot love himself with either natural or elective love.

On the contrary: "The Philosopher says (Ethic. ix, 8): "Love for others comes of love for oneself."

Q. 60 Art. 3; I answer that

I answer that: " Since the object of love is good, and good is to found both in substance and in accident, as is clear from Ethic, I, 6, a thing may be loved in two ways: first of all as subsisting good and secondly as an accidental or inherent good...Consequently both angel and man naturally seek their own good and perfection. This is to love self. Hence angel and man naturally love self, in so far as from choice he wishes for something which will benefit himself."

Reply to obj. 1: "It is not under the same but under quite different aspects that an angel or a man loves self with natural and with elective love, as was observed above."

Reply to obj. 2: "Dionysius used the terms "uniting" and "binding" in order to show the derivation of love from self to things outside self; as uniting is derived from unity."

Reply to obj. 3: "As love is an action which remains within the agent, so also it is movement which abides within the lover, but does not of necessity tend towards something else; yet it can be reflected back upon the over so that he loves himself, just as knowledge is reflected back upon the knower, in such a way that he knows himself."

Article 4: Whether an angel loves another with natural love as he loves himself?

Obj. 1: " Angels do not love another with natural love as he loves himself. Love follows knowledge. Since angels do not know another as he knows himself, it follows that he knows himself by his essence, while he knows another by is similitude. (See Q[56], AA[1], 2). Therefore, it seems that one angel does not love another with natural love as he loves himself."

Obj. 2: "Further, the cause is more powerful than the effect; and the principle than what is derived from it. But love for another comes of love for self, as the Philosopher says (Ethic. ix, 8) Therefore, one angel does not love another as himself, but loves himself more."

Obj. 3: "Further, natural love is of something as an end, and is not removable. But an angel is the end of another, and again, such love can be severed from him, as is the case with the demons, who have no love for the good angels. Therefore, an angel does not love another with natural love as he loves himself."

On the contrary: Every creature loves its like. That seems to be a natural property which is found in all, even in such as devoid of reason."

I answer that: "It must be said that one angel loves another with natural affection, in so far as he is one with him in nature. But so far as an angel has something else in common with another angel, or differs from him in other respects, he does not love him with natural love." The principle is love is reciprocal with those who love us back with a comparative love. (PM)

Reply to obj. 1: "An angel does not love another as he loves himself, because he loves himself by his own will; but he does love another by the other's will."

Q. 60 Art. 4 Reply to obj. 2

Reply to obj. 2: "The expression 'as ' does not denote equality, but likeness. For since natural affection rests upon natural unity, the angel naturally loves less what is less one with him. Consequently he loves more what is numerically one with himself, than what is one only generically or specifically. But it is natural for him to have a like love for another as for himself, in this respect, that as he loves self in wishing well to self, so he loves another in wishing well to him."

Reply to obj. 3: "Natural love is said to be of the end, not as of that end to which good is willed, but rather as of that good which one wills for oneself, and in consequence for another, as united to oneself. Nor can such natural love be stripped from the wicked angels, without their still retaining a natural affection towards the good angels, in so far as they share the same nature with them. But they hate them, in so far as they are unlike them according to righteousness and unrighteousness."

Article 5: Whether an angel by natural love loves God more than he loves himself?

Obj. 1: "It would seem that the angel does not love God by natural love more than he loves himself. The natural union is not possible with the Divine nature because of it being so much greater than the angelic nature. As a result, an angel loves God less than he loves himself, or even than another angel." (PM)

Obj. 2: An angel does not love God more than himself with natural love because one thing loves another as good for itself. Every one loves another with natural love for his own sake. (PM)

Obj. 3: An angel does not love God more than himself from natural love because nature is self-centered in its attempt for self-preservation. (PM)

Obj. 4: To love with charity is proper to God. Therefore an angel does not love God more than self because love from charity is not natural to angels. According to Augustine and St. Paul the love of God is poured out upon their hearts by the Holy Spirit Who is given to them. (Roms. 5)

Obj. 5: It is not natural to love God more than self for natural love lasts while nature endures. But the love of God more than self does not remain in the angel or man who sins according to Augustine (De Civ. Dei xiv), "Two loves have made two cities; namely love of self unto the contempt of God, the earthly city; while love of God unto the contempt of self has made the heavenly city."

On the contrary: "All the moral precepts of the law come of the law of nature. But the precept of loving God more than self is a moral precept of the law. Therefore, it is of the law of nature. Consequently from natural love the angel loves God more than himself."

I answer that: "God is the universal good, and under this good both man and angel and all creatures are comprised, because every creature in regard to its entire being naturally belongs to God, it follows that from natural love angel and man alike love God before themselves and with a greater love. Otherwise, if either of them loved self more than God, it would follow that natural love would be perverse, and that it would not be perfected but destroyed by charity."



Q. 60 Art. 5, Reply to Obj. 1

Reply to obj. 1: "Each part naturally loves the whole more than itself; and each individual naturally loves the good of the more than its own individual good. Now God is not only the good of one species, but is absolutely the universal good; hence everything in its own way naturally loves God more than itself."

Reply to obj. 2: "The angel does not naturally love God for his own good, but for God's sake. If it denotes the nature of love on the lover's part, then it is true; for it would not be in the nature of anyone to love God, except from this---that everything is dependent on that good which is God."

Reply to obj. 3: "Nature's operation is self-centered not merely as to certain particular details, but much more as to what is common; for everything is inclined to preserve not merely its individuality, but likewise its species. And much more has everything a natural inclination towards what is the absolutely universal good."

Reply to obj. 4: "God, in so far as He is the universal good, from Whom every natural good depends, is loved by everything with natural love. So far as He is the good which of its very nature beatifies all with supernatural beatitude, He is love with the love of charity."

Reply to obj. 5: "Who could not love God who has seen His essence?" Only those who are opposed to His will since God's substance universal goodness are one and the same, all who behold God's essence are by the same movement of love moved towards the Divine essence as it is distinct from other things, and according as it is the universal good. Besides those who hate God since they are opposed to Him, yet nevertheless, so far as He is the universal good of all, every thing naturally loves God more than itself." (PM)

Q & A 60.

1. Is there natural love or dilection in the angels? "Natural love is rightly placed in the angels because whatever comes first is sustained in what comes after it regarding evidential thinking. Common to every nature is to have some inclination or natural appetite or love. This inclination is found to exist differently in different nature; but according to its mode. Consequently, in the intellectual nature there is to be found a natural inclination coming from the will, in the sensitive nature, according to the sensitive appetite; but in a nature devoid of knowledge, only according to the tendency of the nature to something. Therefore, since an angel is an intellectual nature, there must be a natural love in this will."

2. Do angels have in them the love of choice? "There exists in the angels natural love, and a love of choice. Their natural love is the principle of their love of choice; because, what belongs to that which precedes, has always the nature of a principle. Wherefore, since nature is first is everything, what belongs to nature must be principle in everything...There is however a difference on the part of the intellect and on the part of the will. Because, as was stated already (Q(59), A [A2], the mind's knowledge is brought about by the inward presence of the known within the knower. It comes of the imperfection of man's intellectual nature that his mind does not simultaneously possess all things capable of being understood, but only a few things from which he is moved in a measure to grasp other

Q & A 60 question 2 cont.

things...The argument is not imperfection in the person desiring, for him to seek one thing naturally as his end, and something else from choice as ordained to such end. Therefore, since the intellectual nature of the angels is perfect, only natural and not deductive knowledge is to be found in them, but there is to be found in them both natural love and love of choice.”

3. Does the angel love himself with natural love or with love of choice? “ Since the object of love is good, and good is to found both in substance and in accident, as is clear from Ethic, I, 6, a thing may be loved in two ways: first of all as subsisting good and secondly as an accidental or inherent good...Consequently both angel and man naturally seek their own good and perfection. This is to love self. Hence angel and man naturally love self, in so far as from choice he wishes for something which will benefit himself.”

4. Does the angel love another with natural love as he loves himself? “It must be said that one angel loves another with natural affection, in so far as he is one with him in nature. But so far as an angel has something else in common with another angel, or differs from him in other respects, he does not love him with natural love.” The principle is love is reciprocal with those who love us back with a comparative love. (PM)

5. Does the angel love God more than self with natural love? “God is the universal good, and under this good both man and angel and all creatures are comprised, because every creature in regard to its entire being naturally belongs to God, it follows that from natural love angel and man alike love God before themselves and with a greater love. Otherwise, if either of them loved self more than God, it would follow that natural love would be perverse, and that it would not be perfected but destroyed by charity.”

Q. 61.

Of the Production of the Angels in the Order of Natural Being

Article 1: Whether the angel has a cause of his existence?

Obj. 1: It seems that angels have always existed and are not caused creatures since in Genesis there is no mention of the creation of angels.

Obj. 2: Also, the Philosopher says (Metaph. Viii, text. 16) that since angels are immaterial they had no need of a cause.

Obj. 3: Augustine (De Trin. Xiii) states that the truth is eternal and since the angels bear the truth they exist always and have no need of a cause.

On the contrary: Ps 148:2 States that God spoke and the angels were made.

I answer that: God made everything. God alone exists of his own essence. Consequently the angels were made by God.

Q. 61 Art. 1 Reply to Obj. 1

Reply to Obj. 1: Augustine indicates that the angels were not passed over in the creation account, but that they were present in the designation as the words, "heavens" or of "light", speak of their share in the creation of all creatures. That is, the angels are described as being created by God in Genesis but under the reference to heavens or of light.

Reply to Obj. 2: "Substances that are subsisting forms have no 'formal' cause of their existence and unity, nor such active cause as produces its effect by changing the matter from a state of potentiality to actuality, but they have a cause productive of their entire substance."

Reply to Obj. 3: (See Reply to Obj. 2)

Article 2: Whether the angel was produced by God from eternity?

Obj. 1: Since God's being is eternal, God produced angels from eternity.

Obj. 2: Since angels exist outside of time they were created outside of time and therefore have always existed.

Obj. 3: Augustine (De Trin. Xiii) proves the soul's incorruptibility by the fact that the mind is capable of truth. But as truth is incorruptible, so is it eternal. Therefore the intellectual nature of the soul and of the angel is not only incorruptible, but likewise eternal."

On the contrary: "It is said (Prov. 8:22), in the person of begotten Wisdom: 'The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His ways, before He made anything from the beginning.'"

I answer that: TA affirms: "God alone, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is from eternity. Catholic Faith holds this without doubt, and everything to the contrary must be rejected as heretical. For God so produced creatures that He made them 'from nothing,' that is, after they had not been."

Reply to Obj. 1: God willed the angels into existence. (PM)

Reply to Obj. 2: Time has everything to do with God's creation of the angels. Their existence had a beginning in time. Our understanding of the influence of time attempts to put angels in a framework they were never intended for angels are outside of time and in it as God wills for them to be.

Reply to Obj. 3: Even though angels have intelligent souls that are capable of truth they did not possess this quality from eternity. It does not follow that angels had existence from eternity past.

Article 3: Whether the angels were created before the corporeal world?

Obj. 1: "God first of all devised the angelic and heavenly powers, and the devising was the making thereof."

Obj. 2: "The angelic nature stands midway between the Divine and the corporeal natures. But the Divine nature is from eternity; while corporeal nature is from time. Therefore the angelic nature was produced ere time was made, and after eternity."

Obj. 3: The angels were made before the corporeal creatures.

On the contrary: Genesis 1:1 tells us "In the beginning God created heaven and earth." Angels were not created before time or otherwise that verse would not be true. (PM)

I answer that: TA insists that the angels were created at the same time as the corporeal creatures. It was accomplished as a single set of creation and not a succession. (PM)

Reply to Obj. 1: Jerome is referencing the Greek manner of creation hinting that the angels were created before the corporeal creatures.

Reply to Obj. 2: Angels are part of the universe God created and not outside of it. Even if Angels move in and out of the created world of corporeal creatures they still were created at the same time.

Reply to Obj. 3: " The creation of the matter of the corporeal creature involves in a manner the creation of all things, but the creation of the angels does not involve creation of the universe."

Article 4: Whether the angels were created in the empyrean heaven?

Obj. 1: "It would seem that the angels were not created in the empyrean heaven. For the angels are incorporeal substances. Now a substance which is incorporeal is not dependent upon a body for its existence; and as a consequence, neither is it for its creation . Therefore the angels were not created in any corporeal place."

Obj. 2: " Further, Augustine remarks (Gen. ad lit. iii, 10) that the angels were created in the upper atmosphere: therefore not in the empyrean heaven."

Obj. 3: "Further, the empyrean heaven is said to be in the highest heaven. If therefore the angels were created in the empyrean heaven, it would not be seem them to mount up to a still higher heaven. And this is contrary to what is said in Isaias (spelling theirs) speaking in the person of the sinning angel. "I will ascend into heaven: (Is 14:13)"

On the contrary: God created the angels from the empyrean heaven. The heaven referred to is the heaven above the firmament as the fiery heaven being in God's presence. (PM)

I answer that: TA asserts that the angels were created in the highest corporeal place to identify with the corporeal world whether that means the empyrean heaven is not the issue. (PM)" So Isidore says that the highest heaven is the heaven of the angels, explaining the passage of Dt. 10:14: 'Behold heaven is the Lord's thy God, and the heaven of heaven."

Reply to obj. 1: "The angels were created in a corporeal place, not as if depending upon a body either as to their existence or as to their being made; because God could have created them before all corporeal

#### Q. 61 Art. 4 Reply to Obj. 1

creation ...They were made in a corporeal place in order to show their relationship to corporeal nature, and that they are by their power in touch with bodies.”

Reply to Obj. 2: By the uppermost atmosphere Augustine possibly means the highest part of heaven, to which the atmosphere has a kind of affinity owing to its subtlety and transparency. Or else he is not speaking of all the angels; but only of such as sinned, who, in the opinion of some, belonged to the inferior orders. But there is nothing to hinder us from saying that the higher angels, as having an exalted and universal power over all corporeal things, were created in the highest place of the corporeal creature; while the other angels, as having more restricted powers, were created among the inferior place.”

Reply to Obj. 3: Isaias is not speaking there of any corporeal heaven, but of the heaven of the Blessed Trinity, unto which the sinning angel wished to ascend, when he desired to be equal in some manner to God, as will appear later on. (Q[63], A[3])”

#### Q & A 61

1. Are the angels the cause of their existence? God made everything. God alone exists of his own essence. Consequently the angels were made by God.
2. Have angels existed from eternity? TA affirms: “God alone, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is from eternity. Catholic Faith holds this without doubt, and everything to the contrary must be rejected as heretical. For God so produced creatures that He made them ‘from nothing.’, that is, after they had not been.”
3. Were the angels created before corporeal creatures? TA insists that the angels were created at the same time as the corporeal creatures. It was accomplished as a single set of creation and not a succession. (PM)
4. Were angels created in the empyrean heaven? TA asserts that the angels were created in the highest corporeal place to identify with the corporeal world whether that means the empyrean heaven is not the issue. (PM)” So Isidore says that the highest heaven is the heaven of the angels, explaining the passage of Dt. 10:14: ‘Behold heaven is the Lord’s thy God, and the heaven of heaven.’”