

1948.1

Causa Causarum

Referring to the poet quoted by Aristotle in the *Physics*, Book II, St. Thomas says: "Vult enim poeta quod non omne ultimum sit finis, sed illud quod est ultimum et optimum, hoc est cuius causa fit."¹ The final cause, therefore, implies not only the notion of ultimate but also that of what is a greatest good. Not every end can be a final cause, but only that end which is a good. "Ultimum et optimum"—such therefore is the definition of final cause.

A true understanding of final cause thus depends upon a correct notion of the good. Indeed, the modern elimination of final causality from the operations of nature has gone hand in hand with an ever-deepening misconception of the good. In the present study we shall try to retrace the gradual deterioration of this notion among the Scholastics themselves. Our main purpose, however, remains purely doctrinal. Only to the extent it may contribute to a better understanding of the truth could a scrutiny of past errors ward off the charge of plucking dead lions by the beard.

First we shall state briefly the doctrine of St. Thomas on the good and its role in final causality. We will then attempt to point out the theoretical misunderstandings and the textual misreadings which led gradually to an utter loss of this notion of good amongst influential Schoolmen of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Lastly, we will state the doctrine of John of St. Thomas concerning the good, a doctrine reaffirming and defending the basic notions of St. Thomas. From this restatement of the true notion of the good, we shall see in contrast how far those Scholastic teachers had strayed from the basic concepts.²

I. DOCTRINE OF ST. THOMAS

The principal doctrine of St. Thomas concerning the good is to be found in the *Summa theologiae*, First Part, Question V; in the *Quaestiones disputatae de Veritate*, Question I, article 1, and Question XXI, article 1; and in the exposition of Boethius's *De Hebdomadibus*.

¹ ST. THOMAS, *In II Physicorum*, lect. 4, n. 8.

² We hope that in the future we shall be able to examine those modern philosophers who had great influence in leading the thinking world away from final causality. We shall then try to point out what connections may exist between the early Scholastic errors regarding the good, and the ultimate rejection of final causality by the moderns. In our opinion, such a comparison will show that, although the Scholastic errors passed unnoticed by many, whereas the errors of the modern thinkers are obvious, the former were far more profound in their deviation from the truth.

In these places the Angelic Doctor speaks of the good as a transcendental convertible with being. It will be well to note that throughout this discussion we confine ourselves to the transcendental good. The moral good is specific to the responsible actions of creatures having an intellect and free will. The transcendental good is more extensive, is indeed coextensive with being. It is with this good that our problem of final causality is principally concerned. Many will admit final causality in human actions but at the same time deny it to the universe as a whole. Indeed, the first objection of those who admit a moral good and a purposeful action of human beings is that in asserting final causality for the universe of being we commit the error of anthropomorphism, by unwarrantedly projecting our own purposeful action into the universe.

In the First Part of the *Summa theologiae*, we read:

Ratio enim boni in hoc consistit, quod sit aliquid appetibile. Unde Philosophus dicit, quod 'bonum est quod omnia appetunt.'¹

...Cum bonum sit quod omnia appetunt; hoc autem habeat rationem finis; manifestum est quod bonum rationem finis importat.²

...Bonum dicitur diffusivum sui eo modo quo finis dicitur movere.³

...Unumquodque dicitur bonum, inquantum est perfectum; sic enim est appetibile, ut supra dictum est (aa.1, 3). Perfectum autem dicitur, cui nihil deest secundum modum suae perfectionis. Cum autem unumquodque sit id quod est per suam formam; forma autem praesupponit quaedam, et quaedam ad ipsam ex necessitate consequuntur; ad hoc quod aliquid sit perfectum et bonum, necesse est quod et formam habeat, et ea quae praexistunt, et ea quae consequuntur ad ipsam. Praeexistit autem ad formam determinatio sive commensuratio principiorum, seu materialium, seu efficientium ipsam. Et hoc significatur per modum; unde dicitur quod mensura modum praefigit. Ipsa autem forma significatur per speciem, quia per formam unumquodque in specie constituitur; et propter hoc dicitur quod numerus speciem praebet; quia definitiones significantes speciem sunt sicut numeri, secundum Philosophum. Sicut enim unitas addita vel subtracta variat speciem numeri, ita in definitionibus differentia apposita vel subtracta variat speciem. Ad formam autem consequitur inclinatio ad finem, aut ad actionem aut ad aliquid hujusmodi; quia unumquodque inquantum est actu, agit et tendit in id quod sibi convenit secundum suam formam. Et hoc pertinet ad pondus et ordinem. Unde *ratio boni, secundum quod consistit in perfecto esse, consistit etiam in modo, specie, et ordine.*⁴

From these passages we may conclude that the proper nature of the transcendental good includes the notions of perfection, appetibility, and final causality. In reality, good and being are identical; and yet the terms are not synonymous. Good is being in so far as it is perfect and therefore appetible, and hence a final cause.

In the *De Veritate*, St. Thomas approaches the notion of the good through the general notion of property of being. Thus, in Question I, we read:

...Secundum hoc aliqua dicuntur addere supra ens, in quantum expriment ipsius modum, qui nomine ipsius entis non exprimitur. Quod dupliciter contingit: uno modo ut modus expressus sit aliquis specialis modus entis; sunt enim diversi gradus

¹ Ia, q.5, a.1, c.

² Ibid., a.4, c.

³ Ibid., ad 2.

⁴ Ibid., a.5, c.

entitatis, secundum quos accipiuntur diversi modi essendi; et juxta hos modos accipiuntur diversa rerum genera; ... Alio modo ita quod modus expressus sit modus generaliter consequens omne ens; et hic modus dupliciter accipi potest; uno modo secundum quod consequitur omne ens in se; alio modo secundum quod consequitur unumquodque ens in ordine ad aliud... Si autem modus entis accipitur secundo modo, scilicet secundum ordinem unius ad alterum; hoc potest esse dupliciter. Uno modo secundum divisionem unius ab altero; et hoc exprimit hoc nomen *aliquid*;... Alio modo secundum convenientiam unius entis ad aliud; et hoc quidem non potest esse nisi accipiat *aliquid* quod natum sit convenire cum omni ente. Hoc autem est anima, quae quodammodo est omnia... In anima autem est vis cognitiva et appetitiva. *Convenientiam ergo entis ad appetitum exprimit hoc nomen bonum*; ut in principio Ethic. dicitur: *Bonum est quod omnia appetunt*. Convenientiam vero entis ad intellectum exprimit hoc nomen *verum*.¹

Here we see that good is a general mode of being, consequent upon every being, not in so far as it is considered in itself, but in so far as it has order to another. We see further that this order is an order of *convenientia*, of proper proportion, not between any two beings whatever, but between any being and the intellectual appetite. Good, therefore, is a name expressive of the general mode of being which is the *convenientia* of being as such to the appetite. In this passage, then, St. Thomas brings out once again that appetibility, order to appetite, is of the very nature of good.

In Question XXI of the *De Veritate*, too, St. Thomas approaches the notion of good from the viewpoint of property of being. This time, however, he stresses the notion of its causality rather than that of its simple relation to appetite. He says:

...Et sic oportet quod bonum, ex quo non contrahit ens, addat aliquid super ens, quod sit rationis tantum... Verum et bonum positive dicuntur; unde non possunt addere nisi relationem quae sit rationis tantum. Illa autem relatio, secundum Philosophum in V Metaphys. (text.20), dicitur esse rationis tantum, secundum quam dicitur referri id quod non dependet ad id ad quod refertur... sicut patet in scientia et scibili; ... relatio vero qua scibile refertur ad scientiam, est rationis tantum... et ita est in omnibus aliis quae se habent ut mensura et mensuratum, vel perfectivum et perfectibile.

Oportet igitur quod verum et bonum super intellectum entis addant respectum perfectivi. In quolibet autem ente est duo considerare: scilicet ipsam rationem speciei, et esse ipsum quo aliquid aliud subsistit in specie illa: et sic aliquid ens potest esse perfectum dupliciter. Uno modo secundum rationem speciei tantum; et sic ab ente perficitur intellectus, qui perficitur per rationem entis; nec tamen ens est in eo secundum esse naturale; et ideo hunc modum perficiendi addit verum super ens... Alio modo ens est perfectivum alterius non solum secundum rationem speciei, sed etiam secundum esse quod habet in rerum natura: et *per hunc modum est perfectivum bonum*; bonum enim in rebus est, ut Philosophus dicit in VI Metaphys. (com.8). In quantum autem unum ens est secundum esse suum perfectivum alterius et conservativum, habet rationem finis respectu illius quod ab eo perficitur; et inde est quod *omnes recte definiētes bonum ponunt in ratione ejus aliquid quod pertineat ad habitudinem finis*; unde Philosophus dicit in I Ethic. (in princip.), quod *bonum optime definiunt dicentes, quod bonum est quod omnia appetunt*.²

From this we see that to define good rightly, we must consider it as perfective, not in any way whatsoever, but as perfective according to all the being which it has in the nature of things. This is the perfectivity of reality, the perfectivity which has the nature of final cause, the perfectivity which all seek — which is, therefore, referred to the appetite.

¹ A.1, c.

² A.1, c.

In the opusculum commenting on Boethius's *De Hebdomadibus*, St. Thomas delves profoundly into the notion of good as it pertains to creatures. The concept of good in this work is the same as the one given in the *Summa* and the *De Veritate*. He says: "...Unumquodque primo et per se appetit suam perfectionem, quae est bonum uniuscujusque, et est semper proportionatum suo perfectibili, et secundum hoc habet similitudinem ad ipsum."¹

From the doctrine of St. Thomas, therefore, it manifestly follows that the notion of transcendental good must include not only being as such, but being as perfect, and hence as perfective, not of the intellect, but of the appetite. Good, most essentially, is being as appetible, as final cause.

II. ERRONEOUS NOTIONS OF THE GOOD

We will now turn to investigate how this notion of the transcendental good gradually suffered basic, though subtle changes at the hands of certain Scholastics of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It will not be possible to deal with each of the writers of this epoch, but from those examined the trend of the error will be surely indicated.

(a) DURANDUS

1. *The good as a property of being*

In 1508 a member of the Order of Preachers, Durandus de Sancto Portiano published a commentary on the Books of *Sentences*. In commenting on the Second Book he set forth the proper nature of the good as follows:

Dicendum ergo quod formalis ratio boni est ratio convenientis ita quod bonitas est formaliter ipsa convenientia et contrahit entitatem ad partem subjectivam quae est relatio: et ad talem relationem quae est convenientia: et sic omnis bonitas est quaedam entitas quae est respectiva: sed non omnis entitas est quidditative bonitas: ita quod non convertuntur essentialiter: bonum vero ratione concretionis importat id quod habet talem convenientiam ut ejus subjectum: vel fundamentum et quia illud potest inveniri in quolibet genere: saltem in generibus absolutis: ideo bonum dicitur converti cum ente *non essentialiter sed denominative*: formalis tamen ratio boni est respectiva scilicet ratio convenientiae.²

This short paragraph contains one of the most radical errors possible regarding the nature of the good, an error concerning the good as a property of being. Indeed, he depicts it as a property of being by affixing it to being as an accident to its subject. In doing this, he distinguishes between the *ratio formalis* of the good and the good considered in the order of concretion. This distinction is fundamental to Durandus's doctrine of the good. His denial of the reality of universals and his tendency towards terminism seem to imply that the good taken formally or *in abstracto* has no extra-

¹ *Opuscula Omnia* (MANDONNET ed.), T.I, p.177.

² DURANDUS, *In II Sententiarum*, Paris 1508, d.34, q.1, fol.212, L.

mental reality but is produced by the intellect from the observation of things; the good, taken concretely, seems to include the relation of *convenientia* and the subject in which it inheres, and only because of this subject do we call it concrete.

In so far as good is said concretely of this subject of the relation of *convenientia*, Durandus admits its convertibility with being, *non essentialiter sed denominative*. We shall best understand what he means by this if we read the distinction as he himself makes it in the form of a premise for his reply:

... Aliquid potest converti cum ente dupliciter uno modo essentialiter: alio modo denominative. Primo modo res convertitur cum ente: quia omnis entitas extra animam est essentialiter realitas et e converso. Secundo modo quando unum non est alterum essentialiter et formaliter tamen unum non invenitur sine altero sicut ens creatum et relatio: quia dato quod non omnis essentia creata sit relatio: nulla tamen essentia creata invenitur sine relatione et ideo convertuntur denominative.¹

Thus, when Durandus says that good is convertible with being *denominative*, he means simply that wherever being is found there also is found the relation of *convenientia*, which is the good. Whether this relation is real or of reason is difficult to determine, because of the terministic nature of Durandus's doctrine. As we will see below, Suarez, who studied Durandus's system, says that he denied all real relations proper.

The question immediately arises as to how Durandus would hold God to be good, what kind of relation he would posit of the Divine Essence. The answer is found in his response to an objection against his position:

Ad quartam dicendum quod antecedens est falsum: quia bonum in Deo dicit relationem vel respectum formaliter non quidem respectum ad intra: sed ad extra videlicet ad creaturas et cum dicitur quod Deus non refertur realiter ad creaturas. Dicendum est quod sicut dictum fuit primo libro dist. xxx. Si relatio accipiat pro respectu per se consequente ad naturam rei. Sic Deus non refertur ad creaturas. Si autem accipiat pro reali denominatione sumpta ex pluribus: sic Deus refertur realiter ad creaturas cum dicitur creator vel bonus: et quod subditur quod sequeretur quod Deus esset bonus ex habitudine ad creaturas: et sic bonitas ejus dependeret a creaturis dicendum quod falsum est. Aliud enim est Deum dici bonum in habitudine ad creaturas et bonitatem ejus dependere ad creaturas. Primum enim est verum: sed secundum est falsum: imo potius bonitas creaturae dependet a Deo: et propter hoc Deus dicitur bonus in habitudine ad creaturam: quia tota creatura: et quicquid bonitatis et perfectionis est in ea dependet a Deo.²

According to this doctrine, therefore, God is good only by a relation of reason — at any rate, His goodness is at most a real denomination flowing from His presence in the creatures; were there no creatures, it would follow that God could not be called good, since goodness requires plurality of being for its very existence.

This doctrine is so obviously erroneous as almost to discourage a refutation. But it serves well to show to what extremes an error on the nature of the good can lead. We may do this most aptly by turning to

¹ *Op. cit.*, fol.211, M.

² *Ibid.*, fol.213, C.

St. Thomas's doctrine on divine goodness, Q.VI of the *Prima Pars*. There, in the first article, St. Thomas demonstrates that it belongs to God to be good. To understand this proof one must have grasped well what St. Thomas taught on the nature of the good itself in the preceding Question. Since, as we shall see, Durandus failed to do that, it is small wonder that he erred in this matter.

To prove "quod bonum esse praecipue Deo convenit,"¹ St. Thomas shows that God is the object of every appetite in so far as He is "prima causa effectiva omnium." Thus he proves by referring to creatures that God is good, but does not in any way state that God is good only in so far as He has respect to creatures. Nor does he mean in any way to say that the causality of God's goodness is efficient causality, as some seem later to have interpreted him.² In the present article he intends merely to prove that God is good; this he does by showing that God is appetible to creatures. All things, he says, seek their own perfection. This perfection, proper to a certain thing, is a similitude of the efficient agent from which the thing came into being. Thus, when a thing seeks its proper perfection, it seeks really a participation of the similitude of the agent. In this way we can say that every efficient cause as such is sought and so is good. God, being the first agent, the first efficient cause, is therefore good.

Even in this first article, St. Thomas, through the very depth of his wording, gives indication of how God is good in Himself: a doctrine which he asserts explicitly only in article 3. Let us read the body of this first article.

...Bonum esse praecipue Deo convenit. Bonum enim aliquid est secundum quod est appetibile; unumquodque autem appetit suam perfectionem; perfectio autem et forma effectus est quaedam similitudo agentis, cum omne agens agat sibi simile; unde ipsum agens est appetibile, et habet rationem boni; hoc enim est quod de ipso appetitur, ut ejus similitudo participetur. Cum ergo Deus sit prima causa effectiva omnium, manifestum est quod ei competit ratio boni et appetibilis.³

In the second article of this Question, St. Thomas is still speaking of the divine goodness in comparison to the created. There he proves that God is the highest good, *summum bonum*; the use of the superlative here indicates that a comparison is made. St. Thomas says that this adjective *summum* "addit supra bonum non rem aliquam absolutam, sed relationem tantum."⁴ This relation is a relation of reason in respect to God, whereas in the creatures it is a real relation.

As we have said, it is in the third article that St. Thomas speaks of the proper goodness of God. There he shows that God is good by His very essence and that it is proper to God alone to be good in this way. Since it contains the proper answer to Durandus's grave error, we will quote the body of this article in full:

¹ *Ia*, q.6, a.1, c.

² Cf. SUAREZ, below, p.105.

³ *Ia*, q.6, a.1, c.

⁴ *Ibid.*, a.2, ad 1.

...Solut Deus est bonus per suam essentiam. Unumquodque enim dicitur bonum, secundum quod est perfectum. Perfectio autem alicujus rei triplex est. 1^a Quidem, secundum quod in suo esse constituitur. 2^a Vero, prout ei aliqua accidentia superadduntur ad suam perfectam operationem necessaria. 3^a Vero perfectio alicujus est per hoc quod aliquid aliud attingit sicut finem. Utpote prima perfectio ignis consistit in esse quod habet per suam formam substantialem. Secunda ejus perfectio consistit in caliditate, levitate, et siccitate, et hujusmodi. Tertia vero perfectio ejus est secundum quod in suo loco quiescit. Haec autem triplex perfectio nulli creato competit secundum suam essentiam, sed soli Deo, cujus solius essentia est suum esse, et cui non adveniunt aliqua accidentia; sed quae de aliis dicuntur accidentaliter, sibi conveniunt essentialiter; ut esse potentem, sapientem, et alia hujusmodi, sicut ex dictis patet (quaest. III, art. 6). Ipse etiam ad nihil aliud ordinatur sicut ad finem, sed ipse est ultimus finis omnium rerum. Unde manifestum est quod solus Deus habet omnimodam perfectionem secundum suam essentiam. Et ideo ipse solus est bonus per suam essentiam.¹

Thus we see how very properly God is said to be good in Himself, by His very essence, since His essence is His very being; since, moreover, whatever is attributed as accidental to creatures is attributed to God as being of His essence; and since, lastly, God is ordained to no other as an end but all others are so ordained to Him. Durandus's position, following as it does from a mistaken notion of the good itself, presents a thorough misconception of the very nature of God.

In the fourth and last article of this question, St. Thomas shows that all creatures are good by a certain participation of the divine goodness. He says: "A primo igitur per suam essentiam ente et bono, unumquodque potest dici bonum et ens, inquantum participat ipsum per modum cujusdam assimilationis; licet remote et deficiente..."² Far, therefore, from God's being good in so far only as creatures exist, the truth is that creatures are good only because God is good by His very essence.

Just as it is difficult to believe how Durandus could have made this error regarding the goodness of God, it is hard to conceive how he could have fallen into such errors on the very nature of the good, for he must have read the doctrine of St. Thomas in the *De Veritate*, Question XXI. In article 1, St. Thomas begins by showing that something can be added to another in three ways. The first is when the thing added is outside the essence of that to which it is added, as when an accidental quality is added to a substance. In this way something can be added to a particular thing only, for, as St. Thomas says, "nulla enim res naturae est quae sit extra essentiam entis universalis, quamvis aliqua res sit extra essentiam hujus entis."³ Thus it is quite obvious that in this way nothing can be added to being as such. Nevertheless, this seems to be the way in which Durandus conceived the good taken formally, to add to the good taken concretely, or to the thing which the good taken concretely includes as subject. It is according to this mode of addition that he posited his denominative convertibility.

¹ Ia, q. 6, a. 3, c.

² A. 4, c.

³ *De Veritate*, q. 21, a. 1, c.

The second way in which something is said to be added to another is by way of contracting or determining. An example of this is the way the notion of "man" adds something to that of "animal." Animal is not a part to which man is added, but animal is something which in itself is determined by man.

This is undoubtedly the way in which Durandus held that the good adds to being when both are considered abstractly or formally. As we have seen, he apparently denied extra-mental reality to a thing when it is considered in abstraction. According to his doctrine, therefore, good, abstractly considered, contracts being to the genus relation. It follows that there is no essential convertibility between the two; his denominative convertibility is present, as we have seen, only according to the first mode of addition, when the good, abstractly considered, is added to being *in rerum natura* as included in the notion of the good concretely considered.—Actually the good does not contract being. Being contracted or determined in this way gives rise to the division of the ten predicaments. But, as St. Thomas says, "bonum dividitur aequaliter in decem genera, ut ens."¹

The third and final way in which, according to St. Thomas, something is added to another, is "secundum rationem tantum; quando scilicet aliquid est de ratione unius quod non est de ratione alterius; quod tamen nihil est in rerum natura, sed in ratione tantum; sive per illud contrahatur id cui dicitur addi, sive non."² It is in this way that good is said to be added to being. It does not contract being, however, for as St. Thomas noted in the first Question of the *De Veritate*, it is a general mode following all being.

Durandus's further contention that the proper nature of the good is a relation of *convenientia* (this term being taken as a proportion between the natures of two beings as such), springs from his misconception of good as a property of being. Good, as we have seen in the doctrine of St. Thomas, is not a relation of *convenientia*, but the name good expresses a particular kind of *convenientia*, a *convenientia* of the being with the intellectual appetite.

As we have seen above, St. Thomas, in the *De Veritate*,³ describes the transcendental properties of being as general modes consequent on every being. Among these general modes he makes a division between those which follow every being *in se* and those which follow each being *in ordine ad aliud*. It is among the latter that the good is to be found.

The group of general modes consequent on every being *in ordine ad aliud* is subdivided into those consequent upon every being according to its division from another being, and those following every being "secundum convenientiam unius entis ad aliud." In the first of these subdivisions,

¹ *Op. cit.*, q.21, a.1, c.

² *Ibid.*

³ Q.1, a.1.

the *aliud* to which every being is ordered is *any other being*; but in the second group, expressive of *convenientia*, the *aliud* denominates two very determinate kinds of being: intellect and will.

It is precisely this that Durandus failed to note. For him the *aliud* of *convenientia ad aliud* signifies any being whatsoever. St. Thomas says this is impossible. Indeed, immediately upon giving the division of those general modes which follow every being *secundum convenientiam entis ad aliud*, he adds: "...Hoc quidem non potest esse nisi accipiatur aliquid quod natum sit convenire cum omni ente. Hoc autem est anima quae quodammodo est omnia..."¹ Thus the *aliud* here is the soul, and it is divided according to the two spiritual powers of the soul, intellect and will. The *convenientia* of every being with intellect is truth; the *convenientia* with will is goodness. Because Durandus neglected to consider the intellectual soul, he erred on the nature of the good. The Thomistic doctrine holds firmly that if there were neither intellect nor will, being would be neither true nor good.

Durandus, however, tried to explain what good adds to being without considering the possibility of the addition of a being of reason; and to conceive the relation of *convenientia*, which the good implies, without making the other extreme of this relation the intellectual appetite. In studying transcendentals one must remember that they can exist only for the intellectual soul and only through the Prime Intellect.

2. Final causality and the good

In the exposition of his doctrine, Durandus divides *convenientia* into intrinsic and extrinsic, the former implying sometimes the relation of formal or material cause, and the latter that of efficient cause. Hence the good would seem at various times to imply the notion of either formal, material or efficient cause.²

In regard to final causality, Durandus makes the following distinction: "...Quod ratio boni dicit finem vel id quod est ad finem ut sic: aut intelligitur de ratione importata per hoc nomen finis et ad finem aut de ratione rei cui competit esse denominative finem: vel ad finem."³

Thus, concerning final cause he makes a distinction similar to the one he made regarding the good.⁴ Accordingly final cause may be considered either formally and abstractly or it may be considered concretely. He goes on to say that the final cause, considered concretely, can in no way be the good formally taken. "...Nullo igitur modo formalis ratio boni est esse finem, vel ad finem: si sic accipiantur."⁵

¹ *De Veritate*, q.1, a.1, c.

² *In II Sent.*, d.34, q.1, fol.213, A.

³ *Ibid.*, fol.212, I.

⁴ Cf. page 80 above.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, fol.212, I.

To understand this doctrine we will do well to consider Question III of this Distinction 34. There Durandus considers more thoroughly the causality of the good. Distinguishing both the good and cause according as each may be taken abstractly or concretely he concludes: (a) The good abstractly or formally taken can be a cause formally taken, and, especially in accord with the doctrine of Aristotle, a final cause formally taken. The reason is that both are respective. In this way Durandus could permit the statement that the good formally taken is final causality. (b) Taken concretely, the good may be called a cause, either, final, efficient, or material. However, it is such a cause only *per accidens*, whereas that which is denominatively good in this way is the *per se* cause. According to Durandus, to be a cause belongs only to what is an absolute thing. In other words, he seems to hold, first, that while the good formally taken cannot be a final cause, it can be said to have the notion of final causality, and, second, that the good concretely taken is *per accidens* a final cause.

Durandus does attribute a motion to the good, though it is difficult to see in what way it is properly a motion of the good. He says the motion of the good consists in its apprehension by the practical intellect. It will be best if we read his own words in this matter:

Ad quintam dicendum quod solus respectus non movet sed absolutum cum respectu movet tam intellectum practicum quam voluntatem. Simplex enim quidditas licet possit movere intellectum ad actum simplicem qui est indivisibilium intelligentia: tamen non potest movere ad actum componentem nisi accepta in habitudine ad alterum quia actus intelligendi componens fertur in duo propter convenientiam unius ad alterum: et sic intellectus practicus movetur a bono inquantum apprehendit aliquam naturam absolutam sub ratione convenientis ad alterum.¹

Although in the first sentence Durandus speaks of a motion of the will, his words would seem to imply that the prime motion of the good is a motion of the practical intellect, the motion of the will being consequent upon this. In reality the motion of the good is a metaphorical motion, a movement of attracting the will; naturally a necessary condition for such a movement, is the presentation of the good to the will by the intellect. This apprehension of the good is not due to a motion of the good, but rather to the motion of the intellect.

Durandus's idea of the motion of the good is fundamentally a rationalization from his concept of the essence of the good. It will be interesting to note how a variation of this idea recurs in the doctrine of Vasquez when he says that final cause has the *ratio formalis* of finalizing when it bespeaks an objective concept; in other words, that final cause moves *by* being known and not merely *through* being known. This Vasquezian doctrine is only one evidence of how much Vasquez's thought was influenced by the teaching of Durandus; there are many more as we shall soon see.

To summarize the errors of Durandus's doctrine of the good, then, we may say that he has erred in considering good as a contraction of being; in making it an accidental relation in so far as it refers to creatures, and an

¹ *Op. cit.*, d.34, q.1, fol.213, D.

extrinsic denomination as it refers to God; in speaking of it as a *convenientia* of a being not to the appetite but to another being; and in allowing it to be, in the nature of things, a final cause only *per accidens*.

We will consider now the doctrine of some of the later Schoolmen. We shall confine ourselves to the authors whose names rank among the foremost in scholarship, Vasquez and Suarez. We will endeavour to point out not only the errors of their doctrine of the good and of the final cause, but also in what way these errors seem to be rooted in the teaching of Durandus.

(b) SUAREZ

1. *The good as a property of being*

In his *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, published in 1614, Francis Suarez, S.J. discusses at great length the notion of the transcendental good. His discussion is found in *Disputatio X*. This tract begins with a list of various opinions as to the proper nature of the transcendental good. Second among these opinions Suarez lists that claiming good to be a real relation of *convenientia*. This opinion, he says, is attributed to Durandus, but is not really the view of that Schoolman. Suarez claims rather: "Sed cum Durandus in aliis etiam rebus neget proprias relationes reales, alia est in praesenti mens ejus, ut infra videbimus."¹

Although Durandus's doctrine, and, more particularly, his notion of denominative convertibility render this claim of Suarez capable of further investigation, still we will not argue the point here, since in the confused state of mind in which Durandus seems to have conceived things anything is possible. That Suarez should make a claim such as this and should, moreover, regard his own doctrine of the transcendental good as being what Durandus really meant — all this is a sure indication of how much influence Durandus had on Suarez's thinking.

The fourth opinion regarding the transcendental good quoted by Suarez is that attributed to a certain Hervaeus in his *Quodlibetales*. Two Hervaei lived in the fourteenth century, both of whom wrote about Thomistic doctrine. In the absence of the proper Hervaean text we will give the opinion as set forth by Suarez:

... Bonitatem nihil aliud dicere quam intrinsecam rei perfectionem, quae absoluta est in absolutis, et relativa in relativis. Unde fieri videtur consequens, bonum nihil aliud esse quam ipsum ens, quatenus in se aliquid perfectionis habet. Haec opinio tribuitur Hervaeo quodlib. 3, qu. 2; ibi tamen magis sentit bonitatem dicere entitatem, quatenus est perfectiva alterius, seu quatenus ad alterius perfectionem ordinatur, quam ut in se habet perfectionem aliquam, de quo sensu infra dicam.²

Suarez accepts this opinion as true, but says it is necessary to add something to it. With this addition he forms his own conclusion which, he adds, is the one Durandus too had intended. Let us read it:

¹ SUAREZ, *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, Paris, Vivès, 1856, disp. 10, sec. 1, n. 5.

² *Ibid.*, n. 9.

Dicendum ergo est, bonum supra ens solum posse addere rationem convenientiae, quae non est proprium relatio, sed solum connotat in alio talem naturam habentem naturalem inclinationem, capacitatem, vel conjunctionem cum tali perfectione; unde bonitas dicit ipsam perfectionem rei, connotando praedictam convenientiam, seu denotationem consurgentem ex coexistentia plurium.¹

One will certainly see Durandus mirrored here. Suarez, however, did not make the basic error regarding the nature of a property of being which we found in Durandus. Indeed, Suarez never speaks of good as a contraction of being, but he speaks of the two as distinct only by reason. He strongly maintains their coextension, moreover, adding there can never be good where there is not being. It will not be amiss to read some of his texts on this point:

Ut sit [i.e. according to his opinion] nonnulla distinctio rationis fundata in rebus inter bonum et ens, ut sic possit bonum attribui enti tamquam proprietas, et non esse synonymum cum illo, quia formaliter aliud est esse seu habere entitatem, aliud vero ratione entitatis habere semper aliquam convenientiam, quam ratio boni declarat.²

Dicendum tamen censeo, bonum proprie dictum semper supponere vel includere ens, seu fundari in ente, ideoque non posse bonum, sub quacunque praedictarum rationum, latius patere quam ens.³

Sequitur deinde, bonum sub eadem ratione sumptum, esse aliquo modo passionem seu proprietatem entis, quia et cum illo convertitur, et secundum rationem illud supponit, et ab eo aliquo modo distinguitur secundum formalem rationem a nobis conceptam et significatam. Et ideo dixi esse aliquo modo passionem, quia non est passio in eo rigore, in quo passio requirit distinctionem aliquam ex natura rei a suo subjecto, sed solum, ut dicitur de quolibet attributo, secundum rationem distincto ab eo cui attribuitur, ut superius declaratum est, tractando de passionibus.⁴

Cum bonum nomen sit connotativum seu denominativum, hic non inquirimus quid illud sit, quod bonum denominatur; nam certum est illud, in communi loquendo, esse ens quod natura seu ratione bonum antecedit, ut in superioribus dictum est, et ex sequentibus magis constabit; sed inquirimus quatenus sit illa forma seu ratio, a qua res bona denominatur.⁵

This last text (one with which Suarez opens his tract), when taken alone, is reminiscent of Durandus: convertibility *non essentialiter sed denominative* between good and being. Viewing it, however, in the light of Suarez's whole doctrine, we shall see that while he maintained the correct conception of a property of being, he was forced to a vague acceptance of denominative convertibility.

Although Suarez did not follow Durandus's basic error regarding the properties of being, he did follow him in holding the *ratio formalis* of the good to be *convenientia* not to the appetite but to *being*. For him the *aliud* of St. Thomas is another being, not always really distinct as Durandus seems to require, but distinct at least by reason. This is indeed the basic error of Suarez's doctrine, and once again it springs from an omission of the notion of intellectual soul in the system, though Suarez's omission was not so complete as was Durandus's.

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp.10, sec.1, n.12.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Ibid.*, sec.3, n.3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, n.5.

⁵ *Ibid.*, sec.1, n.1.

In his discussion, Suarez seems often to teeter dangerously on the precipice of Durandus's error of denominative convertibility. In so far as he saves himself he does so only by holding firmly to his correct notion of property of being and by a consistent vagueness. We encounter his most revealing flaw in the answer to an objection concerning the proper nature of the good. This objection may be stated briefly as follows: good is divided into *bonum alteri* and *bonum in se*. The former is only good *secundum quid*. The *ratio formalis* of the good, as Suarez understands it, applies, however, only to the *bonum alteri*.

Suarez gives two answers to this difficulty. In the first he falls into Durandus's error, yet he seems to redeem himself in the second. In the first he maintains his definition:

... Describere bonitatem, quae est passio entis; bonum autem solum esse passionem entis prout dicit convenientiam ad alterum, seu prout est bonum alteri; hoc enim modo distinguitur bonum aliquo modo ab ente, et convenit omni enti, etiam perfectissimo;...

Bonum autem absolute sumptum, scilicet, prout est bonum in se, non videtur pertinere ad passionem entis, sed potius ad essentiam seu entitatem ejus, ut supra argumentabar, quia bonum hoc modo idem est quod perfectum, ut D. Thomas saepe dicit 1 part. quaest. 5; perfectum autem includitur in essentiali conceptu entis realis, quia non potest concipi ens cum entitate, quin concipiatur cum perfectione essentiali.¹

Suarez here seems to echo Durandus's very words, distinguishing between *bonum* in its *ratio formalis* and *bonum ratione concretionis*. He follows Durandus too in denying the *formalis ratio* of the good to include the perfect.² In this matter it will be interesting to note Suarez's distinctions of the "perfect." They contrast significantly with the distinction we shall find in John of St. Thomas. Suarez divides the perfect as follows:

... Dicit enim Arist., 5 Metaph., c. 16, '*perfectum dici, extra quod non esse ullam partem accipere, seu cui nihil deest*'. . . Hoc ergo sensu perfectum dicitur, non quodeunque bonum, sed illud quod omni ex parte consummatum est, quod est simpliciter bonum. Alio tamen modo potest perfectum dici, quidquid sub aliqua ratione entis, habet perfectionem simpliciter necessariam et essentialem. . . Atque hoc modo bonum et perfectum convertuntur, imo sunt omnino idem, prout bonum dicit id quod in se bonum est, seu quod habet bonitatem, id est, perfectionem sibi debitam; hoc autem nihil aliud est quam habere essentiam vel entitatem sibi debitam; igitur *bonum sub hac ratione nihil aliud essentialiter ac formaliter dicit quam ens*; . . . Imo etiam esse perfectum priori modo, seu bonum simpliciter, nihil aliud est quam esse ens habens totam entitatem, quae ad complementum ejus requiritur.³

This doctrine might be interpreted in keeping with the teaching of St. Thomas, but unless the proper distinctions are made it is *prima facie* far from that doctrine. One cannot divorce the notion of perfect from the formal notion of the good, nor can one say that under this *ratio* of perfect the good essentially and formally signifies only being, that it is synonymous with being. We shall find the proper distinction to solve this difficulty in the treatise on the transcendental good given by John of St. Thomas. We will defer its solution till we come to this doctrine.

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp. 10, sec. 1, n. 14.

² DURANDUS, *In II Sent.*, d. 34, q. 1, fol. 212.

³ *Op. cit.*, disp. 10, sec. 1, n. 15.

One can scarcely fail to see the hand of Durandus in the Suarezian doctrine set forth in this text. True, Suarez does not expressly say here that good and being are convertible *non essentialiter sed denominative*. He does say that good, when considered as perfect, is being, essentially and formally. This notion of perfect, however, he does not hold to be the *ratio formalis* of good. Hence, in so far as perfect and good are convertible here (unless the passage is interpreted in the true sense of St. Thomas and John of St. Thomas), the only implication possible is that the convertibility is merely denominative.

In the second response Suarez seems to extract himself from this difficulty. A careful analysis, however, will reveal that even here he does not quite evade the notion of denominative convertibility between good and being. He says:

Verumtamen *propter usum vocum* potest adhiberi alia responsio. Nam, licet prior in hoc habeat verum, quod bonum sub ea ratione in re non differt ab ente, nihilominus possunt ratione distingui, quod satis est ut bonum assignetur ut proprietas entis, ad modum aliorum transcendentium. Est itaque quoad impositionem vel significationem nominis advertendum, ens solum dici ab esse aut entitate, ut supra exposuimus; perfectum autem clarius exprimere entis perfectionem, in quo negationem quamdam includit, vel saltem sine illa non potest a nobis ejus significatum explicari, scilicet, quod nihil ei desit secundum eam rationem, secundum quam perfectum dicitur. Bonum vero dicere convenientiam aliquam, ratione cujus habet res, quod appetibilis sit; nam bonum per ordinem aliquem aut appetitum, dictum est, ut D. Thomas docuit. . . ex illo Arist., 1 Ethic.: *Bonum est, quod omnia appetunt*, et statim magis explicabitur. Unde necesse est, res etiam illas, quae absolute et secundum se dicuntur bonae, sic denominari, quia habent perfectionem sibi convenientem et appetibilem, et ita etiam fit ut bonum hoc modo de formali significet perfectionem existentem in tali re, connotando in eadem re capacitatem, inclinationem, seu naturalem connexionem cum tali perfectione.¹

Thus, for Suarez, the intrinsic or *in se* goodness of a being consists in the perfection it has according as that perfection bespeaks a *convenientia* with the being itself. Suarez goes on to say that sometimes this perfection is distinguished from the being as accidentally inhering in it. In this case it is easily discerned how the being is good through the goodness of this perfection. Suarez finds the case more difficult, however, where the perfections are not really distinct from the being as accident from substance. Let us read his words on this subject, again:

Quod clarius patet, quando talis perfectio est distincta ab ipsa re, quae ab illa bona denominatur; nam quando homo dicitur bonus ratione virtutis, de formali significatur virtus non utcumque, sed ut bonitas quaedam, in quo importatur, non tantum perfectio virtutis, sed etiam convenientia quam habet cum humana natura, connotando ex parte ipsius naturae capacitatem, vel propensionem ad talem perfectionem. In his vero rebus, in quibus non est distinctio inter perfectionem et rem, quae perfecta dicitur, difficilius videtur explicari haec convenientia vel connotatio; dicendum est tamen, quamvis in re non sit distinctio, a nobis tamen concipi ac significari ad modum distinctorum, id est, *per modum formae denominantis et rei denominatae*, et ideo significari illam formam ut perfectionem accommodatam ei in quo existit, in quo computatur naturalis connexio ejus cum tali forma, et ita distingui tale bonum ab ente, saltem ratione.²

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp. 10, sec. 1, n. 18.

² *Ibid.*

In this latter instance, therefore, the distinction between good and being is a distinction of reason only. One may well ask whether Suarez intended only a *distinctio rationis ratiocinantis* or a distinction implying a *fundamentum in re*. The answer is that he intended it as a *distinctio rationis ratiocinatae*, as it clearly appears from his commentary on the *Prima Pars* of St. Thomas's *Summa theologiae*. There, in discussing the goodness of God, he says that a thing can be called good in three ways:

Primo igitur dicitur res bona, quia in suo esse perfecta est, i.e. quia habet omnia, quae ad complementum sui esse requiruntur.¹

Secundo modo dicitur aliquid ens bonum, quia conveniens est alicui ac proinde ei est appetibile. Hoc autem ipsum intelligi potest duobus modis. Primo, quatenus unumquodque habet perfectionem sibi convenientem et amabilem, quae convenientia, si per modum relationis consideretur, solum est per considerationem nostram, *tamen ut in re habet virtuale fundamentum, solet vocari bonitas transcendentalis*, juxta probabilem opinionem, de qua disput. 10 *Metaphysicae*... Alio vero modo dicitur una res bona respectu alterius, quia est illi conveniens.²

Tertio modo denominantur peculiariter res intellectuales bonae bonitate morali vel actuali, quia opera bona moralia exercent, vel habitu, et aptitudine retinent, quatenus sunt dispositae et propensae ad illud bonum exercendum... hanc tertiam bonitatem non esse illam quae transcendentalis est.³

From the first division of the second mode in which Suarez says things are called good, we may well conclude that Suarez was thinking of a *distinctio rationis ratiocinatae* in the passage from the *Disputationes Metaphysicae* quoted on page ninety. Indeed, this mode of good and that last mode of the passage in the *Disputationes* both refer to a simple being and are undoubtedly to be understood in the same way. That the distinction is a *distinctio rationis ratiocinatae* is evident, since Suarez posits a virtual fundament *in re*. It is a virtual fundament *in re* which underlies a *distinctio rationis ratiocinatae*.

Further and conclusive evidence that he could only have meant a *distinctio rationis ratiocinatae* is afforded by the fact that he did not admit of such a thing as a *distinctio rationis ratiocinantis*. We can find this doctrine in his *Disputationes Metaphysicae*. John of St. Thomas has summarized it as follows:

Sed quidam explodunt distinctionem rationis ratiocinantis et solum admittunt illam quae habet fundamentum aliquod in re; distinctionem vero rationis ratiocinantis utpote fictam solum esse repetitionem ejusdem conceptus sine resultantia alicujus distinctionis in conceptu objectivo. Videatur Suarez in *Metaph. disp.7, sect.1.*, Vasquez, l. p. dist.117, cap.3.⁴

In the above commentary, where he makes the three divisions of the good, Suarez discusses in what ways God is said good. He applies especially to God the mode in which a being is said good in so far as it has the perfection convenient to itself, a *convenientia* which we discern by our reason, basing it on a virtual *fundamentum in re*. Right after describing it, he says:

¹ SUAREZ, *In Iam*, Lib.I, cap.8, n.2.

² *Ibid.*, n.12.

³ *Ibid.*, nn.16, 18.

⁴ JOHN OF ST. THOMAS, *Cursus philosophicus*, T.I (REISER ed.), pp.294b41-295a7.

"Hoc ergo modo, per se notum, et evidentissimum est, Deum esse summe bonum: habet enim perfectionem sibi maxime convenientem et amabilem a se; unde se necessario amat, ut postea videbimus."¹

Thus Suarez did not fall into the error of Durandus: that God is good only in relation to His creatures, because goodness requires a plurality of being. Suarez held that God is good in Himself, though he too required a plurality for the formal notion of goodness. We may have noted this in the last part of his definition given above. "Unde bonitas dicit ipsam perfectionem rei, connotando praedictam convenientiam seu denominationem consurgentem ex coexistentia plurium."²

Here again he seems to have echoed Durandus's words, though he has certainly changed their import. Durandus's plurality was of real beings only; Suarez makes his plurality either real, or one of reason. Thus he is able to save the goodness of God in Himself.

Suarez also held God to be good in so far as He is *conveniens* to creatures. He does not hold this to be quite so evident as his first conclusion concerning God's goodness *in se*, but he does hold it. In discussing this point, he again reflects the errors of Durandus, saying that good in its formal notion of *convenientia* may be considered as the form or some part of another, or as its efficient cause. He concludes that God is *conveniens* to creatures in so far as He is their end, their object, their friend, and through His great power as efficient cause. Thus he does not place the causality of the good in final causality alone but makes it loom through several genera of cause. Indeed, what he has to say of God's causality as end in a later tract will manifest that his conception of final causality tended confusedly to identify it with efficient causality.³

We will do well to read Suarez's conclusion as to the transcendental goodness of God. He says:

Bonitas ergo transcendentalis in Deo est vel prima, vel secunda quae a nobis explicatae sunt, vel utramque simul juxta varios modos explicandi bonitatem transcendentalem, de quibus in disp. 10 Metaphysicae diximus. Praecipue vero solet denominari Deus bonus ex plenitudine omnis perfectionis, et quatenus ex plenitudine ejus propensus est ad se diffundendum et communicandum aliis, quibus bonus esse potest. Quomodo videtur de bonitate Dei praecipue agere Dionys. cap. 4 de Divi. nom. Sic autem clarum est, bonitatem nihil addere essentiae Dei secundum rem, sed solum secundum quandam connotationem et habitudinem rationis nostro modo concipiendi, non quod relatio rationis sit bonitas, sed fundamentum ejus, ut dicto loco declaravi.⁴

We may wonder exactly to which division Suarez refers by *prima* and *secunda*, whether it is to his first two modes in which a thing is called good as given in the quotation on page 91, or to his two divisions of the second mode. According to the phrase which follows "juxta varios modos explicandi bonitatem transcendentalem," and in the light of his last sen-

¹ Cf. SUAREZ, *In Iam*, Lib.I, c.8, n.12.

² Cf. page 88.

³ Cf. below, p.105.

⁴ *In Iam*, Lib.I, c.8, n.18.

tence of this quotation, we conclude that he would interpret the first mode in the light of the first division of the second, and that thus the first mode in the quotation on page 91 is not formally transcendental good, but is presupposed by it.

This position is supported by three conclusions with which Suarez resolves his treatment of the transcendental good in the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*. These three we shall find to be quite parallel with the first mode and with the two divisions of the second mode named in the *Commentary* above. The conclusions in the *Disputationes Metaphysicae* are:

Dicendum tamen censeo, bonum proprie dictum semper *supponere vel includere* ens, seu fundari in ente, ideoque non posse bonum, sub quacunque praedictarum rationum, latius patere quam ens.¹

...Omne verum ens in se bonum est, seu bonitatem aliquam habet sibi convenientem; atque *ita fit* ut bonum absolute dictum cum ente convertatur.²

...Omne ens etiam est bonum respectu alicujus, id est alicui conveniens; quocirca etiam bonum, sub ratione convenientis sumptum, cum ente convertitur, et est attributum seu passio ejus.³

We will note that only the last of these is said to be an attribute or property of being. Suarez means, however, that the second also — if understood correctly — denotes a property of being. To make this plausible, he maintains a division of the perfection of a thing according as that perfection is an accident to the thing or is its very essence. We saw this same division earlier⁴ when Suarez gave the second answer to his difficulty as to how a thing may be said good *in se*. Here he makes it clear that he considers only the *convenientia* of the essential or intrinsic perfection of a thing *in se* as transcendental *bonum in se*, a property of being. He says:

Potest autem haec perfectio in creaturis esse vel essentialis seu intrinseca (sub qua ipsum esse comprehendendo),⁵ vel accidentalis. Prior est inseparabilis ab unoquoque ente, si in suo actuali esse conservetur. Posterior vero saepe potest separari. Denominatio igitur boni, quae omni enti necessario convenit, illa est quae a perfectione intrinseca et essentiali desumitur; prout vero sumi potest a perfectione accidentali (sub hac ratione includendo quicquid ex natura rei distinguitur ab essentia rei, et entitate actuali), sic non est necesse, omne ens creatum esse bonum, id est affectum omni perfectione sibi possibili aut debita. Atque ita fit, *bonum priori ratione sumptum converti cum ente*; ostendimus enim omne ens esse bonum, nihilque esse vere bonum, nisi quod vere est. Sequitur deinde, bonum sub eadem ratione sumptum, esse aliquo modo *passionem, seu proprietatem entis*, quia et cum illo convertitur, et secundum rationem illud supponit, et ab eo aliquo modo distinguitur secundum formalem rationem a nobis conceptam et significatam. Et ideo dixi esse aliquo modo *passionem*, quia non est passio in eo rigore, in quo passio requirit distinctionem aliquam ex natura rei a suo subjecto, sed solum, ut dicitur de quolibet attributo, secundum rationem distincto ab eo cui attribuitur, ut superius declaratum est, tractando de passionibus.⁶

¹ Disp.10, sec.3, n.3.

² *Ibid.*, n.4.

³ *Ibid.*, n.6.

⁴ Cf. p.90 above.

⁵ We may wonder whether by the word "esse" Suarez here means existence or being. If he meant "being," he would have to distinguish being against itself, and then his relation could only have been identity and not *convenientia*. We must understand the term, therefore, as existence, because he meant to consider perfection of a thing as convenient to itself. Moreover, as we saw above, Suarez admitted of no *distinctio rationis ratiocinantis* and hence we should not logically expect one here.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, disp.10, sec.3, n.5.

By these words Suarez does not rule out accidental perfection as a transcendental good; he does, however, remove it from the nature of *bonum in se*, considered as a transcendental good. For him accidental perfection is to be considered as something distinct from the thing in itself, and, therefore, as *bonum alteri*. This is clearly indicated in the passage from his second reply to the objection against his doctrine, quoted above page ninety. As we saw, he says there:

Quod clarius patet, quando talis perfectio est *distincta ab ipsa re*, quae ab illa bona denominatur; nam, quando homo dicitur bonus ratione virtutis, de formali significatur virtus non utcumque, sed ut bonitas quaedam, in quo importatur, non tantum perfectio virtutis, sed etiam convenientia quam habet cum humana natura, connotando ex parte ipsius naturae capacitatem, vel propensionem ad talem perfectionem.¹

Undoubtedly, therefore, Suarez considers accidental perfection as a *passio entis*, a transcendental good in so far as it is *conveniens alteri*. Hence, in so far as it is a good, it is so according to the second division of his second mode in the *Commentary* or to the third conclusion in the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*.

This Suaresian doctrine will appear rather startling in its ramifications. It manifests first of all, as its basis, a complete misconception of the notion of individuality and, when carried through, denies the fundamental distinction between *bonum simpliciter* and *bonum secundum quid*.

Indeed, this doctrine of *simpliciter* and *secundum quid* as applied to being and to good is incomprehensible without a correct notion of what is an individual. As we shall see, St. Thomas's whole treatment of this important question presupposes a correct notion of individuation. It will not be amiss, therefore, to consider briefly the Thomistic idea of individuation and to point out how Suarez departs from it.

In the *Summa theologiae* St. Thomas defines "individuum": "quod est in se indistinctum, ab aliis vero distinctum."² The principle of individuation is none other than *materia signata quantitate*, as he states clearly in the opusculum *In Boethium de Trinitate*:

Illae quae differunt numero in genere substantiae, non solum differunt accidentibus, sed etiam forma et materia. Sed si quaeratur, quare haec forma differt ab illa, non est alia ratio, nisi quia est in alia materia signata. Nec invenitur alia ratio, quare haec materia sit divisa ab illa, nisi propter quantitatem. Et ideo materia subjecta dimensionem intelligitur esse principium hujus diversitatis.³

We note in this text that accidents do have their share in the difference of individuals. John of St. Thomas makes this more explicit when he says:

Unde obiter intelligitur, quam vera sit sententia D. Thomae, quod principium individuationis est *materia signata quantitate et accidentibus*, non quia accidentia formaliter constituent individuationem, sed quia a materia ut a principio per se dependet individuationem, ab accidentibus autem ut a conditionibus designationis, alias frustra individuum definiretur per collectionem proprietatum, etc.⁴

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp. 10, sec. 1, n. 18.

² *Ia*, q. 29, a. 4, c.

³ *Q. 4*, a. 2, ad 4.

⁴ *Curs. phil.*, T. I, p. 429b7-18.

The definition to which John of St. Thomas refers in this last line is the one given by Porphyrius: "Individua ex eo dicuntur, quod ex proprietatibus consistit unumquodque eorum, quarum collectio numquam in alio eadem erit."¹ Such accidents are indeed comprised by the individual and we designate the individual by such distinctive traits.

Suarez's opinion is completely at variance with all this. He holds that everything is individuated by itself, by its very being. Thus he seems to separate the accidents as if they were added on to an already individuated *compositum*. He not only destroys thereby the principle of individuation but also renders impossible the designation of any individual.

Suarez's doctrine of the principle of individuation is found in the *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, Dispute V. The scope of our paper does not permit a thorough investigation of this tract. To illustrate our point we shall confine ourselves to the following two passages from this work. The first concerns the notion of individuation.

...Dicendum est, res omnes, quae sunt actualia entia, seu quae existunt, vel existere possunt immediate, esse singulares ac individuas. Dico *immediate*, ut excludam communes rationes entium, quae ut sic non possunt immediate existere, neque habere actualement entitatem, nisi in entitatibus singularibus et individuis, quibus sublati, impossibile est aliquid reale manere, sicut de primis substantiis dixit Aristoteles in *Prædicamentis*, cap. de Substantia... Omnis ergo entitas, hoc ipso quod est una entitas in rerum natura, necessario est una prædicto modo, atque adeo singularis et individua.²

From the second we may gather his opinion on the individuation of accidents:

Diximus enim dupliciter posse nos loqui de principio individuationis: primo, in ordine ad esse, et ad propriam rei constitutionem secundum se. Secundo, in ordine ad productionem, quatenus determinatur agens ad distinctum individuum producendum, vel ad efficiendum unum potius quam aliud, et consequenter in ordine ad nostram cognitionem, quatenus sensibiliter (ut sic dicam) distinguere possumus unum ab alio. Priori igitur consideratione (quae maxime a priori est, et maxime propria hujus scientiae), vera est posterior sententia, docens accidentia non ex subjecto, sed *ex propriis entitatibus habere suam individuationem et numericam distinctionem*,... Posteriori autem consideratione (quae magis est physica, et a posteriori) dici possunt accidentia accipere individuationem ex subjecto tamquam ex radice, seu occasione potius multiplicationis et distinctionis eorum. Hoc tamen non de subjecto nude sumpto, sed adhibitis aliis circumstantiis, vel conditionibus ad actionem necessariis intelligendum est, ut in solutionibus argumentorum commodius explicabitur.³

Thus, for Suarez, accidents do not serve as conditions for designating the individual being, but rather the substance. In fact, the substance itself would have to be that by which we designate distinctive traits.

John of St. Thomas summarizes Suarez's doctrine of individuation in the following terms: "Prima [sententia] affirmat unumquodque individuari seipso et ex propria entitate, et sicut seipsa habet unitatem formalem, et omnis unitas est passio entis, ideo ipsam entitatem ponit pro principio individuationis."⁴

¹ *Op. cit.*, p.425b33.

² *Sec.1*, n.4.

³ *Ibid.*, sec.7, n.4.

⁴ *Curs. phil.*, T.II, a.3, p.771a11.

A consequence of this opinion is, as we have said, the utter negation of St. Thomas's distinction between *bonum simpliciter* and *secundum quid*. This distinction establishes a definite contrast between being and its transcendental property — the good, the one being said *simpliciter* or *secundum quid* inversely to the other. St. Thomas's doctrine is clearly stated in his reply to the first objection of article 1, Question V, in the *Prima Pars*:

... Licet bonum et ens sint idem secundum rem; quia tamen differunt secundum rationem, non eodem modo dicitur aliquid ens simpliciter et bonum simpliciter. Nam cum ens dicat aliquid proprie esse in actu, actus autem proprie ordinem habeat ad potentiam; secundum hoc simpliciter aliquid dicitur ens, secundum quod primo discernitur ab eo quod est in potentia tantum. Hoc autem est esse substantiale rei uniuscujusque. Unde per suum esse substantiale dicitur unumquodque ens simpliciter; per actus autem superadditos dicitur aliquid esse secundum quid; sicut esse album significat esse secundum quid; non enim esse album aufert esse in potentia simpliciter; cum adveniat rei jam praeexistenti in actu. Sed bonum dicit rationem perfecti, quod est appetibile; et per consequens dicit rationem ultimi. Unde id quod est ultimo perfectum, dicitur bonum simpliciter. Quod autem non habet ultimam perfectionem quam debet habere, quamvis habeat aliquam perfectionem, in quantum est actu; non tamen dicitur perfectum simpliciter, nec bonum simpliciter, sed secundum quid. Sic ergo secundum primum esse, quod est substantiale, dicitur aliquid ens simpliciter et bonum secundum quid; id est, in quantum est ens. Secundum vero ultimum actum dicitur aliquid ens secundum quid et bonum simpliciter. Sic ergo quod dicit Boetius quod in rebus aliud est quod sunt bona, et aliud quod sunt; referendum est ad esse bonum simpliciter, et ad esse simpliciter: quia secundum primum actum est aliquid ens simpliciter; et secundum ultimum, bonum simpliciter; et tamen secundum primum actum est quodammodo bonum: et secundum ultimum actum est quodammodo ens.

This doctrine is quite incompatible with Suarez's teaching on individuation and on the good. Hence, it is small wonder that we find him utterly destroying the very meaning of the distinction with the one word "equivocal," when he does come to speak of it. We find his treatment of this subject immediately following the division of the perfect which he made, as we saw above,¹ in the course of his first answer to the difficulty raised against his notion of the good. There, we may remember, he divided the perfect into that which is perfect *simpliciter*, i.e. lacks nothing as to its complement, and that which is perfect only essentially, i.e. has only necessary and essential perfection. He says explicitly in this passage that the good in so far as it signifies the perfect in this second sense "nihil aliud essentialiter ac formaliter dicit quam ens." He concludes also that only *bonum simpliciter* is to be said perfect in the first sense. In this sense as well he seems to have conceived the good as formally identical with being, for, in the last sentence he adds: "Imo etiam esse perfectum priori modo, seu bonum simpliciter, nihil aliud est quam esse ens habens totam entitatem, quae ad complementum requiritur." From this he proceeds to the distinction of *bonum simpliciter* and *bonum secundum quid*. Let us read what he has to say on this point:

Et hoc modo intelligendus est D. Thomas cum dicere solet (ut videre licet 1 p., q. 5, art. 1, ad 1) aliter inter se comparari in creaturis ens simpliciter et secundum quid, quam bonum simpliciter et secundum quid; nam res habet quod sit ens simpliciter per esse substantiale, secundum quid vero per esse accidentale; habet autem quod sit bona secundum quid per esse substantiale, simpliciter autem per esse accidentale.

¹ P. 89.

Hoc tamen ultimum intelligendum est non praecise de esse accidentali, sed ut conjuncto esse substantiali; non esset enim bonus homo per accidentales virtutes, nisi supponeretur homo, et consequenter substantialiter et naturaliter bonus. Unde in illis vocibus, *secundum quid*, et *simpliciter*, videtur esse aequivocatio; nam cum dicuntur de ente, videntur dici de substantia et accidente praecise comparatis; cum autem dicuntur de bono, dicuntur de substantia creata aut solitarie sumpta, aut ut affecta dispositionibus et facultatibus sibi connaturalibus. *Quo fit ut, licet in modo loquendi sit diversitas, in re tamen nulla videatur esse differentia, quia etiam bonitas vel perfectio, quam confert accidens, si praecise comparatur ad eam bonitatem quam confert substantia, est secundum quid.* Sic enim in universum verum est, quod ex D. Thoma supra retulimus, unumquodque quantum habet de esse, tantum habet de bonitate, et quod etiam retulimus ex Augustino, quod in quantum sumus, boni sumus.¹

Thus understood, St. Thomas's doctrine as given above would have no meaning in reality. Indeed, it could not have any meaning if *bonum* and *ens* were formally one as they are according to this consideration. Nor could it mean anything if accidents were related as separate individuals to the substances in which they inhere.

Having thus identified being and good, when good is taken, not formally, but *sub ratione perfecti*, Suarez can only resort to equivocation when explaining St. Thomas's doctrine. Moreover, taking being itself as the principle of individuation, he could only think of precision *secundum rem* when he considered the division of being into substance and accident.

Yet, St. Thomas's whole purpose in pointing out the difference between being and the good in terms of the distinction "*simpliciter*" and "*secundum quid*," is to show that the two do not differ *secundum rem* but *secundum rationem* only, so that the terms *simpliciter* and *secundum quid* must necessarily be taken univocally in both cases. These terms serve as the very fulcrum for the understanding of the formal difference between being and good.

The reason which Suarez gives for considering the terms *simpliciter* and *secundum quid* as equivocal in the two cases is that, in speaking of being, these terms are applied to substance and accident as *praecise comparatis*, i.e. as individuated one from the other. In speaking of goodness, on the other hand, he says these terms are applied to substance and accident differently: *secundum quid* applies to substance as existing without any accident, while *simpliciter* applies to accident, but only when it is actually inhering in a substance.

In this Suarez is entirely mistaken. St. Thomas never speaks of substance and accident as individuated one from the other. In the present context he refers to the individual both when he speaks of being and when he speaks of good. Indeed, in the natural order accident cannot be conceived as having a separate existence from substance. The distinction which St. Thomas makes between the two, both as regards being and good, is intentional, though none the less real. Indeed, when he speaks of accident in the line of being he makes definite mention of its actual inherence in substance by adding: "*cum adveniat rei jam praeexistenti in actu.*"²

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp.10, sec.1, n.16.

² Cf. quotation, p.96.

Substance and accident divide both being and its transcendental property, good. St. Thomas uses this division here because it serves to distinguish the actuality of an individual proportionally as being prime or secondary. Since being "*dicat aliquid proprie esse in actu*," and since it is by substance that something is first distinguished from potency, and has its first actuality, substance is said to be being *simpliciter*. Accident, being a secondary actuality, is said of being *secundum quid*.

The nature of good, however, bespeaks the perfect which is appetible, and St. Thomas adds, "*per consequens dicit rationem ultimi*." This word "ultimate" has profound significance: for it may be understood to signify the causal nature of the good, as well as the nature of that perfection which is said of a thing to which nothing is lacking, and which is present only when the ultimate actuality is present to the individual. Thus while being most properly refers to the first actuality of an individual, good by its proper nature concerns the ultimate actuality. Hence, because of the ultimate actuality, the ultimate accidental perfection inhering in it, an individual is called good *simpliciter*; because of its prime actuality, its substance, it is, in this precise respect, good only *secundum quid*.

The fact that the good *simpliciter* regards the whole being, the individual, substance and accidents down to the last perfection, is due to the very nature of the good which appeals to the appetite as it were, by reason of the ultimate perfection. Being, on the other hand, by its nature is not ultimate but prime. Hence, this difference must not be attributed to an equivocation in the terms *simpliciter* and *secundum quid*, but is rather to be explained by their univocity.

In making this error, Suarez, as we have seen, has taken the word good to mean "*nihil aliud essentialiter ac formaliter . . . quam ens*." But, as we know, this is not the transcendental good for him. In his opinion, the transcendental good adds to being the *ratio convenientiae*, and is divided into *bonum in se* and *bonum alteri* according as the beings between which this *convenientia* is found are distinct by a *distinctio rationis ratiocinatae* or by a real distinction.

✧ Suarez never makes the assertion openly that, as Durandus claimed, good and being are convertible *non essentialiter sed denominative*. His whole doctrine, however carries this implication. When he speaks of the good as being nothing other than "being formally and essentially," good can be no more than another name for being and hence their convertibility is merely denominative. We pointed this out when first we spoke of his doctrine on this subject — a doctrine he presents in answer to the objection concerning his definition of the good.¹

We also pointed out that when he spoke of the good as a property of being according to his own notion, even then he seemed unable to evade denominative convertibility, referring more than once to the good as de-

¹ Cf. page 90.

nominative. We saw this to be more particularly evident when he spoke of *bonum in se*, wherein he distinguished the perfection and the thing by a mere distinction of reason. There he said that we distinguish them by reason "per modum formae denominantis et rei denominatae."¹ He used a similar expression, moreover, when he spoke of *bonum alteri*, for when treating of accidental perfection as a good (we saw just above that he considered this to be *bonum alteri*) he stated "talīs perfectio est distincta ab ipsa re, quae ab illa bona denominatur."²

We might point out many other passages where he more or less explicitly conveys the idea of denominative convertibility. As we saw at the beginning of our discussion, he seems to have had a correct notion of a property of being. This is incompatible with denominative convertibility, and that is what may have restrained him from openly asserting the latter.

It was through his false concept of the *ratio formalis* of good that Suarez was forced into this logical impasse which may account for the vagueness of his doctrine. Thus we can see how very necessary it is to understand correctly the meaning of *convenientia ad aliud*. St. Thomas's words contain profound truth when they say that in the case of those properties of being which bespeak *convenientia ad aliud*, the *aliud* is to be understood as the soul, the soul being *quodammodo omnia*.

The *convenientia* which Suarez assigned as the *ratio formalis* of the good is no general mode of being at all. It is a special mode, as particularized as each individual being itself. Thus it is that although Suarez tries to retain the correct notion of a property of being with which he started, he is finally compelled to deny it in explaining his own doctrine of the good. But, being averse to make this denial explicit, he lapses into vagueness.

2. On goodness and final causality

This identification of the *ratio formalis* of the good with the *convenientia* between beings has particularly contributed to a false notion of final causality. We found this identity in Durandus and now in Suarez. We shall find it again in Vasquez, though in a new and more modern form. We hope in the future to show its presence in the philosophies of such moderns as Bacon and Spinoza, and to point out its connection with their doctrines of final cause. The other errors which Suarez makes concerning the good are patently at variance with the doctrine given by St. Thomas. Their categorical assertion makes it needless to discuss at length what Suarez might have intended.

The first of these errors lies in the belief that the *ratio* of appetibility is posterior to that of the good. Suarez says: "...Bonum autem formaliter in ratione et denominatione sua non includit conformitatem ad appetitum, quamvis haec ad rationem boni consequatur."³

¹ Cf. page 90.

² *Ibid.*

³ *Op. cit.*, disp.10, sec.1, n.20.

This doctrine follows as a necessary corollary from Suarez's definition of the good. As we have seen, his *aliud* is not the appetite. He looks upon good as the formal *ratio* of attaining the appetible:

...Bonitas autem supponitur in objecto appetitus, et est ratio formalis attingendi illud; appetibilitas autem dicit denominationem sumptam ex proportionem talis objecti cum tali potentia, unde non dicit formalem rationem objecti, sed conditionem concomitantem.¹

Thus, he would compare the good to the appetible in the way light is compared to colour as the object of sight. The two are for him formally distinct. A conclusion such as this is almost unthinkable in the light of that most famous of all definitions of the good, the one given by Aristotle himself in the *Ethics* — "bonum est quod omnia appetunt."

However, the main subject of our present concern is Suarez's denial of the *ratio finis* to the good. Let us consider the following statement: "Bonum habere rationem finis, eo, scilicet, modo quo habet rationem appetibilis."² Accordingly, *bonum* and *finis* are formally distinct. In explanation of this statement, Suarez presents a rather strange division of *finis*.

Etenim si formaliter sumatur habitudo ac denominatio finis, illa non est de ratione boni, sed ad illam consequi potest; nam finis ut sic dicit rationem causae in ordine ad media, vel ad aliquam actionem, quae propter finem fiat, quam habitudinem non dicit bonum, sed solam rationem convenientis. Si autem sumatur finis fundamentaliter, sic attribuitur bono, qua ratione bonitatis habet finis vim causandi finaliter.³

In this division we may again observe the shadow of Durandus. As we saw above,⁴ he had similarly divided end, — a division which was markedly parallel to his division of the good itself into *bonum formaliter* and *bonum ratione concretionis*. Durandus, however, did not come out bluntly and deny the *ratio finis* to the proper nature of the good, although it seems that this division would have forced him to do so had he understood the nature of the good correctly. Suarez, therefore, is more forthright in his error when he denies that the good and the end are formally the same. He looks upon the good as that from which the end has its power to move, a formality separate from the end, yet basic to it. Indeed, neither he nor Durandus deny a motion to the good.

In connection with this subject it will be interesting to take note of Suarez's theory of the *ratio causandi* of final cause. He divides final causation into *actus primus*, which he also calls the *proxima ratio finaliter causandi*, and *actus secundus*. He then adds that the *actus secundus* of final causation is the very act of the will. It will be best to use his own words:

Est ergo tertia sententia, quae constituit etiam hanc finis causalitatem in motione metaphorica. Addit vero, hujusmodi motionem non poni in actu secundo, nisi quando voluntas in actu secundo movetur, et quando sic ponitur in re non esse aliquid distinctum ab ipsomet actu voluntatis.⁵

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp.10, sec.1, n.20.

² *Ibid.*, n.21.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Cf. page 85.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, disp.23, sec.4, n.8.

...Ita aiunt unam et eandem actionem voluntatis causari a fine et a voluntate ipsa, et prout est a voluntate, esse causalitatem effectivam, prout vero est a fine esse causalitatem finalem, et priori ratione esse motionem realem ac propriam, quia talis actio manat a potentia ut a proprio principio physico, posteriori autem ratione esse motionem metaphoricam, quia manat ab objecto alliciente, et trahente ad se voluntatem.¹

This opinion Suarez attributes to St. Thomas and most expressly to Ockham. He himself accepts it as the only possible solution. In support of it he makes the following distinction:

Neque contra illam quicquam obstat objectio supra facta, quod actus voluntatis potius est effectus quam causalitas finis. Nam imprimis in ipsomet actu voluntatis possumus distinguere actionem ab actu, et actum dicemus esse effectum, actionem vero quatenus in suo genere est a fine, esse causalitatem ejus, sicut proportionaliter dicendum est de causalitate effectiva. Deinde, etiamsi in illo actu non distinguantur ex natura rei illae duae rationes, sed fingatur esse pura actio, nihilominus non repugnat ut eadem res, quae est effectus causae, in eo genere, in quo est effectus, sit etiam causalitas, quando ille effectus est ipsamet actio, sufficitque distinctio rationis, ut distinguantur per modum causalitatis, vel per modum effectus, sicut in causalitate activa manifeste constat.²

The *actus primus* or *proxima ratio finaliter causandi* Suarez holds to be the good. He describes what he means by *actus primus* and then asserts it to be the good in the following words:

...Ergo illa ratio, sub qua [aliquid] exercet munus causae finalis, erit, quae proxime constituit finalem causam quasi in actu primo.³

De hac igitur re communis consensus Doctorum omnium esse videtur, bonitatem esse proximam rationem, sub qua finis movet; atque ita illam esse, quae constituit finalem causam, dans illi (ut ita dicam) virtutem ad causandum.⁴

Suarez's proof for this will be helpful for a better understanding of his whole doctrine:

Ratio autem est, quia causalitas finis consistit in motione metaphorica voluntatis, qua illam ad se allicit; nihil autem ad se allicit voluntatem, nisi quatenus bonum est; ergo bonitas est ratio movendi voluntatem; ergo etiam est ratio, seu principium causandi finaliter.⁵

This distinction of final causality into *actus primus* and *actus secundus* is a novel one. Indeed, the distinction between *actus primus* and *actus secundus*, as usually understood, is made with respect to a proportion to potentiality and cannot be understood except as referred to potentiality. The actuation of potentiality according to the proportion "in" is called *actus primus*; further actuation according to the proportion "to" is called *actus secundus*. Such is the distinction St. Thomas makes in the *Prima Pars*, when he says: "Actus autem est duplex: primus et secundus. Actus quidem primus est forma et integritas rei; actus autem secundus est operatio."⁶ The basis for this division may be found in the *Metaphysics*, where St. Thomas comments on Aristotle's division of the modes in which *actus* may be predicated:

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp.23, sec.4, n.8.

² *Ibid.*, n.12

³ *Ibid.*, sec.5, n.1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, n.2.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Q.48, a.5, c.

Ostendit quod diversimode dicatur actus. Et ponit duas diversitates: quarum prima est, quod actus dicitur vel actus, vel operatio. Ad hanc diversitatem actus insinuandam dicit primo, quod non omnia dicimus similiter esse actu, sed hoc diversimode. Et haec diversitas considerari potest per diversas proportioniones. Potest enim sic accipi proportio, ut dicamus, quod sicut hoc est in hoc, ita hoc in hoc. Utpote visus sicut est in oculo, ita auditus in aure. Et per hunc modum proportionis accipitur comparatio substantiae, idest formae, ad materiam; nam forma in materia dicitur esse.

Alius modus proportionis est, ut dicamus quod sicut habet se hoc ad hoc, ita hoc ad hoc; puta sicut se habet visus ad videndum, ita auditus ad audiendum. Et per hunc modum proportionis accipitur comparatio motus ad potentiam motivam, vel cujuscumque operationis ad potentiam operativam.¹

Thus, the division *actus primus* and *actus secundus* is not a division of *actus* considered *simpliciter*, but of *actus* according as it is proportioned to potentiality. The division made by Suarez, however, does not fit in well with the Thomistic doctrine. He is saved from outright error only by the vagueness of his terminology, for it will be noted that he does not say good is final cause *in actu primo* but *quasi in actu primo*. Had he not inserted this *quasi* he would be guilty of making good the form of final cause, whereas just above we saw that he explicitly held them to be formally distinct.

The very vagueness of his doctrine in this matter leads one to believe that he conceived this division of final causation as a kind of quantitative division, a division of actuality in itself, prescinding from any proportion to potentiality. Granting the doctrine as he gives it, we are faced with the impossible situation of a *quasi actus primus* having for its *actus secundus* the operation of a thing other than itself — even though Suarez tries to avert this objection by a distinction of reason. The reason underlying this rather strange division of final causality may well be found in his doctrine concerning the role of final causality in respect to God and in respect to irrational creatures. The doctrine which we have given above is limited by Suarez to final causality, as it applies to created intellectual beings only.

Before going on to consider what Suarez has to say on final causality considered with respect to God and to the irrational creatures, it will not be amiss to add a note concerning his idea of the metaphorical motion of the end. Indeed, he does not seem to understand what is meant by metaphorical motion since he interprets it as a mere means of distinguishing the causality of the end from that of the efficient agent. Here again we had better read his own words:

Quare cavenda est aequivocatio in vocabulo *metaphoricae motionis*; nam respectu nostri illa particula, *metaphoricae*, additur ad distinguendam illam motionem a motione efficientis causae, non vero ad excludendam illam a tota latitudine motionis et causalitatis rectis proprie dictae; cum vero Deus dicitur moveri aut allici a bonitate sua, tota locutio est metaphorica, ad explicandam solam rationem divinae voluntatis.²

¹ In IX *Metaphysicorum* (CATHALA ed.), lect.5, nn.1828, 1829.

² *Op. cit.*, disp.23, sec.9, n.12.

For Suarez, therefore, the motion of the good in final causality as regards the created intellect is a real motion, a motion *proprie dicta*, and is not merely metaphorical.

Turning to final causality as it refers to God, Suarez distinguishes the action of God into immanent and transient. Of the former he says: "Unde dicendum est finem non posse exercere causalitatem suam in divinam voluntatem quantum ad actus immanentes, seu determinationes liberas ejusdem voluntatis."¹

We can agree on the whole with this conclusion, disregarding for the moment what he says about the immanent acts. Indeed, this is the true Thomistic doctrine, as Dr. De Koninck has so clearly asserted in his *Defence of St. Thomas*: "Obviously, when we consider the divine good with respect to the divine will, the term *finis* cannot be taken in the strict sense of final cause, since causality involves dependence."² In support of this Dr. De Koninck quotes from the *De Veritate*, where St. Thomas says:

... Voluntas est alicujus dupliciter; uno modo principaliter, et alio modo secundario. Principaliter quidem voluntas est finis, qui est ratio volendi omnia alia; secundario autem est eorum quae sunt ad finem quae propter finem volumus. Voluntas autem non habet habitudinem ad volitum quod est secundarium, sicut ad causam; sed tantummodo ad volitum principale, quod est finis. Sciendum est autem, quod voluntas et volitum aliquando distinguuntur secundum rem; et tunc volitum comparatur ad voluntatem sicut realiter causa finalis. Si autem voluntas et volitum distinguuntur tantum ratione, tunc volitum non erit causa finalis voluntatis nisi secundum modum significandi. Voluntas ergo divina comparatur, sicut ad finem, ad bonitatem suam, quae secundum rem idem est quod sua voluntas; distinguitur autem solum secundum modum significandi. Unde relinquitur quod voluntatis divinae nihil sit causa realiter, sed solum secundum modum significandi. Nec est inconveniens, in Deo significari aliquid per modum causae; sic enim Divinitas significatur in Deo ut habens se ad Deum per modum causae formalis. *Res vero creatae, quas Deus vult, non se habent ad divinam voluntatem ut fines, sed ut ordinata ad finem*: propter hoc enim Deus creaturas vult esse, ut in eis sua bonitas, quae per essentiam multiplicari non potest, saltem similitudinis participatione in plures effundatur.³

We italicized the sentence "*Res vero...*" in view of the error Suarez makes in considering finality in the transient acts of God. Let us read his own statement:

... Actio Dei transiens non est Deus, nec in Deo, sed in creatura; et ideo habere potest causam finalem, et ordinari in finem. Atque ita, licet Deus non habeat finem sui esse, habet tamen finem suae actionis transeuntis, qui si sit finis proximus, esse potest aliquid extra Deum; agit enim Deus ad extra, ut sese communicet, quae communicatio aliquid est extra Deum, et in universum actio dici potest ordinari in terminum, ut in suum finem; si vero sit sermo de fine ultimo, est ipsemet Deus, non quia intendat aliquid commodum vel bonum sibi acquirere, sed quia agit propter suam bonitatem communicandam et manifestandam.⁴

To understand the basic errors in this passage, we must recall St. Thomas's division of action into immanent and transient, and see how he applies it to divine action. Two pertinent references from the *Summa theologiae* will do for the first point.

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp.23, sec.9, n.3.

² CHARLES DE KONINCK, *In Defence of St. Thomas*, in *Laval théologique et philosophique*, 1945, Vol.I, n.2, p.55.

³ Q.23, a.1, ad 3.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, disp.23, sec.9, n.12.

...Duplex est actio. Una quae transit in exteriorem materiam; ut calefacere et secare. Alia quae manet in agente; ut intelligere, sentire, et velle.¹

Duplex enim est actionis genus, ut dicitur. Una scilicet quae transit in aliquid exterius inferens ei passionem; sicut urere et secare: alia vero actio est quae non transit in rem exteriorem, sed magis manet in ipso agente: sicut sentire, intelligere et velle: per huiusmodi enim actionem non immutatur aliquid extrinsecum, sed totum in ipso agente agitur. De prima ergo actione manifestum est quod non potest esse ipsum esse agentis.²

A transient action, therefore, is one which passes outside the agent to some other thing; an immanent action is one which remains within the agent. Now when we speak of action with respect to God we must remember that we use the term analogously. Since He is entirely immutable, there is no such thing as a motion proper in God. We add "proper" because motion may be understood in a broad and improper sense.³ We do, however, speak of an action or operation of God which is identified in reality with His essence. Although many by a distinction of reason, it is in reality a single operation. "...In Deo secundum rem non est nisi una operatio, quae est sua essentia."⁴ This divine operation is formally an immanent action, in which we distinguish the formalities of knowing and willing. We further divide God's action into action *ad intra* and action *ad extra*. The action *ad extra* consists in the production and conservation of creatures. Although action *ad extra*, taken formally it is nevertheless an immanent action; for God produces and conserves things by His knowledge and volition. Since this immanent action may be said to pass into something exterior in so far as the effect of the immanent action is exterior to God, it is said to be virtually transient.

John of St. Thomas draws our attention to the Angelic Doctor's conclusion of the question on the existence of God in things: "Deus est in rebus non sicut accidens, nec sicut pars essentiae, sed sicut agens; et quia agit ipsum esse, profundissime et intime est in rebus."⁵ In other words, as John of St. Thomas points out in his treatise on the immensity of God and His presence in creatures:

...Sententia Divi Thomae est, quod ipsa operatio Dei immanens, secundum quod virtualiter est transiens et ponens effectum in esse, est formalis ratio a priori contactus divini ad creaturas, et exsistentiae Dei in rebus quantum ad contactum.⁶

And so we see that the division of action into immanent and transient cannot be applied to the divine action as denoting two formalities. The divine action is formally immanent; it is virtually transient only in so far as its effects are exterior.

On the other hand, if the position stated by Suarez in the second conclusion on the action of God *ad extra*—viz., that the transient action of God is *in the creature*—were logically carried through, we fail to see how it could escape pantheism.

¹ *Ia*, q.18, a.3, ad 1.

² *Ia*, q.54, a.2, c.

³ Cf. ST. THOMAS, *De Divinis Nominibus*, c.9, lect.4.

⁴ *Ia*, q.30, a.2, ad 3.

⁵ JOHN OF ST. THOMAS, *Cursus theologicus* (SOLESMES ed.), T.II, p.16.

⁶ *Ibid.*

Again, the division of *finis* into ultimate and proximate does not apply to divine action. This division is based on the possibility of a multiplicity of intentions of the will. In the case of these multiple acts, that which, objectively, has merely the nature of *means* may have, subjectively, the nature of *end*—not an ultimate end, but a proximate one. Where there is no possibility of a multiplicity of intentions the means can never take on the *ratio finis*, and hence the division cannot apply. Such, however, is the case of the divine will, Whose end is eminently one: the divine goodness. In support of this we have the words of St. Thomas quoted above from the *De Veritate*: "Res vero creatae, quas Deus vult, non se habent ad divinam voluntatem ut fines, sed ut ordinata ad finem."¹

It is therefore somewhat surprising to hear Suarez say that God can have a proximate end and that this end is something outside Himself. We may well surmise that this doctrine is closely connected with his strange distinction of the causality of final cause into *actus primus* and *actus secundus*. Thus, with respect to the so-called transient action of God, the *actus primus* of His final causality would be His ultimate end, His own goodness, while the *actus secundus* would be His action in creatures, and while it is His action, it would have to be at the same time the action of the creatures. This contention is supported by the following words of Suarez, where, indeed, he even confuses the final causality of God with His efficient causality:

Consistit autem causalitas finalis Dei respectu effectuum ad extra in hoc, quod Deus intuitu et amore suae bonitatis effectus extra se producit; unde ipsamet operatio quam ad extra habet, essentialiter pendet a Deo tum in ratione efficientis, tum etiam in ratione finis, quia respicit Deum et ut omnipotentem, et ut summe bonum, qui ratione suae bonitatis, et dignus est ut omnia ad ipsum ut ad finem ordinentur, et seipsum dicto eminenti modo inclinatur ad communicandam aliis suam bonitatem propter ipsam. Atque ita facilis est responsio ad rationem dubitandi; negamus enim esse semper necessariam causalitatem finis intra ipsum agens, ut habere possit locum extra ipsum in alios effectus ejus, . . .²

This same doctrine will explain Suarez's peculiar conception of final causality as concerning natural things. He says:

Nihilominus proprius modus loquendi in hac materia est, actiones horum agentium naturalium esse propter finem, et esse effecta causae finalis. Non tamen ut praecise egrediuntur ab ipsis naturalibus agentibus, sed ut simul sunt a primo agente, quod in omnibus et per omnia operatur. Vel e converso (et fere in idem redit) prout ipsa proxima agentia substant directioni et intentione superioris agentis. Et ideo ipsa agentia naturalia non tam dicuntur operari propter finem, quam dirigi in finem a superiori agente.³

In the scope of the natural agents here considered, Suarez would include all irrational creatures. In a special article on the final causality of brute animals, he says that they participate in the causality of the end, as a material motion of the end, but "quantum ad formalem relationem in finem ita existimandum est de actionibus brutorum, sicut aliorum agentium naturalium."

¹ Q.23, a.1, ad 3.

² *Op. cit.*, disp.23, sec.9, n.9.

³ *Ibid.*, sec.10, n.5.

Immediately after stating this conclusion, Suarez goes on to say that this is the opinion of St. Thomas and of many others, including Aristotle. To show that it is the doctrine of St. Thomas, he resorts to a comparison used by the Angelic Doctor—the example of the arrow directed to the target, not by itself but by the archer. One of Suarez's references is to the *Prima Pars*, Question CIII, on the government of things in general. The first article is entitled: "Utrum mundus gubernetur ab aliquo." The example in question is found in the reply to the first objection.

Videtur quod mundus non gubernetur ab aliquo. Illorum enim est gubernari, quae moventur vel operantur propter finem. Sed res naturales, quae sunt magna pars mundi, non moventur aut operantur propter finem, quia non cognoscunt finem. Ergo mundus non gubernatur.

Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod aliquid movetur vel operatur propter finem dupliciter: uno modo sicut agens seipsum in finem, ut homo et aliae creaturae rationales; et talium est cognoscere rationem finis, et eorum quae sunt ad finem: alio modo aliquid dicitur operari, vel moveri propter finem, quasi ab aliquo actum, vel directum in finem; sicut sagitta movetur directa ad signum a sagittante, qui cognoscit finem, non autem sagitta. Unde sicut motus sagittae ad determinatum finem demonstrat aperte quod sagitta dirigitur ab aliquo cognoscente; ita certus cursus naturalium rerum cognitione carentium manifeste declarat mundum ratione aliqua gubernari.¹

St. Thomas's intention in this reply is to prove that the world is governed by an intellect. To do this he draws a parallel between the directed motion of an arrow and that of natural things. From the former we conclude to the presence of an archer; from the latter we conclude to the presence of a governor of the universe. The argument is a posteriori, from effect to cause. Directed motion is an effect of final causality. But final causality necessarily implies an intellectual agent. Therefore, directed motion in beings lacking an intellect must be caused by an intellectual agent, a being other than themselves. If we followed Suarez's interpretation, however, this argument would utterly confuse efficient and final causality; it would lead toward pantheism, and render univocal our direction of an arrow and God's direction of natural things.

For St. Thomas, directed motion is always the effect of final causality. It may be either action or passion with respect to its subject. If it is action it is efficient causality; if it is passion it is the result of efficient causality. Whichever it is, however, it is always the effect of final causality. That it could not be final causality itself is evident from the fact that final causality is motion in a metaphorical sense only. Suarez, however, as we have seen, does not remove final causality from the scope of motion properly so called. Hence he considers this directed motion both as final causality as well as the effect of final causality itself, "non tamen ut praecise egrediuntur ab ipsis naturalibus agentibus, sed ut simul sunt a primo agente."² Having identified final causality with action,³ he identifies it with efficient causality, so that it is the action of a thing moving to its determined end, in so far as this action is the transient action of God.

¹ A.1, 1 – ad 1.

² Cf. quotation, p.105.

³ Cf. p.105.

The whole impact of St. Thomas's argumentation consists in showing that directed motion in a being lacking intellectual knowledge demands the existence of a directing intellect. This is utterly lost in Suarez's interpretation. Suarez would express in the premise what St. Thomas states in the conclusion. Directed motion for him would not only be the effect of final causality; it would be the final causality itself, and as we have just seen, this is identical here with efficient causality. Hence Suarez looks upon directed motion as being at the same time directing motion. Thus while St. Thomas's argument proceeds from effect to cause *in actu secundo*, from directed motion to directing motion, and thence to a real difference between directed and director, Suarez would interpret the argument as proceeding from cause *in actu secundo* to cause *in actu primo*. This verges on pantheism.

Suarez might have tried to evade this difficulty by saying that he too argues from effect to cause *in actu secundo*, since he distinguishes final causality, by reason, from the effect of final causality. This distinction would be similar to the one he made with regard to the created intellectual appetite.¹ Even though he should in some way succeed in thus avoiding the problem, he still would have to explain how such an act, numerically one and the same, can proceed from two principles, the one uncreated, the other created. If it issues formally from both the one and the other, as he appears to hold, it certainly seems impossible to escape pantheism.

However, the most obvious error which Suarez seems to have made in this matter was to consider the directed motion of the arrow and that of natural things as univocal. St. Thomas used the example of the arrow as an analogue from which he manifested the idea of a need for a director in the case of natural things, but he did not intend to identify the two modes of direction.

In the case of the arrow two motions may be considered. In so far as the arrow is a natural thing it has a natural motion, a natural action following its form; in so far as it is an arrow directed to a target it has an artificial motion, a motion imparted to it, which is a passion in so far as it is a natural body. It is this passion of the arrow which we call its directed motion. This passion, however, is at the same time the virtual efficient action of the archer, an effect of final causality. Now, the directed motion of natural things is quite different. In this case the directed motion of the natural bodies, considered as agents, is not a passion in them, but their very own action. St. Thomas rejects the opinion that all operation is the immediate operation of God, v.g. in article 5 of Question CV, *Prima Pars*. In the *corpus articuli* he says: "...Quod Deum operari in quolibet operante aliqui sic intellexerunt, quod nulla virtus creata aliquid operaretur in rebus, sed solus Deus immediate omnia operaretur; puta quod ignis non calefaceret, sed Deus in igne; et similiter de omnibus aliis. Hoc autem est impossibile."

¹ Cf. page 101.

Further in this same article St. Thomas shows in what way God does operate in creatures as regards each of the three principles of action: final, efficient and formal cause. Since Suarez has confused final and efficient causality here, we will quote St. Thomas on these two causes.

Sic igitur secundum haec tria Deus in quolibet operante operatur. Primo quidem secundum rationem finis; cum enim omnis operatio sit propter aliquod bonum verum vel apparens (nihil autem est vel apparet bonum, nisi secundum quod participat aliquam similitudinem summi boni, quod est Deus), sequitur quod ipse Deus sit cujuslibet operationis causa ut finis. Secundo considerandum est, quod si sint multa agentia ordinata, semper secundum agens agit in virtute primi agentis. Nam primum agens movet secundum ad agendum; et secundum hoc omnia agunt in virtute ipsius Dei; et ita ipse est causa omnium actionum agentium.¹

Thus, in so far as the created good moves by way of final cause, it does so because of the similarity it bears to the divine goodness. While the created good is a final cause in virtue of the divine goodness, formally its causality is its own. The same is true of efficient cause: the created agent moves in virtue of the divine, but its formal efficiency is its own. This is another way of stating that God is present in all things by His immanent operation in so far as it is virtually transient.²

Indeed, St. Thomas is insistent that nature itself acts for an end. We find this question treated at length in his commentary on the *Physics* of Aristotle, where he concurs with the Philosopher who defines nature in terms of its action for an end.

...Natura nihil est aliud quam ratio cujusdam artis, scilicet divinae, indita rebus, qua ipsae res moventur ad finem determinatum: sicut si artifex factor navis posset lignis tribuere, quod ex se ipsis moverentur ad navis formam inducendam.³

From this it should be plain how specious is Suarez's argument when on the basis of *De Caelo*, Book I, he attributes to Aristotle the view that natural things do not operate under the causality of an end, "dum conjungit Deum et naturam, dicens nihil facere frustra, satis indicat naturam in agendo propter finem subordinari Deo."⁴ To be sure, Aristotle held that nature is subordinated to God in acting for an end; but he did not deny that at the same time nature does act for an end by its own action. Indeed, he defined nature in terms of finality. Thus, not only did he attribute action for an end to natural things, but he made nature itself a principle of action for an end.

The positive sciences have been all too willing to accept the Suarezian doctrine that nature does not act because of an end, rejecting its counterpart of direction by God as something not within the scope of experimental investigation. However unintentionally, Suarez, by the logical implications of his position, prepared the way to that modern thought which definitely expels finality from nature and, next, God from the universe. This doctrine, so widely accepted and so popular in latter times, had at least

¹ Q.105, a.5, c.; *Contra Gentes*, III, c.67.

² Cf. p.104.

³ *In II Physic.*, lect.14, n.8.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, disp.23, sec.10, n.5.

a logical foundation in the metaphysical speculations of Schoolmen who, even to this day, are acclaimed as faithful exponents of Thomistic teaching.

While his general notion of a property of being may have been right, Suarez went quite astray when he identified being *qua* good with *convenientia unius entis ad aliud*, overlooking the pertinent point that the *aliud ens* in question must be *natum convenire cum omni ente*: "Hoc autem est anima, quae quodammodo est omnia." This alone would account for his inconsistent attitude when faced with Durandus's denominative, non-essential convertibility of "good" with "being." Omitting appetite from the formal nature of the good, he considers "good" and "appetible" as formally distinct, and "appetible" as posterior to the good. His next step is to make a similar distinction between good and final cause. Vasquez, however, will provide a further link between this Scholastic deviation and the hostile attitude of modern thought towards the Aristotelian and Thomistic doctrine of the good, by identifying what Suarez had, inconsequentially, left distinct, viz. *convenientia ad aliud* and final cause.

We will now proceed to show Vasquez's share in this emancipation of being from the good.

(To be continued)

CHARLES HOLLENCAMP.

Causa Causarum*

(c) VASQUEZ

The doctrine of Gabriel Vasquez (1551-1604) on the transcendental good and final causality is to be found in his commentary on the *Summa theologiae* of St. Thomas.¹ We will examine first his doctrine of the good, with special regard to the question how far he too was influenced by the writings of Durandus.² From that we will turn to see his teaching on final causality.

Vasquez's doctrine of the good is to be found principally in his commentary on the *Prima Pars*, Disputation XXIII. We immediately notice that the first two chapters of this disputation are a presentation of Durandus's opinion of the good and a refutation of part of this opinion.

Unlike his contemporary Suarez, then, Vasquez did not attempt to adopt and interpret Durandus in accordance with his own mind, though he did accept part of Durandus's teaching. Like Suarez, however, he chose the doctrine of Hervaeus,³ without accepting it integrally, as a starting-point for the development of his own opinion.

Suarez, as we may remember, having set forth his own notion of the *ratio formalis* of the good, then considered, by way of replying to a difficulty, how it would apply to good considered either *in se* or relatively to another. Vasquez, on the other hand, opens his treatment with this division of the good and thence proceeds to formulate his opinion as to the nature of the transcendental good. In making this division of the good, Vasquez says:

Tribus igitur modis aliquid dicitur bonum, primo, in seipso, quatenus in se bonum est, et non alteri. Secundo dicitur bonum, quod alteri bonum est. cuius ratio in relatione congruentiae, et convenientiae cum alio posita videtur. Hoc vero genus boni adhuc duobus modis contingere potest. Aut enim est in naturalibus, sicut calor in debita proportionem, et sanitas respectu animalis; Aut est in moralibus, et sic actio moralis quae dicitur esse secundum rectam rationem aut conveniens naturae rationali, ut rationalis est, illi bona est.⁴

In considering the good, Vasquez reduces these three modes to the basic division of the good into *bonum alteri* and *bonum in se*. He first turns to the *bonum alteri* and there, in agreement with the opinion of Durandus, he places the *bonum alteri* in a relation of *convenientia* between beings. He says:

* The first part of this article has already appeared in the *Laval théologique et philosophique*, Vol.IV, n.1.

¹ We have used the ANTWERP edition (Belleros) of 1621.

² I must call attention to a preposterous howler which I overlooked in the final correction of the proofs of the first part of this study (*Laval théologique et philosophique*, Vol.IV, n.1). The date of the PARIS edition (1508) referred to in note 2 on page 80 turned up in the main text and replaced the final date (1317) of DURANDUS's revised commentary on the *Sentences*.

³ Cf. *Laval théologique et philosophique*, Vol.IV, n.1, p.87.

⁴ In *Iam* disp.23, c.4, p.110, n.8.

Hoc jacto fundamento nostra in hac re sententia in duobus consistit. Alterum est de bono relate et ad aliud; alterum est de bono absolute, et in se: priorem partem in hoc cap. explicabimus posteriorem vero in sequenti. Bonum igitur relate, et quod est alteri bonum in relatione convenientiae positum est, et in hoc veram existimo sententiam Durandi. An vero semper relatio illa sit rationis, vel realis, parum interest. In moralibus autem, tam bonitatem, quam malitiam in universum esse relationem rationis, probabo I. 2, c.71, art.6. Inter illa vero, quae dicuntur bona hoc modo, quaedam primarie bona sunt, quia ratione sui alteri conveniunt, ut sunt formae accidentariae subjecto inhaerentes: quaedam vero dicuntur secundarie bonae ab effectu, quia aliquid bonum in subjecto efficiunt; quo pacto una substantia alteri dicitur bona.¹

However, Vasquez does not maintain that this relation of *convenientia*, this *bonum alteri* is the transcendental good. Indeed, he denies it categorically: "Observandum tamen est, bonitatem hoc modo non esse passionem entis, ut cap.2. contra Durandum probatum est."²

It is, in reality, owing to a misconception of *convenientia ad aliud* that Vasquez removes the notion of *convenientia* and the consequent *rationes appetibilitatis et finis* from the proper nature of the transcendental good. He could not understand how this notion of *convenientia* between beings could fit in with the notion of good as a property of being. In this last he was quite correct, since the aforesaid *convenientia* would indeed be as limited as the species of beings themselves. We find this argument in his refutation of Durandus immediately following the one directed against Durandus's conception of the goodness of God. He says:

Secundo, aliis rebus hoc modo non convenire bonitatem, quae est passio entis sic ostenditur. Nulla est res quae non sit absolute, et simpliciter bona, quae si aliquae malae dicuntur non absolute, et simpliciter, sed quibusdam malae dicuntur: sicut venenum animantibus: paucissimae vero aut nullae omnibus aliis conveniunt, et bonae sunt: Res igitur creatae non dicuntur bonae simpliciter ex respectu convenientiae cum aliis, sed absolute, et secundum se ratione suae entitatis. Porro qua ratione res quibusdam sunt convenientes, et bonae, aliis sunt malae, et adversae: ac proinde bonum et ens absolute non reciprocarentur, aut non minus ens et malum, quam ens, et bonum, mutua consequentia invicem penderent: quod est absurdum...³

In the light of this it may seem paradoxical that Vasquez, in exposing his own notion of the *ratio formalis* of the good, preserves that essential note of opposition to evil and yet obviously makes it appear impossible that good should be a transcendental property of being. In setting forth this notion, he says: "Ratio igitur formalis bonitatis, quae convertitur cum ente, mea quidem sententia, est integritas, et perfectio rei in suo esse."⁴

Were it not for the word "integritas" here, one might accept this definition. We have seen that St. Thomas said in the *Prima Pars* that "unumquodque dicitur bonum, inquantum est perfectum."⁵ For a correct conception of the good, however, a correct conception of how the word "perfect" applies to the good is essential. From St. Thomas we have seen that the good implies not only the notion of perfect but also that of

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp.23, c.4, p.110, n.9.

² *Ibid.*, p.111, n.9.

³ *Ibid.*, c.2, p.110, n.5.

⁴ *Ibid.*, c.5, p.111, n.12.

⁵ Q.5, a.5, c.

perfective. As we shall see, John of St. Thomas when speaking of the good as perfect shows that the good acquires its transcendental character precisely by virtue of this aspect of perfectiveness.

We noted above that Suarez when he spoke of the perfect with respect to the good failed to make the proper distinctions. We saw that he considered the perfect only as identical with being.¹ Hence he did not include the notion of perfective.

Vasquez has done the very same thing here. The word "integritas" is a first indication of his mind. Within the next few lines he gives further evidence of his misconception of St. Thomas's most direct and explicit statement that "Bonum dicit rationem appetibilis." He says that by these words, St. Thomas "non intelligit denominationem relativam a potentia appetente, nec relationem convenientiae sed rationem perfecti, in qua fundatur praecipue, et ex qua provenit, ut res aliqua appetatur."²

Vasquez has arrived at this conclusion from the doctrine of St. Thomas on the distinction of *simpliciter* and *secundum quid* when applied to being and to good. The reader may recall that in making that distinction St. Thomas wanted to show in what way being and good while "idem secundum rem" were different "secundum rationem." To this end he pointed out how *simpliciter* and *secundum quid* when applied to good were said just as inversely as when applied to being.

The reason for this inversion we found to consist in the very difference between the formal notions of being and good. Thus it is because the good bespeaks the perfect which is appetible, and "per consequens dicit rationem ultimi," as St. Thomas puts it, that it is said *simpliciter* in virtue of that which is only *secundum quid* when we speak of being. As we noted above, when treating of this matter, St. Thomas's *ultimum* here has a very profound meaning and is to be understood in the line of causality as well as in that of being.³ Indeed, St. Thomas by his very words in this response shows that he understands by perfect not merely that to which nothing of being is lacking, but as perfective of the appetite. These words are the *pauca interjecta* which Vasquez has unfortunately omitted from his argument. But let us read it as he has written it:

Hanc sententiam [viz. his opinion of the formal ratio of the good as *integritas et perfectio rei in suo esse*] dissertis verbis tradit S. Thomas in hac quaest. nam in I. art. inquit bonum esse quod omnia appetunt: unumquodque vero appetitur secundum quod est perfectum, et in solut. I. inquit: Sed bonum dicit rationem perfecti. Et *pauca interiectis*: Unde quod est ultimo perfectum, dicitur bonum simpliciter, quod autem non habet ultimam perfectionem, quam debet habere, quamvis habeat aliquam perfectionem in quantum est actu, non dicitur perfectum simpliciter, nec bonum simpliciter, sed secundum quid.⁴

Whence he derives the conclusion which we quoted above and for the sake of completeness repeat here:

¹ Cf. *Laval théologique et philosophique*, Vol.IV, n.1, p.89.

² *Op. cit.*, disp.23, c.5, p.111, n.12.

³ Cf. *Laval théologique et philosophique*, Vol.IV, n.1, p.98.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, disp.23, c.5, p.111, n.12.

Quare cum in I. a. in fine subjungit: Bonum dicit rationem appetibilis, non intelligit denominationem relativam a potentia appetente nec relationem convenientiae, sed rationem perfecti, in qua fundatur praecipue, et ex qua provenit, ut res aliqua appetatur.¹

The *pauca interjecta* without which the proper nature of the good is entirely lost are the following: "Sed bonum dicit rationem perfecti, *quod est appetibile, et per consequens dicit rationem ultimi*. Unde id quod est ultimo perfectum..."²

St. Thomas, therefore, did not understand the good to bespeak the perfect solely in the line of being, but according as it is perfective of the appetite, appetible and consequently ultimate. It is true that the good as perfective in this way is founded on the perfect as being, but this latter is not, taken in itself, the *ratio formalis* of the good. We shall find this pointed out most clearly in the doctrine of John of St. Thomas.

In further confirmation of his doctrine Vasquez cites St. Thomas's articles 3 and 5 of the Question V where he treats the notion of the good. He says:

In artic. 3 et 5. idem omnino docet, et tandem in art. 5. colligit rationem boni, quae in perfectione posita est, constare modo, specie et ordine. Ex quibus licet modum varie videatur explicare idem S. Doctor in hanc quaest. art. 5. et l. 2. quaest. 85. art. 4. et quaest. 21 de veritate; eodem tamen recidit, ut optime notat Cajetan. in praedicto art. 5. Quovis autem modo explicetur, saltem ex S. Thoma habemus, rationem boni ex modo, specie et ordine constari. atque ita idem esse bonitatem entis, et integritatem illius ex his omnibus perfectam.³

In article 5 cited above, St. Thomas means to prove "quod omne ens, inquantum est ens, est bonum." He does this as follows: "Omne enim ens, inquantum est ens, est in actu, et quodammodo perfectum; quia omnis actus perfectio quaedam est. *Perfectum vero habet rationem appetibilis et boni*, ut ex dictis patet (art.1). Unde sequitur omne ens, inquantum hujusmodi, bonum esse."⁴ It is most evident here that St. Thomas considers the perfect to be good in so far as it is appetible, and has *convenientia* with the appetite. It is thus that the good is distinguished from being, although the two are identical and coextensive *secundum rem*.

In article 5, where St. Thomas proves the *ratio boni* to consist in mode, species and order he concludes with the sentence we underlined above when we quoted this entire article. "Unde ratio boni, *secundum quod consistit in perfecto esse*, consistit etiam in modo, specie, et ordine." Thus it is only according as perfect is considered in the line of being that good, having the *ratio perfecti*, consists in mode, species and order.

Moreover, we must remember that to have mode, species and order is proper to the created good. St. Thomas notes this in his reply to an objection in the first article of Question VI, in the *Prima Pars*. He says: "...Habere modum, speciem et ordinem, pertinet ad rationem boni creati;

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp.23, c.5, p.111, n.12.

² St. THOMAS, *Ia*, q.5, a.1, ad l.

³ *Op. cit.*, disp.23, c.5, p.111, n.13.

⁴ *Ia*, q.5, a.3, c.

sed bonum in Deo est sicut in causa; unde ad eum pertinet imponere aliis modum, speciem et ordinem. Unde ista tria sunt in Deo sicut in causa."¹ The question which Vasquez raises as to the way in which St. Thomas defines mode in the various passages is beyond both the point involved and the scope of this paper.

Having misunderstood the notion of "perfect," Vasquez defined the proper nature of the transcendental good in a way which renders good and being identical *re et ratione*. He apparently evades this formal identity by a corollary which reduces good to a relation. But this destroys the transcendental character of the good. Yet it was precisely to retain this character that he had previously denied the doctrine of Durandus which made good a *relatio convenientiae* between beings. Vasquez's corollary reads:

Verum rogabit aliquis, utrum ratio bonitatis sit absoluta, an respectiva, vel ab utraque abstracta. Respondeo ex superiori doctrina bonitatem hoc modo esse relationem, non quidem convenientiae unius rei cum altera, ut putavit Durandus, sed integritatis ex pluribus. Conventus enim omnium absque defectu ad alicujus rei constitutionem relate significatur: haec autem relatio non est ad ipsam essentiam tanquam alicujus rei convenientis, sed est inter ea, quae ad integritatem conveniunt: ipsam quoque essentiam quodammodo respicit tanquam ex eis consummatam, et perfectam. Utrum autem haec relatio sit rationis tantum: an realis, non curo: certum tamen est, in rebus simplicibus esse solum rationis: nam conventus eorum, quae sola ratione distinguuntur, non potest esse realis, ut patet. Quare si haec bonitas esset relatio realis, in rebus tantum compositis esse posset.²

By means of this relation of reason as constitutive of the transcendental good in simple things, Vasquez was able to posit his transcendental goodness of God, which makes God good in Himself. He concludes the corollary by showing how this goodness is said of God.

Ceterum, ut finem imponam huic disputationi, id quod praecipue ad nostrum spectat institutum ex dictis inferamus, Deum videlicet esse bonum, immo summe bonum, hoc genere bonitatis, quae constituitur veluti passio entis. Est enim integer, et perfectus in suo esse, ut nihil ei deesse possit, sive ex iis, quae ad essentiam, sive ad personas, sive ad operationes et emanationes pertinet.³

We may note here that Vasquez holds this good, whose proper nature is a relation of integrity, either real or of reason, to be *veluti passio entis*. In what sense he considers it a property of being is indicated throughout his treatise by the frequent use of the word "reciprocal" in place of "convertible" in connection with being and good. That he follows Durandus's opinion of convertibility *non essentialiter sed denominative* is certain from his own explanation of the relevant passage in the first part of his disputation. It is evident, further, from the corollary to his explanation of how simple things are said to be good *in se*. Showing that they may be called good in so far as by our intellect we discern various perfections in such simple entities and then bind them together by the relation of reason of integrity, he adds: "Ex quibus etiam colligere licet, ens, et bonum non essentialiter reciprocari, sed denominative juxta notata in I cap."⁴

¹ Ad 1.

² *Op. cit.*, disp.23, c.7, p.113, n.20.

³ *Ibid.*, n.21.

⁴ *Ibid.*, c.6, p.113, n.19.

Vasquez rejects the relation of *convenientia* between beings as the *ratio formalis* of the transcendental good, yet he does not set it over and against the good in all respects. It constitutes, according to him, the notion of *bonum alteri*. In article 4 of Question V, St. Thomas had said: "...Cum bonum sit quod omnia appetunt; hoc autem habeat rationem finis; manifestum est quod bonum rationem finis importat."¹ Vasquez explains this as follows:

Conclusio affirmat, quae intelligenda est non de bono, quod in integritate rei positum est, sed de bono relate ad alterum, quod dicitur alicui conveniens: de quo genere boni praecedenti disputatione dictum est. Ceterum, ut ibi notavimus; haec ratio boni convenientis alteri, oritur ex bonitate ipsius rei, quae est ejus integritas, et perfectio et reciprocatur cum ente.²

We find Vasquez's doctrine of final causality in his commentary on the *Prima Secundae*. There he teaches that the proper nature of final cause is none other than the objective concept of goodness as *convenientia*. This objective concept moves the appetite by manifesting the *convenientia* between the external object and the appetite, and thus rendering the external thing appetible in the proper sense of the term. In other words, final causality is entirely a matter of intellection.

We noted the germ of this concept in the doctrine of Durandus who held that the first motion of the good is that whereby the practical intellect is moved to apprehend the relation of *convenientia*. For Durandus this seems to have been properly a motion of the intellect, the good acting as object. Vasquez goes farther, in that he confines the formal *ratio* of final cause to the intellect. But let us read Vasquez's doctrine in his own words:

His praemissis notationibus, nostra sententia, et natura ipsa, seu ratio formalis finis facile explicari potest. Dicimus igitur primum, ex illis tribus, quae ex parte finis reperiuntur, ut supra notatum est, illud esse objectivum, quod est bonum apprehensum, esse objectum ipsum formale voluntatis, sicut color est objectum formale visus, ac si cum Logicis diceremus, conceptus objectivus, in quem fertur voluntas est ratio formalis objecti. Deinde dicendum est, conceptum formalem, et denominationem illam cogniti in conceptu objectivo non pertinere ad rationem formalem objecti, sed esse conditionem objecti voluntatis, nisi quando finis est res supposito a nobis distincta, et habet rationem finis, et appetitus quatenus nobis coniungenda per cognitionem. Utraque pars nostrae sententiae facile probatur; prior quidem quia illud dicitur esse objectum formale voluntatis, in quod fertur voluntas affectu suo ratione ipsius: ita enim est ratio volendi, ut etiam sit volitum: hujusmodi autem est bonum objective existens in intellectu, ut manifestum est: ergo illud est formale objectum voluntatis concrete. Ratio vero formalis abstracte erit bonitas in eo apprehensa, nempe convenientia: quo circa esse reale finis quod est in rebus, aut erit, secundum se non movet, sed quatenus objective apparet in intellectu: cum tamen quaecunque causa efficiens, formalis, aut materialis solum causet secundum esse reale, quod habet extra animam. Ratio vero discriminis est, quia caeterae causae non causant medio sui desiderio, sed secundum quod sunt re ipsa talis, aut talis naturae: at vero finis causat medio sui desiderio, et nisi medio amore sui causare non potest, amor autem respicit ut proprium objectum rem objective existentem in intellectu, ergo ratio finis est id, quod obicitur voluntati media cognitione. Ex quo sit, ut interdum sicut inferius dicemus, finis sit res omnino conficta ab intellectu nullum habens esse adhuc futurum, sed tantum objective existens in intellectu.³

¹ *Ia*, q.5, a.4, c.

² *Op. cit.*, q.5, a.4, in explicatione articuli, p.118.

³ *In Iam IIae*, disp.2, c.2, p.9.

For Vasquez, therefore, the *convenientia* apprehended in the objective concept seems to be the *ratio formalissima* of the final cause. In setting forth this opinion, he was trying to find a middle course between two schools of thought regarding the proper nature of the final cause. As he lists these two opinions, the first holds that the final cause moves by its real being and that consequently its apprehension is only a condition required for its exercise. The other opinion maintains that the intellectual apprehension of the final cause is its very *ratio causandi*.

Vasquez, it seems, tried to avoid both of these positions by making a distinction between the objective concept according as it is in the intellect and according as it is affected by the extrinsic denomination of "to be known." The objective concept existing in the intellect was for him the *ratio formalis* of the end; on the other hand, both the objective concept *qua* denominated as well as the formal concept—i.e. the means by which the thing is known and objectively represented in the intellect, were for him only the *conditio sine qua non* of finality; they take on the nature of end only when they are considered as *finis quo*.

Vasquez's whole theory of final causality owes its fallacy to his erroneous notion of the objective concept. What he thought it to be may be gathered from his own words in one of the *praenotationes* to the passage just quoted. He writes:

Deinde observandum est, ex parte finis, aut objecti voluntatis tria esse. Primum est, ratio ipsa, quae cognoscitur ut bona, objective existens in intellectu: veluti ratio sanitatis, ratio divitiarum, honoris, aut alterius boni, quod apprehenditur a nobis, tamquam nobis conveniens: et hoc possumus appellare conceptum objectivum rei, ut logici loquuntur.¹

This same notion of objective concept undoubtedly prompted Vasquez to follow Durandus in his doctrine of formal truth, a doctrine summed up by John of St. Thomas in the following words: "Ista veritas est in conceptu objectivo, ita quod ipsa conformitas inter rem objective attactam et seipsam ut est in re, dicitur veritas formalis,"² whereas in reality "conceptus... objectivus non est conceptus repraesentans, sed res concepta et objecta ipsi cognitioni."³ And he points out just how a distinction may be made in the objective concept between the "thing" known and that same thing considered as to the denomination it derives from the fact that it is "known." "Conceptus autem objectivus quantum ad rem est idem quod res ipsa in se: haec enim est quae obijcitur et cognoscitur; quantum autem ad statum seu denominationem objectivi, hoc resultat in ipsa re, ex eo quod cognoscatur et concipiatur."⁴

If, therefore, the objective concept is considered on the part of the thing alone, it is identical with the thing in itself *in rerum natura*, and does

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp.2, c.2, p.9.

² *Curs. theol.*, T.II, disp.22, a.2, n.1 (ed. SOLESMES), p.604.

³ *Ibid.*, n.9, p.606.

⁴ *Ibid.*

not exist in the intellect. According to John of St. Thomas in this same treatise, moreover, the objective concept considered as including the denomination "known" supposes the formal concept.

Vasquez's notion of objective concept renders impossible a distinction like the one we have quoted from John of St. Thomas. For Vasquez the objective concept considered from the part of the thing alone is not identical with the thing in *natura rerum* but is a concept present in the intellect, and product of the formal concept. According to his theory, therefore, it seems impossible to divorce the denomination "known" from the objective concept.

Thus conceiving of final causality not only as dependent on intellection, but as identical with the apprehension of the *convenientia* of a being to the appetite of the being apprehending. Vasquez made final causality impossible for creatures below the intellectual level. That he himself saw this is evident from his words:

...Ideo agentia naturalia non dicuntur proprie movere seipsa in finem, eo quod non cognoscat, ac proinde non desiderent finem; sed latiori dumtaxat modo dicuntur moveri in finem, quia a causa prima intelligente finem, et terminum suarum actionum moventur...¹

By this doctrine Vasquez not only denied the very Aristotelian concept of nature which we referred to in our discussion of the Suarezian doctrine, but also left open the way for the accusation of anthropomorphism so often made by more modern critics of teleology.

In his *Cursus philosophicus* John of St. Thomas attacks the opinion that apprehension is the proper nature of final causality. His thesis concerning this matter is as follows: "Apprehensio non est ratio formalis finalizandi, sed conditio requisita ad finem pro ea parte, qua finis etiam est objectum, neque est conditio solum per modum applicationis, sed etiam per modum existentiae."² In support of this thesis he argues that apprehension is a necessary condition for anything being an object of the will, whether it be end or means. Hence, he concludes that apprehension, since it is common to both end and non-end, cannot be the *ratio formalis* of final causality. He applies this argument to both the formal and objective concepts and in this latter he evidently appears to take position directly against Vasquez. He says:

Quod non solum convincit cognitionem et conceptum formalem esse conditionem, et non rationem formalem, sed neque ipsam rationem conceptus objectivi *ut apprehensi et ut habentis esse intentionale*, quia hoc ipsum est commune omni appetibili et objecto voluto, sive sit finis, sive non.³

As a further argument John states that apprehension is in the line of manifestation, in that it manifests the appetibility of the good. Then he shows that since the good as end is in the line of appetibility, while the apprehension is in an entirely different line, namely that of manifestation,

¹ *Op. cit.*, q.1, in notatione circa a.2, q.1.

² T.II, p.272b16.

³ *Ibid.*, p.273a1.

the two cannot be considered as one *ratio formalis*. Instead, appetibility is to be considered as presupposed to apprehension, which serves to make it manifest. Appetibility is of the *ratio formalis* of the good and of end, but apprehension is only a condition *sine qua non*.

In the case of creatures below the intellectual level, this requisite condition of apprehension is replaced by their very nature which is a "*ratio cujusdam artis, scilicet divinae*." Thus, although not possessing their own manifestative apprehension, they move nevertheless to a determined end, being responsive by reason of their very nature to the direct appetibility of that end.

Vasquez also misinterprets the meaning of the "metaphorical motion" of the end. He says:

Neque obstat, quod inter causas physicas finis etiam connumeratur: nam non omnis causa naturalis, effectus eodem modo causare debet: et de fine plane docuit Aristoteles primo lib. de generat. et corruptione c.7, textu 55. non movere physice, hoc est secundum esse reale suum, sed metaphorice: dicitur autem movere metaphorice, quia per sui desiderium tantum movet ut sequenti articulo dicemus, et ita solum est causa physici effectus media causa efficienti rationali, quae dicitur gratia finis operari per desiderium ipsius.¹

What the main fallacy is in this doctrine, and in what way it leaves open the door for anthropomorphism, we shall see shortly when considering the doctrine of John of St. Thomas about the causality of the end. Before turning to this, we will summarize briefly our view of the teaching of Vasquez.

Like Durandus, Vasquez misunderstood the nature of a property of being. Both interpreted the good as a relation, Vasquez adding that it could be a relation of reason as well as a real relation. Vasquez did see Durandus's error in making so specialized a thing as *convenientia* between beings a transcendental property of being. Yet he himself did not quite escape this misinterpretation of *convenientia*. Instead of seeing in it the proper nature of the transcendental good, he left it as something flowing from that proper nature, and identified it with the *ratio finis*. He formed in this way a new link in the process leading to the denial of final causality, inasmuch as he made end identical with *convenientia* between beings. His next misleading step was to define the proper nature of final causality as the objective concept manifestative of this *convenientia* between beings. Thereby he opened the way for the objection of anthropomorphism. The transcendental good itself was for him the relation (either of reason or real) of integrity in the very entity of being.

III. DOCTRINE OF JOHN OF ST. THOMAS

John of St. Thomas (1589-1644) in his *Cursus philosophicus* and *Cursus theologicus* re-stated with unusual profundity St. Thomas's doctrine

¹ *Op. cit.*, disp.2, c.2, p.9.

of the good and of final cause. Many of his theses and arguments stand in direct opposition to the concept of the good and final cause which we find in Vasquez and Suarez.

John of St. Thomas's doctrine of the transcendental good is contained in the *Cursus theologicus*, in the Disputation concerning Questions V and VI of the *Prima Pars*. There he investigates the good under two aspects: first, what as a *passio entis* it adds to being; and, secondly, what is its *ratio formalis*.

Regarding the first of these he points out that a property of being cannot add anything *really* distinct to being, since being is the most universal of all things, and therefore anything really distinct added to it would destroy the universality. Hence, a property of being must include, in its own reality, being itself, and not only whatever in some way it adds to being. To quote John's own words:

Quare formalis ratio boni, et aliarum passionum entis, non potest distingui ab ipsa entitate, sed est ipsamet entitas: non absolute, sed supponendo aliquam connotationem vel condicionem, qua supposita, et per ordinem ad illam, entitas ipsa est passio; sicut in Deo ipsamet essentia, ut explicat peculiarem aliquam condicionem, est attributum.¹

This idea of a *passio entis* implies a very fine distinction, a distinction alien to a mind clinging altogether to the usual concept of property or *passio*, as understood of the accidental properties attaching to certain non-transcendental natures. In these nature and property can be distinguished as substance and accident. To illustrate this, John of St. Thomas uses the example of risibility as a property of man.²

In contrasting the properties of being with the ordinary kinds of property, John of St. Thomas is laying the ground-work for his principal criticism of the errors of Durandus and Vasquez. How he answered these errors more specifically we shall see later when dealing with the erroneous conception of good as a relation.

Turning secondly to the formal notion of the good, John of St. Thomas writes: "Cum autem bonum sit formaliter oppositum malo et excludat illud, necesse est formalem rationem boni venari ex illa condicione seu formalitate, quae formalius est exclusiva mali: inde enim accipi debet constitutio boni."³

In the sequel, John points out that the proper nature of the good cannot formally consist "in aliquo absoluto superaddito enti; nec in aliqua relatione reali, vel rationis."⁴ Whereupon, he lays down in the following words what precisely this proper nature of the transcendental good is.

Dico secundo: Formalis ratio boni transcendentalis consistit in ipsa perfectione intrinseca et entitativa rei, quatenus fundat et connotat rationem perfectivi per modum appetibilis, et non solum per modum formae informantis et constituentis.

¹ *Curs. theol.*, T.I, p.519, n.7.

² *Ibid.*, p.524, n.22.

³ *Ibid.*, p.519, n.7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, n.8.

Et licet appetibilitas explicetur per relationem quamdam rationis ad appetitum, sicut scibile per relationem rationis ad scientiam: non tamen in ista relatione formaliter consistit ipsa ratio boni, sed in eo quod est fundamentum hujus relationis et ei praesupponitur, licet eam connotet aut fundet.¹

This conclusion is based on several texts from St. Thomas. One is that of the *Prima Pars*, Question XLVIII, article 5, wherein the Angelic Doctor says: "...[Bonum] in perfectione et actu consistit principaliter et per se"; another is that of Question V, article 5 of this same Part: "...Unumquodque dicitur bonum in quantum est perfectum: sic enim est appetibile." We saw this text above when summarizing the doctrine of St. Thomas, along with the principal text which John uses to support his doctrine, the text of Question XXI, article 1 of the *De Veritate*.

In his definition, John has been most careful not to confuse the two fundamental notions of the transcendental good, viz. its notion as a *passio entis*, and the notion of good as excluding evil. He named the latter as the genus in his definition, "perfectione intrinseca et entitativa rei." As he says, "quod perfectum sit, omnes intelligunt tamquam per se notum." The reason for this universal acknowledgment that the good is the perfect is that only the perfect rules out evil, since the perfect is that which has all the actuality due to it.

We saw above that Vasquez in setting forth his notion of the transcendental good used a similar argument to prove his position. We noted at the same time that while he placed the transcendental good in the perfection of the thing, he did not understand fully the signification of this word "perfectum" as applied to the good. Like Suarez, he overlooked that the good as perfect comprises something more than actuality and being.

In setting down the specific difference of his definition, John of St. Thomas distinguishes two notions of perfect. From this distinction we will be able to discern where Suarez and Vasquez were in error.

John points out that two types of perfection may be conceived: the constitutive and the perfective. Of these the former pertains to the genus of formal cause, for it constitutes and integrates the entity in itself. Perfective perfection, on the other hand, is of the genus of final cause, for it involves the appetible. It is that which perfects, not as constituting in actuality, but as drawing, attracting to itself as to an end. As John points out, this second sense is more proper of perfection than the first, for it is more proper of perfection to perfect than to constitute in integrity. "Perfectum perficere" is indeed an example of the fourth mode *dicendi per se*: "secundum quod haec praepositio *per* designat habitudinem causae efficientis, vel cuiuscunque alterius."² Since, therefore, the proper nature of the good consists in the perfect, as St. Thomas says, we may well conclude that it consists in the *perfectum per se* in all its actuality, rather than in the perfect considered as static, divorced from its own causality and constituting entity only.

¹ *Op. cit.*, T.I, pp.520-521, n.12.

² Cf. ST. THOMAS, *In I Post. Anal.*, lect.10, n.7.

In denominating good *perfectum per se* we must be careful to have always in mind that we are employing the fourth mode *dicendi per se*. Hence *perfectum per se* here is synonymous with *perfectum perfectivum alterius*. When one says *per se*, the mind tends to think of a thing as an absolute, enclosed in itself. *Per se* in the fourth mode, however, having the notion of *perfective* connotes another and this other in the case of the good is the appetite. Thus good, as *perfectum per se*, is *perfectum perfectivum appetitus per modum finis*.

In making this distinction of the perfect, and in setting forth the notion of the perfect as perfective, constituting the specific difference in his *ratio formalis* of the good, John of St. Thomas has clearly shown where Durandus, Suarez and Vasquez fell into error. It is indeed this notion of the good as perfective of the appetite which gives to it the character of a property of being. Considered simply as constitutive perfection, it has the necessary note of exclusion of evil, but it lacks that of property of being. In examining the doctrines of Durandus, Suarez and Vasquez, we did not find any of them including this note of perfectivity of the appetite in the proper nature of the good. As we saw, Durandus and Vasquez had a fundamentally erroneous notion of good as a property of being; Suarez, however, had the correct notion of property of being, and so, as we noted, he was driven into logical inconsistency in his final position.

The notion of *convenientia ad aliud* given as the proper nature of the transcendental good by Suarez cannot be referred to the perfect as perfective but only to the perfect as constitutive. As we have seen before, the *aliud* for him was another being; and his reason for placing in this notion the proper nature of the good lay in the fact that this *convenientia* seemed to add to the connotation of integrity and completeness which in his view attached to the perfect.

Constitutive perfection, however, as we have said, cannot be a *passio entis*. It is nothing other than being itself; it is actuality as constituting and integrating being. Perfective perfection does add something to being; it adds a certain respectus, a *convenientia* to another, which other in the case of the good is the intellectual appetite. As we saw in St. Thomas, it is necessary that this perfectivity, this *convenientia* have for its object the intellectual soul, since that soul "quodammodo est omnia."

Thus perfective perfection implies in being a certain connotation: it confers on being a certain orientation, which is the basis of the relation of reason by which we know being as good. "Perficiens," therefore, is the specific difference in the *ratio formalis* of the good. This *ratio formalis* may be simply summed up in two words, provided they are rightly understood: "perfectio perficiens." To stress this notion — that it is the perfect as perfective which makes the good a property of being —, we may well read the words of John of St. Thomas describing what is a *passio entis*.

Nec valet argumentum, quod passio debet distingui a re cuius est passio, et sic bonum ab ente. Jam enim dictum est, quod non est passio rigorose: sed solum ratione distincta, et secundum diversum conceptum exprimiendi ens ut in se, vel ut perfectivum alicujus.¹

¹ *Op. cit.*, T.I, p.524.

From these words we must not infer that good can be considered a relation of reason. To be sure, it is *known* to us by a relation of reason which it founds, and may therefore be said "*ratione distincta [ab ente].*" To clarify the point again with the words of John of St. Thomas:

Non tamen potest formaliter in hac relatione consistere bonum, licet per illam a nobis explicetur: quia non potest realis bonitas constitui per id quod rationis est. Unde formale constitutum boni non potest distingui ab ente, sed entitative et in re coincidunt. Superaddit autem ad essentiam, non id quod formaliter est constitutum sui: sed id quod se habet ut condicio requisita ad hoc ut bonum exprimat distinctum conceptum quam ens absolute dictum: quod non exprimeret nisi conditionem illam superadderet.¹

Thus, although this relation of reason is not the *ratio formalis* of the good, it is very important for our knowing that *ratio formalis*. Why? Simply because of the abstract nature of the properties of being, in which "*radicale et formale coincidunt, et solum penes diversos conceptus seu habitudines distinguuntur: et secundum quod fundant istam diversitatem, dicitur unum radicaliter fundare alterum.*"²

Expressly combating the tendency to see the proper nature of the good in a relation, John of St. Thomas in the *Cursus theologicus* sets forth arguments to prove that neither a relation of reason, a predicamental relation, nor a transcendental relation can constitute the *ratio formalis* of the good. He argues first of all that it is obviously absurd to call the good a relation of reason, because it is a property of real being: if it were only a relation of reason it would not belong to being *in re*. He then proffers an equally evident proof that good cannot be a predicamental relation. As a property of being, good must be co-extensive with being. Predicamental relation, however, is only one of the ten divisions of being and so is not being universally considered. Thus, in so far as it is a good, it is rather a certain particular good and not the proper nature of the transcendental good. These first two arguments are directed against the positions of Durandus and Vasquez, the first asserting good to be a real relation of *convenientia* and the latter, asserting good to be a relation of integrity, either real or of reason. In his last argument John proves in the following words that good cannot be a transcendental relation:

Transcendentalis enim relatio qua aliquid ordinatur ad alterum, potius dicit rationem perfectibilis et tendentiae ad bonum et perfectum, quam ipsam formalem rationem boni; licet enim plura perficiantur aliquo respectu transcendentali, tamen non dicuntur formaliter bona quia sic respiciunt et perficiuntur, sed quia supposita tali relatione et perfectione terminant respectum appetitus ad se et redduntur appetibilia.³

This argument may be conceived as directed against the position of Suarez. Suarez, it is true, never uses the term "transcendental relation" when outlining his position. His *ratio convenientiae*, however, which the good adds to being and which, as he says, "*non est proprium relatio, sed solum connotat in alio talem naturam habentem naturalem inclinationem, capacitatem, vel conjunctionem cum tali perfectione,*" may be construed

¹ *Op. cit.*, T.I, p.523.

² *Ibid.*, p.524.

³ *Ibid.*, p.520.

as a transcendental relation. John of St. Thomas tells us in his *Logic* that a transcendental relation "non est forma adveniēns subjecto seu rei absolutae, sed illi imbibita, connotans tamen aliquid extrinsecum, a quo pendet vel circa quod versatur, ut materia ad formam, caput ad capitulum, creatura ad Deum."¹

Since, therefore, Suarez's good seems to be a *ratio rei absolutae imbibita*, connoting something extrinsic, it may be looked upon as a transcendental relation. It does not, however, seem to have the notion of perfectible, and so one may doubt whether or not John's refutation applies to it.

In conclusion, we will turn to the *Cursus philosophicus* to see how John of St. Thomas placed the causality of the end. We shall be able to discern where Suarez and Vasquez erred in this as well as in their notions of the metaphorical motion of the end. His one conclusion reads: "Metaphorica motio, qua finis dicitur causare secundum veritatem, est primus amor finis ut passive pendens ab appetibili, non ut active elicited a voluntate."² As he himself notes, this conclusion supposes one thing. It will be well to quote his own words in regard to this supposition:

Supponit, quod causalitas finis, licet metaphorice sit motio, vere tamen esse causalitatem realem, quia alias si totum, quod datur in causalitate finis, esset metaphoricum et nihil reale. finis non esset vera causa physica, cum tamen sit praecipua et prima causarum, imo per excellentiam est id, cujus causa seu cujus gratia cetera fiunt. Ergo si nullam veram causalitatem habet, vera causa non est.³

The cause best known to us is the efficient cause. Its causality consists in action: the action of the agent on the effect. For us, therefore, the idea of action, of motion, is invariably tied up with the idea of causality. Causality as such, nevertheless, consists rather in the influence exerted in the entity of a thing. This influence need not always be a motion in the proper sense.

It is probably because when we speak of causality we always look for motion that the causality of the end is also described in terms of motion. It is, indeed, called a metaphorical motion. But, seeing that metaphor removes the mind from the world of reality one may be tempted to look upon final causality itself as unreal. It is against this that John warns us in the above-quoted passage. Final causality, though only metaphorically motion, is real *influre in esse*.

In explaining the metaphorical motion proper to final causality, John of St. Thomas analyses the prime act of love. In this act two formalities are joined — that of the first effect of the final cause, and that of its causality. He formulates this doctrine succinctly as follows:

... In illa volitione sunt duo: Alterum, quod est causatum a fine, alterum, quod est ratio causandi. Neque est mirum, quod causalitas identificetur cum causato, quia etiam actio identificatur cum effectu. Id ergo, quod elicentiae seu actionis est in illa volitione, est causatum a fine, quod vero coaptationis et coniunctionis est cum appetibili seu ordinis ad ipsum, quo redditur ponderans in appetitu, ut inclinetur

¹ *Curs. phil.*, T.I, p.578b30.

² *Op. cit.*, T.II, p.278a23.

³ *Ibid.*, p.278a29-40.

ad se et ad alia, hoc dicitur attractio per modum causalitatis ad actum, ut explicatum est. Unde ista attractio et causalitas identice et realiter est ipse actus amoris, formaliter est ordo seu dependentia ipsius ab objecto appetibili proposito ut ponderante in voluntate.¹

Again he says: "Imo ipsemet amor finis ut elicited a voluntate est causatus a fine, ut autem passive pendens ab ipso pondere appetibilis causalitas finis est..."² Among the texts which he quotes from the Angelic Doctor, a most important one is taken from the *De Veritate*. It reads: "Sicut autem influere causae efficientis est agere; ita influere causae finalis est appeti et desiderari."³

Further explaining what he means by saying that the causality of the end is the act of love in so far as it is dependent passively on the very "weight" of the appetible, John follows St. Thomas in distinguishing a certain immutation in the act of love from the *complacentia* of this act. Between these two lies the bridge from final to efficient causality. The formality of final causality is the immutation of the appetite; that of efficient causality is the *complacentia*.

That immutation of the will which is the formality of final causality precedes the complacency, though both *in re* constitute the same action of the will. John of St. Thomas explains in the following words why this immutation must precede and what it is:

At vero finis non constituit speciem, sed movet agens ad exercitium actionis, et quia non potest exercere actionem nisi per aliquam inclinationem, quae generaliter dicitur appetitus, neque inclinatio potest tendere nisi ad aliquid certum, prius necesse est, quod reddatur inclinatio proportionata respectu illius termini in quem tendit. Et illa proportio seu immutatio reddit inclinationem quasi conjunctam ipsi appetibili. Et sic inclinatio ponderosa facta tendit in finem...⁴

This immutation is said to be to the first love of the will as a passion, because it is as it were breathed onto the will by the object. Thus also is it called a metaphorical motion. In this immutation there is no true *transitus*, and hence no true motion. There is only that attraction, that proportion, that connaturality whereby the end is said to move in an immobile way.

To summarize this conception of the causality of the end, we may say that the latter is really identical with the first motion of love of the will. In this love, however, we distinguish two formalities: the act of the will as an action elicited by the will, and this is called the first effect of the final cause; and the immutation of the will whereby it is inclined as by a weight, and this metaphorical motion we call final causality. In intellectual agents the act of the will is elicited by knowledge which gives intentional existence to the end; in natural agents lacking knowledge, this function is supplied by their nature itself, which is in its own way a participation of reason derived from the Prime Intellect.

¹ *Curs. phil.*, T.II, pp.282b45-283a18.

² *Ibid.*, p.279a5.

³ Q.22, a.2, c.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, T.II, p.279b1-14.

In comparing this doctrine with the one taught by Suarez, we may remember that he distinguished between *actus secundus* and *quasi actus primus* in final causation. *Actus secundus* he regarded as the very act of the will, *quasi actus primus* as the good. We noted above that his distinction of *quasi actus primus* and *actus secundus* did not seem to be in exact conformity with Thomistic doctrine. Prescinding from this, however, and taking account of his texts on the *actus secundus* of final causation, as already given,¹ one might conceive that he had the correct notion. He places this *actus secundus* in the action of the will not according as it is from the will but according as it is from the end.

He asserts, moreover,² that the two are identical *in re* and are distinct only *ratione*. In all this he may seem to be quite in agreement with the doctrine of John of St. Thomas. When, however, we come to understand his meaning more precisely, we find him widely at variance with that doctrine. When he speaks of final causality as the action of the will, considered as coming from the end, he means that the causality consists precisely in this action. Now, this action being a real action, the causality itself turns out to be a real motion. We learn this from his definition of metaphorical motion as a real motion, the motion of the final cause. It is called "metaphorical," he adds, so as to distinguish it from the motion of the efficient cause.³

Hence when Suarez speaks of identity *in re* between the causality and the effect of the end, he concurs with the opinion of John of St. Thomas. But when he goes on to say that, because the same action yet has two principles, it must follow that the "causality" and the "effect of the end" are distinct *ratione*, he is on his own. This conception, as we saw above,⁴ led Suarez to confuse final and efficient causality in the case of God. It is equally consonant with his doctrine of the finality of natural things which implies an identification of the action of God with that of the creature. Indeed, if real action flows from the final cause, even though it be conceived of as an attraction in contrast with the impulse of efficient cause, we cannot escape the confusion of efficient and final causality.

John of St. Thomas, as we saw, points out that the formalities of effect and causality are distinct *ratione*: one is the real action (efficient causality), the other is the metaphorical motion (the immutation of the will, its "being weighted" by the good). Unless we maintain that this influence of the final cause is a metaphorical motion, we shall not be able to distinguish it from efficient causality. Moreover, the real action in which effect and causality of the end are identified, does not depend equally upon efficient and final cause, but on the efficient as moved by the final.

Vasquez's error in this matter of the causality of the end, like his error on the notion of the good, is less subtle than that of Suarez. As we saw above, he places the *ratio formalis* of the end in the objective concept and

¹ Cf. *Laval théologique et philosophique*, Vol. IV, n.1, p.100.

² Cf. *Ibid.*, p.101.

³ *Disput. Metaph.*, disp. 23, sec. 9, n.12.

⁴ *Laval théologique et philosophique*, Vol. IV, n.1, p.105.

hence requires active intellection as causality of the end. It would seem, however, that he sees in intellection the first motion of the end only. He defines this metaphorical motion as movement "per desiderium sui," as we have already seen. In so affirming these two motions, he has followed closely a doctrine first laid down by Durandus.¹

Vasquez's concept of the motion of the end "per desiderium sui" could be understood in the true sense, if he meant that "desiderium" to be understood in the passive sense, in agreement with those words of St. Thomas: "Influere causae finalis est appeti et desiderari."² However, as is evident from his following words, it was not in the passive but in the active motion of desire that he placed the proper causality of the end:

Multo probabilior sententia est finem exercere munus, et officium propriae causae finalis, non quidem ad desiderium sui, sed solum per desiderium sui movendo ad voluntatem mediorum vel ad aliquod opus ordinatum ad sui ipsius consequutionem...³

Hence, for Vasquez, the motion of the end was twofold, that of intellection and that of desire. Having regard to his mistaken notion of objective concept we might excuse him from formally holding active intellection to be the motion of the end; yet his conception of the metaphorical motion of the end as desire, indeed as an active desire, suggests the opposite interpretation. For him, seemingly, "metaphorical" motion—as for Suarez—was not metaphorical but real.

* * *

Let us briefly sum up what we have been trying to make out. Our purpose has been to show that the rejection of final causality by modern thinkers was preceded by gradually deepening errors concerning the nature of the good amongst the Scholastics themselves. We chose Vasquez and Suarez, both commentators of St. Thomas, because of the influence they exerted at such a critical epoch: the epoch when Modern Philosophy broke away from Scholasticism altogether. We believe to have succeeded in showing that these authors did not derive their developments of the notion of good and final cause from St. Thomas. Rather, they were deeply influenced by Durandus's fashion of handling the problem. Now Durandus—who published his revised Commentary, anti-thomistic in parts, on the Sentences soon after St. Thomas's teaching had been declared (Sarragossa, 1309) the official doctrine of his Order—had never even claimed to be a disciple of the Angelic Doctor, nor generally been considered as such at all.

In the Doctor Resolutissimus' doctrine the *ratio formalis* of the transcendental good is a real relation of *convenientia* between beings. Durandus completely misunderstood the notion of a property of being. Because this real relation between beings is concomitant with every created being, it is, so he thought, a transcendental property. Whereas for St. Thomas

¹ Cf. *Laval théologique et philosophique*, Vol.IV, n.1, p.86.

² *De Ver.*, q.22, a.2, c.

³ *In Iam IIae*, disp.3, c.2, p.14.

the "aliud" in the expression "*convenientia unius entis ad aliud*" is none other than the intellectual soul, for Durandus the intellectual appetite has formally nothing to do with the transcendental good. It was, in particular, this error, adopted by certain later Scholastics, which led to a corruption of the concept of finality.

Suarez, as we saw, did in fact adopt the substance of Durandus's doctrine of the good. He did not accept the latter's notion of a property of being. Indeed he tried to reduce the particular relation between beings to a *ratio convenientiae*. But this remained a proportion between "beings" without further specification. As a consequence, the notions of "appetible" and "end" were no longer recognized as essential to the proper nature of the good. He was logical, too, in excluding motion for an end from natural things as considered in themselves.

Vasquez went one step further. He accepted Durandus's notion of a property of being. However, he converted the particular relation between beings into a relation of integrity. In so doing, Vasquez removed the relation of *convenientia* from the transcendental good, but without retrenching it from the notion of good altogether: he confined it to what is called *bonum alteri*, and identified it with *ratio finis*. Only in the special case of *bonum alteri*—the domain of final cause—did he conceive of a *convenientia* between beings. Then he restricted the *ratio formalissima* of end to the intellection of this *convenientia*.

To be sure, the times of Vasquez and Suarez were also a golden age of Thomism. Without the help of John of St. Thomas, we should be unable to throw critical light on the erroneous doctrines of the good which we have tried to expose. Yet it was the Scholasticism of Vasquez and Suarez which proved to be in tune with the times—definitely not that of John of St. Thomas and the Salmanticenses. More important, however, is the fact that for many a modern philosopher—from Descartes to Kant—the writings of Suarez in particular were considered as sufficiently representative of the *philosophia perennis*.

A more delicate task will be to show how the extreme positions we have criticized were allowed so much free rein by the omissions and neglect on the part of outstanding Thomists of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, who failed to examine Durandus's clearly stated interpretation of "*convenientia unius ad aliud*," and to lay bare its all too obvious possibilities—which were soon to be fully exploited.

CHARLES HOLLENCAMP.
